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Preface

The impetus for my research into piano quintets came partly from my own activities as a player of chamber music and partly from an interest in books specifically about piano quintets (far fewer than those about piano trios and piano quartets). The Franke Piano Quintet, in which I play the viola, was formed in 1997 with the idea of exploring and performing professionally as much of the repertoire for this ensemble as possible. We located work after work, and, as the list of titles grew (it is still not exhaustive), what became apparent was that it would take many ensembles several lifetimes to rehearse and perform the repertoire available, published or in manuscript.

Rehearsals and performances with our quintet remain a journey of discovery for both performers and listeners. The basis of our repertoire is quintets by Boccherini, Field, Schumann, Brahms, Dvořák op. 81, Respighi, Elgar, Messiaen, Bacewicz and Shostakovich. Our investigations have involved issues of balance, interpretation, size of concert hall, and the question of whether to rehearse the quartet without the piano when assembling a work for performance. To the question, ‘How many piano quintet ensembles are there?’, the answer is, few; apart from the Pihtipudas Kvintetti (Finland), the majority of piano quintets are performed by established string quartets plus a pianist.\(^1\) The Pihtipudas Kvintetti also has two pianists, something that Nils Franke, our pianist, has been quick to point out when string players infuriatingly want to sight-read their way through repertoire.\(^2\)


\(^2\) The *Pihtipudas* piano quintet is comprised of six players, string quartet plus two pianists; because of the ‘vast repertoire [available] the piano work [is] shared between Ella and Jaakko Untamala’. The members of the group, formed in 1988, are based in Finland and
With the general perception that there are few piano quintet works, and that those that exist are closely associated with the nineteenth century, I set out to discover if the genre is one still used by composers. While it seems that the majority of piano quintets were composed from the mid-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries, diminishing in number somewhat in the second half of the twentieth century, they indeed were still being composed by the year 2000, when Alexander Goehr and Thomas Adès joined the list.

At the beginning of the twentieth century many piano quintets had become the sole domain of the professional player with technical expertise. At the same time a growing number of works for piano quintet appeared for amateur or less experienced players (mainly the compositions of British composers such as Edward German). This prompted our quintet to encourage composers to write accessible works for performers today, culminating in the *Five Miniatures for piano and string quartet* by Rhian Samuel and *Concealed Imaginings* by Janet Beat. 3

Thus, what had begun as an interest in a specific type of chamber music became a study of which this dissertation is part. The results show that what is often seen as a nineteenth-century medium with few works to display is a phenomenon alive and well today.

I am grateful for the encouragement, help and advice from my supervisor Prof. Rhian Samuel. Always a tough taskmaster, always professional and where many supervisors would have advised a student to quit writing a dissertation while working full-time, performing professionally,
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and having two children, Rhian would encourage me to continue to write. Her assurances, even if occasionally not what I wanted to hear, were always well-intentioned.

Numerous people helped me in my quest for piano quintet scores and books. These include the librarians at City University, where many of the doctoral dissertations mentioned in this study were made available to me. I would particularly like to thank the music librarian at City, Mandy Cumbridge, and the Copyright and Digital Resources Officer, Peter Williams, for their swift and detailed responses to my queries. The staff at Faber Music, PWM, Boosey & Hawkes, Schott and Breitkopf und Härtel were always helpful in securing copies of scores for perusal and I am grateful for being allowed to use some musical examples from scores not yet available in print, by permission of the publishing houses.

The process of writing was often a difficult one for someone like myself who prefers to perform music rather than write about it. I greatly enjoy the company of my fellow ensemble players, Cristian Persinaru, Todor Nikolaev, Paul Cox and Nils Franke. The playing of piano quintets will always be fun and an enjoyable experience with these musicians.
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Abstract

This study examines the historical development of the piano quintet from the eighteenth to the twenty-first century. This development is coloured by the fact that the ensemble combines two discrete constituents, solo piano and string quartet, each with its own separate heritage. The assessment of the genre thus involves consideration of the manner in which its composers, while applying their own compositional aesthetics, have, over these centuries, treated ensemble interaction and texture. In the twentieth century, in particular, the rise of concern with timbre affected attitudes towards integration of the ensemble.

The introduction to this dissertation argues for the identification of the piano quintet as a genre in its own right, based on its fixed scoring (of piano and string quartet) and the substantial body of works written for the ensemble since the 1770s. Chapters 1-5 consider aspects of ‘ensemble conversation’ within the quintet up to the present, for which a broadly chronological approach is adopted. Early examples by Soler, Giordani and Boccherini are all considered; thereafter, the canonical works of Robert Schumann, Brahms, Franck and Dvořák are viewed in the context of contemporaneous works by, among others, Saint-Saëns, Bruch and Coleridge-Taylor. The study then draws on significant twentieth-century examples by Shostakovich, Schnittke, Ginastera, Xenakis and Feldman, as well as more recent works, by Messiaen, Carter, Goehr and Adès. As will be shown, a surprisingly limited number of models for new works have been utilised, earlier exemplars inspiring later compositions.

Chapter 6 applies some of the observations made to three specific case studies by women composers, two Piano Quintets by Grażyna Bacewicz and one by Sofia Gubaidulina, which are examined in detail and evaluated for their significance both to their own time and ours. The conclusion offers an evaluation of the differing forms of textural and timbral interaction and concludes that the piano quintet, for all its professed links with the Romantic Period, has emerged as an ensemble valued by contemporary composers for its capacity for timbral conversation.
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Introduction

This study surveys the development of works for the most common kind of piano quintet ensemble, piano and string quartet, from the eighteenth century to the beginning of the twenty-first, concluding with the examination and evaluation of three piano quintets from the latter part of the twentieth century by Grażyna Bacewicz (1951 and 1965) and Sofia Gubaidulina (1957).

Combining the string quartet with the piano raises particular challenges to which composers have responded variously as the instruments themselves have evolved. Several hundred piano quintets have been written post-1770.¹ A survey of these works confirms that certain musical elements constantly appear, elements related to both medium and form.

The quartet’s four individual parts, coupled with the piano’s potential for contrapuntal scoring, places the piano quintet at an extreme, beyond other chamber ensembles involving solo stringed instruments, and closer to the notion of symphonic writing. Further, although the piano trio and quartet too might be considered ensembles of two halves, it is only in the piano quintet that the two halves are comprised of truly established discrete entities, the string ‘half’ (i.e., the string quartet) possessing a long evolutionary history and a formidable repertoire, much beyond that of the string trio.² Whether the string quartet is seen as one instrument in four parts, or four individual parts of

¹ Gottfried Heinz includes a fairly comprehensive listing of piano quintets in Die Geschichte des Klavierquintetts von den Anfängen bis Robert Schumann (Neckargemünd: Männeles Verlag, 2001), 233-287. Heinz includes three appendices to his book: 9.1 includes keyboard quintets from Felice Giardini to Robert Schumann, 9.2, piano quintets from Schumann to Brahms, and 10.1, a comprehensive list of all piano quintets for which he has found titles. The most recent titles obviously are not included.

a small orchestra, it has long been perceived as an established, self-contained medium.³

As regards the work, as opposed to the medium, can it be regarded as a genre? The dictionary definition of ‘genre’ is vague: ‘a kind or style, especially of art or literature’.⁴ Heather Dubrow is more specific: she claims that the notion of a genre in literature invites any creator contributing to it to employ an unspoken code of ‘prescriptions and restrictions’.⁵ This seems to accord with the notion of the piano quintet; as implied above, ‘generic patterns’ (Dubrow’s term), no matter how brilliantly conceived or even disguised, are often present.⁶ Hepokoski and Darcy suggest that ‘all genres of music presuppose genre-defining guidelines for the production of typical or more or less standardized “shapes”’.⁷ Indeed, the piano quintets of many eminent composers reveal common traits, some of which flourish until the present day. And, when discussing their compositions for this ensemble, contemporary composers as diverse as Elliot Carter and Alexander Goehr identify specific nineteenth-century works as their inspiration.

Why does writing for this ensemble in particular seem so closely linked to an exemplar? This may, in part, simply be due to the popularity (and persuasive quality) of the piano quintets of both Schumann and Brahms. It

---

⁵ Heather Dubrow, Genre (New York: Methuen & Co, 1982), 9. Dubrow writes that literary ideas are often debated, officially and unofficially, and writers themselves establish the codes of structure. This, applied to piano quintets, would suggest that it is perhaps the medium and genre that are the ‘prescriptions and restrictions’.
⁶ Ibid., 118. Dubrow discusses ‘generic signals’ in Genre, 2-3.
may also be because of the exceptional nature of these two works. As Tovey writes, ‘[I]t is surprising how few have been written, and how abnormal is the position of those that are known as classics’. In the case of other chamber music formations, for example the piano trio, exemplars are not invariably single works but often groups, e.g., Beethoven, op. 1, nos. 1-3; op. 11, op. 44; op. 70, nos. 1 and 2; op. 97 and WoO, 38 & 39. In the case of Schumann’s piano quintet, there is only one in his entire chamber music output, by which, according to Dunhill in 1938, he was ‘chiefly remembered’ and which was representative of a small number of ‘isolated works’ for the genre.

For all the above reasons, I posit here that the piano quintet has become a genre in its own right. However, Amy J. Devitt, also writing from a literary perspective, advises that ‘genre’ can be a both ‘trivial and dangerous concept’ with too much emphasis on ‘labelling’. Thus a discussion of the piano quintet should see past the aspect of genre that ‘encourages standardization’ to one that ‘enables variation’, a kind that ‘both constrains and enables creativity’.

The medium itself, of course, is the most influential constant in the history of the piano quintet; as mentioned above, its two, pre-established ‘groups’, the string quartet and solo piano, have their own history and repertoire. But as with any chamber ensemble, this one can be viewed in two ways, one at each end of a continuum. At one end, it consists of players in a dramatic scenario. Ensemble interaction can range from a straightforward \textit{tutti},

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{8} Donald Francis Tovey, \textit{Essays in Musical Analysis: Chamber Music} (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), 17.
\item \textsuperscript{9} Thomas F. Dunhill, \textit{Chamber Music: A Treatise for Students} (London: Macmillan and Co, Ltd, 1938), 245.
\item \textsuperscript{10} Amy J. Devitt, \textit{Writing Genres} (Illinois: Southern Illinois University, 2004), 4.
\item \textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 4.
\end{itemize}}
to dialogue between the two ‘groups’ or even between up to five, or even six, solo participants.\textsuperscript{12} It can reach from the conventional (as, for instance, between equal string soloists in their normal tessitaurae, or between a solo violin and accompanying piano), to the more unusual (as when high cello is pitted against low violin, or a solo piano melody is accompanied by chordal strings), and can express both conflict and accord.

At the other end of the continuum, the ensemble can be viewed simply as a set of sonic resources. The timbral differentiation between piano and strings is a prime consideration for any modern composer of piano quintets; the melding of colours in different ways has become almost a preoccupation since the emancipation of timbre at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Where on the continuum between these two concerns, interaction (of \textit{dramatis personae}) and timbre, a work sits usually relates closely to the aesthetic outlook of the composer and his/her era. Indeed the relationship between interaction, timbre and the work’s structure informs the whole of this study.

Thus, the ultimate research question considered here is, to what extent does its use of this particular group of instruments influence the genre itself? This question, of course, invokes both the issues of changes in general compositional style and the historical development of the instruments. More localised questions emerge at various points in this study. First, what are the earliest piano quintets currently known and how are the instrumental relationships defined in these works? Second, what is the reason for the

\textsuperscript{12} The issue of six participants within the piano quintet formation can apply to the number of players or parts. In the case of Saint-Saëns’s Piano Quintet op. 14, the scoring for the \textit{Scherzo} (Movement 3) includes an ad libitum additional double bass part. By contrast, six parts to be performed by five players can be observed in the Fugue of Shostakovitch’s Piano Quintet op. 57.
increased interest in piano quintets, post-1870? Third, to what extent have some works served as models for others? And, related to this, why did the piano quintet acquire a reputation as a ‘traditional’ genre in the early twentieth century, and has it, by the twenty-first century, shed this reputation?

In an attempt to answer these questions, it is necessary to distinguish between that repertoire accessible today, and that which can reasonably be considered to have been in circulation at previous points in time. For example, the works for keyboard and string quartet by Giordani, published in London in the 1770s, are unlikely to have made much direct impact on Schumann’s perspective on writing for piano quintet: Schumann’s diaries are very specific about the music that occupied him, yet he includes no mention of Giordani. As will be seen, the only tangible evidence of any piano quintets known to Schumann relates to Louis Ferdinand’s op.1.

The survey that occupies the larger part of this study describes the major stages in the history of the piano quintet repertoire, dividing it into five parts: (1) precursors, and earliest examples, c. 1770-1840; (2) development in the nineteenth century, with a particular focus on the works of Schumann, and (3) Brahms, also still seen as highpoints of the repertoire; (4) further development, c. 1870-1920, a period in which its instrumentation became fixed, thus confirming the ensemble’s reputation as a ‘romantic’ one, and (5) the diversification of the repertoire in the twentieth century, with specific reference to instrumental interaction and timbre. The individual discussion of the three aforementioned twentieth-century quintets follows this survey.

The first chapter of this dissertation concerns the different types of the
piano quintet (the work) in the eighteenth century, categorised by function. The *divertimento* is exemplified by the works of Giordani, published in London in 1770, the accompanied keyboard sonata, by those of Benda. The adapted keyboard concerto is a quintet-type established by Haydn and Mozart. This promulgated the notion of the piano quintet as an ensemble of two separate units. The incipient piano quintet, a work of integrated forces, is illustrated by the works of Luigi Boccherini.

Chapter 2 considers Schumann’s Piano Quintet op. 44, widely regarded as the first canonic work for this ensemble. John Daverio, for instance, claims that Schumann’s Piano Quintet and Quartet ‘mediate the demands of symphonism and the chamber medium’.13 Schumann’s early attempt to write chamber music for piano and strings is considered first, as it reveals the composer’s approach. The documented evidence of early performances for op. 44 is also examined.

Chapter 3 reflects on the impact of Schumann’s quintet with an examination of Saint-Saëns’ Piano Quintet op. 14 (1855), Lalo’s *Grande Quintette* (1862) and Brahms’s Piano Quintet op. 34, which furthers the concept of the ensemble as a quasi-orchestral grouping. The ‘symphonic piano quintet’, as it is sometimes described, places a new emphasis on timbre, in which area Brahms can be seen as an innovator.14

Most of the quintets discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, including those of

---


14 Colin Lawson, ‘The String Quartet as a Foundation for Larger Ensembles’, in *The Cambridge Companion to the String Quartet*, Robin Stowell, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 85. Colin Lawson uses the term ‘French symphonic chamber music’ to describe Franck’s Piano Quintet and ‘quasi-orchestral approach to the medium’ to describe Elgar’s Piano Quintet. It is generally accepted that the late-nineteenth century/early-twentieth century piano quintet produces a large volume of sound and thick texture.
Bruch (1886), Coleridge-Taylor (1893) and Franck (1879), pay a debt at least to Schumann if not Brahms. In contrast, Dvořák’s op. 81 diverges from Schumann’s Piano Quintet in a number of ways. Op. 81, ‘one of the cornerstones of the genre’, is significant for its interaction between the five instruments. The Dvořák work is then considered against the emerging ‘virtuoso’ quintet, embodied in Franck’s work. Chapter 4 concludes by considering the gradually increasing independence of parts: this led to a fractured texture that seemed to contradict what contemporaneous writers considered to be the very essence of chamber music writing. Elgar’s quintet is, in contrast, in ‘orchestral mode’, hardly intimate and lacking textural diversity.

Chapter 5 considers the role of the piano quintet in the twentieth century. Associated with a late-romantic tonal language, it seems to have become a neglected genre, though some have seen it as a vehicle for innovation. The first part of the chapter looks at the use of the ensemble in the works of Ives, Carter and Goehr, while the second traces what seems to be a re-discovery of the piano quintet and its potential for transparent textures in the wake of Shostakovich’s piano quintet op. 57 (1940). The political ideology of Shostakovich’s time is considered, as is his work’s contribution to a renewed interest in the genre. The creation of ‘block-writing’ in the quintets of Messiaen and Xenakis is discussed, as well as fragmentation of the ensemble in works by Riegger, Françaix and Ginastera. Piano quintets by Ginastera,

16 Smallman, The Piano Quintet and Quartet, 124.
17 Lawson, ‘The string quartet as a foundation for larger ensembles’, 326. Lawson cites Ives as a composer whose piano quintet works lie ‘outside the mainstream’ in their ‘creative use’ of the medium.
Hovhaness, Henze, Feldman and Adès, in particular (the last mentioned composed in 2000), demonstrate how a preoccupation with timbre along with both the re-working and rejection of tradition have led to a conscious shaping of the genre.

While the first five chapters outline the periods of distinct development in the history of the piano quintet, the three case studies of Chapter 6 display individual approaches to the piano quintet in the latter part of the twentieth century. They also show a deep relationship between structure and timbre which was noted as incipient in Ives’s *In re con moto et al* in Chapter 5. In the piano quintets of Grażyna Bacewicz (1952 and 1965) and Sofia Gubaidulina (1957), form and content are intrinsically linked to instrumentation, as is the treatment of the thematic material; the growing tendency for timbral merging is noted. Both Bacewicz’s Piano Quintet no. 1 and Gubaidulina’s work reveal a late neo-Classical approach. Bacewicz’s second piano quintet, like Ginastera’s, written at approximately the same time, is radical in its discontinuity, while its manipulation of texture is equally forward-looking.

A combination of the discussion of piano quintets in the twentieth century with an in-depth assessment of the works of Bacewicz and Gubaidulina offers associations with the two key piano quintets in the repertoire (Schumann and Brahms), bringing us (perhaps) full circle.

The sources for this study fall into several categories. The first includes surveys of the piano-chamber music repertoire. A number exist, though they seem to have significantly more material on piano trios and string quartets than piano quintets. One such example is William A. Everett’s guide to *British
Piano Trios, Quartets and Quintets, 1850-1950 (2000), where most space is dedicated to the trio (because of the larger numbers of trios composed). The author’s introduction contains pertinent observations about the functions and purposes of some of the works, placing them in context.\textsuperscript{18} For instance, he claims that the growth of the amateur repertoire is a reaction to the technical complexities of the concert repertoire of this period.

Wilhelm Altmann’s Kammermusik-Katalog (1942), a significant reference point for information with publication details, is a comprehensive list of works categorized into I: chamber music for strings and wind instruments; II: chamber music with piano; III: chamber works for harp and other instruments; IV: for guitar (lute) and other instruments; and V: songs.\textsuperscript{19} Altmann’s work in compiling names of composers and their chamber music is similar to what was achieved by Walter Willson Cobbett, although the latter’s Cyclopedic Survey of Chamber Music is more comprehensive and contains brief descriptions of genres.\textsuperscript{20} The piano quintet does not have its own entry in this survey. It forms part of a small article entitled ‘Pianoforte and Strings’, and briefly describes the piano quintets of Schumann and Brahms alongside other chamber music genres for stringed instruments and piano.\textsuperscript{21} Both these books reflect the ideology of their times, ensuring that information about chamber music is available to all. Similarly, this is what Rangel-Ribiero and Robert Markel appear to have set out to achieve in 1993. Chamber Music: An

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
International Guide to Works and Their Instrumentation is a tabulated, comprehensive list of chamber music, containing types of instruments used, tonality and publication details. Though valuable as a resource, there is no discussion of specific works. Other repertoire guides are published by Maurice Hinson (1978) and Ingeborg Allihn (1998). The information contained in these guidebooks is in principle similar to that of Altmann’s larger contribution, his Handbuch, to be discussed below. Allihn provides a compilation of what is claimed are the ‘most well-known’ chamber music works, though the selection process is not defined further. Aimed at music enthusiasts and concert audiences, it offers elementary information on the form and history of each work. More detailed by comparison is Hinson’s Guide to the Piano in Chamber Ensemble with a 24-page section of entries in alphabetical order on Quintets for Piano and Strings by 127 composers. This also includes other variants of the piano quintet, e.g., the substitution for the cello by a double bass or the violin by a wind instrument. Although the amount of detail for each piece is variable, the author offers information on musical form, style, and the perceived value of a work. First published in 1978, the primary importance of this resource lies in its documenting of the breadth of published repertoire available at the time.

The second category of sources for this study includes historical studies, either of the broad topic of chamber music or else of parallel genres.

24 Allihn, ed., Kammermusikführer. Only the following piano quintets receive acknowledgment: Borodin, Brahms, Dvořák op. 81, Elgar, Ives, Shostakovich, Schumann, and Zarebski.
These sources, unlike those discussed above, are less concerned with listing repertoire; instead, the emphasis is on a musicological contextualization of the works discussed. They shed some light on the piano quintet too. James Webster’s article on Viennese chamber music in the early classical period (written prior to Temperley’s edition of Giordani’s quintets) connects ensemble-formations of the late classical period to the earlier divertimento.26

Basil Smallman, in writing of the development of the piano trio, says that three ‘specific criteria’ needed to be accepted for its development. These pertain equally to the piano quintet:

[T]he strings . . . should be granted near-equal partnership with the keyboard, . . . the scoring should be unequivocally for the piano rather than the harpsichord, . . . and most importantly, . . . all three instruments should be accorded, as nearly as possible, an equal share in the sonata argument through the exchange and alternation of thematic material.27

Smallman suggests that one major reason for ‘the late arrival’ of concerted chamber music with piano was the ‘tardy progress made in contemporary piano construction’: once the Viennese pianos of J. A. Stein and Anton Walter were successfully produced, Mozart, in the late 1770s, proceeded to write piano trios, piano quartets and works for violin and piano.28

These problems also applied to the development of the piano quintet; Heinrich Christoph Koch’s *Musikalisches Lexikon* (1802) makes an explicit link between quartets and quintets.29 He suggests that

the quartet (quatuor) has for some time now been a popular instrumental piece for four instruments . . . consisting of four

---

concertante main parts of which none may deny the other the entitlement of being a main voice.\footnote{Koch, \textit{Musicalisches Lexicon}, 1209. ‘Dieses schon seit geraumer Zeit so beliebte Instrumentstück für vier Instrumente macht eine besondere Gattung der Sonate aus, und besteht im enger Sinne des Wortes aus vier concertirenden Hauptstimmen, von denen keine der andern das Vorrecht einer Hauptstimme streitig machen kann,’ trans. Nils Franke.}

In the entry under ‘Quintet’, Koch again highlights the role of five concertante instruments, suggesting that what applies to four parts ‘also applies to five’.\footnote{Koch, \textit{Musicalisches Lexicon}, 1226. ‘… gilt, mit Anwendung aus fünf Stimmen, auch von dem Quintett’, trans. Nils Franke.}

It seems, therefore, that the concept of equality of parts existed in the quintet of the late eighteenth century. However, Koch refers only to five unspecified players or parts, not the piano quintet.

Some of these broad studies contain specific mention of piano quintets. One such is Colin Lawson’s survey, ‘The string quartet as a foundation for larger ensembles’, which places canonic pieces amongst contemporaneous, lesser-known works.\footnote{Lawson, ‘The string quartet as a foundation for larger ensembles’, 310-327.} Most significantly, Lawson observes that ‘the medium of the piano quintet shows every sign of continued good health, on more than one occasion having broken free of the conservativism that has often been its hallmark’.\footnote{Ibid., 327.} Alexander Goehr’s view of repertoire for this medium (as a foreword to his own programme notes, not in a comprehensive survey) ‘as a form of music making which has been relatively neglected until recent years’ supports Lawson’s claim that it is ‘in good health’, but also acknowledges its traditional connotations.\footnote{Alexander Goehr, sleeve notes for \textit{Music by Alexander Goehr: Trio for Violin, Cello and Piano, Suite for Violin and Piano, Largamente from Op.18, Piano Quintet}, Daniel Becker, Piano, Ning Kam, Violin, Thomas Carroll, Cello, Elias Quartet, Meridian CDE 84562, 2008, 2.}

Unfortunately, Lawson’s article is not typical of general string quartet literature: such discussion involving the string quartet as a basis for other
ensembles does not appear in Paul Griffiths’ *The String Quartet: A History* (1983), for instance, while in Douglas Jarman’s *The Twentieth-Century String Quartet* (2002), small references are made to only two of the most canonic piano quintets of the twentieth century, by Shostakovich (1940) and Schnittke (1976).\(^{35}\) Alan George writes in the *Twentieth-Century String Quartet*,

Schnittke’s First Quartet dates from 1966 but it was with the Piano Quintet of 1976 that he truly found his voice in the world of the string quartet (and as such it occupies a similar position to that of Shostakovich’s Piano Quintet).\(^{36}\)

The third category of sources is literature devoted specifically to the piano quintet. There are only two published books on the subject: Wilhelm Altmann, *Das Handbuch der Klavierquintettspieler* (1936) and Basil Smallman, *The Piano Quartet and Quintet: Style, Structure, and Scoring* (1994), which followed by four years his book on the Piano Trio mentioned above.\(^{37}\) Yet neither is concerned solely with works for piano and string quartet: Altmann treats examples of piano quintets for combinations other than piano and strings and, as its title implies, Smallman’s study is concerned with piano quartets and quintets with varying instrumentation.

Altmann’s *Handbuch* has the subtitle *Wegweiser durch [Guide to] die Klavierquintette*. The author explains that this is not intended to be an historical or indeed analytical approach to the subject. Instead he aims this publication at ‘practising musicians’ and a ‘growing number of music lovers who dedicate themselves to the making of so-called chamber music at


home’. The study is presented chronologically and by ensemble. Although music for piano and string quartet takes up the largest amount of space available, he also considers other quintet formations. Despite his claim to the contrary, Altmann offers basic information on the structure of works and gives performance advice that goes beyond mere description of the relative difficulty of each part within the ensemble. Arguably the most significant aspects of his book are the comparison between the piano quartet and quintet, and the description of the role of the pianist in chamber music for piano and strings. With regard to the latter, Altman advises that

> the primary requirement for a splendid Klavierist is the understanding of not suppressing the strings in terms of sound, yet holding them together tightly; I consider it unfortunate, even wrong, to open the lid of the piano.

Connected to this opinion is Altmann’s assessment of the effectiveness of the piano quintet compared with that of the piano quartet. He regards the combination of piano and string trio as ‘a probably happier one than the piano and string quartet, as it does not tempt one [i.e., the composer] so easily to strive for orchestral sound effects which unfortunately happens frequently in piano quintets’.

Altmann treats piano quartets and quintets in two separate publications; Smallman combines them in one. Thus the latter is able to make more wide-ranging, composer-specific observations and to address issues of piano chamber music in an extensive, though holistic, way. Smallman takes

---

40 Ibid., 5: ‘doch wohl glücklicher als die von Klavier und Streichquartett; sie verführt auch nicht so leicht dazu, orchestrale Wirkungen anzustreben, was leider häufig in den Klavierquintetten geschieht’, trans. Joanne Richardson.
what he describes as a ‘broadly historical viewpoint’, of which ‘the aim has been rather to explore, in a wide-ranging manner, the overall concept of large-scale chamber composition with piano’. 41 He concludes his study with a chapter on mixed ensembles, suggesting that ‘the great chamber forms we have been surveying, even if not already largely defunct, are unlikely to be much cultivated in the future’. 42 Smallman’s view, in the early 1990s, of the future of the traditionally-constituted piano quartet and quintet is pessimistic (unduly so, Goehr and Lawson might claim), these instrumental formations being too restrictive for the timbral preoccupations of music of this time. However, he acknowledges that ‘nothing can be taken for granted, not even the reliability of history as a guide’. 43

From the 1950s onwards, a small number of doctoral dissertations have been devoted to the topic of the Piano Quintet. Gottfried Heinz’s dissertation (2003) provides much historical data and also implies, by never rejecting it outright, an evolutionary trajectory for the work-type. 44 Other dissertations, by Ingrid Gutberg (DMA, 1958), Marion Goertzel Stern (PhD, 1979) and Michelle Marie Fillion (PhD, 1982), group piano quartets and quintets together. 45 Gutberg gives a general overview of the development of both to the

---

41 Smallman, The Piano Quartet and Quintet, vii.
42 Ibid., 181.
43 Ibid., 182.
44 Heinz, Die Geschichte des Klavierquintetts. As discussed above, Heinz’s study is valuable for its comprehensive lists of piano quintets. His discussion focuses on the mechanical development of the piano, and briefly about the early formations of the strings; with emphasis on the combination of violin, viola, cello and double bass. Die Geschichte, therefore, is a book concentrating on keyboard-quintet media (for varying combinations of stringed instruments) c.1760-1842.
end of the nineteenth century. Stern’s work, referred to above, on the other
hand, considers the diversity of chamber music available in London, 1756-
1775, with particular reference to the most popular musical forms of the time.
She also underlines the purpose of the accompanied keyboard sonata as a work
‘used primarily by amateurs at home for entertainment and for pedagogical
purposes’. Stern concludes that it is the texture of the works themselves that
indicates for what purpose or in which context this music may have been used.
Fillion’s study (1982) explores the role of the keyboard instrument for
accompanimental purposes and its use in domestic music making at the time
of Haydn. Her focus is therefore the Viennese Classical period and Austria as
a location. Fillion, too, considers the connections between form, genre and
texture before concluding that the social purposes for which divertimenti were
often written could nevertheless result in music of more substantial quality.

Studies which feature specific works for piano quintet are the DMA
dissertations of James Gwyn Staples III (1972), Ana Lucia Altino Garcia
work considers piano quintets by Webern, Vierne, Elgar, Martinů (second
quintet), Medtner and Ross Lee Finney, in the context of the respective
composers’ output and twentieth-century music generally. Though
instrumentation is considered, evaluation ultimately dwells upon
compositional style: whether it is contemporary or anachronistic. Garcia

46 Stern, *Keyboard quartets*, 104.
47 James Gwyn Staples III, *Six Lesser-Known Piano Quintets of the Twentieth
Century* (unpublished DMA dissertation, University of Rochester, Eastman School of Music,
1972), Ana Lucia Altino Garcia, *Brahms’s Opus 34 and the 19th-century Piano Quintet*,
(unpublished DMA dissertation, Boston University, 1992), Jae-Hyang Koo, *A Study of Four
Representative Piano Quintets by Major Composers of the Nineteenth Century: Schumann,
Brahms, Dvořák and Franck* (unpublished DMA dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1993)
and Terree Lee Shofner, *The Two Piano Quintets of Grażyna Bacewicz: An Analysis of Style
examines the relationship between the piano quintets of Schumann, Brahms and Dvořák, highlighting connections between and influences on these works.

The most interesting aspect of this dissertation is also its most speculative element: a ‘hypothetical reconstruction’ of Brahms’s original string quintet version of the piano quintet. By contrast, Koo’s treatment of four selected piano quintets (Schumann, Brahms, Dvořák and Franck) is somewhat inconclusive, not least because of the absence of a debate on instrumental interaction. Shofner’s work, highly relevant to the present dissertation, focuses on Bacewicz’s piano quintets, relating them to the composer’s own stylistic development.

The fourth category of sources for this study concerns the analysis of the music. Significant examination of individual quintets includes H. C. Colles’s of Elgar’s piano quintet (1919), and Dunhill’s, of Brahms’s op. 34 (1931).

Analysis often occurs in general studies of chamber music; most significant in this regard is the work of Thomas Dunhill (1938), Donald Francis Tovey (1944), Homer Ulrich (1948), Alec Robertson (1957), John Herschel Baron (1998) and Melvin Berger (2001). Dunhill’s *Chamber Music: A Treatise for Students*, is frequently referred to in this dissertation. Its advice on how to compose effectively for various types of media, at a time when compositional influences in Britain remained closely associated with German and German-speaking countries, is relevant to the discussion.

---


Proportionately, more emphasis is placed on writing string quartets than other combinations such as string trios, string quintets and sextets. Dunhill devotes one chapter to duos for piano and another instrument and, significantly, chapter VII includes piano trios, piano quartets and piano quintets together.

Tovey’s *Essays in Musical Analysis: Chamber Music* contains only one piano quintet, that of Schumann. But it is of relevance to this topic in its perception of chamber music; the general survey was originally written in 1928 and, again, contains more details of works for keyboard, duos (including piano) and string quartets.

The works of Schumann and Brahms receive most analytical attention in general studies. This is certainly the case in Ulrich’s *Chamber Music: The Growth and Practice of an Intimate Art* and, also considerably, in Robertson’s *Chamber Music* and Berger’s *Guide to Chamber Music*. Schubert’s ‘Trout’ Quintet D. 667, for piano, violin, viola, cello, and double bass is also discussed, though to a lesser extent. The same applies to John Herschel Baron’s *Intimate Music: A History of the Idea of Chamber Music*.

Schumann and Brahms are a focus in two edited collections namely, *Nineteenth-Century Chamber Music*, ed. Stephen E. Hefling (1998) and *Twentieth-Century Chamber Music* (1996), ed. James McCalla. Each has proved a valuable source.50 John Daverio’s chapter on Schumann’s chamber music records in detail Schumann’s attempts to write chamber music over a period of almost 14 years before the composer’s ‘chamber music year’ of 1842.51 The author contemplates the notion of the quintet as chamber music

---


51 Daverio, ““Beautiful and Abstruse Conversations”, 208-241.
for public rather than private performance, but he does not weigh the musical implications of this. By contrast, Carl Dahlhaus’s essay, *Brahms und die Idee der Kammermusik*, places its subject in a wide historical context, concluding that chamber music as an art form is characterised by the discrepancy between the private and public spheres it inhabits.52 Margaret Notley’s chapter on Brahms’s chamber music, ‘Discourse and Allusion: the chamber music of Brahms’, is surprisingly unspecific about the piano quintet.53 The work is referred to only in two particular contexts, as an example of the composer’s struggle to assemble the musical material for a variety of instrumentations, and as evidence for Brahms’ fugal ability. As in the case of Daverio’s article, Notley is predominantly concerned with compositional processes and their connection to the composer’s personal development.

Perhaps the source of greatest significance to the analytical approach of the present study is Mara Parker’s book, *The String Quartet* (2002). Specifically, it calls for a re-appraisal of the criteria by which the early string quartet, as a work, is understood. Parker suggests:

Rather than seeing the eighteenth-century string quartet as evolving from a homophonic texture to a conversational one, it is more productive to acknowledge that composers approached the medium in a variety of ways. Because scholars have focused on the works of Haydn and Mozart as representative of the period, they have missed the multitude of compositions that did not follow that path. Imposing a set of uniform characteristics and an artificially constructed line of development is ineffective and misleading for it forces us to view the genre as representative of musical classicism. If instead we focus on the genre as a form of discourse, we have effectively created a means with which to examine the string quartet during the eighteenth century.54

---

54 Parker, *The String Quartet*, 282.
Parker’s view that the interaction between string quartet players over a number of decades was not exclusively a matter of gradual development from one set of criteria to another, is as simple as it is persuasive. Her suggestion that one should focus on co-existing ‘types of conversation’ instead, and to illustrate these via wide-ranging examples, extending beyond today’s core repertoire, is a valuable one. Furthermore, she advocates a categorisation of ‘conversation’ by its own characteristics and not by a seemingly hierarchical or chronological sense of relevance.

Parker contextualizes the history of the string quartet as a process where ‘each work must be viewed as a product of an individual composer’s stylistic choices, location, intended performers and listeners.’\(^5\) She explains that, in considering the array of string quartets composed between 1750-1797, she wishes to avoid a ‘linear’ approach to analysing the ‘structural components’ of a work and instead concentrate on the ‘relationship between the four voices.’\(^6\) What makes Parker’s method work so well is that the range of musical works for string quartet is so extensive, far more so than with piano quintets of the same period. Her categories of ‘lecture’, ‘polite conversation’, ‘debate’ and ‘conversation’ (to be discussed in detail in Chapter 1) are equally pertinent to the piano quintet, though, of course, the group dynamic is altered with the introduction of a keyboard instrument. In what appears to be an adjunct to this, Mary Hunter discusses ‘group dynamics of ensemble performance’ (also in the string quartet, though between 1800-1830) with particular reference to ‘first-violin-centricity’ and ‘the ideal of free and equal

\(^5\) Ibid., 23.
\(^6\) Ibid., 23.
contribution by all four parts/players.\textsuperscript{57} This, she considers, ‘is distinct from the longstanding metaphor of “conversation” to describe the relations of parts.’\textsuperscript{58} Hunter’s approach is of a ‘pervasively democratic sociability’, with no particular hierarchy between parts, yet this approach reflects the progression of string quartet performance tradition in the early nineteenth century, the result of which would have implications for the piano quintet.\textsuperscript{59}

However, Parker’s understanding of the string quartet is unique; she deliberately sets out to avoid a ‘blinker and misleading view’ of the genre.\textsuperscript{60} By this, she explains, she does not just exclusively study the string quartets of Mozart and Haydn but a wealth of other contemporary compositions. Applied to the piano quintet, this would involve a study of the works of Schumann and Brahms and also the quintets of Giordani, Boccherini and Soler (amongst others).

Friedhelm Krummacher’s \textit{Geschichte des Streichquartetts} (2005) is another comprehensive work (in three volumes) supporting theories of musical conversation.\textsuperscript{61} Krummacher does not acknowledge Parker, perhaps because his research considers an earlier (1773) aesthetic. However, he cites the famous letter from Goethe to Zelter (Mendelssohn’s teacher), dated 9 November, 1829, in which Goethe says of the string quartet,

\begin{quote}
One hears four reasonable people in conversation with one another, expects to gain something from their discourses and gets to know the peculiarities of the instruments.\textsuperscript{62}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{57} Mary Hunter, ‘‘The Most Interesting Genre of Music’: Performance, Sociability and Meaning in the Classical String Quartet, 1800-1830’, in \textit{Nineteenth-Century Music Review}, Vol. 9, Issue 01 (June 2012), 53.
\textsuperscript{58} Mary Hunter, ‘The Most Interesting Genre of Music’, 53.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 65.
\textsuperscript{60} Parker, \textit{The String Quartet}, 23.
\textsuperscript{62} Krummacher, \textit{Geschichte des Streichquartetts}, 71. The letter appears in Max Hecker, ed., \textit{Der Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und Zelter} (Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, 1918),
Goethe’s comment therefore supports Parker’s approach to assessing string quartet writing on its instrumental conversation, and thus the stance of this study as well.

The discussion of the influence of the medium on the genre of the Piano Quintet will also need to take into account the musical forms used. This is because conversational elements are often intrinsic to form, in particular sonata form. For this, the present study draws on the writings of both Rosen and Hepokoski and Darcy. What these two studies share is an understanding of form as defined by patterns, a range of shared gestures and ‘a sense of the typical’. Rosen writes that the term, ‘sonata form’, was the invention of Marx and refers to a single movement rather than ‘the whole of a three- or four-movement sonata, symphony, or work of chamber music’. Hepokoski and Darcy surmise that

[...] any given point in the construction of a sonata form, a composer was faced with an array of common types of continuation-choices established by the limits of ‘expected’ architecture found in (and generalized from) numerous generic precedents.

An ensemble of two halves, piano and string quartet, increases the possibilities for conversational exchange in sonata form, while ‘the governing principle of alternation was to become the most common means of progress’


64 Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 7-8.

65 Rosen, Sonata Forms, 3-4 and 1. Adolph Bernhard Marx was the author of Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition, Vol. III (1845). Rosen explains that Marx’s ‘codification’ of sonata form established a pattern referred to as ‘an aid to composition’, particularly in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

66 Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 41.
in all forms.\textsuperscript{67} Though W. Dean Sutcliffe applies this idea to the piano trio, it has resonance in the development of the piano quintet.

While piano quintet recordings generally concentrate on a handful of works (Schumann, Brahms, Franck, Dvořák, Shostakovich), over 60 appear in the recorded catalogue.\textsuperscript{68} The majority of these works were written c. 1870–1930, thus confirming the association of both medium and work-type with late-nineteenth century style. The drop in numbers in the early to mid-twentieth century raises the possibility of the work-type and medium becoming outmoded. Yet, since then, numbers have risen, while links with canonic works have increased. This seems to accord with the growth in referential, post-tonal music at this time. The concentration, in performance, on a select number of works has bestowed upon them an elevated status. This situation has encouraged composers to react to these specific pieces, as chapters 2 to 6 will demonstrate.

While research into the piano quintet has generally considered individual works in particular music periods, or else (as per Smallman), the use of mixed ensembles for a set number of players, the present study considers the genre from the earliest known examples to the present-day. As will be seen in the course of this study, a small number of quintets, in which sonata form is pervasive, became models for many others. In the early twentieth century, however, a shift in musical discourse occurred when sonata form, in particular, was replaced by other, less conventional, forms. These works often departed from the models mentioned above and were frequently


\textsuperscript{68} \url{www.arkivmusic.com} (accessed 17-01-2010) revealed the following number of piano quintet recordings: Schumann 55, Brahms 55, Dvorak 48, Shostakovich 41, Franck 22, Elgar 11.
driven by texture, or timbrally-driven conversation.

Thus, composers have viewed the ensemble in various ways: as two halves (piano and string quartet), but also as an ensemble with the potential for many different combinations. By not being restricted to an examination of canonic works, or focussing on a particular historical period, but accepting the nature of the instrumentation and the breadth of its possibilities, it is hoped that this study will provide greater insight into the piano quintet as a genre. Moving beyond the basic models, it is hoped, will prove valuable for player, historian, and composer alike.
Chapter 1. The Piano Quintet and its Precursors, c. 1770-1840

While most of this study considers piano quintets written in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the present chapter is devoted to the early history of the genre. The various stylistic traits exhibited amongst early works continue to appear in much later ones; this, perhaps, is one reason that the piano quintet is considered a conservative genre. Its early history is closely tied both to the development of the instruments in the ensemble and also to that of related genres like the string quartet. Yet this early history is a diverse one, with a number of clear characteristics already defining sub-types of the genre.

When Altmann published his handbook for players in 1936, little research had been conducted into the early development of the piano quintet.\(^1\) Information about the genre had previously cropped up sporadically in general histories, letters and studies of composers who produced piano quintets, but Altmann’s book may be the first to deal with the subject specifically. He claims that the first examples of works for keyboard and string quartet were those of Luigi Boccherini (1743-1805), dating from 1797 and 1799. Furthermore, he suggests that Boccherini ‘created’ [hat geschaffen] ‘the artistic genre’ [Kunstgattung], indicating that, for

---
\(^1\) Altmann, *Das Handbuch*. The publication of this book is a later manifestation of ‘nineteenth-century German enthusiasm for encyclopaedic knowledge’, an obsession that eventually led to accumulating knowledge of Germanic cultural history in the rise of National Socialism in Germany. See Alastair Williams, *Constructing Musicology* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2001), 1. It should be noted that, unlike many historians of 1930s Germany, Altmann was careful not to discriminate against Jewish composers in his publications, the tone of which were surprisingly apolitical for their time. In unpublished memoirs relating to his work, Altmann expressed regret for the persecution many Jewish artists endured during the Third Reich. His *Handbuch für Klavierquintettspieler* is therefore, for 1936, the first known book without prejudice on the subject of the quintet. A copy of Wilhelm Altmann’s memoirs (unpublished) is held in the private collection of Nils Franke.
Altmann at least, the piano quintet was a genre in its own right.² Altmann’s account of the quintet prior to Boccherini remains pertinent today, although recent research has done much to expand our knowledge of developments in the late-eighteenth century.³ Altmann proposes that the genre established itself when the function of the keyboard part was emancipated from figured-bass realisation and the cello acquired an independent role; this theory so far remains unchallenged.⁴

Works for all ensembles with keyboard, be they trios, quartets or quintets, seem to have emerged at roughly the same time, when, supported by rapid technological and acoustic changes in musical instruments, composers experimented with new textures and ideas. However, this occurred earlier than Altmann originally suggested, as Nicholas Temperley has shown: amalgamating data from the work of Marion Goertzel Stern, the British Library, and his own findings, Temperley compiled a table of ‘works (other than concertos) for keyboard and three or more melody instruments’ published in London between 1750 and 1785.⁵ The chart includes 181 published pieces by 22 composers over a 35-year period. Although the majority of works listed are written for four players, the chart includes pieces for keyboard and string quartet, such as Tommaso Giordani’s Sei quintetti, op. 1, published by Welcker in London in 1771, which are now considered to be the first published quintets for keyboard and string quartet. It also includes two quintets for harpsichord or ‘pianoforte’ (fortepiano) and string quartet by Stephen Storace, published by the composer c.1784 in

---

² Ibid., 7.
³ Webster, ‘Towards a History’, and Stern, Keyboard Quartets.
⁴ Altmann, Das Handbuch, 7.
⁵ Temperley, ed., Tommaso Giordani: Three Quintets For Keyboard and Strings, viii.
London. This makes Storace’s works the first (known) to mention specifically the pianoforte (fortepiano) in the quintet formation.

Stern’s and Temperley’s findings therefore indicate that the piano quintet as an ensemble came into being in the 1770s, very probably the result of Giordani’s work. Thus Boccherini can no longer be regarded as the first composer to write specifically for the fortepiano and string quartet, though he was the first (and only) composer to do so extensively, in two collections of six piano quintets each.

The earliest fortepianos were manufactured in Italy c. 1700 by Cristofori. In appearance they resembled harpsichords, but were limited to approximately four octaves, were light to play, and, although used for solo and accompanying work, lacked a powerful tone compared to the harpsichord at the time. The marketing of chamber works with both types of keyboard (harpsichord and fortepiano) reflects a transitionary stage in the development of these instruments. Gottfried Heinz, in his comprehensive catalogue of piano quintets, presents a table of title pages which indicates that, during 1767-1776, a harpsichord was the instrument designated; between 1778-1785, harpsichord or fortepiano; and 1786-1808, most commonly, only fortepiano. No documentary evidence has yet been found concerning which keyboard instrument the quintets of Storace would actually have been played on at their first performance.

---

6 Ibid., viii. Temperley uses the abbreviations ‘h’ for harpsichord and ‘p’ for pianoforte. Where the original manuscript is not written in English he also designates the cembalo and clavecin parts ‘h’. There is no discussion about the differentiation between the pianoforte and fortepiano.


8 Heinz, Die Geschichte, 17.
However, it is worth noting that the interest in chamber music for keyboard and strings was not restricted to London. The set of Six Quintets (1776) by the Spanish composer Padre Antonio Soler (1729-1783), for string quartet and organ or cembalo, indicates that there may have been a growing demand across several European capital cities. The early quintets were in *galant* style, the graceful melody of the first violin supported by less complex parts in the other three strings, and the role of the keyboard similar to that of the harpsichord in *concerti grossi* of the high baroque period.

In the mid-eighteenth century, the strings’ greater ability (than the fortepiano) to sustain was further accentuated by developments in bow-making, the bow being standardised in about 1786 by François Tourte. Werner Bachmann and David Boyden report, ‘The result was a stronger bow, better suited to sustained and *cantabile* playing and to more varied strokes’. Changes to the bodies of string instruments, allowing for greater projection of sound, continued into the early-nineteenth century. A fractionally longer neck, higher bridge, longer fingerboard and thicker sound-posts were used in instrument making, as well as in the modifying of older instruments.

Among the famous manufacturers who experimented with design and

---


10 Antonio Soler, *Sis quintets per instruments d’arc i orgue o clave obligat*, *Introduction, I estudi d’Higini Anglès* (Barcelona: Institut d’Estudis Catalans, 1933).

11 Bashford, ‘Chamber Music’, *Oxford Music Online*, 7. Bashford’s observations indicate two types of emerging chamber music in the period 1740-1800: there appears to have been a divide between music that was easily played by people with a moderate amount of skill ‘in a simple, elegant and forward-looking idiom’, and that of Mozart and Haydn which required greater skill of all players.

mechanics for a touch-sensitive keyboard instrument at this time were J. H. Silbermann in Germany and Americus Backers in London. The latter began making pianos in the 1760s and although externally this instrument resembled a harpsichord, it produced a small tone, with a light touch that was not as responsive as an instrument with a Viennese action of the same period.\(^{13}\) Backers’s work was continued by Robert Stodart and subsequently John Broadwood. Broadwood’s first grand piano is recorded as having been made in 1785, some 14 years after the appearance of Giordani’s keyboard quintets, and a year after Storace’s publication of his two works.

Robin Stowell observes that, as keyboard instruments grew in popularity, the violin’s status declined slightly.\(^{14}\) This, he claims, was in part due to the adaptability of the piano, its being both a melodic and harmonic instrument. However, the buying public seemed to prefer the idea of a keyboard sonata with accompaniment.\(^{15}\) As the aesthetic for a more prominent keyboard timbre developed, the accompanied keyboard sonata and the pragmatic substitution of a string quartet for orchestra in a piano concerto promoted the establishment of both ensemble and genre of piano quintet.

From c.1800 until the 1880s the piano’s technical/mechanical

---

\(^{14}\) Robin Stowell, *The Early Violin and Viola: A Practical Guide* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 15. Stowell claims that the violin’s importance as a solo chamber instrument declined initially during the Classical Period. There were, he states, some composers who preserved its status; one such, of interest to this study, is Boccherini.

\(^{15}\) Ibid., 15. Stowell lists, among others, Schubert’s three sonatas ‘for piano with accompaniment of the violin’ (D 384-5 and 408) as an example of this type of work.
development was remarkable; in its new persona, it finally achieved the ability to dominate in a chamber music setting. Thus the idea of equality of musical forces became achievable really only in the quintet formation, with its complete string quartet. In fact, the combination of string quartet and piano was now capable of producing an ‘orchestral’ sound.

The quintet’s development included experimenting with different forces: the double bass configuration (piano, violin, viola, cello and double bass) appeared at first in the quintets of Hummel (1816), an arrangement of his Septet op. 74, and subsequently in the works of Ries (1817), Cramer (1817), and Schubert (1819). The interest in this quintet combination was as extensive as it was short-lived. Between 1820 and 1842, the year of Schumann’s Piano Quintet op. 44, ten out of 13 published piano quintets used the combination with double bass. By contrast, in the 22 years that separate Schumann’s and Brahms’s quintets, only seven out of 15 published quintets are scored for the double bass formation. Altmann believes that this formation developed because the cello was not strong enough against the piano bass register; however, it is more likely that the double bass was added because the early piano was incapable of providing depth of sound to the lower-register notes. Altmann observes that such addition was detrimental, as, without a second violin, the only violin had to

---

16 Cyril Ehrlich, *The Piano: A History* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd), 32. Though first implemented in 1825, the first overstrung Steinway did not appear until 1859; prior to this, cast iron ‘straight strung’ frames were used. As with any transitional developments on any instrument, change happened over years with much experimentation.


18 Heinz, *Die Geschichte*, 234.

19 Altmann, *Das Handbuch*, 7.
make an increased effort to be heard. Yet with greater density in the lower string parts, the violin was freer to develop fluidity of melodic line, especially in the higher register. The more the piano became prominent, the more other instruments were required to aspire to orchestral volume-levels.\textsuperscript{20}

Marion Goertzel Stern writes that William Newman was ‘the first to distinguish three textures within the repertory of chamber music with obbligato keyboard in the second half of the eighteenth century’.\textsuperscript{21} These textures are trio texture, accompanied sonata texture, and duo-sonata texture. The last two, according to Stern, fall into a single category. To this list, Stern adds ‘concertante-sonata texture’ where ‘the keyboard is most often featured, but the accompanying instruments take over a portion of the thematic material’.\textsuperscript{22} Yet Nicholas Temperley later (1987) notes another trait in the earliest known keyboard quintets of Tommaso Giordani (1770). While they contain traces of accompanied keyboard sonata and reduced piano concerto (Stern’s ‘concertante-sonata texture’), they ‘do not fully represent either of those genres’.\textsuperscript{23} However, Temperley offers no title for this category. I therefore suggest four textural prototypes for most of the works for piano and string quartet up to 1840: the divertimento (Newman’s ‘trio’), the accompanied keyboard sonata (as per

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
  \item Ibid., 5.
  \item Stern, \textit{Keyboard quartets and quintets}, 45.
  \item Temperley, ed., \textit{Tommaso Giordani: Three Quintets for Keyboard and Strings}, ix. Temperley writes: ‘Giordani’s six quintets, [op. 1], are believed to be the first examples of what later would be called the piano quintet’. Giordani is also accredited by Stern, Smallman and Heinz as being the first composer to write for keyboard, and string quartet. Smallman refers to the fact that there were a number of Italian composers in London who were actively composing chamber music in the second half of the eighteenth century. Among them Felice Giardini, who had issued six works for harpsichord, two violins, cello and bass, to the publisher Welcker, prior to Giordani’s. Giordani’s works take credit for being the first for the genre by their title of keyboard and string quartet (Smallman, \textit{The Piano Quartet and Quintet}, 4).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Newman), the reduced piano concerto (Stern’s ‘concertante-sonata texture’) and
the incipient piano quintet. These are shown in the table below. (See Fig. 1.)
Traces of each are found in the later piano quintets to be discussed in the rest of
this study.

Fig.1. The four types of early piano quintet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The divertimento</th>
<th>A work ‘designed for the entertainment of the listeners and the players,’ often used as background music at social gatherings.(^{24})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The accompanied keyboard sonata</td>
<td>A work in which a largely continuous keyboard part is supported by string quartet accompaniment, which may or may not be imagined as an ad libitum scoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The reduced piano concerto</td>
<td>A work in which the string quartet plays an accompanying orchestral role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The incipient piano quintet</td>
<td>A work that displays a more even distribution of musical material and occasional homogeneity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first of these prototypes, the divertimento, is closely related to the
second, the accompanied keyboard sonata. In the latter, the string quartet’s role is
to provide accompaniment to an intricate keyboard work of sonata proportions.
Where the accompanied keyboard sonata and the reduced piano concerto differ is
in the complexity of the keyboard part. Here the latter is, to a greater extent, more
virtuosic. The incipient piano quintet, the fourth prototype, was just appearing in

---

the 1790s.

1. The Divertimento

According to Unverricht and Eisen, the divertimento emerged from the aristocratic courts of central Europe; the keyboard was often the main instrument, accompanied by varying combinations of wind or stringed instruments, sometimes a combination of both. Wendy Thompson also points out that the term ‘divertimento’ in the eighteenth century covered a ‘variety of instrumental combinations’; this would indeed include keyboard and string quartet. Temperley writes that Giordani’s op. 1 appeared ‘at a time of transition not only between harpsichord and pianoforte, but between baroque and classical fashions in chamber music’. These, the earliest-known works specifically for keyboard quintet, reveal some characteristics of the divertimento style. The decision to view Giordani’s quintets as divertimenti, rather than any other of the three categories of quintets listed above, is an acknowledgement of the diversity of scoring within these works. Giordani’s string parts are idiomatic, making use of string crossings etc. and hardly playable on winds, with the exception of the Violin I part, which could be played by the flute. In Giordani’s op. 1, no. 1, the gradually increasing independence of lines is still embedded within the overall ensemble textures. The cello part still often doubles the harpsichord L.H. while Violin I often doubles the keyboard R.H. (See Ex. 1.)

27 Ibid., 1-39.
But the cello is also sporadically independent of the keyboard part. This is seen in Example 2. Here, the cello takes on the melody at b. 12, and continues to present it for several bars in dialogue with violin II and viola. (See Ex. 2.)

The suggestion by Unverricht and Eisen that divertimenti are works for ‘entertainment’ describes Giordani’s quintets. Attempting to categorise these from a structural point of view, Temperley acknowledges (as mentioned previously) that they ‘show affinities both with the keyboard concerto and the accompanied sonata. But they do not fully represent either of those genres’. It seems therefore that on the basis of their hybrid textural features, which at least show some attempt at equality of voices even if the keyboard is still a continuo player, Giordani’s works fit best into the divertimento category.

---

28 Ibid., xiii. Temperley’s edition contains two keyboard parts. The bottom one (minimally edited) gives the harpsichord part as printed in the edition of 1771, and the upper one, Temperley’s keyboard realisation.


30 Temperley, ed., Tommaso Giordani: Three Quintets For Keyboard and Strings, ix.
Mozart’s Trio K. 254 in B flat (1776), entitled, ‘Divertimento’, shows a certain homogeneity of material between the three instruments. Haydn’s works for piano trio, composed between 1784 and 1796, exhibit an even, but not consistent, distribution of melodic and supportive material.

James Webster claims that as early as 1802, the divertimento was in

---

31 Ibid., 12-18.
32 Smallman, The Piano Trio, 2. Smallman discusses the first appearance of the piano trio in the introduction to his book.
decline. Heinrich Christoph Koch observed in his *Musikalisches Lexikon*,

For some time now it [the divertimento] had to give way to the quartet and quintet, as these sonata types have been busily worked on and perfected by Haydn and Mozart.

One reason for this was the elevation of chamber music from background music to ‘concert music’. Another, according to Webster, was the changing attitude to scoring in the second half of the eighteenth century:

*Ad libitum* scorings became rarer as *obbligato* part-writing increased, most obviously in the piano trio and quartet. Indeed, each scoring became almost a genre to itself: rather than merely modifying, as in *Divertimento à 3* and *à 4*, the number of parts became the substantive title: Trio, Quartet, Quintet.

2. The Accompanied Keyboard Sonata

Denis Arnold observes that the notion of accompaniment may have changed since the eighteenth century. He suggests that, while the eighteenth-century term, ‘Sonata for Harpsichord with Violin Accompaniment’, to us implies a hierarchy, ‘this was not the original meaning of the word[s], which carried no suggestion of subservience’. Arnold implies an equal musical partnership. However, it has to be noted that the ‘accompained keyboard sonata’ often has a prominent melodic line played by first violin, the other strings interjecting subsidiary material. Two sonatas for keyboard and string quartet, subtitled ‘Works for experienced and

---

35 Ibid., 247.
inexperienced players’, by Georg Benda (1729-1795), composed between 1780 and 1787, were published as part of an anthology including songs, keyboard music and other chamber works. While the keyboard parts of these sonatas require a player capable of executing the intricate passages with fluency, the string parts are considerably easier. Yet though these works are demanding of the pianist, they are not virtuosic. Benda’s Sonata no. 1, where the keyboard has a dominant role, could well be played without the strings, yet is enriched by their addition.38 (See Ex. 3.)

Ex. 3. Benda, Sonata no.1, I, 109-11639

This example is typical. The keyboard part is substantial, written out and

39 Benda, Two Sonatas for Keyboard and String Quartet, Sonata No.1, 16.
lacking figures; it is accompanied by a string quartet. As such it is ‘the direct ancestor of nineteenth century chamber music with keyboard’. The first movement remains in true accompanied-keyboard sonata tradition throughout its 143 bars. The editor of the Benda edition, Timothy Roberts, points out the piano sempre markings in the string parts, which indicate that the keyboard risks being overpowered by the strings.

Thus the piano’s lesser sonority still plays a part in characterising this sub-genre. While elements of the keyboard concerto in Benda’s works include, for instance, the appearance of a cadenza in the slow movement of the second sonata, the piano plays throughout, without any rests, as in a solo sonata, or a continuo part.

Neither are there extensive virtuosic demands. The idea of a cadenza is also suggested (in the first sonata) by the appearance of a pause, usually concluding on a dominant chord (D major in the first sonata, first movement, though not a cadential six-four). Roberts suggests that the player be ‘inventive’ here, improvising a connecting phrase. Indeed, in his discussion regarding musical interaction, C. P. E. Bach observes that

[t]he accompanist can . . . attract the attention of understanding listeners if the maintained accompaniment is seen as being of solid and dependable ability and noble invention, thereby not interfering with the shining

---

40 Michelle Fillion, ‘Accompanied keyboard music’ in Oxford Music Online, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/00109, accessed 03/09/2010, 1. Fillion’s article contains contemporaneous quotations from, for example, Charles Avison, which discuss the question of balance between the clavichord when accompanied by a violin and/or cello. The message is clear: the violins should always be subservient to the keyboard part to enhance the overall effect, possibly be muted, and the cello played discreetly. The clavichord is, however, the very quietest of keyboard instruments.


42 Ibid., Foreword, n.p.
performance of the leading part.\textsuperscript{43}

Though the string parts in Benda’s two sonatas provide a contrasting timbre to the keyboard part, they are not complex.\textsuperscript{44} While a connecting line can be drawn from this work to the piano-dominated piano quintet of the nineteenth century, this later genre yet allowed the relationship between piano and strings some fluctuation.

Some works reveal traits of both the categories above. Those of Antonio Soler resemble accompanied keyboard sonatas, though they also exhibit elements of the divertimento and, unlike the works of Benda, the keyboard part does not play continuously throughout each movement.\textsuperscript{45} In Soler’s format, much as in a concerto, the string quartet introduces the musical theme before it is taken up and developed by the keyboard and the musical material is passed from one ‘side’ of the ensemble to the other. (See Ex. 4.)

However, the keyboard writing is not of the virtuosic concerto type, and the accessibility of the string quartet parts too, displays an overall approach to scoring that suggests a closer proximity to the accompanied keyboard sonata category.


\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., Foreword, n.p.

\textsuperscript{45} Soler precedes Boccherini in the composition of keyboard quintets by 21 years; the composers were simultaneously at the royal court in Madrid, Boccherini in the service of the Prince of Asturias (later Charles IV and for whom Boccherini wrote his keyboard quintets) and Soler in the service of the Prince’s brother, Prince Gabriel. Jean-Patrice Brosse, CD booklet, ‘Antonio Soler 1729-1783’, \textit{Quintettes III, IV, V Pour Clavecin 2 Violons, Alto & Basse}, Concerto Rococo, Disques Pierre Verany PV792111, 1992, 13-19.
Very rarely in the works do all five instruments play simultaneously. Yet when they do, the keyboard part is not self-sufficient; in this, Soler demonstrates an understanding of balance and integration. Soler’s works therefore reveal an early anticipation of the piano quintet: divertimento in aesthetic, yet partly sonata in its proportions: showing an appreciation of the potential of the medium though not yet invoking the technical virtuosity or complexity of a concerto.

3. The ‘Reduced’ Piano Concerto

It was common practice in the latter part of the eighteenth and early-nineteenth
centuries to perform piano concertos with the accompaniment of a string quartet rather than an orchestra. Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Czerny, Mendelssohn and Chopin all adopted this practice. For instance, Mozart (1756-1791) published chamber-ensemble adaptations of his piano concerti, K. 413, K. 414, K. 415 and K. 449, in 1783, for keyboard plus string quartet. So too did Haydn, with his piano concerti in F major Hob. XVIII.3 (1771) and G major Hob. XVIII. 4 (1781). Piano concertos were performed in this way for reasons of cost, availability of players and the accessibility of printed music. Furthermore, there also appears to have been a growing public demand for keyboard concerti. Indeed, the tradition of playing piano concerti with string quartet accompaniment instead of orchestra continued into the nineteenth century. Bartlomiej Kominek cites a review of 1832 that documents one of Chopin’s performances of his Second Piano Concerto with string quartet.

46 Heinz, Die Geschichte, 78-87. Though Heinz refers to the piano concertos K. 414, 413, and 415, as works published in a version for piano and string quartet, he unusually does not mention K. 449 which received the same treatment. K. 449 was included amongst these reductions: this is substantiated in a letter that Mozart wrote to his father. (See Preface to Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Concerto in F major K. 413, Bärenreiter Kassel, BA 4874a, 1990.) Also, in a letter dated 15 May 1784, Mozart writes of his Concerto in E flat major (K. 449) for small or large orchestra, that it can be played without four wind instruments (two oboes and two horns) in a version à quattro, a piano quintet. K. 449 was composed for Mozart’s pupil Barbara Ployer in 1784 and was given in a domestic concert setting rather than the large acoustic of a major concert hall. (See Bruno Hinze-Reinhold, foreword to the Peters Edition of the Concerto [Edition Peters: No. 4601, 1979].)

47 Horst Walter, ‘Preface’ to Haydn Klavierkonzert F-Dur Hob. XVIII:3, (München: G. Henle Verlag, 2002), II-III.


49 Bartlomiej Kominek, ed., Fryderyk Chopin Piano Concerto No. 2 in F Minor op. 21, Transcription for Piano and String Quartet (Krakow: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 2003), n.p. Kominek cites the Chopin biographer Ferdinand Hoesick, who, in 1832 gave a detailed account of a performance of Chopin playing his Concerto No. 2 with accompanying string quartet. Hoesick writes that the concerto made ‘a greater impression at private concerts’ and that Chopin
The piano expertise of Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia (1772-1806), nephew of Frederick the Great (who employed Boccherini), influenced the subsequent development of the piano quintet. Louis Ferdinand was an accomplished composer and musician, and an inspiration to composers including Beethoven, Schumann and Liszt. Beethoven dedicated his Third Piano Concerto to the Prince, and Schumann studied Louis Ferdinand’s chamber music, particularly the Piano Quartet in F minor op. 6.\textsuperscript{50} The Piano Quintet op. 1 (1803), in C minor, although not actually entitled ‘piano concerto’, is composed in a concerto style.\textsuperscript{51} It is often keyboard-driven, with greater emphasis on the virtuosity of the piano than the string parts.\textsuperscript{52} The piano dominates from the beginning. (See Ex. 5.) However, for all the invention in the solo piano part, the cello part is frequently connected to its bass line, a retrospective component of the piece.

\textsuperscript{50} Robert Schumann, \textit{Tagebücher: Band I 1827-1838}, Georg Eismann, ed. (Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1971), 138 and 144. Schumann refers to Louis Ferdinand’s op. 6, F minor Piano Quartet twice, 14 and 18 November, 1828. On both occasions he rehearsed and discussed the work with friends.

\textsuperscript{51} Louis Ferdinand, \textit{Quintet for Piano, Two Violins, Viola and Violoncello} op.1 (New York: Belwin Mills Publishing Corp), n.d.

\textsuperscript{52} Barbara H. McMurty, ‘Louis Ferdinand, Prince of Prussia’ in \textit{Oxford Music Online}, accessed 03/09/2010, \url{http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/17039,1-2}. McMurty writes that Louis Ferdinand was the ‘most musically talented of the Hohenzollerns’, and that Beethoven was impressed by Ferdinand’s musicianship when he heard him play piano in Berlin, 1796.
Ex. 5. Louis Ferdinand, op. 1, I, 1-6\textsuperscript{53}

\begin{verbatim}
Violino I
Violino II
Alto
 Violoncello
 Allegro con fuoco

Pianoforte
\end{verbatim}

The interaction is strictly between piano on the one hand and string group on the other. (See Ex. 6.)

Ex. 6. Louis Ferdinand, op.1, I, 316-325\textsuperscript{54}

\begin{verbatim}
This work is important in the history of the piano quintet for a number of
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{53} Louis Ferdinand, \textit{Quintet}, op. 1.
\textsuperscript{54} Louis Ferdinand, \textit{Quintet}, op. 1.
reasons. It requires greater pianistic dexterity and ability than previous piano quintets, reflecting the partiality for piano music with string accompaniment at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Then, a comparison of Boccherini’s op. 57 (1799) and Louis Ferdinand’s op. 1 highlights the difference between the composers: string-player Boccherini experimented with texture, timbre and communication within the quintet medium, while pianist Louis Ferdinand brings to prominence the ensemble’s potential for concerto-style writing by emphasizing the role of the keyboard.

It seems that the concept of the ‘reduced’ piano concerto was of particular interest to pianist-composers in the early-nineteenth century. John Field (1782-1837) stands out among these. His only chamber works are piano quintets; Heinz observes that these pieces stand between Field’s extensive output for solo piano on the one hand, and his seven piano concerti on the other, making the piano quintet at first sight an unusual choice of medium. It is worth noting that Field was one of Giordani’s students in Dublin in 1792, after the latter’s move to Dublin in 1783. Heinz considers Field’s ‘relationship with the piano quintet via his first teacher Giordani unlikely as these are stylistically completely different works’. Of course, Field’s works were written some 18 years after his studies with Giordani. The scoring of his piano quintets places them firmly as examples of the ‘reduced’ piano concerto. The quintet movement in A flat major (1816) is an example of Field’s use of the piano quintet for the display of the solo part. (See

Ex. 7.)

Ex. 7. Field, Quintet, A flat major, I, 77-80

4. The Incipient Piano Quintet

While Boccherini’s two sets of Six Quintets, op. 56 (1797) and op. 57 (1799), offer varied approaches, all exhibit an emerging sense of integration and equality among the players: Gutberg describes Boccherini’s op. 57 as ‘among the earliest examples of piano quintets on an almost ‘equal-terms-principle’.’ There are moments of subservience on the part of both keyboard and string ensemble, and occasionally cello doubles keyboard; yet the scale of creative imagination displayed is outstanding. (See Exx 8a & b.)

---

57 John Field, _Quintett As-dur für 2 Violinen, Viola, Violoncello und Klavier_ (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, n.d.).
58 Ingrid Gutberg, _The Evolution_, 47. The ‘equal-terms-principle’ is Gutberg’s own term, which she uses particularly in the incipient quintet examples.
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Ex. 8. Boccherini, op. 57, G 418, III, Variazioni sulla ritirata notturna di Madrid

a) Variation 4, 11-16

b) Variation 5, 1-3

An indication of the influence of instrumental development on composition is the appearance of triplet semiquaver passages and repeated demisemiquaver notes, creating a military drum texture, more easily acquired using the ‘new’ style of French bow as developed by François Tourte, mentioned earlier. It had a significant impact on tone and articulation, and indeed compositional writing in general for stringed instruments, remaining the standard

---

60 The triplet passages in the viola part in Ex. 8a, and the second violin part in Ex. 8b can be achieved using a sautille bow stroke. The Tourte shape of bow naturally ricochets off the string at the correct speed when the bow is placed at the weight middle. This stroke is more difficult to achieve with a Baroque-shaped bow.
bow until the twenty-first century.

Examples 8a and b demonstrate Boccherini’s ability to use the medium with imagination, contrast and variation. The fortepiano is now integral to the conversation, as the detailed dynamic markings of the score indicate.

The dialogue in Boccherini’s op. 56, no. 1 shows some traces of keyboard dominance, then dialogue between Violin I and piano, but it also demonstrates that violin 2 shares thematic material and the viola part links phrases; in short, this is a conversation between the five instruments with a sense of even distribution and equality. No one instrument dominates the work.

While, as seen earlier, organological development affected the piano quintet, so too did the development of its related genres, in particular, the string quartet. Indeed, recent historical studies of the quartet show the way for the study of the quintet. The quartet was already a recognised genre by the late-eighteenth century, enjoying popularity in London, Paris and latterly Vienna. Yet, while Smallman claims that early on it had a ‘steadfast course of development’, Mara Parker demurs: she argues that this is true only ‘if one restricts oneself to the works of Haydn and Mozart’.

In her study of the quartet, Parker looks at the musical ‘conversations’ that

---

61 Jean-Patrice Brosse, CD liner notes in *Antonio Soler 1729-1783: Quintettes III, IV, V Pour Clavecin, 2 Violins, Alto & Basse* (Concerto Rococo, Disques Pierre Verany PV792111, 1992), 18. Brosse explains that in a *fandango* of one of Boccherini’s guitar quintets, the cellist is asked to provide the rhythm using castanets, a device that enhances the idea of the rhythm of the fandango and supports the guitar’s role, in what would be common practice in traditional guitar music of Spain.


63 Smallman, *The Piano Quartet and Quintet*, 1; Parker, *The String Quartet 1750-1797*, xi.
exist between the four voices in works written 1750-1797 and categorizes them, as mentioned previously, as ‘Lecture’, ‘Polite Conversation’, ‘Debate’ and ‘Conversation’.

Friedhelm Krummacher, in his three-volume work published three years later than Parker’s, also considers the notion of interaction within the ensemble. According to Krummacher, one of the first to write about it was Johann Friedrich Reichardt, who, in the Preface to his String Quartet (1773), wrote, ‘I was guided by the idea of a conversation among four people.’ Krummacher distinguishes three types of interaction in the early string quartet: ‘monologues’, ‘expressive conversation’ and ‘musical conversations.’ But while the conversational discourse between four players (string quartet) was moving away from the monologue towards the dialogue, in the quintet, the introduction of another instrument (the piano) and its different timbre produced a more complicated historical narrative.

Parker’s four categories are as follows:

1. **The Lecture**: ‘The ideal lecture consists of a melody plus accompaniment’.

This type of conversation is more of a monologue with the first violinist playing the melody while the rest of the ensemble accompany. This describes much of the

---

64 Krummacher, *Geschichte des Streichquartetts*.
67 Parker, *The String Quartet*, 75.
earliest known keyboard quintets of Giordani (published 1771).  

2. *The Polite Conversation*: ‘Closely associated with the *quatuor concertant*, [it] shares certain characteristics with the lecture’. In this type of conversation there is a clear melodic line, not always the domain of the first violinist. In the early piano quintet this work-type is exemplified in the divertimento of Haydn (op. 5, no. 4) or Giordani’s first keyboard quintet (op. 1, no. 1).

3) *The Debate*. This type of conversation is the most closely associated with the works of Haydn and Mozart, yet, ‘only a very small number of such eighteenth-century works consist solely of this type of movement’. There is a greater sense of interaction between the instrumental parts, no one part dominating over the others. In piano quintet terms this does not emerge until the later keyboard quintets of Boccherini (1799), and more noticeably in the piano quintet of Schumann (1842).

4) *The Conversation*. This type of string quartet has fewer exemplars. Though it is the most ‘democratic’ of discourses, Parker insists that it is not the ‘ultimate goal’ of composers but ‘an option’ for organizing the four voices. This ‘option’ is one that is not apparent in piano quintet composition until much later, with Dvořák’s op. 81 (1887).

Parker describes early string quartets not as a conversation between instruments but as a ‘lecture’, usually dominated by the first violin. This, to an extent, occurs in the piano quintets of Giordani, yet, in Boccherini’s first

---

69 Parker, *The String Quartet*, 127.
70 Ibid., 183.
71 Ibid., 235.
72 Ibid., 75.
exploration of the quintet, the ‘polite conversation’ seemed to have transformed, almost, into a fully-fledged ‘debate’.

The four types of piano quintet commonly found between c.1770 and c.1840 reflect a number of developments from the function of the pieces as reduced concerti to more integrated works based on equal levels of skills amongst participants (and volume amongst instruments). While it is possible to understand the divertimento as the sub-genre from which the others developed, it would be unwise to view the other categories as hierarchical. No matter how tempting it is to regard the incipient piano quintet as the formation that went on to shape the genre in the nineteenth century, it is more accurate to say that the conversational diversity of the four categories, rather than any specific approach to the formation, played an important part in the writing of piano quintets from here on.

By 1826, equality of roles among the five players (though not necessarily their integration) becomes prevalent; it is most evident in the Piano Quintet in C minor by Anton Reicha (1770-1836). This work is neither concerto nor accompanied sonata, and its increased instrumental equality bridges the gap between Boccherini’s achievements and Schumann’s canonic work in 1842.

---

73 Pierre E. Barbier, CD liner notes (trans. John Tyler Tuttle) to Antonin Reicha: Quintet for pianoforte and strings in C minor and Trio for three cellos in E flat major, Kocian Quartet and Jaroslav Tuma, pianoforte (Praga PRD 250 179, 2002) 3-5. Barbier writes of Reicha’s quintet that it contains ‘rhythmic investigations that individualize the four voices, the keyboard calling the tune’.
Chapter 2. Schumann, Piano Quintet, op. 44

The piano quintet gradually became established as a distinctive genre in the later nineteenth century, with Schumann’s op. 44 (1842) a major landmark. The relationship of instruments in this ensemble was still undergoing experimental scrutiny; therefore Schumann’s journey to the completion of this work, via a number of other works for small chamber ensemble for piano and strings and even via pieces for piano and orchestra, is significant here. In this chapter, the Quintet is placed in the context of (1) his early attempts at piano chamber music; (2) of the background to op. 44 and initial performances that help identify the composer’s understanding of ensemble discourse. Following this, (3) his response to the challenge of articulating form and creating drama and cohesiveness via this ensemble in this work is evaluated.

1. Schumann’s early attempts at piano chamber music

Schumann documented his early experiences of playing chamber music: a diary entry dated 13 March 1829 reads:

Evening: fourteenth quartet session. Beethoven’s Trio, op. 97 (bizarre) – Dussek Quartet in E flat (op. 57) – Quartet op. 5 (went well) – much Bavarian beer – long-winded conversation about the ‘students and peasants’ associations – good cheer – late at night the first movement of Schubert’s Trio – very noble music … beautiful sleep.

1 Heinz, Die Geschichte, 216. Heinz entitles Chapter 7, ‘Schumann’s Klavierquintett als Kulminationspunkt’, reflecting the perception that, up to 1842, the piano quintet was an evolving genre whereupon Schumann’s quintet marked its establishment.

2 Robert Schumann, Tagebücher: Band I, 1827-1838, vol. 1, ed. Georg Eismann (Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag Für Musik, 1971), 180, quoted in John Daverio, “‘Beautiful and Abstruse Conversations’: The Chamber Music of Robert Schumann”, 211. The Quartet op. 5 referred to above is Schumann’s own C minor Piano Quartet. Schumann designated this work his op. 5 but it was not published in his lifetime; not, in fact, until 1979.
Further diary entries of the time reveal Schumann’s familiarity with Mozart’s two piano quartets, K. 478 and 493, and, most importantly, Louis Ferdinand’s Piano Quintet, op. 1. During 1828–29 he also sketched out drafts of two piano quartet movements, in A and B major respectively. Additionally, he wrote his first systematic attempt at chamber music for piano and strings, the Piano Quartet in C minor (1829, referred to in the quotation above as ‘Quartet op. 5’). John Daverio underlines the compositional influence of music rehearsed by Schumann, stating that ‘the C-minor Piano Quartet represents an early attempt on Schumann’s part to replicate a narrative pattern that had been deeply impressed upon him by his experience of Schubert’s Piano Trio in E flat’, D. 929.

The most remarkable features of this piano quartet probably lie in its aspirational elements: throughout the score, the composer indicates the use of orchestral instruments, clearly marking this piano quartet as the basis for a future orchestration, the type of which is unclear. (See Ex. 9.)

Ex. 9. Schumann, Piano Quartet, C minor, III, 15-17

---

The piano part, like the string parts, contains many passages that could be scored effectively for larger forces: for example, in the doubling of octaves in the right hand and semiquaver chord reiterations over a descending bass line. While this work seems intended for an orchestral piece without piano, thus placing it outside the move towards what was earlier described as ‘symphonic’ chamber music with piano, the use of the term *Allegro affetuoso* (Mvt I) anticipates a performance direction from Schumann’s Piano Concerto op. 54 (1841-5). Texturally the work is uneven: there is much doubling of instrumental parts, particularly between piano L.H. and cello: an indication, perhaps, of a lack of experience in writing for this medium. (See Ex. 10.)

Ex. 10. Schumann, Piano Quartet, C minor, IV, 3-6

Yet elements of the piece parallel and even anticipate Schumann’s mature style, including moments of conversation. This is most noticeable in the second movement, a *Minuetto (Presto)*, in the dominant major (G). When the string writing becomes more contrapuntal, the piano part is less intricate, indicating a separation of forces. (See Ex. 11.)

At the same time as working on chamber music pieces, Schumann also set
out to draft a Piano Concerto in F major (1829-1831). The work never materialized, but, following the case of the early piano quartet, the intention to compose a piece for larger forces, this time with the piano as a discrete entity, was beginning to emerge.₅

Ex. 11. Schumann, Piano Quartet, C Minor, II, 1-16

2. Background to the Quintet
Schumann completed the Quintet in 1842. Heinz explains that in 1844 Clara Schumann was preparing repertoire for her Russian tour and hoped to play a work by her husband.₆ Robert Schumann indicated in diaries that he did not have time

₅ Heinz, Die Geschichte, 217. Heinz writes of Schumann’s attempts to write a piano concerto in the years immediately preceding the piano quintet composition of 1842.
₆ Ibid., 216-217.
to write a piano concerto for her and, as the Piano Quintet was complete and enough of a large-scale work she prepared this piece for performance. The relative dominance of the piano part over the string quartet is one of the features of this work; Hinson even suggests that the piece is ‘mainly a piano solo in which the string parts double the [piano] part or fill in with isolated phrases’.  

Compared with the earlier-discussed C minor Piano Quartet, where the piano part is not so virtuosic, in the Piano Quintet, op. 44, the piano dominates. Yet one cannot say, simply, that the Quintet was meant for public spaces: Clara, in her diary, while admitting the appropriateness of some such venues for it, expressed concern about a specific one as potentially too large. She suggests that the quintet as a genre occupied that borderline between the two kinds of works.

Leon Plantinga observed that Schumann, ‘the romantic, was a bold progressive who operated within a tradition; his whole purpose was to enrich that tradition, not to supplant it’. The continuation of tradition in the Quintet is seen in its reflection of the approach of Louis Ferdinand’s op. 1, a strongly keyboard-driven work; the enrichment of this tradition is revealed in the work’s interaction between parts: the notion of conversation.

Plantinga claims that what is striking about a comparison between

---

7 Ibid., 216.  
8 Hinson, The Piano in Chamber Ensemble, 482.  
9 Gerd Nauhaus, ed., trans. Peter Ostwald, The Marriage Diaries of Robert & Clara Schumann (London: Robson Books Ltd, 1994), 287. Clara’s diary entry for 2 May 1844 states that she gave a matinée recital of solo piano works, variations for piano four hands and Robert Schumann’s Piano Quintet op. 44. She states that this was a small private gathering of 30-40 people ‘at our place’. The piano quintet was well received and she declares that she would have liked to have scheduled the work at the last concert of the series (5 May 1844) in the Assemblée ‘but the hall is too big for quartet music’. The comment refers to the setting of the intimate versus the large-scale auditorium, rather than the acoustic space.  
Schumann’s early attempts at chamber music and the fruits of his chamber music year in 1842 is that much of the earlier uncertainty about scoring seems no longer to apply. The difference seems to emanate from Schumann’s increased experience as the composer of solo piano music and his activities as a music critic, the latter enabling him to reflect on other composers’ chamber-music writing. An entry in his Tagebücher (2 June 1838) establishes an insight into Schumann’s view that music must have intrinsic qualities.¹¹ He opposes that of his colleague and friend, the conductor, writer, and composer, Heinrich Ludwig Dorn (1804-1892): ‘Dorn assesses no work according to its actual self-worth but compares everything with other [works]. I consider this to be damaging.’¹²

3. Schumann’s response to the challenges of scoring and structure in op. 44

Much of what was to make Schumann’s Piano Quintet, op. 44 the first canonical work in the genre is a design, elements of which subsequent composers were to acknowledge.

The Piano Quintet is a four-movement work. The opening Allegro brillante, a sonata-form construction, is followed by a slow movement marked In modo d’una Marcia. The third movement is a Scherzo with two Trios, and the last movement, Allegro ma non troppo, has been identified, incorrectly, as a sonata-rondo, but is in reality a sonata form of a post-Classical kind.¹³ In contrast,

¹¹ Schumann, Tagebücher: Band I, 1827-1838, 403
¹³ Heinz, Die Geschichte, 222. Heinz cites Kohlhase (Die Kammermusik Robert Schumanns, Bd. 2, S. 162ff., Hamburg 1979) as the analyst who identifies the last movement of the Schumann’s piano quintet as a sonata-rondo.
Donald Francis Tovey demonstrates that the form of this movement, though deceptive, ‘is a very concise and free binary organism’. The symphonic approach to the use of compositional form is upon closer inspection a multi-layered composition that connects form and ensemble in a sophisticated and diverse manner. A brief outline is given below.

Mvt I. *Allegro brillante*

The sonata form of the *Allegro brillante* displays a traditional approach, even when what could be deemed the use of a ‘rogue’ note, the D flat (b. 1), is a compositional idea found in earlier music, for example, the opening bar of Haydn’s Piano Sonata in E flat Hob. XVI.52. The opening theme of Schumann’s Piano Quintet is in the tonic key (b. 1), the second in the dominant, B flat major (b. 57), though the constant, subtle modulations appear to make the overall tonality less certain than it is. (See Exx. 12a & b.)

It seems that the concept of music for public and private performances is reflected in the design of the themes themselves: as is traditional, there is considerable contrast between the tutti ensemble of the first theme and the chamber-style scoring of the second.

The first eight bars exemplify not only a sense of keyboard concerto-type piano quintet but also eighteenth century keyboard writing, with basso continuo and keyboard sonata origins: the piano frequently doubles the complete quartet in

---


15 G. Henle Verlag, (1972), *Drei Englische Sonaten, Sonate in Es*, Hob. XVI.52, 84.
passages which otherwise could be an orchestral *tutti*. Yet this doubling diverges judiciously from a short score of the string quartet: it is rhythmically clear and concise (rather like the harpsichord parts of earlier keyboard quintets) and the quaver repetitions are left to Violin II, viola and cello.

Exx. 12. Schumann, Piano Quintet, op. 44, I

a) Opening theme, 1-8

The entire exposition is driven by the piano: even as the music moves towards the intimacy of the second theme, sculpted for cello and viola, the piano leads the way (see bb. 27ff). And though the piano offers a discreet and unobtrusive accompaniment to the second theme (bb. 57-66), this theme is prepared by a six-bar piano introduction (bb. 51-56).
The link passage to the development section (bb. 116b-131) modulates from the dominant to the subdominant minor. (See Ex. 13.) The keyboard plays throughout, in octaves, providing continuity, while members of the string quartet alternate in doubling this. Thus continues the dominance of the piano part.


In the development section (bb. 132-207), strings offer little more than harmonic support to the piano’s moto perpetuo. (See Ex. 14.) This texture is what Parker describes as a ‘lecture’ (see Ch. 1). While the piano R.H. offers continuous variations on a four-note motif, differentiated by the fourth quaver rising by a tone or an octave, piano L.H. and strings share (and frequently double) simple supporting chords.

---

17 Mara Parker, The String Quartet, 75.
A repeated-note rhythmic motif (quaver-crotchet) appears in the piano L.H. at b. 142, and this is taken up by the strings, introducing a small element of interaction into this section. But overall, the piano dominates again: in this, the development section is reminiscent of that in the piano quintet by Louis Ferdinand. It is divided in two, the second half being, for the most part, a transposed repeat of the first, down a tone. The repeat is marked at b. 162 with a strong motivic gesture in octaves passing back and forth between piano and strings; this perhaps assures us again that interaction between the two groups is not forgotten.

At the end of the development section (b. 202), stepwise lines in all
instruments resolve into a perfect cadence in Eb major and the recapitulation (b. 207). This has both themes in the tonic key, followed by a brief coda (bb. 305-338), the string texture of which perhaps anticipates the start of the fourth movement. (See Exx. 15a and b.)

Ex. 15. Schumann, Piano Quintet, op. 44

a) I, 324-327 (string quartet only)

b) IV, 1-4 (string quartet only)

The quaver repetitions in the upper strings (coupled here with the fourth-beat accents) in Ex. 15a give the passage a dramatic sense of urgency, a technique used by Schumann both to conclude and inaugurate the two outer movements of
the quintet.\textsuperscript{18} The cello, on the other hand, is not given repeated notes to play; its function is to sustain the sound through the bar, changing the note (and bow stroke) according to the rhythmic emphasis indicated.

The idea of connections between movements, be they thematic or textural, continues in the two central movements. For instance, in both Mvts II and III, their six sections are interspersed with recurrences of the opening theme. The recurrences afford opportunities for textural differences in their presentation.

Mvt II. ‘\textit{In modo d’una Marcia}’

Heinz regards the form of this movement as a ‘free rondo’;\textsuperscript{19} Smallman divides this movement into ABACA B A” plus coda.\textsuperscript{20} It displays influences of the earlier divertimento style in which the refrain material is presented on strings with a keyboard harmonic accompaniment. The movement is mostly led by Violin I, with remaining string parts and piano in a supporting role, an approach that reflects that found in the slow movement in a string quartet. This description departs from Donald Francis Tovey’s: ‘[Y]et every note tells, and the instruments are vividly characterised in spite of the preponderance of the piano throughout’.\textsuperscript{21}

There are three themes (A, B, C) that share the common element of circulating around recurring notes: Theme A (based around the note C), Theme B (based around D) and Theme C (based around D flat). Two themes are presented

\textsuperscript{18} Although in Ex. 15a and b, the minims and dotted minims in Violin II and the viola are accorded only a slash (which, for a slashed minim, implies four quavers) the context dictates that these are played as quavers.
\textsuperscript{19} Heinz, \textit{Die Geschichte}, 219.
\textsuperscript{20} Smallman, \textit{The Piano Quartet and Quintet}, 45.
\textsuperscript{21} Donald Francis Tovey, \textit{Essays in Musical Analysis: Chamber Music}, 151.
by Violin I, the third by the piano. (See Exx. 16a, b & c.) Each is characterised by a different texture.

Ex. 16. Schumann, Piano Quintet, op. 44, II, 3 principal themes

a) Theme A, Violin I, 2-5

b) Theme B, Violin I, (29)-35

c) Theme C, Piano, 92-94

The movement is underpinned by the use of alternating tempi for its sections, *Un poco largamente* and *Agitato*. The funeral-march-like Theme A (bb. 3-28), preceded by a two-bar piano solo introduction, is presented by Violin I; thereafter it is passed to the second violin, then back to the first, and then to viola. The piano and cello accompany, the piano L.H. and cello frequently in unison, though the cello is allowed, briefly, to play the march rhythm (bb. 20-21). The texture here is of solo and accompaniment, the piano always in the latter role.

Theme B (in C major), which follows at b. 29, offers a static texture that is
glued together by the piano. Violin I articulates the melody in a duet with the cello; Violin II and the viola render inner harmonies in a broken-quaver pattern; the outer notes of the piano double the Violin I and cello parts, while it also includes the notes of the other voices, all in broken-crotchet triplets. (See Ex. 17.) Thus this texture is one of the complete melding together of parts, in which the clear separation between melody line and accompaniment resembles that found in *Lieder*.

Ex. 17. Schumann, Piano Quintet, op. 44, II, 29-36

Theme C, which appears at b. 92, is a developing texture. The piano leads with its triplets; at first, strings as a group, with a rhythm that seems related to A, are supportive but separate from it, but gradually triplets invade the string parts too and occasional unison/octave passages occur. The treatment of Theme C is as dense as that of Theme A, though the piano is clearly more a leading instrument that a mediating one here.

After the first appearances of Themes A and B, Theme A re-appears at b.
61 with the original texture. At the end of the section, a discreet linking device appears: the piano moves in octaves as if to resolve into F minor, but the actual cadence is deflected. In this central section devoted to Theme C, urgency is created by the accent in all parts on the second beat, while the piano busies itself, filling in with triplet quavers. This technique of a ‘busy piano’ against more aloof, legato, string lines permeates this piece and constantly distinguishes the two instrumental sonorities.

When Theme A returns (b. 109b) again, its presentation is different from that at bb. 2-10 because it is now inflected by the piano triplets of the previous section. Violin I and cello intermittently join in with these triplets. The viola plays the theme in its lowest (and strongest) register, accentuating the (contrasting) melodic rhythm. Remarkably, the two timbres, solo and accompaniment, are combined at one tessitura. The texture of this passage is unusual in that the viola plays a prominent role, which it is not afforded in the String Quartets, op. 41, nos. 1-3, written only a few months earlier. It appears that the combination of strings and piano allows for a more detailed conversation to take place between the string quartet parts, while the piano provides harmonic support. (See Ex. 18.)

Ex. 18. Schumann, Piano Quintet, op. 44, II, 110-111
There follows Theme B, now in F major, with the triplets (now quaver-sextuplet arpeggios) continuing in the piano. The effect is as before, however, of a melded texture across all parts. The movement closes with Theme A, at first in F minor on Violin I, again passing through the strings, with a rhythmic accompaniment on piano. At last in C minor, the theme finally moves to the piano in the last bars of the movement. The final chord is in C major across Violin I (e₂ and c₃), Violin II (perfect fifth, c₂ and g₂) and the viola (c₁ and g₁); the cello and piano are tacet, the effect light and transparent.

Thus a wide variety of textures is presented in this movement; the contrast between the separation of forces, piano and strings, in Theme A and the complete blending of the two in Theme B is considerable; both approaches are present in Theme C.

Mvt III. Scherzo, Trio I and Trio II

The piano quartet op. 6 by Louis Ferdinand, a work with a Minuet and two Trios, was one that Schumann had practical experience of playing; Ferdinand’s Minuet is a Scherzo in all but name, as supported by its tempo indication of Presto. In the early keyboard quintets of Soler, some minuets and trios are for varying combinations of instruments, for example, string quartet alone, or Violins I and II in a duet; however, Schumann’s Scherzo with its two Trios uses the five instruments in a conversational way that is inclusive. (See Ex. 19.)

There are a few brief moments where strings take over these scales from the piano (as at b. 11), while at a few other times they play in contrary motion
with it (as at b. 27), creating countermelodies. For the most part, strings play *tutti*.

Ex. 19. Schumann, Piano Quintet, op. 44, III, 1-4

Trio I (bb. 44-76b) in Gb major, offers another instance of the ubiquitous texture of ‘active’ piano (using quaver triplets again) against the more legato string group. Here the latter plays repetitive, sustained 4-bar phrases, the first violin leading in the presentation of an ethereal theme that is followed in canon by the viola. The texture created here, by the string quartet, is mellifluous and utilizes the bowed string technique of sustaining sounds to skilful effect. (See Ex. 20.)

Ex. 20. Schumann, Piano Quintet, op. 44, III, bb. 45-52
The (written-out) Scherzo returns at b. 76b and is followed by the second Trio (b. 122-196). This latter places greater challenges on the ensemble, both in technical terms and also discourse. When Parker offers examples of what she considers ‘conversation’ in string quartets, those she cites occur most frequently in Minuet-type pieces (21 out of 91 examples). Reflecting on the relationship between piano and string writing in Haydn’s piano trios, W. Dean Sutcliffe observes that ‘[t]here are many passages in which idiomatic string figures are duplicated by the piano’. In the case of Schumann’s Trio II, the exact opposite appears, in that the keyboard writing is derived from working with specific hand positions and then applied to the string parts. This is a multi-layered section, sophisticated and diverse, and, rather like the Trio movements of the early piano quintet, short. From the beginning, two kinds of material are constantly employed: semiquavers and quavers; the ensemble is treated like a set of elements that can constantly be re-arranged. The semiquavers are played in a continuous stream; the quavers are used as an accompaniment. At the opening (Ab major, *L’istesso tempo*), for instance, Violin I and cello play in semiquavers against the piano in quavers. (See Ex. 21.)

---

22 Parker, *The String Quartet*, 235-278.
Ex. 21. Schumann, Piano Quintet, op. 44, III, Trio II, 122-124

Sometimes, the quaver material is sub-divided into two parts. Here the piano’s two hands are treated separately. Eight bars after Ex. 21, for instance, Violin II and the viola are paired in semiquavers; while Violin I, cello and piano play in quavers, the piano plays antiphonally. (See Ex. 22.) This creates a dense texture.

Ex. 22. Schummann, Piano Quintet, op. 44, III, Trio II, 130-132

The only instance of tutti playing in Trio II occurs at the end: an

---

24 If the semiquaver passages are considered the conversation, other patterns form the accompanying dialogue. Though often playing in unison or octaves apart the texture changes with every ‘new’ format.
unanimous downward move (in unison and octaves) to the dominant of E flat major enables a return to the Scherzo for the last time.

Mvt IV. Allegro ma non troppo

Smallman describes the fourth movement as a ‘remarkable type of ritornello’. Its recurring theme (bb. 1-5) gives rise to Heinz’s incorrect assessment of the fourth movement as a ‘Sonatenrondo’. On the other hand, Daverio compares the final movements of Schumann’s op. 44 and op. 47 by observing that ‘the finales of the quintet and quartet are cast in “parallel” forms (with ample codas) that culminate in the climactic return of an important idea from an earlier stage in the four-movement cycle’. The opening theme is passed between the piano and Violin I, and combined with a double fugue (bb. 248-273) before coming to a pause at b. 318. It is then combined with the first theme of the first movement in a fugue and given several different textural treatments. The symphonic element of the whole quintet is perhaps most consistently achieved in this movement, in which the doubling of the melodic line and the string repetitions create the piano quintet equivalent of symphonic tutti scoring.

It opens with a motif that Heinz regards as an alla zingarese-Gestus (a Hungarian-style gesture), which he links to the second trio of the Scherzo.

---

25 Smallman, The Piano Quartet and Quintet, 46.
26 Heinz, Die Geschichte, 222.
27 Daverio, Crossing Paths, 46.
28 Arnold Whittall, Musical Composition in the Twentieth Century (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 134-159. In his discussion of composers born 1890-1910, Whittall explains that, though they could explore and/or reject tonality and atonality, they attached ‘great importance to the preservation of the traditional genres of symphonic music’. He claims that, in the development of the piano quintet genre, Schumann and subsequently Brahms created works considered to be ‘full-blooded’, a result of the complexity of the medium of piano and string quartet; he later used this term with regard to the Piano Quintet No. 1 (1921-23) of Ernest Bloch.
movement. However, this theme may alternatively be understood as being a gavotte-like feature consistent with the Bachian influence on Schumann’s Piano Quintet. Smallman notes that it also represents the reintroduction of the first subject of the first movement. (See Ex. 23.)

Ex. 23. Schumann, Piano Quintet op. 44, IV, 1-5

The instrumentation of this theme evokes the piano concerto with string accompaniment, specifically, what Smallman describes as ‘a remarkable type of ritornello’, a view based on ‘the principal theme return[ing] in a wide range of keys’ and the use of thematic entries on ‘the half bar’. Where there are brief moments of uncertain discourse (bb. 95-110), short passages are passed from piano to string quartet, in a ‘two halves’ formation. The tentative nature of the discourse is in part due to the exchange between the two halves; there is very little (and occasionally no) overlapping of the two groups. It is in effect a question-and-question dialogue and it appears in a transitory point between the theme in the

---

29 Heinz, Die Geschichte, 222.
30 Smallman, The Piano Quartet and Quintet, 46.
31 Ibid., 46.
piano (bb. 77-93) and its return, again in the piano, in b. 136. Though different in texture, the concept of sustaining a harmony for some time without resolution occurs again between bb. 96-113. Both rhythmically and thematically the strings remain a discrete unit until the first attempt at the fugue (fugato b. 248). At this point, because of the contrapuntal nature of the fugue, the texture changes.

Bach’s influence on this movement is tangible. Susan Wollenberg writes that Bach’s Prelude in E flat major BWV 552 shaped the construction of the melodic material particularly in the outer movements.\(^3\) Both the fugato (b. 248) and the double fugue (b. 319) in this movement achieve a high degree of musical cohesion.

The finale, therefore, of Schumann’s piano quintet is a culmination of many considerations: the changing nature of chamber music being played in larger venues, Clara Schumann wanting to play a large-scale work (of piano concerto proportions) to Russian audiences, and a last movement befitting a conclusion. This latter idea appears to have preoccupied Schumann: Daverio writes

Thus with the Piano Quintet Schumann returned to a question he had confronted in several of the symphonic works of 1841: how is it possible to shape the finale of a multimovement work so that it is not only complete in itself but also provides closure for the entire composition?\(^3\)

As is to be expected in the writing of a fugue, the opportunity for arranging the material over the five parts offers greater possibilities for instrumental conversation. In the double fugue, initially this dialogue is neatly

---


interwoven between Violin II, piano and Violin I. When the viola and cello join this discourse the viola plays the violin I part an octave below (bb. 256-260), and when the Violin II re-joins, it plays the viola part an octave above (bb. 262-273). This doubling of the quaver passages strengthens the part even though the transparency of the other parts is not dense. (See Ex. 24.)

Ex. 24. Schumann, Piano Quintet, op. 44, IV, 262-264

As regards instrumental voicing in the fugue, at no point are there more than four voices playing, even when all five instruments are involved in the dialogue. Doubling frequently occurs between piano left or right hand and one or more parts in the string quartet. (See Ex. 25.)

Clara Schumann’s desire to play to a large audience in Russia in 1844 reflects a general concern that spurred on the gradual development of and demand for piano quintets in the early to mid-nineteenth century. With reference to the five piano quintets by John Field, published 1810-1836, Patrick Piggott suggests that:

It is not surprising that he [Field] wrote such music, for the majority of his concerts did not take place in large public halls, but in the elegant salons of
the Russian nobility. It was for such occasions, when it was sometimes necessary for him to play with accompaniment in surroundings which precluded the use of a full orchestra, that he composed those of his works in which the piano is joined by a string quartet.\textsuperscript{34}

Ex. 25. Schumann, Piano Quintet, op. 44, IV, 319-339

Schumann’s Piano Quintet therefore reflects its dual purpose, for both public and private performances, with textures drawn from both concerto and chamber-music writing. The (conversational) chamber elements of op. 44 result from the use of light scoring coupled with a sense of dialogue. The notion of two groups, piano and strings, is prevalent in this work; the piano seems generally to dominate. Yet, as discussed above, the piano of the 1830s and 40s possessed a combination of leather hammers and parallel stringing which offered a greater

\textsuperscript{34} Patrick Piggott, \textit{The Life and Music of John Field} (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1973), 182.
sense of clarity to the middle register, but it did not overpower a string quartet. Thus, the tutti sections of Schumann’s score would have sounded less piano-based in 1840 than on a modern piano. The doubling of the cello part/piano L.H. conveyed a sense that the cello line was supported by the piano, rather than it being the other way around, as can happen on modern instruments. Further, the ‘two-group’ texture is mitigated by the subtle interplay of instruments, also present.

Schumann’s Piano Quintet evokes the genre’s development, from its beginnings in the eighteenth century to its dual function in the mid-nineteenth. Arguably, the historical move from an accompanied keyboard work with chamber-like textures to an ensemble whose sound has orchestral ambitions can be observed in Schumann’s work itself, which starts as an accompanied keyboard concerto (the first movement), and progresses to the symphonic quintet (the last movement) via moments of clearly identifiable chamber writing.

Schumann regarded the string quartet as ‘a conversation, often truly beautiful, often oddly and turbidly woven, among four people’. The Piano Quintet combines the notion of the conversational string quartet with the more public face of piano chamber music as revealed in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries, leading to a work that appears musically unified and tightly organized yet draws on diverse, if not opposing, musical exchanges.

Chapter 3. The Piano Quintets of Saint-Saëns, Lalo and Brahms

Piano quintets by Camille Saint-Saëns (1855) and Eduard Lalo (1862) precede Brahms’s landmark piano quintet and, as one might expect, reflect Schumann’s approach to writing for the ensemble; but while both continue the division, string quartet versus piano, neither advances Schumann’s subtle technique of conversation that colours the division so gratifyingly.¹ These two pieces cannot be considered as influential as those of Schumann and Brahms (Lalo’s remains in manuscript), yet they still contribute to the narrative that is the history of the piano quintet, in particular consolidating Schumann’s work’s position as model. Of course in the period 1855 -1862, few other role models were available.

1. Saint-Saëns, Piano Quintet, op. 14, A minor (1855)

While both Saint-Saëns and Lalo wrote musical discourses that Parker would describe as conversations, Saint-Saëns’s work is highly antiphonal in places.² Even so, Parker’s observation of what constitutes a conversation can still be applied to mid-nineteenth century repertoire: ‘[e]quality of voices is a hallmark of the conversation. This does not mean a perfectly even distribution of melodic material.’³ The antiphonal approach of Saint-Saëns’s Piano Quintet is a matter of compositional taste, not necessarily of historical style; even in 1938, Thomas F. Dunhill cites the division between the piano and string quartet (as evident in Saint-Saëns’s work) as ‘Effective chamber writing’, his

---

² Parker, The String Quartet, 280.
³ Ibid., 235.
influential book for students of chamber music composition encouraging this perspective. However, an approach that separates the two groups so definitely sometimes leaves little room for the investigation of subtle interaction between individuals found in Schumann’s work, or, as will be seen in the case of Brahms, of the kind of timbral exploration that anticipates twentieth-century concerns. Dunhill’s example is one of distinct separation. (See Ex. 26.)

Ex. 26. Saint-Saëns, Piano Quintet, op. 14, I, 15-18

Although the work is composed for piano quintet, Saint-Saëns unusually includes a double bass part (ad libitum) for the third movement only, a lively Scherzo. It is dominated by semiquaver scale patterns in the piano, mostly involving the instrument’s middle and upper registers. It can be argued that the presence of the double bass timbrally strengthens the ensemble’s bass line, not least because it plays largely the same notes as the cello, albeit an octave below, only deviating when passages unidiomatic for the instrument are necessarily simplified.

---

The absence of the bass part in the score further underlines the *ad libitum* instruction in relation to its use, but it also alerts us to the conclusion that this piano quintet (1855) was perhaps considered a rather more flexible medium than is perceived today. Indeed (as discussed in Ch. 1), piano concerti in particular were often published as piano solo with string quartet accompaniment and bass *ad libitum*. Therefore the scoring of Saint-Saëns’s quintet can be said to reveal an approach to ensemble conversation closer to concerto than chamber music-writing.

Like Schumann, Saint-Saëns includes a fugue in the last movement, *Allegro assai, ma tranquillo*. However, this fugue, rather than appearing towards the end of the movement, opens it. The fugue is of course a good opportunity for the merging of voices and parts, but in fact Saint-Saëns manages to separate off the piano from the others quite decisively here: when the piano eventually joins in (b. 59), L.H. doubles the cello, while the R.H. engages in broken-chord figuration, isolating it from all the other instruments. (See Ex. 27.)

Ex. 27. Saint-Saëns, Piano Quintet, op. 14, IV, 1-61
Subsequently, the piano has an accompanying role while the fugue subject is left to the string quartet to develop.

2. Lalo, *Grande Quintette*, Ab major (1862) and the 2<sup>nd</sup> *Fantaisie-quintette*, E flat major (1862)

Written some seven years later, Lalo’s piano quintet movement in A flat major shows a similar division, piano and strings. Ex. 28 again demonstrates a general approach to scoring which in essence retains the independence of the two parts of the ensemble, thereby emphasizing the timbral differences between them, rather than combining them holistically. (See Ex. 28.) Yet, like Schumann, Lalo overlaps rather than separates the forces.  

Lalo’s approach to ensemble conversation appears to reflect musical tastes in Paris in the nineteenth century. Smallman observes that

---

largely by the many music societies which were active in Paris at the time. In general their programmes were devoted more to works of German origin.\footnote{Smallman, The Piano Quartet and Quintet, 72.}

He concludes that composers such as Lalo and Saint-Saëns gained greater recognition for their works because they followed German precedent.

Ex. 28. Lalo, *Grande Quintette*, I, 21-22\footnote{N.B. Pauses do not appear in the autograph score in the string parts on the fourth crotchet beat of both bars.}

Though Lalo’s *Grande Quintette* remains in unpublished manuscript there is a record of a public performance of the first movement in 1862, a performance the composer discusses in his correspondence with Ferdinand Hiller. In the same year (1862), Lalo composed another work for piano quintet, a one-movement 2\textsuperscript{nd} *Fantaisie-quintette* in E flat major. Unlike the *Grande Quintette* in A flat, the score of this work has many corrections in the composer’s own hand. It remains unclear as to whether these two works (*Grande Quintette* and 2\textsuperscript{nd} *Fantaisie Quintette*) are related, though the keys of A flat and E flat major respectively, would seem to suggest some possible connection. Both works appear to have remained in manuscript, the former
being performed for only the second time in 2005.⁸ Lalo’s piano quintet movements provide another example of a slowly growing number of works written under the influence of Schumann’s op. 44.⁹

3. Brahms, Piano Quintet, op. 34 (1862-1864)

Brahms’s quintet (1864), like Schumann’s, has proved a principal member of the canon. Given this fact, its composition, its structure and texture and its contribution to the genre are all considered here.

Regular performances of Brahms’s chamber music are documented in greater profusion after his arrival in Vienna in 1862, the year in which he began work on the music that was to become the Piano Quintet op. 34.¹⁰ It is a work where the composer ‘struggled with such matters as scoring’.¹¹ Yet Dunhill claims that

It is infinitely more thoughtful in the way it is laid out. It is contrapuntal and closely-packed music – there is far more texture in it than is the case with Schumann. It is more discursive, certainly, and less economical in thematic material.¹²

That some of Brahms’s chamber music material was reassigned from one ensemble to another is illustrated by this work, completed for no fewer than three different ensembles.

---


(i) Early compositional influences and revision

Carl Reinecke composed a piano quintet in A major op. 83, which was published by August Cranz in Hamburg in 1855, when Brahms still lived in that city. Through his association with Schumann’s circle, Brahms knew Reinecke via the Schumann household. In a letter to Joseph Joachim dated 10 March 1855, Schumann refers to Brahms’s piano works (opp. 1, 2 and 10), as well as to Reinecke’s recent appointment as Music Director in Barmen. It is therefore possible that Brahms was familiar with Reinecke’s work, given the relative scarcity of piano quintet chamber music at the time. While the piano quintets of the two composers differ considerably, two similarities may be worth noting: first, the distinctive syncopated rhythmic pattern underpinning the Scherzo of Brahms’s piano quintet also occurs in Reinecke’s work. (See Exx. 29 a and b.)

Ex. 29.

a) Reinecke, Piano Quintet, op. 83, III, 1-4

---


Ex. 29. cont.

b) Brahms, Piano Quintet, op. 34, III, 1-6

Furthermore, the chromaticism at the beginning of the last movement of Brahms’s quintet also adorns the opening of Reinecke’s first movement: a melodic pattern that rises in three semitone steps is then followed by the descent of a tone, a motivic idea that forms part of both composers’ work. (See Exx. 30 a & b.)

Ex. 30

a) Brahms, Piano Quintet, op. 34, IV, 1-5
The notion of compositional modelling, as may have occurred in the above works, can also be observed in other examples of chamber music. Susan Wollenberg discusses this concept in relation to Mozart’s ‘Dissonance’ String Quartet K. 465, and its impact on the string quartets and quintet (D. 956) of Schubert. In K. 465, she comments, are found the ‘qualifications’ of ‘uniqueness’, and in Schubert’s works ‘repeated modelling’ particularly of the introduction to Mozart’s string quartet.\(^{15}\) Furthermore, the chromaticism of the opening of Mozart’s K. 465, and its conversational nature within the scoring, is also apparent in Reinecke’s and Brahms’s scores.

The significance of Brahms’s quintet to the development of the genre overshadows the difficult genesis of the work itself, which lasted over two years. Brahms began work on a string quintet for two violins, viola and two cellos in 1862 and listened to a private performance in Vienna.\(^{16}\) This performance, together with the negative view of Joachim, prompted him to say,

---


\(^{16}\) Garcia, *Brahms’s Opus 34*, 46. Garcia lists Heller, Bachrich, Goldmark, Lackenbacher and Gänhsbacher, as the friends of Brahms who gave a private performance of his quintet, of which the composer ‘was apparently very disappointed’.
‘it will be better if it goes to sleep’. By 1864, it was re-worked as a sonata for two pianos, and played by Clara Schumann and Anton Rubinstein. This version was eventually published as op. 34b in 1872.

When Brahms turned to writing his own piano quintet, Schumann’s work was the obvious reference point. The latter’s influence is constantly acknowledged by Brahms in letters to Clara Schumann and Joachim. Indeed, in 1854, Brahms arranged Schumann’s Quintet for four hands. He offered this to Breitkopf and Härtel for publication in 1855 but the piece was rejected on the grounds of its technical difficulties. The manuscript source of this version is now assumed lost, but the Scherzo, which he arranged for solo piano, was finally published in 1983. Brahms began transforming the material of his sonata for two pianos into a piano quintet in 1864. By this point, he had already completed two piano quartets and thereafter finalised his string sextet, op. 36.

(ii) Structure and texture in Brahms’s Quintet

In the Quintet, as in much of his other chamber music, Brahms leads the way towards many concerns of the twentieth century, including a preoccupation with timbre. While he continued to observe the antiphonal approach to some limited extent, he seemed aware that, when too broadly executed, this can

---

17 Garcia, *Brahms’s Opus 34, 47*.
18 Anton Rubinstein (1829-1894). Russian pianist, composer and conductor. At the time of his playing Brahms’s sonata for two pianos with Clara Schumann (1864) he was well established as a pianist in St Petersburg, having studied prior to this in cities such as Berlin and Vienna.
20 Draheim, ed. *Johannes Brahms*, 134.
21 Ibid., 134.
prove the antithesis of an exploration of the subtle nuances of timbre.

Mvt I. Allegro non troppo

Lawson writes that ‘[T]he first movement has a clear formal outline, with many thematic links and fluid phrasing which mark it out as [Brahms’s] most sophisticated sonata structure to date’. The opening movement is in sonata form, with an introduction of 11 bars. A theme in F minor opens the work, with a complementary theme of the first group, still in F minor, at b. 23; the second main theme in C# minor appears at b. 35. The development section lasts from bars 92 to 160, though the beginning of the recapitulation, in F minor again, is not clearly articulated. The complementary theme returns in F minor, though it is varied. The second theme begins at b. 196 in F# minor, but a modulation occurs at b. 208 to return the music to the tonic, F minor. The 17 bars in F# minor between bb. 191-207 place this section a semitone higher than compositionally it might have been, creating a timbral sense of urgency. At b. 224 there is a typically Brahmsian move to the tonic major; the tonic minor returns decisively only at b. 283. This is the full flowering of the extended coda, which began at approximately b. 261, though again, the move into it is blurred.

Brahms’s orchestration of the work appears to reflect its genesis from string quintet, through a two-piano work, to the piano quintet. There are many moments where the sonorities of keyboard and strings are melded together. At the opening, for instance, a combination of piano, Violin I and cello are in unison/octaves. The sonority covers three octaves, piano R.H. uppermost, cello and piano L.H. doubling each other. (See Ex. 31.)

---

22 Lawson, ‘The string quartet as a foundation for larger ensembles’, 324-325.
A short 7-bar response to this follows, with the quintet conventionally divided as in Schumann: piano with fast passage-work versus quartet with broader, chordal material. The first theme appears in full at b. 12. Now the octaves are entirely in strings, while the piano accompanies with descending broken chords, continuing the ‘divided’ approach.

For this movement’s subsidiary theme of the first group, Violin I leads melodically; this and the *dolce espressivo* character allow for inter-ensemble exchange. (See Ex. 32.) Thus it is rather reminiscent of the lyrical second theme of the exposition in Schumann’s op. 44.

In the example below, Violin II offers a supportive counter-melody to Violin I, while piano R.H. and the viola are intermingled. Piano L.H. is isolated as the sole bearer of the bass line, while the cello is noticeably absent. When it does appear, it joins piano L.H. (by now in octaves, b. 29 onwards), and the rest of the texture thickens. Thus throughout this section, as at the opening, there is a clear desire to mix piano and string sonorities into a ‘new’ colour.
The second subject of the exposition is in C# minor, and is presented in the piano and upper strings. Again, sonorities are melded: unusually, the piano is placed an octave higher than the violins, while the accompaniment is left entirely to piano L.H., with again no cello. The low fifths in the piano part ensure that its sound is strong. (See. Ex. 33.) The effect of this scoring, remarkably, is that the piano envelops the string ensemble within it.

Another example of this phenomenon occurs at bb. 39ff. In Ex. 34, a duet is performed by viola and cello, starting on an tenth and progressing in contrary motion. The accompaniment is provided by piano in octaves and Violin II, the piano’s triplet C#-D# pattern at its upper octave blending with
sustained minims on the same notes in Violin II. This accompaniment is contained within the tessitura of the duet and again allows for sophisticated timbral melding. (See Ex. 34.)

Ex. 34. Brahms, Piano Quintet, op. 34, I, 39-40

Another sign of Brahms’s attention to timbre occurs at bb. 55-58. The viola part, high in its register (on the A string), plays well above Violins I and II, producing a slightly strained, tense sound. (See Ex. 35.)

Ex. 35. Brahms, Piano Quintet, op. 34, I, 55-56

In this second subject group, seldom do all five instruments play simultaneously. Frequently there are three voices: piano plus two stringed instruments or piano and two groups of stringed instruments. But it is the way in which they are used that is of greatest importance. As shown above, group
members are often blended by playing the same thematic and rhythmic material in unison or octaves, while the tessitura is controlled too.

During the development section, this mixture of discourses continues. When the rhythm becomes more assertive and polyphonic (b. 123), rather than distribute the material between the five instruments equally, Brahms groups Violins I and II, viola and piano R.H., and cello and piano L.H. together, the latter doubling each other’s pitches, with the piano providing the lower octave. (See Ex. 36.)

Ex. 36. Brahms, Piano Quintet, op. 34, I, 122-124

The recapitulation begins in F minor and contains changes to the scoring that differ from the exposition. In the first subsidiary theme, the melodic line appears now in the cello (b. 184) instead of Violin I. Only three instruments play: Violin I, cello and piano. The cello above Violin I is one of many examples of such inversion of traditional instrumental roles, reflecting once again Brahms’s concern with creating interesting and challenging timbres. (See Ex. 37.)

For the second main theme, the previously absent cello is given the
bass line, so that the piano, relieved of this duty, may intermingle with upper

Ex. 37. Brahms, Piano Quintet, op.34, I, 184-188 (cello part only)

strings. Later, various pairings are changed; also, where previously the conventional division between piano and strings was applied, what was then given to strings is now given to piano, and vice versa. Thus it is clear that altered instrumentation, as well as tonality, is at the forefront of Brahms’s mind here.

An extended coda, marked Poco sostenuto, begins at b. 261. Here the dialogue dramatically changes. For 10 bars the piano L.H. sustains an F in octaves. Above this pedal point (repeated three times to prevent the sustained note from disappearing), is a contrapuntal working of the first theme in the complete string quartet, now at its most conversational (and most Bach-like, one might say). (See Ex. 38.)

Ex. 38. Brahms, Piano Quintet, op.34, I, 265-270
When *Tempo I* (the ‘conclusion’ of the coda) is reached at b. 283, piano and strings are pitted against each other excitedly, the strings offering a concerted tutti in crotchets and the piano hammering out faster figurations in semiquavers: another Schumann-like texture.

**Mvt II. *Andante un poco Adagio***

If the cello was noticeable by its frequent absence in the first movement, Violin II has extended periods of silence in the ternary-form second movement (A flat major). There are two principal themes. The first is introduced by the piano R.H., accompanied by pizzicato cello on the down-beat (simulating a double bass) and off-beat Violin I, viola and piano L.H., thus again melding the instruments, though this time, in terms of tessitura, the accompaniment envelops the melody. However, with the melodic line in the piano’s mid-range, and upper strings placed higher, the accompaniment does not overpower. The *sotto voce* emphasizes the more introspective texture. (See Ex. 39.)

**Ex. 39. Brahms, Piano Quintet, op. 34, II, 1-3**

The beginning of the second theme (bb. 33, E major) is briefly allotted to Violin II and viola in unison. Either could have played this, solo. Yet the doubled line (in the lower register of the violin), offers a different sound,
against which all other instruments play rhythmically – percussively, even. (See Ex. 40.)

When the first theme returns again, texturally the ensemble retains its four instrumental voices rather than five. Even the bridge passage that connects the second theme to the first (bb. 61-74) contains few occasions when all five instruments play or the material is divided in octaves or unisons between the string parts.

Ex. 40. Brahms, Piano Quintet, op. 34, II, 34-37

It is a remarkable feature of this movement that the piano quintet medium is reserved almost exclusively for its central section. The resulting timbral contrast between a piano quartet in the outer sections and the use of the piano quintet formation in the E major passage (bb. 33-60) highlights the noticeable density of sound between both ensembles.

Mvt III. Scherzo. Allegro and Trio

Garcia cites the Scherzo’s ‘unusual structure’, with three main ideas, each of
which is repeated twice.\textsuperscript{23} Notley, on the other hand, identifies ‘a fugato as the developmental centre of a reinterpreted binary form’.\textsuperscript{24} Both indicate three clear themes. (See Exx. 41 a, b and c.)

Ex. 41. Brahms, Piano Quintet, op. 34

a) III, 2-9

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure1}
\caption{Ex. 41. Brahms, Piano Quintet, op. 34 a) III, 2-9}
\end{figure}

b) III, 13-18

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2}
\caption{Ex. 41. Brahms, Piano Quintet, op. 34 b) III, 13-18}
\end{figure}

c) III, 22-29

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure3}
\caption{Ex. 41. Brahms, Piano Quintet, op. 34 c) III, 22-29}
\end{figure}

The first and third themes are strongly connected, in part through the 6/8 metre. Theme I, played \textit{pp}, first appears on Violin I and viola in octaves, the piano offering a belated countermelody, its two hands also in octaves, thereby balancing the other two instruments. The cello plays rhythmic ‘double-bass’ \textit{pizzicati} on the beat (echoing such use at b. 196 in the first

\textsuperscript{23} Garcia, \textit{Brahms’s opus 34}, 71.
\textsuperscript{24} Notley, ‘Discourse and Allusion’, 250.
movement), and the second violin is silent. After the brief intrusion of the second theme in 2/4, the third returns the music to 6/8 with a sudden **ff** (b. 23). All five players pronounce it, the piano at first doubling all the strings’ notes in this exact rhythm, and even filling the chords out further. This produces a huge sound. This third theme places strong emphasis on the repeated-triplet figure; the first theme returns seamlessly. Taken together (without the second theme) they offer an arc: an excursion from **pp** to **ff** (rapidly) and back (more slowly), and a move from delicate, fragmented conversation to a sudden full **tutti**, thereafter to fragmentation again, with a variation in the grouping of instruments.

The second theme (shown above) begins quietly enough at b. 13, with Violin I doubled by viola, the cadence delicately accompanied by string **pizzicati**. This first appearance is intriguing: simply an interjection, played softly throughout. It disappears in the sudden **ff** of the third theme, reappearing at b. 67 for the ‘fugato’ section. Here, it builds to an unforgettable texture at bb.100**ff** where piano R.H. octaves echo a three-octave **tutti** (including piano L.H.) in the rest of the instruments, increasing the sonority to orchestral proportions. Immediately following this, the third theme weighs in (b. 110), **ff** again, but now spread over more than four octaves. So it is as if the two **ff** textures, one where the piano ‘echoes’ and the other with a wider interval span, are competing for the louder sonority. All instruments participate in both.

The third theme (as at b. 47) dissolves once more, and again reintroduces the first theme, the music (now transposed up a minor third) extended so that it may return to the original pitch. Significantly, the
Syncopations of the first theme are discarded (b. 144) and the section rises to another climax two bars later. But then, the ‘echo’ climax of the second theme weighs in unannounced, and thus two ff sections are again juxtaposed. The ‘echo’ section is this time considerably extended and the momentum of this material carries the Scherzo to its end. Overall, this movement seems an exercise in extremes: from the delicate opening of theme 1, and even of theme 2, to the struggle between forces and the extrovert conclusion. In this, the orchestration, from gentle duets to huge ‘orchestral-type’ tuttis, plays a considerable part.

The Trio begins innovatively with piano as soloist, accompanied by a rhythmic cello at first on the open bottom string. After 16 bars, upper strings fill out the melody, while the piano takes over the accompaniment in broken chords and the cello continues its rhythmic bass line, though from here on, the piano L.H. emphasizes its deepest notes. The central 16 bars are in 2/4. Here the texture is altered, with much re-grouping. A canonic conversation commences between cello and piano R.H. (bb. 226-233), and is followed by a similar discourse in bb. 234-241, though on this occasion the grouping is between Violin I and piano R.H. In both instances one member of the medium is tacet: in the first instance it is the viola and in the second Violin II. This approach mirrors timbral contrast achieved in the second movement by also reducing the medium, albeit temporarily, from five to four players. The music returns to 6/8; the strings play homophonically, traditionally quartet-like again, while the piano recedes into the background. It is allowed to reappear with the melody at the very end before the return of the Scherzo.
Mvt IV. Finale: Poco sostenuto - Allegro non troppo

The last movement is broadly in sonata form, though it may also be seen as a hybrid between sonata and sonata-rondo. The opportunity to interpret the movement structure differently is, according to Michael Talbot, part of a wider debate concerning the notion of a last movement. Each composer wrestled with the issue of creating a summative conclusion, ‘[f]or Schubert, arguably, the problem was to prevent his finales from becoming over-long or over-discursive. For Mendelssohn, Schumann, Brahms, and many others, it was to make them sufficiently different in kind from their first movements while maintaining equivalent weight and thematic relevance’.25 The Scherzo demonstrates that although traditional structural concepts were in place in Brahms’s work, these were increasingly subject to a personal response to established formulae. The same is true of the Finale. Key relationships, too, seem to be indicative of this tendency, as for example, the tonal relationships between the first and second theme of the opening movement demonstrate. The main subject is in F minor (b.12) whereas the second is in C# minor (b. 34), making enharmonic reference to the Neapolitan of the dominant, albeit, in minor mode.26 This relationship also defines the tonal distance between subjects in the second movement (b. 1: Ab major, b. 35: E major), making this a subtle but consistent element of the work. The significance of the semitone to the thematic material has also been identified by Garcia, who considers this to be an important device in the makeup of the

---

themes across all four movements.\footnote{Garcia, Brahms’s opus 34, 56-58.}

The opening of the Finale, \textit{Poco sostenuto}, is an exercise in the seamless passing of lines from one instrument to another. (See Ex. 42.) Notably, the cello rises high in its register, doubling at the octave a high violin (bb. 13-17): another new timbre. Then, extraordinarily, it leaps to its bottom note (b. 16), sustaining it beneath the piano’s melodic material. Afterwards, though, it is the piano that provides the bass for this section.

Ex. 42. Brahms, Piano Quintet, op. 34, IV, 1-12

![Excerpt from Brahms's Piano Quintet, op. 34, IV, 1-12]

Following the \textit{Poco sostenuto} the cello introduces the \textit{Allegro non troppo} (b. 41) theme. (See Ex. 43.)

Ex. 43. Brahms, Piano Quintet, op.34, IV, 41-45

![Excerpt from Brahms's Piano Quintet, op. 34, IV, 41-45]

It is accompanied by the piano (both hands), the viola joining the
conversation in b. 45 playing a third below the cello, resulting in a temporary timbral contrast. Following the introspective, yet densely scored, opening to this movement, the Allegro seems strangely frugal in its use of medium. Texturally, with the absence of the upper strings (apart from the viola joining in b. 45) the opening is like the beginning of a cello sonata. Brahms’s Cello Sonata in E minor was composed the year following the final revision of the piano quintet (1865).

Thus, instrumentally, the opening is the exact opposite of that of the Trio. All this indicates the composer’s concern with the relationship between cello and piano at the beginning of this movement.

Once the first violin does enter (b. 53) the ensemble is again subdivided: Violin I and viola play the same rhythm and later (b. 57), an octave apart, unite against the piano. When all five instruments play (b.65), it becomes the whole string quartet against piano; frequently there are moments when the work can be easily imagined in an earlier form, that of two pianos.

In the un pochettino più animato (b. 93) the divisions are either string quartet without piano or piano against the second violin and cello. However, at b.112, a five-part polyphony (string quartet and piano L.H.) hints at what may have been the original scoring in the string quintet version. All five voices are independent of each other, yet this is similar to the opening Poco sostenuto.

The struggles Brahms endured in composing his early chamber music (op. 18 and the two piano quartets) can only be ‘speculated over’. However, his attempts to find the right medium for his musical ideas in op. 34 have been well documented. Though this work is recognised for its ‘thematic exchange’,

it combines components from its previous incarnations, which, as Lawson writes, now ‘exploit an especially resourceful and varied texture’. This resourcefulness was to be influential for subsequent composers in the genre.

(iii) Brahms’s contribution to the development of the genre

A comparison of Brahms’s piano quintet with Schumann’s op. 44 reveals subtle differences in the perception of the ensemble; indeed it is Brahms’s techniques with regard to timbre that were perpetuated in the piano quintet works of subsequent composers. While Schumann’s writing underlines the piano’s fundamental role in the work, its sonorities are more soloistic, the piano colour somewhat apart from that of the strings. Brahms conveys a more orchestral perception of the medium and, crucially, a greater desire to meld timbres. He achieves this by constantly combining different instruments, sometimes in 3rds or 6ths and sometimes in unison and/or octaves, against varying combinations of the others.

Using less than the full group much of the time means that, when it is used, it has greater impact. For instance, in the exposition of the first movement, 44 out of a total of 95 bars involve less than the full ensemble. Brahms generally reserves the full group for structurally significant moments, such as, in the first movement, the tutti version of the first theme (twice) and the ending of the movement. One might claim that such an effect is even greater in the Scherzo sections of the third movement, as discussed above.

Two further textures prove innovations in this work and indicate Brahms’s desire to explore the possibilities of timbral combination even

---

29 Lawson, ‘The string quartet as a foundation for larger ensembles’, 325.
further. The first concerns the strings: crossing of string parts, examples of which were given earlier, produces a particular sound quality, an effect used successfully much later in Shostakovich’s Piano Quintet (1940). The second concerns the piano: it often duplicates the complete string material (sometimes adding bass octaves), including its rhythm. In the case of Schumann’s quintet, the piano does not exactly replicate the string parts, but offers more of a rhythmic skeleton (as did the harpsichord in works of the late-eighteenth century). Brahms however, duplicates the string material literally except for placing piano L.H. and cello at different octaves, and sometimes filling out chords even further, as mentioned above, thus building density of sound. This particular texture is one of Brahms’s contributions to the development of the genre, a sound colour that was increasingly used in the latter part of the nineteenth century. (See Ex. 44.)

Brahms studied Schumann’s piano quintet and its ‘dramatic dialogue between two bodies of sound’ [i.e. the piano and string quartet], avidly.30 His own quintet indicates, however, that he took a somewhat different approach. The work, though not as greatly acclaimed in his lifetime as Schumann’s, became canonic too as it became appreciated as a model for harmonic and contrapuntal technique.31

---
31 Everett, *British Piano Trios, Quartets, and Quintets*, 14. In Britain, particularly London and the Royal College of Music, the legacy of German compositional style permeated the educational instruction used by composers. Everett’s book appears to corroborate the notion that Hubert C. Parry, Charles V. Stanford and Walter Parratt, all teaching staff at the RCM, were ‘sympathetic followers of Schumann and Brahms’, and encouraged German compositional styles.
As has been shown, its approach to instrumentation is another feature which merits greater attention. Thus Brahms provided another reference point for subsequent composers working with the medium, as Chapters 4 to 6 set out to demonstrate.
Chapter 4. After Brahms: the Piano Quintets of the late nineteenth - early twentieth centuries: Bruch, Coleridge-Taylor, Franck, Dvořák, Fauré, Elgar and others

In the field of piano sonatas, symphonies and string quartets, Beethoven’s influence weighed heavily on the shoulders of early Romantic composers, dissipating somewhat later in the period.¹ But such historical expectations were less apparent with regard to the piano quintet, as neither Mozart nor Beethoven wrote for this medium. The only two established quintets were those of Schumann and Brahms, discussed previously; at the London music colleges during 1870-1920, for instance, young composers were encouraged to write in the style of Brahms and the two quintets frequently appeared on concert programmes.² The challenges of writing for piano quintet, as well as the freshness of the genre, made it a focal point for young composers. Between 1890 and 1917, such works proved part of the compositional training of, for instance, Sibelius (1890), Suk (1893), Respighi (1902), Bartók (1904), Webern (1907), Martinů (1911) and Hindemith (1917).

It becomes evident that there was a surge in the number of works composed for piano quintet, many of which contributed to the reinforcement of its standardization. The inclusion of an array of repertoire in a debate about a genre can therefore be considered relevant to its greater understanding. Parker’s observation, though focused on a different historical period, remains pertinent: ‘[B]ecause scholars have focused on the [string quartets] of Haydn

¹ Daverio, “‘Beautiful and Abstruse Conversations’”, 216.
² Paul Rodmell, Music in 19th Century Britain: Charles Villiers Stanford (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2002), 372. The concept of composers learning from previous masters was, especially in the 1890s, a necessary apprenticeship. Scores, attending concerts, and actively participating in music-making were an integral part of this process. Rodmell reports Stanford’s insistence that his students at the Royal College of Music learn good technique (as epitomized by Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert and Brahms).
and Mozart as representative of the period, they have missed the multitude of compositions which did not follow in [their] path.\(^3\)

The conditions in which chamber music was played were fast altering. Dahlhaus notes that, from the middle of the nineteenth century, music for private gatherings, which lent itself to detailed, almost intimate communication between players, began to expand in order to reach larger concert audiences. Yet audience expectation of intimate communication amongst the ensemble (Schumann’s ‘conversation’), remained.\(^4\) Dahlhaus writes:

[The] older aesthetic form no longer agreed with the reality of performance practice. The memory of the once private character of chamber music, a memory that was the prime influence on the aesthetic awareness of listeners, was more powerful than the visible reality to a growing public [audience].\(^3\)

Indeed, the contradiction between audience expectation and compositional reality explains the variety of ensemble textures found in piano quintets at the time. Eventually, though, following Brahms, it is the capability for producing a densely scored, interwoven texture with orchestral ambitions that seemed to have attracted composers, who wrote increasingly demanding instrumental parts.

By now, the piano had completed the major part of its development. Composers were able to explore its new potential, including its greater volume, its more constant timbre across the octaves and its greater sustaining

\(^3\) Parker, *The String Quartet*, 282.
\(^4\) Daverio, ‘“Beautiful and Abstruse Conversations”’, 216.

power. Brahms’s occasional single line writing for piano, and his, as well as Dvořák’s, single-line octave-doubling in the piano all suggest a melodic, rather than harmonic use of the instrument and, in tandem, an accompanying role for the quartet. Whereas this technique is hardly an innovation (Mozart featured it in his concertos, for instance) its prevalence may reflect the greater ability of the concert grand to sustain pitches and ‘sing’.

The piano quintet in the period 1870-1920 was affected by all these issues.

1. The Amateur Market: Bruch, Coleridge-Taylor

The trend towards more ‘public’ chamber music encouraged the emergence of a separate repertoire for the amateur market, as represented by Max Bruch’s and Samuel Coleridge-Taylor’s quintets. These works, in the main, engage little with the exploratory issues above, yet make a particular contribution to the repertoire.

(i) Max Bruch, Piano Quintet in G minor (1886)

Commissioned by Andrew Kurtz, Director of the Royal Philharmonic Society in Liverpool and owner of a chemical factory, Bruch’s piano quintet was intended for Kurtz and his friends and their private chamber music sessions. The scoring underlines the market for which the work was written, connecting the work to the classical and early romantic string quartet and the chamber music repertoire that amateur ensembles were likely to have played.

The work has four movements: I. Allegro molto moderato, II. Adagio,

---

III. Scherzo and Trio, IV. Finale. The first is in sonata form, its first and second themes introduced by stringed instruments, Violin I and cello, respectively. (See Exx. 45 a and b.)

Ex. 45. Bruch, Piano Quintet, I

a) Theme A, 16-20

b) Theme B, 45-49

At b. 34, the melody (a development of Theme A) is placed in Violin I, in the typical Classical solo-plus-accompaniment layout. Violin II and viola fill in the harmonies, while the cello line often doubles the bass line in the piano part. (See Ex. 46.)
Ex. 46. Bruch, Piano Quintet, I, 34-35

Throughout this movement the piano accompanies, merging with the string sound, and providing rhythmic impulse when the strings sustain chords. (See Ex. 47.) The texture of the piano part enhances the momentum of the first movement, giving the themes (played in the strings) an almost orchestral harmonic support.

Ex. 47. Bruch, Piano Quintet, I, 75-77

Bruch uses moderate ranges in all instruments; exceptionally, the piano doubles the cello’s lowest note, and sometimes goes down a further octave.

The second movement, in ternary form, reflects the purpose for which the music was written, with beautiful melodies and a supportive piano part that strengthens them, and string parts that are not too difficult.
The Scherzo is remarkably traditional in its scoring, with dialogue either between piano and string tutti or else the two halves of the string quartet. The 12/8 time-signature, scale passages in Eb major, and spiccatos in the strings are reminiscent of Schumann’s Scherzo. (See Ex. 48.)

Ex. 48. Bruch, Piano Quintet, III, 11-13

In the Trio the Schumann-like texture consists of extended homophonic chords in strings, against arpeggiated chords in the piano that lie comfortably under the hands. (See Ex. 49.)

Ex. 49. Bruch, Piano Quintet, III, 78-81

The Finale of the quintet, in rondo form, is, in contrast with the other
three movements, piano-driven. The refrain material places a melody in Violins I and II over a constant flow of triplet quavers in piano R.H. The lower strings and piano L.H. provide harmonic support and the occasional rhythmic emphasis. (See Ex. 50.)

Ex. 50. Bruch, Piano Quintet, IV, 4-7, refrain

![Ex. 50. Bruch, Piano Quintet, IV, 4-7, refrain](image)

The first episode (bb. 24-45) is a presentation of an emphatic rhythm (Violins I and II an octave apart from the viola and cello); the piano accompanies in a dotted crotchet, quaver rhythm that enhances the strings, yet remains supportive. Only in the second episode (bb. 46-53) does the melodic line shift briefly to the piano, after which it is taken over by the first violin. Cello and piano L.H. provide the simple bass line. (See Ex. 51.)

Ex. 51. Bruch, Piano Quintet, IV, 47-51

![Ex. 51. Bruch, Piano Quintet, IV, 47-51](image)

---

This approach to scoring reinforces the leadership roles of the piano and the first violin and tempts us to equate such conversational roles to a conservative outlook. There is, however, one exception to this approach. In the third episode (bb. 90-112), the strings indulge in imitative entry while a syncopated piano rhythm is interposed between their figures. The overall effect is one of agitation, as generated by the rhythmic figuration distributed across the string quartet. (See Ex. 52.)

Ex. 52. Bruch, Piano Quintet, IV, 105-108

This is an unusual moment in what is generally a conservative discourse. This piano quintet illustrates a broadly traditional approach to conversation. As suggested above, much of the writing conforms to expectations with regard to the roles of specific instruments, possibly because of its history of being commissioned for amateur use.

(ii) Samuel Coleridge-Taylor, Piano Quintet, op. 1 (1893)

Samuel Coleridge-Taylor’s first work for the ensemble was a four-movement Quintet, written when he was 18 years old. It remains in manuscript in the library of the Royal College of Music, and unsurprisingly, given its composer’s
age, presents a traditional approach to scoring, including the four-part fugue in
the final movement, a gesture that could be seen as a nod to the piano quintets
of Schumann and Saint-Saëns.

The work presents a variety of approaches to the medium, but generally
divides the ensemble conventionally into two ensembles, string quartet and
piano. The discourse is not entirely Violin I dominated. In the first movement
*Allegro con moto*, the first subject of the sonata form is presented, with
gravitas, as a unified string sound, in octaves and unison. (See Ex. 53.)

Ex. 53. Coleridge-Taylor, Piano Quintet, op. 1, I, 14-16

In the second subject, the piano leads the melodic line, while Violin II plays a
countermelody, the viola accompanies with triplet quavers and the cello plays
*pizzicato* crotchets. When Violin I joins this discourse (b. 37), it is to
strengthen the Violin II part by playing an octave higher. This is a conventional
approach to both first and second themes.

In the second movement, *Larghetto*, the piano assumes an
accompanimental role, its two-bar introduction in the piano heralding a cello
melody. (See Ex. 54.)
The third movement *Scherzo*, is short (62 bars including the repeat) and involves greater discourse between the string parts. Violin I, however, does not entirely dominate; there are frequent occasions when both violins contribute as a pair. (See Ex. 55.)

The Finale, *Allegro molto*, is in a succinct rondo form. A 7-bar introduction in G minor (6/8), played by the strings and accompanied by the piano is followed by a change of time signature to *alla breve*. This marks the arrival of the refrain. The movement’s motivic material (refrain, B and C) all first appears in the string parts, a preference in scoring indicative of the piano’s role as an accompanying, rather than a conversationally interwoven ensemble member. (See Exs. 56 a, b and c.)
Exx. 56. Coleridge-Taylor, Piano Quintet, op. 1, IV

a) 8-10, refrain

b) 31-33, first episode

c) 53-56, second episode

Two years after the piano quintet, as a result of a challenge from his teacher, Stanford, Coleridge-Taylor wrote a Clarinet Quintet (op. 10, 1895), which was ‘highly individual and rhythmically complex’ and ‘won him wide recognition’.\(^8\) Then in 1899, Coleridge-Taylor’s *Four Characteristic Waltzes* op. 22 were published in the composer’s own arrangement for piano and

---

\(^8\) Lawson, ‘The string quartet as a foundation for larger ensembles’, 321.
strings of his orchestral work of the same name.\footnote{Samuel Coleridge-Taylor. \textit{Four Characteristic Waltzes: Arranged as a Quintet for Pianoforte and Stringed Instruments by the composer} (London. Novello & Co., Ltd, 1899).} This reflected the rising demand for piano quintet repertoire for amateur use and the focus on shorter character pieces, many of which were dance movements or arrangements of popular orchestral works.\footnote{Everett, \textit{British Piano Trios, Quartets, and Quintets, 1850 -1950: A Checklist}, 173 – 187. In Appendix 1 of his book, Everett compiles a list of popular folk melodies that were arranged for a variety of chamber music genres (predominantly piano and strings) and published soon after they were composed. These works were aimed at school ensembles; some were for non-concert use. In Appendix 2 the educational element is extended beyond inexperienced players, though not players capable of playing the mainstream chamber music repertoire of the day. These pieces were not arrangements of folk melodies, although elements were present in the writing, but works by composers that were challenging to intermediate standard players. The breadth of repertoire and their respective composers are testimony to the popularity of chamber music-making practice, especially in the era prior to radio broadcasting (c. 1920).} Given the promise of the Clarinet Quintet, one might hope that this work too might be individual and original. But, tailored to the amateur market, the part-writing is ‘accessible’, the discourse unchallenging. It is reminiscent of the divertimento-type of early piano quintet, with a dominant first violin (all the melodies are presented in this part), cello and piano L.H. often playing similar material, and Violin 2, viola and piano R.H. filling out the harmony. In short, it is a pleasant work, but it contributes little to the investigation of the ensemble for its conversational or timbral potential.

2. Franck, Piano Quintet in F minor (1879)

Vincent d’Indy acknowledges the influence of the past on Franck as he recalls his former teacher ‘pounding away on his piano in a jerky and continually increasing \textit{fortissimo} the overture to ‘Meistersinger’, or something by Bach, Beethoven, or Schumann’.\footnote{Vincent d’Indy, \textit{César Franck: Translated and with an Introduction by Rosa Newmarch} (New York: Dover Publications, Inc, 1965), 100.} D’Indy concludes that ‘Franck continuously draws upon \textit{tradition}, instead of remaining a slave of \textit{convention},’
description that acknowledges influences but rejects formulaic responses.\textsuperscript{12}

Franck is known to have been present at the first performance of Saint-Saëns’s piano quintet in 1855, and it was Saint-Saëns who played the piano in the first performance of Franck’s quintet (a piano-driven work).\textsuperscript{13} The latter work has three movements, I: \textit{Molto moderato quasi lento, Allegro}; II: \textit{Lento, con sentimento}; and III: \textit{Allegro non troppo, ma con fuoco}. Three-movement form is more readily associated with the concerto (though it must be noted that Louis Ferdinand’s quintet, also a piano-driven work and a concerto in all but name, contains four); Franck’s quintet is a departure from those of Schumann and Brahms, and reflects his personal response.

Much has been written about this work’s emotional effect, including Saint-Saëns’s reaction to it at the first performance (apparently, he, and others, thought it excessive).\textsuperscript{14} Indeed, the work imparts an effusive dramatic aura and this relies heavily on the instrumentation. Therefore, understanding the work’s role within the genre of the piano quintet warrants a detailed consideration of the diverse nature of ensemble conversation found within this work.

In the introduction to the first movement (\textit{Molto moderato quasi lento}), piano and strings are pitted against each other in the most obvious way: five bars of strings alone are followed by eight of solo piano, then another five of strings and another eight of solo piano. (See. Ex. 57.)

\textsuperscript{12} Vincent d’Indy, \textit{César Franck}, 84.
\textsuperscript{14} Koo, \textit{A Study of Four Representative Piano Quintets}, 72-73.
Ex. 57. Franck, Piano Quintet, I

a) 1-5, opening and presentation of theme (with descending scale ‘a’, Violin I, opening 10 notes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violin I.</th>
<th>Molto moderato quasi lento.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violin II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violoncello.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klavier.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Violin I offers a theme built on series of descending, scalar phrases, material that is fundamental to this movement and, indeed, to the whole work. This version of the theme (version a) employs double-dotted crotchets and demisemiquavers. In contrast, the solo piano part which follows has a repeated-note melody, its phrases divided by rests, the effect cautious. This separation of the two ‘groups’ of instruments is fundamental to the scenario of the movement and drives it dramatically. In this way, the work could be seen as the culmination of one attitude to the forces of the piano quintet: that of the keyboard concerto. Yet this separation is treated in a highly Romantic manner.

As shown above, at the opening, Violin I takes the lead; indeed, while the piano is frequently a solo entity in this movement, when strings are not
presented as a whole, they are often represented by solo violin accompanied by piano. This is a feature of the work. Another is the doubling, in unison or octaves, of pairs of strings. This is a departure from earlier string writing: greater volume would not have been required in the upper parts for a balance among stringed instruments and therefore it is a particular sonorous effect. It makes what is being played more insistent, even more strident, adding to the drama of the piece.

The movement offers a continual re-working of basic themes. At b. 50 of the Allegro exposition (which follows the Molto moderato introduction), the opening violin theme (Ex. 57a) recurs, modified rhythmically, now beginning with a dotted quaver and semiquaver (version b) (See Ex. 58.)

Ex. 58. Franck, Piano Quintet, I, 50-51 (with descending scale ‘b’, all four string parts)

Various thematic fragments are presented, confirming the instrumental juxtaposition of the two groups, piano and strings, before a coherent theme appears at b. 73. While it begins in the viola part, accompanied by piano, it is actually presented polyphonically on all strings: after the viola, there are entries on second violin, then cello, then Violin I doubled by Violin II an
octave below. The piano remains the accompanist throughout. (See Ex. 59.)

Ex. 59. Franck, Piano Quintet, I, 73-88

The second theme in C# major (enharmonically Db major) appears at b. 90, on solo piano, with string interjections between its phrases. (See Ex. 60.)

Ex. 60. Franck, Piano Quintet, I, 90-92, solo piano

While there are a few moments of blending (unison/octaves) of single
strings with piano (particularly cello), and doubling of pairs of stringed instruments, largely, thematic material is passed polyphonically among the four stringed instruments or played, as at b. 90, on solo piano; this continues into the development section (bb. 143-269).

The piano opens the development section, continuing its solo role, with, at b. 144, the ‘b’ version of the opening, descending theme (heard previously at b. 50) in L.H. This melody is treated with growing intensity as the other instruments are added, one by one, and eventually polyphonically again. An ‘orchestral’ climax is reached at b. 193ff, when a third, emphatic version, ‘c’, of the descending theme is played, **fff.** (See Ex. 61.)

Ex. 61. Franck, Piano Quintet, I, 193-196 (with descending scale ‘c’, all four string parts, first 10 notes)

![Image of sheet music](image)

This melodramatic moment is hardly ‘chamber music’ as Saint-Saëns might have known it; its raw emotional power, disturbing their sensibilities, could be part the reason for his and his colleagues’ distaste for the work. The second version of the descending scale, ‘c’, is given later, at b. 216ff, with an equally intense piano accompaniment also played **fff.** (See Ex. 62.)
Ex. 62. Franck, Piano Quintet, I, 216-219 (with descending scale ‘c’, all four string parts, first 10 notes)

Ex. 63. Franck, Piano Quintet, I, 259-262 (with descending scale ‘b’ in b. 259, piano part)
The recapitulation (bb. 269-399) continues in a similar vein, though is hardly a literal repeat of the exposition. There is another dramatic section at bb. 311ff, where the device of the general pause, and the division of forces given at the very beginning, is invoked again, while there is much doubling of pairs of stringed instruments (Franck’s ‘calling card’) for greater intensity of sound.

A moment just before the beginning of the coda is cited by Dunhill. He writes:

a fine passage occurring at a big climax towards the end of the first movement is, it must be admitted, extremely orchestral, though the effect secured is one of tremendous breadth and intensity, and so completely accords with the spirit of the movement that it sounds legitimate enough.¹⁵

This is given below. (See Ex. 64.)

Ex. 64. Franck, Piano Quintet, I, 400-402

Dunhill’s special pleading stands in direct contrast to Riemann’s observation that ‘it is considered a mistake in a chamber piece if the parts are treated orchestrally’, though Dunhill here considers only one moment in the

work, whereas Riemann describes a fundamental approach to composition.\textsuperscript{16} However, Ex. 64, with its string \textit{fff}s and heavy piano chords, could be construed as bombastic, highlighting as much the limitations of the ensemble as its capabilities.

The Coda (\textit{Più Presto} bb. 412ff) sums up the movement’s various textures: piano solo; strings in unison/octaves; the briefest moment of tutti unison (bb. 427-8); and the four strings in pairs, offering the two descending scale themes (bb. 429-438) heard so passionately in the development sections. In this dialogue of pairs, the viola has the last word, concluding, in a gesture of reconciliation perhaps, with the rhythm of the ‘other’ scale version. The piano remains separate, once again providing (only) the accompaniment, removed from the discourse in which it previously played such a great part.

The second movement, \textit{Lento, con molto sentimento}, is in three sections articulated by key (bb. 1-40, A minor; bb. 41-83, D flat major; bb. 84-109, A minor), the outer sections of which are linked together by a recurring theme. (See Ex. 65.)

Ex. 65. Franck, Piano Quintet, II, 1-4

Throughout this movement the piano is largely accompanimental, the first violin presenting, for the most part, the melodic line. It is, however, in the second section that the texture is more cohesive; its main melody (see Ex. 66 following) remains in Violin I, echoed one bar later by the cello. The piano R.H. has a counter-melody an octave higher, another descending scale, while Violin II and viola provide the harmonic underpinning. (See Ex. 66.)

Ex. 66. Franck, Piano Quintet, II, 41-43

Piano L.H. fills these chords out with fluid semiquavers, so that once more a texture found so frequently in Schumann’s work (fast piano figurations, sustained string chords) is invoked here, too, though the piano R.H. counter-melody is additional. But it is also interesting that the piano L.H. accompaniment honours the register of the two harmonic instruments, its top note doubling the viola, though it reaches an octave lower than the cello. In this way, it melds timbres much in the manner of Brahms.

Towards the end of the second movement (Tempo I, bb. 69-109) the discourse returns to that of the beginning; a piano accompaniment of quavers in 12/8, though, as in the first movement, Franck chooses to double each of two stringed instruments with another in octaves, again intensifying the sound
of each musical line. D’Indy describes this part of the second movement (a development of the first theme, bb. 69-72) as ‘moving onwards in deep sorrow’.\textsuperscript{17} (See Ex. 67.)

Ex. 67. Franck, Piano Quintet, II, 69-71

At the emotional climax (b. 76) the melodic line is played by Violin I, Violin II and viola, all playing the same rhythm, octaves apart. (See Ex. 68.)

Ex. 68. Franck, Piano Quintet, II, 76

The movement closes as it began, with quaver chords in both hands of

the piano, resulting in a strong sense of timbral separation between piano and strings.

The final movement, *Allegro non troppo, ma con fuoco*, is in sonata form, with what d’Indy describes as a ‘Terminal Development’ section towards the end: a ‘cyclic theme by augmentation and change of rhythm’.\(^{18}\)

The movement begins in an unusual way. Violin II plays a chromatic pattern of semiquavers, *pp*, low in its range and played at the point of the bow, producing an effect of unease. Meanwhile, piano L.H. plays tied dotted minim notes (bb. 5-12) rather like the tolling of a bell. The Violin II semiquavers meld with both the piano, and subsequently, other strings (bb. 10-12). (See Ex. 69.)

Ex. 69. Franck, Piano Quintet, III, 1-7

The semiquavers are passed to Violin I at b. 16 and continue between them until b. 74. The first theme is initially alluded to in the piano R.H. at b. 13. (See, Ex. 70.)

---

\(^{18}\) Ibid., 424.
Later, when the strings present the theme fully (b. 73), the quintet is again divided into two halves, Violins I and II in unison, viola and cello an octave below, the piano accompanying. Timbrally the virtuosic piano supports the harmonies present in the strings; and drives towards the ff climax in b. 105. The rhythmical effect of the piano’s quavers is reminiscent of the piano-concerto type piano quintet, and not dissimilar to textures used in the op. 44 of Schumann. (See. Ex. 72.)

From b. 112 onwards the mood becomes calmer towards the key change, an episode in B major commencing in bar 147. The transition to this
key change (bb. 119-140) contains L.H. piano quaver arpeggios, the R.H. playing the melody, the string quartet accompanying. The strings are divided into two halves, Violins I and II, viola and cello.

The episode of bb. 147-198 is presented in the piano part in octaves, with a rhythmic variation on the first theme with harmonies supported by strings in quavers. At b. 199 the first theme returns in the viola and cello (this time G to C). At this point (bb. 199-222) Violins I and II, viola and cello, alternate in presenting the theme, the piano resuming the triplet quaver discourse, a dialogue that could aptly be termed a ‘turbulent mish-mash’ [turbulentes Wirrsal].

Though reflecting in 1884 on the use of sonata form in contemporaneous piano music, Adolf Prosniz points out that in chamber music, there should be a ‘collaboration of different instruments.’ Yet in this third movement of Franck’s Piano Quintet, it could be argued that despite the frantic nature of the piano quavers, they are melded to the pitch of the strings, and, as such, offer a cohesiveness of sound that could justifiably be seen as timbral separation within overall ensemble collaboration.

Towards the end of the Allegro (Ritenuto un pochettino il tempo, b. 428, Db minor) in a section that has two clear groups, piano and string quartet, some of the motivic ideas of both the first and last movement are intertwined, for example, the rising semitone, Ab-Bbb in Violin I (b. 428). When the

---

motif from movement I returns at b. 444 (now in F major, and 3/4 time) the density of harmonies is still apparent minus the climactic status of the previous \textit{fff}. Instead, the Coda begins \textit{meno p} building to a final \textit{fff} chord. (See Ex. 72.)

Ex. 72. Franck, Piano Quintet, III, 444-445

As this example demonstrates, Riemann’s definition of orchestral writing as ‘a melting together of the overall sound’ was becoming increasingly relevant in the writing of piano quintets.\textsuperscript{21}

3. Dvořák, Piano Quintets opp. 5 (1872) and 81 (1887)

This brief discussion of Dvořák’s two quintets, unlike that of those of Schumann, Brahms and Franck above, will not consider in depth the relationship between form and orchestration here, but rather, between the two works themselves, since this, in its own way, sheds light on Dvořák’s approach. This seems to present a definition of chamber music of this time. As described by Riemann, Dvořák’s chamber-music style has ‘less density of

sound, and constant instrumentation which is compensated for by finer nuances and detail’.\(^\text{22}\) Thus he seems to prove a clear example of the fact that, at this time, the ideal of chamber music was increasingly at odds with the reality of an art form placed on the public stage.\(^\text{23}\)

Dvořák’s first attempt to write for piano quintet began in 1872. Dvořák was dissatisfied with op. 5 following its first performance on 22 November 1872, in Konvikt Hall, Prague, and subsequently listed the work as ‘torn up and burned’.\(^\text{24}\) By March 1887 he seemed to have regretted this action and asked the organiser of the first performance, the music critic Dr Ludemít Procháýka, for his copy of the work. Dvořák carried out the revisions, yet by August 1887 he was already starting to copy out a final version of op. 81. Scholarship to date has assumed that Dvořák was unhappy with the outcome regarding op. 5 and therefore turned instead to what was to become op. 81.\(^\text{25}\) There is a possibility, however, that working on op. 5 progressed naturally to the composition of op. 81. A work revised on the cusp of op. 81, the final version of op. 5 reveals two approaches: the piano and string quartet as separate units, and an emerging, flexible, conversational style between five musical instruments. The subsequent detailed exploration of scoring in both works therefore documents the composers’ journey towards


\(^\text{23}\) Riemann’s Musik-Lexikon was first published in 1882. The definition of Kammermusik as requiring ‘less density of sound’ was an entry that remained unchanged through to its eleventh edition in 1929.


\(^\text{25}\) Smallman, The Piano Quartet and Quintet, 62. Smallman writes that, following the performance of op. 5 in 1887, the work remained unknown until the publication of The Complete Edition of Dvořák’s Works in 1959. This suggests that Dvořák felt unhappy about publishing the work at all. He did not re visit it after 1887.
Riemann’s definition of chamber music, as given above.

Overall, movements I and II of the three-movement work contain the greatest number of revisions. The structure of movement I (sonata form) has become tighter, containing around 154 bars fewer, to arrive at its 230-bar final version. The second movement of 106 bars is cut by 24 bars. Sections of all movements are re-written; most of the original final movement, however, is retained. This therefore offers the clearest example of the composer’s earlier scoring, in 1872.

The concept of two units, piano and string quartet, is retained, as in Franck’s work; sub-groupings consist of two string parts plus piano. The cello line is often connected to the bass line of the piano part in either rhythm or pitch, as in bb. 47-49 of movement III, where the octave doubling of the cello line in the piano part raises questions over the musical effectiveness of this scoring. (See Ex. 73.)

The first movement, in its revised state, also contains regular moments of interwoven, independent lines in which up to four textures appear at any one time.

Ex. 73. Dvořák, Piano Quintet op. 5, III, 47-49

![Ex. 73. Dvořák, Piano Quintet op. 5, III, 47-49](image)

Unlike that of Franck in his Quintet, Dvořák’s attitude to greater conversational discourse occurs towards the beginning of the exposition of the first movement. (See Ex. 74.) The textures employed in the piano part show a clear Schubertian influence in their mixture of unison across the two hands, and the interspersing of double-note sequences in scale patterns.\(^{27}\)

Ex. 74. Dvořák, Piano Quintet op. 5, I, 32-33

It is the contrast in scoring in op. 5, between the last movement and the first movement with its extensive later revisions, that documents the transition in the composer’s technique. The *Finale’s* predominant conversational separation of piano and strings could be a retrospective use of the ensemble should it avoid any sense of timbral integration. But indeed, it enables the composer both to use the interaction between the two halves of the ensemble in link passages and yet to integrate timbres at these points. Examples of this are the transition to the second theme (bb. 34-48) or the section preceding the return of the first subject (bb. 242-257) which suggests that ensemble conversation—and integration—is a structural tool. (See. Exx. 75a & b.)

Ex. 75. Interaction of two halves of the ensemble in link passages

a) Dvořák, Piano Quintet, op. 5, III, 34-48

b) Dvořák, Piano Quintet, op. 5, III, 255-257

By the time Dvořák began work on op. 81, his perception of instrumental balance within the ensemble, therefore, had changed. In this later work he avoids the regular use of some established approaches, instead offering a transparent piano part that generates a volume of sound when needed but is based on an equal partnership with strings. The interaction between strings too is equally flexible and therefore the role of each instrument varies throughout the piece.

Susan Wollenberg discusses the affinities that exist between Schubert
These are affinities that Šourek describes as influences that further Dvořák’s ‘artistic evolution’. Wollenberg is more specific and suggests that it ‘is a matter of texture: with both composers, it is the way in which the melodies are set for the particular instrumental combination that provides subtleties, quite apart from the intrinsic attractions of the melodies themselves’. Wollenberg’s observation documents what can be seen as the difference between the two quintets; a shift away from an older model of how a string quartet and piano are to be combined to a more individual and subtle style of writing. (See Ex. 76.)

In Ex. 76 Violin I presents the melodic line, but rather than having an accompanying role that provides harmonic support, Violin II plays a counter-melody. The intricate discourse between the two violins is clear, and, rather than subsume this sound, Dvořák intricately weaves the supporting harmonies in a creative textural way: the viola and cello play pizzicato semiquavers. This lightens the texture, and the piano L.H. arpeggiates chords in triplet quavers, the R.H. playing chords on the off beat. Though the conversation is of two instruments (Violins 1 and 2) supported by three (viola, cello and piano), the aural impression is one of clarity.

---

28 Susan Wollenberg, ‘Celebrating Dvořák: Affinities between Schubert and Dvořák’, *MT*, 132, 1783 (September 1991), 434-437. Wollenberg ‘reassess[es] the influence of Schubert on’ Dvořák in what was the 150th year since Dvořák’s birth.
In Ex. 77 below, though the texture is very different from that in Ex. 75: it is the pitch of the piano R.H. melody (above the pitch of the string accompaniment) that ensures a clarity of discourse. Again, the melody and bass line containing the accompaniment within its tessitura are reminiscent of Brahms. (See Ch. 3.) The strings play *staccato*, which serves to ensure that the rhythm is clear and crisp and enables the melodic line to flow. The *staccato* marks do not appear in the piano L.H., yet with the emphasis on the first beat of the bar and the textural difference between the cello part and the piano the dominance of the piano is neither overwhelmed nor overwhelming. (See Ex. 77.)

Despite the timbral features of op. 81, Dvořák retains some characteristics of op. 5; at the opening of both quintets, the cello joins the piano before the rest of the ensemble enters, suggesting a tendency to build themes from the bass line upwards. (See Exx. 78a & b.)
Ex. 77. Dvořák, Piano Quintet, op 81, III, *Scherzo*, 263-270

Ex. 78. Use of cello and piano in Dvořák’s quintets

a) Piano Quintet, op. 5, I, 9-12

b) Piano Quintet, op. 81, I, 1-16

However, in both works, the cello’s dialogue with the piano is also used as transitional material, as in bars 91-92 of the first movement of op. 81 or bars 41-43 of the second movement of op. 5, suggesting a structural
function for this texture, rather than its being a throwback to the notion of basso continuo.

The viola, Dvořák’s own instrument, also assumes a prominent role, particularly in the later quintet. It is possible that the composer’s being a violinist and viola player (as opposed to the pianists, Schumann, Brahms and Franck) may have affected his approach. For example in the opening of the second movement of Dvořák’s op. 81, the leading melodic line is an exchange between the piano R.H. (accompanied by the L.H. in the treble clef) and the viola. The viola melody is written in the lower part of its register affording a warm and expressive tone. (See Ex. 79.) A viola player’s function within a string quartet is to negotiate pitch- and timbral differences between violins and cello, to blend with and fuse into an overall musical concept. It may therefore not be surprising that the first piano quintet to achieve this degree of homogeneity was written by a violist. The roles of the two violins follow a mostly traditional concept of lead and support in both piano quintets.

Dvořák’s achievement of a new balance within the ensemble was therefore based on assigning specific roles to the cello, recognising the viola’s potential for conciliation and the piano’s ability to balance a string quartet while avoiding any tendency to overwhelm. Completed in October 1887, Dvořák’s op. 81 Piano Quintet received its first performance in the Prague

31 Griffiths, The String Quartet: A History, 132. Griffiths posits that Dvořák may have been helped in his writing of string quartets (which affect piano-quintet-writing style) by his professional experiences as a viola player. Griffiths explains that in Dvořák’s mature string quartets the composer ensures that the viola and not the cello is the ‘second soloist in the ensemble’. The use of the viola as a solo instrument within the string quartet was a new concept when compared to the Violin I and cello dominance of the Beethoven, Schubert, Mendelssohn and Schumann string quartets. Griffiths considers the string quartets of Brahms, Dvořák, and Tchaikovsky, all composed in the 1870s, as an arrival point for a new generation of composers of the string quartet medium, a generation removed from the renowned composers of string quartet writing in the Classical/Early Romantic period, and in particular the dominance of the Beethoven string quartets.
Rudolphinum on 8 January 1888, and was published by Simrock later that same year.

Ex. 79. Dvořák, Piano Quintet op. 81, II, 1-12


By the early 1890s, therefore, composers writing piano quintets were able to draw on four very different works, by Schumann, Brahms, Franck and Dvořák, available in print and distributed by major publishers of the time. Those by Schumann and Franck promote the piano and string quartet as largely self-sufficient musical components. Conversational interaction between individual performers does happen, but, on the whole, two separate forces are maintained within the quintet. In Franck’s work, the separation of forces becomes its *raison d’être*. When strings are doubled by piano, in
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32 Schumann’s op. 44 was issued by Breitkopf und Härtel in 1843, Brahms’s op. 34 was published by Rather-Biedermann 1864, Franck’s piano quintet was issued by Peters in 1880, and Dvořák’s op. 81 was published by Simrock in 1888.
Schumann’s work, strings play four separate parts; the piano doubles their polyphony. In Franck’s, they combine in a single line in unison/octaves (a texture that Dunhill refers to as ‘a single mass of string sound’). The doubling seems to be more for dramatic effect than timbral nuance. Therefore, composers writing piano quintets in the wake of these had a larger number of models to choose from, to imitate, enlarge upon, or even to contradict. But this time was also one of experimentation, during which composers sought to move boundaries defining the purpose and texture of chamber music.

Gabriel Fauré’s Piano Quintet, op. 89, received much critical acclaim at the time of its first performance on 23 March 1906. During its prolonged period of composition, from 1887 to 1906, Fauré expanded its forces from piano quartet to piano quintet. Contemporary critics praised its differences from Franck’s piano quintet but, in so doing, considered only its deployment of thematic relationships. Franck’s close thematic connections are not evident in Fauré’s quintet, yet a similar tendency to ascribe separate roles to piano and string quartet is evident. The beginning of the first movement resembles an accompanied string quartet; as in many of the previous examples of this texture discussed so far, the piano part here could even be mistaken for a harp. (See Ex. 80.)
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33 Dunhill, Chamber Music, 236.
34 Carlo Caballero, Fauré and French Musical Aesthetics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 106.
35 Caballero, Fauré and French Musical Aesthetics, 104.
36 Ibid., 108.
Yet the arpeggiated piano part could be seen as an exercise in timbral fusion, as the articulation of notes concentrated in chords is dissipated across the arpeggio. The piano quintets of Dvořák on the other hand seem less intent on separation of function; in fact, both emphasise musical interaction amongst all instruments. Equality between piano and strings is particularly evident in the multi-layered conversation of the *Dumka* movement in Dvořák’s op. 81. (See Ex. 79 above.)

Sibelius’s early work for the medium, completed in 1890, contains many passages in which the focus is on this overall effect rather than the clarity of the individual parts. (See Ex. 81.)

Sibelius’s approach is in many ways representative of its time. So is that of Max Reger; here the conversational character of chamber music is almost submerged in the orchestral effect of the texture as a whole, though here it is density, not volume, that gives the orchestral flavour.\(^{37}\) (See Ex. 82.)

It would be a fallacy to assume, however, that the development of the piano quintet proceeded in a straight line, from intimate dialogue, piano and

---

\(^{37}\) Max Reger’s Piano Quintet no. 1 (1898), op. post, C minor, was published by B Schott’s Söhne, Mainz, in 1922. Piano Quintet no. 2 (1901), op. 64, C minor, was published by C. F. Peters, Leipzig in 1902.
strings, to orchestrally-inspired complex textures and mass sound.

Ex. 81. Sibelius, Piano Quintet, I, 213-214

Ex. 82. Reger, Piano Quintet no. 2, I, 29

Though many works written at the time favoured the latter approach, some piano quintets, including that of Respighi (1902) continued to stress the role of the piano as a solo instrument. This approach often resulted in the continued use of traditional concepts of conversation, such as unison melodic lines in the strings against a bold accompaniment in the piano, employed systematically in Franck’s piano quintet over twenty years earlier and shown here in Respighi’s. (See Ex. 83.)
The adoption of the piano quintet as part of the teaching process suggests that writing for this formation was no longer considered unusual.

Dunhill writes in 1929:

It can hardly be questioned that a quintet for piano, two violins, viola and cello is the most perfect combination of strings and keyboard instrument that has been devised - for a string quartet forms a better balance with the piano, and is admittedly more satisfactory in itself than a string trio.\(^3^8\)

Anton von Webern undertook repeated attempts at piano-quintet writing during his studies with Arnold Schoenberg. In 1903, he began work on a set of variations in A minor for piano quintet, returning to the genre in 1905 and 1906 for two further works. The only completed piece for piano and string quartet followed in 1907.\(^3^9\) Webern’s score reveals a post-Brahmsian approach to the genre in its attempt to integrate piano and strings, and to balance the

\(^{38}\) Dunhill, *Chamber Music*, 226.

\(^{39}\) Hans Moldenhauer, Prefatory notes in *Anton von Webern: Quintet 1907*, Jacques-Louis Monod, ed. (New York: Boelke-Bomart, 1962), n.p. Moldenhauer lists Webern’s piano quintet being performed by Etta Jones, piano; Oskar Adler, violin; Georg Heim, violin; Heinrich Jalowetz, viola, and Heinrich Geiger, cello. He also explains that the audience was by invitation only and included the critic Gustav Grube. Part of Grube’s review is included in Moldenhauer’s preface. Grube wrote this for the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*: ‘As with all pupils [Alban Berg and Anton von Webern], the pernicious influence of Schoenberg’s compositions made itself felt with these two. The principal theme of the Piano Quintet by Dr. von Webern, while not badly invented, lost itself very soon in wild confusion. Here and there the players seemed to find their way together as if by chance, so that one could sigh with relief and tell oneself “well, finally.” Regrettably, such “glimpses of light” were brief and rare in this chaos.’
conversational element when using one to five voices. This would seem to concur with Rosen’s claim that ‘after Brahms, sonata form provided a loosely constructed model, a pattern that gave free access to the imitation of the classics’. The textures of Webern’s work are based on a sonorous piano part balanced against doubled string parts, e.g. Violins I and II in octaves or unison. As in the case of Brahms’ op. 34, Webern makes extensive use of tutti scoring, while restricting the layers of textures. (See Ex. 84.) In the extravagant gestures of the piano part, however, one might even discern some reminiscences of Franck.

Ex. 84. Webern, Piano Quintet, I, 200-201

So, by the early part of the twentieth century, the piano quintet had become an established genre with a representative, though not yet extensive, body of works. However, it now began to be associated with composers who expressed themselves in a traditionally tonal framework that was beginning no longer to represent current developments in composition.

Edward Elgar’s Piano Quintet of 1919 summarizes many of the

---

40 Rosen, Sonata Forms, 403.
genre’s achievements since Schumann’s op. 44, particularly in its careful balancing of piano and string quartet and its conversational detail that uses different textures while always retaining what Riemann saw as the essential ingredient of chamber music, ‘finer nuances and detail’.\textsuperscript{41} (See Ex. 85.)

Ex. 85. Elgar, Piano Quintet, II, 97-99\textsuperscript{42}

Elgar wrote his Piano Quintet in the same year as his Violin Sonata and String Quartet. These works are what David Cox describes as ‘exercises in self-discipline and economy of texture.’\textsuperscript{43} Yet the texture is anything but ‘economical’. Elgar neatly crafts the piano and strings into discourses that are conversational, yet they reflect some characteristics of the early piano quintet: the cello frequently doubles the piano L.H. Rather as in Brahms’s Piano Quintet, Elgar often divides the ensemble into two halves (piano and strings), most notably Theme 2 in the exposition of the first movement. There are no extremes of dialogue: the piano frequently plays within the range of the string quartet, the piano L.H. occasionally utilizing the lower register of the piano,

\textsuperscript{41} Riemann, ‘Kamermusik’, Musik-Lexikon, 559.
\textsuperscript{43} David Cox, ‘English Chamber Music from 1700’, in \textit{Chamber Music}, Alec Robertson, ed. 338.
dramatizing the depth of sound. Elgar’s discourse has clear melodic lines but
the harmonic support is dense. In this way it epitomizes the media Elgar used
prior to 1919: the ‘large apparatus – symphony, [and] symphonic poem.’

The opening of the second movement is perhaps the most reflective of
the timbre used by Elgar. Here the string quartet are in conversation, and,
rather as in Dvořák’s op. 81, the viola has the melodic line, though here as a
solo within the string ensemble, not a line which begins a canonic parade.
When the piano does join the discussion it is to enrich the harmonies or to
provide a pulse to the sustaining of the string quartets’ chords. In any case, it
is melded within the ensemble, not separated from it. (See Ex. 86.)

Ex. 86. Elgar, Piano Quintet, II, 1-14

There was a decline in the number of piano quintets composed after
1920. As Colin Lawson writes, ‘[C]hamber music for piano and strings had

---

Staples, Six Lesser-Known Piano Quintets of the Twentieth Century, 90.
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acquired a somewhat conservative profile, far from major developments such as impressionism, jazz, atonality and serialism’.\textsuperscript{45} How the piano quintet developed as a genre during the twentieth century is discussed in the following chapter.

\textsuperscript{45} Lawson, ‘The string quartet as a foundation for larger ensembles’, 325.
Chapter 5. Conversation, Timbre, and Sound Itself, 1900-2000

In the twentieth century, as James McCalla notes, despite the ‘modern predilection for new ensembles’, the piano quintet continued to be a medium used by composers; yet, he also notes, it was by no means as popular as the string quartet, still the composers’ ‘Parnassus’.\(^1\) On the other hand, Kenneth Gloag asserts that the string quartet had by this time lost the privileged position it had earlier held; nevertheless he observes its tendency towards experimentation and formal innovation, along with its ‘positive re-engagement with tradition’.\(^2\) Since the piano quintet continued to be closely linked to developments in the string quartet (as well as the solo piano repertoire), it occupied a similarly ambivalent position. As regards experimentation, the emancipation of timbre played a significant role: this was previously noted with regard to Brahms’s quintet (see Ch. 3).

While, early in the history of chamber music itself, form and texture were closely linked to tonal structure, subsequent developments, such as a move to a more chromatic and even atonal language, required a reconsideration of such a link. As tonality, and sonata form in particular, became less influential in this regard, texture began to take on a greater structural significance, part of a process Elliott Carter described as the ‘continuing evolution of musical discourse’ with


reference to music after the Second Viennese School. Indeed, it is no accident that the ‘Theme and Variations’ structure, with its focus on texture, should appear with some regularity in contemporary music, as will be seen.

At the turn of the century and with an established canon, the piano quintet had few (if any) ensembles specifically dedicated to its performance. This was in stark contrast to the string quartet. Post-Second World War, radio broadcasting and a wealth of talented string players instigated a boom in the number of quartet ensembles. Traditionally, many continued to play and record the canon, while others, such as the Borodin String Quartet, frequently performed the works of living composers such as Shostakovich. But for many composers this was a time of departing from tradition. As Douglas Jarman observes,

Now, after the Second World War, there was again a feeling that it was necessary to go back to essentials and the young composers who attended the Darmstadt summer schools in the late ’40s and early ’50s went about re-examining the whole basis of the musical language.

Indeed the Darmstadt school, along with Boulez, of course, felt that tradition had to be swept away.

In the early 60s, the Juilliard Quartet played a great deal of new music,
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premiering the works of living American composers including Elliott Carter, while in Britain, the Alberni Quartet premiered all of Britten’s quartets and some of Shostakovich’s. In 1985, the Kronos Quartet (and subsequently the Arditti in the UK) began to champion string quartets by contemporary composers, combining the qualities of ‘experimentation (if often mixed with traditionalism), desire for the immediately and strongly expressive, [and] openness to the exotic, eclecticism’.  

McCalla sees at this time a growing aesthetic trend of ‘traditionalism’, a desire to integrate more fully into historical tradition the works of the present; this is a viewpoint echoed by Gloag when he writes of the ‘re-engagement with tradition’.  

The state of the string quartet affected the piano quintet. Despite a small number of dedicated piano-quintet ensembles in the twentieth century (Quintetto Mugellini, Warsaw Piano Quintet, Quintetto Italiano, and the Pihtupidas Quintet), the majority of performances were given by an established string quartet plus concert pianist. Many of these ensembles mixed nineteenth-century works with contemporary ones, establishing a tradition different from that of the string quartet. Not only did this tradition mix works of differing eras, for the piano quintet it meant that works from its canon were often performed alongside works for string quartet.  

The piano quintets by Elgar (1919), Bloch (1923), Furtwängler (1940) and Medtner (1904-1950) are testimony to the retention of late nineteenth-century sound worlds well into the twentieth century. With these works, traditional
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10 Ibid., 257.
concepts of form, harmony and the role of instruments within the ensemble survive, ultimately contributing to a perception of the piano quintet as a retrospective, rather than a progressive medium. Arnold Whittall refers to Ernest Bloch’s Piano Quintet No. 1, for instance, as having ‘roots in Teutonic late romanticism’. Yet, while Andrew Porter describes it as ‘one of his most approachable and colourful compositions’, its quarter-tone second subject (movement I) is certainly not retrospective. So, though the piano quintet formation in general remains a ‘typically Romantic genre’, specific examples also reveal twentieth-century approaches to composition. For some, a redefinition of ensemble interaction was the driving force, for others, a redefinition of the whole quintet as a source of sound, somewhat in the manner of an electronic source. The influence of politics, especially in Soviet Russia, also generated new aesthetic aims, examples including the piano quintets of Shostakovich and Schnittke.

Paradoxically, striving for the ‘new’ can evoke the old; both Messiaen’s and Xenakis’s use of ‘block-writing’ (the creation of multiple-voiced, consistent ensemble textures whose parts are subsumed into the whole, and which thus evoke the ‘sound objects’ of electronic music) sometimes produces textures akin to those of Brahms. Dunhill’s words have resonance regarding textures in Brahms’s op. 34, which he described as ‘contrapuntal and closely-packed
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music’.\(^\text{15}\) (See Ch. 3.) Then, composers including Ginastera and Françaix fragment the ensemble, writing one or more movements for varying groups of piano-quintet instruments in the manner of Soler. Thus they are able to promote an individual approach via a much older concept. With regard to Fauré’s second piano quintet, op. 115 (1919-1921), Whittall suggests that, here, ‘radicalism was less a matter of sustained atonal exploration than of the clear-cut alternation between progressive and traditional features’.\(^\text{16}\)

This chapter considers examples of those piano quintets written in the twentieth century that (1) appear to redefine interaction within the ensemble (Ives, Carter and Goehr); (2) re-invent classical textures (Shostakovich and Schnittke); (3) create new textures through ‘block-writing’ (Messiaen and Xenakis); (4) fragment the ensemble itself (Riegger, Françaix and Ginastera), and (5) take the attempt to blend the sound of piano and stringed instrument even further in a preoccupation with timbre (Ginastera, Hovhaness, Henze, Feldman and Adès). For most of these, structure and approach to the ensemble are integrally linked, eschewing the notion of an adherence to any classical form.

1. Interaction in the ensemble: Ives, Carter and Goehr

It could be argued that in the twentieth century, the dramatic premise for the piano quintet became split: either, in traditional vein, a collection of individuals (whether they be grouped as 4+1 or as 5 separate ‘persons’) or a source for various sound-masses. Charles Ives certainly subscribed to the former view but

\(^{15}\) Dunhill, ‘Brahms’s Quintet for Pianoforte and Strings’, 319.

\(^{16}\) Whittall, Musical Composition, 12.
yet altered the notion of the group to one united in a common musical cause.

His piano quintet movements were all written and revised between 1908 and 1924: *Largo risoluto No.1* (1908-1909), *Largo risoluto No.2* (1909-1910) and *In re con moto et al* (1913, revised 1915-16 and 1923-24).17 Typical of Ives, the three works reveal the tendency to challenge established perceptions. In fact, Malcolm MacDonald sees the inclusion of the piano in these pieces as ‘an Ivesian protest against the conventionalities of the [string quartet]’18.

Unlike the traditional four-movement works of the nineteenth century, including a first movement in sonata form, Ives’s works are short, one-movement pieces; Lawson describes them as making ‘creative use’ of the ensemble.19 *Largo risoluto No 1* illustrates both the composer’s awareness of the historical legacy and his ability to avoid replicating existing models.20 The piece is in two sections, the first, a short 9-bar unit in which piano and string quartet collaborate. In a nod to tradition, both sections reveal a rhythmic alliance between piano and cello. (See Ex. 87.)

The second half, however, is free of any such attitudes. Here highly differentiated solo entries are combined and, while pitch and rhythm are precisely notated, the aural effect of the melodic lines is almost random. (See Ex. 88.) Much of the instrumental interaction challenges tradition. The piano, for instance, is passive: an instrument whose overtones are activated by the string parts.
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19 Lawson, ‘The string quartet as a foundation for larger ensembles’, 326.
The sustaining pedal is held down (see the ties from chord to chord), yet there is an accent mark above each bar, along with a $f$ dynamic mark and a hairpin, implying reiteration of the chord and providing a rhythmic regularity that counterbalances the fluidity of the melodic lines in the strings. The string writing both starts and ends conventionally, but its continuity does not depend on the first violin; instead this role is assumed by an inner part, the viola. The composer comments:
I’ll have to admit that some of these shorter pieces like these (for a few players, and called chamber music pieces) were in part made to strengthen the ear muscles, the mind muscles, and perhaps the Soul muscles, too.21

Arguably, the ‘strengthening of the ear muscles’ can also be understood as the composer’s acknowledgement that this music challenges the perceptions of its listeners. The chords in the piano, with their semitone groupings (C♯, F♯, C♯ and B) sustained in a pedal-point way (similarly to an organ), break with tradition both harmonically and timbrally.

The element of conversational tension is further developed in the third of Ives’ three piano quintets, In re con moto et al. Synchronous phrases played on tutti strings overlap with those on piano; each string phrase begins with a double-stopped f chord, then proceeds, mp, until the next f chord thus providing clear articulation of the (unequal-length) phrase. (See Ex. 89.) Ives groups the string quartet as one homogenous unit, flexible in its discourse within a framework, rhythmically underpinned by two ostinati in the piano: the RH plays notes of 5-semiquaver lengths, and the LH, generally, crotchets.

In In re con moto et al, the way in which the music has been written underlines the dramatic, theatrical components of the work without the need for words: a precisely-notated piano part is contrasted with string glissandi, the timing and range of which are given approximate parameters, again emphasising the tension between traditional and experimental elements of the medium.

Ex. 89. Ives, *In re con moto et al*, 24-26 (str: bt. 6 of 7/4 bar, pf: bt. 1 of 4/4 bar)

This illustrates clearly Salzman’s observations that Ives finds ‘new ways of organizing sound;’\(^{22}\) but it also shows Ives’ new ways of organizing the ensemble. (See Ex. 90.)

Ex. 90. Ives, *In re con moto et al*, 60-61

It is Ives’s Second String Quartet (1907-1913), with its three movements, sub-titled, ‘Discussions’, ‘Arguments’, and ‘The Call of the Mountains’, not these

piano quintets, that proved most influential on later quintets by other composers. In this work Ives chooses to use non-musical vocabulary as a descriptive tool to reflect the musical intention and a genre where conversational discourse is intricate and finely wrought. Ives annotates his manuscript score of the quartet thus,

S. Q. for 4 men – who converse, discuss, argue (in re ‘Politick’), fight, shake hands shut up - then walk up on the mountainside to view the firmament!\(^{23}\)

In particular, the second movement, ‘Arguments’, with its performance directions, ‘Allegro con fisto’, ‘Andante emasculata’, ‘Largo sweetoto’, ‘con fuoco (all mad)’, ‘Andante con scratchy (as tuning up)’ and ‘Allegro con fisty swatto (as in a K.O.)’, turns the notion of an intellectual musical conversation into a physically dramatic \textit{scena}.

Ives’s music for piano quintet is particularly significant to the genre. On one hand, its direct influence is limited, given that these works were not published until much later in the twentieth century, and thus could not have a contemporary impact on the development of the genre.\(^{24}\) Yet the composer did show the scores to other musicians, often delighting in any consternation or disapproval that they incurred:

I remember Milcke, in looking over some of the music, came across a part of the \textit{In re con moto et al} for chamber group (which I didn’t intend to show him), and also the church bell piece called \textit{From the Steeples} for bells, and Chamber Set, etc. He jumped back, mad.\(^{25}\)

\(^{23}\) MacDonald, sleeve notes, \textit{Charles Ives (1874-1954)}, 2.
\(^{24}\) \textit{Largo Risoluto} Nos 1 and 2 were not published until 1961. \textit{In re con moto et al} was first published in 1968.
\(^{25}\) Kirkpatrick, ed, \textit{Charles E. Ives: Memos}, p. 70 - 71. Franz Milcke was an American violinist of German descent.
Ives’s music is sometimes impractical, but he then allows the player to modify it for performance’s sake. This is acknowledged in the composer’s footnote to bb. 42–44 of *In re con moto et al*:

In measures 42, 43 and 44 of the piano part, unless there is an extra player, the left hand notes may be omitted (especially if played very fast), dividing the right hand part between the two hands. Although it is better, if possible, throughout, to keep an even tempo, a somewhat slower tempo may be taken from measure 42 on, otherwise it is extremely difficult to get in the longer meters against the beat. In other words, the tempo may be taken back up to the point where the playing is possible.  

This shows Ives working on two levels: creating initially uncompromising material, yet allowing, even recommending, reshaping by the performers. David Nicholls probably does not intend to discount Ives’s own comments on the work when he says:

> Unencumbered by the restrictions of conventional performers and performance practices . . . he could imagine . . . such systematically formulated works as . . . *In Re Con Moto Et Al.*

The scores of Ives’s works for piano quintet contain elements of tension between established concepts of genre and his imagination in which ‘conversing, arguing and shaking hands’ becomes an accepted practice. Arguably, the medium as an ensemble of two ‘halves’, strings and piano, may have initially enabled Ives to take the element of competition or confrontation and apply it to the ensemble, but he did not restrict himself to such boundaries. The notion of a separation (even
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non-communication) of parts within the ensemble was clearly taken up by later composers, particularly Elliott Carter (1908-2012).

During much of the twentieth century, the piano quintet was still perceived as a ‘typically romantic genre’. For many composers, the relationship between piano and string quartet remained a central concern in the writing for piano quintet. Indeed, Elliott Carter suggests that, in his piano quintet (1997) he wanted ‘the piano to have a life of its own, and the string quartet have a life of its own’. This concurs with McCalla’s observations on Carter’s attitude to composing chamber music in general:

>[E]ach individual piece of Carter’s has a striking individuality of sound; for despite certain compositional procedures common from one work to another, Carter likes to invent material specific to each work and designed for its particular performing forces.

Though the invention of Carter’s piano quintet was conceived as one in which the two entities (piano and string quartet) were given a ‘life of their own’, Carter surprisingly draws references from the Piano Quintet of Robert Schumann, the antithesis of what he wished to achieve. This is surprising, because, when writing about his inspiration for his First String Quartet he quotes twentieth-century sources, for example Jean Cocteau’s film _Le Sang d’un poète_, not the quartets of Mozart or Haydn.

Strangely, Carter attributes this perspective to his reaction to Schumann’s Piano Quintet; he saw it as a work with a close connection between piano and
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32 Ibid., 243.
string parts, unlike the present author, saying, ‘I didn’t want to do that’.\textsuperscript{33} This somewhat contradicts the ‘life of their own’ idea, but also stresses that he did not want the formation to sound like a concerto for piano and strings.\textsuperscript{34}

The performers Carter wrote for, as well as instrument-specific considerations, shaped his approach to the work: Irvine Arditti observes that the writing for the violin was ‘almost classical’ in its avoidance of more contemporary/extended playing techniques.\textsuperscript{35} But rather than obviously pit the piano against the strings (as seen in works from Saint-Saëns onwards), Carter intended to have individually characterised the instruments of the ensemble, an approach that recalls Ives’ \textit{In re con moto et al.}

This approach, as applied to the role of the piano in Carter’s quintet, is expressed by the individuality of the piano part, which is given largely interjectory material in the first section, harmonically supportive in the central, and percussive and directional in the final one. As for the strings, they direct the musical focus in the first, engage in conversational variety in the second, and balance the keyboard in its rhythmic drive in the third. Ex. 91 offers a fragment of the first section. (See Ex. 91.)

Carter, similarly to Ives at the beginning of the twentieth century, favours an interwoven approach to texture. In the second section of Carter’s Piano Quintet, where discourse is at its most varied, this interwoven approach exudes timbral clarity. The instrumental range is not extreme, the piano part not densely textured, and all five instruments have their own dialogue. (See Ex. 92.)

\textsuperscript{33} Carter, \textit{Video: Quintet for Piano and Strings}, 12’24”.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., 12’13”.
\textsuperscript{35} Irvine Arditti, \textit{Video: Quintet for Piano and Strings}, 13’59”.
Ex. 91. Carter, Quintet for Piano and Strings, 33-36

Ex. 92. Carter, Quintet for Piano and Strings, 175-177

Alexander Goehr’s Piano Quintet (2000) was composed three years after Carter’s. For Goehr, like Carter, there appears a preoccupation with ensemble interaction. The composer himself suggests that

One has the impression in the great nineteenth century literature, if not in earlier chamber music with piano, of an overbearing struggle between
Steinway and strings. Both in the Quintet and the Trio I really wanted to level out the instruments rather than have the piano as a kind of independent protagonist.\(^{36}\)

Commissioned by Carnegie Hall, New York for the pianist Peter Serkin and the Orion String Quartet, Goehr’s quintet is divided into three movements: I \((\lambda = 76)\); II \((\phi = 76)\); III Tema [Marlboro] and 16 Variations.\(^{37}\) His approach, rather like Carter’s, to music, to composition, and to music other than his own, is extensively documented. And, rather like Carter, he makes historical reference to the connection between genre, form and musical language:

Inevitably, the ensemble of piano and string quartet brings to mind the major works of Schumann and Brahms; but also the fact that Schoenberg required his pupils to compose a piano quintet at the last stage of their apprenticeships.\(^{38}\)

Goehr suggests that the work’s three movements divide into two parts: the first movement a ‘kind of sonata allegro moderato’, with the second movement, ‘a scherzo’, and the Theme and Variations forming the second part.\(^{39}\) The composer’s phrase, ‘a kind of sonata allegro moderato’, is significant. It allows for the possibility that Goehr’s approach to form is in some way more conceptual than actual; that his sense of ‘sonata form’ is more a question of utilising some basic formal concepts, both in terms of structure and conversation, rather than


\(^{37}\) Goehr’s Piano Quintet was scheduled for world premiere in June 2002 at the Aldeburgh Festival. Serkin was however ‘indisposed’ and the premiere was instead given by Tom Poster and the Brodsky String Quartet.


\(^{39}\) Alexander Goehr, ‘Music by Alexander Goehr: Trio for Violin, Cello and Piano, Suite for Violin and Piano, Largamente from Op.18, Piano Quintet’, Daniel Becker, Piano, Ning Kam, Violin, Thomas Carroll, Cello, Elias Quartet, Meridian CDE 84562, 2008, 2. Sleeve notes by the composer. Goehr writes that the Theme and Variations were composed in 1999. The Tema, Marlboro, taking its name from Marlboro, Vermont, where in the summer of the same year he wrote the second half of his piano quintet.
applying a prescribed formula. This would seem to concur with Charles Rosen’s observation that,

By the twentieth century, often the only thing that distinguishes sonata from a strict ternary or da capo form is its freedom. However, a free symmetrical return of the opening material remains basic to much twentieth century music.

With non-tonal sonata forms, of course, tonal polarization and resolution disappeared completely; what remains is the thematic structure along with contrasting textures.\(^{40}\)

Goehr’s ‘traditional’ journey commences with solo piano, later joined by viola (b. 12, 4\(^{\text{th}}\) beat). This opening solo brings to mind the accompanied piano sonata, or indeed, the duo sonata. (See Ex. 93.)

Ex. 93. Goehr, Piano Quintet, I, 1-5

![Ex. 93. Goehr, Piano Quintet, I, 1-5](image)

Thematic material is presented in a traditional way using piano for Theme A (the ‘first subject’) and strings for Theme B (the ‘second subject’). What connects the themes, however, is the use of gradually cumulative textures, built up through part writing, and an initial illusion of sequential entries that do not materialise. (See Ex. 94.)

\(^{40}\) Rosen, *Sonata Forms*, 403.
The scoring of the motivic material in the first and second subjects can be seen as an acknowledgement of the traditional division between piano and string quartet as exemplified by the accompanied keyboard concerto in the late eighteenth century. This concurs with Goehr’s thoughts regarding compositional techniques at that time:

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the German composers developed a refined and subtle manner of using the few rhythmic elements which were known to them. The most astonishing examples are Haydn and above all Mozart, who brought to perfection a technique of composing with varied bar and phrase-lengths. In doing this, they accorded with modern concepts concerning the nature of rhythm.41

The very transparent nature of the score reflects Goehr’s interest in late eighteenth-century music, and, with his own late twentieth-century musical language (more akin to that of the Second Viennese School than Shostakovich) that transparency is reflected in the way that the material is presented: the five instruments function in a dialogue that frequently involves two or the piano alone.

The second movement seems to take transparency as the fundamental idea from which ensemble interaction develops. The opening bars of the movement

---

contain additional references to an imagined classical style, with sharply contrasted dynamics, as found throughout the movement, and the division of musical material between piano and strings. (See Ex. 95.)

Ex. 95. Goehr, Piano Quintet, II, 1-5

The textural division between keyboard and strings (as seen in Ex. 95 above) and the structure of Mvt II (emanating from the rhythmic and melodic pattern of the piano part also seen in Ex. 95), offers opportunities for greater ensemble integration, particularly given the frequent use of single-line textures in the piano part. Further, a change in structural purpose often facilitates a change in ensemble interaction, as will be shown below.

In the last movement, rather as in the piano quintets of Ginastera and Françaix (to be discussed later in the chapter), and even in the works of Viennese Classical composers themselves, variation form allows texture to define structure. Although the presentation of the hymn-like, four-part theme of the Tema [Marlboro] offers a traditional, if not classical string quartet role (in effect a ‘lecture’) the subsequent variations divide up the medium and present a variety of ensemble interactions. Variation 1 is for piano alone and written contrapuntally

42 Parker, *The String Quartet*, 75.
(with the addition of ornaments: bb. 3, 5, and 7 contain *acciaccaturas*), while Variation 2 begins with string quartet and is briefly juxtaposed with the piano part. This division not only affects experimentation, it appears also to restrict it. Goehr often replaces diatonic clarity with timbral melding by clusters, a technique which, as will be seen later, Bacewicz uses in her Piano Quintet No. 2 to great effect. (See Ex. 96.)

Tension between opposing elements, in structure or instrumentation, is an idea central to the work, while the variation format becomes a mechanism for continuity, as each variation connects, or briefly overlaps with the following one.

Ex. 96. Goehr, Piano Quintet, III, Var. 3, 3-5

The ensemble is separated to such an extent that all five players only rarely perform at the same time. David Drew regards the tension between historical influences and originality as an integral part of Goehr’s response to music:

Isn’t it a reaching for some similar freedom on a different and broader plane that animates last Saturday’s Piano Quintet? [reference to the premiere of Goehr’s Piano Quintet 08/06/2002, Aldeburgh Church.] A freedom from the twentieth century as well as the nineteenth? From Fauré
and Shostakovich, even from the *Ode to Napoleon*, as much as from the Schumann and Brahms you [Goehr] actually mention. Yet the piece keeps faith with them all, by the very manner with which it takes its leave from each.\textsuperscript{43}

It seems that the suggestions of ‘keeping faith’ and ‘taking leave’ summarise much of Goehr’s approach to scoring piano chamber music. His writing is clearly based on a detailed awareness of music of previous eras, but he uses that awareness to define the parameters of his own responses. Though his piano quintet appears on one level to redefine interaction, it also includes classical textures, fragmentation and instrumental melding. This could be construed as a reflection on the influences of a life lived, in its majority, in the twentieth century, but it is also possibly typical of a composition commissioned on the cusp of a new century where reflection permeates aesthetic thought: a manifestation of being ‘new in an old way.’\textsuperscript{44}

2. Re-inventing classical textures: Shostakovich and Schnittke

Ives, followed by Carter, introduced an aspect of music-theatre to player interaction. For Dmitry Shostakovich and those that followed him, it did so too, but the issue of the dramatic scenario took a different turn, with extra-musical aspirations. But ensemble integration, relegated in status by Ives and Carter, is at the fore in Shostakovich’s Quintet. The techniques he uses to achieve it both

\textsuperscript{43} David Drew, ‘Canonic Studies and Time Pieces on the Motif FB-AG’, *Sing Ariel: Essays and Thoughts for Alexander Goehr’s Seventieth Birthday*, 83-84.

\textsuperscript{44} The phrase ‘new in an old way’ is used here to illustrate the symbiosis between historical influences and creative modern composition. It is a phrase used by Gubaidulina to describe her compositions using the imagery of a tree, with roots, branches and leaves, as a manifestation of the connection between ‘old’ (roots) and ‘new’ (branches & leaves) in her works. Sofia Gubaidulina, ‘In the Mirror; Three Works, Three Genres, Three Epochs’. Sleeve notes by Hans-Ulrich Duffek. BIS-CD-898, 2002. 4.
glances backwards at pre-Schumann works and forward to the textures of the later twentieth century.

Shostakovich’s Piano Quintet, op. 57, written in 1940 and premiered the same year by the composer and the Beethoven Quartet, quickly gained a reputation for being one of the outstanding works of the genre.\(^{45}\) In his survey, Colin Lawson described the piece as ‘perhaps the most significant work of the period’.\(^{46}\) However, critics were initially sceptical of both its style and content. Moisey Grinberg (1904-1968) was specific:

Yet in its essence this is a composition of profoundly Western orientation (I mean the work of contemporary Western composers). . . The first movement of the quintet, it is true, is constructed in a classical, Bachian scheme. But how much there is in this quintet of stilted, singular new sounds resulting from abstract formal quests.\(^{47}\)

Even Prokofiev commented negatively on what he seemed to regard as the work’s detached character:

What astonishes me is that so young a composer, at the height of his powers, should be so much on his guard, and calculate every note so carefully. He never takes a single risk. One looks in vain for a daring impulse, a bold venture.\(^{48}\)

Both perspectives imply shortcomings: a traditional, if not retrospective, approach to form, and an overwhelming sense of construction and control. Half a century later, Basil Smallman claimed as successes the very features that

\(^{45}\) Laurel E. Fay, *Shostakovich: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 359. The piano quintet was premiered on 23 November 1940, in Moscow by the composer and the Beethoven Quartet. Fay also refers to further performances of the piano quintet until the early 1950s, involving the Beethoven or Borodin or Komitas Quartets, 176-177.

\(^{46}\) Lawson, ‘The string quartet as a foundation for larger ensembles’, 326.


Prokofiev in particular cited as failures: Shostakovich’s ‘turning away from the ultra-modern approach’. The choice for the quintet’s opening two movements, a Prelude and Fugue played without a break between them, enunciate a stylistic influence from the pre-classical period; Prokofiev, too, saw the scoring of the succeeding section, in the Intermezzo (Movement 4), as a reference to times past by describing it as ‘a Handelian trick - a never-ending melody against the backdrop of pizzicato in the bass’. (See Ex. 97.)

Ex. 97. Shostakovich, Piano Quintet, op. 57, IV, 32-35

For all the criticism of Shostakovich’s perceived retrospective stance, it is this very approach that led to a work where textures are, in many ways, new to the genre of the piano quintet: part of what Yuriy Kholopov describes as ‘the aesthetic principle of being old in a new way’. Though the texture of the above example is based on a division between piano and strings, its reference to pre-classical scoring refers to a time when the piano quintet as a formation was not

---

49 Ibid., 138.
yet in existence. Furthermore, despite its retrospective sound-world, its aesthetic base is firmly rooted in the contemporaneous Soviet ideology of Socialist Realism, an artistic manifestation of political thought that demanded ‘works attuned to the epoch’. Transparency of texture and stylistic accessibility, together with select references to recognised achievements in past eras were the main criteria for what was considered to be acceptable art. The ‘Handelian trick’ and the clarity of ensemble textures in Shostakovich’s quintet seem to have satisfied these demands, as the piano quintet achieved ‘immediate popular success’.

The need for accessibility and textural transparency manifests itself in an approach to scoring for the piano that places strong emphasis on two-part textures. In doing so, the piano part appears denuded of its harmonic abilities, and instead converts into a texture of two single-line instruments. Unlike some of the works to be discussed below, which explore timbral solutions for the issue of ensemble integration, Shostakovich’s score often displays the use of transferable instrumental textures that would work equally well on piano or strings. In that sense, it might be considered as being an ‘illusionary’ solution to textural unity.

The transparency of textures in much of the work enabled the composer to re-define the balance between piano and strings, and to treat the piano as an instrument that uses up to four single lines effectively, as opposed to consistent, and even persistent, chordal writing. This in turn affects the use of the string

---

53 Fay, Shostakovich: A Life, 128.
instruments. It produces more moments of instrumental dialogue between individual players, as opposed to melody and accompaniment, or antiphonal block textures. By treating the piano as an instrument that contributes melodic lines, the composer achieves a sense of textural equality, and timbral diversity. (See Ex. 98.)

Thus, it has more in common with the very early examples of the piano quintet rather than Schumann. This may, in part, be a result of the rather contrapuntally written work. Comparing Shostakovich’s Piano Quintet (I, bb. 17-47) to Soler’s no. 6 (III, bb. 48-53) there are similarities in attitudes to texture in the way the respective material is treated.

Ex. 98. Shostakovich, Piano Quintet, op. 57, II, 152-161

![Ex. 98. Shostakovich, Piano Quintet, op. 57, II, 152-161](image)

Both composers have their own melodic language, yet choose different
instruments from within the piano quintet, Soler electing three stringed instruments, while Shostakovich chooses the clarity and percussive nature of the piano to maintain the melodic line, while the viola provides a countermelody. In Shostakovich’s quintet it also works as a foil to the modernist approach to the piano as a percussion instrument incapable of sustaining lines in the manner of a stringed instrument. (See Ex. 99a and b.)

Ex. 99.

a) Shostakovich, Piano Quintet, op. 57, I, 17-47

b) Soler, Keyboard Quintet, No. 6, III, 48-53
All this seems paradoxical in light of what we know about Shostakovich’s intentions for the work, which from the start seem to have been to allow the string quartet to prevail: the violinist Dmitri Tsiganov recalls Shostakovich’s plan to write a piano quintet as early as 1938, to be played by the Beethoven Quartet and himself; according to Tsiganov, Shostakovich suggested that he would write more demanding parts for the string players than the pianist.\textsuperscript{54} Furthermore, Isaak Glikman recalls that Shostakovich used the phrase ‘adding a piano part to this quartet’ as he intended to travel with both the Beethoven and Glasunov Quartets for performances of this work.\textsuperscript{55} Regardless of these intentions, the result is a carefully considered balance between piano and strings, a progressive approach to ensemble conversation, occurring within the boundaries of a more traditional structural framework. Shostakovich himself performed the piece extensively; unsurprisingly, its influence on scoring and ensemble balance can also be felt in many subsequent piano quintets, particularly those of Soviet Russia.\textsuperscript{56}

The piano quintets of Shostakovich and Schnittke have been linked in both their approach to musical texture and compositional style. Ivan Moody suggests that this is the result of a common ‘sense of irony and isolation’.\textsuperscript{57} Colin Lawson, more pragmatically, considers the link to be their ‘textural simplicity’.\textsuperscript{58} Schnittke’s interest in a diverse range of compositional styles is documented in

\textsuperscript{54} Fay, \textit{Shostakovich: A Life}, 116.
\textsuperscript{55} Elizabeth Wilson, \textit{Shostakovich: A Life Remembered} (London: Faber & Faber, 1994), 132. Isaak Glikman was a Professor at the Leningrad Conservatoire and a friend of Shostakovich.
\textsuperscript{56} The influence of Shostakovich’s approach to scoring can be seen in Sofia Gubaidulina’s Piano Quintet. This will be discussed in Chapter 6.
\textsuperscript{58} Lawson, ‘The string quartet as a foundation for larger ensembles’, 327.
his articles on selected twentieth-century composers. Alastair Williams considers their influence on Schnittke’s music to be both an intrinsic part of his style, as well as a potential source for conflict:

His ties to the past are, however, complex since the polystylism for which he is famous is torn between a clashing pluralism and a yearning for the certainties of tradition.

Both aspects of Schnittke’s style are present in the piano quintet, a work that, according to Ivan Moody, combines ‘non-tonal with nostalgic elements’, as can be seen in the transition from the first to the second movements. Here the ethereal chromatic combination of pitches in their bitonal origin (triads on F sharp and G) gives way to a reluctantly emerging sense of G minor. (See Ex. 100.)

Nostalgia is invoked via the use of the BACH and DSCH motifs, in addition to, as Sigrid Neef points out,

a symmetrically constructed chord . . . formed from the first letters of the names of friends, the members of the Borodin Quartet and the pianist Edlina: D= Dubinsky, A= Alexandrov, C and H = S[c]hebalin, B = Berlinsky and E= Edlina. Gidon Kremer, who performed and recorded the piano quintet in the year of its premiere, notes that, in it, the composer ‘conceived the desire to use more harmony or so-called polystylistic music’. Gennadi Rozhdestvensky, who suggested the composer’s orchestration of the piano quintet, observes admiringly
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59 Alfred Schnittke, A Schnittke Reader (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2002). Schnittke wrote essays on works by a number of other composers, including Bartok, Webern, Stravinsky, Berio and Ligeti.
62 Sigrid Neef, liner notes for CD, Alfred Schnittke: Concerto No. 4 for Violin and Orchestra, etc, BMG, 74321 56264 2, 1998, 16.
63 Schnittke, A Schnittke Reader, 234.
that ‘he [Schnittke] uses everything invented before him’.\textsuperscript{64} On the other hand, Richard Taruskin censures the composer’s tendency to ‘re-cycle clichés’, resulting in ‘syrupy Soviet kitsch’.\textsuperscript{65}

Ex. 100. Schnittke, Piano Quintet, I, 66-74 and II, 1-4

The sparse keyboard textures of the Schnittke quintet are rather reminiscent of Shostakovich’s fugal writing in his piano quintet, though the forces, piano and string quartet, are often clearly divided in the former. Yet the cautious use of aleatoric techniques, as well as quarter- and three quarter-tones in the strings and pitch-clusters on the keyboard, place this work in a contemporary sonic world. When piano and strings are used in a more integrated manner, the effect is achieved not so much through compatible textures but by timbral elements. The first entry of the strings in the opening movement, a combination of non-vibrato pitches, frame the sustained piano notes. The effect is an inclusion of

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., 247.
the piano sounds by the strings. (See Ex. 101.)

Arnold Whittall’s suggestion that ‘the most memorable and authentic role for Schnittke was that of the master able to reanimate a traditional genre with a personal blend of allusion and self-projection’, applies particularly to this quintet. Both textural and timbral ideas in the piano quintets of Shostakovich and Schnittke were, at their respective time of composition, not necessarily at the forefront of musical development, yet their use in these works identifies both pieces as canonic representatives of the genre, making them ‘old in a new way’.

Ex. 101. Schnittke, Piano Quintet, I, 30-33*

*[N.B. the vertical line placed in front of the piano chords (right hand) indicates that they are to be played as a cluster, i.e. in the example above all semitones between the given pitches of B-D.]

3. Block-writing

In the twentieth century, as illustrated above by the work of Shostakovich, some

---

of the techniques of earlier composers were placed in new contexts, to entirely
different effect. Another principal example of this phenomenon is Messiaen,
who, in the majority of his compositions, works with differentiated, opposing,
blocks of sound: a stark juxtaposition of elements. These timbral blocks are often
constructed at the start, and do not change. In the case of his Piano Quintet, this
highlights the intrinsic differences in timbre between piano and strings. Thus it
can be argued that the notion of the ‘integration’ of the sound of piano and strings
is foreign to his personal compositional style, and the effect of his technique is to
create a work that harks back to the ‘accompanied concerto style’ of the
eighteenth century. But patently, this is not the case. While Pièce for piano and
string quartet (1991) appears to take the traditional piano quintet division rather
literally, the context, and sound of the work, is new. The opening statements by
piano and strings are indicative of this sense of separation. (See Ex. 102.)

---

67 Robert Sherlaw Johnson, Messiaen (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1975), 24. See, for instance, Couleurs de la Cité Celeste (1963) where the ensemble is clearly and constantly delineated, the piano always separated from the other groups. Sherlaw Johnson writes of Couleurs: ‘It is true that sectionalization has been the weakness of a number of [Messiaen’s] early works, but it is clear that in his later works his musical thought often demands a sectional treatment. The stark juxtaposition of ideas in earlier works eventually becomes sophisticated in the ’40s with superimposition as well as juxtaposition being involved.’ From a timbral point of view, the instrumentation used in both Couleurs and Pièce, involve two ‘units’: in the former, piano and orchestra and in the latter, piano and string quartet.

In an assessment of the piece from a structural and performance point of view, Paul Griffiths judges that:

As an occasional piece, and as a chamber composition, it has a doubly marginal place in Messiaen’s output; its form is a simple palindromic ABA of generally antiphonal patches around a toccata which similarly — and for the performers, challengingly — uses the keyboard and the quartet in alternation.\(^69\)

Compared to the composer’s other chamber piece for more than two players, *Quatuor pour la fin du temps* (1940-1), Messiaen’s perception of the ensemble in *Pièce* shows the development of his style, though, in *Quatuor*, it seems quite circumscribed. Only half of the *Quatuor*’s eight movements involve the full ensemble, enabling the composer to explore the relationship between individual voices, as well as the juxtaposition between duo, trio and quartet writing within one work. Of course, the circumstances of writing this piece must

have played a part in these decisions, as did in a different way the occasion for which the short *Pièce* was written.\textsuperscript{70} In the work for piano quintet, consistent with Messiaen’s general stylistic approach, the string group is quite homogeneous, using homorhythmic material with canonic entries a semiquaver apart, a compositional tool that permeates the entire piece. (See Ex. 103.)

When considering the effectiveness of such writing, Roger Nichols suggests (of *Pièce*) that,

The strings, indeed, present an angular, uncomfortable profile, with much work on a four-note cell, both in unison . . . and with staggered entries. Their parts require considerable agility, particularly . . . where they alternate with the piano.\textsuperscript{71}

Ex. 103. Messiaen, *Pièce*, 11-15

The issue implied by Nichols is one of effective interaction between piano and

\textsuperscript{70} Sherlaw Johnson, *Messiaen*, 61. The *Quatuor* was composed between 1940-1941 in Stalag VIII, prisoner of war camp, Görlitz, Silesia. The instrumentation for the work was determined by the presence of a cellist, a violinist, and a clarinettist as fellow prisoners. Both the clarinettist and violinist had been able to retain their instruments but the cellist was ‘presented with a cello which unfortunately had one of its strings missing’, writes Sherlaw Johnson. Messiaen was given supplies of manuscript paper and eventually a piano ‘an upright, out of tune, and many of its keys refused to function properly’. Sherlaw Johnson, *Messiaen*, 61. In stark contrast, *Pièce* was composed in 1991 as a ‘greetings telegram’ for the ninetieth birthday of the director of Universal Edition, Alfred Schlee (see Griffiths, ‘Eclairs sur l’au-delà’, 511).

strings. Perhaps the problem for Messiaen is that the forces on offer here allow him, within the premise of the work and its scoring, too little in terms of timbral diversity.

The notion of sound-blocks continues to be exploited in piano quintets, particularly by composers with a background in electronic music, where this is part of the lingua franca. Xenakis’s *Akéa pour quatuor à cordes et piano* (1985) contains carefully graded, and often sharp, dynamic contrasts, aimed at achieving clarity of sound and projection of its textures; ensemble integration appears largely based on a perception of compatibility of textures, rather than timbral fusion. Ex. 104 demonstrates the use of double-stopping in strings, in combination with double notes in the piano parts. (See Ex. 104.)

Ex. 104. Xenakis, *Akéa*, 34-35

The composer acknowledges the influence of traditional elements on his
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music, suggesting that it ‘makes no revolution; it comprehends the forms of expression used in the past’.\textsuperscript{73} In the context of the piano quintet, this can be understood as the composer’s attempt to blend the ensemble together. James Harley observes this in \textit{Tetras}, Xenakis’s string quartet written three years before the piano quintet: ‘the title \textit{Tetras} means “four” which Xenakis, in treating the quartet as a single “meta-instrument” rather than four individuals, takes to be “four in one”, a merging of sounds that is also apparent in the piano quintet.\textsuperscript{74}

The visual presentation of Xenakis’s piano quintet score reveals a distinctive approach: the top two staves are occupied by the piano part with the string quartet parts written underneath. Although this may imply a hierarchical perception of the ensemble that reverses the traditional appearance of piano and strings, a consideration of the textural similarities of all parts suggests a fusion similar to the one achieved in \textit{Tetras}, and applied here to the piano quintet formation.

As with Schnittke, Xenakis’s writing for piano quintet began when, as Harley suggests, ‘Xenakis was becoming more and more involved in exploring the melodic-harmonic aspects of his musical perception’; this development led to \textit{Akéa} being ‘the first chamber work [by Xenakis] to be entirely concerned with melodic and harmonic structures’.\textsuperscript{75} The dialectic is closely linked to the overall structure of the movement. Though Harry Halbreich sees five sections in the piece, it is possible to view the work as being in three units, the outer sections (bars 1-12 and 83-93) consisting of a dialogue between piano and string quartet,

\textsuperscript{73} Varga, \textit{Conversations with Iannis Xennakis}, 50. This quotation is from a conversation between Varga and Xenakis in 1980.

\textsuperscript{74} James Harley, ‘The String Quartets of Iannis Xenakis’, \textit{Tempo}, No. 203 (Jan., 1998), 4-5.

\textsuperscript{75} Harley, ‘The String Quartets of Iannis Xenakis’, 5-6.
while the central section (bars 13-82) explores conversational diversity. Piano and string quartet provide musical interjections, while the cello, a favourite instrument of the composer, provides linking passages between them. (See Ex. 105.)

Ex. 105. Xenakis, *Akéa*, 41-44*78*

*[*N.B. the piano score is at the top of both systems.*]

For all its textural density, Xenakis’s piano quintet can be viewed as a traditional response to the genre, not least in its underlying A-B-A structure. Varga, reflecting on the construction of some of Xenakis’s works, put the following statement to the composer: ‘As far as your forms are concerned, you

---

76 Halbreich, CD liner notes.
77 Harley, ‘The String Quartets of Iannis Xenakis’, 2. The author refers to the relevance of the cello in Xenakis’ chamber music. He connects the composer’s memories of his childhood with his particular interest in the cello.
78 Xenakis, *Akéa*. 
work in blocks. Activity within a block remains the same but differs fundamentally from what happens in the next one’.\textsuperscript{79} The composer replied:

Yes, it’s like sentences. In the philosophical statements made by ancient Ionian philosophers . . . you have adjoining sentences that differ sharply in content. There is no need to provide connecting lines.\textsuperscript{80}

Despite Xenakis’s use of blocks, \textit{Akéa} does contain a number of connecting lines, as shown in Ex. 106. These are mostly employed as link passages between blocks of piano and string quartet writing and as such only serve to emphasise the impact made by the blocks they connect. Aurally, the effect is curiously one of \textit{solo} and \textit{ripieno}, a suggestion that supports the composer’s view of his music as comprehending ‘forms of expression used in the past’.\textsuperscript{81}

4. Group-fragmentation in the piano quintets of Riegger, Françaix and Ginastera

It is unlikely that either Riegger, Françaix or Ginastera knew the keyboard quintet works of Antonio Soler, even though Robert Gerhard’s edition was published in 1933. Soler frequently allotted smaller movements (e.g. Quintet IV, Minuettio II, organ solo, b. 172ff) to one instrument or a sub-group of instruments (e.g. Quintet V, IV Rondo, bb. 33-66 viola and cello duet, or bb. 66-99 two violin duet, bb. 246-249). This anticipated a trend in the early twentieth century of which the following are but a few examples. These quintets could be seen as attempting to avoid, at least part of the time, the issues of blending fundamental to the piano quintet.

\textsuperscript{79} Varga, \textit{Conversations}, 143.
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid., 143.
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., 50.
Wallingford Riegger’s Piano Quintet, op. 47 (1951), demonstrates how the ensemble can be manipulated. The work’s traditional overall format of three movements, fast (Allegro) - slow ($| = 80$) - fast ($| = 72$), contains prolonged moments for strings alone; this type of discourse (a monologue), occurs only once in the piano: in the first 20 bars of the first movement. The extent to which the composer uses the string quartet alone (twice in the first movement, and in one extended sequence, 100 bars long, at the opening of the third movement) suggests a deliberate use of the division between piano and strings (see Ex. 106.)

Ex. 106. Riegger, Piano Quintet, op. 47, 1-41

When this kind of ensemble fragmentation is employed in the work as a whole, it can assume a structural role. The piano quintets by both Jean Françaix and Alberto Ginastera illustrate how a variety of instrumental scoring in
individual movements can shape the overall impact, and musical detail, of a work. Françaix’s *Bagatelles* (1932/1980) can be seen as a progression from the use of individual instruments towards unification; but the work also contains several other unifying elements.\(^2\) The movements are linked either by an overlapping final chord, or a direction of ‘*attacca*’ at the end of a fermata bar. However, given the relative brevity in terms of duration (30” to 2’) of the individual *Bagatelles* and the constant play between slow and fast tempi and instrumentation, the work is more integrated than its scoring implies. (See Fig. 2.)

Fig. 2. Françaix, *8 Bagatelles for String Quartet and Piano*, scoring of the 8 movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bagatelle 1</th>
<th>Violin 2 and ’Cello</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bagatelle 2</td>
<td>Solo Viola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagatelle 3</td>
<td>Solo Violin 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagatelle 4</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagatelle 5</td>
<td>String Quartet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagatelle 6</td>
<td>’Cello and Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagatelle 7</td>
<td>String Quartet and Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagatelle 8</td>
<td>String Quartet and Piano</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Françaix’s work employs a broadly accumulative sense of

---

\(^2\) At the time of writing (2010), the date of composition of this work remains unclear. The composer’s autograph has the date of 27/07/1980; this could be the date of the revised version, though the piece is listed as first being performed by the composer at the ICPNM in Salzburg in 1932. Muriel Bellier, *Jean Françaix* in *Grove Music Online*, [http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/10083](http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/10083), accessed 07/01/2011, 1.
instrumentation, Ginastera’s piano quintet (1963) uses the full scoring of piano and string quartet in alternating movements, separated by string or piano solo Cadenzas. (See Fig. 3.)

Fig. 3. Ginastera, Piano Quintet, scoring within the 7 movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Introduzione</th>
<th>Piano and String Quartet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Cadenza I</td>
<td>Viola and ‘Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Scherzo fantastico</td>
<td>Piano and String Quartet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Cadenza II</td>
<td>Violins I and II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Piccola musica notturna</td>
<td>Piano and String Quartet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Cadenza III</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Finale</td>
<td>Piano and String Quartet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ginastera’s work makes extensive use of ensemble fragmentation, both in terms of the compositional structuring of individual movements, and in the conversational details of scoring. In the third movement the music becomes less predictable as it moves away from the note rows established at the beginning of the movement. Here the connection between musical language, structure and instrumental conversation coalesces.

5. A preoccupation with timbre: Ginastera, Hovhaness, Henze, Feldman and Adès

---

In the middle of the twentieth century, there was generally, as previously mentioned, an increased emphasis on timbral blending. However, not all composers approached this issue consistently. With Ginastera, for instance, stylistically his Piano Quintet (1963) belongs to that period of his composition to which he himself referred as ‘neo-expressionist’, a time in which he drew on a broad range of influences.\textsuperscript{84} Michelle Tabor claims that, at this time, ‘he was not compositionally wedded to any particular compositional method’.\textsuperscript{85} A range of devices, from serial elements to poly- and microtonality, inhabits the Piano Quintet, as does a versatility of scoring.\textsuperscript{86} In the next example, the piano is successfully blended into the ensemble through its clever use of brief gestures at a high tessitura, which integrate with string harmonics and high \textit{col legno}. (See Ex. 107.) And yet the opening of the work is distinctly conservative in its antiphonal use of piano and string quartet. (See Ex. 108.)

So, for all its innovation, not least in the combination of possible sounds, Ginastera’s work does retain some traditional features. The rhythmic dialogue of the semiquavers in Ex. 108 can be seen as a communication between piano and strings that, in terms of this genre, go back to the scoring of Saint-Saëns’s piano quintet, as seen, for instance, in Ex. 26 of Chapter 3.

\textsuperscript{85} Tabor, ‘Ginastera’s Late Instrumental Style’, 2.
\textsuperscript{86} N.a., Introduction to Alberto Ginastera, \textit{The Piano Collection}. USA: Boosey & Hawkes, 1991.
The attempt to blend piano with strings revealed a number of new approaches. In some quintets, the piano assumed an almost passive role. One of the most distinctive examples of this occurs in Hovhaness’s Piano Quintet op. 9 (1963). The composer suggests that the piano pedal be held down throughout the movement, resulting in an accumulative activating of overtones in response to the
work’s opening viola solo. (See Ex. 109.)

Ex. 109. Hovhaness, Piano Quintet, op. 9, I, 1-4

The scoring of this movement offers the piano as a texturally integrated instrument, given that its single-line sequences connect to and enhance the continuous string lines, yet much of the piano’s contribution comes from the merging of its overtones, activated by the musical activities of the stringed instruments.

Another work that reveals its composer’s attempts to connect the individual instruments through timbral interaction is Hans Werner Henze’s Piano Quintet (1990/91). Full integration into the body of strings by the piano is achieved by mostly restricting the single-line piano textures to the pitch range inhabited by first and second violins. (See Ex. 110.)

This single-line piano part is not the only way in which timbral interaction is achieved. The piano part frequently plays reading from three (and occasionally four, Mvt III, bb. 125-132) staves. Perhaps a precedent for this approach can be
found in the solo piano works of Debussy, namely his Preludes, Book 2 (1912-13), no. IV, *Les fées sont d'exquises danseuses*, in which the distribution of the musical narrative across three staves enables different timbres to be identified.

Ex. 110. Henze, Piano Quintet, I, 23-24

This offers the pianist a greater sense of clarity in the reading of a virtuosic part. It also highlights the way in which the string and piano parts are melded timbrally. Rhythmically, all five parts complement each other, with not one line dominating to such an extent that it detracts from the cohesion. (See Ex. 111.)
Morton Feldman’s overwhelming desire to employ sound ‘for its own sake’ meant that he was obliged to interrogate tradition as regards scoring and the notion of instrumental ‘conversation’. He maintained that:

Only by un-fixing the elements traditionally used to construct a piece of music could the sounds exist in themselves — not as symbols, or memories which were memories of other music to begin with.  

Feldman’s Piano Quintet (1985) may be considered one of the most individual responses to this medium. John Warnaby describes Feldman’s quintet for clarinet and string quartet (1983), as ‘the essence of his most extended creations, and shows how a discourse could be generated by systematically permutating basic patterns’. Feldman’s piano quintet, a single movement work of over one hour’s length, demonstrates a similar approach.

It is little concerned with form, even interaction between players; the focus

---

of the composition is instead on the exploration of sound and, to that end, the work moves from using only some string players and piano, to patterns of empty bars, during which a sustained string sound reacts to a diminishing piano chord. Much of the work’s instrumental conversation explores the timbral relationship between sustained and decreasing sounds, and between changing combinations of strings and a constant presence of the piano. (See Ex. 112.)

The score also demonstrates how timbre modulation enables a composer to avoid the use of traditional roles of instruments within the piano quintet formation, for example, a leadership function of the first violin, or a keyboard instrument’s ability to balance the string quartet as a united musical formation.

Ex. 112. Feldman, Piano Quintet, 1-6

Instead, David Cope observes the following:

With the composer’s increasing awareness of the subtle timbre alterations available in different registers of various instruments - muting, dynamics, attacks, and decays - comes the realisation that a wealth of timbre overlap

90 N.B. The piano part is written on one stave at the top of the system and the string quartet beneath.
exists between instruments.\textsuperscript{91}

As in Ex. 112 the piano part is written on one stave throughout. Possibly the result of notating a part whose tessitura involves notes from the middle register upwards, it could also reflect a perception of the piano as one of five equal participants in the piece. Arguably, the presentation of the score, in which the piano is positioned above the string quartet, conceptually identical to Xenakis’s \textit{Akéa}, does much to suggest this degree of ensemble integration. Musical integration is achieved largely by the use of subtle timbral alterations, all of which connect seamlessly to one another.

The development of the piano quintet in the nineteenth century was largely governed by the relationship between texture and structure, where texture often reflected a gap between piano and strings. This in turn led to the allocation of specific roles to particular instruments. It seems that much of the twentieth century saw, on the one hand, a continuation of this approach, and on the other, attempts to rethink the nature of musical conversation through a focus on timbre. How both have shaped the piano quintets by Bacewicz and Gubaidulina will be the subject of the next chapter.

In the one-movement Piano Quintet by Thomas Adès (2000), unification of the ensemble, both timbral and thematic, is a primary concern. Another is the creation of textures, while another is sound itself. All this is bound in a referential work, using tonality as one of its components. In short, therefore, Adès’s Quintet exhibits many of the approaches already seen here.

The materials of the work are small fragments, sounding as if they are either extracted from a larger, pre-existing idea, or the potential components of one latent in the work. The music sounds simpler than it looks: constant shifts of tempo by different parts of the ensemble are notated meticulously: a *rubato* is added in a ‘totally controlled manner’. Almost always, however, at least one voice moves in a regular pulse against this. The result is a successful blending of materials, for entrances and exits, whether they be by piano or strings, are often hidden in the texture.

Commentators such as Tom Service and Christopher Fox consider the work to be in sonata form, based on clearly identifiable first and second themes, as well as a repeated exposition, complete with a repeat sign (6 bars after Fig. 12). Service remarks, ‘For a composer who has transfigured tangos, distorted dance music, and warped waltzes, this engagement with the classical tradition seems surprisingly unmediated.’ The approach is not so simple, though: Fox observes obliquely that ‘the recapitulation also demonstrates the piano quintet’s debt to more Modernist versions of sonata-form’, and that, for all its apparently ‘traditional’ exposition material, the material that follows becomes increasingly free. Service suggests that the recapitulation is marked by ‘temporal compression’ and a ‘metaphor for transformation as well as return’. Indeed, the

---


95 Tom Service, ‘Adès: Piano Quintet, Schubert: ‘Trout Quintet’’, Arditti Quartet,
gestures used by some composers to identify major points of change (the end of
the exposition, or development, for instance) are not employed here. That is not
to say that the work is not sectionalised. Indeed, it is composed of a series of
contrasting textures, consistent within themselves, but these do not always serve
to articulate sonata form.

Thematic material in this Quintet is constantly referential, but references
usually consist of just a few notes, and are often hard to pinpoint. However, the
Solo Violin I theme that opens the work clearly recalls the opening of Brahms’s
Piano Concerto no. 2 in Bb, op. 83. (See Exxs. 113a and b.)

Ex. 113.

a) Adès, Piano Quintet, 1-7 (Violin I solo)

b) Brahms, Piano Concerto, op. 83, opening theme

Thereafter, this idea, the main theme of the first subject group, is
examined forensically: there is great play on the opening three notes, while the
whole is rhythmically altered, melodically inverted and expanded in many ways.
It moves to the piano immediately after the violin solo (the violin continuing to

members of the Belcea Quartet, Corin Long and Thomas Adès, EMI Classics, 7243 5 57664 2 7,
CD liner notes, 3.
play, now contrapuntally, in regular metre, against the piano) and then, at fig. 2, to the three lower strings, echoed chromatically by piano. (See Ex. 114.)

Ex. 114. Adès, Piano Quintet, Fig. 2, later entrance of 1st theme in lower strings.

So, throughout this section, three separate materials are being played, by piano, Violin I and a group of the three lower strings. The Violin I material soon spreads, however, and because of this and the uncertain rhythm and ubiquitous nature of the main motif, the ensemble is united.

A passage of pure texture follows at Fig. 3. Two blocks, each consisting of piano L.H., busy in its bottom register, with \textit{pizz} and high harmonics above, are separated from each other by a small fragment on string quartet alone. This fragment anticipates the subsidiary theme, seen at Fig. 4, and played antiphonally by string and piano. (See Ex. 115.)
This, particularly with regard to its clarity of texture, seems to anticipate the second theme. A large amount of textural material based on this melodic idea is repeated in strings almost verbatim, Figs. 4, 6-7; two piano parts, separate in each hand, play busily against this with ostinati, or quasi-ostinati.

The second theme is also based on a simple melodic line, less fragmented and therefore more memorable, which can be expressed as shown below, as the alternative notation beneath the stave indicates. It is reminiscent (in a generic way) of the first theme of the Scherzo of Schubert’s 6th Symphony. (See Ex. 116.)

Ex. 116.

a) Adès, Piano Quintet, Fig. 8
Ex. 116. cont.

b) The same melody in 3/4:

\[ \text{\includegraphics{image}} \]

c) Schubert, Symphony No. 6, II, theme

\[ \text{\includegraphics{image}} \]

The theme is then repeated straightforwardly, and then again, distorted. Throughout this, strings act as an accompanying backdrop. The rest of the exposition is given to manipulation of this theme, moving to hosts of descending scales in all parts with outbursts of $fff$ in an exciting fusion of sound. (See Ex. 117.)

The music drives forward to the antiphony of Fig. 10, marked $ffff$: insistent low Bs on piano (its second lowest note) are pitted against the strings. Then, surprisingly, there is a change to a dreamy section of high strings, B minor chords in piano L.H. held by the sostenuto pedal, with staccato fragments in R.H. above: a huge change of colour, all melded together, concluding in Bb major tonality via an oscillation between the notes F and D. The exposition is then repeated.
*N.B. because of the irregularity of where the bar lines occur (i.e. not aligned across the ensemble), bar numbers are taken from the piano part.

In truth, the ‘development’ section occupies the rest of the work. While material from the exposition returns, it never does so literally, and there is no sense of an articulated beginning to the recapitulation. Neither does the first theme return in any clear sense. This section, as before, moves forward in blocks or sub-sections. It begins with lyrical, *rubato* piano against *legatissimo*, fast-moving (metrically constant), strings. The next block, at Fig. 15, is reminiscent of the antiphonal strident chords at Fig 10, with here, an articulated low B in piano L.H. Another, new, extended texture appears at Fig. 16. The piano offers some sort of stability as it presents a series of long, polyphonic, upward-moving phrases, muddied by the pedal, each starting low. They begin, respectively, at the bottom of the keyboard: on bottom A#, B, A, and B, the last ascending phrase

---

returning to the depths at Fig. 17, to start on D. Against them, strings all engage in swelling double stops, part of an overall crescendo.

The next section (Fig. 17, 4 – 18) is a long, homophonic, showcase of timbre for strings. The tone-colour (rather self-consciously, perhaps) moves from *sul pont. (senza vib.)* to *sul tast*o to *ord.* to *flautando* to *senza vib.,* and so on. It memorably introduces a variation on the second theme on piano, played in short phrases high up, with string drones below. Strings, continuing their web of sound, become restive.

In a new section at Fig. 19, a true melding of sound is accomplished as Violin I and viola pluck triple stops, Violin II and cello play dyads, *molto sul tast*o, *flautando,* and the piano arpeggiates *ppp* triads in the middle of its register, pedal down. The sound grows somewhat more forceful; at Fig. 20, we hear a reminder of the texture at Fig. 3 (with the low piano ostinato) and then the subsidiary theme of Fig. 4. A reminiscence of the scales heard shortly after Fig. 9 then occurs, but now in the piano alone.

This last section is another *tour de force* of integration: with strings in pairs and piano separate, they all play the same kind of material and create a dense web of sound. It is crowded and almost unintelligible, like chiming church bells heard in a fast peal. Glimmers of tonality continually emerge, and the work ends on a (somewhat surprising) C major perfect cadence.

This work, truly of its time, incorporates tonal melodies, a Webernian sense of individual sounds, innovative approaches to rhythm and a great concentration on the blending of timbre, undoubtedly derived from the now-
traditional electronic approach to composition. It represents a huge aesthetic, as well as technical, feat and takes the piano quintet into new realms.
Chapter 6. The piano quintets of

Grażyna Bacewicz and Sofia Gubaidulina

This study concludes with the examination of three piano quintets by celebrated women composers from different generations: two by the Polish composer Grażyna Bacewicz, and one by the Russian (later German resident) Sofia Gubaidulina. Bacewicz’s works represent very different phases of her compositional life, and Gubaidulina’s, an early work that parallels, to some extent, Bacewicz’s first, though is also somewhat more exploratory; Bacewicz’s second quintet approaches timbral investigation enthusiastically. In some ways, then, the three works can be seen as a metaphor for the infiltration of women composers into the twentieth-century mainstream, at first, tentative, then growing in confidence. Thus the three works offer an interesting and different perspective on the twentieth-century piano quintet.

In the 1950s and 60s, the USSR attempted to organize every part of artistic life in the Soviet Union, affecting the music of composers who lived under this regime, including those in Warsaw Pact countries.¹ As Sally Billing points out, the introduction of a ‘cultural policy’ in Poland in 1948 promoted music that was ‘socialist in content and nationalist in form’.² This policy encouraged a certain nationalism (showing the influence of folk music, for instance), transparency and accessibility.³

On the face of it, Bacewicz seems to have been acquiescent to all this. But as Terree Lee Shofner advises, the nationalist aspects of Bacewicz’ work (specifically, her use of folk-music) should be seen in the context of a ban on Polish art during the German occupation of Poland in the Second World War. Therefore this musical trait may be considered as much an expression of (Polish) political independence and identity as of Socialist thought. Furthermore, the transparent textures of Bacewicz’s first piano quintet reflect neo-classical tendencies as much as socialist realism. She had, after all, studied with Nadia Boulanger, one of the principal teachers of the neo-classical style, in Paris in 1932-33. Bacewicz herself observed,

[A]s far as my music goes — for a long time I wrote neoclassically, in other words, combining today’s harmony and instrumental texture with classical forms.

It could be suggested, in view of her status as a leading exponent of Polish music in the 1950s and 60s and a lack of documented disagreements with the communist state, that critics such as Adrian Thomas have overestimated the importance of political ideology in her music.

The traditional elements in Gubaidulina’s only Piano Quintet also reflect the influences of both ‘socialist realism’ and neo-classicism. The connections between her training and an ideologically-shaped musical style are more apparent, however. Although she claims that she was not actively part of the political system in her student days, she was influenced by one of the main exponents of Soviet music of the period, Dmitry Shostakovich, the symbols’ were in accordance with Lenin’s principles of ‘learning from the classics’.


6 Adrian Thomas, *Grażyna Bacewicz: Chamber And Orchestral Music* (Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1985), 35.
recipient of enforced Soviet ideology.\textsuperscript{7}

When considering the influence of Shostakovich on the younger
generation of composers in his extended circle, Elizabeth Wilson suggests that
‘by the late 1950s, they were experimenting in compositional techniques that
Shostakovich himself had rejected’.\textsuperscript{8} However, she also observes that prior to
this rejection, Shostakovich’s style served almost as a compositional model.
She states,

[C]omposers such as Sofiya [Sofia] Gubaidulina . . . started to
compose in the ‘Shostakovich’ tradition, which was seen by the more
enlightened Conservatoire teachers as the ‘positive’ side of socialist
realism’.\textsuperscript{9}

From 1954 to 1959, Gubaidulina studied composition with Nikolai
Peiko, a former student, then assistant, of Shostakovich, at the Moscow
Conservatoire. Karen (nephew of Aram) Khatchaturian, who studied
composition with Shostakovich from 1943 onwards, described his teacher’s
approach to composition as follows:

Everything he said was very much to the point, and his attention to
detail was always of great relevance in the context of the whole.
However, most of his comments concerned matters of form and
instrumental texture.\textsuperscript{10}

Such preoccupations were seemingly shared by younger composers at
the Moscow Conservatoire. Gubaidulina herself claims,

Dimitri Shostakovich and Anton Webern have had the greatest
influence on my work. Although my music bears no traces of it, these
two composers have taught me the most important lesson of all: to be

\textsuperscript{7} Michael Kurtz, \textit{Sofia Gubaidulina: A Biography} (Bloomington & Indianapolis:
Indiana University Press, 2007), 138. Gubaidulina’s ‘First Encounters with the Communist
System,’ are documented by Kurtz in his biography of the composer. ‘Early Encounters’ for
Gubaidulina included the Leninist principle that ‘lies were an acceptable means of defence in
emergencies’. This concept was, for Gubaidulina, ‘a real eye-opener on the whole system’, 22.
\textsuperscript{8} Wilson, \textit{Shostakovich}, 300.
\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., 299.
\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., 184. Here Wilson quotes from a recorded interview between herself and
Karen Khachaturian in 1943.
myself.\textsuperscript{11}

It should be noted that Gubaidulina made this statement to the German musicologist Hannelore Gerlach in 1978, at a time when her style had changed considerably from her student days. However far removed Gubaidulina may have felt by this time from the Zeitgeist of the 1950s, and with it the conventions of the Shostakovich circle, her decision to retain the Piano Quintet in her recognised oeuvre, albeit under ‘juvenilia’, acknowledges the quality of the work, despite its initial lack of success.\textsuperscript{12}

It appears that the different stylistic, if not political, influences on Bacewicz’s first and Gubaidulina’s only piano quintet resulted in similar outcomes. The textual transparency and rhythmic clarity of the neo-classical approach to scoring comes close to what in terms of socialist realism may have been considered ‘accessible’. Further, the folk elements in both works may also reflect general stylistic influences over the satisfying of the demands of the state.

\textsuperscript{11} Hannelore Gerlach, \textit{Fünfzig sowjetische Komponisten der Gegenwart} (Leipzig & Dresden, 1984) 163, quoted by Michael Kurtz in \textit{Sofia Gubaidulina}, 138. Gerlach took notes at every interview that she conducted with composers that were relevant to her study prior to the 1984 publication of her book. She only interviewed Gubaidulina once, yet no notes remain of the session. Kurtz explains that Gubaidulina had requested ‘the opportunity to think more carefully about Gerlach’s questions and prepare written answers, which Gerlach later received’. Kurtz notes that what Gubaidulina wrote contained such a ‘succinct and clear expression’ of her attitudes to composition that they have been quoted numerous times over in articles and programme notes.

\textsuperscript{12} Kurtz, \textit{Gubaidulina}, 44. Gubaidulina composed her Piano Quintet in her third year at the Moscow Conservatoire. It was submitted as part of her final examination portfolio in June 1959; one of the examination panel was Shostakovich. In both an informal setting (the home of Shebalin for a ‘Friday evening gathering’) and the first official performance (November 1958) of the Piano Quintet, Gubaidulina played the piano part alongside the Armenian string quartet, Komitas (A. Gabrielian & R. Davidian – violins, H. Talalian – viola, S. Aslamazian – cello). Kurtz writes that the concert was reviewed in the \textit{Sovetskaja muzyka}; the Piano Quintet receiving a ‘modest and inhibited interpretation’ by the Komitas Quartet. The month quoted by Sikorski for the official premiere is April, yet Kurtz writes November. The work was not published until 1990.
Bacewicz’s Piano Quintet No. 1 was premiered in 1952 by, quite possibly, the composer with the Krakow Quartet.\textsuperscript{13} In fact, Bacewicz was a highly skilled performer on both violin and piano. The work was composed at a time (1948-1956) when the Soviet regime controlled all aspects of ‘artistic expression’.\textsuperscript{14}

Bacewicz’s self-confessed use of classical forms is clearly documented in this piano quintet, a work in four traditional movements. The first movement \textit{Allegro} is framed by two slow sections, this may well account for a further re-working of convention. The slow movement appears third, and the scherzo-like \textit{Presto}, second. The relationship to traditional forms is cemented by the use of quasi-fugal material in the last movement. Shofner adjudges Bacewicz’s compositional approach ‘conservative’, claiming ‘it was not natural for her to quickly assimilate new compositional concepts’.\textsuperscript{15} But she also acknowledges another significant characteristic: the integration of folk-music elements into the works.\textsuperscript{16} This is certainly the case in the first Piano Quintet.

This characteristic, revealed, in particular, in the use of an \textit{Oberek}, a traditional Polish folk dance, in the second movement, has been linked by Billing to Szymanowski’s influence, less so, the influence of politics.\textsuperscript{17} This interpretation would support Lutosławski’s recollection that ‘[Bacewicz] was

\textsuperscript{13} Billing, \textit{Bacewicz}, 234. It is unclear whether Bacewicz premiered the first piano quintet with the Krakow Quartet or whether her brother, also a pianist, premiered the work with the same quartet. Both performed the work and according to Billing, Grażyna Bacewicz is listed first as having played this on 16 November, 1952.
\textsuperscript{14} Shofner, \textit{The Two Piano Quintets}, 14.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 16.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 16.
\textsuperscript{17} Billing, \textit{Bacewicz}, 38.
to a great degree independent from the atmosphere surrounding her’.

Within the overall use of established forms, a hallmark of the piece is its use of short solo phrases that have a structural purpose, as either linking passages or introductions. Here, Bacewicz’s skills as a performer on both violin and piano come to the fore, for example in the convincing use of solo cello in Mvt II, bb. 129-131. Where the solo piano (both a harmonic and melodic instrument) has always lent itself well to linking material, Bacewicz achieves this successfully for a solo stringed instrument too.

The instrumentation reveals a clear instrumental separation, keyboard/strings, of the sort found in the accompanied keyboard sonata of the classical period, though in general the distribution of thematic material here favours strings over piano. There is also an exploration of individual timbres: the piano, for instance, is often used percussively and Violin I occasionally emulates it.

Mvt I. *Molto espressivo - Allegro*

The first movement of the Piano Quintet no. 1 is in sonata form, though the second subject, while moving traditionally from dominant in the exposition to tonic in the recapitulation, is altered considerably when it returns. This can be seen as an illustration of Hepokoski and Darcy’s view that ‘Sonata Theory, too, is concerned with “ruled-governed deformation”’. Modernist symmetry is also revealed here, however, as a 33-bar slow introduction (*Moderato molto espressivo*, beginning on B) returns as a coda, though transposed up a semitone to C and with some minor alterations in the piano part. In both

---

18 Shofner, *The Two Piano Quintets*, 17.
20 Ibid., 19. Shofner describes the first movement of Bacewicz’s first quintet as an
these framing sections, strings form a *tutti* of sustained chords, while the piano is allotted gently expressive, melodic material, moving in and out of the *tutti.*

(See Exx. 118a & b.)

Ex. 118. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no.1, I

a) 1–4

It could even be claimed that, during the introduction, Bacewicz attempts to example of ‘single-movement sonata form’ whose frequent, expanded (though not rondo-like) use of thematic ideas is ‘cyclical’. The movement possesses a clearly defined exposition and recapitulation, and a brief, though discernible development, which is a rhythmic diminution of the first theme, pitched a fifth higher.
meld the instruments as much as possible, hampered only by the piano’s basic inability to sustain chords in the manner of the strings.

The dreamy atmosphere of the introduction is broken at bb. 34-35 when the piano suddenly provides a descending rhythmic quaver passage on A/E, in groups of three then two, introducing the exposition. This is the first of many of the short solo passages mentioned earlier which serve to ‘fill the gaps’ between the larger sections of the piece.

A lively first theme, referring at its start to A minor but moving chromatically thereafter, is introduced by Violin I (b. 36). (See Ex. 119.) Its rhythm, with its accented quaver notes, permeates the first subject section. Not only that, but its very opening motif, A-B-A, could be seen to generate certain critical aspects of the work itself, as will be shown below.

Ex. 119. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 1, I, 36-40, Theme 1

The accompaniment, also emphasising rhythmic quavers, surrounds the theme. It employs the rest of the ensemble in twos and threes. Piano and strings are often conjoined: for instance, at b. 40, both Violin II and piano R.H. play above Violin I, leading to an amalgamation of their sound. The strings
gradually consolidate against the piano, however, leading to a \textit{f} climax, marked \textit{energico} (b.59). This divides the first subject section in half, for the piano then takes possession of the first theme, a major third higher. Thus the roles of the two main groups are exchanged. But at the same time, the accompaniment begins with chords played on both piano and strings (piano below, strings above). (See Ex. 120.)

Ex. 120. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 1, I, 59-60

For a brief moment, there is an integrated \textit{tutti} as the theme’s motif is passed amongst the ensemble, but then the two groups separate again. A clearly antiphonal dialogue occurs: \textit{staccato} (piano) \textit{versus} \textit{legato} (strings) over 16 bars (bb. 66-80). This gradually subsides as the piano (again) leads into the main theme of the second subject group.

However, this is delayed: the piano, in low tessitura, enters first, playing Romantic-style figurations that evoke lied-accompaniment; the cello enters in the next bar, but instead of presenting a song-like melody, it offers a minimal line of alternating C naturals and sharps. (See Ex. 121.) That this line
is not thematically significant within the second subject group is later confirmed by its absence from the recapitulation, yet its prominence here is curious and unusual. In fact, it anticipates the semitonal alternation which proves a feature of the third movement, as will be seen later, and may indeed also echo the opening motif of the piece, A-B-A, the linking interval being here reduced to a semitone.

Ex. 121. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 1, I, 98-108

Regardless of the implications of the cello entry, the chamber-like texture of the second subject material clearly separates it off from the more tutti-based first. The second theme eventually arrives, 10 bars later at b.107, on viola (‘en dehors’); the music builds rapidly, using unmmeasured tremolos in strings, against arpeggiated semiquavers in the piano. An f climax is reached at b. 124, the end of the exposition. At this point, rather as in the Franck Piano Quintet, pauses separate contrasting phrases on the string quartet and piano, emulating dramatic spoken dialogue (or even the improvisatory tone of a
cadenza, with their ‘poco rubato’ markings). They also emphasise Bacewicz’s proclivity for the linking of solo phrases, mentioned earlier, and the division of piano and strings.

The development section (b.158) unrelentingly exploits Theme 1, with strings sometimes in pairs, sometimes tutti. The piano is, separately, chordal. Thus the oppositional division, piano/tutti strings, continues. In a classic end-of-development-section climax at b. 187ff, strings play together in the treble clef, piano R.H. trills on Bb for four-and-a-half bars, and piano L.H. ascends then descends to the recapitulation at b. 194.

The recapitulation of the first theme remains faithful to the exposition until b. 212 where preparation for the second theme, now in the tonic, begins. At b. 236, the tempo changes to 6/8, and the solo piano provides a linking passage, preparing for the new metre. The viola melody (b. 107) now appears in piano (b. 241), while the texture is much thicker; the change in time signature serves to reduce the rhythmic intensity and the mood calms down as sub-units of the ensemble move antiphonally (and with subtle reference to the earlier ‘cadenza’) towards Tempo 1º at b. 272, where the introduction returns, up a semitone.

Mvt II. Presto

The second movement, as mentioned above, presents a simulated traditional Polish folk dance, the Oberek (Theme A).\(^{21}\) This movement too begins with a short introduction (bb.1-9), on string quartet, which continues as

\(^{21}\) Ibid., 31. Shofner defines an Oberek as a genre ‘in triple time with an accent falling on either beat two or three. Other members of this family are the mazur and kujawiak’. The Oberek is a traditional Polish folk dance from the Mazouia region of Poland. See also Billing, Bacewicz, 38.
accompaniment when piano R.H. introduces the dance theme. (See Ex. 122.)

Ex. 122. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no.1, II, 6-15

The thematic focus on the piano throughout this first section is an exception to the (thematic) dominance of strings in this work; another occurs with the presentation of the second theme in the fourth movement, to be shown later.

The piano plays lightly over equally light accompanimental string chords, another separation of forces, solo-plus-accompaniment, as at the presentation of the second theme of the first movement. The transfer of the melody to strings at b. 33 coincides with the arrival of a subsidiary theme (bb. 33-46). At b. 48 there is a move to Violin I and piano, again recalling the reduction of forces for the second theme of the first movement, but with fragmented material and both instruments playing percussively (Violin I sul G, a strained sound, with retakes of the down bow), the sound is melded rather than dissected. (See Ex. 123.)

From here on, (conventional) conversations are now to be had between piano and strings: when one part is in quavers, the other, commonly,
is in semiquavers.

Ex. 123. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 1, II, 48-53

The central section, starting at b. 132, is set off from the first section by its calmer, *poco meno mosso*, character. After a 7-bar presentation of a melody on *tutti* strings, two protagonists, viola and piano L.H., take up parts of the melody at b. 141, the piano, the motif (E-F#-A-G#) from the beginning, but now deep in its register, the viola, the descending fourth interval at the end. This voicing recalls Shostakovich’s Piano Quintet (Mvt I, 17-25) where the viola and piano enter into a dialogue, and produces a marked timbral effect here. (See Ex. 124.)

Ex. 124. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 1, II, 141-155

When the first dance-like section returns at b. 168, it is repeated literally until b. 205 (see b. 47). The duo that began at b. 48 between piano and violin (see Ex. 123 above) gives way to more tutti-based material, marked *ff*. This is followed by a passage for strings alone, beginning at b. 229, Violins I
and II juxtaposed against lower strings. The piano enters again at b. 249, the rhythmic folk dance gathering momentum aided by a dramatic piano *glissando* at b. 256. The intensity is sustained until the dramatic repetition of the note A (bb. 297-300) on piano. The *Oberek* ends with a perfect cadence onto Bb, all five instruments playing *fff*.

The character of the outer sections of this movement confirms its traditional, divisional approach to the ensemble; the central section, with its emphasis on the registral separation of solo instruments, proves somewhat more radical.

**Mvt III. Grave**

The outer sections of this movement are based on a new *tutti*, chordal texture. The structure is quite subtle: though apparently in ternary form, the central section, which begins contrastingly, gradually develops into the material of the opening. At its arrival there is a moment of epiphany.

A piano solo begins it with an eight-bar, ponderous theme, low in the piano’s register. A bass ostinato of two neighbouring chords, their members connected by step wise motion, $C \rightarrow D$, $A \rightarrow Bb$ and $F \rightarrow F\#$, changes slightly at the end of the phrase. The piano voicing is rich, with effective use of octaves in both hands as part of these chords. At b. 9, the material is repeated with some variation, now overlaid with strings in polyphony, the viola perhaps revealing a melody in the middle of the texture, though strings are marked $p$, the piano, $mp$. (See Ex. 125.)

The central section begins at b. 42, but is again preceded, in typical Baciewicz fashion, by a linking passage, bb. 33-41. Here, two *tutti* phrases,
with harmonics in upper strings and repeated bell-like D minor triads in piano, are separated by a phrase of alternating quavers, B-C, in solo piano which anticipates this instrument’s material in the following section.

Ex. 125. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, No. 1, III, 1-11

At b. 42, the three lower strings offer a line of parallel chords whose regular 2-bar phrases show an affinity to folk-song, or possibly a hymn, with a countermelody in Violin I. (See Ex. 126.)

The piano RH continues its alternating-quaver-line, B-C, which gradually thickens. Piano L.H. joins the chorale at b. 54; both hands proclaim it majestically at b. 66 in full, diatonic chords while lower strings adopt the quaver pattern; at this point, all move $ff$ into the repeated first section at b. 76, which moment proves the climax of the movement.

The opening alternating chords are here accompanied by repeated
octave Es in the strings in a moment of great intensity. Thus is revealed that these alternating chords are the seed for the whole movement. Of course, they may be traced back even further: to the alternating notes in the cello solo in the first movement, and the opening motif itself.

Ex. 126. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, No. 1, III, 42-46

The music gradually dissipates; a move to harmonics in strings, coupled with a diminution of dynamics and voices, reduces musical tension and texture to the close. (See Ex. 127.) So, while this movement might seem conventional in its use of a traditional structure, the inherent balance of ternary form is subverted by the dramatic process revealed here.

Ex. 127. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no.1, III, 76-83
Mvt IV. *Con passione*

There is a clear demarcation between the very contrasting characters of the third and fourth movements. The introduction (bb. 1-10), *con passione*, is dominated by energetic semiquavers which generate the main textures of the movement. Strings combine homorhythmically, while the piano plays antiphonally against them in octaves, thus emphasising the timbral division. (See Ex. 128.)

Ex. 128. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 1, IV, 1-3

The piano sets the full tone of the first subject material: the L.H. plays a sustained line in octaves against the semiquavers in the R.H. But this is not the theme: this is introduced, successively and canonically, by Violin I (bb. 11-13), beginning on D; then Violin II a major third higher; then viola and cello in tenths appear two bars later (the cello on F# as was Violin II), and finally the piano, two bars after that, a fourth higher. This canonic treatment, lip-service to the notion of a fugue, therefore results in an almost-fully integrated *tutti* at b. 18. This is achieved in part because the piano was present at the start, its semiquavers also found in the theme itself. (See Ex.129.)
From here on, the material is generally antiphonal, with much separation of texture between piano and strings, until b. 29, where the two forces settle into a conversation of equals. At b. 33, they separate again, though cello is now linked with piano L.H. (See Ex. 130.)

This subsides into a completely new texture at b. 41, where the second subject begins.
The second theme is played on piano alone (bb. 41-48). The reduction of forces from first to second themes, a conventional move, thus occurs once again. The theme recalls, via its intervallic structure and 6/8 metre, material first used in b. 236 of the opening movement, a technique used by Schumann in his op. 44. Its character, also conventionally, contrasts with that of Theme I, given its metre and legato melodic lines. (See Ex. 131.) A countermelody is introduced at b. 49 on cello; it is joined later by the rest of the strings.

Semiquavers return in the development section (bb. 75-106) as does the time signature of 3/4. Initially these semiquavers appear as a moto perpetuo in Violin II and viola (bb. 75-89), with Violin I and cello playing a phrase, based on Theme I, in imitative entry, with Violin I returning for a
second entry after the cello.

Ex. 131. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 1, IV, 41-45

Piano follows (b. 84) and engages in dialogue with the cello. There is a huge drive (‘sostenuto grandioso’) towards the recapitulation at b. 107. Here, the antiphonal first subject is repeated literally for 10 bars; the move to the second subject integrates the instruments more. Theme II (bb. 129-138) is again in 6/8, but now is played by Violins I and II, with a piano accompaniment. Thus the interchangeability of instruments is emphasised again, if not their integration within an overall sound. The coda arrives at b. 138, the two groups pitched clearly against each other yet again.

In this early work, therefore, with its definite (neo-Classical) notions of clarity and transparency, discourse is overwhelmingly and conventionally between the two groups, piano and strings. Furthermore, the interchangeability of function of the instruments is a fairly conventional means of creating variety in repeated sections, and is a technique frequently found in Schumann’s op. 44 and Brahms’s op. 34.

But this quintet cannot be so easily assigned a single aesthetic viewpoint: in many ways, it sits on the cusp of the modern and the traditional. Formal structures are mostly traditional, but are sometimes subverted.
Further, the issue of timbre is often to the fore, and the instrumentation reflects both dramatic conversation and timbral investigation. As mentioned above, the strings mainly present the themes, while the piano is allotted many of the linking phrases; while fragmentation into smaller ensembles occurs frequently, this is more to create timbral effect than to engender discourse, as, often, only two instruments at a time are used (generally, one stringed instrument and piano), with a clear separation of registers. Though in many ways simple and apparently conventional, in this sense, the work is forward-looking.

2. Gubaidulina, Piano Quintet (1957)

Gubaidulina’s Quintet, like Bacewicz’s No 1, composed five years earlier, is a work that contains a number of traditional elements, including its approach to form.22 Gubaidulina states:

To my mind the ideal relationship to tradition and the new compositional techniques is the one in which the artist has mastered both the old and the new. . . . There are composers who construct their works very consciously; I am one of those who ‘cultivates’ them. And for this reason everything I have assimilated forms as it were the roots of a tree, and the work its branches and leaves. One can indeed describe them as being new, but they are leaves nonetheless, and seen in this way they are always traditional and old.23

The piano quintet is an ensemble for which Gubaidulina has not composed subsequently. Her later works reflect an interest in more exotic musical instruments, for instance, Silenzio (1991): Five Pieces for bayan, violin and cello, and works for mixed ensemble, like On the Edge of the

---

22 Michael Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina: A Biography (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 275. The Piano Quintet is one of Gubaidulina’s earliest works; in fact, it is the second officially published work, the first being Phacelia (1956), a vocal symphonic cycle.

Abyss, for 7 Cellos and 2 Aquaphones, 2002.\textsuperscript{24} In general, in later years, she has moved away from traditional genres and forms.\textsuperscript{25} The Quintet was composed in 1957 when Gubaidulina was studying with Nikolai Peiko at the Moscow Conservatoire. She had completed her third year there and needed to decide which specialism to pursue; she gave up piano lessons and concentrated exclusively on composition.\textsuperscript{26} The Piano Quintet was written shortly after this decision; at the premiere the piano part was played by the composer, so she was obviously quite accomplished on this instrument.

At first sight the work is conventional, anachronistic, or even ‘safe’ for a work composed in 1957, albeit in the Soviet Union where Western avant-garde music could only be studied clandestinely.\textsuperscript{27} It shows the marked influence of Shostakovich, particularly in its use of pedal-bass lines, which occur in three of the four movements. (The use of an ostinato in the piano’s mid-range replaces it in the third movement.) However, the language, though tonal, is quite chromatic and exploratory. Then, there are, unlike the Bacewicz Piano Quintet No 1, two central slow movements; the last movement, unusually, is a scherzo. Beyond this, the work reveals signs of timbral exploration. What permeates it most, however, is the rhythmic vitality of the themes, several of which have a subtle, folk-like flavour, and a clever use of rhythmic interplay which sometimes brings humour to the piece. The work also exhibits an assured, mature compositional technique, particularly for a

\textsuperscript{24} Kurtz, \textit{Sofia Gubaidulina}, Appendix B, 275-293.
\textsuperscript{25} The possible reluctance on the part of women composers to accept without question such aspects of a male tradition is discussed by Marcia Citron in her consideration of a putative women’s compositional style, in \textit{Gender and the Musical Canon} (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993), 145-164.
\textsuperscript{26} Kurtz, \textit{Sofia Gubaidulina}, 42.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 52.
26-year-old student.

Mvt I. Allegro

The opening movement of the four is in sonata form. As in Bacewicz’s Piano Quintet No.1, the triple metre invites, throughout this movement and the last, the play of the hemiola. There is no introduction; the movement begins with the declamatory statement of three chords in C major by all five instruments, of which the piano only plays on the first. This is followed by a distinctive pattern of quavers on piano alone. Though the metre is nominally 3/4, the theme wilfully crosses barlines in patterns of crotchets, $4 + 4 + 4 + 3$. This sets the scene, rhythmically, for the rest of the movement. In the first theme, also, the antiphonal relationship (with separate materials) of piano and strings straightway invokes an oppositional approach which prevails throughout the first subject. (See Ex. 132.)

Ex. 132. Gubaidulina, Piano Quintet, I, 1-6, Theme 1

The piano’s part becomes a quaver-monologue in octaves turning into crotchets at b. 15, inviting the appearance of the quaver theme in the string parts. In the first of such passages, the quartet is reduced to a group of three,
the solo moving from Violin II back to piano R.H. (b. 26). The theme returns at b. 33, now chromatic. The ensuing texture for the rest of the first subject remains antiphonal, piano v. strings, and very straightforward. A hint of legato writing appears here, hidden in the antiphony; this will be exploited in the development section, along with the cantabile second theme.

The second subject group is, as is the convention, more chamber-like, with more use of solo strings. Theme 2, which begins with a hemiola, is presented in Violin II in Eb minor over a tonic bass pedal, in thirds, Eb/Gb, in repeated crotchets in piano L.H. Such a bass pedal note will prove ubiquitous in this work. This device is common in Shostakovich’s music, and recalls its use in his Piano Trio No. 2 (1944); it is not one favoured in many of Gubaidulina’s subsequent compositions, however. Meanwhile, piano R.H. is treated as a separate instrument, a technique crucial in creating many of the timbres in this piece, and discussed previously, in Chapter 5, with regard to Shostakovich (but used little in Bacewicz’s Piano Quintet No.1). It complements and punctuates the violin part (b. 76ff). (See Ex. 133.)

Once the theme is announced in Violin II, string parts gradually accumulate canonically; the piano never articulates the theme, however, and drops out at b. 115.

---

28 Shostakovich was present at the committee meeting when Gubaidulina’s composition portfolio (including the piano quintet) was examined, and was encouraging towards Gubaidulina in her work. Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 45.
29 Ibid., 97. In 1971 she composed her String Quartet No. 1, a work that Gubaidulina describes as ‘grow[ing] out of a single pitch, from a common point’. It also asks of the players that they physically move from the centre of the stage to ‘the four corners of the stage’, where, in concentrating on their own part, they become unable to hear each other. Interestingly, this challenges the perception of ‘conversation’ between the four players, and rather like Ives’s Second String Quartet (1907-1913), fragments rather than unites the ensemble.
At b. 123, the development section begins. The repeated-note pattern of the opening three chords of the piano quintet becomes the motivic cell which, along with the *legato* material of the 1st subject and the 2nd subject theme, generates this section. Theme 1 is now presented dissonantly (F#/G), its material switched between piano and strings, with the piano declamatory and the strings less percussive. This exchanging of parts compares with similar instrumental treatment in Bacewicz’s first quintet: the clear classical structure of this movement invites such manipulation, which, as mentioned previously, is a traditional technique. During bb. 141-169, the second theme appears on solo piano, developed in the R.H. with constant play between triple metre and the hemiola, over the Eb-Gb pedal. The score even indicates ‘Quart. tacet al ® [b. 169]’. Textures and conversations are built up cumulatively, using the second theme, from b. 178 onwards; thereafter there are seldom any bars without the crotchet pedal, either in piano or strings: piano pedal notes appear at 178ff, first, B for 67 bars, then at b. 236, F; the *pizz.* cello placed above the low B pedal recalls again Shostakovich’s Piano Trio No. 2. (See Ex. 134.)
Ex. 134

a) Gubaidulina, Piano Quintet, I, 178-193

![Sheet music image]

b) Shostakovich, Piano Trio, no. 2, op. 67, II, 229-233

![Sheet music image]

The pedal note eventually moves to Ab (G#), at b. 287, when the rhythmic force is intensified to ff. At b. 317, a three-note bass ostinato (piano L.H.), Db-C-F, plays for 35 bars. In this passage, the tutti illustrates Gubaidulina’s ability to merge the group timbrally: in repeated crotchets, the inner string voices drive melodic development while outer strings frame this with pedal-like repeated notes, E/A; the piano ostinato, low in its range, continues registral separation while the R.H. chords help meld the whole. (See Ex. 135.)
This introduces the C major recapitulation. For the first 38 bars of the first subject group it is almost identical to the opening of the movement; however, the legato subsidiary material of the first subject group is omitted, and the second theme is presented down a non-traditional major 9th on cello, while the piano counter-material is shifted up a further octave and is thus made more prominent. This second theme material is extended considerably: canonic entries are added and piano R.H. is now included in the counterpoint; the whole merges into a quiet tutti at b. 439. This gives way to a solo piano, pp, link to a coda (bb. 473), using the first theme, whose main function seems to be to lead away from C major to the Neapolitan realm. The return is abrupt and surprising; all parts conclude on a full C major chord.

Mvt II. *Andante marciale*

The second movement, continuing the traditional approach, employs a ternary structure. Here, as before, its inventiveness relates to its detail of instrumental scoring and rhythm. Indeed, rhythmic vitality again permeates the movement, while another incessant tonic pedal proves a foil. Theme A is first presented
in the viola (F major) accompanied by cello in repeated crotchet dyads, with interjected, added colour from high piano. (See Ex. 136.)

Ex. 136. Gubaidulina, Piano Quintet, II, 1-4, Theme 1

Once this theme has been fully presented in the viola part (bb. 1-12 $pp$), it is played in its entirety by the cello (bb. 13-24) an octave below, returning to the viola (bb. 33ff) at a third higher (A major). In the cello version (marked $p$) the accompanying crotchet dyads are now played by the violins in their lowest tessitura; this timbral change ensures that the melodic line is still audible. The piano still interjects the dotted rhythm high in its tessitura, but now, against the cello in its lowest range, it intensifies the preoccupation with unconventional timbres.

Piano R.H. takes over the melody at b. 24, beginning in its middle range, below middle C, while tutti pizz. strings recede into the background. The theme is then passed between piano R.H. and viola, and the piano moves again to its highest range. A full-ensemble sound arrives at b. 45; even so, piano remains separate from strings, the R.H. returning to the interjections of the beginning and the L.H playing a crotchet bass pedal on an Ab minor triad. This dissipates, invoking antiphonal writing between the two groups.

A short four-part ‘cadenza’ (bb. 72-76) links Themes A and B, written,
unusually, for double-stopped viola and cello. (See Ex. 137.) This, in lower strings alone, increases the timbral expressivity of the work.

Ex. 137. Gubaidulina, Piano Quintet, II, 72-76, ‘cadenza’

![Sheet music image]

Theme B, at b. 81, remains in 4/4 time and retains the movement’s initial march-like quality. The piano enters with a fairly undifferentiated line (b. 79), but the use of a melody in thirds (Violins I and II) changes the tone quality subtly. (See Ex. 138.)

Ex. 138. Gubaidulina, Piano Quintet, II, 81-83, Theme B

![Sheet music image]

A recurring dotted rhythm on C#/Db on viola permeates this central section, while filled-out piano chords add depth and richness to the timbre. Various melodic fragments, none particularly noteworthy, appear in this
section, but the dotted rhythm is the overriding factor.

When Theme A returns (b. 145), it modulates back to F major, though an additional F# intrudes. The viola is now accompanied by the full ensemble in repeated crotchets (with the occasional dotted rhythm in piano), the strings quietly playing col legno. The piano, even quieter, eerily sets a military tone. The movement concludes rather like the first, with a pp crotchet chord played tutti.

Mvt III. Larghetto sensibile

The movement’s introspective character is established by a 12-bar introduction (strings, 8 bars; piano, 4 bars), which includes alternating G#s and G naturals, a feature that will return later. The movement proper is in ternary form (A-B-A), its outer sections simple and four-square: not only is the principal melody 16 bars long and regular, but everything in the A section moves in clear units of 16 bars. The theme occupies most of this section but a more chromatic 16-bar antiphonal, yet still legato, variant is also present, creating an a-a\(^1\)-a form. The A section begins with the plaintive Phrygian-like first theme (a), played on Violin 1 (bb. 13-44) and accompanied discreetly by the piano. (See Ex. 139.)

This theme, with its augmented second, may be a nod to the music of the Middle East, whence Gubaidulina’s paternal family had emigrated.\(^{30}\)

At the same time, its very regular phrase-shapes and modal language may also reflect her Tartar heritage. Gubaidulina explained that Tartar music could be heard everywhere at that time [1946] - as folk music and as compositions - on the radio, in the streets, on holidays. Willing or not, (See Ex. 139.)

\(^{30}\) Ibid., 3.
I soaked it up.\textsuperscript{31}

Ex. 139. Gubaidulina, Piano Quintet, III, 13-16, Theme A

Further, the simple accompaniment may evoke the Bayan, a traditional instrument rather like the accordion, used frequently by Gubaidulina in subsequent compositions. After the violin, the cello takes up the theme for the next 16 bars; Violin I plays a countermelody, moving into a high tessitura and extending the pitch-range considerably. At b. 45, the subsidiary, more chromatic, variant (a\textsuperscript{1}) appears. This is yet another 16-bar structure, but unlike the rest of the A section, emphasises the opposition of piano and strings: four bars of piano solo (containing a notable little glissando) are followed by four bars on string quartet plus piano, the piano continuing its own material; then all is repeated. A long duet (a) ensues between Violin II and viola, the melody now in C major on Violin II, with a separate chordal pp piano accompaniment, at the extremes of its range, enveloping the duet. This lasts 17 bars, the extra bar accounted for by the later entrance of the Violin II solo. The original melody (a) returns literally, on Violin I (b. 78), but as part of a full tutti: strings contrapuntal, piano with a variation of its original accompaniment. This too occupies 16 bars. Thus the whole A section, except for a\textsuperscript{1}, presents the strings as languorous soloists, the piano as sympathetic accompanist.

\textsuperscript{31} Andrei Ustinov, ‘Sofia Gubaidulina’s Hour of the Soul (Interview with Sofia Gubaidulina)’ Muzykal’noe obozrenie 3 (1994), 10, in Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 19.
The middle section (B), marked *Più mosso* (b. 94), begins with an irregular, playful, 14-bar piano passage very different from (A). The metre changes intermittently from 4 to 3 beats per bar, while staccato quavers and syncopations in piano R.H. intensify the sense of lightness. Piano L.H. produces a pattern of F-A octaves that gradually builds to a 3+3+2 dance rhythm giving relief from the stately, heavy, atmosphere of the rest of the movement. However, violins in unison soon enter over this, building to the next theme, and stifling the fun.

A new, four-square theme appears at b. 112, presented in canon, **ff**, by pairs of strings in octaves, against a piano with repeated triplet-quaver clusters played *martellato*. This offers marked dynamic contrast to the gentle first theme, though rhythmically they remain related. Far greater contrast was achieved with the preceding short rhythmic passage. (This is perhaps a weakness of the movement: that the 3+3+2 was not exploited further.) The melody employs repetition of a [♩♩♩] rhythm that proves very insistent, so this section is somewhat less balanced: its three phrases last 7, 7 and 8 bars. (See Ex. 140.)

Theme B stops abruptly at b. 134. The return to Theme A is accomplished in a highly dramatic way and involves a tussle between F natural and F#, recalling the introduction to the movement itself (where the alternating notes were G♮ and G#). The melancholy viola, on F#, diffidently attempts its introduction three times while the piano sustains discords.

The ensemble enters, **ff espressivo**, with a highly chromatic version, but this falters. The viola attempts again, twice, again chromatically. Then Violin I descends dramatically, F#-F♯-Eb-D-Db-C in high harmonics with
cello *pizzicati* two octaves beneath (not an entirely convincing combination of timbres), and announces the brief return of Theme I proper.

Ex. 140. Gubaidulina, Piano Quintet, III, 112-115, Theme B

The use of this dramatic device, with its faltering, broken phrases passed from one group to another, for the articulation of the junction of sections, recalls a similar idea at the end of the exposition of the first movement of Bacewicz’s First Quintet previously discussed, which itself recalled Fauré.

Theme I reappears at b. 158, now in piano R.H. rather than Violin I. The two 8-bar phrases of the piano melody are overlaid by a countermelody in Violin II, high in its tessitura, while Violin I and cello play the note A as natural harmonic. The effect is reflective and introspective.

The string quartet introduces the coda, a repetition of the opening. The subtle change is that, at the last four bars in the piano solo, the held chord, previously C-G-F-B in the L.H., is now more dissonant: G#-D#-G-C. The fourth movement begins *attacca*.
Mvt IV. *Presto*

The *Finale* is a triple-metre *toccata*-like *scherzo*, the concept of which may be seen as a re-working of the triple-metre ‘lighter’ finale format as found in the piano sonatas of Beethoven (op. 31, no. 2) and Schubert (D. 537). Formally, it is a rondo of sorts, though its various sections often run into each other, and the effect is of the continuous, though changing, presentation of the opening idea. It has two endings, found in two separate editions of the work, the first published by the Soviet Press, Musika, in 1965, and the second by Hans Sikorski, Hamburg, in 1990. This latter presents the ending not type-set, but written in Gubaidulina’s hand. In both versions, the coda, which begins at b. 464, uses the cello as a pedal in quavers, mostly on F# and C#, while the main melody is played in turn by Violin I, viola, then piano R.H. In the original *Musika* version, the piano phrase is followed by one on viola, then on Violin I. This last is swiftly joined by the other strings, and then the piano, to arrive at a *fff* triumphal close at b. 547.

In the later version, the coda is extended: the R.H. piano entry is altered and when it drops out, the cello moves to *tremoli* and is joined by Violin II. These two build to a *tutti*-strings *tremolo* which finally introduces the piano again, at the two extremes of its range. Strings play softly against it, *sul pont.*, and everything dissipates to a *ppp* conclusion: a huge contrast with the original ending.

The movement proper is linked to the first movement through metre and tonality (C major). The rondo refrain melody (A) is first established by the viola (bb. 9-17). Like the main theme of the third movement, it makes use of the augmented 2nd, perhaps another reference to Gubaidulina’s Middle-
Eastern heritage. A staccato-quaver pedal on the open C string in the cello part accompanies it. (See Ex. 141.)

Despite its folk-like references, the 8-bar melody is not at all four-square: it begins on the off-beat, creating an anacrusis; the subsequent bars divide into 3+4. Also, the first four phrases are unbalanced, consisting of a short introductory figure, then phrases of 6-8-9-8-9 bars.

Ex. 141. Gubaidulina, Piano Quintet, IV, 9-17, refrain theme (A)

An interjected figure, moving from pizz. strings to piano in crotchets, makes use of the hemiola again, auguring the playful use of this device throughout the movement. (See bb. 11-12 in Ex. 141 above).

The piano takes up the melody tentatively at b. 48 and wholeheartedly at b. 51. The staccato quavers persist until b. 87, where there is a shift in texture and the string quartet is presented in smaller groups. The piano (both hands) plays a contrary-motion motif that heralds the first episode (B, bb. 107ff). The key remains C major.

The contrast of the first episode, B, is in the legato, three-quaver
*ostinato* in the piano part (hands in contrary motion). The strings play chordally. (See Ex. 142.)

Ex. 142. Gubaidulina, Piano Quintet, IV, 106-115, episode (B)

At bb. 133-139, string duplets seem an attempt to meld with the piano *ostinato*. The texture changes at b. 143: the piano *ostinato* moves to Violin II and cello, while the viola plays a pedal in the middle, on its low G. This marks the return of the rondo refrain, A\(^1\), at b. 149. The melody returns on Violin I at b. 149, now up a third, while piano offers a separate commentary. The three-note *ostinato* moves back to the piano at b. 158, while its previous material moves into strings and a fused *tutti* is accomplished.

At b. 170, the next episode (C) begins. It is quite brief: all four string parts are in the treble clef, creating an intense, if somewhat strained sound, Violin I continuing with staccato quavers. (See Ex. 143.)

At b. 193, (A) returns once more, the theme in Violin II. It is punctuated not only with contrasts in articulation but also *glissandi* in Violin I (b. 197). The cello plays a C pedal, an octave above its lowest note, the inner strings retain the quaver momentum and the piano interjects its own, separate
material with rhythmic momentum.

Ex. 143. Gubaidulina, Piano Quintet, IV, 170-179, episode (C)

Another episode (D) begins at b. 231; it is introduced strikingly by a sudden contrast in texture, created by dynamics, articulation, and smaller instrumental grouping: Violin I, cello and piano only. (See Ex. 144.)

Ex. 144. Gubaidulina, Piano Quintet, IV, 220-226, episode (D)

In the D section, for a considerable amount of time, piano R.H. has an extended *ostinato*, underneath which a slow arpeggiated line in L.H. is sometimes placed. The two string parts meander around above it, slowly, almost ‘killing time’. This section is indeed a respite from the *scherzo*-like
mood of the rest. The violin and cello are at opposing poles of tessitura, connected only by the quaver movement of the piano. The discourse of three parts creates an unnerving, strangely cold texture, broken by the appearance of Violin II (b. 310) and the viola, in canonic entry (b. 314). The two inner string parts serve to fill the gap between the extremes of the outer ones. However, this is short-lived as the piano increases its pitch range (R.H. an octave higher and L.H. an octave lower) until the whole string quartet is sandwiched between the pitch extremes of the piano (b.323). Towards the end of this section, a crescendo builds into the next.

The rondo refrain (A) appears at b. 343 as a string tutti, completely changing the atmosphere. The piano again offers its own comments on this. The section is seamlessly connected to the next episode (E). Here, all five parts play ff (the strings on repeated down bows) and the piano part is marked martellato. The metre changes from 3/8 to 6/8; the contrary-motion, quaver-pattern phrases in the piano part merge, and the music becomes furious as the strings’ down bows move in 3/4 against the piano’s 6/8. (See Ex. 145.)

Ex. 145. Gubaidulina, Piano Quintet, IV, 375-379, episode (E)
The hemiola is a major feature now. The texture is a dense pattern of agitated sounds as the two sections, piano and strings, compete aggressively against each other. This builds remorselessly until b. 424, at which point the next refrain (A) appears: the piano plays the theme in octaves, its 6/8 pitted even more intensely against the 3/4 of the strings. This carries on until a $\textsf{fff}$ climax at b. 464 when the texture reduces dramatically. Cello returns to a $\textsf{p}$ quaver-pedal C#, and the coda begins. (See Ex. 146.)

Ex. 146. Gubaidulina, Piano Quintet, IV, coda, 480-487

In this quintet, the frequent implied reference to folk-based rhythmic material and seemingly traditional approach to form may reflect the influence of socialist realism. It may also, of course, reflect the work of a young composer not yet totally freed from the restraints of tradition. For Gubaidulina, of course, ‘tradition’ includes the influence of Shostakovich, as in the repetitious use of the single note, the sparse texture and pedal points.

Along with the use of traditional forms, the division of forces, piano/strings, is often emphasised, as at the antiphonal opening, or when the piano is used solo for short spaces of time (as in bb. 141-168 of the first movement), or even when the forces are pitted against each other simultaneously as at the dramatic climax of the last movement. On the other hand, rather as in Bacewicz’s Piano Quintet No. 1, Gubaidulina frequently writes for only two instruments at a time, though, except for the notable
passage in the first movement for viola and cello in four parts, almost always including a piano accompaniment. In all movements, timbral difference is emphasised by separating the registers, not just between piano and one stringed instrument, but between two stringed instruments as well.

As mentioned earlier, the use of the repeated note as a pedal in such circumstances is a strikingly common feature; generally in the bass, it is enunciated (separately) by both cello and piano L.H., and even sometimes the viola. It is also used occasionally in the treble register, though as an ingredient in repeated chords, as seen in the first movement. Placed low, in opposition to solo parts in higher tessituras, it emphasises a concern with timbre. So does the unusual use of double-stopped viola and cello mentioned above, in the first movement. The reduction of forces at other points achieves a similar result, for instance, sections for piano trio in the third movement (bb. 9-44) and the finale (bb. 232-309).

The use of canonic entries is another frequent textural tool and sometimes appears in a reduced ensemble. Movements III (bb. 13-44) and IV (bb. 12-56) contain prolonged passages in which these link tutti sections, not dissimilar to concerto grosso textures. Rather like Bacewicz’s Piano Quintet No. 1, this fragmentation of ensemble enhances (united) discourse.

The mixing of tone-colours almost inevitably draws upon a variety of performance techniques, though not perhaps as fluid as in Bacewicz’s Piano Quintet No.1, and maybe reflects the student Gubadulina’s less extensive experience of stringed instruments. But, as noted with regard to the fourth movement, there are remarkable and striking differences in the way that Gubaidulina uses staccato and legato within the quintet. The effect is
frequently sudden and transforms the character of the music. The use of *glissandi* also serves to punctuate the change from one theme to another, in an abrupt and surprising way. *Col legno* and *sul ponticello* in the string parts add colour and contrast to themes where rhythmic clarity or a change in mood might occur next. And yet, the new ending seems to indicate a belief on Gubaidulina’s part that the quintet as it stood in 1990 did not reveal a strong enough preoccupation with timbre; this ending certainly intensifies this preoccupation considerably, even if it imposes an apparently later, divergent, style on the ending of the work.

The quintet has remained in Gubaidulina’s worklist, at her specific request, despite her subsequent compositions being of a very different and timbrally-unusual character, perhaps because some of these traits are incipient here. In any case, in it, Gubaidulina mixes traditional and original elements in such a way as to create a work utterly worthy of the piano quintet canon.

3. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet No. 2 (1965)

In contrast to the two early works above, Bacewicz’s second Piano Quintet reveals a more dissonant harmonic language. By this time as Shofner observes, the composer was ‘consistently moving towards atonality’ and employed the 12-note row. At the same time, the work presents an original approach to form. Bacewicz’s first quintet generally follows an established four-movement format; the second, in three movements, is much freer in its structure, being built on the notion of constantly-changing timbres. Thomas

---

32 Shofner, *The Two Piano Quintets of Grażyna Bacewicz*, 68.
claims that by the 1960s Bacewicz’s music was lacking in ‘invention’ and in ‘defined thematic hierarchies’, yet fails to note that timbre became a hierarchy itself, one that dominates Piano Quintet No. 2.  

The Quintet commonly rejects traditional, narrative logic; instead, much of its discourse seems fractured. It not only appears to depart from the formal conventions adopted so readily by the First, but also demonstrates the development of Bacewicz’s own musical language. Her intimate knowledge of string, and indeed, piano, sonority, is highlighted here.

Mvt I. Moderato

The first movement is a sequence of carefully crafted episodes and motives; the same motif can employ different tempi and thus assume different characters. It can also appear, repeated literally, later in the movement, in another context. This ‘mosaic’ approach dictates the form; the order of materials is generally unpredictable. On occasion, the organisation seems more conventional, as when the dynamic drops at b. 116, and remains low for a contrasting, quiet section, with the occasional mf, until the f at b. 185, aided by the cello’s gettato (come percussione).

Most gestural fragments are repeated immediately at least once before the music discards them for something else. This offers the work some innate sense of balance, given that phrases are often two bars long, and perhaps proves the strongest link to the previous quintet. Other fragments come back later in the movement, for instance, (1) bb.19-24 return at 193-198; (2) bb. 26-32 return at 133-140; (3) bb. 33-34 return at 78-79 and 200-202, with an

---

33 Thomas, Grażyna Bacewicz: Chamber and Orchestral Music, 115.
immediate repeat at 204-5; (4) bb. 128-129 return at 197-181, and (5) bb. 175-177 return at 189 -192. Thus these long-range repetitions do not promote structural clarity, but, rather, confuse it.

However, while the general effect might sometimes seem that of almost indiscriminate placement, the components of repeated gestures take on considerable structural significance, for example the D pedal in piano L.H. contained in (3), which occurs four times. (See Ex. 147.) Its last appearance is at almost the end of the movement, so the final chromatic clusters serve to obliterate it.

Ex. 147. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 2, I, 33-34

Other components permeate many different gestures; despite the presence of a note-row, the most pervasive feature is the scale. This is clearly seen in the gesture at bb. 26-27, and its repeat, for instance, in piano L.H. Such scale patterns are commonly presented hemiola-fashion, crotchets sometimes lasting across 6/8 bars. (See Ex. 148.)

In the opening three bars of the first movement, a 12-note row,
minus F#, with a repeated D and doubled C, is presented in staggered entries, beginning on natural harmonics on Violin I and viola (therefore with a stress on the perfect 5th) with subsequent diminuendi on all five instruments indicating a concentration on individual sounds and colours not present in the neo-classical First Quintet.\textsuperscript{34} (See Ex. 149.)

Ex. 148. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 2, I, 26-27, piano only

Ex. 149. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no 2, I, 1-3

Gestures that begin with staggered entries permeate the entire quintet, for instance as at bb. 89-92, where the row appears again: this time all the

\textsuperscript{34} The F# appears in the Vc. in b. 4; this can be seen equally as either new thematic material or an extension of the 12-note row in bb. 1-3.
notes are present (many appearing as part of the trills or *glissandi*). Here, perf. 5th-interval entries become diminished 5ths. The use of strong dissonance (G-G# and Eb-Db-E, for instance) in this passage also contributes greatly to the language, but at the same time it contains tonal features, mainly because of the open fifths, A-D, G-C, and the repetition of the note D, which, as seen above, is important to the whole movement. The move towards atonality is therefore not so decisive as Shofner would have us believe.

In b. 14, the row completed, a tritone motif appears which conflicts for the first time with the opening motif of a perfect fifth. Thus it offers the metaphor of tonality versus atonality. Indeed, at b. 14, the row contrasts with the movement’s second material, whose melodic fragments are more tonal, moving through minor triads, A, D, G and C. (See Ex. 150.)

Ex. 150. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 2, I, 14-16

For the whole of the opening, bb. 1-14, the piano proves a ‘colouring agent’, adding rapid note clusters, blurred by the pedal, low in its register, to chords already established by the string quartet. Bacewicz uses the pedal to considerable timbral effect. At bb. 34-35, melding of timbre occurs because
the overtones of the piano and the open strings of the violins, viola and cello are intermingled. (See Ex. 151.)

Ex. 151. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 2, I, 34-35

N.B. the letters D and A above the violin 1 part, and G and D above the violin 2 part, denote the string the composer would like the performer to use to play those particular notes, creating a timbral effect in keeping with the tessitura of the other two instruments.

A little later, during bb. 42-50, the instruments are integrated in a tonal blur via the continuation of vibrations from the piano’s sustaining pedal. (See Ex. 152.)

A particularly memorable colour is achieved at the dynamic climax of the movement, bb. 83-96. Here the piano plays at both its extremes and the strings fill out the pitch-space between. The pedal is again a vital agent in creating the texture. There are three ‘gestures’: first, Vn I, viola and cello arpeggiate across three strings (Vn I in harmonics) while Vn II holds a D on the A string and trills, Ab-G, on the D string. The piano holds down the sustaining pedal all the while. This is followed by another gesture, equally intense, where trills occupy the whole pitch-range. Here, the inclusion of an open G string on cello accompanying the neighbouring trill, F#-G, on the C
string, adds much to the sonority. (See Ex. 153.) Again the sustaining pedal is held down throughout. This gesture is immediately repeated up a tone. This is a supreme example of the melding of the ensemble.

Ex. 152. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 2, I, 42-46

![Ex. 152. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 2, I, 42-46](image)

Ex. 153. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet no. 2, 1, 89-92

![Ex. 153. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet no. 2, 1, 89-92](image)

The musical material which follows this dynamic climax is another example. By separating the two hands of the piano part, Bacewicz creates a
six-part, unusually dense, block of sound. The piano’s voices begin by enveloping the strings’ registers, but move inwards over a period of eight bars, resulting in a gradual condensing of tessitura. (See Ex. 154.)

Ex. 154. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no.2, I, 97-104

However, despite the above examples, a totally unified sound actually occurs quite rarely in this movement. Much more fundamental is the separation of the two groups, solo piano and string quartet. The movement contains a myriad revelations of such division, for instance with regard to the above-mentioned repeated passage, bb. 175-177. This consists of isolated, repeated chords on upper strings, all triple-stopped, and a repeated semiquaver triplet on piano, spread across the two hands on the notes B and A#. The
rhythms of these two components interlock. At the repeat at bb. 188-191, the materials are rhythmically shifted so that piano underlies the string material differently. This again indicates that the materials are separate entities. (See Ex. 155.)

Ex. 155. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no.2, I

a) 175-177

b) 188-191

Another example of this phenomenon occurs at b. 60ff. Though this is a moment of integration, complete with sustaining pedal, the piano material is then extracted: repeated, it becomes a solo. At b. 66 it even takes on the mantle of a traditional cadenza. Both the above cases indicate that it is not just juxtaposition, but also superposition, that is at work here. And this, of course, emphasises the notion of separate forces.

Within the string quartet, there are a few examples of division into
smaller ensembles: cello alone appears at b. 188 and the quartet is divided into two pairs at the repeated section, bb. 19-24, and also at bb. 73-77. Here, the string writing is strikingly similar to a two-piano score. The performance instruction, *come percussion gettato*, only underlines the timbral aspiration of these bars. (See Ex. 156.)

Though the above passage is not ambiguous timbrally, Adrian Thomas observes with regard to the mid-1960s that ‘there is an underlying sense of creative tension in these years, not least because Bacewicz changed her mind on a number of occasions as to the best format for her music’.  

Ex. 156. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 2, I, 73-74

He points out that the first movement of the Concerto for Two Pianos, for example, is a revision of its equivalent movement in the Second Piano Quintet (1965), while the atmospheric second movements of both works are virtually identical.

As the above example (Ex. 156) shows, this Quintet tends to challenge the notion of what string quartet scoring might be. It is comparatively easy to imagine this excerpt as a two-piano score, in which Violins 1 and 2 represent

---

Piano 1, and viola and cello, Piano 2.

Mvt II. *Larghetto*

The structure of this second movement, to which the allusion of a note row is integral, is again an interwoven discourse of timbral colouring, created from a succession of ‘sound objects’, with, as in the first movement, some immediate repetition, and a return to the opening (bb. 1-6) towards the end (bb. 117-121) of the *Larghetto*. This opening of the movement sets out the quasi-note row. (See Ex. 157.)

The use of motivic material that is suggestive of a note row without using it in its entirety, nor applying serial techniques of composition, can be found through this quintet.

Ex. 157. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no.2, II, 1-6

*N.B. the letter D above the violin 1 part denotes the string the composer would like the performer to use to play that particular note, creating a timbral effect in keeping with the tessitura of the other three instruments*

Instead, the patterns formed by some pitch combinations take on the function of melodic material, for example the opening, turning motif, A>B>Bb (as
seen in the cello part). It constantly reappears in various guises: it begins and ends the material, bb. 17-29, and occurs three times in the cello in bb. 59-65. It generates the chromatic descent in the passage, bb. 73-77 (see both Violin I and viola), and thereafter the gestures beginning at b. 79, where the ‘tone-\textsuperscript{2}semitone\textsuperscript{2}’ pattern is augmented to ‘minor 3rd-\textsuperscript{2}semitone\textsuperscript{2}’. This latter material is used in the next movement too: bb. 80-81 appear in a modified form in Mvt III, bb. 2-4.

The timbral techniques employed in this movement emulate those in the first; however, there are fewer antiphonal moments. Ones that stand out in this regard are the brief piano interjections between tutti string passages at bb. 80 and 83, and also at bb. 101-6. (See Ex. 158.)

Ex. 158. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no. 2, II, 80-83

As far as integration of timbre is concerned, the piano frequently uses pedalled clusters to fill out the tutti passages presented in the strings, and the strings themselves fill out such tutti passages with tremolos or the playing of two strings in unison. There is greater use of harmonics in this movement, as might be expected of a slow, quiet movement, and there is somewhat greater
use of solo instruments.

Instances of aural merging include the passage at bb. 49-50. (See Ex. 159.)

Ex. 159. Bacewicz, Piano Quintet, no.2, II, 49-50

This is made all the more effective through the switching of registers between the violins, and between viola and cello; both Violin I and viola play below the pitch of Violin II and cello. The connection between the B flats of the piano and second violin embeds the keyboard instrument in the centre of the string sound, almost submerging it below the activity in the upper string parts.

Similarly, at b. 206, where the piano plays tremolo against the rhythmic chords of the strings, the piano’s clusters are in the middle of the chordal range, and the piano is able to participate in the held-chord string crescendo because of its tremolos. (See Ex. 160.)
Mvt III. *Allegro giocoso*

The third and final movement is again a mosaic structure. Of the three, it is the most antiphonal, with constant discourse between the two groups, piano and strings. But this movement is made more sophisticated by the use of different string techniques: it often seems that there are more than two ensembles, as for instance at the beginning, where strings play, first *pizzicato*, then *arco*, then *spiccato*. There is even some use of smaller ensembles within the quartet, but still, the discourse is between strings and piano. An obvious case occurs at bb. 117-125, where five bars of material from the two violins is immediately transferred to solo piano.

The musical materials that make up the ‘sound objects’ in this movement are the same as in the previous two, and range from scale passages to rhythmically repeated chords and fast piano figurations, repeated over and over. That first and last movements are both in 6/8 means that the same approach to rhythm is applied here: the hemiola is pervasive, and is used to create such patterns as are found in the piano at the opening of the movement. This is the same kind of figuration as appeared in Mvt I, bb. 26-31. (See Exx.
Since the detailed language of this movement draws on the same resources as that of the previous two, there are constant vague references to what has gone by. Sometimes, however, the reference is explicit. For instance, at b. 46, the motif, $A^\flat B^\flat Bb$ (Violin I) recalls the string entries at the beginning of Mvt II (the first three notes of the note row); more curiously, the Violin I part of bb. 50, 8th semiquaver - 51, 4th quaver, is identical to the final gesture in Mvt I (b. 209).\footnote{Thomas, Grażyna Bacewicz: Chamber And Orchestral Music, 115.} The repetition of ideas and themes between movements is not new to piano quintet composition (for example, Schumann’s op. 44); what is unusual is such quotation without development, objectifying the material.
There is literal repetition within the movement too: apart from immediate repetition, long-range repetition here serves (more than in the first movement) to create the structure of the movement. The opening eight bars are repeated at b. 78ff, almost aping an expositional repeat. Another clear example occurs later. There is a notable change of atmosphere at b. 104, marked ‘Poco meno mosso’, in which section Violin 1 and cello play in octaves, *sul tasto*, a *ppp* melody, later taken up in canon by the other two strings in octaves. This mood is not allowed to prevail, however, but returns in another ‘Meno mosso’ section beginning at b. 170, in viola (down a 5th), continuing until b. 180. True to the notion of independent superposition, the canonic entrance of the cello occurs half a bar earlier than on the previous occasion.

There is perhaps a greater sense of continuous development in parts of this movement than in the previous ones. For instance, the piano fragment at b. 34, just four semiquavers long, is then extended and becomes part of a *crescendo*, then *diminuendo*, that lasts 11 bars. Similarly, a four-bar long gesture at b. 54 is repeated four times (the latter two instances transposed up a fifth, with a thicker texture), and then leads into a strings-alone passage, which builds to a climax of trills at b. 73ff, which itself leads into the repetition of the opening, mentioned above.

The movement concludes abruptly but with a reference to the note row which underpins its language. At the very end (bb. 208-209), the whole twelve-note collection is played by strings, completed by piano. (See Ex. 162.)
In a gesture that tonally, if not dramatically, recalls the end of Schoenberg’s *Pierrot Lunaire*, major thirds, quoting those used to create the block of material immediately preceding, are separated off (allotted to the piano part) in the last two bars. But this is not the only nod to diatonic subversion: the cello plays an F major triad, the viola, B minor; Violin I plays a C# minor triad, and its open G string combines with Violin II to play G Major. Even the piano dyads themselves seem to resolve downwards by a semitone. Most emphatically, pizzicato strings are separated off from the piano here.

In this work, Bacewicz treats the ensemble as a resource for the creation of timbre through the forensic examination of register and tone. This involves the invocation of a variety of string techniques (harmonics, *sul tasto*, etc.) and piano pedalling. The resulting colours are based on an attempt to connect the piano with the diversity of the string sound. In this use of the colour palette, Bacewicz is a master of her art.
However, as shown above, clarity of discourse is also a part of the language of the quintet, as contrasting entities are juxtaposed. Thus the work also becomes a subtle study of opposite tendencies - cohesion/opposition - in the ensemble.

The presentation of ideas as individual objects, to be shown off in different contexts, not to be developed and turned into others, recalls perhaps Schoenberg’s approach in the first movement of the op. 11 *Piano Pieces* and, of course, Alexander Calder’s mobiles. Its application in this context adds to the originality of the Piano Quintet No.2.

All three of the quintets studied above reveal a sense of diversity of instrumental conversation, moving from the fairly conventional (Bacewicz’s First) to one in which the form is dictated by what might be seen as the application of colour (Bacewicz’s Second). In the latter, in particular, instrumental textures are often an unpredictable parade of various ideas, none of which ever appears formulaic. Here, as for works in the mid-twentieth century, including those by Lutosławski and Penderecki, texural/timbral blocks of material (often imitating the sounds of electronic music) take over the functions of themes. This approach to composition seems particularly relevant to the piano quintet ensemble as each of the two groups on their own could be seen as timbrally restrictive in the context of timbral emancipation. With reference to Lutosławski’s String Quartet of 1964, Steven Stucky suggests that the composer regarded the writing of a string quartet with some concern, since the transparency of the medium and the limited timbral and polyphonic capabilities of the four instruments would test the soundness of his new methods to the fullest.\(^{38}\)

\(^{38}\) Steven Stucky, *Lutosławski and his music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 45.
However, the structural importance of timbral material was becoming increasingly important. Wolfram Schwinger observes that Penderecki’s *Emanations* for two string orchestras, written in 1958, display a sound world typified rather by its blurred stream of timbres, and by long shifting bands of sound, very diverse in intensity, still comparatively coherent.\(^{39}\)

In her review of Schwinger’s book, Rhian Samuel defines the achievements of Penderecki in this field by suggesting that ‘the intrinsic worth of this music . . . must surely lie in the integration of texture-created form and dramatic effect’.\(^{40}\)

What Samuel observes in the work of Penderecki in this respect are aspects of composition that can also be seen in Bacewicz’s Piano Quintet No.2. Bacewicz’s statement, ‘I mostly pay attention to form’, underlines the significance the composer attaches to musical structure, and identifies a commonality in works that date from seemingly different stylistic periods of her life.\(^{41}\) But in order to articulate that form, Bacewicz relies on techniques and approaches that rely more and more heavily on timbre as her oeuvre proceeds. It is this legacy that is found so clearly in the quintet by Thomas Adès.

For all their composers’ remarks to the contrary, it seems that the writing of piano quintets by these female composers has injected a perspective into instrumental interaction in this ensemble that has enriched an otherwise

---


\(^{41}\) Sally Billing, *Bacewicz: The Violin Concertos*, 103. Here Billing quotes correspondence between Bacewicz and her brother Vytautas on the subject of form in her compositions.
retrospective model.
Conclusion

The purpose of this study has been to examine the piano quintet for the influence of its instrumentation on its development as a genre, as represented by a number of significant works. The ensemble’s make-up of two halves, piano and string quartet, separates it from any other combination of piano and strings or piano and four wind instruments, as each half of the ensemble has a distinct evolution, history and repertoire of its own. The combination of piano and string quartet is therefore the joining together of two originally self-contained units, a formation that presents unique challenges and opportunities.

The study has shown that much of the early development of the piano quintet is linked to aspects of performance practice and organology. By examining the purposes for which piano and string quartet were combined, and the development of these instruments, it has been possible to understand how relationships between the instruments were shaped. However, considerations of more general historical context have also contributed to the investigation, particularly in those eras in which the process of composition needed to conform to wider political pressures, as demonstrated in post-1917 Russia and the post-WWII Soviet Union. The stylistic direction of the piano quintet, like that of any other musical formation, has also been governed by general compositional developments, some of which caused a noticeable reduction in works for this formation. For example, the rise of serialism is almost directly proportional to the decline in the composition of piano quintets in the first half of the twentieth century, though, ironically, in the second half, serialist techniques have contributed much to timbral conversation within the piano quintet.
The great potential of the piano quintet with regard to two principal issues, ensemble interaction and timbral manipulation, has driven this study. It has been shown that, while the former dominated those works written before the twentieth century, the latter has become more prevalent in the past 50 years, though Brahms, too little acknowledged in this regard, led the way. But there remains a dialogue between these two points of view in many works to the present day, as the most recent work discussed, Thomas Adès’s Quintet, indicates. While some, like Bacewicz’s Second Quintet, seem devoted to timbral issues, others, like Goehr’s, keep alive the notion of individual participation in discourse.

Within the two approaches, there is considerable further refinement, as the historical account of the development of the genre from c.1770 to 2000 has proved. Three main developmental stages have been identified: the initial phase, from the 1770s to Schumann’s op. 44, is largely a period in which the keyboard transcended its capacity to support and became a participant in ‘conversation’. The early piano quintets used the presence of the keyboard as a mechanism for harmonic support for string quartet writing, echoing the keyboard accompaniments in a late baroque concerto grosso. But the most widely used form of the piano quintet was the ‘concerto a quattro’, as Mozart called his piano concerti K 413-415 and 449, in which the string quartet fulfilled the role of the accompanying, though sometimes challenging, orchestra. What both variants share in the late eighteenth century is the strict sense of separation between piano and strings, depending on the purpose of the work. The use of the string quartet as an alternative to an orchestral accompaniment is a practice that continued into the early parts of the
nineteenth century, and in doing so, shaped the expected balance between piano and string quartet.¹ The scoring of Schumann’s op. 44 is certainly a logical progression from the accompanied piano concerto of the 1830s, both in terms of the texture and conversation, making Schumann’s work an essentially ‘concertante’ piano quintet.² But Schumann’s canonical work shows the ensemble to be much more than a pair of battling halves, given the nuances of interaction with which it is filled.

The second phase lasts from Brahms’s quintet to the end of the late romantic piano quintet in the early twentieth century. If the previous phase of development was driven both by the separation of piano from strings, and a sense of an accompanied keyboard concerto, the romantic piano quintet seems to have been shaped by a growing sense of textural integration between the two ‘groups’ of participants. This is, to a large extent, the result of stylistic developments in composition in the late nineteenth century generally. As has been shown, it is no accident that as tonal forms (sonata form in particular) recede, so does the notion of articulating form through ensemble interaction: the use of, say, a tutti for the first subject theme, a solo violin and piano accompaniment for the second. But, also, the growing demand for professional string quartets facilitated the tendency for composers to share musical textures between all performers.³ The practice of combining a pianist with an established string quartet for the purpose of public performance undoubtedly dates from this period too. Unsurprisingly, the growing sense of

² Daverio, ‘“Beautiful and Abstruse Conversations”’, 220. Daverio writes that in Schumann’s ‘piano quintet the mediation of private and public character tips towards the latter’.
³ Ibid., 219.
integration is led by conversational detail within the string quartet, a development that attempts to integrate the piano texturally, though not yet, particularly, timbrally.

The third developmental phase heralds a sense of diversity not previously available. Both the classical and the romantic piano quintet seem to accept the confrontation of piano and strings as a given, whereas the changing focus from form to timbral conversation in the twentieth century dissolves this division. Negotiating between struck and bowed notes, piano textures become leaner, more focused on single line textures, and often embedded within the range of string instruments (or vice versa), as can be seen in the second of Bacewicz’s piano quintets. New textures begin to emerge, leading to the combining of different sub-formations within the ensemble.

Beyond these issues, the study has revealed clearly a particular trend in the piano quintet: composers still refer to the two principal works of the genre, by Schumann and Brahms. Yet comparing the relatively small number of piano quintets performed with regularity with a work list of over 700 titles seems to suggest that the perception of the genre, and its use by composers, is more limited than it should be. With the adherence to a limited repertoire comes the phenomenon of new works being linked to a particular piece (Schumann), or a small selection of works (Schumann, Brahms, Dvořák, and Shostakovich) that over time appear to embody the genre. This in turn seals its reputation as conservative, maybe even ‘romantic’. Christopher Fox’s statement that, ‘the piano quintet is not a form in which the confrontation between conventional expectations and the new work offers great potential for
post-modernist shock tactics’, illustrates this perspective.\(^4\)

Elliot Carter’s insistence on not wanting to do what Schumann did, when the interview question was actually about writing a piano quintet in general, also supports the suggestion that the formation is less understood as a genre, and viewed more as a representation of individual, and thus highly influential works.\(^5\) Even Hans Werner Henze’s brief foreword to the score of his piano quintet refers to Brahms’s op. 34.\(^6\) It seems, therefore, that at the end of the twentieth century the issue of writing for piano quintet has been, as far as many composers were concerned, a question of how to respond to a formation defined by Schumann and Brahms, not on how to respond to a genre with a legacy of almost two hundred years. Despite the twentieth century’s considerable shift away from a prior influence, if not dominance of Germanic music, it seems that in the case of the understanding of the piano quintet as a formation this trend has been less decisive.

The piano quintets of Schumann and Brahms continue to influence the debate surrounding piano quintets written within the last two decades of the twentieth century, as composers position their piano quintets in relation to these reference points both in interviews and in writing. Musically, piano quintets by Xenakis, Messaien, Goehr and Adès all utilize ensemble conversations found in previous examples of the medium, and those that intentionally do not do so, such as Carter’s work, only document just how powerfully the influence of earlier canonic works is still felt.


\(^6\) Hans Werner Henze, ‘Quintetto per pianoforte, due violini, viola, e violoncello (1990/91), (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne, 1993), 5.
Undoubtedly, the growth in piano quintet writing in the second half of the twentieth century, and particularly from the 1980s onwards, has been facilitated by the increasing distance from music of the romantic period, a distance that enables composers credibly to ‘re-think’ a genre, as Goehr puts it, rather than be seen to continue along traditional lines. But the recent fusion of the genre’s canonic representations with what Tom Service calls the ‘newly imagined’, raises the question as to whether the identity of the piano quintet in previous eras, and its re-working in the twentieth century may not have created a new focus. If the classical piano quintet is represented by the accompanied concerto, and the romantic piano quintet by a developing chamber formation, has the piano quintet in the twentieth century metamorphosed into a single unit?

It seems that in the late twentieth century the textural separation of piano and strings, once so central to the ensemble’s *modus operandi*, became largely an outdated approach. Instead, timbral integration based on an intentional equality of parts has led to ensemble writing, among certain composers, that, in its essence, rejects established perceptions of conversational interaction between piano and strings. With respect to contemporary music generally, Pierre Boulez suggests that musical works have tended to become unique events, which do have antecedents, but are not reducible to any guiding schema admitted, a priori, by all.

Applied to the piano quintet as a formation, it seems that antecedents

---

have played a more prevalent role in this genre than in that of other chamber ensemble for piano and strings. Never at the forefront of musical development, and often understood to be a ‘romantic’ ensemble, it nevertheless has survived, a potent candidate for further experimentation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Opus Number</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Publication Details</th>
<th>Year Composed</th>
<th>Notes &amp; References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adès Thomas</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faber Music</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Faber Music Hire Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabiev (or Aljabiew) Alexander (1787-1851)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alary, Georges (1850-1929)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op.45</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Durdilly</td>
<td>Pub:1898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alary, Georges (1850-1929)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td>Op. 71</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Hayet</td>
<td>Pub:1911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkan, Ch. V.</td>
<td>Rondo Brillante for Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lemoine</td>
<td></td>
<td>For prepared piano and string quartet. Print on demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrosius, Herrmann (1897-1983)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 55</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderton, Howard (1861-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not listed in Das Neue Musiklexikon (1926) check Everitt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderton, Howard (1861-)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderton, Howard (1861-)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andréé, Elfrida (1841-1929)</td>
<td>Quintett</td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Musik Konstförlag, Stockholm</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreev, Anatolij A</td>
<td>Musika for Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moscow: Sovetskij Kompozitor</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
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<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anrooy, Peter van</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?MS</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon, 224, won Cobbett Prize 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atterburg, Kurt</td>
<td>Arr. for Pf Qnt of his Symphony No. 6</td>
<td>Op.31</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon, 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azevedo, Fernando d'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Brussels: Schott, 1905</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon, 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacewicz, Grażyna</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PWM</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon, 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacewicz, Grażyna</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PWM 3975</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon, 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bach, Fritz (1881-1930)</td>
<td><em>Poéme</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>q</td>
<td>Paris 1770</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garcia, Brahms's Opus 34 the 19th-century Piano Quintet, 6. Keyboard role as part of smaller orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bach, Johann Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garcia, Brahms's Opus 34 the 19th-century Piano Quintet, 6. Keyboard role as part of smaller orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badings, Henk (1907-1987)</td>
<td>Pianoquintetten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denmark/Amsterdam: Donemus</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Duration of 22'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagdasarjan, Edward I. (1922-1987)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannister, Mary J (1932-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barret, Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartók, Béla (1881-1945)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 14</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1897 lost</td>
<td>Lost manuscript. See Garcia, Brahms’s Opus 34 the 19th-century Piano Quintet, 129 &amp; Grove.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartók, Béla (1881-1945)</td>
<td>D.Dille B10</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?1899</td>
<td>Fragment. See Garcia, Brahms’s Opus 34 the 19th-century Piano Quintet, 129 &amp; Grove.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartók, Béla (1881-1945)</td>
<td>Quintetto per 2 violini, viola, violoncello e pianoforte</td>
<td>D.Dille 77</td>
<td>Budapest: Editio Musica, 1970.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1903/4 rev. 1920, 1st perf* 19/03/1910 and 07/01/1921</td>
<td>D.Dille, ed., secured copy of score in 1963. Bartok was the only pianist to play the work in his lifetime, see preface to score.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baussnern, Waldemar von (1866-1931)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td></td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bax, Arnold (1883-1953)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td>London: Murdoch, Murdoch &amp; Co., 1922.</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Dedicated to Edwin Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach, Amy Marcy Cheney (1867-1944)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 67</td>
<td>Fsharp</td>
<td>Da Capo and Boston: A.P. Schmidt, 1909</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becerra Schmidt, Gustavo (1925-)</td>
<td>Quintetto para el Festival Panamericano de 1963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck, Martha Dillard (1902-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1929-31</td>
<td>Heinz, Die Geschichte, 2001. According to Heinz, Beck was also known as Mrs G. Howard Carragan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becker, A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven, Ludwig van (1770-1827)</td>
<td>Pf Concerto No.1</td>
<td>Op.15, arr. Moscheles</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>British Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benda, Georg (1729-1795)</td>
<td>Two sonatas for Piano and String Quartet</td>
<td>G and C</td>
<td></td>
<td>UK: Grancino International Ltd., 1986</td>
<td></td>
<td>Both composed between 1780-1787. Published as part of the Society of Swedish Composers in Swedish Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentzon, Niels Viggo (1919 - )</td>
<td>Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benvenuti, Arrigo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bruzzichelli</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Folia, Diferencias Sobre Cinco Estudios</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg, Carl Natanael (1879-1957)</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stockholm: Musikalista Konstföreningen, 1917</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berger, Wilhelm (1861-1911)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op.95</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Kahnt/Bote &amp; Bock, 1905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berten, Walter (1902-?)</td>
<td>Sonatina for piano and string quartet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwald, F (1796-1868)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwald, William Henry (1864-?)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manuscript.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon, composer from USA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Schwerin.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Opus Number</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Publication Details</th>
<th>Year Composed</th>
<th>Notes &amp; References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biarent, Adolphe (1871-?)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon, composer from Belgium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biber, C</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Opus 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entitled Three Romanzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biber, C</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Opus 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entitled Weihnachts - musik.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibergan, Vadim (1937-)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinz, Die Geschichte, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binenbaum, Janko (1880-?)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birjukov, Juri S</td>
<td>2 Piano Quintette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinz, Die Geschichte, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleichmann, Julius (1868-1910)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op.16</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel KM 855/57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blieseber, Ada Elisabeth (1909-)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1929-31</td>
<td>Heinz, Die Geschichte, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss, Arthur</td>
<td>? Piano and String Quartet or wind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloch, Ernst (1880-1959)</td>
<td>Quintet No.1 for Piano &amp; Strings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Schirmer, 1924</td>
<td>1921-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloch, Ernst (1880-1959)</td>
<td>Quintet No.2 for Piano &amp; Strings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broude Brothers, 1962</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blockx, Jan (1851-1912)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Paris: Heugel, 1899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenthal, Sandro (1874-1919)</td>
<td>Op. 2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Heinz, Die Geschichte, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boccherini, Luigi (1743-1805)</td>
<td>Quintet No.6</td>
<td>Op.57</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>New York: IMC, 1954</td>
<td>1799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodky, Erwin (1896-1958)</td>
<td>Klavierquintett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boisdeffre, René de</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op.43</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Paris: Hamelle, 1889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boisdeffre, René de</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 81</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Paris: Hamelle, 1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolcom, William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1st perf. 10/03/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolzoni, Giovanni (1841-?)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonawitz, J. H. (1839-1917)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op.42</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Sinrock</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borodin, Alexander (1833-1887)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>USA: Belwin Mills Publishing Corporation K 09658, no date given. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1938</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Also published Sikorski, Hamburg, SIK 6609. n.b. Heinz also notes in his Geschichte (241), that when Borodin was in Heidelberg 1859/61 he most probably ([höchstwahrscheinlich] heard Schumann's op. 44 for the first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandt, Fritz (1880-?)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breton, Tomas (1850-?)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge, Frank (1879-1941)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td>London: Augener Ltd, 1919</td>
<td>1904-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briquet, Marc</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1931/1936</td>
<td>Cairo, Egypt. Ref: ArkivMusic.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruckshaw, Kathleen</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pianist (1877-1921).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck, Percy C (1871-1947)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op.17</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musik lexikon &amp; Everett, British Piano Trios, Quartets, and Quintets, p147, BMS 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton, Eldin</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Published: CF 04762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busch, Adolf</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op.34</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadman, Charles Wakefield (1881-1946)</td>
<td>Pf Qnt</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar, Johann Melcior (1648-1692)</td>
<td>Ballet Suite &amp; Entrada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nagel &amp; Hug’</td>
<td></td>
<td>This needs referencing. Possibly 2 separate pieces arranged by a latter day composer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldara,</td>
<td>Sonata a quattro Nr.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edition Peters, 66595</td>
<td></td>
<td>For 2 violins, Viola, Organ or Piano, Violoncello ad. Lib.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltabiano, S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bongiovanni 2257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsen, C. A. (1876-?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Elliot (1908-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Played on CD by Arditti St Qt &amp; Ursula Oppens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castelnuovo-Tedesco, Mario (1895-?)</td>
<td>Op.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forlivesi</td>
<td>1931-32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castelnuovo-Tedesco, Mario (1895-?)</td>
<td>Op.155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forlivesi</td>
<td>1934-1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catoire (Katuar), Georghi Luovich (1861-1926)</td>
<td>Op.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>See <em>Das Neue Musiklexikon</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellier, A (1883-?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Senart</td>
<td></td>
<td>See <em>Das Neue Musiklexikon</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwick, George Whitefield (1854-1931)</td>
<td>Op.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td>A. P. Schmidt 1890</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chugayev, Alexander Georgievich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciortea, Tudor (1903 - ?)</td>
<td>Cvintet Cu Pian</td>
<td></td>
<td>C sharp</td>
<td>Editura Musicala, 1961</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Br &amp; H Archive number: KM1935 a/e, also listed in Hinson, <em>The Piano in Chamber Music</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleve, Halfdan</td>
<td>Piano Quintet after Piano Concerto</td>
<td>Op.9</td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole, Ulrich (1905-?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPAM</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collet, Henri (1885-1951)</td>
<td>Castellanes (Spanish Suite)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paris 1921, Mathot</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>See Das Neue Musiklexikon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conte, David</td>
<td>Quintet for piano &amp; strings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioned by Pacific Serenades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke, Benjamin (1903-?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Not listed in 1982 Grove, possibly for wind or strings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cools, Eugene (1877-?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eschig</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Das Neue Musiklexikon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corghi, Azi (1937-?)</td>
<td>Recordari for pf qnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zerboni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa, Alessandro (1957-?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kistner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couperin, François (1688-1733)</td>
<td>La Sultane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oiseau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer, Johann</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 1</td>
<td>Op.60</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Garcia, <em>Brahms’s Opus 34 the 19th-century Piano Quintet</em>, p. 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullivan, Tom (b.1939)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullivan, Tom (b.1939)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham, Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioned by Pacific Serenades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czerny, Carl</td>
<td>Rondino for piano and string quartet accomp.</td>
<td>Op. 127</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Erlanger, Baron Frédéric (1868?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Simrock, Berlin.</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td><em>Das Neue Musiklexikon</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d’Indy, Vincent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op.81</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daneau, Charles</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cranz</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidoff, Charles (1839-1889)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op.40</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Rather</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Lange, Samuel (1840-1911)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denissov, A</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjoyeaux, Noel</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decourcelle, Nice</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destenay, Edouard</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 1</td>
<td>Op.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haml</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dohnányi, E (1877-1960)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>e flat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simrock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doret, Gustave</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drozdov, Anatoli (1883-1950)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op.11</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunhill, Thomas (1877-1946)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupont, Gabriel (1878-1914)</td>
<td>Poème for Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Huegel</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusch, Alexander von (1877-?)</td>
<td>Frühlingsgesang for Pf Qnt</td>
<td>Op.14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzherbashian, S</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eiges, Oleg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisma, Will</td>
<td>Kalos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Danish composer, work is 12’ duration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enescu, Georges (1881-1955)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enescu, Georges (1881-1955)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td>Op. 29</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erhart, Dorothy (1894-1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erkin, Ulvi Cemal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Ref: ArkivMusic.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger, Gustav (1842-1908)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervin, Max, T</td>
<td>Elli-Pizzi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kendor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervin, Max, T</td>
<td>Mini-Pizzi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kendor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espla, Oscar (1886-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon, 'uses his own scale'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairchild, Blair (b.1877-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hayet</td>
<td>c.1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fano, Guido, Alberto (1875-1961)</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrenc, Louise (1804-1875)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>op. 30</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Source: Grove Music Online &amp; Heinz, Die Geschichte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrenc, Louise (1804-1875)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>op. 31</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauré, Gabriel (1845-1924)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td>Op.115</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Durand.</td>
<td>1919/1921</td>
<td>Garcia, Brahms’s Opus 34 the 19th-century Piano Quintet, p. 129.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdinands, Prince Louis (Prussia)</td>
<td>Quintetto</td>
<td>Op.11</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Fr. A. Urbanek, Prague.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibich, Zdenek (1850-1900)</td>
<td>Piano Concerto No.2 arr. Pf Qnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field, John (1782-1837)</td>
<td>Divertissment</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtyl No.2815, Germany 1818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field, John (1782-1837)</td>
<td>Divertissment for piano &amp; string quartet</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtyl No.1764.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Published Russia 1810 and Germany 1812.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field, John (1782-1837)</td>
<td>Nocturne, arr. Pf Qnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field, John (1782-1837)</td>
<td>Piano Concerto No.2 arr. Pf Qnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field, John (1782-1837)</td>
<td>Quintetto</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtyl, No.2419, published 1816</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>First published 1812 in Russia, then Breitkopf &amp; Härtyl No.3127, 1816 &amp; 1845.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielder, A, Max (b.1859-)</td>
<td>Rondo (Andantino/Allegro/Vivace)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>Wiesbaden: Breitkopf &amp; Härtyl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filippi, Amadeo (b.1900-)</td>
<td>Quintetto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtyl</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>USA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finck, Fidelio (b.1891-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finney, Ross Lee (b.1906-)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finney, Ross Lee (b.1906-)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pet 6457 and Colombia University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foote, A</td>
<td>8 Bagatelles for String Quartet &amp; Piano</td>
<td>Op.38</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Arthur P Schmidt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franck, César</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td>Op.45</td>
<td>f D</td>
<td>Frankfurt: C.F.Peters Nr.3743, no date given</td>
<td>1878/1879</td>
<td>Garcia, Brahms’s Opus 34 the 19th-century Piano Quintet, 104. 1st perf. 17/01/1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franck, Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schlesinger, Berlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazzi, Vito</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Otos</td>
<td></td>
<td>MGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricker, P. R.</td>
<td>Concertante V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friskin, James</td>
<td>Fantasy for Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Stainer &amp; Bell</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friskin, James</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op.1</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Stainer &amp; Bell</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frugatta, Giuseppe (b. 1860-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuleihan, Anis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furtwängler, Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ries &amp; Erler, Berlin, 43017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furuhjelm, Erik, Gustav (1883-1964)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galindo, Blas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Source: Hinson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gebhard, Hans (1882-)</td>
<td>Three Dances from the music to Henry VIII. Arranged as a Quintet for pianoforte and stringed instruments by the composer.</td>
<td>Op.35</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Simrock</td>
<td>1920/21</td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German, Edward</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 1</td>
<td>Op.35</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Simrock</td>
<td>c.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gernsheim, Friedrich (1839-1916)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td>Op.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass, Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GnJessin, Michael (1883-)</td>
<td>Requiem for piano quintet</td>
<td>Op.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goeb, Roger (b. 1914)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldmark, Carl (1830-1915)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op.30</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>Schweers &amp; Haake</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Garcia, Brahms’s Opus 34 the 19th-century Piano Quintet, p. 40, Fugue in Finale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotthard, J. P. (1839-)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Publisher and composer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graener, Paul (1872-1944)</td>
<td>Sehnsucht an das Meer' für pf qnt</td>
<td>Op. 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granados, Enrique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td>UME</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graumann, Karl (1842-1897)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cranz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grieg, Edvard (1843-1907)</td>
<td>Fragment for Pf Qnt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruenberg, Louis (b. 1884-)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cos cob.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grund, Friedrich, Wilhelm (1791-1874)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerrini, Guido</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carisch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacquart, Charles</td>
<td>Sonata a quartre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UE 13064-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata for 2 vns, alto gamba or va, tenor gamba or vcl, keyboard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadley, Henry Kimbll</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 50</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Schirmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahn, Reynaldo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F sharp</td>
<td>Heugel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallnas, Eyvind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STIM 2845</td>
<td></td>
<td>Born 1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamerik, Asger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1843-1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, Ian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, Robert Emil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon - Danish composer born 1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbison, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Roy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauer, Joseph, M.</td>
<td>Zweelfonspiel</td>
<td>Op.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doblinger 07264</td>
<td>02/06/1948</td>
<td>From Ameinet St Qt web-site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haussermann, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydn, Joseph (1732-1809)</td>
<td>Piano Concerto in chamber version</td>
<td>Hob.XVIII:3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G. Henle Verlag, HN 682.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heise, Peter (1830-1879)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op.48b</td>
<td></td>
<td>STIM</td>
<td></td>
<td>UR EN Gatmal Film. Hemberg (1938-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemberg, Eskil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon - Swedish composer 1853-1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heneburg, C. V.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Version of 'Robert de diable' by Meyerbeer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henselt, A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henze, Hans Werner (1926)</td>
<td>per pianoforte, due violini, viola e violoncello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schott, Mainz. 1993</td>
<td>1990-1991</td>
<td>25/03/1993 in Berkeley. Peter Serkin &amp; Guarneri St Qt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrmann, Hugo</td>
<td>Kleine Kammermusik in alten Stil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Db ad lib. Herrmann (1896-1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrmann, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DVM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herz, Jacques Simon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Herz (1794-1880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzogenberg, H. von</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzogenberg, H. von</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Herzogenberg: KM 862/65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess, Karl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schott</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hess (1859-1912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heydrich, Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon, born 1863 (?05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyerdahl, Anders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon, Norwegian composer 1832-1918.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiller, Ferdinand</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 156</td>
<td></td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lost, unpublished MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindemith, Paul</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>comp. 1917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinton, Arthur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elkin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon, composer born 1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoddinott, Alun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Grove, Bd.8, 1980, S.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffmann, E.T.A.</td>
<td><em>HarfenQuartett</em> for piano and strings</td>
<td>Op. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bosworth &amp; Co</td>
<td></td>
<td>Note the score says 'triangle ad lib'. Hofmann (1835-1909).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofmann, Karl</td>
<td><em>Erinnerung an Huetteldorf</em></td>
<td>Op. 44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schlesinger, Berlin</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollbrooke, Joeseph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon, composer born 1840.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollaender, Alexis</td>
<td>Pf Qnt Set</td>
<td>Op. 24</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Garcia, Brahms’s Opus 34 the 19th-century Piano Quintet, p. 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopfe, Julius</td>
<td>Double Concerto for Piano and String Quartet</td>
<td>Op.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Challier</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hopfe born 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hovhaness, Alun</td>
<td>Quintet for piano &amp; strings</td>
<td>Op. 109</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peters 66079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyland, Vic</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op.111</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Kistner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummel, F</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 47</td>
<td></td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummel, J. N.</td>
<td>version for pf and st qt</td>
<td>Op.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haslinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humperdick, Engelbert</td>
<td>Klavierquintett</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Photocopy of score by kind permission of Universitätsbibliothek, Frankfurt/Main.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huré, Jean</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathot</td>
<td>1907/08</td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexikon. Composer born 1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ives, Charles E. (1874-1954)</td>
<td>Halloween</td>
<td>Op. 70</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>BMP previously Boelke-Bon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, William (1730-1803)</td>
<td>8 Sonatas for Hpd, 2 vns, va &amp; vc.</td>
<td>op. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>AME</td>
<td>c. 1773</td>
<td>Source: Grove Music Online &amp; Heinz, Die Geschichte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jadassohn, S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 70</td>
<td></td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jadassohn, S</td>
<td>Op. 76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jirák, Karel Boleslav</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiránek, Josef</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juon, Paul</td>
<td>Op. 33</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schlesinger, Berlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juon, Paul</td>
<td>Op. 44</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schlesinger, Berlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkbrenner, Friedrich</td>
<td>Op. 30</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schlesinger, Berlin</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Garcia, Brahms's Opus. 34 and the Nineteenth Century Piano Quintet, 15. N.B. Kalkbrenner's op. 30 is for DB ad libitum and his Op. 80 is for the 'Trout' combination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley, Edgar</td>
<td>Op. 20</td>
<td>f♯</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stahl</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiel, Friedrich</td>
<td>Op. 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiel, Friedrich</td>
<td>Op. 76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bote &amp; Bock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klean, Bluebell</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Composed 1910-1913.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klebanov, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MZK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klebe, Giselher</td>
<td>Quintett &quot;quasi una</td>
<td>Op. 53</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bärenreiter, BA 4150.</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>In two mvts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fantasia&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klingler, Karl (1879-1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td></td>
<td>M.S</td>
<td></td>
<td>MGG, Suppl. = Bd.16, Sp.1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klughardt, A</td>
<td>Op. 43</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eulenburg</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knaifel, Alexander (b.1943)</td>
<td>In Air Clean and Unseen for Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>CD with Keller St Qt &amp; Oleg Malov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knell, Peter</td>
<td>Collage for pf qnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Commissioned by Pacific Serenades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodallli, Nevit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Ref: ArkivMusic.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koechlin, Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köhler, F. A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kornauth, Egon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 35a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doblinger</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroeger, E. A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Performed Detroit 1890.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvapil, Jaroslav</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Josef (1842-1924)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td>Op. 3</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Josef (1842-1924)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 1</td>
<td>Op. 6</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Kistner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Josef (1842-1924)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel: Verzeichnis des Musikalienverlags, vollständig bis 1902. Labor: KM 917/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacombe, Louis (1818-1884)</td>
<td>Grand Quintette pour piano, 2 violons, alto et violoncelle</td>
<td>Op. 26</td>
<td>f♯</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalo, Edouard (1823-1892)</td>
<td>Adagio - 2nd Fantaisie-quintette for piano and string quartet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Ded’ A. Enrst Lubeck. Copy obtained from Conservatoire Musique, Paris. Possible previous publication by F-PN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalo, Edouard (1823-1892)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>Unpublished. Paris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landré, Willem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Born 1840.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laquay, Reinhold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Swiss composer born 1885.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauater, Hans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Swiss composer born 1864.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauber, Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Swiss composer born 1885.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavaine, Ferdinand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Launer: Costallat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Flem, Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>HL</td>
<td></td>
<td>From Amernet St Qt web-site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Normand, René</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Le Normand born 1846.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lefebre, Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lefkowitz, David</td>
<td>Dreams: All of a Peace for pf qnt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Commissioned by J.C.Kennedy for Pacific Serenades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leighton, Kenneth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Novello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewensohn, Gideon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>NMZ 11/02/02 p.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liatoshinsky, Boris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Born 1895.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieberson, Peter (b.1946-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipkis, Larry</td>
<td>Dancing in her sleep' for pf qnt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Commissioned by Pacific Serenades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livens, Leo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luzzati, Arturo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Born 1864.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Szu-Ts'ung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MZK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ref: Riemann 1975. Argentinian conductor, pianist &amp; composer of It. Descent. Music at Dr Borg's, Mainz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macfarren, Jules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddison, Adela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curwen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahler, Gustav</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malipiero, Riccardo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandl, Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Universal Edition</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Malling: KM 871/73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margola, Franco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bongiovanni</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsick, Armand</td>
<td>Stèle - in memoriam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBDM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Db ad libitum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Henn</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinů, Bohuslav</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Ded. Miss Fanny P. Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinů, Bohuslav</td>
<td>Quintette No.1 pour piano et cordes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinů, Bohuslav</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Very early unpublished work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martucci, G</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 45</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kistner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masseus, Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Donemus</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Danish composer born 1913.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathieu, Rodolphe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsumura, Teizo</td>
<td>Musique pour Quatuor à Cordes et Pianoforte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongaku</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattison-Hansen, Johang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayersky, T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayuzumi, Toshiro</td>
<td>Pieces for prepared piano and strings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peters: 6325b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCabe, John</td>
<td>Nocturnal</td>
<td>Op. 42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Novello</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woman by the Sea for Piano Quintet, first performed Wigmore Hall, 12/09/2001, c. 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meinardus, L (1827-1896)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merz, Victor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migot, Georges</td>
<td>Quintette: Les Agrestides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td></td>
<td>Born 1891.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikorey, Franz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Kahnt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Mikorey born 1873.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moser, Franz</td>
<td>Chamber Version Pf Concerto KV 449 (Nr.14)</td>
<td>Op. 18</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>TJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart, W.A. (1756-1791)</td>
<td>Quintet after wind quintet KV 452, trans. Naumann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart, W.A. (1756-1791)</td>
<td>Adagio &amp; Rondo KV 617</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulder, Herman</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td>Op. 188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Müller</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neidhardt, Nino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. German composer born 1889.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neubauer, Johann (n..b 17th century composer)</td>
<td>Suite for piano and string quartet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Augener</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Very likely a late-19th century arr. of a 17th century work. Das Neue Musiklexicon. French composer born 1879.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niverd, Lucien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novak, V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 12</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Simrock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberstadt, Carolus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Oberstadt born 1871, Dutch composer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oganesian, E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MZK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldberg, Arne</td>
<td>Two Popular Piano Quintets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oldberg born 1874.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onslow, Georges</td>
<td>30 pf qnt works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garcia, Bruch's Opus. 34 and the Nineteenth Century Piano Quintet, p. 103. Op70 1847 with DB. Orbon born 1925.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbon, Julian</td>
<td>Partita No. 2 for piano quintet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orfice, Giacomo (1865-1922)</td>
<td>Riflessi ed Ombre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ricordi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormstein, Leo (1895-2002?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Otterström was a pupil of S Menter born 1868.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otterström, Thorvald</td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoffmeister</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paque, Marie Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavier, Ernst (1826-1905)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfeiffer, Georges</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 41</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schott</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pfeiffer born 1835.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierne, G</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 41</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Hamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platti, Mario (1903-1938)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ricordi: 121130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piston, Walter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitt, Percy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pott, Francis (1957-)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 99</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pousseur, Henri</td>
<td><em>Chronique Berlinoise</em></td>
<td>Op. 1</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia</td>
<td>Larghetto varieé</td>
<td>Op. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radica, Ruben</td>
<td>Four Dramatic Epigrams</td>
<td>Op. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raff, Joachim</td>
<td>Grand Quintuor pour Piano,</td>
<td>Op. 207</td>
<td></td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raff, Joachim</td>
<td>Fantasie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahlwes, Alfred (1878-1946)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lienau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raitio, Vaino (1891-1945)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fazer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasse, Francois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Belgian composer born in 1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratez, Emile</td>
<td>Op. 31</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. French composer born 1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawsthorne, Alan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reger, Max</td>
<td>Zweites Quintett</td>
<td>Op.64</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>C.F.Peters: 3063</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Authorized copy of score by permission of the Reger Institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reiche, Gottfried</td>
<td>Three Sonatinas for 2 vns, va, vc, and continuo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Universal Edition 10639-40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Leo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reissiger, Karl Gottlieb (1798-1859)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worked in Dresden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reissiger, Karl Gottlieb (1798-1859)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 191</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reissiger, Karl Gottlieb (1798-1859)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 201</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendano, Alphonso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Composer born 1853.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respighi, Ottorino</td>
<td>Quintetto</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milano: G. Ricordi &amp; Editori, 1986</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReuB, Heinrich (1855-1910)</td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kistner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReuB, Heinrich (1855-1910)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 15</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rather</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheinberger, J</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richelot, Gustave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Garcia, Brahms’s Opus. 34 and the Nineteenth Century Piano Quintet, p. 116.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riemann, Ludwig (1864-1927)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rietsch, Heinrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinkers, Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Composer born 1879.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, Lergy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochberg, George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg, Hilding (1892-1985)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenhahn, Jacob (1813-1894)</td>
<td>Concertino (mit vier Begleitung)</td>
<td>Op. 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hofmeister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenmüller, Johann</td>
<td>Sonatas no. 7 &amp; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothstein, James</td>
<td>One movement work</td>
<td>Op. 2</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel, Leipzig</td>
<td></td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel: KM 1940 a/f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozsa, Miklos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Born 1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozycki, Ludomir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Schott</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Polish composer born 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubinstein, Anton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 99</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hamil</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated to Johannes Brahms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rückauf, Anton (1805-1903)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kistner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudhyar, Dane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rung, Frederick (1854-1914)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet on a Danish Folk Song</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Das Neue Musiklexicon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Opus Number</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Publication Details</th>
<th>Year Composed</th>
<th>Notes &amp; References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rüter, Hugo</td>
<td>Two Piano Quintets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Composer born 1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarly, Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Belgian composer born 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savasta, Antonio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Italian composer born 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schläfer, Dirk</td>
<td>Op. 5</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td></td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel: KM 927/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schalit, Heinrich</td>
<td>Op. 3</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schelling, Ernst</td>
<td>Divertimento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LEU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenschin, Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td>m.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitt, Florent</td>
<td>Op. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathot</td>
<td>1901-1908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schnabel, Dieter</td>
<td>Two Pieces for Piano and St Qt (or 2 Wind and 2 String Instruments)</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schott's Soehne, Mainz, 1983</td>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>17 March 1978 Darmstadt (Klaus Billing &amp; the Frankfurter St Qt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoenberg, Arnold</td>
<td><em>Die Eiserne Brigade for Pf Qt</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UE 16759 1974</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholz, B (1835-1916)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York: Schuberth</td>
<td>c. 1890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schotte, Armin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Published in Amsterdam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schröter, J. S. (1750-1788)</td>
<td>Three Piano Quintets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert, Kurt</td>
<td></td>
<td>m.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann, Georg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 49</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simrock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Cyril</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Cyril</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1911/1912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seiber, Mathias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1926-1928</td>
<td>Also available as a concerto for piano and strings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgambati, G</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 4</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Schott</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st perf. 29/01/1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgambati, G</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Schott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shera, F. H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shim, Okshik</td>
<td><em>Song of Mongkeumpo</em> for pf qnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Korean composer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibelius, Jean, trans, O Taubmann</td>
<td>Quintet for Piano and String Quartet</td>
<td>Op. 2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel: VA 3349</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>García, Brahms’s Opus. 34 and the Nineteenth Century Piano Quintet, p. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siklos, Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon. Chilean composer born 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvestrov, Valentin (b.1937-)</td>
<td>Quintett</td>
<td>Op.5</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Leipzig: Ernst Eulenburg. No Date. Also pub. Hansen</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinding, Christian</td>
<td>Quintett</td>
<td>Op.5</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Leipzig: Ernst Eulenburg. No Date. Also pub. Hansen</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer, Otto</td>
<td>Quintett</td>
<td>Op.5</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Leipzig: Ernst Eulenburg. No Date. Also pub. Hansen</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smalley, Roger (b.1943-)</td>
<td>Quintett</td>
<td>Op.5</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Leipzig: Ernst Eulenburg. No Date. Also pub. Hansen</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, David Stanley</td>
<td>Quintett</td>
<td>Op.5</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Leipzig: Ernst Eulenburg. No Date. Also pub. Hansen</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soler, Antonio</td>
<td>Quintett</td>
<td>Op.5</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Leipzig: Ernst Eulenburg. No Date. Also pub. Hansen</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonzogno, Giulio Cesare</td>
<td>Quintett</td>
<td>Op.5</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Leipzig: Ernst Eulenburg. No Date. Also pub. Hansen</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorabji, K</td>
<td>Quintett</td>
<td>Op.5</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Leipzig: Ernst Eulenburg. No Date. Also pub. Hansen</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorabji, K</td>
<td>Quintett</td>
<td>Op.5</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Leipzig: Ernst Eulenburg. No Date. Also pub. Hansen</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soro-Barriga, Enrique</td>
<td>Quintett</td>
<td>Op.5</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Leipzig: Ernst Eulenburg. No Date. Also pub. Hansen</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soro, Enrique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponer, A. V.</td>
<td>Ten Variations on a Swabian Folk Song Quintett</td>
<td>Op.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Rieter-Biedermann</td>
<td></td>
<td>Also composed a piano quintet op. 10. Born in 1870.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer, Max</td>
<td>Ten Variations on a Swabian Folk Song Quintett</td>
<td>Op.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Rieter-Biedermann</td>
<td></td>
<td>Also composed a piano quintet op. 10. Born in 1870.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford, C.V.</td>
<td>Three Piano Quintets for 2 vns, va (taille) and vc</td>
<td>Op.28</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>London: Novello, Ewer &amp; Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steibelt, Daniel</td>
<td>Three Piano Quintets for 2 vns, va (taille) and vc</td>
<td>Op.28</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>London: Novello, Ewer &amp; Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Štěpán, Václav</td>
<td>First Spring</td>
<td>Op.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Doblinger</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stierlin-Vallon, Henri</td>
<td>First Spring</td>
<td>Op.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Doblinger</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stöhr, Richard</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 1</td>
<td>Op.7</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Kistner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungarian composer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stöhr, Richard</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td>Op.43</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Kistner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungarian composer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stojanovits, P. L.</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td>Op.9</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Doblinger</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungarian composer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storace, Stephen (1762-1796)</td>
<td>Deux quintettes: No.1</td>
<td>Op.2</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Doblinger</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>One of the earliest examples of a scherzo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storace, Stephen (1762-1796)</td>
<td>Deux quintettes: No.2</td>
<td>Op.2</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Doblinger</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>One of the earliest examples of a scherzo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storace, William</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 1</td>
<td>Op.7</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Doblinger</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungarian composer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strässer, Ewald</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td>Op.43</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Doblinger</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungarian composer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striegler, Kurt</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 2</td>
<td>Op.9</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Doblinger</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungarian composer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suchsland, Leopold</td>
<td>Piano Quintet No. 1</td>
<td>Op.7</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Doblinger</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungarian composer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suk, Josef (1874-1935)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op.8</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Bärenreiter H 5330. Revised Vlastimil Musil, authorized copy.</td>
<td>(1885-1930)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taneiev, Sergei</td>
<td>Op. 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Sikorski, Hamburg.</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Print on demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchaikovsky, Boris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, Mansel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 71</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Mansel Thomas Trust Publications</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tindal, William</td>
<td>3 Quintets for Hpd/pf, 2 vns, va (tenor) &amp; vc</td>
<td>Op.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sikorski, Hamburg.</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>Print on demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toch, Ernst</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 64</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomaszek, Anton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torelli, G (1658-1709)</td>
<td>Sonata for 2 vns, va, vc and keyboard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schott: MIN 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touche, J. C.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tovey, Donald Francis (1875-1940)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapp, Max (b.1887-)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op.3</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Pub: Steingräber, Leipzig</td>
<td>MGG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triebensee, Johann Georg (1746-1813)</td>
<td>Grand Quintuor (2 va's not 2 vn's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vienna: Mus. Magazin.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entitled 'Grand Quintour'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trojahn, Manfred</td>
<td>Soleares</td>
<td>Op.10</td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td>Leuckart, München</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnage, Mark-Anthony</td>
<td>Piano &amp; String Quartet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schott, ED 12776</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>12' duration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungar, Gustav</td>
<td>Variations and Double Fugue</td>
<td>Op. 25</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Pub: Cranz, 1884</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urspruch, Anton (1850-1907)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op.21</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Pub: Cranz, 1884</td>
<td>c.1884</td>
<td>MGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanhal, Johann (1739-1813)</td>
<td>6 Sonatas for Kbd, 2 vns, va, vc ad lib.</td>
<td>op. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>Source: Grove Music Online &amp; Gottfried Heinz, Die Geschichte, 233.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaurabourg, Andréé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Das Neue Musiklexicon: Works for piano and string quartet, no further information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermeire, Oscar</td>
<td>Symphonic Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 25</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Cranz</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Not in Grove, MGG or Riemann.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vierne, Louis Victor Jules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Senart</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1870-1937)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vierne, Louis Victor Jules</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 42</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Lobos, H (1887-1959)</td>
<td>Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vink, Heinrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vockner, Josef (1842-1906)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 70</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>Doblinger</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogler, Abbé</td>
<td>Der Eheliche Zwist</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mezger: Paris</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>For piano and string quartet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogler, Abbé</td>
<td>6 Quintets for piano and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>string quartet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volbach, Fritz</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 36</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Hug.</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorisek (Worzischek), Jan</td>
<td>Rondo for Pf &amp; Qt</td>
<td>Op. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaclav (1791-1825)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagstaff, Julian (b.1970)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wailly, Paul de</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 15</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Rovart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainwright, Robert (1748</td>
<td>6 Quintets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1782)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Ernest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Bruno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walthew, Richard Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Stainer &amp; Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner, Harry Waldo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webern, Anton von</td>
<td>Quintet for Strings &amp; Piano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webern, Anton von</td>
<td>Variations</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webern, Anton von</td>
<td>Quintet</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

British Library


See Grove Music Online: 'The quintets have a concertante cello in addition to the bass part'.

Das Neue Musiklexicon.

Das Neue Musiklexicon.

Cobbett, Vol II, 567-569. Qt awarded prize in competition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Opus Number</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Publication Details</th>
<th>Year Composed</th>
<th>Notes &amp; References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Webern, Anton von</td>
<td>Quintet movement</td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>1906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webern, Anton von</td>
<td>Quintet movement: MaBig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiskopf, Ludwig</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pleyel et Sieber</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Composed three keyboard quintets. Also noted in Heinz, Die Geschichte, 234: HML/Ratliff 1817 Werner: (1695-1766)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner, Gregor Joseph</td>
<td>Pastorella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bärenreiter 1557</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Werner: (1695-1766)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner, Gregor Joseph</td>
<td>Pastorella zur Weinacht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bärenreiter 953</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Werner: (1695-1766)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weydert, Max</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 8</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>W. Wellnitz</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>From Amernet St Qt web-site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittaker, William Gillies</td>
<td>Among the Northumbrian Hills: Variations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stainer &amp; Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Won Carnegie award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson, Malcolm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weinberger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf-Ferrari, Ermanno</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 6</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>Rather</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fragment. Wolf: (1860-1903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfrum, Phillip (1854-1919)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. 21</td>
<td>b♭</td>
<td>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuorinen, C</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wüst, Philipp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Leuckert</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ye, Xiaogang</td>
<td>Enchanted Bamboo for pf &amp; st qt</td>
<td>Op.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schott, Mainz ED 8800</td>
<td>1989-1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Opus Number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td>Year Composed</td>
<td>Notes &amp; References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanella, Amitare</td>
<td>Op. 64</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ricordi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zanella born 1873.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarebski, Juliusz (1854-1885)</td>
<td>Piano Quintet</td>
<td>Op. 34</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Krakow: PWM, 1955</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>A mon cher maitre F. Liszt. First name also appears as Janusz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmermann, Walter</td>
<td>De Umbris Idearum for pf qnt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PWM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zolawski, Wawrzyniec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zsolt, Nandor</td>
<td></td>
<td>b♭</td>
<td></td>
<td>Augener-Schott</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Cobbett, II, 599. Qnt awarded Budapest Lipótvárosa Kaszinó Prize.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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