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ABSTRACT

This project pursues an investigation into the piano works of Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel and Clara Wieck-Schumann, whose music had been largely forgotten until its revival as part of a recent renewal of interest in women composers. While the musical and individual styles of these two composers vary considerably, their music can still be usefully compared within the broad context of nineteenth-century Romanticism. The detailed study of their piano works poses questions relating to issues of performance practice, an area that has still not been widely explored in the literature surrounding their music. The aim of this project will therefore be to identify and address such issues from the perspective of the performer.

The research carried out in this project is performance based. Performance, being a significant component of the research, functions as a tool and serves as an outcome of the project. The submission is presented in two parts. Part A consists of three CDs and contains recorded performances of selected piano works by Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann. The repertoire included in the CDs covers three different genres by both composers; namely, piano sonatas, trios and miniatures. Part B is an exegesis. The commentary contained in this section combines theoretical, historical and practical perspectives that document the processes of research and performance undertaken as part of the project.

Existing research on the repertoire, while gathering momentum, has centred largely on compositional techniques or gender-related studies. Aspects of performance have been substantially neglected. The present study draws heavily on existing scholarship, informed by the intimate experience of the music that comes from performing it. It addresses insights
generated through the process of rehearsing and performing Mendelssohn-Hensel’s and
Wieck-Schumann’s piano works, and examines the musical characteristics and compositional
styles of the two composers. The similarities and differences between their works within each
genre are identified and assessed based on key musical elements such as form, tonality,
texture, notation, rhythm, dynamics, articulation, tempo, and pedalling. Also included is a
discussion of the interpretation of the scores and the stylistic issues encountered while
studying and performing these works.

The primary outcomes of this research reside in the recordings and exegesis and differ
fundamentally from the purely musicological perspectives that characterise most of the
previous work devoted to Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann. The project represents
the first study to investigate the two composers and three of their most characteristic genres
by combining the perspectives of performer and researcher, making it a distinctive
contribution to the comparatively small but steadily growing body of research into these two
composers. It is hoped that this project will serve as a guide and reference for pianists
wishing to study the piano works of the two composers, stimulate publishers to commission
complete editions of the composers’ music, and to provide pointers towards possible areas of
further investigation.
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EDITORIAL NOTES

To avoid confusion, the two composers in question are referred to as Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann following the German styling of their names. Although Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel chose to be published as Fanny Hensel, to refer to her as either Hensel or Mendelssohn may cause confusion, since her celebrated brother Felix Mendelssohn, husband Wilhelm Hensel and German tenor Heinrich Hensel share these surnames. Clara Wieck-Schumann is likewise referred to by her hyphenated surname to distinguish her from her father and her husband.

The dates of all Mendelssohn-Hensel’s and Wieck-Schumann’s piano works are listed in Appendix 1. In the text, dates given in brackets for musical works refer to dates of composition, as cited in the H-U catalogue (Hellwig-Unruh 2000) for Mendelssohn-Hensel, and Reich’s catalogue (2001) for Wieck-Schumann. For all other composers, dates refer to dates of publication as they appear in Grove Music Online.

Titles of compositions have been translated into English only when germane to the argument. For clarity, English has been used for generic titles such as Piano Sonata and Piano Trio. The titles of character pieces (such as Ponte Molle) have been italicised. In the case of character pieces without titles that are identified by their tempo designations (such as Allegro molto vivace ma con sentimento), italics have again been used. Italian terms in common usage (such as tempo, coda) are not italicised, terms indicating dynamics (such as piano) are. In the case of piano, the italicisation distinguishes between the dynamic level and the instrument.
In the case of Wieck-Schumann, some works were published as Romanze and some as Romance; Romance is used within the text for uniformity. The piece published as Wieck-Schumann’s Romanze ohne opuszahl (1853) is referred to as Romance in A minor, her Romanze h-moll (1856) as Romance in B minor.

Some of the character pieces selected for study were published by different publishers over a period of time and appear in different collections under different titles. Works falling into this category include Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Lyrische Klavierstücke, Vier Römische Klavierstücke, and Vier Lieder ohne Worte, Op. 8, as well as Wieck-Schumann’s Quatre Pièces Caractéristiques, Op. 5, and Drei Romanzen, Op. 21. The individual pieces are then referred to according to the order in which they appear. For example, the three lyrical pieces in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Lyrische Klavierstücke are referred to as Lyrische Klavierstücke no. 1, Lyrische Klavierstücke no. 2 and Lyrische Klavierstücke no. 3 respectively. However, the CD contents listed in Part A: Recordings, give the tempo indications and/or titles of each individual piece as appropriate.

Upper case is used for all major and minor keys in the text, in accordance with the practice adopted in Grove Music Online, avoiding the confusion that occurs in English; for instance, between “a minor” and “A minor”.
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INTRODUCTION TO THE SUBMISSION

The purpose of this research was to study the piano music of Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel (1805–1847) and Clara Wieck-Schumann (1819–1896). These two composers were chosen as representing two of the most significant women composers of the nineteenth century. Performance was a significant component of the research, both as a tool and an outcome. This work draws heavily on existing scholarship, informed by that intimate experience of music that comes from performing it. It therefore differs from the purely musicological perspectives that characterise most of the previous work devoted to these composers.

The primary outcome of this research resides in a series of recorded performances of selected piano works (sonatas, trios and miniatures), supported by an extensive commentary. This commentary sets the performances against a broad scholarly backdrop that embraces the personal and professional contexts in which the two composers wrote their music, the structure and expressive character of the works performed, and the place of the composers within the milieu of nineteenth-century Romanticism. The study deals with two important composers and three characteristic genres by combining the perspectives of performer and researcher, making a distinctive contribution to the comparatively small, but steadily growing body of research conducted on the two composers.

Playing the piano was an integral part of the lives of Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann. Both women were excellent pianists and wrote musical compositions for themselves and for others. Despite these similarities, they differed in respect to the broader
professional purpose of their compositional activity. Mendelssohn-Hensel’s pieces were written for her own musical satisfaction and for domestic performance. As such, they were not available to the public beyond the close circle of people who attended her private salon. Moreover, Mendelssohn-Hensel did not expect that her compositions would be published or that they would receive public or critical acclaim (Tillard 1996). Wieck-Schumann’s works were also written to be performed by her, but her audiences were not limited to private gatherings. Her compositions were performed in public concert halls throughout Europe, and this meant they reached a larger, more varied audience than that found in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Berlin salon (Reich 1986). In addition, Wieck-Schumann’s compositions were widely available through publications throughout her life; Mendelssohn-Hensel only published her piano compositions a year before her death in 1847.

In recent years, the two composers have received a considerable amount of attention. Increasing interest in researching and performing their music has resulted in the publication of their music, related research and the production of commercial recordings. Despite the considerable awareness that this has so far raised, most writers, publishers and performers have pointed to the need for a wider acceptance of their works.

A small number of scholars have contributed to the literature pertaining to the piano repertoires produced by the composers. They include Kimber (2003), who provided overviews of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s and Wieck-Schumann’s piano compositions, and Bach (2005), who presented a comprehensive analysis of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s piano trio. Although these texts address only a very small number of the issues relevant to the study of their music, they have succeeded in pointing out other areas worthy of exploration. These
areas include the further investigation of musical languages and compositional styles, particularly as revealed in their piano works.

The main emphasis of the present study is a consideration of the piano music of Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel and Clara Wieck-Schumann from the perspective of a performer. This is a focus area that has received little attention compared with more frequently encountered musicological or feminist perspectives. This study addresses the question by producing a series of performances informed by detailed study of the composers, the artistic world in which they undertook their work, the style and structure of their compositions, and the insights of existing scholarship.

The music included in this study is presented on three CD recordings, which represent Part A of the submission. Part B consists of an exegesis outlining the principles of research upon which the performances have been based. The exegesis reflects the insights of a performer committed to the composers and their works, and focuses on performance practice issues through a consideration of key musical elements such as form, tonality, texture, notation, rhythm, dynamics, articulation, tempo, and pedalling. It presents conclusions about the pianistic idioms and expressive intentions of both composers with the hope of stimulating further performance and study of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s and Wieck-Schumann’s piano music.

The goals of this study are articulated through addressing this primary research question via four sub-questions, as follows:
Primary Research Question

How does a pianist of the twenty-first century approach piano works of these two nineteenth-century composers, Fanny Mendelsohn-Hensel and Clara Wieck-Schumann?

Subsidiary Questions

1. What are the musical characteristics and compositional styles of the two composers?
2. What are the similarities and differences between their piano works in terms of form, tonality, texture, notation, rhythm, dynamics, articulation, tempo and pedalling?
3. How does a performer interpret the scores and realise the intentions of the two composers?
4. What stylistic issues are involved in preparing and performing their piano works?

All of the works selected for study have been recorded commercially by a variety of pianists and are easily accessible. However, it is important to note that recordings, particularly in those instances where only a single version of the work exists, can only provide the listener with one of many possible interpretative approaches.

This project aims to create an alternative view of the works, informed by a thorough investigation of their structure, style and expressive intent. Preparation for the recordings presented in Part A included an intense study of the scores in order to determine how each piece is constructed and to arrive at an understanding of each composer’s musical language and intentions. Account was taken of the personal and professional context from which the music emerged, together with the insights of leading scholars and performers. This process,
which is documented in Part B of the submission, allowed the performer to make the subjective artistic choices that shaped and defined her interpretations.

Existing research on this repertoire, while gathering momentum, has centred largely on compositional techniques or gender-related studies. As such, aspects of performance have been substantially neglected. The commentary contained in Part B of the submission links theoretical, historical, and practical perspectives, documenting the processes of research and performance undertaken towards the project.

It is hoped that the project will create additional interest in this music, encourage more pianists to perform these compositions, and prompt publishers to commission complete editions of these composers’ works.
PART A: RECORDINGS

Part A consists of three CDs comprising recorded performances of selected piano works by Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel and Clara Wieck-Schumann. The repertoire includes piano sonatas, piano trios and piano miniatures by both composers. All recordings were undertaken in Elder Hall, University of Adelaide, Australia. The recordings reflect the insights generated by close integration of performance activity and scholarly research, represented by a series of historically informed performances supported by an exegesis.

The main criterion when selecting the repertoire was to provide a balanced representation of the composers’ piano works that form the focus of the study. It was also the aim of the study to include those piano works of the two composers that best reflect the nature and characteristics of nineteenth-century Romantic music. The three genres that form the focus of this study, the piano sonata, piano trio and piano miniature, figured prominently in the output of both composers. Works were chosen from each genre in order to allow comparisons to be drawn between the composers and to support discussions of performance issues.

The piano sonata genre represents the most comprehensive structure and the most varied of all large-scale music written for the keyboard. As a chamber work, the piano trio enabled a comprehensive study of a work not confined to the solo repertoire; each composer wrote one piano trio, also raising performance-related issues worthy of further investigation. The piano miniature genre is included as one of the most popular and characteristic
categories of nineteenth-century piano music. Furthermore, many of the piano compositions of both composers fall into this category: the Songs without Words for Mendelssohn-Hensel, and the character pieces and romances for Wieck-Schumann.

The detailed contents of the three recordings submitted in the portfolio are as follows:

**CD 1**

FANNY MENDELSSOHN-HENSEL (1805–1847)

*Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11 (1847)*

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allegro molto vivace</td>
<td>11:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Andante espressivo</td>
<td>5:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lied: Allegretto</td>
<td>2:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Finale: Allegro moderato</td>
<td>5:58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLARA WIECK-SCHUMANN (1819–1896)

*Piano Trio in G minor, Op. 17 (1846)*

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Allegro moderato</td>
<td>11:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Scherzo: Tempo di Minuetto</td>
<td>4:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Andante</td>
<td>4:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Allegretto</td>
<td>7:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total time: 52:58

Sock Siang Thia – Piano  Wendy Heiligenberg – Violin  Ruth Saffir – Cello

Piano: Steinway & Sons model D #588098

Recorded on 5 September 2010

in Elder Hall, University of Adelaide, Australia

Recording Engineer: Peter Dowdall
FANNY MENDELSSOHN-HENSEL (1805–1847)

**Piano Sonata in G minor (1843)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Allegro molto agitato</th>
<th>4:23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2. Scherzo</td>
<td>4:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3. Adagio</td>
<td>5:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4. Finale: Presto. Allegro moderato e con espressione</td>
<td>6:38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lyrische Klavierstücke (1836–1839)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Andante con espressione</th>
<th>4:38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2. Andante con moto</td>
<td>4:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3. Allegro molto vivace ma con sentimento</td>
<td>7:17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vier Römische Klavierstücke (1840)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Allegro moderato</th>
<th>2:50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2. Introduktion und Capriccio</td>
<td>8:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3. Largo und Allegro con fuoco</td>
<td>10:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4. Ponte molle</td>
<td>5:09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vier Lieder ohne Worte, Op. 8 (1846)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Allegro moderato</th>
<th>4:34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2. Andante con espressione</td>
<td>3:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3. Lied (Lenau): Larghetto</td>
<td>3:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total time: 78:47

Sock Siang Thia – Piano
Piano: Steinway & Sons model D #588098
Tracks 1–4 recorded on 22 June 2011 and Tracks 5–15 recorded on 19 March 2011
in Elder Hall, University of Adelaide, Australia
Recording Engineer: Peter Dowdall
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CLARA WIECK-SCHUMANN (1819–1896)

**Piano Sonata in G minor** (1841–1842)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Allegro</td>
<td>9:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2. Adagio</td>
<td>3:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3. Scherzo</td>
<td>2:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4. Rondo</td>
<td>5:54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quatre Pièces Caractéristiques, Op. 5** (1834–1836)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1. Impromptu. Le Sabbat: Allegro furioso</td>
<td>2:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2. Caprice à la Boléro: Presto</td>
<td>4:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3. Romance: Andante con sentimento</td>
<td>3:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4. Scène fantastique. Le Ballet des Revenants: Allegro ma non troppo</td>
<td>5:07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drei Romanzen, Op. 21** (1853–55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1. Andante</td>
<td>6:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2. Allegretto</td>
<td>1:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3. Agitato</td>
<td>5:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Romance in A minor** (1853)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Andante</td>
<td>4:41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Romance in B minor** (1856)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Langsam</td>
<td>6:13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total time: 60:49

Sock Siang Thia – Piano
Pianos: Steinway & Sons model D #518405 (8 August 2010) and #588098 (20 March 2011)
Tracks 1–4 recorded on 8 August 2010 and Tracks 5–13 on 20 March 2011
in Elder Hall, University of Adelaide, Australia
Recording Engineer: Peter Dowdall
PART B: EXEGESIS

INTRODUCTION

Part B documents the research and creative processes undertaken in preparing and performing the repertoire included in Part A; the exegesis in Part B contextualises the CD recordings by elucidating the conceptual and creative framework upon which the performances have been based. The exegesis aims to show how theoretical knowledge, together with a performer’s ‘inner experience’ of the music combine to inform the preparation and presentation of the selected repertoire.

The exegesis begins with a Literature Review (Chapter 1) that surveys a range of key resources relevant to the project. It is followed by: Introduction to the Composers (Chapter 2), which provides brief biographies of Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann, focusing on their musical education and professional lives. This lends historical and contextual background to the works forming the core of this study.

The exegesis is further organised into three main chapters presenting detailed discussions on the repertoire included in Part A. The main chapters address each of the three genres represented in the study: Piano Sonatas (Chapter 3), Piano Trios (Chapter 4) and Piano Miniatures (Chapter 5). Each chapter includes structural synopses that provide an overview of the pieces discussed. Also included are formal analyses of selected works and an outline of how the music has been approached in order to produce an informed performance.
Performance issues encountered during the preparation of the recording of the works are also identified and discussed in each chapter.

Chapters 3, 4 and 5 end with a concluding section that provides a summary of the issues relevant to each of the genres discussed. In the Conclusion, these issues are brought to bear on the primary research question of this study.
CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

The materials consulted during the preparation of this project include books, journals, research papers, dissertations, music scores, CD recordings and internet resources. They are grouped into the following categories according to the emphasis of their subject matter:

- Nineteenth-Century Piano Music
- Women and Music
- Literature on Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel and Clara Wieck-Schumann
- Performance Practice Resources
- Scores and Editions
- CD Recordings

Nineteenth-Century Piano Music

Over many years there has been an abundance of scholarly interest in nineteenth-century piano music by authors such as Dale (1954), Plantinga (1984, 1990), Winter (1990b), Witten (1997), Jones (1998), Rosen (1998), Rowland (1998a), Carew (2001), Samson (2001), Rink (2002) and Todd (1990, 2004). Indeed, the nineteenth century witnessed a rapid growth of public piano concerts and new repertoire, stimulated largely by the development of the instrument itself. According to Reich, “By 1830 the piano had a greater range, bigger sound, and more strength than keyboard instruments of the previous century, and it could express intimate emotion as well as display dazzling virtuosity” (2001, 159). The improved
characteristics of the instrument, favoured by many piano virtuosos and amateurs, contributed largely to its popularity in both concert halls and domestic settings of the time.

One aspect of increasing interest in the study of piano music from this period is the rise of women composers and performers. This is distinct from the more specialised study of gender and feminism in music (as discussed in the next section) in that this focus addresses the role of women in the specific context of nineteenth-century Romantic piano music. Increased opportunities for and social acceptability of music education for women by this time allowed many middle- and upper-class women to learn music privately at home from visiting teachers.

By the second half of the nineteenth century there was also greater opportunity for more ambitious women to pursue advanced formal training through established institutions or conservatories (Ellis 2002). As a result, many talented female musicians emerged as successful composers and concert artists. Maria Szymanowska¹ (Chechlińska 2012) and Louise Farrenc² (Friedland 2012) were among many outstanding women who enjoyed the status of renowned performing musician and composer. However, very few compositions by women found any sort of place in the canon and their works seldom featured prominently in concert programs (Bach 2005, 35–42; Citron 2000, 190–232).

¹ Maria Szymanowska (1789–1831) was a Polish composer and one of the first professional virtuoso pianists of the 19th century. She toured extensively throughout Europe, especially in the 1820s, before settling permanently in St. Petersburg. In the Russian imperial capital she composed for the court, gave concerts, taught music, and ran an influential salon. She died in 1831 when Mendelssohn-Hensel was twenty-six and Wieck-Schumann was twelve.

² Louise Farrenc (1804–1875) was a French composer, virtuoso pianist and teacher. She wrote exclusively for the piano from 1820 to 1830, expanding her range to include works for orchestra from 1834. Her work includes 49 compositions with opus numbers.
Researchers have noted the scant acknowledgement accorded to contributions made to nineteenth-century piano music by women. Larry Todd (2010, xvi) argued that “Her [Mendelssohn-Hensel’s] life celebrates the power of an artistic genius that did transform the ‘other Mendelssohn’ into Fanny Hensel, a composer we should now recognise and celebrate”. Some have also implied that prevailing attitudes towards women in this era resulted in an under-appreciation of their work compared with that of male musicians such as Chopin, Liszt and Thalberg (Bates 1996). According to Ellis (2002), women were forced to abandon their careers after they married to fulfil their role as homemaker, and so it seemed inappropriate for them to pursue a profession in music. Furthermore, the restricted nature of women’s participation in music performance and composition prevented them from being more actively involved in music throughout their lives.

Due to the increasing focus given the contributions of women to the field of nineteenth-century piano music, Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann have both received significant scholarly attention. Some studies have explored their lives, with several biographies of both composers being written (Chissell 1983; Reich 1985; Tillard 1996; Todd 2010). In addition, several writers have compiled books of correspondence between the respective women composers and their equally accomplished brothers and husbands Felix and Robert (Citron 1987; Schumann, C. & Schumann, R. 1994, 1996, 2002; Schumann, R. & Schumann, C. 1993).
Women in Music

Many researchers have contributed to the broader literature concerning women and music (Cai 1997; Dees 2004; Ellis 2002; Kimber 2002; McClary 2004; Pendle 2001; Reich 1993; Solie 1995). This literature covers a wide range of topics and contains varied emphases including, among others, the issues of feminism in music, gender and music, reception of the music of women composers, as well as women composer biographies. The increased interest in women musicians and composers is largely due to the second-wave feminist movement which started in the United States in the early 1960s. Cambridge Dictionaries Online (2013) describes feminism as “the belief that women should be allowed the same rights, power and opportunities as men and be treated in the same way, or the set of activities intended to achieve this state”.

According to Beard and Gloag (2005), feminism became a principal concern of musicologists in the 1980s. During the preceding decade, researchers began to turn their focus to women composers and performers and started to review concepts of canon, genius, genre and periodisation from a feminist perspective. In other words, questions about how women musicians fit into traditional music history were now being asked. Beard and Gloag (2005, 48) further explained: “Through the 1980s and 1990s, this trend continued as musicologists like Susan McClary, Marcia Citron and Ruth Solie began to consider the cultural reasons for the marginalising of women from the received canon”. Themes examined during this time included: music as gendered discourse, professionalism, reception of women's music, the sites of music production, relative wealth and education of women, popular music studies in relation to women's identity, and patriarchal ideas in music analysis.
Cook and Tsou (1994) commented that feminist scholarship in musicology which emerged in the late 1980s identified gender as a distinct social force, aiming to investigate its branches within musical culture and posing new questions about musical practice. Jennifer Post (1994) argued that although professional women such as Wieck-Schumann (who was quite exceptional) were more public than other women, she nevertheless fell into a restricted environment characteristic of the private domain. Indeed, the composer lacked the freedom to perform and bore the burden of social restraints. This view was echoed by Rothenburg (1993) who suggested that women such as Mendelssohn-Hensel, who remained in the private sphere, felt the restrictions even more keenly because of their class and gender.

While noting the growing interest in feminist musicological studies and the increased attention given to women’s music, the present study does not focus on the issue of gender per se. Rather, it addresses the fact that there has to date been little investigation into the piano music composed and performed by women composers in the nineteenth century. Therefore, the focus here has been an investigation of the piano music of Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel and Clara Wieck-Schumann with respect to their pianistic idioms and associated performance practice issues.

**Literature on Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann**

According to Kimber (2003), Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann each had their own circle of musical associates in Leipzig and Berlin and made a decisive mark on the musical life of their time. Both attained remarkable success despite the prevailing attitude in European society that women did not assume professional roles. Kimber also suggested that
both Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann were uniquely positioned as major composers, especially composers of piano music. Reich (1993) claimed that the two composers could each serve as a paradigm of the non-professional and the professional musician of the nineteenth century. With a strong determination to stay faithful to their passion for music while remaining committed to their roles as daughters, wives and mothers, both women made many valuable contributions to nineteenth-century piano music through their performances and compositions. They also showed extraordinary dedication and sensitivity in their pursuit of music, despite social circumstances which were not to their advantage.

The scholarly literature on Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel as a composer is limited. Although there are biographies written about her, together with several publications dealing mainly with her songs, there is no extended, performance-based study covering her piano compositions. This is despite the fact that she was an accomplished pianist who composed 135 piano works (Hellwig-Unruh 2000).

Results of pioneering and extensive research on Mendelssohn-Hensel appeared in 1981 in publications by Carol Quin and Victoria Sirota (Quin 1981; Sirota 1981). Sirota’s work, entitled The Life and Works of Fanny Mendelssohn Hensel, presents an abridged biography, discusses the sources of her music, and provides an overview and analysis of her music by genre. Highly original, the author has succeeded in discovering Mendelssohn-Hensel historically and musically. On the other hand, Quin’s work, entitled Fanny Mendelssohn Hensel: Her Contributions to Nineteenth-Century Musical Life, presents a coherent picture of Mendelssohn-Hensel as a composer, pianist, conductor and correspondent based on published sources from 1827 to the date of her research. In assessing Mendelssohn-
Hensel’s compositional skills, Quin focused on the composer’s *Lieder*, Songs without Words and Piano Trio.

Following Sirota’s and Quin’s seminal work on Mendelssohn-Hensel, a biography of Mendelssohn-Hensel, entitled *Fanny Mendelssohn*, was completed by Françoise Tillard in 1992. An English translation by Camille Naish appeared in 1996 and became the first English-language biography of the composer (Tillard 1996). This book serves as an important contribution to the revelation of Mendelssohn-Hensel's place in the nineteenth-century musical scene. It draws extensively on historical sources but lacks any emphasis on Mendelssohn-Hensel’s compositions; comments on her creative output are limited.

The most recent work undertaken on Mendelssohn-Hensel is by Larry Todd, who also wrote the biography *Fanny Hensel: The Other Mendelssohn* (2010). In his work, Todd attempted to answer the question of who Mendelssohn-Hensel really was. He offered a compelling and full account of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s life and music, her relationship with her brother, her position within one of Berlin’s most eminent families and her courageous struggle to define her own public voice as a composer.

Mendelssohn-Hensel’s autograph scores, letters and diaries are among the primary sources held in the Mendelssohn Archive in the *Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz* in Berlin. They have been important sources for research into her life and music. Mendelssohn-Hensel kept a diary from the age of twenty-three and maintained an extensive correspondence with many people. Her diaries and letters are important primary source materials and have formed the basis of a number of studies.
Sebastian Hensel, Mendelssohn-Hensel’s son, collected diaries and letters from the family after the deaths of his mother and his uncle Felix Mendelssohn. He eventually published them in two volumes as *Die Familie Mendelssohn* (Hensel 1888). The earlier editions of Hensel’s work reveal contemporary critical opinion from scholars such as Ernst Wolf and Friedrich Schnapp (Schnapp 1830). Sirota (1981) asserted that both Wolf’s and Schnapp’s claims hold true based on her own experience with materials in the Berlin Mendelssohn Archive.


Several authors have written about Mendelssohn-Hensel’s compositions. Prior to publishing her book on the letters of Mendelssohn-Hensel to her brother, Citron (1983) produced a paper on Mendelssohn-Hensel’s *Lieder* in *The Musical Quarterly*. Camilla Cai, apart from her aforementioned article “Texture and Gender: New Prism for Understanding Hensel’s and Mendelssohn’s Piano Pieces” (Cai 1997), also wrote an earlier article studying the similarities and differences between the composer’s piano music of 1836–1837 and her brother’s *Songs without Words*, Opp. 30 and 38 (Cai 1994).

John Toews (1993) was among the first researchers to study Mendelssohn-Hensel’s piano cycle, *Das Jahr*. The same subject was pursued by Katherine Boyes (1997) who
analysed the complex interwoven texture found in *Das Jahr*. Marian Kimber undertook further research on Mendelssohn-Hensel’s *Das Jahr*, resulting in her 2008 paper “Fanny Hensel’s Seasons of Life: Poetic Epigrams, Vignettes, and Meaning in *Das Jahr*” (Kimber 2008). Although Mendelssohn-Hensel’s *Das Jahr* and some of her piano music have received attention, scholarly study of her remaining piano output remains limited.

Some writers have expressed interest in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s choral work. For example, Olive (2009) created a new performing edition of *Zum Fest der heiligen Cäcilia*. Vana (1996) prepared a modern edition and conductor’s analysis for performance of *Festspiel* and completed the first analysis of the work. Both Olive and Vana addressed the need for Mendelssohn-Hensel’s choral work to be researched, published and performed. Their work provides an example of the type of research that can be extended into the area of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s piano music, especially given the significance of the instrument in her output.

More recently, several researchers have started to show an interest in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s piano music from a performer’s point of view. This is apparent in works such as Anna Goldsworthy’s *Fanny Hensel and Virtuosity* (2002) and Kyungju Park Lee’s *Fanny Hensel’s Piano Works: Opp. 2, 4, 5 and 6* (2008). Both authors have presented a performance-based text on the piano works of Mendelssohn-Hensel.

Although the scholarly writing on Wieck-Schumann as a composer is limited, several biographies have emerged since the beginning of the twentieth century. Berthold Litzmann was the first author to write a comprehensive biography of Wieck-Schumann, producing a three-volume study between 1902 and 1908. Working at the request of the Schumann family,
Litzmann had access to innumerable sources: diaries, letters, concert programmes and other materials. According to Susskind (1977, 7), “After his [Litzmann’s] work was completed, the family destroyed all the later diaries, countless letters and probably a great deal of other material”. An abridged translation by G. E. Hadow, entitled *Clara Schumann: An Artist’s Life, Based on Materials Found in Diaries and Letters*, appeared in 1913 (Litzmann 1979).

Litzmann’s collection of diaries and letters is an invaluable source of information regarding Wieck-Schumann’s personal and professional life. The biography did not concentrate on Wieck-Schumann as a composer but, consistent with the general reception of women's music of the time, placed greater emphasis on the compositions of her husband. This attitude was further demonstrated in Litzmann’s observation of Wieck-Schumann’s marriage to Robert Schumann: “it was at once her highest duty and her highest happiness to lose herself in him” (1979, Vol. I, 304).

A second important book on Wieck-Schumann was published in 1912. Written by her pupil, Florence May (1912), *The Girlhood of Clara Schumann: Clara Wieck and Her Time* profiles Wieck-Schumann's life up to the point of her marriage. It is one of numerous books about Wieck-Schumann which presents more discussions on Robert Schumann than on Wieck-Schumann herself.

Following May’s publication, a third biography of Wieck-Schumann appeared in 1940. Written by John Burk, *Clara Schumann: A Romantic Biography* is based largely on Litzmann’s work. It is very readable and serves as the first full biography on Wieck-Schumann written in English. It offers a detailed account of Wieck-Schumann’s life by focusing on the influence of three important men at different stages of her life: her father,
Friedrich Wieck; her husband Robert Schumann; and her close friend, Johannes Brahms. As indicated by the title, the book is aimed at the general reader and provides no information on Wieck-Schumann’s compositions.

Litzmann’s work was also a source of information for the subsequent biography of Wieck-Schumann by Joan Chisell, entitled *Clara Schumann: A Dedicated Spirit*, published in 1983. Chisell provided a detailed account of Wieck-Schumann’s life, aimed more at the music lover than the scholar. Chisell also included comments on Wieck-Schumann’s compositions ranging in length from a brief phrase to several long paragraphs.

By far the most important of the post-Litzmann biographical studies was a book by Nancy Reich, *Clara Schumann: The Artist and the Woman* (1985). This work provided historical and psychological insights into Wieck-Schumann and was considered “central to the subject for the foreseeable future” (Bomberger 2003, 632). In addition to telling the story of Wieck-Schumann's life, Reich included chapters on the composer's children; her work as editor, performing artist, and teacher; her relationships with Brahms and other major figures of the era; and a list and analysis of Wieck-Schumann's compositions.

Wieck-Schumann’s autograph scores, letters and diaries are among the primary sources held in the Robert Schumann House in Zwickau. They remain important materials for research into her life and music. Wieck-Schumann’s complete correspondence with Schumann (Schumann, C. & Schumann, R. 1994, 1996, 2002), their marriage diaries (Schumann, R. & Schumann, C. 1993), together with the correspondence between Wieck-Schumann and Brahms (Schumann, C. & Brahms, 1979) formed the basis of a number of early studies.
Other sources for Wieck-Schumann’s life and music are two theses: Pamela Susskind’s seminal work, *Clara Schumann as Pianist and Composer: A Study of Her Life and Work* (1977), and Diane Selmon’s *The ‘Inner Voice’: Musical Language and Meaning in Clara Wieck-Schumann’s Compositions* (2009). Wieck-Schumann’s father, Friederich Wieck, played an important role in shaping his daughter’s musical career, especially during her formative years. Wieck’s *Pianoforte Studies* (1901) and *Piano and Song: Didactic and Polemical* (1988) offer an insight into the intensive training given to Wieck-Schumann.

Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann have also been compared as composers and pianists. In 1988, Nancy Walker compared their lives and selected songs in her work *A Stylistic Analysis of Selected Lieder of Fanny Mendelssohn Hensel and Clara Wieck Schumann* (1988). In addition, Iolanda Lucciolla compared their respective piano works in her 2001 publication *The Character Pieces of Clara Wieck-Schumann and Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel: A Stylistic Comparison of Gender Traits and Idioms Proper to the Genre* (2001). However, Lucciolla’s primary focus was on the issue of gender. One exception is publication from Marian Kimber (2003), entitled “From the Concert Hall to the Salon: The Piano Music of Clara Wieck Schumann and Fanny Mendelssohn Hensel”, which presented an overview of the piano music of both composers.

**Performance Practice Resources**

The Oxford Dictionary of Music (1994) defines performance practice as the way in which music is performed, especially as it relates to the quest for the ‘authentic’ style of performing the music of previous generations and eras. Its study covers notation, ornamentation,
instruments, voice production, tuning and pitch, and the size of ensembles and choruses. Resources on performance practice, especially on music of the nineteenth century, are bountiful.

Clive Brown, in *Classical and Romantic Performance Practice 1750–1900* investigated the complex relationship between notation and performance (1999). A leading scholar in performance practice, he identified areas in which musical notation conveyed rather different messages to the musicians for whom it was written compared with modern performers. He also sought to look beyond the notation to understand how composers might have expected to hear their music realised in performance.


Kenneth Hamilton, in *After the Golden Age: Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance* (2008) traced the traditions of piano playing and concert programming from the early Romantic era to the early twentieth century. He also pleaded not to sideline completely the performance traditions of the great pianists of the past through a too rigorous and unhistorical obsession with urtext editions and urtext playing as the composers need not always have the final word.
In contrast, Peter Walls, in *Historical Performance and the Modern Performer* (2002) suggested that performances which are true to the music being performed are the “interpretations” and performances in which something else (showmanship for instance) gets in the way are the “appropriations”. He concluded that if the responsibility of the performer is to realise the composer’s intention, then the music must first be understood as fully as possible. The understanding is not limited to a sense of history and analysis, but also relies on many other aspects. Therefore, a performer needs to remain open to the possibility of discovering the relevance of seemingly unimportant details in order to make necessary and relevant musical judgements.

On the topic of performance versus research, many scholars have expressed their opinions in proposing performance as a valid way to research music. Authors such as David Lockett viewed performance as “a process of thoughtful investigation, analysis and synthesis” (2007, 4). He also argued that a thoughtful performer is undertaking a rigorous process of investigation just as valid as any musicological study. Therefore, performance is, in its own right, a valuable tool for research, generating its own dimension of musical understanding to complement the more traditional theoretical and analytical approaches.

Roy Howat, in “Performance as Research and Vice Versa” (2004) argued that all performance involves research, and that research essentially involves performance on various levels, by discussing different examples of how research and musical performance interact. He further explained that both research and performance involve risk-taking, especially when each field impinges on the other, often in unexpected ways.
In “Performance as Research”, Suzanne Cusick (2004) questioned some of the North American methods of researching performance. She explored the issues of music from the perspective of the relationship of performance and research. She also illustrated that awareness of performance function is essential to the notion of authenticity in performance.

A different conception on the issue of performer versus research was offered by Edward Cone (1989), who pointed out that one can view the performer as a kind of critic who criticises the composition. He also asserted that for a serious musician, “…his piano playing itself is a critical endeavour – that each performance is an implied act of criticism” (Cone 1995, 241).

Issues relating to performance versus analysis have also been debated by several scholars. Roy Howat claimed that “although scores are the most fixed point of reference for our Classical repertoire, far from being absolutes, they rest on sand, and what we scientifically trust least, our musical feeling, remains the strongest and final link to what the composer sensed and heard before subjecting it to notation” (1995, 3).

Throughout his “Playing in Time: Rhythm, Metre and Tempo in Brahms’s Fantasien Op. 116” (1995), John Rink attempted to show that analysis and performance can be linked – and in ways directly impinging on the act of interpretation. His investigation into the music of Brahms differed from much of the research on analysis and performance. Rather than adopt an approach that is theoretically biased, Rink believed that the learning of music is based largely on the intuition of the performer. Indeed, in his “Analysis and (or?) Performance” (2002), Rink explored the dynamics between intuitive and conscious thought that potentially characterises the act of analysis in relation to performance. He stressed that a
performer’s analysis primarily takes place when an interpretation is being formulated and subsequently re-evaluated. This occurs while one is practising rather than performing (Rink 2002).

Finally, William Rothstein, in “Analysis and the Act of Performance” (1995) argued that analysis helps to provide the raw material; the performer’s imagination, and emphatic identification with the work, must do the rest. The performer’s task is to provide the listener with a vivid experience of the work, not an analytical understanding of it. Moreover, an analysis which is sympathetic to the work in all its facets gives the performer a firm basis upon which to build a re-creation. As explained by the author, analysis, transmuted by imagination and a certain amount of cunning, can help to inspire a convincing re-creation of a musical work without which even the greatest music cannot fully live (Rothstein 1995).

Scores and Editions

Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel was an accomplished pianist and composer of some 450 works. According to Henry F. Chorley in Modern German Music:

Had Madame Hensel been a poor man’s daughter, she must have become known to the world by the side of Madame Schumann and Madame Pleyel, as a female pianist of the very highest class. Like her brother, she had, in her composition, a touch of the southern vivacity which is so rare among the Germans. More feminine than his, her playing bore a strong family resemblance to her brother’s in its fire, neatness, and solidity. Like himself, too, she was as generally accomplished as she was gifted (Chorley 1973, 231–232).

Due to the general perception of the time that it was unseemly for women of her status to offer their artistic work to the public, only a fraction of her works were published
during her lifetime. After her death in 1847, her family members made arrangements to publish some of her works. Recently, a greater variety of her music has become available. In 1987, the Furore Verlag began publishing those of her works which had not yet appeared in print.

Mendelssohn-Hensel’s published works can be categorised under the following headings:

- *Lieder*: over 250 *Lieder* for voice and piano
- Piano music: sonatas (2), preludes and fugues, Songs without Words, bagatelles, character pieces
- Organ music: organ prelude
- Choral music: cantatas, oratorio, part song
- Chamber music: piano trio, string quartet, piano quartet
- Orchestral work: overture (1)

The most important source for Mendelssohn-Hensel’s autographs is the Mendelssohn Archive in the *Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz* in Berlin. The manuscripts of her piano pieces are located in Mendelssohn Archive under the anthology of MA Ms. 32, 33, 34, 35, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47 and 49. Other locations which contain manuscripts include the Bodleian Library in Oxford, the Goethe-Museum and Heinrich Heine-Intitute in Düsseldorf, the Rudolf Nydahl Collection in Stockholm, the Library of Congress in Washington, DC, and private collections in Germany and England (Sirota 1981).

Rudolf Elvers catalogued Mendelssohn-Hensel’s manuscripts in the *Mendelssohn Studien* (Elvers 1972, 169–173; 1975, 215–220). The complete works are listed in Renate
Hellwig-Unruh’s *Fanny Hensel: Thematisches Verzeichnis der Kompositionen* (Hellwig-Unruh 2000). The complete list of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s piano works, including her Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, has been extracted from Hellwig-Unruh’s list and is attached as Appendix 1: List of Piano Works by Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel and Clara Wieck-Schumann. A complete edition of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s piano work has not been published at the time of this study. The editions consulted during the course of this research were, wherever possible, first editions. It was beyond the scope of the research to source Mendelssohn-Hensel’s original manuscripts. The editions used in this research are listed in the bibliography.

Tillard provided a list of published compositions by Mendelssohn-Hensel, both instrumental and vocal (Tillard 1996). Since then, a number of new publications have appeared. A summary of the available published piano scores for the repertoire included in this study are listed in Table 1.

**Table 1: Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel: List of Published Scores of Works Selected for Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FANNY MENDELSSOHN-HENSEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piano Trio</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Piano Sonata</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Piano Miniatures</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Clara Wieck-Schumann, unlike Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel, was able to publish a considerable number of her compositions during her lifetime. Her published works comprise twenty-three opus numbers, with the first being published in 1831 when she was twelve. As she grew older, however, she lost confidence in herself as a composer and believed that a woman should not harbour the desire to compose (Bates 1996). In fact, Wieck-Schumann’s compositional output decreased notably after she reached the age of thirty-six, her last publication appearing in 1855 or 1856 (Reich 1985).

Many of Wieck-Schumann’s works remained unpublished during her lifetime and some are lost or of doubtful authenticity. As noted above, the Robert Schumann House in Zwickau has an extensive collection of material relating to Wieck-Schumann. The collection includes a number of music manuscripts and editions of her music. A complete catalogue which comprises both published and unpublished works was compiled by Reich (1985). However, Reich observed that the Pianoforme issued by Breitkopf & Härtel in 1878 is not complete, and that her discussion of the genesis and publication history of each work and the information given in her catalogue “must fill the gap until such time as a complete edition is available” (Reich 1985, 231). Wieck-Schumann’s overall output based on Reich’s catalogue can be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel: List of Published Scores of Works Selected for Study (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Piano works: dances, marches, character pieces, prelude and fugues, sonata (1), variations
- Chamber music: piano trio, romances for piano and violin
- Songs: single songs, Lieder, song for choir
- Concertos: piano concertos (1 complete, 1 incomplete)

Reich (1985) compiled a complete catalogue of works by Wieck-Schumann. The details of the composer’s complete piano works according to Reich’s catalogue are attached as Appendix 1: List of Piano Works by Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel and Clara Wieck-Schumann. A complete edition of Wieck-Schumann’s piano works has not been published at the time of this study. The editions consulted during the course of this research were, wherever possible, first editions. It was beyond the scope of this research to source Wieck-Schumann’s original manuscripts. The editions used in this research are listed in the bibliography. A summary of the available published piano scores for the repertoire included in this study is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Clara Wieck-Schumann: List of Published Scores of Works Selected for Study**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLARA WIECK-SCHUMANN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piano Trio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piano Sonata</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piano Miniatures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recordings

In recent decades, numerous recordings of the music of Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel and Clara Wieck-Schumann have been released. These recordings provide an interesting insight into the composers, their compositional styles and their expressive worlds. They also present a range of interpretative ideas.

To date, there are altogether 16 commercial CD recordings of the Mendelssohn-Hensel repertoire included in this study (six of the piano trio and ten of solo piano works). Her Piano Trio in D Minor, Op. 11 and Vier Lieder ohne Worte, Op. 8 were recorded on period instruments in two CDs. The list of the CDs is provided in Table 3. It contains the artists and record label information sorted by year.

Table 3: Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel: List of Available Commercial Recordings of Works Selected for Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FANNY MENDELSSOHN-HENSEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Ambache, piano; Susan Dorey, cello; Sophie Langdon, violin. BBC Music Magazine: BBC MM45. 1996.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantis Trio: Penelope Crawford, fortepiano; Enid Sutherland, cello; Jaap Schröder, violin. Musica Omnia: MO 0105. 2001. (Recorded on period instruments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seraphim Trio: Anna Goldsworthy, piano; Tim Nankervis, cello; Helen Ayres, violin. 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Piano Sonata in G minor** |
**Lyrische Klavierstücke**

**Vier Römische Klavierstücke**

**Vier Lieder ohne Worte, Op. 8**

Clara Wieck-Schumann’s repertoire included in this study can be found in 19 CD recordings (eight of her piano trio and eleven of her works for solo piano). Two CDs of her Piano Trio in G Minor, Op. 17 were recorded on period instruments. The list of the CDs is provided in Table 4. It contains the artists and record label information sorted by year.

**Table 4: Clara Wieck-Schumann: List of Available Commercial Recordings of Works Selected for Study**

**CLARA WIECK-SCHUMANN**

**Piano Trio in G minor, Op. 17**
Table 4: Clara Wieck-Schumann: List of Available Commercial Recordings of Works Selected for Study (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composers and Performers</th>
<th>Recordings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
CHAPTER 2: INTRODUCTION TO THE COMPOSERS

Fanny Mendelssohn-Henson

Raised in a wealthy and highly cultured family, Mendelssohn-Henson was given the best musical education available. She first learned piano from her mother, Lea Mendelssohn Bartholdy, in Hamburg. When the family moved to Berlin in 1811, her formal music education began with piano instruction from Marie Bigot (1786–1820), a famous pianist from Paris who had lived for many years in Vienna. This was followed by a period of study with Ludwig Berger (1777–1839), another excellent piano virtuoso from Berlin, and Ignaz Moscheles (1794–1870), a great master known as the “prince of pianists” (Beghin 2000: 115–148). Beginning in 1818, Mendelssohn-Henson’s study in music also included theory and composition with Carl Friederich Zelter (1758–1832), the director of the Berliner Singakademie (Tillard 1996). This excellent education undoubtedly shaped the young and talented Mendelssohn-Henson into a fine musician and composer.

---

3 Marie Kienne Bigot was an Alsatian-born pianist. She married Paul Bigot in 1804 and moved to Vienna, where Haydn and Beethoven heard and admired her playing. The Bigots moved to Paris in 1809 where Marie remained as pianist and teacher for the rest of her life.

4 Ludwig Berger was a pianist, composer and teacher. His international career as virtuoso pianist ended because of a nervous disorder that affected his arm. He returned to Berlin in 1815 and became a prominent piano teacher.

5 Ignaz Moscheles was a German-Bohemian pianist, composer and teacher. In 1815, he toured Europe for 10 years before basing his career in London, and later at Leipzig, where he succeeded his friend and sometime pupil Felix Mendelssohn as head of the Conservatoire.

6 Karl Friedrich Zelter was a Berlin composer and conductor. He was on the faculty of the Royal Academy of the Arts, director of the Berliner Singakademie, founder of the Rippienschule Orchestra and the Royal Institute for Church Music. His great appreciation for the music of J. S. Bach strongly influenced both Fanny Mendelssohn-Henson and Felix Mendelssohn.
As a child, Mendelssohn-Hensel showed prodigious musical ability and she impressed many visitors to the Mendelssohn household in the early 1820s. She was a splendid pianist, and her piano pieces show certain individual traits in texture and figuration. Her creative talents were noticed by many important figures of the era. For example, the poet Goethe regarded Mendelssohn-Hensel as being as gifted as her brother, Felix Mendelssohn (Stratton 1904). When Mendelssohn performed for Queen Victoria in 1846 in England, he was told by the queen how much she liked his songs. She asked if she could sing her favourite, *Italien*, a song from his collection entitled *Lieder*, Op. 8. After she had sung it, Mendelssohn admitted to her that it was not his, but rather his sister Mendelssohn-Hensel's (Sirota 1981). It is clear that Mendelssohn-Hensel’s talent was recognised by those who had the chance to experience her musical works.

To her disappointment, Mendelssohn-Hensel’s further pursuit of music was limited by prevailing attitudes towards women. These attitudes were apparently shared by her father, Abraham Mendelssohn Bartholdy, who was tolerant rather than supportive of her activities as a composer. At the age of fourteen, she was reminded by her father to concentrate on her future role as a wife and mother, even though she showed a musical talent comparable to that of her younger brother (Tillard 1996). This restriction resulted in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s composition and performance activities being mainly confined to the Mendelssohn circle, thus failing to reach the public at large. Nevertheless, Mendelssohn-Hensel continued to write music and was able to compose a great deal for her *Sonntagsmusik* (Sunday Musicales) held at home. Her involvement in the *Sonntagsmusik* did not cease even after her marriage to Wilhlem Hensel at the age of twenty-four. She constantly expressed her enjoyment in undertaking the multiple roles of organiser, conductor, composer and performer for these musicales which were very well received at the time (Bates 1996).
In addition to her father’s discouragement of her musical pursuits, Mendelssohn-Hensel’s brother, Felix Mendelssohn, echoed the same sentiment. He claimed that Mendelssohn-Hensel “possesses neither the inclination nor the authorship. She is too much a woman for that, as is proper, and looks after her house and thinks neither about the public nor the musical world unless that primary occupation is accomplished” (Tillard 1996, 247). He did, however, arrange for a number of her songs to be published under his own name. For example, Mendelssohn-Hensel’s *Italien* was published as Mendelssohn’s *Lieder*, Op. 8, no. 3 (Todd 2010). This was perhaps due to his desire to protect Mendelssohn-Hensel’s works against the negative reception often given by society to women’s compositions of the time. In turn, Mendelssohn-Hensel helped Mendelssohn by giving him constructive criticism of his works, which he always considered very carefully. Mendelssohn-Hensel continued to express her delight at finding herself composing and performing to an appreciative audience. According to Tillard, Mendelssohn-Hensel finally took the courage to pursue her passion in composition by making the decision to publish her own music in 1846 (Tillard 1996).

Mendelssohn-Hensel composed a relatively large number of works throughout her short lifetime. From a total output of 466 compositions, more than one-quarter were written for piano. Her piano music includes sonatas, preludes and fugues, Songs without Words, bagatelles and character pieces. Despite all her efforts to compose and perform, Mendelssohn-Hensel was still largely under-appreciated when she died, as only 10 of more than 400 works composed by her were published and recognised during her lifetime. Some of her works were published posthumously by her family, but the majority of her output still remains unknown and unpublished due to family restrictions.
Clara Wieck-Schumann

Like Mendelssohn-Hensel, Wieck-Schumann was very privileged to have access to the best musical training available. According to Reich, Wieck-Schumann was carefully trained as a virtuoso by her father, Friedrick Wieck, and began her first piano lessons with him at the age of five (Reich 2001). She studied theory and harmony with Christian Theodore Weinlig (1780–1842), cantor of the St. Thomas Church in Leipzig, and composition with Heinrich Dorn (1804–1892), director of Leipzig Opera. Her other training in music included lessons in counterpoint with Siegfried Dehn (1799–1858) in Berlin; orchestration with Carl Reissiger (1798–1859), the Kapellmeister; voice with Johann Aloys Miksch (1765–1845), the renowned voice teacher; as well as violin and score reading with teachers in Leipzig. Wieck-Schumann’s attendance at operas in Leipzig with her father and her careful study of musical scores also formed part of her well-planned musical education. Wieck-Schumann soon achieved fame as a result of numerous performances initiated by her father.

Having already experienced a brilliant career as a pianist from the age of 13, Wieck-Schumann continued to perform and compose following her marriage to Robert Schumann in 1840, even as she raised seven children. The various tours on which she accompanied her husband extended her reputation as an accomplished pianist beyond Germany, and it was due to her efforts that her husband’s compositions became widely known in Europe. A genuinely great pianist and piano teacher of her time, Wieck-Schumann was not only widely acclaimed for her technical brilliance, she was also greatly admired as an interpreter of the best repertoire for the instrument (Chissell 1983).
Although she received much positive encouragement, Wieck-Schumann still faced many obstacles in her performing career. The composer often took charge of the finances and household management due to her husband’s inclination towards depression and instability. Part of her responsibility included earning family income, which she often did by performing Robert Schumann's music. She continued to play not only for financial stability, but also because she did not wish to be forgotten as a pianist. She had grown up performing and desired to continue as a performer. Robert Schumann, while admiring Wieck-Schumann talent, wanted a traditional wife; that is, a wife to bear children and to make a happy home, which in his eyes and the eyes of society were in direct conflict with the life of a performer. Furthermore, while Wieck-Schumann loved touring, Schumann hated it, preferring to sit at his piano and compose (Reich 1985). All these events, however, did not stop Wieck-Schumann’s aspiration to continue to perform and to excel in her musical career. She persisted to show such determination throughout her life.

Apart from the often-difficult circumstances surrounding her performance activities, Wieck-Schumann encountered similar challenges to her enthusiasm to compose. At age thirty-six, while she was still performing, Wieck-Schumann stopped composing despite her passion for it. The most likely reason for her decision to stop composing was that she needed to support her family with the money she earned through her concerts. It may also have been a consequence of the negative opinions expressed by her contemporaries concerning a woman's ability to compose. Wieck-Schumann largely believed these views as the statements in her diary dated November 1839 show: "I once believed that I possessed creative talent, but I have given up this idea; a woman must not desire to compose, there has never yet been one able to do it. Should I expect to be the one?" (Reich 1985, 228–229). Clearly, had Wieck-
Schumann’s short composing life been extended without these unhelpful social and personal tensions, a number of other important compositions may well have been produced.

Despite her acquiescence to the misguided social convention that creativity was the domain of men, Wieck-Schumann’s piano music was published with some success during her lifetime (Reich 2001). Spanning a period of about 20 years, her piano works are numbered up to opus 23, with 17 others without opus numbers. All her piano compositions date from 1853 or before, including four pieces for piano and orchestra, 20 pieces for solo piano, and cadenzas for three piano concertos by Beethoven and Mozart. During her lifetime, many of these works drew some attention, but they were not largely recognised after her death compared to other Romantic composers of the nineteenth century.

Social circumstances and family responsibilities quite often limited both Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann in their musical pathways. Nevertheless, both composers continuously expressed fortitude in seeking to fulfil their creative and performance potential. The relatively small compositional output of the two composers compared with other major composers at this time should not present a barrier to their works being investigated and studied in detail. Consequently, it is the ultimate goal of this research to contribute to an increased awareness and appreciation of the works of Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann.
CHAPTER 3: THE PIANO SONATAS

The Piano Sonata in the Nineteenth Century

The sonata genre is the most comprehensive in structure and the most varied in type of all large-scale music written for the keyboard. The origins of the sonata date far back in music history, but the piano sonata as it is presently known is generally considered to date from the time of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach (1713–1788) (Dale 1954). Romantic musicians regarded the sonata genre as the ultimate achievement in instrumental writing. Throughout the nineteenth century, Beethoven’s sonatas wielded enormous influence on compositional, pedagogical and performing practices, setting a standard that few composers were able to match (Rink 2013). Although the genre continued to be represented in the Romantic era, composers after Beethoven and Schubert produced fewer piano sonatas as the form took on a somewhat academic tinge and had to compete against shorter musical forms more compatible with Romantic compositional style and aesthetics. According to Dale:

> After Schubert’s death in 1828 the piano sonata was no longer to maintain the central position it had occupied for so many years in the output of serious composers, nor was it to preserve its original characteristics as a framework for the expression of abstract ideas. Beethoven had already greatly enlarged its structure and intensified its expressive possibilities. Weber had imparted to it some of the attributes of operatic composition. Both had also enhanced its purely pianistic qualities and Schubert had made it more intimately lyrical (Dale 1954, 67).

Robert Schumann wrote that composing a sonata requires “both capability of effort and artistic experience” as the composer had to struggle with “the public reluctant to buy [and] the publisher reluctant to print” (Robert Schumann in Newmann 1969, 61). Generally, piano sonatas did not feature prominently in the output of most Romantic composers. Chopin,
Brahms and Robert Schumann and Felix Mendelssohn produced three each, and Liszt only one.  

Notwithstanding the fewer number of sonatas written in this period, Rink (2013) noted that the sonata genre nevertheless appealed to many women composers of the time including Louise Farrenc, Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel, Clara Wieck-Schumann and Cécile Chaminade. The reason for this may have been that the sonata was regarded as a serious genre and composers with serious aspirations were therefore drawn to it. Rink also pointed out that sonatas offered a perfect first work for young composers to launch a career. Indeed, sonata compositions were often inspired by practical considerations such as performance opportunities, invitations from a publisher or performer, or the desire to write for students.

Rink (2013, par. 9) further explained how Romantic sonatas, while containing many features found in Classical works, also included many progressive innovations such as “a more fluid, expansive melodic handling; a richer harmonic and tonal palette; a pervasive exploitation of motif; overarching cyclical tendencies; and a fusion of the typical four-movement structure into one amalgam”. In addition, a greater range of characterisation is also found in Romantic sonatas through operatic, folk-derived, hymn-like and highly chromatic idioms which were lavishly and imaginatively used in the nineteenth century.

---

7 The piano sonatas are Chopin’s in C minor, Op. 4 (1828), Bb minor, Op. 35 (1839, with its third movement Funeral March, written in 1837), and B minor, Op. 58 (1844); Brahms’ No. 1 in C major, Op. 1 (1852–1852), No. 2 in F# and No. 3 in F minor, Op. 5 (1853); Schumann’s No. 1 in F# minor, Op. 11 (1833–1835), No. 2 in G minor, Op. 22 (1833–1838) and No. 3 in F minor, Op. 14 (1835, revised in 1853); Mendelssohn’s in E major, Op. 6 (1826), G minor, Op. 105 (1821) and Bb, Op. 106 (1827); and Liszt’s in B minor (1852–1853) with a precursor written in 1849.
Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Sonata in G Minor: An Overview

Mendelssohn-Hensel wrote a few experimental piano sonatas during her youth. Her Sonata in F major, H-U 43 (1821), is lost, but her Sonata Movement in E major, H-U 44 (1822) and Sonata o Capriccio in F minor, H-U 113 (1824) are now publicly available. Her first full-length sonata was the Sonate in C minor, H-U 128 written in 1824 for Felix Mendelssohn while he was in Bad Doberan. Nineteen years later, Mendelssohn-Hensel wrote the Sonata in G minor, H-U 395 (1843), which was to become her final large-scale solo piano work before her death in 1847.

Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Sonata in G minor, written in the autumn of 1843, has been selected for performance and analysis in this study. Prior to 1843, Mendelssohn-Hensel received much encouragement to compose, especially following her trip to Italy during 1839 and 1840 (Tillard 1996). Between 1840 and 1841, the composer wrote as many as 40 compositions, subsequently ascribed catalogue numbers from H-U 346 to H-U 385 (Hellwig-Unruh 2000). She appears to have stopped composing the following year, as there are no extant scores from 1842. A diary entry from 1843 reveals Mendelssohn-Hensel’s despair about her flagging creativity. She wrote: “My own music is going dreadfully. For an eternity I have composed nothing, I have totally lost my muse, and my energies for performing too have dropped off considerably” (Mendelssohn-Hensel 2002, 222). Her long compositional drought finally ended in March 1843 when she began composing music for Goethe’s Faust (Todd 2010). However, it was not until after Gounod’s visit in April of the same year that she resumed writing works for the piano.
Gounod and Mendelssohn-Hensel met for the first time in Rome during her visit to Italy in 1839. During this visit she introduced Gounod to the keyboard works of Johann Sebastian Bach (1685–1750), music that he later came to revere. During his stay in Berlin in April 1843, Gounod received a very warm welcome from the Hensel family, and it is quite possible that the admiration he displayed towards Mendelssohn-Hensel during his visit encouraged her to compose the sonata and other pieces around that time. She wrote concerning the event:

Another thing that sways me in his favour is the true affection, and respect, he feels for us, and which he demonstrated in coming to Berlin, for he only undertook the journey in order to visit us. His presence was a very lively stimulus for me, for I played and discussed music a great deal with him during the numerous afternoons I spent alone in his company, for he generally remained with us after twelve (Hensel 1879, 3).

Mendelssohn-Hensel’s sonata displays her well-developed pianistic style and compositional skills. Sirota (1981, 164–165) describes the sonata as a “mature work [which], as well as being musically and dramatically satisfying, shows the composer in total control of her craft”. Waight (2010, 3) regarded Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Sonata in G minor as a “fiery, lyrical and dramatic” work which represents the peak of her output for the instrument. The four movements of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s sonata – *Allegro molto agitato* in G minor, Scherzo in B minor, *Adagio* in D major, and *Finale* (with *Presto* and *Allegro moderato e con espressione*) in G major – are connected by means of transitions and *attacas*, forming a single continuous work. This style also appeared in Beethoven’s late piano sonatas, Weber’s *Konzertstück* in F minor for Piano and Orchestra, Op. 79, J. 282 (1821), Felix Mendelssohn’s Piano Concerto No. 1 in G minor, Op. 25 (1830–1831), Robert Schumann’s Piano Concerto in A minor, Op. 54 (1845) and Liszt’s Piano Sonata in B minor, S. 178 (1852–1853). It is possible that Mendelssohn-Hensel may have used Beethoven’s piano sonatas as models when she composed her work.
Mendelssohn-Hensel’s sonata is characterised by some unusual harmonic structures and the use of bold modulations. Todd (2010) pointed out that the tonal scheme of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s sonata mirrored the descending curve of Felix Mendelssohn’s Cello Sonata No. 2 in D major, Op. 58 which he completed around June 1843. Mendelssohn’s four movements move by descending thirds, from D major to B minor and G major, and then by a fourth to D major; while Mendelssohn-Hensel’s sonata moves by ascending thirds from G minor (first movement) to B minor (second movement) and D major (Third movement), then by a fourth to G major (fourth movement).

The overall structure of the first movement of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Sonata in G minor is adventurous and exploratory. Rather than using the conventional tonal structure and moving from tonic to dominant, her first and second themes in the exposition are both in the tonic, G minor. The principle of creating conflict and achieving conflict resolution through the use of contrasting key centres, a principle that underpins the Classical sonata form, is absent altogether from this movement. Mendelssohn-Hensel radically altered the sonata as a form by bypassing the principle of tonal conflict. Roster (1997), Polk (2010) and Sirota (1981) all noted the composer’s unconventional tonal structure in the first movement where two contrasting themes both appear in the tonic key. Another point of interest in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s first movement is that she begins her recapitulation before the harmony has resolved to the tonic (I), a device that is also found in Beethoven’s Piano Sonata, Op. 111 (Rosen 1980).

The structural outline of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, is summarised in Table 5.
Table 5: Structural Outline of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Sub-section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposition</strong></td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>1–22</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Bar 1 consists of a bass <em>tremolo</em> in the LH reminiscent of the orchestral timpani roll of a concerto introduction. LH tremolo continues as tonic pedal while RH melody joins in block chords. The same melody repeats from bar 10, but with broken chords in the LH. A transitional passage starting from bar 15 goes through brief modulations and leads to the second subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td>22–44</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>The second subject, also in G minor, is introduced in the RH. Characterised by a more lyrical melody, the second subject maintains the <em>agitato</em> feeling from the first subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td>Themes from first subject</td>
<td>45–51</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>Frequent modulations with themes from the first and second subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Themes from second subject</td>
<td>51–54</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55–58</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59–60</td>
<td>Eb minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bvi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>61–66</td>
<td>Bb major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67–73</td>
<td>A minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>74–84</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td>85–100</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>The first subject is restated here with a dominant pedal in D, which serves as a dominant preparation for the return to the second subject in G major instead of G minor compared to parallel section in the exposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>101–104</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>Both themes from the first and second subjects are repeated here with more modulations before the concluding coda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105–113</td>
<td>Eb minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bvi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114–115</td>
<td>Bb major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>biii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116–118</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td>119–120</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121–122</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123–124</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125–126</td>
<td>Ab major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coda</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>127–134</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>A short cadential passage with mostly block chords.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transitional</strong></td>
<td>passage linking to the second movement</td>
<td>135–140</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>The passage moves towards B minor in the second movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The opening passage bears a striking resemblance to Felix Mendelssohn’s Piano Concerto No. 1 in G minor, Op. 25 written in 1831 (Examples 1 and 2). The similarities in texture, melodic shape, harmonic progression and accompaniment type suggest that Mendelssohn-Hensel modelled the opening of her piece directly upon Mendelssohn’s concerto.
Example 1: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, bars 1–9

Example 2: Mendelssohn, Piano Concerto No. 1 in G minor, Op. 25, bars 1–9

In the first movement, Mendelssohn-Hensel displays her preference for a wide keyboard range, creating an open sound between the top voice and the bass line. Her range and melodic handling produce a free and spacious texture, together with an orchestrally conceived sound (Example 3).
Mendelssohn-Hensel’s desire to write an orchestral work was revealed when she started to compose music for Goethe’s *Faust* in March 1843, a few months before she wrote the piano sonata. Referring to her scoring for the soprano solo, four-part women’s choir (and soloists), and piano for the first scene of *Faust*, she confessed she had “envisioned the work with orchestral accompaniment” but, limited by her own “dilettantism,” had not orchestrated the piano part (Todd 2010, 293). It is possible that this preoccupation with orchestral textures influenced her piano writing in the sonata, resulting in rich sonorities and a wide keyboard range.

Consistent with this is Mendelssohn-Hensel’s predisposition towards octave passages (Examples 4 and 5). This piano style possibly developed because she found the Viennese piano that she owned to be weak in the middle register (Tillard 1996). Instead, her ideal instrument appears to have been the Erard her brother Felix Mendelssohn had bought in England for her friend, Pauline Decker (Citron 1987). Ignaz Moscheles was won over by the Erard in 1830: his wife, Charlotte, described his Erard of that time as having “an organ-like tone and full resonant sounds”, while the Czech-born German pianist-composer himself called the instrument a “very violoncello” (Moscheles in Carew 2007, 34).
Mendelssohn-Hensel sought a full and resonant sound and the modern pianist need not be reticent about intensifying the tone in these melodic lines, many of which are written as double octaves.

Example 4: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, bars 34–37

Example 5: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, bars 88–91

Mendelssohn-Hensel’s first movement does not have a complete ending on its final G major chord. Instead, it is connected to the second movement by a transition and an *attaca*, a technique that the composer applied to all the remaining movements in her sonata, creating a single continuous work.

Rather than a traditional slow movement, Mendelssohn-Hensel provided a Scherzo as her second movement. It is written in scherzo and trio form. Her arrangement of fast–fast–slow–fast (*Allegro molto agitato*–Scherzo–*Adagio*–*Allegro moderato e con espressione*) in her four-movement Piano Sonata in G minor is also seen in Beethoven’s Piano Sonata No. 28 in A major, Op. 101 (1816) as well as Chopin’s Piano Sonata No. 2 in B flat minor, Op. 35
(1839) and Piano Sonata No. 3 in B minor, Op. 58 (1844). According to Carew (2007), the keyboard style demonstrated in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Scherzo is reminiscent of Felix Mendelssohn’s delicate orchestral scherzo writing.

The structural outline of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Sonata in G minor, second movement, is summarised in Table 6.

### Table 6: Structural Outline of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Sonata in G minor, second movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scherzo</td>
<td>141–157</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158–167</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>226–241</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>242–249</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250–254</td>
<td>B major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>255–259</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>260–267</td>
<td>V of B minor</td>
<td>A fragment of the first theme from the scherzo section reappears in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the dominant key of B minor to prepare for the final coda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>268–277</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The coda section concludes the second movement in the tonic B minor at bar 273, and then starts moving away from it to prepare for the new key of the transitional/introductory passage that leads to the third movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>25–254</td>
<td>B major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>255–259</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>260–267</td>
<td>V of B minor</td>
<td>A fragment of the first theme from the scherzo section reappears in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the dominant key of B minor to prepare for the final coda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>268–277</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The coda section concludes the second movement in the tonic B minor at bar 273, and then starts moving away from it to prepare for the new key of the transitional/introductory passage that leads to the third movement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Trio beginning at bar 168 consists of another delicate melody that is accompanied by tremolos in B major, with una corda pedal. It is set in the upper register, but with a more irregular phrase structure than the first theme (Example 7).

Example 6: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, second movement, bars 141–150

Example 7: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, second movement, bars 166–177

Mendelssohn-Hensel’s third movement is written in ternary form. The structural outline of the movement is summarised in Table 7.
Table 7: Structural Outline of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Sonata in G minor, third movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>278–286</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>i This short opening passage, marked <em>attaca</em> and <em>Adagio</em>, continues the 3/4 time signature from the second movement. It is a smooth transitional passage leading to a new key, D major, and a new key signature, 9/8 in the third movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>287–298</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>III The third movement begins with an operatic and song-like theme played by the RH in octaves. It is characterised by the rising major 7th interval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>298–306</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>III The soprano voice of the first theme is then taken over by a middle voice with some alterations. The same LH quaver accompaniment in the bass from the previous section is now shifted to the higher register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>307–325</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>III Another song-like theme in the soprano, with motifs assimilated and developed from Section A, forms the new theme of Section B. The major 7th interval apparent in Section A is now replaced with more frequent octave leaps in the single melody line played by the RH. The last four bars of this section involve the use of chromaticism and syncopation, leading to a transitional passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>326–327</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>VI The <em>tremolo</em> in the LH together with the block chords played by the RH transform the calm feeling created by the first two themes into a more majestic rendition of the first theme which is presented immediately after this passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>328–333</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>334–340</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>III The first theme in the soprano voice returns in octaves, with recurring bass notes in semiquavers, resembling a timpani roll in the orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>341–343</td>
<td>E minor</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>344–345</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>346–350</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>iii The coda provides a final close to the third movement in the tonic D major. It is then connected to the Introduction of the fourth movement, <em>attaca</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>351–353</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Mendelssohn-Hensel’s third movement, melodies are placed in the treble and are very song-like, as if written for a soprano. This is especially evident in the expressive minor seventh leap as shown in Example 8. Todd (2010) referred to this movement as being reminiscent of the composer’s many *Lieder ohne Worte* that portray her familiar Gondellied style, with its lilting rhythms and lapping accompaniment.
The same melodious theme is then repeated by a tenor voice, which is later joined by the soprano to form a duet. Following this duet the soprano returns to introduce a second theme, which is simply a slightly developed version of the first (Example 9). After an eight-bar transitional passage, the initial theme returns and is recapitulated through a succession of repeated bass notes in semiquavers that recall timpani sounds in an orchestra. The theme is also paired with a series of wide-ranging chordal accompaniments that create a feeling of grandeur before easing into the last movement (Example 10).
Example 10: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, third movement, bars 332–337

This textural layout requires the pianist to maintain a careful balance between the layers, exploiting the distinctive colours of the different registers and projecting the melodic lines with confidence and purpose. The rich and expansive writing also demands a well-blended relationship between the bass line and the chordal accompaniment above it.

Set in sonata rondo form, Mendelssohn-Hensel’s fourth movement is marked *Allegro moderato e con espressione*. The structural outline of the movement is summarised in Table 8.

**Table 8: Structural Outline of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Sonata in G minor, fourth movement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>368–382</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>I The opening has a cheerful and melodious theme in the style of a Song without Words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>383–394</td>
<td>E minor</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>395–409</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>410–426</td>
<td>E minor</td>
<td>vi A new and more agitated second theme is presented in this section with a restless forward-moving semiquaver accompaniment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>427–451</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mendelssohn-Hensel’s last movement is virtuosic and technically demanding. It consists of passages with three different textures that alternate with persistent semiquavers (Example 11). In addition, there is four-layer writing filled with whirling triplet figurations and Rolllfiguren, in which one note remains fixed while other parts move (Example 12). The movement ends in a powerful climax with a resounding G major chord reiterated in the low register over the last eighteen bars (Example 13). Todd (2010, 299) considers the ending of the last movement to represent “the massive accumulations of sonorities reminiscent of Beethoven”.

### Table 8: Structural Outline of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Sonata in G minor, fourth movement (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>452–455</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>The first theme goes through a series of modulations. The melody played by the RH in octaves is first presented in the original soprano voice, then in a lower voice, finally returning to the soprano register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>456–459</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>460–463</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>464–480</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>481–486</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>487–503</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>504–525</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>526–550</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>551–563</td>
<td>Eb minor</td>
<td>The initial theme from Section A is re-presented and repeated twice with slight variations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>564–619</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>620–638</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>The last movement concludes in the tonic with recurring G major LH chords in the final 11 bars.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 11: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, fourth movement, bars 368–372

Example 12: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, fourth movement, bars 408–412
The arrangement of the musical textures is often reminiscent of chamber music, with the pianist needing to find a way of projecting the changing interactions between the parts. One way of doing this is to notionally assign each voice to a stringed instrument. The right hand melody can be ascribed to the first violin, delivered with full legato. The semiquaver figuration that suggests the second violin is to be played very lightly, while the lower stave notes have the effect of pizzicato lower strings (Example 14).

A similar treatment of mentally assigning each voice to a stringed instrument may also be adopted in the passage with triplet figurations in order to maintain the clarity of voicing (Example 15).
Overall, Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Sonata in G minor is a dramatic work with a combination of both virtuosity and lyricism. The distinctive features of her sonata, as discussed in the overview above, include the adventurous use of form and tonality, wide keyboard range, octave passages, frequent use of tremolo, rich orchestrally-inspired keyboard sonorities, song-like melodies, a preference for long pedals and chamber-like voice leading. These are all elements that the performer can explore in order to project the distinctiveness and originality of the work.

**Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Sonata in G Minor: An Overview**

Wieck-Schumann wrote only one piano sonata. It is also in G minor and dates from 1841 to 1842. The composition, dedicated as a Christmas gift to her husband, Robert Schumann, was initially a two-movement Sonatine, with an Allegro in G minor and a Scherzo in G major. The title page of her autographed copy reads Sonatine. Allegro und Scherzo, followed by her dedication: “Accept with love, my good husband/and be patient with your Clara/at Christmas 1841” (Wieck 1914, 38). In January 1842, Wieck-Schumann then proceeded to compose the other two movements of the sonata: an Adagio in E flat major (which became the new second
movement) and a *Rondo finale* in G minor (Nauhaus 1991). The complete composition is the only work by Wieck-Schumann bearing the title “Sonata”. Although Wieck-Schumann incorporated the Scherzo into the printed edition of *Quatre Pieces Fugitives*, Op. 15 (composed in 1843–1844 and published by Breitkopf & Härtel in 1845), she did not publish her Sonata in G minor in its entirety. The sonata was finally made available to the public when it was published by Breitkopf & Härtel in 1991.

The first movement of Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Sonata in G minor is written in sonata allegro form. It contains rather elaborate thematic material organised into a clear and well-balanced structure. The structural outline of the first movement is summarised in Table 9.

**Table 9: Structural Outline of Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Sub-section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>1–26</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>Designated Allegro, the first subject is ternary (ABA) with the B Section marked <em>Mit tiefer Empfindung</em>. Section A is chordal while Section B is treated more contrapuntally. It contains a melodic line that is more legato and is supported by a dominant pedal D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td></td>
<td>26–70</td>
<td>Eb major</td>
<td>The second subject consists of two themes in Eb major. The first theme (bars 26–44) has a fleeting character that moves between the tonic and dominant of Eb major. The second theme (bars 44–70) is marked <em>Um vieles schneller</em> and is characterised by a highly chromatic treatment of melody and harmony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codetta</td>
<td></td>
<td>70–90</td>
<td>Eb major</td>
<td>This section is marked <em>Tranquillo</em> and uses the same figuration that connects the first subject to the second, except that it is more elaborate here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>New thematic material and themes from the first and second subjects</td>
<td>90–94</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td>With new thematic material and an exploration of themes from the first and second subjects, the development section sees frequent modulations and further application of chromaticism in both melody and harmony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94–96</td>
<td>Ab major</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96–99</td>
<td>F major</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99–102</td>
<td>Db major</td>
<td>bV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102–103</td>
<td>A minor</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104–107</td>
<td>F# minor</td>
<td>#vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107–122</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>123–150</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>The first subject returns with the second theme in the tonic G minor with slight variation at the end to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Structural Outline of Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Sub-section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prepare for the return of the second subject in a different key.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td></td>
<td>150–167</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>167–192</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td></td>
<td>193–212</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>212–219</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an interesting similarity between the opening themes of this movement and that of Weber’s *Konzertstück* for Piano and Orchestra in F minor, Op. 79 written in 1821 (Examples 16 and 17).

**Example 16: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, bars 1–9**

1. Allegro

It may be suggested that Wieck-Schumann, new to the genre, closely modelled her first and only sonata on Weber’s widely acclaimed piece, a work which featured in her concert repertoire. This is further confirmed by the fact that Wieck-Schumann gave her first performances of the Konzertstück shortly after she had completed the sonata in 1842 (Chissell 1983).

Wieck-Schumann’s keyboard range and melodic handling in her first movement demonstrate a controlled approach and restricted texture. The movement continues a pattern of form and idiomatic piano writing which emerged from the Classical tradition. This can be seen in its symmetrical phrases and the balance between homophonic and contrapuntal writing. An example of the latter is the two-part canon, placed on top of a dominant pedal, from the middle of bar 6 (Example 16).

The second movement of Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Sonata in G minor is written in a simple ternary form (ABA). The movement is set in E flat major using a 3/4 time signature. Comprising only 38 bars, the form is relatively straightforward but it is nevertheless filled with deep emotion. Its compactness and expressiveness may have been inspired by the short 28-bar Adagio molto of Beethoven’s Waldstein Sonata, Op. 53, a sonata she performed in a public concert in 1842 (De Veries 1996, 362). The Adagio second movement by Wieck-Schumann opens with a theme that echoes the concluding motif of the first movement (Examples 18 and 19), and a transitional passage marked Animato which contains the shift to the dominant where the second theme emerges (Example 20). This middle section is slightly more intense than the first, especially with the repeated semiquavers in the bass, and the rise in dynamic is marked by several crescendo and forte signs. The first theme returns thereafter
in the tonic, and reaches a climax marked by a crescendo and a stringendo, before ending calmly in the tonic.

Example 18: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, bars 210–219

Example 19: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Sonata in G minor, second movement, bars 1–5

Example 20: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Sonata in G minor, second movement, bars 12–18
The third movement of Wieck-Schumann’s Sonata in G minor, marked Scherzo, is written in traditional scherzo and trio style. It consists of a light, crisp scherzo section (Example 21) contrasted by a thoughtful and sustained trio section (Example 22). Once again, the structure is clear and symmetrical. A complete ternary form in itself, the scherzo section begins and ends in the tonic G major. It contains duple rhythms in the triple time signature of 3/4. Also a complete ternary form in itself, the trio section employs new thematic material in the relative minor key of the scherzo section. The return of the first theme of the trio is placed in reverse order when compared to its first appearance. The whole scherzo recapitulates after the trio. After the concluding theme of the scherzo gradually slows to seemingly close the movement, Wieck-Schumann surprises the listener with a perfect cadence marked schnell and fortissimo, ending the movement with a humorous touch (Example 23). According to Selmon (2009), this movement reflects Beethoven’s or Schubert’s scherzo as it alternates equally between delicate charm and melancholy, while its playful quality at the end – the poco a poco ritenuto over the last two lines, followed by an unexpected rapid final cadence marked schnell – suggests an operatic character exiting the stage in laughter.

Example 21: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Sonata in G minor, third movement, bars 1–6

![Example 21](image)

Example 22: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Sonata in G minor, third movement, bars 41–47

![Example 22](image)
Example 23: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Sonata in G minor, third movement, bars 115–126

The final movement of Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Sonata in G minor is lively and virtuosic. It is written in sonata rondo form (again harking back to Classical procedures) and serves as another example of the composer’s impressive mastery of traditional formal design. It has richly chromatic harmony, with pedals and implied pedals, appoggiaturas and suspensions, and ends with an intense 16-bar passage at an increased tempo. The structural outline of the movement is summarised in Table 10.

Table 10: Structural Outline of Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Sonata in G minor, fourth movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Rondo theme)</td>
<td>1–22</td>
<td>G minor–B flat major–G minor</td>
<td>i–bIII–i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23–27</td>
<td>G minor–V of B flat major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27–31</td>
<td>E flat major–V of C minor</td>
<td>bVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31–39</td>
<td>C minor–V of G minor</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39–54</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (second theme)</td>
<td>55–102</td>
<td>E flat major going through several modulations very briefly</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103–111</td>
<td>V preparation for G minor</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>112–133</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134–138</td>
<td>G minor–V of B flat major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138–142</td>
<td>E flat major–V of C minor</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the whole, Wieck-Schumann wrote her Piano Sonata in G minor in the conventional Classical tradition. All four movements were written with a clear and symmetrical structure. The sonata is characterised by well-balanced musical phrases, a modest keyboard range, a traditional approach to keyboard texture and skillful contrapuntal writing.

In conclusion, Wieck-Schumann’s piano sonata is a more traditional work in contrast with Mendelssohn-Hensel’s, especially with regard to its bold use of innovation. While Mendelssohn-Hensel experimented with the unconventional form and tonality and orchestrally inspired keyboard sonorities, Wieck-Schumann opted for more an idiomatic style of piano writing in her sonata. Wieck-Schumann’s work is also more classically anchored in terms of form and tonality. This is perhaps due to the fact that she had published several of her compositions prior to the sonata. Wieck-Schumann may have adhered more to convention in order to meet the demands of the buying public. Mendelssohn-Hensel, in contrast, composed for a more private audience, and her works mostly featured in her Sonntagsmusik. Therefore, Mendelssohn-Hensel was able to more freely explore different forms of expression in her compositions, resulting in a more innovative approach than that used by Wieck-Schumann.

---

**Table 10: Structural Outline of Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Sonata in G minor, fourth movement (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>142–156</td>
<td>C minor–V of Bb major</td>
<td>iv Repeat of the second theme B in the relative major key of Bb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>156–200</td>
<td>Bb major</td>
<td>bIII The dark and intense feeling is recapitulated for the last time with the return of the main theme. It is radically abbreviated and is transformed by the addition of a coda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>200–221</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>1 The movement is ended with a short coda marked <em>Animato</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>222–237</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Issues

Several practical and interpretative issues were encountered during the preparation of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s and Wieck-Schumann’s piano sonatas. These included tempo, pedalling and score interpretation. A discussion of the issues encountered and the decisions made during the preparation of the works for recording are presented as follows.

Tempo

Lawson and Stowell (1999) observed that historical and contemporary experience demonstrate that tempo is one of the fundamental yet most variable aspects in musical performance. Tempo affected virtually every other aspect of interpretation: dynamics, touch, articulation, pedalling, realisation of ornaments, and the relation of all of these details to the whole. Tempo also affects what the listeners perceive, hence it bears directly on the effectiveness of the interpretation (Rosenblum 1988). In the effort to approach the composer’s intended tempo as closely as possible, modern performers need to understand the relevant contemporary practices in order to avoid choosing a tempo that deviates too far from what was expected by the composer. The choice of tempo also plays an essential part in setting the right mood for a work. Brown (1991) pointed out that Beethoven, for example, considered that the proper tempo was essential to the expression of the character he intended for his music. In the nineteenth century, while some composers preferred to rely on chronometric tempo indications, major composers such as Liszt employed constant changes of time signatures to indicate tempo in their music. Also in this period, there was a tendency to attribute definite tempo implications to mood markings such as maestoso or vivace.
Decisions relating to tempo are influenced by a variety of factors, including technical feasibility, considerations of expression and sonority, requirements of articulation as well as particular performance conventions operating at the time the music was composed. Brown (1999) noted that the determination of tempo also depends on a subtle balance and relationship between a number of factors, including the character of the piece and the genre to which it belonged, harmonic movement, or any close relationship to a specific dance type. Tempo, after all, is not represented merely by the tempo designation affixed to the music, but by a series of other contributing factors. These include preferences reliably attributed to the composer together with broader conventions of place and period. However, it is widely accepted by musicians that, in most cases, a work should not be firmly tied to a single unchangeable tempo. An historically appropriate tempo must take into account plausible parameters such as the many stylistic and aesthetic factors, as well as the varying conditions in which performance takes place. In short, the overall choice of tempo and the extent of any tempo modification are the two issues of tempo that are most frequently faced by the performer.

During the preparation of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s music, the choice of tempo emerged as a significant issue. One case arose in the second movement of her sonata. Although marked as a Scherzo, Mendelssohn-Hensel did not interpret the term literally by giving the second movement of her sonata a humorous tone. Set in 6/8 meter, the piece is light and lyrical in character with very delicate melodies found in both its scherzo (Example 24) and trio (Example 25) sections. A relatively spacious tempo was chosen for the recording, influenced in part by the need for the melodies to breathe. The normal connotations of the term “Scherzo” are not really compatible with the charming and refined themes of this movement.
After experimenting with different tempi, it was found that in order to bring out the delicate melodies, while creating defined changes of colour between the various registers, a rather leisurely tempo worked best. The tempo adopted for the recording is approximately M.M. $J=60$ for the scherzo section while the trio section is about M.M. $J=70$. Both tempi allow space for elegant phrasing and yet are not so slow as to give an unwanted feeling of six-in-a-bar. Tempo *rubato* was not applied extensively throughout the whole movement as it is subtly written with little pause for phrasal breathing (Carew 2007). The feeling of large
pulse units (whole bars or even groups of bars) provides flexibility without the need for

tempo variation as such.

In view of the rhythmic flexibility that formed part of nineteenth-century performance
practice, discussed in detail by Brown in *Classical and Romantic Performance Practice
1750–1900* (1999), the performer is at liberty to exercise some freedom in the delivery of the
music. In the case of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s *Adagio* second movement, this might involve a
quickening of the tempo at the point marked *Animato* (Example 26) with a balancing
*ritardando* at the end of bar 24 (Example 27). Such flexibility is fully in accordance with
contemporary practice and adds an extra dimension of interest and intensity to this short
movement.

**Example 26: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Sonata in G minor, second movement, bars 12–18, with performance notes**
Few nineteenth-century writers offered detailed instruction on the topic of tempo modification. Crelle (1823), in discussing phrasing, advised that the beginning of a musical unit should commence powerfully and importantly while the end of it ought to increase in speed and decrease in power. However, this advice was not found to be applicable to the second theme in the first movement of Mendelsohn-Hensel’s Piano Sonata in G minor (Example 28).
Rather, Kalkbrenner’s prescription that an *accelerando* is required in an ascending phrase to imply passion and agitation while all terminations of *cantabile* phrases should be retarded seems to be more appropriate (Kalkbrenner 1831). In this spirit, it was decided to approach the shaping of the second theme according to the pattern set out in Example 29.

**Example 29: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, bars 22–29, with performance notes**

On the issue of tempo changes, there was a general recognition throughout the Classical and Romantic periods (as there had also been in the Baroque) that, as long as certain aesthetic borderlines were not crossed, holding back some notes and hurrying others was not merely permissible, but an indispensable adjunct of sensitive performance. Czerny listed different situations for holding back and quickening of the time with the intention to show the structure of the music as well as to express the emotion intended in the music (Lawson and Stowell 1999). In the case of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s sonata, there are very few tempo indications other than the initial designation of *Allegro molto agitato*. This may be because the piece was written to be performed by Mendelssohn-Hensel herself, with no need for detailed instructions concerning tempo modification. In approaching the recording, there was no hesitation in applying some fluctuations of tempo to underline the changing musical characters found in this movement.
One particular passage that required this issue to be addressed was the transition from first to second theme of the movement (Example 30).

**Example 30: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, bars 18–25**

The first theme is characterised by a falling melodic line that moves to a series of resolute chords (Example 31), whereas the second theme contains a melody with stepwise descending motion followed by upward leaps (Example 32).

**Example 31: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, bars 1–9**
Czerny (1839) stated that a *ritardando* or *rallentando* is used, among many other contexts, in places marked *crescendo*, to serve as an introduction to an important passage or to wind-up a significant musical phrase. The transition from first to second theme that occurs from bar 15 to bar 22 (partly contained in Example 30), represents just the circumstance described by Czerny. It therefore seems justifiable to gradually slow down at bar 21 and then gradually speed up after the first beat in bar 22 (Example 33). Such flexibility represents a natural musical instinct for most performers. Sources such as Czerny demonstrate that these instincts are entirely consistent with the conventions of the time.

**Example 33: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, bars 18–25, with performance notes**
Brown (1999) identified two main types of tempo modification: modification of the basic pulse either momentarily or for an extended period; and the classic tempo *rubato* that occurs when the accompaniment remains steady while the melodic line is modified for a more or less extended passage. The first type of tempo modification is applied in the third movement of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s sonata, to underline the lyricism apparent throughout the movement. Many of the lyrical melodies require a certain rhythmic flexibility both in the organisation of their detailed contours and in their longer musical shape (Example 34).

**Example 34: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, third movement, bars 290–295, with performance notes**

![Example 34: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, third movement, bars 290–295, with performance notes](image)

Similar application of tempo fluctuation also seemed necessary in the opening theme of the fourth movement of Wieck-Schumann’s sonata (Example 35). Such modification in tempo can assist in presenting the structure and to show the direction of the music more clearly. The flexibility achieved by taking more time at bar 8 also assists the listener to respond to the change of melody and the more rapidly changing harmonic rhythm.
Example 35: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Sonata in G minor, fourth movement, bars 1–10, with performance notes

**Pedalling**

The sustaining pedal, which plays such an important role in enhancing the tone quality of the piano, was first patented in 1783 by John Broadwood (Good 1982). In the Classical era and through the 1820s, any use of the damper-raising mechanism was considered a special effect. According to Rowland (1998b), pianists were at that time using the pedals for little more than to create a particular tone quality or effect lasting several bars at a time. In the nineteenth century, the sustaining pedal was used widely due to the increased importance attached to colour and the desire to achieve greater variety in sonority. Anton Rubinstein once described the pedal as the “soul of the piano” as its possibilities in adding warmth of tone where appropriate are endless (Bowen 1961, 291–292).

While piano music in the nineteenth century depends extensively on the pedal, most composers were still sparing in their indications. Felix Mendelssohn marked some pieces abundantly, but in others left either no directions or only *sempre con (col) Pedale* at the start,
an indication that pedalling (according to personal taste) was an assumed part of the sound. Similarly, Robert Schumann, who considered use of the pedal as one of the most essential and characteristic ways in which the piano expresses itself, often just placed Ped or col Ped at the start of the piece or section (Schumann 1965). Chopin also notated pedal indications abundantly in his music, from both practical and aesthetic standpoints. Successive signs to depress the pedal, without intervening release signs, occur occasionally in Liszt’s music of the late 1830s, and by the 1850s such notation was commonplace (Rosenblum 1988).

Taylor (1981) classified the primary functions of the sustaining pedal as either practical or artistic. The practical function is to achieve a legato effect that would not be possible with the fingers alone; the artistic function is to allow sympathetic vibration when the dampers are lifted from the strings, thus enriching the tone. There are also different ways in which a pianist can use the pedal. They include legato pedalling, direct pedalling, half pedalling, half damping, and flutter pedalling.

Mendelssohn-Hensel’s score markings indicate a desire for long pedals and rich sonority. The nine-bar introduction to the third movement shows only a single pedal marking from the composer at bar 278 (Example 36). A second pedal sign appears at bar 287 when the melody enters (Example 37). The composer did not indicate any further pedalling until 46 bars later. Here, a pedal sign is seen at bar 334 when the melody returns in octaves in the high treble, with a flowing accompaniment in the middle register and a series of repeated notes in the low bass (Example 38).
Example 36: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, third movement, bars 278–286

Example 37: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, third movement, bars 287–289

Example 38: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, third movement, bars 332–337
It is quite impossible to follow strictly the composer’s pedal notation in this movement, especially on the modern piano, which has a considerably longer sustain than the nineteenth-century instrument. Notes played in accompaniment lines easily become amplified, covering subsequent melodic notes and resulting in unacceptably thick textures. The risk of this happening on Mendelssohn-Hensel’s instrument was much less. While the shorter sustain made it possible to play long passages with sustaining pedal on Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Viennese piano, the modern pianist needs to make additional pedal changes in order to avoid blurring of sounds and obliteration of melodies by the accompaniment. The changes of pedal shown in Example 39 help maintain the sustaining quality of the singing melody and avoided textural thickness. Passages with chromatic harmonies require more frequent pedal changes in order to produce a clear and clean singing line (Examples 40 and 41).

Example 39: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, third movement, bars 287–289, with pedal notations

Example 40: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, third movement, bars 314–316, with pedal notations
Apart from the additional and frequent pedal changes needed in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s third movement, there is also a need to flutter the pedal from time to time in the fourth movement. Such pedalling is vital, especially in the section with whirling triplet figurations (Example 42). This adjustment is necessary to avoid the overwhelming thickness of sound that emanates from the bass notes of the contemporary piano. Playing this particular passage without changing the pedal may have been feasible on Mendelssohn-Hensel’s piano, as it would not have had such a robust tone as the modern instrument.

Example 42: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, fourth movement, bars 620–628, with performance notes
In addition to the sustaining pedal, the nineteenth century also witnessed the emergence of the *una corda* marking. Indications for the use of the *una corda* pedal were infrequent in this period, but an interest in colour led some composers to use it at different dynamic levels for the special sound it could create. According to Rowland (1998b), Beethoven indicates the use of *una corda* in his music far more than any other pianist of his generation. Other performers were rather more circumspect, limiting its use because of the resultant change in timbre as well as the tendency for the piano to go out of tune when only one string was hit with the full weight of the hammer. When the *una corda* pedal is depressed, the action of the piano is shifted sideways, so that the piano hammers do not strike every string of a note. Furthermore, the string was to be struck by a softer, less compacted part of the hammer. As a result, the *una corda* modifies not only the amount of tone but also the timbre and colour of the sound.

On the modern piano, the *una corda* pedal can only reduce the number of strings struck from three to two (or two to one, in the case of the lower register). The pianos of the earlier era were more flexible. The engagement of the *una corda* on pianos of the late eighteenth to early nineteenth century created a larger difference in colour and timbre than it does on the modern piano. According to Banowetz (1985), the pianist of this time could shift from the normal *tre corde* position to one in which either *due corde* or *una corda* would be struck, depending on the depth to which the pedal was pressed. Gill (1981) also commented that when the hammers of the piano strike only one string, the piano produces a softer, more ethereal tone. This is most probably the type of sound that was intended by Mendelssohn-Hensel when she added the *una corda* marking in the second movement of her piano sonata (Example 43).
Example 43: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, second movement, bars 166–171

A modern performer needs to have some awareness of the differences between today’s instruments and those of the period in question. She needs to aim for something of the “other-worldly” quality produced by the *una corda* of the earlier instruments. This involves experimenting with the way in which the keys are approached (the speed and height of finger movement), dynamic control and application of both the right and the left pedals. In the case of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s second movement, it is also possible for a performer to scale down the *tremolo* by placing the hands in close proximity to the piano keys. This is done to minimise the physical movement involved in playing *tremolo* and to avoid the overwhelming tone quality that is otherwise produced on the modern piano.

**Score Interpretation**

In studying the music of Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann, many ambiguities and inconsistencies arise with regard to aspects of the printed score. These included the notation of elements such as tempo, dynamics and pedalling. Often, markings appeared unconvincing and the suspicion arose that they may not have always fully represented the composer’s intentions. These situations require the performer to make informed decisions concerning such matters as the interpretation of tempo markings, tempo relationships between sections,
dynamic levels and gradations as well as use of the pedal. Due to the limited range of printed editions available for the study of these two sonatas, a number of recordings were sourced to provide additional insights and validation in support of the decisions made.

The edition consulted during the preparation of Wieck-Schumann’s piano sonata was the first edition issued by Breitkopf & Härtel in 1991. The source for this first edition was the autograph acquired by the Robert Schumann House, Zwickau, in 1926 from Wieck-Schumann’s eldest daughter, Marie (1841–1929). The score contained a number of inconsistencies with regard to dynamic markings. There were discrepancies between certain passages that are present in both the exposition and the recapitulation. In particular, dynamics indicated in the exposition at the beginning of the first movement differ from those present in the parallel passage in the recapitulation. For instance, the rocking phrase in the exposition (marked Mit tiefer Empfindung) in D major has the dynamic markings of piano, forte, diminuendo and piano, before the restatement of the main theme in bar 15 (Example 44).

Example 44: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, bars 6–14
However, when the same passage occurs in the recapitulation in the same key of D major, there is a suspicious piano sign in bar 133. This dynamic marking contradicts not only the similar passage in the exposition, but also the accented melody in the right hand, the spirit of which clearly stems from the preceding forte (Example 45).

Example 45: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, bars 128–136

![Example 45](image)

In this context, the sudden drop from forte to piano makes little sense. The piano indication works better if it is delayed until bar 136, before the main theme is restated in bar 137. It is also possible to introduce a diminuendo around bar 134 to follow the descent of the melody (Example 46).
A close study of the score reveals that the *piano* sign in bar 133 actually applies to the left hand while the right hand melody is played *forte* with accent. It can be concluded that in the exposition, Wieck-Schumann intended to have both voices in the two-part canon played *piano* from bar 6, and then *forte* from bar 11 as is marked clearly in Example 44. However, in the recapitulation, she planned for a different dynamic scheme for the recurring two-part canon. When the canon is first heard in the recapitulation, both the melodies played by right and left hands are marked *piano* as found in bar 129. When the canon reaches bar 132, the right-hand melody is to be played *forte* and accented, while the left-hand melody, with a phrase commencing in bar 133, is to remain *piano*. This is one viable explanation for the puzzling *forte* and *piano* signs in bar 132 and bar 133 subsequently (Example 47).
Example 47: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, bars 128–135, with performance notes

It is possible that the inconsistencies in the score may have been due to editing or printing errors, or perhaps the composer’s own oversight, as she never intended for the music to be published.

Inconsistencies with regard to tempo were also encountered in the first movement of Wieck-Schumann’s sonata. For example, the playful episode in E flat major marked *Um vieles schneller* has a somewhat rubato-like tempo that can be summarised as a fast–slow–fast–slow pattern with *accelerando* and *ritenuto* in between sections. This section, which commences with a fast tempo at bar 44, slows down at bar 59, gradually picks up tempo beginning at bar 61 and slows down once again at bar 67 (Examples 48 and 49).
The episode in the recapitulation, this time in G major, does not contain the parallel fast–slow–fast–slow tempo pattern indicated in the exposition, although there seems little reason to treat the two sections differently (Examples 50 and 51).
Example 50: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, bars 166–172

Example 51: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Sonata in G minor, first movement, bars 180–192

During preparation for the recording, it was decided to treat each section consistently, as indicated in Example 52.
Another example of an interpretative issue arising from a notational inconsistency can be found in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s sonata. In the second movement, an *una corda* marking is indicated at the commencement of the trio in bar 168 (Example 53).

**Example 53: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, second movement, bars 166–171**

The shimmering semiquaver *tremolos* in this section are dampened by the use of the *una corda*. However, there is no *tre corde* found anywhere in the movement to indicate
when the *una corda* pedal should be released. This does not imply that it is not to be released at all. Rather, it has been left to the discretion of the performer as to when the *una corda* should be employed in the *tremolo* passages. As we know, Mendelssohn-Hensel did not expect the sonata to be published and played by a pianist other than herself. Thus, she knew very well when and where to engage and release the *una corda* and saw no need to include the *tre corde* signs. In performance, it was decided play *tre corde* from bar 226 when the first theme returns (Example 54), *una corda* from bar 250 when the second theme reappears for the last time (Example 55), and *tre corde* again from bar 276 to mark the transition into the third movement (Example 56).

**Example 54**: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, second movement, bars 223–227, with added pedal sign

![Example 54](image)

**Example 55**: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, second movement, bars 249–254, with added pedal sign

![Example 55](image)

**Example 56**: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Sonata in G minor, second movement, bars 274–277, with added pedal sign

![Example 56](image)
Summary

The sonata genre was regarded as the ultimate achievement in instrumental writing by Romantic musicians. Both Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann clearly demonstrated their compositional skills in their works. The fact that the two composers modelled their piano sonatas on concerted works that were well known and widely established reveals that they were both cautious in undertaking the challenge of writing large, complex compositions.

The discussion in this chapter reveals significant difference of style between Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann. Both composers display varying approaches in presenting their sonatas. For Mendelssohn-Hensel, all four movements of her sonata are connected by transitions or attaccas, forming a single and continuous work. In the first movement of her sonata, instead of moving traditionally from tonic to dominant, Mendelssohn-Hensel bypassed the conventional tonal scheme, presenting the two contrasting themes in the exposition in the tonic. Her choice of a Scherzo second movement and an Adagio third movement deviated from the common practice in the nineteenth century of having a slow second movement and a lively third movement. Wieck-Schumann however adhered to the convention by placing the Adagio second and a Scherzo third as expected.

In terms of musical style, Mendelssohn-Hensel displayed originality and virtuosity in her sonata, exemplified through her bold explorations of melody, form and harmony. Her command of Romantic pianism includes octaves, tremolos, use of extreme registers and technically demanding passagework. The composer uses a wide range and creates an open texture between the top voice and the bass line. The range and melodic handling reflects this free and spacious texture, and matches her intention to create an orchestral sound from the
Wieck-Schumann’s piano sonata, despite being composed in a more conventional way in terms of form and structure, displays some Romantic characteristics in its exploration of harmony along with several pianistically demanding passages. The composer’s more classically conceived sonata requires a performer to intensify the expression of her music by drawing attention to its harmonic and contrapuntal dimensions. For Mendelssohn-Hensel, the drama expressed through her virtuosic and lyrical style tends to be best realised through attention to the wide-ranging contrasts in character and presentation of the thematic material. To perform the two sonatas as they might have been intended by both composers, one has to approach them in the context of Romantic performance conventions, applying knowledge of the instruments available at the time, supplemented by insights arising from a detailed yet critical study of the score.

In approaching these works, it is important for the performer to engage personally with the spirit of the music. A multitude of creative and artistic choices have to be made in the interest of a strong projection of the works’ characteristics. These choices were informed by a series of scholarly investigations which resulted in the discussions of tempo, pedalling and score interpretation outlined earlier in this chapter. The insights and findings generated through the intense study of the music, composers and related fields reflect the understanding and interpretation of a contemporary pianist in exploring the piano works of these two nineteenth century composers.
CHAPTER 4: THE PIANO TRIOS

The Piano Trio in the Nineteenth Century

Grove Music Online defines “piano trio” as a composition for piano and two other instruments, usually violin and cello. The genre emerged in the mid-eighteenth century from the Baroque duo and trio sonatas through a shift of emphasis from the string parts to the keyboard. It was also influenced by the development of the piano sonata. Early piano trios were written primarily for pianists, often amateurs, and were quintessentially “chamber” music as they could be easily read through in a domestic setting. The trios of Mozart are typical in this regard.

In the nineteenth century, particularly celebrated piano trios were written by Beethoven, Schumann, Brahms, Smetana, Dvořák and Franck. The piano virtuoso composers of the nineteenth century such as Hummel, Chopin and Mendelssohn tended to favour their own instrument with a part of great brilliance. At this time, it was often the composers themselves who performed the piano parts. Such pianist-composers also placed increasing demands on the musicians in this period and would often choose to perform their piano trios with string players from professional string quartets. The rising level of technical difficulty in the piano trios of this time resulted in soloistic writing of greater complexity and, often, a concerto-like arrangement of the parts.

Nineteenth-century composers retained many formal aspects that had become standard in the piano trio of the late Classical period. These aspects include the four-
movement structure and the frequent use of sonata allegro, sonata rondo, scherzo and trio as well as theme and variation forms. The utilisation of shorter pieces such as character pieces or slow Lied (song-like) movements with a contrasting middle section can also be found in piano trios composed at this time. New compositional devices belonging to the Romantic style, including chromaticism, extended developmental procedures, increased “democratic sharing” of thematic material and the heightened level of virtuosity demanded of all the instruments were demonstrated in the piano trios of this time.

The aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11 (1847), and Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Trio in G minor, Op. 17 (1846), as well as to address performance issues related to these compositions. While the genre hardly constitutes a major portion of each composer’s output, a study of these chamber piano works provides valuable insights into the stylistic development of each composer. In addition to providing an overview of the piano trios, the commentary also provides a discussion of the interpretative and stylistic issues encountered while preparing and performing these works. The focus is not confined to the piano part; rather, it encompasses the complete ensemble.

**Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Trio in D Minor, Op. 11: An Overview**

Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Trio in D minor for piano, violin and cello, Op. 11, was composed as a birthday gift for her sister, Rebecka. Completed in 1847, the trio was first performed during Rebecka’s birthday celebration on April 11 of the same year. The performance also opened the season of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Sonntagsmusik and met with
great success (Hensel 1879). Yet, despite the favourable impression the trio left on audiences at its premiere, it was not published during Mendelssohn-Hensel’s lifetime. The composer died shortly after the performance took place. The trio was published three years later when her family submitted the manuscript to the publishers Breitkopf & Härtel.

Cast in four movements, the work is a grand, mid-Romantic trio imbued with many original ideas for its time. Tillard (1996) claimed this ambitious piano trio to be Mendelssohn-Hensel’s masterpiece. It is virtuosic and bold in character, especially in the first and last movements. The two inner movements are very intimate and they reveal the composer’s other strengths in their simple and reflective compositional styles. It is no surprise that the piano assumes a prominent role throughout the trio, given that Mendelssohn-Hensel was a very accomplished pianist.

The dramatic first movement, marked *Allegro molto vivace*, is written in sonata form. The structural outline of this movement is summarised in Table 11.

### Table 11: Structural Outline of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, first movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Sub-section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>1–31</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>Marked <em>Allegro molto vivace</em>, the first movement begins with a one bar introduction by the piano in rapid semiquaver figuration. The main theme is then introduced by the strings with a piano accompaniment that utilises the same running scale-like semiquavers. The theme is then restated by both strings before the piano introduces a transitional motif based on the first subject. The lyrical second subject marked <em>cantabile</em> begins in the cello and is continued by the violin. The second subject is then stated fully by the piano. The closing theme is introduced by the piano in F minor, the parallel minor of the second subject’s F major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>32–57</td>
<td></td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td>58–95</td>
<td>F major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing theme</td>
<td>96–141</td>
<td>F minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unlike her Piano Sonata in G minor which, as discussed in the previous chapter, shows unusual key relationships, Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, follows the standard tonal plan of a sonata movement. In the first movement of her trio, the composer uses the relative major-minor relationship between first and second subjects in the exposition, while utilising the parallel major-minor relationship between the two themes in the recapitulation. The key relationships in the first movement of her trio differ from the more unusual use of tonality in the first movement of her piano sonata, where both first and second subjects in the exposition were in the tonic (G minor–G minor). The recapitulation in the first movement of the sonata, however, also used the parallel major-minor relationship (G minor–G major).

As a whole, the first movement is technically very demanding and provides many examples of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s flamboyant pianism. The movement starts with an agitated semiquaver passage in the piano part which resembles the left hand passage in
Chopin’s *Revolutionary Étude*, Op. 10, no. 12 (Examples 57 and 58). Such semiquaver passagework occurs throughout the movement (Example 59), revealing the composer’s strength as an accomplished pianist.

**Example 57: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, first movement, bars 1–5**

![Example 57: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, first movement, bars 1–5](image)

**Example 58: Chopin, Revolutionary Étude, Op. 10, no. 12, bars 19–21**

![Example 58: Chopin, Revolutionary Étude, Op. 10, no. 12, bars 19–21](image)
Apart from the rapid semiquaver figuration, Mendelssohn-Hensel also uses orchestrally inspired effects, such as the *tremolo*, which also appeared frequently in her sonata (Example 60).

**Example 59: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, first movement, bars 162–167**

**Example 60: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, first movement, bars 58–65**
Octave passages, prominent in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s sonata, are also used frequently in the first movement of this trio. She often used octaves to reinforce and add colour to a melodic line (Example 61). The use of octaves also adds pianistic brilliance and textural excitement to her works (Example 62).

Example 61: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor Op. 11, first movement, bars 74–81

Example 62: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, first movement, bars 231–241
The strings have relatively speaking less demanding parts than the piano and often play a more lyrical role in this movement. However, the strings do occasionally have some challenging passages, such as the double stop *tremolo* (Example 63) and the rapid semiquaver passages (Example 64). The two-part piano writing that is hugely expanded by octaves in Example 63 also poses some difficulty for the strings. It is a challenge for them to match the sonority created by the piano and to produce a well-balanced overall sound.

Example 63: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, first movement, bars 205–218

Example 64: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, first movement, bars 253–256
The second movement is an *Andante espressivo* written in ternary form (ABA) in the style of a Song without Words. Section A has four eight-bar statements of the theme and a five-bar transition. The theme in this section is first introduced by the piano (Example 65). Derived from the theme in Section A, the theme in Section B is also introduced by the piano (Example 66). The reprise of Section A resembles a development with its unusual modulations and use of counterpoint. The piano plays material from Section A while the strings imitate segments from Section B (Example 67).

**Example 65: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, second movement, bars 1–6**

**Example 66: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, second movement, bars 35–40**
In the coda, the theme from Section A returns alone in the violin, is doubled in the piano right hand, and finally imitated by the cello. A short abbreviation of the theme then returns in the piano. The movement ends in A major with *pizzicato* in the strings and *staccato* chords in the piano. The key of the ending prepares for the D major of the third movement, which begins *attacca* (Example 68). The earlier commentary on the piano sonata drew attention to the composer’s fondness for using *attacca* and transition to provide continuity in multi-movement works. The same approach is evident in the trio.
Rather than the expected scherzo in triple time, Mendelssohn-Hensel opted for a brief *Lied* marked *Allegretto* as the third movement of her trio. It is in D major and set in common time. Quin (1981) suggested that Mendelssohn-Hensel may have contemplated writing a scherzo for the third movement, but that she refrained from doing so as she wished the movement to preserve a serious tone. She therefore abandoned that idea in favour of a *Lied*. Quin (1981, 200) based this view on a letter Felix Mendelssohn wrote to Mendelssohn-Hensel’s son, Sebastian, on February 22, 1847: “Tell your mother that I quite agree with her about the scherzo. Perhaps she may one day compose a *scherzo serioso*; there may be such a thing”.

Lasting only 47 bars, the third movement is very simple and straightforward. Written in a free strophic form, the main theme of the *Lied* is heard four times throughout. It is a light, brief monothematic movement in which the theme is slightly varied (with modulation) on each repetition. The movement fits comfortably into the Song without Words genre because of its lyrical, melodic character and clear homophonic texture (Example 69).

The brilliant Finale, marked Allegretto moderato, forms the last movement of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s trio. Its structural outline is summarised in Table 12.

Table 12: Structural Outline of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, fourth movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Sub-section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>1–57</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>58–61</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62–65</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66–71</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td>72–90</td>
<td>F major</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>91–98</td>
<td>F major</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td>99–118</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>119–132</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>133–146</td>
<td>F# minor</td>
<td>#iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td>147–175</td>
<td>Bb major</td>
<td>#VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>176–192</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td>193–211</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td>212–224</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from the first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td>225–243</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from the first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development section contains material from first subject, second subject and transition. The strings present the material in imitative and contrapuntal style while the piano continues with arpeggio and triplet figurations.

The finale’s first and second subjects are recapitulated here without the transition. The second subject from the first movement reappears as a cyclic element before the movement ends with the second subject of the finale.
The inclusion of a lengthy introduction, heavily arpeggiated and with fantasy-like characteristics, is an innovation not found in other piano trios of the time (Example 70). The insertion of this *cadenza* may also be seen as a means to link the third and fourth movements. It again shows Mendelssohn-Hensel’s desire to establish continuity, avoiding a clear-cut ending to one movement by linking it to the next. Stylistically, the passage may betray the influence of Bach – similar passages can be found in Bach’s Chromatic Fantasy and Fugue, BWV 903. The piano is eventually joined by the strings and continues in a brilliant style (Example 71).

**Example 70: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, fourth movement, bars 1–9**

![Example 70](image)

**Example 71: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, fourth movement, bars 32–35**

![Example 71](image)
In the transitional passage marked *Più vivace* before the appearance of the second theme, the violin takes the melody. Here, the piano part is filled with a semiquaver accompaniment in triplets, the same virtuosic *Rollfiguren* which appear in the fourth movement of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Sonata in G minor. At the same time, the piano doubles the melody played by the strings (Example 72).


![Example 72](image)

The second theme that begins at the end of bar 71 has a dance-like character and serves to lighten the mood of the movement (Example 73).

**Example 73: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, fourth movement, bars 68–77**

![Example 73](image)
In the coda, the second theme from the first movement is reintroduced at bar 212, adding a cyclic element to the otherwise conventional sonata form (Example 74).

**Example 74: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, fourth movement, bars 208–216**

Mendelssohn-Hensel’s piano trio as a whole is an ambitious and virtuosic work. The two outer movements reveal piano writing of concerto-like dimensions. They showcase the pianist’s skill with idiomatic writing filled with rapid semiquavers, octaves, chromaticism, arpeggiation and *Rollfiguren*. Her frequent employment of *tremolo* shows her preference for orchestrally inspired figuration. The last movement, in particular, draws attention to the pianist through its long, unusual and innovative solo introduction. The two inner movements are both written in the style of a Song without Words, connected by an *attacca*. The inclusion of smaller character pieces – which flourished in the nineteenth century – rather than the standard scherzo and trio is another example of the composer’s inventive approach. The contrapuntal writing in the second movement with its unusual modulations is highly original. The re-introduction of the first movement’s second theme into the coda of the fourth movement was successfully utilised by Mendelssohn-Hensel as a unifying device, realising a cyclical concept in the work as a whole.
Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Trio in G Minor, Op. 17: An Overview

Written in 1846, when she was 27 years old, Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Trio in G minor, Op. 17, is a four-movement work scored for piano, violin and cello. Along with her Three Preludes and Fugues for the Piano, Op. 16, it can be regarded as the fruit of the joint studies in fugue and daily exercises in counterpoint she undertook with her husband, Robert Schumann (Chissell 1983; Reich 1985). Wieck-Schumann was a seasoned performer who would have been well acquainted with the piano trios of Beethoven, Chopin, C. G. Reissiger, Mendelssohn and Robert Schumann (Pettler 1980). Her experience performing these chamber works influenced her own compositional style and such influences can be traced in her piano trio. The piano trio is a form with which she was familiar as a performer, and she organised a piano trio ensemble in Dresden to embark upon a series of chamber music recitals. Reich (1985, 228) regarded the G minor piano trio as the composer’s greatest achievement, noting that it is “by far her [Wieck-Schumann’s] most outstanding work, structured in the classical tradition but filled with romantic tenderness and lyricism”.

The first movement of Wieck-Schumann’s piano trio marked Allegro moderato is cast in traditional sonata form. The structural outline of this movement is summarised in Table 13.

### Table 13: Structural Outline of Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Trio in G minor, Op. 17, first movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Sub-section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>1–21</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>The movement begins with a lyrical melody played by the violin. The same melody is taken over by the piano. It is followed by contrasting transitional material leading to the movement’s second subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td></td>
<td>22–44</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>The transitional material is heroic in character, based upon dotted rhythms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In line with the dictates of Classical sonata form, the first movement of Wieck-Schumann’s trio begins with an exposition presenting two contrasting themes in opposing styles and keys, connected by a transition. The development that follows explores the harmonic and textural possibilities of these thematic materials. The development re-transitions to the recapitulation where the first theme returns in the tonic key, while the second theme, stated in the relative major (B flat major) in the exposition, is heard in the tonic (G minor). Wieck-Schumann ended her first movement with a coda, the reappearance of the opening theme giving a sense of balance to the overall structure of the movement.

Set in the key of B flat major, the second movement carries the heading Scherzo, includes a trio section, and is marked Tempo di Minuetto. A complete ternary form (ABA) in itself, the scherzo section begins and ends in the tonic. Section A has a “Scotch snap” rhythm in the violin, pizzicato accompaniment in the cello, and a chordal piano part that incorporates
chromatic counterpoint (Example 75). Section B, in the dominant key of F major, has a fugue-like motif in the violin that is imitated by the piano (Example 76).

**Example 75: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Trio in G minor, Op. 17, second movement, bars 1–5**

The trio section in E flat major is extended and transforms triple time into duple, creating a *hemiola* effect (Example 77). This device also appears in many works by Robert Schumann including the Scherzo from his Piano Sonata in G minor, Op. 22, no. 2 and the Finale of his Piano Concerto in A minor, Op. 54.

**Example 77: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Trio in G minor, Op. 17, second movement, bars 35–43**
The repeat of the scherzo section is written out in full (rather than being indicated by *da capo*), giving way to an extended coda which incorporates new material. The movement concludes with a brief recall of the opening material played by the piano, again providing a sense of balance to the movement’s overall structure.

Wieck-Schumann’s *Andante* third movement is in the spirit of a nocturne. It is in G major and cast in ternary form (ABA). The main theme is stated twice in Section A, first by the piano and then by the violin. Each statement of the theme is paired with a slightly different harmony and accompaniment. The rhythmic figures employed are mostly flowing quavers and semiquavers. The contrasting middle section is in the subdominant minor, and marked *Più animato*, a drastic tempo change from the *Andante* of Section A. This contrasting section contains large leaps for the strings and constant dotted rhythms. Section A is then recapitulated, with the opening theme stated by the cello.

Rather than a fast Finale, Wieck-Schumann concludes her trio with an *Allegretto*. It is written clearly in sonata form with skilfully crafted contrapuntal writing. The piano part assumes a brilliant role and is more technically demanding than that of the previous movements. The structural outline of the fourth movement is summarised in Table 14.

### Table 14: Structural Outline of Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Trio in G minor, Op. 17, fourth movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Sub-section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>1–55</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Written in sonata allegro form. The violin introduces the first subject while the piano initiates the contrasting second subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td>56–110</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>111–121</td>
<td>A minor</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>The first subject appears in an altered form, as a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14: Structural Outline of Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Trio in G minor, Op. 17, fourth movement (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Sub-section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(fugue-like version)</td>
<td></td>
<td>122–125</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject (bars 126–129)</td>
<td>126–131</td>
<td>Bb major</td>
<td>bIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First subject (bars 130–131)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td>132–149</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>150–157</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158–161</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>162–165</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>166–169</td>
<td>F minor</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition (bars 170–177)</td>
<td>170–182</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The original first subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bars 178–182)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>183–237</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First subject</td>
<td>238–316</td>
<td>Bb major</td>
<td>bIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject</td>
<td>317–322</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>323–326</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, Wieck-Schumann’s piano trio demonstrates strong adherence to conventional Classical form. The reappearance of the thematic material at the end of each movement shows the composer’s intention to provide a sense of balance and symmetry to the overall structural outline. The use of *hemiola* in the second movement of Wieck-Schumann’s trio is also apparent in the third movement of her piano sonata, a device used to enhance rhythmic interest. The composer’s dramatic use of a contrasting middle section in the lyrical third movement of her trio is a characteristic that can be found in the trios of Schubert, Mendelssohn and Robert Schumann. The last movement showcases the composer’s highly skilled contrapuntal writing and represents (for the pianist) the most technically demanding movement within the trio. The use of fugal writing here is significant, and will be discussed further in the Conclusion to this study.
Performance Issues

During the preparation of the piano trios, the ensemble faced numerous practical and interpretative issues. They included instrumental balance, articulation and tempo. Reflections upon the issues encountered and the decisions made by the players during the rehearsals are presented below.

Instrumental Balance

One central issue in preparing the two piano trios was the balance of parts among the instruments. According to Smallman (1990), the piano trio has come to be regarded, not altogether unjustly, as a taxing medium for both composers and performers, considered “one of the most difficult forms to manipulate” and which is “seldom satisfactory in balance” (Dunhill in Smallman 1990, 82). Indeed, the nature of the instruments involved often poses great challenges to the composer in terms of scoring and to the players in terms of performing. This is especially true when trios written for earlier instruments are played on modern ones, in particular the piano. Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann each owned Viennese pianos at a time when they were composing their piano trios. Mendelssohn-Hensel had great difficulty in finding a piano she really liked and bought a Viennese instrument, as recommended by Felix Mendelssohn in 1840 (Tillard 1996). Wieck-Schumann’s piano was presented to the Schumanns by Graf (serial no. 2616, built in 1839) as a wedding present in 1840 (Winter 1990a). Johann Nepomuk Hummel, expressing his preference for the Viennese pianos over the vastly more popular English instruments, commented:

The German [i.e. ‘Viennese’] piano may be played upon with ease by the weakest hand. It allows the performer to impart to his execution every possible degree of light and shade, speaks clearly and promptly, has a round fluty tone, which in a large room
contrasts well with the accompanying orchestra, and does not impede rapidly with
execution by requiring too great an effort. These instruments are likewise durable, and
cost about half the price of the English pianoforte (Hummel in Carew 2007, 31).

The Viennese instruments Hummel spoke of, like those owned by Mendelssohn-
Hensel and Wieck-Schumann, had a thinner soundboard. This affected the tone, especially in
the treble area, and while it produced a quick response, it also had a rapid decay of sound.
The thinner soundboard results in less depth of tone and a quieter sound with little potential
for any significant volume when compared with the modern piano. A hard set of hammers
consisting of wooden cores covered by a few thin layers of leather meant that the upper
partials were enhanced. These hard, light hammers produced a shiny, brilliant sound, but
were a significant factor contributing to the rapid decay of tone in instruments built prior to
1840 (Nemko 1997).

The later grand pianos utilised new technology and materials. The range increased,
iron replaced wood for the frame, felt was used instead of leather for the hammers, cross-
stringing was introduced, and key weight increased. The newer instruments produced a
considerably more powerful, more sustained sound than that associated with the Viennese
piano of the early nineteenth century. The prototype of the modern piano, with all of these
changes in place, was exhibited to general acclaim by Steinway at the Paris exhibition of
1867. By about 1900, these changes had been adopted by most leading piano manufacturers.
The modern pianist, therefore, produces a sound quite unlike that heard by composers of the
first half of the nineteenth century and around which the instrumental balance within these
trios was conceived.
The idiomatic, virtuosic, and (in the case of Mendelssohn-Hensel) sometimes dominant piano writing presents a challenge to the pianist when performing with only two string instruments. In Mendelssohn-Hensel’s trio, the pianist is occupied for the entire duration of the work with concerto-like writing. The piano either presents the melodic material or provides essential harmonic and rhythmic support. Technically, the piano has the most challenging part, with much of the writing posing significant pianistic demands. These passages, often associated with a thickness of texture, have the potential to become too overbearing on the modern grand piano, jeopardising the balance of the ensemble as a whole. When such situations occur, players may need to adjust dynamic and expressive markings to produce a more musically satisfying result.

An example of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s rather overwhelming piano writing can be found in the development section of the first movement where it leads into the recapitulation (Example 78). Mendelssohn-Hensel opted for an orchestrally inspired sonority rather than a purely pianistic one, producing a long terrain of octaves in the bass imitating the lower strings of the orchestra. While the strings have fragments of the theme, the piano has the theme in the right hand with octave accompaniment in the left, easily producing a thick texture likely to overwhelm the strings. The right hand needs to be strong and incisive to match the projection of the strings while great care needs to be taken with the left hand, for both musical and technical reasons. Working too hard with the left hand produces too much sound, but also poses problems of physical stamina. A light, \textit{staccato} approach to the octaves, enriched by careful pedalling, produces the best result. Short pedals should be applied to further reduce the thickness of the piano part while maintaining the tension created by the underlying drive of the quavers.
A similar situation occurs when the piano and violin are playing melodies in unison (Examples 79 and 80). Mendelssohn-Hensel’s piano trio often contains such problematic doubling of parts. It was decided in rehearsal that the dominant role was to be given to the violin, with the piano melody placed in the background, adding colour to the violin but not competing with it. In this way, risk of undue thickness was minimised. When the tremolo passages involved both hands of the piano such as that given in Example 81, the solution was to gently mark each new harmony according to the dynamic requirements, immediately pulling back to a very soft level.

Example 79: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, first movement, bars 74–81
Another example of a potentially thick texture in the piano part can be found in the fast section of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s fourth movement, marked *Più vivace* (Example 82). The piano part consists of *Rollfiguren* and doubles the melody also played by the strings. After careful listening during rehearsals, it was found that the most satisfying balance was achieved by again giving the main melodic focus to the strings, with the piano playing a supportive role.
Although Wieck-Schumann generally assigned equal roles to each of the players, she still occasionally created problematically thick textures in her piano writing. There are a few passages in her trio with bass-heavy chords, particularly in the third movement (Example 83) and the fourth movement (Example 84). The modern grand piano has a tendency to sound ponderous in such passages. The pianist again needs to take care to avoid overpowering the strings. The strings should also aim for clear projection to counter any thickness from the piano and to achieve optimal clarity in the ensemble as a whole.

**Example 83: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Trio in G minor Op. 17, third movement, bars 26–30**

**Example 84: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Trio in G minor, Op. 17, fourth movement, bars 7–13**
Articulation

By the early nineteenth century *legato* was considered to be the “normal” style of keyboard articulation. In 1801 Clementi (1803, 9) published the statement: “When the composer leaves the *legato* and *staccato* to the performer’s taste (i.e. when neither slurring nor *staccato* is indicated); the best rule is, to adhere chiefly to the *legato*; reserving the *staccato* to give spirit occasionally and to set off the higher beauties of the *legato*”. This sentiment was echoed by Jean Louis Adam (1804) in French. Indeed, this orthodox view remained throughout the rest of the nineteenth century. A significantly different situation however can be found in string playing. Brown (1999) mentioned that in practice, most period instrument performers assume a fairly pronounced degree of non-*legato* for separately bowed notes, at least in faster tempi. This applies to all repertoires well into the nineteenth century.

Brown (1999) also categorised the two levels of articulation as structural and expressive. At the structural level was the articulation of musical phrases and sections, while as an expressive resource appropriate articulation of individual notes and figures was necessary to vivify a musical idea. The author further explained that composers in the nineteenth century were often tempted to provide ever more detailed instruction for articulation in their scores (Brown 1999). However, even in the most carefully notated works, much still remained the responsibility of the performer. The notation of a work, then as now, often depends on the composers’ understanding of the idiom of the instrument.

During the preparation of the trios for performance, there were several instances where the notated articulations required adjustment to enhance the musical and artistic effect of a passage. In Mendelssohn-Hensel’s second movement, the middle section starts with an
eight-bar passage in which a yearning melody is played by the piano in *legato* style. A broken-chord accompaniment, marked *staccato*, is played by the strings. The passage is then repeated with the melody taken over by the violin, while the piano resumes the broken-chord accompaniment in *staccato*. The arpeggiated accompaniment, which could be easily executed by the pianist, caused some technical difficulties in the strings due to the string crossings required.

Also in this section, the change of key and the accompaniment style suggested a “lift” in the momentum of the piece. However, the expressive mood portrayed in the previous section ought to be carried on as indicated by the tender melody. In order to preserve the flow of the melody as well as to facilitate the smooth playing of the strings, it was decided to have the string accompaniments from bars 38–45 played *spiccato* rather than a literal *staccato* (Example 85).

**Example 85: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, second movement, bars 35–46**
Likewise, from bars 45–51 the piano accompaniment was played in a slightly extended *staccato* manner rather than an excessively short one to avoid compromising the expressive continuity of the violin melody (Example 86). The ultimate aim of this interpretation was to avoid dryness of sound, to provide more supportive sonority for the strings, and to emphasise the harmonic aspects of the writing.

**Example 86: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, second movement, bars 41–51**

Decisions on the kinds of articulation needed to highlight certain musical phrases and to brighten certain musical ideas were made in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s fourth movement, which contains frequent changes of tempo. For example, in the section leading to the transition passage marked *Più animato*, it was decided that all players should deliver all of the notes from the second quaver in bar 55 to the end of bar 57 in a slightly detached manner. This was done to punctuate the phrase and to prepare for the different character that emerges in the following section (Examples 87).
Another instance requiring decisions on articulation occurred in the recapitulation of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s fourth movement (Example 88). Here, a new heroic character is established in bar 211, one which also marks the reappearance of the second theme from the first movement. The insertion of the eight-bar theme marks the completion of the cyclic idea. Naturally, in line with the strings, marked *staccato*, the piano part in the bars leading up to the reprise of the theme should also be played in a detached manner. This was done to enhance the sense of grandeur in the reappearance of the second theme and to highlight the cyclical concept that Mendelssohn-Hensel wished to portray.
Example 88: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 11, fourth movement, bars 208–216

Tempo

Questions of tempo were discussed in the previous chapter with regard to the sonatas. As pointed out earlier, this issue required an artistic decision relating to the overall choice of tempo and adoption of tempo modifications within the work itself. In the piano trios similar issues arose, most notably the choice of tempo in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s third movement and the extent of tempo modification required by Wieck-Schumann’s first and last movements.

For Mendelssohn-Hensel, the unusual insertion of a Lied as the third movement of the trio poses a particular complication when deciding upon the most appropriate tempo for the piece. Marked Allegretto, this movement is connected to the previous one by an attacca. Although the third movement is also written in the style of a Song without Words, it is lighter in spirit (Example 89) compared with the more reflective second movement, which finishes very softly and very delicately (Example 90).
In terms of sound and general mood, there are two possible approaches when considering how the third movement relates to the second. One can either let the third movement emerge gradually from the dreamy atmosphere found at the conclusion of the second, or the choice can be made to commence the third movement, the *Lied*, with an entirely different sound and character. It was decided during rehearsals to introduce an immediate contrast for the commencement of the *Lied*, as it contains elements of innocence that are best portrayed without becoming tritely emotional or expressive. As part of this overall expressive choice, a slightly faster *Allegretto* was employed. In order to further underline this idea, a dynamic level of approximately *mezzo forte* (mf) was applied (the score itself was devoid of any dynamic marking).
For Wieck-Schumann, the issues of tempo occurred around the tempo modifications placed at the end of the first and last movements, where the opening materials were heard again. Both moments represented examples of awkward tempo changes. In the first movement the return of the main theme was marked *animato* at bar 265 while the fourth movement had an unexpected *a tempo* at bar 323 after the *poco a poco ritard* at bar 317 (Examples 91 and 92). Combs (2002) suggested that Wieck-Schumann wished to create a moment of surprise by means of this tempo change. The author believed that Wieck-Schumann intended to allow a brilliant ending with an increase in intensity in the first movement and provide a comforting final gesture to ease the tension brought by the minor key in the fourth movement. Both tempo changes were unusual, and necessitated careful preparation by the performers in order to execute them convincingly.

**Example 91: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Trio in G minor, Op. 17, first movement, bars 259–268**
Example 92: Wieck-Schumann, Piano Trio in G minor, Op. 17, fourth movement, bars 313–326

Summary

The two piano trios by Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann bear certain resemblances, both musically and structurally. The first and most obvious of these is the choice of the minor mode for both. Mendelssohn-Hensel’s trio attempts a serious and virtuosic exploration of the minor mode while Wieck-Schumann’s work exploits more of its lyrical potential. Both composers also concluded their trios in the tonic major. Secondly, both composers wrote a substantial four-movement piano trio. Mendelssohn-Hensel’s trio consists of fast–slow–slow–fast movements with a structural pattern of sonata–ternary–strophic–sonata. Wieck-Schumann’s trio was written using a fast–fast–slow–fast pattern with a structural sequence sonata–scherzo and trio–ternary–sonata. Mendelssohn-Hensel was more
adventurous than Wieck-Schumann in this regard, an observation which can also be made in relation to the sonatas.

In terms of the instrumental writing, the roles in Wieck-Schumann’s trio are more equally distributed. Nemko (1997) observed that, as a virtuoso concert pianist, Wieck-Schumann may have been tempted to overload the piano’s role in the ensemble. Instead, she displayed mature musical judgement by maintaining a fine balance between all the instruments in the ensemble and by avoiding commonplace doubling of instrumental parts. In contrast, Mendelssohn-Hensel’s more concerto-like layout places greater demands on the piano than on the strings. Indeed, Mendelssohn-Hensel did not present the string players with many technically challenging passages. The overall challenge for the strings is simply to project well and balance the powerful writing of the piano in order to achieve a cohesive ensemble sound.

To a remarkable extent, Mendelssohn-Hensel’s trio reveals her capacity to present a work that is virtuosic in its outer movements yet intimate and personal in the inner ones. Her first and last movements contain orchestral textures and a sonority that is genuinely dramatic, and which often requires the players to make dynamic adjustments to achieve the best possible balance and textural clarity. Her second movement, while following the Classical tradition in terms of its slow tempo, bears no resemblance to sonata form. Classical slow movements are frequently in ABA form. Instead, Mendelssohn-Hensel introduced a cantabile movement in the style of Songs without Words, filled with Romantic expression. Her third movement is a Lied, in strophic form, rather than the expected Scherzo. This creates certain ambiguities that affect choices of tempo and character, issues which were dealt with in earlier discussion of tempo. She also invoked the cyclic principle through the reappearance of the
second theme of the first movement in the Finale. This piano trio can rightly be recognised as one of the composer’s most accomplished works.

Compared with Mendelssohn-Hensel’s highly ambitious and innovative writing style, Wieck-Schumann’s trio lies more in the tradition of Classical chamber music. She adhered more closely to the conventions of the Classical piano trio and strove to achieve balance in her writing, both in terms of structure and in the relationship between the instrumental parts. All four movements of Wieck-Schumann’s trio were cast in traditional structural formats, and she achieved balance and symmetry by presenting the opening theme in the concluding section of each movement – features which create fewer interpretative problems for the players compared with the structural, expressive and technical challenges found in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s trio.

This study of the piano trios of Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann not only reveals the high level of compositional skill with which both trios were written, but also sheds additional light upon the musical language of the two composers. The insights gathered through investigating and performing their works constitute one model of how they might be approached by contemporary performers. The performances were informed by a series of scholarly investigations into interpretative elements that included instrumental balance, articulation and tempo, as outlined earlier in this chapter.
CHAPTER 5: THE PIANO MINIATURES

The Piano Miniature in the Nineteenth Century

The piano miniature was one of the most popular and characteristic categories of nineteenth-century piano music. It is a type of small-scale composition that existed long before large-scale forms evolved. Dale (1954) considered its ancestors to be the many different kinds of short pieces by the Elizabethan virginal composers and delicate descriptive pieces by the late seventeenth-century and early eighteenth-century clavecinists. By the end of the eighteenth century, the composition of miniatures had declined, substantially replaced by the sonata and allied forms. However, miniatures were revived in the early nineteenth century by Romantic composers who were inclined to express the essentials of a creative piece, and inspired to attach a particular atmosphere to the genre. Piano miniatures such as Felix Mendelssohn’s Songs without Words, Robert Schumann’s character pieces (Carnaval, Op. 9, Kreisleriana, Op. 16, Nachtstücke, Op. 23 and Four Marches, Op. 76), Chopin’s Preludes and Liszt’s Consolations were among the most widely known small-scale piano works of the nineteenth century. Other types of miniatures were variously entitled bagatelle, moment musical, intermezzo, capriccio, humoresque, eclogue, and fantasy piece. Composers often combined a series of character pieces into a suite. For example, Liszt’s Christmas Tree Suite (1874), Tchaikovsky’s Suite, The Seasons, Op. 37 (1876), Borodin’s Petite Suite (1885) and Grieg’s Suite, From Holberg’s Time, Op. 40 (1884).

Although piano miniatures may be composed as individual pieces, they are also often grouped into sets. In some, the individual works are inter-related while in other cases there is
no connection between them. Dale (1954) divided miniatures into two main classes: those with generic titles, and those whose specific descriptive titles bring them within the sphere of programme music. The two classes often overlap as both kinds were sometimes included within a single series. Pieces in this genre are often abstract, descriptive, impressionistic or even improvisatory, but the majority are still symmetrical in terms of form. Kirby (1995) refers to piano miniatures in the nineteenth century as character pieces which, in general, show simplicity of form and which are (most often) written in ternary form (ABA) with a contrasting middle section. The piano miniatures are lyrical and exploit Romantic colours and harmonies. They resemble individual movements of a sonata, although they are in many ways not compatible with the formal and expressive approaches found in the first movement of a sonata. While many Romantic composers continued to compose large-scale piano works such as sonatas and extended sets of variations, the piano miniature stands out as one of the most important genres of the time, representing a significant part of the output for the instrument.

Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Songs without Words: An Overview

The *Lieder ohne Worte* or Songs without Words is a genre widely accepted as Felix Mendelssohn's invention and was developed extensively by him, although some scholars and historians asserted that his sister, Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel, may have preceded him in writing in this genre: Felix’s earliest *Lied ohne Worte* is dated 1821 while an untitled E minor draft of the same year by his sister contains songlike features, and could just as well be regarded as an example of a piano *Lied* (Todd 2010). Furthermore, as children, Fanny often played a musical game of adding texts to piano pieces with her brother, another potential way in which the genre may have emerged (Citron 1987).
Victoria Sirota (1981), one of the earliest researchers on Mendelssohn-Hensel’s life and music, claimed that the composer’s most significant contribution to piano literature lay in her *Lieder ohne Worte*. The piano works published during her lifetime mostly fall into this category of character piece. They include, for example, the *Vier Lieder für das Pianoforte*, Op. 2 (1847), published by Bote & Bock, the Six Melodies for Piano published by Schlesinger in two volumes Op. 4 (nos. 1–3) and Op. 5 (nos. 4–6) (1847), and the *Vier Lieder für das Pianoforte*, Op. 6 (1847) published by Bote & Bock.

Following Mendelssohn-Hensel’s death on 14 May 1847, Felix Mendelssohn gave the Leipzig publisher, Breitkopf & Härtel, four opus numbers by his sister. One of these was her *Vier Lieder ohne Worte*, Op. 8, which consists of her piano pieces composed in 1846 and published in 1850. Subsequently, other pieces written by Mendelssohn-Hensel earlier in her lifetime but not included in her Opp. 1 to 8 have been made available to the public. For example, a set of lyrical pieces written between 1837 and 1838 was published by the German music publisher, Furore, in 1996 under the title *Lyrische Klavierstücke*. In addition, the *Vier Römische Klavierstücke* (Four Roman Piano Pieces) written during her trip to Italy in 1840 were published by Breitkopf & Härtel in 1999. All three sets of character pieces published posthumously have been included in this project to reflect Mendelssohn-Hensel’s creative output in the genre. The titles of each group and its individual piece are provided in Table 15 with their respective H-U catalogue numbers.
Table 15: Mendelssohn-Hensel: List of Piano Miniatures Selected for Study with Corresponding H-U Catalogue Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mendelssohn-Hensel: List of Piano Miniatures Selected for Study with Corresponding H-U Catalogue Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lyrische Klavierstücke (1836–1839)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Andante con espressione H-U 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Andante con moto H-U 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Allegro molto vivace ma con sentimento H-U 332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vier Römische Klavierstücke (1840)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Allegro moderato H-U 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Introduktion und Capriccio H-U 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Largo und Allegro con fuoco H-U 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ponte Molle H-U 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vier Lieder ohne Worte, Op. 8 (1846)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Allegro moderato H-U 423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Andante con espressione H-U 463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lied (Lenau): Larghetto H-U 461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wanderlied: Presto H-U 458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lyrische Klavierstücke**

Sirota (1981) subdivided Mendelssohn-Hensel’s compositional life into three periods: an early period falling between her studies with Carl Friedrich Zelter in 1819 and her marriage in 1829; a middle period, up to her journey to Italy from 1839 to 1840; and a mature period from 1841 till her death in 1847. The *Lyrische Klavierstücke*, or Lyrical Keyboard Pieces, are Songs without Words written during Mendelssohn-Hensel’s middle period from 1836 to 1839. She composed a total of 18 piano pieces during these years, all of which can be found in the Mendelssohn Archive of the Berlin State Library in the anthology MA Ms. 44. Three of the more song-like pieces were published in one volume for the first time in 1996 by Furore, bearing the heading of *Lyrische Klavierstücke*. 
The first Song without Words, marked *Andante con espressione*, was composed by Mendelssohn-Hensel on the wedding day of her brother, Felix Mendelssohn, 28 March 1837. Set in the key of B flat major, the piece is characterised by a descending soprano line (Example 93). The initial theme is repeated twice: first in C minor and then in G minor with a series of brief modulations. The theme reappears in a brief coda and ends the piece in the tonic key.

**Example 93: Mendelssohn-Hensel, *Lyrische Klavierstücke*, no. 1, bars 1–7**

The second Song without Words, marked *Andante con moto*, was completed on 16 June 1838. It is in E major and features a soprano melody set in a lilting 6/8 time signature. According to Polk (2010, 12), this piece “reveals Fanny’s good ear for the vocal ornamentation of the day”. This is especially evident in her employment of wide leaps and repeated two-note figures that are embellished from bar 11. Such writing resembles a soprano swooping up and then delaying the cadence in a dramatic fashion (Example 94). Mendelssohn-Hensel’s writing in this piece is also idiomatic with her use of octave passages and the running demisemiquavers in both sextuplets and nonuplets (Example 95) and in the way that it showcases elements of virtuosity employed by the pianists of her time.

Mendelssohn-Hensel’s third Song without Words, marked *Allegro molto vivace ma con sentimento*, was completed on 28 June 1838. Again, the use of wide leaps and octaves in the melodic writing is a significant feature of this piece (Example 96).


*MV* 1840, shortly after the Hensel family set off for Rome on 27 August 1839. They arrived in Rome on 26 November where they stayed for some months before continuing their journey to southern Italy on 2 June the following year. Mendelssohn-Hensel considered the trip to Italy to be one of the happiest times of her life. Not only was it a long-desired wish come true for her, but the period also allowed her to perform and interact with her husband’s musician and painter friends, something she could not experience at home in Berlin. As she wrote:
Yesterday evening we performed Bach’s Triple Concerto before a brilliant gathering, playing it quite gloriously and to a great deal of applause … on Sunday, 31 May, we were invited to spend the whole day – from the morning coffee onwards – at the French Academy to make music in the wonderful garden hall, in response to my wish (Mendelssohn-Hensel in Lambour 1999).

The praise and recognition that Mendelssohn-Hensel received during her stay in Rome, and the motivation she felt in the presence of her husband’s painter friends, encouraged her to compose a series of “Roman” piano compositions. Four of them were published by Breitkopf & Härtel for the first time in 1999 under the title *Vier Römische Klavierstücke*.

Mendelssohn-Hensel’s first Roman piece, *Allegro moderato* in A flat major, was completed on 22 February 1840. A typical work in simple ternary form, the piece utilises some unusual harmonic progressions and is characterised by its broken-chord accompaniment (Example 97).

**Example 97: Mendelssohn-Hensel, *Vier Römische Klavierstücke*, no. 1, bars 1–3**

The second of the pieces, marked *Introduktion und Capriccio*, was composed on 19 March 1840. A more elaborate work written in B minor, it begins with imitative counterpoint similar to that often found in string quartet writing (Example 98) and perhaps recalls the influence of Bach. At bar 18, Mendelssohn-Hensel included a four-bar *cadenza*-like passage.
filled with demisemiquavers (Example 99). She then ended the 25-bar introduction with a brief recapitulation of the counterpoint that moves attacca to a Capriccio.

**Example 98: Mendelssohn-Hensel, *Vier Römische Klavierstücke*, no. 2, bars 1–8**

![Example 98](image1)

**Example 99: Mendelssohn-Hensel, *Vier Römische Klavierstücke*, no. 2, bars 18–19**

![Example 99](image2)

Mendelssohn-Hensel wrote her third Roman Piece, in G minor, on 29 March 1840. It consists of a *Largo* that moves *attacca* to an *Allegro con fuoco*. The *Largo* has an opening theme that does not settle on a tonic triad in root position until bar 16. It ends with a grand cadence on the dominant before moving on to the playful, fantasia-like second theme marked *Allegro con fuoco*. This second theme, which continues from bar 17, uses the polyrhythm of four against six or two against three. This rhythm frees the treble voice to make use of highly
“elastic” vocal ornamentation. The section features augmented-sixth chords and dissonant appoggiaturas as well as frequent changes of time signature – up to seven changes – a practice not found in her other piano works.

The fourth Roman piece was completed on 22 April 1840 and is entitled *Ponte Molle*, which literally translates as “Spring Bridge”. Also known as the Milvian Bridge, the *Ponte Molle* is a five-arch Roman bridge built on the Tiber to the north of Rome. It was the point of entry to Rome for travellers arriving from the north. On the basis of the date on which this Song without Words was written, as well as its mellow tone, it may be suggested that the piece is a perfect reflection of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s sad feelings at having to depart Rome to return to her home in Berlin.

In C minor and marked *Andante con espressione*, this atmospheric and passionate work begins with a notable two-bar introduction employing an augmented sixth chord. Mendelssohn-Hensel includes three words above the ensuing soprano melody: “*Ach, wer bringt etc.*” taken from a Goethe poem titled *Erster Verlust* (1789) or “First Loss”. This is a text that Mendelssohn-Hensel first set in 1823 for her brother to take to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832) on her behalf. The text from the poem once again portrays Mendelssohn-Hensel’s deep sorrow at leaving Rome after spending what she regarded as her happiest moments there (Tillard 1996).

**Vier Lieder ohne Worte, Op. 8**

The four compositions for piano comprised by the *Vier Lieder ohne Worte, Op. 8* (1846) were prepared for publication by Felix Mendelssohn after the death of his sister (Tillard 1996).
The set contained four Songs without Words of different characters which Mendelssohn carefully selected. The collection begins with a rhapsodic piece marked *Allegro moderato* in B minor, a short chorale-like work in A minor marked *Andante con espressione*, a nocturne entitled *Lied* and marked *Larghetto* in D flat major, and a *Wanderlied* in E major marked *Presto*. The four compositions included in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Op. 8 were published together with her Six Songs, Op. 9, Five Songs, Op. 10, and the Piano Trio, Op. 11.

Sirota (1981, 176–177) completed an extensive analysis of the first piece in this set, stating: “A closer look at the structure of this piece reveals that this is no ordinary song form. It is rather hybrid, combining features which are usually reserved for a discussion of sonata allegro form”. Indeed, the inclusion of the opposing thematic material characteristic of the sonata form shows that Mendelssohn-Hensel incorporated into this Song without Words more sophisticated structural elements than are normally found in a Romantic character piece. This ambitious undertaking was perhaps prompted by newly gained confidence; she would decide to publish her works for the first time under her own name in July 1846, barely two months after the piece was written (Citron 1987). It is also obvious that Mendelssohn-Hensel wrote it with the aim of elevating the intellectual standard of her Song without Words, a piano style with which she was well acquainted. Although Mendelssohn-Hensel cast this piece very differently to her other Songs without Words, which are often either set in a simple ternary form or written in a through-composed style, the elements of a clear, homophonic texture with a predominant melody are still present. An analysis of the piece as given by Sirota (1981) is summarised in Table 16.
Table 16: Analysis of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s *Vier Lieder ohne Worte*, Op. 8, no. 1 in B minor (adapted from Sirota’s Illustration I. Analysis of Fanny Hensel’s *Lied ohne Worte*, Op. 8, no. 1 in B minor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Sub-section</th>
<th>Bar numbers</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposition</strong></td>
<td>Theme A</td>
<td>1–16</td>
<td>B minor: i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closing theme X</td>
<td>17–22</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition Y</td>
<td>23–35</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme B</td>
<td>36–45</td>
<td>III, bV, bVII, bv, ii, iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of A</strong></td>
<td>Theme A</td>
<td>46–69</td>
<td>biv, iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-transition Z</td>
<td>70–75</td>
<td>Altered iv German aug. sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
<td>Theme A</td>
<td>76–91</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closing theme X</td>
<td>92–97</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition Y</td>
<td>98–110</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of B</strong></td>
<td>Theme B</td>
<td>111–121</td>
<td>N, bVII, VII,bI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of A</strong></td>
<td>Theme A</td>
<td>122–133</td>
<td>biv, iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-transition Z</td>
<td>134–137</td>
<td>B major: V7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closing theme X</td>
<td>138–149</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coda</strong></td>
<td>Transition Y</td>
<td>150–165</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second piece of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Op. 8 is unlike her usual Songs without Words in that it is choral or instrumental, rather than pianistic, in its layout. Its contrapuntal writing and frequent use of pedal point (Example 100) differ greatly from the homophonic texture she normally adopted in her piano compositions. Indeed, the piece could have been transcribed for a choir or chamber group that formed part of the programs in her *Sonntagsmusik*, should she have lived long enough to further revise and arrange her music.

**Example 100: Mendelssohn-Hensel, *Vier Lieder ohne Worte*, Op. 8, no. 2, bars 1–6**

The D flat major song entitled *Lenau*, Op. 8, no. 3, alludes to a poem by the Austrian poet, Nikolaus Lenau (1802–1850). Lenau is known for the lyrical quality of his verse which
was greatly appreciated by Felix Mendelssohn. Mendelssohn-Hensel seemed to have shared the same enthusiasm as she set Lenau’s poem *Schilflied* as a choral song, published in 1846. Prior to this, Mendelssohn had set the poem as a solo song in 1842.

The third piece from Mendelssohn-Hensel’s *Vier Lieder ohne Worte* has a wistful melody (Example 101) and is again set in simple ternary form. It bears an internal reflective mood that portrays a very personal, solitary emotional world. In terms of harmony, the middle section involves several surprising turns that provide yet another example of her creative treatment of harmony (Example 102).


![Example 101](image)


![Example 102](image)

Mendelssohn-Hensel’s fourth piece in her Op. 8, entitled *Wanderlied*, includes a feature typical of this genre: a singing melody accompanied by a running accompaniment throughout the whole composition (Example 103).
Example 103: Mendelssohn-Hensel, *Vier Lieder ohne Worte*, Op. 8, no. 4, bars 1–4

In conclusion, all three sets of Mendelssohn-Hensel’s piano miniatures discussed above represent Songs without Words that are highly Romantic in conception. All three pieces in her *Lyrische Klavierstücke* contain melodies that are vocal in character, evident from the use of vocal-like ornamentation and a melodic range similar to that of a soprano. Her frequent employment of octaves to emphasise the melodic line and the use of ostinato bass and repeated bass notes and chords in the accompaniment are characteristic of these lyrical pieces. The *Vier Römische Klavierstücke* are in turn lyrical (no. 1), contrapuntal and virtuosic (no. 2), vocal-like and scherzo-like (no. 3), and atmospheric, with feelings of regret (no. 4). This set of pieces briefly summarises her trip to Italy. Lastly, Mendelssohn-Hensel’s *Vier Lieder ohne Worte*, Op. 8, are four Songs without Words with very different characters: an ecstatic Allegro moderato, a short chorale-like Andante con espressione, an intimate and nocturne-like Lied, and the fast Wanderlied. These piano miniatures provide a snapshot of the composer’s creative output in this genre, combining lyricism and virtuosity and quintessentially Romantic in character.

**Wieck-Schumann’s Character Pieces: An Overview**

Reich (1985) noted that in the late 1830s, Wieck-Schumann’s piano compositions showed a tendency to shift from popular virtuosic showpieces to more complex and less openly showy
works. Indeed, this trend can be traced in her output of character pieces alone. One of her earliest works in this genre, *Quatre Pièces Caractéristiques*, Op. 5, is a skillful representation of Romantic pianism, revealing influences from composers such as Chopin, Mendelssohn and Schumann. Many features of the new Romanticism, such as miniature forms with extra musical associations and an experimental approach to rhythm and metre, can be found in this set. Her later compositional output on the other hand became more serious. This is evident especially in her late romances, namely the *Drei Romanzen*, Op. 21 (1853–55), Romance in A Minor (1853) and Romance in B Minor (1856). All the character pieces cited above were selected for study in this project, reflecting the transformation of her compositional language over her compositional career.

*Quatre Pièces Caractéristiques, Op. 5*

Wieck-Schumann’s *Quatre Pièces Caractéristiques*, Op. 5, were first published in 1836, prior to her marriage to Robert Schumann. By the age of 17, she had already been composing music for publication and was already a highly trained and experienced pianist. The four pieces contained in this set were composed during her teenage years and were played for Chopin in 1836. Wieck-Schumann’s performance and composition impressed Chopin so much that he requested a manuscript copy of her work (Reich 1985).

In 1830, when Wieck-Schumann was just 11 years old, Robert Schumann stayed with her family in order to take piano lessons with her father. According to Robert Schumann in his diary entry of 4 July 1831:

There was certainly more wit in what she [Wieck-Schumann] said than in the rest of us. Though she is barely three shoes tall, there is in her heart a development which awakens fear in me. In this girl, mostly in abrupt contrasts, the changes between
capriciousness and moodiness, laughing and weeping, death and life occur as quick as lightning (Borchard 2007, 24).

The subtle mood shifts and rapid changes of character described by Robert Schumann are directly reflected in the four pieces included in her Op. 5. Both the first piece, *Impromptu: Le Sabbat* and the last piece, *Scène fantastique: Le Ballet des Revenants*, bear programmatic titles and contain elements of the supernatural, a common theme in nineteenth-century music and literature. The thematic motifs present in the two pieces are closely related and serve to demonstrate the cyclical concept of the set (Examples 104 and 105).

**Example 104: Wieck-Schumann, *Quatre Pièces Caractéristiques*, Op. 5, no. 1, bars 1–10**

![Example 104: Wieck-Schumann, *Quatre Pièces Caractéristiques*, Op. 5, no. 1, bars 1–10](image)


![Example 105: Wieck-Schumann, *Quatre Pièces Caractéristiques*, Op. 5, no. 4, bars 102–111](image)
Unlike the character pieces composed during the early 1800s and mostly intended for home performances, Wieck-Schumann wrote her compositions with the aim of raising the intellectual standard of the genre. In doing so she felt she could take her music beyond the salon and have it performed in concerts to larger audiences and to greater success. It is little wonder then that her performance of *Quatre Pièces Caractéristiques*, Op. 5 before the royal family and Prince Esterhazy in Vienna, along with her public performance there on 7 January 1838, proved to be very successful (Reich 1985).

The first piece of Wieck-Schumann’s *Quatre Pièces Caractéristiques*, Op. 5, entitled *Le Sabbat: Allegro furioso*, is written in the style of an impromptu. Having been an avid reader of Romantic novels with supernatural themes, Wieck-Schumann skilfully depicts a fanciful scene of the rite of the witches’ Sabbath. Her use of wide leaps, chromatic appoggiaturas creating dissonances, unexpected accents, ascending passages in semitones, syncopations, and cross-rhythms add to the theatrical effect of the piece (Examples 106 and 107).


![Example 106](image)


![Example 107](image)
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The second piece, entitled *Caprice à la Boléro*, is written in the form of a scherzo. It starts with a series of repeated rhythmic patterns suggesting an instrumental accompaniment to the dance, possibly that of a drum (Example 108). Rhythmic contrast is then created with use of the *hemiola* (Example 109).


![Example 108](image)


![Example 109](image)

The lively first section of the piece is lent contrast by the middle section, a lyrical melody with broken-chord accompaniment, a feature commonly found in Robert Schumann’s piano works. As with the first section, the middle section also uses the *hemiola*, a rhythmic device that appeared regularly in works of Wieck-Schumann, Robert Schumann and Brahms (Example 110). This feature is also evident in Wieck-Schumann’s piano sonata and trio discussed in earlier chapters.
The third piece of Wieck-Schumann’s *Quatre Pièces Caractéristiques* is a Romance in B major. In ternary form, it is a work of deep feeling, resembling a love song, with chromatic harmony throughout (Example 111). Section A is transformed to the minor mode on its return, thus bringing the wistful piece to a melancholy close (Example 112).
Also apparent in this piece is the use of cross-rhythms, which blend well with the charming harmonies and the expressive melody, full of a sense of longing, that unfolds throughout the work (Example 113).


The fourth piece, entitled *Scène fantastique: Ballet des revenants*, literally, “Fantastic Scene: The Ballet of the Ghosts”, is an imaginative composition that enters the world of the supernatural. It suggests Wieck-Schumann wished to portray this as an elegant and graceful ballet. The background to the composition appears to be the ghost stories Robert Schumann told during his stays with the Wieck family.

Evenings were the nicest time. Robert would fetch the children – Clara and her two brothers, Alwin and Gustav – to his room, and here he would become a child again with the children. He told them his best stories and played charades with them….. Or he appeared clothed as a ghost, so that they ran from him shrieking … He told the fearful Clara about Doppelgänger and about the pistol that he always carried with him, and she was the kind of child who believed everything he told her (Schumann 1931, 223–224).

Marked *Allegro non troppo*, this piece opens with a short introductory statement that is soon replaced by a fleeting passage marked *con moto*. Robert Schumann made direct reference to Wieck-Schumann’s Op. 5, no. 4, in his Piano Sonata No. 1 in F sharp minor, Op. 11, composed in 1835. Dedicated to Wieck-Schumann, the first movement of his piano sonata is based on the same motifs (the rocking motif in fifths) found in Wieck-Schumann’s Op. 5, no. 4 (Chissell 1983), as can be seen in Examples 114 and 115.
Example 114: Robert Schumann, Piano Sonata in F sharp minor, Op. 11, no. 1, first movement, bars 1–13


*Drei Romanzen, Op. 21*

First published by Breitkopf & Härtel in December 1855, the *Drei Romanzen*, Op. 21, were three piano pieces composed in June 1853. The autograph of the first piece, located at the Robert Schumann House in Zwickau, was presented to Robert Schumann on his birthday with the inscription: “For my beloved husband, June 8, 1853” (Klassen 1987, viii). The second and third pieces are dated 25 June and the end of June respectively. While the second
and third romances exist only in a single copyist’s manuscript dated by the composer, the first exists in another autograph preserved in the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde (Society of the Friends of Music) in Vienna. It bears the inscription: “Written for my dear friend Johannes Brahms on the 2nd of April, 1855” (Reich 1985, 300). The two dedications seem puzzling, but are not contradictory. By the time negotiations for the publication of the three pieces were completed, Brahms had become a close and trusted friend, and this may go some of the way towards explaining the two dedications.

The first of the Drei Romanzen, marked Andante, conveys a deep feeling of sadness through its melody, harmony and dynamics. Written in a simple ternary form, it begins with a dark and sorrowful theme in A minor that encompasses widely-spaced chords played by both the right and the left hands (Example 116).

**Example 116: Wieck-Schumann, Drei Romanzen, Op. 21, no. 1, bars 1–4**

![Example 116](image)

The middle section, in F major, has a more joyous mood, with triplet figuration (Example 117) also found in Robert Schumann’s Novellette, Op. 21, no.1, in the same key (Example 118). Marked Sehr innig bewegt and Animato, its theme is characterised by a dreaminess that contrasts with the dark and melancholy first section. It is also filled with passages of cross-rhythm that give rhythmic freedom, rather than tension, to the lyrical soprano voice.
The second piece in F major is an Allegretto with very colourful harmony. It is a short work that provides a delicate contrast to the first piece in the set, acting almost like an intermezzo between it and the more serious third piece that follows. Wieck-Schumann notated the chords clearly with semiquavers followed by rests rather than crotchets with staccato (Example 119). This is a feature also found in Robert Schumann’s Fughetta, Op. 32, no. 4, in G minor, and the “Soldier’s March” from his Album for the Young, Op. 68, no. 2, in G major.
The third Romance, in G minor, is marked *Agitato* and brings another increase in tempo. Set again in ternary form (ABA), with a repeated Section A at the end, this piece has a restless quality characterised by the accented passing notes apparent in the first section. Although marked only *piano* (*p*), the work has an intensive melodic contour built out of numerous chromatic and step-wise movements. The middle section has many unexpected and irregular phrase structures and consists of tonal fluctuations between G major and E minor. When Section B finally settles in G minor, the Section A returns *a tempo* and is heard twice before the piece ends swiftly in its tonic G minor.

**Romance in A Minor**

Composed together with the *Drei Romanzen*, Op. 21, in July 1853, Wieck-Schumann’s Romance in A minor was dedicated to Rosalie Leser who became one of the composer’s close friends during her time in Düsseldorf. Her autograph bears the following dedication: “Composed for my faithful Rosalie ... Clara Schumann. Düsseldorf, July 1853”. This romance, written in a melancholy tone characteristic of Wieck-Schumann's later years, was published separately in 1891 (Reich 1985). In simple ternary form, the piece contains a middle section with a very expressive melody accompanied by triplet figuration (Example 120).
Romance in B Minor

The Romance in B minor was Wieck-Schumann’s present to Brahms for his 22nd birthday on 7 May 1855. After finishing the piece on 2 April in the same year, she signed the manuscript with the dedication: “Liebendes Gedenken [Loving thoughts], Clara”. The Vienna autograph, a presentation copy, is dated at the end of the piece with Christmas 1856 and includes the same inscription as the manuscript. It may have been presented to Brahms at Christmas 1856 (Reich 1985). Wieck-Schumann wrote in her diary: “It sounds quite sad, yet I was certainly sad when I wrote it” (Arnold 2004, 8). This is especially true as she was going through awful times: concerning Robert’s mental illness, she only received bad and depressing news from the asylum in Endenich. However, Brahms’ presence consoled her and gave her new courage.

The piece is marked by a concentrated intimacy of expression in which the characteristically melancholic tone of Wieck-Schumann’s later piano music is apparent, in stark contrast to the character of the miniatures composed during her youth. This romance
also marks her last solo work for piano as, after the death of her husband on 29 July 1856, she immersed herself in performing and teaching. The falling line of the main theme is highly reminiscent of the Andante and Intermezzo of Brahms’ Piano Sonata No. 3 in F minor, Op. 5, written in 1853 and published the following year (Examples 121–123). The middle section of Wieck-Schumann’s Romance in B minor, marked Etwas voran, brings a slight lift in mood with many unexpected modulations. It also consists of a very tender melody that is accompanied by triplet figurations, a feature that often appears in the middle sections of her late romances.

**Example 121: Wieck-Schumann, Romance in B minor, bars 1–4**

![Example 121](image)

**Example 122: Brahms, Piano Sonata No. 3 in F minor, Op. 5, Andante, bars 1–5**

![Example 122](image)

**Example 123: Brahms, Piano Sonata No. 3 in F minor, Op. 5, Intermezzo, bars 1–4**

![Example 123](image)

Overall, the piano miniatures of Wieck-Schumann selected for study present two different compositional styles. The *Quatre Pièces Caractéristiques*, Op. 5, are programmatic
character pieces and the set is cyclical in its conception. It shows that Wieck-Schumann was already an accomplished composer in her teenage years, with compositional techniques comparable to those of other composers of the time. The romances written in her later years, namely the *Drei Romanzen*, Op. 21, the Romance in A minor and the Romance in B minor, are more reflective and intimate in character. They contrast markedly with earlier pieces often intended to showcase her pianistic skills. Instead, the later piano miniatures are mostly nostalgic and intimate in character. The drastic change of mood reflected in the late romances probably reflects her deep concern over her husband’s worsening health.

**Performance Issues**

In approaching the piano miniatures of Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann several practical and interpretative issues were encountered, involving time signatures, rhythm, arpeggiation, and pedalling. Discussions of the issues arose and the decisions made during the preparation of the works for recording are presented below.

**Time Signatures**

It is through the management of time signatures that a composer can indicate the pulse unit of a piece as a whole and changes in metre within it. Time signatures may be categorised as duple or triple (according to whether the beat or pulse is organised in twos or threes) and as simple or compound. More generally, a time signature represents the temporal hierarchy of subdivisions, beats and bars maintained by performers and inferred by listeners. This functions as a dynamic temporal framework for the production and comprehension of
musical durations. In this sense, time signature is more an aspect of the behaviour of performers and listeners than an aspect of the music itself (London 2013).

In preparing Mendelssohn-Hensel’s *Vier Römische Klavierstücke*, no. 4, *Ponte Molle*, certain discrepancies arose between the two time signatures used in the piece. Set in a simple ternary form, the first section is written in the compound triple time of 9/8; whereas the middle section is in compound duple of 6/4. Upon closer examination it is evident that the overall phrasing of the melody and the accompaniment in the middle section are actually in duple rather than triple metre. Mendelssohn-Hensel’s own writing in beaming the quaver notes throughout the whole middle section supports this view. The simple triple feel of 3/2 fits more naturally than the compound duple of 6/4 (Example 124).

**Example 124: Mendelssohn-Hensel, Vier Römische Klavierstücke, no. 4, bars 31–37**

![Musical notation](image)

**Rhythm**

In music notation, a dotted rhythm consists of a note followed by a dot to indicate an increase in length equal to one half of its simple value. It is then followed by another note that is of length equal to the value of the dot. It allows two notes to be played in different lengths (long followed by short) in the same time allowed for two equal notes. Triplet rhythm, on the other
hand, consists of three equal notes played in the time normally allowed for two. One common circumstance which requires interpretative decisions from the performer occurs where a succession of triplets are to be played against equal or dotted pairs of notes. According to Booth (2010), when this situation occurs, the player must either interpret literally by playing the two parts in cross-rhythm, or synchronise them by distorting one part to fit the rhythm of the other. This distortion is generally known as synchronisation, a convention normally considered a Baroque phenomenon but which apparently continued well into the nineteenth century, and has recently become an issue of scholarly debate. Many writers have shown that this rhythmic assimilation applies in the music of Schubert and Brahms (Bilson 1997; Newbould 2003; Shawe-Taylor et al. 1963).

While preparing the piano miniatures of Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann, questions arose concerning the possible synchronisation of dotted against triplet rhythms. The first example can be found in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Vier Lieder ohne Worte, Op. 8, no. 1, Allegro moderato. The closing passage of the initial theme, which carries a new motif characterised by octave leaps linked to dotted rhythms, presents dilemmas in interpretation (Example 125).

If, for instance, one were to play the rhythm in bar 17 precisely as it is notated, the
demisemiquaver would be played slightly after the last semiquaver in the accompaniment.
However, if we refer to notational conventions current in the Baroque which carried over into
the Romantic period, the more appropriate approach may be to play such passages by treating
the dotted rhythms as triplets. Badura-Skoda (1993) argued that the practice of playing the
semiquaver at exactly the same time as the third note of the triplet was not obsolete in the
nineteenth century and can be traced in works by Schumann, Chopin, Heller, Liszt and
several others. Mendelssohn-Hensel would have been very much aware of this practice.
Furthermore, to play the semiquaver slightly after the third note of the triplet produces a note
with a very short time value, potentially reducing the expressive quality intended for the
octave leap (Example 125). Therefore, it was decided to synchronise these cases and play the
last demisemiquaver of the melody together with the last semiquaver of the triplet
accompaniment.

A similar rhythm occurring in Wieck-Schumann’s Romance in B minor was treated
differently. In the middle section marked *Etwas voran*, the composer cast a tender melody
that is accompanied by triplet figurations. In contrast to Mendelssohn-Hensel’s *Lieder ohne
Worte*, Op. 8, no. 1, Wieck-Schumann provided clear indications as to how the dotted rhythm
against the triplet should be played (Example 126).

**Example 126: Wieck-Schumann, Romance in B minor, bars 31–33**
In bar 31, it is apparent that the dotted rhythm in bar 31 is a triplet – a dotted rhythm used “within” a triplet, requiring no synchronisation. In bar 32, the use of an equal pair of semiquavers against the triplet accompaniment, immediately followed by another pair of semiquavers with a demisemiquaver rest in between them, a triplet marking after them, as well as the vertical alignment of notes in the treble parts, makes it obvious that differentiated rhythms are required here, all without synchronisation. However, when first encountering the dotted rhythm in bar 33, one may not be able to immediately decide on the interpretation of the true demisemiquaver, whether to play it as it is literally written (cross-rhythm) or to adopt the earlier convention (synchronisation). Here, the performer’s decision should be guided by the demisemiquaver and the clearly marked triplet sign that appears on the last quaver beat in bar 32. This suggests that Wieck-Schumann did not intend for the dotted rhythm in bar 33 to be played as triplet (with synchronisation), but rather as a genuinely dotted rhythm. Therefore, the treatment of cross-rhythms may then be applied to the pattern with the demisemiquaver being played right after the last semiquaver in the accompaniment.

**Arpeggiation**

Arpeggiation is a regular feature of accompaniment in keyboard music. It largely dates from the mid-eighteenth century, although many earlier examples exist. Generally, there are two types of arpeggiation: notated and unnotated. Notated arpeggiation is normally written out in full and can be seen in much Baroque music such as Bach’s Sonata for Violin and Clavier in C minor, BWV 1017, second movement (Taylor 2003). Unnotated arpeggiation, on the contrary, is often left to the discretion of the pianist. In some cases, the notes in both hands are arpeggiated simultaneously; in others, the arpeggiation commences with the lowest note
in the left hand and proceeds continuously to the highest note in the right hand. The “spread” from the lowest to the highest notes can be executed in two ways: one with the highest note in the chord aligned with the pulse, or the other with the lowest note in the chord aligned with the pulse (Peres Da Costa 2012).

In approaching the repertoire presented in this study, decisions with regard to arpeggiation were made according to the overall principle that the requirements of the melodic line should normally take precedence. The use of pedal sometimes adds an additional dimension that may affect the solution adopted, as discussed below.

During the preparation of Wieck-Schumann’s *Drei Romanzen, Op. 21*, no. 1, *Andante*, it was found that each of the opening four bars of the piece contains a chord that required arpeggiation (Example 127). Pianists, especially those with a small hand span, may for purely technical reasons need to spread most chords that span more than an octave. This need not, however, compromise the music’s expressiveness, as smooth execution of arpeggiation enhances the Romantic expressiveness of the music.

**Example 127**: Wieck-Schumann, *Drei Romanzen, Op. 2, no. 1*, bars 1–4, with performance notes

![Example 127](image)

In the first bar there are two ways of approaching the chord in the left hand: either before the beat or on it. Essentially, both ways are acceptable as long as the emphasis is always on the top E in the right hand and not upon the arpeggio. A player may not wish to
become too preoccupied with the notes in the spread as they function as harmony notes that provide support to the more important melody note, which in this case is the top E in the right hand. A more natural way of playing this bar would be to play the spread chord slightly before the first beat. This helps establish the melancholy atmosphere and mood of the piece while building momentum towards the first melody note. The other issue to consider is the bass note – it needs to be caught by the pedal, with a clean progression to the next chord.

In bar 2 the preferred choice is to begin the spread chord on the beat. This is because the melody progresses from the last quaver in bar 1 to the first quaver in bar 2. In order to prevent the spread from holding the melodic line up it is best to play the bottom A of the left hand chord together with the E in the right hand. There is plenty of time for the remaining notes to find their place after the beat and underneath the long melodic note.

The spread chord in the right hand of bar 3 requires a similar approach by beginning the spread on the beat where the bottom C of the right hand chord is played together with the bass note A in the left hand. It is important to take time in spreading the chords and to produce a ringing tone from the E at the top of the spread.

In bar 4 the third crotchet beat consists of a left hand chord which again may have to be split due to its wide span. There are a few ways to play this chord but a viable recommendation is to spread it before the beat. One could first play the second chord in the bar, follow it by depressing the pedal, catch the bottom E with the pedal, and then proceed with the rest of the chord.
Pedalling

The chapter on the piano sonatas touched upon issues of pedalling, including the application of long pedals versus frequent pedal changes, flutter pedalling, and the use of *una corda*. Similar issues surfaced while preparing the second piece, *Allegretto*, from Wieck-Schumann’s *Drei Romanzen*, Op. 21. In the passages containing pedal indications one needs to decide how literally they should be observed.

There is now a widespread understanding of the differences between the modern piano and those of the nineteenth century, particularly in terms of their sustaining abilities, as discussed in the previous chapter. Pedal markings devised for instruments in the nineteenth century do not necessarily work well on modern pianos due to their differing pedal and damping mechanisms. This means that the modern pianist, when studying nineteenth-century music, may often encounter pedal notation that seems unnecessary or even unmusical. As a result, certain adjustments to the pedalling notated may be required. Such notation was conceived for nineteenth-century instruments, which had less sustaining power. Furthermore, the earlier instruments were built with homogeneity and brilliance of sound as their primary objectives.

In Wieck-Schumann’s *Drei Romanzen*, Op. 21, no. 2, *Allegretto*, there are four passages which feature pedal indications, three of which are problematic. As always in such instances, the player needs to consider the spirit in which the markings were devised and use the ear and the imagination to achieve an acceptable result. With regard to the first of these (Example 128), the pedal is to be applied on the first beat of bar 10 and sustained until the pedal release sign at the end of bar 11. Yet, if one is to adopt these indications literally, the
result is musically unconvincing, the pedal blurring the harmony and producing an undesirable, muddled effect. The change of colour implied by the use of the pedal in bar 10 has a definite musical purpose, however, as it is preceded by a change of dynamic to *pianissimo* (*pp*) at the end of bar 9. It was decided to apply the pedal until the end of the third quaver of bar 10 to highlight the colour change, and then return to the detached and light sound of the separate chords without the pedal thereafter, with some differentiation of length and colour (Example 128).


![Example 128](image)

The passage from bar 15 to 18 is similarly problematic (Example 129). An alternative way to play this passage is to apply the pedal on the third quaver of bar 16 only, and then on the accented first quaver in bar 18 (Example 129).

**Example 129: Wieck-Schumann, *Drei Romanzen*, Op. 21, no. 2, bars 15–18, with performance notes**

![Example 129](image)

The third passage with pedal markings poses no problem in producing a sustained sound without blurring the harmony as there is a wide gap between the chords and the bass notes (Example 130).
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However, the final passage in question requires the performer to release the pedal before the marked point, preferably on the third quaver in bar 38, and then to apply an additional short pedal on the first accented beat in bar 39 (Example 131).


Summary

As a whole, the works selected for study in this chapter reflect the concept of piano miniatures that both Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann pursued, yielding insights into the Songs without Words of Mendelssohn-Hensel, and the character pieces and romances of Wieck-Schumann. By highlighting the musical characteristics and compositional styles of these two composers, the performer was able to identify similarities and differences between
their works. In this particular genre, Mendelssohn-Hensel was consistent in her frequent employment of Romantic pianism and quasi-vocal lyricism. Wieck-Schumann, on the other hand, evolved from a more extrovert and ostentatious style to more intimate compositions of great emotional depth. The works included in this study were composed at different phases of the composers’ creative output. All can be regarded as worthy contributions to the piano miniature of the nineteenth century.

In preparing the repertoire presented in this study, many opportunities were provided to explore issues such as time signatures, treatment of rhythm, arpeggiation, and pedalling. These issues were discussed earlier as a result of artistic insights gathered during the preparation of the selected works. The pieces require thoughtfully consideration of these issues if an expressive and stylistic performance is to be the end result. The process of preparing the piano miniatures was heavily informed by relevant performance practice literature that substantially shaped their interpretation.
CONCLUSION

The aim of the research project was to pursue an investigation into the piano works of Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel and Clara Wieck-Schumann from the perspective of the performer. The exegesis stands as a commentary, combining theoretical, historical and practical perspectives that document the processes of research and performance undertaken as part of the project.

The first chapter, Literature Review, presented the survey on a range of key resources relevant to the project; while the second chapter, Introduction to the Composers, provided brief biographies of Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann, lending historical and contextual background to the works forming the core of this study. The last three chapters of this exegesis, Piano Sonatas, Piano Trios and Piano Miniatures summarised the knowledge and understanding gained in the research and performance of selected piano works by Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann. Consideration of key musical elements such as structure, dynamics, articulation, phrasing, texture, tempo, and pedalling led to a series of personal artistic choices that reflected the personal insights of a performer committed to this music.

The study of the piano sonatas reveals both composers used approaches to form and texture that were characteristically Romantic. Yet there are distinct differences between them. Mendelssohn-Hensel’s compositional textures are more flexible, irregular and orchestral in conception, and her melodies, with their wider range and more expansive phrase structure, are more distinctive and pianistic. In contrast, Wieck-Schumann’s sonata adheres more closely to conventions while her compositional textures are more classically anchored and consistent throughout. Mendelssohn-Hensel’s wider melodic range, as well as her more
expansive approach to texture, suggest that she felt relatively more compositional freedom within the confines of her private salon. It may also mean that she was less pianistically focussed in her musical imagination. Wieck-Schumann’s more controlled use of the musical landscape is rooted in traditional concerns for balanced musical phrases and the well-established sonata form.

The study of the piano trios reveals similar trends. Both piano trios contain many ideas that were original at the time. These trios can therefore be considered as providing the most useful areas of comparison as they bear out the two women’s differing approaches and capacities. Mendelssohn-Hensel’s trio exhibits not only the pianistic and virtuosic elements common in the nineteenth century, but also exemplifies her strong inclination towards lyricism. With the piano assuming a prominent role throughout the piece, Mendelssohn-Hensel succeeds in showcasing her inventiveness in composing a piano trio that operates on a scale similar to that of a piano concerto, especially in the first movement. Wieck-Schumann, on the other hand, has written a finely crafted trio in the Classical mould. Unlike Mendelssohn-Hensel, Wieck-Schumann allows each instrument to contribute equally, without the piano dominating the strings. Despite the contrapuntal writing, especially in the last movement, there is a pervading quality of poetry and tenderness. While the entire work is characterised by expressive moderation, it skilfully embraces the intimacy of the piano trio through an admirably balanced texture.

It is important to note that neither composer decided to include a ‘standard’ scherzo movement in their piano trios. This was perhaps due to the intention to break from established tradition with which they may have felt they did not quite fit (for Wieck-Schumann) or want to fit (for Mendelssohn-Hensel). Wieck-Schumann, despite her trio’s
obvious stature, belittled it, saying it lacked imagination at some points, stating in her diary after she composed the work: “There are some nice passages in the trio and I believe it is also fairly successful as far as form is concerned, but naturally it is still women’s work, which always lacks force and occasionally invention” (Litzmann in Reich 1985, 228). At the time she wrote her trio, Mendelssohn-Hensel, in contrast, was experiencing a period of intense compositional focus encouraged by the success of her first publication. The compositional challenge that she faced and the degree of effort she invested in writing the trio can be traced from her remark that the work on the trio had “put me through my paces” and that, afterwards, “my musical muse had abandoned me; since my trio I have not written a single bar” (Elvers 1986, vii).

One striking point of contrast between these two north German Romantic composers is the manner in which they refracted the important influence of J. S. Bach. It is apparent that both composers must have been influenced by the Baroque master, yet they reveal this influence very differently. A Bachian allusion can certainly be found in Mendelssohn-Hensel’s trio, where her opening cadenza in the Finale might well be said to recall Bach’s Chromatic Fantasy and Fugue, BWV 903. While no such obvious allusion appears in Wieck-Schumann’s trio, the use of fugue in her Finale is significant, where in the course of the development a fugal exposition and later stretto are interspersed with returns of the second subject, a passage beginning at bar 111. This striking integration of contrapuntal writing into the Finale had no precedent in the piano trio literature of the time; Robert Schumann may perhaps have inspired the passage through his use of fugue in the Finale of his Piano Quartet in E flat, Op. 47 (1842), and Wieck-Schumann performed this quartet in Leipzig in 1844 (Susskind 1977), but her deployment of contrapuntal writing in a piano trio remains an accomplished and original stroke of invention. Joachim, for example, wrote to Wieck-
Schumann in 1860 stating: “I would rather have heard your trio [than music by Moritz
Hauptmann]. I recollected a fugato in the last movement and remember that Mendelssohn
once had a big laugh because I would not believe that a woman could have composed
something so sound and serious” (Joachim in Reich 1985, 228).

Aside from her husband’s example, Wieck-Schumann may also have modelled her
use of fugue as a developmental technique in the Finale on such symphonic precedents such
Beethoven’s Symphony No. 3 in E flat major, Op. 55 (“Eroica”), where fugue is briefly
invoked in both first (from bar 236) and second movements (from bar 114). Beethoven’s later
works, on the other hand, more frequently include fugues per se, such as the dramatic final
movement of the Piano Sonata in B flat, Op. 106 (“Hammerklavier”). One might also
consider that of Wieck-Schumann’s teachers, Weinlig was Thomas-Cantor in Leipzig, hence
a direct successor to Bach himself, while Heinrich Dorn, although remembered first and
foremost as an operatic composer, was a student of Zelter and an accomplished contrapuntist
(Reich 1985). Robert Schumann wrote numerous works testifying to his engagement with
Bach; significantly, the works written in direct response to Bach, such as his Piano Quartet,
Op. 47 (1842) and Six Fugues on B-A-C-H, Op. 60 (1845), both date from the 1840s, while
Wieck-Schumann’s wrote her Three Preludes and Fugues for the Piano, Op. 16, in 1845, the
same year as Robert Schumann’s Bach homages were published, and two years prior to
composing her trio (1847). We also know that the Schumanns began joint studies in fugue
and daily exercises in counterpoint in January 1845 in Dresden (Reich 1986). During this
time, they studied Cherubini’s Counterpoint and Fugue, and analysed both Bach and
Beethoven (Chissell 1983). Taken together, this confluence of interest in counterpoint and
fugue in the 1840s may all have contributed to Wieck-Schumann’s decision to employ fugal
technique in her trio.
Mendelssohn-Hensel’s trio, on the other hand, reveals little evidence of an engagement with fugue or Bachian counterpoint more generally. And yet Mendelssohn-Hensel received, ostensibly, much the same training as her brother, who went on to use fugal techniques extensively in several of his works, effortlessly integrating fugal writing, for example, into the development sections of both first and last movements of his “Italian” Symphony, Op. 90 (1833). One possible explanation as to the lack of obvious Bachian contrapuntal gestures in the music of Mendelssohn-Hensel is that she had simply not developed as far in her compositional technique; moreover, she may have felt such complexity to have been out of place in her largely lyrical, pianistic style.

The conclusion may be drawn that there is a marked difference in the level of technical skill demonstrated in the works of these two composers. Apart from the lack of contrapuntal writing that we find in her music, Mendelssohn-Hensel’s tonal plan in her sonata, especially in her first movement, as well as her unremitting use of arpeggios and left hand accompaniment triplets towards the end of the fourth movement, could also be ascribed to less accomplished compositional skills. One would conclude Mendelssohn-Hensel to have been a less literate composer – or perhaps, at least in regard to form, she purposely diverted from the norms of sonata writing for her own expressive purposes. She appears to have had the more thorough musical training, yet she never wrote anything technically much beyond songs and chamber music, and at the very end of her career, a piano trio, a work which is in many respects a miniature virtuoso piano concerto, with largely supporting roles taken by the strings and little of the interplay between the three instruments that is so fundamental a characteristic of chamber music. Wieck-Schumann, on the other hand, and despite what appears to have been less extensive training, was sufficiently skilled to have written a piano concerto at age 14 and by her maturity was already an accomplished and professional
composer. And then: Mendelssohn-Hensel had a vast output, which remained largely unpublished; yet more of Wieck-Schumann's output, while tiny in comparison, found its way into print.

The striking paradoxes between the two composers can be better understood through an understanding of the differing social circumstances in which these two women were brought up, lived and worked. Although Mendelssohn-Hensel was given the same opportunity to attain music education at a young age alongside her brother, and showed exceptional talent, she was not encouraged to become a professional musician or composer as she grew to maturity. Unlike her brother Felix, Mendelssohn-Hensel was not encouraged to have her work audited by well-known composers; Felix’s early works were evaluated by his teachers Karl Zelter and Ignaz Moscheles, the young prodigy played before Goethe at the age of 12, and was brought by his father to such major musical centres as London and Paris, where his compositions were heard and critiqued by such important figures as Johann Hummel and Luigi Cherubini (Tillard 1996). Mendelssohn-Hensel, however, was denied such opportunities to learn from the criticism of masters. Her father wished her to concentrate on her role as a wife and mother appropriate to her aristocratic social class (Todd 2010). This greatly reduced her opportunities as well as her incentives to refine her musical gifts.

On the other hand, Wieck-Schumann was moulded by her father to become a musical prodigy. The comprehensive musical training provided by her father, and many other well-known musicians which he had systematically programmed, provided a strong foundation for Wieck-Schumann’s career (Reich 1985). Her frequent concert appearances as pianist and her creative partnership with her husband Robert Schumann, and acquaintance with many
important musical figures at different stages of her life led to her becoming a far more accomplished musician in comparison with Mendelssohn-Hensel.

From another point of view, the differences found in the sonatas and trios are also the result of the different purposes that lay behind these compositions and their different performance settings. As mentioned by Reich (1993), Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann can serve as paradigms of the non-professional and the professional women musicians of the nineteenth century, representing two different traditions and classes. Wieck-Schumann, having published her compositions during her lifetime, perhaps felt the need to conform to conventional expectations. Furthermore, she relied on the income generated by her professional activity. She may also have wished her music to be technically accessible to the amateur. In contrast, Mendelssohn-Hensel was primarily composing for her personal pleasure and for performances at her salon. She could therefore take a freer, less constrained approach with regard to technical difficulty and compositional style in general.

The detailed study of the miniatures reveals the strength of the two composers in a genre that is today widely considered as the quintessential form of Romantic piano music. Mendelssohn-Hensel’s miniatures selected for study in this project encompass her Songs without Words written over a period of 10 years. They reveal her focus upon expanding the genre into something more sophisticated than a simple character piece. Most of her works are carefully crafted with a beautiful foreground that is both musically and dramatically satisfying. She included a brief contrapuntal passage in the second of her Vier Römische Klavierstücke featuring imitative counterpoint and the cadenza-like passage recalling Bach in her trio, yet overall such features are uncharacteristic of her style. For Wieck-Schumann, the longer span of her compositional life reveals the significant series of stylistic changes she
made in her miniatures. Her earlier character pieces are, according to Reich, “popular crowd-pleasers” and “technically showy” (1985, 226), and consist of elements typical of nineteenth-century pianism, such as bravura technique, lyrical, aria-like middle sections, miniature forms with extra-musical associations, a loosening of regular phrase structure, experiments with rhythm and time signatures, and the use of dance rhythms. These can all be found in her *Quatre Pièces Caractéristiques*. Her romances written in the 1850s, however, reveal a shift in style from the display of brilliance to a greater intimacy of expression, less extroversion and an emotional range often characterised by a sense of nostalgia.

The primary purpose of this project has been to examine the selected piano works of Mendelssohn-Hensel and Wieck-Schumann, and to propose guidelines and reference points to pianists wishing to explore them. The repertoire covered in this project reveals both composers produced music of admirable quality. Analysis of it provides opportunities to explore performance-related questions. This leads to a special understanding that comes from performing the music, in which insights obtained from its study can be linked with, and further supported by, historical and theoretical perspectives. This multi-faceted approach differentiates the current project from the purely academic investigations previously undertaken into these composers and their works. It highlights the distinctive insights that can be gained from using performance as one of a number of investigative tools. Similarly, it stresses the need for performers to support their practical insights with historical and theoretical awareness in order to produce more historically and musically informed performances. It is ultimately hoped that further exposure to the piano works of these two unique musical personalities will generate greater interest amongst performers and listeners, and stimulate publishers to commission long-overdue complete editions of their music.
APPENDICES

Appendix 1:
List of Piano Works by Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel and Clara Wieck-Schumann (sorted by year of issue)

Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel’s piano works according to the H-U catalogue (Hellwig-Unruh 2000) with year of composition in brackets

1. H-U 1, 12 Gavotten (lost) (1819)
2. H-U 4, Klavierstück in D minor (1820)
3. H-U 29, Klavierstück in E minor (1821)
4. H-U 30, Klavierstück in E major. Andante (1821)
5. H-U 37, Klavierstück in G minor. Allegro (1821)
6. H-U 39, Klavierstück in Bb major (1821)
7. H-U 40, Klavierstück in G minor. Allegro agitato (1821)
8. H-U 41, Klavierstück in Ab major (1821)
9. H-U 42, Klavierstück in A minor (frag) (1821)
10. H-U 43, Sonate in F major (lost) (1821)
11. H-U 44, Sonatensatz in E major. Allegro assai moderato (1822)
15. H-U 71, Übungsstück in G minor. Allegro moderato (1823)
16. H-U 74, Übungsstück in Eb minor. Larghetto (1823)
17. H-U 79, Übungsstück in G major. Allegro assai moderato (1823)
18. H-U 81, Walzer für den Herzog von Rovigo (four hands) (1823)
19. H-U 84, Übungsstück in G major. Presto (1823)
20. H-U 86, Übungsstück in C major. Allegro ma non troppo (1823)
21. H-U 88, Übungsstück in C major (1823)
22. H-U 92, Übungsstück in B minor. Allegro ma non troppo (1823)
23. H-U 96, Übungsstück in G minor (1823)
24. H-U 99, Klavierstück in C major. Lento ma non troppo (1823)
25. H-U 102, Klavierstück in Bb major. Andantino (1823)
28. H-U 113, Sonata o Capriccio in F minor (1824)
   i. Adagio
   ii. Andante sostenuto e con espressivo
   iii. Allegro molto
29. H-U 114, Tokkate in C minor. Allegro moderato (1824)
30. H-U 116, Klavierstück in C minor (1824)
31. H-U 123, Übungsstück in G minor. Allegretto (1824)
32. H-U 127, Gigue in E minor. Allegro (1824)
33. H-U 128, Sonate in C minor (1824)
   i. Allegro moderato
   ii. Andante con moto
   iii. Finale. Presto
34. H-U 130, Klavierstück in G minor. Allegro di molto (1824)
35. H-U 132, Klavierstück in F minor (1824)
37. H-U 139, Klavierstück in C minor. Allegro (1824)
38. H-U 140, 32 Fugen (lost) (1824)
39. H-U 144, Klavierstück in G minor (1825)
40. H-U 145, Klavierstück in F minor (1825)
41. H-U 146, Klavierstück in C minor. Andante con moto (1825)
42. H-U 165, Capriccio in F# major. Humoristisch und etwas ironisch (1826)
43. H-U 166, Etüde in F major. Allegro moderatissimo (1826)
44. H-U 167, Klavierstück in F minor. Allegro ma non troppo (1826)
45. H-U 177, Klavierstück in D minor. Andante (1826)
46. H-U 181, Klavierstück in C minor. Andante con espressione (1826)
47. H-U 183, Klavierstück in C minor. Allegro di molto (frag) (1826)
48. H-U 184, Waltzer in F# major. Westöstlicher redaktionsswalzer (1826)
49. H-U 187, Klavierstück (lost) (1826)
50. H-U 193, Fugata in Eb major. Largo non troppo lento (1827)
51. H-U 200, Klavierstück in B minor. Andante (1827)
52. H-U 202, Klavierstück in F minor (1827)
53. H-U 214, Klavierbuch in E minor (1827)
   i. Preludio
   ii. Fuga
   iii. Allegro di molto
   iv. Largo
   v. Preludio
   vi. Toccata
   vii. Anhang. Fuga (frag)
54. H-U 216, Klavierstück in E minor (1829)
55. H-U 223, Fuge (lost) (1828)
56. H-U 229, Klavierstück in E major (1829)
57. H-U 231, Präludium in A minor (frag) (1829)
58. H-U 235, Ostersonate (lost) (1829)
59. H-U 239, Klavierstück in A minor. Presto (1829)
60. H-U 246, Sonate in Eb major (incomplete) (1829)
   i. Adagio
   ii. Intermezzo. Allegretto
   iii. Largo molto
61. H-U 251, Präludium in A minor (1830)
62. H-U 253, Fantasie in Ab major. Adagio (1830)
63. H-U 263, *Das nordlicht.* Allegro di molto (frag) (1832)
64. H-U 267, *Klavierstück* in C minor. Con moto (frag) (1832)
65. H-U 273, *Fuge* in Eb major (1834)
68. H-U 300, *Klavierstück* in G minor. Allegro agitato (1836)
70. H-U 302, *Klavierstück* in F minor. Allegro agitato (1836)
71. H-U 303, *Klavierstück* in F major. Allegro con spirit (1836)
72. H-U 304, *Klavierstück* in F minor. Allegro con brio (1836)
73. H-U 308, Capriccio in F# minor. Allegro ma non troppo (1836)
74. H-U 310, Bagatelle in F major. Allegretto (1837)
75. H-U 311, Bagatelle in D major. Con moto (1837)
76. H-U 313, *Klavierstück.* Allegro moderato B major (1837)
77. H-U 314, *Klavierstück* in Bb major. Andante con espressione (1837)
79. H-U 322, *Klavierstück* in E minor. Largo con espressione (1837)
80. H-U 330, *Klavierstück* in E major. Andante con moto (1838)
81. H-U 332, *Klavierstück* in Eb major. Allegro molto vivace ma con sentiment (1838)
82. H-U 333, *Etüde* in G minor. Allegro con brio (1838)
83. H-U 337, *Notturno* in G minor. Andantino (1838)
87. H-U 345, *Gondelfahrt* in G minor. Serenata (1839)
89. H-U 349, *Klavierstück* in B minor. Introduktion; allegro (1840)
90. H-U 350, *Klavierstück* in G minor. Largo; allegro con fuoco (1840)
92. H-U 353, *Villa Medicis* in Ab major. Allegro maestoso (1840)
98. H-U 368, *Klavierstück* in G major. Allegro molto (1841)
   i. Januar. Ein Traum. Adagio, quasi una Fantasia; Presto
   ii. Februar. Scherzo. Presto
   iii. März. Agitato; Andante; Allegro moderato ma con fuoco
   iv. April. Capriccioso. Allegretto; Allegro
   v. Mai. Frühlingslied. Allegro vivace e gioioso
   vi. Juni. Serenade (Niederschrift) Largo; Andante
Juni. Serenade (Reinschrift) Allegro
viii. August. Allegro; Tempo di Marcia; Allegro assai
x. Oktober. Allegro con spirito; Poco più presto
xi. November. Mesto; Allegro molto
xii. Dezember. Allegro molto; Andante; Allegro
xiii. Nachspiel. Choral

103. H-U 391, Klavierstück in G minor. Allegro agitato (1843)
104. H-U 393, Klavierstück in E minor. Allegretto ma non troppo (1843)
105. H-U 394, Klavierstück in A major. Allegro molto vivace (Op. 2, no. 4) (1843)
106. H-U 395, Sonate in G minor (1843)
   i. Allegro molto agitato 
   ii. Scherzo
   iii. Adagio
107. H-U 396, Klavierstück in Eb major. Adagio (1843)
108. H-U 403, Klavierstück in G minor (1844)
109. H-U 404, Klavierstück in Eb major (frag) (1844)
110. H-U 405, Klavierstück in A major. Allegro moderato assai (1844)
111. H-U 406, Klavierstück in Eb major. Allegretto (1844)
112. H-U 408, Klavierstück in C minor. Allegro molto (1844)
113. H-U 409, Klavierstück in Ab major. Allegretto grazioso (1844)
114. H-U 410, Klavierstück in E minor. Allegro molto (1844)
115. H-U 413, Klavierstück in C minor. Allegro molto (1846)
116. H-U 414, Klavierstück in B major. Allegro molto vivace e leggiero (1846)
117. H-U 417, Klavierstück in Db major. Andante cantabile (1846)
118. H-U 420, Klavierstück in C# minor. Allegretto (Op. 4/5, no. 2, Mélodie) (1846)
120. H-U 424, Klavierstück in F# major. Andante cantabile (Op. 6, no. 3, O traum der jugend, o goldner stern) (1846)
121. H-U 425, Pastorella in A major (1846)
122. H-U 426, Klavierstück in D minor. Allegretto (1846)
123. H-U 427, Klavierstück in F# minor (frag) (1846)
124. H-U 438, Klavierstück in B major. Lento appassionato (Op. 4/5, no. 4, Mélodie)
125. H-U 442, Klavierstück in C major. Allegro molto vivace (1846)
126. H-U 443, Klavierstück in E minor. Tempo di scherzo (1846)
127. H-U 452, Klavierstück in E major. Andante con moto (1846)
128. H-U 454, Klavierstück in Ab major. Andante espressivo (Op. 6, no. 1, Lied) (1846)
129. H-U 456, Lied in Eb major. Andante espressivo; più allegro (1846)
130. H-U 458, Wanderlied in E major. Presto (Op. 8, no. 4) (1846)
131. H-U 459, Klavierstück in A major. Allegro vivace (1846)
132. H-U 461, Lied (Lenau) in Db major. Larghetto (Op. 8, no. 3) (1846)
133. H-U 463, Lied in A minor. Andante con espressione (Op. 8, no. 2)
134. H-U 465, Trio in D minor (Op. 11) (1847)
Clara Wieck-Schumann’s piano works with year of composition in brackets (Reich 1985)

1. Variationen über ein Originalthema (1830)
2. Variationen über ein Tyrolerlied (1830)
3. Etude (Presumably early 1830s)
4. Phantasie-Variationen über ein Wieck Romanze (1831)
6. 9 Caprices en forme de valse pour le piano, Op. 2 (1831–1832)
7. An Alexis (1832)
8. Rondo in H Moll (1833)
9. Romance variée pour le piano, Op. 3 (C major) (1833)
10. Valses romantiques pour le piano, Op. 4 (1835)
11. Quatre pieces caractéristiques, Op. 5 (1835)
   i. Le Sabbat
   ii. Caprice à la Boléro
   iii. Romance
   iv. Ballet des Revenants

12. 6 Soirées musicales, Op. 6 (1836)
   i. Toccatina in A minor
   ii. Nocturne in F Major
   iii. Mazurka in G minor
   iv. Ballade in D minor
   v. Mazurka in G major
   vi. Polonaise in A minor

13. Variations de concert pour le pianoforte, sur la Cavatine du Pirate, de Bellini, Op. 8 (1837)
15. Scherzo pour le pianoforte, Op. 10 (1838)
16. Trois Romances pour le pianoforte, Op. 11 (1840)
   i. Andante in Eb minor
   ii. Andante in G minor
   iii. Moderato in A major

17. Impromptu in E major (published in Album du gaulaire, 1885) (1844)
   i. Larghetto in F major
   ii. In poco agitato in A minor
   iii. Andante espressivo in D major
   iv. Scherzo in G major (Scherzo originally composed for unpublished Sonatine, which was then published posthumously in Piano Sonata in G minor)

20. Piano Sonata in G minor (1842–1843)
   i. Allegro
   ii. Adagio con espressione e ben legato
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iii. Scherzo. Trio
iv. Rondo

21. 3 Preludes and Fugues: *III Praeludien und fugen für das pianoforte*, Op. 16 (1845)
   i. B flat major
   ii. B flat major
   iii. D minor

22. Piano Trio in G minor: *Trio fur pianoforte, violine und violoncello*, Op. 17 (1846)
   i. Allegro moderato
   ii. Scherzo. Tempo di menuetto
   iii. Andante
   iv. Allegretto


25. *Romanze* (A minor) (1853)


27. Cadenzas (2) for Beethoven Piano Concerto in G Major, Op. 58 (1846)


29. Cadenzas (2) for Mozart Piano Concerto in D Minor (K. 466) (Unknown)

30. *Vorspiele* (Improvisations written out probably in 1895)

31. *Präludium and präludium für Schüler* (Improvisations written out probably in 1895)
Appendix 2:
List of Published Scores of Works Selected for Study
(sorted by year of issue)

Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel


Clara Wieck-Schumann


Appendix 3:
List of Available Commercial Recordings of Works Selected for Study
(sorted by year of issue)

Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Solo Piano Works


**Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel’s Piano Trio**


Clara Schumann’s Solo Piano Works


Clara Wieck-Schumann’s Piano Trio


Text-based Materials


Hensel, Sebastian. 1879. Die Familie Mendelssohn, 1729–1847, nach Briefen und Tagebuchern (Vol. 3). Berlin: Behr, B.


Polk, Joanne. 2010. Notes to The Piano Sings: The Piano Music of Fanny Mendelssohn. New Port Classic B003DNLLQI.


**CD Recordings**


———. 1998. "Allegro molto vivace ma con sentimento in E flat major" and "Introduktion und capriccio in B minor". In *Klaviermusik aus der Italienzeit*. Elżbieta Sternlicht,
piano. AM 11802.
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