MUSICAL MEANING AND INTERPRETATION
Robert S. Hatten, editor

EDITED BY
HEATHER PLATT
AND
PETER H. SMITH

Expressive Intersections in Brahms

Essays in Analysis and Meaning

INDIANA UNIVERSITY PRESS
Bloomington and Indianapolis

This book is a publication of

Indiana University Press
601 North Morton Street
Bloomington, Indiana 47404-3797 USA

iupress.indiana.edu

Telephone orders 800-842-6796
Fax orders 812-855-7931

© 2012 by Indiana University Press
All rights reserved

No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher. The Association of American University Presses' Resolution on Permissions constitutes the only exception to this prohibition.

♾ *The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1992.*

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Expressive intersections in Brahms : essays in analysis and meaning / [edited by] Heather Platt and Peter H. Smith.
p. cm. — (Musical meaning and interpretation)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-253-35705-2 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-0-253-00525-0 (e-book) 1. Brahms, Johannes, 1833–1897—Criticism and interpretation. I. Platt, Heather Anne. II. Smith, Peter Howard.
ML410.B8E77 2012
780.92—dc23
2011031951

1 2 3 4 5 17 16 15 14 13 12

Contents

Acknowledgments vii

PART 1

1. "The Wondrous Transformation of Thought into Sound": Some Preliminary Reflections on Musical Meaning in Brahms 3
   Heather Platt and Peter H. Smith
2. The Learned Self: Artifice in Brahms's Late Intermezzi 19
   Steven Rings

PART 2

3. "Alte Liebe" and the Birds of Spring: Text, Music, and Image in Max Klinger's *Brahms Fantasy* 53
   Yonatan Malin
4. Brahms's *Mädchenlieder* and Their Cultural Context 80
   Heather Platt
5. Ancient Tragedy and Anachronism: Form as Expression in Brahms's *Gesang der Parzen* 111
   Margaret Notley

PART 3

6. Sequence as Expressive Culmination in the Chamber Music of Brahms 147
   Ryan McClelland
7. "Phantasia subitanea": Temporal Caprice in Brahms's op. 116, nos. 1 and 7 186
   Frank Samarotto

8. Monumentality and Formal Processes in the First Movement of Brahms's Piano Concerto No. 1 in D Minor, op. 15 217
James Hepokoski

9. The Drama of Tonal Pairing in Chamber Music of Schumann and Brahms 252
Peter H. Smith

Selected Bibliography 291
List of Contributors 297
Index of Brahms's Compositions 299
General Index 301

Acknowledgments

The impetus for a volume of essays exploring intersections of consummate technical craft and profound expressivity in Brahms's music arose from discussions with members of the Board of Directors of the American Brahms Society. We are indebted to the society for its encouragement and for its generous subvention to defray expenses associated with the production of this book. The society has supported five other volumes: *Brahms Studies: Analytical and Historical Perspectives*, ed. George S. Bozarth (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); *Brahms Studies* 1–3, ed. David Brodbeck (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press in affiliation with the American Brahms Society, 1994, 1998, and 2001); and *On Brahms and His Circle: Essays and Documentary Studies by Karl Geiringer*, ed. George S. Bozarth (Sterling Heights, Mich.: Harmonie Park Press in Association with the American Brahms Society, 2006). *Expressive Intersections in Brahms: Essays in Analysis and Meaning* complements and extends these works by bringing together some of the most recent scholarly approaches to the analysis and hermeneutic interpretation of Brahms's compositions.

From the very early stages of the project, Robert Hatten, series editor, and Jane Behnken, sponsoring editor, at Indiana University Press have demonstrated their unflagging support. We are grateful for their guidance through the various stages of work on this volume and for their assistance in arranging for the illustrations that appear in chapters 3 and 4. Robert gave generously of his time, perceptively reading each of the essays as they were completed; all our authors have benefited from his editorial acumen. A number of other scholars also offered advice at the very earliest stages, when the concept of the volume was only beginning to emerge: we are grateful for the counsel of Richard Cohn, Roe-Min Kok, and Joseph N. Straus. We would also like to acknowledge the constructive criticisms of the anonymous scholars who reviewed our initial proposal for the press; in particular, we greatly appreciate L. Poundie Burstein's advice and encouragement.

We were fortunate to have contributors who immediately recognized the merits of the project. They conceived fascinating essays, each of which brings a unique voice to the volume, and they graciously participated in discussions throughout the editorial process. Aside from the stimulating ideas offered by the authors, both in their essays and in e-mail exchanges, we greatly appreciated their unfailingly prompt responses to our queries and concerns. In particular, we acknowledge Steven Rings, who read and commented on our first chapter,

24. This motivic linkage is quite striking: Brahms echoes the end of m. 15 by freely introducing the simultaneity E–C as a dissonance above tonic harmony. For a recent study on this type of compositional technique, see Peter H. Smith, "New Perspectives on Brahms's Linkage Technique," *Intégral* 21 (2007): 109–54.

25. Specifically, dominant chords now replace tonic as frames for this phrase, and the descending thirds in the left hand now outline dominant seventh harmony.

26. Brahms came to know the piece from Carl von Winterfeld's *Johannes Gabrieli und sein Zeitalter* (Berlin: Herrmann, 1834), 3:92–98. His careful annotations are discussed in Virginia Hancock, "Brahms's Performances of Early Choral Music," *19th-Century Music* 8/2 (1984): 125–41.

27. Virginia Hancock discusses this performance and the subsequent reaction. See "The Growth of Brahms's Interest in Early Choral Music, and Its Effect on His Own Choral Compositions," in *Brahms: Biographical, Documentary and Analytical Studies*, ed. Robert Pascall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 33–34.

28. Brahms to Eusebius Mandyczewski, 26 May 1892. This letter is given in the English version of Karl Geiringer's 1933 article, "Johannes Brahms im Briefwechsel mit Eusebius Mandyczewski," in Bozarth, *On Brahms and His Circle*, 253. Geiringer's footnote identifies the volume Brahms mentions as that containing the "Saul" setting.

29. The work is scored for six soloists, two choirs, two violins, and continuo. The connection with a solo piano piece seems unlikely until one thinks of a piano reading of this score, whose fully textured passages would result in thick chords similar to the capriccio.

30. Manfred Bukofzer speaks of its "impetuously accelerated rhythm" in *Music in the Baroque Era* (New York: Norton, 1947), 93.

31. Curiously, the Winterfeld edition omits the final empty bar; however, Hancock, "Brahms's Performances," 131, makes it clear that Brahms studied the original parts in preparing his performance and would have been able to notice Schütz's unusual notation.

32. The unity of the collection is fully explored in Jonathan Dunsby, "The Multi-piece in Brahms: Fantasien, Op. 116," in Pascall, *Brahms*, 167–89.

33. There is a discrepancy with the autograph in m. 49 that has been pointed out by Camilla Cai (see below). I agree with her argument that Brahms missed an error in the first proofs (as he did many others!) and that this is a printer's error. Thus, in m. 49, the last two notes should be D–C♯ instead of C–B♭. This correction has an effect on the shape of the passage, which can be observed in Example 7.16. See Camilla Cai, "Brahms' Short, Late Piano Pieces—Opus Numbers 116–119: A Source Study, an Analysis and Performance Practice" (Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1986), esp. 193. I am also grateful to Channan Willner for helping to confirm the contents of proof sheets.

34. Indeed, as late as 1807 the philosopher Christian Friedrich Michaelis characterized the capriccio as "serious and sublime." He is quoted more fully in Annette Richards, *The Free Fantasia and the Musical Picturesque* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 135.

35. *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts* (Berlin, 1821), Eng. trans. S. W. Dyde, *Philosophy of Right* (London: Bell, 1896), 26.

8 Monumentality and Formal Processes in the First Movement of Brahms's Piano Concerto No. 1 in D Minor, op. 15

James Hepokoski

Does the epic, sprawling character of the opening movement of Brahms's First Piano Concerto present its listeners with uncommonly daunting formal and hermeneutic problems? Such was the claim of Giselher Schubert in 1994: "The massive first movement of the Piano Concerto, op. 15, remained unique in Brahms's *œuvre*: never again did he compose an instrumental movement of such length. . . . In the first movement . . . Brahms considerably increased the number of theme groups, with the result that the movement is almost impossible to grasp as a whole."[1] Was Schubert registering a generally shared impression? What is required of us to experience a coherent succession of events in this movement? Following an overview of some historical and methodological considerations, this essay proposes the outlines of a Sonata-Theory–based reading of the movement as a whole.[2]

In the past several decades discussions of Brahms's op. 15 have focused largely on one or both of two interrelated issues.[3] The first seeks to lay out the remaining traces of its troubled, still somewhat mysterious compositional history from 1854 through 1859—from two-piano sonata to symphony to concerto, a history mediated by reactions and advice provided by Julius Otto Grimm, Clara Schumann, and Joseph Joachim—sometimes extending to its initial publication in a solo-piano arrangement in early 1861.[4] The second issue, often intertwined with the first, centers around deciphering the presumed allusions and connotations of a few of its themes—the crisis-ridden opening page, the "Benedictus" text-underlay at the onset of the D-major Adagio, and so on—with particular attention given to their potential biographical implications. Here, Brahms's intimacy and psychological identification with the Schumann family loom large.

Such exercises in decoding are inquiries into what I call the *vertical* implications of an isolated thematic module: a single passage's connotative significance considered apart from the role of its placement(s) within a composition. Vertical connotations comprise such things as programmatic representations, quotations of or allusions to specific moments of esteemed earlier works, and the deploy-

ment of standardized theme, gesture, topic, tempo, or texture types associable with culturally constructed, subjective moods or actions. These last include the stock-in-trade affective postures circulating within nineteenth-century Austro-Germanic music: heroic, celebratory, marchlike, hymnic, folklike, introspective, reverential, aspirational, melancholic, funereal, stormy, combative, menacing, demonic, "purely musical" (self-referential images of the music-technical, as with, say, imitative/fugal practice or conventional developmental procedures), and so on. Vertical resonances are historical through and through. Among other things, they situate an individual work within a specific cultural tradition. This presupposes a network of shared expectations within a community of listeners themselves shaped by institutions devoted to sustaining that tradition.

With regard to at least the first movement, less attention has been paid to providing an adequate account of what additional connotations accrue to those modules by virtue of their assignments within the movement's formal processes.[5] These constitute what I call their *horizontal* aspect, the work's events considered as participants in the ongoing, linear-temporal flow, with particular attention paid to the manner in which they are placed into a dialogue with the generic action spaces of, in this case, a sonata-form–based structure. What does it mean to have *this* musical module situated *there* (as opposed to elsewhere)—*and* following, say, *that* module? Within any composition each module has both a vertical and a horizontal aspect. Any text-adequate discussion needs to be concerned with both.

The Quest for Monumentality

An important component of Brahms's concerto was its enormous size. Its durational expanse challenged any listener who wished to follow its overarching musical argument, as opposed to merely basking in selected individual moments. The 484 bars of its first movement alone span around twenty-two minutes, the concerto as a whole around forty-eight—much to the distress of Eduard Bernsdorf, its bewildered and hostile critic in the *Signale für die musikalische Welt*.[6] This made the work longer than its only significant rivals, Beethoven's Violin Concerto and Fifth Piano Concerto. In contrast, Mendelssohn's and Schumann's concertos had been more modestly sized, while Liszt's two piano concertos were veritable miniatures, requiring only about twenty minutes each.[7] As Brahms supporter Adolf Schubring put it in 1862, "The first movement is more gigantic than that of any other concerto known to me. Gigantic works demand gigantic proportions."[8]

But neither the tallying of bar numbers nor the clocking of absolute durations tells the full story. The composer also enhanced the movement's impression of uncommon magnitude through his choice of an unusual meter: a

broadly sweeping, Maestoso $\frac{6}{4}$. (With its opportunities for strategically placed, "Brahmsian" $\frac{3}{2}$ hemiolas, $\frac{6}{4}$ would reappear in several of his later works, among them the Third Symphony and the Second Piano Concerto.) From one perspective, the $\frac{6}{4}$ can strike us as a joining together of two bars of $\frac{3}{4}$, as if notating a hypermeter that could invite those who read the notation to perceive the work—an aspect of which is the notation itself—as coursing onward in oversized metric strides. From another, it can be perceived as a notationally fortified $\frac{6}{8}$, a heftier, weightier alternative, plunging ever forward like a sturdy ship through wide seas.[9] How might readers of the score perceive this movement differently had it been notated in $\frac{3}{4}$—the meter of Mozart's C-Minor Piano Concerto, K. 491, or Beethoven's "Eroica"—or in the typically lighter $\frac{6}{8}$?[10]

For all these reasons and more (including thematic content and orchestration) the colossal impression of Brahms's concerto, recalling the proportions of Beethoven's and Schubert's Ninth Symphonies, is anything but culturally neutral. Its commanding bulk and resounding earnestness suggest its viability as a cultural monument on behalf of the Austro-Germanic tradition within which it is so self-consciously situated. Brahms's concerto was a contemporary yet historicizing work. As such it participated in the midcentury drive toward grand-scale feats of commemoration and monumentalism, topics treated recently by Alexander Rehding. Any such monument—musical, sculptural, or architectural—is charged with the connotation of cultural depth and seriousness of purpose. It "accords privileged importance to heritage and traditions . . . [and thereby] approaches the fundamental question of who we are by telling us where we come from." Above all—as is the case in Brahms's first concerto—it seeks to provide its listeners with

> the sense of being a self-sufficient musical object that radiates greatness as though out of itself; and it piggybacks on the newly minted work-concept that had bestowed new prestige on the art of music and that only made this monolithic, self-reliant impression possible. The work that the nineteenth-century musical monument was to perform effectively consists in bringing together two distinct types of magnitude: one component, historical greatness, can be summarized under the modern keywords of collective memory and identity formation, while its other component, physical size, shows a marked tendency toward dramatic proportions (or even lack of any proportionality) that would elicit astonishment from its audience . . . an aesthetics of wonderment.[11]

Metaphorical Hermeneutics and Dialogic Form

Any search for a cogent pathway through this monumental first movement needs to pursue questions of its thematic-modular succession. That success-

ion cannot be suspected of being arbitrary: one must presume that Brahms intended it to "make sense" within the contexts of its cultural traditions. Steering clear of vapid trumpetings on behalf of "unity" or "perfection," my concern is only to inquire into the composer's staging of a dramatized musical narrative appropriate to concerns within the state of composition in Germany in the 1850s.[12] While that narrative may be read as one founded on an exclusively musical logic—motives, chords, keys, contrapuntal lines, formal patterns—its linear ordering of contrasting affective states also invites its listeners heuristically to attach to it any number of external metaphors of response, action, and striving.

None of what follows should be taken as a bluntly programmatic reading. Any claim of programmaticism would imply the presence of a privileged reading intended by the composer in which this or that theme is to be conceptually associated with only this or that poetic idea, person, or activity. That is not the argument of this essay. One needs to distinguish between overtly or covertly illustrative music and the capacity of abstract instrumental music to be synchronized with a wide range of metaphorical analogues, none of which can claim exclusivity. Such music harbors multiple strata of potential meanings. These are differing registers of metaphor that may be activated through close analysis and responsible hermeneutics. None of these registers discloses any supposed single meaning—the *proper* meaning—once and for all.[13] One of my aims, though, will be to explore the metaphorical analogue that situates this piece within a much-conflicted historical situation. Whatever other connotations it might have sought to convey, Brahms's concerto also spoke, as a manifesto by example, to the strained and polemical context of Austro-Germanic art music at that time. But any such manifesto involves more than size. It must also be discernible in the musical processes themselves, not only in the choice of the concerto's ideologically charged materials but also in their disposition within a minor-mode, sonata-oriented work.

The commentary that follows is grounded in the concept of *dialogic form:* interpreting a work as participating in a dialogue with established traditions, one that the listener or analyst can seek to recover.[14] Its premise is that the meaning of a work's succession of details is not to be sought exclusively in its acoustic surface —what it audibly presents to us. No work is a self-sufficient statement capable of defining its own terms from ground zero. Instead, every work plugs into the power systems of genres that are already there as foundational elements within the contemporarily accepted norms of musical discourse. An essential aspect of a work's meaning is to be located in the details of how it realizes—or refrains from realizing—the set of expectations of the genre within which it participates. No genre (such as any type of sonata form) is to be construed as a rigid, ahistorical template. Not only do genres comprise generous and flexible arrays of compositional options for the realization of any expected action space within them, but they are also historically situated, bearing cultural connotations and aesthetic ideologies that change with time. Brahms's midcentury sonata form started from premises that had changed since the era of Mozart and Beethoven, premises that led to different inflections of historicized consciousness.

While one aspect of a work is *immanent,* or specific to the content of that work alone (Brahms's concerto is distinguishable from Beethoven's "Emperor" concerto, not merely reducible to the genre that they share), another aspect is *relational*—how it interacts dialogically with the historically situated norms of the genre, which provide interpretive guidelines for what happens immanently within the piece. In this case Brahms composed the first movement in dialogue with the concerto-sonata format of an earlier generation—that which, like Mozart's and Beethoven's, begins with a substantial orchestral tutti (or ritornello) preceding the onset of the solo exposition proper.[15] Sonata Theory calls this the Type 5 sonata.[16] By the 1850s there was a more efficient alternative. Mendelssohn's concertos, Schumann's piano and cello concertos, and others had omitted this opening tutti, producing trim, Type 3 sonata forms without any expositional repeat.[17] Thus at midcentury one could compose the first movement of a concerto either in the older Type 5 format (in the case at hand, subjected to a number of midmovement modifications) or in the leaner, more modern Type 3 abridgment or variant thereof. While it would be overdrawn to conclude that Brahms's retention of an initial, Type 5 ritornello was an anachronism, it is possible to read it as ideologically significant: a proclamation of solidarity with the Beethovenian concerto tradition in all its architectural splendor and gravitas, a tradition that he and Joachim were coming to regard as aesthetically compromised in their own times. Merely by deploying such an opening tutti, Brahms not only demonstrated that his work was emphatically a concerto (as its title promised) and not a symphony (however symphonic its materials and treatment might strike its listeners) but also proposed another set of solutions (as opposed to, say, Liszt's) as the truest successors to the Beethoven legacy.[18]

Equally significant for our charting of the narrative of the work is that this is a movement in D minor. As is the situation with most minor-mode sonatas, animating that narrative is the procedure of composing the successive action zones as event spaces through which an initially negative state (represented by the minor mode and certain styles of thematic material) is reacted to in an attempt to overcome it, to transform it permanently into a positive one (the major mode). None of this should be approached simplistically: obviously, major and minor modes carry wide ranges of expressive tints and topoi depending on the manner in which they are realized. Positive or negative connotations are less in the modes themselves than they are historical tropes of signification accepted culturally as

community-shared features of musical communication.[19] By the 1850s the major-minor modal dichotomy and its historically accrued connotations had long been crystallized into an absolute binary, an essential feature of any composer's palette of colors. At the heart of this movement is the customary minor-major premise: the deploying of Type 5 sonata processes to generate a drama of starkly contrasting feelings that seeks to emancipate the initial D-minor situation into D major. Every recurrence of D minor (or minor-mode proxy) suggests the persistence of a state of threat, sorrow, weariness, or potential defeat; every D-major gleam (or major-mode proxy), however underdetermined or fleeting, suggests a vision of escape or overcoming.

This leads us into an overview of the individual details of the first movement, which Brahms constructed upon the varying appearances of seven separate modules—the movement's basic musical ideas, some of which are motivically interrelated. For purposes of reference these are provided in Examples 8.1–8.7. (Example 8.3a sprouts an important variant in the development, m. 278, labeled here as Example 8.3b.) I have also provided the relevant Sonata Theory designation for each of them. The symbol R1:\ means that the module is first presented in the opening ritornello (or tutti), mm. 1–90.[20] Subsequent, varied versions of that module will also be labeled with the R1:\ identifier to remind us where it had originally appeared. The symbol S1:\ refers to the two modules (Examples 8.6 and 8.7) introduced only in the solo exposition, a space that includes its soloed preface at m. 91 (Example 8.6). The P, TR, S, and C labels are standard within Sonata Theory (primary theme, transition, secondary thematic zone, closing zone, each construed as a generic action space to be decked out with appropriate content). TM³ (Example 8.7) refers to the third member of a trimodular block, which term will be addressed as it arises below.

In any sonata analysis the most pressing requirement is to explore the implications of its musical materials as they are initially presented at the opening of the piece. As a result, much of what follows will concentrate on the initial *Anlage* (layout) of modules presented in the orchestral tutti (R1) and their reappearance and expansion within the subsequent solo exposition (S1). Once the implications of R1 and S1 are grasped, the remainder of the movement can be dealt with more efficiently.

The Opening Tutti (Ritornello, R1, mm. 1–90): Overview

The presence of a broad and thematically differentiated opening orchestral tutti aligns this movement with formalized "Classical" practice. An opening tutti has three structural functions.[21] The first is an *introductory/anticipatory function:* preparing for the soloist's entry, which in turn must be planned to be

Examples 8.1–8.7. Brahms, Piano Concerto No. 1 in D Minor, op. 15, themes.

Example 8.1. R1:\P, mm. 1–12.

Example 8.2. R1:\TR, mm. 26–36.

Example 8.3a. R1:\S, mm. 45–51.

Example 8.3b. Development, variant of R1:\S, mm. 278–80.

Example 8.4. R1:\C$^{1.2}$, mm. 76–80.

Example 8.5. R1:\C$^{1.3}$, mm. 82–86.

Example 8.6. S1:\P^{pref}, mm. 91–96.

Example 8.7. S1:\TM^{3}, mm. 157–64.

engagingly responsive to what has just preceded it. The second is an *expositional-rhetoric function:* laying out a succession of modules that, regardless of the contrasting keys they may (or may not) visit, topically suggest the action zones of a sonata exposition, P TR ’ S / C.[22] The third is a *referential-layout function:* the establishing of a succession of modules that will be recycled, in this order, in later rotations. Brahms's initial tutti carries out all these functions.[23] This is not to say that mm. 1–90 (R1) are merely normative. On the contrary, they abound with provocative content.

One of R1's notable features is its tonal/modal course. The Classical precedents had begun and ended in the same key and normally in the same mode, with declarative security at both ends, regardless of any tonal diversions that might have been placed into their interiors. Brahms alluded to this precedent as a conceptual norm but realized it in a dramatically unconventional way. In this D-minor concerto R1 concludes in D *major* (mm. 82–90)—easily assimilated to the norm—but, as all commentators have noted, the eruptive opening, R1:\P, with its first chord of B$\flat^{6}$ (mm. 2–3, soon turned into a B$\flat^{6}_{5}$, mm. 4–10), is tonally underdetermined. Considered only vertically, in isolation and without regard to the key signature, the turbulent opening page does not suggest D minor. As Joseph Dubiel put it, what we encounter at the outset is a "characteristic Brahmsian gambit," that of starting a composition with the postponement of any "clear presentation of . . . [the] tonic triad."[24] (Retrospectively, one might suppose that "D minor" batters the work open in an alarming variant, inflected with a $\hat{5}$–$\hat{6}$ shift [B$\flat^{6}$] that ratchets up its urgency—or one might construe the opening chord as suggesting a dark D-minor triad altered via the *Leittonwechsel* [L] operation. However we derive it theoretically, it is as if any pure D minor—fatalistic enough on its own—is blown apart, as though a mere D-minor chord is unable to contain its explosive distress.)[25] This invites us to grasp the succession of modules comprising R1 as a process that, by degrees and through various tonal digressions, eventually produces—or is unable to evade—the stark inevitability of a D-minor PAC (perfect authentic cadence, m. 66, R1:\EEC [the first tutti's analogous point of "essential expositional closure"], even though the tonic is represented only by octave Ds).[26] But even while the brute fact of D minor is confirmed at m. 66, the process does not end here. This seemingly no-exit moment reignites the initial "B$\flat^{6}$" music full force (m. 67). This time, through an effort of will (mm. 76–81), that passage is crafted to break through to a concluding stage, its emancipation into D major (mm. 82–90)—a proleptic vision of the desired outcome of the sonata activity to follow: exorcising the D-minor threat by converting it into D major.

But this is only a description of the obvious. The larger questions are ones of purpose and implication: how might we frame this R1 music as a whole? It is

clear that the opening tutti subdivides into two complementary sections (mm. 1–66, 66–90), each of which is launched by the "symphonic" opening module R1:\P. Within the tradition this explosive eruption could be read as an unforeseen intrusion "coming out of nowhere"—bursting into our awareness from the blankness of silence and suggesting an immediate and extreme existential crisis. Each R1 section responds to R1:\P with different material: the first, groping, mourning, spectral, tonally insecure (Examples 8.2 and 8.3a); the second, pushing through to a short-lived *forte* celebration of major-mode attainment (Examples 8.4 and 8.5). This is the fundamental expressive structure of R1.

Thus the opening tutti stages contrasting responses to the anguished crisis implied by R1:\P. The generically inevitable reintrusions of R1:\P (sometimes varied) also dominate all that follows, each appearance beginning a new cycle of response. On the broadest level the movement is "about" responding to the recurring challenge of whatever calamitous upheaval R1:\P might be imagined to represent. From this perspective the movement calls upon the action spaces of the Type 5 format first (in R1) to conjure up the extremity of the crisis and to suggest two modes of response to it, and second (in the remainder of the movement) to deploy the genre as a goal-driven medium through which the trajectory of reactions to the initial module can be dramatized.

R1:\P (mm. 1–25): Connotations

R1:\P (Example 8.1) is not only the determinative module for the entire composition, but it is also the richest in connotations. It can be explored from three different vantage points: programmatic implication and its broader resonances of metaphor; intertextual allusions; and musical processes. With regard to the first, no commentator fails to associate R1:\P's turbulence with Brahms's alarm at learning the news of Robert Schumann's suicide attempt—his leap into the Rhine—on 27 February 1854, an association conveyed many decades later to Max Kalbeck by Joseph Joachim. In response to a request from Kalbeck, Joachim had replied that it had been originally composed in its aftermath as "a kind of powerful shiver" (*eine Art mächtiger Schüttelfrost*)—doubtless referring to that module's brandishing of strident trills. Kalbeck, then, was able to declare that it had arisen from a representation (*Vorstellung*) of the catastrophe and as such conveyed Brahms's shuddering, sympathetically experienced "soul-image" (*Seelenbild*) of the event.[27] The compositional facts line up with this claim. Within about two months after this "most devastating day of Brahms's life" (as Styra Avins characterized it), Brahms had drafted three movements of a D-minor sonata for two pianos (provisionally orchestrated to become a projected symphony by June and July 1854).[28] The opening of the first movement of this sonata is usu-

ally agreed, on the basis of remarks by Joachim and Albert Dietrich, to have been an early version of the music that now begins the concerto.[29] Complementarily, Brahms's refashioning of earlier conceptions of the work into a piano concerto (with newly composed second and third movements) was undertaken in earnest two years later, around October 1856, only a few months after Schumann's death on 29 July.[30] It is not difficult to presume that the monumental concerto—largely drafted in the ensuing three months—figured in Brahms's mind as an act of commemoration and solidarity.

What are we to make of such information? Does R1:\P (mm. 1–25) point toward the interiority of Brahms's shock in 1854 or, more literally, toward a hyperdramatized portrayal of Schumann's fateful "Sprung in den Rhein" as an objective event? Is it "mehr Ausdruck der Empfindung als Malerei"? Or the reverse? Or both? Crude as it might seem to absolute-music partisans, it is certainly possible to construe the module as realistically pictorial, with the terrifying event translated into graphic musical analogues. Beyond the portentous ultimacy of the moment we find a determined ascent to a trilling madness high above the (pedal-point) river (m. 8: notice the demonic-tritone anacrusis to the high point) followed by an impetuous downward plunge (mm. 8–11).[31] (Dare one go so far as to suggest the proto-Straussian image of the resultant splash in the second half of m. 11?)

Of course one need not reduce the potential R1:\P connotations to this image alone. Indeed, some might prefer that any all-too-literal depiction of the delusion-driven leap be sidelined altogether as a trivialization of R1:\P's more elevated resonances within a venerated tradition of "pure music." It is often held, for instance, that the power of abstract instrumental music—its ability, particularly in the era of subjectivity, to stir us at more primordially affective levels—lies in its normative refusal to demand any such referential attachment, conveying instead, in Roger W. H. Savage's recent characterization (grounded in concepts of Heidegger and Ricoeur), a precognitive "ontological vehemence" that "touches the fundamental element of our mortal dwelling," opening us to "dimensions of experience that precede the objectification of reality" in a way that "refigures our inherence in the world."[32] Within the conceptual world of nineteenth-century Germanic Romanticism, such poetic qualities within music were claimed to access soul states (*Seelenzustände*, as both Robert Schumann and A. B. Marx had put it), expressing feelings beyond words or reductions to prosaic images or rule-of-thumb analyses.[33] This was a conception of music's expressive value that young Brahms, in all likelihood, would have shared. R1:\P is a *Seelenzustand* of explosive alarm, the onset of an unspecified catastrophe that must now be faced.

Yet we have every reason to think that the distress conveyed by this opening was linked in Brahms's mind, even if not pictorially, with the memory of

Schumann's 1854 misfortune and (by 1856) death. From this perspective one aspect of the concerto is "about" Brahms's relation to Schumann (along with Clara and the Schumann family). But the Schumanns were not merely individuals whom Brahms happened to know. On the contrary, they embodied an artistic position lobbying on behalf of the presumed sanctity and weightier purposes of art, as opposed to current compositional styles that they regarded as trading in publicity or ego-inflated virtuosity. Schumann's decline and death could be taken as a symbol for the state of that aesthetic position within Austro-Germanic art music, threatened with eclipse by cultic and progressive trends. On these terms the concerto could be construed as both a monument to all that Schumann had represented and a demonstration that young Brahms, as his de facto chosen successor, was now up to the task of carrying on the enterprise in the grandest possible formats.

As mediated by Brahms, then, the Schumann crisis was also a crisis of continuation. Under these lights the concerto is "about" the challenges of its own musical present in the wake of a tragic and enormous loss, just as the processes of this first movement can be read as seeking at the outset to reenact the crisis of that critical situation, whose urgency can be heard to cry out in the gripping *Angst* of R1:\P. Can the Austro-Germanic tradition be renewed in the hands of a young, rising master, committed to remaining true to the highest aspirations of Mozart, Beethoven, and Schumann? This political aspect of the work's implication is buttressed not only by its interest in self-promotion as a public-display piece (initially with the composer as soloist) but also by the processes of the piece's execution as one works one's way through it. As an aesthetic manifesto the concerto is "about" the obligations of composing a "symphonic" concerto worthy of that description under the burden of the seemingly unsurpassable achievements of the past. The first movement posits a recurring, in extremis question in R1:\P and then stages a reply to it in the bar-by-bar moments of its performance, taking us through the heavy friction of a Type 5 sonata. The piece, in short, demonstrates itself.

That the tradition was somehow at stake in imperiled times is suggested by R1:\P's apparent pointings to specific passages from classic repertory pieces. R1:\P propels the concerto forward through a purposeful act of backward-looking recall. It participates in the aesthetics of the secret: those with knowledge of the repertory can hear one register of its meaning in terms of the similar music that it calls up to memory. Identifying the specific passage alluded to is less important than the invitation to open such an inquiry—to hear (or to believe that one hears) the coexisting presence of esteemed tokens from the past in the presentness of the concerto's opening bars. While the game of allusion spotting in Brahms encourages unconfirmable speculation (those insisting on absolute

verification may frown on the practice altogether), this may well have been its point: to invite the listener to connect current, audible presence to a historical, newly canonical past.

In the case of R1:\P three such allusions might be proposed, and together these three invoke the three masters whose achievements most clearly represented the tradition with which Brahms was seeking to align himself: Beethoven, Mozart, and Schumann. The *fortissimo*, apocalyptic ferocity of the onset, initially a $B\flat^{6}$ (mm. 2–3), seems to point toward the blazing D^{6} moment of recapitulation in the first movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony (m. 301), just as it may also evoke in its "B-flatness" the D-minor/B♭-major conflict (i and VI) in that earlier work. Apart from the biographical context typically noted by commentators—that Brahms had experienced his first hearing of a live performance of Beethoven's Ninth in Cologne in late March 1854, about a month after Schumann's suicide attempt—one need only recall that since its premiere the Ninth had been often regarded as a work that had exhausted the limits of the old formats.[34] Through this allusion Brahms takes up the challenge of meeting the problem head-on. Equally provocative, though, are R1:\P's similarities to certain features of the (much quieter) opening of Mozart's C-Minor Piano Concerto, K. 491. These could hardly be coincidental: the triple meter, the early displacement of $\hat{5}$ by $\hat{6}$ in the top voice, the upward leap on the two strongly pronounced quarter notes, and the negatively connotative descending chromatic line. Finally, while the eruptive opening of Brahms's concerto might recall that of Schumann's Third Symphony (both texturally and in its melodic leaps), a case has also been made on behalf of R1:\P's intertextuality with the first movement of Schumann's Fourth. Richard Taruskin reads that module as "constructed almost entirely out of 'classical' allusions. The most immediate one is to Schumann's own D-minor symphony, composed in 1841 as his Second, but revised in 1851 and published posthumously as his Fourth. It, too, begins by 'allowing the timpani and the drums to resound' in a lengthy roll . . . and its first Allegro theme (alluded to thereafter in all the other movements) is also marked by a surprising leap that lands on the very same notes [D and F] as does Brahms's intensified version."[35]

In purely musical terms the opening $B\flat^{6}$ (mm. 2–3; $B\flat^{6}_{5}$, mm. 4–10) and its displacement of an expected D minor have been commented upon so often that little more needs to be added here. What we encounter more broadly within R1:\P is a wide-ranging, eleven-bar module elided with its much-intensified variant (mm. 11–21, A^{6}_{5}, now suggesting D minor). This leads to an elided continuation (mm. 21–25) that is cut short on the V^{6}_{4} chord of D minor, leaving its resolution hanging in the air. Holding the entire paragraph in place is the chromatically sinking bass from D (as conceptual tonic, despite what occurs above it) to A (as dominant) in ever-shortening durations: D (mm. 1–10), C♯ (11–20), C♮

(21–22), B♮ (23–24[1]), B♭ (24[2]), and A (25). In other words, we have the traditionally negative symbol of the chromatically descending tetrachord, and it is that fatalistic emblem that controls the course of R1:\P as a whole.

R1:\TR and S (mm. 26–66): Bleak Aftermath

The drop from an aggressive *forte* to a soul-weary *piano* at m. 26 is the first of many stark contrasts offered by this movement: the opening assault lifts to reveal a crushed presence only beginning to emerge from under the onslaught (Example 8.2). This is the kind of abrupt shift that the exasperated Eduard Bernsdorf singled out for criticism in the *Signale für die musikalische Welt* in his 3 February 1859 review of the Leipzig premiere: "The musical ideas either crawl forward in a feeble and sickly manner or they rear up into the heights in a feverish frenzy, only in order to collapse even more exhaustedly. In a word, the whole emotional tone and invention in the piece is unhealthy. . . . Only very rarely can one speak of an organic process of development and a logical spinning-forth."[36]

Here Bernsdorf may have reduced the concept of *Fortspinnung* (or, alternatively, what we might call developing variation) to one of a smoothly progressive causation, in which one module seemingly generates another "logically," while moving ever forward into the piece. This is defensible so far as it goes: each of any piece's moments is obviously vectored forward in terms of temporal duration, reaching outward to create and consolidate a future. But even as any moment is to be oriented forward (by the text-adequate listener) to play its role in the realization of a generic goal to come, it is also to be referenced backward, under the presumption that it responds to its immediate predecessor or to the state of affairs produced thus far in the piece. This latter quality is a module's reactive aspect. From that point of view we may speak of *reactive modules.* This first movement consists of an accumulating set of reactive modules, successively responding to the traumatic state of affairs implied by R1:\P and also, by extension, to the cumulative chain of reactive modules that has preceded each of them. While the concept of causality implies an irreversible linearity, the reactive aspect of modules involves a retrospective dimension. Or, to draw upon phenomenological perspectives, all streaming moments of acoustic presentness have aspects of both retention (a consciousness of what is just past) and protention (anticipating the not yet). Each present moment is heavy with the burdens of both the past and the future.

In terms of their proto-expositional function, mm. 26–45 are transitional (R1:\TR), serving as a linking passage to a secondary thematic zone (R1:\S) that begins in m. 46. Here the rhetorically transitional function is also modulatory,

moving from a residue-husk of D minor (m. 26, over V) to a sequential reiteration up a fifth on A minor (m. 35) and finally dissolving into a much-clouded preparation for the B♭-minor coloration characterizing R1:\S. Particularly notable is Brahms's choking-down of dynamics for the entirety of R1:\TR. It had been the almost invariable Classical norm to sound R1:\TR with an elided burst of *forte* vigor that continues to gain energy up to the medial caesura (MC).[37] Here Brahms reversed the norm. An overwhelming R1:\P, ending with clubbed force (m. 25), is succeeded by a TR from which the normative energy has been drained. It is as if the act of continuation were unthinkable. And yet the task of proceeding onward must be faced if the piece, along with the tradition, is not to be shut down altogether. All the more significant, then, is that the A-minor sequence (m. 36) reduces the dynamics from the original *piano* (m. 26) to *pianissimo* (with *diminuendo* in m. 40), mutes the upper strings (*con sordino*), finds itself unable to reproduce the entirety of its model intact (crumbling into a common-tone diminished seventh chord, m. 41), and is capable of only slouching its way toward a weakly articulated MC effect in m. 45 (the gap on beat 1). We are faced with a cluster of counternormative, entropic images.

The reactive status of R1:\TR is clear. Its bass consists of lingering reverberations of the incipit of R1:\P (mm. 2–3) with two modifications: the initial B♭ has been settled back to A, clarifying its D-minor orientation (here implicitly over V); and that incipit has been rhythmically altered into single-bar-length reiterations. R1:\TR floats above these bobbing shock-wavelets, with whose triple-time, rocking pulsations its own are allied. At the same time, setting out from a D-minor reality, R1:\TR's upper voice is aspirational, prayerlike, as if descrying the possibility of a D-major emancipation far down the road, not yet graspable in its current present. Brahms arrayed the thematic model, mm. 27–34, as a sentence: two complementary hoists (the presentation, mm. 27–28, 29–30), prepare one for a yearning, upward glance (the continuation, mm. 31–35), projecting a fleeting vision of "D major" (a V^6_4 of hopeful expectation, *crescendo,* with upper-voice intervals recalling those of R1:\P), decaying at once to V^6_4 of D minor (m. 32, *diminuendo,* a weary sigh—the thrust of the entire movement *in nuce*) and thence to the $^5_3$ resolution, an A-major chord completing a half cadence in D minor. (This $^5_3$ chord also furnishes the "missing" resolution of the V^6_4 in m. 25, whose dominant is prolonged in the bass through m. 34.) When the A-major chord darkens to A minor (m. 35), echoing the D-major/D-minor "lights-out" decay in m. 32, the model begins to be replicated sequentially, and more softly, a fifth higher, a spectral sequence suggestive of loss. This time, the music stalls on the corresponding major-minor decay (A–a, m. 40), disintegrating into the mists of a diminished seventh, out of which materializes

the dominant of an unexpected key, B♭ minor. At the moment of the R1:\MC (m. 45, beat 1), almost all sense of forward motion, and the will to continue, has been lost.

What is launched at m. 46 must be regarded as R1:\S (Example 8.3a), although nearly everything about it is estranged from customary practice. Within nineteenth-century, minor-mode Type 5s, the norm at this point was to provide a major-mode S that started either in the relative major (III) or, less often, in the tonic major (I).[38] In this case not only is the major mode absent, suggesting the inaccessibility of consolation or relief, but for fourteen bars the key evoked, over its prolonged dominant, is B♭ minor, the minor submediant of D minor. From one perspective B♭ minor might respond to the implied "B-flatness" of the opening upheaval, mm. 2–3, now dimmed into a grieving minor. From another, one might regard B♭ minor as the bleak, maximally distant hexatonic pole of the longed-for D-major sonority ephemerally glimpsed only a few bars before.[39] However one interprets it, from the standpoint of any normative procedure the impression conveyed is that of having wandered into foreign tonal territory—a zone of utter darkness.

Led by quiet winds, R1:\S struck Joachim as a "wonderfully beautiful, first minor-mode song."[40] In context, it issues forth as a desolate *Grablied,* or funereal grave song—a site of mourning. Melodically, it continues the gently rocking figures heard in R1:\TR, perhaps recalling its descending fourths (from mm. 28–29, 30–31). As Dubiel noted, R1:\S is also "the movement's most mobile theme . . . the one theme to change in character, and, in most performances, tempo, from its original form."[41] Here in R1 the theme begins with an antecedent-like gesture (mm. 46–51, though entirely over V), whose consequent, begun in m. 52, stalls in mm. 55–59, *diminuendo,* and, through downward slippages in the bass, drifts into the hazy murk of $C\sharp^{ø7}$ (mm. 62–63)—again suggesting, as with R1:\TR, an inability to complete or continue.

And then everything changes. This $C\sharp^{ø7}$ in mm. 62–63, $vii^{ø7}$ of D minor, precipitates a moment of decision. The gears clench; frozen grief gives way to determination; the calamity is to be faced and overcome; the tradition must continue. The violins remove their mourning mutes, and a dissonantly explosive, *forte* rush (mm. 64–66) swerves into D minor, bringing R1:\S to an end with a firmly stamped i:PAC that seizes the challenge of what that global tonic represents.[42] The perfect authentic cadence in m. 66 may be construed as R1:\EEC, simultaneously opening the way to a subsequent closing zone. That closing material starts by reigniting R1:\P in m. 67, which unsettles the just-confirmed D minor with its *Leittonwechsel* "$B\flat^{6}$" and brings us back to the situation initially set forth at the beginning.[43] This time, the response to it will be different.

R1:\C (mm. 66–90): Confrontation and Prediction of Victory

Notwithstanding its sense of rebeginning, the return of R1:\P in m. 67—now recast as R1:\C—is less formally idiosyncratic than it might initially appear. Here Brahms may have had in mind what had become an "alternative" option within the concerto practice of the preceding several decades. In those Type 5, minor-mode concertos, in which R1:\S had begun in a nontonic key, it had become conventional to provide a stormy, often *forte* return to the original minor tonic toward the end of R1, either before or shortly after the PAC that marked the attainment of R1:\EEC. Occasionally (as in John Field's Piano Concerto No. 7 in C Minor), the shift back into the tonic was ushered in with a return of R1:\P, as occurs here, creating something of a "ternary" impression.[44] (Instances in which the secondary key persisted and attained satisfactory closure at the end of R1 seem to have been rare.)[45] Apart from any possible precedent in Field's works or in now-little-known works of others, two obvious minor-mode models would also have been Mozart's Piano Concerto in C Minor, K. 491/i (m. 63, *forte*—although in this case R1:\S, m. 44, had also been in the tonic) and Schumann's Violin Concerto in D Minor, WoO 23 (m. 42, merging, *crescendo,* into D minor after an R1:\S, m. 31, like Brahms's, also largely over the dominant).[46] Brahms's difference from these last two precedents lies in the caesura-gap impression of m. 66 (octave Ds corresponding to m. 1, now *crescendo*). This produces an effect of nonelision, facilitating an inexorable thrust into the convulsive thematic content of m. 67, reerupting in high relief (R1:\P = R1:\$C^{1.1}$).

This briefer, second cycle is one of action. Measures 66–75 replicate mm. 1–9 with enhanced orchestration, including new leaps in the horns. Upon reaching the downbeat of m. 76 (= m. 10, now reconceived as iv of D minor), these correspondence measures are swept away in favor of an athletic intervention springing forward with a new, eighth-note-driven propulsion, R1:\$C^{1.2}$, mm. 76–82 (Example 8.4). This passage is structured as a three-bar unit repeated in slightly altered invertible counterpoint, thus creating the presentation modules of a new sentence. R1:\$C^{1.2}$ signals the fictive protagonist's "musically active" determination to take up the R1:\P challenge.[47] And to conquer it: R1:\$C^{1.2}$ steers into a full-orchestra shout of major-mode triumph—a *Jubelruf* ("shout of jubilation," Example 8.5, R1:\$C^{1.3}$, mm. 82–90), envisioning the hoped-for victory down the road: the overturning of D minor into D major.[48] Simultaneously, in the bass the "threat" intervals of R1:\P (or the bass of R1:\TR) are turned into a sunny dance of joy. Such early visions cannot last: this D major fades to *piano* (and *pianissimo* in the trumpets) by m. 90, the end of the opening tutti. As a whole, R1 has been preparatory. It has outlined a recurring

crisis, two responses to it, and an imagined outcome. The larger journey—that of seeking a sonata-oriented realization of all this on a broader scale—is about to begin.

Solo Exposition, Part 1: Preface and Onset of S1 Proper (mm. 91–141)

The entry of the soloist at m. 91 introduces a more personalized intervention into the discourse (particularly evident when Brahms himself was the pianist), setting out into the open seas of Solo 1 and all that follows. The final sonic item is now activated: the piano itself, in dialogue with all that has preceded it. This is a dramatic moment in all Type 5 sonata forms. Here the shift of attention to the piano is coupled with a shift from R1's concluding D major back to D minor ("lights out"), resetting the modal situation back to its status quo ante. All this is spliced smoothly into the proceedings. The broad, D-major *diminuendo* of the previous bars had suggested a receding of the tutti to prepare for this quiet entrance, which picks up and continues those measures' reiterative triple groups in the bass. Similarly, the piano's "new" melody at this point (Example 8.6) spins out the rhythms and contours of the vigorous R1:\C$^{1.2}$ (Example 8.4).[49] Pushed onward into each succeeding bar with recurring, oar-stroke anacruses, it allows elements from R1:\C$^{1.2}$ to flower into a lyricism more expansive than anything heard thus far. Starting out from a subdued D minor, the theme conveys a hypnotic, antique flavor, marked by undulating thirds and sixths in gentle descents. We might hear in it something set apart, reverentially ceremonial: a *Requiem*-inflected entry cloaked in black, mindful of the sober circumstances that have given rise to the will to construct this musical monument. Donald Francis Tovey's suggestion might not be far from the mark: "a touching theme worthy of Bach's ariosos in the *Matthew Passion*."[50]

While the piano entry signals the textural start of Solo 1, what it provides is a corridor to the onset of the solo exposition proper (the point at which material from R1:\P returns to start another rotation of material—here, m. 110). This commonly encountered feature is what Sonata Theory calls a "preface," labeled as S1:\P^{pref}. Its length and content vary from one work to another.[51] In this case the entry is somber and understated, antivirtuosic, calling attention to the "symphonic" intent of the concerto in its initial avoidance of technical display.[52] In the harried context of all that has preceded it this module seems leisurely, precisely measured. A primly contained, four-bar antecedent (mm. 91–94) leads to what starts as an expanded consequent (m. 95) but that, after some harmonic blossoming, returns only to another half cadence (V/D, m. 101). As the figuration starts to climb upward (m. 101), the orchestral strings swell dynamically, soon

suggesting the return of a postponed but inexorable threat. Registering the increasing tension, the soloist's 3 + 3 subdivisions of the $\frac{6}{4}$ bars split into 2 + 2 + 2 hemiolas (mm. 107–108, *molto crescendo*), and the theme's initial security comes undone with the *forte* C♯^{o7} in m. 109, hurling once again into shuddering crisis-material from R1:\P (m. 110), now rattled forth, *fortissimo*, by the soloist. The appearance of that module announces the onset of the solo exposition proper.

Or does it? Matters are not that simple. The return of R1:\P material in the piano, m. 110, does not start at the beginning of that theme but rather at the point corresponding to m. 18—midway through that module's convulsions (mm. 110–17 = 18–25). Here one recalls that the preceding entrance of R1:\P at m. 66/67 (positioned as R1:\C$^{1.1}$) had provided only mm. 1–10 of the theme. In short, m. 110 continues the R1:\P material that had been interrupted (by R1:\C$^{1.2}$) at m. 76; or, from another perspective, mm. 76–109 can be construed as an interpolation replacing the "missing" mm. 11–17 of R1:\P. Did the "exposition" actually begin much earlier? If the return of mm. 1 and 2 of R1:\P is taken to mark the initiation of a new, large-scale rotation, that would indicate that the rotation had begun in m. 66/67. Such an initiation is typical of the onset of the solo exposition, not of the closing zone of R1. On the other hand, the obviously concluding gestures of mm. 76–90, along with the suppression of the soloist until m. 91, demonstrate that ultimately they are to be regarded as the end of the opening tutti. Here we experience an ambiguity of structural boundary points.[53] Rotation 2 does start at m. 66, but the solo exposition proper—led into by the lyrical S1:\P^{pref}—is not fully released until the resumption of R1:\P material at m. 110. It is as if the attempt to start a solo exposition at m. 66/67 had been derailed with the intervention of R1:\C$^{1.2}$ at m. 76 and is only permitted to rebegin (shorn of its "used-up" initial modules) at m. 110.

Measures 117–23 provide a brief but strenuous, quasi-canonic working out of R1:\P's incipit.[54] In this final version the turmoil is cut short by an abrupt half cadence (V/d, m. 123) and, following the rotational ordering of the opening tutti, a slightly altered, now piano-led, R1:\TR—personalized broodings on that "aspirational" module. Sounded a fifth higher than its version in the opening tutti, this passage proceeds, *diminuendo*, to an MC effect in m. 141, suggesting the arrival of F minor, in order to prepare the way for secondary-theme space.

Solo Exposition, Part 2: The Trimodular Block (TMB) and S1–R2 Closing Zone (mm. 142–225, 226–30)

While the practice is not invariable, it is typical of Type 5 sonatas to interpolate a new theme at some point within Solo 1's S space. One of the ways that this could be handled was to resound R1:\S as an opening module leading to a

second apparent MC and the new theme (in the proper secondary key or mode), introduced by the soloist. In such cases Solo 1 displays apparent double medial caesuras, the situation producing a trimodular block (TM^{1}, TM^{2}, TM^{3}, in which TM^{1} and TM^{3} are thematic, and, between them, TM^{2} is a transitional passage setting up the second caesura).[55] In this case R1:\S = S1:\TM^{1} (m. 142, in F minor over V), merging into S1:\TM^{2} at m. 150, altering the module with a modal shift to F major and leading to a second MC (expressing III:HC, m. 156), and thence to the pianist's new, hymnic theme, S1:\TM^{3} (m. 157, in F major, Example 8.7). The aim is to lift the minor-mode pall that has been dominating most of the movement in order to open an expansive zone of radiant, major-mode promise.[56] As with all minor-mode sonatas that move to the major mediant for their secondary theme, that thematic module bears the hope (not always realized) of reappearing in the tonic major in the recapitulation, thereby, through the mechanisms prebuilt into the sonata process, emancipating the original tonic minor into tonic major.

To grasp the logic of this portion of the solo exposition, one needs to consider how it responds to and furthers the comparable passage in the opening tutti. There, stasis, grief, and mourning (R1:\TR, R1:\S) had given way to a determination to reconfront and conquer the initial crisis, imagining the eventual victory with the tutti's concluding, D-major *Jubelruf*, R1:\C$^{1.3}$. While the sequence of events remains much the same here, the expositional pathway to that modal success is broadened into an expansive major mode and a new, confidently hopeful theme. Initially, the soloist murmurs the cold *Grablied* (R1:\S = S1:\TM^{1}), but before long it is led in a different direction. There is no need to repeat the blunt, cadential decision heard in m. 66 of R1. That choice has already been made, and as the movement proceeds, every new bar displays its accumulating results. This time, the *Grablied* is made to turn the corner, lightening into the major mode with a warm breeze of strings, *crescendo* (S1:\TM^{2}). The III:HC MC at m. 156 is the rotational analogue to the earlier i:PAC (m. 66). It opens the gateway to the thematic goal of the exposition, the lyrical S1:\TM^{3} (Example 8.7), *poco più moderato,* an extended, major-mode passage for unaccompanied soloist. Within the still operative rotation its opening ten bars replace R1:\C$^{1.2}$ (which, as a consequence, never reappears in this movement).

This sentential theme subdivides into two parts: presentation (S1:\TM$^{3.1}$, mm. 157–66, sounded as two antecedents) and continuation (S1:\TM$^{3.2}$, mm. 166–99).[57] The expressive role of S1:\TM$^{3.1}$ within the movement is so obvious as to need little additional comment here. (Tovey noted its "vein of noble consolation"; Dubiel characterized it as an "anthem"; Roger Moseley likened it to an eloquent soliloquy "embodying the protagonist's true character.")[58] Every listener senses that its upward-rising motion (imitated in the left hand) reverses the mournful droops

of the preceding *Grablied.* Perhaps less apparent is its incipit's adoption (mm. 157, 158) of the rhythm of the negatively bobbing bass of R1:\TR (m. 25/26ff.; see Example 8.2), finally reconfiguring the aftershocks of the initial crisis into a positive theme of mellifluous promise. The continuation, m. 166, is the theme's telos—the now lyrically absorbed *Jubelruf* (m. 166, R1:\C$^{1.3}$ = S1:\TM$^{3.2}$), completing the rotational succession laid out in the opening tutti. The soloist lingers on this *dolce* module as a moment of cherished attainment—prolongs its vision and drifts into a nearly static reverie, deflecting away chromatically from F onto the warm shadow of a D♭ chord (m. 176). The soloist appears to be so deeply lost in introspection as to be unable to continue, and the completion of the module is handed over to supportive woodwinds. Within a few bars the winds lead the theme back to F major for a first point of rest with the III:PAC at m. 184; the cadence is elided with a varied restatement of the entire S1:\TM^{3}, led by the strings.

The cadence at m. 184 represents a point of achievement, but the exposition's work is not finished. The positive response to the initial crisis, it seems, needs confirmation. The string-led reiteration of S1:\TM$^{3.1}$ at m. 184, enriched by the soloist's accompanying figuration, begins as that confirmation, but it soon swells into an urgent call to action, imagining, perhaps, a more declarative expositional conclusion. The orchestra rears up to sound four statements of the *Jubelruf* on descending fifths—the major-minor sevenths, A^7, D^7, G^7, and C^7 (mm. 192–95)—as if summoning reinforcements from the four corners of the earth. To no avail: the rapt soloist defuses the energy with a gentle drift downward to a *pianissimo* III:IAC at m. 199.

While m. 199 is not a moment of full cadential closure, the remainder of the exposition has the character of a prolonged and static epilogue, settling into an even deeper, richer serenity. As the bass winds down to near motionlessness, soft reverberations of the *Jubelruf*—now as misty evocations in the horn—are intermixed with fragmentary recollections of the incipit of S1:\TM^{1} and TM^{2}. The expositional close proceeds in two phases. The first, mm. 199–210, seeks to provide a fuller closure with a PAC in F major. Its initial glide toward that cadence is evaded in m. 204 with a bass slippage to A♭, momentarily darkening onto an F-minor chord immediately shaded with dominant evocations of D♭ (mm. 205–206; cf. m. 176) before reaching an F:PAC in m. 210.[59] This is the moment best regarded as S1:\EEC, even as the same motives, in the exposition's final moments, continue to linger in the air for the next several bars: subdominant-tinted memories of accomplishment over a pedal-point F bass.[60] Its final touch is the fading away, in the orchestra alone, of R1:\S (S1:\TM^{1}) in mm. 216–26: a wistful, memorial recall of the *Grablied,* beyond whose initial mourning the work's advancement has, at least, brought us this far into the movement.[61]

The state of supreme calm reached at the end of the exposition (m. 226) is one of achievement, stretched out on a broad plain of satisfaction. It stands as the polar opposite to the frenzied shock of the opening. The structural problem that it brings, though, is that its *pianissimo* stillness reverses the nearly invariable generic norm within earlier concertos. The expected procedure was to conclude the solo exposition with an extended round of bravura: a display episode concluding with a trill cadence elided with the *forte* onset of the second tutti (or ritornello, R2). This is not what happens here. Instead, we have been lulled into a state of countergeneric tranquility—precisely where "the concerto" qua concerto ought not to be at this point. And indeed, some eleven bars before the end of the broader exposition the piano had faded away into silence, relinquishing the final settling of accounts to the orchestra. Since the soloist is no longer playing, we might construe this subdued close, mm. 216–26, as the second tutti (R2)—or at least as in dialogue with the concept of that traditional structural pillar, whose normally brilliant energy is fully suppressed here.

Brahms's antiexhibitionistic stance could not be clearer. Such a conclusion repudiates this aspect of the virtuoso concerto. But in terms of compositional accomplishment, have we been beguiled into a narcotized stasis at the "wrong" generic moment, when so much more remains to be accomplished? The heroism of the mission—like Odysseus's or Aeneas's or Rinaldo's—requires the sustaining of a multistaged linear journey toward a clear goal: the completion of the concerto, the carrying on of the endangered tradition. Bewitchment into an eroticized tarrying can lead one, however momentarily, to forget the duties of the larger task at hand. The unexpected *fortissimo* alarm in the piano at m. 226 registers a sudden awakening out of the dream, a panicked jolt of awareness. Turning the *Jubelruf* into a strident call to action, the soloist is hurled headlong into the developmental fray—and into the return of the original problem, the R1:\P module, the start of the development proper.

Development (mm. 231–310)

The return of R1:\P at m. 231, along with its "B♭^{6}," restores to memory, with a vengeance, the original crisis.[62] As a whole, the development (as was the norm) cycles through its materials in rotational order, proceeding only as far, though, as R1:\S. Thus we have, in succession, R1:\P at m. 231, the "aspirational" R1:\TR at m. 255/259, and the important transformation of R1:\S (Example 8.3b) at m. 278. The development stops short of attaining the next modules in line, the emancipatory modules, R1:\C$^{1.2}$, S1:\TM$^{3.1}$, or the *Jubelruf*. In other words, it is dominated by the negative modules, not the positive ones.

The R1:\P segment, mm. 231–55, locks the soloist and orchestra in a characteristically stormy, *forte* struggle: the descending bass line recurs—D–C♯–C♮–B♮–A (omitting B♭)—but is thereupon wrenched into a plummeting sequence of descending fifths (m. 245), doubling its speed at m. 248 and emptying onto a high-tension G♯^{o7} at m. 251. Dropping to *piano* at m. 255, the modulatory R1:\TR, with its major-minor decays further enhanced, is turned into a chiaroscuro dialogue between the orchestra and the piano in a model (mm. 259–67) and varied sequence (mm. 267–73, touching on the crucial B♭^{6} in m. 271). Heard here for the last time in the movement, R1:\TR fades into empty wisps, mm. 274–77, with the final bar retracing R1:\MC, now on V of B minor—preparing the arrival of R1:\S, the module next in line.[63]

This time Brahms recasts that module, originally so haunted and spectral, as an agent of determination (m. 278), setting out forcefully in B minor (still over the dominant). This is a transformative moment. Now with the key signature temporarily altered to a more hopeful two sharps, the soloist seizes the R1:\S *Grablied* and converts its formerly mournful stasis into a commanding vector rushing forward in impatient cross-rhythms (mm. 283–85) toward a decisive cadence. Surprisingly, that cadence arrives with a Picardy-third B-major chord (m. 287) and a simultaneous drop to *piano*. Registering a premature delight in this initial success of the motivic transformation, the B-chord opens the door to a playful and *leggiero* modulatory model (mm. 287–91) and sequence (mm. 291–95), as if all were well. But this is not the case: the end of the sequence falls into the clutches of a half cadence in the fateful key of D minor (V$^{4-3}$, mm. 295–96). Measure 295 is the onset of a prolonged dominant lock in that key, laid down even more resolutely in m. 297, as the two-sharp signature relapses back to one flat. Above the swelling A dominant, preparing for the recapitulation, the premature hopes of the transformed R1:\S (Example 8.3b) can be heard dissolving away.

The entry into the recapitulation could not be more shattering (mm. 306–10, again, with the parallel moment of the first movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony obviously in mind). With maximal force the *fortissimo* orchestra sweeps up the futile resistance of the soloist with a cadential vortex of sound. Hammered forth rhythmically with triplet upbeats, the four-bar drive to cadence accrues weight and inescapability with each beat, pointing at the D-minor resolution to come with a plunging inner voice descending from $\hat{8}$ to $\hat{1}$ and a hastening split into hemiola subdivisions in mm. 308–309. The cadence onto octave Ds (i:PAC, m. 310; cf. m. 66) is so potent as to overwhelm any hope of escape.[64] The gravitational force of D minor is too strong. We are looking into the abyss.

Recapitulation (mm. 310–443)

No commentator fails to mention the grand coup at the outset of the recapitulation—Solo 3—and its extraordinary treatment of the return of R1:\P. Instead of allowing the music to burst into the customary $B\flat^{6}$ crisis (followed at once by $B\flat^{6}_{4}$), the soloist jams a *fortissimo*, fully packed E-major chord above the D bass (also played by the left hand). This creates the E^{4}_{2} shock in m. 311, rivaling the analogous passage in Beethoven's Ninth. Summoning unanticipated resources at the piece's darkest hour, the soloist trumps the blackness of the moment with a blaze of light. The musical ultimacy of this sonic moment (vertically) is enhanced by its placement (horizontally) at one of the most crucial points in any minor-mode sonata: the triggering of the recapitulatory rotation, within which the expositional materials must be reconfronted and, by its end, resolved in either victory (major mode) or defeat (minor mode). Moreover, although the onset of the recapitulation is often the site of the vestigial third tutti in the orchestra (R3), its role is usurped here by this pianistic intervention. Straining to seize control over R1:\P, the soloist has elbowed R3 out of the way. One cannot improve upon Dubiel's remarks: at the moment of recapitulation "the specter of the B♭ chord arises again. . . . The piano's E six-four-two in m. 311 . . . works for the [D] tonic, even as it pushes the tonic aside, because it finally breaks the spell of the B♭ chord."[65] And it is the soloist who now commands the thematic material of R1:\P, full force, for the next several measures.

But that module is not so readily overtaken. The E^{4}_{2} sets off a struggle, with the R1:\P material, now in the piano, sounded in extenso, replete with perilous, mocking trills and downward-cascading leaps. Not only is the theme's initial portion harmonically reconceived, but it also features two vertiginous tritone leaps in the bass (D–G♯ in m. 317; G–C♯ in m. 327)—sonic images of a disorienting madness or howling malevolence, of the *diabolus in musica*. Measures 310–27 are referential measures, recomposing mm. 1–18 bar for bar. R1:\P regains its original harmonic footing in the center of m. 327, and mm. 328–34 are more literal correspondence measures with mm. 19–25 (at the original pitch level but reorchestrated), finally completing the remainder of the chromatic-tetrachord descent (C♯–C♮–B♮–B♭–A) begun with the D in mm. 310–16.

The correspondence measures are left behind at m. 334, the start of the recapitulation's recomposed transition zone; the original transition (Example 8.2) is abandoned. The struggle with R1:\P continues into the next several bars, intensifying toward the *fortissimo* V^{6}_{4} at m. 341. With the arrival of that $^{6}_{4}$ the impassioned, full orchestra pours forth S1:\P^{pref}, a theme associated more properly with the soloist (and here, with its newly charged verve, sounding quasi-"Hungarian"). In the context of such intense conflict, that module seems impulsively grabbed

onto, orchestrally blurted as a gesture of desperation (perhaps trying also to discharge its postponed, pent-up R3 pressure). Adding to this impression, its placement is dislocated. In normative rotational order, if it were to reappear at all, it would have been presented before R1:\P, not after it. All this suggests a culminating frenzy of disorientation.[66]

This revised passage moves through a series of stepwise-ascending tonalities, D minor (the movement's tonic), E minor, and F♯ minor, which winds up preparing for the return of S1:\TM^{1} (= R1:\S) in that unexpected key in m. 366. The revision proceeds in three discrete blocks, the first of which is the modulatory model, mm. 341–48. This model starts out with a fierce *fortissimo* in D minor (S1:\P^{pref}, initially over V) that is almost immediately choked back to *piano* to produce a "Picardy" D-major cadence at m. 345. Again we experience a glimpse of the larger tonal vision of the concerto: D minor giving way to D major (above which a smiling, major-mode fragment of R1:\P is briefly heard in the horn, mm. 345–46). But that D major is only short-lived: with the soloist's rippling entry at m. 345 ($F\sharp^{o7}$), it evaporates and is led into E minor at m. 348. Measures 348–55 sound a dynamically subdued sequence of the model: E minor to E major (m. 352, with the R1:\P fragment now sounded in the cellos) and thence to F♯ minor, m. 355. At this point the soloist picks up its own melody, S1:\P^{pref}, with what initially seems to be the start of another sequence but is instead a transposition of a chordal succession associated with that module at its first sounding (mm. 355–61 = 95–101, up a major third); the pianist thus refashions the theme more closely to its original presentation. This generates a half cadence in F♯ minor at m. 361, which is then made to function as a medial caesura ushering in five bars of caesura fill and the onset of S1:\TM^{1} in that remote key.

Bringing back S1:\TM^{1} in ♯iii carries a number of implications. First and most important, that module is not to be resolved into the tonic at this point: within sonata space the *Grablied* will remain alienated from the tonic, incapable of being assimilated into it.[67] Second, that module relapses to its original, limpid version (Example 8.3a), not to its energized transformation sounded in the development (Example 8.3b). Third, its F♯ minor counterbalances the opening tutti's presentation of the theme in B♭ minor: both are a major third away from the D tonic; both are in the minor mode; and both belong to the same hexatonic system.[68] Fourth, hexatonically (via a simple *Leittonwechsel* operation), F♯ minor can suggest a deflated alternative to the tonic, D major. F♯ minor is readily reinflated back to D major through a maximally smooth $\hat{5}$–$\hat{6}$ shift. Hexatonically construed, its remoteness instead turns out to be very close. One needs only to supply a tonal adjustment around the TM^{2} area to accomplish the transformation into D major, and this happens in mm. 374–75. While mm. 366–74 are referential measures to mm. 142–50, m. 375 (A^{7}) is more literally what Sonata Theory calls

the crux—the point at which, for the most part, this portion of the recapitulation begins to be a transposition of the analogous bars of the exposition with only small variants (m. 375 = 151, 376 = 152, and so on, in similar correspondence measures)—in this case preparing for the tonal resolution to be provided by S1:\TM³, now in D major. At this crux point, principles of symmetrical balance—a broad stretch of near-literal restatement, now in the tonic—supersede those of compositional invention.

Most of the tonal resolution, from S1:\TM³ onward, needs no extended commentary. The issues that it retraces are those of the expositional model, now transposed to the tonic, wherein any cadence or major-minor fluctuation takes on added significance. The articulation of the S3:\ESC ("essential structural closure") is of consummate importance: this is the goal of the entire sonata trajectory, carrying with it the hopes for the cadential resolution of the original D-minor premise into its parallel major. Tracking through the dozens of correspondence measures, one expects this to occur at m. 434, the major-mode, authentic-cadential moment parallel with the S1:\EEC at m. 210. And perhaps m. 434 should be understood in this way, although a small alteration in the right hand of the piano (suppressing the tonic pitch on its second note) renders this PAC slightly more attenuated than the one at m. 210. The main point, though, is that by the initial bars of the recapitulation's closing zone, mm. 434–37, the minor-mode problem of the movement appears to have been overcome. D minor has been transformed into an extended stretch of D major (m. 381ff.) and confirmed by major-mode authentic cadences (mm. 408, 423, 434). The apparatus of the sonata has done its work and provided us with what promises to be a successful outcome. By m. 437 (= m. 213), four bars into the cozy, subdominant-leaning fade-out (and some thirteen bars short of a complete retracing of the expositional model's concluding music), all seems secure.

Then the illusion collapses. In m. 438 ominous timpani strokes intrude: dominant and tonic, *piano* and *marcato*. Suddenly the soloist's reverie-like arpeggiations shift from D major to D minor. With a chill, we enter a region of loss. Everything so far gained through the sonata process slips through our grasp. Here, near the end of the recapitulation, the sonata is shown to have modally failed. It has proven unable to overturn the original situation, D minor, into a permanent D major. With the unexpected darkening into D minor—the return of the repressed—the soloist's arpeggiations, *pianissimo* and *diminuendo*, shrivel away, marked with falling lines in both right and left hands like musical tears or images of expiration. Particularly notable is that the left hand, mm. 440–42, reinscribes most of the descending chromatic tetrachord (from tonic to dominant, D–C♯–C♮–B♭–A) that had provided the bass underpinning for R1:\P at the movement's beginning. In this case, however, the half cadence on the dominant

of D minor (mm. 442–43) produces an unexpected medial-caesura effect (i:HC MC), whose subsequent upbeat fill, m. 443, recalls that of mm. 45, 141, and 277. What is being prepared is a return of the *Grablied,* which has yet to be sounded in the tonic.

Merger: End of Recapitulation and Coda (mm. 444–50, 451–84)

But to sound the *Grablied* in its original, mournful version (Example 8.3a) would be only to return to the original condition of static grieving. This could suggest an inability to continue to pursue the task of modal overcoming in subsequent movements. Instead, at m. 444 the soloist bolts forward with the resolute version of that module (Example 8.3b), originally introduced in the development and regrasped here in D minor (over V), with even more energetic determination (*Tempo 1 poco più animato*, even, by bar 446, *più agitato*). Is m. 444 the beginning of the coda, following an open end to recapitulatory space? Although opinion on this matter is not unanimous, Tovey, Böttinger, and Dubiel all think so.[69] Intuitively, one might suppose that the sudden change of tempo and texture argues in its favor, and within a few bars, with the frenzied return of the major-minor struggles associated with R1:\P (m. 451), a new rotation of materials has begun, obviously infused with coda rhetoric. But we also recall that at the m. 443 fade-out, the equivalent of mm. 216–26 had not yet been sounded (the exposition's final bars, valedictory memories of the R1:\S *Grablied*). In other words, at m. 443 the recapitulatory rotation of expositional materials is not complete. Thus the tonic return of Example 8.3b at this point, even while suggesting coda rhetoric, alludes to the calmer, earlier recall of Example 8.3a, in III, at the end of the exposition. It is doubtless for this reason that some analysts—notably Carl Dahlhaus and Renate Ulm—have deferred the onset of the coda to the return of R1:\P at m. 451.[70] The plunge forward of mm. 444–50 serves both as a reference to the conclusion of the expositional rotation and as the onset of contrasting coda rhetoric, although perhaps not yet, strictly considered, the coda proper. Instead, it is a solo-led *crescendo* link into the more explicit coda that follows in m. 451, a *fortissimo* tutti that is also a recrafting of the R4 expectation, even as the soloist continues to be heard. The traditional cadenza is suppressed: another indication of Brahms's "symphonic," not virtuosic, intention.

The tumultuous coda enacts a struggle to avoid—but ultimately to be overwhelmed by—the gravitational force of a concluding, negative cadence in D minor.[71] The electrifying D-major (D^6) onset of R1:\P at m. 451 cannot be sustained. It leads, through G-minor coloration, to an emphatic A-major cadence in m. 461, but this is only V of D minor, as the roaring octaves in the piano above it im-

mediately show. By m. 466 the soloist wails out variants of S1:\P^pref in desperate attempts to forestall any D-minor cadence. In vain. After two swirling windups (mm. 474–75, 476–77) D minor asserts itself once and for all, slamming the iron door shut with a final i:PAC and resounding bars of confirmation, mm. 481–84.

* * *

In sum: the moment-to-moment processes of this movement (along with the whole concerto) intervened into the heated aesthetic and cultural issues of mid-century Germany. The work was a monumental manifesto, allying itself with a more classicizing tradition of which young Brahms saw himself as the emerging champion. This aspect of the movement was evident in two conspicuous ways: in its full-blown presentation of a bulky, Type 5 sonata, pointing back toward a revered Austro-Germanic tradition (with Beethoven as the foremost model); and in the aspiration to write a movement that is more symphonic than virtuosic—a movement that displays its suppression of technical bravura at the telling points in the form where they would have been most expected.

In terms of structure, the movement stages a "purely musical" drama that initially lays down the image of a catastrophic D-minor situation and then seeks to overcome it through the D-minor-to-D-major potential of the sonata process. The resulting Type 5 sonata is organized around seven contrasting musical modules whose successions may be construed by the listener as laying out a quest narrative in search of a lasting D major. The initial crisis (R1:\P) invites interpretation via differing levels of metaphorical connotation, although in one way or another the evocation of Robert Schumann, or, more generally, the aesthetic position that he held, hovers over the entire conception. Ultimately, Brahms constructed this first-movement sonata as failing, as being unable to sustain the seemingly secure D-major reverie outcome that fills most of the recapitulation's second half, until the decay near its end. The disintegration back to D minor, and thus to the condition of the original problem, is enhanced in the coda, whose inescapable currents sweep away any apparent gains made in individual moments in the preceding sonata.

But this is only the first act of a three-act drama. The D-major vision will glow again in the "Benedictus" movement that follows (Adagio and also in 6/4): the "gentle portrait" of Clara Schumann—a radiantly contemplative offering whose thematic materials, however much they contrast with those of the first, may be heard as transformations of some of that earlier movement's modules.[72] And while the Type 4 finale (sonata-rondo) will recollapse the Adagio's D major to D minor, it will, in the end, push through to a more permanent D major. Here too, as is always pointed out, the finale's rondo theme is a fast-tempo,

minor-mode transformation of the first movement's hymnic S1:\TM^3, as if the process initiated earlier is regenerated under new terms. Even as the conclusion of the first movement is a representation of bitter defeat, the drama is by no means over.

Notes

1. Giselher Schubert, "Themes and Double Themes: The Problem of the Symphonic in Brahms," *19th-Century Music* 18/1 (1994): 10–23 (quotation from p. 13).

2. James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

3. English-language summaries of these two issues may be found in George S. Bozarth, "Brahms's First Piano Concerto op. 15: Genesis and Meaning," in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Konzerts: Festschrift Siegfried Kross zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Reinmar Emans and Matthias Wendt (Bonn: Gudrun Schröder Verlag, 1990), 211–47. See also Siegfried Kross, "Brahms and E. T. A. Hoffmann," *19th-Century Music* 5/3 (1982): 193–200; Christopher Reynolds, "A Choral Symphony by Brahms?," *19th-Century Music* 9/1 (1985): 3–25.

4. A summary of the stages of the compositional process is provided in Juan Martin Koch, *Das Klavierkonzert des 19. Jahrhunderts und die Kategorie des Symphonischen: Zur Kompositions- und Rezeptionsgeschichte der Gattung von Mozart bis Brahms* (Sinzig: Studio, 2001), 305–25. Among other things, Koch clarifies and provides dates for three different layers of the final autograph score.

5. The principal exception here is Joseph Dubiel's "Contradictory Criteria in a Work of Brahms," in *Brahms Studies* 1, ed. David Brodbeck (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), 81–110. Germanic discussions—including Giselher Schubert's and Juan Martin Koch's (nn. 1 and 4 above)—tend to stem from Carl Dahlhaus's overview in *Johannes Brahms: Klavierkonzert Nr. 1 D-Moll, op. 15* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1965). A more casual reading of the concerto had been provided decades earlier by Donald Francis Tovey, "Brahms: Pianoforte Concerto in D Minor, op. 15," in *Concertos*, vol. 3 of *Essays in Musical Analysis* (London: Oxford University Press, 1936), 114–20.

6. 3 February 1859, repr. in Dahlhaus, *Johannes Brahms*, 30: "Und dieses Würgen und Wühlen, dieses Zerren und Ziehen, diesen Zusammenflicken and wieder Auseinanderreissen von Phrasen und Floskeln muß man über Dreiviertelstunde lang ertragen!" (And this throttling and rummaging about, this tugging and pulling, this patching up and tearing apart again of phrases and clichés—one must put up with it over three-quarters of an hour!) Translation by the author.

7. Chopin's Piano Concerto No. 1 in E Minor, op. 11, is also an extended work: a first movement of around twenty minutes, with the whole concerto requiring just under forty.

8. "Adolf Schubring: Five Early Works by Brahms (1862)," trans. Walter Frisch, in *Brahms and His World*, rev. ed., ed. Frisch and Kevin C. Karnes (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009), 212. Joachim's D-Minor Violin Concerto (*Konzert in ungarischer Weise*), op. 11, from the late 1850s—a sibling work by one of Brahms's closest friends of the time and one that was dedicated to him—similarly features a twenty-minute initial movement within a complete-work duration of about forty minutes. On the complementarity of the two concertos, see Malcolm MacDonald, "'Veiled Symphonies'?: The Concertos,"

in *The Cambridge Companion to Brahms,* ed. Michael Musgrave (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 160–61.

9. The simile is only fanciful, stressing the forward-vectored yet triple-time "rocking" motion. Still, within a different tradition, compare the § in, say, the sea-voyage first movement of Rimsky-Korsakov's *Sheherazade* (1888), whose principal theme also sports two clipped, downbeat quarter notes.

10. Is it relevant to note that, according to a 1914 report by Charles Villiers Stanford, when in the later nineteenth century Brahms himself conducted the First Piano Concerto he did so in a way that brought out the movement's "rhythmical swing," namely, "in an uneven four," with alternating strong and weak beats on counts 1, 3, 4, and 6? See Bernard D. Sherman, "How Different Was Brahms's Playing Style from Our Own?," in *Performing Brahms: Early Evidence of Performance Style,* ed. Michael Musgrave and Sherman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 6.

11. Alexander Rehding, *Music and Monumentality: Commemoration and Wonderment in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 26–27.

12. For our purposes narrative can be taken to imply a planned succession of contrasting (and recurring) affective or connotational states that invite us to interpret them metaphorically within a cultural tradition of generic norms.

13. See the broader discussion of metaphor and narrative in Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory,* 251–54.

14. James Hepokoski, "Sonata Theory and Dialogic Form," in *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre,* by William E. Caplin, James Hepokoski, and James Webster, ed. Pieter Bergé (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009), 71–89; and Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory,* e.g., 9–11, 340–42, 614–18.

15. By the 1850s, and probably even several decades before, the term *tutti* is preferable to *ritornello,* which in this context can seem fussily archaic. For concertos of the Mozart-Beethoven era, Darcy and I use the terms *ritornello* and *tutti* interchangeably—as they were used in the late eighteenth century (*Elements of Sonata Theory,* 445–47). Ritornello reminds one of the classical concerto's origins in earlier concerto formats; tutti is a more neutral label.

16. Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory,* 345, 431–33, 469–95.

17. The Type 3 sonata is that of the standard, textbook format: exposition, development, recapitulation. A Type 3 sonata without expositional repeat—increasingly an option in modern symphonies and sonatas from the 1830s onward—reduced the grand-scale symphonic or sonata-oriented format to that of the overture, which generically lacked an expositional repeat.

18. The issue of the "symphonic concerto" or the "Sinfonie mit obligatem Klavier" has swirled around Brahms's concerto ever since its 1859 premiere. Juan Martin Koch has recently provided a study of such concertos in *Das Klavierkonzert des 19. Jahrhunderts* (see n. 4 above). Koch (319) essentially agrees with Peter Böttinger, who sought to locate symphonic aspects of Brahms's op. 15 in its polyphonic and contrapuntal moments—particularly with regard to the first theme of the opening tutti—and in its treatment of orchestral sound considered apart from thematic materials. Böttinger, "Jahre der Krise, Krise der Form: Beobachtungen am 1. Satz des Klavierkonzertes op. 15 von Johannes Brahms," in *Aimez-vous Brahms "the Progressive"?,* ed. H.-K. Metzger and R. Riehn (Munich: Fritz Kriechbaumer, 1989), 41–68.

19. A more nuanced discussion of the minor-mode sonata and its implications may be found in Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory,* 306–17. See also Hepokoski, "Approaching the First Movement of Beethoven's *Tempest* Sonata through Sonata Theory," in *Beethoven's* Tempest *Sonata: Perspectives of Analysis and Performance,* ed. Pieter Bergé, Jeroen D'hoe, and William E. Caplin, Analysis in Context: Leuven Studies in Musicology, vol. 2 (Leuven, Belgium, and Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2009), 181–212.

20. On the terms *tutti* and *ritornello,* see n. 15 above. To avoid a revision of shorthand labeling in this essay, I have retained the first part of Sonata Theory's label for ritornello or tutti themes: R1:\. The alternative T1:\, however, referring to the first tutti, is also possible. The Type 5 labeling system is laid out in Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory,* 451–53.

21. Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory,* 447–51.

22. Explicating the action zones and their symbols is the burden of much of Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory.* For an expository summary, see 14–22.

23. For more on the referential-layout function vis-à-vis subsequent rotations, see Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory,* 469, 470–75.

24. Dubiel, "Contradictory Criteria," 81.

25. Robert S. Hatten interprets the "annunciatory force" of this chord as deriving from the same "recitative chord" at the opening to the recapitulation in the first movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony (another monumental work). *Musical Meaning in Beethoven: Markedness, Correlation, and Interpretation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 183–84.

26. The bare octaves make this a case of an "attenuated" PAC. See Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory,* 170.

27. Both comments are cited in Bozarth, "Brahms's First Piano Concerto," 213. Original German and translation also in Reynolds, "A Choral Symphony by Brahms?," 4, 24 n. 8.

28. Styra Avins, *Johannes Brahms: Life and Letters,* trans. Josef Eisinger and Styra Avins (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 36.

29. Bozarth, "Brahms's First Piano Concerto," 211–15, 222; Koch, *Das Klavierkonzert des 19. Jahrhunderts,* 305–309; Dahlhaus, *Johannes Brahms,* 3; Reynolds, "A Choral Symphony by Brahms?," 5.

30. The dating here follows Koch, *Das Klavierkonzert des 19. Jahrhunderts,* 309.

31. Such, more or less (though our descriptions differ slightly), is the view of Richard Taruskin, *The Nineteenth Century,* vol. 3 of *The Oxford History of Western Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 686–88. Taruskin's larger point is to call attention to Brahms's subsequent suppression of the pictorial realism in favor of other, aesthetically ideological purposes.

32. Roger W. H. Savage, *Hermeneutics and Music Criticism* (New York: Routledge, 2010): "ontological vehemence," x, 5, 84, 87, 93, 123, 138; "fundamental element," 110; "dimensions of experience," 102; "refigures our inherence," 109 and elsewhere. Savage links his assertion regarding the affective content of music with the "state of mind" or "attunement" suggested in Heidegger's existential *Stimmungen,* or moods, background manners or colorations "in which we inhabit the world" (93–95, 101–102, 104). Heidegger's objectless *Stimmungen,* attributes of *Dasein,* are also appealed to (via Heinrich Besseler) by Karol Berger in *A Theory of Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 200–201.

33. On Marx, Schumann, and *Seelenzustände,* see Scott Burnham, "Criticism, Faith, and the 'Idee': A. B. Marx's Early Reception of Beethoven," *19th-Century Music* 13/3 (1990): 188 n. 26, 191; Leon B. Plantinga, *Schumann as Critic* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1967), 120; and Beate Perrey, *Schumann's* Dichterliebe *and Early Romantic Poetics: Fragmentation of Desire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 19 ("'rare' and 'secret states of the soul'"), 36, 64, 113, 137–39.

34. James Hepokoski, "Beethoven Reception: The Symphonic Tradition," in *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Music,* ed. Jim Samson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 424–59, esp. 426–30.

35. Taruskin, *The Nineteenth Century*, 688. Further D-minor relationships with Schumann's music—beyond the fourth symphony—are suggested in Reynolds, "A Choral Symphony by Brahms?," 7–8.

36. Repr. in Dahlhaus, *Johannes Brahms*, 29–30: "Die Gedanken schleichen entweder matt und siechhaft dahin, oder sie bäumen sich in fieberkranker Aufgeregtheit in die Höhe, um desto erschöpfter zusammenzubrechen; ungesund mit einem Worte ist das ganze Empfinden und Erfinden in dem Stucke. . . . Von einer organischen Entwicklung und einem logischen Fortspinnen ist gar selten die Rede."

37. Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 483–84. As noted in that discussion, it had been common to compose the spirited R1:\TR in such a way as to allow its opening portion to serve as the elided onset of R2, following the normative trill cadence at the end of S1.

38. Issues of key-choice for R1:\S are central to all conceptions of Type 5 concerto structure. As noted in Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 488–90, the late eighteenth-century (Mozartian) norm for *major-mode* concertos, with only a few notable exceptions, was to sound R1:\S in the tonic, thus retaining the tonic key throughout an essentially nonmodulatory opening tutti. Julian Horton has pointed out, however, that by the 1790s some composers—such as John Field—moved to V (within major-mode concertos) for the whole of R1:\S and typically returned to the tonic toward the end of R1 in preparation for the soloist's entry. See Horton, "John Field and the Alternative History of Concerto First-Movement Form," *Music & Letters* 92 (2011): 43–82, esp. 56–60. "The modulating R1" (an option that also occurs, at least as a modulatory "feint," in Beethoven's first three piano concertos) is "a practice that gained currency in London in the 1790s and was sustained throughout the nineteenth century in concerti from Hummel to Brahms" (56).

In the first half of the nineteenth century minor-mode concertos written in the Type 5 format often moved to III to begin R1:\S—like a sonata exposition, opening up an alternative space of light—although that relative-major key normally collapsed back to the tonic minor at some point before the end of R1 (see n. 44 below; for some exceptions, see n. 45). Less frequently, a minor-mode Type 5 could present the opening of its R1:\S in the tonic major, as in Chopin's Piano Concerto No. 1 in E Minor, op. 11, whose R1:\S starts in E major before being reclaimed by E minor. See also the discussion of concerto form in Claudia Macdonald, *Robert Schumann and the Piano Concerto* (New York: Routledge, 2005).

39. On hexatonic poles, along with an interpretation of them in terms of the *unheimlich*, see Richard Cohn, "Uncanny Resemblances: Tonal Signification in the Freudian Age," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57/2 (2004): 285–323.

40. Joachim to Brahms, 4 December 1856 ("wunderbar schönen ersten Moll-Gesang"), commenting on the (now-lost) first version of this movement—one that apparently lacked any major-mode alternative theme in its solo exposition. See, e.g., Koch, *Das Klavierkonzert des 19. Jahrhunderts*, 313, who associates Joachim's comment with both R1:\TR and R1:\S. Compare n. 56 below.

41. Dubiel, "Contradictory Criteria," 105.

42. On the attenuated PAC (octaves, m. 66), see n. 26 above.

43. Dubiel, "Contradictory Criteria," 84, suggests a different reading of the cadence at m. 66 followed at once by that "B♭^{6}": "The qualification of D [m. 66] consists in its immediate reorientation back toward the B♭ chord that initially delayed it—as though the resolution of this chord somehow did not take and the process must be attempted all over again." To the extent that one emphasizes the cadence on D minor as "not taking," one might propose that this unsettling undoes the R1:\EEC effect at m. 66—thereby construing the remaining modules of R1 as extensions of S space. While remaining open to this option, my preference is to regard m. 66 as R1:\EEC, in part because the return of R1:\P is a more characteristic C than S gesture.

44. Examples of modulatory R1s that bring back the minor-tonic key (but not R1:\P) toward the end of R1 abound in the first decades of the nineteenth century. To cite only a sample: Hummel, Piano Concerto No. 2 in A Minor, op. 85/i (a–C–a) and No. 3 in B Minor, op. 89/i (b–D–b); Moscheles, Piano Concerto No. 3 in G Minor, op. 60/i (g–B♭–g); Ries, Piano Concerto No. 3 in C♯ Minor, op. 55/i (c♯–E–c♯) and No. 4 in C Minor, op. 115/i (c–E♭–c); Kalkbrenner, Piano Concerto No. 1 in D Minor, op. 61/i (d–F–d) and No. 2 in E Minor, op. 80 [86]/i (e–G–e). Compare Mozart, Piano Concerto No. 20 in D Minor, K. 466/i, in which R1:\S leads off in an F major that it cannot sustain; and Beethoven, Piano Concerto No. 3 in C Minor, op. 37/i, in which R1:\S begins in E♭.

Four examples of both major-mode and minor-mode concertos that return to the tonic with a second sounding of R1:\P are cited in Horton, "John Field and the Alternative History," 56–60. "Field composed a modulating R1 for five of his seven [piano] concerti, nos. 1 (1799), 2 (1810), 3 (published 1816; date of completion uncertain), 4 (1812–15), and 7 (1832, although the first movement was completed in 1822). He adopts two basic variants: either A [our R1:\P] is reprised in the tonic before the soloist enters [the "ternary" option]; or the non-tonic end of B [essentially our R1:\S, perhaps extending in some cases into R1:\C] is linked to the tonic solo entry via a modulating retransition" (57). Of the seven concertos, no. 7 (in C minor) is the only minor-mode work. See also n. 38 above.

45. The example perhaps best known to Brahms was the companion piece to his own piano concerto, Joachim's Violin Concerto in D Minor, op. 11/i, "Hungarian," which introduces R1:\S in an F major that persists to the end of the opening tutti. (A solo bridge cadenza leads back to D minor and Solo 1.) Similarly, in Brahms's Piano Concerto No. 2 in B♭, op. 83/i, the key of R1:\S (D minor, iii) persists to the end of R1 (m. 65, although three bars of aftermath fill return us to V/B♭, m. 69). See also the examples of Field's piano concertos (surely also known to Brahms), cited in nn. 38 and 44 above.

46. While Schumann's Violin Concerto was not published until 1937, it was composed in 1853—the period in which he first became acquainted with Brahms. The concerto was certainly known to Joachim and thus probably to Brahms as well, since the former had been involved with a private reading of the concerto in Hanover in January 1854.

47. Note the coincidence(?) of the rhythmic configuration of R1:\C$^{1.2}$ with a not-dissimilar module in the first movement of Schumann's third symphony, mm. 25–30, 77–82 (in between whose appearances one also encounters a full-throated return of P at m. 56).

48. On *Jubelrufe* in the nineteenth-century repertory, see Constantin Floros, *Gustav Mahler* (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1977), 2:211–14, 392. Renate Ulm interprets this initial sounding of R1:\C$^{1.3}$ as "a kind of 'Hunt-motive.'" "'Lässt er noch keine Pauken und Drommeten erschallen?': 1. Klavierkonzert D-Moll, op. 15," in *Johannes Brahms: Das symphonische Werk: Entstehung, Deutung, Wirkung*, ed. Ulm (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1996), 130.

49. Those who had heard intertextual allusions of R1:\P to portions of Schumann's fourth symphony might also imagine that this new melody at m. 91, S1:\P^{pref}, in its sinuous working around the intervals between F and C♯, is not dissimilar to another generative motive of that symphony, for example, mm. 2–4, 5–7. On the other hand, its rhythm, based on that of R1:\C$^{1.2}$, also recalls the rhythm from Schumann's third, mentioned in n. 47 above.

50. Tovey, "Brahms: Pianoforte Concerto," 116.

51. Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 498, 511–12, 516–20.

52. Immediately following the 1859 premiere of Brahms's concerto, his assailant in the *Signale für die musikalische Welt*, Eduard Bernsdorf (nn. 6 and 36 above), remarked acidly that "the composer has deliberately made the principal part of this concerto as uninteresting as possible" (repr. in Dahlhaus, *Johannes Brahms*, 30; also quoted in Roger Moseley, "Between Work and Play: Brahms as Performer of His Own Music," in Frisch and Karnes, *Brahms and His World*, rev. ed., 139).

53. Apart from the special problem addressed in this work, ambiguities in the boundary point of S1 are common in concertos whose initial entry is a newly thematic S1:\P$^{\text{pref}}$ (Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory,* 519). Concertos that feature a S1:\P$^{\text{pref}}$ typically lead to a restatement of R1:\P in the orchestra, unlike the situation here (511).

54. In an earlier (now lost) version of this movement, this passage, along with its analogue in the recapitulation, was apparently longer and even more blustery before Brahms's revisions of either November–December 1857 or February 1858; these were among the last compositional retouchings that he made in this movement. Koch, *Das Klavierkonzert des 19. Jahrhunderts,* 314–18. See n. 4 above.

55. Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory,* 170–77, explicates the concept of the trimodular block; 535–42 discuss the trimodular block in the context of the Type 5 sonata. The latter section explores Mozartian treatments of the trimodular block in Type 5 sonatas; Mozart, more typically, revisited R1:\S as the third module of the trimodular block, TM^3, the reverse of the procedure found here in Brahms's concerto.

56. It is likely that Brahms's (no longer available) first draft of this movement, from late summer and early autumn 1856, lacked the major-mode theme that now starts at m. 157. On 4 December 1856, after reviewing that initial draft, Joachim suggested that to the "wonderfully beautiful minor-mode song" (n. 40 above) he add "something correspondingly elevated and beautiful . . . in major" (cited in Dahlhaus, *Johannes Brahms,* 5; Koch, *Das Klavierkonzert des 19. Jahrhunderts,* 313).

57. Hearing mm. 157–60, an obvious antecedent, one expects that m. 161 will begin a parallel consequent. That pseudo-consequent, however, leads to another III:HC at m. 166 and moves onward to a new idea at that point. This converts the "two antecedents" into the presentation of a large-scale sentence. See Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory,* 125–28, which discusses a parallel case in Beethoven's First Symphony.

58. Tovey, "Brahms: Pianoforte Concerto," 116; Dubiel, "Contradictory Criteria," 99; Roger Moseley, "Brief Immortality: Recasting History in the Music of Brahms" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2004), 131.

59. The PAC is slightly attenuated at m. 210, since the right hand of the piano does not sound F on the downbeat of that bar. While the closure may not be completely full, I nonetheless regard it as the effective point of closure for S1's secondary-theme space.

Retrospectively, we may construe the double sounding of the horn call (mm. 199, 210) as a valedictory gesture belonging "naturally" in C space. The III:IAC in m. 199 provides an impression so close to full closure that it is as if the horn misunderstands the situation and releases itself prematurely (with preplanned C material). Within two bars, however, Brahms stages the narrative as if "realizing" that a full-closure III:PAC (S1:\EEC) has not yet been attained. Consequently, as a recovery move, the bass moves downward to $\hat{3}$, the typical I^6 onset of an expanded cadential progression, seeking to initiate the characteristic motion toward producing the PAC not achieved at m. 199. Along the way, that cadence is evaded (mm. 203–204), the expected A bass darkens to A♭, and so on. The PAC (S1:\EEC) is finally attained at m. 210, whereupon the horn call is rereleased, now situated in the proper place and heard over a tonic pedal that confirms C-space.

60. Compare "C as S-aftermath," in Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory,* 182–83.

61. Measures 216–26 are constructed on two cycles of an $\hat{8}$–$\flat\hat{7}$–$\hat{6}$–$\natural\hat{7}$–$\hat{8}$ module, circling around an attained tonic usually held in the bass as a pedal point. This is a common procedure within the tradition, often found within closing zones (Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory,* 184). Its presence helps to support the interpretation of mm. 210–26 as S1:\C (post-EEC).

62. Alternatively, if one had decided not to construe mm. 216–26 as R2, one might suppose that this R1:\P at mm. 231–32 represents a vestigial memory of the traditionally *forte* R2 gesture (the second tutti), merging immediately into Solo 2 at m. 233.

63. Dubiel, "Contradictory Criteria," 106–107, makes much of this R1:\TR passage, and particularly of its rising bass-line succession C (m. 259), C♯ (m. 263), D (m. 271), reversing (or undoing) the "abnorm" of the D–C♯–C succession first heard in mm. 1–22 and thus providing a strong corrective action on the way to further assimilations in the recapitulation.

64. This is one of the few development sections in the repertory to end with an explicit perfect authentic cadence in the tonic (as opposed to being interrupted on V). The absolutism of this cadential moment seems to have impressed Mahler, who composed an analogous, though further radicalized, reentry into the recapitulation in the first movement of his Symphony No. 2 in C Minor, "Resurrection."

65. Dubiel, "Contradictory Criteria," 85.

66. Along with the coda, mm. 451–84, this entire transitional passage, mm. 339–62, was an April 1857 replacement for whatever had originally been in Brahms's second draft of the movement from December 1856 and very early January 1857—an improvement, wrote Brahms to Joachim on 22 April, of one of the earlier version's "weak spots." Koch, *Das Klavierkonzert des 19. Jahrhundert,* 314.

67. On the concept of tonal alienation within S or TMB modules, see Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory,* 245–47, 277–78. Thus far, R1:\S and its Example 8.3b variant have appeared in B♭ minor (m. 46), F minor (m. 142), B minor (m. 278), and F♯ minor (m. 366).

68. In this instance, this is what Richard Cohn dubbed the "southern" hexatonic system, incorporating major and minor triads on D, B♭, and F♯. See Cohn, "Maximally Smooth Cycles, Hexatonic Systems, and the Analysis of Late-Romantic Triadic Progressions," *Music Analysis* 15/1 (1996): 9–40; and "As Wonderful as Star Clusters: Instruments for Gazing at Tonality in Schubert," *19th-Century Music* 22/3 (1999): 213–32.

69. Tovey, "Brahms: Pianoforte Concerto," 117; Böttinger, "Jahre der Krise," 63; Dubiel, "Contradictory Criteria," 105.

70. Dahlhaus, *Johannes Brahms,* 10; Ulm, "'Lässt er noch keine Pauken,'" 128.

71. Measures 451–84 comprise a second-thought recomposition from April 1857; what was originally there is unknown. See Koch, *Das Klavierkonzert des 19. Jahrhunderts,* 316.

72. Reynolds, "A Choral Symphony by Brahms?," 6; Koch, *Das Klavierkonzert des 19. Jahrhunderts,* 326–31.