

The Symphonies of Louise Farrenc (1804-1875): A Comparative Examination

By

J. Cameron Stephenson

July, 2021

Director of Thesis: Dr. Kevin N. Moll

Major Department: Theory/Composition/Musicology

Abstract

This study examines the three symphonies of Louise Farrenc. The entirety of Symphony No. 2 in D major, op. 35 is discussed, with the finale movements of symphonies 1 and 3 being provided to compare form, tonality, and orchestration. Each analysis is supplemented by formal charts and an appendix of relevant musical examples.

The first section supplies biographical information on Louise Farrenc, followed by a list of her compositions. The second section discusses scholarship available on Farrenc, including contemporaneous primary sources and recent dissertations, books, and articles. The third section presents an overview of the three symphonies and the historical context surrounding each. The fourth section provides analyses for the first three movements of Symphony No. 2, which is followed by analyses of each symphony's finale movements in section five.

This thesis aims to account for current scholarship available of Louise Farrenc and her music, assimilate relevant primary and secondary sources, and present a comprehensive study on her symphonies through analysis of representative movements.

The Symphonies of Louise Farrenc (1804-1875):
A Comparative Examination

A Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the
Department of Music Theory, Composition, and Musicology
East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree
Master of Music
With concentrations in
Music Theory and Music History and Literature

J. Cameron Stephenson

July, 2021

The Symphonies of Louise Farrenc (1804-1875):
A Comparative Examination

By

J. Cameron Stephenson

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF
THESIS

Kevin N. Moll, PhD

COMMITTEE MEMBER:

Amy E. Carr-Richardson, PhD

COMMITTEE MEMBER:

Mark Douglas Richardson, PhD

CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT
OF

Theory/Composition/Musicology

Thomas Huener, PhD

DEAN OF THE
GRADUATE SCHOOL:

Paul J. Gemperline, PhD

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to the assistance of my mentors at East Carolina University, all of whom have helped to shape the direction of this study. Dr. Kevin N. Moll has devoted many hours to guide me through every stage of this thesis, to which I am extremely grateful. His expertise, patience, and guidance have been invaluable to me throughout the years I have spent as his student. I would also like to thank Dr. Mark Richardson and Dr. Amy Carr-Richardson for their insight and encouragement. Finally, I wish to thank my family, friends, and colleagues for their continued support.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
I. Biographical Sketch.....	3
A. <i>Daughter, Student, Wife, Mother</i>	3
B. <i>Composer and Professor</i>	6
C. <i>Widow, Collaborator, and Scholar</i>	10
D. List of Compositions.....	12
II. Summary of Primary and Secondary Scholarship	15
A. Secondary sources	15
B. Primary Sources.....	20
III. Overview of the Works in their Entirety.....	22
A. Context of Programming and Reception of the Symphony in Paris from 1820-1850.....	22
B. Compositional and Performance History.....	25
C. Symphony No. 1	28
D. Symphony No. 2	30
E. Symphony No. 3	32
IV. Examination of Symphony No. 2.....	35
A. Movement 1	35
B. Movement 2	40
C. Movement 3	44
V. Comparative Examination of Finales.....	49
A. Symphony No. 2	50
B. Symphony No. 1	62
C. Symphony No. 3	68
D. Comparisons.....	72
VI. Concluding Remarks.....	76
Works Cited	80
Appendix: Musical Examples	83



Louise Farrenc (Portrait by Luigi Rubio - 1835)

Introduction

Louise Farrenc (1804-1875) was an eminent figure in the Parisian musical society of the 19th century. Throughout her career, she served as a scholar of early keyboard music, professor of piano at the prestigious Paris Conservatoire, and a composer whose chamber, orchestral, vocal, and solo piano works were heard throughout the concert halls of Paris. Despite the success of her chamber music and the favorable critical reception of some of the era's most prominent critics, Farrenc's orchestral works, particularly her three symphonies, failed to receive substantial or long-lasting recognition from Parisian audiences. These symphonies, while conservative in nature, display a level of craft that one would expect to find in a mature composer well versed in the studies of orchestration, counterpoint, and form.

In line with the heightened interest in women composers that has over the last few decades, Farrenc's music has been the subject of recent scholarship. In addition, there are now

recordings of all of her completed orchestral and chamber works, as well as a large portion of her music for solo piano.¹ While her symphonies or overtures have only just begun to be performed by major orchestras, they have been programmed by various ensembles in both Europe and North America in recent years, including the Aurora Orchestra and the Philadelphia Orchestra.

The aim of this study is to provide a close inspection of selected movements from the symphonies of Louise Farrenc. This will be achieved in four parts. The first will be a biographical sketch, including a catalogue of works by the composer to orient the reader to the circumstances and musical world in which Farrenc found herself during the conception and execution of the symphonies. Second will be an account of the scholarship presently available on Louise Farrenc, comprising mainly secondary source material. Next will be a generalized examination of the three symphonies and their adherence to the classical sonata process, which will include discussion of the compositional and performance history of the symphonies. The final section will provide a detailed account of representative movements of each symphony (including the entirety of the second symphony in D major, Op. 35). This analysis is not intended to present a fine-scale examination of each individual movement; rather, a comparative approach will be taken to view each movement and symphony in relation to each other. It is important to note that a comparative first-movement analysis of the three symphonies has already been undertaken by notable Farrenc scholar Christin Heitmann, and thus such an approach could prove superfluous. Therefore, the lens of focus will be shifted towards the finale movements of each symphony. While this thesis is indebted to the efforts of figures such as Heitmann and Bea Friedland, it is the author's hope that it will provide insight to areas that are underdeveloped in the current field of research devoted to the music of Louise Farrenc.

¹ The complete orchestral works of Farrenc have been recorded by Johannes Goritzki and the North German Radio Symphony, Hannover, and Christoph König and Solistes Europeens.

Part 1: Biographical Background and Scholarship on Farrenc

I. Biographical Sketch

The amount of scholarship currently available on Louise Farrenc and her music is limited. Much of the information presented in this chapter is sourced from Bea Friedland, who revived interest in the long-forgotten composer in 1975, the centenary of Farrenc's passing. There is certainly room in the field for further biographical scholarship on the composer in question to complement the analytical articles and books that have appeared in recent decades.

A. *Daughter, Student, Wife, and Mother*

Jeanne-Louise Dumont was born in Paris on May 31, 1804. She was the second-born of three children to Marie-Louise Elisabeth Curton and Jacques-Edme Dumont, a decorated sculptor employed by the various governments that presided over France between the reign of Louis XVI and the Bourbon restoration.² Louise's older brother, Auguste, would, as did his father, grandfather, great-grandfather, uncles, cousins, and others of the Dumont clan, devote himself to the visual arts. Bea Friedland, in her comprehensive biography *Louise Farrenc, 1804-1875: Composer, Performer, Scholar*, notes that Auguste, who was "destined to become the brightest star in the galaxy of Dumont sculptors," proved his worth by winning the *Prix de Rome* in 1823.³ It is little surprise that Louise, as many Dumonts before her, would show a natural inclination towards the arts from a young age; she is noted to have shown a budding talent for

² Bea Friedland, *Louise Farrenc 1804-1875: Composer, Performer, Scholar* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1980), 7-8.

³ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 8, 11.

drawing and painting.⁴ Despite her early predispositions, Louise was shepherded away from these disciplines by her godmother and first music teacher, Anne-Élisabeth Cécile Soria.

Cécile Soria, who was first acquainted with Jacques-Edme Dumont during his stay in Italy (he had won the prestigious *Prix de Rome* in 1788), was invited to serve as his six-year-old daughter's first music teacher. Having been a student herself of Muzio Clementi, Soria was well-qualified to teach young Louise in the basics of harmony, theory, solfège, and keyboard studies. Louise proved to be a precocious pupil of solfège and the piano in particular, and her proclivity towards composition warranted further study.⁵ At age 15, she would begin systemic study of composition with Anton Reicha, who was by this point professor of counterpoint and fugue at the Paris Conservatoire. It is not explicitly clear whether Louise took her lessons with Reicha in an official capacity as a student of the Conservatoire or as a private student, as the protocol of the Conservatoire at the time prevented women from taking any courses on the study of composition; they were permitted only to study "harmonie et accompagnement pratique."⁶ Christin Heitmann, one of the foremost scholars of Farrenc and her music, notes that Farrenc's alignment with the practices of Viennese classicism is due to the influence of the Bohemian-born Reicha.⁷ A pupil of Salieri, Albrechtsberger, and Haydn, Reicha had consorted with several of the leading composers in Vienna during the first years of the nineteenth century, including Ludwig van Beethoven, who had befriended Reicha during their tenure in the *Hofkapelle* in Bonn. Reicha would in turn teach (either privately or through the Conservatoire) some of the prominent figures of the Romantic era, including Franz Liszt, Hector Berlioz, George Onslow,

⁴ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 19.

⁵ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 20.

⁶ Christin Heitmann, "Louise Farrenc," *Musik und Gender im Internet*, 2. (Accessed November 26, 2020).

⁷ *Ibid.*

Charles Gounod, Pauline Viardot, and César Franck. Louise would study under him from 1819-1825, with a brief interruption for her marriage to Aristide Farrenc in 1821.

Aristide Farrenc (1794-1865) was a leading figure in the Parisian music publishing scene of the nineteenth century. Initially a student of flute at the Conservatoire, Aristide likely first met the young Louise during one of the many concerts and dances that the residents of the artist's colony of the Sorbonne (the residence of the Dumont family at this time) held. A program of one of these concerts shows both Aristide and Louise billed, playing works for their respective instruments and a potpourri together. He would prove to be a supportive and sympathetic husband; Friedland notes that their marriage was "a stable and mutually supportive relationship...[achieving] a blend of communality and independence rarely seen in the nineteenth century."⁸ Aristide would also prove to be a successful businessman, with the *Éditions Farrenc* gaining prestige both in Paris and abroad through its securement of publication rights to all of Johann Nepomuk Hummel's future compositions. The relationship between Hummel and the Farrencs was not limited to Aristide, however. It is documented that Louise sought Hummel's assessment of her piano technique, and there is speculation that she was mentored by Ignaz Moscheles as well.⁹ In addition to the works of Hummel and his contemporaries, *Éditions Farrenc* also published a number of works by Louise Farrenc herself.

In February of 1826, Louise and Aristide's only child, Victorine Farrenc, was born. Victorine would become a virtuoso pianist in her own right, owing much to the tutelage of her mother. In concerts advertised during the 1840s, Victorine would be listed as the pianist in concerts of her mother's compositions. Despite evidence of her inclinations towards composition as well, Victorine's career as a performer was prematurely ended when she fell ill in 1849. She

⁸ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 25, 27.

⁹ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 29.

would finally succumb to her illness a decade later in 1859, an event that would leave a large impact on the compositional career of her mother.

B. *Composer and Professor*

Despite Louise Farrenc's obvious talents at the piano, it was not until the 1840s when she would establish a career as a pedagogue on her instrument. In 1842, a year after completing her first symphony, Farrenc was referred to the Duke and Duchess of Orléans as a music teacher.¹⁰ Later that year Farrenc would receive an appointment as Professor of Piano at the Paris Conservatoire, a position which she would serve in for nearly three decades. Her aptitude for teaching can be seen through the large number of *Premier Prix* awards her students won, as well as the professional careers they would pursue after ending studies at the Conservatoire.¹¹ A frequently discussed event of her tenure involves her campaign for a salary equal to her male counterparts, which the successful premiere of her Nonet helped to guarantee. While the Nonet is undeniably her most successful composition, her compositional career had been steadily growing over the course of the previous two decades.

Louise Farrenc's compositional career officially began in the years 1824-1825 when her husband published her first numbered compositions, opp. 2 and 4 (opp. 1 and 3, curiously enough, have left behind no evidence of their existence).¹² Farrenc was noted to have a timid personality and need for encouragement; despite the support of her family and affirmations of her teachers, it was ultimately her husband who nudged Farrenc's compositions into the public consciousness. Michel Brenet, a student in Paris during the later years of Farrenc's life, notes that "Farrenc was able to sense his young wife's talent, to encourage her, virtually force her, they

¹⁰ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 68.

¹¹ James R. Briscoe, ed. *New Historical Anthology of Music by Women* (Indiana University Press, 2004), 171.

¹² Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 32.

say, to make available to the public works which her modesty, of a degree rarely encountered, impelled her to keep unpublished.”¹³ Her compositions of the 1820s and 1830s are (with few exceptions) works for solo piano written in genres popular at the time: variations, rondeaux (often based on melodies from popular operas), and others. The two notable exceptions are the orchestral overtures, which represent Farrenc’s first foray into the medium.

Out of the works from this decade, Farrenc’s *Air russe varié* (Op. 17), a set of variations for piano, garnered the most critical praise. A review of the work appeared in an 1836 edition of *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* penned by Robert Schumann. After lambasting the variations of other composers as “trash to be ripped up and tossed into the furnace,” Schumann provides the following critique of the Farrenc example:

Were a young composer to submit to me variations such as these by L. Farrenc, I would praise him highly for the auspicious talent and fine training everywhere reflected in them. I soon learned the identity of the author - rather, authoress - the wife of the renowned music publisher in Paris, and I am distressed because it is hardly likely that she will ever hear of these encouraging lines. Small, neat, succinct studies they are, written perhaps still under the eye of her teacher, but so sure in outline, so logical in development - in a word, so finished - that one must fall under their charm, especially since a subtle aroma of romanticism hovers over them.¹⁴

While Schumann’s positive review may be one of the only examples of German critical reaction to her works, Farrenc’s music would turn the heads of notable French critics as well.

The 1840s saw a considerable shift in her oeuvre; the music of this decade is written for various chamber ensembles (most of which are centered around the piano) and the introduction of her three symphonies, discussed at length below. Although she had experimented with symphonic and chamber genres in the previous decade, the works of the 1840s show a

¹³ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 32.

¹⁴ Robert Schumann, *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, vol. 5 (1836): 73. Cited in Bea Friedland, *Louise Farrenc, 1804-1875: Composer, Performer, Scholar* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1980), 19.

considerably increased level of maturity. The symphonies attracted the attention of François-Joseph Fétis, one of the most prominent music critics of the nineteenth century. Fétis would prove instrumental in bringing these works to the Parisian public; aside from premiering the first symphony in Brussels, he also wrote at length about the virtues of Farrenc's first symphony in the *Revue et gazette musicale*, one of the leading music journals in Paris at the time. He also included her in his *Biographie universelle des musiciens* (1862). Farrenc's fame culminated with the premiere of her *Nonet* in 1850.

The *Nonet*, whose premiere featured a then 19-year-old Joseph Joachim, was met with great acclaim.¹⁵ A review in the *Revue et gazette musicale* states that if Farrenc “had been born in Germany, she would be the object of the most flattering ovations; but no one is a prophet in his own country; therefore, she encounters at home many obstacles to attaining the distinguished rank which so rightfully belongs to her.”¹⁶ This sentiment would echo throughout the rest of her compositional career; ultimately her nationality, sex, and choice of genres to compose in would work against her. Despite this, she still enjoyed considerable success with her compositions in the later portion of her career, particularly with her *Sextet for Piano and Winds* and her trios featuring flute and clarinet. Unfortunately, the death of Farrenc daughter Victorine at the start of 1859 led to her withdrawing from all musical life for a time, halting her performing and compositional careers in favor of devoting her energy to teaching.¹⁷ The 1860s, however, would still see her reputation as a composer continue to grow in the consciousness of the Parisian musical elite.

¹⁵ Ryan Jacobsen, “Louise Farrenc: 1804-1875” (Doctoral research Lecture, University of Colorado Boulder, 2020), 6-7.

¹⁶ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 101.

¹⁷ Jacobsen, “Louise Farrenc: 1804-1875,” 5, 8.

The *Académie des Beaux-Arts*, one of the five constituents of the *Institut de France*, had a practice of awarding prizes to members of their organization who displayed excellence in one of the fields of art. The *Prix de Rome* represented for a long time the culmination of compositional achievement for any aspiring composer at the Conservatoire. This was, until 1903, barred to any women who might be inclined to apply.¹⁸ In 1861, a second prize – one which was not based on a singular composition, but rather one awarded to individuals who displayed consistent excellence in a particular field – was established at the *Académie des Beaux-Arts*. The *prix Chartier*, named after its benefactor, was created to reward those who had contributed works of high esteem to the genre of chamber music. Merely seven months after the first recipient of the award had been decreed, the *Académie* nominated three candidates for the *prix Chartier*: Adolphe Blanc, Eugène Sauzay, and Louise Farrenc.¹⁹ However, the *Académie* decided against splitting the award between the three candidates, and instead named Farrenc as the sole recipient of the award. This would occur again in 1869, where Farrenc was again named the singular winner against a nomination of two other composers.²⁰

The recognition gained from the first *prix Chartier* likely helped ease Farrenc out of her creative withdrawal. She would contribute six more compositions to her total corpus before retiring from the field altogether. Friedland acknowledges that these works, predominately for the piano, lack “the level of sophistication or originality of her piano compositions from the 1840s.”²¹

¹⁸ Annegret Fauser, “*La Guerre En Dentelles: Women and the Prix de Rome*,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 51, no. 1 (1998): 84.

¹⁹ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 127.

²⁰ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 132.

²¹ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 135.

C. *Widow, Collaborator, and Scholar*

A second blow to Farrenc's personal life would occur with the death of her husband in 1865. Until his passing, the Farrencs had been occupied with the epitomal work of Aristide's career – *Le Trésor des Pianistes*. The work was a compilation of representative keyboard works from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries.²² The idea for the anthology emerged in the late 1850s when Aristide and Fétis were collaborating on the second edition of the later's *Biographie universelle des musiciens*.²³ Friedland notes that a parallel between Farrenc and her husband's scholarly activities is found in her concert programs from the time period. Instead of the typical repertoire of Beethoven sonatas, she included works from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries alongside her own compositions.²⁴ While recovering from the grief of her daughter's death, Farrenc began to immerse herself in the keyboard works of the late Renaissance and early Baroque that her husband was compiling into his *Trésor*. Farrenc rose to become a coeditor of her husband's project, and even would help sponsor a *soirée musicale* featuring a preview of works in the forthcoming compilation, complete with program notes detailing each composer's biography and details to orient the listeners to the music of the era.²⁵ This would evolve into a biweekly series of lecture recitals during the winter of 1862, which drew large crowds (although this may be due to the programming of Farrenc's own compositions in the recitals, as she was only recently awarded the *prix Chartier*).²⁶

Perhaps the greatest editorial decision the Farrencs took was to subscribe to an *Urtext* viewpoint. The introduction to the *Trésor* states the following: "As much as possible, *Le trésor*

²² Heitmann, *Louise Farrenc*, 2.

²³ Katherine Ellis, "The Making of a Dictionary François-Joseph Fétis: Aristide Farrenc, and the "Biographie Universelle Des Musiciens" *Revue Belge De Musicologie / Belgisch Tijdschrift Voor Muziekwetenschap* 62 (2008): 63.

²⁴ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 144.

²⁵ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 146.

²⁶ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 152.

des pianistes will be engraved from the original editions, to which [the new editors are convinced] it is impermissible to change or add anything.”²⁷ The first eight volumes were published between 1861 and 1864, after which Aristide’s death left Farrenc as the sole contributor to the project. To fund the continuation of her late husband’s project, Farrenc auctioned off his personal library – a collection of over 1600 treatises, scores, musical dictionaries, and medieval manuscripts.²⁸ She would be able to work on the *Trésor* for the majority of the next decade, publishing a further fifteen volumes by 1875, many of which were fervently praised by Fétis. Farrenc ultimately retired from the Conservatoire on New Year’s Day of 1873.

Aristide’s death brought an end to a continued presence of Farrenc’s music in the concert scenes of Paris. Being her musical champion, he advocated for her music by arranging concerts and readings of her works in Paris and abroad. It was mainly through the efforts of her piano students that her works were still heard, although occasional revivals of certain chamber works were heard up until her death.

Louise Farrenc died on September 15, 1875. She was survived by her two siblings, the sculptor Auguste and her younger sister Constance, who is said to have only enjoyed the arts as an amateur rather than as a professional.²⁹ Numerous eulogies enumerated her contributions as a pedagogue, composer, and scholar. The *Revue et gazette musicale* published the following memorial only a few days after her passing: “without question the most remarkable of all women who have devoted themselves to musical composition...Her works bear witness to a power and imagination as well as to a degree of knowledge which have never before been the attributes of a

²⁷ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 154.

²⁸ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 161.

²⁹ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 10.

woman.”³⁰ Perhaps as a final reminder of the impermanence of her legacy, no personnel from the Conservatoire attended her funeral, save for her colleague and fellow piano professor Antoine Marmontel, who later memorialized her in his *Les pianistes célèbres* (1878).³¹

D. List of Compositions

Louise Farrenc’s compositional output defies expectations for a French composer of the period, particularly considering she lived her entire life in Paris, one of the epicenters for opera in Europe. Her three favored genres were music for solo piano, chamber music, and music for orchestras of classical proportions. There are a few vocal works that survive, including a couple of arias of an operatic nature. Notable absences from her oeuvre are the genres of piano sonata and opera. While it has been speculated even during her own time that she had hoped to write an opera but was denied a libretto by the operatic societies of Paris, to date no direct evidence of this has been found.³²

Below is presented a table of compositions, which includes all pieces by Farrenc with opus numbers and two unnumbered arias.³³ The works on Table 1 are listed by opus number, with notable works without opus numbers supplied at the end. Where possible, the date of publication is supplied for each piece. Pieces that were not published during Farrenc’s lifetime are given an approximate date of composition instead. Information for this table has been adapted from Bea Friedland’s *Louise Farrenc, 1804-1875: Composer, Performer, Scholar*.

Table 1: List of Compositions by Louise Farrenc

Opus	Title	Instrumentation	Date Published*
2	Variations brillantes sur un theme d 'Aristide Farrenc	Piano	1825
4	Grandes variations sur l'air: Le premier pas	Piano	1825

³⁰ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 175.

³¹ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 180-181.

³² Florence Launay, “The Vocal Music of Louise Farrenc,” in *Louise Farrenc und die Klassik-Rezeption in Frankreich*, ed. Rebecca Grotjahn and Christin Heitmann, (Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2006): 155-6.

³³ This is adapted from similar charts found in Appendix 1 of Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 179-181.

Biographical Sketch

5	Variations sur un air de la <i>Cerentola</i> [Rossini]	Piano	1830
6	Variations sur l'air: <i>O ma tendre musette</i>	Piano	1828
7	Air suisse varié	Piano	1832
8	Trois rondos faciles	Piano	1828
9	Rondo brillant sur un cheour du <i>Pirate</i> [Bellini]	Piano	1833
10	Variations brillant sur un theme du <i>Colporteur</i> [Onslow]	Piano	1828
11	Rondo brillant sur des thèmes d' <i>Eurianthe</i> [Weber]	Piano	1833
12	Varitions sur une galopade favorite	Piano	1833
13	Rondo brillant sur une cavatine de <i>Zelmire</i> [Rossini]	Piano	1833
14	<i>Les Italiennes</i> , trois cavantines favorites de Bellini et Carafa, variées	Piano	1835
15	Variations brillant sur la cavatine d' <i>Anna Bolena</i> [Donizetti]	Piano	1835
16	<i>Les Allemandes</i> , deux mélodies favorites variées	Piano	1836
17	Air russe varié	Piano	1836
18	<i>La Sylphide</i> , rondo valse sur un motif de Masini	Piano	c.1836
19	Souvenir des <i>Huguenots</i> [Meyerbeer]	Piano	c.1837
20	Variations concertantes pour piano et violon, sur un air suisse	Piano, Violin	1836
21	<i>Le jours heureux</i> , quatre rondinos sur des themes favorites	Piano	1836
22	Fugues for piano	Piano	1833*
23	Overture No. 1 in E minor	Orchestra	1834*
24	Overture No. 2 in E-flat Major	Orchestra	1834*
25	Variations avec orchestra sur un thème du Comte Gallenberg	Piano, Orchestra	c.1838
26	Trente études dans tous les tons majeurs et mineurs	Piano	c.1839
27	Hymne russe varié	Piano	c.1839
28	Variations sur un theme allemand	Piano	c.1839
29	Variations à quatre mains sue un thème des <i>Capuleti</i> [Bellini]	Piano	c.1839
30	Quintette pour piano no. 1	Piano, Violin, Viola, Cello, Double Bass	1842
31	Quintette pour piano no. 2	Piano, Violin, Viola, Cello, Double Bass	1851
32	Symphony No. 1 in C Minor	Orchestra	1841*
33	Piano Trio No. 1 in E-flat Major	Piano, Violin, Cello	1855
34	Piano Trio No. 2 in D minor	Piano, Violin, Cello	1855
35	Symphony No. 2 in D Major	Orchestra	1845*
36	Symphony No. 3 in G Minor	Orchestra	1847*
37	Sonata for Piano and Violin No. 1 in C Minor	Piano, Violin	1855
38	Nonet in E-flat Major	Woodwind Quintet, Violin, Viola, Cello, Double Bass	1849*
39	Sonata for Piano and Violin No. 2 in A Major	Piano, Violin	1855
40	Sextet in C Minor	Piano, Woodwind Quintet	1852
41	Douze études brillantes	Piano	1858
42	Vingt études de Moyenne difficulté	Piano	1855

The Symphonies of Louise Farrenc

43	Mélodie	Piano	1858
44	Piano Trio No. 3 in E-flat Major	Piano, Clarinet, Cello	1861
45	Piano Trio No. 4 in E Minor	Piano, Flute, Cello	1862
46	Sonata for Cello and Piano in B-flat Major	Piano, Cello	1861
47	Scherzo	Piano	1858
48	Valse brillante	Piano	1863
49	Nocturne	Piano	1863
50	Vingt-cinq études faciles	Piano	1863
51	2 nd valse brillante	Piano	1864
-	<i>Le prisonnier de guerre</i> , scene dramatique	Tenor, Orchestra	-
-	Andrea la folle	Voice, Orchestra	1832*

* Denotes the work was never published in Farrenc's lifetime; estimated date of composition is supplied

II. Summary of Primary and Secondary Scholarship

Modern scholarship on Louise Farrenc first appeared in the 1970s. Despite this, it was not until the 2000s that most of the secondary sources on Farrenc were first published. This section will supply an overview of the secondary sources available today and their most salient points. Following this will be a discussion of primary sources on Farrenc that are available (i.e., not in private collections or in the archives of the Bibliothèque nationale de Paris), which predominately take the form of contemporary criticism in the various music journals of the time.

A. Secondary Scholarship

While Farrenc's name did not disappear completely between her death in 1875 and her renaissance a century later, her role as a composer was largely ignored in articles and other sources. A passing mention to Madame Farrenc is made in several articles during the first half of the 20th century, however it is almost always in her capacity as the aunt to the opera composer and critic Ernest Reyer (1823-1909),³⁴ and rarely as a composer in her own right.³⁵ Farrenc is also mentioned as editor of *Le Trésor des Pianistes*, although these citations are often even more brief than the former category.³⁶ Discounted from the category of secondary sources are works by Fétis and others who wrote about Farrenc in the immediate aftermath of her passing and who knew her during her life.

1. *Bea Friedland*

Undoubtedly the most significant work in this category is the monograph of Bea Friedland titled *Louise Farrenc, 1804-1875: Composer, Performer, Scholar*. Published first as an

³⁴ C., Review of *Ernest Reyer: sa vie et ses œuvres*, by Henri de Curzon, *The Musical Times* 65, no. 973 (1923): 237.

³⁵ Paul Landormy and Frederick H. Martens, "Lili Boulanger (1893-1918)," *The Musical Quarterly* 16, no. 4 (1930): 511.

³⁶ Kris Steyart, "Mozart with a French Twist: 'Mademoiselle Jeunehomme' Revisited," *The Musical Times* 157, no. 1937 (2016): 10.

abbreviated article in a 1974 volume of *The Musical Quarterly*³⁷, Friedland's work was formally submitted as a dissertation for the City University of New York in the following year.³⁸ The work is divided into two broad sections: the first being a comprehensive biography accounting for the entirety of Farrenc's life (as well as biographical sketches of her family, mentors, contemporaries and other prominent musical women of the time), and the second being a catalogue of, and critical response to, her compositional output.

The biographical portion of Friedland's dissertation is, save for perhaps the efforts of Fétis in his *Biographie universelle des musiciens*, the first (and only true) biography of Louise Farrenc. While others have summarized her life to varying lengths after this monograph was published, they are all indebted to Friedland's work. Indeed, she laid the groundwork for other scholars by compiling and condensing the various primary source materials, most of which likely resided in the Bibliothèque nationale de Paris. Although some could view her tangents on minor characters in Farrenc's life as unnecessary, they serve to illustrate the musical landscape in which she was active, as well as give readers a deeper understanding of Farrenc's unique role during the time period.

The second portion, which is simply subtitled "the music," is divided into three main categories, each with a summarization and critique on the three main genres of Farrenc's compositional output. The three chapters are devoted to her piano music, chamber music, and orchestral music, respectively. Rudimentary analysis of Farrenc's oeuvre is supplemented by selected excerpts from scores. Since most of her orchestral music remained unpublished until the late 1990s, Friedland provides her own short scores for works still in manuscript form.³⁹ The

³⁷ Bea Friedland, "Louise Farrenc (1804-1875): Composer, Performer, Scholar," *The Musical Quarterly* 60, no. 2 (1974).

³⁸ Bea Friedland, "Louise Farrenc (1804-1875): Composer, Performer, Scholar," PhD diss., (University of Michigan Ann Arbor, 1975).

³⁹ *Die Kritische Ausgabe der Orchester- und Kammermusik sowie ausgewählter Klavierwerke Louise Farrenc*, published by Florian Noetzel, represents the first complete critical collection of Farrenc's orchestral music.

critical and analytical reviews of Farrenc's works by Friedland are also a first in modern scholarship, as the only previously published source to fulfill such a role comes from Fétis' own review (along with other authors in *La Revue et Gazette musicale*) from the 1840s. Friedland's comments on the symphonies will be explored further and compared to those found in more recent scholarship. In the appendix of the monograph is a thematic catalogue, which is yet another first in the scholastic repertoire.⁴⁰

By now it should be obvious that Friedland's pioneering work in the study of Louise Farrenc and her music is among the foundational. That being said, its length and tendency to focus on minutia make it less friendly to the casual reader than to the musicologist. As we are approaching the golden jubilee of *Louise Farrenc, 1804-1875*, a revision or new edition would certainly benefit the study of Farrenc's musical legacy.

2. *Christin Heitmann*

Based on the size and scope of her research and her numerous publications, Christin Heitmann is the single most important scholar on Farrenc. Her dissertation, *Die Orchester- und Kammermusik von Louise Farrenc: vor dem Hintergrund der zeitgenössischen Sonatentheorie*, ranks second in the list of important works as a general overview of Farrenc and her music, as Friedland's book has a more extensive biography and discusses pieces not mentioned or analyzed by Heitmann.⁴¹ Heitmann's dissertation is the first major analytical undertaking of Farrenc's music and is an indispensable source in this field. It examines the concerted music of Farrenc under the lens of the theories of sonata forms of her predecessors, most notably those of Anton Reicha, Farrenc's composition teacher.⁴²

⁴⁰ Heitmann has also completed a thematic catalogue of Farrenc's works as the final volume of the *Farrenc Complete Edition* published by Florian Noetzel of Wilhelmshaven.

⁴¹ Christin Heitmann, "Die Orchester- und Kammermusik von Louise Farrenc: vor dem Hintergrund der zeitgenössischen Sonatentheorie," (PhD diss., Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2002).

⁴² This can be found on pages 79-113.

This source is divided into two large sections: one devoted to a biography of Farrenc and another to her music. The section on music is prefaced by a survey of the theories of sonata form that were circulated prior to Farrenc's compositional period, although a large emphasis is placed upon the theories of Anton Reicha, her composition teacher. The analysis portion is, as the title suggests, devoted to the symphonic and chamber music of Farrenc. Her symphonies are well-represented in this section, with the first movement of each being described in detail⁴³ along with the finales of symphonies 1 and 2,⁴⁴ and a discussion on thematic contrast of the finale of the 3rd symphony.⁴⁵ Commentary on the second movement of Symphony No. 1 is also included in the dissertation.⁴⁶ This section in particular is useful to anyone with an interest in these works, but the omission of discussion on the remaining movements of the symphonies, which includes all of the minuet/scherzo movements from the symphonies and the slow movements from symphonies 2 and 3, presents an opportunity for further substantive analysis on Farrenc's symphonic oeuvre.

In 2006, in collaboration with Rebecca Grotjhan, Heitmann compiled an anthology of articles of varying degrees of relevance to Louise Farrenc. This is perhaps the most important wide-ranging source currently available, as it includes topics pertaining variously to any of three categories: the musical culture of France, the compositions of Louise Farrenc, and issues of editing and canon-building. There are no fewer than four articles on the Symphony No. 3, op. 36, including an introduction to the topic by Grotjahn, an article by Heitmann herself,⁴⁷ an analytical study discussing the role of the slow introduction in the first movement of Farrenc's Symphony

⁴³ The first movement for symphony 1 can be found on pages 120-128; symphony 2 can be found on pages 129-138; symphony 3 can be found on pages 138-147.

⁴⁴ The finale of symphony 1 can be found on pages 223- 232; symphony 2 can be found on pages 232-241.

⁴⁵ The finale for symphony 3 can be found on pages 179-185.

⁴⁶ This can be found on pages 205-210.

⁴⁷ Christin Heitmann, "Symphonie Nr. 3 g-Moll op. 36, 1. Satz – Die Eröffnung einer 'großen Symphonie'?" in *Louise Farrenc und die Klassik-Rezeption in Frankreich*, ed. Rebecca Grotjahn and Christin Heitmann, (Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2006).

No. 3 by Signe Rotter-Broman,⁴⁸ and a contribution by Peter Schleuning expanding on Reicha's theories of form.⁴⁹ Other articles of relevance to this study are Katherine Ellis's "The *Société des Concerts* and the 'Classical' Symphony, 1831-1849,"⁵⁰ which sheds insight to the issues of programming contemporaneous French composers in the premiere Parisian symphonic institution, and Freia Hoffmann's "Die Kritische Werkausgabe Louise Farrenc,"⁵¹ which outlines the process of creating a critical edition of a collection of compositions and the issues that were encountered throughout the process.

3. *Published Scores and Critical Editions*

A selected portion of Farrenc's music has been published in recent years by the Florian Noetzel Verlag in Wilhelmshaven, Germany. Aside from selected piano and chamber pieces, the collection features critical editions of all of Farrenc's completed orchestral pieces with commentary by scholars on the subject. Heitmann herself provided commentary for the scores to Symphonies 2 and 3. It was Freia Hoffmann, however, who directed the operation to create the critical editions for Farrenc's most noteworthy pieces.

4. *Other Secondary Scholarship of Note*

No discussion of the music of Louise Farrenc can afford to ignore the French scholarship that has been published in recent decades. One source which is especially pertinent to the current study is Muriel Boulan's doctoral dissertation entitled "La Symphonie française entre 1830 et

⁴⁸ Signe Rotter-Broman, "Der Kopfsatz der Symphonie Nr. 3 g-Moll op. 36 von Louise Farrenc – Zur Funktion der Eröffnung für den Satzprozess," in *Louise Farrenc und die Klassik-Rezeption in Frankreich*, ed. Rebecca Grotjahn and Christin Heitmann, (Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2006).

⁴⁹ Peter Schleuning, "Gedanken zur *intrigue* der g-Moll-Sinfonie von Louise Farrenc," in *Louise Farrenc und die Klassik-Rezeption in Frankreich*, ed. Rebecca Grotjahn and Christin Heitmann, (Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2006).

⁵⁰ Katherine Ellis, "The *Société des Concerts* and the 'Classical' Symphony, 1831-1849," in *Louise Farrenc und die Klassik-Rezeption in Frankreich*, ed. Rebecca Grotjahn and Christin Heitmann, (Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2006).

⁵¹ Freia Hoffmann, "Die Kritische Werkausgabe Louise Farrenc," in *Louise Farrenc und die Klassik-Rezeption in Frankreich*, ed. Rebecca Grotjahn and Christin Heitmann, (Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2006).

1870.”⁵² Although Farrenc is mentioned, she is not the sole focus of the study. Her symphonies are discussed only in the context of other French composers of the time, including Georges Onslow, Felicien David, Charles Gounod, and other French contemporaries of the mid 1800s. A thorough analytical discussion on both large and smaller scales is presented as well. Among other things accounted for in this dissertation is the stylistic evolution of the symphony during the time illustrating the gradual shift from a Germanic model to an autonomous French symphonic tradition that resulted in a “gradual revision of musical forms.”⁵³ For anyone wishing to gain a deeper understanding on the context in which the symphonies of Farrenc were composed, this source doubtless to has much to offer.

B. Overview of Relevant Primary Sources

As far as primary source material concerning Farrenc and her music are concerned, there is another important source available outside of the archives of the Bibliothèque nationale de Paris: the reviews made by critics and other musical intelligentsia in contemporary journals. Among the Parisian musical journals of the time, the one most pertinent to Farrenc is the *Revue et gazette musicale de Paris*. Contributors to this journal included several of the major figures in the Parisian musical circles of the 19th century: Berlioz, Liszt, Schumann, and Wagner are among the most well-known of these. Fétis, however, is the most important. He had founded the precursor to *La revue et gazette musicale de Paris* in 1827.⁵⁴ A scathing critic of Berlioz and his music, Fétis was a staunch supporter of Farrenc and her music, which is all the more important considering his rigid views on “good” music. Throughout the years, Fétis wrote several articles

⁵² Muriel Boulan, “La Symphonie française entre 1830-1870,” Doctoral Diss.: Université Sorbonne-Paris (2011).

⁵³ Muriel Boulan, “La Symphonie Française Entre 1830 Et 1870,” theses.fr, accessed July 26, 2021.

⁵⁴ Peter Bloom, “Critical Reaction to Beethoven in France: François-Joseph Fétis,” *Revue Belge De Musicologie / Belgisch Tijdschrift Voor Muziekwetenschap* 26/27 (1972): 70.

on Farrenc's symphonies (as he often conducted them himself) that were published in *RGM*, and even included her in his *Biographie universelle des musiciens*.

Because performances of her music were rarely staged outside of Paris, there are few reviews of her compositions from journals outside of her native city. Of the few that exist, the commentary made by Robert Schumann in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* is perhaps the most valuable. Additional reviews may be found in the journals and newspapers of Geneva and Brussels, which are where her symphonies were performed. Friedland lists other contemporary periodicals, including *La France Musicale*, *La Fronde*, and *La Revue Musicale*, the predecessor of *La Revue et gazette musicale de Paris*.⁵⁵

In *Louise Farrenc, 1804-1875*, Friedland makes several references to the letters of the Farrencs in her book, yet the contents of these are not listed in great detail in the text itself. These letters primarily seem to reference professional events, but a thorough study of these manuscripts might shed some insight onto Louise's compositional methodology, her relationships with and opinions of her contemporaries, and other areas of interest. These writings can be found in the *Département de la musique* of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Other items of interest in this collection include Aristide Farrenc's notes and articles, and Louise's manuscripts for many, if not all of her compositions.

⁵⁵ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 257.

Part 2: The Symphonies of Farrenc

III. Overview of the Three Symphonies

The symphonies of Louise Farrenc fill an important gap in the history of the genre. In addition to the dearth of examples of symphonies written by women during the first half of the 1800s, they represent traditional symphonies written in the 1840s - the very decade that been described as a relatively dormant phase for the symphony by scholars such as Carl Dahlhaus.⁵⁶ Farrenc's symphonies are nestled between the works of Beethoven and his immediate successors on one side and those of Brahms, Bruckner, and Mahler on the other. While it is entirely likely that this "yawning chasm" is not as empty as Dahlhaus apparently believed, nevertheless the lack of major symphonies of the mid-nineteenth century that have been assimilated into the orchestral repertoire only reinforces this idea. This approach to the history of the symphony makes the examples of the genre as provided by Farrenc all the more important. By attempting to close this "chasm," a more informed perspective of the trajectory of the symphony of the 19th century can be achieved.

A. Context of Programming and Reception of the Symphony in Paris from 1820-1850

To understand the context of the symphonies of Farrenc, one must be familiar with her predecessors, contemporaries, and the state of orchestral music in Paris during the second quarter of the 19th century. For much of the century, there was only one institution for symphonic music in Paris – The *Société des Concerts du Conservatoire*. This, as Katherine Ellis in her article, states the *Société* "occupie[d] an appropriately ambiguous place in the history of Parisian musical life ... it was both innovative and conservative..."⁵⁷ Its founder and lead conductor,

⁵⁶ Carl Dahlhaus, *Nineteenth-Century Music*, trans. J. Bradford Robinson (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989): 78.

⁵⁷ Ellis, "The *Société*," 31.

François-Antoine Habeneck, greatly improved Beethoven's influence in Paris by introducing audiences to his symphonic repertoire, yet failed to move past the German master's oeuvre and thus settled "into a formidable rigidity in which new players, new audience members and new composers all struggled to gain entry (the latter being hardest hit)." ⁵⁸ To say that Beethoven dominated the concert series under Habeneck would be an understatement. In addition, the amount of attention which contemporary composers received was minuscule. From 1831 to 1849, only ten living composers received performances of their symphonies by the *Société*. Felix Mendelssohn and Georges Onslow received the bulk of the performances; Onslow being programmed eight times and Mendelssohn five.⁵⁹ Farrenc is among those listed, albeit only once. The dominance of Beethoven during the concert cycles was often at the detriment of these contemporary composers. Their symphonies would be compared with Beethoven's not just by the critics, not just due to the latter's influence in the genre but also due to the direct competition they faced in the programs of the concerts; of all the 27 concerts that featured living composers during the 1831-1849 concert cycles, only three were not concluded by a Beethoven work, with Mozart, Mendelssohn, and an unidentified composer taking the concluding portions of these concerts.⁶⁰ Thus, it is easy to see how many of the contemporary composer's symphonies could not avoid the direct comparison to Beethoven.

While his symphonic legacy might have presented difficulties for composers of the genre in Paris, their plight was something shared in varying degrees of intensity with the rest of Europe. As Dahlhaus notes in his *Nineteenth-Century Music*, "to prove himself a worthy heir of Beethoven, a composer of a symphony had to avoid copying Beethoven's style, and yet maintain

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ Ellis, "The *Société*," 32.

⁶⁰ Ellis, "The *Société*," 49.

the same degree of reflection that Beethoven had reached in grappling with the problem of symphonic form.”⁶¹ This sentiment is supported by Friedrich Rochlitz, whose obituary for Beethoven contained the following quote: “Strong composers avoid him on this ground [instrumental music]; weaker ones subjugate themselves, in that they labor mightily to imitate him.”⁶² This resulted in a split in the symphonic tradition in Europe: those that continued to develop the symphony within its traditional boundaries, and those that found a spiritual successor to the symphony in the form of the symphonic poem. All of Farrenc’s symphonies fall into the former category. There is no evidence to suggest that any of her orchestral compositions had inherent programmatic ties, as even her two early overtures bear no subtitle or extra-musical narrative. Thus, if one is to find influences for her symphonies within the Parisian symphonic tradition, one has to look for those who tended toward the conservative, or who otherwise belonged to previous generations of symphonists. Beethoven, due to his presence in the Parisian concert halls of the time, is of course the most evident influence upon Farrenc’s symphonies.

There were few other orchestral composers who had any presence in the Parisian concert halls during this time. Mendelssohn, Mozart, Haydn, and Onslow make up the majority, with Schubert notable by his absence. Parisians were slow to adopt the music of Schubert; his orchestral debut coming only in 1851 by the *Société Philharmonique*, one year after audiences in the city had been introduced to Wagner’s *Tannhäuser* overture. Several years prior, Habeneck had attempted to program Schubert’s C major symphony, “The Great,” but this was aborted after only one rehearsal, and would not be programmed by the *Société* until 1897.⁶³ Of the symphonic

⁶¹ Dahlhaus, *Nineteenth-Century Music*, 153.

⁶² Friedrich Rochlitz, “Nekrolog,” *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 29 (March 28, 1827): 228. In *After Beethoven: Imperatives of Originality in the Symphony*, Mark Evan Bonds. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996).

⁶³ J. G. Prod’homme and Frederick H. Martens, “Schubert’s Works in France,” *The Musical Quarterly* 14, no. 4 (1928): 510-1.

composers frequently performed in Paris, only Onslow was a Frenchman (despite his English heritage).

Thus we are presented with the overwhelming German influence on the Parisian symphonic tradition, one which favors composers of foreign birth and classical sensibilities. It is within this tradition that Farrenc composed her own symphonic works, which, although unique in their own way, never escaped both the dominance of Beethoven and the general conservatism of the performance-oriented institutions.

B. Farrenc's Symphonic Compositions and Their Performance History

Farrenc's first ventures into the realm of orchestral music was in 1834. Her overtures (Opp. 23 and 24) represent the first compositions in her oeuvre for more than two players, as almost all of her previous works were scored exclusively for solo piano. The scoring for these works is identical: pairs of flutes, oboes, clarinets, bassoons; four horns, two trumpets, three trombones; timpani, and the usual complement of strings (see Table 2). Interestingly, the performing forces for her subsequent orchestral works gradually decreased in size, as will be seen later. These works are in the traditional sonata form expected for concert overtures of this time, complete with slow introductions in the parallel mode of their main Allegro sections. Both overtures were performed several times during the composer's lifetime. The first was premiered in 1835 by *Le Gymnase musical*, a newly formed concert society at the time, and the second first performed five years later by the *Société des Concerts du Conservatoire*.⁶⁴ The later concert would be reviewed by Hector Berlioz, who summarized the work as "well written, and

⁶⁴ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 39-40.

orchestrated with a talent rare among women.”⁶⁵ As is the case with the rest of Farrenc’s orchestral music, these works remained unpublished during the composer’s lifetime.

Perhaps this positive critical assessment inspired Farrenc to compose more orchestral music, as only a year later in 1841 she composed her first symphony. Set in the key of C minor, it is numbered in her catalogue as Opus 32. Despite completing the work at the beginning of the decade, it would not be until 1845 when the symphony saw its premiere. This delay was not from a lack of trying, however. In a letter to Daniel Auber, director of the Conservatoire and thus Farrenc’s employer, Farrenc requests him to use his influence to help persuade François Habeneck, then conductor of the *Société des Concerts du Conservatoire*, to audition and possibly program her symphony.⁶⁶ The Société would not program the work until April of 1845, by which time it had already been premiered, but not in Paris.

On February 23, 1845, Farrenc’s first symphony was first performed in Brussels. Fétis, then director of the Conservatoire in Brussels, was the conductor for the premiere. This did not go unnoticed to the Parisian press; news of the premiere had been reported both before and after the concert itself. Reviews from critics present at the concert were favorable; however, none was as important in establishing Farrenc as symphony composer of merit as the review written by Fétis himself. Initially skeptical of premiering the work, Fétis notes that after rehearsing it, any trace of doubt about the quality of the symphony was eradicated.⁶⁷ He ends his report of the concert and the success of the composition with the following praise: “...after having produced such a work, Madame Farrenc has won the right to be placed among the most distinguished

⁶⁵ Hector Berlioz, “Septième Concert Du Conservatoire,” *Revue et Gazette Musicale de Paris*, Vol. 7, No. 13 (1840): 248. Cited in *Louise Farrenc, 1804–1875: Composer, Performer, Scholar*, Bea Friedland, (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1980).

⁶⁶ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 79-80.

⁶⁷ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 82-83.

composers of the present day.”⁶⁸ A subsequent performance in Paris would take place on April 27, 1845, during which several other compositions by Farrenc would be programmed, including one of the overtures and the *Variations on a Theme by Count Gallenberg* (Op. 25) for piano and orchestra.

The second symphony, written in the wake of the premieres of her successful first symphony, was completed in late 1845. As her only major-key symphony, the op. 35 Symphony stands out for several reasons, not the least of which is her commitment to counterpoint in the second and fourth movements. Critics noted several departures from traditional orchestration and formal procedures, most of which can be seen in these same movements.⁶⁹ The symphony was premiered on May 3, 1846, and would receive a performance in Brussels (once again under Fétis’s direction) the following year.⁷⁰

The Symphony No. 3 (op. 46) was Farrenc’s last foray into orchestral music. Though completed in 1847, the symphony was not premiered until April 22, 1849, where it was performed by the orchestra of the *Société des Concerts du Conservatoire*. Henri Blanchard, one of the contributors to *Le revue et gazette musicale* and a fellow student of Anton Reicha, notes how the symphony was programmed on the same concert as Beethoven’s monumental fifth Symphony – a decision which he rightly states was neither “generous, skillful, or gallant,” as this unfairly pitted her work against one of Beethoven’s most famous pieces.⁷¹ Apart from the unfavorable comparisons to one of the century’s most important symphonic works, critical reception was positive, with Blanchard praising Farrenc as “one who, without scholastic pedantry, reveals – alone in her sex, throughout musical Europe – genuine learning united with

⁶⁸ François-Joseph Fétis, “Lettre À M. Le Directeur De La Gazette Musicale.” *Revue et Gazette Musicale de Paris*, Vol. 12, No. 11 (1845): 82.

⁶⁹ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 89-90.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ Henri Blanchard, “8th Séance de la Société des Concerts,” *Revue et Gazette Musicale de Paris*, Vol. 16, No. 17 (1849): 5.

grace and taste.”⁷² The work received another performance, this time in Geneva Switzerland in early March of 1850 at the behest of Jules Delacour, the director of the conservatory there.⁷³

Just a year later, however, Farrenc would see her fortunes turn in regards to the performance of her symphonic repertoire. The *Revue et gazette musicale* notes in February of 1851 that the *Société* had denied a subsequent request to program the third symphony, likely due to Narcisse Girard’s (the successor of Habeneck) notorious period of conservatism.⁷⁴ A third performance was eventually given in 1853 by another Parisian symphonic society, but this would prove to be the last time the symphony would be heard in its entirety during the composer’s lifetime. Attempts made by Aristide Farrenc to bring the third symphony to German audiences in 1856 proved unfruitful. After submitting the work to both the *Museumgesellschaft Frankfurt* and the *Gewandhaus* in Leipzig, he was denied his request to have the symphony performed for, as mentioned by Aristide, “*raisons banales*” (trivial reasons).⁷⁵

Table 2: Orchestration of the Symphonies

	<i>Symphony No. 1</i>	<i>Symphony No. 2</i>	<i>Symphony No. 3</i>
<i>Woodwinds</i>	2 Fl, 2 Ob, 2 Cl, 2 Bsn	2 Fl, 2 Ob, 2 Cl, 2 Bsn	2 Fl, 2 Ob, 2 Cl, 2 Bsn
<i>Brass</i>	2 Hn, 2 Tpt	2 Hn, 2 Tpt	2 Hn
<i>Percussion</i>	Timpani	Timpani	Timpani
<i>Strings</i>	Vln I&II, Vla, Vlc, Cb	Vln I&II, Vla, Vlc, Cb	Vln I&II, Vla, Vlc, Cb

Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 32 (1841)

The first symphony, as is the rest of Farrenc’s symphonic works, follows the standard formal conventions of the classical and early romantic era symphony (see Table 3). The first

⁷² Blanchard, RGM, No. 17 (1849): 5.

⁷³ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 99.

⁷⁴ Ellis, “The Société,” 32.

⁷⁵ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 118.

movement is in sonata form, complete with a slow introduction and repeated exposition. The slow introduction and the movement proper are in different time signatures, but this is not an uncommon practice for the time. Thematic material from the slow introduction does share melodic fragments, which could lend itself towards viewing the slow introduction as derivative from the first theme. This is further corroborated by the coda, which presents the first theme in canon between the first clarinet and bassoon in the same tempo as the introduction. Using a theme in canon with itself is a device that Farrenc makes great use of in her second symphony in particular.

Table 3: Formal Overview of Symphony No. 1

<i>Movement</i>	<i>Time Signature(s)</i>	<i>Tempo Markings</i>	<i>Key</i>	<i>Form</i>
<i>I</i>	4/4 (Slow Intro), 3/4	Andante sostenuto, Allegro	C Minor	Sonata Form (w/ 1 st repeat)
<i>II</i>	12/8	Adagio cantabile	Ab Major	ABAB ¹ A
<i>III</i>	3/4	Moderato	C Minor, C Major	ABA ¹
<i>IV</i>	6/8, 2/4 (second theme)	Allegro assai	C Minor	Sonata Form (no repeats)

The slow movement, in the key of the submediant, is relatively straightforward. Melodic phrases are played first by the strings and then echoed by the woodwinds, which is a technique that Farrenc frequently uses in her slow movements. Similar to the first movement, she often shifts the key signature to reflect temporary tonicizations, typically only doing so in transition sections which are naturally more harmonically unstable than the surrounding thematic sections. An example of this can be seen in measures 26-28 of the second movement, where Farrenc moves the strings into the key of E major to reflect the Neapolitan shift to F-flat major for the impending E-flat major resolution in measure 31. Formally the movement follows an ABAB¹A format, although one might be tempted to call it an abbreviated sonata form due to the brevity of the final reprise, which functions similarly to a coda section.

The minuet and trio movement shows Farrenc's classical sensibilities, as the minuet as a dance movement model had become antiquated by this point. The trio is in the parallel major key of the movement, which is to be expected. The traditional reprise of the minuet is honored in this movement.

As is the case with the first movement, the finale is in sonata form. However, in order to distinguish it from the first movement, the conventional repeat of the exposition is omitted. In another move away from convention, Farrenc modulates from compound to simple meter for the second theme, shifting from 6/8 to 2/4. While this is not an especially audible transition, it is significant that Farrenc chose to demarcate the second theme in this manner. The first and second symphonies have identical orchestrations: pairs of flutes, oboes, clarinets, bassoon, horns and trumpets complemented by timpani and the usual assortment of strings.

Symphony No. 2 in D Major, Op. 35 (1845)

This symphony is arguably Farrenc's most adventurous in terms of compositional techniques and formal considerations. The first movement, as is the first symphony, is a sonata form replete with a grand slow introduction and repeated exposition (see Table 4). Unlike the other symphonies, the meter is not altered between the slow introduction and the movement proper. Compared to the other movements of this symphony, the first movement is formally straightforward and follows the traditional tonal landscape expected of a sonata form first movement.

Table 4: Formal Overview of Symphony No. 2

<i>Movement</i>	<i>Time Sig.</i>	<i>Tempo Markings</i>	<i>Key</i>	<i>Form</i>
<i>I</i>	4/4	Andante, Allegro	D Major	Sonata Form (w/ 1 st repeat)
<i>II</i>	3/8	Andante	A Major	ABAB ¹ A
<i>III</i>	3/4, 2/4	Vivace, Poco meno presto	D Minor, D Major	ABA ¹ B ¹ (Coda)
<i>IV</i>	2/4	Andante, Allegro	D Major	Sonata Form/ Sonata-Rondo

The second movement is formally the same as the slow movement of the first symphony. The key centers and modulations are not uncommon for the time period, although Farrenc does show an affinity to modulations to chromatic mediants, a technique Beethoven employed with great success in his own compositions. The B sections are primarily where this modulation occurs, moving from the home key of A major to F major for the first theme, then to a striking C minor (a doubly-chromatic mediant relationship to the tonic of A major)⁷⁶ for the reprise of the B section later in the movement. The extensive woodwind reprise of the A theme after this is a sublime use of the wind instruments in this genre and shows a clear homage to the orchestrational style of Mozart.

The dance movement in this symphony is a scherzo, which is more up to date than the minuet of the previous symphony. Interestingly, Farrenc chooses to write this movement in the parallel minor key of the piece. The trio once again modulated to the overall major tonic key, but this time is accompanied by a shift in meter, moving from 3/4 to 2/4 with a slight change in tempo as well. This section makes much use of the woodwinds to carry the melodic material. The scherzo is restated after the trio, but the innovative feature of the movement is the presence of a coda after this reprise. The coda reprises the meter, key center, and melodic material used previously in the trio.

The finale of the second symphony is unique among those found in Farrenc's symphonies. It is once again in sonata form (with heavy influences of rondo form, as will be discussed later), but features a slow introduction, which the other finales do not. This slow introduction is in the form of a short fragment in the style of a Bach chorale, which is used to

⁷⁶ A doubly-chromatic mediant is the relationship between two chords of the opposite mode (major and minor) with no common tones, the roots of which are a third apart.

showcase the origin of the thematic material for the movement. This theme dominates the entire movement, almost to the point where the secondary theme is barely noticeable. Although there are no repeats of the exposition marked, Farrenc writes out the first period of the exposition immediately following the closing theme to trick the listener into thinking that the exposition is being repeated. After this ruse, Farrenc abruptly shifts to the parallel minor and begins the development in earnest, using the opening theme as the subject for a fugue which spans most of this section. Recalling the woodwind chorale of the second movement, the recapitulation is given in the first oboe with flowing clarinet, bassoon, and flute accompaniment, augmented by quiet string pizzicatos. This section is also roughly half the tempo of the rest of the movement, allowing the listener to relish in the Mozartian moment. The tempo resumes its normal pace after this period, where the recapitulation continues as expected, with the thematic content of the exposition now being presented in tonic, save for the second theme, which moves to F major. The coda serves as another, more traditional development section, although on a much smaller scale. As is discussed below, the symphony displays several instances of humorous denials of expectation, along with a display of contrapuntal prowess that proves her tutelage under Reicha was not in vain.

Symphony No. 3 in G Minor, Op. 36 (1847)

The third symphony is the smallest in terms of performing forces. The symphony is scored for pairs of flutes, oboes, clarinets, bassoons, and horns, with timpani and strings. It also exhibits the shortest slow introduction in a first movement, with the *adagio* only lasting seven measures. This is balanced in the subsequent Allegro by an 18-measure build-up to the first theme, which is delayed until measure 25. As is the case with the other first movements, this one is in sonata form with repeats surrounding the exposition, notwithstanding the build-up to the

first theme as mentioned previously (see Table 5). Her proclivity towards modulations to parallel keys is seen in the recapitulation, where the second theme is presented with a key change to G major. This of course is only temporary, as she returns to the tonic of G minor for the closing theme of the recapitulation and subsequent coda, which is heralded by a change in tempo to a fiery *più presto*.

Table 5: Formal Overview of Symphony No. 3

<i>Movement</i>	<i>Time Signature(s)</i>	<i>Tempo Markings</i>	<i>Key</i>	<i>Form</i>
<i>I</i>	4/4, 3/4	Adagio, Allegro	G Minor	Sonata Form (w/ 1 st repeat)
<i>II</i>	4/4	Adagio cantabile	Eb Major	ABAB ¹ A
<i>III</i>	3/4	Vivace	G Minor, G Major	ABA ¹
<i>IV</i>	Cut time	Allegro	G Minor	Sonata Form (no repeats)

The slow movement is the only example of Farrenc's that is not in a triple meter. It follows the conventional dual period between winds and strings as seen in the first movement, but this time it is presented in the winds first. The orchestration here is perhaps even more Mozartian than her previous passages featuring woodwinds, as it almost perfectly represents a wind sextet of pairs of clarinets, bassoons, and horns. Farrenc does not usually venture far from the tonic key of E-flat major (including tonicizations for B-flat major and C minor), save for notable tonicizations of D-flat major and G major, neither of which is preceded by a change in key signature as can be found in other movements. There are also influences of variation and sonata forms in the slow movement, which can be found in the developmental section occurring after the G major statement of the A theme, and the repetition of the A theme found throughout the movement.

The scherzo shows an unmistakable influence of Mendelssohn, with its vivace tempo and flowing melodic line. This movement features more modulations than the second movement,

with written-out key changes to E major, A-flat major and C major (foreign key relationships to the tonic) leading up to the B section of the scherzo. The trio is in the parallel major of the tonic key, which has proven to be a firm favorite of the composer. Formally speaking, this movement is on the whole less adventurous than the scherzo of the second symphony, as it lacks a written-out reprise of the scherzo, metrical interplay in the trio, and coda based on the trio.

The finale is written in cut time and is once again in sonata form without slow introduction or repeats. This movement lacks many of the defining characteristics of the prior symphonies' finale movements, as it is neither as adventurous in form nor as rich in contrapuntal writing. It is rather curious that Farrenc's last symphony would outwardly appear to be her most conservative, as one would expect an increased confidence in composing for the orchestra would lead her to be more experimental or innovative with form and orchestration. The chromaticism and tonal relationships present in this symphony, however, suggest that the symphony is not as conservative as initially perceived.

IV. Examination of Symphony No. 2⁷⁷

The symphonies of Louise Farrenc can generally be described as conservative for her time. Each movement broadly follows the expected forms of the late classical and early romantic era symphonies as exemplified by Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven. This is not to say that her contemporaries had no bearing on her symphonies – one can see the influence of Mendelssohn in particular in the scherzo movements – but rather that Farrenc looked more towards the “old masters” for inspiration in her symphonic works. This may be at least partly explained by the state of symphonic music in Paris during the 1840s. The *Société des Concerts du Conservatoire* had a habit of rarely programming music outside of Beethoven’s oeuvre, which would have greatly reduced Farrenc’s chances of hearing the works of other symphonists that were either not active in Paris or still relatively unknown at the time.⁷⁸

A. Movement I

This movement has been discussed by Christin Heitmann in her dissertation *Die Orchester- und Kammermusik von Louise Farrenc*, and thus will not be discussed in depth here.⁷⁹ It is a straightforward sonata-allegro movement complete with a slow introduction and repeated exposition (see Table 6). In terms of character, it bears more resemblance to the early overtures than it does to the other symphonies, striking a balance between the grandiose and light-hearted.

Table 6: Formal Overview of Movement I

Section	Slow Intro	Exposition				Dev	Recap				Coda
		: T1	Trans	T2	CT :		T1	Trans	T2	CT	
Key Center	D	D	D	A	A	Var.	D	→ D	D	D	D
Measures	1-24	25-46	47-70	71-91	91-108	109-195	195-216	217-240	241-261	261-279	280-329
Instrum	Tutti	Str.	Tutti	WW	Tutti	Var.	Str	Tutti	WW	Tutti	Str+ww




⁷⁷ In this and all subsequent discussions of the symphonies, references to this can be found in the figures located in the appendix.

⁷⁸ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 20, 39.

⁷⁹ Heitmann, *Die Orchester- Und Kammermusik*, 129-138.

A slow introduction precedes the events of the sonata-allegro movement. Heitmann points out a similarity between the opening measures of Farrenc’s D major symphony and the E-flat major symphony of Mozart (KV 543) through the unison fortissimo rhythm played by the entire orchestra.⁸⁰ Following this is a dually imitative piano passage: one imitation based on repeated-notes between the horn and oboes, and another between the arpeggiations of the cellos and second violins. The arpeggio gesture is mentioned briefly in Friedland’s book as an example of Farrenc’s tendency to incorporate material from the slow introduction into the movement proper, which is posited as an influence of Haydn.⁸¹ The link between the slow introduction and the first theme as stated by Friedland can be found in Figure 1 (see appendix below). The repeated note passage in the oboes is developed further by the violins and cellos, where it is transformed from a simple rising motion into a complete melodic phrase. Harmonic tension is raised through a series of chromatically descending chords, which aid in the tonicization of D minor at letter “A” (measure 14). The arpeggio gesture is given precedence here underneath the biting suspensions of the upper strings and woodwinds. After developing this further, the slow introduction ends with a dramatic cadential 6/4 chord presented in a fashion similar to the opening bar (measure 24). The resolution of the dominant chord arrives at the downbeat of the allegro but is considerably softer than the preceding measures to yield to the theme in the low strings (see Table 7 for a list of motives for this theme).

Table 7: Motives Chart for Symphony No. 2 Movement I

Motif A	Motif B	Motif C
		

⁸⁰ Christin Heitmann, *Die Orchester- und die Kammermusik von Louise Farrenc*, 129.

⁸¹ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 161-162.

Beneath the rumbling tremolos of the middle strings, the cellos and basses present the ascending gesture of the first theme, which is comprised of motives A and B (measures 25-27). The first violins respond with their own gesture, motif C, that rapidly descends through a series of broken arpeggios (measures 27-29). A D pedal is sustained throughout most of the period, which creates some tension against the C-sharp fully diminished chords that occur during the consequent phrase (measures 29-33). A more conventional period follows this which borrows from the ascending repeated notes found in the slow introduction (measures 25-33). This is followed by a more lyrical passage that emphasizes offbeats in the first violins, which mirrors the order of events in the slow introduction as well (measures 38-46). 16th-note runs in the first flute, first violins, cellos, and basses herald the arrival of the transitional theme at letter “B,” which is at measure 47.

The transition marks the first orchestral tutti of the allegro. The strings power through arpeggiations while the woodwinds oscillate between written-out trills and sustained pitches. These written-out trills can be found in other works by Farrenc, most notably her second overture and the finale movement of this very symphony. The tutti modulates to A major by way of a D – e – a – F – D#^{o7} progression that culminates in an imitative passage that winds its way between pairs of woodwinds and strings (measures 47-63). The second theme begins immediately at letter “C” (measure 71), which continues the imitative idea first between the solo oboe and clarinet and later between first violins and cellos (see fig. 2). Heitmann points out motivic similarities between this theme and the first theme, which features a combined and shortened A and B motifs.⁸² A crescendo and increase in orchestration leads to measure 91, where the closing theme is introduced. The most predominant feature is a near-constant dotted rhythm that pervades each

⁸² Heitmann, *Die Orchester- und Kammermusik von Louise Farrenc*, 130-131.

line at some point. The retransition to the opening of the exposition is almost rushed, providing little sense of closure before the mid-string rumblings and low-string arpeggiations begin anew.

The rushed cadence that is less satisfactory in the first ending sees more success in the second ending, which flows nicely into the development section, which begins in measure 109 (see Table 8). The dotted rhythm is given an imitative treatment between solo woodwinds while the strings and first clarinet offer a harmonic pad for them to play off of. By measure 115, however, Farrenc abandons this idea and segues into a passage that develops the second theme. This is accompanied by a key change which nullifies the two sharps and establishes C major as the starting point. The second theme is given again in canon, but it is now played by the solo flute and bassoon instead of oboe and clarinet. The short two-measure fragment trails off into a wedge effect⁸³ between the flute on the downbeats and bassoons now in thirds on the offbeats (measures 117-118).⁸⁴ A fermata separates this from the oboe and clarinets, repeating this fragment down a step in the oboe and down a perfect fifth in the clarinets. Another fermata passes before the fragment played by the strings is developed into a smooth transition (measure 125), alongside a reemergence of the dotted rhythm in the woodwinds. A cadential 6/4 of the key of B-flat major ends this section of the development, after which the key signature is changed to reflect this new key (measure 125).

Table 8: Development Chart for Symphony No. 2 Movement I⁸⁵

Section	Dev. 1	Dev. 2	Dev. 3	Retrans.
Measures	109 – 124	125 – 151	151– 173	173 – 194
Notable Harmonies	b – C – d – F ⁷	B ^b - b ^b – f – F	F – E – d	A – d – C – e – a – G – b – A ⁷
Instrumentation	Str + WW	Tutti	Str + WW	Tutti
Thematic Content	CT+ Theme 2	Theme 1	Theme 2	Theme 1

⁸³ A wedge effect is the contrary motion of two passages that move by step.

⁸⁴ This device is used in a strikingly similar manner in the finale movement of the same symphony (measures 73-82).

⁸⁵ For a similar graph, see Heitmann, *Die Orchester- und Kammermusik*, 135.

The first theme is now presented almost unchanged, save for the transposition up a major sixth from its original position in D major (measures 125-129). The winds now assume an accompanying role, and the second violins present a rhythmically active arpeggio pattern in contrast to the ascending melodic line in the cellos, basses, and bassoons (measures 125-126). By the consequent phrase, one can be sure that the movement has indeed reached the development section, as the two gestures of the theme begin to work their way throughout the strings and adding new layers of rhythmic variance (measure 129). By measure 133, this pattern is used to sequence through a $C^7 - f - F^7 - b^b - b^{b7}$ progression, before ultimately returning to f minor by way of b^{o7} . The C motif makes up most of the thematic content of this section of the development. F major is briefly suggested through the return of the second theme at letter "F" (measure 151), but it is quickly undermined by a solo bassoon line outlining d minor. After this, the key reverts back to a presumed A minor while the flute continues the second theme (measure 155). The entrance of the oboe two bars later (see measure 157) triggers a canonic passage between solo woodwinds that lasts until measure 162, by which time the strings have assumed control of the theme. Another quasi-canonic passage occurs afterwards, although the entries are reduced to mere 3-4 note fragments (measures 166-172).

Letter "G" (measure 173) sees the return of all performing forces along with the first theme again (in the first violins and violas), now localized in A major. This quickly gives way to C major and A minor before an imitative passage descending from $G - b - g\#^{o7} - E - A$ returns the music to its harmonic origins in D major at the recapitulation at letter "H" (measures 195). The music from the exposition is repeated with little variance in orchestration. The only notable difference is the change in harmonic direction during the transition to prepare for the second theme (now in the tonic key of D major). After this, the second theme plays out as it did in the

exposition with subtle changes to orchestration in the woodwinds, with the closing theme following suit.

The entry into the coda is similar to the entry of the development section: repetition of the dotted rhythm in the woodwinds is supported by rising harmonic tensions in the strings (measure 278). Just when it seems another development section is imminent, Farrenc restabilizes D major and presents the music from the transition section again (measure 286). The tension is gradually increased until the music climaxes with decisive woodwind and string stabs in measures 306-307. Immediately after, the first theme returns as an imitative gesture between violins and cellos, basses, clarinets, and bassoons. Refrains from the second theme and transition section play out until the movement concludes with five broad I – V – I – V – I chords.

B. Movement II

The second movement of Farrenc’s second symphony is the only movement not to be centered around the tonic key of D. Instead, it explores the dominant key of A major, as might be expected within the conventions of the sonata process in symphonies of the classical and early romantic eras (see Table 9). One discerns a noticeable departure from tradition in the character of this movement; however, in lieu of a dignified and often serious slow movement (examples of which can be found in the two symphonies flanking this one), Farrenc’s music here ranges from coquettish to bombastic. The 3/8 meter paired with the andante tempo (96 bpm) helps to establish this character. This movement is not without its more sublime moments, however, as discussion of the final reprise of the A theme will reveal.

Table 9: Formal Overview of Movement II

Section	Intro	A	Trans	B	Trans	A¹	Trans	B¹	Trans	A²	Coda
Key Cent.	A Maj	A Maj	A-F	F Maj*	F-A	A Maj	A-c	C Min*	A ^b -E	A Maj	A Maj
Measures	1-4	5-28	29-59	60-75	76-100	101-124	125-154	154-170	171-200	201-229	229-264

* Denotes a mediant relationship with the tonic

The introduction to the movement is brief, spanning only 4 measures and comprising notes derived from the A major triad. The cellos and basses open with octave A's on the first and third beats of each measure which are supplemented by the bassoon's E and C# in measure three. Simultaneous with their entrance is the pianissimo sixteenth-note A-E motion of the timpani, whose unusual role in this slow movement introduction adds to the comical nature of the introduction. The first theme, introduced by the first violins in measure 5, is a sweet yet succinct little phrase that has a pronounced stuttering nature due to the many repetitions of short fragments (see Fig. 3). Each short phrase is connected by an ascending arpeggio that rises first from the bassoon and subsequently from the flute. The staccato accompaniment momentarily switches to legato at the end of the first phrase of the second period in measure 17, only to resume within the oboe and clarinet parts, after they switch roles with the violins and violas for the consequent phrase.

The orchestration gradually thickens beginning at letter "A" (measure 29), at which point the short phrases are replaced with a gradually unfurling 8-bar phrase in the clarinets and later bassoons. Accompanying this phrase is a mixture of repeated notes and arpeggios in the strings. Fragments foreshadowing music to come can be found in the first violins in measures 30 and 32, where a hurried 32nd-note to 16th-note figure encircling E can be found. This is realized later in measure 43, where the first violins use this rhythmic pattern to outline arpeggios before switching to octave E leaps in measure 47, cementing the modulation to E major that began in measure 43. Under this violin passage, the first oboe in tandem with the second violins presents a slow chromatic ascent which is augmented by the first bassoon and violas in parallel thirds below the chromatically rising line two measures later. While the woodwinds play a simple eighth-note melody, the strings introduce an ascending dotted 16th-note pattern. The trumpets in

F are introduced in measure 55 (an unusual instrument for a slow movement) which heralds a modulation from E major to F major, and is fulfilled in measure 60, or letter “B”.

The dotted rhythm now dominates the B section, which is the first example of the bombastic character mentioned earlier (see Fig. 4). Aside from the fanfare-like melody, the tutti orchestration replete with trumpets and rhythmically-active timpani help to create this character change that continues until letter “C” (measure 76), by which point the orchestration simmers down to the chamber-like levels of the A section after a brief two-beats of silence. Here traces of the A theme are heard between the first violins, solo bassoon, oboe, and flute. The arpeggio connections from the first theme also are referenced, although now descending instead of ascending. The first violins oscillate between triplet-16th-note and dotted-16th-note passages starting at measure 83. This prepares a return to the tonic key of A major in measure 91; however, the cadence is prolonged for ten additional measures as the strings and woodwinds play a triplet-sixteenth-note passage.

Letter “D” (measure 101) is the first reprise of the A theme that is significantly varied. The most noticeable addition is a triplet-sixteenth-note countermelody supplied by the first violins which mirrors the stuttering nature of the theme. The character has shifted slightly as well and is no longer as coquettish as the first time. The pattering accompaniment is replaced with a slower staccato gesture in the strings, and the staccatos present in the melody have mostly vanished under slurs. The bassoon and flute, originally merely links between the phrases of the melody, play the melody in its entirety for the first eight bars. The oboes and bassoons then trade fragments of the second phrase starting at measure 109. The triplet-16th motion is constant throughout the entire A¹ section until measure 139, whereupon the first violins resume their dotted-sixteenth-note arpeggios from before, modulating to G major. The triplets are often

presented directed against straight 16th-notes to create more motion. The chromatic dotted 16th note ascent is played by the solo oboe and bassoon in measure 145, accompanied solely by the violins playing octave gestures on G. This is followed by a modulation to C minor as the passage concludes at letter "F" (measure 155).

Although the bombastic character has returned, the minor modality of measure 155 considerably sobers it from the previous B section. This section carries on in the same manner as the previous B section did, save for the change of modality. It should be noted that choice of modulations for the B sections are symmetrical: A major to F major for the first, and A major to C minor for the section, both of which are chromatic mediant to the tonic key. The section corresponding with the introduction of the triplet-16th notes is absent, however, and in its place is a new transition section, which is developed from the rising chromatic line from the end of the A section, beginning at measure 178. The dotted-16th notes are underpinned by a passage featuring woodwinds playing dotted quarter notes that softly crescendo. The passage reaches a climax briefly in measure 188 with the final return to A major. A short bridge in the strings gives way to an extended passage of octave gestures, passing from first violins to solo flute, bassoon, and finally clarinet. The final reprise of the A section is ushered in at letter "H" (measure 201).

Similar to a passage heard in the fourth movement, this wind-only passage has a distinctly Mozartian flair to it through its gracefully intertwining lines and delicately scored instrumentation. Farrenc gives the theme first to the solo clarinet and then to the bassoon in canon a measure later (see Fig. 5) Above this soars a pitch held by the solo oboe (measure 201) that falls into a countermelody before yielding it to the second horn and then second clarinet. The oboe then trades roles with the first clarinet in measure 209 for the second phrase of the theme. The bassoon continues its canonic function a measure after while the clarinets in thirds offer

harmonic context. The flute interjects with a brief arpeggio at the end of this phrase, which is mirrored by the bassoon a measure after, before carrying on the canon with the oboe for the consequent phrase (measure 218). The flute and second bassoon help to signal the end of this moment of grace with their motion towards the cadence beginning in measure 222. The woodwinds slowly give way to the emerging strings at letter “I,” which sees the bassoon take center stage with a gentle arpeggio over a I-V⁷/IV-vii^o/V-iv progression over an A pedal in the horns and first violins (measures 225-228).

At the coda (measure 229), the cellos present a new theme, which combines elements of the dotted 16th note and main theme. The first violins take over the new theme for the second phrase which leads to an extended cadential prolongation between measures 242-249. Leading into “K” (measure 259) is a descending line in thirds played by the oboes. Measures later, a cascading triplet arpeggiation flows from the first flute to the first horn, and finally to the first and second violins. A final statement of the A theme in the bassoons and lower strings (measure 255) follows with the triplets continuing in the violins and clarinets. This brief statement only lasts four measures and is punctuated by two beats of rest. The first violins present a fragmentary version of the A theme underneath triplets in the clarinet, flute, and then bassoon. Another beat of rest separates this from the final two measures, which has the winds outlining an A major chord with the strings providing pizzicato downbeats.

C. Movement III

While Farrenc may have turned to the classical masters for inspiration in the surrounding movements, the third movement is undoubtedly influenced by her contemporary, Felix Mendelssohn. Bea Friedland has already made this connection in a general sense regarding her symphonic music: “her kinship with Mendelssohn...is apparent in the classical ideal of formal

and textural lucidity which they share,” but even a cursory glance at the famous scherzo from his *Midsummer Night’s Dream* suite reveals similarities in thematic content and development.⁸⁶ This movement is the first symphonic scherzo Farrenc wrote, as the first symphony employs a dated menuetto as the basis for its dance movement. The scherzo is in the key of D minor with the accompanying trio being in D major (see Table 10).

Table 10: Formal Overview of Movement III

Section	Scherzo			Trio			Scherzo			Coda (Trio 2)
	: A :	: B	A ¹ :	A	A ¹	A ²	A	B	A ¹	
Key.Cent.	D Minor	F-d	D Minor	D-A	F-A	A Maj	D Minor	F Maj	D Minor	D Major
Measures	1-37a	34b- 66	67-104	105-137	138-179	179-259	260-296	297-329	330-365	366-389
Time Sig.	¾ Time			2/4 Time			¾ Time			2/4 Time

The movement begins with a piano D minor chord in the strings, after which the violas and cellos enter with the first gesture on the second beat (see Fig. 6). The emphasis on the second beat creates momentum which carries through the majority of the scherzo. Violins in unison continue the phrase after the first two bars by repeating a rhythmic motif based upon this initial gesture transposed to different pitch levels. A hemiola effect in measures 6 and 7 propels the phrase forward. The initial gesture is now inverted and presented first in the second violins and then in the first violins and solo flute. The first violins then slowly descend, using the rhythmic motif from earlier over the backdrop of a chromatic descent played by the clarinets and bassoons. This leads into letter "A" (measure 19), where F major is the new key center, although the modulation for this began measure 15. The second oboe and first clarinet begin this next period with quarter note scales in contrary motion, the ascending version of which is accented with an appoggiatura on the highest point of the line. This idea is passed between various sections before

⁸⁶ Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 163.

the rhythmic motif from earlier signals the brief transition section. After this is a first ending that tonicizes D minor to smoothly return to the opening and a second ending (“B”) that begins the B section of the scherzo.

The B section, beginning in measure 34, is the first orchestral tutti in the movement and begins with fortissimo sforzandos to heighten the contrast between it and the previous section. The upper woodwinds, horns, and violins are given broad dotted-half notes that slowly descend while the bassoons and remaining strings push the motion forward with rapidly ascending 8th-notes. The relative major key (F major) prevails as the key center until measure 42, whereupon D minor returns. This is interrupted by a brief tonicization of D-flat major (a chromatic mediant of F major), the contrast of which is accented by dropping the dynamic level to pianissimo and reducing the orchestration to strings and later first flute and bassoon. A-flat major yields to a D fully diminished 7th chord, which in turn yields to a D minor triad in second inversion, a B-flat 7th chord, and another second inversion D minor triad, until an A major 7th chord is prolonged in measure 54. The first violins slowly cascade with an extended 8th-note line that is supported by octave A’s in the timpani, solo bassoon, clarinet, oboe, and flute. A measure of rest separates this from “C,” or the return of the A section.

The reprise of the A section follows the same form as its original statement. Both the performing forces and the dynamic levels have been increased for this reprise. The second period, beginning at “D” (measure 86) now sits firmly in D minor. The brief transition section is again followed by a repeat with first and second endings. The second ending, aside from the tutti forte downbeat, is played exclusively by pizzicato basses, before leading into the trio.

The trio modulates to the parallel major key of D major and changes meter to 2/4. The bassoons are given the melody initially, which is a simple ascending and descending scale. The

clarinets take over after the first 8 measures, with a new violin countermelody composed of descending thirds with appoggiaturas on the downbeats (see Fig. 7). The violins later introduce a theme of repeated and scalar 8th-notes that morphs into triplet 8th-notes at letter “F” (measure 127). As this triplet passage gradually crescendos toward a tutti passage, it quickly gives way to a sparsely accompanied cello line that modulates from A major to F major by measure 145. The initial trio theme is heard again here in the clarinet, but now sports a new countermelody in the oboe and the violin countermelody being stated in the flute. These themes are passed throughout the orchestra as the music modulates back to D major. Another passage exclusive to the winds can be found from measures 157-178 (letter “H”), featuring a brief canonic passage between the solo flute and oboe in the final six bars. In addition to this, the clarinet imitates the oboe line (measure 169) four bars after oboe melody begins (measure 165). Letter “H” reintroduces the triplet theme in the violins, which once again leads to a climatic orchestral tutti. The tutti is greatly extended this time with a new melody in the low voices and a broad descending line in the upper voices. This passage modulates to F-sharp major by way of b minor (measure 197), which concludes at letter “I” (measure 213).

The common tone F-sharp provides a link between the previous key and the return to D major as heard in the horn, who then proceed to reintroduce a developed version of the trio theme. They are succeeded by the clarinets and first violins repeating the music originally heard between measures 113-120 with the horns now beginning the D-pedal that was originally in the bassoons. There is another brief canonic passage between the first violins and flutes starting in measure 227 that ends with a 5-bar extension of the previous music before the triplets make yet another return. This time, the music is firmly situated in D major. The ensuing tutti triumphantly

plays out the rest of the trio, which then dwindles down to piano strings and timpani to transition back to the scherzo.

The return to the scherzo is, as expected, essentially a repeat of the music heard at the outset of the movement. The composer introduces subtle changes to orchestration, which required all of the music to be written out again (i.e., without the normal literal repeats). Two bars of complete silence end this section. The coda of the scherzo is unusual in that it abandons the A theme in favor of music from the trio. As such, the key signature, time signature, and tempo are all altered to their condition in the trio, and the cellos begin the simple theme that was originally first heard in the bassoons. The coda is an abridged version of the trio, with most of the thematic material surviving albeit severely shortened and without any deviance from the key of D major. The movement ends almost as a mirror to the way it began; a rapidly descending scale in the woodwinds and strings is an inverse of the opening gesture featured in the cellos.

The only movement from Farrenc's Symphony No. 2 that has not been accounted for yet is the finale. The discussion below includes comparisons between the finale of this work and the other two symphonies, following separate analyses for each. As such, the analysis of the final movement of the second symphony has been withheld until the next section.

V. Comparative Examination of Finale Movements

As mentioned above, Heitmann provides analyses for each of the first movements from Farrenc's three symphonies, in addition to several of the finales and a representative slow movement. However, only the first two symphonies have their final movements represented in totality; the third is only discussed in terms of thematic contrast. Therefore, in the present study I am electing to focus on the finale movements in order to provide complete coverage of these movements as well as to present a summation of the comparisons between these movements.

The finale movements of Farrenc's three symphonies serve as the main basis for comparing form, style, compositional technique, and orchestration between the works. The reasoning behind focusing the finale movements is twofold: first, it allows a detailed examination of the finale of Symphony no. 2, which is arguably her most adventurous; and second, the first movements have already been discussed at length by Christin Heitmann. While Heitmann does discuss the finales of symphonies 1 and 2, her analyses are cast in the context of Anton Reicha's theories of sonata form, as is discussed above. To that extent, her examinations of the finale movements differ from the ones found in this study. Heitmann does not produce a complete analysis for the finale of symphony 3, but she does devote a section to thematic contrast in the first theme of this movement. In the discussions below, Heitmann's analyses will be referenced when relevant.

The relative freedom that finale movements granted composers during the late classical and early romantic eras provides room for experimentation with various types of form. Unlike the first and third movements of a traditionally structured symphony, the finale is not forced to follow a single prescribed form; rather, composers are free to choose from a selection of forms including sonata form, theme and variations, rondos of various sizes, and even sonata-rondo.

Farrenc elects to use sonata form for all of her finale movements, although often the sonata form of the finale movements has strong rondo characteristics.⁸⁷ The finales will be presented in the following order: Symphony No. 2, Symphony No. 1, and Symphony No. 3. The second symphony's finale is presented first in order to provide an uninterrupted discussion of the piece continuing from the previous section. The other two finales are presented in chronological order.

A. Symphony No. 2

Counterpoint is arguably the strongest driving force behind the finale of Farrenc's second symphony. This is best illustrated in the development, the form of which warrants a separate table (see Table 13), which will be supplied during the corresponding section of the text. A table of the commonly used motives will supplement the discussion as well (see Table 12). A table for the formal analysis of this movement can be found below (see Table 11).

1. Introduction to the Movement

Consisting of only seven measures, the introduction for the finale movement is one of the shortest slow introductions Farrenc wrote in her symphonic works. It is rooted firmly in the tonic key of D major and ends on a half cadence which is emphasized by a fermata. The orchestra is divided into 5 different groups. The first, comprising the bassoons, brass, cellos, and basses, plays the bass line, which includes motives X and Y.

It should be noted that the trumpets only play motif X and the last four notes, resting for the remainder of the introduction. The second group is represented by the flutes in unison and the first violins. The third and fourth groups are the alto and tenor lines of this four-part chorale introduction (see Fig. 8). These are to be grouped together, as these roles are often switched at

⁸⁷ For further discussion of the interplay between sonata and rondo forms, see James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory: norms, types, and deformations in the late eighteenth-century sonata* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 388.

Table 11: Formal Overview of Symphony No. 2's Finale

Sonata:	Intro	T1	T1	Trans	T2	CT	Trans	T1	Dev	Retrans	T1	T1	Trans	T2	CT	Trans	T1	T1	Trans	T2	CT	Trans	Coda
Rondo:	Intro	A		Trans	B		Trans	A		C	A	A	Trans		B								A
Mm.	1-7	8-24	25-40	41-82	83-98	99-143	143-185	185-197	214	295-315	316-326	327-342	343-372	373-402	403-447	447-489	489-509	509-550	550-596				509-596
Key	D	D	D	A-C	C	A	A-	D	d	A ped.	D	D	B ^b	A-D	D	D-G	G-A	G-A	G-A				D
Cen.																							
Harm.	I	I	I	I	V-	V	I	I	i	V	I	I	^b VI	V-I	I	I-IV	IV-V	I	I				I
Func.	X,Y,Z	X,Y,Z	X,Y,Z		^b III/V		X,Y,Z	X,Y,Z	X,Y,Z		X,Y,Z	X,Y,Z			Y								X,Y,Z
Instrum.	Tutti	Str	Tutti	Str	Tutti	Tutti	Str	Str	fugal	Tutti	WW	Tutti	Tutti		Tutti								Tutti

certain points during the introduction for any given instrument. This group is comprised of the oboes, clarinets, second violins, and violas. Last, and in terms of important, least, is group 5, which is only played by the timpani. Similar to the trumpets, the timpani only plays at the beginning and end of the introduction. The character of this section is quite unusual; it appears as if Farrenc is referencing a chorale in the style of Bach and his contemporaries, but at this time no one has found any potential source from which this has been borrowed. It does, however, create a precedent for thematic material and counterpoint that is carried throughout the remainder of the movement (Fig. 8).

2. Exposition

The exposition begins with a reduced scoring as well as a complete shift in character (Fig. 9). The full orchestral forces are dropped in favor of the first and second violins, with the cello, viola, and select woodwinds creeping in during the second phrase. The character of the exposition is light and classically minded, which provides contrast with the grandiose baroque sensibilities of the introduction.⁸⁸ The classical mood is reinforced with the addition of a trill over the first violins' D in measure 13. Haydn would seem to be a likely candidate for the movement's inspiration; the emphasis on contrasting dynamics and orchestration, paired with the disruption of conventional expectations as generated by the form are trademarks of Haydn's compositional style, and the humorous way that he employed them in his symphonic works makes for a compelling model when viewing Farrenc's work. The strongest examples of these can be found later in the movement, which will be extrapolated upon when relevant.

⁸⁸ Heitmann lists the first theme as being contrapuntal between the first and second violins. See Heitmann, *Die Orchester- und Kammermusik*, 233.

Table 12: Motives Used in Symphony No. 2's Finale

Motif X	Motif Y	Motif Z
		

As is to be expected, the first theme commences at the beginning of the exposition, as the slow introduction eliminates any further need to stabilize the tonic.⁸⁹ The first period of the theme last for 17 measures: seven for the antecedent phrase and ten for the consequent. The antecedent phrase, as mentioned in the previous paragraph, features only the violin sections. The entry of the cellos in measure 15 signals the beginning of the consequent phrase, with violas joining in measure 20, followed by the first oboe in measure 20, and the second oboe, first flute, and bassoons in measure 22. It should be noted that theme 1, presented in the first violins, is lifted note for note from the bass voices (group 1) of the introduction. Motivically, the three primary motives for this movement can be found all within the first 7 measures of the theme: motive X and Y are presented in the first violins, and Z is found initially in the second violins as a counter melody. Motif Z is used as the primary thematic material in the consequent phrase, being passed between the violin sections in a sequence. Measures 21-24 of the consequent phrase have thematic interest and serve mainly to emphasize the dominant of the key, which is accomplished through a wedge effect (defined above) between the upper voices ascending and lower voices descending to measure 24. This is accentuated with a crescendo to *forte*, which is delayed until 25 by a beat of silence.

⁸⁹ A similarity in melodic contour and pitch material between this theme and that of J. S. Bach's *Art of Fugue* theme. See Heitmann, *Die Orchester- und Kammermusik*, 235.

Measure 25, marked as “A” in the Florian edition of the score, denotes the beginning of the second period. The intimate chamber character of the first period has given way to an orchestral tutti. This period is largely identical to the first, sans the countermelody initially provided by the second violins, which has been replaced with a broader offbeat accompaniment, and the elision of the final measure of the consequent phrase with the beginning of the transition (m. 41). Another noteworthy change is the order in which the Z motif is introduced in the consequent phrase; Farrenc now gives the initial line of the sequence to the second violins (m. 32), with the first violins acting following a measure later an octave higher.

The transition begins with a D pedal in the low strings and brass. Over this, the first violins, flute, and bassoons arpeggiate I and IV chords with chordal reinforcements coming from the middle strings, oboes, and clarinets. The lower strings abandon the pedal D for a C# and double the F# major arpeggiation pattern outlined by the bassoons in measure 51. This resolves as a secondary dominant two measures later to the expected B minor (vi) chord. A major is tonicized in measure 55, after which follows a descent in the bass instruments to F natural accented by chromatically charged scalar passages in the flutes, first clarinet, and second violins. This culminates in a temporary modulation to Bb major in measure 61, marked as “B” in the Florian edition. This passage is harmonically static with repeated I-V⁷ motions in the strings under a meandering arpeggiation in the first flute and bassoon. This diversion ends after 8 measures with a return to A major. This section can be viewed as functioning the same way as a Neapolitan chord, as they both feature a flattened major II chord in relation to the key of A major, which is almost immediately affirmed by the oboes, who feature G# in their descending scalar passage. After this, the solo flute and bassoon are paired once more for an unaccompanied broken E major dominant arpeggiation, with the flute on the off beats and the bassoon on the

downbeats. This is echoed first by the cellos and first violins, then the flute and bassoon again, and finally by the full string section before returning to a more lyrical passage in measure 83, or letter “C”.

Identifying the second theme of this movement is somewhat problematic. There are two candidates, each of which is denoted by a rehearsal mark in the Florian edition. The first, measure 83, or “C,” is in A major, the expected key for the second theme. This theme features an initial leap upwards followed by a scalar descent (Fig. 10). It is played initially by the first violins and echoed by the second violins two measures later. A solo flute, clarinet, oboe and finally bassoon pass around a variation of this theme over a simplistic accompaniment pattern in the strings. It is unlikely this section is intended as the second theme due to its brevity: the passage is merely 16 bars in length, of which the final four measures feature no thematic content from the theme and modulate to C major. This leads us to measure 99, (Letter D), which is the second candidate for the second theme (Fig. 11). While this section is of equal length of 16 measures, the theme is present throughout. The theme, derived from the Y motif of the first theme, is present first in the first violins (with the second violins playing the theme down a major 10th), followed by the cellos, the solo oboe and finally solo bassoon. Similar to the first candidate, this one also modulates towards the end. Instead of moving away from the movement’s overall dominant, as the section at “C” did, it returns to it, albeit in the form of A minor.

While neither candidate is wholly convincing as the second theme, it is the opinion of the author that the section at “D” is the more plausible of the two. The support for this can be found in the following reasons: it features a stronger V-I cadence at the beginning, and it is derived

from the first theme of the movement. This latter statement holds more weight when one considers the importance of the first theme in the movement as a whole.

The first theme of the movement receives the most development as it practically dominates the development section (as will be discussed later), it is introduced to us in the slow introduction, and of course is repeated twice at the beginning of the exposition. The prevalence of this theme, coupled with a secondary theme that is derived from it harkens back to the monothematic compositions of Haydn, which is posited above as a strong contender for the inspiration for the movement.

Following the candidates for the second theme, all the orchestral forces return (measure 115), providing strong *forte* punctations on the offbeats. This is contrasted with *piano* woodwind chorale interruptions for two bars. The subsequent section finds its way back to A major and draws its inspiration from measures 73-82, which features the offset arpeggiation from the strings with the addition of a solo oboe melody, which rises stepwise to a high C# until it, in conjunction with the second oboe, descends by way of suspensions. From measure 135 onwards, the process is repeated in the solo bassoon, although the suspensions are replaced with a more straightforward chromatic descent.

Measure 143, letter “E”, heralds the beginning of the closing theme. This section begins with another *forte* orchestral tutti, with the brass, violas, basses, and later timpani providing the repeated eighth-note pedal points of F# and A. Measure 151 sees all instruments but the first violins fall into a homophonic rhythmic pattern. The first violins alone present the “trill” motif that Farrenc has employed several times in her orchestral writing, most notably in the first movement of the same symphony. This passage erupts into a sweeping sixteenth-note descent that flows from the upper to lower strings (bolstered by the bassoons) to the clarinets and flutes

until measure 169, or “F”. The rhythmic motion is reduced to eighth-notes that chromatically re-emerge from the depths against an offbeat A pedal point. The figuration itself seems classical in natural, and the sforzandos that occur on the final beat of each phrase once again bring Haydn to mind. Farrenc allows the first violins two more sixteenth-note scalar descents before reducing the orchestra to a piano to begin the harmonic transition back to the key of the first theme. This section, beginning in measure 185, recalls motif Y first in the violins and violas, and then in the oboes. This leads to measure 197, (“G”) where D major is reestablished, and the first theme is heard again. This restatement of the theme before the true development emphasizes the sonata-rondo influences apparent in this movement.

3. *Development*

One of the strongest examples of Haydnesque wit can be found between letters “G” and “H”. Farrenc tricks the listener into thinking the exposition has been repeated by supplying the first theme, reproduced exactly as it had been in the exposition, at letter “G”. This replication is only through the first period, ending with the conveniently placed beat of silence at the end of the consequent phrase. Then, Farrenc destroys the illusion by beginning the development in earnest at measure 214, or letter “H”. This begins the first true section of the development.

The insertion of this theme gives credence to the influence of sonata-rondo influences in the movement, as it functions as a sort of ritornello expected in the rondo form, yet its elision with the development section provides the necessary compromise between forms found in sonata-rondo movements. A suitable model for this amongst Haydn’s works can be found in the finale to his famous “Clock” symphony (No. 101), which, as Elaine Sisman states, is a “masterly amalgamation of rondo, sonata, variation, and fugue.”⁹⁰ The proposition of this movement as a

⁹⁰ Sisman, *Haydn*, 256.

model stems from the similarities not only in key, with both pieces in D major, but because of the fugal development sections that abruptly shift to D minor.⁹¹

Table 13: Development Chart for Symphony No. 2's Finale

Measure	214	220	226	231	237	243	246	252	261	273	286	295	304
Soprano	Sub.	Free	Link	CS1	Free	Ep. 1	Sub.	Ep. 2	Stretto	Ep.	Free	Ep. 4	Sub.
Alto		Tonal A.		CS2	Free		CS1		Stretto	3	Free		Stretto
Tenor				Sub.	Free		Free		Stretto		Free		Free
Bass					Tonal A.		CS1		Tonal A.		Sub.	A ped	A Pedal
Motives	X, Y	X, Y, Z		X, Y		Y	X, Y	Z	X, Y	Z	X, Y, Z	Z	

As one would expect of a student of Reicha, Farrenc proved in several of her works to have a strong command of the contrapuntal skills necessary to write a fugue. Such skills are on full display in the development section, where Farrenc transforms the initial theme into a four-voice fugue. Perhaps to adjust the lighthearted character of initial theme into the serious and academic tone so often associated with counterpoint, the antecedent phrase of the first theme is transposed to the parallel minor to adapt to its new role as a fugal subject (Fig. 12). As one would expect, the first entry of the subject is in the soprano line, which in this instance is the first violins. Aside from the modal shift, the antecedent phrase is kept intact save for the removal of the final 7th measure of the phrase, which is now the entry point for the tonal answer of the second violins. The soprano line uses a combination of the Y and Z motives to harmonize against the second entry of the answer, which begins on the fifth scale degree of the key, as one might expect. Being a tonal answer, the pitches of the motif X have been reduced from a perfect fifth ascent and subsequent minor third descent to a perfect fourth ascent and major second descent. The Y motif, however, is unaltered for the answer. Following this is a five-bar episode which lasts until measure 230. Measure 231 introduces the violas (acting as the tenor voice), who

⁹¹ Hetimann notes that in Reicha's theories on fugue, he states that it is appropriate to employ fugues in the second portion of a symphonic movement. See Heitmann, *Die Orchester- und Kammermusik*, 234.

present the second entry of the subject. This is followed in due course by the cellos' tonal answer, which is to be expected of their bass-line function. Another episode, still based on the same motives, follows this but is limited to only three measures this time.

Letter "I" denotes the start of the next entry, which is in the first oboe and second violins is accompanied by the full orchestra sans trumpets and flutes. Unlike the previous entries, this one is seven bars instead of the previous six. Measure 253 introduces the Z motif, which is treated as an imitative sequence much as it was in the consequent phrase of the first theme. This section can be treated as an episode, but interestingly it separates the answer from its subject, which commences in the low strings and bassoons in measure 261 in the key of F major. False entries are presented in the oboes, flutes, and horns during this passage, which anticipate the stretto that begins in measure 266. This passage temporarily establishes itself in g minor in the clarinets and violas. The bassoons, oboes, trumpets, horns, and flutes all contribute to the stretto, until the flute initiates yet another episode on the Z motif in measure 273. This passage closely resembles the consequent phrase from the first theme, complete with the wedge effect and the final beat of silence. Unlike the consequent phrase, however, this passage extends a further three measures. The low strings, bassoons and oboes forcibly interject a developed version of the X motif, this time reduced to an ascending fifth, which is repeated immediately up a whole step. The other strings continue the momentum with variations of the Y and Z motives.

Finally, the development reaches its climax at measure 295. An orchestral *fortissimo* is underlined by an extended A pedal in the low strings and timpani. This pedal continues for 21 measures, marking the retransition back to the tonic of D major to follow. After yet another imitative Z-motif section, the subject makes one final appearance in this section in the form of a

hurried stretto that increases in tension, until all is finally halted in a fermata on the expected A major triad.

4. Recapitulation

After the dust of the highly active development section has settled, Farrenc once again toys with our expectations. Perhaps fearing the ritornello had left the first theme stale, she opts instead to provide a reprieve from the contrapuntally active development section by presenting the first theme as a lyrical quarter-tempo passage. The baroque sensibilities of fugue give way to an operatic aria for oboe accompanied by meandering clarinets and gentle string pizzicatos. However, the contrapuntal nature is not lost, as the rhythmic augmentation of the theme leaves plenty of room for counterpoint between the oboe and other woodwinds. The bassoons and flutes make brief appearances as supporting characters for the clarinets as well. Farrenc even adds ornamentation to the oboe line in the form of turns and written out appoggiaturas (Fig. 13). The *Andante sostenuto* section might give the listener the impression it had been lifted directly from a Mozart opera, which gives credence to Farrenc's ability to keep a theme sounding fresh (a skill amply demonstrated in her earlier variations for solo piano and piano and orchestra).

After this period, the original tempo and character return at letter "L".⁹² Instead of the offbeat accompaniment this section previously utilized, the first theme is presented as another stretto, with one measure separating the two entries of the theme. The orchestral tutti and forte dynamic marking help awaken the audience from its Mozartian daydream. The subsequent transition section uses the same music as it did in the exposition, with one notable change: it has been transposed down a major third to the key of Bb major. While the Bb major passage of the transition in the exposition functioned as a large-scale Neapolitan chord, this modulation serves

⁹² Heitmann considers this to be the beginning of the recapitulation, which the preceding *Andante* to be a continuation of the development. See Heitmann, *Die Orchester- und Kammermusik*, 233.

as a ^bVI to the tonic of D major. Measure 373 sees the return of the D major key signature, and the remainder of the transition plays out in this key.

Letter “N” is the location of the second theme’s first candidate. It modulates by third again, setting up the second candidate to start in the newly tonicized key area of F major. The music is recycled from the exposition without any substantial alteration for the remainder of the second theme area and the closing theme. The first deviation of this occurs in measure 497, where the developed Y motif featured in the transition to the ritornello is expounded upon by the flutes, oboes, clarinets and finally bassoons. This section, which in the context of the entire sonata form would be called a coda, functions more as a secondary development section.

5. Coda

This section, beginning in measure 509 (letter “R”), presents the first theme in the key of G major in the first violins, while the second violins provide a countermelody based on the Z motif. This section is very fragmented and features snippets from various passages found throughout the movement. For example, the music starting at measure 528 can be traced back to the transition section of the exposition, while the sweeping sixteenth-note runs starting in measure 542 are reminiscent of those found in the closing theme section. This comes to a climax a few bars later in measure 546 where a cadential 6/4 to dominant motion is punctuated by two tutti down beats, both of which are followed by a measure and a half of silence.

“S” marks the beginning of the second coda section, rooted firmly in the tonic and less developmental in nature. The opening texture of first and second violins is retained here, although their roles are switched. The second violins have the final statement of the first theme while the first violins and later violas accompany them with an energetic sixteenth-note line. The solo flute takes up this line and brings it into focus during measures 558-565. Underneath this floating melody are pairs of bassoons and horns providing harmonic stability through slowly

rising chords, pizzicato basses, and first violins and cellos providing the last variation of the Z motif. From here the texture is reduced even further to a pianissimo passage for clarinets, where the X motif is referenced through ascending fifths that are harmonized in thirds that eventually peak and gently roll into letter “T”. The violins, violas and cellos, and finally bassoons all have a turn with a simple sigh gesture that seems to want to fade to nothing. Then, as a last bout of humor in the vein of Haydn, this tranquil *pianissimo* in the bassoons is answered by an orchestral *fortissimo*. The strings have another sixteenth-note passage followed by a $I^6 - IV - V^7 - I$ progression in homophony. The strings slide into the final bars of the piece, which simply outline a D major triad on three successive downbeats, giving a dignified end to the finale.

B. Symphony No. 1

Although the first symphony established the template that Farrenc would follow for her subsequent entries in the genre, it is not without its own quirks. Meter changes and unexpected modulations color the finale movement. As is the case with the two finale movements that follow, it is written in sonata form without written repeats for the exposition. Some experimentation with formal conventions can be found, but ultimately the movement comfortably rests within its conservative boundaries. As is to be expected, the finale is in C minor. Unlike with the overtures, Farrenc does not end her minor-key symphonies in the parallel major, as one might expect of a symphony of the post-Beethovenian era.

No introduction precedes the first theme of the finale. A commanding gesture in the violins is accompanied by pulsating violas and pedal C downbeats in the low strings (see Fig. 14 in the appendix). This opening gesture of a descending third with a repeated final note is a generative motif that reappears many times throughout the movement. This motif will be referred to as motif “X” for these occasions. The first theme itself is largely comprised of variations of

this generative motivic cell, which suggests Farrenc had closely studied Beethoven's compositions. As mentioned in an earlier section of this study, Farrenc would be likely unable to avoid Beethoven's symphonies, as they dominated the programs of Habeneck's *Société des Concerts du Conservatoire*. As the theme comes to its height during the initial period (measures 1-22), it winds down in a pattern of written-out half-steps that evolve into descending thirds (referred to in this symphony as motif Y) that ends in a call-and-response passage between the strings and winds of the X motif.

Letter "A" (measure 23) marks the first orchestral forte (see Table 14). One can already see similarities in construction between this finale and that of Farrenc's second symphony; the first theme's first period being played initially by strings with woodwinds augmenting the latter portion of it, the first theme presented again as an orchestral tutti, and the first period being *piano* while the second is *forte*. The theme this time, however, is moved from the unison violins to the violas, cellos, basses, and bassoons. The violins take over the former viola accompaniment pattern, while the remaining winds sustain long chords to support the harmony. The upper winds and violins regain control of the melody by measure 29, and the lower winds and strings present the neighboring-tones-descending-by-third motif (Y) in rhythmic augmentation. A new gesture consisting of an ascending arpeggio followed by a descending scale sweeps through the orchestra in measure 37. While initially affirming C minor as tonic, the introduction of G-flats in measure 44 marks the first signs of a transition, this time to an expected E-flat major for the second theme. The G-flats imply an E^b minor harmony, which is used to strengthen the cadence to B-flat major, which is achieved by letter "B" (measure 53). However, this is immediately subverted by octave B naturals in the strings (Fig. 15). The octave B-naturals are accompanied by a key signature shift to B major the following measure.

Table 14: Formal Overview for Symphony No. 1's Finale

Section	T1	T1	T1	Trans	T2	T2	CT	Dev	Dev(T1)	Dev(T3)	Retrans	T1	Trans	T2	T2	CT	Coda	
Measure	1-22	c	23-36	37-53	54-68	59-96	97-131	131-166	167-198	199-298	299-314	315-350	351-369	370-384	385-412	413-439	440-468	
Key	c	c	c	c-B ^b	B->E ^b	E ^b	E ^b	e ^b ->g	g	B ^b ->Var	G	c	c->E ^b	E->C	C->c	C->c	c	
Instr.	Str+ww	Tutti	Tutti	Tutti	Str+ww	Str+ww	Tutti	Str+ww	Tutti	Str+ww	Str+ww	Tutti	Tutti	Str+ww	Str+ww	Tutti	Str+ww	Tutti

Another consistency between the first and second symphony's finale movements are the so-called false second themes. The term "false" here denotes a theme that is not fully realized and is brief. The "false" second theme, which is in the wrong key, begins tranquilly in the flutes and violins and hardly completes a single phrase before it begins to modulate back to E-flat major in measure 63. The clarinets lead this modulation, which results in the key signature returning to its original state by measure 69. The "true" second theme then begins in earnest. While in the correct key, Farrenc decides to switch the meter for this theme; 6/8 becomes 2/4 just in time for the first clarinet and flute to trade ascending scalar passages between themselves (see Fig. 16). The strings occupy themselves with simple quarter-note rhythms to supply the harmony. The first violins, violas and cellos do receive the 8th-note passages as well several measure later, while the bassoon and then oboe present a new countermelody in the form of an ascending fourth followed by an ascending third.

Letter "C" (measure 87) marks the transition to the closing theme. The full woodwind section now joins the first violins in a dotted-rhythm pattern that grows into 8th-notes just before the closing theme itself in measure 97. In a moment of quiet tension, the winds and strings outline a Bb⁹ chord with C-flats grating against the pedal B-flats. The C-flats do resolve to C naturals shortly before the closing theme as well. The second violins, violas, cellos, and later clarinets and basses create more tension by playing triplets against the straight dotted rhythms in the other winds and first violins. Rhythmic and harmonic tension are resolved by the *fortissimo* tutti of the closing theme. The dotted rhythm now serves as a triumphant E-flat major fanfare. Hints of minor can be found between measure 113 and 114, but otherwise this section is firmly rooted in the mediant. The 6/8 time signature returns unannounced at letter "D" (measure 117), which largely serves as an extension of the cadence. Of note is the *sforzando* V/IV in measures

124-125, which resolves to IV before suddenly dropping in dynamic to a *piano* for the cadential 6/4 that is left hanging at the end of the exposition.

The resolution occurs in the lone viola line at letter “E” (measure 131), which consists of repeated *pianissimo* E-flats. This stark shift in tone establishes the beginning of the development section. Once E-flat minor is established through the staggered entry of the first and second violins, the first clarinet then presents a variation on the first theme. This is relayed to the cellos afterwards and the first bassoon makes an abbreviated statement. The B-flat of the triad is raised a half-step, and the triad enharmonically shifts to B-major for the next four measures. The first flute and pair of oboes continue the theme. The B-natural rises once more in measure 147 to create an D-sharp diminished seventh chord, to which the cellos, first flute and first clarinet, and oboes respond with the theme now even more fragmented than before. The triad mutates once more, and with a D reinforcement in the cellos it creates a D⁷ chord, which suggests an eventual G minor resolution. A gradual increase in performing forces with a slow crescendo creates tension during this dominant prolongation leading towards letter “F” (measure 167). Here the first theme is restated in full in the expected g minor. This section plays out similarly to the tutti section of the first theme, although this statement of the theme modulates to B-flat major by way of a g – D – A – d – F⁷ progression (measures 181-197).

A bar of silence punctuates the end of this section of development and the introduction of a new theme at letter “G,” or measure 199 (see Fig. 17). This Mendelssohnesque lyrical section consists of three layers: a broad melody (initially in the solo clarinet)⁹³, a rapid 8th-note accompaniment (first seen in the first violins), and gentle downbeats (originally in the cellos). These three layers are nearly always present from letter “G” to letter “N,” which marks the end

⁹³ Heitmann refers to this theme as a cantilena, which is a smooth lyrical passage evoking a lullaby (See Heitmann, *Die Orchester- und Kammermusik*, 228).

of the development. The inclusion of a new theme in the development section brings a sonata-rondo form to mind, as it would seem to fill the requirements of a “C” section. The weight this section carries is even more convincing when one considers the sheer length it occupies in comparison to the second theme – over 100 measures compared to the mere 32 that comprises both the “false” and “true” second themes. However, the lack of a final “A” section to round out the sonata rondo form ultimately points up the inapplicability of such a situation. The injection of a new theme in the development is unique to this movement alone. The second symphony’s finale, as previously discussed, heavily relies upon the first theme for virtually every section of the development.

The recapitulation seems to grow naturally out of the preceding development section, which is another point of contrast with the second symphony’s finale movement, wherein the finale reaches a climatic fermata before continuing onwards. The music of the recapitulation is similar to that of letter “A,” as it reprises the first theme in a tutti *fortissimo* manner. The theme is given in the first violins and first flute only, which plays between the tutti orchestral chords. This statement of the theme is followed by a more direct copy of the music from letter “A” at letter “O” (measure 337). The transition section to the second theme can now be clearly identified, as it is where the music ceases to copy that of the exposition. This occurs in measure 357, where the expected 8th-note gesture suddenly inverts and rises upwards. The articulation marks are changed as well, changing from staccato to slur groupings on each three 8th-notes. Where the transition originally modulates to E-flat major, the corresponding section in the recapitulation suggests a move to A-flat instead.

The second theme area initiates with the same modulation by half-step in the strings, but instead of shifting to B major, E major is now employed. It is interesting to note that Farrenc opts

not to change the key signature to correspond with this key center; instead, she suggests a shift to C major or A minor through a natural key signature. C major is eventually solidified through the entrance of the “true” second theme, which once again modulates meter from 6/8 to 2/4. This section, along with the subsequent closing theme area, follows closely the music of the corresponding sections in the exposition, save for the music now being in C major instead of E-flat major. Where there was originally the *sforzando* V/IV chord, this is now a *pianissimo* unwinding in the strings (sans basses) which serves to return to C minor instead of C major. After the unwinding is completed, the coda begins.

Letter “S” (measure 469) changes meter once more back to 2/4, where it will stay for the remainder of the symphony (Fig. 18). The *Più Allegro* tempo marking creates a frantic character, which can be seen in the tremolo arpeggio motions in the first violins and violas. The triple-feel of the 6/8 meter is not completely gone, as triplets mark each V-I gesture in the other strings and the winds. This continues through a gradual crescendo that leads to a passage that emphasizes offbeats. A prolonged dominant harmony resolves in measure 517, where the offbeats continue in the violins amidst the tremolos of the lower strings and block harmonies of the winds. The symphony comes to a close with a vigorous final I – V – I – V – I cadence.

C. Symphony No. 3

In many respects, Farrenc’s final symphony displays a return to the conservative academicism of her first symphony. The finale movement is once again in sonata form; however, the experimental tone of the second symphony finds no place here. The movement begins with a brisk cut-time theme which will be referred to as theme 1a (see Table 15). Played in unison in the strings, theme 1a for 8 measures before theme 1b begins (see Fig. 19).

Table 15: Formal Overview for Symphony No. 3's Finale

Form	T1a	T1b	Trans.	T2	CT	Dev.	T1b	Trans.	T2	CT	Coda (T1a)	Coda
Measures	1-8	9-39	40-63	64-86	87-124	125-212	213-243	244-273	274-296	297-333	334-355	356-393
Key Center	g	g	g->B ^b	B ^b	b ^b ->B ^b	Var.	g	g->G	G	g	g	g
Instr.	Str.	Str+ww	tutti	Str+ww	tutti	-	Str+ww	tutti	Str+ww	tutti	Str+ww	tutti

The first theme is more lyrical than its counterparts in the earlier symphonies, and uniquely features the woodwinds (represented by the first oboe) from the beginning (see Fig. 20). The prior two symphonies waited a phrase before introducing the woodwinds. The first phrase of the melody consists of an initial leap of a minor sixth followed by a series of stepwise descents on the offbeats. The consequent phrase uses this initial leap and subsequent descent as a motif before crescendoing into a *forte* unison arpeggiation and trill that resolves to D. The second period of the main theme introduces the flutes, first bassoon, timpani, and horn in G in supporting roles. The first violins and later cellos play a melody that is based on leaps and repeated pitches that are mostly quarter-note lengths. The first violins answer in the consequent phrase with a gesture that is formed by a held pitch that subsequently descends by 8th-notes, which is repeated at chromatically lowering pitch levels. The first theme section ends with a *tutti forte* dotted rhythm in the upper strings and downbeats in the winds, lower strings and percussion.

Letter “B” (measure 40) is the start of the transition to the second theme. As is the case with all of Farrenc’s transition sections, it is fully orchestrated and uses loud dynamics, in this case *fortissimo*. Arpeggios are followed by descending then ascending scales in the first violins. G minor gives way to B-flat major, and eventually a half cadence landing on F major is reached. The pair of clarinets, followed by the oboes and first bassoon, link this to the second theme

through a series of chromatically rising and then falling scales. The orchestration of the second theme is initially exactly the same as the first theme; full strings with the first oboe supporting with held pitches. The first violins once again are given the melody, which this time consists of an initial descent followed by stepwise ascending pitches. The cellos present a similar countermelody while the second violins and basses create motion with pizzicato downbeats and syncopated offbeats. The second period's melody is similar to that of the corresponding section in the first theme; near-constant quarter-note motion with repeated pitches. A-flats are introduced towards the end of this line, which creates a move towards E-flat major. This continues with the following progression: $A^{b7} - D^{b7} - b^{o7} - G^7 - c - F^7 - B^b - E^b$, which ends with a cadential 6/4, returning the music to B-flat major (measures 80-86). The resolution is diverted to B-flat minor at letter "D" (measure 87), however, with the lower strings and woodwinds trading off fragments of the closing theme. The theme returns to B-flat major through a chromatic wedge effect (measures 105-109) in the strings and winds that ends with a measure of silence. The orchestra returns in full force with a *fortissimo* cadential extension. The closing theme ends with a pronounced downbeat tutti rhythm that leads directly into the development by way of a $B^b - B^{b7} - G^7 - b - F\#$ progression (measures 119-128).

Theme 1a begins the development section at "F" (measure 129) with two noticeable changes: the admittance of woodwinds playing octave $B - F\# - G - C\#$'s, echoing the initial pitches of the strings, and the change of key to b minor. The first theme proper is replaced with a developed version of theme 1a in the lower strings, while the violins interject with downward arpeggiations. The winds (minus horn in B-flat) play downbeat chords. The seven-bar phrase is not evenly divided amongst the different lines; the violins play the arpeggio three-bar phrase followed by continuous 8th-notes for four measures, while the lower strings play the four-bar

opening motif followed by the three-bar consequent phrase. This process repeats for the next seven measures, albeit with the roles reversed in the string sections. A new section of development follows this, when the first and second violins separate. The firsts continue with the opening motif on the downbeats, while the second omit the opening held note and start the 8th-note gesture immediately on the second 8th-note of the measure, creating a composite rhythm of continuous 8th-notes between the two sections. The cellos replace the second violins after four measures. Beneath this, the orchestra is outlining a $C\#^{o7} - d - d^o - c - e^{o7} - d^o$ progression. This culminates in a grand $C - e^{o7} - C^7$ prolongation, with the violins creating most of the motion with their arpeggios. Nearly two full measures of silence separate this from the extended retransition, which commences at letter “H” (measure 178).

The woodwinds, which have been uncharacteristically neglected thus far in the symphony, are given precedence for the remainder of the development section (Fig. 21). The second theme is played by a quartet of oboes and clarinets. Three beats of silence followed by a fermata on a rest, divides this gentle theme with the forceful string and timpani answer, which is based on the music from measures 4-8 of theme 1a. Flutes and oboes calmly respond with the second theme again after another fermata, and the cycle continues again in the strings. The woodwinds, now augmented with occasional horns, pass fragments of the second theme around, over top of meandering countermelodies. A *poco ritenuto* leads to the cadence on D major, which concludes the development section.

The theme 1b begins again exactly as before, after the fermata at letter “I” (measure 212). The first change in music cannot be found until the transition section, where a sudden shift to E-flat major is begun in measure 250. The E-flat leads back to D major, which of course leads to the expected G major of the second theme. The first phrase is identical to that of the exposition

(save for the second theme beginning in G major now), but the woodwinds are given a more prominent role during the second period. The closing theme at “M” (measure 297) proceeds as it does in the exposition as well. The final downbeat rhythm follows a $g - E^b - E^{b7}$ progression (measures 328-333) before the coda begins. The cellos, accompanied only by the oboes’ held pitches, present a developed version of theme 1a, with the first flute providing a final comment at the end of the gesture. This repeats again at the pitch level of D-flat before the cellos and first violins pass the motif between themselves. The oboes are augmented by the bassoons leading up to the cadence, which is held for three measures. Letter “O” (measure 356) has the violins and cellos reprise theme 1a at a *pianissimo* dynamic. The music diminished in rhythmic value as it continues to ascend, and, as the other string sections join in, they descend until the winds and timpani rejoin at measure 367 in a *fortissimo* tutti. Arpeggios in the violins outline the $vii^{o7}/iv - iv - i^6 - Ger^{+6} - cad.$ 6/4 progression in the winds. Afterwards, a G-major scale is played by the bassoons and lower strings between flute and violins gestures. The violins play an ascending arpeggio followed by a descending g minor scale first in unison and later in thirds between $iv - cad.$ 6/4 – i stabs in the full orchestra. Finally, the majority of winds and strings participate in a descending g minor scale that ends with tutti g minor stabs on the final 3 downbeats.

D. Comparisons of Characteristics Between the Finale Movements

Now that the finale movements of Farrenc’s three symphonies have been examined, discussion of their similarities and differences can be entertained. They will be compared based on the following criteria: adherence to traditional sonata form, usage of tonality, and usage of orchestration. This section is intended to synthesize information found in the above analytical discussion to offer some ideas as to how those analyses can be useful to understanding the work’s structures.

1. Form

All three symphonies share the same movement sequence, yet each symphony has subtle and not-so-subtle differences from one another. While each finale is in a type of sonata form (albeit without repeated expositions and incorporating rondo characteristics of varying degrees), only symphony 2 has an introduction. The third symphony's theme 1a, similar to an introduction, functions as a sort of ritornello throughout the movement. The first and second symphony repeat the first theme with increased performing forces, while the third opts instead to have one statement of the first theme that unfolds over a longer period of time. Only the second and third symphonies have distinct transition sections; the first elides the transition with the second statement of the first theme. The third symphony is the only symphony of Farrenc's that has a stable second theme in the finale. The first and second symphonies both use a thematic group for the second theme, the totality of which in each case are overshadowed in length by the closing theme. The first symphony is the only one which introduces a new theme in the development section, which occurs after two brief sections of development based on the first theme's motives. All of the symphonies manage to find common ground in the coda sections, at least. In each symphony, the coda is divided into portions: one quasi-developmental in nature, and the other acting as a harmonically closed tailpiece.

2. Tonality

Farrenc's tonal language is conservative when one compares her orchestral works to that of her contemporaries, notably Schubert, Beethoven, and Schumann. Despite this, she still infuses occasional moments of harmonic intrigue into her symphonic music. The first symphony delays its transition from C minor to E-flat major in the exposition through a diversion into B major, which is acting as an enharmonic bVI to the new key. Farrenc also toys with the conflict between major and minor in the closing theme section, shifting between C major and C minor

during the recapitulation and coda. The second symphony similarly explores major and minor polarity, but it is only on a broad scale, as the development firmly sits within the realm of D minor. The second theme areas of the Symphony No. 2's finale also explore mediant relationships. Interestingly, the "false" second theme is presented in the expected key of A major, while the "true" second theme is in the wrong key of C major, which is the opposite for the first symphony, whose "true" second theme is the one in the correct key. The third symphony features some moments of harmonic chromaticism in the first theme and development sections.

3. *Orchestration*

Farrenc's usage of orchestration is typically tied to the form of any individual movement. While broad generalizations apply to all three symphonies, the third is notable for diverging from the conventions established by the first two. In the finales of Farrenc's first two symphonies, the first theme is allotted solely to the strings alone, with woodwinds slowly being added during the consequent phrase, whereas the third symphony introduces the woodwinds from the beginning of the first theme. Transition sections are consistently scored for the full orchestra at first, but only the second and third use woodwinds to transition to the second theme area. All three use woodwinds as melodic instruments in the second theme areas, although they are almost always augmented by the violins. Similarly, the first and second symphonies only use strings to begin the development section. The third uses woodwinds as well. Extended woodwind passages are found only in symphonies two and three, but each vary in their location. The second symphony features the woodwinds in its Mozartian recapitulation, while the third uses it just beforehand, during the retransition. The first sections of the codas vary in each case: strings only initially in the first symphony, woodwinds only initially in the second, and a chamber mixture of solo winds and select strings in the third. The second coda sections are scored for full performing forces,

with select sections of smaller performing forces at play in the second and third symphonies, but ultimately return to the full orchestration by the final phrase.

As mentioned above, this study provides a comprehensive discussion of all the finale movements of Louise Farrenc's three symphonies, something that is not fully realized in Heitmann's dissertation, which only provides complete coverage of the finales of Symphonies Nos. 1 and 2. Heitmann's work, however, remains an invaluable source to consult for the breadth of music it covers, although it is still only accessible to those capable of reading German. To date, the present study is the only English language analysis of Farrenc's symphonic music.

VI. Results and Conclusions

Louise Farrenc's symphonic music does not take any great lengths to push the symphony beyond what her predecessors had achieved. In fact, even Beethoven, her most notable predecessor, had already outpaced her in terms of expanding the boundaries of the symphony as outlined by Haydn and Mozart. And among her contemporaries, one only has to compare the grand scope and compositional innovations of Berlioz's *Symphonie Fantastique* with any of Farrenc's examples of the genre to come to this conclusion. What did she accomplish with her symphonies, then?

In order to answer this question, one must consider Farrenc's motivations for writing symphonies, which was a genre that few women had written for before. Perhaps Farrenc had hoped that her symphonies would serve to legitimize her status as a "serious" composer, which likely was a result of the internal politics of the conservatoire of that time and justifying her position as a woman composer/professor. Although she was often regarded as less than ambitious when it came to promoting her own music, this appears not to be the case with her symphonies. Farrenc herself submitted the first symphony to the *Société des Concerts* and advocated for it to be programmed, as has been discussed earlier. Although the symphonies did not leave a lasting impression on general public, critical reception of these works shows that the intelligentsia looked upon them favorably, even earning her the support of Fétis. And, of course, the greatly renewed interest in Farrenc and her music breathes a second life into the legacy of Farrenc's compositions.

Musically speaking, the symphonies follow the classical precedents of the late eighteenth century, with occasional influences from her contemporaries to be found. While all adhering to classical and early romantic formal conventions, Farrenc's symphonies do display their own

personal touches. This can be seen particularly in the finale movements, where Farrenc consistently blurs the lines between sonata and sonata-rondo forms, as is discussed above with regards to the finale of the second symphony in particular. One can also trace a stylistic trajectory between the three symphonies – Farrenc begins in a style derivative of Beethoven, subsequently becoming experimental and seeking other influences, and finally adhering to a more concise and formally conservative style of composition. Perhaps the lukewarm reception of her second symphony in comparison to her first led to this change of direction with her third symphony. Indeed, the decreasing enthusiasm for her symphonic music in general possibly dissuaded Farrenc from creating any other symphonies. Whatever the case may be, they reflect the maturation of Farrenc’s compositional style during the course of the 1840s.

Research for this study indicates that the prospects for further investigation of Farrenc’s music are abundant. With the dramatic increase in interest in the music of women and various *Kleinmeister* of the nineteenth century, Farrenc and her contributions are beginning to enter the consciousness of scholars, students, and even musical amateurs. Building on previous research, this study supplies an individualized approach to analysis of Louise Farrenc’s most ambitious orchestral works, which has not been accomplished yet in English. There is still room for further discussion and examination of her music, however, which could include discussions on possible motivic relationships between movements, specific allusions to the music of Beethoven, Haydn⁹⁴, and others, and even a more detailed investigation of the influence that contemporary symphonists exerted on Farrenc’s compositional style. Other topics could include examinations of her chamber music, solo piano literature, and the oft-forgotten vocal works. Farrenc’s standing within the conservatoire, her role as a pedagogue, and her role as a scholar of early keyboard

⁹⁴ This has already been discussed by Friedland, but an in-depth study of this topic would be beneficial. See Friedland, *Louise Farrenc*, 161-163.

music are also areas ripe for further development. In addition, this thesis, when viewed in context of the greater nineteenth century, provides a view of one of the forgotten branches in the complex history of the symphonic tradition.

From an analytic standpoint, we are approaching complete coverage of all movements of Farrenc's symphonies, but there are still some omissions. Between Heitmann's writings and the present study, nine out of the twelve total movements have been discussed in detail. Currently missing are analyses of the dance movements of symphonies 1 and 3 and the slow movement of symphony 3. Of course, there is still much to discuss within the other nine movements, and so any further analytic engagement with the symphonies is encouraged.

Aside from the music, there is much still to be said about the scholarship currently available on Farrenc. Friedland and Heitmann's dissertations are referenced often in this study, but Boulan's dissertation and Grotjahn and Heitmann's anthology have not been covered in as much depth, and thus should be fully accounted for in future research. Most of the recent scholarship on Farrenc is in German, with notable studies in French, and so English language scholarship needs to fully assimilate the French and German sources to consolidate the current available information.

The symphonies of Louise Farrenc may not have been on the avant-garde on the music of her time, but within their reactionary framework are moments that break out of the classical symphonic mold. But as they stand, the symphonies represent a milestone achievement in the life of a woman who, although ultimately forgotten by her peers and her public, managed to leave a musical legacy that we are vigorously rediscovering today. To close with a quote from Fétis' review of the first symphony, one finds a succinct appraisal of her status as a symphonic composer: "We should not look, no doubt, in her work for those traits of eminently original

creation as found in the symphonies of Beethoven; but, who has it nowadays? What I can say is that after having produced such a work, Mrs. Farrenc has won the right to be placed in the rank of the most distinguished composers of the current day.”⁹⁵

⁹⁵ Fétis, “Lettre À M. Le Directeur,” 83.

Works Cited

- Berlioz, Hector. "Septième Concert Du Conservatoire." *Revue et Gazette Musicale de Paris*, Vol. 7, No. 13 (1840), p. 248. In *Louise Farrenc, 1804–1875: Composer, Performer, Scholar*, Bea Friedland. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1980.
- Blanchard, Henri. "8th Séance de la Société des Concerts." *Revue et Gazette Musicale de Paris*, Vol. 16, No. 17 (1849) p. 5.
- Bloom, Peter. "Critical Reaction to Beethoven in France: François-Joseph Fétis." *Revue Belge De Musicologie / Belgisch Tijdschrift Voor Muziekwetenschap* 26/27 (1972): 67-83.
- Boulan, Muriel. "La Symphonie française entre 1830 et 1870." Doctoral Diss., Université Sorbonne-Paris, 2011.
- _____. "La Symphonie française entre 1830 et 1870." theses.fr. Accessed July 26, 2021.
- Briscoe, James R., ed. *New Historical Anthology of Music by Women, Volume 1*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004.
- C. Review of *Ernest Reyer: sa vie et ses œuvres*, by Henri de Curzon, *The Musical Times* Vol. 65, no. 973 (1924): 236-37.
- Dahlhaus, Carl. *Nineteenth-Century Music*. Trans. J. Bradford Robinson. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Ellis, Katharine. "The Making of a Dictionary: François-Joseph Fétis, Aristide Farrenc, and the "Biographie Universelle Des Musiciens." *Revue Belge De Musicologie / Belgisch Tijdschrift Voor Muziekwetenschap* 62 (2008): 63-78.
- _____. "The *Société des Concerts* and the 'Classical' Symphony, 1831-1849," in *Louise Farrenc und die Klassik-Rezeption in Frankreich*, ed. Rebecca Grotjahn and Christin Heitmann, Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2006, pp. 31-49.
- Farrenc, Louise. *Symphonie Nr. 1 C-Moll op. 32. Die Kritische Ausgabe der Orchester- und Kammermusik sowie ausgewählter Klavierwerke Louise Farrenc*, vol. I/1. Ed. Katharina Herwig. Wilhelmshaven: Florian Noetzel, 2000.
- _____. *Symphonie Nr. 2 D-Dur op. 35. Die Kritische Ausgabe der Orchester- und Kammermusik sowie ausgewählter Klavierwerke Louise Farrenc*, vol. I/2. Ed. Christin Heitmann. Wilhelmshaven: Florian Noetzel, 2000.
- _____. *Symphony Nr. 3 G-Moll op. 36. Die Kritische Ausgabe der Orchester- und Kammermusik sowie ausgewählter Klavierwerke Louise Farrenc*, vol. I/3. Ed. Christin Heitmann. Wilhelmshaven: Florian Noetzel, 2000.

- Fausser, Annegret. "La Guerre En Dentelles: Women and the Prix De Rome, in French Cultural Politics." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 51, no. 1 (1998): 83-129.
- Fétis, François-Joseph. "Lettre À M. Le Directeur De La Gazette Musicale." *Revue et Gazette Musicale de Paris*, Vol 12 No. 11 (March 16, 1845): p. 83.
- Friedland, Bea. "Louise Farrenc (1804-1875): Composer, Performer, Scholar." *The Musical Quarterly* 60, no. 2 (1974): 257-74.
- _____. "Louise Farrenc (1804-1875): Composer, Performer, Scholar." PhD diss., University of Michigan Ann Arbor, 1975.
- _____. *Louise Farrenc, 1804–1875: Composer, Performer, Scholar*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1980.
- Grotjahn, Rebecca; Heitmann, Christin. *Louise Farrenc und die Klassik-Rezeption in Frankreich*. Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2006.
- Heitmann, Christin. "Louise Farrenc." *Musik und Gender im Internet*. Accessed November 26, 2020. https://mugi.hfmt-hamburg.de/de/Artikel/Louise_Farrenc.html
- _____. "Louise Farrenc." Trans. Nicole-Denise Kadach. *New Historical Anthology of Music by Women*. Ed. James R. Briscoe. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004.
- _____. *Die Orchester- und Kammermusik von Louise Farrenc: vor dem Hintergrund der zeitgenössischen Sonatentheorie*. Wilhelmshaven: F. Noetzel, Heinrichshofen Bücher, 2004.
- _____. "Symphonie Nr. 3 g-Moll op. 36, 1. Satz – Die Eröffnung einer 'großen Symphonie'?" In *Louise Farrenc und die Klassik-Rezeption in Frankreich*, ed. Rebecca Grotjahn and Christin Heitmann, (Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2006).
- Hepokoski, James and Warren Darcy. *Elements of Sonata Theory: norms, types, and deformations in the late eighteenth-century sonata*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Hoffmann, Freia. "Die Kritische Werkasugabe Louise Farrenc." in *Louise Farrenc und die Klassik-Rezeption in Frankreich*, ed. Rebecca Grotjahn and Christin Heitmann, (Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2006).
- Landormy, Paul, and Frederick H. Martens. "Lili Boulanger (1893-1918)." *The Musical Quarterly* 16, no. 4 (1930): 510-15.

- Launay, Florence. "The Vocal Music of Louise Farrenc." In *Louise Farrenc und die Klassik-Rezeption in Frankreich*, ed. Rebecca Grotjahn and Christin Heitmann, (Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2006).
- Jacobsen, Ryan. "Louise Farrenc: 1804-1875." Doctoral research lecture, University of Colorado Boulder, 2020.
- Prod'homme J. G.; Martens, Frederick H. "Schubert's Works in France." *The Musical Quarterly* 14, no. 4 (1928): 495-514.
- Rochlitz, Friedrich. "Nekrolog," *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 29 (March 28, 1827). Cited in Mark Evan Bonds, *After Beethoven: Imperatives of Originality in the Symphony*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996: 228
- Rotter-Broman, Signe. "Der Kopfsatz der Symphonie Nr. 3 g-Moll op. 36 von Louise Farrenc – Zur Funktion der Eröffnung für den Satzprozess." In *Louise Farrenc und die Klassik-Rezeption in Frankreich*, ed. Rebecca Grotjahn and Christin Heitmann, (Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2006).
- Schleuning, Peter. "Gedanken zue *intrigue* der g-Moll-Sinfonie von Louise Farrenc." In *Louise Farrenc und die Klassik-Rezeption in Frankreich*, ed. Rebecca Grotjahn and Christin Heitmann, (Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2006).
- Schumann, Robert. *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, vol. 5 (1836): 73. Cited in Bea Friedland, *Louise Farrenc, 1804-1875: Composer, Performer, Scholar* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1980), 19.
- Sisman, Elaine. *Haydn and the Classical Variation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Steyart, Kris. "Mozart with a French Twist: 'Mademoiselle Jeunehomme' Revisited." *The Musical Times* 157, no. 1937 (2016): 6-12.

Appendix: Musical Examples

Symphony No. 2 in D Major, Op. 35

Movt. I:

Fig. 1 (Mm 1-2, 25-26), as found in Bea Friedland's *Louise Farrenc, 1804-1875: Composer, Performer, Scholar* (Pg. 162). The underlined motif demonstrates the link between the slow introduction (*Andante*) and first theme (*Allegro*)

Andante ♩ = 69

Hn. I Ob.
ff Vln. II
Vlc.

Allegro ♩ = 80

Vla., Vln. II
pp
Vlc.
Cb.
pp

Fig. 2 (Mm 71-74)

Ob. I
dolce
Cl. I
dolce
Cl. II
poco riten.
Ob. II

Movt. II

Fig. 3 (Mm 5-8)

Musical score for Fig. 3 (Mm 5-8). The score is in 3/8 time and A major. It features three staves: Vln. 1, Vla. Vlc., and Bsn. The Vln. 1 part is marked *dolce cantabile*. The Vla. Vlc. part is marked *p*. The Bsn. part is marked *p*. The score shows a melodic line in the first violin and a rhythmic accompaniment in the viola/violoncello and bassoon.

Fig. 4 (Mm 60-65) String Only

Musical score for Fig. 4 (Mm 60-65) String Only. The score is in 3/8 time and B-flat major. It features four staves: Vln. I, Vln. II, Vla., and Vlc., Cb. The Vln. I and Vln. II parts are marked *ff*. The Vla. and Vlc., Cb. parts are marked *ff*. The score shows a rhythmic accompaniment in all string parts.

Fig. 5 (Mm 201-211)

Musical score for Fig. 5 (Mm 201-211). The score is in 3/8 time and A major. It features three staves: Ob., Cl., and Bsn. The Ob. part is marked *p*. The Cl. part is marked *dolce*. The Bsn. part is marked *dolce*. The score shows a melodic line in the oboe and a rhythmic accompaniment in the clarinet and bassoon.

Etc.

Movt. III

Fig. 6 (Mm 1-11) Strings only
Vivace ♩ = 92

Musical score for Fig. 6, Movt. III, Strings only, measures 1-11. The score is in 3/4 time with a key signature of one flat (B-flat). The tempo is Vivace with a quarter note equal to 92 beats per minute. The score is divided into two systems. The first system includes parts for Violins (Vlns.), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vlc.), and Contrabass (+Cb.). The second system includes parts for Violin II (Vln. II) and Violin I (Vln. I). The dynamics are marked with a piano (*p*) dynamic. The score concludes with the word "Etc." at the bottom right.

Fig. 7 (Mm 113-16)

Musical score for Fig. 7, measures 113-16. The score is in 2/4 time with a key signature of two sharps (D major). The parts shown are Violin I (Vln. I), Clarinet (Cl.), and Bassoon (Bsn.). The Violin I part features a melodic line with slurs and accents. The Clarinet and Bassoon parts provide harmonic support with sustained notes and some rhythmic patterns.

Movt. IV

Fig. 8 (Mm 1-7) Strings Only

Musical score for Fig. 8, Movt. IV, Strings Only, measures 1-7. The score is in 2/4 time with a key signature of two sharps (D major). The tempo is Andante with a quarter note equal to 88 beats per minute. The dynamics are marked with fortissimo (*ff*). The score shows a complex string texture with various rhythmic patterns and articulations.

Fig. 9 (Mm 8-14)

Allegro $\text{♩} = 80$

Vln. I

Vln. II *p*

Fig. 10 (Mm 83-87) Strings Only

Vln. I

Vln. II *p*

Vla.

Vlc.+Cb. (8vb)

Fig. 11 (Mm 99-104)

Vln. I

Vln. II

Vla.

Fig. 12 (Mm 214-226)

Vln. I

Vln. II *p*

Etc.

Fig. 13 (Mm 316-321) Woodwinds only

Andante sostenuto ♩ = 72

Musical score for woodwinds in Fig. 13. The score is in 2/4 time, key of D major, and tempo of Andante sostenuto (♩ = 72). It features three staves: Ob. I, Cl. I, and Cl. II. The Ob. I part consists of a few notes. The Cl. I and Cl. II parts feature complex rhythmic patterns with triplets and slurs. The Cl. I part has a melodic line with slurs and a fermata. The Cl. II part has a rhythmic accompaniment with triplets and slurs.

Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 32
Movt. IV

Fig. 14 (Mm 1-6)

Allegro assai

Musical score for strings in Fig. 14. The score is in 6/8 time, key of C minor, and tempo of Allegro assai. It features three staves: Vlns., Vla., and Vlc., Cb. The Vlns. part has a melodic line with slurs and a dynamic marking of *p*. The Vla. part has a rhythmic accompaniment with slurs and a dynamic marking of *p*. The Vlc., Cb. part has a rhythmic accompaniment with slurs and a dynamic marking of *p*.

Fig. 15 (Mm 53-59)

Musical score for strings and flutes in Fig. 15. The score is in 6/8 time, key of C minor, and tempo of Allegro assai. It features three staves: Flts., Vlns., and Vla., Vlc. The Flts. part has a melodic line with slurs and a dynamic marking of *p*. The Vlns. part has a rhythmic accompaniment with slurs and a dynamic marking of *p dolce*. The Vla., Vlc. part has a rhythmic accompaniment with slurs and a dynamic marking of *pp*. The Cb. part has a rhythmic accompaniment with slurs and a dynamic marking of *sf*.

Fig. 16 (Mm 69-78)

a tempo

Fl. 1

dolce

Cls.

Fig. 17 (Mm 199-205)

Cl. 1

dolce

Vln. I

Vlc. *pp*

Etc.

Fig. 18 (469-472)

Più Allegro

Ob.

Vln. I

pp

Vla.

Vlc. *pp*

Etc.

Symphony No. 3 in G minor, Op. 36
Movt. IV

Fig. 19 (1-8)

Allegro ♩ = 126

Fig. 19 (1-8) is a piano score for the first eight measures of the fourth movement. It features two staves: a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The key signature is G minor (two flats) and the time signature is common time (C). The tempo is marked 'Allegro' with a quarter note equal to 126 beats per minute. The first four measures are marked with a forte dynamic (*f*), while the last four measures are marked with a piano dynamic (*p*). The music consists of rhythmic patterns of eighth and sixteenth notes, with some rests and dynamic changes.

Fig. 20 (Mm 8-14)

Fig. 20 (Mm 8-14) is a score for strings and woodwinds. It includes four staves: Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), and Violoncello/Double Bass (Vlc. Cb.). The key signature is G minor and the time signature is common time. The Violin I part has a melodic line with slurs. The Violin II and Viola parts play a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes. The Vlc. Cb. part has a bass line with rests and some notes. The score is marked with a piano dynamic (*p*).

Fig. 21 (Mm 178-182)

Fig. 21 (Mm 178-182) is a score for woodwinds. It includes two staves: Oboe 1 (Ob. 1) and Clarinet (Cls.). The key signature is G minor and the time signature is common time. The tempo is marked 'poco ritenuto'. Both parts are marked with a piano dynamic (*p*). The Oboe 1 part has a melodic line with slurs. The Clarinet part has a bass line with slurs. The score is marked with a piano dynamic (*p*).

