Stephen Hinton, Editor-in-Chief

# BEETHOVEN

José Bowen & Richard Will, Reviews Editors





UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS PRESS: URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Editors Mark Evan Bonds José Bowen Michelle Fillion Stephen Hinton (Editor-in-Chief) Christopher Reynolds Elaine Sisman **Richard Will** Editorial Advisory Board William E. Caplin William Drabkin William Kinderman Richard Kramer Lewis Lockwood Nicholas Marston William Meredith Maynard Solomon Glenn Stanley James Webster Assistant Editor Christina Acosta

### Contents

- iv Notes to Contributors
- v Editor's Note
  - vi Abbreviations
    - TIM CARTER
- 127 Metrical Equivalence in Beethoven: Some Problems in Performance and Analysis

JOANNA COBB BIERMANN

- 162 Cyclical Ordering in Beethoven's Gellert Lieder, Op.48: A New Source SEOW-CHIN ONG
- 181 The Autograph of Beethoven's "Archduke" Trio, Op.97

REVIEWS

NICHOLAS MARSTON

- 209 Barry Cooper, *Beethoven*; Lewis Lockwood, *Beethoven: The Music and the Life* ROBIN WALLACE
- 225 Angelika Corbineau-Hoffmann, *Testament und Totenmaske: Der literarische Mythos des Ludwig van Beethoven*

SCOTT DEVEAUX

- 233 "Diabelli" Variations: Uri Caine and Concerto Köln
- 237 Contributors

#### NOTES TO CONTRIBUTORS

*Beethoven Forum,* a journal devoted to the work, life, and milieu of Ludwig van Beethoven, is published semiannually by the University of Illinois Press.

For matters of style, contributors should refer to this volume of *Beethoven Forum*. Submissions should be double-spaced, with notes following the text, and they should incorporate the abbreviations given at the beginning of this volume. Musical examples require captions that provide titles, measure numbers (in the case of published works), and complete references to the source of sketch material; these should be included on both the examples and a separate page of example captions.

Please submit three copies of the text (no disks until requested) to Stephen Hinton, Editor-in-Chief, *Beethoven Forum*, Department of Music, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-3076.

Copies of books and materials for review should be sent to Richard Will, Reviews Editor, *Beethoven Forum*, Macintire Department of Music, 112 Old Cabell Hall, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904-4716.

Editor's NoteSpecial thanks are due to Don Anthony at the Center for Computer AssistedResearch in the Humanities (CCARH) at Stanford University for setting the music<br/>examples.

# Abbreviations

	Literature
Anderson	Emily Anderson, ed., <i>The Letters of Beethoven</i> , 3 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1961; rpt. New York: Norton, 1985).
Brandenburg	Sieghard Brandenburg, ed., <i>Ludwig van Beethoven: Briefwechsel: Gesamtausgabe,</i> Beethovenhaus edn., 8 vols. (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1996–)
BS I, BS II, BS III	<i>Beethoven Studies,</i> ed. Alan Tyson, vol. 1 (New York: Norton, 1973); vol. 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977); vol. 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)
СВ	Karl-Heinz Köhler, Grita Herre, and Dagmar Beck, eds., <i>Ludwig van Beethovens Konversationshefte</i> [= Conversation Books], vols. 1–9 (Leipzig:VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1968–88), vols. 10–11 (1993, 2001)
JTW	Douglas Johnson, Alan Tyson, and Robert Winter, <i>The Beethoven Sketchbooks:</i> <i>History, Reconstruction, Inventory,</i> ed. Douglas Johnson (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985)
Kerman, Quartets	Joseph Kerman, The Beethoven Quartets (New York: Norton, 1967)
Kinsky-Halm	Georg Kinsky, <i>Das Werk Beethovens: Thematisch-bibliographisches Verzeichnis seiner sämtlichen vollendeten Kompositionen,</i> completed and ed. Hans Halm (Munich and Duisburg: G. Henle, 1955)
MGG	<i>Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik,</i> ed. Friedrich Blume, 17 vols. (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1949–86; rev. 2nd edn. Ludwig Finscher, 1994–2000)
N I	Gustav Nottebohm, <i>Beethoveniana</i> (Leipzig and Winterthur: J. Rieter- Biedermann, 1872)

N II	Gustav Nottebohm, <i>Zweite Beethoveniana: Nachgelassene Aufsätze</i> (Leipzig: C. F. Peters, 1887)
n 1865	Gustav Nottebohm, <i>Ein Skizzenbuch von Beethoven</i> (Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel, 1865); Eng. trans. in <i>Two Beethoven Sketchbooks</i> (London: Gollancz, 1979), pp. 3–43
n 1880	Gustav Nottebohm, <i>Ein Skizzenbuch von Beethoven aus dem Jahre 1803</i> (Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel, 1880), Eng. trans. in <i>Two Beethoven Sketchbooks</i> (London: Gollancz, 1979), pp. 47–125
New Grove	<i>The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians</i> , ed. Stanley Sadie, 20 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1980; 2nd edn. New York: Grove, 2001)
Schindler (1840)	Anton Schindler, <i>Biographie von Ludwig van Beethoven</i> (Münster: Aschendorff, 1840); Eng. trans. as <i>The Life of Beethoven,</i> ed. I. Moscheles, 2 vols. (London: H. Colburn, 1841)
Schindler (1860)	Anton Schindler, <i>Biographie von Ludwig van Beethoven,</i> 2 vols. (3rd edn., Münster: Aschendorff, 1860)
Schindler-MacArdle	Anton Schindler, <i>Beethoven as I Knew Him,</i> ed. Donald W. MacArdle, trans. Constance S. Jolly (London: Faber; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966)
Solomon, Beethoven	Maynard Solomon, <i>Beethoven</i> (New York: Schirmer, 1977; 2nd edn. New York: Schirmer, 1998)
Solomon, <i>Essays</i>	Maynard Solomon, <i>Beethoven Essays</i> (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988)
TDR I—V	Alexander Wheelock Thayer, <i>Ludwig van Beethovens Leben</i> , vol. 1 (rev.) continued by Hermann Deiters (Berlin: Breitkopf and Härtel, 1901); vols. IV–V completed by Hugo Riemann (Leipzig, 1907, 1908), vols. II–III rev. Riemann (Leipzig, 1910, 1911), Deiters's 1901 edn. of vol. I rev. Riemann (Leipzig, 1917); vols. II–V re- issued (Leipzig, 1922–23)
Thayer 1, 11, 111	Alexander Wheelock Thayer, <i>Ludwig van Beethovens Leben,</i> 3 vols. (Berlin: F. Schneider, 1866, 1872, 1879)
Thayer-Forbes	<i>Thayer's Life of Beethoven,</i> rev. and ed. Elliot Forbes, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964)
Thayer, Verzeichniss	Alexander Wheelock Thayer, <i>Chronologisches Verzeichniss der Werke Ludwig van</i> <i>Beethovens</i> (Berlin: F. Schneider, 1865)
Wegeler-Ries	Franz Gerhard Wegeler and Ferdinand Ries, <i>Biographische Notizen über Ludwig van Beethoven</i> (Coblenz: K. Baedeker, 1838), suppl. Wegeler (Coblenz, 1845)

vii Abbreviations

	Journals
Acta	Acta Musicologica
AmZ	Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung
ВЈ	Beethoven-Jahrbuch (1908–1909) and Beethoven-Jahrbuch, Zweite Reihe (1953– )
JAMS	Journal of the American Musicological Society
JM	The Journal of Musicology
ML	Music & Letters
MQ	Musical Quarterly
NBJ	Neues Beethoven-Jahrbuch
19CM	19th-Century Music
	Libraries
BL	British Library, London
BN	Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris
GDM	Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, Vienna
SBK	Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin-Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin
	Presses and Publishers (for citations in footnotes)
ВН	Beethovenhaus
Cambridge UP	Cambridge University Press
Harvard UP	Harvard University Press
Oxford UP	Oxford University Press
Princeton UP	Princeton University Press
u Nebraska p	University of Nebraska Press
u California p	University of California Press
u Chicago P	University of Chicago Press
Yale UP	Yale University Press

## Metrical Equivalence in Beethoven: Some Problems in Performance and Analysis

Tim Carter

he majority of conducting students has been set the problem of how to beat the opening of the last movement of Beethoven's First Symphony, op.21 (see ex.1a). Here a slow introduction ( $\frac{2}{4}$ , Adagio) leads to the Allegro molto e vivace ( $\frac{2}{4}$ ). The introduction consists of fragments of rising scales extending by degrees (a third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh) with in effect a notated accelerando; this leads to the octave scale (in the new tempo) at the beginning of the first subject. There are two main issues in mm.6–7: first, the handling of the



Example 1: Symphony No.: in C Major, op.21 (1800), movt.IV, mm.1–8, violin I (NA, I/1). fermata on the quarter note (in some editions, an eighth note plus an eighth-note rest); and second, how to give the preparatory beat(s) for the octave scale. The latter problem stems from, and is solved by, the answer to the main question: what is the relationship between the beats in the Adagio and in the Allegro molto e vivace?

Conducting teachers may tend in the first instance to opt for a mechanical solution: beat the Adagio in four (eighth notes), the Allegro molto e vivace in two (quarter notes)—at least at its beginning—and assume that a sixteenth note in the slow tempo becomes a quarter note in the fast one. The fermata is created by holding the second eighth-note beat of m.6, picking up the tempo again on the third eighthnote beat, which is subdivided (as is the fourth eighth note) to provide the quarter-note beat for the new tempo; the third eighth-note beat might also mark the cut-off of the fermata. The result is something akin to ex.1b, where mm.6-7 are in effect equivalent to one measure (stretched by the fermata) under the old tempo: thus the principal accent at the beginning of m.8 (the structural downbeat of the first subject) does indeed occur on a downbeat, in this case one of an aural m.7. Once the student has mastered that, the teacher will no doubt prompt greater nuance, but this mechanical solution is entirely workable. It is also instructive, not least because it suggests some basic operating principles that might somehow govern intramovement tempo (and we will see, meter) changes in Beethoven in terms of whether (or not) maintaining some kind of constant pulse across such changes is plausible, desirable, or even necessary. A further issue arises from ex.1: we will see that if Beethoven changes tempo and/or meter in the middle of a measure, he often tends somehow to retain the integrity of that measure (with or without its successor[s]) as a single metrical unit, whether visually or aurally, or both. All this has obvious ramifications for performance.

Tempo in Beethoven has received extensive discussion in the scholarly literature. For example, Clive Brown has shown that the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries marked a transitional stage in how tempo was conceived and represented.<sup>1</sup>The earlier eighteenth-century concept of each meter (i.e., time signature) having a natural rate of motion—dictated, in turn, by association with specific dance

I am most grateful to Mark Evan Bonds, Clive Brown, Barry Cooper, Roy Howatt, and Tonu Kalam for their comments on earlier drafts. Music examples are drawn where possible from Ludwig van Beethoven, *Werke: Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke*, ed. J. Schmidt-Görg et al. (Munich: Henle, 1961–; NA), or failing that, *Ludwig van Beethovens Werke: Vollständige kritisch durchgesehene überall berechtigte Ausgabe* (Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel, 1862–65; GA), save in the case of op. 109, where I have returned to the first edition.

I. Clive Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performance Practice*, 1750–1900 (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999), pp.282–414, to which I am indebted.

types—shifted to a more fluid situation of tempo being judged according to a combination of information providers, comprising tempo terms (Andante, Allegro, etc., with or without modifiers), meter, and predominant note values, then further inflected by senses of generic propriety, acoustic requirements, and local preference. This issue also raises the arguments for and against Beethoven's metronome marks. As is well known, Beethoven at least initially endorsed the metronome with some enthusiasm on the grounds that it provided a more accurate indicator of tempo than conventional tempo terms.<sup>2</sup> In 1817 he published two pamphlets giving metronome marks, the first for his Symphonies Nos. 1-8 and the Septet, op.20, and the second for the string quartets to date (up to and including op.95). We also have his metronome marks for the "Hammerklavier" Sonata, op. 106, for the Ninth Symphony, op.125, and for a few other works. By the middle of the nineteenth century, metronome marks were widely included in musical editions, including those of Beethoven by performers claiming some proximity to, or authority from, the composer; for the piano sonatas, metronome marks by Carl Czerny (1846, 1856–68) and Ignaz Moscheles (1858) have been particularly influential given these pianists' direct connections with the composer.<sup>3</sup> Beethoven's own metronome marks have, of course, been subject to furious debate, usually because they often

2. There is an extensive literature both for and against Beethoven's metronome marks; see, for example, Peter Stadlen, "Beethoven and the Metronome," ML 48 (1967), 330–49; idem, "Beethoven und das Metronom," *Musik-Konzepte* 8 (1979), 12–33; idem, "Beethoven and the Metronome," *Sound-ings* 9 (1982), 38–73; Rudolf Kolisch, "Tempo and Character in Beethoven's Music," MQ 77 (1993), 90–131, 268–342.

3. All this material is most usefully collated (with only a few errors) in Rainer Riehn, "Beethovens originale, Czernys und Moscheles' auf Erinnerung gegründete, Kolischs und Liebowitz' durch Vergleiche der Charaktere erschlossene Metronomisierungen," Musik-Konzepte 8 (1979), 85-96. Much of the information on Beethoven's, Czerny's, and Moscheles's metronome marks given below is taken from here; Czerny's are derived from part 4 of his Pianoforte-Schule, op. 500, Die Kunst des Vortrags der älteren und neueren Klavierkompositionen, oder Die Fortschritte bis zur neuesten Zeit (Vienna: A. Diabelli, 1846; Reihn and others incorrectly date this 1842), and from his revised new edition of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas for Simrock (Bonn: 1856-68; Reihn incorrectly dates this 1850); Moscheles's come from his Ludwig van Beethoven's sämtliche Sonaten für Pianoforte (Stuttgart: Eduard Hallberger, 1858). There are facsimiles of the relevant sections of Czerny's op. 500 in both its Vienna edition (Carl Czerny: Über den richtigen Vortrag der sämtlichen Beethoven'schen Klavierwerke; Czerny's "Erinnerungen an Beethoven" sowie das 2. und 3. Kapitel des IV. Bandes der "Vollständigen theoretisch-practischen Pianoforte-Schule op. 500," ed. Paul Badura Skoda [Vienna: Universal Edition, 1963]) and its London one (R. Cocks, 1846; Carl Czerny: On the Proper Performance of All Beethoven's Works for the Piano; Czerny's Reminiscences of Beethoven and Chapters II and III from Volume IV of the "Complete Theoretical and Practical Piano Forte School op. 500," ed. Paul Badura Skoda [Vienna: Universal Edition, 1970]).

seem out of kilter with perceptions of how this music might or should go: it has been argued that his metronome was poorly calibrated or otherwise faulty (neither has been substantiated), that Beethoven devised his metronome marks haphazardly and largely (in the case of the 1817 pamphlets) after the fact, and even that we have entirely misunderstood their meaning. Brown, on the other hand, aligns himself with those period performers who have adopted Beethoven's metronome marks with enthusiasm and often (but not always) success in their search for a plausible authenticity: by his reckoning, we should *prima facie* treat a mark as correct unless one can demonstrate strong grounds for taking it otherwise (for example, by way of a mistranscription or misprint). Brown, however, would also argue for a flexible, rather than constant, beat,<sup>4</sup> to which I would add the need for caution in one's assumption of which point in a given movement Beethoven took to measure that beat for the sake of generating a particular metronome mark.

None of these discussions, however, has focused on, or drawn upon, the issue of intramovement changes of tempo and/or meter, for all that such changes are quite common at least in certain contexts in music of the late Classical and early Romantic periods. They are found quite regularly in specific types of operatic numbers (chain finales, two-tempo arias), in Mass movements, in "fantasy"-like pieces usually for keyboard or small ensemble, and in symphonic or related movements with slow introductions. But they also become a more widespread feature of Beethoven's middle- and late-period instrumental works. These cases not only raise significant performance problems, but also have a bearing on our understanding of Beethoven's use of notation, on the one hand, and his treatment of (hyper)meter, on the other. Moreover, given that such changes are often viewed as contributing significantly to the disruptive and/or fragmentary nature of the composer's later music—which then may or may not be shown to tend toward higher-level cohesion—a study of them also has an impact on our sense of his developing style.

To broach these issues, one must first explore what kinds of evidence can feasibly be brought to bear both on general principles for Beethoven, if there are any, and on specific instances in his output. Relying on musical common sense, and

4. Compare Schindler's widely cited comment on the second movement of the Piano Sonata in D Major, op. 10, no. 3, that "Beethoven himself said that the pace of this movement must be changed fully ten times"; see Tallis Barker, "Interpreting Beethoven's Markings: A Preliminary Survey of the Piano Sonatas," *Music Review* 55 (1994), 169–82, at p. 174. Of course, Schindler is nowadays rarely trusted, even if views were given some credence in the nineteenth century. Brown discusses this and the broader parameters for tempo modification in *Classical and Romantic Performance Practice*, pp. 375–414.

on what seems to work, is dangerous—so the debate about Beethoven's metronome would suggest—and yet it cannot be dismissed: period performance has shown that we can certainly educate, and change, our musical intuition, yet any performance that appears willfully counterintuitive will fail to be convincing. As we will see, there are often notational and structural clues as to what Beethoven might have intended in a given case, while broader analytical issues can sometimes have a bearing on quite precise performance details. But there are always gray areas where different forms of evidence conflict rather than coincide, or where a reading prompted by this evidence might fail to persuade. How one might handle these situations is one of the more interesting offshoots of the present enquiry.

Some examples will reveal the problems of conflicting evidence. My "mechanical" solution to the last movement of the First Symphony, discussed above, is effective and perhaps even convincing. Yet my claim for a constant pulse between the Adagio and the Allegro molto e vivace is not supported by Beethoven's metronome marks (eighth note equals 63; half note equals 88), where it speeds up by just over a third (the difference between half note equals 63 and 88), although it is clear that Beethoven would not (and could not) have made any such mathematical calculation.<sup>5</sup> A similar approach to the slow introduction of the first movement has the same difficulty. Here an eighth note in the introduction (c, Adagio molto) would seem to become a half note in the Allegro con brio  $(\mathbf{e})$ ,<sup>6</sup> although the metronome marks (eighth note equals 88 for the Adagio molto; half note equals 112 for the Allegro con brio) suggest that the pulse speeds up by just over a quarter. Accepting for the moment that the new metronome mark is to be applied immediately (we will see some apparent exceptions below), one might still feasibly argue that despite such increases in speed, a pulse may still be conceived, and perhaps even perceived, as somehow constant even when it is not so in "real time." These increases over equivalence, which may also be prompted by additional modifiers to basic tempo terms (so "con brio,""e vivace," etc.), do not necessarily disturb the basic hypothesis developed here, given that of all musical parameters tempo is perhaps the one most open to flexibility, with the greatest degree of tolerance within the boundaries that set off one category from another. This is prob-

5. So Barry Cooper tells me (private communication). One assumes that Beethoven derived his metronome marks by a combination of empirical observation and convention, which in turn would explain why the kinds of relationships discussed in this essay are not always reflected in precise mathematical terms.

6. Hence the tendency to play the last four thirty-second notes of m. 12 (the last measure of the introduction) as sixty-fourth notes, which will then be equivalent to the sixteenth notes in the equivalent descending scale in m.18.

ably even more the case at points where such increases of tempo most often appear, toward the beginnings of movements (the transition from a slow introduction to a main Allegro or the like) and their ends (the shift from a fast tempo to a faster one for a coda): here the issue is just of local significance, and once the new pulse is established, its derivation is no longer an issue.

The case of the last movement of the Third Symphony, op.55 (Eroica), is not so easily dismissed. This set of theme and variations (in <sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> throughout) falls into three broad sections delineated by tempo terms, and each is given (in 1817) a different metronome mark: the introduction, presentation of the "Prometheus" theme (first the bass line, then the melody), and initial variations are Allegro molto (half note equals 76); there is a slower middle section marked Poco andante (eighth note equals 108); and a final Presto (quarter note equals 116).<sup>7</sup> Many conductors will beat quarter



Example 2: Symphony No.3 in E Major, op.55 (*Eroica*; 1803), movt.IV, mm.346–49, brass omitted (GA, I/3).

7. This is the usually accepted reading; it was misprinted by Beethoven as eighth note equals 116. Brown would no doubt argue (cf. *Classical and Romantic Performance Practice*, p. 300) that the seeming-ly odd situation of the opening Allegro molto having a faster metronome mark than the final Presto is due to the fact that the Presto has a higher rate of smaller note values and therefore sounds faster anyway.

notes in the Allegro molto (thus two beats per measure). In handling the transition to the Poco andante (see ex.2), they may give m.348 double its length: two quarter note beats for the dotted quarter note with fermata, a third to cut off that note and to give the new tempo, and a fourth for the upbeat, now an eighth note in Poco andante. The subsequent measures will be beaten in four (i.e., eighth notes). This produces a relationship between the Allegro molto and the Poco andante of a quarter note becoming an eighth note; that eighth note then becomes a quarter note for the final Presto (with a slight increase in tempo). Yet according to the metronome mark, this requires the beat in the Allegro molto to slow down by about a third (the difference between quarter note equals 152 and eighth note equals 108).<sup>8</sup> This might be done abruptly, or be achieved (at least in part) by way of a ritardando leading into the fermata in m.348. For that matter, some conductors may already have come close to the slower pulse by taking the theme and initial variations at a slower tempo than the introduction (i.e., closer to half note equals 54), prompted, no doubt, by a sense of what the theme seems to require, and also by what emerges as quite difficult figuration in the violins. To do so presumes that Beethoven's opening metronome mark did not take the theme into account, and also that (at an earlier stage) he failed to give that theme an appropriate tempo term (the initial Allegro molto still operates). Purists wishing to adhere to the initial tempo term and metronome mark right through to the Poco andante (and denying a ritardando into the fermata) will probably be unable to convey any metrical continuity in m.348.Views will vary on whether or not this is a problem.

#### "Tactus"-based Equivalence

Beethoven in fact takes some care with metronome marks when dealing with one particular category of tempo/meter change. In the third movement of the Eroica, the reprise of the scherzo ( $\frac{3}{4}$ , Allegro vivace, dotted half note equals 116) contains four measures in ¢ marked "Alla breve" (whole note equals 116).<sup>9</sup> Something similar (but without metronome marks) occurs in the trio of the second movement of the String Quartet in A Minor, op.132. This movement is in  $\frac{3}{4}$  (Allegro ma non tanto), but mm.218–21 are in ¢ (marked "L'istesso tempo"), where the measures

9. This is marked incorrectly in the Eulenburg score, which gives half note equals 116.

<sup>8.</sup> Compare the more logical (it seems) handling of similar tempo changes in the last movement of the String Quartet in F Major, op. 59, no. 1, also in  $\frac{2}{4}$  throughout, where the Allegro (*Thème russe;* quarter note equals 126) leads to Adagio ma non troppo (eighth note equals 69) to Presto (half note equals 92).

remain equivalent. These examples have a bearing on the more extended, and somewhat controversial, case of the second movement of the Ninth Symphony, with its scherzo (<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, Molto vivace) and trio (¢, Presto). The metronome marks noted by Beethoven's nephew, Karl, are dotted half note equals 116 for the scherzo and (probably) half note equals 116 for the trio, although as many have noted, the latter seems too slow. Brown, however, argues that the correct metronome mark for the trio is whole note equals 116, the mistake having occurred by way of a not uncommon misprision of the note value to be applied to a given metronome mark (we will see several examples elsewhere).<sup>10</sup> This, Brown admits, is very fast, but he notes that it is not without parallels elsewhere in Beethoven's output. By this reading, one measure of the trio is equivalent to one measure of the scherzo, a relationship strongly supported by my argument to be made over Beethoven's use of ¢, below. Therefore the conductor's beat stays at one per measure throughout the movement whether it varies in tempo is a separate issue<sup>11</sup>—although it may also be inflected



10. Clive Brown, "Historical Performance, Metronome Marks and Tempo in Beethoven's Symphonies," *Early Music* 19 (1991), 247–58, at pp.256–58. Peter Stadlen originally advocated whole note equals 116 ("Beethoven and the Metronome" [1967]) but then recanted ("Beethoven and the Metronome" [1982], p.54). Jonathan Del Mar (*Ludwig van Beethoven: Symphony Nr. 9 in d-moll; Critical Commentary* [Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1996], p.39) regards half note equals 116 as a mistake, rejects whole note equals 116, and follows others in suggesting half note equals 160. Barry Cooper (*Beethoven*, The Master Musicians [Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000], p.345) notes his idea that Karl misheard Beethoven's "einhundertsechzig" (160) as "einhundertsechzehn" (116). It should be said, however, that whatever Beethoven intended, he still marked a stringendo over the eight measures leading to the change to **¢**.

11. My caveat may seem craven, but it has some justification, given that for present purposes I am more concerned with the conceptual relationship between the scherzo and trio measures than with the status of the trio's (or for that matter, the scherzo's) 116. Jonathan Del Mar's more recent statement (pace his half note equals 160 for the trio in his edition) that the "tempo relationship" [sic] over the double bar between the scherzo and the trio "absolutely has to be old dotted half = new half" is to my mind untenable, proportionally speaking, even if it has some precedent in the literature; see his "Concerning the Review of the *Urtext* Edition of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony" (and reviewer David Levy's response), *Beethoven Forum* 10 (2003), 102–10, at p.107.

Example 3: String Quartet in ▷ Major, op.74 ("Harp"; 1809), movt.III (NA,VI/4). a. mm.9–12. b. mm.77–81, cello. hypermetrically ("ritmo di tre battute," "ritmo di quattro battute"). A performer of Renaissance music familiar with the principles of mensural notation would regard this as a case of proportional equivalence based on the notion of a regular *tactus*, a constant pulse that can be subdivided into three or two (as in these examples from the Eroica, the Ninth Symphony, and op. 132, movt.II), or even four or six.

There are several examples of this procedure in Beethoven's works. The most obvious occur where one kind of duple time is changed into one kind of compound duple (thus  $\frac{2}{4}$  to  $\frac{6}{8}$ , or  $\frac{4}{4}$  to  $\frac{12}{8}$ , where a quarter note equals a dotted quarter note). But the principle also works at higher metrical levels. In the third movement of the String Quartet in Eb Major, op.74 ("Harp"), the "scherzo" (<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, Presto) alternates with a "trio" (Più presto quasi prestissimo) in which "Si ha s'immaginar la battuta di §,"<sup>12</sup> i.e., the <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> measures are to be grouped in pairs (see ex.3). The metronome marks again suggest a precise equivalence (scherzo, dotted half note equals 100; trio, dotted whole note equals 100).<sup>13</sup> Thus two measures in the trio are equivalent to one in the scherzo (so an eighth note becomes a quarter note), or to put the same musical point another way, the <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> measures of the scherzo are divided into two (hence, \$) rather than three.<sup>14</sup> Curiously, and perhaps deliberately, this play of triple and compound duple meters has already been a tendency at the beginning of the second half of the scherzo (see ex.3a), where there is always (at least in performance) a strong feeling of a shift from <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> to <sup>8</sup>/<sub>8</sub> that may or may not need to be resisted.

The last movement of the String Quartet in F Minor, op.95 (Serioso), is another case. Here the main Allegretto vivace in  $\frac{6}{8}$  (preceded by a slow introduction discussed below) shifts to a concluding Allegro in ¢. According to Beethoven's metronome marks (dotted quarter note equals 92; whole note equals 92),<sup>15</sup> the dotted quarter note beat in the Allegretto vivace is subdivided (as a whole note) into two in the ¢; thus two measures of the Allegro equal one of the Allegretto vivace. One assumes that similar principles operate in the second movement of the "Hammerklavier" Sonata, for which we do not have any intramovement metronome marks from the composer. Here the scherzo ( $\frac{3}{4}$ , Assai vivace; marked by Beethoven at dotted

12. This is typical of Beethoven's pidgin-Italian, which is often incorrect, albeit clear.

13. Beethoven's metronome mark for the trio was dotted half note equals 100 (i.e., the same as for the scherzo), but this is widely accepted as a misprint; see Brown, "Historical Performance, Metronome Marks and Tempo in Beethoven's Symphonies," p.250.

14. Beethoven achieves a similar (one assumes) effect in a different way in the third movement ( $\frac{3}{4}$ , Scherzando vivace) of the String Quartet in Eb Major, op.127. Here the middle section involves an accelerando to Presto (still  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; Beethoven reiterates the time signature). Presumably two measures of the Presto equal one of the Scherzando vivace.

15. Perhaps 72; see n.26, below.

half note equals 80) moves to a trio ( $\frac{2}{4}$ , Presto), returns to the scherzo, and then has the coda interrupted by four measures in  $\phi$ , marked Presto. Two measures of the trio seem equivalent to one of the scherzo; so the latter's dotted half note divided into three quarter notes is equivalent to one whole note in the trio (two measures of the  $\frac{2}{4}$  Presto) divided into four quarter notes. For the  $\phi$  Presto, we have the same 2:1 relationship at the level of the measure: the scherzo's dotted half note divided into three quarter notes becomes equivalent to a double whole note (two measures of  $\phi$ ) divided into eight quarter notes.

It is probably no coincidence that many of these examples involve  $\mathbf{c}$ , given the apparent meanings of that time signature. Beethoven seems to use ¢ in at least three not necessarily contradictory ways.<sup>16</sup> In a stand-alone context, ¢ prompts thinking of the measure being divided into two rather than four (in effect,  $\frac{2}{2}$  rather than  $\frac{4}{4}$ , just as ¢ is often taught in theory books), but more important, it also seems to suggest a somewhat faster tempo than c. Theorists earlier in the eighteenth century had often linked ¢ with a doubling of the normal tempo of c—a notion that lingers in some early-nineteenth-century accounts as well-although as Brown has shown, this was increasingly at odds with most common practices. But the fact that ¢ had at least some implication for tempo—even if the results can be confused is clear from a problem with the Mass in C, op.86, that Beethoven noted to Breitkopf and Härtel on 17 July 1812: "At the beginning of the Gloria I have altered  ${f c}$ to ¢ time signature thus altering the tempo; and that is the way the time was indicated at first. A bad performance at which the tempo was too fast induced me to do this," i.e., to alter the original ¢ to ¢, which Beethoven is now seeking to reverse.17

However,  $\mathbf{e}$  also has archaic associations—hence its use in Masses or fugues even later in the nineteenth century—because of its links with writing "alla breve" ( $\frac{\hbar}{2}$ ). Beethoven rarely if ever writes *alla breve* in this sense, although he does use the term in a manner distantly related to the original mensural distinction between  $\mathbf{e}$ and  $\mathbf{e}$ , even if the result is very different. In mensural notation,  $\mathbf{e}$  has the *tactus* at the double–whole note (the *brevis*), and  $\mathbf{e}$  has it at the whole note (the *semibrevis*); thus, with a constant tactus four half notes in  $\mathbf{e}$  have the same duration as four quarter notes in  $\mathbf{e}$ . This explains why  $\mathbf{e}$  was often interpreted by theorists as in-

<sup>16.</sup> For a broader discussion of ¢ in this period, see Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performance Practice*, pp.313–35. However, Brown does not explore the proportional and cautionary implications raised below.

<sup>17.</sup> Barry Cooper, Beethoven and the Creative Process (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p.173; see also Brown, Classical and Romantic Performance Practice, p.320.

#### 137 Metrical Equivalence in Beethoven: Performance and Analysis

volving some kind of doubling of the tempo of c. But while Beethoven does not adopt the "double tempo" principle, he often seems to use ¢ to convey information about some kind of doubling of the pulse, especially when an Allegro or the like in  $\frac{2}{4}$ ,  $\frac{6}{5}$  or **c** moves to a faster section in **¢**. We have seen one example in the last movement of op.95, discussed above, where two measures of ¢ equal one of §. Similarly, the fourth movement of the Fifth Symphony, op.67, marked Allegro (c, half note equals 84), ends with a Presto in ¢ (whole note equals 112). According to Beethoven's metronome marks, the tempo doubles and speeds up by about one third more (the difference between whole note equals 84 and 112). Conversely, there is not this "doubling" of the pulse when ¢ already applies.<sup>18</sup> Further, not only will a shift to  $\phi$  invoke some kind of proportional equivalence at the level of the (new) measure; it will also suggest that the two half-note beats of the ¢ measure somehow occupy the time of one previous "beat" (however that beat may be defined). This is the case in all the examples discussed above—save op.106, movt.II—even if some further speeding up then occurs (as in op.67, movt.IV). The principle sometimes (but not always) operates in reverse, as in the last movement of the String Quartet in Eb Major, op.127, which begins in ¢ (no tempo term) and concludes with an Allegro con moto in §, where a whole note becomes a dotted quarter note (i.e., one measure of ¢ becomes a half-measure of §); I discuss this case further below.19

These observations help explain some apparent anomalies in Beethoven's use of ¢ that caused Brown concern, but which he was unable to resolve.<sup>20</sup> In the first

18. For example, in the last movement of the String Quartet in E Minor, op. 59, no.2, in ¢ throughout, the initial Presto (whole note equals 88) shifts to a concluding Prestissimo (whole note equals 112); the metronome marks are close to those in the last movement of op.67, but their units of measurement are not. For a similar example, see the last movement of the String Quartet in C Minor, op.18, no.4, again in ¢ throughout, where the Allegretto (whole note equals 66; some scores give "Allegro") leads to a Prestissimo (whole note equals 84).

19. However, there are several exceptions, chiefly when  $\phi$  is used in a slower tempo (and therefore where a  $\frac{2}{2}$  pulse is independent of speed). The Piano Sonata ("quasi una Fantasia") in E<sup>b</sup> Major, op.27, no.1, is particularly interesting in its sequential changes of tempo and meter within and between movements. Its first movement is in a ternary form, with the A section an Andante in  $\phi$ , and the B section an Allegro in 6/8; here there would seem to be a 1:1 relationship at the level of the measure (so half note becomes dotted quarter note). For a later example, see the first movement of the String Quartet in A Minor, op.132; here the slow introduction ( $\phi$ , Assai sostenuto) precedes an Allegro (c), usually read as an eighth note becoming a quarter note (see below). In this case,  $\phi$  seems to be used because of the predominantly half-note movement of the introduction rather than as any indication of tempo.

20. Brown, Classic and Romantic Performing Practice, p.320 (and his Table 9.1).

movement of the First Symphony, the introductory Adagio molto (**c**, eighth note equals 88) leads to an Allegro con brio (**¢**, half note equals 112). This can be compared with the first movement of the Second Symphony, op.36, with an Adagio molto (<sup>3</sup>, eighth note equals 84) preceding an Allegro con brio (**c**, half note equals 100). The tempo terms are the same, and the rhythmic pacing of the main sections of each movement is similar; thus for Brown, the difference in tempo expressed by the metronome markings for the main Allegro con brio (half note equals 112 in op.21 and 100 in op.36) is not sufficient to warrant the different time signature. However, there may be a different explanation for the **¢** in op.21, movt. I. Here the predominant beat in the introductory Adagio molto is in quarter notes (the fastest note values are largely sixteenth notes, with only a few thirty-second notes), whereas the predominant beat in the opening Adagio molto of op.36, movt. I must be in eighth notes (there are long stretches of triplet sixteenth notes, plus a significant number of sixty-fourth notes). In practice, the relationship between the two slow



Example 4: Piano Sonata in C Major, op. 53 ("Waldstein"; 1803–04), movt.III, mm. 1–4, 403–04, 485–88 (NA,VII/3). introductions and their main movements is the same: an eighth note in the Adagio molto becomes a half note in the Allegro con brio (speeding up to the extent of the new metronome mark). Yet in op.21, movt. I, the ¢, signifying two half note beats in the time of one previous beat, cautions against a reading of a quarter note becoming one half note rather than two, a trap into which an unsuspecting performer might have been led in the absence of clearer directions (such as the metronome marks that Beethoven provided later).<sup>21</sup>

There is some attraction to the notion of Beethoven treating  $\phi$  as cautionary, i.e., not so much forcing one reading as preventing another. It also provides a useful way of judging the particularly tricky case of the last movement of the Piano Sonata in C Major, op.53 ("Waldstein"). Here the "Introduzione" (§, Molto adagio) leads to a rondo (<sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, Allegretto moderato) that concludes with a Prestissimo in ¢ (Beethoven altered his original "Presto" in the autograph). There is always some debate about the appropriate tempo for the rondo's Allegretto moderato: Czerny shifted between quarter note equals 88 (1846) and quarter note equals 100 (1856-68), while Moscheles (1858) had quarter note equals 112. There is more consistency over the Prestissimo: Czerny first had whole note equals 88, then 84, while Moscheles gave whole note equals 80. The question of the relationship between the Allegretto moderato and the Prestissimo, however, is particularly acute because of the recurrence in the latter of the rondo theme in two guises, once at the beginning moving in quarter notes, and then in augmentation moving in half notes (see ex.4a); clearly there seems to be some kind of relationship between the two sections. Instinct might initially suggest a quarter note in the <sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> becoming a half note in the **¢**: this would particularly be the case if the Allegretto moderato were taken on the fast side. As a result, the rondo theme would be presented at double speed at the beginning of the Prestissimo, and then in effect at its original speed when

21. A similar argument probably explains another "anomaly" (for Brown): the first movement (not the finale, *pace Classic and Romantic Performing Practice*, p. 320) of the Septet, op.20. Here an Adagio ( $\frac{3}{4}$ , eighth note equals 72) precedes an Allegro con brio ( $\frac{6}{4}$ , half note equals 96). The Adagio is somewhat between the slow introductions of the First and Second Symphonies in terms of smallest note values (some triplet sixteenth notes and thirty-second notes, but no sixty-fourth notes), yet the predominant pulse is probably at the quarter note (as in op.21, movt.I) rather than the eighth note (op.36, movt.I), hence requiring the cautionary  $\frac{6}{4}$ . The last movement (the sixth) of the Septet, where an introductory Andante con moto alla marcia ( $\frac{2}{4}$ , eighth note equals 76) leads to a Presto ( $\frac{6}{4}$ , half note equals 112) is more straightforward: the two half-note beats of the Presto equal one quarter-note beat of the Andante, with additional speeding up. As for Brown's reverse anomalies ( $\frac{6}{4}$  being used where  $\frac{6}{4}$  might seem more logical; in op.59, no.2, movt.II, op.92, movt.I, op.125, movt.III), they all involve slow movements where  $\frac{6}{4}$  (read as a slower  $\frac{2}{3}$ ) would be stylistically inappropriate. heard later in augmentation. Beethoven's change in the autograph from Presto to Prestissimo, however, seems designed to counter this reading and to prompt one more in keeping with the principles of ¢ outlined above, with two half notes in ¢ equaling one previous "beat," i.e., a quarter note in the <sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub>. In this case, the rondo theme would be heard in three guises in the movement as a whole: the original in the Allegretto moderato, at quadruple speed at the beginning of the Prestissimo, and at double speed later in that section (see ex.4b). Thus we are in a similar situation to the last movement of the Eroica, where the "Prometheus" theme is presented at three different speeds. For once, my solution for op.53 agrees with Czerny's 1846 metronome marks (quarter note equals 88; whole note equals 88)—Czerny says in his memoirs that he played the "Waldstein" for Beethoven—although by 1856–68 he had changed his mind (quarter note equals 100; whole note equals 84).<sup>22</sup> However, the 1846 reading leads to a slower Allegretto moderato than one might nowadays expect.

This discussion of the last movement of the "Waldstein" also offers a useful opportunity to forestall a (potentially major) criticism of the present argument as it evolves. In none of the cases above and below am I arguing for absolutely strict proportional, metrical, or even (save in a very few special cases) metronomic equivalence. To do so would be musically counterintuitive; it would deny the performer a much needed flexibility to respond to individual circumstances, environments, and even expressive whim; and it would not be justified by the little evidence we have from Beethoven himself. The kinds of relationships emerging here, then, are to be viewed more as tendencies that may be inflected in various ways, rather than as dogmatic formulas. But although there may be innumerable "right" ways to deal with each specific case, there are also demonstrably "wrong" ones that fly in the face of the reason articulated here. While my reading of the relationship between the Allegretto moderato and the Prestissimo of the last movement of op. 53 is supported both by the notational evidence and by Czerny (at least in 1846), I would not dare call Moscheles's interpretation "wrong." Yet conceiving the relationship by way of a quarter note equaling a half note probably would merit such a label. In short, a musicologist may or may not be allowed to tell a performer how to perform a given piece, but can reasonably say how not to do it.

<sup>22.</sup> Reihn makes an error in his listing of Czerny's 1846 marks. For these and other options, see Sandra P. Rosenblum, "Two Sets of Unexplored Metronome Marks for Beethoven's Piano Sonatas," *Early Music* 16 (1988), 59–71.



Example 5: Piano Sonata in C Minor, op. 13 ("Pathétique"; ?1797–98), movt.I, mm. 133, 137–42 (NA,VII/2).

#### **Thematic Recurrence**

The recurrence of the same melodic material in two or more sections of different tempo/meter, as in the last movements of the Eroica and of the "Waldstein," offers a particularly intriguing test case of *tactus*-style procedures, given that presumably we are meant to perceive some kind of relationship between the original material and its reappearance. One obvious precedent is the first movement of Haydn's Symphony No.103 in E Major ("Drumroll"), where the slow introduction returns within the main movement. In the first movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata in C Minor, op.13 ("Pathétique"), the introductory Grave (**c**), which recurs, shifts to the main Allegro molto e con brio (**¢**). If the main "beat" of the Grave is the eighth note, then by the principle of **¢** established above, an eighth note in the Grave becomes two half notes in the Allegro molto, with or without additional speeding up. Thus eight measures of the Allegro molto have the duration of one measure of the Grave, which is supported by the recurrence of the introduction's thematic material in the faster tempo toward the beginning of the development (see ex.5).<sup>23</sup> The first movement of the Piano Sonata in E Major, op.81a ("Les Adieux"), of-

23. Czerny came reasonably close to this reading in 1856–68 (eighth note equals 63; half note equals 144), although in 1846 he took the Grave slower (sixteenth note equals 92). My solution is the same as Hans von Bülow's, it seems, as expressed in the old Schirmer edition (1894) of the Beethoven sonatas. Adolph Bernhard Marx took a different view, with a quarter note in the Grave becoming a whole note in the Allegro molto e con brio; see Uwe Kliemt, "Gesetzt den Fall, A. B. Marx habe recht: Annäherung an Beethovens Tempoverständnis," in *Tempo, Rhythmik, Metrik, Artikulation in der Musik des 18. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Günter Fleischhauer et al., Michaelsteiner Konferenzberichte, 53 (Michaelstein: Stiftung Kloster Michaelstein, 1998), pp.140–47.

fers a similar, if more extended, example. Here the descending-third "horn" call in quarter notes ("Le-be wohl!") that opens the slow introduction (4, Adagio) returns in the second subject of the main movement (¢, Allegro) in whole notes, and later forms the primary material for the coda (again, in whole notes). The relationship between the Adagio and Allegro would therefore seem to be in the region of a quarter note becoming a whole note (perhaps to be conceived as an eighth note becoming a half note), which also fits the ¢ principle.

The fact that my resolution of these two examples is not commonly followed in performance raises interesting questions. Even granting the room for flexibility argued above, Czerny's reading of op.81a is somewhat problematic, at least if one accepts the notion that an introductory motive or theme recurring in a faster tempo will preserve durational equivalence: his 1846 metronome marks for the Adagio (eighth note equals 63) and the Allegro (half note equals 112) prompt an eighth note becoming almost a whole note rather than my proposed half note.<sup>24</sup> This in turn suggests that Czerny viewed the return of the "Lebe wohl!" motive in the Allegro in some kind of diminution, played almost twice as fast as heard in the Adagio. He must also have rendered the opening Adagio more slowly than one might expect, and the Allegro somewhat faster. Moscheles reaches a slightly happier mean (eighth note equals 72; half note equals 108), although even that does not come close to my reading (he has the pulse speed up by about half as much again). Similar problems arise in the first movement of the Piano Sonata in D Minor, op.31, no.2 ("Tempest"), where in the shifts from Largo to Allegro, Beethoven's notation (and his use of c throughout) would seem to prompt a quarter note becoming a half note, whereas many performers opt for an eighth note becoming a half note. Presumably, however, there are cases not open to such dispute. For example, in the first movement of the String Quartet in A Minor, op.132, the four note motive (in half notes) of the introductory Assai sostenuto (¢) recurs in whole notes throughout the development of the main Allegro (in c). Thus two measures in the Allegro would seem to last the time of one in the Assai sostenuto (i.e., an eighth note becomes a quarter note): certainly, it is hard to imagine anything different.

Of course, thematic recurrence can take various guises, given the standard possibilities of augmentation (playing a theme proportionally slower) and diminution (proportionally faster), as in the last movement of the "Waldstein" (ex.4b above) and apparently as felt by Czerny in the first movement of "Les Adieux." In princi-

<sup>24.</sup> Czerny preserved a similar relationship in 1856–68, with (Adagio) eighth note equals 72 and (Allegro) half note equals 126.

ple, then, there is no reason to favor direct equivalence; the question, rather, is whether Beethoven somehow indicates a preference for, or a caution against, one kind of equivalence over another. My argument concerning the "Waldstein" suggests that he does so by way of a combination of time signature (the  $\mathbf{e}$ , as I read it) and tempo term (Prestissimo). Those unwilling to accept my ¢ principle, however, would do well to consider the well-laid trap in the Choral Fantasia, op.80. After a long introduction for piano solo (c, Adagio), the piece moves to its so-called Finale, constructed (after a further introduction in c, Allegro) as a set of theme and variations  $\binom{2}{4}$ ; marked Meno allegro or Allegretto in different sources). The theme is presented and varied (with subsequent changes of tempo and meter) first by the piano and orchestra, and then with the chorus; the latter's entry is prepared at m. 398, and it begins the original <sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> theme at the upbeat to m.412 ("Schmeichelnd hold und lieblich klingen / Unsers Lebens Harmonien"). At m.489, there is a shift from  $\frac{2}{4}$  (the prevailing tempo is Allegretto ma non troppo quasi and ante con moto) to  $\mathfrak{e}$ , marked Presto. Just before the change, the chorus has sung the cadential "Froh die Gaben (die Gaben) schöner Kunst," with the melody moving in eighth and quarter notes; at the Presto, the chorus repeats the same music, now in quarter and half notes. At first sight (and almost certainly, on sightreading the piece), the relationship between the  $\frac{2}{4}$  and the  $\oint$  would be read as a quarter note equaling a half note, thus keeping "Froh die Gaben" at a constant speed. This relationship cannot be correct, however. Later in the Presto (m. 530), an imitative development of the main theme moving in half notes ("Nehmt denn hin, ihr schönen Seelen") repeats the same development of the theme in the earlier  $\frac{2}{4}$  (upbeat to m.474) in eighth notes. This requires the relationship between the  $\frac{2}{4}$  and the  $\mathbf{e}$  to be eighth note equals half note: the eighth note equals quarter note suggested by the initial thematic repetition at m.489 would make mm.530ff. impossibly slow. Therefore unless Beethoven has made a terrible mistake (unrectifiable in performance), the Presto's initial "Froh die Gaben (die Gaben) schöner Kunst" is in diminution (twice as fast as just heard at the end of the  $\frac{2}{4}$ ). This is precisely what the ¢ cautions according to my reading of the time signature, with two half note beats of the ¢ equaling one quarter note beat of the previous meter.

The presence of augmentation or diminution does not deny the association of thematic recurrence and *tactus*-style procedures; indeed, it strengthens that association and its long-established roots. A useful final example is provided by a movement usually seen as somehow related to the *Choral Fantasia*, if immeasurably superior to it. In the finale of the Ninth Symphony, the main theme ("Freude, schöner Götterfunken") first appears complete in the orchestra (m.92) in **c**, marked Allegro assai (half note equals 80); presumably, this is also the tempo for its first

appearance in the voices (m.237). In the  $\frac{6}{8}$  "Alla marcia," marked Allegro assai vivace (dotted half note equals 84),<sup>25</sup> "Freude, schöner Götterfunken" eventually appears (m.543) moving in dotted quarter notes rather than quarter notes, but at roughly the same speed. "Seid umschlungen, Millionen" (m.595) is in  $\frac{3}{2}$  marked Andante maestoso (half note equals 72); it then reappears in  $\frac{6}{4}$  (m.655), marked Allegro energico, sempre ben marcato (dotted half note equals 84), where it is combined with "Freude, schöne Götterfunken." For the three appearances of "Freude, schöne Gotterfunken," then, the reasonably constant half-note pulse is subdivided into two quarter notes, then (as a dotted half note) two dotted quarter notes (so 3:2 at the level of the eighth note), then (again as a dotted half note) three quarter notes (3:2 at the level of the quarter note). The process is strikingly archaic.



Example 6: String Quartet in A Minor, op. 132 (1825), movt.I, mm. 130–32 (GA, VI/ 51).

25. The reading of dotted quarter note equals 84 is widely accepted as an error; see Hermann Beck, "Bemerkungen zu Beethovens Tempi," BJ (1955/56), 24–54; Brown, "Historical Performance, Metronome Marks and Tempo in Beethoven's Symphonies," pp.253–56; Del Mar, *Ludwig van Beethoven: Symphony Nr. 9 in d-moll; Critical Commentary*, pp.58–59.

#### Note-to-note Equivalence

Although a number of examples discussed thus far and the ¢ principle outlined above might derive more or less distantly from tactus-based principles-i.e., measure-to-measure or beat-to-beat-performers may often tend to work on a noteto-note basis, where necessary subdividing a note value in one tempo/meter to whatever extent is required to produce an equivalent in the other. These relationships are not necessarily proportional at the level of the measure, strictly speaking, although as we will see, proportion may still ensue depending on the units involved. The simplest examples appear where a given note value remains the same, or simply doubles or halves in value. In the third movement of op.132 (the Heiliger Dankgesang), the shifts from the Molto adagio (c) to the Andante (3) would seem to keep the eighth note constant, at least notionally. Similarly, in the third movement of the String Quartet in E Major, op.127, the Scherzando vivace (3) is periodically interrupted by a short stretches of  $\frac{2}{4}$  marked Allegro where (so the melodic motion suggests) the quarter note remains constant. In the first movement of op.132, on the other hand, the Adagio measure that twice interrupts the Allegro (mm.21, 131) in effect halves the tempo, with a quarter note becoming an eighth note, or so the second interruption suggests (see ex.6). Here violin I's dotted quarter note and eighth-note motive in the second half of the Adagio measure becomes a dotted half note and quarter note in the viola and cello in the Allegro. This Adagio therefore has the same tempo as the opening Assai sostenuto, discussed above.



Example 7: String Quartet in C Major, op. 59, no.3 (1805– 06), movt.I, mm.26–32 (NA, VI/4).

The resulting simplicity of counting offers a convenient way of negotiating tempo/meter changes even when Beethoven's metronome marks would (again) seem to prompt something different. The first movement of the String Quartet in C Major, op. 59, no.3, has a slow "Introduzione" (3, Andante con moto, quarter note equals 69) leading to an Allegro vivace (c, half note equals 88). Beethoven's metronome marks in effect have one measure in the introduction equivalent to two in the Allegro vivace (dotted half note equals 23; double whole note equals 22). But again, Beethoven cannot have calculated it this way, and most performers will probably manage the transition by way of some kind of constant pulse (eighth note becomes a quarter note), as in ex.7, with or without some speeding up. This example is also instructive in other ways. Despite the change of meter and tempo in the middle of m.29, Beethoven preserves the look of a <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> measure. This may be just for the sake of elegance (and what would become typographical convenience). My resolution of the relationship between the Andante con moto and the Allegro vivace (see ex.7b), however, preserves the sound of a <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> measure, maintaining metrical continuity across the change of tempo and meter.

Skeptics might once more complain at the discrepancy between this reading and Beethoven's metronome marks: his Allegro vivace, at half note equals 88, is faster than mine (half note equals 69, i.e., the quarter note of the Andante con moto). Yet the question once again arises of what musical moment Beethoven was taking for his half note equals 88. A further example helps argue the point. The last movement of the String Quartet in F Minor, op.95, has a slow introduction (<sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, Larghetto espressivo) leading to an Allegretto agitato (<sup>6</sup>/<sub>8</sub>; see ex.8). The continuity of the motive in violin I strongly suggests that an eighth note becomes a dotted quarter note. Beethoven, however, gave metronome marks of (Larghetto espressivo) eighth note equals 56 and (Allegretto agitato) dotted quarter note equals 92.<sup>26</sup>



Example 8: String Quartet in F Minor, op.95 (Serioso; 1810), movt.IV, mm.7–10, violin I (NA,VI/4).

26. Brown suggests that the 92 might be a misreading of 72 (which would be more consistent with similar cases); see "Historical Performance, Metronome Marks and Tempo in Beethoven's Symphonies," p.257.

Given that this relationship appears irrational—and is almost impossible to conceive directly—it seems likely that he intended an accelerando through the first two § measures (accompanying the crescendo) so that the new tempo arrives only in m. 10 with the appearance of the main theme.<sup>27</sup> Similar instances of implied (and commonly applied) accelerandos modifying a constant pulse between a slow introduction and the main movement can be found in the first movements of the Fourth Symphony, op.60 (Adagio, ¢, to Allegro vivace, ¢; quarter note equals 66 to whole note equals 88), and the Seventh, op.92 (Poco sostenuto, **c**, to Vivace, §; quarter note equals 69 to dotted quarter note equals 104). Presumably, something similar also occurs at the beginning of the last movement of the "Appassionata" Sonata, op. 57—marked "attacca" from the previous movement—which is quite similar to the last movement of op.95. One might argue that the first movement of op.59, no.3, is another case in point, with the new (faster) tempo only becoming fixed by, say, the *forte* theme in m.43.

The case of ex.7, with an upbeat in a new tempo/meter completing a measure of an old tempo/meter, is common in Beethoven's chamber works.<sup>28</sup> One often



Example 9: String Quartet in B<sup>J</sup> Major, op. 18, no.6 (1799– 1800), movt.IV, mm.43–44 (Adagio), 1 (Allegretto quasi allegro), violin I (NA,VI/3).

27. Once that tempo is established, however, the beat remains constant through the shift to Allegro (¢) for the coda, as we have seen. Compare Wagner's comments on handling the transition from the first to the second movements of the String Quartet in C# Minor, op. 131, in his essay "On Conducting," where he advocates establishing the new tempo only from m.8 on; see *Three Wagner Essays*, trans. Robert L. Jacobs (London: Eulenburg, 1979), pp.71–72.

28. Compare the second movement of the String Quartet in G Major, op.18, no.2 ( ${}^{3}_{4}$ , Adagio cantabile, eighth note equals 72), which has a faster middle section ( ${}^{2}_{4}$ , Allegro, half note equals 69) beginning on an upbeat. Beethoven's metronome marks suggest a near enough note-to-measure relationship, although few ensembles will take the Allegro so quickly.

finds it also with the additional twist of a fermata in mid-measure. In the last movement of the String Quartet in B Major, op. 18, no.6, the slow introduction (La Malinconia), an Adagio in  $\frac{2}{4}$ , leads attacca to the Allegretto quasi allegro in  $\frac{2}{8}$  (see ex.9); the <sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> Adagio also recurs within the main movement. As Elaine Sisman has noted,<sup>29</sup> this piece belongs to a tradition of musical representations of melancholy going back at least to C. P. E. Bach, one of whose Trio Sonatas (in C minor; H. 579, W. 161/1; composed in 1749 and published in 1751) offers a direct precedent for op.18, no.6, and also for the kinds of equivalences discussed here. The first movement of C. P. E. Bach's Sonata plays on character types determined by the bodily humors, portraying a "conversation" between a "Melancholicus" (violin II) and a "Sanguineus" (violin I); the former is represented by music in ¢, marked Allegretto, and the latter by music in § (Presto). According to Bach's verbal instructions, one measure of the Presto is to be played as triplet eighth notes of the Allegretto (so a quarter note in the Allegretto becomes a dotted quarter note in the Presto). In the last movement of op.18, no.6, an eighth note in the Adagio seems to become a dotted quarter note in the Allegretto quasi allegro, although Beethoven's metronome marks once again suggest a further increase in tempo (eighth note equals 58; dotted quarter note equals 88). In the transitional m.44, the three sixteenth-note upbeat under the new time signature and tempo notationally completes a <sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> measure, which contains a fermata of undefined duration. We are in a similar position to the case of the last movement of the First Symphony (see ex.1 above), and one is inclined to suggest a similar solution, dividing the original beat to provide the new one, and in addition, perhaps giving the fermata an at least notionally fixed length (see ex.9b). The first movement of the String Quartet in Bb Major, op.130, is another case in point. Here, a slow introduction (3, Adagio ma non troppo) leads to an Allegro (C), with an eighth note in the Adagio becoming a quarter note in the Allegro (see ex.10); this also operates in the reappearances of the Adagio ma non troppo in the main movement. The fermata on the quarter note in violin I is held in effect for three eighth note counts (and the fermata on the eighth note in the lower parts for two), leaving the last eighth note count of m.14 to equal the quarter-note upbeat in the new tempo.

There are other examples. In the first movement of the Piano Sonata in F# Major, op.78, the shift from the opening Adagio cantabile  $\binom{2}{4}$  to the Allegro ma non troppo (**c**) would now seem straightforward (see ex.11). The relationship is in the region of a sixteenth note becoming a quarter note, the transitional measure (m.4) forms a complete unit under the old time signature, the fermata has a more or less

29. In Sisman's as yet unpublished paper "The Labyrinth of Melancholy."



Example 10: String Quartet in Bb Major, op.130 (1825–26), movt.I, mm.13–16, violin I, violin II (GA,VI/49).

> defined duration, there is a slight break before the upbeat in the new tempo, and two measures of the Allegro equal one of the Adagio (see ex.11b).<sup>30</sup> There are, of course, other options, including bringing in the upbeat sooner (as in ex.11c, in effect shortening m.4 to a <sup>3</sup>/<sub>8</sub> measure) or prolonging the fermata (perhaps preceded by a rhapsodic *ritardando* on the first beat of m.4) and making a clear break before the upbeat in the new tempo. These readings, however, produce significant metrical disruption (compare the "purist" treatment of ex.2 above), whereas in my handling of exs.7, 9–11, I have tended to prefer metrical continuity, with the transitional measure still sounding complete under its original tempo/meter. This seems intuitively "right"—or at least, not "wrong"—although the argument remains circular and is based on an as yet unexamined premise concerning the nature of, and need for, this continuity. What other types of evidence can plausibly be brought to bear on such cases to help break the vicious circle, or at least move more comfortably within it?

> 30. Moscheles got reasonably close to this reading, with (Adagio cantabile) eighth note equals 76 and (Allegro ma non troppo) quarter note equals 138. Czerny's (1846) recommendation (eighth note equals 72; quarter note equals 116) is somewhat out of kilter.



Example 11: Piano Sonata in F# Major, op.78 (1809), movt.I, mm.3–5 (GA, XVI/147).

#### **Issues of Hypermeter**

The last movement of the String Quartet in F Major, op.135, is another instance in which Beethoven takes some care over a transitional measure (see ex.12). The opening Grave ma non troppo tratto (3) leads to an Allegro ( $\phi$ ).<sup>31</sup> As in the last movement of op.18, no.6, and the first movements of op.59, no.3, and ops.78 and 130, Beethoven gives m.12 the number of notes appropriate to the measure under the old time signature, even though that signature changes in mid-measure, as does the tempo.<sup>32</sup> The fermata in mid-measure also has, at least conceptually, a defined duration. And the whole adheres to the  $\phi$  principle outlined above, with two halfnote beats in the Allegro equaling one quarter-note beat in the Grave.

Here, at least, one can also draw on a different argument. In most shifts from a slow tempo/meter to a fast one involving a (near-)constant pulse, a note-to-mea-

31. In the Eulenburg score, the first appearance of the Allegro is in c, but this is an error (and the equivalent music in the recapitulation is in  $\phi$ ).

32. Presumably, the "Adagio" marked at the beginning of m. 12 is in the manner of a *rallentando;* it almost certainly does not impact on the metrical equivalence between the Grave and the Allegro which, as we will see, is confirmed by the reappearance of the Grave later in the movement.



Example 12: String Quartet in F Major, op.135 (1826), movt.IV, mm.11–15, violin I, cello (GA,VI/52).

> sure equivalence will have significant implications in terms of hypermeter: the four, six, or eight beats of a slow measure will become four-, six-, or eight-measure phrases in the faster tempo-we have already seen an example in the first movement of the "Pathétique" (see ex.5 above). The same will operate in the reverse: when moving from fast to slow, measures will become beats. My reading of the last movement of op.135 has the quarter notes of the Grave become measures in the Allegro. At the end of the development, as Beethoven prepares for the return of the Grave prefacing the recapitulation, he manipulates the (predominantly fourmeasure) phrase structure to provide a six-measure phrase precisely before the return (see ex.13). Thus six whole notes (six measures) in the fast tempo become six quarter notes (one measure) in the slow one, while the quarter notes in the Allegro continue as sixteenth notes in the violins.<sup>33</sup> This prompts a reassessment of the opening of the movement: although the introductory Grave is in  $\frac{3}{2}$ , the meter is as yet not strongly enforced, in part because of the rests (the time signature seems to have been influenced by the notation of the motto "Muss es sein?"). Indeed, these twelve  $\frac{3}{2}$  measures could quite easily be regrouped as eighteen measures of  $\frac{3}{2}$  without violating the principal accents or other metric indicators, which in turn smooths the transition to the four-measure phrases of the Allegro. It remains true, however, that matters become much clearer toward the beginning of the recapitulation, which may, of course, be Beethoven's point.

> 33. This has a further impact on the subsequent Allegro (beginning at m. 174): the ten measures of mm. 174–83 are grouped (depending on how one wishes to count it) as 6 + 4, 4 + 6, or 4 + 4 + 2.







Example 13: String Quartet in F Major, op. 135, movt.IV, mm. 147–62 (GA,VI/52).





Discussions of hypermeter in Beethoven's music have tended to focus largely on single-tempo movements,<sup>34</sup> but intramovement changes of tempo/meter as discussed in this essay provide case studies that are more intriguing, precisely because they raise the question of whether (hyper)metric continuities can operate across what would seem to be metrical dislocation. The implications can also be far reaching. In the first movement of the String Quartet in Eb Major, op.127, the  ${}_{4}^{2}$  Maestoso leads after six measures into a  ${}_{4}^{3}$  Allegro by way of (m.6) a notated accelerando (a trill as thirty-second notes through triplet thirty-second notes to sixtyfourth notes). The broad relationship between the Maestoso and the Allegro must be in the region of eighth note becomes dotted half note, producing the reading represented in ex.14. Thus the four eighth-note counts in the Maestoso become four-measure phrases. Of course, something like this will always happen where the slow section is in some kind of duple meter, but in the case of op.127 there are further ramifications. In the last movement of this Quartet, there is a shift from the initial  $\phi$  (no tempo term) to a  $\frac{6}{8}$  Allegro con moto. A whole note becomes a dotted quarter note, and thus one measure in the ¢ becomes a half-measure in the s; the s section then introduces a reworking of the last movement's first subject (now in C major) in effect twice as slow as it was first heard (see ex.15). But this § falls strongly into half-measures and thus is quite reminiscent (also motivically) of the  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the first movement. The four-measure phrases of the  $\phi$  also tend to fall into the 3 + 1 (or 1 + 2 + 1) pattern characteristic of most measures of the first movement's opening <sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> Maestoso. It is particularly significant that from the climactic fortissimo in m.237 (still in ¢) to the § presentation of the first subject in m.259 (the third measure of the § section), the hypermetric groupings involve five four-measure phrases (the first half of the first § measure is in effect the fourth measure of

34. For example, Andrew Imbrie, "Extra Measures and Metrical Ambiguity in Beethoven," in BS I, 45–66; Richard L. Cohn, "The Dramatization of Hypermetric Conflicts in the Scherzo of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony," 19CM 15 (1992), 188–206.



Example 15: String Quartet in Eb Major, op. 127 (GA,VI/48). a. Movt.I, mm. 1–2; movt.IV, mm.237–44 (violin I). b. Movt.I, mm.6–8; movt.IV, mm.256–59, (violin I).

> the fifth four-measure phrase). That leaves a five-"measure" count (2 and one-half  $\frac{6}{8}$  measures), which is metrically indeterminate (by virtue of the trills in the violins) before coming back into focus, producing what feels like a stretched-out version of a sixth four-measure phrase. These six four-measure phrases are equivalent to the six  $\frac{2}{4}$  Maestoso measures that began the first movement, a relationship further emphasized by the trills (a written-out trill concluded the Maestoso) that then relax into the  $\frac{6}{8}$  theme. Thus a relationship is forged between the opening of the first movement and the ending of the last.

#### **Structural Proportions?**

Many of my examples discussed thus far are drawn from works for some kind of ensemble (string quartets, symphonies) in which there may be special needs in coordination at points of transition. A solo pianist, on the other hand, might legit-
imately claim to be less bound by these and other constraints; certainly we have seen cases in which Czerny and Moscheles apparently took a liberal view of tempo, meter, and even motive. Yet the emerging consistency of my proposed solutions does raise questions about their general applicability even when relative freedom is, or at least was, the norm. The issue comes to a head in a highly problematic case in Beethoven's output that has not hitherto received any discussion in the literature.

The Piano Sonata in E Major, op. 109, is one of the most studied of Beethoven's late piano sonatas and is the subject of at least three monographs, one dissertation,









Example 16: Piano Sonata in E Major, op. 109 (1820), movt.I, mm. 1–9 (Vienna: Adolph Martin Schlesinger, 1821; with minor editing).

and numerous important articles.<sup>35</sup> This interest is in part due to the unusual number of sources that survive for the piece, including extensive sketches of different kinds, an autograph manuscript, and various materials associated with the work's publication. Almost all of these studies somehow engage with the interpretative and analytical problems of the first movement, although none deals with them in the manner developed here. It starts with a Vivace ma non troppo  $\binom{2}{4}$ , which is interrupted after eight measures by an Adagio espressivo (3) of fantasy-like, even rhapsodic, character (see ex.16). The Adagio espressivo returns later in the movement at the equivalent point in the recapitulation, so that it seems to act (at least in part) as a kind of second-subject area: in the exposition it establishes the dominant and precedes the "development" (Tempo primo), and in the recapitulation it is transposed to close in the tonic, prior to the coda. This rhapsodic passage has commonly been construed as somehow "parenthetical" (Kinderman) or, more emphatically, "disruptive" (Stanley), while even analysts who tend to prefer cohesion (Schenker, Forte, Marston) have been hard pressed to relate it to the "main" material of the movement; for all that, they have variously found some motivic and voice-leading connections between the two. Yet just its place within an otherwise reasonably regular sonata form (if it is) must call the parenthetical/disruptive view into question. Also, the obvious issue arising in the present context is whether Beethoven was somehow concerned with easing the transitions between these two sections in different tempos and meters, and also with establishing some kind of equivalence between them.

In handling the transition, one clue is provided by the endings of the two Adagio espressivo episodes as each leads back to a Tempo primo (see ex.17).<sup>36</sup> In the

35. Heinrich Schenker, Beethoven, Die letzten Sonaten: Sonate E dur op. 109; Kritische Einführung und Erläuterung, ed. Oswald Jonas (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1971); Allen Forte, The Compositional Matrix (New York: Music Teachers National Association, 1961; rpt., New York: Da Capo, 1974); William Rhea Meredith, The Sources for Beethoven's Piano Sonata in E Major, Opus 109 (Ph.D. diss. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1985); William Kinderman, "Contrast and Parenthetical Enclosure in the Piano Sonatas, Opp. 109 and 111," in Zu Beethoven, vol.3, Aufsätze und Dokumente, ed. Harry Goldschmidt and Georg Knepler (Berlin: Verlag Neue Musik, 1988), pp.43–59; Nicholas Marston, Beethoven's Piano Sonata in E, Op. 109 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995); Glenn Stanley, "Voices and Their Rhythms in the First Movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata op. 109: Some Thoughts on the Performance and Analysis of a Late-Style Work," in Beethoven and His World, ed. Scott Burnham and Michael P. Steinberg (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000), pp.88–123.

36. My music examples here follow the first edition (1821).Various later ones seek to rationalize the left hand by adding one or two quarter-note rests toward the end of m.15; two is not unreasonable, as my argument will show.



Example 17: Piano Sonata in E Major, op. 109, movt.I (Vienna: Adolph Martin Schlesinger, 1821; with minor editing, including the addition of the double bar lines). a. mm.15–16. b. mm.65–66.

first instance, m.15 is, in effect, a double-measure containing (in the right hand) six eighth notes' worth of sextuplet thirty-second notes, then four eighth notes' worth of sixteenth notes, then (in the  $\frac{2}{4}$  half-measure) two eighth notes (in the new tempo), i.e., twelve notated eighth notes in all placed over eight notated eighth notes in the left hand. In keeping with what we have seen above, Beethoven again seems concerned to preserve the visual metrical integrity of the transitional mea-

sure so that it adds up (at least in the right hand) to a complete (six quarter-note) unit, for all that the tempo and meter change before the end of the measure, and that the last eight sixteenth notes under the old tempo might more effectively have been rendered as thirty-second notes (easing the transition from the sextuplets). In the recapitulation, however, we find a different strategy (see ex.17b). The left hand of m.65 has an appropriate number of quarter notes (one quarter note and a half-note rest with fermata), and the  $\frac{2}{4}$  measure (changing to Tempo primo half-way through) is also complete. In the right hand, however, m.65 has six eighth notes' worth of sextuplet sixteenth notes, then one eighth note's worth of quintuplet thirty-second notes, then two eighth notes (so nine eighth notes in all); m.66 has the correct four eighth notes.

Although ex.17b is, on the face of it, more irregular, it appears more accurate in its performance requirements. Indeed, it suggests a quite precise relationship between the Adagio espressivo and Tempo primo (i.e., Vivace ma non troppo) of an eighth note becoming a quarter note. By this reading, mm.65-66 add up to nine eighth notes (m.65) plus three (m.66; two eighth notes in the old tempo and the durational equivalent of one in the new), i.e., twelve. This produces a sounding double <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> measure as distinct from the written double <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> measure at the close of the first appearance of the Adagio espressivo. In terms of duration, then, the second beat of the <sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> measure in ex. 17b (the Tempo primo) is the last eighth note of a second <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> measure that began in the middle of m.65 (at the quintuplet thirty-second notes). But if Beethoven here seems to notate the music as it might sound, in ex.17a he notates it, instead, as it might properly look. For the same durations to apply as in ex.17b—i.e., for the <sup>2</sup>/<sub>4</sub> half-measure in the new tempo to sound as the last eighth note a <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> measure in the old, the *ritardando* needs to be stretched out, for example, with the eight sixteenth notes having the sounding duration of five eighth notes rather than four (which may further explain why Beethoven opted for sixteenth notes rather than thirty-second notes to slow things down). This is neither implausible nor unplayable. But this reading of ex.17a and ex.17b hinges on the notion of a more or less direct relationship between the Vivace ma non troppo and the Adagio espressivo (quarter note becomes eighth note), where one measure of the Adagio occupies the time of three Vivace measures.<sup>37</sup>

Neither Czerny nor Moscheles considered it thus. Czerny's 1846 metronome marks are (Vivace ma non troppo) quarter note equals 100 and (Adagio espressi-

<sup>37.</sup> This also requires the first two notes of the first subject to be regarded as an upbeat. In his early sketches, Beethoven began the theme on a downbeat, but its subsequent mutations and its working-out in the movement make the upbeat status quite clear (although Stanley disagrees).

vo) eighth note equals 66 (in 1856–68, the opening is marked quarter note equals 112). Moscheles gave quarter note equals 112 and eighth note equals 72. Both come closer to the eighth note in the Adagio espressivo having the duration of a half note (i.e., a measure) in the Vivace ma non troppo (so one Adagio measure equals six Vivace measures, not three). This produces a quite fast Vivace (what about the "ma non troppo"?) and a very slow Adagio. Many modern performances, particularly on more resonant grand pianos, also tend in this direction: even if the Vivace is indeed taken "ma non troppo," the Adagio espressivo will usually be played quite slowly. My reading, then, might seem to be the least persuasive of all those proposed in this essay—at least to a rhapsodic performer—even though it fits the principles established here and also seems confirmed by Beethoven's notation (at least of mm.65–66). Its chief consequence is that the Vivace ma non troppo is to be rendered somewhat slower than is customary, and the Adagio espressivo somewhat faster.

Hypermetric issues that aided my cause in the last movement of op.135 may also be useful here. My reading has three measures of the Vivace ma non troppo equal three quarter-note beats (one measure) of the Adagio espressivo. Each time the Adagio espressivo appears, it is preceded by what can be construed as a threemeasure phrase (for example, treating m.6 in ex.16 as a structural downbeat because of the arrival of the dominant), and it is always followed (in the successive Tempo primo) by some kind of six-measure patterning (whether 3 + 3 or 2 + 4); this is particularly clear in the development. Indeed, it is tempting to argue that the whole opening Vivace ma non troppo could in part be read as three threemeasure phrases beginning with a silent downbeat: this places structural downbeats on the e<sup>1</sup> of m.3 (a point of arrival even though it is supported by a  $\frac{6}{3}$  chord and the main V–I cadence comes one "beat" later) and the dominant harmony at the beginning of m.6. And in general, playing with three- and four-measure phrases becomes a significant feature of this movement.

Further support, however, comes from a different quarter. I have already noted the adherence of this movement to some kind of sonata form. If one counts up the equivalent beats (by my proportional reckoning) in the fast and slow sections and maps them on to the formal divisions of the sonata form, quite unexpected things emerge (see Table 1). The near-equivalence of the development and the coda is noteworthy—of course, Beethoven is not unknown for having codas as long as other sections of a sonata-form movement (e.g., the first movement of the Fifth Symphony)—although since both here are in Tempo primo the relationship between the fast and the slow tempos is not an issue. However, having a quarter note in the Vivace ma non troppo equal an eighth note in the Adagio espressivo means

Vivace ma non troppo $\binom{2}{4}$ Adagio espressivo $\binom{3}{4}$ Tempo I $\binom{2}{4}$ ; including upbeat) (continues) Adagio espressivo $\binom{3}{4}$ Tempo I $\binom{2}{4}$ ; including upbeat)	<pre>quarter note = 1 eighth note = 1 quarter note = 1 quarter note = 1 eighth note = 1 quarter note = 1 (final fermata counted as 2)</pre>	17 46 66 19 53 69	Exposition = 63 Development = 66 Recapitulation = 72 Coda = 69
	counted as 2)		

Table 1: Sectional durations in the first movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata in E Major, op.109

that the exposition and recapitulation are roughly the same duration, which perhaps is not a surprise, and that they are close to the durations of the development and the coda, which perhaps is.<sup>38</sup> A reading of this movement in four sections of roughly equal temporal duration has a persuasive elegance. In these overall proportions, at least, it would also seem that the two Adagio espressivo episodes are far less parenthetical or disruptive than some commentators would have us believe.

This essay has explored different kinds of musical and other evidence taken under consideration with regard to the types of equivalences that might operate in the case of intramovement changes of tempo and/or meter in Beethoven's music. I have not discussed every such instance in the composer's output, although enough examples have been presented here to offer potential ways of dealing with the rest. Nothing so obvious as a straightforward system for managing such situations has emerged: musical notation in the common-practice period was never as precise in these matters as medieval and Renaissance mensural notation had been, on the one hand, or as would appear in various twentieth-century notational developments, on the other. Indeed, the issue would become a significant concern for com-

38. Indeed, a different mode of counting could have produced even closer parallels, for example by including a first "silent" downbeat (so the opening Vivace ma non troppo is eighteen quarter notes), and by treating the final  $\frac{3}{4}$  measure of the second Adagio espressivo as containing six eighth notes (so the rest in the left hand suggests) rather than the actual nine. By such means, it is possible to produce a reading of the movement that plays on 18s, 48s, and 66s, although this might be seen by some as reminiscent of the fudging sometimes involved in calculating Golden Sections, and anyway, the durations in Table 1 are surely as equivalent as can be perceived in real time.

posers even as the metronome became more widely accepted (and believed): Berlioz, for example, relies in his *Harold en Italie* on complex combinations of tempo terms, metronome marks, and verbal instructions to indicate his (often precise) metrical intentions. In this earlier, transitional stage, however, we are left to decipher clues in the music (both as written and as sounding) and to inject a hefty dose of musical common sense. That may be cause for complaint or celebration.

There are many ways to take these arguments further. One is to consider metrical equivalence not just within but between Beethoven's movements, especially when these movements are marked attacca or are somehow linked. The second movement of op. 109, a Prestissimo in § (attacca from the fermata ending the first movement), probably maintains the pulse from the first movement (so a quarter note becomes a dotted half note). Elsewhere, Beethoven's own metronome marks prompt some metrical continuity between movements, as in the String Quartet in E Major, op.74, third movement (Presto, dotted half note equals 100) and fourth (Allegretto con Variazioni, quarter note equals 100), or the String Quartet in F Minor, op.95, second movement (Allegretto, ma non troppo, quarter note equals 66) to the (attacca) third (Allegro assai vivace, ma serioso, dotted half note equals 69). Extending the principle further, one can quite easily imagine a reasonably constant pulse, variously subdivided, linking all four movements of the Fifth Symphony (half note equals 108; eighth note equals 92; dotted half note equals 96; half note equals 84 leading to whole note equals 112), or the seven movements of the String Quartet in C# Minor, op. 131. My enquiry also raises broader questions concerning Beethoven's use of tempo terms (standard, standard with modifiers, nonstandard) and time signatures (especially  $\phi$ ), or even his choice of rhythmic values for a given passage. It further embraces interpretative and aesthetic issues concerning pulse in this music, and also performance practices historical or otherwise. My main aim, however, has been to suggest how particular kinds of analytical enterprise might benefit performers, and how a sensitivity to particular performance issues might benefit the analyst, even when the results, as in my reading of the first movement of op.109, might cause surprise, if not discomfort, to both camps.

## Cyclical Ordering in Beethoven's Gellert Lieder, Op.48: A New Source

For Sieghard Brandenburg, former director of the Beethoven-Archiv, on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday.

## Joanna Cobb Biermann

ieder number among Beethoven's earliest compositions. The song "Schilderung eines Mädchens," for instance, which appeared in 1783 in Boßler's weekly musical magazine *Blumenlese für Klavierliebhaber*, and "An einen Säugling," which was published one year later in Boßler's *Neue Blumenlese*, are two such works by this very young composer. Publishing songs singly was not the rule in Beethoven's time, however. They generally appeared in larger or smaller song collections. Beethoven, too, usually wrote whole "bundles" of songs, which he often revised again before publication. Sometimes this revision also included a reordering of the songs.<sup>1</sup> Beethoven is generally credited with being the "inventor" of the song cycle with his An die ferne Geliebte, op.98, published in 1816. What was he doing with song groupings before that time?

A newly rediscovered source for his Gellert Lieder, op.48, presents us with fresh information regarding this question, rich in implications for many of his work groups. In 1993 the Beethoven Archive in Bonn was able to purchase the earliest known copy of the first issue of op.48, containing numerous handwritten correc-

The author would especially like to thank Professor Bathia Churgin, kindest of friends and colleagues, and Dr. Sieghard Brandenburg for their critical readings of an earlier version of this essay and their helpful comments. For permission to use parts of the earlier German version, published in the *Bonner Beethoven-Studien 2*, the author is indebted to the Beethoven-Hans Bonn and its director, Dr. Ernst Hertric.

I. See the description of the development of Beethoven's song collection op.52, in Beethoven: Werke: Gesamtausgabe (= NGA), XII/I: *Lieder und Gesänge mit Klavierbegleitung, Kritischer Bericht*, ed. Helga Lühning (Munich: Henle, 1990), p.7. tions, including what seems to be a reordering of the already printed songs. The existence of this source had been known by rumor, but it had disappeared for many years and was unavailable, for instance, to Kinsky and Halm for their Beethoven-Werkverzeichnis. This copy closes a gap in the chain of sources for op.48. The single steps involved in Beethoven's ordering are thus unusually well documented. Before I detail these steps and consider their implications for Beethoven's evolving thinking about cycles, I will proceed first with an overview of the surviving sources relating to the Gellert Lieder, all of which stem from a relatively late stage in the compositional process.

#### Autograph and Manuscript Sources: Sketches

Although no sketches directly related to op.48 have survived, others document clearly that Beethoven was repeatedly drawn to one of the Gellert poems, "Vom Tode," and treated it several times over the course of twenty-four years, both before and after the composition of the six songs, op.48. Several draft settings of this text survive, all of which are different from the version published in op.48:

- A complete draft in D minor with two different endings can be found in the sketchbook Grasnick 1 (fols.13<sup>r</sup> and 13<sup>v</sup>) and can therefore be dated late 1798.<sup>2</sup>
- Another attempt, this one in A minor, is found in Landsberg 6 (fol. 58<sup>v</sup>).<sup>3</sup> It, too, is clearly different from the version we find in op.48. This must have been drafted toward the end of 1803, some eighteen months after op.48 had been completed and about six months after its publication.
- In 1822 Beethoven offered the publisher Peters a further version of the song "Vom Tode." Although it has not been preserved, it is identified by its first line in the autograph list that the composer sent to Peters as "meine

2. First mentioned in N II, p.479. Alfred Ebert printed it in its entirety in "Das Autograph der Gellert-Lieder Op.48 No.5 und 6 von Beethoven," *Die Musik* 9 (1909/10), 57–59. See also Erna Szabo, *Ein Skizzenbuch Beethovens aus den Jahren 1798–99: Übertragung und Untersuchung* (diss. Bonn, 1951), as well as Helga Lühning, NGA (music vol.), pp.269–70. Günther Massenkeil offers a reconstruction of the text using the second ending, and he argues convincingly that it is not a draft, but rather a shorthand notation of a completed composition in his article "Religiöse Aspekte der Gellert-Lieder Beethovens," in *Religiöse Musik in nicht-liturgischen Werken von Beethoven bis Reger*, ed. Walter Wiora, with Günther Massenkeil and Klaus Wolfgang Niemöller (Regensburg: Bosse, 1978), pp.85–89.

3. See N 1880, p.57. The sketch is printed in its entirety in Ebert, "Das Autograph der Gellert-Lieder," pp.59–60. lebenszeit / verstreicht / in g moll." The printed Lied in op.48 is in F# minor.<sup>4</sup> As Tyson pointed out, it is possible that the G-minor version was developed out of one of the sketches that have survived.

### Copyist's Manuscript and the Autograph

Although a contemporary complete manuscript copy of op.48,<sup>5</sup> stemming from Beethoven's Viennese circle of acquaintances, is not a direct source for the printed first edition, it does give us two important points of information. First, this copy, which corresponds to the autograph with respect to most details of the music itself, bears the date "Montags den 8t Martz 1802." With the discovery of this manuscript, all speculation about what event had given rise to the composition and the time of its completion was laid to rest.<sup>6</sup> It had been posited prior to the discovery that the death of Countess Browne, the wife of one of Beethoven's foremost patrons in Vienna, who was herself the recipient of the dedications of several works by Beethoven, had prompted the composer to turn suddenly to these texts. This would have placed the time of composition in May 1803, more than one year after the date on this manuscript copy, and would "externalize" Beethoven's motivation for setting these songs. The second important piece of information to be gleaned from this copy, and a central one for the arguments presented here, is the ordering of the songs, which differs from the order now usually accepted, but which corresponds to that in the autograph and in the new source being discussed here, the first printed copy.

The autograph has unfortunately not been preserved in its entirety: only two of the six songs have survived.<sup>7</sup> It is—to use the terminology of Johnson, Tyson, and Winter—a "working autograph" and was not used as the printer's copy. As can be seen from the Viennese copy just mentioned, it must have been finished by March 1802 at the latest. Both of the Lieder preserved in the autograph are complete. (An additional twelve measures of an earlier version of the ending of the "Bußlied" are

4. Alan Tyson, "A Beethoven Price List of 1822," in *Beethoven Essays: Studies in Honor of Elliot Forbes*, ed. Lewis Lockwood and Phyllis Benjamin (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Department of Music, 1984), pp.54 and 57.

5. GDM VI 8819. This MS copy was discovered by Joseph Schmidt-Görg and described in "Zur Entstehungszeit von Beethovens Gellert-Liedern," BJ 5 (1961/64), 87–91.

See Kinsky-Halm (pp.113–14), where the assumption is made that the death of Countess Browne had been the motive for the compositions, and thus that the songs had been composed only in May 1803. Joseph Schmidt-Görg was able to refute these arguments with his discovery of the manuscript.
BH, Bonn, Sammlung Bodmer: Mh 30 and 31.

also included.<sup>8</sup>) Beethoven himself set down the ordering of the last two songs with his autograph inscriptions, numbering the "Bußlied" as number 5 and "Gottes Macht und Vorsehung" as number 6.

## The Printed Sources

We know from a letter dated 6 August 1803 from Ferdinand Ries, Beethoven's pupil and helper, to the publisher Nikolaus Simrock that Mollo was the original publisher of the op.48 Lieder.<sup>9</sup> An enclosed bill showed that the copy of op.48 promised was also included in the packet to Simrock, which must have been sent off within a few days of the date on the letter.

## The Mollo Corrected Copy

Kinsky and Halm could not obtain a copy of any Mollo edition of op.48 and therefore declared—with reservations—the Artaria edition to be the first edition. In this connection they did mention, however, that they had been informed of the exis-



8. Printed in *Ludwig van Beethoven: Supplemente zur Gesamtausgabe, vol.5: Lieder und Gesänge mit Klavierbegleitung,* ed.Willy Hess (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf and Härtel, 1962), p.28, as well as in the NGA as no.104 (= Hess 141).

9. The original source has not been preserved. Parts of the letter were printed in Erich Hermann Müller, "Beethoven und Simrock," *Simrock-Jahrbuch* 2 (1929), 23–25, and are included in Brandenburg, letter no.152.

Plate 1: Title page of the Mollo corrected copy (Beethoven-Haus, Bonn). tence of an interesting and confusing corrected copy formerly in the possession of Max Friedländer. This copy (plate 1), which proves to be so significant, is the one the Beethoven Archive was able to purchase in 1993.<sup>10</sup>

From the form of the title page, complete with impressum and price, it is clear that this was intended by Mollo to be the first edition. (The lack here of a dedication and publisher's number is of no consequence, because such items were often missing on title pages at that time.) The large number of handwritten corrections, however, and the fact that the edition was not further distributed in this form suggest a "corrected copy," reflecting the final use—if not the original purpose—of this issue. (To call this and the later Mollo edition "ante" and "post correcturam" seems to me inaccurate, as can be seen from the individual corrections.)

The corrected copy is complete, with a title page and thirteen pages of music (pp.2–14). The thirteen pages of music are consistent in their printing style, with three systems per page. The voice is notated in the soprano clef. One stanza of each poem is printed under the vocal line. All further stanzas of the text are missing. As in the two earliest extant manuscript sources, the "Bußlied" is the penultimate song.

#### **Corrections and Changes**

The edition shows numerous mistakes of many different kinds, about fifty in all, a number that makes it serious competition for Nägeli's edition of op.31 that so infuriated Beethoven with its approximately eighty errors.<sup>11</sup>There are wrong notes, mistakes in the poetic text, and false rhythms. Missing rests, ties, and dynamics impede proper execution and interpretation. The many corrections, in red crayon, were entered not by Beethoven but by an unknown editor, who noticed almost all the wrong notes. He also caught most of the mistakes in rhythm. A number of dynamic markings and slurs as well as one tempo marking have been added. Mistakes in the poetic text, on the other hand, are corrected rather infrequently. Although this "proofreading" resulted in unusually extensive corrections, it still would not be judged adequate by modern standards. In this respect it reminds one of Beethoven's own corrections in copyist's work and in printed editions.

#### The Mollo First Edition

Long before this corrected copy was recovered, but after the publication of the Kinsky-Halm Verzeichnis, another copy of an edition by Mollo was found in the

<sup>10.</sup> BH, Bonn, Signature: C 48/30. It was auctioned at Sotheby's in London on 28 May 1993.11. Brandenburg, letter no.139.

Hoboken collection,<sup>12</sup> apparently the only surviving example of the edition actually released for sale by the publisher, which thus can properly be called the first edition.<sup>13</sup> This copy has a Mollo impressum and was printed partly from the plates used for the corrected copy and partly from completely new plates. The title page, though new, is still not free of mistakes:VI LIEDER / von Gellert / am Klavier zu Singen / und / Dem Herrn Grafen Browne / Brigadier im Rusischem [sic] Dienste / zugeeignet / von / HERRN LOUIS van BEETHOVEN / Wien bey T. Mollo u. Comp. / [l.:] 1599 [r.:] 1 f 30.

It now includes a dedication—as we know, Countess Browne had died in the meantime, in May 1803—for which there was no room on the original plate, as can be discerned by the visible edge of the plate in the reproduced title page of the corrected copy. With the new plates, Mollo seized the opportunity to save space and improve the disposition of the music on the page: three further plates, the ones with the songs 2, 3, and 4, are newly etched. All have four systems per page instead of three. This means that every song now has one page for itself, obviating page turns within individual songs. Details on the old plates, retained for this edition, were altered to make them consistent in style with the newly etched ones: they now have new brackets, new, larger letters for the titles and tempo markings, and the voice has a new soprano clef, so that all of these things are identical on all of the plates, both old and new.

These were the plates that were soon taken over by Artaria for their edition, which was identical with this one except for the impressum. In fact, the plate number in the Mollo first edition is actually an Artaria numbering. This means that the trade must have already been a settled matter between Mollo and Artaria early on.

## **Corrections and Filiation**

Did the corrected Mollo edition serve as a printer's copy for Mollo's second one? In order to answer this crucial question it is necessary to see whether the red crayon corrections were actually made in the new edition. The comparison shows that all of the corrections—except for two small oversights—were properly carried out.<sup>14</sup>

12. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Sammlung Hoboken: Beethoven 224. This edition was used by Helga Lühning for her critical edition in the NGA. The Mollo corrected copy was rediscovered only after the volume had appeared.

13. This edition was the one sent by Ries to Simrock in August 1803, as a comparison of the two demonstrates. Simrock's edition appeared at the end of the year. Simrock used the treble clef for the voice and printed the complete poetic text. This edition is far more beautiful and clearly arranged than the Mollo first edition.

14. In the course of engraving the three new pages, a few new mistakes slipped in.

In addition, there are a number of other changes that were not marked in the corrected copy. At first they could be taken for changes made independently by the publisher, for example, the addition of precautionary accidentals, corrections in the poetic text, filling in the missing rests, etc. Other corrections raise doubts about this assumption, however: for instance, the additions of slurs and extra dynamics but, above all, changes of notes that do not correct any obvious mistake like parallel octaves, or that are not suggested by parallel passages. Two changes are so weighty that another explanation must be sought. One passage is especially revealing: it is the setting of the text "Herr, handle nicht mit mir nach meinen Sünden" (God, do not treat me according to my sins) in the "Bußlied" that is different in the two Mollo editions.<sup>15</sup> This change goes far beyond that which a publisher would normally do without authorization. The comparison with the autograph shows that Beethoven had had problems with precisely this passage: there, two different versions can be deciphered, despite his crossings-out (ex. 1).

The corrected copy follows the authorized version in the autograph (albeit with two mistakes). Mollo's next edition shows a third version of the bass line (and does correct the mistakes that had crept into the corrected copy). The passage strongly suggests that Beethoven was participating in this series of corrections. It also indicates that we are still missing a source, namely the one in which the many corrections of lesser and greater importance, the dedication, but also the exchanging of the order of the last two songs were included.

#### Beethoven's Poetic Source and the Ordering of the Songs

What prompted Beethoven's choice of texts and his original ordering? The poetic source, Christian Fürchtegott Gellert's collection, "54 Geistlichen Oden und Lieder" (54 Sacred Odes and Songs), first printed in Leipzig in 1757, obviously offered Beethoven texts that spoke to him, but no model for ordering his subset. They are grouped neither by content nor by form, and the collection as a whole is not so much a cycle of poems as a kind of compendium for the purpose of devotionals in the home.<sup>16</sup> Gellert himself wrote in the foreword "Ein Lied [ist] für sich ein Ganzes . . . , das man in einer Sammlung, als von den andern abgesondert, betrachten muß" (Each song is a whole, in and of itself, which one must contem-

15. Ebert, "Das Autograph der Gellert-Lieder," pp.45–46, mistakenly reverses the order of the versions. Figure 1 shows this page in the corrected copy.

<sup>16.</sup> See Lühning, Kritischer Bericht, p.22.

Example 1: Four versions of mm. 29–30 of the "Bußlied" (first version of the autograph complete here: only the changes and errors in the other versions are notated).

- a. MOLLO FIRST EDITION (new bass, mistake in r. hand corrected)
- MOLLO CORRECTED COPY (bass as in autogr., new mistake in right hand)
- c. AUTOGRAPH: SECOND (AUTHORIZED) VERSION (bass only)
- d. AUTOGRAPH: FIRST VERSION (complete here, crossed out in autograph)



plate separately from all the others).<sup>17</sup> Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach's famous collection of settings of all fifty-four of Gellert's odes and songs, printed only one year after the poems and certainly known to Beethoven in one of its many reissues, also offers no criteria for a systematic ordering.<sup>18</sup> In his foreword Bach writes that the songs were printed in the order in which he had composed them.

Helga Lühning proposes the theory that Beethoven may have used a later edition of Gellert's poems in which they were ordered by thematic group because he seems to have included an example from almost every group. I suggest that Beet-

17. Christian Fürchtegott Gellert, Gedichte, *Geistliche Oden und Lieder*, ed. Heide John, Carina Lehnen, and Bernd Witte (= Gesammelte Schriften II, ed. Bernd Witte [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997], p.109).

18. See Schmidt-Görg, "Zur Entstehungszeit," p.89.

hoven began by setting individual poems, chosen because they spoke to him personally. Subjective criteria were often the impulse behind his song compositions, themselves seldom commissioned works. Joseph Schmidt-Görg pointed out the chronological connection between Beethoven's crisis related to his increasing deafness and his engagement with these texts, which were no longer in fashion at that time.<sup>19</sup> That Beethoven had selected Gellert texts was also considered remarkable by the first critic writing of these songs in the *Leipziger Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* in 1804.<sup>20</sup> Günther Massenkeil has pointed out textual reminiscences of some of Gellert's stanzas that Beethoven did not set with passages in the Heiligenstadt Testament and sees this connection as clear evidence of the profound personal meaning these texts had for Beethoven.<sup>21</sup>

As to the eventual form of publication, it is quite unlikely that Beethoven had in mind a circumscribed collection of this length at the beginning of his compositional efforts. This is indicated by the lack of variety of the meters chosen (four of the six songs are alla breve), the sometimes very divergent keys and the similarity in the style of setting several of the songs.<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, two things can be clearly documented: first, that Beethoven did take these six songs, which were first composed independently of one another (and with each standing alone as an independent poetic-musical unit), and decided to group them together for publication; and second, that he then, in retrospect so to speak, thought repeatedly about the structuring of the whole complex. His experimentation with the order of the songs occurred after he had finished writing the autograph—the corrected copy suggests this—and again after the first printing.

#### Four Orderings

Four different constellations in the ordering of the songs can be established. Three of them can be found in the Mollo editions: two in the corrected copy (one printed and one in red crayon), and the third in the revised Mollo first edition (figure 1). Stage 1 shows the order in the three earliest sources: the Viennese copy from

19. Ibid., pp. 30-31.

- 20. Leipziger Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung 6 (6 June 1804), cols.608–12.
- 21. Massenkeil, "Religiöse Aspekte der Gellert-Lieder," p.84.

22. Ibid., p.92. Massenkeil uses Arnold Schmidt's term of the "declamatory principle" here. Gudrun Busch sees here the direct influence upon Beethoven of C. P. E. Bach's settings in his "Da der Gesang eine große Gewalt über unser Herz hat': Die musikalische Rezeption der Dichtungen Gellerts, in: Ein Lehrer der ganzen nation," in *Leben und Werk Christian Fürchtegott Gellerts*, ed. Bernd Witte (Munich: Fink, 1990), p.211.

#### 171 Cyclical Ordering in Beethoven's Gellert Lieder, Op.48

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4
Autogr.[5 & 6] Viennese copy Mollo corr. copy	Ms. red crayon marks in Mollo corr. copy	Mollo first edn. & Artaria edn.	Hoffmeister & Kühnel later edn.
1 "Bitten"		"Bitten"	←"Bitten"
¢ E major		¢ E major	¢ E major
2 "Liebe d. Nächsten"		"Liebe d. Nächsten"	"Gottes Macht"
¢ E♭ major		¢ E♭ major	¢ C major
3 "Vom Tode"		"Vom Tode"	"Liebe d. Nächsten"
<sup>3</sup> ₄F♯ minor		≩ F♯ minor	¢ E♭ major
4 "Ehre Gottes"		"Ehre Gottes"	"Vom Tode"
¢ C major		¢ C major	<sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub> F# minor
5 "Bußlied"	"Vom Tode"	"Gottes Macht"	"Ehre Gottes"
<sup>3</sup> 4 minor/ A major	<sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub> F# minor	¢ C major	¢ C major
6 "Gottes Macht"	"Ehre Gottes"	└ "Bußlied"	"Bußlied"
¢ C major	¢ C major	¾A minor/A major	ÅA minor/A major
by March 1802 at the latest	before August 1803	August 1803	End of 1803

Figure 1: Orderings of the Lieder in Op.48: Sources

March 1802, the printed version of the Mollo corrected copy at the Beethoven-Haus, and the autograph, as far as preserved. (As already mentioned, because it is a fragment, the autograph can give us proof for only the last two songs. Nevertheless, because of the consistency in the order of the songs 1–4 in the earliest sources, which was then also retained in the Mollo first edition and the Artaria edition printed from the same plates, it can safely be assumed that this order was preserved in the lost parts of the autograph as well as in the printer's copy.)

It is noteworthy that the song "Gottes Macht" is still the last song in these three earliest sources. If one looks at it from the standpoint of its ability to round off a cycle, several aspects make it seem a good choice: musically, its radiant C-major key; in terms of its poetic content, its praise for a great, almighty, omnipresent God and also the beginning line of the text, "Gott ist mein Lied!" (God is my song!), which may have seemed to Beethoven to sum up the whole collection in some way. The composition itself, however, makes it less powerful as a final song. The first critic of Beethoven's Gellert Lieder found it to be the only song of the group that was "nicht wohl getroffen" (not a successful setting). He continued: "This song has the most insignificant [unbeträchtlich] and an almost meagre music."<sup>23</sup> Beethoven most certainly did not consider his music "insignificant," but the brevity of this piece (only eighteen measures) and its dry, recitative style do perhaps make it seem a bit too "thin" to create a sense of finality, especially following the "Bußlied." Throughout, the text is set according to the "declamatory principle," to borrow Arnold Schmitz's term. In the other Lieder of op.48, Beethoven uses this kind of declamation only in short passages, not for a whole—albeit short—song. The accompaniment is so thinly voiced that it can easily be compared with the draft of a setting of the poem "Vom Tode" from the sketchbook Grasnick I in the careful reconstruction by Günther Massenkeil.

Stage 2 is created by the red crayon markings in the corrected copy. Whether these corrections stem from Beethoven or from the publisher is not known. (As can readily be seen, moving the third and fourth songs to the fifth and sixth positions gives us no further information about the placement of the other songs.) This reordering was obviously not carried to the fullest extent; nor did it have any impact on later sources.

Two things are common to all four of these orderings. First, the positioning of the song "Vom Tode" directly before the song "Die Ehre Gottes."The tension created by the deeply earnest admonishment of "Vom Tode" in F# minor ("Denk, o Mensch, an Deinen Tod"), with its piano postlude in the dark, low region of the instrument is released in the beginning of the next song by many contrasting elements: glowing C major (following F# minor), fortissimo beginning (following the piano ending), the upward leap of more than two octaves to the following Lied, and as a topic the turning away from death to the eternal God whom all of Nature praises. (The harmonic distance of a tritone makes the distance between mortal man and God palpable.) The second common factor is that in all four orderings the song "Vom Tode" is never at the beginning or end of the grouping, but always in the middle.

In Stage 3 the songs 5 and 6 have been exchanged, so that now the "Bußlied" is the final song. This piece shows an inner development and an impetus that are foreign to Beethoven's other Gellert songs. In its effectiveness as a finale of the collection, this song's position was never subsequently called into question in other editions, although, in general, publishers for a long time felt free to reorder pieces as they chose. Placing the "Bußlied" at the end created links in terms of both the musical and the poetic content back to the first song, "Bitten," which greatly

23. Leipziger Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung 6 (6 June 1804), col.610.

strengthen the quasi-cyclical character of the six songs, including a large-scale fifth relationship (E major–A minor/A major) between the first and last songs.

Stage 4, represented by Hoffmeister and Kühnel's edition of late 1803, shows a further variant in the ordering of the songs. It seems highly likely that this edition was also occasioned by Beethoven. At almost the same time that they reprinted the Gellert Lieder, Hoffmeister and Kühnel released an edition of Beethoven's Adelaide, op.46. There, too, one finds changes that Helga Lühning considers too "invasive" to have been made by the publisher without Beethoven's approval.<sup>24</sup> Perhaps there was a letter by Beethoven (or from one of his helpers), now lost, requesting those changes. For Simrock's edition of Das Glück der Freundschaft, op.88, we do have such a letter: Ferdinand Ries wrote Simrock on 22 October 1803, passing along Beethoven's request that there be changes made in the poetic text. Simrock obliged with one of the several corrections, changing an already finished plate.<sup>25</sup> Interestingly, the Hoffmeister and Kühnel edition of op.88—published in Leipzig about the same time as the Simrock edition appeared in Bonn, in the late fall of 1803—printed the text in precisely the form Beethoven had requested from Simrock via Ries, making all the corrections requested in that letter, including changing the title to "Das Glück der Freundschaft" (The Joy of Friendship). During this period it seems that Beethoven was actively promoting further editions of works that had originated as Viennese publications in Leipzig, and in Bonn, the latter city located in the territory ceded to France by the Peace of Lunéville and hence in yet a third legal territory.

Even lacking incontrovertible evidence of its authenticity, the result of the reordering of the songs found in the Hoffmeister edition is still very persuasive. First, all of the changes noted in Stage 3, namely the frame "Bitten"–"Bußlied," the sequence "Vom Tode"–"Die Ehre Gottes aus der Natur" and concurrently, the placement of the Lied "Vom Tode" in the middle of the group, have been retained here. Unique to this stage, though, is the placement of "Gottes Macht," originally the last song of the group, here moved to second position. If the six songs are performed one after another, this apparently small change has a very large effect. First of all, the only two songs with the same meter and key, "Die Ehre Gottes" and "Gottes Macht," both in C major and in alla breve meter, are no longer positioned one after another as they would have been if performed from Mollo's first edition. Second, the very harsh transition between "Bitten" in E major and "Die Liebe des

<sup>24.</sup> Lühning, Kritischer Bericht, p.27.

<sup>25.</sup> Ibid., pp.26-27.

Nächsten" in  $E^{\downarrow}$  major, which is not the product of any textual considerations, is avoided by this new ordering. The almost identical chord position makes this half-tone shift even harsher (ex.2).

The reordering also creates third relationships between the songs (with the exception of "Vom Tode"). In Stages 1 and 2 they existed only between the last two songs. In a number of works from this period Beethoven set up third relationships in, for instance, the "Appassionata" Sonata, op. 57, the Third Piano Concerto, op. 37, and the String Quintet, op. 29. This last ordering also formalizes textual relationships.<sup>26</sup>

#### Changes in the Orderings and Their Meaning

The last change in the order of the songs that can be shown without doubt to be authentic, namely moving the "Bußlied" to the end in the Mollo first edition, was of great consequence and also proved to be a felicitous choice. This song exhibits an immense inner dynamic and a strong impetus toward the climax at the end. In this it corresponds to the inner development of the text. As the only through-composed song in Beethoven's Gellert songs, coming after a series of strophic songs, this piece traces the spiritual development of the "Büßer" (the penitent) in his relationship to God—it would, of course, have been much more difficult to mirror this development in a strophic song.



26. In this ordering, three groupings are set up, nested within one another. The outer bracket is explained in the next section of this essay. The next pair, songs 2 and 5, both in C major, focus on God and praise him as omnipotent. The two central songs deal thematically with mankind: first, in "Die Liebe des Nächsten" with man's relationship to man in reference to God; and second, in "Vom Tode" with the individual human being, faced with his own mortality and thus reduced to his lone-liest possible state.

Example 2: a. "Bitten." b. "Die Liebe des Nächsten."

In the first three stanzas, the penitent sinner prays to God. He senses his alienation from the Creator, prays for forgiveness, and begs to be received by Him. Exactly in the middle, after three stanzas, the emotional turning point is arrived at—one is tempted to apply the Baroque term "Affektumschlag." The sinner is suddenly reassured of God's grace and mercy. In the last two lines of the poem, he has gained the conviction that he has been heard and accepted by God: "Er hört mein Schreyn, der Herr erhört mein Flehen, / Und nimmt sich meiner Seelen an." (He hears my cry, the Lord hears my supplication, / and takes up my soul.)

At this crucial midpoint, the music also changes radically. After a fermata, the key, A minor, changes to A major, and the second part begins in a faster tempo and with a piano prelude introducing the vocal line with the accompaniment of a lively bass line in stepwise motion. The melody remains basically the same for the last three stanzas, creating a kind of strophic song within a through-composed one. Only the piano figures of the accompaniment are varied. One could perhaps interpret it as follows: the constancy in the melody signals the firmness of the newly won assurance of the penitent, while the piano presents variations on the theme of "Joy." The variations become more intense, culminating in a coda in which the last two lines of the poem are repeated.

The position of the "Bußlied" at the end not only leads the listener to an emotionally liberating musical climax there, but also allows a musical and poetic tie back to the first song, "Bitten," which once again strengthens the conviction that interconnections are being created here. The second part of the "Bußlied," especially, creates the arch back to "Bitten," which also has a piano prelude (in a slower tempo) with a similarly lively bass moving in stepwise motion. This beginning is in strong contrast to the other Gellert songs. Fully half of them begin with a single chord in the piano before the stark entrance of the voice, and their accompaniments are generally chordal.

The songs "Bitten" and "Bußlied" show not only musical parallels but also common traits both linguistic and in content. Only in these two songs is God addressed directly. The solemn opening song "Bitten" is programmatic for all six songs of op.48. It is a cry to God: "Vernimm mein Flehn, merk auf mein Wort; / Denn ich will vor dir beten!" (Hear my supplication, heed my word / for I want to pray to You!) and the "Bußlied" is the theologically correct answer to this entreaty: God's forgiving acceptance of the penitent sinner. The linguistic correspondences between "Bitten" and the second part of the "Bußlied" strengthen the bracketing effect of the two songs. They are the only two poems in which God's mercy ("Barmherzigkeit") is a theme, in "Bitten" with the words: "Du krönst uns mit Barmherzigkeit" (You crown us with mercy) and in the "Bußlied" with the lines:"Früh wollst du mich mit deiner Gnade füllen, / Gott Vater der Barmherzigkeit" (Early you wanted to fill me with Your grace, / God, Father of mercy). The image of a God who promises assistance and hastens to the aid of mankind is, moreover, unique to these two poems: in "Bitten" in the second half of the couplet just quoted: "Du krönst uns mit Barmherzigkeit, / und eilst, uns beyzustehen" (You crown us with mercy, / and hasten to assist us) and in the "Bußlied" in the invocation: "Herr, eile du, mein Schutz, mir beyzustehen" (Lord, hasten, my Protector, to assist me).

The first four lines of the poem "Bitten" make it clear that God's grace is immeasurable and freely given, a gift with no strings attached: "Gott, deine Güte reicht so weit, / So weit die Wolken gehen" (God, your goodness extends as far as the clouds). When the narrator says, "Früh wollst du mich mit deiner Gnade füllen" (Early you wanted to fill me with Your grace), then this "early" has multiple meanings: "early" in the life of the penitent, at the time at which he still refused God's grace and lived in sin; but also as "early" in this group of songs, namely at the beginning, in "Bitten," where this promise of grace appeared.

Connections between biographical facts about composer's lives and their works should be made gingerly. In the case of Beethoven's Gellert songs and especially with the "Bußlied," a strongly personal-biographical connection can be assumed, however. The "early" in the poem can also refer to earlier in Beethoven's own life, when he bitterly resented and resisted a creator who would allow a composer like him to be robbed of his hearing. This resentment is documented in letters that Beethoven wrote to his friends Franz Gerhard Wegeler and Karl Amenda in the summer of 1801. The letter to Wegeler, in which he reveals for the very first time the secret of his increasing deafness, contains the following sentence:"Ich habe schon oft den schöpfer und mein daseyn verflucht" (I have often cursed the Creator and my existence).<sup>27</sup> Several days later he expressed himself even more forcefully to Amenda, a Protestant pastor: "Dein B. lebt sehr unglücklich, im streit mit Natur und schöpfer, schon mehrmals fluchte ich lezterm, dass er seine Geschöpfe dem kleinsten Zufall ausgesezt, so dass oft die schönste Blüthe dadurch zernichtet und zerknikt wird" (Your B. lives very unhappily, in conflict with Nature and Creator, often have I cursed the latter that he exposes his creations to the tiniest chance, so that often the loveliest flowers are thereby destroyed and broken).<sup>28</sup> Beethoven's setting of the Gellert texts seems to indicate that he had conquered to a certain extent his rebellion against his Creator and-at least for a time-had succeeded in regaining the image of a merciful and loving God in whom mankind is sheltered.

<sup>27.</sup> Brandenburg, letter no.65 (29 June 1801).

<sup>28.</sup> Brandenburg, letter no.67 (1 July 1801).

## The Question of Multistrophic Texts

The postulate that Beethoven, in the course of the composition and publishing process of his Gellert songs, linked these pieces closer and closer together in a kind of cyclical form forces us to think about the question of the multistrophic poems on which they are based. The repetition of the music with, for instance, fourteen further stanzas in "Die Liebe des Nächsten," or the eighteen-measure, simple song "Gottes Macht und Vorsehung" with fifteen stanzas in all—to name just the two most extreme examples—would greatly distort the proportions of the whole, making each song much more independent of the others and thereby destroying the possibility of any sense of cycle. The extant sources give at first no unequivo-cal answer to the question of the music's repetition with further stanzas.

Beethoven set all of the stanzas only in the "Bußlied." (There are six of them, but he changed their structure radically in this through-composed song.) All of Gellert's texts are multistrophic, however. Two of the songs in the Mollo corrected copy do show dal segno marks at the beginning and end. (Curiously enough, a third song, "Die Ehre Gottes," has one only at the end.) The editor who marked the mistakes in red crayon neither added new marks nor crossed out the ones printed there, a fact that—given the incompleteness of the correction process seen here offers no clear proof of Beethoven's intentions. In the following Mollo first edition, the lone sign at the end of the fourth song ("Die Ehre Gottes") has been removed, and those in the other two songs, both of which were newly etched, have been inserted at the same places in the new plates. It is important to note here that no Mollo or Artaria edition of these songs ever printed any of the following stanzas that the notation seems to demand.

The autograph of the song "Gottes Macht" can perhaps throw some light on this subject. At the end of the song, Beethoven wrote something at the end of each system that he must have crossed out again immediately. The chronological proximity of these two acts is recognizable because the color of the ink is the same in both. This fact makes it, of course, extremely difficult to see what exactly the composer was eliminating here. There are, however, horizontal marks that can be recognized—on the basis of comparison with other Beethoven autographs—as a part of his dal segno sign.<sup>29</sup> It is also difficult to imagine what else he might have wanted to write there. Interestingly, no dal segno sign appears in this song in either of the Mollo editions.

29. See here the sign that was struck out and then rewritten in the facsimile of the "Flohlied," in Ludwig van Beethoven, *Drei Lieder nach Gedichten von Goethe,* with comm. Helga Lühning (= Veröffentlichungen des Beethoven-Hauses Bonn, Series 3: Ausgewählte Handschriften in Faksimile-Ausgaben, ed. Sieghard Brandenburg, vol. 13 [Bonn: BH, n.d. (1999)]). Simrock's handsome edition, on the other hand, prints all the stanzas of all of the poems. Up to four stanzas are printed under the vocal line; further stanzas are printed on a separate page, opposite the song. Since Beethoven initiated this edition, as Ries's letter mentioned above proves, and because Simrock more than once was asked by the composer to make corrections in his Beethoven editions, it could be argued that Simrock's printing of all of the stanzas might be an authentic change.<sup>30</sup> But already in the first critique of these songs, which was based on the Simrock edition, doubts about the performability of the songs with all the stanzas were expressed.<sup>31</sup>

There are other possible explanations for Simrock's decision to print all the stanzas. Their complete appearance could be a remnant of an ad libitum practice accepted or at least tolerated by Beethoven as a necessity. (Simrock, a respected Bonn colleague of the young Beethoven and of his father before him, was known to the composer from his earliest days as a fine practical musician.) An especially startling example of an unauthorized change made in the text of a Beethoven work by the publisher Simrock is the 1802 edition of Beethoven's Piano Concerto in C, op.15, to which he added a part for viola in order to make it playable by an orchestra without wind instruments.<sup>32</sup> Beethoven's reaction to this change is not known.

Simrock's printing of the complete Gellert texts could also be the result of his ambition as a publisher to neglect nothing that would make his handsome edition stand out among its many competitors. Simrock in general seemed more willing than many of his colleagues to print even long texts in their entirety. Two examples of this are settings of Schiller's poem "An die Freude," one of them by Dalberg (ca.1799) and the other by Zumsteeg, many years later (ca.1818). In both editions he printed all nine stanzas for both solo voice and choir.

It could also be the case that all of the stanzas were simply regarded as in some sense an integral part of the work, even when they were not well suited to be sung

30. Helga Lühning argues this in her critical report, pp.23–24. She is not completely consistent in her argumentation, however. She does print all of the stanzas, but elsewhere calls the song "Gottes Macht und Vorsehung" the shortest song (p.25), which it, of course, would not be, if all fifteen stanzas were sung.

31. The first printed critique cited above was of the Simrock edition, not the Mollo first edition. In addition to the comments about the "meagre" music, the critic noted that stanzas 8 and 9, among others, fitted the music badly ("offenbar übel passt"). See also Hans-Joachim Moser, "Kleine Beiträge zu Beethoven's Lieder und Bühnenwerken: 2. die Strophenwiederholungen zu den Gellert-Liedern," NBJ 2 (1925), 51–54, as well as Lühning, Kritischer Bericht, p.23.

32. See Hans-Werner Küthen's critical report to NGA, III/2 (Klavierkonzerte I), p.12.

to the music. The early Viennese manuscript copy already mentioned, the only source containing all of the stanzas, points in this direction, with only one verse underlying the vocal line; all other stanzas are placed together, following the body of the song.

Finally, Simrock's printing of the whole poetic text might be understood as his personal interpretation of Beethoven's intentions. Simrock did indeed print all of the poetic text, but he did not add the repeat or dal segno signs that would have been necessary if the performance of all of the stanzas had been called for. He printed only the dal segno signs that appeared in the Mollo first edition.<sup>33</sup> Thus the basis for his decision here would have been not a letter from the composer, but rather the copy of the Mollo edition that Ries sent him.

#### Conclusion

In first preparing his Gellert settings for publication, Beethoven, it seems, began with six discrete songs, more a simple collection of songs to be chosen from by the performer, ad libitum, and in any order (and perhaps with any number of stanzas) than anything else. During the course of publication he thought repeatedly about the order in which he wanted to see them printed. By virtue of his ordering and reordering it became something more than a mere collection, but still something other than a song cycle. It became a complex grouping with an order imposed by the composer (and with an implied obligation to perform all six songs), a musical work distinguishable from both multimovement pieces, on the one hand, and collections, on the other. Jonathan Dunsby has created the useful term "multi-piece" for such groupings, consisting of "music in sections which do not make a whole in every sense but which are not entirely unconnected."<sup>34</sup>

The Bagatelles, op. 119, also a "multi-piece" in Dunsby's opinion, provide a useful comparison here.<sup>35</sup> The first five were chosen by Beethoven out of a number of older compositions, some of them dating back perhaps as far as 1793.<sup>36</sup> He reworked some of them and ordered them for publication. In the end, after his choice

33. Hoffmeister and Kühnel also printed them there too, without, however, printing the following stanzas of the text.

34. Jonathan Dunsby, "The Multi-piece in Brahms: Fantasien Op. 116," *Brahms: Biographical, Documentary and Analytical Studies*, ed. Robert Pascall (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983), p. 167.

35. Ibid., p.169.

36. Barry Cooper, Beethoven and the Creative Process (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p.265.

of the five, he felt compelled to compose a final, sixth Bagatelle to sum up in many ways and tie together his collection.<sup>37</sup>

In the Gellert songs, op.48, there are, in contrast, no new compositions and no newly created musical links. Beethoven created relationships by a process of recognition of the possibilities inherent within the songs themselves and in their juxtaposition, not by rewriting. The compositional process had been fully completed before Beethoven reordered his songs. He recognized that the "Bußlied" made a satisfying conclusion musically, emotionally, theologically, and that it tied back to the first song. If the fourth ordering as seen in the Hoffmeister and Kühnel edition is accepted as authentic, as I argue, then further structural tightening on the basis of key and of the text can be discovered.

In her critical report on the Gellert songs, Helga Lühning writes that one cannot assume "that Beethoven with the conception of op.48 had the invention of the first song cycle in mind." In this essay she argues that when Beethoven did get around to composing the first "real" song cycle with his *An die ferne Geliebte*, op.98 anomalous as it is—he did recall his "not-yet-cycle," op.48. The (piano) variation and the references in the last song to the first one are elements he could adopt from the older work. Joseph Kerman writes in regard to the probable connection between *An die ferne Geliebte* and Beethoven's letter to the "Immortal Beloved" that "music had often provided Beethoven with a field for the working out of emotional conflicts."<sup>38</sup> In his song cycle, op.98, Beethoven "seems to be saying that only through art could he achieve loving communication; the beloved is unreachable except through songs."<sup>39</sup> A journey of understanding and reconciliation is being made, through art, in both *An die ferne Geliebte* and the *Gellert Lieder:* in the one it leads to the renunciation of human love; in the other, earlier one, to the embracing of divine love.

37. That op.119 became a group of eleven bagatelles is an accident of publishing history. It is actually a composite of two discrete groupings, with numbers 7–11 composed by Beethoven for Friedrich Starke's Pianoforte Schule, vol. 3, published in 1821, and both groups then printed together in England. See Alan Tyson, "The First Edition of Beethoven's Op.119 Bagatelles," MQ, 49 (1963), 331–38.

38. Joseph Kerman, "An die ferne Geliebte," in BS I, 131. See also Alan Tyson, "Beethoven's Heroic Phase," *Musical Times* 110 (1969), 139–41.

39. Kerman, "An die ferne Geliebte," p.132.

# The Autograph of Beethoven's "Archduke" Trio, Op.97

During the festivities in honor of the Princess of Baden and when your Imperial Highness was hampered by a sore finger I began to work rather hard; and one of the fruits of this diligence is a new pianoforte trio. —Beethoven

## Seow-Chin Ong

hus wrote Beethoven to his friend, benefactor, and pupil, Archduke Rudolf sometime after 12 March 1811.<sup>1</sup> Preoccupied with the Princess's visit and a sore finger, His Royal Highness was, in all likelihood, temporarily unable to have his music lessons with Beethoven. Ironically, this minor accident gave the composer time to complete the masterpiece that now immortalizes the Archduke's name more than any other composition dedicated to him.

Work on the "Archduke" Trio, the most expansive, lyrical, and deeply felt of all the composer's works in this genre, had, in fact, begun the year before. Although completed in the early months of 1811, it was not published until 1816, in two parallel editions by Steiner in Vienna and Birchall in London.<sup>2</sup> This unusually long delay has been remarked upon on several occasions, often with the assumption or implication that Beethoven never sought to sell the work prior to 1815, when he

I would like to thank Joseph Kerman, Daniel Heartz, Klára Moricz, and David Schneider for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper. The present essay revises some of the findings presented in chapter 6 of my doctoral dissertation, *Source Studies for Beethoven's Piano Trio in Bb Major, Op.97 ("Archduke")* (University of California, Berkeley, 1995).

1. Anderson, I, 316 (letter no.300). The original text of the letter appears in Brandenburg, II, 182 (letter no.489): "Während Den Festlichkeiten der PrinzessinVon Baden wegen und dem Wehen Finger von ihro Kaiserl. Hoheit fieng ich an etwas Fleißig zu arbeiten, wovon unter andern auch ein neues *Trio* die Frucht ist fürs Piano." This letter is undated. Both Anderson's editorial "late March, 1811" and Brandenburg's "Wien, Ende März 1811" stem from the date of the festivities, 5–12 March 1811.

2. See my Source Studies, pp. 297–303; and Alan Tyson, *The Authentic English Editions of Beethoven* (London: Faber and Faber, 1963), pp. 13–27.

apparently initiated events that led to publication the following year. But that was not the case, for the composer had offered it to Breitkopf and Härtel soon after it was completed in a letter of 12 April 1811.<sup>3</sup> Why that venerable Leipzig firm did not publish it then is evident from another letter written several years later, ironically at the time when both Steiner and Birchall were busy preparing to issue their first editions of the work. Writing to Härtel on 19 July 1816 in response to repeated offers to include new Beethoven compositions in the catalogue of the firm, Beethoven reminded the publisher that Härtel had refused to pay him the sum of 100 gulden for the work, even though elsewhere the composer could have obtained, as he claimed, "50 or even 60 gold ducats for that kind of composition."<sup>4</sup> Härtel, Beethoven pointedly remarked, "cannot expect me to be a loser."<sup>5</sup>

The unusual delay in the publication of the "Archduke" Trio accords well with the finding made by both Sieghard Brandenburg and Alan Tyson that the work's autograph actually dates from 1814/15, a time closer to the publication of the music, and not from 1811, the year of the "Archduke" Trio's completion.<sup>6</sup> This conclusion is now contradicted by new evidence indicating that early 1811 is, in fact, the date of the autograph. In the present essay I will introduce and discuss the new evidence, following a summary of the case for 1814/15. I will then examine two particularly extensive and interesting revisions in the autograph, one in the scherzo and one in the Andante, as evidence of the composer's apparent dissatisfaction with the earlier versions.

### 1. The Date of the Autograph

In an article published in 1977, Brandenburg argues that the autograph of Beethoven's last violin sonata, the Sonata in G Major, op.96, dates from the winter and spring of 1814/15, even though the music was completed in 1812.<sup>7</sup> This dating is widely accepted as correct.<sup>8</sup>

3. Brandenburg, II, 184 (letter no.492). Translated in Anderson, I, 319 (letter no.304).

4. For information on equivalencies of Viennese currency during Beethoven's time, see Julia Moore, "Beethoven and Inflation," *Beethoven Forum* 1 (1992), 191–223.

5. Anderson, II, 586–87 (letter no.642). The original text of the letter is in Brandenburg, III, 274–75 (letter no.950).

6. See Sieghard Brandenburg, "Die Quellen zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Beethovens Streichquartett Es-Dur Op.127," BJ 10 (1983), 223–24; and JTW, p.198.

7. Sieghard Brandenburg, "Bemerkungen zu Beethovens Op.96," BJ 9 (1977), 11-25.

8. See, for example, Richard Kramer's review of Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata for Piano and Violin, G Major, Op.96: Facsimile of the Autograph Manuscript in ML 59 (1978), 226–27. Figure 1: Paper type 1: Violin Sonata, op.96 autograph (The Pierpont Morgan Library) Mold A and Mold B.





Preserved in the Pierpont Morgan Library in NewYork, the autograph of op.96 is an unusual document.<sup>9</sup> In contrast to the sort of *Querformat* paper measuring roughly 230 mm x 320 mm that Beethoven often used, it comprises larger *Hoch-format* paper measuring about 356 mm x 244 mm. Still rarer is the distinctive watermark shown in figure 1,<sup>10</sup> which identifies the paper as originating from the central Italian town of Fabriano rather than from a paper mill located within the Habsburg empire as was usually the case with Beethoven. The initials "PM" in the watermark indicate the manufacturer of the Fabriano paper was Pietro Milani (1744–1817).<sup>11</sup>

Among the thousands of folios of Beethoven's extant manuscripts, only a scant forty-nine folios are known to be distinguished by watermarks similar to that of figure 1.<sup>12</sup> Significantly, these include the sixteen folios (whose watermark appears as figure 2) that make up the second volume of the two-volume autograph of the "Archduke." Housed together with volume 1 in the Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Kraków, volume 2 of the "Archduke" autograph contains the last two movements of the work (the first two movements are found in volume 1).<sup>13</sup> It is entirely made up of larger *Hochformat* paper (measuring about 327 mm x 225 mm), with each folio forming half of a full sheet as opposed to the typical division of a sheet of *Querformat* paper into four folios (the structure of the volume is laid out in figure 3).

On the basis of two presumptive conventions of watermark study that have been vital to the considerable progress made in the study of Beethoven manuscripts since the late 1960s—that papers with the same watermark date from the same time, and that Beethoven would normally exhaust his current supply of manuscript paper before he would buy more—Brandenburg has concluded that the "Archduke" autograph originated, like the autograph of op.96, from the winter and spring of

9. I am grateful to J. Rigbie Turner, Mary Flagler Cary Curator, at the Pierpont Morgan Library, for allowing me access to the manuscripts needed for this study.

10. The illustrations of the watermarks in all the figures were drawn freehand. No attempt has been made to ensure that they are scaled proportionately to the sizes of the papers.

11. See Brandenburg, "Bemerkungen," p.12. Paper has been a chief product of Fabriano since medieval times.

12. Besides the autograph of op.96, manuscripts with the same paper type include the autograph of *An die Hoffnung*, op.94, in the Houghton Library, Harvard University (Ms Lowell 12); the two autographs of "Die Laute Klage," WoO 135 (GDM, A 12; and SBK, Mus. ms. autogr. Beethoven Grasnick 6), and a rejected score draft for the last movement of op.96 in BN (Ms 60, No.1).

13. I am grateful to Prof. Dr. Krzysztof Zamorski, Director of the Biblioteka Jagiellońska, and Mrs. Agnieszka Mietelska-Ciepierska, Head of the Music Department, for making it possible for me to study the manuscript. Figure 2: Paper type 2: volume 2 of the "Archduke"Trio autograph (Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Kraków).





Figure 3: "Archduke" Trio autograph: structure of volume 2.



1814/15.<sup>14</sup> That both op.96 and the "Archduke" were published only in 1816, several years after they were completed, in parallel first editions by Steiner and Birchall, are matching facts that seem to support Brandenburg's single date for the autographs of the two works.

Notwithstanding these similarities, however, the date of 1814/15 does not fit comfortably with certain features of volume 1 of the "Archduke" autograph. Of the seventeen folios of this volume, all of which are in the usual *Querformat*, the first three are prominently differentiated from the rest by both their narrower widths and their single-leaf status—none of them may be linked to either a bifolio or a gathering in

Horizontal (mm.)	Vertical (mm.)
312	225
310	225
316	223
327	225
	Horizontal (mm.) 312 310 316 327

Table 1: Folio measurements of volume 1 of the "Archduke" autograph (Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Kraków).

14. Brandenburg, "Die Quellen."

the autograph. This differentiation is illustrated in figure 4, which shows the structure of the volume, and Table 1, which details the dimensions of its various folios. Not surprisingly then, folios 1 and 2 have their own individual paper types, which are illustrated in figures 5 and 6 respectively. These paper types do not match figure 7, the paper type for the remaining folios of the volume that, by virtue of the letters "GT" and the manner of the script, point to Giacomo Testori's paper mill in Habsburg, South Tirol, as the place of origin.<sup>15</sup> No watermark may be found in folio 3.<sup>16</sup>

	Folio	Paper Type/Quadrant
Figure 4: "Archduke" Trio	1	3/?
autograph: structure of vol- ume I.	2	4/?
	3	?/?
		5/4b
	5	5?/3b?
		5/1b
		5/3b
	8	5?/4b?
	L 9	5/2b
	10	5/1a
		5/3a
		5/2a
	13	5/4a
	$\Gamma^{14}$	5/1a
	$L_{15}$	5/4a
	$\Gamma^{16}$	5/3a
	L <sub>17</sub>	5/2a

15. See Georg Eineder, *The Ancient Paper-Mills of the Former Austro-Hungarian Empire and their Watermarks*, vol.8 of *Monumenta Chartae Papyraceae Historiam Illustrantia* (Hilversum: Paper Publications Society, 1960), watermarks 289 (plate 88), 464 (plate 134), 465 (plate 134), 861 (plate 241), and 1071 (plate 279).

16. Folios 1, 2, and 3 are impossible to date because their component folios are missing. Nevertheless, the watermark of folio 1 (figure 5), a small fleur-de-lys situated by the horizontal folding edge of the original sheet, does appear in three "Archduke" sketch sources of 1810–11. These are two eightpage manuscripts—one in the New York Public Library, MS ZBT-25 no.2, and the other in the Beethoven-Archiv (Bonn), MS Bsk 18 (SBH 646)—and the Landsberg 11 Sketchbook (Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Kraków). See my *Source Studies*, pp.396–97, paper types 3 and 4; and JTW, p.553, paper type 27. In determining that volume 1 of the "Archduke" autograph originates from 1814/15, Brandenburg does not differentiate among the different papers of the volume, but speaks as if only one paper type were present in it: "Die beiden ersten Sätze befinden sich auf einem anderen ungewöhnlich mittelitalienischen Papier, das zweifellos derselben Zeit (1814/15) angehört." See his "Die Quellen," p.224. Figure 5: Paper type 3 (one quadrant): "Archduke" Trio autograph, volume 1, folio 1.



In an attempt to explain the aberrant watermarks of folios 1 and 2 while maintaining his theory of a later date for the "Archduke" autograph, Alan Tyson speculates that these first two folios might have been "survivors" from an earlier and (presumably) lost original autograph that Beethoven wrote out soon after he completed the work.<sup>17</sup> Indeed, Beethoven had inscribed "Trio am 3<sup>ten</sup> März 1811" at the top of the first page and "geendigt am 26<sup>ten</sup> März 1811" at the end of the autograph, with "März" replacing a crossed-out "April" to indicate, perhaps, that the March date was entered into the manuscript at some time after the autograph was made.<sup>18</sup> But Tyson's speculation of a great hiatus in the making of the "Archduke"



Figure 6: Paper type 4 (one quadrant): "Archduke" Trio autograph, volume 1, folio 2.

17. JTW, pp.198–99. One suspects that the ever-cautious Tyson would have liked further to include folio 3 as another "survivor" if there had been a watermark.

18. These dates match the events Beethoven mentioned in his letter to the Archduke, quoted earlier in n.1, wherein he reported his completion of the music.



autograph seems to be contradicted by the evidence: there are no significant differences in ink and script between the first three folios and the rest of the volume. Regardless of the different paper sizes and the varied watermarks, all the folios of volume I appear to have been written at about the same time.

With the "Archduke" autograph thus offering apparently conflicting evidence for the date of its origin, it is fortuitous that two further sources taken together may present the strongest reason yet for questioning the date of 1814/15. The first source is a one-page manuscript of "Archduke" sketches in the Pierpont Morgan Library (Cary 46; Plate 1) that has never been investigated thoroughly.<sup>19</sup> The second is a set of parts for the work that once belonged to Archduke Rudolf himself

19. For a description of this manuscript, see my Source Studies, pp.16-17.

Figure 7: Paper type 5: "Archduke"Trio autograph, volume 1, folios 4–17.

G 礼 XV. ontal /oli in 6 uto14 2 1 . . . shil y 2478 #1 5 5 19 22: 1 1475 7. 25 Nor 22 ti A

Plate 1: Sketch folio for Beethoven's "Archduke"Trio, op.97. The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, Mary Flagler Cary Collection (Cary 46). Reproduced by permission.
and now housed in the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde inVienna (Ms A58a).<sup>20</sup> Brandenburg reports that the two string parts from the set are missing;<sup>21</sup> I found them preserved together with the piano part in a bundle.<sup>22</sup>

Except for the first folio of the piano part, this set of "Archduke" parts is written out entirely by Wenzel Schlemmer (1760–1823), Beethoven's trusted copyist.<sup>23</sup> They contain corrections and other entries in the composer's hand, as well as fingering markings in the violoncello part to indicate that they were once used in performance, perhaps by Beethoven, Ignaz Schuppanzigh, and Joseph Linke at the work's first public performance on 11 April 1814, the occasion of the composer's last public appearance as a pianist. As far as my inquiry is concerned, Schlemmer's parts are important for two reasons: (1) they may be dated to 1811, the year of the "Archduke"Trio's completion;<sup>24</sup> and (2) the text of the Andante is identical to that of the autograph and thus presents the final version of the music.

20. The old siglum for this manuscript XI 4677, Q 16976 cited by Sieghard Brandenburg in "Die Beethovenhandschriften in der Musikaliensammlung des Erzherzogs Rudolph," *Zu Beethoven: Aufsätze und Dokumente* 3, ed. Harry Goldschmidt (Berlin:Verlag Neue Musik, 1988), p. 168, is no longer in use. My thanks to Dr. Otto Biba, Director of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, for his kind hospitality and for allowing me access to this manuscript.

21. Brandenburg, "The Beethovenhandschriften," p. 168.

22. The origin of the Schlemmer parts may be traced to Beethoven's request expressed in a letter to Archduke Rudolf to have parts of the work made:"Da ich troz aller angewandten Mühe keinen Kopisten, der mir im Hause schrieb, erhalten konnte, schicke ich ihnen mein Manuscript, sie brauchen nur gnädigst zum *schlemmer* um einen Tauglichen Kopisten zu schicken, der das Trio jedoch nur in ihrem Palaste kopiren müste." See Brandenburg, II, 183 (letter no.491), where the date of the letter is speculated to be "Anfang April 1811." A somewhat earlier date of "end of March 1811" accompanies the translation of this letter in Anderson, I, 316–17 (letter no.301) as follows: "Since in spite of all my efforts I have not been able to secure a copyist who will copy at my home, I am sending you my manuscript. All you need to do is kindly to send to *Schlemmer* for a good copyist who, however, must copy the trio at your palace."

23. Brandenburg ("Die Beethovenhandschriften," p.168) identifies the hand of the first folio as that of Aloys Fuchs (1799–1853), an Austrian scholar and collector of musical autographs who was appointed to the board of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in 1829. This folio contains the title page and (in the verso) the first twenty-one measures of the first movement. Brandenburg suggests that the original first folio might have contained an attractive dedication in Beethoven's own hand and was removed as a keepsake.

24. Brandenburg (ibid.), too, gives the same date in his examination of the piano part. Details of the watermarks of the Schlemmer parts will be included in my forthcoming essay "Aspects of the Genesis of Beethoven's String Quartet in F Minor, Op.95" in *The String Quartets of Beethoven*, ed. William Kinderman (Champaign: U Illinois P).

The Morgan Library folio is written only on one side and records, for the most part, a draft for the D-major Andante variations laid out mainly in single-line continuity—from the last measures of Variation 4 and continuing into the concluding Variation 5–Coda complex, the whole draft corresponding roughly to mm.138– 94 of the movement. The draft occupies staves 3–14 of the manuscript; part of the stretch of staves 11–13 is transcribed in ex.1.<sup>25</sup>



() = passage reproduced in a variant version in example 2, mm. 178x-184x.

Example 1: Pierpont Morgan Library MS (Cary 46): transcription of staves 11–13.

25. All editorial markings are enclosed in brackets. Sketches made earlier are placed below those written later, as indicated by the dotted lines.

Figure 8: Paper type 6 (one quadrant): The Pierpont Morgan Library Ms, Mary Flager Cary Music Collection (Cary 46).



Because it is a single folio, the watermark of the Morgan Library manuscript is incomplete (figure 8).<sup>26</sup> It is essentially the same as quadrant 1b of figure 9, one of the two paper types that characterize Landsberg 11, the sketchbook containing the bulk of the extant sketches for the Andante variations. Since the Andante sketches in Landsberg 11 are among the later entries that Beethoven entered in the sketchbook,<sup>27</sup> we may infer that the Morgan Library folio dates from no earlier than the fall of 1810, the *terminus ante quem* for Landsberg 11, and no later than early 1811, when the work was completed.

Figure 9: Paper type 7, Mold B: Landsberg 11 Sketchbook. (Reproduced, by permission, from Douglas Johnson, Alan Tyson, and Robert Winter, *The Beethoven Sketchbooks: History, Reconstruction, Inventory* [Berkeley and Los Angeles: U California P, 1985], p.556.)



26. For details of the usual connections between watermarks and sheet gatherings, see JTW, pp.46–54.27. See my *Source Studies*, pp.190–91.





Example 2: "Archduke" Trio autograph, volume 2, pp.46– 47: transcription of excised music in context.



The most significant point about the Morgan Library manuscript to my inquiry is that mm.178a-85a, an eight-measure passage in the draft of the coda (bracketed in ex.1), are absent from the Schlemmer copy of 1811. But it appears, although in a variant version, in the autograph in mm. 178x-84x (ex.2), where it is fully scored in ink, before Beethoven crossed it out with bold strokes of the quill, together with mm.185x-88x, which he had already written out. (Measures 185x-88x, which correspond to mm.186a-89a in the Morgan folio, are crossed out, not because Beethoven rejected them, but because they stand in the way of the revision of mm.178x-84x that Beethoven wanted to make starting at the "=de" referent.) Since the music that replaces mm. 178x-84x in the autograph is reproduced in the Schlemmer copy, the cancellation in the autograph must have been done before the Schlemmer parts were made in 1811. The autograph therefore cannot have been written later than that year. Consequently, and despite the correspondence of the rare watermark between the "Archduke" autograph and the autograph for the Violin Sonata, op.96, there is no reason not to take the composer's inscribed dates of "Trio am 3<sup>ten</sup> März 1811" and "geendigt am 26ten März 1811" in the former manuscript at face value, even though March 1811 is a good twenty-odd months earlier than 29 December 1812, the date of the first performance of op.96. The prevailing wisdom that papers with the same watermark date from about the same time does not hold true in this instance. But a more significant point concerning the new date of the "Archduke" autograph is that it calls into question the view that the "Archduke" is closer than previously recognized to works that Beethoven completed in 1815/16, including the two Cello Sonatas of op. 102, the Piano Sonata in A, op. 101, and An die ferne Geliebte, op.98.28

### 2. Attempts at Revision

As the first complete text of the work, the "Archduke" autograph naturally served as the source for the Schlemmer parts. These, in turn, became the basis for the (presumably lost) *Stichvorlage* for the Steiner and Birchall editions,<sup>29</sup> a fact attested

28. See Brandenburg, "Die Quellen," pp.223-24.

29. The inscription "S. A. Steiner und Comp. Nr. 2582" at the top of many pages in both volumes of the autograph has led Kinsky and Halm to conclude, incorrectly, that the autograph served as the *Stichvorlage* for the Steiner edition; see Kinsky-Halm, p.272. Written in the neat hand of Tobias Haslinger (who took over the firm under his own name in 1826), it served merely to indicate Steiner's ownership of the manuscript ("2582" is Steiner's publication plate number), which he had obtained as part of the agreement he made with Beethoven; see the draft of the contract of sale in *Ludwig*  to by the telltale reappearances of some particular features of the Schlemmer text in both the Birchall edition and the proof copy for the Steiner edition.<sup>30</sup> Before the *Stichvorlage* was made, however, Beethoven apparently proofread the Schlemmer parts with the aid of the autograph, during the course of which he revised the text somewhat, mainly in isolated details, such as dynamic markings. In the autograph, these corrections and revisions appear in both reddish-brown and black pencil—testimony to Beethoven's going through the manuscript on more than one occasion with a critical but, as we will see, far from perfect editorial eye. The same implements were used in the editing of the Schlemmer parts.

Further changes to the "Archduke" text occur in the Steiner proof copy, although this time Beethoven did not record them in the earlier sources. As a result, some revisions, such as the addition of "dolce" for the violin double stop at m. 191 in the opening Allegro and the grace notes in the piano part in m. 197 of the same move-

30. The evidence supporting this conclusion is different for each of the two first editions, and two representative examples may be mentioned here. Both the Schlemmer and the Birchall violin parts are marked by missing accidentals needed to change Db to Db in mm.249-55 of the scherzo (and later in the reprise of the same music). These omissions probably stem from the imperfect proofreading that Ferdinand Ries undertook on the composer's behalf (Ries, an old pupil of Beethoven, was then living in London); see Friedrich Chrysander, "Beethoven's Verbindung mit Birchall und Stumpff," Jahrbücher für musikalische Wissenschaft 1 (1863), 435. Although the omissions originated in the autograph, they characterize neither the Steiner edition nor the publisher's proof copy that contain corrections in Beethoven's hand. (The whereabouts of this proof copy is unknown. It once belonged to Martin Bodmer, a noted collector of original Beethoven manuscripts, and it appears to be missing several pages. I thank Dr. Brandenburg for allowing me to consult a microfilm of it in the Beethoven-Archiv [microfilm numbers 1414/15 and 1471-73]). Indications that the Steiner first edition was based on the Schlemmer text appear in several places in the Steiner proof copy. For example, the proof copy followed Schlemmer (and the autograph) by abbreviating, in the finale, the series of sixteenth-note tremolos in the piano part in mm.152-58 and mm.160-64. These abbreviations were removed in the final print on Beethoven's instruction:"alle aúsgesetzt."This sort of clarity that Beethoven wanted for his printed music gives point to his comment to a friend in 1816, the year the "Archduke" was published, that "any engraved work is better than a manuscript" (jeder Stich besser als schrift); see Brandenburg, III, 251-52 (letter no.929) and, in translation, Anderson, II, 574-75 (letter no.630).

*van Beethovens sämtliche Briefe*, ed. Emerich Kastner and Julius Kapp (Leipzig, 1923; rpt. Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1975), p.307. This contract is slated for inclusion in vol.8 (yet to be published) of Brandenburg's edition of the letters; a translation appears in Anderson, III, 1423. One fact worth mentioning is this: mm.213 and 214 of the scherzo are missing in the autograph, but not in the Schlemmer parts and in the two first editions, which also points to the Schlemmer parts, and not the autograph, as the basis for the *Stichvorlage* for Steiner and Birchall.

ment, appear only in the Steiner proof copy and not in the autograph or in Schlemmer. Clearly, then, no single early source—not even the autograph—transmits what might be considered a definitive text of the work.

Nevertheless, the autograph remains uniquely significant because of the many revisions it contains.<sup>31</sup> As mentioned previously, two revisions—one in the scherzo and another in the Andante—are quite extensive and will be discussed below in some detail. The remaining revisions are comparatively small. Of these, the most interesting concerns the tempo marking of the slow movement. Copied out as "Andante cantabile" in Schlemmer and engraved the same in the two first editions, it appears as "Andante cantabile ma però con moto" in the autograph, with "ma però con moto" inscribed in a distinctively smaller script in lighter ink. The change was apparently made after Beethoven had proofread the Schlemmer parts, perhaps following a rehearing of the music that alerted him to the potential for the music to drag. The revised tempo marking appears in the text of the *Gesamtausgabe* published by Breitkopf and Härtel in the 1860s.

### 3. The Revision of the Scherzo

Replete with ink cancellations and erasure patches caused by scraping (perhaps with a small blade), mm.74–85 of the scherzo make up the most difficult passage to read in the "Archduke" autograph. The corrections affect only the string parts; in ex.3, the erased music (insofar as it can be made out) is placed above the revised version for comparison.

In place of the background series of running eighth notes that now occupy mm.74–84, what Beethoven once had in mind was a more playful idea: starting at m.74, the tossing back and forth of the pervasive subthematic anapestic motives between the strings and the piano, in a manner similar to the motivic interplay between the two hands of the piano part in mm.78–85. This much is clear from

31. These revisions do not (of course) include corrections of copying errors, some of which still remain in the autograph to bear striking testimony to the mechanical and workmanlike approach that Beethoven sometimes adopted while writing out the manuscript. The omission of two measures in the scherzo (mm.213–14) I have mentioned previously (see n.29). Also worth noting is the insertion of an E<sup>4</sup> accidental in the violin part in m.97a of the first movement exposition to create a nonsensical major-seventh double stop with the F below in place of a dominant seventh. This error came about because Beethoven had apparently mistaken the redundant E<sup>b</sup> accidental in the previous measure to be foreign to the key signature. One copying error that the composer *did* spot after he had written out the autograph was the omission of mm.352–55 in the rondo finale. To correct this error, Beethoven copied out the missing measures into an additional folio (fol.15) and inserted it into the manuscript.





Example 3: "Archduke" Trio autograph, volume 1, p.23: transcription of mm.74–85 of the scherzo. the few bits of music that have survived the scraping, and that may yet be discerned (but only barely) amid the veritable thicket of cancellations.

A desire to obtain maximum contrast between this passage and the one immediately following was probably Beethoven's reason for revising. For when compared to the moto perpetuo type of running eighth notes, the extended stretch of motivic interplay in the strings does not generate the same degree of momentum and, consequently, cannot lead to as emphatic an arrival point at m.85 to contrast with the new music that begins in m.86—a *dolce* tune in the cello over a *subito piano* cushion of an accompaniment in the keyboard. Furthermore, the separate roles in the texture of the final version in mm.78–85—the relentless forward thrust of the strings in the background against the light motivic interplay in the piano generate a certain friction that motivic interplay alone cannot create here, but which forms part of the essential nature of the contrast between the two musical passages: warmth and lyricism in the mellower subdominant key from m.86 onward against the brighter, more forceful angularity of the previous music in the tonic.

#### 4. The Revision of the Andante

The rejected music in the coda of the Andante in ex.2 that allows us to establish the date of the "Archduke" autograph is also the most interesting and important revision in the manuscript. As ex.4 indicates, the final version of the coda of the Andante is in two sections. The first, mm. 160–74, is characterized by an extraordinary passage of harmonic fog, where a series of frustrated cadential resolutions and diminished-seventh chords create a certain sense of suspended motion recalling the bridge passage in mm.21–26 of the opening Allegro. The break from the preceding uncomplicated and straightforward harmony of the theme and variations that form the main bulk of the movement is sharp and drastic.

By contrast, the second section, mm.174–93, seeks immediately to mitigate the effect of this harmonic cloud by affirming and reaffirming D major as the tonic, at once richly sonorous and quietly radiant. This section has two phrases. In the first phrase, mm.174–85, we hear in the cello and violin a brief and touchingly wistful dialogue based on music derived from the main Andante theme, followed by a longer thematic paraphrase of the same music in delicate triplets in high octaves in the piano. Following this paraphrase, the second phrase, mm.185–93, gently settles the music deeper and deeper into the home key, to the point of almost complete inaction when the tranquillity is disturbed by the unexpected entry of the dominant-seventh harmony of Eb. It is the earlier version of the first phrase that Beethoven crossed out in ex.2.

Example 4:"Archduke"Trio: Andante coda, mm.159–94.







This revision may be summarized as follows. In ex.2 and prior to the cancellation of the music, Beethoven made small pencil crosses in the free adjunct staff below mm.178x-80x to signify that they were to be eliminated. With mm.178x-180x thus excised and m.177 followed immediately by m.181x, the music approaches more nearly the stretch of mm.178–84 in ex.4, the passage of paraphrase in octave triplets in the piano right hand. But whereas this paraphrase lasts seven measures in ex.4, in ex.2 it plays for only four (mm.181x-84x), and Beethoven sought twice to broaden it.

The first attempt at extending the paraphrase appears in ex.2 in the sketch in the adjunct staff below mm.183x and 184x. By replacing the last two beats of m.184x with this sketch of one measure and two beats, the paraphrase is prolonged by a modest one measure of cadential elaboration.

The second attempt involves the sketch in the adjunct staff below mm.185x-88x. A real intensification of the paraphrase rather than a token cadential prolongation, this more substantial four-measure sketch, which Beethoven marks for the violin, is meant to replace just one measure, m.184x. Consequently, the paraphrase passage now lasts seven measures (mm.181x-83x, followed by the sketch in the adjunct below mm.185x-88x), and this length is retained in the final version. A complete, but modified, version of this second attempt is then written out in the autograph (the "Vi=" at m.178x is linked to the "=de" at m.178), following the cancellation of the original passage. As ex.4 shows, the final version combines two aspects of ex.2: the sketch in the adjunct staff for the violin but now rescored for the piano, and the string parts of mm.178x-80x.

The questions that must be asked concerning the cancellation and revision are these: why did Beethoven abandon his original conception of the passage so late in the genesis of the movement? And how does this passage compare with the final version in terms of its function in the coda?

In spite of Beethoven's revisions, the length of the coda in the autograph remains unchanged: the number of measures removed is the same as the number of measures added. Rather, what has changed is the comparative weight of the various tonic cadences in the paraphrase passage and, consequently, the way the music paces itself as it draws gradually to a close. This change needs to be examined in some detail.

Prior to the cancellation in ex.2, the paraphrase passage begins with a tonic cadence in mm.180x-81x. Because this cadence is preceded by an evaded tonic cadence in mm.177–78x and the powerful pull to the tonic in the ensuing three-measure cadential delay, it acquires an added weight that firmly establishes it as the fundamental closing cadence of the movement. As a result, the attempt to height-

en the key further by means of another emphatic tonic cadence in mm.184x-85x at the end of the paraphrase comes somewhat as an anticlimax. Despite being music of the greatest beauty, this additional paraphrase passage is structurally ineffectual.

In ex.4, the paraphrase passage also begins with a tonic cadence, but one markedly less assertive than that in ex.2; in this example, it is evident in mm.177–78 that the effect of this cadence is undercut by, among other things, the anticipatory tonic chord in m.177. The weight of the next tonic cadence, which comes at the end of the paraphrase passage in mm.184–85, is significantly enhanced by the evaded tonic cadence in mm.181–82 and the pull to the tonic in the ensuing three-measure cadential delay. Unlike ex.2, this fundamental closing cadence of the movement is not followed by another passage designed to heighten the tonic further. Rather, the music now fades quietly away and—notwithstanding the surprise chord—concludes one of Beethoven's quietest, most expansive and ethereal movements.

If Beethoven's concern had been purely technical, there would have been no need for him to cross out so much of the music he had already written out carefully in the autograph. For the problem of an emphatic tonic cadence coming after the arrival of the fundamental closing cadence could be solved simply by removing the offending second cadence—that is, the paraphrase passage of mm.181x-84x in ex.2—and leaving the rest of the now-canceled music intact. It is apparent, then, that preserving the paraphrase passage was a particular priority with the composer.

Perhaps the paraphrase passage meant to Beethoven a sublime moment in the Andante—the movement that is the heart of the whole work—whose calm and contemplative character has been the feature that impressed commentators since Beethoven's time. Carl Czerny, who had studied the "Archduke" with the composer himself, singled out the Andante theme—the foundation of the whole movement—as "holy, religious."<sup>32</sup> Berlioz had a similar view, and described in more striking and vivid terms the sort of reaction that one can have during the course of listening to the "Archduke":

At the third or fourth recurrence of the sublime and passionately religious theme in the middle of the *Andante*, one of [the listeners] may no longer be able to restrain his tears, and once he begins to let them flow, he will end up

32. Carl Czerny, On the Proper Performance of All Beethoven's Works for the Piano (Czerny's Reminiscences of Beethoven and chaps.2 and 3 from vol. IV of the *Complete Theoretical and Practical Piano Forte School*, op. 500), ed. with comm. Paul Badura–Skoda (Vienna: Universal Edition and Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Theodore Presser, 1970), p.101. (I have witnessed this phenomenon more than once) weeping violently, fiercely, and convulsively. That is what you may call a musical effect. Here is a listener overwhelmed and intoxicated by the art of sound, a human being lifted to heights immeasurably far above the plane of ordinary life.<sup>33</sup>

Something of "heights immeasurably far above the plane of ordinary life" may, indeed, be glimpsed here. The soft and delicate triplets in the high register in slow tempo that sparkle in the paraphrase passage create a figuration rarely encountered in Beethoven's music. It does, however, appear in the winds in the finale of the Ninth Symphony, at the concluding measures (mm.650–54) of the section beginning "Ihr stürzt nieder Millionen?"—the section of the finale imbued with an imposing religious aura. In that music, which Beethoven had instructed to be played "divoto"—devoutly—the triplets of the woodwinds give subtle point to shimmering tremolos in the strings, thus lending musical imagery to the words "above the starry firmament he must surely dwell" (über Sternen muß er wohnen).<sup>34</sup> Indeed, it was a similar imagery that inspired Adolf Bernhard Marx to describe the "Archduke" Andante as "lofty and calm as the starry night, still as a prayer,"<sup>35</sup> further

33. Hector Berlioz, *The Art of Music and Other Essays (A Travers Chants)*, trans. and ed. Elizabeth Cscicsery-Rónay (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1994), p.61. The original text in Hector Berlioz, *A travers chants* (4th edn. Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1886), p.95: "Au millieu de l'andante, au troisième retour de ce thème sublime et si passionnément religieux, il peut arriver à l'un d'eux de ne pouvoir contenir ses larmes, et s'il les laisse un instant couler, il finira peut-être (j'ai vu le phénomène se produire) par pleurer avec violence, avec fureur, avec explosion. Violà un effe[t] musical! violà un auditeur saisi, enivré par l'art des sons, un être élevé à une hauteur incommensurable au-dessus des régions ordinaires de la vie!" For a discussion of issues concerning Berlioz and heightened musical experiences, see Katherine Kolb Reeve, "Primal Scenes: Smithson, Pleyel, and Liszt in the Eyes of Berlioz," 19CM 18 (1995), 211–35.

34. Pulsating triplets also lend musical imagery to blazing stars at one point in the song *Abendlied unterm gestirnten Himmel*, WoO 150, written in 1820 when the composer was in the midst of work on the *Missa solemnis*, op.123. Like the slow movement of the second "Razumovsky" Quartet, which supposedly came to Beethoven when he was "contemplating the starry sky," this song is in E major; see n.35.

35. "Das Andante ist erhaben und ruhig, wie die Sternennacht, still wie ein Gebet" (Adolf Bernhard Marx, *Ludwig van Beethoven: Leben und Schaffen,* 2 vols. [1859; 3rd edn. Berlin: Otto Janke, 1875], II, p.224). In making this link between the "Archduke" Andante and the Ninth Symphony finale, Marx probably had in mind Czerny's report that the broad and serene E-major Adagio of the second "Razumovsky" Quartet, which has a hymnlike opening theme and a soaring first violin part that prefigures the solo violin in the Benedictus of the *Missa solemnis*, came to Beethoven when he was "contemplating the starry sky and thinking of the music of the spheres"; see Thayer-Forbes, pp.408–09.

testimony to how the "Archduke" Andante was widely understood by serious listeners in the nineteenth century.

As the comparison with the finale of the Ninth Symphony also indicates, in a broader sense, the sort of quietly elevated and rarefied spirit that resonates from the Andante coda looks ahead to the composer's last style; one is reminded of other inspired moments, such as the closing measures of the Heiliger Dankgesang movement from the String Quartet in A Minor, op. 132, and the Credo from the Missa solemnis, op.123. Also stylistically forwardlooking, but in a very different and more intense way, is the contemporaneous Quartet in F Minor, op.95, which, although completed in 1810, was not published (like the "Archduke" and op.96) until 1816.36 In its unprecedented tautness, pithiness, and volatility, as well as its emphasis on fugue and counterpoint and on high contrasts-it shares the last three features with the "Archduke" Scherzo-op.95 gathers quite remarkably, in a single entity, several distinctive hallmarks of the late quartet style of the 1820s. It is, as Beethoven remarks in one of his rare letters in English, "written for a small circle of connoisseurs,"<sup>37</sup> a pronouncement applicable also to every one of the composer's late quartets. Even op.96, the remaining chamber work of the time, is not devoid of late-style characteristics: witness the widespread lyricism; the Baroque-inspired pliability of the chromatic lines in the last movement fugato variation;<sup>38</sup> the ex-

36. Steiner was once again the Viennese publisher, although this time the authentic English edition was brought out not by Birchall but by Clementi in 1817. See Kinsky-Halm, p.268; and Tyson, *The Authentic English Editions of Beethoven*, pp.95–96. The watermark for the vast majority of the forty folios of the op.95 autograph (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Mus. Hs. 16.531) is similar to paper type 31 in JTW, p.554. Although this watermark is also found in some of the folios of the Landsberg 9 Sketchbook (SBK), a manuscript dating from about February to March 1814, there is good reason to believe that the op.95 autograph originates not from 1814 but from 1810, the year of the Quartet's completion. Arguments for 1810 are presented in my essay "Aspects of the Genesis of Beethoven's String Quartet in F Minor, Op.95."

37. The full text of this letter appears in Anderson, II, 604–07 (letter no.664), where the date is given as "c. October 11, 1816," and Brandenburg, III, 305–07 (letter no.983), where "um den 7. Ok-tober 1816" is suggested. For recent discussions of Beethoven's audiences, see Joseph Kerman, "Beethoven Quartet Audiences: Actual, Potential, Ideal," in *The Beethoven Quartet Companion*, ed. Robert Winter and Robert Martin (Berkeley and Los Angeles: U California P, 1994), pp.7–27; and Leon Botstein, "The Patrons and Publics of the Quartets: Music, Culture, and Society in Beethoven's Vienna," ibid., pp.77–109.

38. It is interesting to note the contrapuntal similarities between this G-minor fugato variation and the thirteen-measure G-minor fugato *Klavierstück*, WoO 61a, that Beethoven wrote on 27 September 1825 for Sarah Burney Payne, granddaughter of Charles Burney, as a souvenir for her visit. (See Solomon, *Beethoven*, p.339; and Thayer-Forbes, pp.956–57. Thayer mistakenly identifies Sarah Burney Payne as Burney's daughter.) ploitation of trills as an intrinsic part of the expression; the slick and glassy dancelike character of the trio, and so on. Evidently, then, the transition from the "heroic" to the late style had already begun at least by 1810, three years earlier than usually acknowledged.<sup>39</sup> And it could be earlier still if we take into account the kinship between the sort of lyrical *Innigkeit* of the "Archduke" Andante and parts of the *Missa solemnis* and the late quartets with the "reflective, pensive lyricism" that Lewis Lockwood senses in some middle-period works including the Mass in C, the slow movements of the Violin Concerto, and the slow movements of the first two of the three op.59 Quartets.<sup>40</sup>

39. See, for example, Joseph Kerman and Alan Tyson, *The New Grove Beethoven* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1983), p.91.

40. Lewis Lockwood, *Beethoven: The Music and the Life* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2003), p.273. Something of this "reflective, pensive lyricism" may already be heard in such earlier works as the slow movement of the "Pathétique" Sonata and the first movement of the "Moonlight" Sonata.

## REVIEWS

Who's Beethoven?

Facts are always misleading. We are all of us made up of many lives, most of them unlived; . . . Only in the stories we invent can we be sure of getting closer to truth. —Jeanette Winterson

# Nicholas Marston

Barry Cooper. *Beethoven*. The Master Musicians. Series edited by Stanley Sadie. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. xvi, 410pp.

Lewis Lockwood. *Beethoven: The Music and the Life*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2003. xix, 604pp.

t comes as no surprise that each of these recent major studies bears a dustjacket portrait of Beethoven. Cooper's gives us the 1820 Stieler portrait (the misprint "Steiler" on the end-flap is unfortunate); though the score of the *Missa solemnis* is all but omitted, the composer stares us almost full in the face, the eyes only slightly raised.<sup>1</sup> On Lockwood's cover, the 1823 Waldmüller image looks out over our shoulder, contemplating we know not what. For Lockwood, this portrait captures something of Beethoven's "otherworldly, abstracted demeanor" (p.403) at this stage of his life. Alessandra Comini, on the other hand, describes Waldmüller's work as "not the picture of a hero. But it is certainly a picture of Beethoven." She notes Waldmüller's reputation for "photographic verisimilitude" along with a characteristic "plenitude of the detailed observations of his sitters . . . posited against a neutral but richly mottled background." By contrast, "all the elements dear to future mythmakers are present in Stieler's heroizing con-

1. The full portrait is reproduced as Cooper's plate 8 (between pp.176–77), and Cooper notes that 1820 is the correct date, despite the inscription 1819 on the reverse: see, *inter alia*, CB 1, pp.260–61 (ca.8–15 Feb. 1820). Lockwood (p.406) gives the date as 1819.

ception: genius inspired by inner voices in the presence of nature, with leonine hair writhing wildly in symbolic parallel to the seething turbulence of creativity."<sup>2</sup>

Consider now Cooper's and Lockwood's treatments of one hardy perennial of Beethoven lore."Cramer, Cramer! We shall never be able to do anything like that!" Thayer passed on to Beethoven scholarship the composer's alleged response on hearing Mozart's Piano Concerto in C Minor, K.491, at an Augarten concert in the closing years of the eighteenth century.<sup>3</sup> Both Lockwood and Cooper draw Thayer's anecdote into their narratives concerning Beethoven's own C-Minor Concerto, op. 37. For Lockwood, "Mozart's late piano concertos formed Olympian models that [Beethoven] sought at first to emulate in his own concertos"; his C-Minor Concerto, though, "breaks new ground in regions where Mozart had never traveledin its dramatization of musical ideas, its juxtapositions of intensity with lyricism, its decisive contrasts that differ from those of Mozart's C Minor Concerto, its obviously strong model. We can readily believe that Beethoven said to J. B. Cramer a few years later" (pp.174-75), whereupon the anecdote follows, though without acknowledgment to Thayer. Cooper notes the tradition of associating op.37 with K.491, but immediately asserts that "it is doubtful whether Beethoven actually knew Mozart's concerto when he was first sketching his own. K.491 remained unpublished until about August 1800, by which time Beethoven had undoubtedly made substantial progress with his own work, and the anecdote that he heard Mozart's at a concert while with Cramer in 1799 is highly unreliable" (p.125). A footnote gives the Thayer reference; points out that the anecdote "was related only many years later by Cramer's widow," who was not directly involved; and warns that "the identity of the concerto was not a central part of the story."

Another comparison: the last of Cooper's eighteen chapters is entitled "End of an era" and covers the years 1824–27. Writing of the composition of the late quartets, Cooper is scornful of the familiar assumption that "after the Ninth Symphony, Beethoven turned his back on the public, withdrawing into a private world to write string quartets purely for his own satisfaction. Nothing could be further from the truth. . . . It was public demand, filtered through a number of publishers, that fuelled this unprecedented burst of activity in a single genre" (pp.334–35). Lockwood's final (twenty-first) chapter bears the heading "Timeless Music: The Last Quartets," and his entry point is Karl Holz's 1857 reminiscences to Wilhelm von Lenz, published in the latter's *Beethoven: Eine Kunst-Studie*. Holz accounted for the

<sup>2.</sup> Alessandra Comini, *The Changing Image of Beethoven: A Study in Mythmaking* (New York: Rizzoli, 1987), pp.65 (Waldmüller), 47 (Stieler).

<sup>3.</sup> Thayer-Forbes, p.209.

existence of the last two Quartets, ops. 131 and 135, in terms of compositional overdrive following the three "Galitzin" works, ops. 127, 132, and 130: "Such a wealth of new quartet ideas streamed forth from Beethoven's inexhaustible imagination that he felt almost involuntarily compelled to write the C‡-minor and F-major quartets" (Holz/von Lenz, quoted in Lockwood, p.441). Lockwood comments that the five last quartets "belong to a special and rarefied plane of musical thought. . . . Holz's memoir reinforces the feeling, felt by listeners from Beethoven's time to ours, that the last quartets form a *summa* of his creativity, that they give access to higher regions of thought and feeling that lie beyond even his farthestreaching earlier achievements" (p.442).

What I mean to suggest by these comparisons is that the dust-jacket illustrations are, perhaps, the wrong way round: Cooper's Beethoven seems more that of (Comini's) Waldmüller, Lockwood's that of (Comini's) Stieler. Lockwood himself draws an analogy with portraiture in describing the relationship of his own book to the work of other scholars, among whom he names Cooper. When a number of artists paint the same sitter, "despite certain obvious resemblances, the differences will outweigh the similarities. For no matter how faithfully painters work to present their subjects, they also present themselves. . . . Since this book springs primarily from my experience of the music, it inevitably reflects my own viewpoint and interests" (p.xviii). Thus it is not surprising to find Lockwood, an accomplished cellist, giving considerable weight to the cello sonatas and Beethoven's use of that instrument (the general index contains an entry for "cello music and writing"), while Cooper's study offers a wealth (some might think an excess) of detail on Beethoven's folk-song settings, a subject on which a decade ago he contributed a major monograph.<sup>4</sup>

What I do *not* mean to suggest is that Lockwood is guilty of uncritical reliance on biographical cliché in contrast to Cooper's more skeptical, fact-conscious approach, or that Cooper's engagement with the music is more shallow than Lockwood's. Here are two major life-and-works studies by two of our most distinguished Beethoven scholars; each is writing primarily for a general readership, though each succeeds in distilling within his narrative the essence of a remarkable quantity of the vast amount of specialist research that Beethoven and his music continue to inspire. The learning is only more lightly worn in Cooper's case, inasmuch as his is a decidedly "Select bibliography" (Appendix D, pp.389–95) in comparison to Lockwood's (pp.559–78), and his footnotes, too, are considerably fewer and more con-

4. Barry Cooper, Beethoven's Folksong Settings: Chronology, Sources, Style (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

cise than Lockwood's endnotes.<sup>5</sup> These features, as also the Calendar, List of Works, and Personalia (Appendices A–C, pp.351–87), are series requirements of the venerable British "Master Musicians" volumes, among which Cooper's takes its place as successor to the earlier 1984 *Beethoven* by Denis Matthews. Lockwood's book is not series-dependent, though it too offers a synoptic "Chronology" (pp.551–58). Music examples are scarce in both texts, though Lockwood's is supplemented by a bank of further examples accessible on a Web site associated with the book and maintained by the publishers (such examples are cued into the text by a parenthetical "\*W" followed by a number). Norton has been more generous than Oxford University Press in the provision of illustrations, too, though the quality of reproduction is not always exemplary.

As his preface and the subtitle "The Music and the Life" make clear, Lockwood's primary concern is with Beethoven's music; the "aim is to present his life mainly through his development as a composer, rather than to devote each chapter to a biographical narrative combined with a partial overview of his artistic growth" (p.xv).<sup>6</sup> Chapters are routinely divided into subsections with individual headings

5. It is not in the spirit of this review-article doggedly to list omissions and minor factual inaccuracies or disagreements, but a few observations may be in order here. Each author cites the other's publications respectively in his bibliography. Cooper includes no index entry for Lockwood, while Lockwood's sole entry for Cooper refers to the latter's "quixotic project" to promote "a speculative 'realization'" of the first movement of the Tenth Symphony (pp.548-49). Given Lockwood's extensive discussion of the Ninth Symphony (pp.411-40), it is surprising to find no reference to either Nicholas Cook, Beethoven: Symphony No.9 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993), or Esteban Buch, La Neuvième de Beethoven: Une histoire politique (Paris; Gallimard, 1999), all the more so given Lockwood's subsection (pp.413-17) entitled "The Political Background of the Ninth." Cooper's citations of Beethoven's correspondence are "for convenience" (p.ix) to the Anderson edition, though her translations have been modified where necessary in consultation with the German text of Brandenburg. Lockwood cites primarily Brandenburg, cross-referencing to Anderson as appropriate. He also references the second (1998) edition of Solomon's well-known biography, whereas Cooper cites only the original (1977) publication. Lockwood dates WoO 14 to "winter of 1800-1801" (p.141), while Cooper argues for "the end of 1801" (p.111). On pp.148-49 Cooper recounts an occasion on which Beethoven improvised on an idea from a Pleyel quartet and gives the date as 1805, with no further explanation. Lockwood (p.285) quotes Czerny as dating the incident to "1808 or 1810"; but in Carl Czerny, Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben, ed. Walter Kolneder (Strasbourg: P. H. Heitz, 1968), pp.45-46, the dates are 1808 or 1809 (Lockwood cites a different, related source [p.525, nn.11-12]). CB currently runs to eleven volumes, not ten (see Cooper, p.389, though vol. 11 was not published until after his book had appeared). Finally, Wordsworth wrote "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive" (cf. Lockwood, p.70).

6. Cooper, by contrast, promises "more emphasis on biography" (p.viii), though he is here comparing his study to Konrad Küster, *Beethoven* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1994); and William Kinderman, *Beethoven* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995). that may refer specifically to compositions ("The Second Symphony"; "Oratorio and Mass") or to broader biographical and historical contexts ("Napoleon and Self-Made Greatness"; "Beethoven's Knowledge of Bach and Handel"). The overall organization is broadly chronological, the book's four parts spanning the years 1770– 92, 1792–1802, 1802–12, and 1813–27. Internally, however, the chronological thread of each part occasionally gets tangled, as when, for example, the opening of chapter 15 (p.312) takes us back to 1806 and the "Razumovsky" Quartets, whereas the Seventh and Eighth Symphonies and some contemporaneous works had been discussed some eighty-odd pages earlier (pp.230*ff*.). Similarly, while a subsection on "The Late Bagatelles" (pp.395–99) following on a discussion of the "Diabelli" Variations raises no eyebrows, one is disconcerted to find the discussion of the Bagatelles beginning with op.33, the origins of which reach back to the 1780s.

Nonetheless, the four-part division advertises the extent to which Lockwood's picture of Beethoven's development adheres closely to the conventional early-, middle-, and late-period one, with the early period divided between the Bonn and Vienna years (Lockwood also posits a "second Bonn period" from 1787 on [p.62]). Yet one of the most striking aspects of Lockwood's book is its general avoidance of the language of "periodization" in favor of the concept of "maturities": the "first maturity" covers the years 1792-1802, the "second maturity" 1802-12, and the "final maturity" 1813-27. As far as I can tell, Lockwood offers no theoretical defense of this conception or its nomenclature. While any comprehensive study of Beethoven must inevitably confront the issues of periodization and style (and "style"-particularly "late style"—is prominent in Lockwood's vocabulary: see particularly pp. 346-48), and while Lockwood properly cautions against a too-simplistic association between biography, style change, and individual compositions (see p.125 for the well-made suggestion that the "revolutionary features" of the Eroica Symphony "are subtly foreshadowed by path-breaking works written in the preceding five years"), I find the idea of successive "maturities" problematic in two senses. First, maturity implies a teleology: it is the culmination of a preceding period of maturation. Once reached, it may indeed be sustained for some considerable time (we generally think of ourselves as "reaching maturity" in our mid or late teens, and-equally generally-maintaining it thereafter). But I am unclear as to whether Beethoven's "maturities," in Lockwood's view, are meant to indicate stable periods of "mature" composition (in which case, where shall we locate the process of maturation leading to the "second" or the "third maturity," each of which follows directly upon its predecessor?7), or whether the term is meant to signal a *period* of

7. It becomes clear in his text that Lockwood regards 1813–17 as a "twilight zone" separating the "second" from the "third maturity": see p.333 and further below.

maturation, reaching a point of perfection at its end (a notion that would itself trail difficulties in its wake).

A second implication would seem to be that all works within a given "maturity" are equally "mature"; yet Lockwood appears to deny this himself when in his "overview" of the "first maturity" he writes convincingly of the shift from an "aesthetic of gratification to that of involvement" (p.173), which took place in relation to musical experience at the end of the eighteenth century, and he goes on to characterize Beethoven's output during this period as made up of works "written for worldly success, in which he aimed . . . not to shock patrons or listeners too radically," alongside "works that show signs of higher imagination, though they were still designed to ingratiate," and then "Beethoven's really original compositions, those produced entirely from within. . . . In this main line are the works that show the younger Beethoven in his first maturity" (p.176).

"Maturity" crops up in a more conventional context at the very outset of the book. If Lockwood's text tends somewhat to play down the traditional tripartition of Beethoven's life and works, he offers one of his own, in the form of a prologue surveying "Youth, Maturity, [and] Old Age" through the medium of three letters: one from mid-September 1787 to Joseph Wilhelm Freiherr von Schaden; that of 17 July 1812 to "Miss Emilie M. at H."; and that of 7 December 1826 to Franz Gerhard Wegeler. Lockwood uses these three letters, the connecting thread between which is that of childhood (Beethoven writing as a child, to a child, and finally describing himself as "an old child"), not to identify stylistic change or rupture but rather to draw out psychological traits (the 1787 letter, "ostensibly about an unpaid debt, is an expression of pain and loss" [p.4]), to anchor some broad summaries of Beethoven's career and development, and finally to enter the caveat that the traditional three-period approach risks obscuring "the connections between works from different periods," not least those "between early and late works" (p.14).

Cooper's Contents page gives no hint of any distinction between overarching style periods whatever, and his text is largely free of such references; nonetheless, it emerges that he adheres essentially to the traditional years 1802 and ca.1815 as marking the emergence of middle- and late-period styles in general.<sup>8</sup> His eigh-

8. Cooper cautions that "to suggest that [Beethoven's] 'second period' began in 1802... is an oversimplification" (p.123), while acknowledging that it is not without some justification. While for Lockwood, it is in the Piano Sonata in A, op.101, that "the late style in all its fullness comes forth" (p.346), Cooper's choice, "if one had to identify the first work in this late style (a dangerously simplistic approach)," would fall on the "innovative and prophetic" Cello Sonata in C, op.102, no.1, "a clear harbinger of the style that was to pervade his music for the remainder of his life" (p.242). Other writers, notably Rosen, have seen the cluster of works composed in 1815–16 as more experimental,

teen chapters each bear a title and a parenthetical chronological span, ranging from thirteen years (1770-83) to several periods of just two years each. Titles occasionally highlight specific works (the Quartets, op. 18, and the First Symphony; the Missa solemnis, the Ninth Symphony), but more generally carry some biographical import ("Farewell to Bonn";"Immortal Beloved"). The approach is rigorously chronological from beginning to end, and Cooper deftly draws in evidence from the letters, sketchbooks, and (in the later chapters) the conversation books, to reinforce and amplify the biographical tale. True to the differing orientations of each book, Cooper touches on more of Beethoven's output, especially as regards the early works, than does Lockwood, with discussions of individual pieces arising as they occur in the narrative. Matters including the devaluation of the Viennese currency and its consequences for Beethoven's income are dealt with in scrupulous detail yet with admirable clarity; and Cooper's concern for ultra-precision comes through, for example, in his identification of many modern scholars' disregard of the consequences of Beethoven's birth date for calculations of his age:"Writers all too often refer to Beethoven's age in a particular year by deducting 1770 from that year, disregarding the fact that, for example, almost throughout 1780 he was only nine years old" (p.3).9

The guardianship struggle is an unavoidable biographical episode that Cooper sets out in considerable detail too, though a comparison of his and Lockwood's treatments of a minor figure, Johann Michael Sailer, in this context is illuminating. Cooper argues that the *Missa solemnis* reveals a shift in Beethoven's religious outlook, "which became more overtly Christian and less deistic during 1818–19, perhaps through the influence of Archduke Rudolph" (p.272). Sailer, "a renowned professor of theology and future bishop," is introduced in the following paragraph in the context of this shift, as Cooper examines at length the motivations and implications of the (abortive) plan to have Karl educated at Sailer's Catholic institution at Landshut and interprets the plan itself as a further indication of Beethoven's increased orthodoxy in religious matters. Lockwood, despite (or perhaps because of) his more work-based approach, barely notices Sailer's role in post-Enlightenment German Catholic theology, and particularly to his insistence "on

pointing beyond Beethoven's late style "to the generation that followed his death": Charles Rosen, *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven* (new edn. London: Faber and Faber, 1997), p.404.

<sup>9.</sup> See also the prefatory note to the Calendar (p.351) that, however, begins with Beethoven's baptism rather than his conception: compare *The Beethoven Compendium*, ed. Barry Cooper (London: Thames & Hudson, 1991), p.12.

the primacy of the individual believer's interior experience of faith and spirituality" (p.403). All this is then brought to bear on the *Missa* itself, as Lockwood speculates that "Beethoven's awareness of this new stress on individual experience in German Catholic worship may have helped to motivate the strong expressions of personal devotion that he employed . . . , such as his insertion of the personal exclamations 'O' and 'Ah' before certain clauses in the Gloria" (p.405).<sup>10</sup>

Lurking behind all this is the thorny issue of the relationship between life and works, to which Lockwood dedicates a subsection (pp.15-21) of his prologue. Acknowledging the skeptical views taken by Tovey and Dahlhaus, he nonetheless asserts that "the theory of an absolute separation [of life and works] is self-defeating and will not hold"; but he withdraws from theorizing a specific relationship between musical structures and biographical detail, merely suggesting that "we can acknowledge that deeply rooted elements in the creative individual's personality, angle of vision, speech habits, interactions with people, and ways of dealing with the world find resonance in many of the artist's works" (p. 19). Drawing the sketchbooks into the argument, he focuses on the "dazzling contrast between quotidian disorder and artistic order, between utter carelessness in matters of [Beethoven's] daily life and fanatic zeal in preserving the record of his personal artistic history and seeing to the last detail in his work." This, for Lockwood, captures a "basic paradox. What Beethoven would have regarded as the essence of his life lay in the works themselves" (pp.20-21). Is this perhaps to evade the question? Cooper takes a similar line when, early on in his preface, he observes that "it might even be said that [Beethoven's] composing life was his real life, . . . whereas mundane activities of daily life were of marginal concern for him" (p.vii).<sup>11</sup> Both authors quite rightly distance themselves from any naive connection between life circumstances and artistic creation ("None of Beethoven's personal struggles of 1801 are evident in the music written that summer," writes Cooper [p.110], for example), though pre-

10. Persistently to note discrepancies and divergences in the two authors' treatments of a given figure or topic would be pointless, but in the present context readers might like to compare Lock-wood's and Cooper's comments on the inscription at the head of the Kyrie in the autograph of the *Missa* (Lockwood, pp.406–07; Cooper, pp.291–92). In particular, Lockwood's is the only account I can recall that notes the possible connection between the inscription and a sentence in E.T.A. Hoffmann's famous review of the Fifth Symphony.

11. Evasive or not, what we might call the "schwer gefasste Entschluss" reached here by both authors might plausibly trace its origin to Beethoven himself. As John Daverio points out in his review of Klaus Kropfinger, *Beethoven* (Kassel and Stuttgart: Bärenreiter and Metzler, 2001), "Beethoven practically willed the two domains [life and art] into a state of absolute unity: 'Live only in your art'": John Daverio, "The Dialectical Composer," *Beethoven Forum* 10 (2003), p.201. The reference is to entry no.88 in Beethoven's *Tagebuch* (Solomon, *Essays*, p.274).

sumably neither would dissent from an interpretation of Beethoven's compositional *per ardua* trajectories as artistic expressions of a particular and marked life attitude. This, at any rate, is how I understand Lockwood's "final thoughts" on the String Quartet in C# Minor, op.131: it is Beethoven's "final word on the ways in which the human soul, confronted by an implacable world, comes to terms with fate and mortality through struggle but at last through endurance and resignation" (p.488).

The life-and-works question, understood in terms of relating "Beethoven's personal life to his artistic evolution," intrudes once more when Lockwood turns to what, in his chapter 16, he terms "The 'Fallow'Years": "Except for the deafness crisis, no period in Beethoven's life has aroused more speculation than the years from 1813 to 1817" (p.333). The main problems are how to account for both the drop in quantity of output as well as the lapse in quality represented above all by works such as Wellingtons Sieg and Der Glorreiche Augenblick, described respectively as "far below Beethoven's normal standards, a shameless concession to the political wave of the moment" (pp. 337-38) and "a grotesque parody of his serious style" (p.340). Lockwood's strategy is to see the glass as half-full rather than half-empty: works like these are to "be set aside as negligible products" (p.347), and we should concentrate instead on seeing these years not as a lapse following a period of intense activity and success but rather as one "of quiet gestation in which the late style slowly emerges" (p. 333), in the Piano Sonata in E, op.90 and, more especially, that in A, op. 101; the Cello Sonatas, op. 102; and An die ferne Geliebte. The various biographical factors post-1812 need to be set alongside an artistic development, "his evolution toward the transcendental. . . . What has been seen as a 'fallow' period might be reconceived as a period of self-reconstruction, . . . in which a new composing personality within him was in process of emerging" (p.347).

Lockwood's fifteen or so pages on this "lengthy twilight zone between [Beethoven's] second and third maturities" (p.333) are matched by some forty in Cooper's account. More significantly, Cooper associates "declining productivity" only with the years 1815–17 (his chapter 14, pp.236–59), while discussing 1813–15 as Beethoven's "political phase" (chapter 13, pp.220–35). Works like the *Elegischer Gesang*, op.118, the *Abschiedsgesang*, WoO 102, and the cantata *Un lieto brindisi*, WoO 103, left unmentioned by Lockwood, are not just occasional works with odd scorings but also examples of Beethoven's constant search for "fresh challenges" (pp.231– 32). As for *Wellingtons Sieg*, Cooper argues that while it has been represented as both a masterpiece and "the nadir of Beethoven's compositional achievement," all this is to miss the point: "It is different in kind, designed to be entertaining rather than serious and sophisticated." Indeed, Cooper is happy to regard it as "highly imaginative and original" (p.226). And the drop in output is focused most sharply on the twelve-month period following the completion of op.101 in November 1816. While entertaining various explanations of Beethoven's inactivity—the effect of repressive censorship, domestic issues including his guardianship of his nephew, isolation from his friends—Cooper characteristically turns to the facts as provided "consistently and unequivocally by Beethoven himself" (p.254): numerous letters relate that he fell ill with a severe inflammatory fever, and that this was responsible for his failure to compose at his usual rate.

What sort of Beethoven does Cooper want? In challenging Solomon's view that Beethoven's creativity "came to a full stop" after the composition of the Violin Sonata in G, op.96,<sup>12</sup> he takes on board the common perception of a post-1812, post-unsterbliche Geliebte "crisis," indicated outwardly in Beethoven's use of prostitutes, lack of personal hygiene, antisocial behavior, and so on. As Cooper points out, lack of attention to his appearance or concern for table manners were hardly specific to this period of Beethoven's life. As for the prostitutes, the issue turns mainly on the well-known references to "fortresses" (Festungen) in a series of letters to Zmeskall. Cooper traces the origins of the claim to the work of Editha and Richard Sterba on the guardianship struggle:<sup>13</sup> it is a "hypothesis [which] has been far too readily and widely accepted" (p.223).<sup>14</sup> Maybe so, and I admit that my repeated efforts to trace in any early-nineteenth-century German dictionary a colloquial definition of Festung that would support the Sterbas' interpretation have so far come to nought. But some of Cooper's attempts to refute the meaning imputed to the Zmeskall correspondence seem to me to be almost wilfully naive and insistent on an overly literal reading, for example, when he asks how Zmeskall might be "wounded near' certain' fortresses," or wonders why Beethoven would describe him as "Proprietor, Governor, Pasha of various rotten fortresses' unless he actually ran a brothel, for which there is no evidence" (p.223).

The truth or otherwise of this particular interpretation is in any case not my main concern. Rather, I get the impression that notwithstanding his unwavering and laudable concern for factual accuracy, Cooper fervently does not *want* Beethoven to be writing about prostitutes here, because it would upset the image he seeks to create.<sup>15</sup> That Beethoven was basically good, kind, and of underlying no-

12. Solomon, Beethoven (1977), p.219, quoted in Cooper, p.222.

14. I take Lockwood to be referring to this and similar claims when he writes curtly that "Beethoven's relations with women have become the stuff of endless speculation, some of it poignant and some of it prurient" (p.196).

15. See also p.277 for a further dismissal of sexual innuendo, though in drawing attention to his conclusions in these cases I intend no imputation of prudishness toward Cooper (or Lockwood).

<sup>13.</sup> Editha and Richard Sterba, Beethoven and His Nephew (New York: Pantheon, 1954).

ble motives I am happy to accept. But Cooper seems on occasion to go out of his way to deflect any baser instincts whatever. Thus Beethoven's treatment of Steibelt at an improvisation contest, while insensitive, is excusable on the grounds that to have behaved differently in these circumstances would have been "hypocritical" (p.92); in other situations, "as always, he [Beethoven] demanded from both himself and others that same nobility of intent that permeates his music" (p.142); "he could be magnanimous even when angry!" (p.202); "Beethoven was clearly more sinned against than sinning" (p.228). As for his treatment of Johanna, "no doubt his actions will continue to be criticized by those who do not share, or even understand, his high ideals. His behaviour . . . can be seen—like his music—as a reflection of his lofty ambitions, his high moral principles, and ultimately, his underlying religious beliefs and devotion to God" (p.256).

If this last sentence encapsulates, from the perspective of the life, the essence of the relationship between life and works in Cooper's understanding, then the other side of the coin can be seen in his vaunting of the place of unity as a compositional aim in the music. Again and again, from the discussion of the Piano Concerto in C, op.15 onward (see pp.54–55), Cooper emphasizes Beethoven's mastery of long-range tonal, motivic, and thematic connection and transformation; even the rarely discussed "Namensfeier" Overture, op.115, is redeemed through its demonstrating Beethoven's "customary skill in motivic manipulation, with a two-note falling figure heard in the first bar of both the slow introduction and the main Allegro being developed in all kinds of ingenious ways, even to the extent of generating the second subject" (p.234). The Piano Sonatas, op.10, nos.1 and 2, show Beethoven "exploring the concept of the hyper-work, where not only a movement but now a whole sonata is related to something outside itself, while being fully self-contained" (p.74). Not all readers will be consistently convinced by Cooper's examples, though in highlighting this element of his commentary I do not in any way mean to suggest that I regard the techniques at issue as anything other than central in many respects to Beethoven's compositional means. That said, I also want to stress the increasing importance of a drive towards "disunity," or the confrontation of opposites, particularly in much of the late music. Cooper is alive to this tendency too; in terminology no doubt derived from Kerman's book on the quartets,<sup>16</sup> he tends to write of "dissociation" and "integration." But he is uncomfortable with dissociation tout court: even the Fantasia, op.77, evinces "a sense of gradual progress from instability to stability" and reveals a degree of "motivic cohesion" (p.187), while in the case of the neue Kraft fühlend episodes of the Heiliger

16. Kerman, Quartets, pp. 303ff.

*Dankgesang* in op.132, the absolute contrast between these and the modal theme and variations "becomes the unifying factor of the movement: *the dissociation is the integration*" (p.329; my emphasis). Just as Beethoven's human actions and reactions, however seemingly inexcusable, are ultimately justifiable by appeal to some nobler principle, so the discontinuities and fissures in the music always yield finally to a higher unity.

To suggest that some of Beethoven's late music, at least, might require us to accept disunity as aesthetically valid is to invoke the thought of Adorno, whose work on Beethoven has gained in prominence in what Lockwood elsewhere has called "our current age of artistic fragmentation and intellectual instability."17 Given its intended readership, it is no criticism to say that Cooper's book makes no mention of Adorno. Lockwood does draw on his work in a handful of instances, and despite the occasional implicit agreement (see pp.215-16), one soon senses an underlying antagonism: following an outline of motivic unification in the Credo of the Missa solemnis, he holds up this aspect of the movement as one that "argue[s] against the view of Theodor Adorno, for whom the Missa solemnis is an 'alienated masterpiece' whose surface fragmentation is symptomatic of inner conflicts in the work that point to Beethoven's increasing disillusionment with the ideals of the Enlightenment" (p.409). The point resonates with an earlier one, where to "the divided, self-conscious, modernist outlook that Adorno brought to bear on Beethoven, on music, and on art as a whole" Lockwood responds that "to his pessimism there is no final response except that provided by listeners and musicians who seem to arise in every new generation and regard works such as the Eroica and the 'Emperor' Concerto as among their most significant personal experiences. Listeners accept them not as antiquated expressions of a political idealism that has been cruelly banished by history, but as evocations of the human possibilities that might be realized in a better world" (p.251). In a similar vein, Lockwood wants us to accept the Ninth Symphony as having been "written to revive a lost idealism" (p.422): the claim comes in a section on "Changing Views of the Ninth" in which Adorno again appears, along with (predictably enough) Susan McClary and others. Here, in one of the

17. See, for example, Theodor W. Adorno, *Beethoven: The Philosophy of Music*, ed. Rolf Tiedemann, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998); Daniel K. L. Chua, *The 'Galitzin' Quartets of Beethoven: Opp.127, 132, 130* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1995); James Parsons, "Pour the Sweet Milk of Concord into Hell:'Theories of Unity and Disunity in Late Beethoven," *Music Analysis* 18 (1999), 127–42; and Lewis Lockwood, "Recent Writings on Beethoven's Late Quartets," *Beethoven Forum* 9 (2002), 84–99: the quotation in the text is from p.84, where it continues: "Beethoven's last quartets remain a lofty testament to *completeness and fulfillment* that is felt by musicians and laymen alike" (my emphasis).

most passionately argued passages in the whole book—and lengthy quotation is unavoidable—we read:

In fact, against the strong, totally committed forms of ideological interpretation in the current phase of ascendant "cultural studies," in which modern political and social content is read into every work of art or literature, there is no recourse or final court of appeal; to a convinced ideologue, objections are simply the product of an opposed ideology and cannot possess any special claim to "truth," a word that can now be used in some critical circles only with quotation marks.

Accordingly, those looking for ground to stand on outside ideology may be able to do so only by recommitting themselves to analysis, which concerns itself exclusively with the structural, or recommitting to history, that is, to understanding the Ninth not as a disembodied art product out of time and space, but as the work of an artist living in a particular period and context, who carried out a project that had personal meanings that we can reconstruct from the accumulated debris that has covered his tracks since then (pp.420–21).

Credo, credo . . .

Lockwood's position could hardly be clearer. But his espousal of the concept of "dualism" suggests at least that he might be more prepared than Cooper to entertain a tension between dissociation and integration, or a play of opposites in Beethoven's music, that cannot necessarily be resolved into a unitary whole. Lockwood identifies "aesthetic dualism" between contrasting pairs of works (the Fifth and Sixth Symphonies, or the Piano Trios, op.70, for example),<sup>18</sup> as well as between movements of individual works, the "most palpable examples" of which are the twomovement Piano Sonatas, ops. 54, 78, and 90 (p.467).<sup>19</sup> He appears less inclined to use the term in relation to those individual movements in which Beethoven ex-

18. The Trios op.70 might themselves be considered as a "parallel" to the Piano Sonatas, op.27, and therefore as further examples of the "quasi una fantasia" genre. I treat this question in rather more detail in my article "'*Haydn's Geist aus Beethovens Händen*'? Fantasy and Farewell in the Quartet in Eb, Op.74," in *The String Quartets of Beethoven*, ed. William Kinderman (Champaign: University of Il-linois Press, forthcoming).

19. It is notable that Lockwood omits op.111 here; nor does he mention dualism in the subsection devoted to this last sonata (pp.388–91). Also absent is any reference to Lawrence Kramer's concept of "expressive doubling" in these sonatas: see Lawrence Kramer, *Music as Cultural Practice, 1800– 1900* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: U California P, 1990), pp.21–71. plores—and in my view, maintains—an opposition of radically different kinds of material. Perhaps the most telling examples—and recall Lockwood's alertness to those "parallel connections between youth and old age in [Beethoven's] artistic development" (p.14)—are to be found in the early and late works: the second movement of op.18, no.2; the finale (incorporating *La malinconia*) of op.18, no.6; the finale of op.29;<sup>20</sup> the slow movement of the Ninth Symphony, and the *Heiliger Dankgesang* of op.132; the first movements of ops.132 and 130. But I would like to focus briefly on a middle-period example, in a work that routinely receives less attention than it merits: the first movement of the Piano Sonata in F, op.54.

As already noted, Lockwood reads a dualistic relationship between the two movements of op.54 and furthermore sees it as similarly related as a whole to the preceding "Waldstein" Sonata, op. 53 (p.467). For Cooper, "op. 54 is best viewed as the valley between the mountains of the 'Waldstein' and the 'Appassionata'"; its lack of popularity he puts down to the absence of "a very strong character, unusually energetic or thrusting rhythms, and striking melodies"; in consequence, op. 54, which Cooper compares to the Triple Concerto, op. 56, "seem[s] rather tame and laid-back," though by no means lacking in originality. Of the form of the first movement, he writes that it "resembles a simple rondo with coda, but the refrains are increasingly decorated, while the two episodes use the same material as each other and are very unequal in length-45 bars and 12 bars respectively" (p.139). He notes, too, the opposition of dotted and triplet rhythms, and their reconciliation in the coda. Lockwood's main discussion of op. 54 comes in a subsection devoted to Cooper's mountains, the "Waldstein" and "Appassionata" Sonatas. Opus 54 is the "diminutive sibling" (p.295) of op.53, its "aesthetic double." He does not comment on its form beyond pointing out that the direction "Tempo di Menuetto" means not minuet form but rather "the character and manner of the minuet [adapted] to a larger form that resembles a rondo" (p.296).<sup>21</sup>

That the movement works on a dualistic opposition of materials is plainly evident, even if from m. 137 onward an accommodation is found between the righthand dotted figures and the left-hand pedal triplets. The appeal to rondo form is by no means irrelevant; but one of the fascinations of this movement is the play of formal references throughout. The first triplet episode (mm. 25*ff.*) may initially be

20. The String Quintet in C, op.29, is discussed not by Lockwood but by Cooper, who characteristically explains the "wholly unexpected insertion" into the finale of an A-major "minuet-style passage" as having been prepared by the tonally irregular A-major second subject of the first movement: see pp.110–11.

21. Lockwood's principal analytical comment on the first movement concerns the long-range implications of the subdominant-orientated first phrase: see p.296 and p.526, n.39. The heading of the first movement of op.54 reads "In tempo d'un Menuetto," as Lockwood makes clear.

entertained as a grotesque trio; the embellished returns of the "rondo theme" (mm.1-24) clearly allude to variation form, thereby suggesting a parallel with movements such as the Heiliger Dankgesang and the slow movement of the Ninth Symphony (as well as to Haydn's "double variation" movements). Nor should we ignore the extent to which the movement, for all its quirks, may be read against the conventions of sonata form, which generic expectations would most immediately "predict" for a first movement at this period. Central to this reading is the recognition that mm.25-69 need not be regarded as a single, unarticulated formal section. The brief cessation of motion on the second beat of m. 38, following the establishment of the dominant key, may be understood as the end of a sonata-form "exposition"; a "development" now ensues, beginning with previously heard material (the "second subject," mm.25ff.) now transposed to an unexpected key (V/ Ab) and undergoing further tonal adventures, moving subdominant-ward through Ab to Db (m. 58), which, as VI, then falls to a dominant pedal to prepare the "recapitulation" at m.70. The "second subject" is recapitulated at m.94 and remains firmly rooted in the tonic, its twelve-measure length now more nearly balancing its fourteen-measure "exposition" exemplar. It is at this point that the sonata-form model goes awry, as a third return (a second "recapitulation?") to the "first group" ensues in m.106: despite the embellishment and extension from m.129 onward, the structural fidelity here to mm. 1-24 weakens any argument that we might take m.106 as the beginning of a forty-nine-measure coda.

It is *not* that the movement is or is not "in" this or that form. What I take to be significant about the first movement of op.54 is precisely the extent to which Beethoven succeeds in holding in tension a range of opposed and sometimes contradictory formal markers across a musical surface that most obviously foregrounds a dualistic conflict. Is there a biographical correlative here? Reflecting on Klaus Kropfinger's approach to the life-and-works conundrum, John Daverio noted Kropfinger's "highly qualified" suggestion that the "musical facts" we are offered in Beethoven's works "might represent 'the musically and prismatically refracted reflex of his multi-layered, complex, conflict-laden and yet at the same time harmony-craving personality'."<sup>22</sup> Does not Lockwood's "basic paradox" (p.21), that "dazzling contrast between quotidian disorder and artistic order" (p.20), advert to another dualistic relationship? Or is it indeed the case that "[musical] facts are al-ways misleading"?

"We are all of us made up of many lives, most of them unlived." Opus 54 could be thought to represent what Nicholas Cook, writing recently of *Wellingtons Sieg*,

22. Daverio, "The Dialectical Composer," p.203.

and *Der glorreiche Augenblick*, calls "The Other Beethoven."<sup>23</sup> Although unquestionably more canonical by comparison, op.54 nonetheless seems one of those works destined always to be the bridesmaid, never the bride—or perhaps "best man, never the groom" might better suit the conventionally "masculine" context of the "Waldstein" and the "Appassionata."What I see in Lockwood's and Cooper's magisterial accounts is "certainly a picture of Beethoven"; which is ineluctably to say, a *particular* Beethoven. In the main, the Beethoven I see more than any other is the one we have come to know as "Beethoven Hero."<sup>24</sup> To court cliché in driving home the pictorial analogy, both authors have stripped away from the surface some of the accumulated layers of varnish and grime, as well as doing the necessary repair work and touching-up, so that the likeness, although unmistakable, is nevertheless changed. How *true* a likeness? "Only in the stories we invent can we be sure of getting closer to truth."<sup>25</sup>

23. Nicholas Cook, "The Other Beethoven: Heroism, the Canon, and the Works of 1813–14," 19CM 27 (2003), 3–24.

24. Compare Scott Burnham, *Beethoven Hero* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1995), p.110: "Beethoven's music is heard as the voice of Music itself," with Cooper, p.349: "Beethoven is still in many ways the central figure in Western music." Lockwood admittedly seeks a broader, more nuanced concept of heroism: see his p.516, n.14 for a brief response to Burnham, including a plea for consideration of those "other" works, excluded because they "do not fit," as also his "Beethoven, Florestan, and the Varieties of Heroism," in *Beethoven and His World*, ed. Scott Burnham and Michael P. Steinberg (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000), pp.27–47.

25. Jeanette Winterson, *The Times*, 20 March 2004, p.26. Here and in the epigraph, Winterson is writing of the creation of fictional selves in cyberspace, but her remarks seem no less relevant to some of the issues discussed above.

# The Literary Beethoven

Robin Wallace

Angelika Corbineau-Hoffmann. *Testament und Totenmaske: Der literarische Mythos des Ludwig van Beethoven*. Hildesheim: Weidmann, 2000. [ii], 400 pp.

Beethoven, shut up with the four walls of his deafness, rehearsing the unhearable *semplice e cantabile*, somehow reconstituting the blister shirt of the intolerable into these shakes and triplets, a hurrying into flowering along the fencerows: dying, for my father, came to be like that finally—in its messages the levitation of serenity, as though the spirit might aspire, in its last act, to walk on air.

—Amy Clampitt, "Beethoven, Opus 111" (from *The Kingfisher*, 1983)

my Clampitt's poem, in which Beethoven becomes a *Doppelgänger* of the poet's dead father, a twentieth-century midwestern farmer whom he neither met nor imagined, is a recent example of an approach to Beethoven and his music that extends in an unbroken continuum back to the composer's lifetime. The connection between op.III and the theme of mortality—a theme foregrounded by Angelika Corbineau-Hoffmann's choice of title—can likewise be traced back to the earliest years of the work's reception. A review that appeared in the *Berliner allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* in 1824, two years after the sonata's publication and well before Beethoven's death, featured a (probably fictional) conversation between the authorial persona (an anonymous critic) and a young musician.<sup>1</sup> "Edward" describes the content of the second movement as follows:

Do not the harmonies of the theme already swell like the mournful music borne through the night from the funeral procession [Beethoven's] rolling on in the distance? . . . Now the first troop of those who accompany the corpse. . . . Memory takes us back to the deathbed. Through the continuous humming of the bells I once again hear the last laboring breaths of the dying one. Confusedly, and then ever more clearly, angel voices sound for him through the night in the delirium of his last hours. Children's songs lull from above, like the trilling of the lark in the highest blue of the ether. . . . And the whole earth mourns the misunderstood favorite, and everywhere can be heard the death knell; gentle laments, sad memories, thankful, loving celebrations accompany him to his resting place.

The author, however, is unmoved, describing his own reaction to Edward's performance of the work in more skeptical terms: "How difficult it was for me to wait for the end—and how—yes, I will admit it, how dumbfounded must I have appeared when I finally found that Edward had stopped and called out not from displeasure, but rather that the young man, who was now bathed in tears, pale and disheveled, was that deeply affected by this—this chaos of sounds."

The *BamZ* article is, at the very least, disingenuous; its author, A. B. Marx, would probably have agreed more with the young student than with his fictional interrogator. The dichotomy that Marx presents, though, was a familiar one by the 1820s. Those who could verbalize their experience of Beethoven (particularly of challenging new works like this one) were likely to be deeply moved, while those who listened with a more skeptical ear ("What nonsense cannot be forced upon a composition," says Marx's critic, "that the composer himself may never have thought of?") might hear only unmusical noise.

Thus, the implicit methodological question raised by the statement with which Corbineau-Hoffmann begins this fascinating and frustrating book—"It is a strange project to write a book about Beethoven, who had so little to do with words, from the perspective of literary studies, specifically that of comparative literature" (p. I)—

1. Adolf Bernhard Marx, "Rezension: Brief eines Rezensenten an den Redakteur," *Berliner allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 1 (17 March 1824), 95–99.
is a rhetorical one only. History shows that Beethoven's music has always been closely associated with words, and so the value of this book is clear a priori.

Corbineau-Hoffmann is a professor of comparative literature at the University of Leipzig. She has established a reputation for her work on Proust and is the author of books on a wide range of topics, from introductory texts to detailed analytical studies.<sup>2</sup> It is no surprise, therefore, to find her writing a book whose sole topic is the "nonsense" that can be forced upon Beethoven's compositions, bringing order to that chaos of sounds. This is not a book, though, that English speakers whose primary interest is in Beethoven's music will readily read. For one thing, it is densely and repetitiously written, with genuine insights sharing space with belaborings of the obvious (e.g., among very many, "Fiction finds the boundaries of its freedom in the facts of history" [p.203];"The way and manner in which Beethoven speaks about himself . . . does not in any way have to correspond to the image that his contemporaries received of him and transmitted to us" [p.80]; "Insofar as music arises from the person, it is lived and suffered through in the process of creation" [p. 166]). For another, as K. M. Knittel has already pointed out, Corbineau-Hoffmann's musical and biographical references are problematic,<sup>3</sup> and there is nothing in this book to demonstrate that her understanding of music is anything more than rudimentary. Indeed, only about a half dozen Beethoven compositions are mentioned in more than passing.

Corbineau-Hoffmann does not, however, profess to be writing about music: hence her opening disclaimer. The title of her introductory chapter, "Why Beethoven?", is borrowed from Leonard Bernstein, who posed that question in an "imaginary conversation" originally published in *The Joy of Music.*<sup>4</sup> As Corbineau-Hoffmann summarizes Bernstein's argument: "The technical ability of the composer and the formal qualities of his music cannot explain the fascination that Beethoven exerts. . . . It is not hard to recognize that at this point musical analysis

2. See Angelika Corbineau-Hoffmann, *Beschreibung als Verfahren: Die Ästhetik des Objekts im Werk Marcel Prousts* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1980), *Marcel Proust* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1983), *Einführung in die Komparistik* (Berlin: Eric Schmidt, 2000), *Kleine Literatur der Großstadt* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003), and many other titles.

3. K. M. Knittel, Review of *Testament und Totenmaske: Das literarische Mythos des Ludwig van Beethoven* in ML 83 (November 2002), 625. Knittel points out that Corbineau-Hoffmann erroneously describes Johann van Beethoven as the older of Beethoven's two brothers and the "Heilige Dankgesang" as the slow movement of op.130. Corbineau-Hoffmann also seems unaware that the familiar Hoffmann essay on Beethoven's instrumental music, which she discusses at length, is based not just on that author's review of the Fifth Symphony, but on that of the Piano Trios, op.70, as well.

4. Leonard Bernstein, The Joy of Music (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1959), pp.21-29.

has finally shown its inability to explain the 'Beethoven phenomenon:' here we attain to myth; the question: Why Beethoven? comes into its own" (p.4).

That is not exactly what Bernstein said, though. His claim, rather, was that Beethoven's music has a kind of internal integrity that eludes simplistic conceptions of musical form. "Why Beethoven?", which Corbineau-Hoffmann seems to know only in German translation, was originally paired with another "imaginary conversation," "What Do You Mean, Meaning?", in which Bernstein tackled that vexing issue head-on, coming down on the side of an essentially Hanslickian formalism. "Music, of all the arts, stands in a special region, unlit by any star but its own, and utterly without meaning . . . without any meaning, that is, except its own, a meaning in musical terms, not in terms of words, which inhabit an altogether different mental climate."<sup>5</sup>

What will disturb musical readers most about Corbineau-Hoffmann's book is the implicit claim that the "literarische Mythos" defines (insofar as he can be defined) not only the real Beethoven, but the only one that matters. For example, the influence of the Heiligenstadt Testament (the "Testament" of the book's title; "Totenmaske" seems to be used metaphorically to refer to the understanding of Beethoven that has accumulated since his death) on later perceptions of Beethoven is undeniable. The fact, though, that this, along with the "unsterbliche Geliebte" letter and a few others, is the only creative work of Beethoven that the author discusses with any insight, leaves some important questions annoyingly begged. Is Corbineau-Hoffmann really suggesting not only that Beethoven, though perhaps inadvertently, was primus inter pares among the creators of the "literarische Mythos," but that his having written these personal communications did more to set the course of his reputation than did all the creative energy he put into composing music? Was Leonard Bernstein wrong to suggest that the question "Why Beethoven?" could ultimately be answered internally, in terms of the quality of the music and without regard to the various interpretations that have been placed upon it (important though these latter may be)?

That these questions could even be raised is a corollary of the fact that Corbineau-Hoffmann is writing not just about Beethoven's reputation in literature, but about his literary mythos. *Mythos* in German does not have the facile connotations that its literal equivalent—myth—has acquired in English; it is not a synonym for "falsehood." Corbineau-Hoffmann follows Lévi-Strauss in suggesting that the function of myth is to set forth an essentially irreconcilable contradiction, making

5. Ibid., p.33.

the "Arbeit am Mythos" that is her central theme into an ongoing labor of Sisyphus, whose ultimate resolution is unobtainable, even undesirable (p.25).

Thus her book differs in kind from its most direct predecessor, Donna Ann Beckage's 1977 comparative literature dissertation *Beethoven in Western Literature*.<sup>6</sup> The avowed purpose of that work was to survey the "dozens of literary authors, some well known, some relatively obscure, whose interest in Beethoven had somehow manifested itself in their writings."<sup>7</sup> Corbineau-Hoffmann is at once more and less inclusive than Beckage. While dwelling on an international repertory of familiar works like Huxley's *Point Counter Point* and Mann's *Doktor Faustus*, she makes no mention of Anthony Burgess, E. M. Forster, Milan Kundera, or E. T. A. Hoffmann's writings about Kapellmeister Kreisler, to name just a few obvious omissions. Although she discusses literary characters apparently modeled on Beethoven—most notably Mann's Adrian Leverkühn—she completely ignores Shaw's Owen Jack.

On the other hand, Corbineau-Hoffmann gives considerable attention to a genre of writing that fell entirely outside of Beckage's purview: that of commemorative eulogies (Gedenkreden). In a lengthy chapter, she shows how speakers from Grillparzer through H. H. Stuckenschmidt (in a 1970 radio address) took advantage of particularly significant dates to recast the Beethoven mythology, and even try to undo it. "Does insight into the myths of the past really hinder the formation of myths in the present?", she asks in reference to Dominik Hartmann's "Beethoven Ruhm: Versuch einer Entmythologisierung" of 1970, and in this case the question is almost certainly rhetorical. Much of the material of this chapter is little known to English speakers, not just because of the linguistic barrier, but because it focuses on issues of German nationality. In particular, the crucial dates of 1870 and 1920 represent antipodes in the history of German national pride and self-awareness, with the latter date likewise inspiring very different responses by Hugo von Hofmannsthal and Arnold Schering. Hofmannsthal, as Corbineau-Hoffmann acknowledges, "was neither a great expert on music nor a particular devotee of Beethoven" and preferred Austrian musicians like Mozart, Haydn, and Johann Strauss (p.131), while Schering saw the composer as the avatar of a spiritual German identity that transcended political boundaries (p.137).

Corbineau-Hoffmann also makes an unusual distinction. She devotes a section of the book to literary works that present Beethoven and his music: a category that

<sup>6.</sup> See Donna Ann Beckage, *Beethoven in Western Literature* (Ph.D. diss., University of California at Riverside, 1977).

<sup>7.</sup> Ibid., p.1.

ranges from Hoffmann's criticism to a variety of stories, poems, and plays in which Beethoven appears as a character or his music is described (e.g., Wagner's *Eine Pilgerfahrt zu Beethoven*, Dieter Kühn's *Beethoven und der schwarze Geiger*, Lenau's "Beethovens Büste"). She then goes on to discuss literary compositions in which Beethoven is "composed" (the scare quotes are hers) in literary terms. It is here that we encounter Tolstoy's *Kreutzer Sonata*, Gide's *Symphonie pastorale*, and Michel Butor's *Dialogue avec trente-trois variations de Ludwig van Beethoven sur une valse de Diabelli*, among many others. Each work chosen by Corbineau-Hoffmann, including some fairly bizarre ones like Gert Jonke's "Theatersonate" *Sanftwut oder der Ohrenmaschinist* (but not his *Opus 111: Ein Klavierstück*), is discussed in considerable, sometimes tediously repetitious (musical?) detail, resulting in a book consisting of nearly 400 closely printed pages.

What are musicians interested in Beethoven to make of this mass of literary and mythic material? "Beethoven ist ein Mythos," writes Martin Geck in a monograph cited by Corbineau-Hoffmann in her final chapter. The quote continues:

Admittedly, this circumstance . . . is at the same time an exciting challenge: The fact that life, thought and creative work are woven together as with scarcely any other great composer, and that the works that arose from them are as self-contained as they are in need of interpretation, makes new mental efforts continually necessary in order to understand the phenomenon of music in its tension between subject and object (p.360).

There are certainly indications that Corbineau-Hoffmann has tried to respond to this challenge as directly as possible. Her book itself is laid out as a four-movement "symphony," with a Grave introductory section followed by an Allegro con fuoco, an Andante maestoso, a Scherzo allegretto and an Allegro con moto. There is also an intermezzo (Ritardando molto affettuoso) halfway through the book and a coda (no separate tempo indication) at the end, and the whole is framed by an introduction and conclusion, presumably in mere prose. The idea of giving each section a tempo indication seems to derive from Glauco Mauri's play *Die Konversationshefte Beethovens*, in which, according to Mauri, "the piece itself in its entirety is to be understood as a musical score, in which each individual scene has its own specified tempo and atmospheric stamp" (p.228).

Despite what I am convinced was a sincere effort on Corbineau-Hoffmann's part to make the book read the way a piece of music sounds, however, I could find no meaningful connection between this layout and the content of the book beyond, that is, the obvious connection between the structure of a symphony (or of a sonata-form movement) and that of an expository essay. The same could be said about the clear pretense that lies behind the book; despite her earnest attempt to take the subject-object tension in music seriously, Corbineau-Hoffmann has written a book in which music is done lip service only.

This is not to say that the book has no value for musicians; indeed, it abounds in food for thought. In the concluding (post-coda) section, for example, Corbineau-Hoffmann acknowledges that only those works about which Beethoven provided partial verbalizations—the *Eroica*, op.132, the Fifth and Ninth Symphonies—have nourished the "Arbeit am Mythos"; those in which Beethoven grappled with his texts—*Fidelio*, the *Missa solemnis*—have inspired no comparable reaction, allowing music in these instances to triumph over literary discourse (p.385). Naturally, these are among the works she does not discuss. Her conclusion, though, is a provocative one: despite the ongoing attempt at reconciliation that is at the heart of the mythmaking process, Beethoven remains "ein Mythos à rebours." "Die Angst vor Beethoven," to borrow Wolfgang Hilbig's provocative title, remains an ineluctable part of the myth despite that it aims to silence that angst. The death mask always suggests, as it did for Rilke, "the face of one from whom God has blocked off the sense of hearing, so that there might be no sounds apart from his own" (p.382).

It is perhaps unclear whether Rilke used the third person masculine possessive pronoun here to refer to Beethoven or to God, and this ambiguity is mirrored in Corbineau-Hoffmann's statement that "the transcendence toward which Beethoven's music strove still allows the immanence of earthly shocks to shine through, and even the not infrequently purely imaginary character of Beethoven's literary 'scenes' cannot drown out the real presence of his music—and with it, the signature of suffering that adheres to it" (p. 380). The term "real presence" is one widely used by the church to describe the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and Corbineau-Hoffmann's use of it here can hardly be unintentional, given the number of literary parallels between Beethoven and Christ that she has examined earlier in the book. If Beethoven's nature is both transcendent and immanent, however, Corbineau-Hoffmann suggests, echoing a phrase from Hofmannsthal cited earlier in the book, that in both capacities he remains an enigma, as inaccessible as ever. As for his "composed" texts—*Fidelio* and the *Missa solemnis* again: they "reduce the myth practically to silence" (p. 385).

Is it possible, though, that the mythical content of Beethoven's music worked (and continues to work) itself out in musical processes as well as literary ones: that all of that living and suffering was interpreted musically by Beethoven in ways that necessarily precede literary interpretation and therefore exceed the limits of the "literarische Mythos"? Here the rhetorical question, implicitly raised by Corbineau-Hoffmann on the first page of her book, comes back to haunt its conclusions. Beethoven did indeed have little to do with words. That he nevertheless said things in his music that have inspired two centuries of myth-making poses a challenge to those of us who relate to Beethoven in more specifically musical terms than does Corbineau-Hoffmann to speak our piece. If Beethoven had not written the Heiligenstadt Testament; if he had not become a symbol of German national identity; if his deafness had not come to represent Christ-like suffering and redemptive power; would his music have given rise to the same, or similar, myths, only expressed in terms of material that was ready to hand? If so, what are the *musical* factors that generated the Beethoven mythology, and why did it take a musician to set that mythology in motion? For helping to frame these questions, even if only *à rebours*, Angelika Corbineau-Hoffmann deserves our thanks.

Scott DeVeaux

Uri Caine and Concerto Köln. "Diabelli" Variations. Munich: Winter & Winter, 2002. 910 086–2.

Tri Caine is probably someone whose name has yet to cross the threshold of *Beethoven Forum*. A pianist with an arch wit and an education that places him somewhere between classical music and jazz, Caine has situated his work at the boundary between art music and its clever deconstruction. His previous recordings have matched Mahler and Wagner with klezmer, and Schumann's *Dichterlieder* with weeping country guitars, Japanese poetry, and Latin grooves. Most impressively, his seventy-two-variation remaking of the "Goldberg" Variations crashed Bach's contrapuntal masterpiece against the staggering variety of styles and instrumentations available in the late twentieth century—not only Baroque, Classical, and Romantic, but also jazz, salsa, experimental music, and hiphop. Now he's moved to Beethoven, with an orchestrated version of the "Diabelli"Variations that is as deeply stimulating as it is unsettling.

This project has more than a whiff of historical scholarship. Caine is heard not on piano, but on the fortepiano, an Erard from 1839. Even the accompaniment is distinctively historical. For this is an orchestrated "Diabelli," featuring Caine matched as soloist against the Concerto Köln: a democratically organized band of thirty musicians playing mostly eighteenth-century instruments (twenty strings matched by winds and brass, one to a part). The orchestration is fascinating and often rewarding. In the slower variations, such as No.24 or 30, legato string lines bring out the counterpoint more effectively than the most sensitive pianist. In other cases, the winds and brass add a boisterous quality to the music. In the noisy Variation No.21, for example, horns puff out the repeated eighth-note thirds in the pianist's left hand, while the lowest notes are banged out on the timpani.

The climax of all this comes with the fugal finale of Variation No.32. Scored for full orchestra, it sounds curiously like a symphonic conclusion to the whole. The piano is part of the mix, adding its dry, percussive timbre to various lines. But as the movement progresses, Caine crosses the line. After the eighth-note counterpoint enters, he's no longer a faithful orchestrator, but . . . well, a jazz musician enjoying the chance to add his *own* lines to the complicated texture. And when the variation finally comes to rest on the dissonant *fortissimo* whole-note chord, it sounds like the occasion for a cadenza—so Caine improvises one. He begins more or less in style with elegant Beethovenian counterpoint, but after a minute or so moves toward more abstract, chromatic harmonies. Finally, he bursts into what one might expect—or fear—from a jazz pianist: a late-twentieth-century mixture of stride piano, post-bop lines, and dissonant harmonic clusters.

All of this is enough to give the average Beethoven listener heartburn. Frankly, for those who find adding heaps of notes to a sacrosanct text an appalling breach of performance decorum, I do not recommend this recording. For others, though, Caine's approach may offer a new avenue of interpretation. As with the "Goldberg," he's chosen another set of variations, which offers the maximum overlap with jazz. And after all, the "Diabelli" Variations are not going anywhere. Their status as a nineteenth-century masterpiece is secure. The score is on the shelf, and faithfully precise recordings continuously appear. Why not give it a new kind of interpretation, one more indebted to the spirit of jazz and modern music?

Unfortunately, there's a good deal to this version of the "Diabelli" Variations that does not wear well. Partly, it's a matter of musical resources. Consider, for example, Caine's "Goldberg" Variations, where each variation was a surprise, an immersion in a different musical universe. The sense of parody was so wide-ranging that one never knew what would come next. In the "Diabelli," however, the basic sound—fortepiano and orchestra—is always the same. Undoubtedly, this has to do with the original context for performance (it was originally commissioned for the Kempen Musik Festival in 2001). It also has to do with the performers. The musicians in Concerto Köln play their parts beautifully, but they do not improvise. The orchestra plays the straight man to Caine's solo antics, which throws all the weight onto the often schizophrenic keyboard playing, laid onto the orchestrated score like graffiti strokes on a painting. If some hear this as a war against Beethoven, I can understand why.

What exactly does Caine add? Sometimes it's humor. There's an element of rough parody in this performance that seems in tune with its original source. Imagine Beethoven, armed with a tape recorder, adding rude noises to Variation No.13 (on what other recording can you hear actual sneezing?); or slipping an oom-pah accompaniment under the lumbering Germanic bass line of Variation No.25. Or imagine him, on Variation No.22, augmenting his silly parody of Mozart's "Notte e giorno faticar" with increasingly dissonant glissandi. Or perhaps think of Beethoven as a time traveler, capable of importing chords from the future. There are odd, amusing moments when Beethoven's textures are interrupted by chords from *Tristan* (Variation No.18) or the *Rite of Spring* (Variation No.3). Or for that matter, imagine Beethoven parodying himself. One of the Beethoven's own variations (the fifth) begins with a rhythmic motive that vaguely recalls the famous opening of the Fifth Symphony. So why not go one better? Caine adds a new variation (track 6) that bluntly claims "dit-dit-dah" as his own motive. After the repeat sign, it picks up the main theme of the *Eroica* as well.

But mostly, Caine sees his role as providing a continuous commentary to Beethoven's Variations. Caine listens hyperactively and often has interesting ideas. Sometimes he plays obsessively with Beethoven's rhythmic motives, or jerks away suddenly into flighty fast passages. But the problem is that all this is happening *at the same time* as the original source. On many variations, you can hear Beethoven's complex musical argument as performed by Concerto Köln. But all this is conjoined with a sensibility from some other harmonic and rhythmic space, and it can be profoundly irritating. It's rather like watching a movie on a DVD without being able to turn off the auxiliary audio tracks: how can you enjoy the dialogue when the director is constantly jabbering in your ear?

On a few occasions, Caine turns a few of the more virtuosic variations into solo piano showcases. Often, he takes an element from the original to start with: the broken octave figuration of Variation No.16, for example, is turned into a kind of boogie-woogie, while the trills and sixteenth-note figurations of Variation No.6 become the basis of an abstract fantasy. But mostly these are variations with *no* text. With careful listening, you can follow the rough outline of the harmonies. Somewhere, he's hearing the form of the variations and creating his own structures for them. Otherwise, it's a hodgepodge of completely new material. This is where the more jazzy and dissonant material comes through. Throughout Variation No.18, for example, you can hear him suddenly shifting rapidly and unpredictably between atonal clusters, bluesy phrases, and post-bop harmonies.

For many people, Caine's identity as a jazz player will seem the obvious answer to despair or confusion. When he swings Beethoven's sixteenth notes like a bebop player, or when his improvising takes a bluesy turn (especially as the harmony moves to the subdominant), a smile can come to the face: oh, *that's* what he's doing! But watch out. Caine is a modernist, and often uncompromisingly difficult. In jazz terms, he's "outside," which means that his improvised lines often have only a fleeting relationship to the prevailing harmonies. At times, when chords disappear into dissonant mutterings, one might conclude that he doesn't have the chops for the job. Other passages are counter-statements, of course. Like Thelonious Monk, Caine plays the way he does because he *likes* to—a reality that may be more disconcerting than reassuring.

The best moments in the "Diabelli" come where Caine is discrete. Sometimes, as with the Variation No.30, gentle counterpoint unfolds for more than a minute before Caine deigns to enter. Indeed, the whole collaborative approach often works much better with the later, slower variations, which give him more room to maneuver. On Variation No.29, the orchestral part is reduced to funereal accompanying chords, giving Caine's flighty improvisations the chance to be clearly heard. A different, but equally effective example, is Variation No.20. The relentless, ponderous chords of the original—a challenge for many classical performers to pull off—act as a background against which Caine's responses act in dialogue. As Caine digs in to the difficult harmonies, one can feel the piece as a whole slowly building to a groove, culminating in a final bluesy climax (once again, over a satisfying subdominant chord). The whole thing has an overarching sense of conclusion that seems to complement, and even extend, the original.

If I had to choose a favorite Variation, I'd choose No.31. It's a minor-mode variation where, for once, we find Caine securely matched against the great composer. Beethoven has notated a melodic line so intricate, so rhythmically detailed, and so rhapsodic, that Caine's first reaction is virtually unlike anything we've heard to this point: he plays it note-for-note, with an almost fanatical certitude. Only on the repetition does he begin improvising. His rhapsodic utterances—more harmonically secure than elsewhere—sound as if he's deep in conversation with Beethoven's utterance. It's a lovely combination, something like a classical music equivalent to the jazz practice of "trading fours." Not all of Caine's experiments work, or continue to work on repeated hearing. But when they do, they suggest a new and unexpected way in which Beethoven, and jazz, can survive into the twenty-first century. ContributorsJoanna Cobb Biermann is visiting assistant professor of musicology at Indiana Uni-<br/>versity. Affiliated with the Beethoven-Archiv in Bonn for a number of years, she is the<br/>author of the catalogue of the first and early editions of Beethoven's works in the<br/>collections of the Beethoven-Haus and contributes to the Kinsky-Halm revision project.<br/>She will be editing Beethoven's small piano pieces for the Neue Gesamtausgabe.

Tim Carter, formerly at the Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, University of London, is David G. Frey Distinguished Professor of Music at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He is the author of various books on music in late Renaissance and early Baroque Italy, including *Monteverdi's Musical Theatre* and the Cambridge Opera Handbook on Mozart's *Le nozze di Figaro*. His monograph on Rogers and Hammerstein's *Oklahoma!* is forthcoming from Yale University Press.

Scott DeVeaux is associate professor at the University of Virginia, where he teaches courses in jazz, music theory, and twentieth-century music. His book *The Birth of Bebop* (1997) won numerous awards, including the AMS Kinkeldey Award.

Nicholas Marston is university reader in music theory and analysis at Cambridge University and a Fellow of King's College. His book on Schenker's unpublished *Erläuterungsausgabe* of Beethoven's "Hammerklavier" Sonata will be published in 2007.

Seow-Chin Ong is associate professor of music history at the University of Louisville. He is currently preparing a facsimile edition, with transcription and commentary, of Beethoven's Landsberg 11 Sketchbook for the University of Illinois Press.

Robin Wallace is associate professor of musicology at Baylor University. He is the author of *Beethoven's Critics: Aesthetic Dilemmas and Resolutions during the Composer's Lifetime* and coeditor and translator for the series *The Critical Reception of Beethoven's Compositions by His German Contemporaries.* 

