



# Berkeley Symphony Orchestra

05 | 06 Season



## Nagano and Ohlsson Together!

March 29, 2006

Chowning  
Schumann

Zellerbach Hall, UC Berkeley

# BERKELEY SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

2005–06 SEASON

KENT NAGANO, CONDUCTOR/MUSIC DIRECTOR

GEORGE THOMSON, ASSOCIATE CONDUCTOR

8:00 pm, Wednesday, March 29, 2006

Zellerbach Hall

## JOHN M. CHOWNING

**Voices, Version 2**  
for Soprano and Integrated Electronics  
(U.S. Premiere)

Maureen Chowning, soprano

In association with  
the Center for New Music and Audio Technologies (CNMAT), UC Berkeley

## ROBERT SCHUMANN

**Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in A Minor, Op. 54**

- I. Allegro affettuoso
- II. Intermezzo: Andante grazioso
- III. Allegro vivace

Garrick Ohlsson, piano

— INTERMISSION —

## ROBERT SCHUMANN

**Phantasie in C major for Violin and Orchestra, Op. 131**

Stuart Canin, violin

## ROBERT SCHUMANN

**Symphony No. 4 in D Minor, Op. 120**

- I. Ziemlich langsam—Lebhaft
- II. Romanze. Ziemlich langsam
- III. Scherzo. Lebhaft. Trio
- IV. Langsam—Lebhaft—Schneller—Presto

## Program Notes

### **Voices, Version 2, for Soprano and Integrated Electronics**

#### **JOHN CHOWNING** (b. 1934)

*John M. Chowning was born on August 22, 1934, in Salem, New Jersey. In the spring of 2004, Chowning was approached by Evelyne Gayou of the Group de recherches musicales, part of L'Institut national de l'audiovisuel in Paris (Musical Research Group of the National Audiovisual Institute). He at first declined the commission, due to hearing loss, but after being fitted with a new digital hearing aid, was able to compose again and accepted the commission. Chowning began work on Voices in June 2004, learning the MaxMSP software along the way. The work had its premiere on March 12, 2005 in the Salle Olivier-Messiaen at La Maison de la Radio France in Paris with Maureen Chowning as the soloist. Since that time, he has been revising the work, preparing version 2 of Voices. The work is scored for soprano and personal computer running MaxMSP. Duration ca. 18 min.*

#### *The composer has provided the following comments:*

For nearly a thousand years, the oracle—a person, a location, and a prophetic utterance—held a place of singular prominence in the history and culture of ancient Greece. Most often a woman, Sibyl, she prophesied when possessed by the spirit of a deity. The most important of all Sibyls was the Pythia of Delphi, whose roots are found in a succession of goddesses beginning with the cult of Gaia, the Earth-Mother, followed by Themis and Phoebe. Her utterances were believed to be the voice of Apollo through her voice. The questions were posed to the Pythia by supplicants from all over the ancient world and

ranged from the mundane to the portentous. A typical form of the oracular ritual at Delphi consisted of preparation and tribute, the query, entry of the Pythia into the sacred chamber, her reaching an ecstatic state or trance, possession by the spirit of Apollo, and finally, the oracular utterance, sometimes interpreted by attendant priests. The oracles were often associated with caves and chasms, and at Delphi it may have been that vapors from an opening in the rock enhanced the ecstatic state of the Pythia.

Long before the oracles of antiquity, caves had been locations for ritual, harboring the primary evidence of an expressive propensity in incipient cultures as represented by wall paintings such as those found at Lascaux (19,000 BP) and the much older paintings found in the Chauvet cave (32,000 BP). The sensory experience within a cave, however, would have been as much auditory as it was visual, with echoes, reverberation (dense echoes), and resonances, all seeming to emanate from rock walls at varying densities and at disorienting distances. With no acoustic theory, echoes would seem to be spontaneously generated from rock surfaces—surely mystifying, if not at times terrifying—accompanied by dancing shadows animated by the flicker of a flame. Scholars are beginning to consider the acoustic properties of cavernous spaces in relation to the parietal art and the assumed ritual.

More than thirty years ago I visited such a prehistoric cave complex in Malta. The experience was unforgettable and I wondered then about the cultural imprint on prehistoric people of ritual in caves, the only places in which dense echoes could have been experienced in prehistoric times. Echoes can have magical perceptual effects

that seem to touch something deep within us, and perhaps it is the dense echoes associated with ritual and mystery from these cavernous origins that were perpetuated in the ancient temples as in that of Apollo in Delphi and in more recent monumental architecture, the great churches and concert spaces that are the preferred complement to the sacred choral/orchestral repertoire.

*Voices* is a play of imagination evoking the Pythia and the mystifying effects of her oracular utterances in reverberant spaces. A single soprano engages a computer simulated cavern with her voice. The computer allows us to project sounds at distances beyond the walls of the hall in which we listen—to create an illusory space. Her utterances launch synthesized sounds within this cavern-like space, sounds that conjure up bronze cauldrons, caves, and their animate inhabitants, sounds of the world of the Pythia modulated by our technology and fantasies but rooted in a past even more distant than her own—the Pythia’s voice becomes the voice of Apollo.

**Technical note:** Selected pitches of the soprano’s voice line are tracked by the computer running a program written by the composer in MaxMSP, a powerful synthesis/processing programming language developed by Cycling ’74. The soprano’s voice is transmitted from a small microphone to the computer where it is spatialized, mixed with synthesized sounds, and then sent to the surround sound system in the auditorium. At each sung target pitch that is captured by the MaxMSP pitch tracking algorithm, the program synthesizes accompanying sounds using a form of frequency modulation synthesis. The overall pace of the composition, therefore, is determined by the soprano. The spectra of the synthesized sound, largely inharmonic, are “composed” to function in the domains of pitch and harmony as well as timbre, an idea first brilliantly conceived and realized by Jean-Claude Risset in *Mutations* 1967.

—John Chouning

## Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in A Minor, Op. 54

**ROBERT SCHUMANN** (1810–1856)

*Robert Schumann was born on June 8, 1810 in Zwickau, in Saxony, approximately equidistant from the great German cultural centers of Weimar, Leipzig, and Dresden. He died on July 29, 1856, in an insane asylum in Endenich near Bonn, in the Rhineland. In mid-May of 1841, Schumann composed a single-movement work for piano and orchestra, the Phantasie in A Minor. Sketched between May 4 and 14 and scored May 15–20, it was first heard in public at a rehearsal of the Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra, with the composer’s wife, Clara (aged 22), at the keyboard. The date was August 13—two weeks later, she gave birth to the couple’s first child. In June of 1846, after the family had relocated to Dresden, Robert wrote a movement in rondo form for piano and orchestra as a companion piece to the original Phantasie. With the addition of a slow movement (the Intermezzo), finished on July 16, the Piano Concerto was complete. Both Schumanns hoped the work would have its premiere in Leipzig, where their friend, Felix Mendelssohn, was music director, but scheduling difficulties prevented this. Instead, Clara gave the premiere of the work on December 4, 1845 in Dresden under the direction of Ferdinand Hiller, the work’s dedicatee. A month later, on January 1, 1846 she finally performed the work at the Gewandhaus in Leipzig, with Mendelssohn conducting. Publication in parts followed quickly from Breitkopf & Härtel of Leipzig in July of the same year. The score was published posthumously, also by B & H, in September of 1862. The work is scored for pairs each of flutes, oboes, clarinets, bassoons, horns, trumpets, and timpani; and strings. Duration ca. 32 min.*

Early in his life, Robert Schumann seemed to be headed for a brilliant career as a concert pianist. His early compositional output includes large numbers of pieces for his own instrument, but they were mostly solo works. He longed to compose a piano

concerto for himself, as was customary for virtuosos on any instrument, and from 1827 on began several such works. None of them reached completion, however. Looking back over this period from the vantage point of 1839, Schumann wrote an interesting essay on the genre of the piano concerto for the periodical he had founded, *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* (*New Journal for Music*). He observed that the number of piano concertos in general had dropped during the decades of the 1820s and 1830s, compared to preceding years. The rapid changes in the construction of the instrument, combined with the growing skill of piano players, he concluded, had rendered the concerto almost obsolete. In other words, the pianos of Mozart’s and Beethoven’s time were incapable of holding the concert stage by themselves—thus, they needed the support of the orchestra. “Modern” pianos and pianists, Schumann writes, no longer need this external help. He writes:

We have for some considerable time been witnessing the preparations for this separation from the orchestra. In defiance of symphonic music, piano playing in recent times aspires to rule purely by virtue of its own resources . . . . It would of course have to be accounted a loss if the concerto for piano with orchestra were to fall out of favor altogether.

He went on to call for a “genius who will show us a brilliant new way to combine the orchestra with the piano so that the master at the keyboard can unfold the wealth of his instrument and his artistry while the orchestra does not merely look on but brings increased artistry into play.” A rhetorical gesture, no doubt, as he clearly saw himself as just the “genius” for the job.

By the time he wrote these words, however, his days as virtuoso pianist were over, thanks to a hand injury. One used to read in music history books that it was caused by the use of a mechanical practice device for increasing the independence of the fingers, but now it is generally believed

that the injury was caused by a mercury treatment for a syphilitic condition.

In the meantime, however, his life became intertwined with another pianist of great talent. In 1830, he moved into the home of music pedagogue Friedrich Wieck in Leipzig, for intensive studies in the art and craft of music. There he was introduced to Wieck’s only daughter, Clara, a promising musician in her own right. By 1835 his affection for Clara Wieck had blossomed into a full-fledged romance, although her father objected to the match (keep in mind that she was only 15 at the time and he was 24) and put up many obstacles to their meeting. They became engaged in late 1837, but Schumann had to go to court in order to obtain Clara’s release from under her father’s control. Finally, they were married in September of 1840.

It is worth devoting a few words here to the career of Clara Schumann (1819–1896). She, too, was one of the most important musicians of the 19th century, primarily as a virtuoso concert pianist, but she also enjoyed some renown as a composer. At the time of her wedding to Robert, she was already a performer with an international reputation, while he was still a relatively unknown composer. Indeed, on many of their travels together for performances of Robert’s works, he would find himself eclipsed by the reputation of his wife; this was the cause of some domestic friction. In general, however, they enjoyed a close professional and personal partnership. After their marriage, she gave up touring to bear and raise their eight children, but she still gave local performances (especially of Robert’s works, as he was unable to do so) and continued composing and teaching. After Robert’s untimely death, she resumed concert tours, but never composed again. Her last public appearance at the piano was in 1891, but she taught until her death in 1896.

Schumann’s joy at finally being able to wed Clara sparked a burst of creative activity, curiously concentrating on a single genre at a time. 1840 was devoted to song

composition, 1841 to music for orchestra. He returned to the idea of writing work for piano and orchestra, and much encouraged by Clara, completed a single-movement *Phantasie* for these forces in mid-1841. He revised it in early August, and on the 13th Clara—nine months pregnant!—tried it out at a rehearsal with the Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra. No public performance ever took place, and Schumann was unable to interest a publisher in the work, so he set it aside for the time being.

In 1845, Schumann picked up the work again, composing a new movement in rondo form which was to serve as the finale. He completed this in June, then by mid-July wrote a slow movement to precede the rondo. Finally, in late July, he revised the original *Phantasie* to serve as the first movement of what was now a three-movement work.

After the read-through of the *Phantasie* in 1841, Clara wrote in her diary that “The piano is interwoven with the orchestra in the most subtle manner—neither can be imagined without the other.” This observation sums up perfectly Schumann’s “new way” of writing a piano concerto. The classical piano concerto of Mozart and Beethoven was derived from the opera aria, and treated the soloist and orchestra as separate entities, allowing for dramatic juxtapositions between the two protagonists. Schumann’s solution was to create a more fluid relationship between piano and orchestra, a partnership rather than a competition.

The concerto is innovative in formal terms as well. The many changes of tempo in the first movement reflect Schumann’s experimentation—in keeping with other composers in the middle of the 19th century—with the notion of compressing the multiple movements of an extended work into a single movement. Even after he decided to expand his original single-movement *Phantasie* into a full three-movement concerto, he took pains to unify the overall work using techniques he had already developed in his D Minor Symphony (also heard on tonight’s

program): the second movement leads into the third without a break, and the transition between the two movements is built from the melody of the opening movement.

The work opens with a unison E from the orchestra, which is answered by a flourish from the solo piano. Its descending contour anticipates the main theme of the movement, which is stated by the orchestra, then echoed by the soloist. The movement is lyrically profuse, but many of its themes bear a strong family relationship to this principal melody. A lengthy solo passage takes us to C major, and a new variation on the main theme played by the clarinet and accompanied by the piano (*Animato*). Such delightful interplay between the soloist and the wind instruments occurs frequently in this work, reminiscent of Mozart’s piano concertos.

A majestic orchestral passage slips sideways into the remote key of A-flat, preparing a calmer section (*Andante espressivo*) in which a dreamy version of the main theme is heard, shared among piano, upper strings, and clarinet. The soloist breaks the mood suddenly by recalling the movement’s dramatic opening gesture (*Tempo I [Allegro]*), which sets the stage for the return of the main theme in yet another guise; the tempo marking (*Passionato*) says it all. This passage, acting as a development section, leads to the recapitulation of the opening material (*Tempo I*). The cadenza is in its customary place, but uncustomarily is free of bombast and empty display. A march-like coda (*Allegro molto*) based on yet another variant of the principal theme rounds out the movement.

After so much vigorous activity, the airy Intermezzo, in F major, provides a moment of relaxation. The *staccato* articulation of the main theme gives a feeling of weightlessness to the outer sections, while a rich cello melody grounds the central portion. The form of the movement is ABA’, but before the second A section can reach its expected conclusion, it is deflected toward the key of A major. Reminiscences of the opening movement steal across the

music and build up sufficient momentum to sweep us into the final movement without interruption. The finale’s main melody is yet one more blood relation of the opening movement’s principal theme. But whereas the downward motion of the first movement’s melodies lent a thoughtful, introspective tone to the piece, the finale’s version treats the initial descent as a springboard which sends it leaping upward. This marvelous transformation imbues the finale with a youthful, athletic spirit and, by nicely balancing the affect of the opening movement, provides a satisfying close to the concerto.

### **Phantasie in C Major for Violin and Orchestra, Op. 131**

#### **ROBERT SCHUMANN (1810–1856)**

*Schumann began sketching out the Phantasie for Violin in Düsseldorf on September 2, 1853 after a visit from Joseph Joachim, to whom the piece is dedicated. Soon after, the work had progressed to the point where he was able to copy out both a full score and a piano reduction between September 5–7. The premiere took place in Düsseldorf (where Schumann was municipal music director) on October 27 of the same year, with Joachim as soloist. Further performances followed soon after, in Leipzig on January 12, 1854, and in Hanover, where Joachim was concertmaster of the Court Orchestra, on January 20. In each case, Joachim was the soloist. In honor of the Schumanns’ visit, Joachim also conducted a performance of Schumann’s D Minor Symphony (also heard on tonight’s program). The Phantasie was first published (in parts) by Friedrich Kistner, Leipzig, in June of 1854, but the score was not published until 1887 (Leipzig, Breitkopf & Härtel). The work is scored for pairs each of flutes, oboes, clarinets, and bassoons, horns, trumpets (Schumann’s score specifies valved horns and trumpets, still unusual in Germany at this date), and timpani; and strings. Duration ca. 13 min.*

Aside from his activities as composer and performer, Robert Schumann devoted much of his creative energy to writing about music. He was a tireless advocate for new music, and some of his early judgments of young composers have become famous—for example, “Hats off, gentlemen—a genius!” in his review of Frédéric Chopin’s Opus 2. It is not surprising, then, that some of the most talented young musicians of his era flocked to his side, where they received personal and professional encouragement.

One of the most prominent of Schumann’s youthful followers was the Hungarian-Jewish violinist Joseph Joachim (1831–1907), whom Schumann had known since the former’s days as a child prodigy in the early 1840s. Joachim was to become one of the leading violinists of his age, and one of the towering figures in 19th-century music. As a child, he worked with Felix Mendelssohn in Leipzig, and after 1848 served as Franz Liszt’s concertmaster at the court orchestra in Weimar. In 1852, however, he broke with the more radical German composers and asserted his allegiance to the more classically oriented tradition followed by the Schumanns and Johannes Brahms, another of their young protégés. Joachim decamped to Hanover to become concertmaster of that court orchestra, and he remained there until his final move to Berlin in 1866.

Around the middle of August 1853, Robert Schumann seemed to be gaining the upper hand over the physical and mental problems that had plagued him throughout adulthood, and he embarked on a period of remarkable creative activity. At the end of the same month, Joachim visited the Schumanns for a few days, and the contact triggered in Robert’s mind the idea of composing for violin and orchestra. The first fruit of this inspiration was the C Major *Phantasie*, which he began to work on the day after Joachim’s departure.

The *Phantasie* begins with a slow introduction in the relative minor (A minor). This introductory passage is a miniature ternary form in itself (A-B-A). The

beginning of the B section is announced by the entrance of the soloist with a series of dramatic gestures, which continue during the reprise of the A section. So far, the violin has not participated materially in the melodic fabric of the piece, but during the transition into the movement proper, the soloist takes control of the A minor theme and transforms it into the jaunty C major melody that Schumann uses to mark important structural points in the rest of the piece.

In the fast portion of the work, the violin hardly gets a moment's rest. In this *Phantasie* there is none of the dramatic tension between orchestra and soloist that characterizes many concertos. This is a showpiece for the violinist, pure and simple, with the orchestra adopting a subsidiary role. In its broad outlines, the work is laid out along the lines of a symphony movement, but with a surprise or two along the way (Schumann tended to use the term "*Phantasie*" for works that were almost, but not quite, in classical sonata form). For example, the music from the A section of the slow introduction suddenly makes an appearance in the middle of the development section, giving the impression of a very unorthodox recapitulation. But this is soon shown to be a ruse, and a long build-up to the real recapitulation begins in earnest. A dazzling cadenza for the soloist occupies its usual place near the end of the movement (but it is prepared in a most unusual fashion, with a subdominant [IV] chord rather than a tonic in second inversion [I<sup>6</sup>4]). The cadenza never reaches a proper conclusion, but eventually the orchestra, apparently weary of waiting, sneaks back in with the bouncy main theme heard earlier. The ensuing coda uses material from the slow introduction, now transformed in character by being heard in the major mode, and thus nicely balancing the opening of the work.

Alas, Schumann's burst of creativity was not to last. At the end of September, still under Joachim's spell, he wrote a full-scale Violin Concerto (not performed until 1937), but soon afterward began his final decline,

leading to his suicide attempt in February of 1854, his confinement in an asylum, and his death two years later.

## Symphony No. 4 in D Minor, Opus 120

### ROBERT SCHUMANN (1810–1856)

*Schumann began work on his D Minor Symphony on May 29, 1841, only nine days after completing the A Minor Phantasie for Piano and Orchestra (which would eventually become the first movement of the Piano Concerto heard on tonight's program). It took him only a week to sketch out the symphony; he spent much of that summer working out the details of the full score, finishing on September 9. This first version of the work (billed as his "Second Symphony") had its premiere at a December 6 concert of the Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra under the direction of Ferdinand David. After failing to get the work published, Schumann set it aside for a decade. He returned to it in December of 1851, reworking it during the week of December 12–19. This new version was first performed by the Düsseldorf Allgemeine Musikverein (the municipal orchestra) under Schumann's direction on March 3, 1853, in a benefit concert for the composer. Breitkopf & Härtel issued the symphony in parts and in score (as well as in an arrangement for piano, four hands) the following autumn. B & H eventually published the original version of the symphony posthumously, in 1891 (in score, with parts available separately). The work is scored for pairs each of flutes, oboes, clarinets, and bassoons; 4 horns (2 only in the Romanze), 2 trumpets (silent in the Romanze), 3 trombones (but not in the Scherzo), 2 timpani, and strings (with solo violin in the Romanze). Duration ca. 28 min.*

**T**he problem that perplexed 19th-century composers was this: how to live up to the models of large-scale form left behind by Beethoven, when their own instincts were primarily lyrical in inspiration? For that was

The Master's primary legacy (or so it seemed to the generation of musicians who followed him): effortless control of vast sonic spaces; the ability to write enormously long, emotionally taut pieces of music whose component parts sound like they belong together. For most composers of the Romantic era, the natural form of expression was the miniature: the song, the character piece for piano, the bagatelle for the drawing-room chamber ensemble. It was all too easy for them to fall into the trap of writing longer works by stringing together a series of shorter ones.

Robert Schumann recognized that, fortunately, Beethoven was not the only model at hand. Franz Schubert, unsurpassed genius of the miniature, the art song, and the *Impromptu* for piano, had also mastered the longer forms of composition: the piano sonata, the string quartet, and the symphony. But most of these more substantial treasures were unknown to the world at large. Schubert, dead at the age of 31 in 1828, had managed to publish only a fraction of his oeuvre, chiefly the more marketable items such as songs and short piano pieces. The longer works still awaited discovery some years later, and it was Schumann himself who rescued the manuscript of Schubert's Great C Major Symphony, D. 944, from the dusty cupboard in which it had languished, unseen and unheard, since the death of the composer.

Another work by Schubert (in this case, one that was published) that probably influenced Schumann is the "Wanderer" Fantasy, Op. 15/D. 760. This is a four-movement piece for solo piano that has no break between movements, and generates all of its melodic material from a single song melody. These two works contain features that Schumann integrated into his own large-scale pieces: the art of continuous thematic evolution—deriving new themes from old, a penchant for choosing structural tonalities using keys related by thirds (rather than fourths of fifths as did the Classical composers), sharing themes across movements, and blurring

the boundaries between movements.

Schumann's Opus 120 is considered a landmark in the history of the symphony. In many ways an experiment, it shows Schumann grappling with the idea of using thematic recurrence to unify a multi-movement symphony. This struggle is reflected in the many names he gave the work: the title page of the autograph of the 1853 score has the word "Symphony" crossed out, and in its place is written "Symphonistic Phantasie." Furthermore, the first printed edition calls the work "Introduction, Allegro, Romanze, Scherzo, and Finale in a single movement." Schumann does his best to blur the boundaries between the movements. In the score, there are no solid double bars at the end of any movement; there is always a short rest notated with a fermata (a "hold" sign), and the next movement begins without a break. Two movements (the first and third) never fully recapitulate their opening material, making them feel like open rather than closed forms, and contributing to the feeling of the symphony as a single continuous sweep.

When, encouraged by the success of his Symphony No. 3, the "Rhenish," Schumann picked up the work again in 1851, his stated aim was to touch up the orchestration—to clarify the melodic material. But in the process, he couldn't resist the urge to tighten the thematic connections between movements—he rewrote the transition from the third movement to the finale to incorporate the main theme from the first movement. With one stroke Schumann not only strengthened the connection between the first and last movements of the symphony, but provided a sense of closure by allowing the long-denied recapitulation of the first movement theme to happen at last.

The work opens with a Beethovenian blast from the full orchestra (save trombones) on a unison A. As the note fades, a murmuring is heard in the tenor range: a slow-moving melody progressing by step and encircling the tonic D. In the course of the slow introduction (*Ziemlich langsam*) this somber utterance gradually infects the

rest of the orchestra until, having gained in confidence, it puts out a new shoot, now in double time and with wide-ranging leaps added to its start. Excited by this innovation, the entire orchestra picks up the tempo and plunges into the first movement proper (*Lebhaft*). The quick-time variant of the original slow, growling melody dominates the entire first movement, either in whole or in fragments, either in the foreground or as backdrop. It remains a presence even after the modulation to the relative major (F major) and the introduction of new, more ingratiating melodic material.

Another unison outburst on E-flat announces the start of the development section. After dissecting the opening theme and tossing bits of it around in different minor keys, the music heads for D-flat major and a new dotted-rhythm theme is heard, a sort of rhythmic abstraction of the main theme. After more fits and starts, yet another new theme emerges: a serene melody in F major. Or is it new? A close listening reveals that is derived from the “new” dotted-rhythm theme by augmentation (lengthening the note values). Then most of the development is repeated, transposed up a minor third. The dominant of D minor is reached—the recapitulation must be close at hand. But no, Schumann has other plans. After a long preparation, the key of D is regained, but it is not the opening theme we hear. Instead, the serene melody introduced not long before shines forth in brilliant D major. Almost as an afterthought, the original subject is heard too, but only briefly and just before the end of the movement. Our normal expectation for a full and satisfying recapitulation has been thwarted—for the moment.

The lyrical slow movement in A minor (the title “Romanze” was an afterthought on Schumann’s part) provides a respite from the drama of the other movements. Cast in a simple ternary form (A B A’), the outer sections feature a poignant tune played by the oboe and first cellos. These passages provide a frame for the D major song in flowing triplets played by the solo violin in

the central B section. Unexpectedly, the sinuous melody from the slow introduction to the first movement returns to bridge the passage from the first A section into the B section—another example of Schumann’s attempt to break the boundaries between the movements.

Bursting into the quiet last moments of the Romanze, the gruff and vigorous Scherzo (now back in D minor) comes as a shock. In another example of the multiple thematic interconnections among the movements of this symphony, the melody of the Trio is essentially the same as the violin solo from the central portion of the Romanze, now transposed to B-flat. Schumann sets up the expectation that this movement will be a double Scherzo on the Beethovenian model (Scherzo-Trio-Scherzo-Trio-Scherzo) but the final section of the second Trio melts away leaving only chords bereft of their melody.

These chords merge into the slow introduction (*Langsam*) to the final movement. Right away, we hear fragments of the main theme from the first movement, which quickly bring us back to D minor from B-flat. Led by thrilling calls from the brass, the orchestra swells to a great climax on a dominant seventh chord on A. Thus prepared, the finale proper begins with an emphatic statement of the main motive from the principal theme from the opening movement, now in the tonic (D major) and combined with the dotted rhythm of the second theme from the same movement. This provides a sense of recapitulation that we were denied in the opening movement. Indeed, in many ways the entire finale feels like a recapitulation of the opening: its formal structure is very similar, even to the point of marking the start of the development with another unison fortissimo thunderclap! As the finale spins to its close, Schumann increases the tempo twice, building to a frenzied conclusion. The symphony that began in darkness and mystery ends in light and euphoria.

©2006, Victor Gavenda  
(except Chowning statement  
©2006, John Chowning)