

Beethoven's "violation": his cadenza for the first movement of Mozart's D-Minor Piano Concerto

Prof. Dr^a Janet Schmalfeldt
TUFTS UNIVERSITY

Linguagem Estruturação/Teoria da Música

We have it for a fact that on March 31, 1795, Beethoven performed a concerto by Mozart at a concert in Vienna for the benefit of Mozart's widow Constanze. Which concerto? Beethoven was known especially to have admired Mozart's Concerto in D Minor—now No. 20, K. 466; and so it has become customary to imagine that this was the work he performed.¹ As Mozart scholars know, the D-Minor Concerto is one of the six late piano concertos for which no written cadenzas by the composer have survived. It is frustrating to note, from Mozart's letters in April 1785, that he sent cadenzas for K. 466 and K. 467 to his family in Salzburg; these have never been found.² We can wonder, then, just what Beethoven played, or improvised, at the point when he reached those gaping silences at the pre-cadential fermatas in the first and last movements. Musicologists have ascertained that he probably did *not* perform the cadenza I wish to discuss, unless he managed to remember it fourteen years later: it is now generally held that he wrote virtually *all* of his concerto cadenzas, including those for K. 466, in 1809, thus well after he had published all but the last of his own concertos, and roughly twenty-four years after Mozart premiered the D-Minor Concerto in 1785.³

Opinions about Beethoven's cadenza for Mozart's first movement run the gamut from "magnificent" (David Grayson), through "problematic" (Robert Levin), to "beautiful and poetic," "despite its faults" (Eva and Paul Badura-Skoda).⁴ At the farthest end of this spectrum we have Richard Kramer's brilliant critique from 1991—a scathing account of Beethoven's

¹ Alexander Wheelock Thayer records the advertisement of March 31, 1785, announcing Beethoven's performance of a Mozart concerto. "We opine that this concerto was Mozart's in D minor, which Beethoven loved especially, and for which he wrote cadenzas." (FORBES, 1967, p. 175).

² The letter of 8 April 1785 appears in BAUER & DEUTSCH (1962-75, as cited in WOLFF, 1991, p. 231, note 7).

³ As discussed by Richard Kramer, Sieghard Brandenburg has established that all of Beethoven's surviving cadenzas for opp. 15, 19, 37, 61 (piano version), and K. 466 were composed for his student the Archduke Rudolph in 1809. (BRANDENBURG, 1988, p. 141-76; 173-75; as cited in KRAMER 1991, p. 125).

⁴ GRAYSON, 1998, p. 32; LEVIN, 1989, p. 284; BADURA-SKODA, 1986, p. 247.

“artistic impropriety.” For Kramer, it would be too simple to dismiss Beethoven’s outrageously Beethovenian (rather than *echt* Mozartean) cadenza as “an aberration foreign to the style.” Something more personal is at hand—an agenda, an attack, a confrontation, an assault; Beethoven overtly “violates” his Mozartean legacy (KRAMER, 1991, p. 128, 131).

We come more fully to understand Kramer’s own agenda when his essay about the cadenza reemerges as chapter 9 within his 2008 book *Unfinished Music*. This work is broadly concerned with a topic no less profound than the nature of artistic creation itself; Kramer searches for the origins of creative processes—those ephemeral moments of conception that might capture something of the nature of an artistic act before it becomes fixed forever as a text. His sources are thus improvisations, alterations, fragments, and flights of fantasy as revealed in sketches, revisions, unfinished compositions, and, yes, cadenzas (KRAMER, 2008; see p. vii-ix.⁵).

As a historical phenomenon, the cadenza—any cadenza—is “burdened with paradox and enigma,” in Kramer’s words (p. 212). It pretends to be completely spontaneous and improvisatory; it is the moment within the work where the composer invites the performer to *take over*, to step outside the text, while at the same time commenting or meditating upon it, usually with virtuosic ingenuity. Even if, by 1789, the theorist Daniel Gottlob Türk actually condones the writing out of cadenzas and their memorization prior to performances,⁶ Kramer holds that the very act of writing down a cadenza “constitutes in itself a violation of the rule, for now the cadenza *intrudes* into the workings of the concerto and assumes a textual presence that the conventions of the genre seem to disallow” (p. 211). It is one thing for Emanuel Bach and for Mozart to compose cadenzas *for their own pieces*; who but those composers themselves would be in a better position, stylistically speaking, to engage intimately with their own texts, all while feigning the role of the performer? In Kramer’s view, it is quite another thing—a very brazen thing—for Beethoven, despite his great reverence for Mozart, to compose a cadenza that, through “a diction and a posture alien to Mozart,” threatens to “dismember” the concerto itself (p. 211).

Now, precisely what constitutes a violation of the “ground rules” for Mozartean cadenzas? On my count, Kramer addresses six broken rules; various critics have concurred about other violations, and I am prepared to add to the list. Let us begin with Beethoven’s

⁵ Citations from Richard Kramer will hereafter refer to KRAMER (2008).

⁶ Türk’s Rule No. 10: “... a cadenza which perhaps has been learned by memory with great effort or has been written out before should be performed as if it were merely invented on the spur of the moment, consisting of a choice of ideas indiscriminately thrown together which had just occurred to the player.” (TÜRК, 1982, p. 301).

opening. The complete cadenza is given at **Example 1**. A glossary of terms for abbreviations and symbols in my music examples follows at **Table 1**.

The musical score is presented in five systems, each with a measure number on the left:

- System 1 (Measures 6-8):** Labeled "Lead-in" and "presentation". It features a treble clef with a melodic line and a bass clef with a supporting line. Chord symbols (6) , (V_3^5) , (IV) , and bII are written below the bass line. A tempo marking "(RIT.¹: MT)" is at the top right.
- System 2 (Measures 9-11):** Labeled "continuation (modulating)". It continues the melodic and harmonic development. Chord symbols (4 vii) , (iv) , (V^7) , and (iv) are present. A bracketed chord symbol $[\text{vi6}]$ is also shown.
- System 3 (Measures 12-14):** Labeled "(no cad.)". It shows a continuation of the melodic pattern with a fermata over the final measure.
- System 4 (Measures 15-17):** Labeled "(SOLO¹: ST¹, part 2)". It begins with a dynamic marking *ffp* and a fingering "5". The dynamics then change to *decrease.* and *pp*. A key signature change is indicated as $(\text{E}^\flat \rightarrow \text{D}^\flat)$. The system concludes with the instruction "into B maj.: I".

Example 1: Beethoven's cadenza (WoO 58) for Mozart's Piano Concerto in D Minor, K. 466, first movement.

20 *in B:* VI^{\flat}_6 ; *li*

25 *transformed rep.*
 $\text{VI}^{\flat}(\frac{4}{3})$ *into br* *i* EC *6*

29 *frag.* VI^{\flat}_7 *6* *5*

33 *further frag.* *36* *to A, m. 43*
 (Return to RIT¹: MT)

into home key: iv

37

40 *frag.* *iv*₆ *(6)* VI^{\flat}_5

Example 1: Continued.

(SOLO¹: entry theme)

43

47

51

54

58

60

62

Pia presto

frag.

"cryptic phrase"

p

f etc.

(Tutti.)

PAC

Example 1: Continued.

RIT.¹:	opening orchestral ritornello
SOLO^{1, 2}:	first solo exposition, second solo exposition, etc.
MT:	main theme
TRANS.	transition
ST:	subordinate theme
TM:	trimodular theme
P^{rf}	primary theme refrain
CS:	closing section
PAC:	perfect authentic cadence
HC:	half cadence
DC:	deceptive cadence
EC:	evaded cadence
EC: dec.:	evaded cadence, deceptive type (see Schmalfeldt, 1992)
MC:	medial caesura (see H&D, 2006)
pres.	presentation (as the initiating formal function of a sentence)
contin.	continuation (as the destabilizing second formal function of a sentence)
antec.	antecedent
conseq.	consequent
frag.:	fragmentation
<=>	elision
==>	functional transformation (“becomes”)
Caplin:	William E. Caplin, <i>Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven</i> (NY: Oxford, 1998).
H&D:	James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, <i>Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata</i> (NY: Oxford, 2006).

Tabela 1: Termos para abreviações e símbolos nos Exemplos musicais.

Following Kramer, we can note that the cadenza begins with a trill on scale-degree 2[^]; this is the trill that would traditionally signal a Mozartean close, and so its appearance here turns the signs of Classical cadenza “on their heads” (p. 229). I note as well that this “lead-in” features what has been called a harmonic “retrogression”—dominant to subdominant (V to iv), and that the following chain of trills outlines the unlikely interval of a diminished fifth (E—G—B-flat), expanded to become a diminished octave when the high E-flat is achieved at m. 5. “Manifesto-like” is how Kramer describes this opening (p. 211), and one can hardly disagree.⁷

The cadenza proper now immediately takes on the opening idea of the concerto’s first orchestral ritornello. Whereas *every one* of Beethoven’s cadenzas for his own concertos begins with a reference to his ritornello’s opening idea, this is less often Mozart’s choice.⁸ Paul Mies may have been the first to write that Beethoven “severs” the three motivic components of Mozart’s ritornello idea one from another.⁹ You will see those three motives at the beginning of **Example 2**, which shows the complete first ritornello. They consist of: (1) the syncopations in the upper strings; (2) that “menacing” triplet “slide” in the basses; and (3) the melodic activity in the first violins at m. 3. This third gesture might be said to anticipate the recapitulatory version, in the home key, of the solo’s first subordinate theme, Part 2 (see Example 5c, from the exposition). Beethoven presents the motives successively, rather than simultaneously.

⁷ At this point in my lecture at SIMPOM on 27 November 2014, I performed mm. 1-5 of Beethoven’s cadenza at the keyboard. Elsewhere throughout my presentation, I played excerpts from the cadenza and from Mozart’s concerto shown in my music examples.

⁸ Two cadenzas in which Mozart begins with his opening orchestral ritornello idea are for the first movement of the G-Major Concerto, K. 453, and for the first movement of the Concerto for Two Pianos in E-flat, K. 365.

⁹ MIES (1970, p. 34).

(1) RIT. $\frac{1}{2}$: MT—16-bar sentence

Allegro. pres.

Strings

(1) (2) (3)

(rg.-ov)

contin.

Ob. Asc.-Step Seq. (Leerlauf)

(2) TRANS.

16

VI. I. Bass. Wind

i PAC

VI. Bass.

(VI 6/5) VI 6/5 VI 6/5

Example 2: Opening orchestral ritornello: Mozart's *Piano Concerto in D Minor*, K. 466, first mvt. (two-piano reduction).

The image displays a musical score for a piano and string ensemble, labeled "Example 2: Continued." The score is divided into five systems, with measure numbers 56, 71, and 77 indicated. The piano part is written in treble and bass clefs, while the string part is in treble clef. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and dynamics. Key annotations include "var. rep." at the top, "one more time" in quotes, and "(5) CS (codettas)" in parentheses. Specific markings like "PAC" (Piano Accompaniment) and "Str." (Strings) are present. The score also features Roman numerals (VI, V, IV) and a time signature change from 6/8 to 3/4. A "Solo" section is marked at measure 77, with a reference to "See Example 5".

Example 2: Continued.

For Philip Whitmore, here is an instance of “developmental treatment rarely encountered in Mozart’s cadenzas” (WHITMORE, 1991, p. 200). Richard Kramer records Beethoven’s extreme registral gaps, which contribute to what he calls *Zergliederung*, a term associated with “analysis,” in the sense of “a breaking down into component parts” (p. 224). In fact, Beethoven’s developmental “analysis” of Mozart’s text goes deeper: he is remembering, and transforming, the moment in the first Solo section, at mm. 95-98, where the pianist joins the orchestra in its return to the opening ritornello material. In the cadenza, at mm. 5-6, the non-syncopated melodic rhythm of the soloist’s gesture refers to its earlier presentation at that entry, with the tone E-flat substituting for E-natural.

Most important, Beethoven begins *in the key of E-flat—the Neapolitan*, flat-II. It would have been impossible for Mozart to begin a cadenza in or on the Neapolitan: whether virtuosic or thematic, his openings tend fundamentally to imply or to prolong the home dominant, because that harmony is needed for preparing and leading into his characteristic return to a secondary solo theme in the home key.¹⁰ But Kramer is one of several commentators to concede that this choice is not completely outlandish. It does not land outside of Mozart’s tonal range within the movement, and so, for example, it does not break one of Türk’s rules for the construction of cadenzas—a rule that Mozart consistently observes: “In no case should one modulate to a key which the composer himself has not used in the composition.”¹¹ In **Example 2**, we can note that the Neapolitan 6th plays a climactic role at **m. 49**. Here it prepares what could easily have been the strongest cadence thus far within the orchestral ritornello; a deceptive progression and then an evaded cadence (EC) motivate what I have dubbed a “one-more-time” repetition¹² of this cadential progression, as if emphatically to highlight the radiant flat-II. This is the very passage that returns to initiate the closing ritornello, directly after the conclusion of the cadenza. And by now the passage can be heard as a vivid reminder that the model-sequence design of the developmental second Solo section has culminated in the tonicized key of E-flat. Within unpublished materials from 1988, Schenkerian analyst Edward Laufer proposed flat-II as fundamental to the middleground path of this development towards the home dominant, and Joel Galand’s voice-leading graph, in an article from 2000, supports that view.¹³ But Beethoven would hardly have needed such knowledge in order to recognize the outstanding role of the Neapolitan. A decisive moment arises when the solo’s first subordinate theme, Part 2, returns in the tonic minor within the recapitulation, at mm. 303-10; here the consequent phrase of the theme surges upward and onto the Neapolitan with an exclamatory octave leap, as if in a reckless effort to escape the minor mode one last time. (See Example 5c, from the exposition; the recapitulatory version is not shown.)

In short, the shimmering, high-register sound of E-flat at the beginning of Beethoven’s cadenza might be justified, even celebrated, as an unorthodox but deeply insightful engagement with Mozart’s text. But *no* writer about the cadenza has found convincing justification for Beethoven’s next tonal goal—the region of *B major* achieved by

¹⁰ For a definitive summary of Mozart’s practices in cadenzas and lead-ins, see BADURA-SKODA (p. 214-41). See also LEVIN (1989, p. 279-87).

¹¹ Türk’s Rule No. 4 – see TÜRK (1982, p. 300).

¹² SCHMALFELDT (1992).

¹³ LAUFER (1988); GALAND (2000, p. 381-450 – see Galand’s graph on p. 437).

m. 15. Nor can one easily account for how he gets there, although my voice-leading graphs at **Example 3** attempt to do just that.

Transcription into computer notation provided by
Harvard doctoral candidate William O'Hara, with my gratitude.

Example 3: Voice leading graphs: Beethoven's cadenza for Mozart's K. 466, first movement.

Remember Türk's rule. We can search in vain for references to B major in Mozart's movement, and it should come as no surprise that there are none; in Mozart's tonal vocabulary, its distance from the home D minor is far too remote. Here, then, is a case of "radical tonal deflection" for Kramer (p. 225)—the kind of "stylistic discrepancy" that, for Philip Whitmore, "was to become a feature of all ad libitum cadenzas written for the concertos of earlier composers for well over a century" (WHITMORE, 1991, p. 200).

As I suggest in **Example 3**, a straightforward relationship between E-flat major and B major can be proposed: E-flat major relates to B major as tonic to the submediant flat-VI, a chromatic third-relationship sometimes explored by Mozart himself. For instance, see the excerpt at **Example 4**, from the cadenza for the first movement of Mozart's early *Jeunehomme* Concerto No. 9, in E-flat, K. 271 (from 1777): here the composer transforms his

second subordinate solo theme by moving from the first-inversion tonic through a deceptive progression into C-flat major, thus flat-VI, then tonicized.

The musical score consists of five systems of piano accompaniment in E-flat major. The first system shows a V7 chord. The second system is marked (ST²) and includes dynamics *sf* and *frag.*, with chords I⁶, II⁶/₃, V⁷, and ^bVI, and the label DC-prog. The third system includes further frag. and chords [V⁵/₃] and ^bVI. The fourth system shows a V(6/4) chord. The fifth system ends with a PAC (Piano Accompaniment) marking and a 7/3 triplet.

Example 4: From Mozart's cadenza for the first movement of his Piano Concerto in E-flat, K. 271.

And yet, by comparison, Beethoven's route from E-flat to B could not seem more circuitous. As shown in **Example 3**, his diatonic progression from E-flat through C minor to G minor—the subdominant for Mozart—promises a relatively stable tonal environment. But a voice exchange, bringing B-flat into the bass, is followed by a sleight-of-hand linear 6-5 series, resulting in the return to E-flat in the form of its *minor* 6/4-chord. One last linear 6-5 motion yields the controversial B-major harmony, now approached from E-flat minor as an ordinary *diatonic* submediant, notated enharmonically.

The Badura-Skodas regard the “martellato repeated notes” that ensue as “un-Mozartean.” (Perhaps they think that this is too much like the opening of Beethoven's “Waldstein” Sonata?) But here the onset is instantly treated to *subito piano*, and a *decrescendo* invokes the effect of becoming lost in thought, until the pianist persona thinks to turn towards an imitative B-major meditation on Mozart's subordinate solo theme. Surely Beethoven can be forgiven his imitative treatment of this theme, a technique not at all foreign to Mozart. His gentle evaded cadence at **m. 25** further conforms with Mozart's avoidance of authentic cadences in cadenzas until the end. This transformation of the theme simply cannot close; it awaits its modal shift into the parallel B minor at **m. 27**, where Mozart's conclusive *minor*-mode version of the theme in his recapitulation is now restored, albeit in the wrong key, and with a new, tender, yet quietly stirring *agitato* accompaniment.

In an article from 2006 entitled “The Cadenza as Parenthesis,” Matthew Bribitzer-Stull's very fine voice-leading graphs of Beethoven's cadenza propose to integrate this B-major/B-minor passage within the cadenza's overall “dominant-prolonging” tonal plan, specifically by showing its role within “an incipient equal division of the octave”—the long-range descending major-thirds progression from E-flat through B/b to G minor, where the subdominant is achieved at **m. 36**.¹⁴ I acknowledge Bribitzer-Stull's contribution to my own alternative graph, as shown below **level b** in **Example 3**. Beyond this, however, I hope it will be clear that my graph proposes *no genuine middle-to-background status* for the upper-voice relations that B major/B minor supports. Like Bribitzer-Stull, I hear those harmonies as prolonging the upper-voice E-flat/D-sharp and its lowered form, D-natural. But my graphs especially depart from his at the point where I propose an “auxiliary cadence” that goes awry: B minor, as a local “mediant,” leads to G *minor* through its dominant 7th, rather than to what should have been G major.

¹⁴ BRIBITZER-STULL (2006 – see his graphs and discussion on p. 239-42).

Thus perhaps we can say that, from a Schenkerian perspective, my graphs underscore the views of those who regard Beethoven's move into B major/B minor as his greatest stylistic violation. On the other hand, my reading of the cadenza's voice-leading dénouement argues that Beethoven instinctively recaptures what I think any Schenkerian analyst would regard as the motivic focal point of Mozart's D-Minor Concerto—its spectacular preoccupation with the relationship of scale degree 6[^] to 5[^], B-flat as the upper neighbor to the primary tone, A-natural.

Notice the prolonged B-flat in my graphs, starting at **m. 36**. From here, Beethoven retrieves the primary tone A-natural at **m. 43**, with his ardent recall of the soloist's first theme—the seminal “solo entry theme” in its home key. He then explodes with a *più presto* flourish that, *Urlinie*-like, accomplishes a stepwise descent over the prolonged dominant to the definitive, rhetorically fundamental closure of the movement on scale-degree 1[^].

To understand better the significance of this interpretation, we turn to the concerto itself. This is the work that, in his book *The Classical Style*, of 1971, Charles Rosen claimed had become “as much myth as work of art”; it may be said to “transcend its own excellences” (ROSEN, expanded ed., 1998, p. 228). This is also the *only* concerto by Mozart that pianists regularly continued to perform over the nineteenth century; and Rosen, without stressing that point, may have provided one reason for its popularity. It was Rosen who, to my knowledge, first gave special attention in English to the remarkable, even novel, motivic relations that Mozart's opening solo entrance theme generates, not just within the first movement but also within the finale—relations that, for Rosen, are “almost too obvious.” In his words: “This new openness of thematic relations, this parade of unity, arises from an inward dramatic necessity, the sustaining of a unified tone demanded by the tragic style” (p. 235).¹⁵ For Beethoven and for those who followed him, Mozart's “motivically cyclic,” proto-“organicist” and processual approach (my terms) to intramovement connections in K. 466 must have seemed both visionary and inspiring.

Rosen demonstrated his point simply by providing five unannotated examples—the ordered opening ideas of three solo themes from Mozart's first movement and two from his finale; these are the ideas that, citing Rosen, David Grayson has called a “family of themes” (GRAYSON, p. 36). I reproduce Rosen's five excerpts at **Example 5**, where I place each excerpt within its complete thematic context and provide annotations, substituting for Rosen's captions more recent terms for formal functions that combine William Caplin's with those of James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy.¹⁶ I also superimpose Schenkerian “analytic overlays.” Let us take a look at what these themes hold in common.

¹⁵ Eva and Paul Badura-Skoda report that: “The thematic relationship of [the solo reentry theme in the finale at mm. 64ff.] with the solo subject of the first movement has often been mentioned.” (BADURA-SKODA, 1986, p. 252).

¹⁶ CAPLIN (1998, chapter 17, “Concerto Form”); HEPOKOSKI & DARCY (2006, chapters 19-22, on “The Type 5 Sonata”).

77

84

91

Tutti.

μ Str.

PAC

Example 5: (a) First movement, K 466, SOLO1: entry theme (new) (Caplin: “alternative MT”; H&D: “Preface”).

111

114

Tutti.

Wind

model

seq.

in III (F):

Example 5: (b) First movement, K. 466, SOLO1: ST1, part 1 (H&D: TM1).

Example 5, (b), continued.

Example 5, (c), SOLO¹: ST¹, part 2 (H&D: TM³).

antecedent

consequent

5

10

Tutti. Vi.

EC VI IV ii₃ V(4=3) i PAC

Example 5, (d) Finale, K. 466, RIT.¹: Rondo refrain (MT; P¹).

63

70

(rondo refrain -> TRANS.)

—6 IV V(4=3) i PAC

Example 5, (e) Finale, K. 466, RIT.¹: Solo re-entry theme (H&D: TR¹, *sujet libre*).

Rosen merely observes that so much of the material of the concerto is “related with striking effect to the opening piano phrase, and always accompanied by the same parallel thirds” (p. 233). He is referring to the solo entry theme, labeled **(a)**. “Almost too obvious” to mention for Rosen must have been the upward octave leaps prominent in all five themes. The solo entry theme opens with this gesture; the later themes each refer back to it, either directly or with variants. The two most closely related themes—the first and the last, at excerpts **(a)** and **(e)**—in fact share the same harmonic progression over the span of their initial phrases: i—iv—V—I; indeed, the second phrase of the theme at excerpt **(e)** repeats the progression. A close harmonic bond between the consecutive themes **(b)** and **(c)** gives strength to the idea that they serve as Part 1 and Part 2, respectively, within the first movement’s first subordinate solo theme, as I think Caplin would propose: whereas theme **(b)** opens with an ascending-step sequence (I—ii—iii, in F major) on its way to a half cadence (and medial caesura), theme **(c)** elaborates on this plan and expands it: the theme projects an antecedent phrase moving from I to V, and then a consequent that begins sequentially on ii.

Finally, the scale-degree patterns that I bracket within all five examples are there to reinforce Richard Kramer’s display of a recurring melodic contour that serves, in his terms, as the “intervallic core of the concerto”; in scale-degree language, the pattern is $5^{\wedge}-7^{\wedge}-(2^{\wedge})-1^{\wedge}$. As Kramer astutely notes, Beethoven seems “analytically” to draw upon this idea (but *not* on its specific scale-degree pattern) at what Kramer calls the “cryptic phrase” (p. 226), where Beethoven delays the cadence by returning to E-flat, the Neapolitan (see Example 1, mm. 57-59). Kramer reproaches Beethoven, both for this indication of his overly “analytical” approach, and more strongly for his “transgression” in recollecting that same gesture in his cadenza for Mozart’s finale. For Kramer, “it is an axiom of Classical form that the movements of this or that work, no matter how deeply they may be shown to belong to one another, are by definition self-contained: their ‘themes’ are exclusive of one another; they do not depend upon one another for their sense” (p. 226). I submit that the intramovement motivic/thematic cross-references shown at Example 5 defy this axiom in Mozart’s D-Minor Concerto! Far from “abstruse”, and meant mainly “to be inferred,” as Kramer would have it, these relations would seem to reside directly on the surface, and surely at the heart, of the piece; they really cannot be missed by the fingers and the ears of the performer.

Just below the surface, but not at all far below, we have one more outstanding detail that unites the essential materials of the concerto. As shown with the analytic overlays in **Example 5**, each and every one of the five themes presented here opens on the concerto’s

primary tone, A-natural (scale-degree 5[^]), or, in the case of excerpt (b), achieves that tone by means of an initial ascent (*Anstieg*). As well, each theme finds a unique way of prolonging the primary tone through striking reference to its upper neighbor, B-flat, and then closes with a stepwise, *Urlinie*-like descent. Joel Galand has described the incipits of themes (a), (d), and (e) as instances of a “motivic parallelism.”¹⁷ Placed within their complete thematic contexts, those openings can be said to participate within expanded parallelisms—enlargements (*Vergrößerungen*)—of breath-taking magnitude. And here we are beholden to ask whether the D-Minor Concerto confirms the tendency in general of minor-mode music in D to dwell upon the “lament”-associated semitone relation 6[^] to 5[^]. If so, the tradition begins very early. For example, recall the well-known fourteenth-century Kyrie in the Dorian mode, albeit with a B-flat, to avoid the tritone F-B-natural¹⁸. Think about the Queen of the Night’s second aria (“Der Hölle Rache”), with whose ferocity the first movement of K. 466 has been frequently compared. Remember Beethoven’s “Tempest” Sonata and his Ninth Symphony, whose slow movements, like Mozart’s Romanza in the concerto, happen to be in B-flat. Think about Schubert’s “Gretchen am Spinnrade,” or about the opening of Brahms’s D-Minor Piano Concerto. In fact, think about every piece in D minor that you know, and it’s likely that you will discover the neighbor relation 5[^]6[^]5[^] at work. And so, without wanting to exaggerate the role of this long-range motive in the D-minor Concerto, I wish simply to emphasize that Beethoven’s cadenza “hears” the centrality of the motive and responds to it with uncanny sensitivity.

It might not even be appropriate to claim, like Rosen, that Mozart’s solo entry theme in the first movement “generates” the intramovement motivic relations we have investigated. I have annotated the score for the complete first orchestral ritornello, at **Example 2**, in order to show that the neighbor-note 6[^]-to-5[^] motive and the stepwise descents from 5[^] to 1[^] inform the overall design of each of its five thematic units, or “zones,” as numbered and labeled in the score: (1) the ritornello’s main theme; (2) its non-modulating transition, arriving on the home dominant; (3) the material that becomes the solo’s subordinate theme, Part 1, but here closing, of course, in the home key, rather than in the mediant; (4) a varied repetition that delays its conclusion via another “one-more-time” cadential repetition; and, finally, (5) a closing section, in which codettas yet again highlight the neighbor 6[^]. The entrance of the solo theme dovetails the end of the ritornello, as an

¹⁷ See Galand’s voice-leading sketches for the first few bars of these three themes in GALAND (2000, p. 389).

¹⁸ *Liber Usualis* 46, Kyrie from Mass XI (“Orbis factor”). Edited by the Benedictines of Solesmes (DESCLÉE, TOURNAI, 1938).

upbeat and at first almost as if another codetta. Then this theme responds to those motivic 6[^]-5[^] gestures by giving them exquisite attention and further development.

We return now, for the last time, to Beethoven's cadenza, at **Example 1**, and to the passage that leads into that solo entry theme at **m. 43**. It is no exaggeration to claim that this is one of the most memorable solo entry themes in Mozart's repertoire; as with the case of the solo entry theme in the composer's only other minor-mode concerto, in C minor, this *new* solo theme returns *only* within the developmental section of Solo2—that is, *not* within the recapitulatory Solo3-section. Thus there could not have been a better choice for Beethoven's third and last thematic recall, nor can one imagine a more deeply heartfelt transformation of the theme—it *burns* with passion.

The theme breaks off precisely at the point where its signature neighbor-tone B-flat is transferred upward by an octave. a hesitant repetition of that fragment (at m. 50) sets off the raging *più presto*. This reaches the high f⁴ at m. 56—one complete octave beyond the range of Mozart's fortepiano, and thus another violation. Then comes the mysterious “cryptic phrase,” twice repeated, but followed by that characteristically Mozartean rapid-fire descent and ascent to the cadential trill (for an example of the ascent, review Example 4). Certainly “un-Mozartean” for Eva and Paul Badura-Skoda is “the way the bass motive is [then] angrily tossed about.” But they award Beethoven the tribute of “stroke of genius” for his ending (1986, p. 248). When the “correct” trill on scale-degree 2[^] has finally been reached, the composer returns to the opening three tones of the solo entry theme. As his “last word,” he directly throws that theme's primary tone and its all-pervasive upper neighbor into immediate, impassioned relief. This emphatic condensation of the concerto's central motivic idea is just so brilliant—so good—that Edwin Fischer, Paul Badura-Skoda, and Alfred Brendel all adopt it as the ending of their own K. 466 cadenzas.

This final gesture would likely be another instance for Richard Kramer of post-Mozartean “over-articulation”—of an “analytical abstraction” that does not belong within the realm of Mozart's style. Here, and in many respects, it seems fair to say that Kramer is very much allied with the “historical performance” tradition that gathered both momentum and critique in the 1980s—one in which *only* a cadenza that emulates what Mozart himself might have written would be deemed appropriate. But, judging from other cadenzas for K. 466 composed in the early 1800s—for example, the one by Hummel—the concept of “stylistic authenticity” had not yet been embraced. Would Beethoven have been able to write an *echt* Mozartean cadenza? Of course. Within his aesthetic milieu, he felt no obligation to do so. In

response to Kramer, I have attempted to show that, with the D-Minor Concerto, Mozart himself entered into a new compositional realm—one that Beethoven recognized as a premonition of his own. Was there a personal agenda for Beethoven? Competition? The need to assault the very legacy that had nurtured and served him as his greatest inspiration throughout his earliest years? We'll never know. It could be argued that, in this cadenza, Beethoven exerted considerable, even respectful *restraint* in comparison with the belated cadenzas he composed for his own concertos in 1809. But that topic takes me too far afield. I close by expressing my gratitude to Richard Kramer for his profoundly stimulating essay, and for provoking me to come to Beethoven's defense.

References

- BADURA-SKODA, Eva and Paul. 1986. *Interpreting Mozart on the Keyboard*. Translated by Leo Black. Reprint, New York: Da Capo Press. (First published in German as *Mozart-Interpretation*, 1957.)
- BAUER, Wilhelm A., and Otto Erich DEUTSCH, eds. 1962-75. *Mozart: Briefe und Aufzeichnungen*. Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum. Kassel.
- BRANDENBURG, Sieghard. 1988. "Die Beethovenhandschriften in der Musikaliensammlung des Erherzogs Rudolph." In *Zu Beethoven: Aufsätze und Dokumente*, vol. III, edited by Harry Goldschmidt. Berlin.
- BRIBITZER-STULL, Matthew. 2006. "The Cadenza as Parenthesis: An Analytic Approach." *Journal of Music Theory* 50/2: 211-51.
- CAPLIN, William E. 1998. *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- FORBES, Elliot, ed. 1967. *Thayer's Life of Beethoven*. Rev. ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- GALAND, Joel. 2000. "The Large-Scale Formal Role of the Solo Entry Theme in the Eighteenth-Century Concerto." *Journal of Music Theory* 44/2: 381-450.
- GRAYSON, David. 1998. *Mozart: Piano Concertos Nos. 20 and 21*. Cambridge Music Handbooks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HEPOKOSKI, James, and Warren DARCY. 2006. *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- KRAMER, Richard. 1991. "Cadenza Contra Text: Mozart in Beethoven's Hands." *19th-Century Music* 15/2: 116-31.
- _____. *Unfinished Music*. 2008. New York: Oxford University Press.

- LAUFER, Edward. 1988. "Some Development Sections and the Study of Voice Leading." Unpublished materials presented in a guest lecture at Yale University, 26 April.
- LEVIN, Robert D. 1990. "Instrumental Ornamentation, Improvisation and Cadenzas." In *Performance Practice: Music After 1600*, edited by Howard Mayer Brown and Stanley Sadie, 267-91. New York: W. W. Norton. (First published by The Macmillan Press, 1989.)
- MIES, Paul. 1970. *Die Krise der Konzertkadenz bei Beethoven*. Bonn: H. Bouvier.
- ROSEN, Charles. 1998. *The Classical Style*. Expanded edition. New York: W. W. Norton. (First published, 1971).
- SCHMALFELDT, Janet. 1992. "Cadential Processes: The Evaded Cadence and the 'One More Time' Technique." *Journal of Musicological Research* 12: 1-52.
- TÜRCK, Daniel Gottlob. 182. *Clavierschule, oder Anweisung zum Clavierspielen*, (Leipzig and Halle, 1789). Translated with introduction and notes as *School of Clavier Playing* by Raymond H. Hagg. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- WHITMORE, Philip. 1991. *Unpremeditated Art: The Cadenza in the Classical Keyboard Concerto*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- WOLFF, Christoph. 1991. "Cadenzas and Styles of Improvisation in Mozart's Piano Concertos." In *Perspectives on Mozart Performance*, edited by R. Larry Todd and Peter Williams, 228-38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.