



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Future of Schubert Interpretation: What Is Really Needed?

Author(s): Malcolm Bilson

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Early Music*, Vol. 25, No. 4, 25th Anniversary Issue: Listening Practice (Nov., 1997), pp. 715-722

Published by: [Oxford University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3128415>

Accessed: 01/12/2012 20:37

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Oxford University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Early Music*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Malcolm Bilson

The future of Schubert interpretation: what is really needed?

DURING the 1991 Mozart Conference at Lincoln Center in New York City¹ a recording was played of Serge Rachmaninoff performing the first movement of Mozart's A major sonata, K331.² To describe Rachmaninoff's performance as not heeding the text would be superfluous; it was so free in this regard that the penultimate Adagio variation was actually faster than the Allegro that followed it. This gave rise to a great deal of controversy among the participants; there were those who were outraged at the 'utter lack of respect for the composer and the text', while others proclaimed, 'But who today plays as flexibly and gorgeously as Rachmaninoff?'

Indeed, who *does* play the piano today as gorgeously as Rachmaninoff, according to some the greatest pianist of his generation? Yet if Mozart, possibly the greatest keyboard player of his day, had made a recording of that movement on his own Walter fortepiano, it would have been equally as wonderful as Rachmaninoff's, equally as flexible, but very different. My own goals as a pianist and musician have always been to glean as much information as I can from the pertinent sources, and then hope that I can transform that information into something as imaginative and creative as did Rachmaninoff, albeit of a different nature.

Many aspects of David Montgomery's article 'Modern Schubert interpretation in the light of the pedagogical sources of his day' in *Early music*, xxv/1 (Feb 1997) fill me with dismay. Such an article represents a recent kind of performance practice scholarship that leads us in just the opposite direction from the one I think we should be taking. It says: 'Find out what was permitted, and don't exceed those bound-

aries.' In an age when most mainstream performances are very far from the kind of creative, imaginative playing of which in the case of Serge Rachmaninoff we have direct witness and in the case of Wolfgang Mozart well-founded suppositions, such thinking can only be detrimental. Our principal goal should be to get into the passion and emotion of the music as deeply and richly as possible. This is not merely a romantic notion; it is what every late 18th- and early 19th-century treatise known to me stresses above all else (see below). To me the study of performance practice always promised More from the greatest works, not Less. The subject of study is, to be sure, to ascertain just what kind of More (i.e. the ostensible differences between what Mozart would have played and what we have from Rachmaninoff).

Montgomery's article addresses two main issues: the appropriateness (or lack thereof) of adding free ornamentation to Schubert's instrumental compositions, and the proper use of giving way in tempo, commonly called rubato. Montgomery admits that none of the tutors of Schubert's time list him as one of the 'approved' composers for whom the particular treatise might be applicable, as Schubert's public publishing and performing life was far too short to make any impact until quite a few years after his death. Nevertheless, says Montgomery, by studying as many treatises as possible from the period one should be able to arrive at some understanding of general performance practices of the time, and should therefore be able to correlate these to a particular composer living at that time and in that place. I am in complete agreement with this concept.

The protagonist and apparent impetus for

Malcolm Bilson has been focusing on the Viennese fortepiano repertory for 30 years, and is currently recording all the Schubert sonatas for Hungaroton.

Montgomery's article is pianist Robert Levin, who in a recording of Schubert's A minor sonata, D537 (Sony Vivarte, SK53364) introduced a few variants and lead-ins. Montgomery cites an earlier review of this CD by Susan Kagan, who was so offended by Levin's accretions that she suggested that a WARNING! label might well have been affixed to the cover of the CD.³ Montgomery is equally affronted by Levin's freedoms, and has taken the trouble to write them out (occupying in all half a page). It must be pointed out that neither Susan Kagan nor David Montgomery offer any precise critique of how and what Levin actually plays; their common objection is that he takes such liberties at all!⁴

Now, the Performance Practice Movement is supposedly interested in 'how it was or might have been ideally'. Yet all over the world young musicians are being taught, from the best Urtext editions, the art of *Thou shalt not*: 'Thou shalt not depart from the written text.' (Even when we know from the treatises and other sources that this is precisely what was expected.) 'Thou shalt observe stylistic differences.' (Even though it is tabu to investigate what those differences may have been.)

Montgomery quotes me as saying: 'I believe that every measure of every piece in this repertoire (Schubert) has to be understood and interpreted.' Later on the same page: 'Robert Levin, Malcolm Bilson and Paul Badura-Skoda are not alone in the opinion that Schubert's music requires considerable personal interpretation.'⁵ Note that the word 'personal' has been added by Montgomery, but I gladly take it on. I believe that personal interpretation is intrinsic to the First Rule of every treatise (in all following excerpts the italics are mine):

Leopold Mozart: One must take pains to discover the affect intended by the composer, and execute it correctly. Because the sorrowful often alternates with the joyous, so one must assiduously endeavour to perform each according to its manner. In a word, one must play everything in such a way that *one is oneself moved by it*.⁶

Türk: Whoever performs a composition so that the affect (character, etc.), even in every single passage, is most faithfully expressed (made perceptible) and that the tones become at the same time a *language of feelings*, of this person it is said that he is a good executant.⁷

Starke: Strong and weak, and all the different nuances, are for our senses as the moon is for the tides of the sea.

[He then quotes the 'most esteemed music director Türk']... Whoever presents a piece of music so that the *affect* [character] in it is accurately expressed in every passage, and *where the tones are turned into a 'language of the emotions'*, of that man we say, he has a good *Vortrag*.⁸

Virtually every treatise known to me proffers a similar First Rule. These invariably come before those passages that instruct us on the proper use of the bow, rendition of unmarked notes, *tempo rubato*, etc. To put it in the simplest terms: the player must be himself moved, and must be able, through his art, to make manifest that which moves him through his execution. The 'language of the emotions' is basic and central.⁹

But I was intrigued by the rather fascinating notion that WARNING! labels might be affixed to CDs and concert programmes. To quote Susan Kagan: 'Perhaps the most important issue here is the obligation of Levin, in making such additions and changes, to inform his audience. An unsuspecting listener who is not familiar with the original score cannot have the slightest idea that what he is hearing is not what Schubert composed. This record needs a WARNING! label ...'¹⁰ Most treatises of the time, including those quoted by Montgomery,¹¹ tell us, with regard to such free extemporizing, that there should be very little of it and that it must be appropriate to the character of the composition and introduced at the proper place. The most we get from Kagan is that Levin's embellishments 'trivialize' the music; there are no specific critiques of particular passages she considers awkward or non-Schubertian. In a 66-minute disc Levin has some 20 seconds of free ornamentation; is *this* the kind of 'excess' the treatises speak out against?

But if such WARNING! labels are indeed appropriate, to what of kind of performances might they be applied?

I recently heard on the radio a performance of the Schubert B♭ Piano Sonata, D960, by one of our leading mainstream performers, on modern piano. This pianist is a noted Schubert and Beethoven player, and his recordings have garnered many international prizes. I listened carefully, and would venture to say that hardly one bar of what he was playing corresponded to what Schubert had carefully notated, according to every late 18th- and early 19th-century

source known to me. Leopold Mozart and others tell us that all notes under a slur are to be played *diminuendo*, that is, gently tapering. This particular pianist played every bar *crescendo*, as is the common modern way, in order to promote the famous 'long line'. (This long line principle is heard to even greater effect from string players and singers with their continuous rich vibrato.)¹² Once again, Leopold Mozart: 'One must take pains to discover the *affect* intended by the composer, and *execute* it correctly.' Can the true affect of any passage be rendered by an execution contrary to that indicated by the composer?

Lest anyone object that Leopold Mozart is too early for Schubert, it should be noted that Brahms still taught the same rule of slur = *diminuendo*, even quite late in his life.¹³ In this regard I recently heard, in a live concert, a very distinguished and famous pianist play the Brahms B minor Rhapsody, op.79 no.1. If one follows this slur = *dim.* rule, here in the left hand heavily reinforced by the off-beat octave entrances, marked by Brahms 'Agitato', the work takes on a desperate, lunging character, basic to its very nature (ex.1). Our pianist played all quavers completely evenly—to my mind not coming up to what I would consider a *minimum requirement* for a reasonable rendition of this piece.

Or the live concert I heard a few months ago by a very famous pianist of the Mozart 'Jeunehomme' piano concerto, K271, a pianist who is now recording the entire set for an important label. Virtually none

of Mozart's specific performance instructions were followed; everything was played smoothly and legato in a dynamic range between *piano* and *mezzo-piano*; fulminating, bubbling, brilliant virtuosity was changed into gentle, angelic sweetness. Where were the WARNING! labels for these performances? Thus, a WARNING! label for 20 seconds out of 66 minutes of what Kagan calls 'tampering with the music', but no WARNING! labels for performances that severely misrepresent the composer and the work *from beginning to end*?

The reader might counter that I am being too extreme; after all, the notes on the page (and Kagan refers to good, respected editions) are sacrosanct; other matters are a question of taste. I say No: the words of the play are not sacrosanct; the *meaning of the words* in proper context is, and this is what every musical treatise tells us (see the quotations above). A rendering of *Macbeth*, with every word intact and beautifully pronounced, that turns it into a light comedy, is for me no worse than the Jeunehomme concerto turned into a kind of china-doll saccharinity.

Back to Schubert: Montgomery writes that

Acquaintances wrote that his (Schubert's) singing was clear and unaffected, that in the performance of lieder he believed in maintaining strict tempo. ... he would appear to have sung somewhat in the style of one of his finest interpreters, the Freiherr Karl von Schönstein (1797–1876), who was known for a smooth, non-ornamented approach to Schubert's songs. On

Ex.1 Brahms, Rhapsody in B minor, op.79 no.1, beginning

the other hand, we know Johann Michael Vogl, Schubert's most famous interpreter, for a theatrically extroverted embellisher ... Schubert himself wrote proudly that he and Vogl performed 'as one' which admission would make him an accomplice, willing or not[?], to Vogl's liberties. *Fundamentally, however, only one of these portraits of Franz Schubert can be true.*' [italics mine]¹⁴

I believe, quite to the contrary, that both can and must be true—even indispensable—in understanding and interpreting Schubert's music.

Two general manners of performance are referred to here, which we might describe as the 'simple, unaffected, direct' approach on the one hand, and the 'dramatic, fluctuating' approach, on the other. The one remains in tempo, adds little if anything to the text, and is sensitive to the changing expressive components of the music without lending them what we might call dramatic exaggeration. The other stresses the dramatic (drama = gesture), leaning on more important notes, perhaps even delaying them, hurrying over less important notes, inserting variants and lead-ins, etc. We can easily understand these two currents in the music of the time (or indeed of many different times). Czerny, for example, refers to the difference between Beethoven and Hummel in the late 1810s in Vienna:

Hummel's advocates reproached Beethoven for mistreating the fortepiano, claiming that he lacked clarity and precision, that he brought forth only a confusing noise through the overuse of the pedal, and that his compositions were *recherché*, unnatural and irregular, lacking true melodies. On the other hand, the Beethovenists asserted that Hummel lacked all genuine imagination; his playing was as monotonous as a hurdy-gurdy ... and his compositions were nothing but reworkings of Haydnian and Mozartian motives.¹⁵

Note that according to Czerny (and others), Hummel was a smooth and elegant player, yet it is just Hummel's treatise that Montgomery cites for playing he considers to be opposite of Schubert's. 'To my knowledge, Hummel is the only Viennese pedagogue of this period to discuss voluntary giving-way in pace.'¹⁶ Not at all: in his *Vollständige und Praktische Klavierschule* Czerny has seven detailed pieces of music showing precisely such retarding and accelerating, in even greater detail than Hummel's. Such playing belonged very much to the standard practice of the time, and must have been often done

to excess by those players whose *Vortrag* was not considered to be exemplary.¹⁷

But let's examine more closely one oft-quoted description of Schubert's playing and singing, written in 1860 by his friend Leopold Sonnleitner (mentioned by Montgomery):

Schubert always indicated whenever he wished or allowed any kind of hesitation, acceleration, or free performance [*Vortrag*]. Where he indicated nothing he would not allow the slightest arbitrary intervention, not the slightest giving way of tempo. Even if this were not easily shown through the ample testimony of Schubert's contemporaries, it would be obvious to any music-lover just by observing the figures in the accompaniments. A galloping horse doesn't allow itself to be put out of time; a spinning wheel can indeed be stopped, but only when the spinning maid, gripped by passion, forgets for a moment to drive it—it cannot, however, run fast one second and then slow the next, bar by bar;—a live, beating heart cannot suddenly stop (unless struck by an apoplexy) in order that the singer can remain on his high A, at the words 'Dein ist mein Herz, und wird es ewig bleiben', just to let us hear his true emotion ... such miserable excesses, that we are forced to hear again and again, can only serve as small examples, yet such a senseless mode of expression has become the rule.¹⁸

If such a 'senseless mode of expression' had 'become the rule' by 1860, it can hardly be claimed that such a manner of singing is in vogue today. When has anyone last heard a singer that would hold the high A of 'DEIN ist mein Herz?', while a hapless pianist wrestles to make sense out of the rhythm? On the contrary, what characterizes our age most dramatically is the *utter regularity* of expression provided by most 'mainstream' performers. And it is important to note that what is described by Sonnleitner are *Lieder* with regular accompaniments; it is perhaps no coincidence that *Winterreise* was more Vogl's (the dramatic singer) cycle than Schönstein's (the simple, unaffected one); there are not many 'spinning-wheel' or 'horse-galloping' accompanying figures to be found in *Winterreise*.

But I have other problems, or at least questions, with regard to Sonnleitner. What is 'simple and direct', and what does 'would not tolerate the slightest giving way in tempo unless it was marked' really mean? There are many composers and performers who claim to play in what they call 'strict tempo' whose recordings, on examination, are anything but strict. A 'simple, direct' performance is most likely

one in which good balance between heavy and light, strong and weak, long tones vs. short tones, etc. seems 'natural' to the listener; such performances almost always contain considerable small fluctuations. But these slight changes do not impinge themselves as *dramatic occurrences*. Sonnleitner's remarks are those of one friend 30 years after Schubert's death.¹⁹ Would these remarks apply as well to such music as the middle section of the second movement of the A major piano sonata, D959 (called most aptly by Alfred Brendel a 'paroxysm')?

Richard Taruskin has brought the word *Werktreue* ('faithfulness to the work') into our general consciousness.²⁰ For Taruskin the word can have both good and bad connotations; to me it means in its simplest and most direct sense that I would hope to be able to be inspired in a similar way that the composer was inspired. The concept of *Werktreue*, however, seems to be giving way in many circles (see Kagan and Montgomery) to something we might call *Komponistentreue* ('faithfulness to the composer'); Montgomery wants us to play it the way the composer played it.²¹ I believe that the question must be asked: is the composer's performance the best possible one of the work? Or is it indeed the only valid performance of the work, even if we believe in

Werktreue, and even in those cases where we can know how the composer performed (Stravinsky, Bartók, etc.)? And if it is not, then is the whole area of Performance Practice just up for grabs—anything goes? On what can we base our search for 'Mozart rather than Rachmaninoff'?

Türk tells us (in 1789) and Starke repeats (in 1819) the following directions for achieving good *Vortrag*: (1) a previously developed facility in playing and note-reading, security in rhythm, a good knowledge of thoroughbass and of the piece itself that one is playing, and then especially; (2) clarity in execution; (3) expression of the prevailing character; (4) proper application of ornaments and other such devices; (5) a proper feeling for every passion and emotion expressed in the music.²² I believe that Rachmaninoff's Mozart passes nos.1 and 2, but then veers off radically in nos.3–5.

I have translated the German word *richtig* as 'proper'; but there might be an '*unrichtig*' or improper manner of execution as well. Just how can we know what is *richtig* and what *unrichtig*? Proper execution must always be derived from our understanding of the meaning of the music; again to quote Starke: 'Whoever presents a piece of music so that the affect (character) in it is accurately expressed in

Ex.2 Schubert, Sonata in A major, D959/i, bars 1–16

every passage, and *where the tones are turned into a "language of the emotions"*, of that man we say, he has a good *Vortrag*.'

Let's look at a specific example (ex.2), with my own annotations in the manner of Hummel and Czerny. The opening bars represent a fanfare, and are, I believe, to be overdotted and played somewhat sharply.²³ Now, many pianists play these quavers long, but I am not familiar with any kind of fanfare that has such a rhythm; to me it sounds unnatural. (Unnatural is the opposite of 'simple, unaffected', as perceived *personally* by me.) But furthermore, if Schubert had really wanted genuine quavers here, he would not have written dotted rhythms in bar 341 in the coda (ex.3)—is the last note of bar 342 really twice as long as the last note in bar 341?²⁴

Bars 5 and 6 present long chords—these halt the forward motion of the fanfare-like music and should therefore be played slightly longer than written. Most sources do mention playing long notes slightly slower than written, and fast grupetti (second half of bar 4) slightly faster. Of course, we are told, this effect must not be exaggerated; it must be 'imperceptible.' At the end of bar 5 there will be some kind of punctuation—one player might consider it a semi-colon, another a question-mark, still another an exclamation point, but to run into bar 7 with no perceivable articulation of any kind would be quite *unrichtig*, I believe. (Starke: ... proper punctuation and proper separating of one musical period from the other ...)²⁵

At bar 7 triplets begin. These are based on very general material, and their function is to bring in the opposite sentiment of the sharp fanfare-like rhythm of the opening. As such it would not seem appropriate to play them in exactly the same tempo as the opening fanfare. (Starke: 'Whoever presents a piece of music so that the *affect* [character] in it is *accurately expressed in every passage* ...') I would play

these à la Sonnleitner, very smoothly, not leaning, for example, on the first note (*d*^{'''}) of the descent. Bar 8 must have some sort of characteristic rhythmic snap in proper (*richtig*) relation to bar 7. The triplets from bar 11 build up in excitement (otherwise why did Schubert write the crescendo?), perhaps accelerating (imperceptibly, of course) to bar 13, where a slight leaning on the first triplet could show the dramatic highpoint, further suggested by the *forte* and *dim.* markings.

Such descriptions seem quite mechanical to me and are not the type of thing in which I am happy to indulge. And I am not saying that one *must* lean on the first quaver in bar 13, and that one *may not* lean on the first quaver of bar 7. I do claim, however that every such expressive device has a direct emotional bearing on the meaning of the music, and in the best *Vortrag* all these matters are infinitely connected. These are our tools: they are mentioned by every source but rarely discussed in concrete terms. What is offered instead, however, and is implicit in both Montgomery's and Kagan's remarks, is: 'Get an Ur-text, follow it closely and don't allow yourself liberties.' What I have mentioned in my description of these few bars are not liberties, they are *readings* by which 'the affect (character) is accurately expressed in every passage.' They are personal (thank you, Mr. Montgomery) readings of what I perceive to be on the page.

Montgomery: 'Many artists within the historical movement have now translated their arguments directly into recorded sound, often with no commentary—asking us, in effect, to accept a number of non-notated practices on faith.' And further along: 'Bilson ... supports a "lost notation" theory (including the assimilation of dotted figures to triplets)—which calls upon a few insightful people to render intelligible to others what Schubert really meant to write, but didn't.'²⁶ This suggests that notation is

Ex.3 Schubert, Sonata in A major, D959/i, bars 339–43

The image shows a musical score for Schubert's Sonata in A major, D959/i, bars 339–43. The score is written for piano and consists of two staves: a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The key signature is one sharp (F#) and the time signature is 3/4. The score begins with a treble clef staff containing a fanfare-like opening with dotted rhythms and triplets. The bass clef staff contains a more rhythmic accompaniment. The score is numbered 339 at the beginning of the first measure.

really fixed, and that such gestures as dotted rhythms are always to be executed identically, in some precise fashion. But we know that music notation is anything but precise;²⁷ I would challenge Montgomery to find any good treatise that doesn't endeavour to explain how to render musical (i.e. slightly uneven) a notation that cannot possibly show those slight deviations that bring it alive. Montgomery may be right about the triplet assimilation, or I may be right, but saying 'what Schubert meant to write, but didn't' is no less absurd than saying 'He really meant to write "nife", but unfortunately wrote "knife"; the proper pronunciation of the word is intelligible only to a few insightful people.'

A further, rather amazing statement reads: 'One thing is certain: had Schubert lived long enough to see his last three sonatas into print—dedicated, as they were intended to be, to Hummel—and had Hummel deigned to play them (mostly, he played his own music), Schubert's *fresh and direct musical manner* might have been lost forever.' [italics mine]²⁸ Hummel's playing, from all sources known to me, is reputed to have been very much on the straight side (see the comparison to Beethoven above). But even if Hummel's playing had indeed been so different from Schubert's (of which we admittedly know very little), would that really have made Schubert's style 'lost forever'? We have a great deal of documentation, for example, about Chopin's piano playing and teaching, which was widely known and admired; yet many of us concerned with Chopin performance practice feel that his style has

almost completely died out in favour of a more Lisztian manner of playing.

Susan Kagan: 'Can one imagine adding embellishments, changing notes, or improvising in the 'Hammerklavier' Sonata?'²⁹ Well, I and six of my former students have played and recorded all the Beethoven sonatas; I don't play the 'Hammerklavier', but I do play op.109 and I certainly do embellish the right hand in the first variation of the third movement.³⁰ This is highly decorated, free-sounding coloratura that would seem 'unnatural' played exactly the same way twice. Indeed, I believe all the players in the series vary some repeats. In spite of Beethoven's admonitions *he* varies them when he rewrites them, so shouldn't we when he only provides repeat marks?³¹ One could counter that 'Quod licet Jovis non licet Bovis' ('What is permitted to Zeus is not permitted to the cow'), but Jovis (the composer) is no longer with us, and the work must be brought to life by someone! Robert Levin or I or anyone else can be criticized for 'missing the mark' on any interpretative matter according to the opinion of the reviewer; reviewers *should* develop personal taste, just as players should. But critics who constantly set upon every player who endeavours to be creative are going to drive our all-to-often arid music-making still further into the dust. We have to begin to understand that the great masterworks of the past must not be treated as dead museum pieces but rather as living, passionate works of art, as described in the First Rule of every treatise of the period. My name may be Bovis, but I'm all I've got!

1 Conference, 'Performing Mozart's Music', Juilliard School, New York City, 19–24 May 1991. The papers presented at this conference were published in *Early music*, Nov 1991, Feb 1992 and May 1992 issues.

2 RCA Victor Gold Seal 09026-61265-2, disc 10, track 12

3 *Fanfare*, Nov/Dec 1995, pp.362-3.

4 I might mention here that Levin's *ossia* at bar 298 of the third movement was so convincing that I have adopted it in my own performance; I can hardly imagine it any longer without.

5 D. Montgomery, 'Modern Schubert interpretation in the light of the pedagogical sources of his day', *Early music*, xxv/1 (1997), p.102.

6 Mozart Leopold, *A treatise on the fundamental principles of violin playing*, 2nd edn, trans. E. Knocker (London, 1951), pp.255-6

7 Daniel Gottlob Türk, *School of claviers playing* (1789), trans. R. Haagh (Lincoln, NE, 1982), p.321.

8 Friedrich Starke, *Wiener Piano-forte Schule*, part 2 (Vienna, 1819), p.15

9 Such points of view are to be found

virtually everywhere in writings of the time, not just in reference to musical matters, e.g. the painter Casper David Friedrich in 1817 in *Über Kunst und Kunstgeist* ('On art and the spirit of art'): 'Look with your own eye, and as the objects appear to you, so should you reproduce them; the effect that they have on you should be given back in your painting! ... To each person nature makes itself manifest in a different way, for that reason noone can make his theories and rules valid for another as immutable laws. Noone can be a yardstick for another, only for himself and souls congenial to his

own.' *Caspar David Friedrich in Briefen und Bekenntnissen*, ed. S. Hinz (Munich, 1974), p.83.

10 S. Kagan, review in *Fanfare*, xix/2 (Nov/Dec 1995), pp.362-3. Near the end of her review Kagan offers 'Those interested in Schubert's Schubert may turn to Schnabel ... Goode ... Gothoni ... or for fortepiano enthusiasts ... Seth Carlin.' The supposition here is that if one does not alter the precise text one will have 'Schubert's Schubert'. There is no question of which of these players knows how to read the text correctly, or may or may not have any real affinity for Schubert's deeper sense ...

11 See Montgomery, 'Modern Schubert interpretation', p.109, quoting August Swoboda, *Allgemeine Theorie der Tonkunst* (1826).

12 In a recent master class I asked a student who was playing the opening bars of Beethoven's Sonata in A₁, op.110, to observe the two-note slur at the beginning, to play the second note as a release of the first, and not equally loud. She replied 'Oh, but then I will lose the long line.' This manner of playing is so universal that it is hardly necessary for me to mention the name of the pianist playing the B₁ Sonata: out of ten recordings of that work one would be lucky to find one that does not operate according to this 'long line' principle.

13 See R. Pascall, *Playing Brahms; a study in 19th century performance practice* (University of Nottingham, 1991), p.18

14 Montgomery, 'Modern Schubert interpretation', p.104.

15 Carl Czerny, *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben* (R/Baden-Baden, 1968), p.19.

16 Montgomery, 'Modern Schubert interpretation', p.111.

17 See the reference to Czerny and a fine annotated musical example in G. Barth, *The pianist as orator* (Cornell University Press, 1992), p.75.

18 Leopold Sonnleitner, in *Erinnerungen seiner Freunde*, ed. O.E. Deutsch (Leipzig, 1957), p.98.

19 One cannot but wonder how we might perceive of Stravinsky's music if all the recordings were lost and we only had Robert Craft's remarks on how that composer wanted his music played, what he would and would not have tolerated ...

20 R. Taruskin, *Text and act* (Oxford, 1995), p.10.

21 We can presume that if it could be shown that Schubert added *Eingänge* and embellishments in a similar fashion to Levin, both Kagan and Montgomery would then change their minds.

22 Starke, *Wiener Piano-forte Schule*, part 2, p.15.

23 For a detailed discussion of the various possible ways to play such dotted figures, see Türk, *School of claviers playing*, pp.350-51.

24 A similar instance seems to prove the opposite in the first movement of the Mozart Piano Quartet in G minor, K478. I wondered, at one point, if the quavers in bar 1 might not be intended to be overdotted. But if Mozart had intended them to be sharper, he would have notated semiquavers in bars 244ff., thus the quavers in bar 1 must indeed be solid quavers.

25 Starke, *Wiener Piano-forte Schule*, part 2, p.14.

26 Montgomery, 'Modern Schubert interpretation', pp.101-2.

27 See Türk, *School of claviers playing*, for example.

28 Montgomery, 'Modern Schubert interpretation', p.111.

29 Kagan, p.365.

30 As I do in similar passages in my traversal of the complete Schubert Piano Sonatas for Hungaroton Classic, currently about half-way to completion.

31 Claves Records, *The complete Beethoven keyboard sonatas (including the three Bonn sonatas)*, Tom Beghin, Malcolm Bilson, David Breitman, Ursula Dutschler, Zvi Meniker, Bart van Oort, Andrew Willis; on nine period pianos, release date September 1997.

*In Trondheim, Norway
July 21. - July 29. 1998*

**THE RINGVE
MUSEUM XXI
INTERNATIONAL
SUMMER COURSE**



**Early Music
Performance Practice
Master Classes &
Ensemble Playing
*Attention on English Music***

F A C U L T Y:

Ian Partridge

voice

Mary Collins

renaissance/baroque dance

Marion Verbruggen

recorder

Lucy van Dael

baroque violin

Laurence Dreyfus

viola da gamba/baroque cello

Ketil Haugsand

harpsichord

Hans Olav Gorset

*chamber music coordinator &
flute*

For further details:

THE ST.OLAV FESTIVAL

P.O.Box 2045

N-7001 Trondheim, Norway

Tel.: (47) 7392 9470

Fax: (47) 7350 3866

<http://www.pd.uwa.edu.au/Keith/ringve.html>