

**Eighth International
New Beethoven Research Conference**



**Westin Waterfront Hotel, Boston MA
October 30-31, 2019**

Sponsored by the American Musicological Society, American Beethoven Society, the University of Alabama, and the University of California, Los Angeles.

Program committee: Joanna Biermann (University of Alabama), Erica Buurman (Ira F. Brilliant Center for Beethoven Studies, San Jose State University), William Kinderman (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign), David Levy (Wake Forest University), Julia Ronge (Beethoven-Haus, Bonn), William Meredith (emeritus director, Ira F. Brilliant Center for Beethoven Studies)

Wednesday, October 30, Day 1
9:00-5:00, Location: Stone

8:00-9:00: Continental Breakfast (complimentary) in Stone

Session 1: Reception History

Wednesday October 30, 9:00-11:15

Session Chair: Julia Ronge

Martin Nedbal, University of Kansas: "Dramaturgical and Political Aspects of Fidelio Reception in Nineteenth-Century Prague"

Leanne Langley, Royal Philharmonic Society: "London Calling: The *English Music Gazette* and Beethoven's 'Quartetto' (1819)"

James Parsons, Missouri State University: "Beethoven, the Choral Finale, and Schiller's 'Exclusionary' Second Strophe"

Session 2: Works

Wednesday October 30, 1:45-5:00pm

Session Chair: William Kinderman

Nicholas Marston, University of Cambridge: "The Limits of Integration? Beethoven's String Quartet in C, Op. 29 and Violin Sonata in G, Op. 96"

Ned Kellenberger, Illinois College: "The Solo Part of Beethoven's Violin Concerto, Op 61: A Reevaluation"

3:15-3:30: *Break*

Francesco Fontanelli, Giorgio Cini Foundation, Venice:
From *la gaieté* to the 'melancholy' Adagio: The genesis of
the slow movement theme of the Quartet Op 27. 127"

Elisa Novara, Beethoven-Haus Bonn: "'Freylich war der
Effect ganz derselbe, aber nicht für das Auge':
Beethoven's own arrangement of the Great Fugue op.
133/134"

Thursday, October 31, Day 2
9:00-12:30, Location: Harbor II

8:00-9:00: Continental Breakfast (complimentary) in Harbor II

Session 3: Sources

Thursday October 31, 9:00-11:15

Session Chair: Joanna Biermann

Jens Dufner, Beethoven-Haus Bonn: "'Copyist A': What do
we actually know about Wenzel Schlemmer?"

Theodore Albrecht, Kent State University: "Joseph
Stieler's Portrait of Beethoven Holding the *Missa solemnis*:
What the Composer Was Really Thinking"

John D. Wilson, Austria Academy of Sciences, Vienna:
"Mozart and Beethoven Reconsidered: Evidence from the
Bonn Years"

Keynote

Thursday October 31, 11:30-12:30

Session Chair: David Levy

Elaine Sisman, Columbia University: "Reckoning and
Deducing with Beethoven."

Abstracts

Session 1: Reception History

Martin Nedbal

Dramaturgical and Political Aspects of Fidelio Reception in Nineteenth-Century Prague

This paper discusses previously overlooked journalistic reviews and production materials (such as conducting scores, prompters' librettos, and vocal parts) associated with Fidelio performances at Prague's Czech and German theaters between 1814 and 1888.

These documents illustrate both the transformations of the opera's stage form and the political meanings associated with Beethoven's work during this period. Most importantly, these materials prove that nineteenth-century Prague productions centered around the 1814 as opposed to the 1806 version of the opera, an issue that has been contested ever since Oldřich Pulkert's 1977 discovery of an 1806 Leonore manuscript in Prague's National Theater Archive. Whereas Pulkert claimed that the 1806 Leonore was produced by Karl Maria von Weber at the Estates Theater in 1814 and then again by Bedřich Smetana at the Provisional Theater in 1870, Helga Lühning and others were more cautious, pointing out that it was unclear whether Weber and Smetana conducted the 1806 or the 1814 versions.

At the same time, these documents show that the form of the opera was unstable. Various conductors and directors (including Gustav Mahler in 1886) shifted the position of individual numbers and chose different versions of the overture, sometimes using more than one overture during a single performance. Fidelio, furthermore, acquired specific political overtones in nineteenth-century Prague. Prague's German community understood the work as a national symbol, such as during celebrations of Beethoven's anniversaries and other cultural achievements (i.e., the opening of the New German

Theater in 1888). As the relations between Prague's Czechs and Germans grew more tense in the second half of the nineteenth century, the Czech theater mostly ignored *Fidelio*, and in connection to occasional Czech performances, Czech critics complained about what they viewed as specifically German aspects of the work.

Leanne Langley

London Calling: The *English Musical Gazette* and Beethoven's "Quartetto" (1819)

Beethoven's relationship with the London Philharmonic Society, founded in 1813, has been documented by scholars from Alexander Thayer, Alan Tyson and Barry Cooper to Alexander Ringer, David Levy and Arthur Searle. Placing letters, scores and performances in the longer narrative of Beethoven's interest in London from 1807, and in Edinburgh from still earlier, 1803, such studies illuminate his dealings with publishers, instrument-makers, performers, and friends including George Thomson, Muzio Clementi, J.P. Salomon, Ferdinand Ries, George Smart, Charles Neate, and John Broadwood. Without question, Beethoven aimed to make an impact in Great Britain. He held his professional brethren there in the highest regard, hoped to visit one day, and certainly knew the value of the British market.

All the more striking, then, is the recent discovery of a "new" Beethoven piece, published in London on at least three occasions in the early nineteenth century, never doubted as his at the time but equally not noticed, studied or catalogued by later scholars. It seems to have been missed by virtue of first appearing in an anonymous, short-lived music periodical of small circulation, the *English Musical Gazette* - a journal that, as new research reveals, can now itself be connected directly with the Philharmonic Society. My paper will present what can be conjectured about the commissioning and function of the piece, a 54-bar four-voice vocal setting of the *Agnus dei* entitled

“Quartetto.” I will argue that although brief, this work is an authentic missing link in our knowledge of Beethoven’s compositional activity in 1818-19, a period for which little evidence of his sketching has otherwise survived. “Quartetto” may even prompt insight into the larger works taking shape in the composer’s mind around this time, including the Hammerklavier Sonata, *Missa solemnis*, and Ninth Symphony.

James Parsons

Beethoven, the Choral Finale, and Schiller’s “Exclusionary” Second Strophe

For many critics, among them Adorno, Chua, Mathew, Rehding, and Solomon, Beethoven contradicts himself in the choral finale of the Ninth Symphony. At issue is the apparent incongruity of the second-strophe of Schiller’s “An die Freude,” which states that “whoever has not been able to do this [call even one soul their own] must steal away,” over and against the words Beethoven most often repeats in the choral finale, “All men become brothers.” Solomon contends that “those who choose Elysium yield up their individuality to the group” (Joy is the “Tochter aus Elysium”), while for Chua “the humanism” the movement “champions treats . . . [the] Other as less than human.” Such interpretations misread Schiller: while open to all, Freude is not a right, it must be earned. For Schiller, Joy is the cornerstone of a larger aesthetic-philosophical project where the harmony of head and heart demands the experience of compassionately interacting with others in order to achieve Enlightenment self-actualization. Self and community must work together. Society is not in a position to banish anyone, and the joyless individual is free to develop and enter the circle of joy at some later point.

Interpretations advancing the idea of incongruity also misread Beethoven. Instead of repeating the words “Alle Menschen werden Brüder” at eleven climactic moments—most extravagantly the last time at the start of the vocal-quartet cadenza

(measure 832)—he just as easily could have dropped the line and directed his attention to another from Schiller’s verse or a different poem altogether. Reading Schiller in light of his social contract in which the individual and society collaborate for the good of all, I provide an alternative reading of Schiller’s widely misunderstood second strophe and Beethoven’s setting of it in the choral finale of the Ninth Symphony.

Session 2: Works

Nicholas Marston

The Limits of Integration? Beethoven’s String Quintet in C, Op. 29 and Violin Sonata in G, Op. 96

Beethoven’s music, and particularly that of his so-called ‘heroic decade’, is routinely regarded as emblematic of concepts such as an organic unity, integration of part and whole, and similar such expressions. In this paper I discuss two works – the little-discussed String Quintet in C, Op. 29 (1801) and the Violin Sonata in G, Op. 96 (1812) – standing at either end of that decade. Both exhibit a conspicuous wealth of features that can be conventionally understood as unifying or integrative; in particular, the finale of each work relates importantly to what has preceded it. In the case of the Quintet, the principal connection is between the finale and the first movement, while the finale of Op. 96 discloses subtle interconnections to all three preceding movements. Notwithstanding all this, I argue that both finales, in similar ways, stage an ‘extreme’ or ‘absurd’ integrative moment that, paradoxically, may serve to threaten the very notion of ‘integration’ itself.

Ned Kellenberger

The Solo Part of Beethoven's Violin Concerto, Op. 61: A Reevaluation

It is not widely recognized that the familiar final version of the solo part of Beethoven's Violin Concerto op. 61 may not stem entirely from the composer. This uncertainty shifts attention toward earlier versions preserved in the composer's hand in the autograph manuscript. With the absence of confirmation that Beethoven assembled the final version himself, a reevaluation of the different versions of the solo violin part is justified.

The concerto was composed in six weeks under pressure of the premiere deadline. Some difficult passages were omitted before the premiere, and it is possible the lack of preparation time for the soloist (Franz Clement) and the orchestra forced these practical removals. Beethoven was not satisfied with the premiere performance; later revisions of the solo violin part seemed to respond to shortcomings in this Performance.

Among the sources for Beethoven's op. 61 are three versions of the solo violin part. Two of these versions are found in the autograph manuscript, now held in a collection in Vienna in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek. The first version was used for the premiere on 23 December 1806; the second is a revision from May and June of 1807. The third version is found in the first published edition from Vienna dating from January 1809. Startling departures from the standard text of the violin part can be based on these sources, such as a virtuosic solo presence at the recapitulation of the first movement. No single version presents itself as the definitive authoritative version of the solo violin part. A synthetic approach to the different violin solo revisions seems justified.

Francesco Fontanelli

From *la gaieté* to the "melancholy" Adagio: The genesis of the slow movement theme of the Quartet op. 127

Scholarship on the op. 127 quartet makes references to a scherzo-like movement entitled “la gaieté”, which Beethoven had inserted into the work, but later discarded. As Nottebohm demonstrated, the composer did not renounce his original ideas; instead, he used the material of the gaieté to build the Adagio theme. Barry Cooper reconstructed the creative process in 2014; the question of the ‘meaning’ of these transformations, however, remains open. What kind of quartet did Beethoven foresee? And which role did he intend to attribute to the slow movement within the overall structure of the work?

My paper discusses the sketch content in order to identify the composer’s possible models and the technical/stylistic problems he confronted. I will first shed light on the hitherto overlooked origins of the gaieté. The French title appears in late eighteenth-century collections of airs de contredanses and occurs as designation of piano character pieces. These precedents are crucial to understand the early project for the op. 127 quartet: the sketches present us a playful country dance, followed by a bel canto-style Adagio motivically related to it, but contrasting in character. I will examine how the composer attempted to realise the idea of a ‘theatrical’ juxtaposition between dance theme and lyrical theme, in the light of the youthful experiments in the op. 18 quartets. Finally, I will tackle the last metamorphosis: the disappearance of the gaieté, ‘camouflaged’ within the Adagio melody, now transfigured into an aura of sublime melancholy. Beethoven chose a chiaroscuro harmonization alternating between F minor and A flat major. He thus created an evocative link between the slow movement and the subdominant sonorities of the quartet’s initial Allegro. My paper evaluates for the first time these «intermovement correspondences» (Gossett) suggested by the sketches, advancing new perspectives on the analysis of the op. 127 Quartet structure.

Elisa Novara

**“Freylich war der Effect ganz derselbe, aber nicht für das Auge”:
Beethoven’s own arrangement of the Great Fugue op. 133/134”**

Beethoven’s own 4 hands piano transcription of the Great Fugue op. 134 is, in many regards, different from any other piano arrangement he made: firstly, it is given an opus number, which is something that conventional Klavierauszüge usually do not have; secondly, it has a dedication, namely to Beethoven’s patron and pupil the Archduke Rudolf. It is notoriously difficult to play that it barely fulfills the primary function of 4 hands piano transcriptions in the 19th century: a more easily accessible performance practice would have resulted in better circulation of the work.

A more conventional transcription of op. 133 might have been made by Anton Halm in April 1826, but it has not survived: Beethoven rejected it, after having examined it, and decided to write one himself. The reasons why the composer might have wanted to realize this “knechtischen Dienst” (BGA 2193) at this point of his life and career remain mysterious. Halm’s report about Beethoven’s critical judgement of his work focused on the fragmentation of the parts between the two players. Halm’s arrangement probably “sounded” like the Great Fugue, but it did not “look” like it. This paper will discuss Beethoven’s sketches for the transcription of the Great Fugue op. 134, in particular for the first fugal section (Artaria 214). I will argue, based on evidence provided by his ongoing revisions of the disposition of the parts and of the subjects, that Beethoven’s first concern in arranging the Fugue was to preserve the contrapuntal structure in such a way that it could still be clearly read and understood as such. I will also address the genetic question of whether or not Beethoven might have sketched other parts of op. 134 in other sources that are now lost and examine his “arranging” strategies compared to his “composing” ones.

Session 3: Sources

Jens Dufner

“Copyist A”: What do we actually know about Wenzel Schlemmer?

In 1970, Alan Tyson published his famous “Notes on Five of Beethoven’s Copyists” which is still crucial for Beethoven research. Tyson was the first to attempt a systematic examination of the most important scribes who worked for Beethoven and allowed him to disseminate his works. Even half a century later, the article still represents the most up to date knowledge of Beethoven’s copyists. Although biographical details have been stated more precisely and further scribes identified in the meantime, no broader systematic investigation on Beethoven’s copyists has been undertaken since then. Tyson himself, actually, understood his study only as a starting point of a fundamental research on the composer’s scribes.

This applies also for Wenzel Schlemmer, classified by Tyson as “Copyist A”, who plays an outstanding role among Beethoven’s copyists, regarding both the extremely long time period he worked for Beethoven (Tyson gives a time span from 1799 to 1823) and his outstanding significance for the composer. Our knowledge about Schlemmer is essentially based on Tyson’s findings and his attributions are rarely questioned, although the sources are sometimes uncertain or even contradictory and the interpretation of his handwriting often less clear than usually assumed. The same applies to the mention of Schlemmer in Beethoven’s correspondence: the copyists Beethoven speaks about can often only presumably be connected with him. On reading Tyson’s essay carefully, we can see that the author was fully aware of the problems: his reasoning is always extremely scrupulous and he marked his attributions as cautious hypotheses only. Nevertheless, while Tyson’s essay is widely cited, the doubts he expresses are usually ignored. This paper takes a critical look at the insights we actually have about Wenzel Schlemmer and his

collaboration with Beethoven. In this context, the manuscripts attributed to Schlemmer should also be examined more closely. The paper will discuss whether they really all come from the same hand, and will consider which role Schlemmer played in Beethoven's compositional oeuvre.

Theodore Albrecht

Joseph Stieler's Portrait of Beethoven Holding the Missa solemnis: What the Composer Was Really Thinking

Joseph Carl Stieler's portrait of Beethoven holding the Missa solemnis is one of the most recognized, most reproduced, and most adapted images of the composer. Even so, its origins remain unclear. Its date has been given as ca. 1819, ca. 1820, ca. 1821, or even some combination of these. Through a close reading of Beethoven's Conversation Books (now being published in an updated English edition), it becomes apparent that Stieler began sketching on February 12, 1820, and put the finishing touches on the oil portrait on April 10 of that year. Moreover, we learn that the Munich-based Stieler undertook the portrait upon commission from the Frankfurt banker Franz Brentano, to please his wife Antonie. Although Beethoven holds the beatific Missa solemnis (still incomplete) in his hands, he is scowling in a manner inconsistent with the music. At a sitting at Stieler's studio on March 28, 1820, Beethoven held not a score, but instead a conversation book into which he entered his concerns about the guardianship of his nephew Karl, including the colorful pun *Arschmundschaftsgericht* (Assholeship Court). Here, then, was probably the cause of Beethoven's angry scowl. The conversation books allow us to trace the portrait's completion on April 10 and its being sent to the Brentanos in Frankfurt, but only after Stieler exhibited it publicly in Vienna (to divided opinions among Beethoven's circle) and made a copy for himself.

John D. Wilson

Mozart and Beethoven Reconsidered: Evidence from the Bonn Years

In November 1792, when the young Beethoven left his home for Vienna to study composition with Joseph Haydn, it was well understood among his friends and supporters that he would aspire to the legacy of Wolfgang Amadé Mozart, who had died not even a year earlier. This sentiment was most directly expressed in Beethoven's album by Count Ferdinand Waldstein, who predicted that the young musician would "receive the spirit of Mozart through Haydn's hands." Musicians, music lovers, and scholars ever since have usually taken Waldstein's entry at face value, as a prophetic intimation of Beethoven's later status in the trinity of Viennese Classicism, even though it came decades before any such concept was considered and many years before Beethoven had established his compositional talents among anyone outside his immediate circle. But what, really, would the "spirit of Mozart" have meant to a young Bonn musician and his supporters in 1792? Building on two research projects into musical life in Bonn during Beethoven's youth, as well as recent revelations by Dieter Haberl about the duration of Beethoven's first stay in Vienna, by Elisabeth Reisinger on the relationship between Mozart and Elector Maximilian Franz, and by this author on the revised chronology of Beethoven's Bonn works, this paper explores the Bonn reception of Mozart and his music: how much of it was known and collected, and how local audiences compared it to that of other composers. Especially in need of critical revision is the differing reception of his operas and his instrumental music, the former highly appreciated and the latter hardly known for most of the 1780s. Finally, evidence of a surprising — and seemingly improbable — knowledge in Bonn of Mozart's Requiem as early as 1792 dovetails with a consideration of the change in local perceptions of the composer immediately after his death.

Keynote

Thursday October 31, 11:30-12:30

Elaine Sisman

Reckoning and Deducing with Beethoven

This talk draws together a series of firsts—Beethoven’s first work for the theater in Vienna, his first variations to be granted opus numbers, his first symphony written on a “subject,” and his first offering to a publisher that required fact-checking—in order to reconsider a very familiar problem from a new angle.

Beethoven Conferences and Symposia in 2020

- February 6–7:** Beethoven symposium at the Oxford Beethoven Festival, Oxford
- February 10–14:** *Beethoven-Perspectives*, Beethoven-Haus, Bonn
- February 29–March 1:** *Beethoven 2020: Analytical and Performative Perspectives*,
Conservatorium van Amsterdam
- March 27–29:** *Beethoven the European*, Lucca
- April 17–18:** *Neue Wege? Alte Klischees? Mozart – Stefan Zweig – Beethoven*,
Beethoven-Haus, Bonn
- April 30–May 2:** *New Perspectives on Beethoven's Chamber Music*, Ira F. Brilliant
Center for Beethoven Studies, San Jose
- May 5–7:** *Die Trias der Wiener Klassik: Haydn - Mozart - Beethoven*.
Gemeinsamkeiten, Parallelen, Gegensätze, Vienna and Eisenstadt
- May 19–22:** *Beethoven-Geflechte*, University of Vienna
- May 9–10:** *String Quartets in Beethoven's Europe*, University of Auckland
- June 19–20:** *HNO-Kongress Beethoven und Hörverlust*, Bonn
- June 25–27:** *Beethoven und seine rheinischen Musikerkollegen*, Beethoven-Haus,
Bonn
- July 2–:** *Understanding Beethoven: Musicology and Computer Science in Dialogue*,
Mutter-Beethoven- Haus, Koblenz
- August 5–8:** *Beethoven and the Spirit of Innovation (Historical Keyboard Society of
North America)*, Saint Paul
- September 16–19:** *Musikwissenschaft nach Beethoven* (XVII. International
Conference of the Gesellschaft für Musikforschung), Beethoven-Haus,
Bonn
- September 29–October 1:** *Reframing Beethoven*, Center for Beethoven Research at
Boston University
- November 4–6:** *Beethoven and the Piano*, Lugano
- November 5–7:** *Beethovens Missa solemnis: das „größte Werk, welches ich bisher
geschrieben,“* (Fritz Thyssen Stiftung), Cologne
- November 19–21:** *(Un)Populäres Musiktheater: Patriotismus auf der Bühne 1789–
1815*, Beethoven-Haus, Bonn
- December 10–13** (tbc), *Beethoven symposium*, UCLA