

Preface

Beethoven's Violin Concerto op. 61, composed for Franz Clement's benefit concert on 23 December 1806, was the culmination of a fruitful artistic relationship that went back to at least 1794, when Beethoven wrote in Clement's autograph album: "Dear Clement: Continue to pursue the path that until now you have travelled so beautifully, so magnificently. Nature and art compete to make you a great artist. Follow both and, you need not fear, you will reach the great – the greatest goal possible to an artist here below. Be happy, dear youth; and return soon, that I may again hear your dear magnificent playing. Entirely your friend L. v. Beethoven (In the service of H.I.H. [the Elector] of Cologne) Vienna 1794."¹

The idea of writing a violin concerto for Clement probably derived from Beethoven's collaboration in his previous benefit concert on 7 April 1805, in which Beethoven directed the first fully public performance of the "Eroica" and Clement played a D major violin concerto of his own composition. Whether Beethoven's decision to write a concerto for Clement was directly connected with the 1805 concert, or whether it was taken later, cannot be determined from surviving sources, but there is no question that the concerto, despite its subsequent dedication to Stephan von Breuning, was specially written for Clement. It was, as Beethoven's jocular inscription on the first page of the autograph (source A) states, a "Concerto par Clemenza pour Clement primo Violino e direttore al teatro a vienne," and Beethoven undoubtedly composed the work with Clement's artistic and technical characteristics in mind, consciously or subconsciously including musical allusions to Clement's own D major Concerto of 1805.² Viennese tradition even ascribed the theme of the Rondo to Clement himself.³ The reliability of this tradition may be questionable, but a close stylistic connection is clearly demonstrated by comparison of the musical characteristics of the two D major concertos, as well as the manner in which the solo instrument is treated in both of them; at the very least Beethoven wrote his Violin Concerto to suit Clement's style of performance. This was evidently acknowledged in Beethoven's circle, for Anton Schindler later remarked that Beethoven's Violin Concerto was "famous for its artistic peculiarities (use of short bow strokes, following the old Italian school of Tartini and Nardini, and predominant use of the highest positions)."⁴

The original version of the Violin Concerto

Beethoven did not finish the score of his Violin Concerto until very shortly before the date fixed for its premiere. Carl Czerny, who was then in direct contact with Beethoven, related that it was written "in a very short time" and that it was performed "scarcely two days after its completion,"⁵ while Dr Bertolini, who was closely associated with Prince Lichnowsky, reported that "Clement played his solo at sight without any previous rehearsal."⁶ Beethoven's haste to finish the work is graphically illustrated by the untidy writing in the later part of the autograph and the large number of second thoughts and messy corrections towards the end of the concerto, which even by Beethoven's standards are exceptionally frequent. Despite the lack of rehearsal, Clement's performance seems to have been impressive, but the single known report of the concert also indicated that the work itself was not felt to be entirely satisfactory. "The admirable violinist Klement played, amongst other excellent pieces, also a violin concerto by Beethhofen, which on account of its originality and its diverse passages, was received with exceptional acclamation. Klement's well-known art and charm, his power and technical command on the violin, which is his slave, were greeted with deafening applause [...] With regard to Beethhofen's concerto the opinion of connoisseurs is unanimous; they acknowledge that it contains many beautiful things, but they must at the same time concede that cohesion often seems to be lacking, and that the endless repetition of certain banal passages could easily become tedious."⁷

The Violin Concerto performed at Clement's concert was not, however, the work we know today, for although in the published edition of 1808/9 the overall structure remained unchanged and the orchestral parts differ from the autograph only in minor details, the solo part was substantially revised for publication. The original solo part, preserved only in Beethoven's autograph, is less idiomatically suited to the violin and rather less varied in its figurations than the published version. As Shin Augustinus Kojima argued persuasively, the extensive use of passages of broken octaves and chords, and the "frequent repetitions of identical or similar figurations,"⁸ which characterised the initial version of the solo part in movement I and to some extent in the Rondo, may well have been the cause of the reviewer's comment about "the endless repetition of certain banal passages."

Towards publication

In September 1806 Beethoven had been in correspondence with Breitkopf & Härtel about publishing a group of compositions that were close to comple-

tion at that time, including the String Quartets op. 59, the 4th Symphony and the 4th Piano Concerto.⁹ The Violin Concerto was not mentioned in the correspondence, probably because he had still not begun work on the score. These negotiations faltered towards the end of November, and at some time between then and the late spring of 1807 Beethoven seems to have concluded an agreement with the Vienna Bureau des arts et d'industrie (Wiener Kunst- und Industrie-Comptoir) to publish all these works, together with the Violin Concerto and the Overture to *Coriolan*.

During the early months of 1807 he was occupied with the completion of the 4th Symphony and 4th Piano Concerto, and the composition of *Coriolan*, all of which were performed in two concerts given by Prince Lobkowitz in March of that year; it seems unlikely therefore that he gave much further thought to the Violin Concerto at that time. With publication in mind, however, he evidently commissioned a copy of the autograph score of the Violin Concerto that is now lost (source *S*₁), which, as indicated below, seems to have played a significant part in the production of a further score copy (source *S*₂) that served as the basis for the Vienna edition of the concerto.

The events that necessitated the production of this second score copy (*S*₂) took place in April 1807. Muzio Clementi, passing through Vienna on his way to Italy, took the opportunity to make contact with Beethoven and on 20 April, for the substantial sum of £200, secured the rights to publish English editions of seven of Beethoven's recent works, later allotted the opus numbers 58–62, together with an arrangement of the Violin Concerto as a piano concerto. From a letter dated 22 April, which Clementi wrote to his partner William Frederick Collard, it is apparent that the idea of making the arrangement was Clementi's, for he reported: "I agreed with him [Beethoven] to take in M.S. *three Quartets* [op. 59 nos. 1–3], *A Symphony* [op. 60], an *overture* [*Coriolan* op. 62], a *concerto for the violin* which is beautiful and which, at my request, he will adapt for the pianoforte with and without additional keys [op. 61]; and a *concerto for the Pianoforte* [op. 58], for all of which we are to pay him two hundred pounds sterling."¹⁰

This letter and the contract signed by Clementi and Beethoven on 20 April provide important information about the dispatch of the Violin Concerto to London. In clause 4 of the contract, written in French by Beethoven's recently acquired friend, Baron Ignaz von Gleichenstein, who also signed the contract as a witness, it was stipulated: "Monsieur L. v. Beethoven promises not to sell these works either in Germany or France or anywhere else except with the condition that they shall not be published for four months after their respective dispatch to England: for the ~~three quartets~~ ^{the violin concerto}, and for the symphony and for the overture, which have just left for England, Mons. L. v. Beethoven promises to sell them on condition they are not published before 1 Sept. 1807."¹¹

The comment that the Violin Concerto, Symphony and Overture had "just left" for England, cannot have been strictly accurate; this is demonstrated by Clementi's statement in his letter dated 22 April: "Today sets off a courier for London through Russia, and he will bring over to you two or three of the mentioned articles." The phrase "just left" may, however, have signified that the three items specified were intended to be handed over to Clementi at the time the contract was signed. The substitution of the Violin Concerto for the quartets in the contract seems to reflect a last minute change of plan. While assembling material for delivery to Clementi, Beethoven probably discovered that he had mislaid the quartets; it is known from his correspondence in May 1807 that he was still not able to locate a copy of them at that time. Referring to the quartets in a letter to Countess Josephine Deym on 11 May he explained that "despite looking everywhere I can't find my score, and so they cannot be copied for *Clementi*"; and he wrote to her brother, Count Franz Brunsvik, on the same day asking him to send him speedily a set of parts of the quartets so he could have them copied.¹² Unable to obtain a score or parts to give to Clementi, Beethoven probably realised that the set of parts used for the premiere of the Violin Concerto was to hand and asked Gleichenstein to substitute the concerto for the quartets in the contract. This was presumably done before Clementi signed it, or at least in his presence. In order for Beethoven to retain a set of parts of the Violin Concerto for himself, however, the solo violin and some or all orchestral parts would have had to be duplicated, and this would have necessitated a day or two's delay. These circumstances would explain the postscript in Clementi's letter of 22 April where he added: "Mr van Beethoven says, you may publish the 3 articles he sends by *this courier* on the 1st of September next,"¹³ indicating that since writing, in the body of the letter, that "two or three of the mentioned articles" would be despatched, the doubtful item of the three pieces mentioned in the contract as having "just left" had now been delivered to Clementi.

As an immediate consequence of his agreement with Clementi, Beethoven seems to have been prompted to seek additional income from selling the rights to publish his new compositions in France. On 26 April he secured Gleichenstein's help in writing letters based on the Clementi contract, this time in German, to Pleyel in Paris and Simrock in Bonn (at that stage part of France) offering them the same six works for publication in France.¹⁴ In these letters the works were set out in two groups, in a different order from the original version of the Clementi contract. In the contract the works had been listed as Quartets, Symphony, Overture, Violin Concerto, piano arrangement of Violin Concerto, Piano Concerto, but in the letters to Pleyel and Simrock the first group was given as Symphony, Overture, Violin Concerto, and the second as Quartets, Piano Concerto, piano arrangement of Violin Concerto. Each group was given a different publication date: 1 September 1807 (as in the contract) for the first and 1 October 1807 for the second. The changed order reflects the substitution of the Violin Concerto for the quartets in § 4 of the contract with Clementi.

Since Clementi's letter of 22 April evidently reached London, though perhaps after a rather lengthy journey, it is reasonable to assume that the music specified in the contract as having "just left" for England, which according to Clementi's postscript was entrusted to the same courier as the letter, also reached London safely. That the Violin Concerto was indeed in the first batch of music sent to London is also implied in Clementi's later correspondence. When he returned to Vienna towards the end of 1808, he tried to ensure that Beethoven received the long delayed payments that were due to him and, having spoken to Beethoven, wrote to Collard on 28 December 1808 to ascertain which of Beethoven's compositions had arrived in London. Clementi's wording seems to confirm that the Violin Concerto was in the first of two consignments, for he reported that Beethoven "says he sent you by two expeditions the 6 articles agreed upon for £200 viz: the Violin-Concerto. Symphony. Overture. 3 Quartets. Concerto for Pforte. The Violin-concerto adapted for the Fortepiano."¹⁵

The fact that there was a gap of only one month between the proposed earliest publication dates for the two batches of works also suggests that Beethoven expected there to be little delay before the second group of compositions was dispatched, and this is supported by his evident anxiety, indicated in his letters to Josephine Deym and Franz Brunsvik, to have the op. 59 quartets copied for Clementi as quickly as possible.

This makes it more likely that the second parcel of works, including the piano arrangement of the Violin Concerto, was ready to be sent to London around the end of May. Whether or not this chronology is correct, however, has little bearing on the textual content of the London edition.¹⁶ In assessing the London edition's significance for the text of Beethoven's Violin Concerto, the vital factors are the provenance of the material on which it was based, and an appraisal of the manner in which this was used by the publisher.

Manuscript orchestral parts

As suggested above, the material for the Violin Concerto sent to London in April 1807 will either have been a set of original string parts from the premiere, together with duplicates of the wind and timpani parts, or a complete set of duplicates.¹⁷ This is similar to the procedure Beethoven was to follow in providing material for Clementi's edition of the Choral Fantasia op. 80 in 1810. One page of a manuscript Oboe I part of the Violin Concerto, with sketches by Clementi on the reverse, survives;¹⁸ its use by the engraver of the London edition is confirmed by the addition of markings related to the stave numbers of the printed Oboe I part in that edition. Internal evidence shows that this surviving page does not come from the original part used for the premiere, but from a copy of that original part.¹⁹ The Violino principale part included with this material can only have contained the version performed at the premiere (perhaps with a few minor modifications), for there is no reason to suppose that Beethoven intended to undertake a major revision of the solo violin part of the concerto at the time of his contract with Clementi.

Revisions to the autograph, copied material, and new solo parts

During the following weeks Beethoven will have been engaged in the preparation of the second batch to send to London and also of the material that was to serve as the basis of the Vienna edition. His surviving correspondence, however, tells us nothing about the further publishing process of the Violin Concerto or its piano adaptation during the last eight months of 1807.²⁰ But it is clear that in the early part of that period Beethoven must have been occupied with the arrangement of the solo part for piano and the revision of the solo violin part. Clementi had stated in his letter of 22 April: "Remember that the Violin concerto he will adapt himself and send it so soon as he can."²¹ According to the contract, each work was to be paid for after its receipt in London; the solo piano part would therefore be worth £33 6s 8d to him (as much as the Symphony). This, together with the specification of 1 October 1807, in the letters to Simrock and Pleyel, as publication date for the second batch of works (including the piano version of op. 61), suggests that Beethoven will

have begun the piano arrangement of the solo part of the Violin Concerto very soon after signing Clementi's contract.

It was probably the process of arranging the solo part for piano that prompted Beethoven to undertake a major revision of the solo violin part. A series of pencil sketches for the left hand of the solo piano part on the lowest blank staves of movements I and II in the autograph, correspond fairly closely with the left-hand in the published edition. These sketches were followed, or perhaps to some extent accompanied by alterations to the solo violin part in the autograph, together with numerous alternative passages written on the vacant staves at the bottom of each page in a dark ink different from the ink used for the original text of the autograph. Beethoven's sketches for revising the solo violin part clearly followed his earliest sketches for the left hand of the solo piano part; some of the additions in the dark ink with which the revisions to the solo violin part are written overlies the pencil sketches.²² Kojima's research broadly established the dates at which Beethoven used the two colours of ink that appear in the autograph. The light brown ink in which the bulk of the text was written was also used in the autographs of op. 59 no. 3, op. 60 and op. 62, which were put down on paper between August 1806 and February 1807. The darker ink used for the revisions was also used for the autograph of the Mass in C major, which was written in July and August 1807. A letter of 4 March 1807, to Marie Bigot, was written entirely in the light brown ink and the last known use of this ink by Beethoven is his signature on the letter to Nikolaus Simrock (written for him by Ignaz von Gleichenstein) dated 26 April 1807. The first documented use of the darker ink is Beethoven's letter to Josephine Deym of 11 May 1807.²³

The copied score and its sources

During the weeks following the contract with Clementi, Joseph Klumpar copied a new score of the Violin Concerto (S_2) to serve as the basis for engraving the Vienna edition. Taking the publication schedule into consideration, Herttrich reasoned that Klumpar's score was "probably finished by July of that year at the latest."²⁴ Indeed, it is quite likely that by the time of Beethoven's departure for Baden in mid June 1807, he had already received the score copy and completed the first phase of checking and correcting it. The corrections made by Beethoven at this stage were in pencil, and these were then inked over by Klumpar. Red crayon (Rötel) amendments by Beethoven, which also appear in this score, were connected with the correction of proofs, probably in December and January 1807/08.

The layout of Klumpar's score clearly shows that it was intended from the start to include both solo parts, and must therefore date from after 20 April. There are good reasons to believe, however, that the assumption of Tyson, Kojima and others that Klumpar copied the orchestral parts in his score directly from the autograph is incorrect. A number of puzzling features, none of which may be seen as conclusive on its own, can only be explained adequately as a whole by the existence of a lost score copy (S_1), in which Beethoven may have made several amendments, but in which a substantial number of errors, reflecting an early stage of the autograph, remained uncorrected. The compelling evidence for the existence of this lost copy, which helps to explain how some of the most problematic differences between Klumpar's extant score and the autograph may have arisen, is examined in detail in the Critical Commentary. Other aspects of Klumpar's score, not discussed by earlier editors, which are examined in the Critical Commentary, include the sequence in which Klumpar copied the solo and orchestral parts; this is vitally important for understanding how the final text of his score came about and for assessing its significance for the *Fassung letzter Hand* of the Violin Concerto.

The authorship of the solo parts

Several scholars have questioned whether Beethoven himself wrote the versions of the solo parts that appear in Klumpar's score. In the case of the solo piano, this is partly on the grounds that it has been considered to be musically weak in a number of places,²⁵ and partly because Beethoven is known to have had little interest in the task of transcription, often leaving such things to others and merely checking their work or making small adjustments. This case, however, is rather different from such transcriptions as the piano trio arrangements of the 2nd Symphony or Septet, probably drafted by Ferdinand Ries and merely 'corrected' by Beethoven, or the contemporaneous arrangements of orchestral works for smaller ensembles by Franz Alexander Pössinger and others. There is no parallel to the creation of a piano concerto from a violin concerto in Beethoven's output, and he would surely not have been content to leave this to a third party, especially since he had promised Clementi to undertake the arrangement himself. Even if Beethoven entrusted some of the drafting of the part (such as the tutti sections) to another, there can be no doubt that the bulk of the work was Beethoven's own, for the sketches for the left hand in the autograph correspond to a great extent with the finished part in Klumpar's score. In any case, it is clear from Beethoven's numerous revisions in Klumpar's score that he took full responsibility for the final version. Comparison of the

piano part with the violin part also reveals many points of divergence, some of them of a kind that no mere arranger is likely to have originated, such as the counterpoint to the bassoon solo in the left-hand of the piano in bb. 523f. and 527f. of movement I, where the solo violin is silent, a passage that is not sketched in the autograph (see facsimile I, p. 77). At many points, too, the piano part corresponds closely with dark ink additions in the autograph that were originally intended for the revised violin part. Furthermore, in a conversation with Thayer in 1861, Charles Neate, to whom Beethoven gave Klumpar's score in 1816, referred to the transcription for piano "which Beethoven said he himself had arranged and was effective;"²⁶ Czerny, Ries and Gerhard von Breuning all mentioned the piano version of the Violin Concerto as having been arranged by Beethoven himself.²⁷

Doubts that have been expressed about Beethoven's authorship of the revised solo violin part are equally questionable and certainly cannot be supported by firm evidence. Franz Alexander Pössinger has been proposed as the originator of the final version by two writers,²⁸ and several other scholars have raised questions about the coherence of the published version.²⁹ The only evidence to link Pössinger directly with the Violin Concerto is the inscription *Pössinger Pressant* on the final leaf of Klumpar's score, not in Beethoven's hand; but this seems more likely to have been in connection with a commission to arrange the concerto for smaller ensemble, as Pössinger did in the case of other works by Beethoven, including the 4th Piano Concerto. At any rate, as considered further below, if Beethoven required advice or assistance in revising the solo part it is surely more likely that he would have turned to Clement. The idea that Beethoven lacked confidence in dealing with technical or aesthetic aspects of violin writing, however, is surely absurd. He had studied the violin with Franz Ries in Bonn and taken further violin lessons from Wenzel Krumpholz after his arrival in Vienna. During the first decade of the 19th century he continued to play the violin from time to time, albeit rather inaccurately according to Ferdinand Ries;³⁰ even after his hearing began to deteriorate seriously he participated regularly in Stephan von Breuning's domestic quartet parties.³¹ In the autograph of the Violin Concerto Beethoven notated fingering in the orchestral violins (Larghetto, VI. II, b. 4) as well as the solo violin part, which contains a number of fingerings in his handwriting in the original text and the dark ink alternatives. Fingering also occurs in the contemporaneous autograph of the String Quartet in E minor op. 59 no. 2; and the op. 59 string quartets as a whole show that he needed no assistance from anyone in writing technically taxing, yet idiomatic music for the violin.

Amid all this speculation some facts about the provenance of the solo parts are certain. No-one could have produced either of the solo parts by simply copying what is in the autograph (except in the case of movement II, where Beethoven made his occasional dark ink changes directly into the original solo violin part, which exists there almost in its final form); the sketches for the left hand of the piano part are far too incomplete, where they are not absent altogether, and the variants of the violin part do not constitute a discrete version. The violin part copied into Klumpar's score sometimes includes the original text, even where Beethoven's autograph provided alternatives, sometimes contains modifications of the alternatives, and occasionally presents a version that is completely different from either the original text or the alternatives in the autograph. The proportion of material in the final version that does not appear anywhere in the autograph, however, is very small and, since the task of producing the revised solo part was primarily one of selection, it would be very strange if Beethoven had entrusted this to anyone else.

Nevertheless, in view of Clement's close connection with the genesis of Beethoven's Violin Concerto it is relevant to consider whether he may have been directly concerned with the revision of the solo violin part. There is certainly circumstantial evidence to suggest that Clement remained closely connected with Beethoven's Violin Concerto after the 1806 premiere, despite the fact that only two later performances by him (Prague 1815 and Vienna 1833) are known for certain. Because of the private and semi-private nature of much Viennese music making at this time, many performances have left little or no trace in the documentary sources, while the programmes of others are imperfectly known. Anton Schindler mentioned twice in his Beethoven biography, however, that the concerto was heard again in the year following the premiere, observing that although it 'was performed by Franz Clement in 1806 with no success at all [...] a second attempt the next year was better received but not really well enough to overcome the prejudices that the work had already aroused'.³² Schindler's testimony may not be entirely reliable, since he did not come to Vienna until 1813 and only became closely associated with Beethoven after 1820; nevertheless he had access to the recollections of many of his Viennese associates and claimed in particular that he had derived much of his information about the time preceding his direct knowledge from Stephan von Breuning, the eventual dedicatee of the Violin Concerto.³³ His comments suggest, therefore, that at least one further performance had taken place within a year or so of the premiere. More concrete, though not entirely unequivocal evidence of Clement's continuing involvement is provided by a

note sent to him by Beethoven in January 1808, which suggests Clement's intention to perform the Violin Concerto again in the *Liebhaber* concert on Sunday 31 January 1808. From the note it appears that Clement asked Beethoven for orchestral parts, but Beethoven replied "of all the parts I have found only a faulty bass and 2 violin parts,"³⁴ adding that he had sent the parts back again for correction to the Industrie Kontor, and that they would not be available on Sunday. His final comment reinforces the impression that it is the Violin Concerto that is in question here, for he commented "There is no alternative but for you to play a concerto of your own, which has not yet been heard in that hall." It may not be too far-fetched to see an oblique reference in the last sentence to Clement's D major Violin Concerto, which was probably published in the summer of 1807.³⁵ The probability that Clement performed Beethoven's Violin Concerto in collaboration with the composer on a number of occasions in the years following the premiere, is strengthened by comments in Jacob Dont's preface to his edition of the Violin Concerto, published in 1880. It states that Dont's father, Joseph Valentin Dont (1776–1833), "in Beethoven's time first cellist in the K. K. Court Opera in Vienna, heard and accompanied the Violin Concerto, written for the then violin virtuoso Franz Clement, from the first performance on, very often again also in Beethoven's presence." The preface to Dont's edition suggests furthermore that Beethoven's conception of the work, and perhaps a few aspects of its text were clarified during these rehearsals and performances, for it points out that "Many differences from earlier editions will not escape the attention of the observant player of this edition of Beethoven's Violin Concerto. On the basis of reliable tradition Professor Jac. Dont in Vienna is able to declare that much in the traditional version is incorrect, particularly with respect to the tone-shadings." More significantly he claimed that his father, "solicitous for the education of his son, to whom he taught the violin at that time, wrote down and noted very precisely the conception wished for by Beethoven."³⁶

Such claims, years after the event, must be treated with great caution, but they are likely to contain at least a grain of truth. Clement surely gave other Viennese performances of Beethoven's Violin Concerto, in the composer's presence, which have not left their trace in the records. If so, we must presume that in all performances subsequent to the premiere, Clement performed the revised version of the solo part, perhaps with some of the minor modifications approved by Beethoven that were included in Dont's edition. Whether Clement had any direct influence on the major revision of the solo part that took place before publication is an entirely different question, which in the present state of knowledge cannot be answered. But consideration of the continuing relationship between Beethoven and Clement at this time, as well as the similarity of many of the revised passages to Clement's own violin writing, indicates that Beethoven still had Clement's style of playing (and writing) in mind when he revised the solo part. This makes it very much less likely that Beethoven, were he not wholly responsible for the revision, would have turned to anyone else for advice.

The publication of the concerto

The few further details that are known about the process of publication of the Violin Concerto and its piano version can be summarised briefly. The earliest publication date of 1 September 1807, agreed with Clementi and specified in the offers to Pleyel and Simrock, will undoubtedly have been agreed with the Viennese publisher, too. The payment to Beethoven of 1500 Gulden by the Kunst- und Industriekontor in late July 1807³⁷ probably indicates that by that date all six works were in their hands. In January 1808 an announcement from Vienna, issued in August 1807, was printed in the Weimar *Journal des Luxus und der Moden* stating that Beethoven's 4th Symphony was "in the press, together with a very beautiful overture to Coriolan and a grand Violin Concerto."³⁸ Not until 10 August 1808, however, did the *Wiener Zeitung* carry an advertisement for the piano concerto version of op. 61 (repeated in the Leipzig *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* on 5 October 1808). But it seems clear that the orchestral parts and piano solo part had already been printed for some time before this edition was publicly announced; Beethoven's letter to Franz Clement implies that the orchestral parts were almost ready in January 1808. Since, however, the orchestral parts were the same for both versions of the concerto, it is not so clear that the solo violin part was yet printed; Clement might easily have intended to play it in January 1808 from a manuscript copy or, given his phenomenal memory, even without music.³⁹ Kojima suggested that a copy of the solo violin part was probably printed "if not in January at least in spring 1808,"⁴⁰ on the grounds that the concerto was needed as a wedding present for Stephan von Breuning, who was to marry Julie von Vering in April 1808. In fact, although the Violin Concerto is dedicated to Stephan von Breuning and the piano concerto version of the work to his wife (described on the title page as 'Julie de Breuning née noble de Vering'), there is no firm evidence to link the publication directly with their wedding.⁴¹ It is certainly the case, however, that the copy of the violin solo part presented to Breuning by Beethoven, which is preserved in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, is

the sole extant exemplar of this printing and 10 of its 22 pages are differently engraved from the later Violino principale part in the first edition (see Critical Commentary). The first known reference to the publication of the violin concerto version of op. 61 occurs in the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* on 19 April 1809,⁴² which suggests that it had probably been issued within the previous couple of months.

The London edition of Beethoven's Violin Concerto did not appear until around August 1810.⁴³ In that edition, the orchestral parts were apparently based primarily on the manuscript parts supplied by Beethoven, and mostly reflect the state of the autograph around the time of the premiere, but there are a very few places in which another source seems to have been involved. The most notable of these is the discrepancy with the autograph in the violoncello part in bb. 525–533 of movement I, which corresponds with those bars in the Vienna edition (see Critical Commentary). This might have come about in a number of ways: an alteration may have been made to the part before it was sent to London, which is improbable; an alteration may have been made by the publishing firm solely on the basis of a copy of the Vienna edition, which is questionable, since other significant discrepancies with that edition remained unchanged; or, most plausibly, a correction had either been sent to London by Beethoven or conveyed to Clementi during the latter's visit to Vienna in December 1808. A revised solo part could have been sent to London by Beethoven with his second consignment of works, but if so it could certainly not have been the only source used by the London engraver, for both solo parts in the London edition are clearly dependent on the printed parts from the Vienna edition. Tyson showed that the London piano part reproduces a curious engraving error from the Vienna edition at b. 301 of movement I. Moreover, close scrutiny of the solo violin part in the London edition indicates that it is based on the Industrie Kontor's *second* issue of the part, which probably did not appear until 1809 (see Critical Commentary). As a source for the text of the solo violin part, therefore, the London edition is of little or no value. In addition to its derivation from the Vienna edition, it was also assimilated to the solo piano part in many places by the English publisher.⁴⁴

The major textual problems

There are two passages in the Viennese first edition that have long been suspected of transmitting major misreadings; one concerns the cellos in bb. 525–533 of movement I and the other relates to the omission of b. 417 in the Rondo. These readings in the first edition differ from the autograph. The versions found in the autograph first appeared in print in Breitkopf & Härtel's Beethoven *Gesamtausgabe* (the Violin Concerto volume was published in 1863),⁴⁵ although later editions continued to reproduce the text of the first edition well into the 20th century. Since Alan Tyson discussed these problematic passages in his two articles of 1962 and 1967, however, it has generally been accepted that the versions in the Viennese first edition simply resulted from a combination of copyist's and engraver's errors.⁴⁶ Yet, in both cases there has never been a satisfactory explanation of how the "errors" may have arisen. The arguments used by Tyson and later by Hertrich, neither of whom considered the possibility of a lost score as one of the sources of Klumpar's copy, are inconclusive and questionable. The nature of these problems is outlined here, but the Critical Commentary includes a more detailed examination of them.

In bb. 525–533 of movement I the autograph contains a passage in which cellos and basses divide into separate parts with an independent line for the cellos. Klumpar's copy includes the cello part only in bb. 529–531, while *col basso* is assumed for the rest of the bars. Yet in both the Vienna and London editions cellos play the whole passage at bb. 525–533 *col basso*. The printed parts show no signs of having been amended at any stage indicating either that the engraver overlooked the cello part in bb. 529–531 or that he had been instructed not to engrave it. The text of the old Beethoven *Gesamtausgabe* was evidently based on a collation of the autograph and the Viennese first edition only, and it consists of an amalgamation of features from both. At the time Tyson wrote his 1962 article, however, neither the Eulenburg, Boosey & Hawkes, nor Philharmonia scores of the Violin Concerto contained the version of the autograph with the independent cello part in bb. 525–533.⁴⁷ The cello line was present in the piano reduction by Carl Reinecke, made to accompany Ferdinand David's edition of the solo part (Breitkopf & Härtel) of 1865, but it was absent, for instance, from the piano reductions used in the editions by Henri Vieuxtemps (Schuberth: 1869), Jacob Dont (Schlesinger: 1880), August Wilhelmj (Peters: 1882) and Carl Prill (Universal: 1901).

Although the omission of the separate cello line in bb. 525–533 may seem wrong to anyone who knows Beethoven's Violin Concerto in the form in which it is generally played today, the passage is not obviously unsatisfactory or musically deficient without it. The independent cello part was undoubtedly absent from many 19th- and early 20th-century performances and is still occasionally omitted.⁴⁸ Musical arguments are of limited value in estimating whether its omission was a deliberate change or an inexplicable error, but if

Beethoven did indeed decide to alter the passage in a lost source his purpose may have been to sustain the calm simplicity of the coda until the three-bar crescendo at the end of the movement. After the bassoon has played the first part of the phrase, a cultivated musician would be sure to recall the cellos' continuation subliminally, and perhaps it was precisely this subtle effect that Beethoven envisaged. None of the attempts, from Tyson onwards, to explain the discrepancies between the autograph, Klumpar's copy and the first edition as mistakes are convincing. A mistake of this kind could only have resulted from an extraordinary succession of errors, and the explanation offered in the Critical Commentary indicates that the version in the first edition is more likely to represent Beethoven's *Fassung letzter Hand*.

The major problem in the Rondo is of a rather different kind. It is a question of whether the parallel passages at 41ff. and 214ff. should have the same five-bar repetition of the tonic and dominant figuration, or whether the second occurrence should have a four-bar repetition. In the autograph bb. 174–218 were certainly intended originally to be an exact recapitulation of the first 45 bars of the movement and Beethoven therefore marked it as a *da capo*. A copyist preparing orchestral parts or a score from the autograph, if he followed Beethoven's instructions correctly, could only have reproduced an exact reprise of the passage; the version of the passage beginning at b. 214 in Klumpar's score, assuming it is not an inexplicable error of copying, must therefore have derived from a source other than the autograph. A definitive *Fassung letzter Hand* cannot be determined, but the evidence examined in the Critical Commentary suggests that the abbreviated version that is found in Klumpar's score and the Vienna edition most plausibly resulted from the omission of the bar (deliberately or accidentally) in the source, or sources, from which Klumpar copied the solo parts into the score.

Performing practice issues in the solo violin part

Problems of fidelity to the composer's expectations do not end with the textual issues discussed above. It is indisputable that the solo part in Klumpar's score and the first editions is uninformative in many respects, which might perhaps have been clarified in further performances involving the composer, or which he quite consciously recognised as the soloist's prerogative. Many slurs and articulation marks that would be necessary to a stylish performance were clearly omitted from these sources, which also contained a number of errors and ambiguities. Some of the articulation was evidently to be supplemented by analogy with patterns that are indicated at the beginning of such passages, for instance, in movement I in bb. 197, 357ff., or in the Rondo in b. 297. Elsewhere, some slurs are surely intended where nothing is indicated. This is not untypical for violin concertos at this period, even those written by violinists; it seems clear that the edition of Clement's D major Violin Concerto of 1805,⁴⁹ though rather more fully marked than Beethoven's, also leaves many such decisions to the performer. According to Andreas Moser, the practice of supplementing the bowing indications in Beethoven's Violin Concerto went back to the premiere; referring to the use of the so-called "Paganini bowing" at bb. 139f. of movement I (although Paganini was unknown in Vienna in 1806!) he reported Joachim's statement that at the time of his study with Joseph Boehm in the early 1840s Viennese violinists already believed that Franz Clement (then still alive), had used this bowing at the first performance.⁵⁰

Clement's style did not, as a reviewer remarked in 1805, resemble "the marked, bold, strong playing, the moving, forceful Adagio, the power of bow and tone that characterize the Rode-Viotti School."⁵¹ He seems to have favoured a less legato approach with more varied patterns of slurring. In his own D major Violin Concerto, however, figurations very similar to those in Beethoven's concerto are seldom left for more than a bar or two without various patterns of slurs intermingled with the separate notes, and it seems likely that he would spontaneously have introduced additional slurs, particularly in many of the extensive passages of separate semiquavers and triplet quavers in movement I of Beethoven's Violin Concerto. This is also suggested by Dont's edition as well as by Vieuxtemps' edition, which may plausibly reflect advice from several of Beethoven's associates, at whose behest the 13-year-old Vieuxtemps gave a highly acclaimed performance of the concerto in Vienna in 1834, the year after Clement's last known performance of the work.

The present score is published in conjunction with an edition for violin and piano (EB 8656) which contains two copies of the solo violin part: a part corresponding exactly with the Violino principale part in the full score and an edited part with bowing and fingering. The latter draws upon 19th- and very early 20th-century editions of the concerto in an attempt to cast light on the ways in which Beethoven might have expected the solo to be realised in practice. The editions that have been considered contain bowing, fingering and other markings by the following violinists, who were active in Beethoven's lifetime, or are likely to have had particular insights into Viennese traditions of performing the work:

1. Pierre Baillot (Paris: Richault, c. 1828)
2. Ferdinand David: MS bowing and fingering in a reissue of the original edition (Vienna: Haslinger, c. 1827), British Library: *Tyson P. M.* 46.(1.)

3. Ferdinand David (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1865)
4. Henri Vieuxtemps (Leipzig: Schuberth, 1869)
5. Jacob Dont (Berlin: Schlesinger, 1880)
6. Heinrich Dessauer „with special reference to the artistic conception of Joseph Joachim“ (Mainz: Schott, 1897)
7. Joseph Hellmesberger Jr. (Leipzig: Cranz, c. 1901)
8. Joseph Joachim and Andreas Moser (Berlin: Simrock, 1905)

Other practical editions have neither the virtues of a close connection with, nor an informed understanding of the performing practices of Beethoven's time. In many cases they perpetuate established 19th-century approaches. Wilhelmj's edition, of 1882, for instance, is very similar to David's, and Prill's 1901 edition seems to be based closely on Wilhelmj's. Later 20th-century editions include more modern bowing styles and fingering practices, which differ markedly from those of the earlier editors.

A more detailed analysis of the 19th-century traditions of performing Beethoven's Violin Concerto, including the matter of cadenzas and ornamentation, and their implications for our understanding of the composer's text may be found in the Preface and Commentary to the edition for violin and piano (EB 8656).

Tempo

It is clear that the 20th- and 21st-century approach to tempo in the first two movements differs sharply from that of the 19th century. Czerny, in relation to the piano version of the concerto, gave a tempo of $\text{♩} = 126$ for movement I and Joachim indicated $\text{♩} = 120$. Among early recordings only Toscanini with Heifetz (1940) began this movement at around $\text{♩} = 120$, although Szell with Huberman (1934) and Barbirolli with Kreisler (1936) were not far behind with an initial tempo of $\text{♩} = 112$. Bruno Walter with Szigeti (1934) however began at about $\text{♩} = 100$. Approaches to tempo and rubato had already begun to change significantly during the second half of the 19th century, as the Wagnerian concept of flexible tempo became increasingly influential. The pervasiveness of this approach during the first half of the 20th century is documented in numerous recordings; Walter's opening tutti fluctuates between its initial $\text{♩} = 100$ and about $\text{♩} = 126$ by b. 73, then slows to around $\text{♩} = 104$ in the first solo section. A number of the early soloists speed up the tempo at various points; Huberman, for instance, occasionally reaches $\text{♩} = 126$. Heifetz and Enesco, however, sustain the fastest overall tempo with the least tempo variation. But in the G minor section at bb. 331–350 of movement I even Enesco slows down to about $\text{♩} = 96$, while Heifetz and Huberman are slightly slower at about $\text{♩} = 92$. Other violinists are even more leisurely in this passage, Szigeti decelerating to $\text{♩} = 76$ and Kreisler to a *quasi adagio* tempo of $\text{♩} = 66$.⁵² Perhaps Enesco, Huberman and Heifetz were in touch with the Joachim tradition; Enesco through Joachim's pupil Marsick, with whom he studied in Paris, Huberman through his studies in Berlin with Joachim's assistant Markees, and Heifetz through his teacher in St Petersburg, Joachim's pupil Leopold Auer. In his book *Violin Master Works and their Interpretation*, however, Auer recommends tempo flexibility, apparently of the Wagnerian kind, in movement I of Beethoven's Violin Concerto, although it is unclear how much slowing down and speeding up he envisaged.⁵³ Whether Joachim himself made any significant slowing down in this passage, however, remains in doubt. Dessauer's edition, based on Joachim's interpretation, despite its numerous and detailed performance instructions, contains no suggestion for modifying the tempo of movement I at any point, although Dessauer comments at the beginning that "The first movement is very frequently taken too slowly. The indication 'ma non troppo' is only intended to convey the idea that we should not choose a much too rapid tempo, but still not deprive the movement of the character of a flowing Allegro; otherwise the performance would be too ponderous and halting."⁵⁴ Neither Czerny nor Joachim's own edition⁵⁵ suggested any change of tempo for the G minor section of mvt. I at bb. 330ff., although Czerny's explanation that the term *espressivo* generally indicates a holding back of the tempo⁵⁶ might imply a moderate slowing down at mvt. I, b. 301. As a general rule Czerny was insistent that Beethoven's tempos should be adhered to with only subtle flexibilities within a movement; he considered that without the correct tempo "the whole character of a piece is distorted";⁵⁷ and in relation to his metronome markings he stated: "we have striven to indicate the speed, which is the most important part of correct interpretation, as accurately as we remember it, and also the style of performance, according to Beethoven's own view."⁵⁸ In this context it may be relevant, too, that for movement I of Mendelssohn's Violin Concerto op. 64, Joachim made the point in his preface to the edition in volume III of his *Violinschule* that "six bars before the *piano tranquillo* the tempo must be gradually but very imperceptibly slackened, so as to let the second subject begin in a quietly consoling manner. At the descending triads, however, the *tranquillo* must not degenerate into the strong *ritardando* with which it is unfortunately so often burdened. Any essential change of tempo at the G major motive that might spoil the *alla breve* feeling would be in direct opposition to the composer's wishes."⁵⁹ In the violin

part of Mendelssohn's Concerto Joachim indicated at this point a decrease from the tempo of $\text{♩} = 112$ at the beginning of the movement to $\text{♩} = 100$. If a similar proportion were assumed for the passage at movement I, bb. 330ff. of Beethoven's Concerto, where however, unlike b. 301, there is nothing to indicate a decrease in tempo, we might imagine that Joachim reduced the tempo from $\text{♩} = 120$ to about $\text{♩} = 108$, though Dessauer's edition and Moser's preface to Joachim's edition give no indication that any change of tempo was envisaged here or elsewhere in the movement.

Kreisler remains the only recorded violinist to take such an extremely slow tempo in the G minor section of movement I, but most modern recordings and performances continue to exhibit a very marked slackening of the tempo in this section and with the addition of an extensive cadenza it is not unusual for the first movement of the concerto to last around 25 minutes.

Czerny's and Joachim's tempo of $\text{♩} = 60$ for the *Larghetto* also indicates a much brisker tempo than is taken by most present-day performers. Earlier 20th-century violinists, too, such as Szigeti ($\text{♩} = 48$), Kreisler, Huberman ($\text{♩} = 44$) and even Enesco and Heifetz ($\text{♩} = 50$) played the movement significantly slower than Czerny and Joachim recommended. The long bowings in 19th-century editions of the concerto indicate that the flowing tempo suggested by Czerny and Joachim for this movement was normal at that time and there can be little doubt that Beethoven would have found the slow tempos generally adopted today for the first two movements thoroughly unsatisfactory.

The tempo of the Rondo seems to have been less variable over time. Czerny's and Joachim's recommendation of $\text{♩} = 100$ is at the fast end of the scale of 20th- and 21st-century performance, but is approached in one or two recordings, including Heifetz's. Most modern performers, however, opt for a slightly slower tempo of around $\text{♩} = 92$ – 96 (sometimes, though rarely, getting as slow as $\text{♩} = 88$). Carl Flesch, according to the posthumously published edition of his *Memoirs*, recalled that he had heard Enesco play the Rondo at a tempo of $\text{♩} = 48$ in New York, which he considered "an inexplicable blunder," and in the same sentence, stated that the "generally accepted" tempo was $\text{♩} = 69$, it seems likely, however, that both numbers were misprinted the wrong way round (perhaps because of confusion over the German method of expressing the numbers as *acht-und-vierzig* and *neun-und-sechzig*), since $\text{♩} = 48$ is obviously inconceivable and $\text{♩} = 69$ is much slower than any 20th-century recording.⁶⁰ In fact, in his 1949 live performance, Enesco's tempo ranged from about $\text{♩} = 84$ – 86 in this movement.

The direction of the orchestra and the signification of *Solo* and *Tutti*

Methods of direction in Beethoven's Vienna were very various. Beethoven undoubtedly expected his choral works to be conducted by a non-playing time beater, as his note on the copyist's score of his *Meeres Stille und glückliche Fahrt* shows. Having inscribed the metronome mark $\text{♩} = 84$ on the first page of music, he wrote in the margin. "Nb: for this first tempo, the Kapellmeister in giving the tempo raises the hand as little as possible except in *Forte* – in the first bar somewhat higher in the 2nd and 3rd already slackening and in the 4th again the most unnoticeable movement. Not accompanied by the slightest noise but with the most extreme quietness."⁶¹ A number of accounts of Beethoven's conducting survive, apparently indicating that he also directed orchestral music in a similar manner. Spohr, for instance, who was resident in Vienna between 1812 and 1815 and played in the grand performance of the 7th Symphony given for the Congress of Vienna, referred to Beethoven's focus on achieving the right dynamic level from his orchestra and described how he would almost disappear beneath the music desk in *piano* and leap into the air for *forte*.⁶² It is highly unlikely, however, that Beethoven would have attempted to conduct a concerto. In piano concertos he would have expected direction from the keyboard and, in the Violin Concerto, would undoubtedly have taken it for granted that the soloist should direct the performance in conjunction with the leader of the first violins, who would have been responsible for ensemble during solo sections. This expectation is strongly suggested by the layout of the Violino principale and Violino primo parts in the Viennese first edition. The principale part includes the primo part during most tutti's, in the same size print as the solo sections, while cues for other instruments (and occasionally for the primo part) are given in smaller print, reflecting Beethoven's evident intention that the soloist would not play in some short tutti's (e. g., mvt. I, bb. 178–181 and 452–455). In this edition, as in Klumpar's score, most VI. I entries in movement I are identified in the principale part by the Italian word *noi* [we] or occasionally *Tutti*, and solo entries marked *Solo*.⁶³ In movements II and III, *noi* is no longer found and the terms *Tutti* and *Solo* are used.⁶⁴ The *Solo* markings, which sometimes occur where nothing is marked in the orchestral parts, will have been essential to alert the soloist to the transitions from orchestral to solo sections where they were printed in the same size notes.

No cues are provided in the orchestral first violin part of the Violin Concerto as they were, for instance, in Violino primo parts for Beethoven's symphonies, where the leader (Konzertmeister) would normally have directed the perfor-

mance at that time. Nevertheless, a subsidiary directing role for the leader was probably envisaged. A passage in Spohr's diary from 1803, when he accompanied his teacher Franz Eck on a concert tour to Russia, indicates the ideal role of the orchestral leader in solo concerto performances: "Herr Eck's concerto on 16 October in the Schauspielhaus [in Danzig] went brilliantly. Since I knew thoroughly the concert pieces my teacher performed I undertook their direction as first violin. The musicians, soon recognising how secure the young director was, followed me willingly and the soloist's performance was thus made much easier, which he thankfully acknowledged."⁶⁵ But it is doubtful whether such conditions were often fulfilled when orchestras played unfamiliar concertos on very limited rehearsal.

It seems unlikely that the different presentation of Clementi's edition indicates different performing practices in London. The Violino principale part in that edition has three different sizes of notes: the largest for the solo sections, an intermediate size for the Violino primo part in longer tuttis, in which it would be practicable for the soloist to play, and the smallest for cues for other instruments. The Violino primo part is also marked with orchestral cues in the manner of a violin-director, making the role of the leader more explicit. In any case, we can be in absolutely no doubt that at this date, and for many years after, there would have been no separate conductor involved in a performance of this kind in England.

It was standard practice at that date that violin soloists played with Violino primo in tuttis. Even in clarinet and flute concertos it seems clear that the soloist would have played a version of the Violino primo line in major tuttis.⁶⁶ The practice appears to have survived well into the 19th century. It is strongly implied, for instance, in the original editions of concertos by Clement, Rode, Kreutzer, Spohr, Bériot (op. 16), and Molique (op. 10), spanning the period 1800–1830, which, as in the Vienna edition of Beethoven's Violin Concerto, print the tutti passages in notes of the same size as the solo passages, using smaller print for cues. Some editions contain even more concrete evidence.⁶⁷ From the 1840s onwards, however, the solo parts of concertos routinely have tutti sections in small print (e.g. Spohr's 15th Concerto of 1844), implying a change in practice, probably associated with the participation of a conductor.

Whether the tutti and solo markings in early 19th-century orchestral string parts were meant to indicate a reduction of forces during solo passages (as seems to have been standard practice in late 18th-century Vienna)⁶⁸ is much more difficult to determine. In the Vienna edition of Beethoven's Violin Concerto the Violino primo part is extensively marked with Tutti and Solo, but there are only sporadic markings in the other string parts (none in Viola), so that additional instructions would need to have been added by anyone wishing to perform it in that manner. We cannot be certain, however, that the omission of a full set of instructions in the edition was deliberate. The manuscript sources suggest that Beethoven expected tutti and solo to be marked in all string parts, and their inclusion (almost complete) in the string parts of the London edition indicates that they were present in the manuscript parts used for the première. Tutti and solo instructions are normally included in all the string parts of published early 19th-century concertos, but this might merely be intended to warn the players to play more quietly in these passages. Only a more extensive survey of surviving sets of manuscript orchestral parts for early 19th-century violin concertos than has yet been undertaken could provide concrete proof of changing practice in this respect, for, to save copying expenses, ripieno parts, containing only the tuttis, would be made for players who were not to accompany the solo sections. Printed parts provide poor evidence for this practice, because it would have been more costly for publishers to have separate ripieno parts engraved even if there was an expectation that string numbers would be reduced in solo sections. There is evidence, however, that ripieno parts continued to be employed in Vienna at least until the 1820s. A surviving set of manuscript parts for movements I and II of Beethoven's Violin Concerto from about 1818 includes ripieno string parts.⁶⁹ In concerts of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, where a large orchestra of mixed amateurs and professionals was common, this was the case even in symphonic music.⁷⁰ A similar procedure appears to have been used at the premières of Beethoven's 7th, 8th and 9th symphonies. In large oratorio performances, too, it was also conventional; at the Lower Rhine Musical Festival this practice was only abandoned when Mendelssohn directed it in 1833.⁷¹ Specific evidence that the practice of reducing forces for solo sections in violin concertos continued at an even later date is demonstrated by manuscript orchestral material used by Paganini for performing his violin concertos and other solo pieces with orchestra, which includes single string parts marked "di obbligato" and multiple parts designated "di rinforzo," the latter including only the tutti sections.⁷²

On balance, it seems highly likely that Beethoven expected this practice in his Violin Concerto and that, in the early years at least, it would have been performed in this manner. In addition to the arguments advanced above, there is a further compelling piece of internal evidence: at mvt. I, bb. 531ff., mvt. III, b. 9 and equivalent places, and mvt. III, b. 329 (where Beethoven added a large Rötel *Sempre Tutti* in the autograph), *Tutti* occurs above the Violino primo

part where the soloist is still playing the separate Violino principale part. This instruction makes little sense either for the soloist or the Violino primo players, but is perfectly explicable as an instruction that the ripieno string players should join in again.

In manuscript performing material which includes ripieno string parts, there is typically only a single string set containing both the complete tutti and solo sections. A number of factors make it likely that two players on each upper string part and one on each bass part accompanied during solo sections. In Beethoven's Violin Concerto, the violas are occasionally divisi during solos (notably mvt. I, bb. 420f.), and in the autograph at mvt. II, b. 87 Beethoven originally wrote *uno violino pp* for VI. *VII* (also present in the London edition) but later deleted *uno violino* and changed *pp* to *ppp* for the violins.

Solo and *Tutti* instructions have been included in this edition on the basis of the sources. Discrepancies are noted in the Critical Commentary. In the score, Solo and Tutti are marked only in Violino principale and Violino primo, but they are included in all the separate orchestral parts.

General Performing Practice Issues

In seeking to appreciate how Beethoven's musical conception may have been embodied in the notation it is important not merely to possess a reliable text that represents his final conception of the score as accurately as possible, but also to understand how he would have expected performers to respond to it, and how his expectations may, or may not, have been encoded in the musical notation. It is certain that notation will, in many respects, have conveyed quite different things to Beethoven and the musicians of his time than it does to musicians today. Of greatest concern to Beethoven were the notes and rests for each instrument and the tempo and volume at which these were to be played, but not every aspect, even of these fundamental parameters was equally important to him. We may regard the pitches as largely fixed (especially in instrumental music), but note lengths were often less exactly defined. Conventions of performance, generally understood by musicians of Beethoven's time, affected the precise relationship of long and short in dotted figures, the unequal performance of notes of the same length in a succession of slurred notes, and the length of notes followed by rests. Dynamic, accentuation and articulation markings, though similar to those used in later periods, also had a different range of meanings for Beethoven than for his predecessors and successors. A number of these issues, as they relate to the performance of the orchestral parts of Beethoven's Violin Concerto, are highlighted here.

Staccato, 'non-legato', portato, and chord playing

The question of whether Beethoven used more than one form of staccato mark with differentiated meanings has been extensively debated since Nottebohm drew attention to Beethoven's written comments about staccato marks in the String Quartet op. 132 and his corrections in the manuscript parts in the Allegretto of the 7th Symphony. It is now generally agreed, however, that Beethoven used only one mark, the stroke, on unslurred notes, reserving dots for *portato*. The suggestion that in some cases we can distinguish a special category of staccato stroke that was intended to signify an accent, advanced in Ernst Herttrich's "Vorwort" to the individual volumes of the new Beethoven *Gesamtausgabe*,⁷³ and occasionally indicated with wedges in the solo part of the Violin Concerto in Kojima's 1973 edition, can scarcely be supported either on the grounds of appearance in Beethoven's autographs or of the composer's evident musical intention.

The meaning of Beethoven's staccato markings in particular contexts varied considerably and it is important to recognise that he frequently omitted staccato marks where the style of performance they implied seemed unnecessary or obvious. Furthermore, he very rarely indicated articulation in trumpet parts and almost never in timpani parts at this period. Where instruments were simultaneously playing the same rhythmic figures he would often only include staccato marks in some instruments; he would generally omit them, for instance, where the instruments were playing notes repeated at the same pitch. A typical passage occurs at mvt. III, bb. 20–30; here instruments playing the melody (VI. *VII*, Fl., Ob. and sometimes Cl. and Cor.) are marked with staccato while accompanying instruments have no staccato. Despite the inconsistent articulation markings, Beethoven undoubtedly regarded it as part of the performers' duty to match their articulation to that of the instruments with the leading melodic material, or to apply well-known conventions of performance. In such instances, no editorial staccato has been supplied in the present edition. In the Violin Concerto, as in all Beethoven's works, staccato marks might sometimes indicate shortening of the note, sometimes an accent (or a combination of the two), and sometimes merely confirm that the note so marked does not belong in a preceding or following slur. The presence or absence of staccato marks has little or no direct bearing on how short notes may have been expected to be played; they indicate that the notes are not to be legato, but the precise degree of shortness in particular cases was determined by other factors. The modern performer's tendency to play most notes with stac-

cato marks very short is undoubtedly anachronistic. Where Beethoven wanted longer notes to be distinctly shortened he often indicated this by the use of rests rather than staccato marks, as when the orchestral strings begin to develop the four-note timpani figure at b. 10 of movement I. In some contexts, however, notes that were not marked staccato would conventionally have been played shorter than they were written. This applied particularly to notes at the end of a phrase followed by rests, hence, perhaps, Beethoven's lack of clarity in specifying the length of such notes (e.g. mvt. I, bb. 29, 31, 35, 498, 500, 504, where some instruments have crotchets and others quavers). If, on the other hand, he wanted a note to be held for its full value, as with the first note in mvt. III, bb. 11, 12, 15, 16, where in contrast to the initial statement of the rondo theme he envisaged a separate bow stroke for the second note, he could only be sure that the player would hold the first note for its full length by writing a cautionary *ten.* [tenuto].

The question of whether Beethoven ever expected a distinct "non-legato" performance style for notes that had neither slurs nor staccato marks is complex,⁷⁴ but it seems highly unlikely that the absence of any such markings in many passages in the solo part of the Violin Concerto was explicitly envisaged by the composer as indicating a particular style of performance. Indeed, it seems often to be the case that the phrasing or articulation was deliberately left to the discretion of the soloist.⁷⁵ In the orchestral parts the situation is rather different. The absence of slurs (except where they were omitted through oversight or because the context was obviously legato) may sometimes indicate that in wind instruments the notes were not expected to be smoothly slurred. In such places as mvt. I, b. 150, however, second clarinet and bassoon would clearly have been intended to resolve the dissonance in the usual legato manner despite the absence of slurs. For string instruments, the absence of slurs generally indicated that the notes were to be executed with separate bows, but not necessarily that they were to be played in a markedly detached manner. Thus, whether simply unslurred or supplied with staccato marks, the appropriate degree of articulation would have been determined by context and the musical instincts of the players, which were undoubtedly quite different from ours. Distinct separation of the notes seems unlikely to have been envisaged where it was not specifically indicated by rests, or when notes were repeated at the same pitch (e.g. the strings at mvt. I, bb. 485–487, where a continuation of the preceding notation with rests, or perhaps a somewhat less detached *portato* articulation, may have been envisaged).

In other accompanying figures of notes repeated at the same pitch, where these were not too fast, it seems clear from a number of contemporary sources that string players may instinctively have played them in a single articulated bowstroke (e.g. mvt. I, bb. 446f.). Where Beethoven explicitly notated *portato*, with dots under a slur the precise degree of separation would have been determined by the musical context. Beethoven certainly did not expect this notation to elicit a sharply detached style of performance, as it might have done in works by string-playing composers at that time; he undoubtedly intended a style of articulation that would more normally have been shown by horizontal lines, or lines and dots under a slur at a later period. Brahms, who stubbornly continued to use dots under a slur as the notation for *portato* (or *portamento* as he called it), eventually permitted Joachim to replace them in some of the separate violin parts in his first editions with lines under a slur (e.g. in movement III of the D minor Violin Sonata op. 108), while retaining his own notation in the violin part in the score.⁷⁶

In performing multiple stopped notes in string parts, many modern orchestras still divide chords of more than two notes, so as to avoid an arpeggiated attack. This is clearly unhistorical. Where Beethoven and his contemporaries wrote three- and four-note chords for string instruments, they undoubtedly wanted them to achieve the specific 'brilliant' or dramatic effect of a broken chord (e.g. at mvt. I, bb. 84ff., 279ff. etc.). Among Beethoven's contemporaries who explicitly stated that three- and four-note chords should be played as such was Johann Friedrich Reichardt, who also instructed in his treatise on orchestral playing that such chords should always be played down bow even if repeated in rapid succession.⁷⁷ In fact it is quite likely that players would even have played some two-note chords in a slightly spread manner. Ensembles of Beethoven's time (and well into the 20th century) generally laid less stress on vertical togetherness than is the case today; indeed, it is clear from historical evidence that *not* being completely together on the beat was often a desired artistic effect.

Accents and Dynamics

As a conductor, Beethoven was noted for his concern with dynamics, and this is also apparent in his music. Many of his corrections in Klumpar's score concern the placing or amplification of accent and dynamic markings; throughout this source he was assiduous in adding lines after crescendo and, more rarely, diminuendo instructions to clarify their extent. Although he occasionally wrote \leftarrow and \rightarrow , it is clear that these 'hairpins' represent only the most important dynamic gestures and that many more subtle ones were left to the discre-

tion of performers who were schooled in the performance conventions of the time. In the Violin Concerto he employed a relatively restricted range of accent and dynamic markings; *fp* does not occur at all and *sfp* rarely. In movement I, however, he twice used the rare instruction *fz*, for cellos and basses (bb. 111 and 113), probably synonymous with *rfz* and implying an accent followed by a rapid and powerful crescendo (the first *fz*, replaces *cres.*).⁷⁸ Where he wanted to prevent a diminuendo or to counteract a weaker metrical accent, he used a succession of *fz* as at bb. 75ff. in movement I. His strongest accent was indicated by *sf*. He rarely used $>$ as an accent and where it occurs at mvt. II, bb. 43ff., for instance, its extension over two notes seems to indicate a broad, possibly agogic, accent and diminuendo gesture. An exceptional *ppp* occurs near the end of the Larghetto where, having removed the instruction *uno violino* in first and second violins, he added an extra *p* to a pre-existing *pp*.

Slurs

For the modern editor one of the most problematic aspects of Beethoven's notation is his placement of slurs. The precise lengths of longer slurs seems in many contexts to have been of little concern to him, making it difficult to distinguish between a slur that has implications for phrasing or bowing and one that is merely an indication of legato. Beethoven's slurs in the autograph are often ambiguous, and are frequently omitted altogether where they were evidently intended, while Klumpar, who was in most respects a careful and accurate copyist, often compounded the lack of clarity in Beethoven's original by writing slurs in his score copy of which the exact beginning and ending were equally (or differently) unclear. Beethoven very rarely corrected or clarified the length of Klumpar's slurs, suggesting that in most cases he did not regard their precise extent to be particularly important, although he often supplied missing slurs. His primary concern in such cases seems to have been to secure a legato execution. Thus, at the repetition of the opening material of movement I at bb. 102–104 he simply wrote slurs for woodwind and Violino principale over each bar (where he did not omit them entirely), rather than the more nuanced (though not consistent) slurring in movement I, bb. 2–4. Nevertheless, he seems occasionally to have intervened to amend the slurring. At mvt. I, bb. 199f., for instance, he was evidently concerned to ensure that there was unbroken legato over two bars in the solo piano part and, during his initial pencil correction of the score, joined Klumpar's two one-bar slurs to make a single two-bar slur. Later in the publication process he apparently made similar corrections in the proofs of several orchestral parts in the passage beginning at mvt. I, b. 77, amending pairs of one-bar slurs in this motif to two-bar slurs (though not consistently), probably to avoid accentuation of the second bar of the phrase (see also Critical Commentary mvt. I, bb. 77f., 79f., 81f., 83f.).

Unlike the staccato, the legato, strictly interpreted, has no gradations; terms such as *molto legato* can logically refer only to the smoothness of the connection between slurs, not to the execution of notes within them.⁷⁹ But, as in so many areas of performing practice, the deceptively simple notation (slur or no slur) encompassed a range of meanings for performers of Beethoven's time that it does not normally suggest to modern players. These may have included phrasing within slurs by means of dynamic variation or accentuation and, in particular contexts, legato performance where no slurs are marked. A good example of the latter occurs, for instance, in second oboe and clarinet as well as both horns at mvt. I, b. 194, where the first two notes must surely be slurred and the third note probably played with a new impulse rather than a distinct separation from the preceding note.

In string parts, breaks between bow strokes frequently have no implication of articulation and, conversely, more than one bow stroke may be required to execute long phrasing slurs (as at mvt. I, bb. 77ff.). The ideal of inaudible bow changes in string playing was already well established in Beethoven's lifetime. In wind parts, there is little to suggest that breaks in slurs were a specific indication for breathing, nor, except in the case of short phrasing slurs of two or three notes, that the end of a slur and the beginning of another need necessarily indicate any kind of articulation. The situation where a slur ends before the final note of a legato phrase, particularly where this is over a bar line, is especially problematic, since Beethoven himself was quite inconsistent about whether his slurs extended to the final note or not, often slurring similar phrases differently on different occasions (e.g., mvt. III, Fg. I, bb. 69ff. and 244ff.), although it seems unlikely that he consciously wanted a different pattern of legato and separations. There are also many cases of conflicting slurring where instruments simultaneously have the same rhythmic pattern. The opening of movement I of the Violin Concerto, where Beethoven's slurring in the autograph is extremely sporadic and contradictory, provides a good illustration of this and of the problems facing an editor in such circumstances (see Critical Commentary). This passage would probably have been expected to be played with a continuous legato, with breaks in the sound only where rests are marked; the phrasing would thus have been achieved by accentuation and dynamic nuance. In such cases, particularly where a slur does not begin on the first beat of a bar, it seems plausible that the beginnings of slurs

were intended to indicate some degree of accentuation. The likelihood that breaks in slurs had any clear implications for phrasing in this case, however, is diminished by Beethoven's evident lack of concern for marking the slurs clearly and unambiguously. And when the theme comes *fortissimo* at mvt. I, bb. 366ff., the nature of the conflicting slurs in the wind and strings suggest even more strongly that the pattern of slurring had little or no explicit implications for phrasing.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the generous assistance of the libraries identified in the Critical Commentary in supplying copies of the source material and the kind permission to reproduce the facsimiles. I am grateful for the support and interest of colleagues, with whom I have discussed difficult textual problems and editorial decisions. My thanks also go to Frau Liselotte Sievers of Breitkopf & Härtel for her patience and unfailingly friendly courtesy. And finally, I must express my warmest thanks to Christian Rudolf Riedel, whose support throughout the editorial process has been invaluable; he has, as ever, provided perceptive and stimulating criticism at all stages in the preparation of this edition, bringing his extensive knowledge of Beethoven's notational practices together with his acute practical insights to bear on the many problems of the unsatisfactory source material. Any shortcomings in the edition are, of course, entirely my responsibility.

University of Leeds, Spring 2009

Clive Brown

- 1 Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien *Cod. Ser. n. 308 Samml.: Han*, fol. 196r.
- 2 See Franz Clement, *Violin Concerto in D major (1805)*, ed. by Clive Brown, Wisconsin, 2005 [= Clement Violin Concerto], pp. vii–xii.
- 3 Arnold Schering, *Die Geschichte des Instrumental-Konzerts bis auf die Gegenwart*, Leipzig, 1905, ²1927, reprint 1965, p. 204.
- 4 Anton Felix Schindler, *Beethoven as I knew him*, ed. by Donald W. MacArdle, transl. by Constance S. Jolly, London, 1966 [= Schindler/MacArdle], p. 135.
- 5 Carl Czerny, *Die Kunst des Vortrags der ältern und neuen Claviercompositionen [...] Supplement (oder 4ter Theil) zur grossen Pianoforte-Schule*, Vienna, [c. 1842], [= Czerny, *Die Kunst des Vortrags*], p. 117.
- 6 Alexander Wheelock Thayer, *Ludwig van Beethovens Leben*, 5 vols., ed. and suppl. by Hermann Deiters and Hugo Riemann, ^{3–5}Leipzig 1917–1823 [= Thayer/Deiters/Riemann], vol. II, p. 538.
- 7 Johann Nepomuk Möser in the *Wiener Zeitung für Theater, Musik und Poesie*, vol. 2 (1807), p. 27.
- 8 Shin Augustinus Kojima, *Die Solovioline-Fassungen und -Varianten von Beethovens Violinkonzert op. 61 – ihre Entstehung und Bedeutung*, in: *Beethoven-Jahrbuch VIII (1971/1972)*, Bonn, 1975 [= Kojima, *Solovioline-Fassungen*], p. 112.
- 9 *Ludwig van Beethoven Briefwechsel. Gesamtausgabe*, ed. by Sieghard Brandenburg, München, 1996 [= Beethoven Briefwechsel], vol. 1, p. 289.
- 10 John South Shedlock, *Clementi Correspondence*, in: *Monthly Musical Record XXXII (1902)* [= Clementi Correspondence], p. 143, which contains a facsimile of the first page of the letter.
- 11 „Monsieur L. v. Beethoven promet de ne vendre ces ouvrages soit en Allemand [sic] soit en France soit ailleurs, qu'avec la condition de ne les publier que quatre Mois après leur depart respectif pour l'Angleterre: pour les trios quatuors le concert pour le violon, la Symphonie et l'Ouverture, qui viennent de partir pour l'Angleterre, Monsieur L. v. Beethoven promet de les vendre, qu'à condition de ne les publier avant le 1. Septembre 1807.” – Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, *Mus. Ms. autogr. Beethoven 35*, 8. In the original manuscript the words “les trios quatuors” have been crossed out and the words “le concert pour le violon” inserted directly above the deletion. See also the facsimile in Barry Cooper's article. *The Clementi-Beethoven Contract of 1807: A Reinvestigation*, in: *Muzio Clementi Studies and Prospects*, ed. by Roberto Illiano, Luca Sala, Massimiliano Sala, Bologna, 2002 [= Cooper 2002]; he does not discuss the deletion in § 4, however, and argues that the Violin Concerto was not sent in this first batch of material, which he believes never to have reached England.
- 12 Beethoven Briefwechsel, vol. 1, pp. 311f.
- 13 Clementi Correspondence, p. 144; the emphasis on ‘this courier’ occurs in *Thayer's Life of Beethoven*, rev. and ed. by Elliot Forbes, Princeton, 1970 [= Thayer/Forbes], vol. II, p. 418, although it is omitted in Shedlock's transcription, which, however, is also incomplete with regard to Clementi's underlining in the portion of the letter that is reproduced in facsimile in his article.
- 14 Beethoven Briefwechsel, vol. 1, pp. 308f., pp. 310f.
- 15 Thayer/Deiters/Riemann, vol. III, p. 88.
- 16 Precisely what material for the Violin Concerto was sent to London, and when, cannot be demonstrated with certainty from the surviving evidence, which is susceptible of different interpretations. Barry Cooper (2002) argues that the Violin Concerto was not included in the first consignment.
- 17 The material used for the première may have included only one complete copy of each string part, together with a set of ripieno parts containing only the tutti sections (see „The direction of the orchestra and the signification of *Solo* and *Tutti*”, p. XVI).
- 18 Library of Congress, Washington *ML 96. C72 No. 24 (Case)*. Hertrich and other editors have assumed that the oboe fragment was part of the material from the première.
- 19 For details see the Critical Commentary.
- 20 The only reference to his dealings with the publisher during that period is a letter which mentions a score of the 4th Symphony sent from Baden to the „Industrie-Comptoir” in July, and a quartet copied about that time, presumably as the engraver's source for the Vienna edition. Cf. the letter to Gleichenstein in Beethoven Briefwechsel, vol. 1, p. 317.
- 21 Clementi Correspondence, p. 143. Shedlock's transcription says „as soon as he can” and this is followed in Thayer/Forbes, but the facsimile reproduction in the *Athenaeum* (July 1902), p. 135, clearly shows that it is “so” not “as.”
- 22 *Beethoven Werke, III/4, Werke für Orchester. Kritischer Bericht*, ed. by Ernst Hertrich, München, 1994 [= Hertrich 1994], p. 9.
- 23 Kojima, *Solovioline-Fassungen*, p. 104.
- 24 Hertrich 1994, p. 9.
- 25 Alan Tyson, *The Textual Problems of Beethoven's Violin Concerto*, in: *The Musical Quarterly*, LIII/4 (1967) [= Tyson, *Textual Problems*], p. 498.
- 26 Beethoven's letter to Neate of about 6 February 1816: „[...] la Partition du Concert pour le Violon vous ne refuserès comme sovenir de moi.” Beethoven Briefwechsel, vol. 3, p. 221.
- 27 Thayer/Forbes, vol. II, p. 636.
- 28 Fritz Kaiser, *Die authentische Fassungen des D-dur-Konzertes Op. 61 von Ludwig van Beethoven*, in: *Bericht über den internationalen musikwissenschaftlichen Kongress Kassel 1962*, Kassel, 1963, pp. 196–198. Hans-Werner Kühn, *Wer schrieb den Endtext des Violinkonzerts op. 61 von Beethoven? Franz Alexander Pössinger als letzte Instanz für den Komponisten* [Who wrote the Final Text of Beethoven's Violin Concerto Op. 61? Franz Alexander Pössinger as Last Authority for the Composer], lecture at the Symposium of the 8th Beethoven Easter Festival Warsaw 2004, 6–7 April 2004, congress report in: *Beethoven 3*, Akademia Muzyczna w Krakowie, Kraków, 2006, pp. 209–230, id. in: *Bonner Beethoven-Studien 4*, Bonn, 2005, pp. 91–108.
- 29 Willy Hess, *Die verschiedenen Fassungen von Beethovens Violinkonzert*, in: *Schweizerische Musikzeitung CIX (1969)*, pp. 197–201.
- 30 Ferdinand Ries and Franz Gerhard Wegeler, *Biographische Notizen über Ludwig van Beethoven*, ed. by Alfred Kalischer, Berlin, 1906, p. 141.
- 31 Gerhard von Breuning, *Aus dem Schwarzspanierhause. Erinnerungen an L. van Beethoven aus meiner Jugendzeit*, Wien, 1874, ed. by Maynard Solomon as *Memories of Beethoven: from the House of the Black-Robed Spaniards*, transl. by Henry Mins and Maynard Solomon, Cambridge, 1992, p. 40.
- 32 Schindler/MacArdle, p. 161 (see also pp. 135f.).
- 33 Schindler/MacArdle, p. 89.
- 34 Beethoven Briefwechsel, vol. 2, p. 3. The transmitted text contains an almost undecipherable sign scribbled by Beethoven which most likely reads „I. K.” (i.e. Industrie Kontor).
- 35 Clement Violin Concerto, p. ix.
- 36 *Vorbemerkung* to Jacob Dont's edition of Beethoven, *Violin-Concert*, Berlin, c. 1880, see also Clive Brown, *Ferdinand David's Editions of Beethoven*, in: *Performing Beethoven*, ed. by Robin Stowell, Cambridge, 1994, pp. 124ff.
- 37 See Beethoven Briefwechsel, vol. 1, pp. 318–320.
- 38 P. 29, quoted in George Kinsky and Hans Halm, *Das Werk Beethovens. Thematisch-Bibliographisches Verzeichnis seiner sämtlichen vollendeten Kompositionen*, München, 1955, p. 144.
- 39 For information about Clement's memory see Clement Violin Concerto, pp. vii–viii.
- 40 Hertrich 1994, p. 8.
- 41 Hertrich 1994, p. 8.
- 42 Hertrich 1994, p. 7.
- 43 Alan Tyson, *The Authentic Editions of Beethoven*, London, 1963, p. 55.
- 44 Tyson, *Textual Problems*, p. 488.
- 45 *Ludwig van Beethoven's Werke. Vollständige kritisch durchgesehene überall berechnete Ausgabe*, series 4, No. 29, ed. by Ferdinand David, Leipzig, 1863.
- 46 See Notes 24 and 45.
- 47 Alan Tyson, *The Text of Beethoven's Op. 61*, in: *Music & Letters 43/2 (1962)*, pp. 104–114.
- 48 George Kennaway, formerly co-principal cello in the orchestra of Opera North, informed the present writer that he played the concerto in 1994 under the conductor George Hurst, who insisted that cellos play *col basso* in this passage.
- 49 CONCERT | pour le violon avec accompagnement de grand | Orchestre | compose [sic] par | FRANÇOIS CLEMENT | Directeur de la Musique théatrale sur | la Wien | N° 259 Pr. | A VIENNE | Au magazine de l'imprimerie chimique I. R priv. Rue | Paternoster. [1807] [= Clement CONCERTO]
- 50 Andreas Moser, *Geschichte des Violinspiels*, Berlin, 1923, vol. II, p. 148.
- 51 *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung 7 (1804/05)*, p. 500.
- 52 For further information of recordings as evidence of changing approaches to tempo in movement I of the concerto see Mark Katz, *Beethoven in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction: The Violin Concerto on Record*, in: *Beethoven Forum*, University of Illinois Press, 2003, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 33–54.

- 53 Leopold Auer, *Violin Master Works and their Interpretation*, with a foreword by Frederick H. Martens, New York, 1925, p. 93.
- 54 Beethoven. *Violin-Concert. Mit Bezeichnung und Winken unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Auffassung v. Josef Joachim für den Vortrag versehen von Heinrich Dessauer*, Mainz, 1897, p. 1 (transl. by the editor). Also published in English as *Newly Revised and Provided with Numerous Explanatory Remarks for Concert Performance With Special Reference to the Artistic Conception of Joseph Joachim Edited by Heinrich Dessauer*, New York, 1903, p. 1. The English version of this note, in which the first sentence seems to be an unaccountable mistranslation, reads: "The first movement is frequently taken at too rapid a tempo. The indication 'ma non troppo' is only intended to convey the idea that the tempo should not be chosen at too rapid a gait but still not rob the movement of the real character of a flowing Allegro; the interpretation would otherwise be too heavy and dull."
- 55 Joseph Joachim and Andreas Moser, *Violinschule*, Berlin, 1905 [= Joachim/Moser, *Violinschule*], vol. III, pp. 185–208.
- 56 Czerny, *Vollständig theoretisch-praktische Pianoforte-Schule op. 500*, Wien, 1839, vol. III, p. 26.
- 57 Czerny, *Die Kunst des Vortrags*, p. 120.
- 58 Czerny, *Die Kunst des Vortrags*, p. 119.
- 59 Joachim/Moser, *Violinschule*, vol. III, p. 228.
- 60 *The Memoirs of Carl Flesch*, transl. by Hans Keller and ed. by C. F. Flesch, London, 1957, p. 179.
- 61 Beethoven *Werke, X/2, Werke für Chor und Orchester*, München, 1998, p. 215.
- 62 Louis Spohr, *Lebenserinnerungen*, ed. by Folker Göthel, Tutzing, 1968, vol. I [= Spohr, *Lebenserinnerungen*], p. 178.
- 63 Although the last two solo violin entries in movement I are also rather oddly marked *noi*.
- 64 For further implications of the use of the word *noi* in the solo part see the Critical Commentary.
- 65 Spohr, *Lebenserinnerungen*, p. 29.
- 66 Carey Campbell, *Should the soloist play during the tutti of Mozart's Clarinet Concerto?*, in: *Early Music*, vol. 37/3, August 2010, pp. 423–436.
- 67 See the VI. princ. parts in Clement CONCERTO, mvt. I, b. 201, six bars of a tutti passage are given as a six-bar rest to facilitate a page turn and in Kreutzer's 17th Concerto (c. 1805), where a cue for Corni in small notes in bb. 1f. is followed by the part of VI. I in full-size notes, specifically labelled *Violino princ.*; and each subsequent VI. I passage during the opening tutti is identified in the same way up to the *Solo* marking in b. 33.
- 68 Dexter Edge, *Recent discoveries in Viennese copies of Mozart's concertos*, in: *Mozart's piano concertos: text, context, interpretation*, ed. by Neal Zaslaw, Michigan, 1996, pp. 51–65 and Richard Maunder, *The scoring of Mozart's keyboard concertos*, in: *Early Music Performer* 25 (Nov. 2009), pp. 4–13.
- 69 Cf. ms. orchestral parts for mvt. I and II of the Violin Concerto (c. 1818) Wien, Archiv der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde IX 7786.
- 70 Clive Brown, *Die Neubewertung der Quellen von Beethovens Fünfter Symphonie / A New Appraisal of the Sources of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony*, Wiesbaden, 1996, pp. 35ff./67ff.
- 71 Clive Brown, *A Portrait of Mendelssohn*, Yale, 2003, p. 127.
- 72 Maria Rosa Moretti, Anna Sorrento, *Catalogo tematico delle musiche di Niccolò Paganini*, Genova, 1982.
- 73 *Beethoven Werke V/1*, p. IX.
- 74 See Clive Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750–1900*, Oxford, 1999 [= Brown, *Classical and Romantic*], p. 186–199.
- 75 For further discussion see the Preface to the edition for violin and piano EB 8656.
- 76 See Clive Brown, *Joachim's violin playing and the performance of Brahms's string music*, in: *Performing Brahms*, ed. Michael Musgrave and Bernard D. Sherman, Cambridge, 2003, pp. 52–54.
- 77 Johann Friedrich Reichardt, *Ueber die Pflichten des Ripien-Violinisten*, Berlin and Leipzig, 1776, pp. 12f.
- 78 See Brown, *Classical and Romantic*, pp. 87–95.
- 79 This is true for string and wind instruments, though for the piano a *molto legato* or slurred technique, in which the finger remained on the key until after the next was played, was recommended by some writers of the time, e.g. Johann Peter Milchmeyer, *Die wahre Art das Pianoforte zu spielen*, Dresden, 1797, pp. 5–7.