

33. Registre 66: the names of four of the five were associated with brass instruments: Neuffer, Ernest, Braun, Heina, Wunderlich. Information on Benda's score was provided by the late John D. Drake.
34. Campardon, *Les Comédiens du Roi*, 2:352-53.
35. D.P. Charlton, "Orchestration and Orchestral Practice in Paris, 1789-1810," Ph.D. diss., Cambridge University, 1973, pp. 114-20.
36. Borrel, "L'orchestre du Concert Spirituel..."
37. Zaslav, "Toward the Revival of the Classical Orchestra," p. 180 and note 47.
38. *Almanach général de tous les spectacles* (Paris, 1791), p. 54.
39. Méhul, *Siratonice* (1792) and *Mélidore et Phrosine* (1794) are the first.
40. Zaslav, "Toward the Revival of the Classical Orchestra," p. 172.

Tändelnde Lazzi: On Beethoven's Trio in D Major, Opus 70, No. 1

Joseph Kerman

Beethoven's Piano Trio in D major, composed in 1808, published as the first half of opus 70 in 1809, and soon thereafter provided with the sobriquets "Fledermaus trio" and "Geister," has been poorly treated in the Beethoven literature. Bibliographical control in such matters is a chimera, of course, but a conscientious scan has not turned up more than one or two articles or sections of books in which the music is discussed in any sustained way. The one important recent article devoted to the Trio does not treat the music extensively, for in "Stages in the Composition of Beethoven's Piano Trio Op. 70, No. 1" Alan Tyson had his hands full dealing with the sketches and the newly-emerged autograph.¹ His study was a breakthrough—a crest breaking on the new wave of Beethoven scholarship, one might say—in that here for the first time a long draft in a sketchbook was identified confidently as the precise source from which Beethoven derived the autograph; and I admire it. But I have had occasion to remark before on the absurd situation in which the Beethoven bibliography grows by several hundred items every year, year in year out, while major works remain undiscussed in any kind of analytical detail.

One discussion of the "Ghost" Trio is, however, famous and distinguished. This is E. T. A. Hoffmann's review of the original edition of opus 70, published in the *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* of 1813. Parts of this review and parts of Hoffmann's even more famous 1810 review of the Fifth Symphony went to make up the article "Beethoven's Instrumental Music" which appeared in the *Fantasiestücke in Callots Manier* of 1814 and was widely influential. But in recasting his work in a musical journal for a literary collection, Hoffmann not surprisingly left out the bulk of his technical analysis in both articles (and much of what he left has sometimes been excised by later editors). Carl Dahlhaus has recently stressed in several of his writings how Hoffmann's reviews combine romantic metaphysical speculation with detailed, sometimes bar-by-bar analyses. There are about 3500 words of such technical writing in the original Fifth Symphony review and about 1500 words on each of the opus 70 trios, plus

music examples and lengthy musical *Beilagen*. Today's rigorous musical analysts would probably characterize Hoffmann's work as mostly "description," rather than analysis proper, and they would have a point; Schenker certainly had no use for Hoffmann. But they would probably also grant that Hoffmann has some penetrating things to say especially about thematic derivations and relationships, and also that he interrupts his technical discourse with metaphorical and evaluative statements only rarely—though always with calculated effect. And they should honor him, describer or analyst, whichever he may be, as a founding father of their discipline.

Hoffmann as a writer on music has his low and high styles: on the one hand music-analytical nuts and bolts, on the other great edifices of aesthetic legislation reaching up into the spirit realm. Here is a part of his conclusion to the review of the "Ghost" Trio, following his analysis of the finale (my italics):

Notwithstanding the geniality that prevails in the entire Trio, not even excepting the melancholy Largo, Beethoven's genius is still earnest and solemn. It is as though the Master feels that man could never speak of deep, mysterious matters—even when the spirit, intimately familiar with such matters, feels itself exalted with gladness and joy—in ordinary words, but only in sublime, noble language. The dance of the Priests of Isis must be a supremely exultant hymn! This reviewer, too, is convinced that where music operates only through itself and not, let us say, towards some specified dramatic end, pure instrumental music ought to shun *insignificant facetiousness* and *trifling japes*. What a profound mind seeks, for the presentation of joy—a joy which, coming hither from unknown regions, more glorious and beautiful than anything here in our constrained world, kindles a wondrous inner life in the heart—is a higher expression than can be imparted by mere words, which pertain only to the sphere of limited earthly feelings.²

While such sentiments are not unfamiliar in romantic writings about music, here they seem strangely ill-fitted to their immediate context. *Gemüthlichkeit* is not the word one would have thought of for the ghostly slow movement of this Trio, and the finale, which Hoffmann has just finished analyzing and praising for its originality, organicism and powerful stormy quality, can hardly be said to shun the *Spassthafte* (let us not presume to refer to *tändelnden Lazzi*...). To be sure, Hoffmann was always rather slow to respond to the unbuttoned side of Beethoven's genius. In his review of the Fifth Symphony, he remarks dryly that the abrupt double bass outbursts beginning the second half of the Trio may strike some people as playful, "but for the reviewer a sinister feeling was awakened."³ Nevertheless, a warning against facetiousness in music coming hard on a discussion of the "Ghost" Trio finale seems very curious indeed, so much so as to implant the suspicion that Hoffmann may have been covertly pleading with Beethoven not to let his sense of humor get the better of him.

If I now enumerate a number of points—six, to be exact—that seem to me decidedly playful, it is not that I wish to show up Hoffmann. On the contrary, if this essay were not dedicated to Gerald Abraham, I would wish to dedicate it with respect to Hoffmann's memory. My main wish is to get something down on

paper about a brilliant movement which has been all but ignored by critics since Hoffmann's pioneering review. What follows will go into detail at some points, though of course it is not conceived of as a full critical study. Like Hoffmann, I shall indulge myself in some rather lengthy musical examples.

1. While Hoffmann rightly observed that Beethoven's finales tend to build up activity and pressure continuously,⁴ this tendency need not be incompatible with a continuous display of high spirits in the best classical tradition for finales. The Eighth Symphony (which Hoffmann did not yet know) is a perfect example. For each of his first four symphonies—though not, as it happens, for the next two, completed just before the "Ghost" Trio—Beethoven had devised (or chosen) themes with witty or jocular features of one kind or another. The finale of the "Ghost" Trio has a decidedly amusing theme, and amusement is compounded by the way the theme is treated later in the movement.

Ex. 1

The image shows a musical score for the finale of the "Ghost" Trio. It consists of two staves: a piano part on the left and a violin part on the right. The piano part begins with a tempo marking of "Presto" and a dynamic of "p". It features a series of rhythmic patterns, including a triplet of eighth notes. The violin part enters with a dynamic of "p" and a melodic line. The score includes various dynamic markings such as "p", "pff.", "sf", "cresc.", "str.", "p, dolce", and "etc.". There are also performance instructions like "Vln. f" and "Vln. pff.". The score is divided into measures, with some measures numbered (e.g., 5, 10).

One point of wit within the theme (ex. 1, theme 1) is provided by the accompaniment motive in bars 1-2, 3-4,⁵ 5-6, and 6-7. This Beethoven derived by free inversion from the opening motive in the melody, construed as starting with the first downbeat—which is indeed where the theme starts at most of its later reappearances and transformations, eliding or omitting the opening upbeat leap of a sixth. Another source of wit is the rhythmic situation. The first *fermata* comes unexpectedly soon and extends a slightly unexpected harmony, but what is most unexpected is the irregular way the harmony resolves, with the F# holding fast and the A# turning back to A₄. As an aberrant check to rhythmic continuity, a *fermata* generally sets up somewhat momentous expectations, at least in this style, and so when a *fermata* comes on a chord

demanding resolution—such as, typically, the 6-4 chord of a cadenza—the music can seem to slip on a banana peel if that resolution is thwarted. Here, rather more subtly, it seems about to take a pratfall but lands insouciantly on its feet.

There is no problem about the resolution of the second *fermata*; its dominant harmony is simply prolonged in the sequel. It contributes to the whimsical rhythmic instability of the theme nonetheless, by insistently renewing the slow-down already suffered in bar 4, and by renewing it a bar early—or is it only two beats early, or even one? This second slow-down is less sudden than the first. The music seems to be getting under way by a series of very odd fits and starts.

(In the first movement of the Trio, too, the music hardly has a chance to get under way before it stops unexpectedly. No *fermata* is specified, but the opening flurry of eighths and sixteenths *all'ottava* slows down to a single high note, F₄, held by the cello all through bars 5 and 6. The effect, enhanced by a *diminuendo*, might be described as that of a “written-out *fermata*.” Something similar occurs also in the “Archduke” Trio, opus 97. As in the finale of the “Ghost” Trio, in the first movement the stop comes on an unexpected (implied) harmony: although in bar 5 the F₄ suggests nothing stranger than the tonic minor chord, in bar 6 it is sea-changed into E₄ by the low octave B₃ quietly set under it by the piano. F₄(E₄) and B₃ resolve to a D-major 6-4 chord. The widely-spaced hollow fifth or doubly augmented fourth in bar 6 is a wonderful and very original sonority; Beethoven does *not* add the D and G₄ which would turn it into a conventional German sixth, both because that would sound tawdry and because what he is doing is gradually building up the texture from the opening octaves through two parts to three and up. In any case, the resolution of the first *fermata* in the finale seems doubly whimsical when one remembers the rich and mysterious resolution at the analogous point in the first movement.)

2. The finale is in sonata form. Common as it may be in sonata-form movements for elements of theme 1 to return somewhere in the second group, it is hard to think of another case in which this happens just in the way it does here. Example 2 shows the situation. An overlapping *fortissimo* phrase in A major simulates the opening gesture of theme 1, sweeping its way up to a *fermata* on another slightly remote chord. This time the resolution of the held chord is normal in harmonic terms; in thematic terms, however, the sequel is not the second phrase of theme 1 but a version of the first. In other words, what had originally been a 4-bar antecedent in the tonic now appears as an 8-bar consequent starting in the supertonic, B minor.

Ex. 2

This is such a disconcerting and delightful twist that Beethoven decided to repeat the passage with yet another twist. In bars 95ff. the upward sweep leads to a stop on a different chord, whereupon the piano right hand spins out a deceptively innocent-sounding cadenza-like passage, nine bars long, leading to the antecedent-become-consequent in a very different key, the flat supertonic, B₃ major. “This [passage] must be played so light and equal that it may appear like a free improvisation,” writes Czerny in his disquisition upon the correct performance of Beethoven’s piano music, “*but yet so strictly in time* that the accompanists [*sic*] may come in at exactly the right moment.”¹⁶ Sooner or later *fermatas* in Beethoven themes are nearly always filled out by cadenzas or cadenza-like passages, as has happened here. There are prominent examples in both of the symphonies he had just completed: the famous oboe cadenza in the recapitulation of the first movement of the Fifth, and a cadenza in tempo for the first violins at a closely analogous point in the Sixth (bars 282-88).

In the Trio Beethoven works his way back from B₃ and F to A in a vigorous octave passage with shifting accents (not illustrated). The juxtaposition of sharp and flat regions embodied in this part of the exposition is exactly mirrored in the recapitulation, where E minor/E₃ major leads to D as previously B minor/B₃ major had led to A. And in both exposition and recapitulation the flat region is anticipated by momentary features in the bridge passages, which include *fortissimo* outbursts on F₄ and B₃ respectively.

(In the first movement of the Trio, too, flat and sharp regions had been juxtaposed, first of all in the F_4 and $F\sharp$ that we have already discussed within the first theme itself. In the first movement—as in the finale—the bridge passage in the exposition includes a *fortissimo* outburst on F_4 . And as in the finale, this is mirrored in the recapitulation: it is not mirrored exactly, though, but more powerfully, since the first theme group is now extended in such a way as to lead into a long cantabile passage in B_b , which in effect crowds out the original bridge material. $F_4/F\sharp$ and $B_b/4$ flicker in the trills preceding the final cadences of the exposition and recapitulation, respectively. F is also an important key area in the development section. The whole treatment of the flat regions is more searching here—more earnest and solemn, perhaps, as Hoffmann would have wished—and wittier in the finale, where Beethoven is carefully saving a punch-line for the coda.)

3. The development section of the finale is relatively short. It emerges out of an overflow of energy uncontained by the exposition, culminating in yet another *fermata*, after which the main subsection of the development applies fragmentation technique to the secondary theme (shown beginning in bars 9-10 of example 1). Basically, in large structural terms, the next and last subsection amounts to a straightforward dominant pedal, 18 bars long, preparing for the recapitulation. Seldom, however, has such a pedal at such a formal juncture been bodied out in so surprising a fashion.

The passage is illustrated in example 3. It was also singled out for illustration by Hoffmann, who noted that the triplets constitute an entirely new feature in the movement. In this version of the first theme, every musical element has been simplified. Its rhythmic anomalies have been smoothed out into steady quarters for the first four bars (with one triplet) and steady triplets thereafter, all over an ostinato in halves. Its harmonic subtleties have been cancelled out by a regular two-bar alternation of tonic and dominant harmonies. Its phrase structure has been simplified from an *ab* pattern to *aa'*; the original consequent has been dropped and a new one added which is simply a variation of the antecedent with a new cadence.⁷

The process here is nothing other than “that ancient device of theme-transformation” which is usually associated with the name of Liszt, and which Gerald Abraham once defined by reference to that music-hall science, but dimly remembered in Britain in the 1930s, “by which a black felt ring ingeniously twisted into the shapes of various characteristic hats enabled the performer to impersonate now Napoleon, now a Nonconformist minister.”¹⁸ To this memorable definition, in which musicology draws upon chapeaugraphy, a historical corollary may be added. The nineteenth-century process of theme-transformation treats relatively brief themes within symphonies, sonatas, and so on, in one of the ways traditional for the treatment of full tunes in variation sets—not the “decorative” or ornamental way, but the

Ex. 3

“characteristic” way, by which a tune is altered in tempo, rhythm, mode, dynamics, etc., so as to register some new unexpected mood. Beethoven had always known about this way of writing variations, like Byrd and Bach before him. As early as 1802, he experimented with a set of variations consisting exclusively of “characteristic” members—they are even all in different keys: the Six Variations on an Original Theme, opus 34, a work of which he was evidently quite proud. Napoleon appears in C minor. Outside of variation sets,

however, there are few examples of theme-transformation in Beethoven.⁹ This one in the "Ghost" Trio is certainly one of the most striking.

For here the elegant and witty first theme of the finale has been transformed into something that is clearly intended to sound naive and rustic, and therefore by definition a little comical. Countrified strains of just this kind become a feature of Beethoven's writing rather suddenly in 1824-26, as I pointed out in my book on the Beethoven quartets. Quite like example 3 is the first little tune in the trio of the Presto movement from the C#-minor Quartet, opus 131, in which again both the cadences after *a* and *a'* are harmonically stable—both come on tonic chords—but only the second is melodically so. Tunes of this kind are much less easy to find in Beethoven's earlier music, however; and it may come as a surprise to find almost as many in the minor mode as in the major. But of course there are two such tunes in the major in the third movement of the "Pastoral" Symphony, where they contribute to the peasant merry-making. And with the first of these, the F-major tune for oboe with bassoon accompaniment which Schindler said was meant to evoke the drowsy blunders of village musicians, we might indeed presume to refer to *tändelnde Lazzi*. The Sixth Symphony and the "Ghost" Trio offer another example of two works sketched in close conjunction which, for all their very considerable differences, share certain particular musical ideas occupying Beethoven at the time.

(Was it from the finale of Beethoven's D-major Trio, one wonders, that Brahms got the idea for the famous theme-transformation in *tranquillo* triplets shortly before the recapitulation in the finale of his D-major Symphony? A most unrustic moment.)

4. We can perhaps backtrack for a moment, just long enough to observe that the official "second theme," shown in example 4, is another rustic item quite similar in spirit to those we have been discussing, although the disposition of the cadences after the *a* and *a'* phrases is less naive than in example 3, less static and more propulsive (as makes sense for a sonata-form second theme, especially such a short one). Actually I illustrate this fragment mainly in order to illustrate Beethoven's show-off counterpoint. Notice how this theme, too, starts with an accompaniment motive in inversion, and a pretty jokey one at that, how the piano perseveres with the inversion after sashaying or dribbling past a 6-4 chord, and how very distinctly we are given to hear the characteristic motive of the *first* theme a moment later.

Contrapuntal and thematic work of this kind is sometimes taken as evidence of constructive intent and intellectual power. That surely would be too solemn a way of looking at the action here (or at the appearance of the inverted inversion motive in example 2, bars 90, 92, 94, etc.). A composer to whom counterpoint had never come easily, at first, is now able to improvise all sorts of *lazzi* with it; he is also able to convey something of his own pleasure at

this new virtuosity. (The counterpoint is not literally improvised, but it was probably invented at high speed while the autograph was being written. The whole compositional process, Tyson suggests, was unusually rapid.) How seriously Beethoven took these contrapuntal appendages in example 4 seems indicated by the abruptness with which he dropped them, one and all. His second presentation of the little theme, with its chords safe in root position and its workaday piano figuration, sounds rather like a plain man's good-natured answer to the dandified airs of the first (bars 63ff.).

Ex. 4

The image shows two musical staves. The top staff is for Violin I (Vln.) and the bottom staff is for Piano (Pft.). Example 1 (bars 55-60) shows a violin part with a fermata over a cadenza, marked 'pizz.' and 'Vln'. Example 2 (bars 60-65) shows a piano part with a fermata over a cadenza, marked 'arco' and 'f'.

5. *Fermatas* in Beethoven themes, as has already been remarked in connection with example 2, are sooner or later nearly always expanded into cadenzas or cadenza-like passages. But it is also true that sooner or later these *fermatas* are nearly always cancelled, too—usually later, in the coda, so that the motion of theme 1 can carry through strongly and unequivocally to a firm conclusion.¹⁰ (Everyone will immediately think of the first movement of the Fifth Symphony as an exception. It is only half an exception, though, since the second *fermata*—the one filled in by the oboe cadenza in the recapitulation—is indeed expunged from the coda.) In the finale of the "Ghost" Trio Beethoven has in fact divested theme 1 of its *fermatas* early in the exposition and recapitulation, at bars 28ff. and 238ff., and of course also in its transformation and recapitulation at the end of the development section, as we have seen. Never mind; he is saving his most developed demonstration of the theme's potential for rhythmic normalcy till the usual place, the coda. The demonstration is a double one and, needless by now to say, doubly hilarious.

The coda begins (ex. 5) with theme 1 sounding blunter than ever before, partly because the neat inversion motive has at last been put to rest. When the

melody reaches high C# there is no *fermata* but instead an extra bar; the *fermata* is measured out exactly. There follows an extraordinary passage in which the tricky harmonic progression of bars 4-5 is slowly unpacked in *pizzicato*. Bar 374 adds a seventh to the F#-major chord; bars 375-77 finally respell A# as Bb, etc.; bars 378-80 feint towards a cadence in Bb minor—a last reference to the flat regions which were opened up in the exposition; bars 381-84 opt for a diminished seventh rather than an augmented sixth; and the D-major sixth chord of bar 5 returns, somewhat shakily, at bar 384. In four more bars we are arrived at a tonic cadence, which is not what happened but what we expected to happen the first time around.

Ex. 5

The musical score for Example 5 consists of several staves. The top staff is for strings (Str.) and includes a *pizz.* marking at bar 370. The violin (Vln.) part begins at bar 385. The piano (Pft.) and left hand (LH) parts are shown below the violin. The score includes various dynamics such as *p*, *f*, *cresc.*, and *sf*. There are also performance markings like *8 Skr.* and *3*. The score ends at bar 410 with a *ff* dynamic.

Yet one more appearance for the first theme: and Beethoven rolls out yet one more inspiration. The tune is broken up in performance bar by bar between the two string instruments, the violin bending a little low to meet the cello reaching up a little high. For him who harkens secretly, as Schumann might have said, there is a special little bonus at bar 391, a special quick smile. This is the one bar of the theme in which the instruments do not alternate; and so the

high C#, far from receiving a corona, is in this last appearance decidedly eclipsed.

The fascinating effect of the violin-cello alternations in this passage seems to be unique in Beethoven. Its humor is far less broad than that registered by the alternations breaking up the scherzo theme in the Second Symphony, for example, and is in fact hard to account for—hard and dull and flat, no doubt, as is always the case when tiresome people insist on trying to explain jokes. The alternations amuse, I think, because at this tempo they strike us as improbable and precarious; but instead of seeming gauche, they seem as elegant and funny as a pair of aerialists' flailing motions which balance them perfectly on a high wire. Beethoven tried similar thematic break-ups in his later piano trios, though in a serious and even sententious mood: see opus 70, no. 2, Allegretto, bars 51ff. and opus 97, Andante cantabile, 141ff. Then there are wonderfully imaginative examples in the late quartets: see opus 127, Adagio, 39ff.; opus 130, Andante con moto, 14ff. and Alla danza tedesca, 129ff.; opus 131, Andante, 1ff. and Presto, 149ff.; opus 132, Assai sostenuto-Allegro, 23ff.; opus 135, Allegretto, 5ff. and Allegro, 54ff. The latter passage, in which yet another country-dance theme is cradled by a freely alternating accompaniment figuration, approaches the original model in the "Ghost" Trio most closely, both in technique—in rhythm, tempo, even key—and in affect.

6. We come finally to the one feature which more than any other, I think, causes the fun in this finale: its metrical ambiguity. Does theme 1 scan in more or less regular two-bar patterns, and if so do the strong beats come at the beginning of the odd or the even bars?

Such questions come up again and again in analyses of Beethoven and all other composers, and they are not always easy to resolve. In a penetrating article devoted to this problem specifically, "Extra' Measures and Metrical Ambiguity in Beethoven," Andrew Imbrie reaches different conclusions than did Schenker and Tovey in their metrical analysis of certain passages in the Fifth Symphony and the Piano Sonata in D, opus 10 no. 3 (a work with interesting points of contact with the "Ghost" Trio).¹¹ Imbrie concludes that in some cases metrical questions ought not to be resolved at all—that the composer may very well have been working deliberately with ambiguity as an expressive element of his language. Themes may not always scan the same way at all their reappearances.

In the "Ghost" finale, things seem fairly straightforward at the beginning. The *second* and *fourth* bars should be strong because of the *sforzato* and the *fermata*, among other reasons. A shade of ambiguity clouds the fifth bar, though the stress provided by the melody is offset by the bass, unchanged from bar 4; by the *seventh* bar, however, Beethoven has plunged the meter into a cheerful chaos. According to this scanion, incidentally, the *sixth* bar is strong (note the *crescendo*) and so the F# chord in bar 4 can be heard deceptively

resolving to the subdominant in bar 6, rather than to the tonic in bar 5—a progression that surprised and amused us earlier. The rather odd *C*_♭s play into the subdominant resolution.

This scansion is certainly forced by the rustic information of theme 1 at the end of the development section (ex. 3). The accompanying half-note ostinato starts one bar ahead of the melody, of which the *second* and *fourth* bars are made strong by the regular changes of harmony. But there is more than a suggestion of shifted accents when the tune moves from the cello to the violin. Now the change of harmony at bar 202 to a D-major 6-4 chord seems to make the *first* bar of the theme strong; the second bar is harmonically ambiguous, perhaps, but perhaps we hear it more easily as a (weak) continuation of the 6-4 than as a (strong) new dominant. And in the repeat the *first* bar (bar 206) is strengthened further by the reinforcement of the ostinato by the violin octaves. Scanned in this way, the passage brings out the recapitulation on a weak bar, thus matching the exposition.

The *forte* appearance of the theme in the coda (see ex. 5) comes out on a strong bar, but a reversal of bar-accent must take place at once, for bar 375 must clearly be strong. The scansion of the unpacking episode that follows is baffling, and by the application of a familiar critical plot which some will probably find not amusing in the least, I conclude that Beethoven meant us to be baffled and bemused by our own bafflement. A touch of unusually broad humor, for this movement, is provided by the diminution in bar 387.

The final thematic entrance in bar 388 also comes out on a strong beat (I think), but now the reversal of accents is undercut. This is a particularly delightful and witty passage. Somehow the alternation violin/cello keeps the theme's *first*, *third*, *seventh* and *ninth* bars sounding strong; there is now no *sforzato* on the second bar, and I have already suggested why the fourth sounds weaker than before. A shrewd new harmonic-rhythmic detail strengthens the *fifth* bar. Then in the continuation the *eleventh* bar gets an extra accent when the half-note ostinato returns from example 3—in itself a droll gesture in this new context.

Clearly the coda is now careering towards metrical disaster, or at least bathos! The indication "*cresc.*" at bar 401 already hints at the change of accent which by 405 is a *fait accompli*. The piece ends strong. It might have been a great joke to end a big piano trio on a weak bar. But it would not have been Beethoven's kind of joke—never, not even in his most unbuttoned mood, not even in a piece that Tyson shows was composed in high fettle and at a great rate.¹²

To read through numerous commentaries on the opus 70 trios from Hoffmann's day to our own is to get a single message, though it is sometimes expressed more explicitly than at other times. Critics almost always seem to view the second trio, in E_♭, as a finer work than the first, in D, and in particular

they prefer the E_♭ finale to the D-major. I think this view requires—how can I say?—review. Apart from its indubitably higher ranking on the scale of *Sparschaffigkeit*, the D-major finale seems to me more finely crafted than its companion. Beethoven's untamed sense of humor, so easily accepted by those Beethovenians who first cut their teeth on Tovey, may actually put off others raised up under sterner masters. Schenker, whose claim to divulge the "true content" of Beethoven's "Eroica" Symphony should never be forgotten or forgiven, could write ten pages of fine print on the finale without so much as suggesting that humor might form any part of that content. We humorists, who cherish the "Eroica" finale, can only chuckle when Nigel Fortune in *The Beethoven Companion* calls the "Ghost" finale "less arresting" than the other movements. It arrests, all right. It is Beethoven's *Musikalischer Spass* without Mozart's malice.

Notes

1. *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* 97 (1970-71), 1-20. There is a penetrating discussion of the first movement of the "Ghost" Trio in August Frenkel's *Beethoven* (Berlin, 1927), pp. 161-76.
2. E. T. A. Hoffmann, *Schriften zur Musik: Nachlese*, ed. Friedrich Schnapp (Munich, 1963), p. 130. I draw on English translations of the *Fantasiestücke* version of this passage which appear in *The Musical Quarterly* 3 (1917), 132 (Arthur Ware Locke) and Strunk's *Source Readings*, pp. 779-80.
3. *Beethoven: Symphony No. 5 in C Minor*, ed. Elliot Forbes (Norton Critical Score, New York, 1971), p. 159.
4. Hoffmann, *Schriften zur Musik: Nachlese*, p. 129.
5. The motive at this point is made explicit in the recapitulation and elsewhere.
6. Carl Czerny, *The Art of Playing the Ancient and Modern Piano Forte Works, Together with a List of the Best Pieces for that Instrument, by All the Celebrated Composers from Mozart to the Present Day, Being a Supplement to the Royal Piano Forte School*, op. 500, tr. John Bishop (London, [1846]), p. 98.
7. Another simplification is the omission of the opening upbeat leap of a sixth, but perhaps we hear that echoed in the new downward sixth between bars 194 and 195, etc.
8. Gerald Abraham, *A Hundred Years of Music* (London, 1938), p. 42.
9. I am indebted to Walter Frisch for the clarification of this and many other issues in musical analysis and criticism. Theme-transformation in the finale of Beethoven's Piano Concerto in C minor is discussed in his *Brahms and the Principle of Developing Variation* (California Studies in 19th-Century Music, II; Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1984), pp. 42-44.
10. See my article "Notes on Beethoven's Codas" in *Beethoven Studies* III, ed. Alan Tyson (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 141-59.
11. In *Beethoven Studies* II], ed. Alan Tyson (New York, 1973), pp. 45-66.

12. Reversal of bar accents was also, I think, Beethoven's main reason for the two compositional changes that Tyson discusses and illustrates in his *PRMA* article (note 1). In his example 3, an early version of the "fragmentation" subsection of the development (bars 165-93), Beethoven corrected the autograph so as to cut out one bar, thus assuring that the 8-bar lead-in to the "transformation" sub-section (my example 3) comes out on a strong bar, bar 185. In Tyson's example 5, from the big draft in the sketchbook which Beethoven followed when preparing the autograph, the passage leading from F major to A major near the end of the exposition (bars 117-26) was again abbreviated by one bar, in two half-bar segments.

Russians in Venice: The Visit of the *Conti del Nord* in 1782

Elsie and Denis Arnold

Venice was perforce eastwards looking. Her prosperity was built on the trade from the Middle East and beyond; she was a bulwark against the heathens, and until the last years of the republic she was still interested in links with Russia. The whole relationship with Russia came into question in the 1780s when the final setting up of embassies became a serious issue; and by a happy chance, the heir apparent to the throne, Catherine the Great's son Pavel Petrovich and his bride-Maria Feodorovna, the Princess of Württemberg, proposed a visit to the Serenissima. It was to be an informal visit, preserving a *perpetto incognito*. The visitors merely asked that they be able to enjoy "tutti li divertimenti e Spettacoli del Paese."¹ But the Venetians grasped the opportunity and decided that the visitors should be entertained at public expense. So they put into operation their procedures for receiving important guests. These had been evolved throughout the years, for their first official guests could be traced back to the fourteenth century.² They had been so frequent throughout the eighteenth century that a routine had been established. In the distant past, the nobility had been entertained at a banquet in the Arsenale and a small sum of money for incidental expenses had been put at their disposal. Now a group of noblemen, generally of some official office, were told to make arrangements.

For the visit of the *Conti del Nord* (the *incognito* of the Russians) four very distinguished partisans were given this task. This quartet—Francesco Gritti, Piero Mocenigo, Nicolò Tron and Alvise Mocenigo—was given no concrete figure of what to spend; the official views were merely that it was necessary to have "alcune Feste di Ballo ne' Teatri, ed altri Pub[bl]ici Spettacoli,"³ so the committee set to work with a will. The visitors were in Venice for not quite a week, from 19 to 25 January. What was packed into these few days was incredible.⁴ An opera at the Teatro San Benedetto, a cantata concert at the Casino filarmonico in the Procuratie Nuove, a visit to the Arsenale followed by a grand dinner again at the Teatro San Benedetto, a bullfight in the Piazza, a regatta, the gymnastic display known as the *Forza d'Ercole*⁵—these were only some of the arranged events. Far from being truly