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ABSTRACT

Numerous influences can be detected in Beethoven’s Violin Concerto op. 61. The most notable of these stem from Mozart, the Viennese violinist Franz Clement, and the French violinist-composers Giovanni Battista Viotti, Rudolph Kreutzer, and Pierre Rode. French composer Luigi Cherubini was ardently admired by Beethoven and remained a potent influence throughout Beethoven’s middle-period compositions.

Time-pressure and hurried preparation for the premiere exerted impact on the genesis of op. 61. Certain difficult passages were omitted by Beethoven before the premiere, and it is possible the lack of preparation time for the soloist (Franz Clement) and the orchestra led to these removals. The last solo violin version is the most idiomatic, but not always artistically superior to the previous versions. Beethoven was not satisfied with the premiere performance, and later revisions of the solo violin part might have responded to shortcomings in this performance. The critics opined that the concerto suffered from monotony, and many of Beethoven’s solo violin revisions appeared to address this complaint through the use of more sophisticated ornamentation and rhythm.

The sources for Beethoven’s Violin Concerto op. 61 contain three versions of the solo violin part. Two of these versions are found directly in the autograph manuscript in Beethoven’s hand, now held in a collection in Vienna in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek. The first version was used for the premiere on 23 December 1806; the second is a revision from May and June of 1807. The third version is found in the first published edition from Vienna dating from January 1809. These successive revisions reveal aspects of Beethoven’s creative process and
elucidate some of his most pressing musical and aesthetic goals for the op. 61 violin concerto. The revisions in the solo violin part focus on enhancing the work through treatment of tessitura, pulse, motivic development, and various techniques such as rhythmic diminution and augmentation. These compositional tactics serve Beethoven’s overriding thrust toward formal expansion, which characterizes many of his middle-period works. After researching the various revisions, I conclude that no single version presents itself as the definitive or authoritative version of the solo violin part. A synthetic approach to the different violin solo revisions may be justified.

The concerto is compared with other middle-period works in order to place certain of its characteristics into perspective. These features include thematic uses of the timpani, unifying rhythmic motives, destabilizing harmonic surprises, striking timbres, and dramatic registral contrasts. These comparisons help us understand the meaning and motivation behind the genesis and revisions of the violin solo part.
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An aura of mystery surrounds the composition and premiere of Beethoven’s op. 61 violin concerto. Beethoven initially wrote his op. 61 violin concerto for Franz Joseph Clement for one of Clement’s benefit concerts in Vienna, a program held on 23 December 1806. Clement had been involved with the premieres of Beethoven’s “Eroica” Symphony and his opera \textit{Fidelio} in 1805; he would be involved again with the premieres of Beethoven’s Fifth and Sixth Symphonies in December 1808. Clement had served since 1805 as music director of the Theater an der Wien, the venue where the premiere of the violin concerto took place. Beethoven’s dissatisfaction with the performance at the premiere is recorded in his letter to Count Moritz von Dietrichstein from January 1808. He writes, referring to his experience at the Theater an der Wien, that he could not allow his compositions to suffer such a “risk of an unsuccessful performance.”\footnote{Brandenburg, Sieghard, ed. \textit{Ludwig von Beethoven: Briefwechsel Gesamtausgabe}, vol. 2 (1808-1813). Munich: Henle, 1996, 4, L. 316.; also see Anderson, Emily, ed. \textit{The Letters of Beethoven}, vol. 1 (1787-1814). New York: St. Martin’s Press Inc., 1961, 201, L. 180. There is a significant discrepancy in the dating of these letters. Sieghard Brandenburg hypothesizes the letter is from January 1808, and Emily Anderson dates the letter November 1808. Bathia Churgin, after consulting Sieghard Brandenburg, believes that Anderson’s dating is incorrect. See “Beethoven Violin Concerto in D Major Op. 61,” 4. In this passage, Churgin erroneously gives the date of the premiere as 23 December 1807. The correct date is 23 December 1806. She undoubtedly did this to reconcile the fact that Beethoven disclosed his displeasure more than a year after this concert. Either way, the premiere of op. 61 rankled Beethoven more than a year later, enough that it caused Beethoven to second-guess future performances.}

Clement received the dedication inscribed in the autograph, though the final dedication in the first printed edition went to a childhood and lifelong friend of Beethoven’s, Stephan von Breuning. Breuning had recently assisted Beethoven in revising the libretto of his opera \textit{Fidelio} for the revival of that work in 1806. The change in dedication might also be attributed to Beethoven’s apparent disappointment of Clement’s performance of the work at the premiere. In
the letter mentioned above, it is difficult to determine where Beethoven placed the blame for the apparently underwhelming performance. The composer suggests that Clement was conducting Beethoven’s works in an excellent fashion without Beethoven’s presence at the rehearsals. The concert was organized by Clement. Beethoven also mentions that at the premiere the players played from “rough copies,” which reflects the hurried and inauspicious nature of the preparation. One source reports that Clement “sein solo ohne vorherige probe a vista spielte,” that Clement “played his solo from sight without a rehearsal.” Certainly Beethoven and Clement’s association did not end as a result of the premiere of op. 61, as is reflected by Clement’s later involvement with Beethoven’s premieres. The bigger falling-out between the two would come much later when Beethoven would specifically request Ignaz Schuppanzigh as a performer over Clement to lead the premiere of his Ninth Symphony.

Beethoven’s op. 61 was composed hurriedly in about six weeks and was likely being feverishly revised within a day or two of the concert. Clement, the soloist, was even rumored to have sight-read at least part of the concerto at the premiere. In sum, these would not seem like auspicious circumstances under which to compose and premiere a piece, and the hasty completion and lack of preparation by Clement and the orchestra could partially explain the tepid critical reception. The critics’ view, according to one source, was unanimous that the work

---

2 This review appeared in the Wiener Theater-Zeitung at the beginning of 1807; see Mahling, Beethoven-Interpretationen, vol. 1, 456.


contained moments of beauty but that overall its length and monotony kept it from being numbered among Beethoven’s greatest works. They also questioned the concerto’s continuity. Lawrence Sommers suggests that Clement himself believed the concerto would be met with “tedium” and cites Clement’s programming of the evening as evidence. The audience, however, was enthusiastic and applauded the work appreciatively, and posterity has confirmed their response. As monumental and difficult as the solo part to the concerto is, it is remarkable that it was attempted by Clement on such short notice. Without much preparation time, Clement may have been sloppy during the performance, though he was supremely gifted and there is no further evidence of shortcomings on his part, only the report of Beethoven’s alleged disapproval from the aforementioned letter. The same could be suggested for an orchestra that was surely underprepared. Many of the revisions which occurred after the premiere simplified the violin solo part from a technical perspective, and these could represent a response Clement’s performance at the premiere.

---

6 Wiener Zeitung für Theater Musik und Poesie 2 (1807), col. 27.
8 Perhaps Clement’s difficulty at the premiere is what gave rise to the myth that the violin concerto was initially considered “virtually unplayable.” See Anne-Louise Coldicott is found in Coldicott, Anne-Louise. “Concertos and other orchestral music,” in Cooper, Barry, ed. The Beethoven Compendium. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1991, 218. There is no citation, but she is probably referencing Anton Schindler, who implies that the concerto’s demands on the soloist may have in part been responsible for its neglect after the premiere. Considering the technical demands of the concerto are less than contemporary concerti published by Viotti and Franz Clement, this assertion is highly questionable. Clement also performed the concerto in 1807, where the work apparently received a greater reception than the premiere, albeit the source is again the unreliable Anton Schindler. See Schindler, Anton. Biographie von Ludwig van Beethoven. Münster, 1970, 140. However, if the work was well-received, it becomes more difficult to explain its neglect during the remainder of Beethoven’s life. See also Stowell, Robin, Beethoven Violin Concerto, 33 for more discussion regarding the gradual spread of the concerto’s influence.
There are multiple passages in the solo violin part which seem to make less sense under the hand in the version that would have been used for the premiere.9 Gustav Nottebohm took note of this situation, and his comments seem plausible, including his assertion that some revised passages lose musical significance whilst adhering to more idiomatic violin textures.10

Beethoven was familiar with the idiomatic possibilities of the instrument, as is revealed in his many other violin works to this point, including his nine violin sonatas, his Triple Concerto, and the two Romances for violin and orchestra, op. 40 and op. 50.11 The “Kreutzer” Sonata op. 47, designated in the style of a concerto by Beethoven, demonstrates a supreme mastery of violin writing.12 Beethoven fingered violin parts in sections of the op. 59 string quartets, signifying his ability to control the idiomatic qualities of violin playing.13 Beethoven was a competent violist, having played viola in an orchestra in Bonn from 1788-92.14 For these reasons it is quite curious

9 These are discussed in chapter two.


that his initial writing of the solo part for the premiere was idiomatically questionable, and this is probably best explained by the hurriedness in which the part was composed.\textsuperscript{15} One passage that benefited from revision is found in measures 363-364 in the first movement; there is no effective and efficient way to transition between these measures and maintain musical integrity in the earliest version of the work. It is no coincidence that this is one of the most heavily revised passages in the solo violin part. In versions II and III Beethoven found a way to forgo the use of the D string in favor of the open A and E strings, gaining idiomatic ease but losing nothing of the passage’s musical intent or effectiveness.

Most of the concerto prior to any revision was in line with expectations of Beethoven’s high quality. In the premiere version, passages like measure 460 of the first movement are fully

\textsuperscript{15} Stowell, \textit{Beethoven Violin Concerto}, 51.
idiomatic and written skillfully to lie under the hand, in addition to producing a brilliant, even sizzling virtuosic effect. It can also be inferred that perhaps idiomatic considerations were some of the least important to Beethoven and the last to be considered during the composition of op. 61. Far more important in the initial stages of the creative process were considerations of formal design and rhythmic and motivic development, as well as questions of timbre and orchestration. This would explain why the revisions were centered almost entirely around the solo violin part instead of other orchestral forces. Beethoven also left the solo part of his piano concertos to be late in realization, because he himself could play them without fixing the notation. Clement, the soloist at the premiere, also was a noted improvisor with a highly personal style, and would have been capable of performing with sparse notation. Later on the program at the premiere, Clement performed a series of improvisations, as well as a sonata on one string while holding the violin upside-down.\textsuperscript{16} Beethoven may have regarded his concerto after the premiere as not yet settled or entirely finished. The composer made significant formal changes to other works after their premieres, including extensive revisions to \textit{Fidelio}, the “Waldstein” Sonata, and Beethoven’s \textit{String Quartet op. 130}.

In addition to certain idiomatic shortcomings, Beethoven improved upon other apparent weaknesses of the concert violin part used at the premiere, concerning impressions of monotony and length. Though some critics perceived these weaknesses, Beethoven himself confirms them by the manner in which he revised the solo part, often altering repetitive passages with more nuanced ornamentation and rhythmic devices. It is difficult to ascertain how much influence the critical reception, or the influence of Clement himself might have had upon Beethoven during

\textsuperscript{16} Stowell, \textit{Beethoven Violin Concerto}, 30.
the revision process. Scholars do not suggest that Beethoven reacted directly to critics. However, Beethoven was most likely acutely aware of the critical reception, and his actions in revising the concerto align at least in some respects with the critical consensus. Beethoven drastically revised his opera *Fidelio* in response to criticisms, and while it is unlikely that his entire aim was to pacify critical reception in revising op. 61, he presumably took such opinions into some consideration.\(^1\)

Considering the initial nature of the violin solo part which was later revised, it is doubtful that Beethoven collaborated extensively with Clement before the premiere. Some, like Otto Jahn, have suggested that Clement was intimately involved with the solo part before the premiere.\(^2\) This seems questionable: Clement would have pointed out the dubious violinistic nature of some passages, particularly considering he would have to be playing them at the premiere. It seems unconvincing to assume Beethoven consulted Clement and later disregarded his advice, as Jahn posits. Rather, if any collaboration took place before the premiere, it was probably quite cursory. It is most likely, in light of the nature of the revisions, that if Clement was consulted, it was mainly after the premiere. Beethoven and Clement had a working professional relationship, as demonstrated by their numerous collaborations and projects around Vienna and Clement’s involvement with multiple premieres of Beethoven’s works.\(^3\) It is on this basis and the fact that the concerto was composed for Clement that some have been tempted to


assume that Clement was more heavily involved than he likely was. The hurried nature of the process would have allowed for a severely limited potential for feedback. Most likely Clement’s impact even after the premiere was minimal. Beethoven would not have needed Clement in order to create a more violinistically effective part, as he was largely capable of working through this on his own. The fact that Beethoven changed the dedication is a strong indication that Clement and the concerto were not inextricably linked in Beethoven’s mind.

Though Beethoven may not have directly collaborated with Clement on the writing of the solo violin part, he surely knew of Clement’s own Violin Concerto in D Major, which most likely premiered at the same concert as Beethoven’s “Eroica” Symphony in March 1805. There are ample indications that Beethoven was paying homage to Clement’s style in his own concerto.\textsuperscript{20} There is evidence that not only was Beethoven dedicating the concerto to Clement and writing it at Clement’s request, but that the composition itself was responding to Clement’s specific style of artistry, which is praised in one contemporary review for its “elegance.”\textsuperscript{21} Besides the concerto, Beethoven had performed with Clement numerous times at smaller and more informal events around Vienna, so Beethoven was familiar with Clement’s strengths and weaknesses.\textsuperscript{22} Brown mentions one measure from Clement’s concerto in the solo part that is perfectly preserved in the solo part from Beethoven’s op. 61, as well as several other similarly drawn passages and

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} \textit{Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung} 7 (1804-1805), 500-501.
\item \textsuperscript{22} A couple of specific examples of Beethoven and Clement’s collaboration are cited by Robert Haas in “The Viennese Violinist, Franz Clement,” 22. In December 1807 and January 1808 Clement persuaded Beethoven to conduct amateurs at the University hall. Beethoven and Clement performed elsewhere before Beethoven’s Violin Concerto was written, but no specific cases are provided. Clement also would have played in the premiere of the “Eroica” Symphony under Beethoven’s direction in March 1805.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
figurations in the violin solo parts between the two concertos. The identical measures in the solo violin parts of the two concerti are measure 310 of the first movement of Clement’s concerto and measure 182 of the first movement of Beethoven’s. The first entrance of the solo violin in Beethoven’s op. 61 resembles measure 219 from Clement’s first movement. The octaves with slurred grace notes and the overall outline of an arpeggio are similarities between these passages. The first half of measure 450 from the first movement of Beethoven’s concerto aligns nearly exactly with measure 355 in the first movement of Clement’s concerto. The only difference is the addition of the slur in Clement’s passage. However, Beethoven was less detailed with his slurring than Clement. The composer likely would have anticipated that Clement would have improvised a slurring pattern suitable to his own style. Measure 296 in the first movement of Clement’s concerto closely recalls measure 456 in the first movement of Beethoven’s concerto. The figuration of the sixteenth notes in both passages outline ascending arpeggios. Beethoven and Clement both rely multiple times on chromatic passages. In Clement’s concerto, twice in the first movement chromatic passages are featured by

---

the soloist, in measures 196 and 375. In both cases they precede extended trills. In this way these two passages assume a similar function to the chromatic passages for the solo violin in Beethoven’s first movement, in measures 473-474 and measures 199-200. Beethoven’s passages are more formally expansive than Clement’s, but shortly after both chromatic passages in Beethoven’s solo violin part long trill passages also appear.

Measures 196-199, movement I

Measures 375-377, movement I

Measures 124-125 and the parallel passage in measures 303-304 of the first movement of Clement’s concerto closely resemble Beethoven’s use of figuration in passages such as measure

Measures 124-127, movement I

Measures 302-304, movement I

152 and 156 and the parallel passage containing measures 426 and 430. Both concertos rely on
the same broken-octave triplets pattern. Clement’s broken octaves outline the melody while Beethoven’s broken octaves rely on the rules of counterpoint to form a countermelody to the second theme. The passage in measures 352-359 in the third movement of Clement’s concerto bear likeness to the opening passage of the soloist in Beethoven’s concerto. Both passages are characterized by ascending broken thirds. In the Clement example, the broken thirds reach an arrival in measure 353, and in measure 354 they begin again near the bottom of the violin register. Beethoven’s broken thirds in measure 97 begin on the same note, then dip slightly down twice before finally emerging triumphantly in a grand swooping scalar motion which culminates on the high D, coinciding with the second exposition. Clement also breaks free of the broken-thirds pattern in measure 355 to pursue sweeping scalar gestures, though his scales soon descend, and the end of the passage is more passive. The broken thirds from Clement’s violin concerto also may have inspired measures 128-129 and measures 388-389 in in the first movement of Beethoven’s own concerto.

There are several more subtle similarities in the figurations both composers feature in their violin concertos. Measure 315 and 317 in the development of Beethoven’s concerto are configured similar to measure 118 in the second movement of Clement’s concerto. Both
passages are characterized by descending triplets which outline a descending arpeggio.

Beethoven also leans heavily on this tactic in his passagework in movement III, particularly in measures 81-88 and in measures 256-263. Beethoven employs a similar tactic in measures 319-320 in the first movement as Clement does in measures 248 and 250. Both composers draw on repeated descending arpeggios that return to the same beginning note each time. In the first version of the solo violin part, Beethoven wrote four straight appearances of arpeggios beginning on the same note. The composer in measures 154 and 428 of the first movement appears to have drawn on Clement’s figuration in measures 276 and 278 of the first movement. Both composers feature broken chords over three strings. The bottom note is unison with the bass and viola sections in Clement’s passage, and in Beethoven’s example the bottom notes harmonize in thirds with the second theme. Clement slurs the broken chords differently in both instances.
Beethoven chooses not to write any articulation markings in his examples, but both of Clement’s examples of slurring would be appropriate options for the performer.

Another potential influence of Clement’s concerto on op. 61 is the use of expanded *tutti* sections. Clement’s concerto opens with a massive *tutti* section 106 measures long, and it is possible that Clement’s concerto was one factor behind Beethoven’s inclination to plan the movement with such long orchestral interludes. Inspired by Brown, Stowell digs deeper and offers the most detailed comparison between the two works. Beethoven was at least in some respects writing in a manner that would be recognizable and comfortable for Franz Clement and would cater to Clement’s strengths as a performer. In later years their relationship would sour as Clement failed to evolve as a player and fell out of fashion. Beethoven himself expressed disgust with Clement’s old-fashioned style, and perhaps with this concerto and its premiere, the seeds of this increasingly contemptuous feeling toward Clement were already being planted.

Not long after this, Clement’s reputation would begin to decline.

In addition to the influence of Clement, Beethoven was strongly influenced by French compositional tendencies. Boris Schwartz, Cristian Neacsu, and Robin Stowell have all explored various aspects of Beethoven’s reliance on the violin concerti of Giovanni Battista Viotti and Rudolph Kreutzer. Yenn-chwen Er discusses the French composer and violinist Pierre Rode’s

---

24 For similarities between Beethoven’s and Clement’s concerti, see Brown, Clive. *Violin Concerto in D Major (1805)*, ix-x.


influence on Beethoven. Beethoven wrote violin sonatas for both Rudolph Kreutzer and Pierre Rode, two of the chief exponents of the French manner of violin performance and pedagogy. Beethoven was also an ardent admirer of the French composer Luigi Cherubini, who significantly influenced Beethoven’s middle-period style.

The violin concerti of Mozart exerted considerable influence on Beethoven’s op. 61. The opening to op. 61 is arguably directly taken from the opening of Mozart’s Fourth Violin Concerto. Mozart begins the concerto with a unison tonic D (the same tonic as Beethoven’s op. 61) repeated on the first five beats. In similar fashion, Beethoven’s op. 61 opens with five quarter-note iterations on the tonic D in the timpani. The only significant difference other than the orchestration of these two passages is that the second beat of Mozart’s opening is a dotted eighth-sixteenth figure. The solo violinist in Mozart’s Fifth Concerto enters with two unaccompanied pickup notes. The sparseness and nakedness of this lone voice is especially striking. In op. 61, the orchestra falls away entirely in the solo violin’s opening passage, linking these two works. Notable also is that the solo violinist’s entrance in both concerti is part of an introduction to the second exposition. In this way Beethoven applied some of Mozart’s formal ideas and orchestration techniques.

Only two pages of sketches have survived for this concerto, which may signify that Beethoven was working more from scratch on op. 61 than many other pieces of the same time period. Nevertheless, it is likely that extensive sketches for the concerto have been lost. Churgin

---


suggests that it is likely there were more, but these have not survived.\footnote{From the information detailed by Barry Cooper, it seems plausible that there are more sketches than those that have survived. See Cooper, Barry. “The compositional act: sketches and autographs,” in \textit{The Cambridge Companion to Beethoven}. ed. Stanley, Glenn. Cambridge University Press, 2000, 32-42. Barry Cooper also details how in this period, Beethoven’s sketches grew more complex. See Cooper, Barry. \textit{Beethoven and the Creative Process}. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990, 80-81. See also Churgin’s useful overview of the sketches in “Violin Concerto in D Major Op. 61,” 70-72.} One of the two surviving sketch leaves is related to the piano version op. 61a and contains only material from a piano cadenza for op. 61a. The other page is found in Landsberg 10, a miscellaneous collection of sketches also containing material for Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony op. 67 and Cello Sonata op. 69. It is significant that the motive from the beginning given to the timpani is developed in these sketches. Noteworthy too is the presence of the E-flat harmonic surprise (translated into the final version as a D-sharp) in measure 10, which is present in these sketches. The passage from measures 10-17 of the first movement closely resembles the final concerto version as found in the autograph manuscript, but none of the other sketches contain easily decipherable material. The sketch page is scarcely legible, but it is certain that Beethoven himself would have discerned more from its contents. From these sketches, it appears the very first and elemental material conceived by Beethoven was this recurring motive and that the piece was largely built upon its foundation.\footnote{Cooper notes that Beethoven frequently began his conceptions of pieces not with melodic material but with ideas regarding the broader manner of the piece and its key area. For more on Beethoven’s use of sketches, see Cooper, Barry. \textit{Beethoven and the Creative Process}. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990, 120.} The other elemental material involved the use of his trademark harmonic surprise, which Beethoven also places near the beginnings of other middle-period works.\footnote{See further discussion in chapter three for more details on the rhythmic, motivic, and harmonic tendencies of Beethoven’s middle period.} Other than this repeated-note motive, the harmonic surprise, and its continuation in one passage (measures
10-17 in the first movement), nothing is known from the surviving sketches that is of thematic interest.

On 20 April 1807, London-based publisher Muzio Clementi appeared in Vienna and paid Beethoven for the rights to several of his recent compositions. At this time, Clementi also convinced Beethoven to make an arrangement of op. 61 for piano. Kojima offers the explanation - based largely on ink analysis - that Beethoven revised the violin concerto in May and June of 1807 indirectly due to this request from Clementi. According to Kojima, while Beethoven sketched piano chords at the bottom of the autograph score in response to his new contract for op. 61a, he also scratched out various revisions of the violin part. The impetus for revising the violin part arose largely because Beethoven reopened the score, providing an excuse to revise some of its deficiencies. In Kojima’s view, it is even possible that Beethoven never would have revised the violin solo part at all without having been cajoled into the piano arrangement. It is impossible to know whether Beethoven would have revised the violin part either way, but it is almost certain he would have before publication. While creating another autograph manuscript of the solo parts, Beethoven inevitably would have revisited the violin solo part. It is true that perhaps thinking about the work as a piano concerto offered to Beethoven new insights into the violin work, so that a fundamental shift in perspective regarding the solo parts became a source of inspiration for the extensive revisions. Both seem plausible, though only the former is suggested by Kojima. Kaiser suggests that version III is a reaction to the


piano version and is not as sound as the premiere version of the violin concerto.\textsuperscript{35} Places like measure 114 of the first movement certainly seem to support Kaiser’s viewpoint.\textsuperscript{36} In measure 114, version III lies on the keyboard very nicely, whereas version II would be quite awkward on the piano, involving jumps with the thumb between beats two and three, instead of an easy gliding back and forth as in version III. This suggests that at least in some passages the piano revision took precedence over that of the violin revision. This is a compelling reason why it is justifiable to cautiously question the authority of the first printed edition of this work. Beethoven was not only thinking about the piece as a violin concerto, and this tends to jumble the part-writing between the idiomatic tendencies of the violin and piano. This context suggests another reason why Clement’s involvement appears to have been limited, as the violinist would most likely have chosen version II in measure 114. The fact that Beethoven’s revisions are so intimately tied to Clementi’s request for the op. 61a piano version indicates even more strongly that Clement was not involved in the revision.

Music example 1.15

A key autograph score is presumed missing, one which would have contained the op. 61


piano and violin solo parts used in the first published edition from Vienna. The violin solo and piano solo parts are typically grouped together as part of the lost autograph manuscript, but it is plausible that there would have been a separate autograph for each. The copyist score, presumably translated from this missing autograph or autographs, survives and provides an important source in the critical editing of this work, along with the original autograph manuscript and the first published edition. The printed version (version III) contains materials from both the premiere version (version I) and the revision of May/June (version II) as well as some original content. There is enough material in the copyist score that is missing from versions I and II that no copyist could possibly produce the surviving copyist score without consulting a different source. Thus it is almost certain there are at least one or two missing autograph manuscripts.

When Beethoven himself transferred material from the original manuscript to the new manuscript, he chose which of the versions pleased him at the time and revised and refined new ideas. The quality of the original content in version III would seem to link it directly to Beethoven. The copyist score contains corrections in Beethoven’s hand, and it was authorized by the composer for publication. However, because the autograph for the copyist score used in the printed edition has not survived, it is impossible to verify that it was indeed composed entirely by Beethoven. The shoddiness of the piano solo part has led to speculation that another person did most of the arranging for the work, and that Beethoven merely corrected and verified much of the material. Beethoven was involved in several projects whose composition was

37 Some scholars attribute version III to Beethoven’s friend, violinist and composer Franz Alexander Pößinger. If Beethoven handed over his autograph manuscript to Pößinger, and Pößinger proceeded to assemble the final versions of the violin and piano solos from this material, then there may not be a missing autograph manuscript of the solo parts in Beethoven’s hand. See the discussion below.

38 Plantinga, Beethoven’s Concertos, 249.
largely influenced by others and authorized by his hand. There is suspicion that Beethoven was less diligent about the quality of the material not entirely composed by himself. This creates an aura of uncertainty around the work in its double incarnation. However, the doubt thrown on the piano part however does not reflect on the violin part, as the violin part appears above reproach in its quality. The overall aesthetic quality of the violin part and its secure position in the repertoire have been enough to subdue any serious speculation about its authorship.

I tend to doubt the authenticity of the piano part and agree with Leon Plantinga and other commentators on this issue. When compared to the other far superior piano concertos, it is difficult to imagine Beethoven’s intimate involvement with op. 61a. It is simply untidy, even shoddy. The arrangement involved a considerable sum of money, and Beethoven may not have been willing to dedicate much time to it, as it was more of a monetary than artistic goal. The sole motivation for the piano version appears to be Clementi’s request and the offer of money. That the orchestral part was not altered in any way for the piano version implies the pragmatic nature

---

39 Plantinga suggests that Beethoven’s approach to the piano version indicates that it was “not really his concern.” See Beethoven’s Concertos, 248-249. Hans-Werner Küthen compares arrangement processes for both Beethoven’s op. 58 and op. 61 in 1807 and links the two through the arranger and copyist Franz Alexander Pössinger. Küthen concedes that evidence of Pössinger’s involvement in the piano version op. 61a is more indirect than the arrangement of op. 58. For more on Franz Alexander Pössinger’s potential involvement in the revisional process, see Küthen, Hans-Werner. "Wer schrieb den Endtext des Violinkonzerts op. 61 von Beethoven? Franz Alexander Pössinger als letzte Instanz für den Komponisten?" Bonner Beethoven-Studien 4, 2005, 91-109. Fritz Kaiser doubts the authenticities of both the final piano and violin versions, believing the final autograph manuscript used by the copyist containing both the violin and piano versions was probably prepared by Franz Alexander Pössinger and not Beethoven. See Kaiser, Fritz, “The Authentic Versions of the D-Major Concerto Op. 61 by Ludwig van Beethoven,” 196-198. However, in order to arrive at the version found in the copyist’s score, Beethoven would have had to entrust the original autograph manuscript to Pössinger and allowed entirely unique adaptations and additions to his own composition. Why would Beethoven trust Pössinger more than Clement for a process of assembling the violin version? Clement was the original dedicatee in the autograph manuscript, the performer at the premiere, a friend of Beethoven’s, and perhaps the greatest violinist in Vienna. Grouping the violin and piano versions together is highly questionable.

of the transcription. Because the nature of the relationship between the soloist and orchestral part is so complex in op. 61, it seems impossible to transfer the violin aesthetic to a different instrument without altering the orchestral part. This signals that the intent behind op. 61a was not to build a piano concerto infused with the drama and groundbreaking ideas of form, rhythm, and harmonic possibilities that Beethoven’s other piano concertos display.
CHAPTER 2: REVISIONS IN THE SOLO VIOLIN PART

The uncertainty surrounding the critical sources of Beethoven’s op. 61 has ignited a spirited debate. Beethoven’s compositional process often involved a complex series of revisions within the autograph manuscript, prompting questions about the definitive nature of the source material. William Kinderman cites multiple striking examples elucidating how Beethoven added thematic material at late stages of the compositional process. Alan Tyson unearths how Beethoven revised works after their premieres. In the Henle edition of the op. 61 solo violin versions, a distinct preference is shown toward the first edition. The first-edition version is larger, symbolizing that it is more authoritative in nature. Other revisions are diminutive and placed above or below. However, the authority of the first edition is not always warranted by the evidence. There is a lack of evidence that the decisions made in the solo violin part for the first edition came directly from Beethoven. A second autograph manuscript with the final versions of the op. 61 violin and piano solo parts does not survive (if it ever existed); it is this lost autograph of Beethoven’s that presumably was consulted by the copyist. The copyist’s score is

---


43 The juxtaposition of the different versions of the violin solo part of op. 61 is included in the Kritischer Bericht to Beethoven Werke Abteilung III, Band 4, ed. Herrtrich, Ernst. München: G. Henle Verlag, 1994, 35-63.

presumed to be the basis for the first edition, though some discrepancies exist between the two. Therefore the philosophies of Otto Jahn and Max Rostal are flawed. Both subscribe to the authority of the first edition, assuming that it aligns more with the will of Beethoven than the autograph manuscript. This philosophy presumes that each step in the revision process offers an improvement on the previous step. However, the publishing process of op. 61 is mired in uncertainty, and the manner in which Beethoven approaches composition is incompatible with that assessment.

The question of the origin of op. 61’s sources is one which must be addressed in part by studying the aesthetic qualities of the various revisions. The quality of the drama and the extent to which Beethoven’s artistic ideals are represented in the versions are important considerations. An overriding ideal of Beethoven’s at this time was his commitment to expansive musical forms. Beethoven employed various tactics to broaden the scope and formal construction in op. 61. It is important to consider the effectiveness of these compositional devices employed by Beethoven, including rhythm and pulse, tessitura, and motivic development. The violin solo’s idiomatic qualities also must be considered. How seamlessly these elements are incorporated into the musical aesthetic of op. 61 is of central importance in the ongoing conflagration that is the critical editing of Beethoven’s op. 61.

A synthetic approach may be merited for performance of the solo violin part in the passages where multiple versions exist simultaneously, indicating that Beethoven never decided

45 See chapter one for more discussion.

46 Tovey’s introductory comments in his Essays in Musical Analysis 3 centered around the scope of the concerto. See p. 88. Churgin in “Violin Concerto in D Major Op. 61” also reveals how Beethoven expanded the form of the concerto, particularly in op. 61 and the two final piano concerti. See pp. 2-3. Chapter three discusses how expansionism is carried throughout Beethoven’s middle-period works.
which version was best. In some instances, the modern performer may ascribe some validity or even equal value to each version. A performer should determine which version best represents the local and global contexts of the work, whereby the revisions may be best evaluated in their aesthetic context. In this way, the violin solo part will most accurately reflect Beethoven’s artistic aims for the concerto. At least two violinists have sought to incorporate the alternative versions of the solo part into their performances. In 2016, Anton Steck recorded the concerto in the “original version after the autograph,” with the L’arpa Festante orchestra under the direction of Matthew Halls. This recording claims to be the world premiere recording of the original version; however, this assertion may be slightly misleading. Much of the original version was crossed out by Beethoven, and Anton Steck does not perform these crossed-out passages. It would be more accurate to say that the violinist played the version which might have been performed at the premiere. Patricia Kopatchinskaja employs a more synthetic approach during her performance with the Frankfort Radio Symphony and conductor Philippe Herreweghe in 2014. She incorporates both sets of violin solo revisions found in the autograph manuscript, choosing each version on a passage-by-passage basis at her own discretion. The violinist’s performance highlights the improvisatory nature of the composition of the solo violin part and the usefulness of drawing on Beethoven’s complete creative process.

---


One reason the autograph manuscript should be consulted is because some errors often occur each time the music is transferred from one source to another. The present author places equal weight on the revisions in the autograph manuscript as compared to the first edition, believing that whoever assembled the solo parts often placed more importance on idiomatic concerns rather than musical aspects. Beethoven’s apparent authorization of the copyist score used for the first edition did not disown all of his other revisions. The extent of Beethoven’s involvement in the publishing process is unknown beyond some corrections in the copyist’s score. However, discrepancies between the copyist’s score and the first printed edition raise uncertainty about whether the copyist score was the only source used for the first edition. Beethoven’s hands-on involvement throughout the entire process is in question, but Beethoven’s revisions in the original autograph manuscript are not a question for speculation or debate. They are in his handwriting, fastidiously immortalized in the Grasberger facsimile autograph as well as in the original manuscript held in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna.

While competing versions may have merit, the version descended from the first edition is one of the great masterpieces in the entire concerto literature. There is no problem with its continued proliferation. As discussed in the previous chapter, there is ample admirable scholarship and traditions which have coalesced into the commonly accepted performance


50 See chapter one for more discussion on the nature of the revisions.

51 Grasberger, Franz, ed. Beethoven, Ludwig van. *Konzert für Violine und Orchester, D-Dur, Opus 61*. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck U. Verlagsanstalt, 1979. Multiple descriptions of sources discuss the autograph manuscript, including Del Mar’s Critical Commentary to the Bärenreiter critical edition of Beethoven’s op. 61 and 61a, 22. It should be noted that the facsimile does not convey many of the nuances that are apparent when viewing the autograph manuscript itself and is therefore not a viable substitute for the critical editor.
editions of this piece. Clive Brown compares and contrasts many of these performance editions in his critical edition.\(^{52}\) Much of the modern scholarship on op. 61 is by musicologists that do not perform and are not violinists. A serious performer has not produced a scholarly critical edition of the piece since the early 1980’s, which allows Clive Brown’s study to stand out within modern scholarship.\(^{53}\) Deciphering the nature of the solo violin part benefits from knowledge of both violin performance and scholarship.

Understanding Beethoven’s creative process informs the nature of Beethoven’s involvement with the work and more effectively reveals his intentions and ideals.\(^{54}\) Barry Cooper introduces the topic of Beethoven’s creative process with discussions of Beethoven’s aims as a composer.\(^{55}\) Beethoven’s artistic goals are inextricably linked to the analysis of his compositional process. A working relationship should be built between Beethoven’s beliefs and what is represented in the music itself. This interaction between the music and Beethoven’s ideals should be at the center of analysis. Beginning with Beethoven’s aesthetic goals can reconcile ambiguities in the source material.

Looking beyond Beethoven for a broader context of interpreting scores is important. Jonathan Del Mar has dedicated his editing exclusively to Beethoven. This narrowing of perspective presents certain pitfalls, whereas dealing with other composers in a broader context of editing can illuminate the analytical process. Chopin’s nebulous source material requires an


\(^{53}\) Ozim’s scholarly contribution however included only the *urtext* violin solo part with no explanatory notes. See Ozim, Igor, ed. *Beethoven Violin Concerto: Violono Solo*. New York: Schott, 1982.

\(^{54}\) Kinderman suggests that revisions often reveal which “internal relations” of a piece may be especially significant in “Compositional Phases and Analysis,” 21-22.

editor to grapple with soul-searching ambiguities. Chopin scholar Jeffrey Kallberg asserts that a modern taste for finding closure and for determining the single definitive version undermines the whole conception of the music at that time. Works were often conceived fluidly in the early and mid-nineteenth century. As with Chopin, the flexible nature of Beethoven’s compositional process is at odds with what an editor is often charged to do, which is to make exclusive decisions to produce a single definitive version. This is the rationale behind the consideration of a synthetic approach with op. 61 and why the editing process itself should be examined for works with complex source material such as Beethoven’s op. 61.

Certain musical characteristics must be highlighted in order to frame the discussion surrounding the revisions of the solo violin part. Tessitura, pulse, and lyricism inform the drama of this work. Beethoven’s concept of drama is also revealed through his motivic development and formal design. Each of these compositional techniques should be addressed in order to unearth the mysteries of the revisions of the solo violin part of Beethoven’s op. 61.

This chapter follows Shin Augustinus Kojima’s categorization of the versions of the solo violin part. There are three versions. Beethoven likely spent six weeks of earnest composing from November until the premiere on 23 December 1806. Beethoven made revisions to the solo part as he was composing. The original line that Beethoven wrote for the solo violin is version Ia, and the revisions of version Ia are version Ib. Where there is both version Ia and Ib, Ia is always crossed out, with the exceptions of measures 157-161 of the third movement, where Ib is crossed out instead of Ia, and measure 364 in the first movement, where neither Ia or Ib is crossed out.

---


crossed out. This gives credence to Kojima’s assertion that Ia and Ib may have been written simultaneously. Version Ia is of interest in tracing Beethoven’s compositional process but is not a viable performance option. Version Ib was used for the premiere performance of the work on 23 December 1806. In May and June of 1807, Beethoven revisited the autograph at which time he sketched the piano chords to op. 61a at the bottom and also extensively revised the solo violin part. However, Beethoven did not cross out version I where version II exists. The composer appears to leave both as options. In multiple places Beethoven sketched two options for version II. In these places Beethoven did not always cross out the first option, so that version IIa and IIb exist simultaneously, as in measure 174 of the first movement and measure 141 of the third movement. However, in measure 76 of the third movement, Beethoven draws a line through IIa. Version III is the progenitor of the first edition and synthesizes ideas from both version I and version II; however, numerous passages are newly composed. There is no autograph source for version III, thus rendering study of the two versions in Beethoven’s hand necessary.

The reasons for a synthetic approach begin with the concerto’s non-linear revision process. Version III borrows from both version I and version II. There does not appear to be a consistent rationale by which version I or II is chosen. In measures 254-264 in the third movement, version III consistently favors version I, and version II is disregarded. Each version was viewed for its possibilities and not in a way that would discard previous suggestions. A curious case materializes in measures 203 and 476 of the first movement, which are parallel passages from the exposition and recapitulation. Both versions I and II are used as templates for

---

58 Cooper warns against the trap of assuming that successive revisions are necessarily better or that Beethoven’s discarding of ideas completely invalidates them. See Beethoven and the Creative Process, 132.
version III in these two passages. Version III in measure 203 borrows from version II in measure 476. Version III in measure 476 borrows from version I in measure 203. This is evidence Beethoven is looking across the whole movement structurally as he makes his aesthetic decisions in deciding between versions. Beethoven considered all of his previous ideas while compiling version III. In version III measure 468, the leap during the first beat borrows from the large leap in version I in the same measure, and the use of triplets is stolen from version II. Thus in this instance version III represents a culmination of previous ideas. Version III had more previous material and ideas on which to draw, allowing for a more cohesive product.

Music example 2.1

Music example 2.2
However, the superiority of version III is not above reproach. In measure 154 of the first movement, version III runs the risk of being overly and unnecessarily frantic. It is difficult to justify a switch for one measure to sixteenths, as there is no clear precedent for it, and it possibly overemphasizes measure 154, which is the consequence of the antecedent-consequence four-bar phrase. Version II in this place freshens the passage by varying the articulation and pattern of the intervals within each three-note set, offering a welcome contrast to measure 157. Version II does not disrupt the characteristic elegance of the passage. For these reasons, version II is preferred to version III in measure 154.

Music example 2.3
Measures 114-117 of the first movement find more richness of expression in version II than version III. Version II alternates each half measure between the top note of the octave and bottom note of the octave, creating a livelier, more buoyant, and more spontaneous atmosphere. This transforms the passage into a series of surprise leaps and falls, which captivate attention more dramatically than version III’s predictable and easily anticipated patterns. Descending gradually in measures 116 and 117 in version II feels more expansive than in version III, more in keeping with the character established in measure 100, with its sweeping scalar gesture. The triplets in measure 116 followed by the sixteenths run the risk of creating too much excitement at a time when the diminuendo is the greatest. However, the triplets are more lyrical and arresting than their counterparts in version III. They embody a spirit of improvisation more in keeping with a free-spirited violin obligato. The more inevitable and determined scale of version II in measure 117 is as effective as the sinuous, wandering passage of version III in preparing the tutti entrance. Version II in this passage is preferred to version III due to its lively and improvisatory character.

TESSITURA
Many of Beethoven’s revisions for the solo violin reflect a desire to showcase the extreme registers of the instrument, often juxtaposed closely together. Boris Schwartz takes note of Beethoven’s tendency to write in the “silver high register of the E-string.”\(^{59}\) One of the defining characteristics of Beethoven’s op. 61 is its willingness, even stubbornness, to remain in a stratospheric range. Venturing into the upper registers of the violin is a precedent established by Mozart in his violin concerti. In the first movement of Mozart’s Fifth Violin Concerto, the solo violin in one passage has the instrument’s highest C-sharp. Beethoven’s op. 61 only travels three semi-tones higher to the violin’s highest E. The opening of the violin solo entrance in Mozart’s Fourth Violin Concerto is in the upper register, written in sixth position. By writing the solo violin significantly higher than the \textit{tutti} violin parts, the solo part is easily distinguished. Donald Tovey notes this orchestration technique in Beethoven’s op. 61.\(^{60}\)

Beethoven had already experimented with the upper registers of the violin. Dating back to his Bonn years, the fragment surviving of his Violin Concerto in C Major indicates strong reliance on the upper registers. Beethoven writes daring material in the upper register of his op. 59 quartets of 1806. These writing tendencies for the solo violin are found especially in his massive “Kreutzer” Sonata op. 47. Suhnne Ahn further elucidates how the stratospheric writing in op. 61 compares with Beethoven’s sonata writing and his previous unpublished concerto written in the Bonn years, with special emphasis on Beethoven’s massive op. 47.\(^{61}\) The revisions to the solo violin part of op. 61 are characterized not only by their reliance on the upper registers

\(^{60}\) Tovey, \textit{Essays in Musical Analysis} 3, 90.
but also by many large leaps and passages which begin at one extreme register and end at the other. This allows for a more seamless integration of passages into a larger, more expanded overall framework. As the critical reception for op. 61 suggested, the challenge of increasing the length of a work is to avoid monotony, and tessitura is one of Beethoven’s most trusted techniques to expand the boundaries of the violin concerto while avoiding this potential pitfall.

Beethoven takes advantage of the natural soprano register of the solo violin in order that it is never subsumed by the orchestra. In passages like measure 162 of the first movement, where the violin solo joins the orchestra melody, the range of the solo instrument is such that the violin can be described, even though it is in unison with the principal oboe and first violins. In measures 164-165 in the first movement, version III quickly descends and ascends over a massive part of the violin range, highlighting the massive tessitura change. The leap upward in the first beat of measure 164 enables version III to highlight register. A gradual realization of tessitura change characterizes version I, and the effect is buried in subtlety. The first two beats of measure 164 in version III contain multiple large leaps of a tenth, which is permittedidiomatically due to judicious use of open strings. The tenths expand beyond the octave interval soundly established in measure 162 and allow for more grandiosity.

Music example 2.5
In the passage beginning in measure 315, version III contains a more severe juxtaposition of the extremes of tessitura as compared to version I. Version I throughout these measures stays in the upper and middle registers, whereas version III dips down onto the G-string in both measures 316 and 318. The more advanced contour of version III adds more interest and drama in the passage than version I. Version III allows for more expansive phrasing, as the descending and ascending measures juxtaposed together allows for a two-measure grouping as opposed to the one-measure groupings of version I. This serves to break up the potential of monotony. Measure 337 in the first movement is another instance of version III adding a dramatic change in tessitura through its use of a slurred octave-ascending leap. Version I does not contain this leap, nor does it contain the dramatic drop down in measure 333 of version III, where after resolving on the dissonance on the second beat, version III immediately drops an octave and a fourth down to a C-sharp. There are two massive leaps in version III that are absent from version I, which contribute to the drama of the section. The octave leap in
version III measure 337 creates an expansive and buoyant impression. It soars and yet does not lose its lyrical qualities. Another place version III scoops down where version I does not is in measure 343, which produces more expansiveness and contour to the passage.

Both idiomatic concerns and dramatic use of tessitura characterize the revisions in measures 409-413 in the first movement. Version II is a viable substitute to version III in measures 410-413. In measure 411 version II may be superior to version III because in the second half of the measure in version II deviates from the pattern established in measure 409, thus alleviating concerns of monotony. Version III strictly maintains the pattern that is seen earlier in 409-410 and may be too predictable. In measure 413, version Ib is nearly unplayable as printed due to a massive leap (the greatest in the solo violin part in the entire concerto) that
must occur in both hands of the violinist in the time span of one sixteenth note. The violinist must cross from the top string to the bottom string with the bow and shift from sixth position down to first extremely rapidly in the left hand. That great leap was preserved in version III but with the reasonable idiomatic adjustment of adding slightly more space with the use of the eighth note instead of the sixteenth on the downbeat. The element of time in the practical sense disqualifies version Ib. Another reason version II does not seem as effective as version III in this passage is due to the use of more closed harmony. Version III relies on the very open and expansive I 6/4 chord, harmonically similar to the opening of the third movement. Version II in the beginning of measure 413 is one of the more awkward-sounding suggestions Beethoven wrote in the entire work. The two consecutive downward leaps immediately pale in comparison to the other two versions. Perhaps Beethoven was thinking practically and idiomatically about the demands of the great leap on the violinist in version I or the novel timbre of the open string.
Yet aesthetically the leap down to the open A-string disappoints expectation rather than generating interest or drama.

PULSE

Beethoven’s inventiveness regarding pulse allows for unprecedented dramatic control. It is one of the largest reasons why Beethoven is able to effectively expand the form of the concerto, symphony, and string quartet all during this time period. One of the key elements that allows for expansion is his masterful control of techniques such as diminution and augmentation. Articulation frequently introduces another level of engagement with pulse. Clashes between duple and triple meters characterize much of the revision process. Beethoven’s limitless imagination for improvisation is manifested in multiple passages, such as in the g-minor sections in the first movement and third movements.

One passage that characterizes Beethoven’s revisions regarding rhythmic complexity and particularly the clash between duple and triple meters is found in version III in measures 152-154 in the first movement. Churgin suggests that the broken octave motive in measure 153 of version III exists because of its hemiolic effect. Performers should be aware of the hemiolic possibilities in this passage, as most performances tend not to emphasize this rhythmic complexity. Measure 153 adds a dance-like element, alternating back and forth in an improvisatory nature and promoting a fresh and spontaneous character. In measure 154 of

---


version III, Beethoven shifts from a triple to a duple pulse, but taking into account the full tutti, there is no compelling reason aesthetically to agitate the material with sixteenths. Version III appears as an indecent randomized outburst, considering that the transition to duple feeling from the triple feeling does not appear elsewhere in the passage. Version II adjusts the pulse by reason of slurring, adding variety and interest without compromising the character of the passage. Therefore version II is more tasteful in measure 154. Rhythmic complexity or escalation can occasionally distract from more important aesthetic considerations.

A passage which deliberately maintains a consistent pulse appears in measures 331-346 of the first movement. The underlying rhythmic simplicity allows for more effective variation and embellishment within the solo violin part. The two parallel passages in the first movement of measures 331-339 and measures 340-346 contain the same slurring patters. However, Beethoven significantly embellishes the passage beginning in measure 340 as compared with the passage beginning in measure 331, particularly in version III. In version III measure 340,
Beethoven breaks the eighth-note precedent and favors sixteenth notes; in measure 342.

Beethoven changes to a dotted-eighth and sixteenth pattern, with a turn over the dotted eighth note; in measure 344, triplets appear. Remarkably the overriding pulse is consistent in spite of the consistent variation of rhythm across the gestures. Measures 332, 334, and 336 establish the same melodic gesture three times to clearly establish a precedent that will momentarily be
broken. This is similar to how measures 309, 311, and 313 intentionally establish the similar material three times, creating firm expectations. In both cases the expectations will be manipulated into more dramatic interest as Beethoven begins to vary the material in subsequent measures. After the local expectation is established in measures 331-339, each gesture in the solo violin thereafter is a unique adaptation in version III. Version I throughout the section of 341-344 maintains straight sixteenth notes, thus rendering itself less interesting and lacking the improvisatory nature of version III. Version I provides a diminution in measures 342 and 344 of the two eighth-note motive, present throughout the entire section from measure 331 to measure 347. This motive is present on the last beat of measures 332, 334, and 336, and as an anticipation carries considerable local significance. Version III preserves it consistently as eighth notes, but perhaps version III could benefit from adopting version I’s sixteenth note version in one or both of measures 342 and 344.

In measures 182-190 of the first movement, there are multiple notable instances where Beethoven adjusts the pulse between the different solo violin versions in versions II and III, mostly concerning articulation and the shift between duple and triple meters. In measure 182, Beethoven’s use of articulation marks and slurring marks in version II adds more variety to the pulse, while version III opts in favor of a scale.\(^{64}\) Beethoven usually leaves scales free of printed

\(^{64}\) Measure 182 in version III is the measure whose solo violin part is stolen directly from Clement’s own Violin Concerto in D Major, and it appears exactly like Clement’s in both the version I and version III. See chapter one above for more discussion on Clement’s influence on Beethoven, 1-14.
articulation, leaving the articulation decisions up to the performer. In measure 187, version II has slurs which are absent from version III, which, though challenging from an idiomatic

Music example 2.11

---

perspective, add a freshness of variety. In version II of measure 190, the second half of the measure is triplets, whereas version III remains in sixteenth notes. Version III in measure 182 favors a more lyrical expression than version II. Beethoven is balancing his desire to constantly shift the pulse with the inherent nature of the two main themes on which the piece is built, which are lyrical and expansive in nature. However, version II is more varied and more engaging throughout the passage in measures 182-190 and deserves a close look for performers. Unfortunately, version II is less coherent in measures 182-184. The same capitulation is made in version II in measure 183 as is made in version II in measure 413. Beethoven shies away from the higher, more technically demanding parts, but in a way which does not strengthen the passages aesthetically. Could it be that Clement played these passages out of tune at the premiere, prompting the revisions?

Beethoven uses both articulation and the transition between duple and triple meter in the passage in measures 195-204 in order to adjust the pulse and create more dramatic interest. In measure 195, version III is in triplets rather than the sixteenth notes of version I. The triplets of version III produce an effect of defiance, pride, and nobility. A different direction is immediately taken on account of these triplets, as they represent a stark departure from the entire previous section which relied exclusively on sixteenth notes. The triplets serve to break up the threatening monotony of so many continuous sixteenths. Version I in measure 195 attempts to stave off monotony merely by slurring wider swaths of notes, but version I is not able to properly showcase a soloist who is breaking free from the orchestra in this section. In addition to the change from a duple to triple feeling to convey the drama of the new section, measures 195, 197, and 199 employ various articulations to alter the pulse and maintain drama. The tessitura of
these three passages and the rhythm itself remains quite stable from measures 195-200, so it is incumbent on Beethoven to alter the articulation to provide interest. The pulse is broken up asymmetrically partway through the second beat of measure 196 by reason of the end of the slur and subsequent staccato markings. In measure 197, the change in articulation for the first beat holds throughout the two measures, creating a more disjunct and pointillistic, beat-by-beat notion of this passage, which is in turn brutally negated by the long two-measure pulse beginning in measure 199 and extending through measure 200. This change in pulse by the violin soloist is similar to how Beethoven transitions in the *tutti* section from the half-bar pulses of measures...
176-177 into the slurred two-measure pulses of measures 178-179. Beethoven also manipulates the articulation in version II of measure 154 to further the drama of the passage.

The passage from measures 172-178 in the first movement is notable for its use of syncopation and rhythmic complexity in version III, characteristics not prevalent in the other versions. Variety of pulse is infused in version III which make this passage perhaps the pre-eminent example for Beethoven’s masterful control of pulse in the solo violin part in the entire concerto. Version III’s superiority in this passage is above reproach. The large leaps of measures 172 and 173 are eighth notes. This changes in measures 174 and 175, where diminution forces the parallel leaps to be in the space of a sixteenth note. This diminution intensifies the phrase to its conclusion in measure 178. Even while this diminution is occurring within the violin solo part itself, Beethoven is setting up a diminution with the entire tutti beginning in measure 174.
The orchestra plays only once per bar as a downbeat chord in measure 174 and measure 175. Suddenly in measure 176 the orchestra plays every half measure, a dramatic diminution, which brings the section to a rousing conclusion at the beginning of measure 178. Strikingly, in measure 178, after all the heightened drama and intensity, the arrival itself is a massive pacification in pulse. The pulse switches instantly from every half measure to a massive two-measure pulse, an incredible switch and tactic which allows Beethoven to emphasize one of his overriding ideals for the concerto, that of expansion of form. Another reason in this passage from measures 172-178 that version III is more effective is its variation of pulse in measures 172-174. In measure 172, the pulse is on the first eighth note, the second eighth note, and the fourth and fifth eighth notes. In measure 173, the pulse is on the first eighth note, the second eighth note, the fourth, the sixth, and the eighth eighth notes. In measure 174, the pulse is arguably either on every single eighth note, or on the first, seventh, and eighth eighth notes. In all three measures there is remarkable variation within the pulse, allowing for consistent drama throughout the section.

Measure 199 begins another chain of diminution. The use of slurs in the passage of measures 199-204 reveals the pulse. The pulse beginning in measure 199 lasts two measures. Measures 201-202 both contain one pulse per measure. In measure 203, there are two pulses. In measure 204, the first half is one pulse under the slur. The second half of the measure contains two pulses, on the C-sharp and on the E, the third and fourth beats respectively. The C-sharp receives the pulse because the articulation changes to staccato. The E stands out by reason of the leap from the previous A, which creates the high point in the entire concerto for the solo violin in terms of tessitura. So in measure 203, Beethoven uses both articulation and tessitura to highlight
the pulse. The ascension of each pulse begins in earnest at the beginning of measure 203. The third beat of measure 203 ascends, the first beat of measure 204 ascends, the third beat of measure 204 ascends, and finally the fourth beat E ascends. This is another way to discern that there is a pulse both on beat three and beat four of measure 204. In this way the diminution is manifested. Version I in measures 203 and 204 fails to continue the pattern of diminution and thus is weaker and feels awkward in comparison to version III.
A similar pattern of diminution emerges (as compared with measure 204 and its parallel place in measure 475) in measure 328 of the first movement. All three of these passages are immediately followed by extended trills, which in turn signal the endings to their respective sections. All three contain nearly identical articulations and tessitura. Of these three, measure 475 is the lone passage where all the versions (except of the crossed out version of Ia) agree on articulation and pulse. Measure 328 and measure 204 both contain distinctive versions I and III. In both cases, version I fails to engage in diminution due to its slurring patterns. Version III consistently emphasizes the practice of diminution as a dramatic device more than the other versions. Version III simplifies and unifies the material across these three passages that are roughly similar in their function, whereas version I is more improvisatory across all three sections. Beethoven alters these three passages slightly and tastefully in version III, but he maintains consistency within the rhythmic structure and tessitura.
The passage from measures 162-172 in version Ia of the third movement is one of the largest truncated sections within the solo violin revisions. In measures 162-171 Beethoven initially wrote thematically passive trills in the solo violin, but immediately decided the solo violin should play a more serious role in the development of the drama in this section. Version Ib is characterized by florid slurred sixteenths throughout measures 162-166, which maintain more intensity than the trill. Virtuosic octave passages are added to Ib in measures 168 and 170. In addition to the dazzling effect of their technical demands, these two measures also serve as the
beginning of a diminution which dries the music forward until the end of the passage in measure 173. A two-measure pattern is established, but in measures 172-173 the soloist breaks the pattern. This diminution renders measures 172-173 more powerful. Version Ib and version III transition much more effectively into the next section of 174 than version Ia by generating much more rhythmic interest.

Beethoven is presented with a conundrum in measures 319-320 of the first movement concerning pulse. Version I contains the opening motive from measure 1 by reason of its pulse. The D on the E-string in third position is iterated four consecutive times, each half measure for two measures. The downside of resorting to this motive is that the reputation begins to sound laborious. Another possible shortcoming of version I is that the necessity of having to leap over multiple strings so many times in a row to make the high D causes an urgency and a breathlessness which may not be the overriding intention of the passage. The tutti is subdued and does not call for extroversion. However, the harmony changes on the third of these descending arpeggios, and a strong player could produce an effective rendition by altering dynamics and colors of the sound. Version III ushers measure 321 in more gently, without the leap of version I, allowing for a more nuanced beginning to the next phrase (measures 321-324). In this way Version III represents a superior and more seamless musical transition than version I. The augmentation from a half-measure pulse in measure 319 to the full measure pulse of measure 320 adds arresting drama in version III not present in version I. Is restating the five-note motive more important than local continuity and fluidity? In measures 321-323, version III is far more interesting. Version I reverts to prosaic measure-by-measure repetition. Version III alternates between duple and triple meter each measure and presents novel articulations and bowings. The
first time the meter switches to duple in this passage in measure 322, an immediate importance to every beat as well as a musical stubbornness is immediately observed. This creates a remarkable contrast to the surrounding measures 321 and 323, which are florid and lyrical. Version I engages in the duple meter only in measure 324, but it is more effectively observed twice as in version III.

IDIOMATIC CONSIDERATIONS

It is no secret that version III tends to leave out many of the most difficult passages contained in the first two versions in favor of less technically-demanding passages.\textsuperscript{66} The emphasis on simplicity portrays the lyricism intended by Beethoven for this movement. It also allows for more seamless expansion of the scope of the individual sections and their connection to the formal structure. One passage where idiomatic considerations were the impetus for

\textsuperscript{66} Stowell, \textit{Beethoven Violin Concerto}, 54-55.
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revision is the section from measures 365-381 in the first movement, which was crossed out before the premiere. This is perhaps the most striking of all the revisions because of its length and the fact that it significantly alters the presentation of the recapitulation. The passage is fiendishly difficult, and it is possible it was omitted from a practical standpoint for the premiere. According to Czerny, the piece was finished scarcely two days before the premiere, and another source claims the concerto was partially read at sight by Clement at the premiere.\textsuperscript{67} Whether the omission of this passage was on account of Clement’s influence or of Beethoven’s own qualms is a subject for debate. Churgin suggests that the passage was omitted due to the \textit{tutti fortissimo}, which would potentially overshadow the soloist.\textsuperscript{68} This is plausible, but the solo violin part in this place is written so uniquely different from all the other instruments and is so consistently in a high register that it likely could be detected without too much capitulation from the \textit{tutti} orchestra. Churgin’s comment also assumes that the violin solo is inherently so important that it always must be distinctly heard. However in this passage the solo violin would be in a supporting role, so every detail need not be highlighted to convey its purpose. This passage also could have been omitted to give the soloist an opportunity for a break or to showcase the orchestra without the distraction of a violinist fiendishly scrambling around the instrument.


\textsuperscript{68} Ibid, 73.
Perhaps, in a different vein than Churgin suggested, the soloist would actually be drawing excessive and unmerited attention.69

Another massive revision as a result of idiomatic difficulties is the passage in measures 297-306 of the third movement. Version Ia is crossed out in this section and does not entirely fill in each measure, signifying that Beethoven immediately changed his mind and wrote in version Ib simultaneously. Initially version Ia consisted of two-octave arpeggios in first position. In version Ib Beethoven decided to preserve the underlying rhythm of the opening theme of the third movement: a pickup eighth note, a quarter note, and three eighth notes. This rhythm is preserved throughout the entire section as it traverses through different key areas, always outlining an octave within each arpeggiated measure. In this way version Ib gives thematic material to the solo violin. The difficulties lie in the fact that the entire passage is given in slurred broken octaves. Version Ib survived until the premiere, but Beethoven indicated second thoughts a few months later with various suggestions in version II, which departed from the strict adherence to octaves in measures 301 and 303. Version III removes the octaves entirely. The stunning virtuosic effect is diminished, but the barriolage of version III maintains a reasonable level of difficulty. This revision represents a capitulation for idiomatic reasons, for the dramatic effect of version III is less than that version Ib. At the premiere Clement may have struggled to execute the passage with secure intonation. It is notable that a passage of identical difficulty in

69 Wholesale changes to form were not uncommon late in Beethoven’s compositional process, and this adjustment in proportion of the solo part fits in with Beethoven’s typical style. Cooper proffers a salient discussion of this in Beethoven and the Creative Process, 129, and he cites Philip Gossett’s article from 1974, “Beethoven's Sixth Symphony: Sketches for the First Movement.” Journal Of The American Musicological Society 27, no. 2, 248-284. Kojima, as a key editor and scholar of Beethoven’s op. 61, also authored an article the prior year, 1973, entitled “Probleme im Notentext der Pastoralsymphonie Op. 68 von Beethoven.” Beethoven-Jahrbuch 9, 217-261. It is noteworthy that 1973 was also the year of publication of Kojima’s full score with Henle of the Beethoven Violin Concerto op. 61, thus signifying concurrent work on the source materials of Beethoven’s op. 61 and op. 68.
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measures 172-173 of the third movement was preserved, perhaps because it is merely a two-measure burst as opposed to ten measures of continuous rapid broken octaves. Version II in these measures presents a viably dramatic alternative to version I. It offers a fresh deviation from the pattern established in measures 168 and 170, which is appropriate for the last iteration. Version III adjusts for the unnecessary and nearly impossible leaps in version Ib at the ends of measures 168 and 170 by adding in eighth-note rests at the ends of these measures.
There are several other notable idiometrically-minded revisions. Measure 113 of the first movement in version I involves an odd jump of a seventh before the final beat, presenting an unusual stretch for the left hand. This difficulty was removed in version III. Version I in measure 154 is characterized by a series of extremely awkward string-crossings that are nearly impossible to execute eloquently. Both versions II and III present more palatable suggestions, both idiomatically and aesthetically. There is slight difficulty in measure 165 in version I as there is no great way to shift in order to execute the final two beats of this measure. One can shift to fourth position on the open E, but this is not an ideal solution. Version III reveals that this annoyance to the soloist is unnecessary by offering a viable musical version which erases the difficulty of the shift. The version I passage in measures 315-318 is extremely harrowing for the soloist, as well as more monotonous as mentioned previously in this chapter. Version III improves on both these shortcomings.

Perhaps the most egregious out of all the idiomatic difficulties in any of the versions is the transition between measures 362 and 363 in version I. There is no effective way to accomplish this without severe difficulties, and the idiomatic solutions require aesthetic sacrifices. Version III improves these shortcomings without sacrificing musical integrity.
Measure 364 is also quite awkward idiomatically as compared with version III, with the necessity of crossing two strings as well as blocking a tenth. Judicious use of the open strings in version III is much more effective idiomatically, and the resonance and timbre of the open strings works well in the context of the crescendo to the tutti fortissimo. Setting the hand up properly for the octave leaps in measure 450 and 451 also creates massive danger for violinists in version I. Versions II and III radically depart from the musical approach of version I in these measures and in the process present idiomatically satisfying alternatives. As compared to the premiere version of the work, it is clear that Beethoven was far more concerned about the idiomatic possibilities of the violin part in his revisions, many of which addressed these awkward passages.
CHAPTER 3: THE VIOLIN CONCERTO IN THE CONTEXT OF BEETHOVEN’S MIDDLE-PERIOD STYLE

Beethoven’s middle-period style was fully realized with his “Eroica” Symphony, op. 55. According to Alan Tyson, the heroic period begins in 1801 with Beethoven’s growing deafness and culminates in 1805 with the opera Fidelio and the op. 55 symphony, both which predate the writing of op. 61.\(^{70}\) Lewis Lockwood notes the overwhelming consensus that op. 55 represents a “decisive turning-point in Beethoven’s development.”\(^{71}\) A popular demarcation for the launching of Beethoven’s middle-period is the writing of the “Heiligenstadt Testament” in October 1802.\(^{72}\) Considering the “Eroica” Symphony began to be sketched in 1803, this interpretation allows op. 55 to be a tipping point from the early to middle periods.\(^{73}\) Kinderman identifies the “Eroica” Symphony as the embodiment of Beethoven’s “great stylistic transition” of 1803.\(^{74}\)

Beethoven’s op. 61 displays many of the characteristic features of the middle-period style. Among these are his tendency to deconstruct a piece into its barest formal elements of rhythm, harmony, and motivic development.\(^{75}\) These elements, all present in the sketches to the


\(^{75}\) Broyles notes all of these characteristics of Beethoven’s middle period style: Broyles, Michael. The Emergence and Evolution of Beethoven’s Heroic Style. New York: Excelsior Music Publishing Co., 1987, 97-110.
concerto, tie together the entire creative process. To further understand the purpose behind Beethoven’s revisions for this concerto, it is important to look at how these same devices are translated in the context of the composer’s other middle-period works. The tapping motive in op. 61, introduced in measures 1-2 by the timpani carries dramatic import throughout the movement. Motives which reappear throughout entire movements are introduced in the beginnings of Beethoven’s other middle-period works, such as in the “Appassionata” sonata, the Fourth Piano Concerto, the second movement of Op. 59 no. 1, and the Fifth Symphony.

Beethoven’s effective use of surprising and destabilizing harmonic effects is on display in op. 61 with the dissonant D-sharp of measure 10. Through his unique orchestration techniques, Beethoven stretches the boundaries of registral and timbral contrast. The juxtaposition of the timpani with the winds in the first two measures of op. 61 is a poignant example of Beethoven emphasizing expansiveness through tessitura and timbre. These middle-period tactics allow Beethoven to challenge expectations regarding form.76

The introduction of a five-note motive by the solo timpani in measure 1 of op. 61 is one of the concerto’s most defining features. Throughout the movement, this motive provides commentary on the first theme and is interspersed with other thematic material.77 This five-note motive of op. 61 is employed to subtly infuse passages with certain characters, as if an outside

---


77 See Plantinga’s discussion of the five-note motive in his Beethoven’s Concertos, 218-224. Plantinga posits that the use of the five-note motive throughout the first movement is one reason for the movement’s striking uniformity, 222.
Middle-Period Rhythmic Motives

“Appassionata” sonata, measure 10

Op. 58 opening

Op. 59 no. 1, movement 2 opening

Op. 61 opening

Op. 67 opening

Op. 67 transition between movements 3 and 4
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force were involved. The relationship between the pulse and the rhythmic motive develops early in the movement. In the beginning, the timpani comments on the opening theme, sometimes accompanying the winds as in measures 8-9, and sometimes acting as an equal force to the winds as in measures 1 and 5. The first violins take over the motive in measure 10 with eighth-note and eighth-rest combinations, which further solidify the motive’s military intentions. In measure 14 the motive is transformed in the celli and bass sections into a lyrical character, which contrasts the timpani’s rigid, military character in measure 1. The motive is augmented by appearing on beat two and on subsequent weak beats until measure 16. In measure 18 it appears as a diminution into sixteenth notes in the strings. The clarinet and bassoon at the beginnings of measures 18, 20, and 22 hold their notes for five eighth-notes while the strings fill out the five eighth-notes with sixteenth-notes. The gigantic fortissimo tutti arrival of measure 28 is an outline of the five-note motive. Beethoven combines the diminution presented in measure 18 with the first-violin iteration of eighth note and eighth rest combinations from measure 10 within the five quarter-note tutti motive in measures 28-33. In measure 34, Beethoven remains in the framework of the five-note motive but alters the pulse in the strings and timpani. The motive continues in the first violins as a partner to the wind section’s presentation of the second theme in measures 43-50. In measure 50, the horns, trumpets, and timpani take over the motive as the violins assume the second theme in the minor mode momentarily in measure 51. The timpani, horns, and trumpets are marked piano and embody dirge-like qualities. The triplets in this passage in the violas and celli suggest turmoil beneath the pristine, lyrical melody. It is no accident that in measure 84, the first violins have a series of five chords after which the orchestra

---

Plantinga notes that the motive at first feels “exterior,” 218.
winds down and the soloist enters. The first notes the soloist then plays in measures 88-89 represent two iterations of the five-note motive fused together.

Perhaps the most striking instance of the motive within the movement occurs in measure 330. The motive is eerily transformed into a dirge-like fate motive in the trumpets in pianissimo, recalling measure 50. This time the dynamic insists on a more subdued and more sinister color. The motive is passed from the trumpets to the bassoons in measure 338 and finally to the horns in measure 346, who continue the dirge until 357. In 350 there is a diminution of the motive. The whole note disappears and the motive marches lugubriously and inexorably on quarter notes until 357. Beethoven saves the grandest presentation of the five-note motive for the recapitulation in measure 365. Both Kinderman and Plantinga note that the five-note motive encounters a special function here, where it is taken up exuberantly by the entire tutti section. This is a stark contrast to the bareness with which it is presented in the first measure of the piece by the solo timpani. Its triumph is also more poignant after the motive’s mournful appearance in the development merely a few measures prior.

One reason the five-note motive in the first movement of op. 61 is able to provide such continuity throughout the movement is due to its relation to the two principal themes. The first theme is two half notes leading to an arrival on the fifth beat of the phrase. The motive fits neatly underneath the first two half notes, and then the fifth note is the phrasal arrival, similar to measures 1-2 where the fifth note of the introductory motive coincides with the arrival of the

---

79 See Plantinga, 221-222 for discussion about Beethoven’s middle-period tactics concerning treatment of recapitulation. Kinderman also provides an abbreviated overview of Beethoven’s treatment of recapitulation, reaching back as far as his op. 18 string quartets for examples. See Beethoven, 141. See also chapter two for more about this passage.

80 Churgin in “Beethoven Violin Concerto in D Major, Op. 61” unearths some of these intricate relationships between the themes and five-note motive, 19.
wind section. The second theme commences with three quarter notes and two eighth notes leading to a half-note phrasal arrival point. The rhythmic outline is nearly identical to the five-note motive except that the fourth quarter note of the second theme is broken into two eighth notes. This enables a variety of interactions between the motive and the themes. In the opening passage, the timpani is a conversant with the wind section, engaging in equal dialogue with the first theme. In measure 513, the motive is employed to accompany the second theme. Thus the motive interacts with both the first and second themes throughout the movement.

Weaving a short thematic motive throughout an entire movement is not a technique confined to op. 61 but extends to much of Beethoven’s middle-period output. Beethoven often constructs entire movements around recurring rhythmic motives. From the genesis of the sketches for op. 61 which contain this rhythmic motive, and throughout the revisional process, the purpose for Beethoven’s motivic designs are further elucidated through multiple middle-period examples. The op. 57 “Appassionata” sonata, the op. 67 symphony, and the op. 58 piano concerto are middle-period works which inculcate rhythmic motives over vast expanses.

---


“Appassionata” sonata, the motive most similar to the five-note motive of op. 61 is the triplet figure introduced in measure 10. The four-note figure alternates between two distinct registers in measures 12-13 before culminating in a brief and frenzied outburst, which ends in a fermata in measure 16. The triplet motive of the “Appassionata” is nearly identical to the most notable motivic example, that of the opening of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony. In op. 67, though the meter is duple, the feeling of triple meter is preserved within its iconic four-note opening motive. The third movement is built from the same motive in triple meter. Another four-note motive appears in the first movement of op. 58. The Fourth Piano Concerto opens with a passage characterized by sets of four repeated notes, which are quickly discovered to be an important and recurring element in the work. The four repeated notes remain on the same pitch, similar to the five-note motive of op. 61 and the motive from the third movement of op. 67. However, in the development, in measures 231-235, occasionally the triplet pickups lead to a different harmony. The four-note motive from the beginning of op. 58 is arranged such that the first three of these operate as pickup notes leading to the fourth note. For discussion of the opening of op. 58 and its recurring motive, see Martin, James. “The Importance of Beginnings in Beethoven’s Fourth Fortepiano Concerto.” The Beethoven Journal 11 no. 1, 2-6.
movement.\textsuperscript{85} Similar to op. 61, the motive is presented in its most elemental form on the tonic note by a solo voice in a low register. The entire movement proceeds from this motive.

The use of the five-note motive in op. 61 recalls other instances in Beethoven’s middle period in which the timpani’s use is expanded for dramatic purposes. The surviving sketches for op. 61 feature the timpani and its presentation of this motive in the first measure, indicating the timpani’s significance to the work from the beginnings of the creative process. In his collection of Civil-War poetry "Drum-Taps," Walt Whitman refers to the sounds of nineteenth-century warfare, to the drums and bugles and marches that accompanied the armies of that era, the same sounds that haunted Beethoven in 1806:

\textit{Phantoms of countless lost,}
\textit{invisible to the rest henceforth become my companions,}
\textit{Follow me ever -- desert me not while I live.}\textsuperscript{86}

The drums and trumpets associated with war surface often in Beethoven's music, from the op. 37 Piano Concerto (1803) to the Agnus Dei from Missa solemnis (1822). However, this preoccupation with war is most prominent in his compositions from the war-torn years 1805-1809. Vienna was occupied by Napoleon's armies in November 1805 and again in May 1809, and the horror and bloodshed of the Napoleonic wars were ever-present. This tumultuous


\textsuperscript{86} "Ashes of Soldiers" in Whitman, Walt. \textit{Civil War Poetry and Prose.} New York: Dover, 1995, 37. This poem was first published as "Hymn of Dead Soldiers" in "Drum-Taps" in 1865, and later incorporated into Whitman's collection "Leaves of Grass."
atmosphere is reflected in Beethoven’s use of the timpani during this middle-period “heroic” phase, during which Beethoven invoked the timpani’s dramatic militaristic associations more than any other composer.87

The op. 61a Piano Concerto, Fidelio, and the Fourth and Fifth Symphonies are characterized with novel and dramatic uses of the timpani. The timpani can produce some of the most subtle sounds in the orchestra and therefore emerges easily from the context of silence, stillness, and anticipation. In the revisions to the solo violin part, Beethoven’s keen interest in exploring color both within the solo violin part itself and in its timbrel relationship to the timpani and other orchestral forces. The juxtaposition between the foreboding of the timpani’s distant colors and the military triumph of its more bombastic passages characterizes these examples. Op. 61, despite its apparent serenity, also reflects this militaristic character. The solo violin exudes a soaring quality, owing in part to the expansive high range of its sonorities, hovering far above in the upper registers. Nevertheless, the music is firmly grounded by the motive of repeated notes associated above all with the timpani, though also with the trumpets and horns. In the latter sections of the development of the first movement, Beethoven builds up the sonority so that the pattern of softly repeated drum taps in quarters is reflected in a pattern of eighth-note figuration in the orchestral violins and figures of animated sixteenths in the violin solo. Once the chromatically descending bass line reaches a pedal point on A in measure 357, the violin solo begins a long chromatic ascent in figuration in triplet eighths, a pattern that in Beethoven's

87 Anthony Hopkins suggests that Beethoven was perhaps the first composer to “free the timpani” from its often predictable and banal role. See Hopkins, Anthony. The Seven Concertos of Beethoven. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999, 85.
original conception was to have led to a virtuosic decoration of the solo at the beginning of the recapitulation.  

In a cadenza written for the first movement of op. 61a, the dialogue between timpani and solo piano consolidates the timpani’s role as a key purveyor of drama throughout the concerto. There are two passages where the timpani assumes the role of catalyst during transitional sections: in the long retransition into the first theme and in the denouement at the end of the cadenza. These two passages highlight the timpani’s role in propelling the soloist into key formal sections of arrival. The timpani continues beating relentlessly without resting at these transitions. Other than these two passages, the timpani functions in the cadenza as an equal-dialogue partner with the solo piano, presenting the five-note motive in military, march-like fashion.

As in the cadenza for op. 61a, one of the timpani’s roles in Beethoven’s Fourth and Fifth Symphonies is that of a transition device. Both symphonies employ long, continuous pianissimo passages in the timpani at key transition areas. In the first movement of the Fourth Symphony, the timpani has a fortissimo trill in three passages in the exposition (measures 85-86, measures 173-175, and measures 187-188). This idea is continued in the development in measures 257-259 with another fortissimo timpani trill. But at the sparsest passage of the development, before the buildup into the recapitulation, the timpani trills instead in a sinister pianissimo, whispering in measures 283-284 and again in measures 287-288. In both instances the timpani appears as an unaccompanied solo voice, an indefinite source of suspense. In measures 311-335, the timpani ceaselessly trills between the tonic and supertonic, remaining in pianissimo until a

---

88 See chapter two for further details and analysis of this passage.
crescendo in measure 325 takes the timpani to *fortissimo* in measure 333, which coincides with the arrival of the recapitulation. The wave of sound from the timpani invigorates the *tutti* crescendo and is the main source of momentum ushering in the recapitulation.

In Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, the timpani controls the transition between the third and fourth movements. In measure 324 of the third movement, the timpani outlines the lengthy conversation between the bassoon and strings in the previous passage in measures 317-321. However, the timpani has no conversant within the orchestra; instead it functions as a narrative device, providing commentary on the previous passage and foreshadowing the bombastic military triumph of the finale. A diminuation process commences in measures 328-331. The timpani plays only on the downbeat in these measures. In measures 332-335, the timpani plays on both the downbeat and the third beat, and in measures 336-373, the timpani plays on every beat. Here the instrument is a relentless, driving force of Fate, hurling the music from the austere key of C minor into the triumphant and heroic C major finale.

Another striking dramatic use of the timpani surfaces in the introduction to the last act of *Fidelio*. In a stark departure from traditional tuning practices (which emphasize the tonic and dominant), the timpani is tuned to A and E-flat, outlining a sinister tritone relationship. The timpani appears in measures 14-16 and 29-30, both times propelling the drama and increasing the foreboding of the moment, in which Florestan is imprisoned. Beethoven extended the boundaries of the timpani for the dramatic purpose of illuminating the gravity of Florestan’s unfortunate situation. The outline of A and E-flat mirrors the use of Beethoven’s harmonic surprise in measure 10 of the first movement of op. 61. The enharmonic D-sharp is juxtaposed with A major in the following measure. This harmonic overlap between *Fidelio* and the violin
concerto gives credence to Maiko Kawabata’s hypothesis of a dramatic rescue plot associated with op. 61.⁸⁹

The drama of op. 61 relies heavily on the element of tessitura in order to create unique and dramatic timbre.⁹⁰ The highest and lowest ranges of the orchestra are often radically juxtaposed within passages to create more extremes within the work. Perhaps the most striking example is provided at the transition into the second exposition. The solo violin breaks free of its broken-thirds pattern and ascends in a sweeping scale up to the highest D accessible on the violin. This occurs simultaneously with the timpani entrance on the same note four octaves below.⁹¹ Throughout the section from measures 387-425 in the first movement, Beethoven relies heavily on massive leaps in tessitura. There is a two octave swoop upward in measures 421 and 422, followed by a massive, immediate plunging descent of over an octave in measure 423. Another expansive descent occurs in measure 393, and as in measure 423, the notes immediately preceding and following the leap are melodic in nature. Dramatic leaps characterize the section in measures 400-405, where Beethoven alternates between the different registers. The tessitura differentiates the two voices. One voice is the B in measure 400, the A in measure 401, the G in measure 402, the D in measure 403, and the C-sharp in measure 404. The other voice is the F-sharp in measures 400-401, the B in measures 402-403, and the E in measures 404-405. This differentiation of voices has its genesis in the different vocal registers used on the operatic stage.


⁹⁰ This has been shown in previous discussions in chapter two regarding the relationship between tessitura and the solo violin revisions.

⁹¹ Kinderman notes the drama created by the extremes of registers and timbres used in this situation. See Kinderman’s Beethoven, 140-143.
This technique might indicate some of Beethoven’s heavy study into the opera and stage world with his opera *Fidelio*. The violin is thus showcased as its different characters and timbres appear throughout the juxtaposition of its highest and lowest registers.

In addition to op. 61, op. 57, op. 58, and op. 59 no. 1 are middle-period examples characterized by the differences in timbre which occur from extreme registral experimentation. In the “Appassionata” sonata, each movement is characterized by passages which span the entire piano range. In the first movement, measure 13 begins as an outburst which extends up into the stratosphere and descends rapidly until the passage is assumed by the lower voice in measure 14, which is almost five octaves below where the passage began. Another passage is the series of arpeggios in measures 227-234, the first two of which span four octaves, the third of which covers five octaves in measures 231 and 232. After measure 5 of the third movement, the tessitura gradually descends all the way down to the low F on the downbeat of measure 20, again spanning nearly five octaves. The passage from 113 to 118 of the third movement spans a semitone above five octaves. These juxtaposition of registers contribute to the scope and drama of the work.

In the second movement of op. 59 no. 1, there are numerous passages where Beethoven dramatically contrasts the extremes of the first violin in its upper register and the cello in its lower register. One way Beethoven emphasizes the timbral contrast is with contrary motion. One example of this is in measure 384, where the first violin ascends until measure 386, while the cello descends in the same period down to a D-flat, a semitone above its lowest note. The first violin contains an A-flat, four octaves and a fifth in its interval above the cello. Passages such as measures 424-426 contain short three-note bursts which are rapidly passed through each
instrument, creating a frenzied juxtaposition of register. Measure 431-434, also a passage built on three-note bursts, begins in the cello near the bottom of its register and extends all the way to the upper register of the first violin. Later the three-note motive is presented in its most elemental form in measures 466-468, where the three-note burst in each instrument outlines a B-flat triad such that each instrument contributes one octave to the continual four-octave arpeggio in a strophic arrangement. Measures 231-235 in the first movement of op. 58 are worth comparing to measure 300 in the first movement of op. 61, the beginning of the development. Both of these passages juxtapose the rhythmic motive in the basses and celli with the soloist in a higher register. The glaring contrast between the bass and soloist largely informs the drama in the relationship between the soloist and tutti sections. All of these uses of tessitura contribute to the overall scope and drama of their works and expand the possibilities of expression in Beethoven’s middle-period output. These middle-period examples bring further clarity to the focus on tessitura in the revisions of the solo violin part and further understanding of the reason Beethoven believed the solo part could be effectively altered. Beethoven’s focus on utilizing extreme registers for dramatic purposes during this time was applied to the revisional process of op. 61.92

Beethoven often emphasizes the tonic at the outset of his middle-period pieces.93 The solo timpani notes which open op. 61 are in the tonic. Two massive punctuated tonic chords characterize the iconic opening of the “Eroica” Symphony. The second movement from Beethoven’s Op. 59 no. 1 begins with the rhythmic motive by the cellist in the tonic of B-flat.

---

92 See chapter two for more details regarding tessitura and the solo violin revisions.
93 Op. 67, a notable exception, skirts a direct emphasis of the tonic C at the outset.
Op. 60 also opens on a unison tonic B-flat; Op. 62 begins on a unison C; Op. 68 begins with a drone on the tonic F, and Op. 58 commences on a clear tonic G major chord in the solo piano. However, near the opening of these works Beethoven presents numerous harmonic destabilization techniques. The sudden juxtaposition of keys can often be quite jarring and grips with intense spiritual drama.\(^94\) In op. 59 no. 1, after the opening in the tonic B-flat major, A-flat major appears. A-flat is the seventh pitch of the B-flat scale, and thus the sense of where the tonic lies is instantly uncertain. Shockingly, B major suddenly emerges, further obscuring any sense of the tonic.\(^95\) In op. 58, the first phrase is unmistakably in the tonic of G major, but the orchestra commences the second phrase in B major.\(^96\) Interestingly, the development of the first movement of op. 61 begins in b minor, and shortly thereafter the major mode occurs in measure 305, making this a trifecta of middle-period examples with unexpected passages in B major.

The ‘Appassionata’ sonata continues the trend of reaching for distant keys shortly after the tonic is established. The opening phrase is in f minor and ends on a V6 chord of C major. The next phrase is in G-flat major, and ends on a half cadence with a D-flat major V6 chord. This presentation of the Neapolitan key so early immediately causes one to question whether the first phrases was truly the tonic or if the second phrase is, or neither. This ambiguity stirs up

\(^94\) Broyles describes some of Beethoven’s middle-period harmonic tendencies in 106-110. Plantinga notes in Beethoven’s op. 58 the sudden harmonic upheaval by the tutti section after the soloist’s initial phrase, 195.

\(^95\) For a further look at Op. 59 no. 1’s revolutionary qualities, see Lockwood, Lewis. *Beethoven Studies in the Creative Process*. Harvard University Press, 1992, 198-208. Lockwood also draws many interesting parallels between op. 55 and op. 59 no. 1, beginning with the fact that both finales were the launching points for their other three movements. Lockwood also compares their approach to motivic development.

\(^96\) For more on the dramatic characteristics of op. 58, see both of Owen Jander’s articles on the same subject: Jander, Owen. "Orpheus Revisited: A Ten-Year Retrospect on the Andante Con Moto of Beethoven’s Fourth Piano Concerto." *19th Century Music* 19, no. 1, 31. and Jander, Owen H.. "Beethoven's 'Orpheus in Hades': the 'Andante con moto' of the 'Fourth Piano Concerto.'" *19th Century Music* 8 no. 3, 195-212. See also Kinderman’s *Beethoven*, 135-140.
dramatic suspense as the listener eagerly waits for the tonic to emerge. In op. 60, the work begins on the tonic of B-flat, but the certainty of the harmony disappears in measure 2 with the unison G-flat in the strings, juxtaposed with the sustained B-flat in the other voices. One wonders if this suggests a G-flat chord, but suddenly the G-flat descends to an E-flat. Now the three pitches of an E-flat minor chord have now been heard. But this coloration does not linger, and in measure 3, the strings rise back up to a unison F, briefly creating stability, though not enough to convince the listener that the tonic is B-flat. The strings drop to a D-flat, and now it feels almost certain that the key is b-flat minor, since G-flat and D-flat have been juxtaposed against a B-flat. Deliberately skirting from key area to key area allows Beethoven to instill the gravely ominous character in the introduction, a character which is a stark contrast to the triumphant heroism of the exposition. The satisfaction that the tonic of the movement, B-flat major, has finally been reached lends dramatic effect to the exposition. In still another example of early harmonic destabilization, Kinderman notes the dissonant C-sharp which appears in movement I of the “Eroica” Symphony in measure 7, which briefly clouds over the opening of E-flat major.⁹⁷ Beethoven in each of these works is allowing the opening harmonic clashes to further the drama and suspense of each piece.

Beethoven’s op. 61 preserves this middle-period pattern of introducing an unrelated key in the early measures with the D-sharp introduced in measure 10. This D-sharp appears in the initial surviving sketches for this work, connecting the genesis of the work with the aforementioned middle-period works.⁹⁸ It is presented immediately after the completion of the

---

⁹⁷ Kinderman, Beethoven, 96-97.

⁹⁸ In the sketches, this D-sharp is noted as the enharmonic E-flat.
first phrase, which ends in the tonic of D major; in this context the D-sharp feels strongly chromatic. It is impossible to determine whether this note will merely lead to the supertonic of E or if is initially the start of a drastically different key.\(^9\) The fact that what immediately follows in the downbeat of measure 11 is a dominant A-major chord is even more striking. The juxtaposition of the D-sharp and A major outlines a tritone relationship, and suddenly it looks as if the D-sharp were an exoticism.\(^10\) When the D-sharp is again sounded throughout the entire next measure of 12, it becomes clear that Beethoven has an important thematic and formal function for these notes. But they are soon forgotten.\(^11\) Later in the movement this early foreshadowing is expounded upon when the D-sharp is taken up by the first and second violins in measure 65. The rest of the strings outline a tritone of F-sharp and C, and instead of finding consonance in the next measure as in measures 10-11, the string voices uneasily raise a half step, preserving the tritone relationship and the harmonic ambiguity of a diminished chord. The horns preserve the A throughout this passage, completing the diminished chord. This further develops the unsettling and destabilizing effect intended for this iconoclastic note. In the second exposition the D-sharp is preserved with the first violins in measures 110 and 112 exactly as it occurred in measures 10 and 12 respectively. In the recapitulation the note appears in unison between the three upper string parts in measure 374, and in measure 376 as a unison D-sharp.

---


\(^10\) This tritone relationship recalls the tritone tuning of the timpani in Fidelio. Also notable is the appearance of the theme in A-flat major in the third movement of op. 61, a tritone relationship from the tonic D major. Several scholars note this distant key’s surprising effect: Plantinga, Leon. Beethoven’s Concertos. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1999, 231; Stowell, Robin, Beethoven Violin Concerto. Cambridge University Press, 1998, 89; and Tovey, Donald Francis. Essays in Musical Analysis 3. Oxford University Press, 1972, 95-96.

\(^11\) Tovey, Essays in Musical Analysis 3, 89.
between second violin, viola, and bassoons split an octave. The final passage the D-sharp is emphasized is in measures 440 and 442, which are parallel to measures 110 and 112. The solo violin finally takes up the D-sharp, and in all four versions of the solo violin part, Beethoven preserves the D-sharp. All the previous iterations of the D-sharp are more fully understood when the violin soloist finally presents it; this harmonic thread introduced in measure 10 receives a felicitous and satisfying concluding remark.\(^\text{102}\) The harmony is the same in both of these passages of measures 110 and 112 and measures 440 and 442; however, the timbre is altered. The bassoon carries the A in the earlier passage, and in the later example the flue and oboe sustain it. Each time the D-sharp occurs, it produces a slightly different effect as a result of varied orchestration and motivic purpose. What to most composers would be a local chromatic color used at the beginning for immediate effect, Beethoven weaves throughout the fabric of the movement.

* * *

This study has traced the development of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto op. 61 from its beginnings to its final version. The concerto reflects numerous influences, especially Mozart, the Viennese violinist Franz Clement, and the French violin school including Giovanni Battista Viotti, Rudolph Kreutzer, and Pierre Rode. However, from the earliest surviving sketches, we can ascertain that Beethoven’s treatment of the concerto was uniquely his own and represented a

\(^{102}\) Another instance in the first movement in which the presentation of important thematic material in the solo violin part is delayed occurs in the treatment of the second theme. This theme does not appear in its entirety in the solo violin until the coda. Beethoven uses the anticipation of these moments to further expand the formal structure of the work.
stark departure from the past with regard to its formal structure, its relationship between soloist and orchestra, and its treatment of timbre and harmony.

In the revision process, these qualities were refined and dramatized through additional techniques such as rhythmic augmentation and diminution and figuration techniques which drew on practices evident in music by Clement and the French violin school. With the boundaries of harmony and rhythm firmly established, Beethoven’s violin solo part assumed a more improvisatory character. The composer appears to have addressed critics’ concerns regarding monotony and his own displeasure with the premiere.

Beethoven’s violin concerto and its revisions embody the composer’s middle-period style. The rhythmic, harmonic, and timbral qualities displayed in the concerto and its revisions take on further significance when compared to other middle-period works, which help elucidate the meaning and possible motivations behind the compositional genesis and revision process. Beethoven’s concerns with dramatic continuity as revealed in the sketches and revisions of the solo violin part are comparable to the composer’s approaches to other pieces during his middle period. The composer’s treatment of timbre, tessitura, and rhythmic motives in other middle-period works reveal his intentions for op. 61 from the genesis of the work and throughout the revisions of solo violin part. The different versions of the solo violin part in particular shed light on the artistic goals of the composer and deserve our renewed attention.
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