

Franz Schubert

(b. Vienna, 31 January 1797 — d. Vienna, 19 November 1828)

Scherzo in B-minor D 759/3.

— Completed Performing Version by Nicola Samale & Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs —

Orchestral Movement in B-minor D 797/1.

— Conjectural Finale to the ›unfinished‹ Symphony D 759 —

Schubert's Unfinished: A stock-taking

The B-minor Symphony (D 759), in its surviving form as a three-movement (!) fragment, has posed questions to posterity that have remained unanswered to the present day. These questions have given rise to a multitude of tenacious legends and rumors that have been elevated into a ‘theory’, and sometimes heatedly debated, by musicologists, critics, and aestheticians. In essence, the debates are a musicological snipe hunt. Posterity has turned the hard necessity of the fragment into a virtue: the claim is still heard that Schubert considered his symphony ‘finished’ at the end of the E-major Andante, thereby creating in effect a new species of a two-movement symphony. Any completion, so the theory goes, is unthinkable in view of the “degree of perfection” attained by the extant movements. This was followed by the self-serving pronouncement that the sketched Scherzo was “not at the same level as the first two movements”, and thus irrelevant. It would seem that the mere fact that Schubert let this musical torso, including its calligraphic title page, go out of his hands and dedicated it to the *Steiermärkischer Musikverein* (= Styrian Musical Society) constitutes ‘evidence’ that he regarded the work as finished in its two-movement form. It has even been claimed that the piano fantasy *Der Wanderer* (orchestrated *inter alia* by Franz Liszt and Charles Koechlin), a work he began to write in November 1822, was conceived as the symphony's Finale, or at least its ideal continuation. Arnold Schering, writing in 1938, conjectured that the symphony was complete because it minutely follows an assumed program: namely, the prose sketch *Mein Traum* (= *My Dream*) handed down by Schubert. Others maintain that Schubert simply abandoned this symphony, like so many others. Yet all of these are mere speculation, pointless in view of the paucity of facts and ill-suited to shed light on the matter. Musicologists have played a key role in the formation of this legend and continue this dubious enterprise to the present day. Regrettably, even the preface to Werner Aderhold's scholarly-critical edition of the symphony – an edition that also invites criticism on some finer points of its editorial method – is but another example of the hapless snarl of fact and fiction, discoveries and conjectures, reality and wishful thinking. Let us therefore summarize the known facts:

At some indeterminate time Schubert composed at least three movements of a symphony in B minor, initially in complete short score. The first three of these ten pages of sketches, corresponding to the first 248 bars of the complete score of the first movement, are lost. The sketch of the third movement ends with the draft of the Trio, the subsequent staves being left blank. The handwritten full score elaborated from the sketch breaks off in the third movement after a few orchestrated bars. It contains seventy consecutively numbered pages of fair copy, the first being a title page in calligraphic roman script that reads “*Sinfonia / in / H moll / von / Franz Schubert mpia*” (“*mpia*” is an abbreviation of *manu propria*, or “in his own hand”). Below this, to the left, we find the date “*Wien den 30. Octob. 1822*”. After Schubert's death on 19 November 1828, the short-score sketches of the symphony passed to his brother Ferdinand and then, following the latter's death in 1859, to the Viennese autograph collector Nicolaus Dumba. In contrast, the full score wound up, by an unknown route, in the private library of Schubert's friends, the brothers Anselm and Josef Hüttenbrenner. (Anselm was initially secretary and from 1824 director of the *Steiermärkischer Musikverein* in Graz; Josef functioned as a sort of private secretary to Schubert in 1822-3, no doubt mainly taking care of his financial affairs.) At first the score evidently remained with Josef, who wrote out a version for piano four-hands in 1853. He also added several markings in the manuscript itself, e. g. prefixing a number of instrument names to the brace on page 21 and probably inserting the page numbers on pages 2 through 70. At some point Anselm Hüttenbrenner in Graz obtained Josef's manuscript. The *Schubert Lexikon* (Graz, 1997) claims that “it is unknown when the symphony passed from him to his

brother in Graz, for the memoirs and epistolary communications that he sent to various recipients many years later (see Deutsch's *Erinnerungen*, pp. 3, 88, 222, 497 and 512) are self-contradictory, not least regarding the symphony's dedication." In this light, Schubert allegedly dedicated and presented the work to Graz's *Musikverein* in 1823 as a token of gratitude for being made an honorary member. As a proof, Anselm Hüttenbrenner cited a letter of thanks dated 20 September 1823.

We owe the discovery of this semi-symphony to the Viennese conductor Johann Herbeck, a tireless seeker of Schubert autographs, thanks to whom many manuscripts survive today that might otherwise have been lost over the years. As early as 1860 Herbeck heard that Anselm Hüttenbrenner preserved a number of previously unknown Schubert manuscripts. Finally, on 1 May 1865, he paid Hüttenbrenner a visit in Graz on the pretext of wanting to conduct the latter's own compositions in Vienna. Hüttenbrenner willingly offered Herbeck the original of the symphony although he would have been perfectly satisfied with a copy, as the conductor recalled in his memoirs. (From this, the *Schubert Lexikon* drew the conclusion that the reproach leveled against Hüttenbrenner by several scholars – namely, that he deliberately withheld the manuscript – probably does him an injustice.) Herbeck conducted the première of the two complete movements in Vienna on 17 December 1865. (It is known that 106 musicians took part, i. e. an orchestra with a very large string section and doubled wind parts.) Even then he regarded the absence of further movements as a shortcoming, and as a 'makeshift Finale' for this occasion he chose the madcap last movement of Schubert's Third Symphony. The symphonic torso was published by Spina, Vienna, in 1867, at which time the publisher supplied its nickname, '*The Unfinished*'. At first Herbeck apparently kept the manuscript. Anselm Hüttenbrenner died in 1868, and after Herbeck's own death in 1877 the fragmentary score was acquired by Nicolaus Dumba, eighteen years after he had purchased the short-score sketches. Dumba then added his signature to the lower left-hand corner of the title page. The manuscripts of the Scherzo were first made known by Friedländer, who was allowed to consult them on Dumba's premises in 1883 and published his findings in Berlin in 1887. Two years earlier, in 1885, the *Unfinished* was issued in print in Leipzig, as part of the *Alte Schubert-Gesamtausgabe* (= Old Schubert Complete Edition), in an edition partly supervised by Johannes Brahms. The sketches were reproduced in the critical commentary (I/13) to Series I of the *Gesamtausgabe*. When Dumba died in 1900, he bequeathed the fragmentary score and the sketches to the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, in whose archive the reunited material has remained since 7 March 1901. The draft Scherzo was also made accessible in a facsimile edition published in 1923-4 by *Drei Masken Verlag* in Munich. It was not until 1967 that Christa Landon, while scouring the archive of the *Wiener Männergesangsverein* (= Men's Choral Society) in Vienna, unearthed another, previously unknown page of score containing bars 10 to 20 of the Scherzo. This leaf is incompletely orchestrated, but as it lacks a page number it evidently never entered Hüttenbrenner's collection. According to Landon, the leaf was severed from the full score. She assumed that it initially remained among the possessions of Schubert's family and later passed to the *Männergesangsverein*, perhaps as a commemorative gift. In 1978 Walther Dürr and Christa Landon issued an updated facsimile edition of the fragmentary score and sketches (omitting the blank pages), published by Katzbichler. Finally, a new *Urtext* edition of the complete material, including critical commentary, was published in 1996 by Bärenreiter in the *Neue Schubert Ausgabe* (= New Schubert Edition) accompanied by a miniature score which, unfortunately, omits the critical commentary.

This is practically all one can say about the *Unfinished* with any degree of certainty. Any claims beyond this will remain pure conjecture until the source situation improves or paper and handwriting analyses reveal new insights. There are even considerable doubts as to the work's date of origin: the only firm evidence is the date given on the title page, which, according to Schubert's usual habits, would normally indicate when he began to work on the symphony. Another item of evidence thought to bear on the work's genesis is the letter of thanks written on 20 September 1823. This, and the not unwarranted assumption that the short-score draft must have arisen shortly before the score, led ultimately to the extrapolation that Schubert drafted the symphony in summer 1822 and scored it sometime between 30 October 1822 and autumn 1823. Another item of evidence put forward by many writers is a document allegedly dealing with the two extant movements, for which it supposedly represents a sort of 'program'. This text, entitled *Mein Traum* and purportedly written on 3 July 1822, is known from a pencilled manuscript among Ferdinand

Schubert's papers and a copy by Schober. Beyond these, there is not a single reference to the symphony in any surviving document from Schubert's day! The composer did not even mention it in his well-known letter of 7 December 1822 to Joseph von Spaun in which he lists his works of the preceding months, expressly stating that it is "all I can say about myself and my music". This letter could at least cast doubt on the assumption that the draft originated in summer 1822.

No less questionable is the value of *Mein Traum* as a 'program'. Schering's analysis and the correlations he discovered between the text and the first two movements are consistent, but his comment that the work "was left unfinished for this reason" is sheer speculation. Moreover, according to the *Schubert Lexikon*, the date placed beneath the pencilled manuscript and the title itself are not even in the composer's hand, but stem from his brother Ferdinand. As far as I know, no extensive analysis of the manuscript's handwriting or an examination of its authorship has yet been undertaken; at least no findings have reached publication. There is, therefore, no firm evidence for the date of the story in *Mein Traum*. In the meantime, it has also been discovered that Schubert's letter of thanks to the *Steiermärkischer Musikverein* – a letter linked with the *Unfinished* although it only mentions one of his symphonies, not a particular symphony – was forged at some unknown time and for unknown reasons by Josef Hüttenbrenner. The *Schubert Lexikon* states that "the wording alone is untypical of Schubert; furthermore, Schubert never signed his letters this way. On the contrary, the signature was quite obviously copied into the letter from the autograph title page of the *Unfinished*. What Hüttenbrenner, the man most likely responsible for these manipulations (at the time he was probably the only person with access to the handwritten score), wished thereby to accomplish eludes discovery." Even the letter itself, now available in various facsimile reproductions, is recognizably not in Schubert's hand, but, as Ernst Hilmar informs us, in a secretarial script common to the age. Nor is the authenticity of the symphony's title page above question: the handwriting of the lines with the date differs from that of the title itself, and Hilmar, in his major study *Datierungsprobleme im Werk Schuberts* ("Problems of Dating in Schubert's Works"), points out that Schubert, "while travelling, consistently indicated the location as well as the date of his works; only those written in Vienna lack a place of composition." Hence, for a work begun in Vienna, Schubert would not likely have written "Vienna, 30th October 1822," but at most "30th October 1822". Equally remarkable is the fact that the opening of the short-score sketch, too, is no longer locatable today, for Schubert, as with his other drafts, might well have dated the beginning of the composition on its first page. This is all the more conceivable in that the full score of the *Unfinished* lacks a date in the upper right-hand corner of the first page, where Schubert usually placed it (see the full score of the *Great C-major Symphony*), especially if we accept the date on the title page of the full score was manipulated. In sum, all of the scant secondary documents on the symphony's genesis are either forgeries or at least questionable. This is not a recent discovery, but the relevant questions and statements issued by various scholars over the last 180 years have been studiously ignored by large parts of the Schubert establishment. In the end these doubts as well as the innovative design of the *Unfinished*, which seemed to transcend that of the *Great C-major Symphony*, led various scholars to assume that the work originated at an even later date, as the similarity between the Scherzo theme and the opening of the E-flat-major Trio of 1827 seemed to suggest.

At best, the circumstances surrounding the symphony's genesis might be deduced or corroborated by the appearance of previously unknown documents or music manuscripts, new methods of dating, watermark and paper analyses, or further handwriting comparisons. Regrettably, Schubert scholarship continues to be remiss in this respect. Watermark and paper analyses of Schubert's manuscripts have essentially been undertaken only by Ernst Hilmar and Robert Winter. Winter presented his findings in the path-breaking essay "Paper Studies and the Future of Schubert Research", published in the volume *Schubert Studies* edited by Eva Badura-Skoda (Cambridge, 1978), in which he issued an urgent plea for further investigation. His appeal went unheeded in the world of musicology: paper studies of the *Unfinished* have no more been forthcoming over the last twenty-five years than textual analyses of the complete source material. Anyway, Winter's essay is largely irrelevant to the *Unfinished* as it focuses on 120 manuscripts from the final six years of the composer's life, i.e. from 1823 to 1828. Still, it does inform us that the *Unfinished* was written on paper used for other major works of the year 1822, including the *Wanderer Fantasy*. Equally interesting is the discovery that the symphony was not written out on paper types that

Schubert used in 1823 (types Ia, Ib, IIa and IIb in Winter's catalogue). Yet Winter unfortunately fails to specify whether his words apply to the full score or the sketch, both of which, moreover, are written on different types of paper – the full score on sixteen-line paper, the short score on fourteen-line paper in oblong format.

There are other difficulties as well. As Ernst Hilmar points out in his above-mentioned article, “watermarks, and especially their variants, merely demarcate a calendrical range. To make the dates more precise it is imperative to compare the autograph in question with other relevant manuscripts from the same period. Another difficulty arises from the fact that Schubert, with remarkable frequency, reused written paper later for outlining or writing down other works.” To this we should also add the possibility, mentioned by Winter, that Schubert used residual stacks of older paper for particular compositions or drafts, thereby further obscuring their dates of origin. Similar problems arise with the procedure Hilmar describes for handwriting comparisons. At least his article informs us that the bass clef in the full score of the *Unfinished* has a shape customarily found in Schubert's manuscripts of 1821 and 1822; the frequent and striking use of a downward stem to the right of the note-heads in the symphonic torso, he maintains, is likewise typical of the period from spring 1820 roughly until summer 1822. Both studies thus seem to provide cautious corroboration of 1821-2 as the symphony's date of origin and argue against a date after 1822. Long ago Schering, as additional arguments, mentioned the similarities between the symphonic fragment and the songs *Grablied für die Mutter* (1818), *Der Unglückliche* (1821), and *Ihr Grab* (1822). Again, however, there have been no follow-up studies, and it is too soon to draw firm conclusions.

Schubert's Unfinished as a four-movement whole?

The theory generally accepted today is that Schubert ultimately abandoned the symphony. However, there is nothing in the manuscripts to support or refute any of the speculations as to whether he abandoned the work or not, and if so, why. The third movement, after all, was written out in sketch form and contains everything Schubert needed for its later elaboration. There is even a complete orchestration of its opening bars. Admittedly the score breaks off at this point, but not even the second page of score discovered by Christa Landon for the Scherzo constitutes proof that Schubert did not complete the movement in a yet undiscovered manuscript, for the page ends precisely at the point where he committed a scribal error: Ordinarily Schubert scored his works from top to bottom, but on this page he became confused and interchanged the clarinet and the bassoon – a good reason for removing the page, even if the surviving movements in the manuscript contain similar errors that he allowed to stand. In his final writing on this page he even expressly noted “bassoons” and “clarinets” in the left-hand margin in order to make note of his error. That he finished the score of the Scherzo can thus not be proved at present, but neither can it be disproved.

The custom of performing the two surviving complete movements as a self-contained unit quickly led to the widely accepted claim that they formed a ‘finished’ whole. But the draft Scherzo offers incontrovertible proof that a two-movement symphony in B-minor, ending with an Andante set in the dominant key and unmistakably demanding a continuation, was inconceivable in terms of the contemporary understanding of symphonic form. The question therefore arises: how are we as listeners or performers to deal with this fragment? However, to the present day many listeners, left completely in the lurch by popularizing biographies, misleading program notes, and uninformed CD booklets, do not even know that an autograph draft of a third movement exists at all. For this reason many 20th century composers have, despite the source situation of the *Unfinished*, gone so far as to write an entirely new Scherzo and Finale! In this light it is especially tragic that Schubert – as later happened to Bruckner with his unfinished Ninth – failed to have his own intentions observed by posterity, not least because of the mythification of the experts, simply because his symphony has not come down to us in a performable four-movement form.

How should a completion of the *Unfinished* be carried out at all? A stylistically plausible orchestration of the Scherzo, along with a fleshing out of the rudimentary sketches for a Trio, is at least theoretically feasible. In practice, however, attempts along these lines, some dating from the first half of the 20th century, have failed to take hold. Besides the mythification, a simple reason for this, as with the performance versions of, say, Mahler's Tenth, is that in most cases the performance material can only be obtained on hire. Most orchestras have the parts to movements 1 and 2 in their library in any case, so why spend valuable money on orchestral material for a Scherzo that is in any case not entirely original? To the present day no edition (except the present one) has made the orchestral parts of the Scherzo available for purchase. Moreover, many completions are stylistically quite dubious: only the leading British Schubert scholar Brian Newbould, when he orchestrated the Scherzo in the 1980s, was the first to take into account that Schubert wrote for natural trumpets and horns with slide crooks! And finally, wouldn't a comparatively light Scherzo, after the 'transfigured' Andante, lower the symphony to a mundane and trivial plane?

Still more urgent is the question of the Finale, of which allegedly not a trace exists. Yet shortly after Herbeck discovered the *Unfinished*, the British Schubertian and autograph collector George Grove raised the possibility that the first entr'acte from Schubert's incidental music to *Rosamunde, Prinzessin von Zypern* (D 797/1), being almost four-hundred bars long and likewise in B-minor, may well have been the symphony's original Finale. At his instigation this *Entre=Act* (so in Schubert's own handwriting) was already used as a concluding movement at the symphony's London première on 5 February 1881. An examination of the sources shows that the theory is not airtight: the instruments in the undated *Entre=Act* score are laid out in a different order from the score of the symphony, where Schubert placed the flutes on two staves (they are combined on a single staff in the *Entre=Act*). Further, according to Robert Winter, the *Entre=Act* is written on paper that Schubert did not begin to use until roughly autumn 1823, and thus differs from that of the first two movements. This point was already noted in 1969 by Maurice E. Brown in the preface to his Eulenburg Edition of the *Rosamunde* music.

As I have noted when I looked through the original manuscript in the Austrian National Library, the *Entre=Act* is indeed written with a darker and earlier ink and a thick quill that does not match the other surviving manuscripts of *Rosamunde* but bears noticeable similarities to the handwriting of the symphony! Moreover, the *Entre=Act* was originally headed "*allegro mod^{to}*", exactly like the opening movement of the symphony; it was only later that Schubert turned the abbreviation for 'moderato' into a "*molto*", thereby slowing the tempo to "*allegro molto moderato*". The movement heading "*No.1 Entre=Act nach dem 1. Aufz.*" ("No. 1, Entr'acte after Scene 1") was obviously squeezed at a later date into the top margin of the page, where there was just enough space for it, and it is written with a noticeably thinner ink and a finer nib that matches the other surviving manuscripts of *Rosamunde*. It follows that the full score, originally headed simply "*Allegro moderato*" in B-minor for orchestra, was probably finished before it was inserted into the ballet music in November 1823. (In view of the uncertain dates of the first three movements, it is not inconceivable that they were even written after this B-minor movement, which would account for a number of anomalies.) It is thus equally conceivable that the movement was indeed intended to serve as the symphony's Finale; in fact, it is hard to imagine what other use it might have had. This is consistent with the findings of Gerald Abraham, who noted that Schubert, in his great haste, retexted several earlier pieces for the commissioned ballet and wrote only five of the ten *Rosamunde* items afresh (nos. 4, 5, 8, 9 and 10). Whatever the case, Abraham produced the first generally credible completion of the *Unfinished* and published it in 1972 with a stylistically questionable elaboration of the Scherzo (using modern horns and trumpets) and inserting the *Entre=Act* as a final movement. It managed, however, to reach no more than one single grammophone recording and a few performances and is largely forgotten today. No further handwriting or paper analyses of the *Entre=Act* have been forthcoming, much less with regard to its possible links with the *Unfinished*. As this question has been bandied about for more than 120 years, it represents yet another major lapse on the part of Schubert scholarship.

It is not least owing to these ties to the theater – and the 19th century's underlying aesthetic bias toward a sharp distinction between 'absolute' symphonic music and 'dramatic' theater scores – that this orchestral movement has been rejected by large parts of the Schubert establishment as a potential Finale to the

Unfinished. On the contrary, the theory has only added grist to the mill of those who seek to justify its putative two-movement design, not least by trying to denigrate the musical value of the Scherzo and the alleged Finale. Various lines of argument have been marshaled against the thesis that the two movements are not on the same lofty level as the rest – a reproach based not least of all on misconceptions regarding their performance. For example the *Entre=Act*, if used as a Finale, would have to be taken at a faster tempo, i. e. the original ‘Allegro moderato’, and various interpolated ritardandos probably entered the piece only when it was reworked into incidental music. On the contrary, there are many motivic relations linking the Scherzo and the *Entre=Act* with the symphony's first two movements, thereby solidifying the musical coherence of all four movements. One particular motivic germ-cell is the opening upbeat figure in both the Scherzo and the *Entre=Act*, an extension of the introductory motto in the basses that serves as the germ-cell of the entire symphony (B-C#-D, b. 1). In various alternative forms it can already be found in the accompaniment to the main theme of the first movement (D-E-F#-G, b. 9f), in the main theme itself (A#-B-C#-D, b. 16f), in the transition to the secondary theme (B-C#-D#-E, b. 41f), in the secondary theme itself (D-E-F#-G, b. 46f), in the opening transition to the Andante (inverted in the basses as E-D#-C#-B, n. 1), the second part of the main theme (F#-G#-A-B, b.s 33–5), and in the contrasting lyrical theme (A-G-F-E, b. 74f). As the music progresses it is subjected again and again to new manipulations. This motivic germ-cell becomes the central element of the *Entre=Act*. Abraham, in his performance version, already recognized how it might be used to splice the end of the Scherzo with the opening of the *Entre=Act* (in this case F#-G#-A#-B). At the same time, the motif draws on the end of the first movement's development section, where it crops up between bars 202 and 212 in a similar rhythmic form with a distinctly symphonic character familiar from the opening of Mozart's *Jupiter* Symphony. With the beginning of the Scherzo it marks a major juncture in the *Unfinished*: if every theme in the first two movements enters on the downbeat, the upbeat transformation beginning at this point is something new. In the *Entre=Act*, Schubert first turns the germ-cell into a violently propulsive concatenation; the main theme (b. 7) circles this figure over and over again, and it is developed with almost maniacal single-mindedness as the movement progresses.

No less original is the form: Schubert's idea of developing the lyrical second group from the main theme is highly interesting and should be regarded today as innovative rather than regressive. Seventy years later Bruckner lit on the same idea for the fourth movement of his Ninth. The consequences were much the same: even today narrow-minded musicologists regard its bleak lyrical period as “inadequate and rudimentary” even though it was consistently planned that way from the very start. The *Entre=Act* even develops the main theme into a concluding period (b. 68) with the character of a third theme, repeated intact in the recapitulation. The mighty unison (b. 92) likewise anticipates Bruckner: the ‘splitting’ of the pitch G# into its neighboring pitches G and A (b. 55f) even recalls the guiding principal of Bruckner's Ninth (see b. 18 of its 1st mvmt.). The development section (m. 150), exactly like that of the first movement, chiefly makes use of the germ-cell and a new idea. Especially bold is the elision of development and recapitulation that first becomes manifest in the lyrical theme (m. 211), as later in Bruckner. In the coda (m. 321) Schubert uses the germ-cell for a furious final escalation and a brief, almost parenthetical final appearance in the major mode.

There is other evidence suggesting that the movement was conceived independently of the theater score: Brian Newbould noted that the *Entre=Act* contains a fully-fledged, well-proportioned development section with two strands of development. This form is typical of Schubert's symphonic movements, Newbould adds, but not for sonata forms in theater scores (e.g. opera overtures), which basically avoid double developments of this sort. Newbould also points out that the harmonic design is equally untypical of incidental music: the composition of symphonic orchestral movements in B-minor was still boldly experimental for Schubert at this stage, for natural horns or trumpets in B did not exist. Schubert had to make do with trumpets in E and horns in D (or horns in E in the Andante), but this did not permit him to undertake lengthy passages in B-major such as might be found particularly in a Finale, unless he were intent on a more tragic ending. How probable is it that he would muster the time and effort involved in such an experiment in orchestral writing for the sole purpose of using an ambitious piece on this scale to open a theater score that was merely a matter of musical hackwork, had to be finished in a few weeks, and is

known to contain several self-borrowings from his own works? To be sure, a definitive clarification of the symphony's Finale can only be provided by a short-score draft, which, however, is no more extant today than the first three pages of the sketch to the opening movement. Odd that precisely those manuscripts have disappeared that might have shed light on the genesis of this music! The many manipulations associated with the *Unfinished* lend fuel to the suspicion that particular facts on its gestation and transmission were meant, for unfathomable reasons, to be obscured. Perhaps the solution to this riddle continues to reside in the archives of self-serving autograph collectors.

About this Edition

Earlier published completions of the *Unfinished* were not entirely successful: completions of the Scherzo, for example, were rendered stylistical suspect through the use of chromatic horns and trumpets. Moreover, only the final state of the putative Finale (in its subsequent function as entr'acte music) was used rather than the original state, divested of its several theatrical accretions. Not the least reason why these completions have failed to take hold is that the orchestral parts were invariably available only on hire. Our necessary new edition therefore offers a set of parts available on sale. Given their immensely wide dissemination, it seemed superfluous to reprint the first two movements. To be sure it must be stressed, in the interest of honesty, that although there are no doubts that the draft Scherzo in Schubert's hand belongs to the symphony, no proof has yet arisen, notwithstanding solid arguments, that the B-minor orchestral piece in our publication was actually intended to be the Finale of the *Unfinished*. Granted, a performance of these two movements after the *Unfinished* makes it possible to experience the work as a self-contained four-movement whole, but strictly speaking we are dealing with a pastiche. Unlike many other completions of well-known fragments, ours has the advantage of being, for the most part, by the composer himself (apart from the necessary addition of the second part of the Trio).

The composer and conductor Nicola Samale, as a labor of love, already ventured to orchestrate the Scherzo to D 759 in the early 1980s. In the wake of our work on the fragmentary Finale to Bruckner's Ninth, we pondered the possibility of producing the present new version of Schubert's Scherzo from 1986. By the summer of 1998 I had written the new score at Samale's request and in ongoing consultation with him, adding performance instructions and reworking several passages in the Trio, first to underscore several structural connections (e. g. 2nd mvmt., see b. 48–52 of the new Trio), and second to reflect several alterations in the orchestration of the main movement. As Schubert's sketch of the Scherzo is available in transcription and facsimile in the New Schubert Edition, we refrain from publishing it here. The sense of expectation that Schubert created at the end of the Andante made it logical to suggest an *attacca* to the following Scherzo. In this case, however, it would be necessary to add a third kettledrum, for he demands a kettledrum in E in the Andante but returns to one in F# at the opening of the Scherzo. Owing to the interlocking relation between the final motif of the Scherzo and the opening motif of D 797/1, we also recommend an *attacca* to the final movement. Once again, this presupposes an additional kettledrum, unless the low F# kettledrum that Schubert calls for in D 797/1 is changed to one on high F#. We present this alternative in cue notes, not least because the low F# does not sound well on the plastic heads in use today.

Commentators such as Paul-Gilbert Langevin and Harry Halbreich long ago cast doubt on the short, terse major ending, which seems ill-prepared by the furious coda, although this is not particularly consequential in a theater score. As I have noted when I looked through the original manuscript in the Austrian National Library, the sharp signs in the final bars of D 797/1 are placed quite distant from the note-heads. We took this to mean that Schubert may well have considered ending the movement in the minor mode at first. In this connection, it should also be noted that the sketch of the first movement was likewise originally intended to end in the major mode: the two *tutti* hammerblows were to be followed by a *pianissimo* B-minor chord sustained for four bars and then by three bars of a major chord at an even softer dynamic level, the minor third merely changing to a *tierce de Picardie*. In the score, however, Schubert immediately entered the definitive minor ending without any known preceding draft. A minor ending to the putative Finale

would be very effective in the context of this tragic symphony; Brahms arrived at a similar ending decades later in his Fourth. For this reason we enclose a minor-mode variant of the final bars as an alternative. Apart from this, this edition is based on a comparison of early prints and the Old Schubert Edition, correcting some obvious errors and adding some playing indications if required.

Recent studies of performance practice in Schubert have been inspired and carried out in exemplary fashion, especially through Jos van Immerseel's concerts and CD recordings of the symphonies with the ensemble Anima Eterna (SONY) – a superbly fruitful cooperation between scholars and performers. According to Bruce Haynes, the tuning pitch in Vienna during Schubert's lifetime lay between 435 and 445 Hz, and was thus, notwithstanding earlier assumptions to the contrary, not far removed from current usage. The string sections in Viennese orchestras around 1820 had an average size of roughly thirty musicians. Various orchestral performances and recordings on period instruments have demonstrated that the work can even sound well with a string section of 6-6-4-4-3. It goes without saying that larger forces are permissible, as witness the première under Herbeck; however, it should be borne in mind that when more than twelve first violins were used (e. g. at academies and festive concerts in large auditoriums) the woodwinds were usually doubled. Another point to be considered is the spatial separation of the first and second violins on the left- and right-hand sides of the concert platform – a placement that Schubert definitely presupposed, as can be seen from the spatial effects obviously written into the score. In Schubert's day, string players played on catgut strings. The original wind section included wooden transverse flutes, horns with slide crooks, natural trumpets, and narrow-bore trombones. Such chromatic pitches as were possible at all on horns were produced by stopping with the hand. These pitches, which can, of course, be played effortlessly in tune on modern double horns – at least theoretically – must be played as stopped notes to obtain their special timbral effect. Schubert calls for an unusually large number of stopped notes in the *Unfinished*, even on the major third above the second partial (this topic is discussed in John Humphries's *The Early Horn: A Practical Guide*, Cambridge, 2000). Regarding balance, it should be noted that horns and trombones in Schubert's day were roughly two-thirds the size of today's instruments and had narrower bores. Two natural horns, two natural trumpets, and three narrow-bore trombones should be used wherever possible; fortunately there is a growing number of versatile players with a command of these instruments. For ease of performance, it is customary today to change the original alto clefs for the trombones in the manuscript into the tenor clefs used today. But it should not be overlooked that Schubert reckoned with an alto trombone. The use of a tenor instrument as first trombone only took hold at the end of the 19th century and is foreign to Schubert's style. (The parts in our edition are, however, available in both alto and tenor clef as an aid to sight reading.)

Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs, Bremen, © 2010 (Contact: info@benjamingunnarcohers.com)
— The performance material is available on sale.—

Translation: Bradford Robinson, © 2010

The preparation of the orchestral parts brought to light some printing mistakes and errors of Repertoire Explorer Study Score 884 (cf. Corrigenda 2010). This corrected conducting score is in concordance with the parts.