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ABSTRACT

Brahms's Duo-Piano Sonata and Piano Quintet in F minor, Opp. 34\textsuperscript{bis} and 34, are respectively the second and third versions of an archetypal concept which the composer had originally expressed as a String Quintet (now lost). Significant evidence of Brahms's creative process is to be found in the extant manuscripts of the two transcriptions: the working draft of Op. 34\textsuperscript{bis}, the copyist's manuscript of the same (corrected by Brahms), and the autograph of Op. 34. The following original printed sources have been available for comparison with these manuscripts: the second issue of the first edition of Op. 34\textsuperscript{bis} (published by J. Melchior Rieter-Biedermann \textit{circa} January 1872), and both the \textit{Erstdruck} and the third issue of the first edition of Op. 34 (brought forth by the same publisher in December 1865).

This study unravels the history of the original Quintet and of the two transcriptions, and examines the extant manuscripts in order to gain insight into Brahms's creative process. All of the information pertinent to the history of the three works has been retrieved from the correspondence between Brahms and his various friends. The chronology of revisions made by Brahms and others in the extant manuscripts has been determined for the first time. To supplement the examination of the creative process as evidenced in the manuscripts, this author has presented the revised first movement of Op. 34\textsuperscript{bis} and of Op. 34 (based upon the Rieter-Biedermann editions).
The study of the extant manuscripts has revealed Brahms's constant efforts to improve his initial creative impulses. In addition to making refinements in sonority and expression, he executed some important alterations in themes and accompanimental material. His continual re-evaluation of these works was stimulated not only by his own artistic convictions, but by external factors such as criticisms solicited from his friends, varying instrumental sonorities, and the impending performance and publication of each work.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When Johannes Brahms left his native Hamburg on his first excursion to Vienna in September 1862, he carried with him the manuscript of a newly-completed String Quintet in F minor. From the imperial capital he forwarded this work to three of his closest friends, including the famous violinist Joseph Joachim. The latter felt that the instrumentation lacked the sonority appropriate to some of the ideas. After hearing the work for himself, Brahms decided to alter it, and by early 1864 had transcribed it as a Duo-Piano Sonata. The première of this version, given by the composer and Carl Tausig in April 1864, was a failure. At the suggestion of his friend Hermann Levi, Brahms made yet another transcription, this time synthesizing the timbre of the piano with that of strings in a Piano Quintet. This final version was completed (except for a few revisions) by the end of October 1864.

The original String Quintet is now lost; probably it was destroyed by the composer. He preserved the Duo-Piano Sonata, refusing to consider it as a variant version of the Piano Quintet. Publication of the

---

1 Clara Schumann had received the first three movements after their completion in August; the finale was sent to her in December from Vienna. The entire work was forwarded to Joachim at the end of September 1862, and to Albert Dietrich the following April. See Chapter II.

latter took place in December 1865, although the Duo-Piano Sonata was not published until early 1872 because of the dedicatee's reluctance to relinquish the copyist's manuscript.

Significant evidence of the later stages of Brahms's creative process is to be found in the extant manuscripts of the two transcriptions: the autograph of the Sonata for Two Pianofortes, a corrected copyist's manuscript of the same, and the autograph of the Quintet for Piano, Two Violins, Viola and Violoncello. The first is obviously a working draft, in which Brahms made numerous alterations of notes, distribution of material, registers, and expression (phrasing and articulation, dynamics, and expression words). Many of these changes were not incorporated in any other source. The second manuscript, which


4 Again, the publisher was J. Melchior Rieter-Biedermann. See Chapter II, fn. 114.


served as the Stichvorlage for the composer's original edition,\(^8\) contains normal editorial corrections as well as a few revisions in expression and one change in register. The autograph of the Piano Quintet, which was used as a Stichvorlage, shows revisions of notes, distribution of material, registers, and expression. Some note-cancellations and refinements in expression were not incorporated in any of the printed sources.\(^9\) The relationships of the extant manuscripts to each other and to the lost String Quintet are illustrated in Example 1.

This study will attempt to unravel the history of the original Quintet and of the two transcriptions, and to examine the extant manuscripts in order to gain insight into Brahms's creative process. The history of all three works is based on information culled from a decade of correspondence between Brahms and several friends; pertinent extracts from various letters are translated and collected in an Appendix. The changes made by Brahms in the extant manuscripts of the later transcriptions are considered in chronological order, beginning with those that appear in the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata. The most significant revisions are described in the text, others are shown in

\(^8\) A print of the second issue, in the collection of original editions belonging to the late Donald M. McCorkle, was available for this study. Example 13 (the only xerographic illustration of Op. 34bis) was made from this print.

\(^9\) Brahms evidently notated these changes in his autograph when he was checking the galley proofs of the original edition. A xerographic copy of a print of the Erstdruck (i.e., the first impression/first state/first issue), and a print of the third issue, were examined in the course of this study. The xerographic copy and the print are in the collection of original editions belonging to the late Donald M. McCorkle. The copy was made from a print of the Erstdruck in the Hamburg Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek (No. M B/5460). In this thesis, all xerographic illustrations of Op. 34 (i.e., Examples 8\(7\)/2 and 14) were made from the print of the third issue.
Example 1. Stemma of Brahms's Opp. 34 and 34bis

Date  
completed by  
8 September 1862

completed in  
early 1864

completed by  
27 February  
1864

completed by  
the end of  
October 1864

December 1865

c. end of  
September 1871

c. January  
1872

Item  
String Quintet  
(now lost)

Working draft of Op. 34bis

Copyist's manuscript  
(later Stichvorlage)  
of Op. 34bis

further revision  
of working draft  
of Op. 34bis

Autograph manuscript  
(later Stichvorlage)  
of Op. 34

Original edition  
of Op. 34

further revision  
of working draft  
of Op. 34bis

further revision  
of copyist's  
manuscript of  
Op. 34bis

Original edition  
of Op. 34bis
accompanying tables. It has been necessary to include a discussion of numerous changes made by the copyist (when notating the Duo-Piano Sonata), and later incorporated by Brahms in the writing of the final transcription. One can assume that such alterations in the copyist's manuscript were executed according to Brahms's instructions.¹⁰

It has been impossible, within the scope of this study, to acknowledge insignificant mechanical changes made by Brahms in all three manuscripts. These revisions do not provide insight into the composer's creative process (e.g., measures 467-71 of the finale of Op. 34bis were painstakingly revised by Brahms before the copying of the working draft; see Example 2). As is the case in all subsequent illustrations, the cancellations which the composer made in lead are represented by broken lines; insertions executed in lead are indicated by parentheses. Stem directions and the placement of marks of articulation are the same as in the manuscript. The copyist made other small refinements in this passage.¹¹ Such minute changes also appear in the autograph of the Piano Quintet, as in measures 113 and 115 of the first movement (see Example 3).

After the completion of the Piano Quintet, Brahms never again availed himself of this particular ensemble. The first venture in this

¹⁰See Chapter V, pp. 105-06.

¹¹For the open octaves E₁-E and F₁-F in measures 467-68 of the working draft, the copyist substituted E-c and F-c. He omitted c-f and f in the left-hand part of the Secondo on the first beats of measures 468 and 470 respectively, and deleted the g' sustained at measures 469/6-70/1 in the right-hand part of the Primo. In the upper line of the right-hand part of the Secondo, he substituted f'' for d'' at measure 471. In the working draft, Brahms later cancelled the reading in the Secondo and wrote a slightly different version. See Chapter VII, pp. 165-66.
Example 2. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, finale (Poco sostenuto—Allegro non troppo—Presto non troppo), measures 467/3-69 in the working draft

Example 3. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34, 1st movement (Allegro non troppo), measures 113-15 of the first- and second-violin parts in the autograph manuscript

little-used medium had been Schubert's Piano Quintet in A major (1819), the famous Forellen Quintet. Brahms's fine performance of this work had helped to secure his first appointment in 1857, at the princely court of Detmold. There can be no question about his familiarity with Schumann's
splendid Piano Quintet in E flat, Op. 44 (1842-43). Like Schumann's work, Brahms's Piano Quintet is scored for piano and the usual string quartet, while Schubert's included a double bass instead of a second violin.

The F-minor String Quintet was neither the first work nor the last which Brahms recast for a different medium. The Serenade in D major (1857-58) was originally sketched for eight instruments, but was finally arranged for orchestra and published as Op. 11. A more famous example is the Piano Concerto in D minor, Op. 15, written during the years 1854-59. It was drafted as a work for two pianos, and Brahms intended to turn it into a symphony. However, the orchestration did not proceed to his satisfaction, and he finally decided to combine the media of orchestra and piano in a concerto, just as he later synthesized two media in the creation of the F-minor Piano Quintet. The Variations on a Theme of Haydn were completed in the summer of 1873 as a work for two pianos; by the middle of September Brahms had written a version for orchestra.

The Duo-Piano Sonata and Piano Quintet constitute the first instance in which Brahms evidently regarded two versions of a composition as equals. This situation arose at only one other time in his career: he published the orchestral and duo-piano versions of the Haydn Variations as Opp. 56a and 56b respectively.

The young Brahms had arranged the Scherzo for piano solo in 1854, as a birthday present for Clara Schumann.

Brahms was not the only master who reworked his compositions after their initial completion. Bach revised the Johannespassion after its first performance (1723). Wagner, after he had finished the score of Parsifal, made changes in the instrumentation. Following the first performance of his Fifth Symphony (1904), Mahler altered the entire orchestration. See Max Graf, From Beethoven to Shostakovich: The Psychology of the Composing Process (n.p.: Philosophical Library, 1947; reprint ed., New York: Greenwood Press, 1969), pp. 443-47.
The String Quintet and the two later transcriptions were created during a period of transition in Brahms's life. With his first journey to Vienna in September 1862, he unconsciously took the first step in transferring his abiding place from Germany to the imperial capital. The process was a very gradual one; for many years he was without a permanent home, moving back and forth between Vienna, Hamburg, and other foreign parts. The elaboration of the String Quintet, and the subsequent composition and revision of the Duo-Piano Sonata and of the Piano Quintet, took place during various sojourns in Vienna, Hamburg, and the spa Baden-Baden.

During these transitionary years, Brahms's works exhibited characteristics of his youthful style as well as indications of his approaching maturity. This blending of styles is exemplified in his Piano Quintet, which combines much that is strongly romantic in spirit with moments of quiet and introspection. Perhaps the most symphonic of all Brahms's chamber music works, its massive sonorities and passionate, stormy energy bring to their highest point tendencies found in the two preceding Piano Quartets, Opp. 25 and 26 in G minor and A major respectively. Yet its periods of serenity point toward a style of greater repose, of "intellectual and spiritual concentration," that would distinguish the works of Brahms's maturity.


CHAPTER II

THE HISTORY OF OPP. 34 AND 34BIS

Brahms's habit of carrying ideas in his head for years, and of saying nothing about a new work until constant revision had made him reasonably satisfied with it, makes it impossible, in many instances, to know at what point a composition was begun. This is so in the case of the original String Quintet in F minor. No mention of it appears in any of the published correspondence until 29 August 1862, by which time the first three movements had already been completed.

1860–June 1862

It is possible that the String Quintet was started sometime between the beginning of 1860 and June of 1862, during which time Brahms, having resigned his post at Detmold after three seasons, was active chiefly in his native city. These few years were particularly happy and productive. Brahms enjoyed directing a small ladies' choir ever since the spring of 1859,¹ an appointment which encouraged him to write a long series of small-scale choral pieces. At the same time, his reputation as a composer was growing steadily. In 1860 the firm of N. Simrock, of Bonn (and later Berlin), published its first editions of his music. From then on, Brahms could be certain of seeing his works printed by one of

¹The size of the group had soon increased to forty, and it became known as the Hamburger Frauenchor (Hamburg Ladies' Choir).
his several publishers, among them the Swiss firm of J. Melchior Rieter-Biedermann, of Winterthur and, from 1862, Leipzig. This house issued several works in 1861.

During that year, Brahms continued to establish himself as a pianist and conductor. Many of his concerts were given jointly with the famous Hungarian violinist Joseph Joachim\(^2\) or the pianist Clara Schumann, who had become his two closest friends, or with the baritone Julius Stockhausen,\(^3\) the great interpreter of Schubert and Schumann, who was to inspire and introduce to the public many of Brahms's most beautiful songs. That summer, Brahms took an apartment that was very much to his liking in Hamm, a suburb of Hamburg, where he knew he would find the quiet necessary for his work.

Thus, these Hamburg years were a period of intense activity in congenial surroundings. Brahms created the first of the Romanzen aus L. Tieck's "Magelone," Op. 33 (dedicated to Stockhausen), and several songs, duets, and canons for voices. In the domain of instrumental music, he devoted himself to composing three large works: the two Piano Quartets, Opp. 25 and 26,\(^4\) and the Variations and Fugue on a Theme by Handel, Op.

\(^2\) The two musicians had met when the twenty-year-old Brahms was touring with the Hungarian violinist Eduard Reményi. As boys, Joachim and Reményi had been fellow students at the Viennese Conservatoire. Joachim had begun his concert career under the aegis of Mendelssohn, and was Royal Concertmaster in Hannover at the time of his meeting with Brahms, who was two years his junior. Between Joachim and Brahms there rapidly grew a deep attachment, and the violinist remained one of Brahms's most intimate friends for most of his life.

\(^3\) Brahms and Stockhausen had met in 1856 at the Rhine Music Festival at Düsseldorf. They soon had become close friends, and gave many concerts together during the next ten years.

\(^4\) In the published correspondence, no mention of these works appears until 29 July 1861. By that time, several movements of each had been sent to Clara. See Johannes Brahms, Clara Schumann--Johannes Brahms. Briefe aus den Jahren 1853–1896, im Auftrage von Marie Schumann hrsg.
24. He also completed the *Variations on a Theme by Schumann*, Op. 23, his earliest extant piano duet. According to his biographer Max Kalbeck, the first sketches of *Ein deutsches Requiem* must have been begun during this period.⁵

**June–December 1862**

In June of 1862 Brahms left Hamburg to meet his friend Albert Dietrich,⁶ court musical director at Oldenburg, at the Rhine Music Festival, given that year at Cologne from the eighth to the tenth of the month. Brahms found both the music and the company of his colleagues immensely stimulating.⁷ From Cologne, he and Dietrich journeyed to Bad Munster-am-Stein, in the Rheinpfalz (Palatinate). There they took rooms in an inn, close to where Clara Schumann was staying with her family. In a letter to Joachim, Brahms commented that he could not think of composing, but was enjoying the air and freedom.

---


⁶ Dietrich (1829-1908) had studied with Schumann at Düsseldorf from 1851 until 1854, during which time he and the young Brahms had become friends. He served as municipal music director at Bonn until 1861, and then at Oldenburg, where he worked until his retirement in 1890.

⁷ See his letter of 20 June to Joachim in the Appendix, p. 239.
However, his remark need not be taken seriously, especially since a letter from Dietrich to his wife reports that he and Brahms spent the mornings composing while Clara practised. In the afternoons they played music together, or made excursions into the beautiful countryside. Each day ended with the three of them participating in an evening of music at Clara's house.

The combination of idyllic surroundings, stimulating companionship, and daily music-making must surely have sparked Brahms's creative powers. Clara observed in a letter to Joachim, "Johannes regretted that he had not brought any real work with him so as not to loaf about, which he cannot stand for long." Kalbeck believes that Brahms occupied himself with the sketches for, among other things, the String Quintet in F minor. This makes particularly noteworthy Clara's remark that she and Brahms had played Schubert's great C-major String Quintet (D. 956) "several times" during Brahms's two-week stay. The F-minor String Quintet by Brahms, like that of Schubert, was scored for two cellos

---

8 As Kalbeck points out, Brahms "loved to boast about his alleged idleness" (liebte es mit seinger angelichen Faulheit zu renommiern). See Johannes Brahms, I/2: 476. On page 477, Kalbeck quotes Dietrich's letter to his wife (only an extract is given).

9 See Clara's letter of 1 July in the Appendix, p. 239.

10 See Kalbeck, Johannes Brahms, I/2: 476, II/1: 52. In addition to the sketches for the F minor String Quintet, Kalbeck mentions the sketches for the C minor Symphony, and for the Allegro, Adagio (later cancelled) and Scherzo of the E minor Cello Sonata, Op. 38. No mention of this Sonata appears in the published Brahms correspondence of 1862. Shortly before his arrival at Bad Münster he had sent Clara a packet of manuscripts which included a version of what was to become the first movement of the C minor Symphony, as well as what he had completed of the Magelonenlieder. These works were played in the course of the musical evenings at Clara's, and many other works of Brahms were enjoyed. See fn. 9. The C minor Symphony, Op. 68, was not completed in its final form until September 1876.

11 See Clara's letter of 1 July in the Appendix, p. 239.
instead of the more usual two violas, and may well have been begun at Bad Münster in a burst of enthusiasm for Schubert's masterpiece.

On 29 June, Dietrich and Brahms reluctantly left Bad Münster and, accompanied by Heinrich von Sahr, an old friend from Leipzig, made an impromptu walking tour of the Palatinate. Brahms returned to his pleasant rooms at Hamm on 10 July, and evidently set to work on the String Quintet. He made rapid progress, and by late August the first three movements had been completed and dispatched to Clara. She acknowledged them in a letter dated 29 August, explaining that she could not examine them until she returned to Luzern, in a few days' time, from a hastily-improvised excursion. On 3 September she expressed to Brahms her delight in the three movements. She had played them for Theodor Kirchner and Stockhausen, both of whom had been equally charmed by them. Since Brahms had not instructed her to return the manuscript, she seized the opportunity to ask that she be allowed to keep it until the fourth movement arrived. Brahms seems to have complied with this

12 From Berthold Litzmann's biography of Clara Schumann and the Brahms Briefwechsel, volumes IV (with Otto Julius Grimm, his old friend from the Hannover days of 1854) and V (with Joachim), it is apparent that for many years Brahms sent a newly completed movement or movements first to Grimm or Clara, and then to Joachim, for their comments. See Berthold Litzmann, Clara Schumann; Ein Künstlerleben, 3 Bde. (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1923-25), and Johannes Brahms, Johannes Brahms im Briefwechsel mit J. O. Grimm, hrsg. Richard Barth, Johannes Brahms Briefwechsel IV (Berlin: Deutsche Brahms-Gesellschaft m. b. H., 1908, reprint ed., Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1974).

13 See Appendix, p. 240. Considerable gaps in the published correspondence between Clara and Brahms are due partly to the fact that she destroyed many of Brahms's letters in 1886-87, after the friends had agreed to return each other's letters. See Marie Schumann's "Geleitwort" in Brahms, Clara Schumann—Johannes Brahms Briefe (no page number is given).

14 See Appendix, p. 240.
By this time he had finally made up his mind to go to Vienna, a venture that both Clara and Joachim had often recommended. Brahms's attraction to the city of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert, the most famous musical centre in Europe, had been increased that summer by his meeting with the distinguished singer Luise Dustmann-Meyer at the Rhine Music Festival. She had been working at the Court Opera House in Vienna, and extolled to Brahms the beauties of the imperial capital. No doubt his decision to visit the city was also occasioned in part by the hope that any success he might achieve there would enhance his prestige with his compatriots, and would thus increase his chances of being elected leader of the Hamburg Singakademie and the Philharmonic Orchestra.

By the time he set out for Vienna, on 8 September 1862, Brahms had completed the last movement of the String Quintet. He must have copied the first three movements either in score or in parts before sending them to Clara, for the entire work was in his possession when he wrote to Dietrich a few days before his departure:

The C-minor Symphony is not finished, but on the other hand [I have completed] a String Quintet (2 Violoncellos) in F Minor,
which I would most gladly send you and have [you] write to me about it, but nevertheless I'd rather take it with me.16

Soon after his arrival in Vienna, Brahms encountered some old friends from Hamburg days, and quickly made the acquaintance of many of Vienna’s leading musicians. Among the latter were the violinist Joseph Hellmesberger, director and professor at the Vienna Conservatoire and leader of the city's only resident string quartet party, and the virtuoso pianist Carl Tausig, Liszt's brilliant pupil.17

Joachim, in the midst of a lengthy sojourn in England, became acquainted with the String Quintet slightly later than did Clara, but was introduced to it in its entirety. He had informed Brahms that he would return to Hannover at the end of September.18 Accordingly, Brahms sent the completed work to Hannover late that month, asking Joachim to return it and tell him what he thought of it as soon as possible. Brahms requested that Joachim, should he find time to have the work played, have it copied, making corrections with regard to bowing signs, double stops, and whatever else he felt necessary.19

By the time Brahms had sent the manuscript to Hannover, Joachim had decided to remain in London for another three months.20 However,

16 See this undated letter in the Appendix, p. 241. "Die c-moll-Symphonie ist nicht fertig, dagegen aber ein Streich-Quintett (2 Violoncelli) in f-moll, das ich am liebsten Dir schickte und mir darüber schreiben liesse, aber ich will's doch lieber mitnehmen."

17 It was Tausig who inspired the writing of the Variations on a Theme by Paganini, Op. 35, during the winter in Vienna.

18 See Joachim’s letter of 19 September 1862, in Brahms Briefwechsel V: 314.

19 See Appendix, p. 241.

he neglected to inform Brahms of this decision, and the resulting misunderstanding between the two was worsened by the fact that the manuscript and the accompanying letter did not reach London until early November. Brahms, assuming that his friend was back in Hannover, could not understand why Joachim did not send any word about the String Quintet. Becoming increasingly annoyed, he wrote four letters of reminder between the middle of October and early November, the fourth consisting of a single sentence demanding the return of the manuscript. These, too, did not reach London until November.

On 14 October Joachim was informed of the arrival at Hannover of the parcel from Brahms. In a letter written the same day to Clara, he excitedly speculated that it might be the String Quintet. As he had been in England since early March, it seems likely that he had been told of the composition's impending completion in a letter written by Clara or perhaps Dietrich, which apparently has not been published or is not extant. 21 Despite Joachim's sending of an urgent request to his friend Bernhard Scholz in Hannover, 22 the parcel was not immediately forwarded to London.

21 It is unlikely that Brahms had told him about the work before his departure for England. If this had been the case, at least one movement probably would have been virtually completed by that time, for Brahms was not in the habit of making a new composition known to his friends while it was still in a relatively undeveloped state. Even Clara was resigned to this; in a letter dated 1 May 1862, she wistfully remarked, "I won't ask at all about what you are now working [on]—unfortunately I hear nothing about this, or about your inner life in general!" (Was Due jetzt arbeitest, dannach frage ich gar nicht mehr--ich erfrage ja leider nicht davon, wie überhaupt von Deinem Innen Leben!) See Brahms, Clara Schumann—Johannes Brahms Briefe, I: 400. If some portion of the Quintet had, in fact, been completed by the time Joachim departed in March, Brahms likely would have played it for Clara during his visit at Bad Münster; yet neither she nor Dietrich mentions anything of this nature as being among the several compositions that were tried.

22 See Joachim's letter written 23 October, in the Appendix, p. 242.
In his first letter of reminder, Brahms remarked that he would like to try the Quintet. Even at this point he may have been considering having it performed at a concert of his own which, he told Joachim, his friends in Vienna were urging him to give. In the second letter, written on 31 October, he earnestly asked for the return of the Quintet. Another letter, seemingly written on the same day, complained: "Very soon it will scarcely be possible to ask the people here for a rehearsal [of the String Quintet], since daily there is more to do for the concerts." He added that he would write again "the day after tomorrow," which means that the fourth and final demand for the Quintet was sent on 2 November.

This supposition seems to be confirmed by Clara's letter of 10 November (ibid., p.244), informing Joachim that Brahms was planning to have the Quintet "played at Hellmesberger's at the end of this month." Brahms himself, in a letter to Joachim evidently written 9 November, stated that "a performance at my concert has, of course, no doubt become impossible" (ibid., p.244). The concert took place on 29 November in the Vereinsaal of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde. The program comprised the Piano Quartet in A major, Op. 26 (with Brahms being assisted by three members of the Hellmesberger Quartet) the Variations and Fugue on a Theme by Handel, Op. 24, Bach's F major Toccata for organ, and Schumann's C major Fantasia, Op. 17. See Brahms's letter to Joachim, evidently written in mid-October, ibid., p.242.

See the Appendix for a discussion of this and other pertinent letters in the chronology of the Brahms-Joachim correspondence.

"Schon in der nächsten Zeit wird es kaum möglich sein, hier von den Leuten eine Probe zu verlangen, da täglich mehr für die Konzerte zu tun ist. Ich schreibe übermorgen wieder, ..." (see Appendix, p.243). Brahms was probably referring both to the concert at which he was to make his first appearance before the Viennese public, and to the concert which he was planning to give himself (see footnote no. 37). At the former, which was presented by the Hellmesberger Quartet on 16 November, Brahms' Piano Quartet in G minor, Op. 25, was performed, with the composer at the piano. Hellmesberger's party also played Mendelssohn's String Quartet in E-flat and Beethoven's in C-sharp minor, Op. 131.

See Appendix, p.243.
After dispatching three anxious letters to Scholz, Joachim finally received the String Quintet, but none of Brahms's letters, sometime between 1 and 4 November. Despite his enthusiasm for this work "of [the] deepest meaning, full of manly strength, and lofty [in] construction," he had some reservations about the demands that it would make upon the performers. He expressed the candid opinion that Hellmesberger and his musicians might not be able to do it justice:

I would prefer that I might play it for you first; . . . [Hellmesberger] lacks [the] boldness and strength that are necessary for all your works.

His intention to have the Quintet copied in London could never have been fulfilled, for three days later he received all but the last of Brahms's letters requesting the return of the manuscript. It was given to the London music dealer Chappell, who packed it, in Joachim's presence, for mailing to Vienna. Chappell neglected, however, to pay the postage, and the parcel was therefore held at the post-office for some time, as Joachim apologetically explained in a letter written in mid-November.

It is not known when Brahms finally received the manuscript from Joachim, as no letter acknowledging its arrival appears to have been

---

27 See the one dated 23 October, ibid., p.242. The other two do not appear in Joachim, Letters.

28 Joachim seems to contradict himself concerning the date of the manuscript's arrival. In his letter of 5 November (see Appendix, p.243), he told Brahms that he had received it "just yesterday" (Erst gestern), in otherwords, on 4 November, while in a letter written on the eighth of the same month (ibid., p.243), he said that it had arrived eight days ago, that is, on 1 November.


30 Ibid., pp.243, 244.
published. Indeed, a long silence may have ensued between the angry composer and his unfortunate friend, for their next (published) communication is a letter from Brahms thanking Joachim for his Christmas greeting. Clara delightedly responded to the arrival of the "magnificent" (prächtig) last movement in a letter dated 18 December, and urged that the parts be sent to Joachim so that she could hear him perform the work early in January when she was scheduled to be in Hannover.

Knowing how angry Brahms had become over the length of time the String Quintet had remained out of his hands since it was first sent to Joachim, Clara perhaps feared that the composer would not consider dispatching the parts to Hannover. Thus, although she concluded her letter by asking whether the score in her possession should be sent to Joachim or Dietrich, she evidently decided that she herself should take it to Joachim. The next day she advised the latter that she would bring it with her when she came to Hannover at the beginning of January.  

Brahms, however, had begun to regret the harsh words he had written to Joachim in the course of the misunderstanding concerning the Quintet. His warm letter of thanks for his old friend's Christmas greeting was

---

31 Ibid.

32 In the correspondence between Simrock and Brahms published in the Briefe an P. J. Simrock und Fritz Simrock, no reference is made to the String Quintet. Nevertheless, Brahms may have indicated to Clara that he was hoping to have the work published by this firm, for she asked if he had received an honorarium from them (see Appendix, p.245). Brahms had met Fritz Simrock in the summer of 1860, when the latter was junior partner in the well-known firm of N. Simrock, of Bonn and Berlin. It published its first editions of Brahms's music that same year, and eventually became his principal publisher. The Piano Quartets, Opp. 25 and 26, were brought out by this firm in 1863.

33 See Appendix, p.245.
evidently accompanied by the parts of this work, which he would not name but referred to as "the thing . . . , which has given me so much annoyance and so little joy."\(^{34}\)

1863

Thus, in early January Joachim received the parts from Brahms as well as the score from Clara.\(^{35}\) In a letter which he wryly described as "an ice-breaker" (ein Esibrecher),\(^{36}\) written at the end of the month, he informed Brahms that he and his musicians had played the Quintet twice and were planning a third playing. He concluded his letter with a promise to soon write again, and to offer further comments on the work.

As no such letter had arrived by 12 February, Brahms gently prodded: "Up to now your ice-breaker has unfortunately been followed by nothing, . . . To hear something about my Quintet would, of course, be very dear to me."\(^{37}\) In mid-February Joachim became engaged to the contralto Amalie Weiss, but Brahms sensed that this happy distraction was not the only reason for his friend's silence regarding the Quintet. On 3 April he asked that it be returned, and that Joachim simply insert an

\(^{34}\)"das Ding . . . , das mir so viel Ärger und noch so wenig Freude gemacht hat." Ibid., pp. 245, 246.

\(^{35}\)There can be no doubt that both were in his possession at the end of the month, for at this time he inquired in a letter to Brahms: "May I keep the score and the parts?" (Kann ich Partitur und Stimmen noch behalten?) Ibid., p. 246.

\(^{36}\)Ibid., p. 246.

\(^{37}\)"Deinem Eisbrecher ist leider bis jetzt nichts gefolgt, . . . Über mein Quintett wäre mir freilich einiges zu hören sehr lieb und wert." Ibid., p. 246.
"NB" (Nota Bene) in the score whenever he wished to call attention to something. Brahms realized that the violinist, through his silence concerning the Quintet, had

already tacitly inserted the clearest NB. It certainly cannot be presented to the public, and so it is much better for it to sleep.38

Brahms concluded his letter by remarking that he was going to Hamburg very shortly. Joachim responded on 7 April, informing his friend that he and the other members of his quartet were going to give soirées in Hamburg on the twenty-first and twenty-third of the month; he suggested that Brahms join them in Hamburg and then come to Hannover with them. He was venturing, therefore, to keep the Quintet manuscript, so that he and his musicians might play the work for Brahms at Hannover.

For the first time, he suggested that some changes be made:

As it is, I would not like to produce it publicly—but only because I hope you will alter here and there some roughnesses [which seem] too great even to me, and will lighten the coloring now and then.39

This made Brahms all the more anxious to begin the necessary revisions, and on 13 April he repeated his request for the manuscript's return, explaining, "[I] am coming, after all, for the purpose of hearing [the Quintet] without superfluous roughnesses, if possible."40

Two days later, Joachim probably sent both the score and the parts back to Vienna. His reluctance to do so is evident in his accompanying

38 "Das deutlichste NB. hast Du freilich schon stillschweigend hingesetzt. Dem Publikum kann man es wohl nicht vorführen, und so legt es sich wohl besser schlafen." Ibid.


40 "Komme ich überhaupt dazu, ohne überflüssige Schroffheiten, wenn möglich, hören." Ibid.
letter, which asserted that his criticisms of the composition could be fully appreciated only if Brahms were to hear it performed. Joachim was concerned chiefly with the Quintet's lack of what he described as "sound-charm" (Klangreiz). He explained that the instrumentation was in places too thin for the ideas, while sometimes it remained too thick for long passages. When he wrote to Clara several weeks afterward, he commented frankly, "it is a great pity that the general effect of this piece, in spite of so much that is remarkable in it, should be unsatisfactory." Upon receiving the score and parts of the Quintet from Joachim, Brahms perhaps altered the objectionable places pointed out by his friend, and then arranged to have the work performed privately by Heller, Sigmund Bachrich, the composer Karl Goldmark, Louis Lackenbacher, and Joseph Gänsebacher. This performance failed to satisfy Brahms, and he determined to hear the Quintet played by Joachim and his musicians, who were more familiar with it. It was likely after this trial performance in Vienna that Brahms sent the score to Oldenburg for Dietrich's

---

41 Evidently written on 15 April. Ibid., p.247.

42 See his letter dated 26 May, 1863. Ibid., p.248.

43 Kalbeck maintains that Brahms had altered these places before having the work tried in Vienna ("er die von Joachim angedeuteten anstössigen Stellen abgeändert oder gemildert hatte"). See Johannes Brahms, II/1: 53. Joachim, however, made no allusion to such changes having been already made when he and his musicians played the Quintet in May for Brahms. See Joachim's letter to Clara, dated 26 May 1863, in the Appendix, p.248.

44 His father, Johann Baptist Gänsebacher (d. 1844), a pupil of Vogler and Albrechtsberger, had been a distinguished musician and church composer. Josef was a doctor of jurisprudence, but later relinquished this career to become a cellist and a professor of singing at the Vienna Conservatoire. Brahms dedicated to him the Cello Sonata in E minor, Op. 38.
perusal, keeping the parts with him so that he might take them to Joachim on his way back to Hamburg. On 29 April he informed the latter that he would leave Vienna on Friday (1 May), asking that he arrange to have quartet- and quintet-playing at his house Sunday morning or afternoon.

Brahms spent three days in Hannover, and Joachim had the Quintet played for him. Even at the hands of such artists, who had carefully studied and tested it, the work still did not please Brahms. A letter from Joachim to Clara, written a few weeks after Brahms's visit, indicates that a decision somehow to change the Quintet was reached at Hannover: "I was glad that Johannes, on hearing it himself, wished to alter it. A man of his strong character cannot accept anything on hearsay."

Brahms arrived back in Hamburg on 5 May 1863, and wrote to Dietrich shortly after the seventh, asking him to return the score so that he could make further alterations. Dietrich responded with an invitation to come immediately to Oldenburg for a visit; the String Quintet score must have been returned to Brahms sometime during the happy days the friends spent together. After arriving back at Hamburg, Brahms most

---

45 See Brahms's letter to Dietrich dated from April 1863 in the Appendix, p. 247.

46 Joachim's letter mentioning the Hamburg soirées had not reached Brahms in time to permit him to arrange his schedule so that he might meet his friend in Hamburg and then accompany him to Hanover. See Brahms's letter of 13 April, ibid., p. 247.


48 See Joachim's letter of 26 May, ibid. Apparently Joachim was unaware that Brahms had already heard the Quintet performed privately in Vienna.

49 See his letter to Dietrich written shortly after 7 May, ibid.
likely made some revisions, then forwarded to Dietrich "the promised Quintet" (das versprochene Quintett). He passed the summer in or near his native city, trying to keep the peace between his frail mother, now seventy-four, and his fifty-seven-year-old father.

Before the end of May, he received word from Vienna that he had been elected leader of the Singakademie (Singing Academy), a well-established choral society. His hopes of obtaining the conductorship of the Hamburg Singakademie and the Philharmonic Orchestra had been bitterly shattered by Stockhausen's appointment in the fall of 1862. Thus, after due consideration, Brahms accepted the Viennese offer, and began making plans for his programs. In addition, he was occupied with the cantata Rinaldo, on a poem by Goethe.

In mid-August, on his way back to Vienna, Brahms visited briefly with Clara at Lichtental, a beautiful suburb of the famous spa Baden-Baden, where she had purchased a house the previous year. For the next several years, Brahms generally spent his summer holiday near Clara at Baden-Baden. He delighted in taking long morning walks through the wooded hills, and was inspired to begin many of his compositions during his sometimes lengthy stays. An additional source of stimulation was provided by the great variety of people who assembled at Baden-Baden from every part of Europe. It was here that Brahms was to meet the Princess

---

50 See the letter dating from late May, ibid.

51 He wrote about it to Joachim in June, and it seems to have been largely completed by the end of September. See Brahms Briefwechsel, VI: 12-14, 16. See also Clara's letter of 18 October in Clara Schumann--Johannes Brahms Briefe, II: 430. The final chorus was not completed until 1868.
Anna von Hessen, to whom he would dedicate both Opp. 34 and 34bis, as well as Johann Strauss, the pianist Anton Rubinstein, and many other artists.

By the last week in August, Brahms was back in Vienna, and on 28 September took office as conductor of the Singakademie. His programs were ambitious: two Bach cantatas, a large number of à cappella works of the seventeenth century, Beethoven's *Opferlied*, Schumann's *Requiem für Mignon*, and several of Brahms's own adaptations of folk songs for four voices were performed at the first two concerts, on 15 November and 6 January.

1864

By late February, Brahms had rewritten the String Quintet as a *Sonata for Two Pianofortes*. He informed Breitkopf & Härtel on the twenty-seventh of the month that he could offer them "a grand 'Sonata' for 2 pianos, which I should have [played] this very day, and really intend to play as soon as possible, with Carl Tausig." Brahms told Clara of the new version in a letter that apparently has not been published. He may have made some obscure reference to what had prompted the making of the transcription, for on 10 March Clara replied:

I cannot quite understand what you have written to me about your Quintet. Did you have it performed and was it a flop? And

52 Marie Anna Friederike (b. 1836), Princess of Prussia, a niece of Friedrich Wilhelm III. In 1853 she married Friedrich Wilhelm Georg Adolf, Landgraf von Hessen. At his death in 1884, she became Dowager Landgräfin.

would you for that reason have made a Duo out of it? [If this is so,] it must not have pleased you yourself in its original state, or rather in [its] sound?  

There is no evidence of any performance having taken place after the two private playings in Vienna and Hannover. It is doubtful that Brahms, having been dissatisfied with the Quintet under Joachim's leadership, would have arranged yet another performance. It is interesting that Joachim himself was apparently not informed, at least in writing, of the transcription until August.

On 4 April Brahms responded to Clara's letter, telling her that he intended to play the new version in public for the first time with Tausig on the seventeenth, at an extra Singakademie concert devoted to Brahms's works. Tausig must have been most impressed with the Duo-Piano Sonata, for he had apparently been begging Brahms to allow him to have it for his own concerts.

The program of 17 April was well received as a whole, but the Sonata for Two Pianofortes reportedly made no impression on the audience. Just as the G minor Piano Quartet had been called "'an offence against the laws of style'" after its first public performance on 16 November 1862, so the Duo-Piano Sonata was subjected to foolishly exaggerated criticism. The Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung, normally sympathetic to Brahms, complained that the first movement was "'expanded beyond [the


55 In a letter written from Moscow on 17/24 April, Clara expressed her surprise that Brahms would perform with this "kettle-drummer" (Pauker). See Brahms, Clara Schumann-Johannes Brahms Briefe, I: 450. An extract from Brahms’s letter of 4 April appears in the Appendix, p. 249.
limits of propriety," and the second "indistinct, enigmatic dreaming," while the last two movements "evoked the oppressed mood of the lecture-room."

Brahms was understandably resentful of the audience's reaction; the work's failure to please may have led him to decide that the medium of two pianos required further consideration.

The Singakademie's season came to an end with the annual foundation concert, presented on 10 May. Brahms had become disheartened with the more mundane aspects of his work as a conductor, and finally rejected his re-election. In June he returned to Hamburg, where he was sadly obliged to arrange his parents' inevitable separation. Anxious to devote further attention to the Sonata for Two Pianofortes, he invited his friend Adolf Schubring to spend a few days in Hamburg, and offered to send the Duo-Piano Sonata, "with which you can prepare yourself." Schubring evidently was not able to come, so Brahms dispatched both his own manuscript and the copyist's manuscript, which had been used for the first performance, to Clara at Baden-Baden in July. On 23 June she had requested that the work be sent to her so that she might study it and thus be familiar with it when Brahms visited her that summer. She was

---


also eager to try it with the celebrated Russian virtuoso and composer Anton Rubinstein, whom she had met in Moscow and who had now come to Baden-Baden.

Clara sent her thanks for the Duo-Piano Sonata on 19 July, adding that she had worked hard with it for two days and had played it with Rubinstein. She was not quite as warm in her praise for this transcription as she had been for the original String Quintet.

The first movement in particular charmed me, but really I love all the movements, only here and there I find in the arrangement something overdone, and hardly comprehensible for the listener if he is not sufficiently familiar with it, [and] then it seems to me very difficult technically here and there.\(^{59}\)

Evidently Brahms had asked that she keep the work for only a short time, and then return it to him so that he could send it to a publisher. She cautioned,

> don't you want to wait with the printing until we [have] played it a few times here, where this or that in addition will perhaps occur to you yourself. . . . I don't like to send it, since I wanted to play it again with Rubinstein tomorrow.\(^{60}\)

Four days later, Clara returned the work. She had been playing it with Hermann Levi,\(^{61}\) conductor of the opera house at nearby Calrsruhe,

---


\(^{60}\)"Willst Du nicht mit dem Druck noch warten, bis wir es hier noch einige Male gespielt, wo Dir dann vielleicht selbst noch dies oder jenes auffällt. . . . Ich schicke es nicht gern, da ich es nächster Tage noch 'mal mit Rubinstein spielen wollte." Ibid.

\(^{61}\)Levi (1839-1900), who had studied at Munich and at the Leipzig Conservatory, had been a great admirer of Schumann's music, and had quickly become fascinated by that of Brahms. In 1861 he had paid his respects to Brahms in Hamburg. The master became reacquainted with his gifted admirer after arriving at Baden-Baden in July of 1864, and the friendship blossomed during that summer. For many years Levi worked for the recognition of Brahms's compositions. In 1872 he became musical
and could no longer refrain from giving Brahms her true impression of it:

At the first playing I got the feeling of an arranged work, but [I] thought I was prejudiced and said nothing about it. Levi, however, said the same thing quite decidedly, without my having uttered a word.62

Earlier in her letter she suggested transcribing it for orchestra:

The work is so wonderfully outstanding, interesting throughout... . . , masterful in every respect, but--it is not a sonata, but [rather] a work whose ideas you might--[in fact, you] must!--strew, . . . over the whole orchestra. A multitude of the most beautiful ideas get lost on the piano, [being] recognizable only to the musician [and] not enjoyable to the public. . . . please, . . . follow [my advice] just this once, [and] rearrange the work once more.63

Like Joachim, Clara knew that Brahms could not "accept anything on hearsay," and was therefore anxious that he bring the manuscript with him when he came to Baden-Baden. She could then show him specific places to support her contention that the work should be recast.

At the end of the third week in July, just a few days after Clara had written this letter, Brahms left Hamburg. He paid a brief visit to Joachim, who had just returned from a lengthy sojourn in England, and then hurried to Baden-Baden, where he surprised Clara on the thirty-

director of the Munich Court Opera; as his fame as a Wagner conductor increased in the mid-seventies, his friendship with Brahms foundered. He was chosen by Wagner to conduct the first performances of *Parsifal* at Bayreuth in 1882.


63"Das Werk ist so wundervoll grossartig, durchweg interressant . . . , meisterhaft in jeder Hinsicht, aber--es ist keine Sonata, sondern ein Werk, dessen Gedanken Du . . . über das ganze Orchester ausstreuen könntest--müsstest! Eine Menge der schönsten Gedanken gehen auf dem Klavier verloren, nur erkennbar für den Musiker, für das Publikum ungeniessbar. . . . bitte, . . . , folge nur disemal, arbeite das Werk nochmal um." Ibid.
first. Doubtless he had hastened there to discuss her suggestion that a transcription be made of the Sonata for Two Pianofortes. He settled into an inn at Lichtental, and began finishing and revising the compositions he had brought with him, among them the Duo-Piano Sonata.

On 10 August Clara had to leave for a concert tour of Switzerland. She and Brahms had surely played the Duo-Piano Sonata before her departure, and in a letter written to her on the fifteenth Brahms remarked cryptically, "my double-sonata [Doppel-Sonate] does not appear, and [will be] lost to the whole world, if my writing-finger does not have patience." By this he may have meant that he had not yet decided what medium would be most appropriate for the new transcription, and had become so frustrated that he was ready to scrap the idea entirely. It was perhaps at this time that he sent one of the manuscripts (probably the copy) to Joachim. He may not have told his friend that he was considering making another transcription, for his letter of 29 August, requesting the manuscript's immediate return, asked only that Joachim comment briefly on the work and on the advisability of having it printed.

---


65 See Kalbeck, Johannes Brahms, II/1: 154.

66 "meine Doppel-Sonate sich nicht blicken lässt, und am Ende der Welt verloren, wenn meine Schreibfinger keine Geduld haben." See the Appendix, p. 250.

67 As a youth, Brahms had considered Joachim his superior as a composer. Schumann and Liszt also appreciated the violinist's compositions. See Karl Geiringer, Brahms: His Life and Work, 2nd ed., with a new appendix of Brahms's letters (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), p. 32. In 1855 Brahms had arranged to exchange contrapuntal exercises with Joachim, for mutual criticism, hoping in this way to strengthen his technique of composition. The exchange took place every two weeks, for several years.

68 See Appendix, p. 251.
Of particular significance is the fact that this letter was written shortly after Brahms had spent a few days in Carlsruhe attending the third congress of the Allgemeine deutsche Musikverein, 22-25 August 1864. He had stayed with Levi, who had become a close friend during the summer. Evidently it was Levi himself who suggested that the Sonata for Two Pianofortes be transcribed for the medium of piano quartet. This is indicated not only in a letter written to Brahms after the Piano Quintet had been completed, but by the following statement which Kalbeck quotes:

I had advised Brahms to make a [Piano] Quintet out of the F minor Sonata. He wrote the score in the summer of 1865 [sic] in Baden-Baden and brought it to me at Carlsruhe.69

Although the year is obviously incorrect, Levi's use of the word "summer" indicates that his suggestion concerning the transcription was probably made before September. Indeed, it could have been made while Brahms was in Carlsruhe for the congress. In any case, Brahms's letter of 29 August to Joachim indicates that he was anxious to play the Duo-Piano Sonata with Clara again when she returned to Baden-Baden in early September. Perhaps he was also planning to ask her opinion of Levi's advice.

From Levi's comments, one gathers that Brahms, his powers at last fired by his friend's suggestion, may have transcribed the Duo-Piano Sonata very quickly. Apparently he wrote the parts for the stringed

69"'Aus der f-moll Sonate ein Quintett zu machen, hatte ich Brahms geraten. Er schrieb die Partitur im Sommer 1865 [sic] und brachte sie mir nach Karlsruhe.'" Kalbeck, Johannes Brahms, II/1: 59-60. In a letter written to Brahms after the new Piano Quintet had been tried with Clara and Ferdinand David at Carlsruhe and Mannheim, Levi alluded to the fact that "I was responsible for the new arrangement" (ich mit Schuld sei an dem neuen Arrangement). See this letter of 9 November in the Appendix, pp. 252, 253.
instruments in score but, eager to have the work played as soon as possible, took time to give only a suggestion of the piano part. He then brought the score to Carlsruhe. Levi recalled that

we divided the same amongst ourselves in three portions, and Brahms, [Ferdinand] David and I wrote out the parts during a day and the following night . . ., so that the piece could be tried the following day. (NB. [we copied the parts for] only the stringed instruments—Brahms played the piano part from a pencil sketch which he made himself.)

The transcription probably had not been completed when Clara, now back at Baden-Baden, wrote to Joachim on 15 September, for she surely would have mentioned the new version. This means that the trial performance to which Levi alluded must have occurred sometime between that date and Brahms's departure on 10 October. The composer may have felt considerable relief at having finally achieved a highly effective expression of his archetypal concept, for he returned to Vienna with a light heart.

70."Wir schnitten dieselbe in drei Teile auseinander, und Brahms, David und ich schrieben während eines Tages und der darauf folgenden Nacht . . . die Stimmen aus, so dass das Stuck am folgenden Tage probiert werden konnte. (NB. nur die Streichinstruments—den Klavier-part spielte Brahms nach einer Bleistiftskizze, die er sich machte.)" Quoted by Kalbeck, Johannes Brahms, II/1: 60 n. Ferdinand David was concert-master of the Gewandhaus Orchestra in Leipzig from 1836, and leader of the David Quartet. He was a close friend of the conductor of the orchestra, Mendelssohn, and became one of the most important teachers at the Conservatory established by the latter in 1843. Joachim had been one of David's pupils.

Brahms left Baden-Baden on 6 October, but, after two days in Carlsruhe, returned to retrieve a trunk that had accidentally been left behind. He finally departed from Baden-Baden on 10 October. See Litzmann, Ein Kunstlerleben, III: 164n.

72"'Ich konnte so froh reisen, das Herz war so voll Liebe und so voll Freude, dass alle die dumpfen Wolken doch geschwunden)." See Brahms, Clara Schumann--Johannes Brahms Briefe, I: 464. The letter is dated 13 October 1864.
The writing of the Piano Quintet was not the only project which occupied Brahms during his stay at Baden-Baden. In September he composed the first three movements of the String Sextet in G major, Op. 36.73 Neither did he discard the Duo-Piano Sonata. Through Clara, he had become acquainted that summer with the Princess Anna von Hessen, herself an accomplished musician. In a letter written to Levi many years later, the princess recalled that she and Brahms had often made music together at Clara's house, and that he and Clara had played for her the Sonata for Two Pianofortes.74 She must have expressed great enthusiasm for it, since Brahms evidently told Clara, before leaving on 10 October, that he wanted to dedicate the work to his royal friend. Clara mentioned the matter to the princess a day or so later, and informed Brahms, in a letter dated 15 October, that she had expressed "a truly childlike joy"75 at the idea, and had asked whether she would receive the first copy of the work. According to the princess' letter to Levi, Brahms subsequently sent her the manuscript of the Duo-Piano Sonata; this must have been the copyist's manuscript, of which the title page bears the dedication.

73 According to Kalbeck, Johannes Brahms, II/2: 160.

74 This letter, written on 23 June 1899, is quoted by Kalbeck, ibid., p. 62n. See also the princess' letter to Clara, dated 19 August 1864, in Litzmann, Ein Kunstlerleben, III: 160-61.

75 "eine wahrhaft kindliche Freude." See this letter of 15 October in the Appendix, p. . Brahms's English biographer Florence May states that the composer asked permission to dedicate the Duo-Piano Sonata to the princess the day after it was played for her. See The Life of Johannes Brahms, 2nd ed., rev. by the author (originally pub. 1905), with an Introduction by Ralph Hill, 2 vols. (London: W. Reeves, [1948]), II: 360-61. However, Clara's letter of 15 October indicates that the matter was not brought to the princess' attention until after Brahms had left Baden-Baden.
Upon his return to Vienna, Brahms must have set about finishing the sketched piano part of the Piano Quintet and making any refinements that he felt were necessary in the string parts. He had expected to be able to send the completed work to Clara at the end of October, but was bothered by various interruptions:

For a couple of days I have been spending every quiet hour at the Quintet in order to be able to send it to you. But I am never allowed a moment's peace, . . .

. . . I am so sorry that I cannot produce the finished Quintet for you today, but just now I have absolutely no peace.76

At some point, Clara informed Princess Anna that the Duo-Piano Sonata had been turned into a Piano Quintet which was also dedicated to her, and of which she would receive the first copy. At Clara's suggestion, the princess decided to express her appreciation by presenting Brahms with the autograph score of Mozart's G minor Symphony, K. 550. It was in his hands by early December,77 and he considered it the greatest treasure in his collection of autographs. Clara tantalizingly hinted at the gift in a letter written early in November.

In this same letter, dated 3 November, Clara delightedly acknowledged the arrival of "the magnificent [Piano] Quintet" (das herrliche


Quintett). She had hurried to Carlsruhe to show it to Levi and David, who had begun copying [it] as if nailed [to their chairs], . . . Levi tells me how wonderfully it is scored. . . . I can stay here a few more days, and on Sunday morning we want to try it at Levi's. 78

Thus, Clara, Levi, and David tried the Piano Quintet for the first time on 6 November 1864, with their mutual friend Julius Allgeyer 79 as a captivated listener. It is possible that no one else participated in this performance, for both Clara and Levi postponed writing about the work until they had played it again "with better forces, at least [with] a better first violin." 80

This they did at Mannheim the following Tuesday, where they enlisted the help of an excellent violist by the name of Koning. 81

Letters written the next day by Levi and the day after by Clara were full of praise for this latest transcription. Levi thought it "incomparably beautiful," while Clara exclaimed, "we . . . celebrated hours of rapture!" She found the first three movements "wonderful


79Brahms had come to know this copperplate engraver and photographer when the latter had been a pupil of the engraver Keller at Düsseldorf in 1854. The two had renewed their acquaintance and become good friends during the months Brahms spent at Baden-Baden in 1864.


81In a letter written 10 July 1863, Clara had described Koning as "a first-class player (Viola)" (einem vortrefflichen Spieler [Viola]). See Litzmann, Ein Kunstlerleben, III: 142.
throughout (a couple of quite small places excepted)." In some instances, Brahms followed his advice.

Although obviously delighted with the Piano Quintet in general, both Levi and Clara expressed the opinion that a few alterations were required in the last movement. Levi felt

the need of a speedy, brilliant . . . closing; what now follows [after the fortissimo chord at measure 403] gives the impression of [being] labored, deliberate; . . . But we have already spoken enough of this face-to-face. . . . if, as I believe [is true] in this case, every musician or a friend such as Joachim says the same thing, then don't spare the effort, and change and reduce the last 4 pages. Clara echoed Levi's criticism of this movement: "There are just a few places where the work falls so very dryly on one's warm heart!"

Despite Levi's urging, Brahms never reduced the last few pages, nor did he alter the finale's second theme, which Clara considered to

---

82 "über alle Maassen [i.e., Massen] schön," (Levi, letter dated 9 November; see Appendix, p.252.) "wir . . . haben Wonnestunden gefeiert!" (Clara, letter dated 10 November; see Appendix, p.254.) "durchweg wundervoll (ein paar ganz kleine Stellen ausgenommen)." (Clara, ibid.)

83 "ein richtiger Kapellmeister kann bekanntlich nicht leicht etwas ungerupft lassen." See Appendix, p.252.

84 "das Bedürfniss eines baldigen brillanten . . . Schlusses; was später kommt, macht den Eindruck des Gearbeiteten, Absichtlichen; . . . Doch darüber haben wir mündlich schon genug gesprochen. . . . wenn aber, wie ich in diesem Falle glaube, alle Musiker oder ein Freund wie Joachim dasselbe sagen, so scheue die Mühe nicht und verändere und reduziere die 4 letzten Seiten." See Appendix, pp.252, 253.

85 "es sind da so einige Stellen, wo einem die Arbeit gar so trocken auf das warme Herz fällt!" See Appendix, p.254.
be too slow and lacking in "real tension." This was the theme with which Joachim had "still not made friends" in the two-piano version. He may not have seen the Piano Quintet, or even have been informed of its existence, until he visited Brahms at Baden-Baden in the late summer or early fall of 1865. By that time, Brahms had sent the work to be engraved.

Clara had concluded her letter by telling Brahms that the Piano Quintet would be returned by Levi. The latter, however, made it a practice to copy out with care a new work which Brahms sent to him on approval, and to return this copy instead of the autograph manuscript. Brahms, in gratitude, often allowed his friend to keep the autograph. Kalbeck believes that this happened in the case of the Piano Quintet.

---


87 When, at the beginning of September 1864, Joachim returned the Duo-Piano Sonata manuscript that Brahms had sent him, he alluded to "the second theme of the last movement, with which I have still not made friends" (das zweite Motive des letzten Satzes . . . , mit dem ich mich noch immer nicht befreunde). Ibid., p. 254.

88 There is, until this time, no mention of the Piano Quintet in the correspondence published in the Brahms Briefwechsel VI, nor is there any in the Bickley collection of Joachim's Letters.

89 Levi later wrote to Kalbeck: "'Whenever he [Brahms] sends me new works on approval, I copy the same carefully, send him the copies and keep the manuscripts for myself. In this way I have come to possess a whole pile of manuscripts.'" (Wenn er mir neue Werke zur Ansicht schickte, so schrieb ich dieselben säuberlich ab, schickte ihm die Kopien und behielt die Manuskripte für mich. Auf diese Weise bin ich in den Besitz eines ganzen Stosses von Handschriften gelangt.) Quoted by Kalbeck in Johannes Brahms, II/1: 155n. and by Leopold Schmidt, ed., in Johannes Brahms im Briefwechsel mit Hermann Levi, Friedrich Gernsheim sowie den Familien Hecht und Fellinger, Johannes Brahms Briefwechsel VII (Berlin: Deutsche Brahms-Gesellschaft m. b. H., 1910; reprint ed., Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1974), p. 20n.

90 "Brahms left the manuscript with Levi, who took care of the copying [by writing it] with his own hand, and for this was permitted to keep the manuscript" (Brahms überliess das Manuskript Levi, der die Kopiaturen meist eigenhändig zu desorgen pflegte und dafür die Manuskripte zurückbehalten dürfte). See Kalbeck, Johannes Brahms, II/1: 155.
The possibility that Levi kept the autograph for a time is not negated by his November letter, in which he remarked,

make sure that I get the printed [score] as soon as possible. Whenever you have something ready, send it here to me; (if not to the friend, then to the copyist?)

However, it seems that he had returned the autograph by the following February at the latest, for he inquired in a letter dated the fourth of that month, "what's happening with the Quintet?" Clara had asked the same question with regard to the last movement, in two letters written in December.

1865

In January Brahms finished the Waltzes, Op. 39, for piano duet, which had been written over a period of several years. On the second day of February he received a telegram from his brother, summoning him to their mother's side. By the time he reached Hamburg, she was dead. Quietly he returned to Vienna and resumed his work on *Ein deutsches Requiem*, which had remained in a preparatory stage during the preceding four years. At the beginning of May he was on his way to Carlsruhe, and by the seventh of the month had arrived at Baden-Baden.

During this unusually long sojourn at the spa, Brahms devoted much of his time to the composition of the *Requiem*. He also created a new

---

91 "Sorge, dass ich recht bald die gedruckten bekomme. Wenn Du etwas fertig hast, schicke es mir hierher; (wenn nicht dem Freunde, doch dem Copisten?)" See Appendix, p. 253.

92 "Was macht das Quintett." See Appendix, p. 254.

93 Ibid.

work, the Trio for Violin, Horn, and Pianoforte in E-flat major, Op. 40. This was written in May, along with the last movement of the G major String Sextet; the finale of the E minor Cello Sonata appeared in June. 95

It was perhaps in July that Brahms turned his attention to the final revising of both the Piano Quintet and the Variations on a Theme by Paganini, both of which were sent to a publisher on the twenty-second of that month. They were dispatched not to Breitkopf & Härtel, to whom Brahms had mentioned the Variations and the Sonata for Two Pianofortes as early as 27 February 1864, but to Rieter-Biedermann. In the accompanying letter, Brahms asked that the engraving be hastened so that he might receive a usable copy of the Piano Quintet as soon as possible. He was expecting Joachim to come to Baden-Baden, and wanted his friend to hear it. 96 However, a copy could not have arrived in time for Joachim's visit, since Brahms did not receive even the galley-proofs until shortly before his departure from the spa at the end of October. 97 He quite likely corrected the proofs of the score only, for in his July letter to Rieter-Biedermann he admonished: "NB. The [string] parts

95 According to Kalbeck, Johannes Brahms, II/1: 185, 160, 190.

96 Earlier letters that must have been exchanged by Brahms and his Swiss publisher concerning these works have not been published, or are not extant.

97 According to a letter written by Brahms to his father on 21 October, he planned to leave Lichtental around the twenty-eighth of the month. Quoted by Kalbeck, Johannes Brahms, II/1: 200. The galley-proofs had just arrived when Brahms was writing a letter to Gänsbacher, in which he remarked that he expected to be in Karlsruhe in fourteen days' time. Since he gave a concert there with Levi on 3 November, the letter to Gänsbacher must have been written a few days before 20 October. Ibid., p. 255.
must still be corrected after the score."

In this same letter, Brahms had suggested the possibility of publishing the two-piano version "as [a] 'Sonata for 2 Pianos'" (als 'Sonate für 2 Klaviere'). He explained that to me and everyone who [has] played or heard it, it has, after all, a special appeal in this form, and might be very well received as an interesting work for 2 pianos. In any case I can give you a 4-hand [one-piano] arrangement [of the Piano Quintet] (but for later publication). Understandably, he was concerned that the standard version of the Piano Quintet have time to become known before the arrangement appeared. He may have been intending to write this arrangement himself, but evidently did not find time to do so. It was not until several years later than Kirchner was chosen, seemingly not by Brahms, as the arranger.

After completing a series of very successful recitals in Mannheim, Switzerland, and Carlsruhe, Brahms journeyed in mid-December to Hamburg, to meet his father's fiancee. He passed the Christmas week at Detmold and Düsseldorf.

1866-69

After spending New Year's with the Dietrichs at Oldenburg, Brahms arrived back at Hamburg on the eleventh of January for a longer visit. He found the first edition of the Piano Quintet waiting for him, and sent his thanks to Rieter-Biedermann the following day, asking to be

98"NB. Die stimmen vom 'Quintett' müssen noch nach der Partitur korrigiert werden." See Appendix, p. 255.

99"Es ist mir und allen, die es gespielt oder gehört, doch einmal besonders lieb in dieser Gestalt, und möchte ein interessantes Werk für 2 Klaviere doch wohl gern empfangen werden. Ein 4 händiges Arrangement kann ich Ihnen jedenfalls (für spätere Herausgabe jedoch) geben."

Ibid., p. 255.
notified if Princess Anna acknowledged the receipt of the first copy.

No doubt the possibility of publishing the Sonata for Two Pianofortes was still in his mind, and he felt that a few words from the princess would give him the opportunity to ask for the return of the copyist's manuscript which he had entrusted to her in 1864. The princess, however, must have been extremely reluctant to part with it, for Brahms's efforts to obtain it were to prove fruitless until September of 1871.¹⁰¹

The Viennese première of the Piano Quintet was to have been given by the Hellmesberger Quartet, assisted by Clara Schumann, at the beginning of February 1866. As early as October of 1864, Brahms had let it be known, through a letter to Gănsbacher, that the work would be at the disposal of either Hellmesberger or the violinist Ferdinand Laub, whose quartet was challenging Hellmesberger's virtual monopoly on quartet-playing in Vienna. The Piano Quintet was accepted by the Hellmesberger group simply, as it turned out, to make it unavailable to the Laub Quartet. For months it was on Hellmesberger's program of Sunday, 4 February, along with the Horn Trio. However, on the Friday before the concert, Hellmesberger decided that the Piano Quintet would not be performed.¹⁰² It did not receive a public hearing in Vienna until 16

¹⁰⁰ See letter evidently written on 12 January, in Appendix, p.255.

¹⁰¹ See his letters to Rieter-Biedermann of 13 November 1868, and 15 October 1870, in Appendix, p.256. The letters to the princess herself have not, apparently, been published. Wilhelm Altmann was informed that they were not in the possession of her family; see his article "Entstehungsgeschichte von Brahms' op. 34," Die Musikwelt, Monatshefte für Oper und Konzert II/9 (1 June, 1922): 19n. Altmann remarked that the letters apparently were not preserved, "at least not in the family archives of the Landgraves of Hesse, according to the information given by the administration" (wenigstens nicht in dem Familienarchiv der Landgrafen von Hessen nach Mitteilung der Verwaltung).

¹⁰² See Kalbeck, Johannes Brahms, II/1: 198-99, 228n., and Clara's letter to Brahms of 4 February 1866, in the Appendix, p.255. See also Brahms's letter to Gănsbacher, offering the Piano Quintet to either
December 1875, when the pianist Julius Epstein played it with Hellmesberger's quartet. 103

The general public may, like Hellmesberger, have failed initially to appreciate the Piano Quintet. In a letter to Rieter-Biedermann dated 28 October 1869, Brahms remarked that he had recently played it in Carlsruhe, and added, "if the audiences everywhere were so well-disposed toward me and the work, I would go on tour with it." 104 Evidently he was not accustomed to finding the Piano Quintet so warmly received. Clara and Joachim, however, were to meet with brilliant success when they performed it in London on 3 April 1876. 105

1870

By June of 1870, Kirchner had apparently been engaged to make the piano-duet arrangement of the Piano Quintet. The choice had seemingly not been made by Brahms, for he very politely expressed his displeasure in a letter written to Rieter-Biedermann on the twentieth of that month:

Between ourselves: I am not particularly glad that he [Kirchner] is arranging my "Quintet," since I have my special fondnesses for the 4-hand principle—which his à 4 ms [i.e., his arrangements à 4 mains] do not give me. But since one knows [how] to value Hellmesberger or Laub, on p. 255 of the Appendix.

103 William Murdoch states that the first public performance of the Piano Quintet took place in the Salle Erard, Paris, on 24 March 1868. The pianist was Louise Japha, whom Brahms had known during his boyhood in Hamburg. See Brahms; with an Analytical Study of the Complete Pianoforte Works (London: Rich & Cowan, 1933), p. 362. Curiously, such a performance is not mentioned in any other source consulted by me.

104 "Wenn die Zuhörer aller Orten so gütig gegen mich und das Stück wären, würde ich damit reisen." See Appendix, p. 256.

105 See the letter written by Clara the day after the performance, in Brahms, Clara Schumann-Johannes Brahms Briefe II.
Indeed, Kirchner was not hurried, for the arrangement was not published until fourteen years later, in 1884.

On 15 October, a few months after Brahms had sent the letter from which the above extract is taken, he wrote again to Rieter-Biedermann, this time concerning the Duo-Piano Sonata. He had returned to Vienna from his summer visit at Baden-Baden, and although the copyist's manuscript of this work was still not in his possession, he was optimistic that he would soon have it. For the first time, he specified that the title should be Sonata for Two Pianofortes, whereas he had earlier referred to it as the Sonata for Two Pianos. He further proposed that the words "after the 'Quintet'" appear below the title. The opus number, however, presented a problem and Brahms simply wrote a question mark in its place. He strongly advised against the making of a four-hand (one-piano) arrangement, remarking that it would be "extremely uncomfortable, unplayable and obscure." The work should, he said, be printed not as two separate parts, but as a single score. Thus the
composition would stand in its entirety before both players.108

1871-72

The next year, during his usual summer visit at Baden-Baden, Brahms finally succeeded in obtaining the copyist's manuscript of the Duo-Piano Sonata from the dedicatee. Triumphantly he wrote to Rieter-Biedermann on 23 September 1871, "I have . . . managed to be able to send you our 'Quintet' [i.e., the two-piano version]," adding in exasperation, "I'll never leave a manuscript with princesses again!" He reiterated his request that the work be printed in score, and again emphasized the impracticality of a piano-duet arrangement, "for this [work] is always played with much passion."109 Nothing was said concerning the opus number.

In his response, Rieter-Biedermann must have suggested two different titles, perhaps including opus numbers, for the Duo-Piano Sonata. Brahms, still at Baden-Baden, replied: "Title No. 1 unfortunately does not seem quite right to me now, [but we may use] approximately No. 2."110 Thus, there is no definite evidence in the published correspondence as to whether it was Brahms or his publisher who suggested that "bis" be appended to the opus number that had been given the Piano Quintet. This

108"ausserst unbequem, unspielbar und undeutlich." See Appendix, p.256. Brahms points out that the format which he describes had been used previously, for Liszt's arrangement of Beethoven's Symphony no. 9.


110"Titel Nr 1 ist mir nun leider nicht recht, ungefähr Nr. 2." See Appendix, p.257. Brahms dated this letter "Sept.," but Altmann, the editor of this volume in the Brahms Briefwechsel, suggests that it was, on the contrary, written on 5 October.
Latin adverb, meaning "twice,"\textsuperscript{111} at least avoided the connotation of an inferior version, such as would have been implicit in "Op. 34a." Instead, it implied a second appearance of a work that had been published earlier. One might question whether the matter of the opus number had been decided by the time the galley-proofs were sent to Vienna in late November, for Brahms referred to "the proofs of Op. 34"\textsuperscript{112} in his acknowledgement.

The month in which the first edition of the Sonata for Two Pianofortes appeared cannot be documented on the basis of the correspondence that has been published. Brahms's acknowledgement of the proofs, in which he promised to attend to them as soon as possible, was dated "Nov[ember]," but was more likely written on 2 December.\textsuperscript{113} Thus, one might assume that he returned them before the middle of December. Brahms was at this time becoming increasingly preoccupied with concern for his father, who fell seriously ill the following January and died on 11 February. It is therefore understandable that reference neither to the dispatching of the proofs nor to the appearance of the printed edition is to be found in the correspondence of this trying period. However, considering the time at which the proofs must have been received, it seems likely that the edition was brought forth in January of 1872.\textsuperscript{114}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{111} Sometimes used to indicate that a particular measure(s) is to be repeated.
\item \textsuperscript{112} "die Korrektur von op. 34." See Appendix, p. 257.
\item \textsuperscript{113} According to Altmann, who inserts "on the contrary, 2 Dec." (vielmehr 2. Dezbr) enclosed in brackets.
\item \textsuperscript{114} Kurt Hofmann suggests January as the month during which the edition probably appeared. See Die Erstdrucke der Werke von Johannes Brahms (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1975), p. 73.
\end{itemize}
CHAPTER III

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE CREATIVE PROCESS: A DESCRIPTION
OF THE PROBABLE FOUR STAGES

The process of creative thinking may be viewed as consisting of a
series of phases or stages. The physiologist and physicist Hermann von
Helmholtz (1821-94) and the mathematician J. Henri Poincaré (1854-1912),
both of whom published descriptions of their own thought processes, gave
the impetus for this conception. Each suggested that the pursuit of
the answer to an original problem involved an initial period of investi­
gation that continued until no further progress seemed possible. Both
scientists recalled that, after a period of rest, "a possible solution
would occur . . . in an apparently sudden and unexpected manner." Poincaré observed that a second period of conscious work was required,
consequent to what he described as "sudden illumination". Both he and

1 See Hermann von Helmholtz, Vorträge und Reden, 5th ed., vol. 1
(Brunswick, Germany: Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1896), and the chapter
entitled "Mathematical Creation" in J. Henri Poincaré's The Foundations
of Science (New York: Science Press, 1913). A good general view of
investigations into creative thinking, from Poincaré to the sixties, is
given by W. Edgar Vinacke in The Psychology of Thinking, 2nd ed., McGraw-

2 Vinacke, Thinking, p. 356.

3 Quoted in Morris I. Stein and Shirley J. Heinze, Creativity and
the Individual; Summaries of Selected Literature in Psychology and Psy-
chiatry, A McKinsey Foundation Annotated Bibliography (Glencoe, Illi-
nois: The Free Press, 1960), p. 56. This excellent book devotes a
chapter (pp. 13-77) to the literature on the creative process, and in-
cludes general books and articles as well as those that consider this
Helmholtz emphasized the importance of unconscious activity, especially in the period preceding the illumination. Poincaré himself believed that the initial period of conscious labor set the unconscious in motion; unconscious activity then produced an inspiration, which was subsequently shaped and verified by the second period of conscious work.

Among later writers, there is considerable agreement that the creative process encompasses more than conscious effort alone. The "non-conscious factors" have been characterized by different expressions. The term "unconscious" is adopted in this discussion.

The facets of creative thinking described by Helmholtz and Poincaré were analyzed as four distinct stages by Graham Wallas. In The Art of Thought, he labeled them Preparation, Incubation, Illumination, and Verification, terms still used today. Wallas believed that during the first stage, as Helmholtz had said, the problem is "investigated . . . in all directions." During the second, the individual does not consciously think about the problem; he may turn his attention to a different one, or may relax from conscious work. Wallas observed that the Illumination stage begins with Intimation, described as "a vague impression of mental activity," which is followed by a flash of insight. Finally, during the process among artists, mathematicians, musicians, poets, and scientists. Also useful is the bibliography (not annotated) by Albert Rothenberg and Betty Greenberg, The Index of Scientific Writings on Creativity; General: 1566-1974 (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1976), pp. 146-61.

4 Stein and Heinze, Creativity, p. 13.
6 J. Varendonck, quoted in ibid., p. 97.
Verification stage, the validity of the insight is tested and the ideas achieve their exact form.

These (or similar) stages have been identified by other investigators, including J. M. Montmasson, the psychologist R. S. Woodworth, J. Rossman, who made a study of inventors, and J. Hadamard, who examined the work of mathematicians. Woodworth, however, is not certain that unconscious work goes on in the Incubation stage. He suggests that the individual, when attacking the problem afresh, recalls from the preparatory stage only the relevant material, and for this reason the matter seems clear to him.

Although Wallas based his formulation of four stages on the thought processes described by Helmholtz and Poincaré, he believed that these stages occurred also in the writing of poetry or music: "even when success in thought means the creation of something felt to be beautiful ... rather than the solution of a prescribed problem, the four stages ... can generally be distinguished from each other." In two


8 Another psychologist, J. F. Dashiell, is among those who relate the phenomena of the creative process not to the unconscious but to the data of experimental psychology on successful recall. See Stein and Heinze, Creativity, p. 18.

9 Wallas, Art of Thought, p. 82.
different experiments, undertaken in 1935 and 1937, Catharine Patrick investigated the writing of a poem and the painting of a picture under laboratory conditions. She concluded that both studies provided evidence to substantiate the four stages suggested by Wallas. Preparation was manifested by frequent thought changes, showing that the individual was receiving various ideas. Incubation was indicated by the "spontaneous recurrence of a mood or idea, somewhat modified, while ... [the individual] was talking of other things." The writing of the first lines of a poem, and the drafting of the shapes in a picture, were evidence for Illumination. In both studies, most of the revision occurred in the fourth quarter of the total time spent in the experimental session, indicating the Verification stage.

Between the years 1939 and 1942, E. D. Hutchinson drew on reports by artists for several studies of the creative process. He, too, concluded that it comprised four essential stages; these were the same as those described by Wallas and later writers. Hutchinson used slightly different terms for the last three stages. The second he named the Stage of Frustration, since this emotion, "often characterized by ... restlessness, [and] feelings of inferiority," results in the

---


11 Stein and Heinze, Creativity, p. 63.


13 Hutchinson, quoted in ibid., p. 25.
temporary renunciation of the problem. Like Patrick, he observed that the preceding work is involuntarily recalled during this period. He attributed the onset of the third stage, which he called the Period or Moment of Insight, to the termination of the psychic tension by some sudden stimulus. He maintained that secondary insights could occur during the final Stage of Verification, Elaboration, or Evaluation.

Regrettably, there has not been much in the way of controlled experimentation brought to bear upon the psychology of musical creation. While the results of what little experimentation has been done are valuable, they are neither decisive nor complete. James L. Mursell and other authors who have investigated the creative process in music—notably Max Graf and Géza Révész—have relied largely upon details about the lives, works, and utterances of the great composers. In these authors' often elaborate ruminations on the act of musical creation, evidence for the four stages formulated by Wallas can be discerned, as will be seen later in this discussion.

Some writers have objected to the general conceptions that the four stages are more or less discrete. Wallas himself had called attention to the fact that they constantly overlap as the individual explores different problems, and one aspect of a particular problem may be incubating in the unconscious while the conscious is preparing or verifying another. Since the early fifties, this idea has been taken even


15 Wallas, Art of Thought, pp. 81-82.
further by M. Wertheimer, W. Edgar Vinacke, and J. Eindhoven. They prefer to think of preparation, incubation, illumination, and verification as "ongoing processes," which "overlap and interweave between the occurrence of the original stimulus and the formation of the final product." Since neither preparation nor verification is necessarily completed in a single session of uninterrupted effort, it is logical to assume that a series of illuminations, varying in significance, could occur as the individual resumed his work again and again. Similarly, a kind of preparation may occur at the start of each session. Incubation of some ideas and verification of others may accompany various sessions; incubation may also take place between any two periods of work. In other words, the activities of preparation, incubation, illumination, and verification operate "to varying degrees throughout the creative process."  

Nevertheless, on the basis of the experimental evidence gathered by such authors as Patrick, Montmasson, Hutchinson, and Hadamard, it can be stated that one or another of these four conscious and unconscious activities predominates for a time in the course of creative thinking.

The first stage sees the occurrence or invention of the problem or idea, and its initial investigation. In a study of twenty-four American poets, R. N. Wilson found that four major sources of stimuli were drawn upon: "the gross natural environment, interpersonal relations, symbol

---


17 Vinacke, Thinking, pp. 361, 359, 360.
systems (language), and the self." Using as a basis details about the lives, works, and words of the great composers, together with experimental findings, Mursell concluded that "musical composition, like all other forms of original and authentic artistic expression, is unquestionably . . . a product of life experience and of the emotions of daily living." Thus any of an almost infinite variety of circumstances may occasion the arrival of the first idea for a musical work.

As the individual investigates the problem or idea, various concepts occur to him, and he tries to elaborate them. One school of thought concerning creative work in general, and musical creative work in particular, stresses that such ideas well up spontaneously from the unconscious. Another school of thought gives special consideration to the psychological factors, "such as experience, study, tradition, experimentation," upon which the ideas depend. Sometimes the general plan of a composition may arise as the first conception. Frequently,

---


19 James L. Mursell, The Psychology of Music (New York: W. W. Norton, 1937), p. 264. The experiment to which he specifically alludes was conducted in 1934 by Julius Bahle and involved thirty composers, including Arnold Schönberg. It is discussed on pp. 260-61; see also pp. 262-64 and 268-69. Bahle reported his findings in "Die Gestaltung der kompositorischen Schaffens im vokalen Schaffen zeitgenössischer Komponisten," Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie 91 (1934): 444-51.

20 Mursell, Psychology of Music, p. 274.

21 Révész, Introduction, p. 199. He refers to these two different concepts "the metaphysical" and "the psychological" respectively, and discusses them on pp. 198-205.

22 Mursell, Psychology of Music, p. 275.
however, the composer has to elucidate his initial ideas by means of trial-and-error sketching. Since the process of preparation, described as the recognition and formulation of the problem and the occurrence of ideas about its solution,\(^23\) predominates during this initial period of effort, it may be termed the stage of Preparation.

Graf maintained that from the time a musician becomes aware of the first ideas for a composition, an ever-increasing amount of "conscious thinking and conscious forming accompanies the whole composing process."\(^24\) However, in the case of such masters as Beethoven and Brahms, Mursell maintains that "once a beginning has been made, a process of gestation often very prolonged and largely subconscious is initiated."\(^25\) As previously mentioned, Helmholtz and Poincaré both observed that they reached a point in their investigations where further progress seemed impossible and conscious work on the problem had to cease.\(^26\) Similarly, Patrick, Hutchinson, Montmasson, and Hadamard, in their studies of poetic, artistic, and mathematical invention, discerned a period during which the individual generally turned his attention to other matters. Although no active work was done on the problem or idea, results of the preceding efforts fermented; changes and modifications occurred. At this time, the process of Incubation predominates.

This stage leads to "some preliminary decisions, a kind of

\(^{23}\) See Vinacke, Thinking, p. 361.

\(^{24}\) Graf, From Beethoven, p. 308.

\(^{25}\) Mursell, Psychology of Music, p. 277.

\(^{26}\) See Wallas' quotation of Helmholtz and Poincaré in Art of Thought, pp. 80-81.
illumination," which often occurs suddenly and seemingly without conscious effort. Brahms himself remarked that if he approached a musical idea about which he had not thought for some time, "it is sure to have taken shape; I can now begin to really work at it." This is echoed by Graf's statement that "composition . . . is accomplished in a . . . coordination of unconscious forming and critical thinking, of inspiration and work." Poincaré, Wallas, and some later writers implied that only the moment of insight together with the immediately preceding and accompanying psychological events constituted Illumination. They considered all subsequent conscious effort to elucidate the insight as comprising one or perhaps two further stages. However, to several other researchers Illumination is characterized not only by the crystallization of previous ideas, but by the drafting of these formulations. This

27 Vinacke, Thinking, p. 361.

28 From a conversation with George Henschel, February 27, 1876. Quoted in Henschel, Personal Recollection of Johannes Brahms (Boston: Gorham Press, 1907), pp. 22-23.

29 Graf, From Beethoven, p. 377.

30 Poincaré, quoted in Wallas, Art of Thought, p. 81; see the annotations for Montmasson, Invention, and Wilson, "Poetic Creativity," in Stein and Heinze, Creativity, pp. 73, 69-70. Wilson alone distinguished not only the fourth stage, which he called Elucidation of the vision, but a fifth. It was "barely distinguishable from the fourth," and involved "a reappraisal of what has come before." He named this fifth stage The End of the poem and its meaning to the poet.

31 See the annotations for Patrick, "Poets," idem, "Artists," and Hutchinson, Think Creatively, in Stein and Heinze, Creativity, pp. 63-64, 53-54, 25. See also Vinacke, Thinking, p. 361. In an experiment on scientific thought, Patrick investigated only the first three stages, and again concluded that Illumination was characterized by "the formulation of plans following incubation." She described the experiment in "Scientific Thought," Journal of Psychology 5 (1938): 55-83. See the annotation in Stein and Heinze, Creativity, pp. 74-75.
stage is therefore manifest in the writing of the first lines of a poem, the creation of the general shapes in a picture, and the production of a draft of a musical composition.

The process of Verification then becomes predominant as the results of Illumination are examined critically and refined. New insights may also occur. At this stage, a musical work is polished, given trial performances, and put forward to friends of the composer. To use Graf's expression, "the whole composition work, ... is now consummated in the light of conscious forming." In preparation for publication, an autograph or a copyist's manuscript is developed and revised to serve as the Stichvorlage (engraver's lay-out manuscript).

Eindhoven, Vinacke, and Wertheimer have emphasized the fact that "there are wide individual differences in patterns of creative thinking." It is therefore quite possible that, in a creative situation, one or more of the stages dominated by preparation, incubation, illumination, or verification could recur, perhaps many times, as the individual returned again and again to a work that he had once considered finished. This is the case with Brahms's String Quintet in F minor, which had been at the Verification stage for several months before the composer tempor-

32 See the annotations for Hutchinson, Think Creatively, and Wilson, "Poetic Creativity," in Stein and Heinze, Creativity, pp. 25, 70.

33 Graf, From Beethoven, p. 433.

34 Vinacke, Thinking, p. 359.

35 Bach, Brahms, and Bruckner frequently revised finished compositions; Mozart Mendelssohn, and Wagner occasionally did so. Mahler altered the entire orchestration of his Symphony no. 5 after its première in 1904. Graf mentions many of the works revised by these masters, in From Beethoven, pp. 442-47.

36 Brahms had hoped to have it played at his concert on 29 November 1862. Trial performances occurred the following year in April and May. See Chapter II, pp. 22-33.
arily abandoned it. Subsequently he transcribed it for piano duo; this version evolved into a finished work which Brahms intended to publish a few months after its première. However, both Clara Schumann and Hermann Levi felt that it should be recast, and Brahms, at Levi's suggestion, transcribed it for piano and string quartet. This final version, too, was refined for publication. After the Piano Quintet had been published, Brahms returned—perhaps more than once—to the Duo-Piano Sonata, and made further revisions.

To clarify the history of Brahms's archetypal concept as it evolved through three media, the periods of time dominated by the processes of preparation, incubation, illumination, and finally verification will be referred to as Stages 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively. It should be understood of these "stages" that, while each is characterized by a single predominant process, it also embraces the other three in varying degrees.

Before making the transcriptions for piano duo and piano quintet, Brahms probably did not experience a repetition of the preparatory stage. However, the other three stages, after occurring in the development of the String Quintet, recurred as the Duo-Piano Sonata and the Piano Quintet evolved. The first appearance and subsequent reappearances of these three stages will be differentiated by letters of the alphabet:

Stage 2\textsuperscript{a}, 3\textsuperscript{a}, 4\textsuperscript{a}, 2\textsuperscript{b}, 3\textsuperscript{b}, 4\textsuperscript{b}, etc.

---

\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., p. 15.

\textsuperscript{38}One can assume that the existence of the String Quintet made it unnecessary for Brahms to do any preliminary sketching for the Duo-Piano Sonata. Both the String Quintet and the Duo-Piano Sonata were in existence when Brahms transcribed the material for piano quintet, so that again it hardly seems likely that any sketching was required. In each instance, Brahms could simply have begun the drafting of the transcription itself.
CHAPTER IV

THE CREATIVE PROCESS, PART I: THE LOST STRING QUINTET

Postulation of the Creative Process

Brahms was obviously reluctant to reveal anything of the preparatory stage in his creative process. However, he once remarked that an idea for a new composition was "simply an inspiration from above ... [which] germinates unconsciously and in spite of ourselves." Brahmus usually derived this inspiration from "preexisting themes, personal experiences and events, Alpine scenery, Romantic literature, and the like."3

Kalbeck states that Brahms began the String Quintet in F minor during his visit with Clara Schumann at Bad Münster-am-Stein near the

---

1 He periodically destroyed accumulated sketches, and working drafts, so that at his death there remained only ten sketches, some transcriptions, and three unpublished, finished works. In his Testament, he declared that all such residual unpublished manuscripts should be burned. See Donald M. McCorkle, in collaboration with Margit L. McCorkle, "Five Fundamental Obstacles in Brahms Source Research," Acta Musicologica (48/2 (1976): 257.

2 From a conversation with Sir George Henschel, February 27 1876. Quoted in Henschel, Personal Recollections of Johannes Brahms (Boston: Gorham Press, 1907), pp. 22-23.

3 Among the examples that may be cited are the Variations on a Theme of Haydn (inspired by a preexisting theme), Nünie (written after the death of Brahms's friend Anselm Feuerbach), and the Schicksalslied (inspired by a poem of Hölderlin). See Paul Mies, "Aus Brahms' Werkstatt; Vom Entstehen und Werden der Werke bei Brahms," N. Simrock Jahrbuch I, ed. Erich H. Müller (1928): 43-63.
end of June 1862. The spectacular beauty of the surroundings, the companionship of Clara and Dietrich (two of his dearest friends), and the daily music-making at Clara's house must have provided a highly stimulating atmosphere for Brahms's inventive powers. Indeed, he spent his mornings composing, as Dietrich reported in a letter to his wife.

Two works for strings by Franz Schubert—the great C major Quintet, D. 956, and the D minor Quartet, D. 810 ("Death and the Maiden")—were among the compositions which Brahms played with Clara during this visit. Brahms's Quintet, like that of Schubert, was scored for two cellos instead of the more usual combination of two violas.

On 29 June, after having spent two weeks at Bad Münster, Brahms began a walking tour of the Palatinate with Dietrich and a mutual friend. This may have provided a refreshing respite (Stage 2^a) from the demanding task of sketching and elaborating the ideas for the String Quintet. When Brahms returned to Hamm on 10 July, he evidently turned his attention to the drafting of the entire work (Stage 3^a). By late August he had completed and sent the first three movements to Clara, in order that he might receive her comments on them and begin making the final revisions (Stage 4^a). The fourth movement was finished by 8 September, when he departed for Vienna.

---

4"the Quintet was begun in the spring of 1862 at [Bad] Münster am Stein" (das Quintett wurde im Frühling 1862 zu Münster am Stein begonnen). Max Kalbeck, Johannes Brahms, 4 vols. in 8, Dritte Auflage (Berlin: Deutsche Brahms-Gesellschaft m. b. H., 1908-14; reprint ed., Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1976), II/1: 52.

5See Chapter II, fn. 8.

6In a letter to Joachim, Clara remarked that she and Brahms had played the C-major Quintet and the D-minor Quartet "several times" during Brahms's stay. See the Appendix, p.240.
From the imperial capital, Brahms forwarded a manuscript of the complete Quintet to Joachim late in September. The composer was anxious for his friend to make any necessary corrections and immediately to return the manuscript so that it could be revised before its premiere scheduled for 29 November 1862. Brahms, however, could not have begun making these alterations until late November or early December, by which time the long-overdue manuscript surely would have reached Vienna. His revision of the work was interrupted at the end of December, when he sent the parts to Joachim, who finally returned both the score and the parts in mid-April of the next year.

Brahms arranged to have the String Quintet performed privately in Vienna near the end of April. Subsequently, he sent the score to Oldenburg, to get Dietrich's opinion of it. Brahms kept the parts and, on his way back to Hamburg, stopped at Hannover for three days (1-3 May 1863) to hear a private performance of the Quintet by Joachim's ensemble.

Finally convinced that, in Joachim's words, "the general effect of this piece, . . . [was] unsatisfactory," Brahms determined that further revisions were necessary. Shortly after his arrival in Hamburg on 7 May, he sent a letter to Dietrich requesting the return of the score "so that I can change some more things in it, which unfortunately is very

---

7 See Chapter II, fn. 23.
8 Clara had received the score of the fourth movement in mid-December 1862. She had decided that this, together with the score of the other three movements already in her possession, should be handed over to Joachim. The complete score reached him by the end of January 1863. See Chapter II, p. 20, and fn. 35.
9 See his letter of 26 May 1863 in the Appendix, p. 248.
necessary." At Dietrich's invitation he went to Oldenburg for a visit; the String Quintet manuscript must have been returned at that time. After returning to Hamburg, Brahms made further revisions in the score, then forwarded it to Dietrich as he had promised.

Stylistic Influences on the Germination of the String Quintet

Kalbeck's assertion that the lost Quintet was begun during Brahms's stay at Bad Münster compels one to compare the transcriptions of this work with Schubert's C major Quintet and D minor Quartet, both of which Brahms had played with Clara during his visit. Such a comparison is needed in order to determine whether or not the two Schubert compositions might have influenced the germination of Brahms's String Quintet. Of course, stylistic influences on the lost Quintet can only be postulated on the basis of the two later versions; however, both of these transcriptions undoubtedly offer an accurate representation of the material of the original Quintet. In the following discussion, references will be made to Op. 34 rather than to Op. 34bis.

The conclusion of the Scherzo in Op. 34 bears a striking resemblance to the finale of Schubert's great Quintet: in both works the strings in unison play the accented dissonant flatted supertonic which acts as upper neighbor to the tonic (see Example 4). In Schubert's finale, the vehement repetition of supertonic (unaltered) resolving to

---

10 "damit ich noch etwas darin herumwirthschaften kann, was leider sehr nöthig ist." See Appendix, p. 248.

11 The letter accompanying the composition referred to it as "the promised Quintet" (das versprochene Quintett). Ibid.
tonic is heard repeatedly before the final cadence (see Example 1, measures 417-20). An analogous passage in Brahms's Scherzo (measures 187-91) involves the flatted supertonic as part of an insistently repeated sixteenth-note figure from the Second Theme.

A similarity as significant as this invites investigation into other sections of these works. The Main Theme of the slow movement in Op. 34 and the Second Theme of the first movement in the C major Quintet (an expressive cello duet, measures 60-79) are particularly alike in several respects. Brahms's theme, like Schubert's, is a tranquil duet;
it occupies the first thirty measures of the piano part. The range of the lower voice would have required a cello in the original Quintet; the upper voice, with a range of g to d⁵⁄₄, might well have been played by the other cello.

Example 5. Franz Schubert, String Quintet in C major, D. 956, 1st movement (Allegro ma non troppo), measures 60-64.

In the first two measures of both themes, the duet sways back and forth within a very limited ambitus, the lower voice doubling constantly at the third. Subsequently, this line in Schubert's duet becomes more independent, whereas in Brahms’s theme it generally continues to move at the third or sixth below the melody.

The accompaniment to the first twenty-two measures of Brahms’s duet (until the commencement of the closing period), is also similar to that of Schubert's theme. In the treble register, a portato eighth-note figure is softly interjected after the first beat of virtually every measure, while a pizzicato note in the tenor usually gives impetus
to the first beat. Thus, it may be suggested that, in the lost String Quintet, Brahms's theme was presented in the same manner as Schubert's. To the end of measure 22, cellos may have played the duet, violins may have provided the portato accompaniment, and the viola may have interjected the pizzicato notes.

Several resemblances to Schubert's D minor Quartet occur in two themes of Op. 34. The opening of the Second Theme in the first movement of Brahms's work (measures 34-35) resembles that of the Second Theme in the same movement of Schubert's (see Example 6). The accompaniment in both passages begins several beats before the entry of the melody and consists of a pedal-point reiterated quietly in triplets.

The antecedent phrase of Brahms's theme (measures 34-38), like that of Schubert's, begins pianissimo, and may have been played as a duet by the

Example 6. Franz Schubert, String Quartet in D minor, D. 810, 1st movement (Allegro), measures 61-63

E.g., in Schubert's theme, see measures 63 and 75; in Brahms's, see measure 6, 9-12, and 18.

Whereas Schubert's theme is immediately repeated an octave higher in the violins, the length of Brahms's forbids this. However, when the duet is recapitulated Brahms creates a similar effect. The first eight measures (75-82) are stated as they appeared at the opening of the movement; then, the duet is begun anew, with the upper voice transposed an octave higher and played by the first violin (measures 83-104).
violins. Each theme starts with an anacrusis, leading to a motive that begins with an ascending step; the anacrusis and the motive are then repeated a third lower. All, or nearly all of this is doubled at the lower third in each theme. Schubert makes frequent use of the opening motive, sequentially repeated fortissimo, in both the latter part of the Exposition (e.g., measures 90-92) and the Development. Brahms states the entire antecedent phrase fortissimo in the Development (measures 149/4-153).

Other thematic similarities are to be found in the Third Theme of Brahms's Scherzo (first period, measures 22-29) and in the Second Theme in the finale of Schubert's Quartet (first period; see Example 7).

Example 7. Franz Schubert, String Quartet in D minor, D. 810, 4th movement (Presto), measures 88-101

Each theme is a forthright chordal progression in 6/8 time, periodically given impetus by triplet anacruses. Brahms's theme proceeds twice as fast as Schubert's, with a note to each beat rather than to each measure. Both begin by alternating three sustained chords (excluding the opening anacrusis) with three in triplet rhythm. While Schubert consistently emphasized the first beat of each measure with a forzando, Brahms called for accents only in the consequent phrase, to create syncopation. The
melodic line in Schubert's theme gradually ascends from f' to a'';
Brahms's melody descends from a'' to g'. The ranges of the supporting voices are also similar.

General Comments on the String Quintet

Clara Schumann greeted Brahms's original Quintet with great enthusiasm. She found the first three movements "beautiful, ... magnificent," and the finale "magnificent, finishing the whole, full of verve." Of course, she had no choice but to try the work at the piano, and it seems that she never heard it played by a string ensemble. Perhaps for this reason she praised the Quintet in very general terms, rather than attempting to offer specific criticisms. When Brahms later informed her that it had been transcribed for two pianos, she remarked:

Could you not have altered it easily and yet have left it as a Quintet, after all there were only places which did not sound good, but [there was] much [that was] quartet-like!

---

14 "[das Quintett] wird ja immer schöner, herrlicher" ([the Quintet] grows ever more beautiful, more magnificent); "prächtig, das Ganze beschliessend, voller Schwung." See Appendix, p.240.

15 During her stay at Luzern, she tried the first three movements on an upright piano (see her letters of 29 August and 3 September 1862 in the Appendix, pp.240,241). In a letter written from Berlin on 18 December, after the arrival of the finale, she remarked that "playing [the Quintet] so laboriously at the piano is so very unsatisfying" (das Spielen so mühsam am Klavier genügt so gar wenig; ibid., p.245). She expressed the hope that she could hear Joachim and his musicians play it when she visited Hannover at the beginning of January. Evidently she sent her score of the Quintet to Joachim, but was unable to go to Hannover. See Chapter II, p.20, and Berthold Litzmann, Clara Schumann; Ein Künstlerleben,3 Bde. (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1923-25), III: 136.

16 "Hättest Du das nicht leicht ändern und doch als Quintett lassen können, es waren doch nur Stellen, die nicht gut klangen, vieles aber wieder so ganz quartettmässig!" See her letter of 10 March 1864 in the Appendix, p.249.
Evidently she had been pleased with the work as a whole, but realized that there were a few problematical passages.

No letter from Dietrich concerning the Quintet appears to have been published. It is therefore impossible to determine whether or not he had the opportunity to perform the work with his musicians. His only (published) reference to the Quintet appears in *Erinnerungen an Johannes Brahms*, in which he remembered it as

a masterwork: the realization of his [Brahms's] things was becoming magnificent, ever more beautiful, ever more finished, more ingenious. In the work . . . [there was] a great feeling of spirit and power.17

Joachim, in his first letter concerning the String Quintet, hailed it as "a piece of [the] deepest meaning, full of manly strength."18 He was aware that it would make considerable demands upon the technique of the instrumentalists.

I would prefer that I might play it for you first; because . . . Hellmesberger would not play it suitably for you. He lacks the boldness and strength that are necessary for all your works. It is difficult, this Quintet, and I am afraid that, without energetic playing, it will sound a little unclear.19

Joachim, a violinist who performed both as a soloist and as a chamber musician, was more sensitive than Clara and Dietrich to problems of


sonority that existed in the Quintet. His letter dating from the end of January makes it apparent that some of the difficulties concerned the material in the bass register:

we played through your Quintet for the second time, and want to do it a third time, for Prell wants to practice his 2nd bass [i.e., cello] part at home. Already it was much clearer, the energy broke through with less grumbling and growling in the depths.20

A similar criticism appears in his letter of 7 April:

As it is, I would not like to produce it [the Quintet] publicly— but only because I hope you will alter here and there some roughnesses [which seem] too great even to me, and will lighten the coloring here and there.21

When he forwarded the Quintet score and parts to Brahms on the fifteenth, he explained that

Sound-charm [Klangreiz], to approximately characterize it with a word, is what, to me, is missing from serene enjoyment [of the work]. . . . Right at the second line, for example, the instrumentation seems to me not sufficiently energetic for the mighty rhythmical moves; it sounds almost faintingly weak for the ideas. Often again, everything stays too thick for uninterrupted stretches. You yourself must hear where the ear lacks [a sense of] repose.22

Nevertheless, he praised the "almost wanton creative power" evidenced in

20 "Dein Quintett haben wir . . . zum 2temmal durchgespielt, und wollen's auch ein drittes Mal tun, für das Prell seine 2te Bassstimme zu Haus einüben will. Es war schon viel klarer, die Energie brach mit weniger Murren und Knurren in der Tiefe durch." Ibid., p.246.


22 "Klangreiz, um's annähernd mit einem Wort zu bezeichnen, ist's, was mir daran zum ungetrübten Genuss fehlt. . . . Gleich auf der 2ten Zeile z. B. ist mir die Instrumentation für die mächtigen rhythmischen Rückungen nicht energisch genug; es klingt fast ohnmächtig dünn für den Gedanken. Oft wieder liegt alles ununterbrochene Strecken lang zu dick. Du musst's eben selbst hören, wo es dem Ohr an Ruhe gebricht." Ibid.
the Quintet, adding that it was "full of spirit through and through."23 As he later observed in a letter to Clara, there was much that was "remarkable" in the String Quintet, but "the general effect . . . [was] unsatisfactory."24

**Individual Movements**

**First Movement**

Scattered through the Piano Quintet are a few passages for the string ensemble alone, or for the strings with a minimum of support from the piano part. In some instances, piano and strings participate more equally, but the texture does not exceed five voices. Such passages would have been quite effective for the original ensemble of five strings.

It should not be surprising that several of these passages in the opening movement were mentioned by Clara when she first wrote to Brahms about the String Quintet:

> how heartfelt [is] the second [part of the] first theme, then the second [theme] in C-sharp minor, how wonderfully the instruments blend in the development of this and [in] the transition back to the first [i.e., to the Recapitulation], and at the close the dreamy place.25

"The dreamy place" must be the exquisite *Poco sostenuto* section (measures 261-79) that begins the Coda. These nineteen measures comprise the longest passage of the Piano Quintet in which virtually all of the

23"fast übermütigen Gestaltungskraft"; "durch und durch voll Geist." Ibid.

24 See his letter of 26 May 1863, ibid., p. 10.

25"wie innig das zweite erste Motive, dann das zweite in Cis moll, wie dann die Durchführung dieses und der Übergang wieder ins erste, wie da die Instrumente sich so wunderbar verschmelzen, und am Schluss die träumerische Stelle." See her letter of 3 September 1862, ibid., p. 240.
material is played by the strings (see Example 8). The piano sustains, with lower-octave doubling, the tonic pedal-point that would have been played by the second cello (measures 261-70/1). The parts written for the strings are possibly quoted directly from the original Quintet.

Example 8. Johannes Brahms, Op. 34, 1st movement (Allegro non troppo), measures 261-65

"The transition back to the first" must refer to the quiet announcement of the Principal Theme at measures 160-64/1, analogous to measures 273-79 in the Poco sostenuto section. The instrumentation would have been similar to that of the latter passage.

"The second [part of the] first theme" would be the espressivo Transition that begins at measure 23. Until the middle of measure 29, the parts for the violins and the viola in Op. 34 probably reflect the original version. Presumably, the piano plays what would have appeared in the two cello parts.

Clara's comment on the wonderful blending of instruments "in the
development" perhaps alludes to the quiet imitative elaboration of the Second Theme at measures 136-44 and 154-59. Brahms added very little to the original five-part texture when he made the two transcriptions. The line that now stands in the viola part at measures 137-44 perhaps did not appear in the original Quintet, for it is not present in the Duo-Piano Sonata (see Example 9).


Naturally, some sections of this movement would have been problematical, as Joachim's letters indicate. By stating that the instrumentation of "the second line, for example, ... seems to me not sufficiently energetic for the mighty rhythmical moves," Joachim may have been alluding to measures 5-11, where rushing sixteenth-notes are punctuated by emphatic chords.
strings were incapable of the crisp articulation and the orchestral sonorities that the material often seemed to require. In the first movement alone, his criticism that "the instrumentation . . . sounds almost faintly weak for the ideas" would have been applicable not only to the passagework and emphatic chords of measures 5-11, but to the fortissimo presentation of the Principal Theme in measures 12-22, the agitated elaboration and fortissimo transformation of the Second Theme in the Development (measures 145-53), and the stormy Tempo I section which concludes the Coda (measures 283-99).

Figuration similar to that of measures 5-11 is prominent in the accompaniment to the Principal Theme (measures 17-21) and to a variant of the Third Theme (measures 65-73), and is almost constant in the Tempo I section of the Coda. One can well understand Joachim's remark that the Quintet was "difficult" and would require "energetic playing," for such passagework would have demanded considerable strength and technical facility. When Brahms made the final transcription, he placed nearly all of this figuration in the piano part, so that it would be executed with the necessary clarity and incisiveness.

Such passagework, when played in a low register either by a cello or a viola, would have sounded indistinct. Joachim's allusion to "grumbling and growling in the depths" may have referred to the bass figuration at measure 17-18 and at the second half of measures 293-94 (all of which appears in the piano part in Op. 34).

Second Movement

With its lyrical themes and its simplicity of texture, this movement would perhaps have been the most effective for string quintet. It delighted Clara, who exclaimed, "it joyfully sings and rings from
beginning to end! I keep starting it again and would like never to stop." She referred to this movement as "an Adagio." When Brahms transcribed it for piano duo he designated it Andante, undoubtedly because he felt that a slightly faster tempo would be required to compensate for the decay of tone on the piano. However, before the working draft was copied, he added un poco Adagio. He retained this tempo designation in the final transcription, where much of the thematic material remains in the piano.

This movement would not have posed any serious problems of technique or sonority in the original version. There is no intricate passagework that might obscure melodic lines or create rumbling effects in the bass. However, it is probable that the original ensemble could not fully convey the intensity of the climaxes, for in the transcriptions Brahms added octave and/or unison doublings during these passages (see Example 10). Such doublings also appear in the last period of the return of the Main Theme (measures 95-104) and in measures 105-15 and 120-26 of the Coda.

The extended preparation for the return of the Main Theme (measures 55-74) would have been particularly well suited to the original ensemble. The expressive leaps of an octave or a ninth obviously require the strings.

27"wonnig singt und klingt das bis zur letzten Note! Immer fange ich es wieder an und möchte nicht aufhören." See her letter of 3 September 1862 in the Appendix, p. 240.

28 Many refinements affecting tempo in individual passages were executed in the working draft. See Chapters V, p. 95 and VII, p.163.

29 E.g., see the conclusion of the Main Theme at measure 27-32, of the Second Theme at measures 45-46, and the climactic measures 50-53 of the sempre poco accelerando episode.
Example 10. Johannes Brahms, Op. 34, 2nd movement (Andante, un poco Adagio), measures 29-31

At measures 65-72, Brahms seems to have added nothing to the original four- and five-voice texture.

Third Movement

Scherzo. Neither Clara nor Joachim offered any specific comments on the Scherzo. Clara simply remarked, "I love the Scherzo very much." After Joachim had tried the Quintet for the second time with his musicians, he was able to tell Brahms that "much charmed me, particularly the vigorous, sturdy Scherzo."

Much of the Scherzo would have been well within the technical and sonorous capabilities of the original ensemble. Indeed, the instrumentation of the pianissimo Main Theme (measures 1-12) probably resembles

30"das Scherzo liebe ich sehr." See Appendix, p. 240.

31"vieles, namentlich das markig gedrungene Schrezo, hat mir entzückt." Ibid., p. 246.
the original very closely. The two-measure reiteration of C preceding
the entry of the theme was evidently absent in the original Quintet;
Brahms added it in pencil to the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata
(see Chapter V, page 96). The hushed statement of the Second Theme at
measures 13-21 may be scored exactly as it was in the String Quintet. 32

The fortissimo transformation of this theme (measures 57-66) was
perhaps one of the passages which sounded "vigorous, [and] sturdy" to
Joachim. Although it greatly benefits from the incisiveness of the
piano part in the final transcription, it would have seemed satisfactory
in the original version. The same might be said of the first period
(measures 22-29/1) of the Third Theme; however, the texture of the
canon second period must have been rather thin.

With its quiet Subject (measures 67-71/1) and softly-treading
contrapuntal lines, most of the fugato would have been well suited to
the original ensemble. On the basis of the original reading in the
autograph of Op. 34, 33 one can suggest that the Subject was presented
first by a cello in the String Quintet. The original ensemble must
have seemed inadequate for the climactic measures 92-99 of the fugato;
Brahms added doublings in both transcriptions.

The scoring of the last quarter of the movement (measures 144-92),
almost constantly tutti, may have occasioned Joachim's criticism that
"often again, everything stays too thick for uninterrupted distances."

32 The shape of the melody at measures 18-21 is slightly different
from what evidently occurred in the String Quintet; Brahms had altered
it in the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata. See Chapter V, p. 96.

33 The present viola part was originally notated for the cello in
measures 67-76/1 and 80-84/1, and for the second violin at measures
76-80/1.
Orchestration problems were likely evident during the climactic measures 177-89; the texture of this passage in the String Quintet may have been very different from that of the Piano Quintet (see Example 11).


Trio. The Trio, which Clara considered "a little short" (etwas sehr kurz), might have provided a most effective contrast to the sustained excitement of the Scherzo. Neither the theme (to measure 209, repeated) nor the contrasting period (measures 225/4-33/1, repeated) exceeds the sonorous and technical capacities of a string quintet. Brahms preserved the original five-voice texture in the first statement of the theme. To the presentation and repetition of the contrasting period, he added one line of octave doubling and a few harmony notes to strengthen the cadence. As in the Transition of the first movement, he

34 See the Appendix, pp. 240, 241.
transcribed the original cello parts for the piano at the repetition of the theme (measures 210/4-25/1 and 241/2-58/1). Harmony notes and octave doublings were added (see Example 12).

Example 12. Johannes Brahms, Op. 34, Trio (Allegro), measures 210-12

Fourth Movement

As in the case of the other three movements, Clara offered nothing but praise for the finale:

I find the last movement magnificent, finishing the whole, full of verve, the Introduction quite beautiful, the 2nd theme such a pleasing contrast to the first, and in the Development again such [an] ingenious meshing of all the themes, in short, [it is] even quite masterly.35

Her allusion to the "meshing of all the themes" in "the Development" is

35"ich finde den letzten Satz prächtig, das Ganze beschliessend, voller Schwung, die Introduktion gar schön, das 2. Motiv als Gegensatz des ersten so wohltuend, und in der Durcharbeitung wieder so geistvolles Ineinandergreifen aller Motive, kurz, eben ganz meisterlich." Ibid., p. 245,
puzzling. The movement proper, as it stands in both transcriptions, does not have a Development, although the Second Theme is canonically elaborated (measures 125–36) and the return of the Main Theme includes a lengthy developmental extension of the third phrase (measures 195–236). It is possible that Clara was referring to the great Coda, which constitutes one-third of the movement (measures 342–492) and functions as a kind of terminal Development, transforming and juxtaposing the Main and the Second Themes.

Joachim's only specific comments on this movement concern a couple of passages that were not to his liking:

I am unsympathetic with only the place in the last movement with the Baroque Scheinfifths ([lost autograph] page 39) and the insignificant melody; also the restless canonic presentation on the next page. This surely cannot please you; it sounds affected!36

"The insignificant melody" must refer to the Second Theme, which is preceded by a brief ascent in fifths and fourths (measures 92/2–94/1 and 106/2–08/1). With regard to Op. 34bis, Joachim later remarked that he had "still not made friends" with "the second theme of the last movement."37 It seems therefore that his dislike for the theme had nothing to do with whether or not it was suitable to the medium of string quintet.

Brahms evidently thought that it required the strings' expressive-

36 "Wirklich unsympathisch ist mir nur die Stelle im letzten Satz mit den barocken Scheinquinten (Seite 39) und der nicht bedeutenden Melodie; auch die unrühige kanonische Fortsetzung auf der nächsten Seite. Das kann Dir auch nicht gefallen; es klingt gemacht!" Ibid., p.247.

37 "das zweite Motiv des letzten Satzes, mit dem ich mich noch immer nicht befreunde." Ibid., p.251.
ness, for he virtually excluded the piano from the initial statement (measures 94-107/1). In the immediate repetition (measures 108-24), the piano plays what must have been the second cello part and the conclusion of the second violin and viola parts. When this theme returns (measures 252-82), the piano assumes the material formerly entrusted to the cello and some of the inner voices; the texture generally does not exceed five parts.

There are a few other passages in this movement, as in the first and third movements, in which the participation of the piano is minimal. In the quiet imitative passage that opens the Poco sostenuto Introduction, the second cello-part was transcribed for the piano; Brahms added just a few doublings to strengthen the crescendo at measures 11-12. Similarly, the piano was excluded from most of the opening fourteen measures (342-55) of the Presto, non troppo Coda.

In spite of the distribution of material between piano and strings, the number of parts active in some passages of Op. 34 remains the same, or very nearly the same, as it might have been in the String Quintet. In Op. 34 Brahms probably transcribed the Main Theme intact until measures 54-57, where he later added the sustained pedal-point that now stands in the cello part. During the immediate repetition of the theme, the texture does not exceed five voices until the analogous measures 71-78. Brahms added several more doubling and harmony notes when he transcribed two of the later transformations of this theme (measures 161-83, 321-41) and the transformation of both themes at measures 439-66.

However, as in the opening movement and the Scherzo, the original ensemble would have lacked the force, incisiveness and contrast in timbres required to achieve the intended expression in the vigorous
Transition (measures 81-92), the canonic elaboration of the Second Theme, and the concluding triplet passage (measures 137-58/1).

The canonic elaboration of the Second Theme sounded "restless" to Joachim, probably because of all the triplet movement occurring simultaneously in upper and lower strings. In the original Quintet, the triplets in the tenor register probably continued at measures 128 and 132, as they do in the Duo-Piano Sonata (see Example 13).

Example 13. Johannes Brahms, Op. 34bis, finale (Poco sostenuto—Allegro non troppo—Presto non troppo), measures 127-29

The inadequacy of the instrumental forces would also have been evident in most of the great Coda. Five strings could not have approached the fullness of harmony and massiveness of sonority necessary at measures 362-438 and 478-92. The cellos' relentless triplet movement in the bass at measures 372-83 may have sounded heavy and rough to Joachim (see Example 14). These triplets, like those at measures 424-38 and, in the movement proper, at measures 149-58 and 307-16, would have been extremely difficult. It is not surprising that Joachim's second cellist was anxious to practice his part before attempting a third rehearsal!
Example 14. Johannes Brahms, Op. 34, finale (Poco sostenuto—Allegro non troppo—Presto non troppo), measures 374-77
CHAPTER V

THE CREATIVE PROCESS, PART II: THE SONATA
FOR TWO PIANOFORTES

Survey of the Stages of the Creative Process

Brahms's returning the String Quintet manuscript to Albert Dietrich in May 1863\(^1\) perhaps marked the beginning of a temporary renunciation of the work (Stage \(2^b\)). Distracted by his parents' difficulties, it is unlikely that the composer could spare much time for the consideration of the Quintet. Furthermore, by the end of the month he had been offered the conductorship of the Wiener Singakademie. After finally deciding to accept the position, he began planning programs for the forthcoming season in Vienna, understandably seeking the advice of Dietrich.\(^2\) The fact that Brahms became occupied with the new composition, *Rinaldo*, which was well started by early June,\(^3\) may indicate that he ceased work on the String Quintet.

Perhaps Brahms did not return to the Quintet until the cantata was largely finished at the end of September 1863. Sometime within the next few months he drafted the transcription for piano duo (Stage \(3^b\)).

---

\(^1\)See Chapter II, p.24, and Brahms's letter to Dietrich, dating from late May, on p. 249 of the Appendix.


\(^3\)See Chapter II, fn. 51.
By 27 February 1864, when the new version is first mentioned in the published correspondence, the Verification stage (4) was well begun. The working draft had been revised and copied; as will be explained below, it seems likely that Brahms instructed the copyist to incorporate specific revisions not present in the autograph manuscript. Both the latter and the copyist's manuscript were probably at Brahms's disposal before the twenty-seventh, for he had planned to try the work with Carl Tausig that day.

The failure of the première of the Sonata for Two Pianofortes, given by Brahms and Tausig in Vienna on 17 April 1864, may have caused the composer to feel that further revisions were necessary. He must have been occupied with such alterations shortly after his return to Hamburg in June, for he invited his friend Adolf Schubring to spend a few days' holiday with him, informing Schubring that they would be playing the Duo-Piano Sonata. By the middle of July, Brahms must have completed whatever changes he wished to make, for he dispatched both the working draft and the copyist's manuscript to Clara at Baden-Baden, evidently informing her that he intended soon to send the work to a publisher. Clara's letter of 22 July, urging that this version be transcribed for orchestra, seemingly put a stop to these plans, and Brahms hastened to Baden-Baden. He and Clara surely would have played

---

4 See Brahms's letter to Breitkopf & Härtel in the Appendix, p.248.
6 See Brahms's letter to Schubring, dated 19 June 1864, in the Appendix, p.249.
7 Refer to Chapter II, p.27.
8 See Appendix, p.250.
and discussed the Duo-Piano Sonata between his arrival on 31 July and her departure for a concert tour on 10 August. The work perhaps underwent further revision at this time.

Many of the changes that appear in the two manuscripts of the Duo-Piano Sonata probably arose from varying instrumental conditions and sonorities. Brahms possibly tried the work on more than one piano before sending his autograph to the copyist. After the completion of the copy he evidently played the Duo-Piano Sonata on several different instruments, partnered by Tausig in Vienna, by Clara in Baden-Baden, and perhaps by others. The invitation which Brahms sent from Hamburg to Schubring indicates that the composer had access to at least two instruments while in his native city.

By the end of October 1864, after his return to Vienna from Baden-Baden, Brahms had received "a beautiful grand piano" from the firm of Streicher. The different sonorities of the new instrument perhaps gave rise to many of the alterations executed in the Piano Quintet autograph, and to some of the changes subsequently made in the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata (see Chapters VI and VII).

Stage 3, Phase I: Transcription of the String Quintet for Piano Duo

That Brahms considered critically the material of the String Quintet, even as he transcribed it, is attested by numerous instances of

9 For example, his cancellation of some octave doublings in the bass line at measures 123-33 of the first movement was perhaps occasioned by an instrument that had a very sonorous bass register. See p. 122.

10 "einen schönen Flügel." See the letter written by Brahms to Clara at the end of the month, in the Appendix, p. 251.
redress scattered throughout the four movements of the working draft. Harmony notes or octave doublings were cancelled frequently by his deliberate smearing of the ink with his finger. In the first movement, such changes made in the midst of writing sometimes involved more than the alteration of isolated chords. In two instances, the phrasing of an entire passage was affected. Among the most interesting is the alteration made in the midst of the imitative dialogue that blossoms from the Closing Theme. At measure 248, Brahms completed the first beat in all but the left-hand part of the Secondo, then cancelled what he had written and began the measure afresh. The excised material (Example 15) indicates that he perhaps intended to extend the sequential descent, but immediately changed his mind. It is also possible that he decided at this point to omit material present in the original String Quintet.

Stage 3, Phase II: Elaboration of the Working Draft

Before sending the draft to the copyist, Brahms made numerous alterations in notes as well as in expression (phrasing and articulation, dynamics, and expression words). With a few significant exceptions in the first movement and the Scherzo, revisions of notes in all

11 The eighth-note figures moving across the barline at measures 84–85 of the Closing Theme were originally connected by one long slur. Brahms immediately reconsidered it, cancelled it in ink, and replaced it with three-note slurs. He never used it again, either in the remainder of this passage, or in the Recapitulation. A similar situation occurs at measure 155 in the Development, where the two triplet interjections in the right-hand part of the Secondo were originally given three-note slurs. Brahms changed his mind before continuing the pattern in the next bar, and replaced both three-note slurs with a two-note slur followed by a staccato dot. He used this articulation in the triplets of the four succeeding measures.
four movements were concerned with perfecting details of texture and balance. Occasionally a passage was made less difficult technically by the redistribution of material between the two hands of one piano part.\textsuperscript{12} In the outer movements and the Scherzo, Brahms sometimes indicated that Primo and Secondo should exchange parts, so that the share of the Secondo in the thematic material would be more nearly equal to that of the Primo.\textsuperscript{13}

Brahms's relatively few revisions and insertions of dynamic markings and expression words usually served to intensify the effect(s)

\textsuperscript{12}E.g., in the first movement at measures 256-59 the lowest voice in the right-hand part of the Secondo was transferred to the left-hand part. Each f in the original right-hand line was replaced by F.

\textsuperscript{13}See Table 1, measures 4-21, 63-74, 225-26; Table 3, measures 1-13; and Table 4, measures 42-49, 490-92.
clearly inherent in a given passage. This is best illustrated by the expression words added at various places within the second movement. The first movement and the last two show scarcely any alteration or insertion of dynamics and expression words. In all but the Scherzo, Brahms made some minor revisions in phrasing and articulation. Such detailed refinements which result in a more effective performance, do not significantly alter the sound of the material.

Thus Brahms, at this time, was mainly engaged in solving relatively minor problems of sonority that had arisen in the process of transcription, and in giving more detailed directions for performance. Revisions in all four movements were executed in both ink and lead. Notes were altered and cancelled more frequently in the first movement than in any of the others; the transcription of this movement seems to have posed the most difficulties.

**First Movement**

The revision of this movement was evidently begun well before Brahms had finished drafting it, for several changes made within the first two-thirds of the Exposition appear as the original reading in the Recapitulation. The most noticeable of these changes concerns the triplet accompaniment of broken octaves in the low bass line at measures 51-55 (see Textual Notes, page 222). Brahms decided to clarify the last three measures by transposing the first and last notes of some of the triplets up an octave to a less resonant register. In the Recapitulation, this new pattern constitutes the original notation at

---

14 When correcting the copyist's manuscript, he made the same alterations in measures 51-52 and in the second triplet of measure 53.
the analogous measures 213-17. At measures 57-58 of the Primo, Brahms divided the passagework between the two hands to simplify execution; the analogous measures 219-20 adopt this new reading.\(^{15}\)

In only one instance, the thematic texture was significantly altered. These changes concerned tessitura and doubling rather than affecting the shape of the theme itself. The passage in question is the opening of the Second Theme and its countermelody in the Recapitulation at measures 196-97. The original reading simply reproduced measures 34-35, transposed virtually intact to F-sharp minor, as shown in Example 16. Brahms added a new dimension to this opening by raising

Example 16. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, 1st movement (Allegro non troppo), original reading of measures 196-97

\(^{15}\)Brahms forgot to make the same change in measures 61-62 and therefore used the old distribution when he wrote the analogous measures 223-24 of the Recapitulation. Later, while correcting the copyist's manuscript, he made the appropriate alterations in measures 61-62 and 223-24, and added them to his autograph.
the tessitura of both the theme and the countermelody. The former was transposed up an octave; to give a brighter sound greater substance, Brahms added doubling at the lower octave. The eighth- or sixteenth-note pick-ups were clarified by the cancellation of the upper or lower third in one or both parts of the Secondo. The countermelody was rewritten with upper-octave doubling, and with the c♯ transposed up an octave.

Most of the other changes made in this movement consist of the cancellation of pedal-points, harmony notes, or doubling notes to thin and lend greater focus to the texture or to create a better balance between treble and bass. Many such revisions concern the development and recapitulation of the Second Theme (see Table 1, measures 139-41, 143-45, 151, 201-02, 205-06, and 207-08). The texture was thinned in the Transition and at the opening of the Principal Theme in the Recapitulation (see Table 1, measures 29-30 and 174-75). A considerable amount of doubling was removed from some sixteenth-note passagework accompanying the Third Theme (measures 65-68 and 229-30). The original reading of measures 65-66 is shown in Example 17.

In two instances, Brahms decided that a low bass pedal-point was perhaps too heavy for the material it supported. At the end of the Development, C was originally reiterated throughout measures 155-61;

16 The doubling in measures 67-68 (Primo) was the same as in measures 65-66. In the analogous measures 229-30 of the Secondo there was no doubling of the left-hand part on the first beat of each measure; otherwise, the doubling was the same as in measures 65-68. Brahms cancelled the doubling of the left-hand part in measures 65-68, leaving (perhaps accidentally) only the right-hand doubling in measures 66 and 68. In measures 229-30, all of the doubling was cancelled. After the making of the copy, Brahms cancelled the right-hand doubling line in both measures 66 and 68 of his autograph, but only in measure 66 of the copyist’s manuscript.
### Table 1

**Brahms's Alterations in the Working Draft of Op. 34bis, Stage 3, Phase II (First Movement)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Phras. &amp; Artic.</th>
<th>Dynamic Markings**</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4-22; 63-74/1; 225-26</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I &amp; II exchange parts to equalize thematic interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/3, 4; 30/3, 4</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open thirds g^b'_1-b^b'_1 and f^#'_1-a' were originally reiterated in triplet-eighth rhythm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*51-55</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nuance added to final measures of Closing Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*57-58</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*65-68; 229-30</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-72</td>
<td>II and/or I</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73/2-4</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-77/1; 80-81/1; 238-39/1; 242-43/1</td>
<td>I; II</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sixteenth and eighth notes connected by two-note slurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139/3-41/1; 143/3-45/1</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedal-point g^b (reiterated in half notes) cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Instrument(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Phras. &amp; Artic.</td>
<td>Dynamic Markings**</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141/4</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slur extended to first beat of measure 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151/2, 4</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower thirds (c'''' and a''''') deleted from sixteenth-note pick-ups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*155/3-61</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Texture of accompaniment thinned by deletion of d'''''' and A''''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174/3; 175/3</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-02</td>
<td>I/L</td>
<td>+8,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedal-point (f# and g reiterated simultaneously in half notes) cancelled; bass line doubled at lower octave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205-06</td>
<td>I/L</td>
<td>+8,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alterations as in measures 201-202 (pedal-point consisted of g and a#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207-08</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each chord thinned by cancellation of one note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*196-97</td>
<td>I/R &amp; II</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>+8,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*253-56</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*253-62</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256-60/1</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See fn. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Instrument(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Phras. &amp; Artic.</td>
<td>Dynamic Markings**</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*256-62</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265/3-66</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*281/4-82</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297/1</td>
<td>II/R</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open octave F₁-F₃, originally sustained in these measures, is replaced by reiterated open fifth

Ties from octave in preceding measure are cancelled

f'' and f' (which originally concluded first beat) cancelled and notated an octave lower

**The only refinement in expression words is described in the text
Example 17. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, 1st movement (Allegro non troppo), original reading of measures 65-66 in the Secondo

Brahms later indicated that it should yield to c in the second half of each measure. The tonic pedal-point at the conclusion of the Recapitulation (measures 256-62) initially consisted of the open Octave F–F. It was struck and sustained in the two left-hand parts in alternation on the second and fourth beats of each measure. Brahms revised the left-hand part of the Secondo more than once, and most of his alterations are quite ambiguous. He did, however, cancel several of the low F's.

On two occasions Brahms felt it necessary to strengthen a passage by inserting a brief doubling or harmonizing line in the bass. In measures 253-56, the opening of the imitative dialogue that concludes the Recapitulation, he reinforced the Primo by adding a bass line imitating that of the Secondo. Lower-octave doubling was added at measure 282, emphasizing the beginning of the ascent toward the climactic
Tempo I section of the Coda. The addition of legato ed espressivo to the ethereal pianissimo passage beginning at measure 273 of the Coda constitutes the only refinement of expression words. Brahms occasionally augmented the movement's sparse supply of dynamic signs. The insertion of such signs is of significance only in the imitative dialogue that concludes the Recapitulation (measures 253-62). Within the context of the crescendo at measures 254-55 and the forte of measures 256-60, Brahms added more local decrescendo signs to complement the shape of the melodic lines.

Apart from the insertion of two-note slurs in the Closing Theme at measures 76-77 and 80-81 (recapitulated at measures 238-39 and 242-43), phrasing and articulation in this movement were virtually untouched.

Second Movement

No truly significant changes were made in the notes, phrasing and articulation, and dynamics of this movement. At cadences in the Main Theme and in the un poco accelerando episode, a few harmony and/or doubling notes were cancelled to thin the texture (see Table 2, measures 22, 31, 54-55, and 104). Octave doubling was added in only one instance to reinforce briefly the Secondo's countermelody at the opening of the Coda.

A few small changes, all occurring in the Coda, were necessary to compensate for the decay of tone on the piano (see Table 1, measures 265-66 and 269) and to avoid the immediate restriking of a note in the midst of rapid passagework (see Table 1, measure 297).

A few crescendo and decrescendo signs were added to color the final measures of the Third Theme (71-73) and the countermelody to the recapitulation of the Second Theme (measures 198-99).

Decrescendo signs were inserted in measures 253-60 of the Primo. In the Secondo, they were added to measures 253-58, but only the signs in measures 253-56 appear in the copyist's manuscript. The signs in measures 257-58 were either added after the making of the copy, or were overlooked by the copyist.
TABLE 2

Brahms's Alterations in the Working Draft of Opus 34bis, Stage 3b, Phase II (Second Movement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Phras.</th>
<th>Dynamic Markings**</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/4</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>II/R</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49/4-50/1</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54/2-55/1</td>
<td>I/L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104/2</td>
<td>I/L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105-06/1</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115/1; 116/1</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116/2,3</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120/1,2</td>
<td>II/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expression words are discussed in text
(see Table 2, measures 105-06). The return of the closing period of the Main Theme, beginning at measure 118 in the Coda, was raised to mezzo forte from piano and pianissimo in the Primo and Secondo respectively.

Brahms did, however, add expression words which affected the tempo of the movement itself and which heightened the effect of specific passages. The pace of the movement was made slightly slower by the addition of un poco Adagio to the original Andante. Sempre was added to the un poco accelerando of the episode that begins at measure 47, ensuring a constant increase in momentum until the poco ritenuto of measure 53. The descent toward the return of the Main Theme was made more gradual by the insertion of poco ritardando in measure 74; for the beginning of the theme at measure 75 Brahms added tempo primo. At measure 111, where the varied return of the Second Theme reaches forte, Brahms added poco stringendo to impart a sense of urgency; after the climax at measure 115, he inserted poco ritardando to dispel this agitation.

Third Movement

Scherzo. The presentation of some of the thematic material in the Scherzo was significantly altered, just as, in the first movement, the opening of the Second Theme in the Recapitulation had undergone considerable revision. As in the first movement, passages of the Scherzo were subjected to changes either in doubling or register. Notes were sometimes cancelled to clarify the texture, although this was done less

20 Accents and a crescendo sign were added in measures 115-16 to make this material even more expressive.
frequently than in the opening movement.

The beginning of the Scherzo was made more effective by the addition of the prefatory two measures in which the tonic pedal-point is reiterated alone, quietly marking time. By establishing the metrical pulse in this way the syncopation of the beginning of the Main Theme is made more emphatic. To intensify the opening ascent of the theme, Brahms added a repetition of each note on the beat in the bass of the Secondo. 21

Equally effective are the revisions made in the last four measures of the initial appearance of the Second Theme. The original version, with every new note occurring on the beat, is shown in Example 18.

Example 18. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, 3rd movement (Allegro) original reading of measures 18/2-21 in the right-hand part of the Secondo

Brahms imparted a piquant syncopation by having each sixteenth-note anticipate the pitch of the following eighth. The original form of this melody was retained for the fortissimo transformations that appear later in the movement.

Several of the remaining changes concern adjustments in sonority. To counterbalance the forte octaves ascending in the treble at measures 126-27 and 130-31, the imitation in the left-hand part was transposed

21 The insertion of this line resulted in the redistribution of material; originally the functions of the two pianos were exactly the same as they are at the return of the theme, measures 47-56.
down an octave to a more resonant register. Similarly, in measures 93-98 of the fugato, Brahms added upper-octave doubling to the extension of the Subject in the Secondo, with the effect that it is not overpowered by the high treble octaves of the counterpoint in the Primo. The appoggiatura at the movement's conclusion (measure 192) was emphasized by unison in addition to octave doubling.

As in the first movement, harmony and/or doubling notes were sometimes cancelled in order to clarify the texture or make a bass line sound less ponderous. Such alterations occurred at the ascent in measures 144-45, in the low bass accompaniment at measures 185-89 of the Primo, and in the midst of the fortissimo transformation and superimposition of the Main Theme and the Second Theme at measures 180 and 184 (see Table 3). Brahms added dynamic symbols and abbreviations to intensify the latter passage (see Table 3, measure 178-80 and 182-84 for the only dynamics inserted in the movement at this stage).

Phrasing and articulation were not altered. Brahms did, however, add senza Pedal to the two pianissimo appearances of the Main Theme, and col Pedal to the first presentation of the Third Theme (beginning at measure 22).

Trio. The repetition of the theme, beginning at measure 209 was softened from forte to mezzo forte. In the return of the theme after the contrasting section, a more legato phrasing was adopted (see Table 3, measures 216 and 244). No other significant refinements were made.

Finale

Probably Brahms temporarily abandoned the drafting of this movement in order to revise what he had transcribed, for at the beginning of the
### TABLE 3

**BRAHMS’S ALTERATIONS IN THE WORKING DRAFT OF OPUS 34BIS, STAGE 3<sup>b</sup>, PHASE II (THIRD MOVEMENT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Phras.</th>
<th>Dynamic Markings**</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-13/1</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>I and II exchange parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1-2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*3-4</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td></td>
<td>+8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*18/2-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*93-98/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+8'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*126-27;</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Texture thinned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>I/L</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8&lt;sub&gt;T&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Texture thinned by deletion of doubling line in the bass register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178-80/1;</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>sf Superimposition of Main Theme and Second Theme intensified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182-84/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180/1;</td>
<td>II/R</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8&lt;sub&gt;L&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>First sixteenth-note (c') replaced by a rest, to clarify texture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Instrument(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Phras.</td>
<td>Dynamic Markings**</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185-89</td>
<td>I/L</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c deleted so that bass line sounds less ponderous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*192</td>
<td>I/L</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>II/R</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slur in theme extended to first beat of measure 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244/4</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slur in theme extended to first beat of measure 245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The only refinement in dynamic abbreviations is shown in Table 11, measure 209.
recapitulatory section he distributed material in a way that had been indicated by revisions made in lead in the expository section (see Table 4, measures 42-49).

As in the first movement, most of Brahms's alterations concerned problems of texture and balance, and therefore consisted of the cancellation of octave or unison doublings and harmony notes. Most of the composer's attention was devoted to a strongly syncopated concluding passage (measures 137-60, recapitulated at measures 295-318), and to the Coda. In the former, he cancelled some lower-octave doubling in the treble (see Table 4, measures 141-45). An accompaniment of triplet octaves low in the bass was reduced to single notes (see Table 4, measures 149-51, 153-56, 307-09, and 311-14). The original octaves, when combined with the other left-hand line (which doubled the octaves' upper or lower notes at the unison), would have provided too powerful an accompaniment for the treble chords.

Such an accompaniment occurred frequently in the Coda, and Brahms always cancelled doublings in one or both left-hand parts (see Table 4, measures 389-90, 423-31, and 431-35). He allowed heavier triplets to stand only in the climactic measures 435-38, cancelling one doubling line

22 Brahms made a pedal-point less prominent in one instance: he added ties to the c in the left-hand line of the Secondo at measures 448-61, so that it would be struck in every second measure rather than in every measure.

23 The descent in the left-hand part of the Secondo at measures 389-91 was originally entirely in octaves. In the fortissimo passage that begins at measure 423, the line that now stands in the left-hand part of the Secondo was to be doubled at the lower octave ad libitum. At the end of measure 431, doubling was to continue at the upper octave ad libitum, and lower-octave doubling of the present line in the Primo was to begin, also ad libitum. Both doublings were to continue until the middle of measure 435, where the two left-hand parts began to play in thirds, doubling each other at the octave.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Phras. and Artic.</th>
<th>Dynamic Markings</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41-49/1</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107; 265</td>
<td>II; I</td>
<td>8,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120/2-21</td>
<td>II/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141/2-45/1</td>
<td>II/R</td>
<td>-8_{T}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149-51,</td>
<td>II/L; 153-56;</td>
<td>-8_{L}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307-09;</td>
<td>I/L</td>
<td>-8_{T}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149/1;</td>
<td>I/R; 307/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*341</td>
<td>II/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367/4-68/1</td>
<td>I/L</td>
<td>8,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* I and II exchange parts to equalize thematic interest
* Second and third notes in the ascending line are transposed to a lower register
* See fn. 24
* Texture clarified at anacrusis and first beat of each measure
* Triplet accompaniment made less ponderous
* Melody concludes on tonic (rather than mediant) to create a more emphatic cadence
* Bass octaves transposed to a lower register to strengthen cadence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Phras. and Artic.</th>
<th>Dynamic Markings</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>388-89; 390</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*403/4-19</td>
<td>I/L &amp; II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423/5-31/4</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431/5-35/3</td>
<td>I/L; II/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435/5-38/3</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438/4-39/1</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448-61</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*451/4-55/4</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*486-87, 489</td>
<td>I/R &amp; II/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490/5-92</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4--Continued

*388-89; 390 Triplet accompaniment made less ponderous

*403/4-19 Triplet accompaniment made less ponderous by cancellation of ad libitum doubling

*431/5-35/3 As above

*435/5-38/3 Triplet accompaniment thinned by cancellation of upper line in II/L (which doubled that of I/L)

*438/4-39/1 I & II exchange parts

*448-61 See fn. 22

*451/4-55/4

*486-87, 489

I & II exchange parts
instead of two (see Table 4).

Perhaps the greatest technical difficulty of the entire movement was posed by the triplet octaves in the Secondo at measures 403-19. Originally they were to be played ad libitum by the right hand alone; Brahms indicated that the left hand, sustaining the bass octaves now found in the Primo, might take the lower notes of the right-hand octaves wherever possible. The left-hand of the Primo doubled the right-hand chords in different inversions. To free the left hand of the Secondo so that it might play all the lower notes of the triplet octaves, Brahms indicated the transferral of its sustained bass to the Primo, where it replaced the left-hand chords.

In this movement, as in the first, melodic material underwent significant alteration in only one instance; the changes again concerned tessitura and doubling. The passage in question occurs near the end of the Coda. Initially the high tessitura of the melodic line in measures 483-85 was maintained in the Primo and Secondo at measures 486-89 (see Example 19). Perhaps to enhance the effect of the final chords, Brahms transposed the right-hand part of the Primo down an octave at measures 486-87 and 489, slightly thinning the texture at the same time by cancelling lower-octave doubling (and some harmony notes) in the right-hand part of the Primo and/or Secondo.

Minor changes in melodic material may be observed earlier in the movement (see Table 4, measures 107, 265, 149, and 307). Grace notes were added to the espressivo transformation of the Second Theme in the right-hand part of the Primo at measures 451-55.

Expression words were neither altered nor inserted. The only
Example 19. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, finale (Poco sostenuto; Allegro non troppo; Presto non troppo), original reading of measures 486–89
significant change in dynamics was the addition of decrescendo signs in measures 438-39; as a result, the piano dolce at the end of measure 439 was no longer a subito piano effect.

Little attention was given to phrasing. A small change was made within the Second Theme at measure 120-21. The only significant alteration occurred at measure 341, which immediately precedes the Coda. To indicate that the Coda should follow attacca, without a break, Brahms lengthened the slurs that originally concluded at the end of this measure.

Stage 4b, Phase I: Instructions
to Copyist

There exist in the copyist's manuscript of the Duo-Piano Sonata numerous deviations from the autograph (working draft) which remained unchallenged by Brahms, even in the galley proofs. Many of the changes made by the copyist are relatively unimportant; those which contradict the autographs of both the Duo-Piano Sonata and the Piano Quintet can be considered as copyist's errors. Other deviations from the autograph of the Duo-Piano Sonata, however, are in agreement with that of the Piano Quintet. This suggests that Brahms instructed the copyist

24 Measures 120-21 originally were given the same slur as the analogous measures 102-03. Brahms later lengthened it, then cancelled it entirely to emphasize the first note of the descending line (a'') by separating it from the preceding and following notes.

25 For example, at the opening of the Transition in the first movement, the copyist began the lower voice in the right-hand part of the Primo one measure late, overlooking the half notes a'' and g' at measure 23 of the working draft. However, he copied the analogous notes (a'' and b'') in measure 25. Brahms notated this line for the second violin in the Piano Quintet (see measures 23-26).
to make these changes, and then subsequently incorporated them himself when he wrote the transcription for piano quintet. This hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that some of the alterations made by the copyist—such as the omission of lower-octave doubling from several measures of a bass line—are of such significance that it seems highly improbable that they were the result of human error. Many of these important changes were later included by the composer in the final transcription.

Therefore it seems logical to assume that Brahms gave the copyist specific instructions for alterations, either verbally or as a list of errata. Such instructions may be regarded as constituting the first phase in the Verification stage, for they concern the preparation of the Duo-Piano Sonata for performance and eventual publication.

First Movement

The copyist omitted or inserted lower-octave doubling, presumably according to Brahms's instructions, in the first four measures of the Transition and in measures 105-07/1 of the Development. The left-hand bass line of the Secondo was affected in both passages. In the former, the doubling in the working draft was not copied; Brahms himself omitted it in the autograph of the Piano Quintet. The reverse occurs in the passage cited in the Development: the copyist added lower-octave doubling, which Brahms had used since the beginning of this bass line at measure 102. 26

26 In the Piano Quintet the cello begins this line, naturally without lower-octave doubling. When it is taken over by the piano, it continues in single notes.
Most likely Brahms gave the copyist instructions in the manner of interpreting the left-hand part of the Secondo at measures 257-62, where some of the revisions in the working draft are quite unintelligible. It is also possible that he requested the transposition of a chord at measure 22 (see Table 5), for he notated the transposed version in the autograph of the Piano Quintet.

A few relatively minor insertions of dynamics and/or expression words were made at measure 31-32, 155, 213, and 227 (see Tables 9 and 5). Most of them seem to have been added simply for clarity, and all of them are present in the autograph of the Piano Quintet. The copyist added accents emphasizing a line in an imitative passage (see Table 5, measures 129-31). Fingering was supplied in measure 157 (see Table 5).

Second Movement

As in the first movement, the copyist in one instance added lower-octave doubling that was allowed to stand in both the Stichvorlage and the galley proofs, although it was not included in the Piano Quintet (see Table 6, measures 109-10/1). However, of greater significance is the change made by the copyist in the articulation of the syncopated figure which characterizes the Main Theme and reappears later in the movement. Brahms had tied common notes whenever they occurred in this figure; the copyist always notated a slur instead of a tie (see Example 20). In each instance the composer allowed this change to stand, both in the copyist's manuscript and in the galley proofs. If

27 The figure includes common notes when it appears on the first beat of the following measures: 1, 2, 5-7, and 13 of the Main Theme (recapitulated at measures 75, 76, 79-81, and 95), and 69-71 in the preparation for the return of the Main Theme.
TABLE 5
ALTERATIONS REQUESTED BY BRAHMS IN THE STICHVORLAGE OF OPUS 34BIS,
STAGE 4b, PHASE I (FIRST MOVEMENT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Notes**</th>
<th>Dynamic Markings***</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/3</td>
<td>I/L</td>
<td>8,</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bass chord (C-G-c) transposed to a lower register to strengthen cadence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-26/1</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td>8,</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Texture clarified by omission of doubling in extreme bass register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/4-32</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Conclusion of Transition strengthened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*105/2-07/1</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td>+8,</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Ascent in treble register emphasized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129/3, 130/3, 131/3</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Ascent in treble register emphasized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*257-62</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Copyist added fingering at measure 157/2 in I/L.
***Dynamic abbreviations and expression words inserted by copyist are shown in Table 9 (see measures 155, 213, and 227).
TABLE 6
ALTERATIONS REQUESTED BY BRAHMS IN THE STICHVORLAGE OF OPUS 34BIS,
STAGE 4, PHASE I (SECOND MOVEMENT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Phras.</th>
<th>Dynamic Markings**</th>
<th>Accent</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13/1, 14/1</td>
<td>II/R</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/4-23/1</td>
<td>II/R</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*32</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*35/2-36/2; 43/2-44/2</td>
<td>II/L; I/R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109-10/1</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td></td>
<td>+8,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-13</td>
<td>II/R</td>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expression words changed and inserted by copyist are shown in Table 10, measures 25, 27, 105, and 115.
Example 20. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, 2nd movement (Andante, un poco Adagio), measure 1 in the right-hand part of the Secondo: opening figure of the Main Theme (A) as notated by Brahms, and (B) as notated by the copyist

it was erroneous, it evidently did not meet with his disapproval, although he did not adopt it in the Piano Quintet. However, the copyist's changes in phrasing at measure 111-13 were incorporated in the Piano Quintet autograph (see Table 6).

Several of the copyist's alterations and insertions of expression words were utilized by Brahms when he made the final transcription.

28 It is possible that the copyist, seeing the slur for the upper notes in each appearance of this figure, did not look closely at the tie and assumed that it was a slur for the lower notes. Of course, one might also conjecture that Brahms requested the substitution of a slur for the tie in these instances, then changed his mind when he wrote the Piano Quintet, notating ties as he had done in the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata. In either case, it seems unlikely that the use of slurs instead of ties in the Stichvorlage escaped his attention. For example, in measure 75, where the return of the Main Theme begins, he made several revisions in dynamics immediately above and below this figure, and would surely have noticed that a slur appeared in place of a tie. However, he left the slur untouched.

29 The few additions made by the copyist but not incorporated by Brahms in the autograph of the Piano Quintet should be acknowledged. Sempre molto dolce and dolce appear in the copyist's manuscript at measures 1 and 17 of the accompaniment to the Main Theme; if Brahms had requested their insertion, he did not consider them necessary in the final transcription, where this material is played by violin and viola. The a tempo inserted by the copyist at measure 118—after the ritenuto begun at measure 116—was also omitted from the Piano Quintet. In that manuscript, Brahms drew a line to indicate that the ritenuto was to continue until the end of measure 117. In the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata he had simply written poco ritenuto above measure 115, without indicating how long this effect was to last.
Most significant is the addition of *poco accelerando* at measure 25 of the Main Theme, followed by *a tempo* when the cadential $V^7$ resolves at measure 27. Two changes concern the varied return of the Second Theme in the Coda (see Table 10, measure 105 and 115/1).

The copyist also made a few refinements in dynamics, all of which were incorporated by Brahms in the autograph of the Piano Quintet. Crescendo and decrescendo signs were inserted to add nuance in the Main Theme (see Table 6, measures 13-15 and 22-23). The *diminuendo* after the climax of this theme was begun one measure earlier than it is in the autograph, at measure 32 instead of 33. Accents were inserted at measures 35-36 and 43-44 to emphasize the opening of the Second Theme and its repetition.

**Third Movement**

**Scherzo.** As in the two preceding movements, the copyist added some octave doubling that remained uncancelled even in the galley proofs (at the extension of the Subject in the fugato). Brahms had begun doubling the Subject at the upper octave in the second measure of this extension, whereas the copyist started the doubling in the first measure (see Table 7, measures 92-93).  

Brahms possibly requested the copyist's use of a quarter note followed by an eighth-note rest on the first beat of measures 125-41, replacing the dotted quarter notes found in the working draft. In the Piano Quintet, quarter notes and eighth-note rests appear in all but the first few measures of this passage.  

---

30. In the Piano Quintet this line is taken by the violins in unison from measure 92 until the middle of measure 98.

31. They occur in measures 130-43.
### TABLE 7

ALTERATIONS REQUESTED BY BRAHMS IN THE STICHVORLAGE OF OPUS 34BIS,

STAGE 4\(^b\), PHASE I (THIRD MOVEMENT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Artic.</th>
<th>Remark**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92-93/1</td>
<td>II/R</td>
<td>+8,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyist began doubling of the extension of the Subject one measure earlier than Brahms had indicated in the working draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*125-41</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Copyist omitted staccato dots for triplet accompaniment, and non legato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dynamic abbreviations and expression words changed and inserted by copyist are shown in Table 11, measures 71, 88, 144, 194, and 235.
With a single exception, the few dynamics and expression words inserted by the copyist in the fugato (see Table 11, measures 71 and 88) were utilized by Brahms in the autograph of the Piano Quintet. These insertions serve to subdue contrapuntal lines heard with the Subject. The Piano Quintet also adopted the dynamics added by the copyist at measure 144; whereas the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata calls for an uninterrupted crescendo from piano at measure 142 to fortissimo at measure 145, the copyist inserted piano crescendo at measure 144.

Trio. The very few changes made by the copyist in the Trio constitute refinements or clarifications of dynamics and articulation. All of these alterations were later incorporated in the autograph of the Piano Quintet. The reiterated pedal-points that accompany the first statement of the theme were designated by the copyist mezzo forte instead of poco forte, and one of the countermelodies in the middle section was reduced from forte to mezzo forte (see Table 11, measures 194 and 235). The only refinement in articulation was the copyist's use of non legato for the flowing accompanimental material that begins in the Primo at measure 211; in the working draft, Brahms had added staccato dots in lead.

Finale

In this movement alone, the copyist made significant changes and additions in both notes and expression words. As in the other movements, he executed very few refinements in dynamics. The most important additions of expression words occur in the movement proper;

32 Namely the piano added by the copyist in measure 96 of the Primo.
changes in notes are found only in the Presto, non troppo Coda. In
the Piano Quintet Brahms incorporated all of the expression words added
by the copyist, as well as nearly all alterations in notes. Apart
from inserting a single accent, the copyist executed only two small
alterations in dynamics. Both of these changes, appearing in the Coda,
were included by Brahms in the final transcription.

Most of the changes in notes occur in the first few measures of
the final a tempo section (measures 467ff) of the Coda. The texture
of the three opening measures was made much less heavy—particularly in
the bass register—by the omission of some notes and by the substitution
of harmony notes for lower-octave doubling (see Table 8). The melodic
line in the Secondo was slightly altered (see Table 8, measures 470-71/1).

Changes in notes are to be found elsewhere in the Coda; all have
to do with octave doubling. The copyist omitted some lower-octave
doubling from the quiet sequential ascent and descent of a motive from
the Second Theme (see Table 8, measures 449ff and 457ff). To strengthen
the dominant in the final cadence of the movement, he doubled it at the
lower octave (measure 491).

All of the changes mentioned above were incorporated by Brahms in
the Piano Quintet, except the omission of lower-octave doubling at
measures 449ff and 457ff. Just as he must have done for measures
257-62 of the first movement, the composer probably instructed the

33 Emphasizing the beginning of the repetition of the Second Theme
in the left-hand part of the Secondo at measure 266. Either Brahms
or Rieter-Biedermann, when correcting the copyist's manuscript, inserted
such an accent at the analogous measure 108, in the left-hand part of
the Primo.

34 From the middle of measure 445 to the end of measure 463 the
melody is played in octaves by the first violin and viola.
### Table 8

**Alterations Requested by Brahms in the Stichvorlage of Opus 34Bis, Stage 4b, Phase I (Finale)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Dynamic Markings**</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>266/2</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>See fn. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*389/4-91</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td>8, +8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449, 451, 453, 455, 457-63: first beat</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>-8T</td>
<td>Syncopation inherent in melody emphasized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467/4, 468/1</td>
<td>I/L</td>
<td>-8T</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Open octaves E♭-E♭ and F,-F replaced by open sixth and fifth in less resonant register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469/6-70/1; 470/1</td>
<td>I/R; II/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Texture thinned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470/3-71/1</td>
<td>II/R</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>d♭'' replaced by f'', to duplicate melodic line of measures 468-69 at the upper octave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*491/1</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dynamics and expression words changed and inserted by copyist are shown in Table 12, measures 93, 192, 403, 420, 445, 464, and 467.**
copyist in the manner of interpreting the Secondo's left-hand part at measures 390-91. Originally measures 388-91 of this part had been entirely in octaves. Brahms clearly cancelled the octave doubling as far as the middle of measure 389, but the lead revisions affecting the remainder of the passage are ambiguous. As shown in Example 21, the cancellations which Brahms made in pencil are represented by broken lines, and his insertions are enclosed in parentheses. The reading notated by the copyist is identical to that which Brahms wrote in the Piano Quintet.

Example 21. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, finale (Poco sostenuto; Allegro non troppo; Presto non troppo), revised reading of measures 389-92/1 in the left-hand part of the Secondo

The copyist's addition of un pochettino più animato to the Second Theme (measures 93ff) is as significant as the changes in notes made by him in the Coda. Another insertion of expression words occurs in the recapitulation of the Main Theme, where he added sempre dolce in both pianos for the exquisite dialogue that begins in the third phrase (measures 192ff).

Two insertions of expression words appear in the Coda; both of them concern the transformation of the Second Theme (see Table 12, 35

The expression probably should have been repeated for the recapitulation of this material at measures 251ff. In the Piano Quintet it appears in ink at measure 93, and in lead at measure 251.
measures 445 and 464). The copyist also raised the dynamic level to *fortissimo* at measures 403-19 and 420-23.\(^{36}\) Possibly this was because the triplet octaves which dominate this passage had been divided between two hands (see page 103), and therefore could be played much more forcefully.

**Stage 4\(^b\), Phase II: Revision of Copyist's Manuscript**

Apart from correcting some of the copyist's errors (see Textual Criticism, page 218), Brahms was mainly concerned with making refinements in expression (i.e., phrasing and articulation, dynamics, and expression words). He executed very few changes in notes; none was made in the second movement, and a single note was cancelled in the finale. A few notes in the fugal of the Scherzo were transposed up an octave to create a more effective climax. In four measures of the first movement he continued to thin the bass register and clarify texture, as he had done in the working draft.

**First Movement**

Brahms made more revisions in this movement than in any of the other three, as was the case in the working draft. It is not surprising that some alterations begun within this movement in the latter manuscript were carried further by Brahms in the copyist's manuscript. The composer had clarified the triplet accompaniment of broken octaves from the end of

\(^{36}\) The copyist inserted *fortissimo* in both pianos at the middle of measure 403, where the octaves begin. For the emphatic chords that climax the passage (measures 420ff) he notated *fortissimo* rather than the *forte* that appears in the autograph.
measure 53 through measure 55 in his autograph (see pages 222); when revising the copyist's manuscript, he made the analogous changes in the beginning of the passage (measures 51-53). Similarly, the thinning of the texture in some passagework accompanying the Third Theme (see page 88) was continued by Brahms's cancellation of the doubling notes in the right-hand part of the Secondo at measure 66.

A few changes in phrasing and articulation should be mentioned. Brahms replaced with wedges the staccato dots that had been copied from the working draft for the emphatic chords in the Principal Theme area. He changed his mind about the two-note slurs which he had added in the working draft at the Closing Theme (see page 93), and cancelled them in the copyist's manuscript. Perhaps at the same time, he added staccato dots to the octaves that accompany this material.

Brahms made a single alteration in expression words: at the forte climax of the Closing Theme (measures 86 and 248) he cancelled the espressivo that had been copied from the working draft. Dynamics were scarcely altered.

Second Movement

The only significant change in this movement was the addition of measures 5-11, Primo and/or Secondo; 20-22/1, right-hand of the Secondo.

Perhaps no dynamic signs were present in measures 214-16 of the working draft when it was sent to the copyist, for the latter did not notate signs for either piano in these measures. When revising the copyist's manuscript, Brahms inserted long crescendo and decrescendo signs for both pianos. He allowed these to stand even in the galley proofs, although at some point he had added in his working draft short crescendo and decrescendo signs such as appear in the analogous measures 52-54. The shorter signs were used also in the Piano Quintet, at both passages.
staccato dots and slurs at the beginning of measure 50, to indicate that the triplet-octave accompaniment to the *forte* episode should be played *portato*. Brahms inserted a few dynamics, all of them relatively unimportant. At the climactic measures 116-17 of the Coda, he indicated that the crescendo and decrescendo signs in the *Primo* were to apply only to the melody.

**Third Movement**

As in earlier phases (see Table 3, measures 93-98, and Table 7, measures 92-93), Brahms was concerned with strengthening the extension of the Subject in the fugato. He indicated that it should be briefly transposed up an octave at the climactic measures 98-99, so as to be heard more clearly amidst the high treble counterpoint of the *Primo*.

Brahms's other revisions apply to phrasing. There is an interesting disagreement between the slurs found in the working draft for the *forte* reminiscence of the Main Theme, and those which Brahms supplied for this material in the copyist's manuscript and in the Piano Quintet.

---

39 At the return of the Main Theme in the Secondo at measure 75, he added *pianissimo* to the accompaniment in the left-hand part. In the Coda, at measure 108, he softened the accompanimental material in the *Primo* by inserting *piano*.

40 Specifically, the second half of measure 98 and the first two sixteenth-notes in measure 99.

41 The copyist did not notate slurs for this material at measures 38-41 and 42-45 (in the right-hand part of the *Primo*), or at measures 139-42 (in the *Secondo*); perhaps none was present in the working draft when it was copied. However, he notated slurs for the analogous measures 125-28, 129-32, and 135ff. The first two slurs agree with those present in the working draft, but the last is slightly shorter than the one in the draft, concluding in measure 137 instead of measure 138/1. Brahms evidently preferred this shorter slur, for he inserted it in the copyist's manuscript at measures 38-41, 42-45, and 139-42 (although the longer slur appears for these passages in the draft). The shorter slur was used consistently in the Piano Quintet.
In the Trio, the composer made two minute refinements in articulation and dynamics.\textsuperscript{42}

**Finale**

At one point in the recapitulatory part of the movement, Brahms cancelled two notes in the *Primo* to allow the imitative entry of the *Secondo* to be heard more clearly.\textsuperscript{43} Apart from this, he revised only phrasing and dynamics. All of his changes in phrasing are quite minor, and concern material that accompanies the Second Theme.\textsuperscript{44} Perhaps the most significant revisions occur at measures 471-76, where Brahms added crescendo and decrescendo signs in both piano parts to create nuance within the *poco a poco crescendo* begun at measure 468.

Stage \textsuperscript{4b}, Phase III: Subsequent Revision of Working Draft,

**Preceding Transcription for Piano Quintet**

A comparison of the two extant manuscripts of the Duo-Piano Sonata shows that many refinements executed in the working draft were never added to the copyist's manuscript. However, some of these changes and

\textsuperscript{42}The tie connecting the two a's in the left-hand part of the *Primo* at measures 203-04 was cancelled. A decrescendo sign was added in the last few measures of the movement, after the *pianissimo* at measure 258.

\textsuperscript{43}This occurs during the imitative dialogue that develops from the Main Theme. At measures 201-02, f' was cancelled from the triads in the right-hand part of the *Primo*.

\textsuperscript{44}A slur for the countermelody in the left-hand part of the *Primo* was added at measures 102-06, and inserted but subsequently cancelled at the analogous measures 261-64 (in the left-hand line of the *Secondo*). A slur was added in the theme itself at measures 111-12/1, (left-hand part of the *Primo*) and in an accompanimental line at measures 114-15 (right-hand part of the *Primo*); the absence of these two slurs from the working draft was surely a simple oversight on Brahms's part.
insertions appear as the original reading in the autograph of the Piano Quintet. It seems therefore that Brahms, after revising the copyist's manuscript of the Duo-Piano Sonata, made further alterations in the working draft before beginning the final transcription.

Most of Brahms's revisions affect phrasing and articulation; indications for pedalling were added occasionally. Very few refinements in dynamics were made. Brahms continued to concern himself with thinning the texture by cancelling octave doublings. It is obvious that such deletions in one passage of the Secondo in the first movement were made before Brahms wrote the piano part in the final transcription (see below).

First Movement

As in many of the early revisions the most significant alteration made at this time involves the low bass register. By cancelling much

---

45 A comparison of the working draft with the copyist's manuscript makes it apparent that Brahms supplied few dynamic abbreviations and symbols in the draft before sending it to the copyist. After the latter returned the draft, the composer inserted more dynamic symbols and abbreviations in each movement, to give clearer instructions for performance. These insertions cannot properly be considered as alterations; they are simply duplications. For example, in expository sections Brahms added dynamic abbreviations and symbols which originally had been notated only in recapitulatory sections, and vice versa. Similarly, dynamic marks which initially had appeared for only one piano were inserted by the composer in the other piano part (e.g., to the accompanimental material in the Primo at measures 47ff, Brahms added piano, which was already present for the theme in the Secondo). Such insertions are not mentioned in the text of this chapter, but are distinguished in the revised score by the symbol.

46 However, the few octave doublings which were cancelled in the Scherzo and the finale of the working draft were necessarily eliminated when Brahms transcribed the material in question for stringed instruments. Therefore, these particular cancellations in the Duo-Piano Sonata could have been made either before or after the writing of the Piano Quintet.
of the original octave doubling, Brahms reduced the strength of the bass line in the imitative development of the Principal Theme (see Textual Notes, measures 122-133). He subdued it further by changing the dynamic level from piano to pianissimo.\(^{47}\)

Some alterations and refinements in phrasing and articulation were also executed. At the opening announcement of the Principal Theme Brahms shortened the slur in the second measure, beginning it on the first eighth-note.\(^{48}\) Of interest are the three staccato dots which were added to the left-hand part of the Secondo at measure 186, in the recapitulation of the Transition. They perhaps indicate that Brahms was toying with the idea of utilizing them for this entire bass line, as he later did in the Piano Quintet (measures 184-89 of the latter). Pedalling was added to smooth out the reiterated triplets that accompany the second and third phrases of the Second Theme (measures 39-40, 43-44, 201, and 205).

Brahms added dynamics and expression words to soften further the sixteenth-note passagework at measures 65ff and 227ff (see Table 9), which he had clarified earlier by the cancellation of doubling notes.\(^ {49}\)

\(^{47}\) Alterations made in the left-hand part of the Secondo at measures 298-300 could have been executed before or after the making of the final transcription. To facilitate a more forceful rendering of the accented octaves, Brahms added arpeggio signs and half notes to indicate that the lower note of each octave should be struck slightly ahead of the upper, and sustained (see revised score). In the Piano Quintet, the eighth-note line is played by the cello and viola in unison.

\(^{48}\) This shorter slur was originally notated, and subsequently lengthened, in both the first and second measures of the Piano Quintet. See Chapter VI.

\(^{49}\) At measure 227, piano dolce e leggero appears in pencil. However, e leggero may have been a late addition, for it was included neither in the Piano Quintet nor in the galley proofs of the Duo-Piano Sonata.
# TABLE 9

**OPP. 34BIS AND 34: REFINEMENT OF DYNAMIC ABBREVIATIONS AND EXPRESSION WORDS (FIRST MOVEMENT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s) **</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Revised Stichvorlage</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Revised Autograph (Stichvorlage) **</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Stichvorlage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20; 182</td>
<td>II/L; I/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>marcato [Pi]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>p sotto voce</td>
<td>p sotto voce</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>p sotto voce</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>espress. [Pi]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>espress. leg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>espress. [Va]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>espress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>espress. [Vn I]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>pp dolce e legg.</td>
<td>p dolce e legg.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>espress. [C]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>espress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86; 248</td>
<td>I; II</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>pp^ pp</td>
<td>pp dolce [Pi]</td>
<td>††</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>cresc.</td>
<td>cresc. [tutti]</td>
<td>††</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>sempre p</td>
<td>sempre p [Pi]</td>
<td>††</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>espress. [C]</td>
<td></td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure(s)**</td>
<td>Instrument(s)</td>
<td>Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Revised Stichvorlage</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Revised Autograph (Stichvorlage)***</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Stichvorlage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>pp sotto voce</td>
<td>p espress.</td>
<td>††</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sotto voce [Va]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>espress. [Pi]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>espress. leg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219; 223</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>††</td>
<td>espress. [Va; C]</td>
<td>††</td>
<td>††</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>p dolce</td>
<td>p dolce [Vn II, Va]</td>
<td>p dolce e legg.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>p espress. [Pi]</td>
<td>††</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dolce [Pi]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f espress.</td>
<td>f espress. [Vn I, Va, C]</td>
<td>††</td>
<td>f espress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>espress. [Vn I, Va, C]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>††</td>
<td>espress. [Pi]</td>
<td>††</td>
<td>espress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 9—Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)**</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Revised Stichvorlage</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Revised Autograph (Stichvorlage)***</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Stichvorlage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>p dolce</td>
<td>p dolce</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>p—pp dolce [Vn I]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>leg. e</td>
<td>leg. e</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures are numbered according to the Duo-Piano Sonata. Measures 83 and 245 of the latter are deleted in the Piano Quintet.**

***The instrumental part(s) to which the reading applies appears in square brackets.**

'†'Reading same as col. 3.

'§'Reading same as col. 4.

'††'Reading same as col. 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)**</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Revised Stichvorlage</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Revised Autograph (Stichvorlage)***</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Stichvorlage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>espress.[Pi]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>espress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>p poco</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>poco acceler.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>acceler.</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Vn I, Vn A, C]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>poco acceler.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>poco acceler.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Pi]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>a tempo</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>a tempo</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Tutti]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>poco string.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Vn I, Vn II, C, Pi]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-32</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>dimin.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>sosten.dimin.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Tutti]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>II &amp; I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>più animato, poco a poco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>un poco</td>
<td>sempre poco</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>sempre poco</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>acceler.</td>
<td>acceler.</td>
<td></td>
<td>acceler.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Tutti]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Instrument(s)</td>
<td>Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Revised Stichvorlage</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Revised Autograph (Stichvorlage)**</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Stichvorlage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>a tempo</td>
<td>a tempo</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>a tempo poco</td>
<td>a poco più sosten.</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>p espress. sotto voce</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>p espress. sotto voce</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-04</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>un pochettino ritard.: ?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>poco f cresc.</td>
<td>espress. poco cresc.</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>espress. cresc.</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>poco f molto espress.</td>
<td>poco molto espress.</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>poco f molto espress.</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>p [Vn I]</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>f sempre poco f</td>
<td>f sempre f espress.</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>f sempre f</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>poco ritard.</td>
<td>un poco ritard.</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>un poco riten.</td>
<td>poco ritard. sosten.</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Instrument(s)</td>
<td>Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Revised Stichvorlage</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Revised Autograph (Stichvorlage)***</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Stichvorlage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>p− espress.</td>
<td>mf espress.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>mf espress. [C]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>mf espress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***The instrumental part(s) to which the reading applies appears in square brackets.
†Reading same as col. 3.
§Reading same as col. 4.
††Reading same as col. 5.
A few dynamics were inserted elsewhere in the movement.

Second Movement

Notes, phrasing and articulation remained unaltered. However, Brahms duplicated some slurs and arpeggio signs to provide more complete instructions for performance. His few insertions of dynamic symbols are relatively insignificant.

Third Movement

The cancellation of a few octave doublings in the bass and the treble could have occurred either before or after the writing of the Piano Quintet. The only significant refinement that predated the

---

50 Crescendo and decrescendo signs were inserted near the end of the extension of the Third Theme, in the right hand of the Secondo at measures 72-73. In the Development, Brahms prepared for the fortissimo entry of the Second Theme by adding crescendo at the end of measure 149, and crescendo signs in measure 150. The decrescendo signs added in the recapitulation of the Second Theme on the first and third beats of measures 201-02 and 205 create nuances slightly different from the analogous measures 39-40 and 43 of the Exposition. They might well have been added after the making of the transcription; in the latter, Brahms chose to use in the recapitulatory statement the same crescendo and decrescendo signs as he had used in the expository statement of this material.

51 E.g., arpeggio signs were inserted at measure 16 for the third chord in the Primo (already present for the analogous chord in the right-hand part of the Secondo at measure 98), and for the right-hand part of the Secondo at the last two chords of measure 90 (compare with measure 90). Similarly, he supplied slurs for both parts of the Secondo at measures 105-06/2, and for the left-hand part of the Primo at measures 108-09/2 (these slurs are analogous to the one already present in the right-hand line of the Primo at measures 108-09/1).

52 Specifically, he added decrescendo signs for the syncopated figure at the opening of measures 1 and 2 in the Main Theme, and decrescendo signs to create nuance within the lower voice during the return of this duet (at measure 103 of the Primo, on the sixteenth-notes of the first two beats).

53 In the left-hand part of the Secondo, Brahms cancelled the G, on the first beat of measures 41 and 45. He deleted the upper-octave doubling of the c' which is reiterated on the first beat of measure 176.
final transcription was the addition of signs or abbreviations to indicate accentuation. Brahms inserted accent signs near the climax of the fugato, in the left-hand part of the Secondo. To emphasize the supertonic appoggiatura that concludes the movement, he added forzando (measure 192). Phrasing was not altered in the Scherzo; a very minor refinement in articulation appears in the forte reminiscence of the Main Theme.

In the Trio, dynamics remained virtually unaltered; notes and expression words were left intact. However, as in the first movement, Brahms made a few revisions in phrasing and articulation. To create a more legato restatement of the theme, he inserted slurs at measures 221-22 and 223-24 (Secondo). Staccato dots were added to the triplet in the bass at measure 233 (Primo), providing a slight impetus for the repetition of the contrasting motive.

Finale

Cancellations to thin or to clarify the texture appear in a few passages. However, like those in the Scherzo, they could have been

in the right-hand part of the Secondo. It is not possible to say whether Brahms substituted a for c' in the left hand of the Secondo (measure 106/1) before or after the making of the final transcription.

For the second and third notes of measure 94, and for the quarter notes in measures 97 and 99.

To indicate a sudden release of the tied octave which concludes this reminiscence, Brahms added a staccato dot (measures 41, 45, 128, 132, 138, and 142).

A crescendo sign was added in both piano parts at the opening of the repetition of the contrasting motive (measures 233-34).

Lower-octave doublings were deleted from triplet-octave passages in the right-hand part of the Primo at measures 384-85, and at measures 365-67 in the right-hand part of the Secondo (c'''' was deleted throughout the latter passage). In measure 489, the four-note chords in the
made after the writing of the Piano Quintet. The addition of fingering at measures 141-43 in the right-hand part of the Secondo also could have occurred either before or after the making of the final transcription.

A few refinements in dynamics, phrasing and articulation certainly preceded the writing of the Piano Quintet. The most significant change in dynamics occurs at the opening of the a tempo section (measure 467). Instead of allowing it to begin at the pianissimo dynamic level established in measure 463, Brahms inserted piano. The only noteworthy alterations in phrasing and articulation are the addition of staccato dots to a pedal-point reiterated in sixteenth-notes below the Main Theme (measures 53-57), and the insertion of a slur for a countermelody heard above the Second Theme (measures 108-12 and the analogous measures 266-68).

right-hand part of the Primo were reduced to g'' and the open sixth a^'_f'' respectively.

58 In the Piano Quintet, this material is played by the violins.

59 A few other additions should be mentioned. The chromatic melody that bursts out forte in measure 13 of the Introduction was subdued to piano in measures 15-16. At the end of measure 16, Brahms added a crescendo sign followed by forte on the first beat of the next measure. The closing passage of the Introduction was intensified by the addition of crescendo (in both pianos) at measure 32. A few very minor insertions and cancellations were made at measures 123 (decrescendo sign in the Primo cancelled), 145 (crescendo sign inserted on the last beat of this measure in the Primo), 224 (decrescendo signs added on the first beat in both piano parts), and 479 (crescendo sign inserted beneath the Primo system).
CHAPTER VI

THE CREATIVE PROCESS, PART III:

THE PIANO QUINTET

Survey of the Stages of the Creative Process

Brahms's efforts to decide upon a more appropriate medium for the material of the Duo-Piano Sonata proved fruitless. On 15 August 1864 he complained in a letter to Clara that "my double-sonata [Doppel-Sonate] does not appear, and [will be] lost to the whole world, if my writing-finger does not have patience."¹ This letter, written during his sojourn at Baden-Baden, suggests that he was considering renouncing the work entirely (Stage 2c).²

It was probably during Brahms's stay at Carlsruhe, late in August 1864, that Hermann Levi advised him to transcribe the Duo-Piano Sonata for piano quintet.³ Brahms's letter of 29 August to Joachim, requesting the immediate return of the Duo-Piano Sonata manuscript,⁴ indicates that the composer was anxious to consider this work further, presumably because of Levi's suggestion.

¹See Chapter II, fn. 66.

²Perhaps at this point he sent one of the two manuscripts of the Duo-Piano Sonata (probably the copy) to Joachim, and temporarily turned his attention to some of the other works which he had brought with him to the spa. See Max Kalbeck, Johannes Brahms, 4 vols. in 8, Dritte Auflage (Berlin: Deutsche Brahms-Gesellschaft m. b. H., 1908-14; reprint ed., Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1976), II/1: 54.

³See Chapter II, p.31.

⁴In the Appendix, p.251.
Before leaving Baden-Baden for Vienna in early October, Brahms drafted the Piano Quintet (Stage $3^C$). The parts for the strings were written in score, and the piano part was sketched in pencil; this version is now lost. Perhaps he made some refinements in the string parts before asking Levi and David to try the work with him. The piano part was completed after his return to Vienna. By the end of October, the verification stage ($4^C$) had begun: Brahms had written and revised a full score, and had sent it to Clara. After playing it first with David and then with both David and the violist Koning, Clara and Levi sent letters to Brahms expressing their delight in this new transcription.

By February 1865 at the latest, Levi had returned the autograph score to Brahms; the latter incorporated in this manuscript some of the changes suggested by his young friend. Brahms perhaps made further refinements before sending the autograph score to the engraver near the end of July. As will be explained below, the composer apparently made other alterations in this autograph when he later checked it with the galley proofs.

Stage $3^C$: Transcription of the Duo-Piano Sonata for Piano Quintet

Nothing in the published correspondence indicates that Brahms had

---

5 See Chapter II, p.32.

6 Clara acknowledged the arrival of the score in a letter written at Carlsruhe on 3 November 1864. See Appendix, p. 251.

7 See Chapter II, p.38.

8 See Brahms's letter of 22 July to Rieter-Biedermann in the Appendix, pp. 254-255.
both the String Quintet and the Duo-Piano Sonata at hand when he made
the final transcription. Indeed, the urgency of a request sent to
Joachim for the return of the copyist's manuscript of the Duo-Piano
Sonata suggests that he did not have a suitable score from which to
make the transcription. However, he surely would have been reminded
of the original Quintet as he reconsidered the Duo-Piano Sonata.

Distribution of Material

In his transcription of the Duo-Piano Sonata for the medium of
piano quintet, the lowest voice (which would have been played by the
second cello in the original String Quintet) was entrusted to the piano
part. Brahms thus took advantage of the resonance of this instrument's
bass register. His distribution often provided the string quartet and
the piano each with material formerly found in both the Primo and the
Secondo parts. Such passages might comprise as few as two measures, or
as many as eighteen. More frequently, however, either the Primo part
or the Secondo was retained for the piano in the final transcription,
with the other piano part transcribed for the string quartet. Again,
such an arrangement might comprise only a few measures, or more than
twenty. A few passages, discussed in Chapter IV, seemed so naturally

9 The working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata, which had undergone so
much revision, would have been most difficult to utilize as the only
source for the new transcription. Brahms evidently used both the draft
and the copyist's manuscript; alterations present in each were incor-
porated by him in the autograph of the Piano Quintet. See Chapter V,
PP.105-06 and 120-21.

10 See measures 63-64 of the first movement, and measures 109-126
of the second.

11 E.g., the Primo was retained intact for the piano part in mea-
ures 41-65/1 of the finale, and in measures 1-17/1 of the first move-
ment. The Secondo was utilized for the piano part in nearly the entire
Tempo I section of the first movement (measures 285-97). The adoption
suited to the timbre of strings that all or nearly all of both piano parts was transcribed for the string quartet (thereby perhaps reflecting the original distribution of material in the lost String Quintet).

Changes in Notes

The most significant alterations in melodic material concern the lengthening of two imitative passages. The sequential dialogue that develops from the Closing Theme in the first movement (measures 82ff, recapitulated at 243ff) was evidently extended by several measures. At the opening of the Poco sostenuto introduction to the finale, Brahms notated the second entry in the cello part one measure later than it occurs in the Duo-Piano Sonata, thus delaying also the imitative entries in the first-violin, second-violin, and viola parts. The imitative passage consequently comprised thirteen measures instead of twelve; the entire movement was thus made one measure longer.

In two instances, Brahms restored melodic material to the register in which it had originally been written in the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata. At the extension of the Subject in the fugato of the Scherzo, he ignored the transposition sign that he had inserted in the draft at measures 98/2-99/1, and did not add upper-octave doubling until of such large sections from the Primo or the Secondo can be contrasted with, for example, measures 57-73 in the first movement. In the piano part, Brahms retained the Primo intact at measures 57-62, the left-hand lines from both the Primo and Secondo at measures 63-64, the Secondo at measures 65-66, and the Primo at measures 67-73.

12 The paste-over upon which Brahms wrote the present measures 83-87 does not cover the last three measures of the original reading (the equivalent of measures 85-87). The original version of this dialogue in the Recapitulation is completely obscured by a paste-over; the present measures 245-50 required only three-quarters of this paste-over. See fn. 28.
the middle of measure 98. In measures 486-87 and 489 of the finale, the right-hand part of the Primo was transcribed for the violins and elevated to the high treble register in which it had originally appeared.

Some changes were made in the a tempo section of the Coda in the finale. The syncopated agitato descent in the right-hand part of the Primo at measures 477/6-81/3 was transcribed for the strings, which play it on the beat; thereby contrasting it with the syncopated chords notated for the right-hand line in the piano part. Similarly, the repetition of this descent (in the bass) and the remainder of the bass line, until the final cadence, were also transcribed on the beat.¹³

Lower-octave doubling was generally omitted from melodic and accompanimental voices transcribed for strings,¹⁴ unless, of course, Brahms wished to create a particularly forceful effect. He occasionally found it necessary to omit or to change accompanimental material when it was adapted to the string ensemble.¹⁵ In the Scherzo (measures 3-4) he deleted the imitation of the ascent of the Main Theme in the bass. This line was an addition in the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata (see Chapter V, page 96); Brahms had probably intended it to

¹³ See measures 481/6-89/6 of the left-hand lines in the Duo-Piano Sonata.

¹⁴ E.g., lower-octave doubling that adds substance to a melodic line in the high treble register of the piano was unnecessary when this line was transcribed for the violin. See measures 96-99 of the first movement.

¹⁵ For example, at measures 51-54 of the first movement, the undulating triplets and duplets in the right-hand part of the Secondo were omitted in favor of movement in quarter and half notes in the violin parts. The broken-octave accompaniment to the elaboration of the Second Theme at measures 138-45 of the Duo-Piano Sonata was replaced, in the final transcription, by more suitable figuration involving notes a tone or a semitone apart.
compensate for the decay of tone on the piano.

The composer continued to thin the texture in measures 149–58 and 467–72 of the finale. In the former passage, the accompaniment to the syncopated melody was made less ponderous by the omission of the supporting treble chords. At measures 467–72, doublings and harmony notes were deleted from the material in the bass register as well as from the imitative line that begins at measure 468 in the treble.

Changes in Expression

It should not be surprising that phrasing and articulation, dynamics, and expression words, like the notes themselves, underwent relatively little change in the process of transcription. The few significant alterations in phrasing and articulation all occur in the first movement. In the opening announcement of the Principal Theme, the shorter slur which Brahms had earlier adopted in measure 2 of the Duo-Piano Sonata (see Chapter V, page 122) was used in both the first and the second measures, as shown in Example 22. At the extension of

Example 22. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34, first movement (Allegro non troppo), original reading of measures 1–2 in the first-violin part

---

16 The surging triplets in the bass had earlier been made lighter by the cancellation of octave doubling. See Chapter V, p. 100.
the Third Theme, Brahms again utilized slightly different phrasing from that which appears in the Duo-Piano Sonata. To emphasize the subdued syncopation inherent in the treble countermelody (transcribed for the first violin), he began slurs on the second beats instead of the first.  

The only refinement in articulation concerned the accompaniment to the conclusion of the Principal Theme: the staccato octaves in the bass were made more emphatic by the addition of marcato (measures 20ff, recapitulated at 181ff).

Additional changes were made in dynamics and expression words. In the first movement, Brahms gave more explicit instructions for the performance of the canonic transformation of the Principal Theme (measures 122ff), and slightly altered the dynamic level of part of the Second Theme (measures 39ff, 43ff, recapitulated at 200ff and 204ff; see Table 9). Dynamics were not changed in the second movement; however, as he had done earlier (see Chapter V, page 95), Brahms added expression words which would heighten the effects inherent in a given passage.

A few dynamic markings were added in the Scherzo. Brahms

---

17 In measures 69, 70, 71, and 73. He did the same thing in the Recapitulation at the analogous measures 231, 233, and 234.

18 Measure numbers in this chapter refer to the Piano Quintet. The reader is advised that the measure numbers in Table 9 refer to the Duo-Piano Sonata.

19 In the closing period of the Main Theme he inserted poco stringendo (measure 29); sostenuto was added to broaden the climax that follows (measure 31).

20 Brahms incorporated crescendo and decrescendo signs in the countermelody in the piano part at measures 5-6. Also in the piano part, a crescendo sign was added at measure 156 to emphasize the approach to the final fortissimo section. Crescendo signs were inserted for the ascents in the string ensemble at measure 168 and 173-74.
inserted the word "sempre" for the pianissimo Main Theme, its imitative countermelody, and a staccato contrapuntal line in the fugato (see Table 11, measures 3, 5, and 71), in other passages he chose to delete this word (See Table 11, measures 67 and 176). Expression words were not altered in the Trio, but Brahms did make some changes in dynamics to create a more effective balance between piano and strings.

Dynamics and expression words in the finale are, until the Coda, virtually identical to those which appear in the Duo-Piano Sonata. All of the refinements in the Coda affect the piano part. Brahms added crescendo and decrescendo signs to emphasize the countermelody at measures 399-402. To provide more explicit instructions for the performance of the extended lull at measures 439-66, he added or altered expression words (see Table 12, measures 439 and 464).

Stage 4c, Phase I: Elaboration of the Autograph Manuscript

After completing the full score of the Piano Quintet, Brahms

21 Another minute alteration in expression words affected a contrapuntal line in the piano part (see Table 11, measure 76).

22 He strengthened the repetition of the theme, designating it forte rather than mezzo forte (measures 210ff in the upper three string parts). The accompaniment, in the piano and the cello parts, to the statement of the contrasting motive in the violin parts was softened from forte to mezzo forte (measures 226-33/1).

23 The only noteworthy refinement preceding the Coda is the addition of espressivo to the chromatic forte melody of measures 13ff, transcribed for first violin and cello. One can also observe that, at the return of the Second Theme in measures 252ff (transcribed for first violin), Brahms notated dynamic symbols in measures 252-53 but did not bother to repeat them in subsequent measures.

24 Tranquillo was substituted for espressivo at the transformation of the Second Theme, and was added to the variant of the Principal Theme.
OPP. 34BIS AND 34: REFINEMENT OF DYNAMIC ABBREVIATIONS AND EXPRESSION WORDS (THIRD MOVEMENT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Revised Stichvorlage</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Piano Quintet</th>
<th>Revised Autograph (Stichvorlage)***</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Stichvorlage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>sempre pp</td>
<td>[Vn I, Va]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>sempre pp</td>
<td>[Pi]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>I/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>pp sempre [Va]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>§</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>sempre p</td>
<td>sempre p</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>p [Vn I]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>sempre p</td>
<td>sempre p</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>sempre p [Va]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sempre molto p [Pi]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>pp sempre</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>pp sempre [Pi]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>§</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>p, cresc.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>p, cresc. [Tutti]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>§</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>ff sempre</td>
<td>ff sempre</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>ff [Vn I, Vn II, Va, C]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>poco f</td>
<td>mf</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>mf [C]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>f mf</td>
<td>mf</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>f [C]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Instrument(s)</td>
<td>Revised Work-Draft</td>
<td>Revised Stichvorlage</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Work-Draft</td>
<td>Revised Autograph (Stichvorlage)**</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Work-Draft</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Stichvorlage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>mf</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>mf [Vn I]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The instrumental part(s) to which the reading applies appears in square brackets.**

†Reading same as col. 3.

§Reading same as col. 4.
TABLE 12

OPP. 34BIS AND 34: REFINEMENT OF DYNAMIC ABBREVIATIONS
AND EXPRESSION WORDS (FINALE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Revised Stichvorlage</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Piano Quintet Revised Autograph (Stichvorlage)***</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</th>
<th>Subsequently Revised Stichvorlage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>f espress. [Vn I, C]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>p espress. [Vn I, C]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>un pochetino più animato</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>un pochetino più animato [Tutti]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>p leg. ed espress.</td>
<td>p leg. ed espress.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>p leg. ed espress.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>II/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p leg. ed espress.</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>I/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>p espress. [C]</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159-60</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>poco sosten.</td>
<td>poco riten. [Tutti]</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Tempo I [Tutti]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Instrument(s)</td>
<td>Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Revised Stichvorlage</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Revised Autograph (Stichvorlage)***</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Stichvorlage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192-93</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>sempre dolce</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>sempre dolce [Tutti]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>p espress. leg.</td>
<td>p espress. leg.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>p espress. leg.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>espress. leg.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>espress.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>espress. [C] p [Vn I]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>legato, p</td>
<td>legato, p</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>p, leg.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317-20</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>poco riten. [Tutti]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Tempo I</td>
<td>[Tutti]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>pa leg.</td>
<td>pa leg.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>p leg. tranquillo [Vn I, Va, Pi; later C]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ff [Tutti]</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>ff [Pi]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Instrument(s)</td>
<td>Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Revised Stichvorlage</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Revised Autograph (Stichvorlage)***</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Working Draft</td>
<td>Subsequently Revised Stichvorlage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>p dolce espress.</td>
<td>p dolce espress.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>p dolce tranquillo [Pi]</td>
<td>p dolce espress.</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>p espress.</td>
<td>p dolce espress.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>p dolce espress. [Vn I, Va]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>p dolce</td>
<td>p dolce tranquillo [Pi]</td>
<td>††</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>poco ritard.</td>
<td>poco a poco ritard.</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>poco a poco riten. [Vn I, Va, C, Pi]</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p [pi]</td>
<td>††</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***The instrumental part(s) to which the reading applies appears in square brackets.
†Reading same as col. 3.
§Reading same as col. 4.
††Reading same as col. 5.
changed his mind about several of the alterations made in the course of transcription. He used "paste-overs" to obscure the material that he had added in the sequential dialogue following the Closing Theme of the first movement. In the finale, he cancelled the extra measure occurring in the imitative opening, and transposed measures 486-87 and 489 of the first-violin part down an octave.

Many of the other note-alterations consist of the addition (and, in one instance, cancellation) of doublings at the unison or octave. In the first two movements, some thematic material transcribed for one stringed instrument was reinforced by the insertion of a doubling line in another instrumental part. Important changes in instrumentation were made in the fugato of the Scherzo, and, at Levi's suggestion, in the Second Theme of the slow movement (see below, pages 151 and 153).

It is significant that the letter in which Brahms alluded to his new Streicher grand piano was written when he was "spending every quiet hour" on the Quintet (see Chapter V, page 83). The different sonorities of this more powerful instrument might have necessitated the frequent thinning of the bass material in the piano part, and the


26 The alteration and cancellation of low bass notes in the outer movements and in the slow movement suggests that the bass register of the instrument was particularly resonant. In his letter, Brahms remarked that Streicher had given him the piano because "he wished to acquaint me in this way with new advancements" (Er hat mir eben neue Errungenschaften dadurch mitteilen wollen). It is interesting to learn that the firm of Streicher, long-established in Vienna, had begun to alter its designs radically in the American direction soon after the exhibition of Steinway pianos at the London fair of 1862. Eduard Hanslick, well-known music critic and one of the first champions of Brahms, had attended the exhibition and had subsequently expressed his admiration for the Steinway instruments in an article published in the Wiener Musikzeitung. Possibly it was this article that helped to
occasional addition of doubling to strengthen thematic material in the string ensemble.

The few significant refinements in phrasing and articulation all occur in the first movement. Dynamics remained virtually unaltered and again, the only noteworthy revision is to be found in the first movement. All of the changes in expression words consist simply of the cancellation of *espressivo*. Brahms's frequent deletion of this word in the thematic material of the outer movements was probably occasioned by a comment which Levi had made:

> Just once, count how many *espressivo*s appear in the first part of the first movement; to me it seems almost like a vote of non-confidence against the performers.

In one instance (see below, second movement) Brahms added expression words, but evidently could not decide whether or not the effect was appropriate, and wrote a question mark after the last word.

Similarly, he had second thoughts about some of the changes that he had made in the instrumentation of the fugato, and about the cancellation of doublings in measures 184-91 of the Scherzo.


In the grand piano exhibited by Steinway and Sons of New York in 1855, the one-piece cast-iron frame had been given what is essentially its present form. Steinway had perfected their system of cross-stringing by 1859. Brahms's Streicher, which probably followed this American example in some respects, would have been more powerful than the instruments to which the composer had become accustomed.

27. "Zähle einmal, wieviel *espressivo*s im ersten Theile des ersten Satzes vorkommen; es erscheint mir fast wie ein Misstrauensvotum gegen die Ausführenden." See his letter of 9 November 1864 in the Appendix, p. 253.

28. It is possible that he had these doubts when he was checking the autograph with the galley proofs. In any case, his ideas for further revisions in these passages were never carried out.
First Movement

Brahms excised the material which he had initially added to the imitative dialogue that blossoms from the Closing Theme.\textsuperscript{29} The version that now stands in both Exposition and Recapitulation is, in fact, one measure shorter than that which appears in the Duo-Piano Sonata: measures 83 and 245 of the latter are omitted.

Apart from the deletion of this material, Brahms's relatively few significant revisions in notes concern details of sonority and balance. The alterations executed in the bass line of the piano part may have been occasioned by Brahms's playing of the work on the Streicher piano. In two instances where the dynamic level is \textit{fortissimo} Brahms transposed a bass octave in the left-hand line down an octave, to achieve a more powerful effect (see Table 13, measures 22/3 and 149/4).\textsuperscript{30} Conversely, the bass material that occurs in the left-hand line in the course of the piano Third Theme was transposed up an octave to a less resonant register, and some lower-octave doubling was deleted (see Table 13, measures 59-60 and 63-65/1).\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{29} The material that originally appeared between the present measures 82 and 88 in the Exposition and between measures 244 and 251 in the Recapitulation is partially or totally obscured by a paste-over. In the Exposition the last three measures of the original dialogue extend beyond the paste-over and are cancelled in lead. These measures are the equivalent of the present measures 85-87; the distribution of material between piano and strings for the first five beats of the cancelled reading is the opposite of that which appears in the present measures 85-86/1.

\textsuperscript{30} This occurs at the conclusion of the Principal Theme (measures 22/3, recapitulated at measure 183/3), and at measure 149/4, immediately before the \textit{fortissimo} transformation of the Second Theme.

\textsuperscript{31} These changes were not made in the analogous measures 220-221 and 224-26/1 of the Recapitulation, probably because the material had been notated a fourth higher (i.e., in the tonic key), in a less sonorous register.
### TABLE 13

**BRAHMS'S ALTERATIONS IN THE AUTOGRAPH OF OPUS 34,**

**STAGE 4°, PHASE I (FIRST MOVEMENT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Phras. &amp; Artic.</th>
<th>Dynamic Markings**</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1-2</td>
<td>Vn I, C, Pi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/3, 183/3</td>
<td>Pi/L</td>
<td>8,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-60</td>
<td>Pi/L</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-65/1</td>
<td>Pi/L</td>
<td>8' -e_r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Vn II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*83ff, 245ff</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-95</td>
<td>Vn I, Vn II, Va, C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remark**

- Bass octave lowered to strengthen cadence
- No decrease in dynamic level at conclusion of Second Theme
- Bass line raised to a less resonant register
- Bass progression thinned and raised to a less resonant register
- Slur which began in preceding measure originally continued to the end of this measure
- Articulation changed to match legato of sequential ascent in piano part?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Phras. &amp; Artic.</th>
<th>Dynamic Markings**</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>159/4-61</td>
<td>Vn II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mel. Trn. Dbl. Hrm.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Announcement of Principal Theme strengthened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226/2-4</td>
<td>Pi/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bass line thinned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Vn I</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Originally, new slur began on a''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-35/1</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elaboration of Third Theme strengthened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slur originally began on first beat in this reminiscence of Principal Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279/4</td>
<td>Pi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Crescendo cancelled; rewritten two beats later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290/1-2, 291/1-2</td>
<td>Vn II</td>
<td>-8T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Texture of passagework thinned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Refinements in dynamic abbreviations and expression words are shown in Table 9, measures 20, 182, 39, 57, 63, 123, 201, 205, 219, 223, 231, 252.
The only significant changes made in the string parts concern doubling lines. The announcement of the Principal Theme at the end of the Development, and the elaboration of the Third Theme, were strengthened by the addition of doubling at the unison and octave respectively (see Table 13, measures 159-61 and 230-34). In order to thin the texture of rapid passagework in the Coda, Brahms cancelled lower-octave doubling (see Table 13, measures 290-91).

Levi's allusion to the frequent inclusion of *espressivo* in the first movement (see page 146) probably prompted Brahms to delete this word from parts of the Second and Third Themes (measures 200, 204, 57, 63, 218, 222, and 230), and of the imitative dialogue that develops from the Closing Theme (measure 251; see Table 9). The only significant change in dynamics occurs at the opening of the *Poco sostenuto* section (measure 261), in which Brahms softened the melody in the first-violin part from *piano* to *pianissimo*. Minute refinements in dynamics were executed at the conclusion of the Second Theme and at the ascent toward the final *Tempo I* section (see Table 13, measure 56 and 279).

Several alterations were made in phrasing. The most significant concerns, once again, the opening announcement of the Principal Theme. In the first two measures, Brahms revised the phrasing to agree with that which he had originally notated in the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata. The beginning of the varied statement of this theme in the cello part at measure 273 underwent a very minor change in phrasing (see Table 13), as did the extension of the Third Theme in both the Exposition and the Recapitulation (see Table 13, measures 66 and 229). The only significant change in articulation was the cancellation of staccato dots in the string parts at the end of the Exposition (measures
90–95, including both the *prima* and the *seconda volta*).

**Second Movement**

The most significant changes in this movement concern the instrumentation of the statement and repetition of the Second Theme (measures 34/3ff). Levi had remarked that this theme, which was originally transcribed for the cello, was very difficult for this instrument, and had wondered if the viola would be more suitable.\(^\text{32}\) Brahms accordingly cancelled the cello line to the end of measure 42, and transferred the theme to the viola; the latter had originally doubled the cello at the unison in measures 36–40. The present cello line (measures 35–42) was added on a blank stave below the system.\(^\text{33}\) The repetition of this theme (measures 42/3ff) was originally continued in the viola and cello parts alone at measures 44–46; Brahms strengthened both voices by doubling them in the right-hand line of the piano part.

Brahms's other revisions in the piano part concern low bass notes in the left-hand line. The reiterated pedal-point in measures 50/2–53/1 of the *poco accelerando* episode was thinned by the cancellation of octave doubling.\(^\text{34}\) The original reading of the left-hand line at measures 36/3–38/1 of the Second Theme is completely obliterated by cancellations in ink and lead.\(^\text{35}\)

---

\(^\text{32}\) See his letter of 9 November 1864 in the Appendix, p. 253.

\(^\text{33}\) The original reading of the second-violin and viola lines in measures 33–34 is obscured by cancellations in ink and lead.

\(^\text{34}\) Originally, Brahms had duplicated the left-hand line of the *Secondo*, where the open octave B₁–B is repeated in syncopation.

\(^\text{35}\) When Brahms transferred the theme from the cello to the viola, he perhaps decided that this left-hand line was too prominent, and replaced it with the single reiterated b.
As he had done earlier (see fn. 18, and Chapter V, page 95), Brahms considered making an adjustment in the tempo of a passage. In the return of the Main Theme, he thought of slightly slowing the concluding measures 103-04, where he inserted un pochettino ritardando: ?.

Dynamics, phrasing and articulation remained virtually unaltered. In one instance Brahms inserted pizzicato; the initial absence of this word had probably been a simple oversight on his part. A very minor alteration in phrasing occurs at the end of measure 34.

Third Movement

Scherzo. Brahms's note-revisions concern the thinning of the texture in the string parts at the climactic measures 184-191. In the cello line he cancelled the third and fourth notes in the sixteenth-note motive reiterated at measures 184-89; the analogous deletion was made in the first- and second-violin lines at measures 190-91. Marginal notations, added at the end of the system in which these alterations appear, indicate that Brahms had second thoughts about this passage. Beside the cello line he wrote "NB" and the rhythm . He notated after the first-violin line.

As in the second movement, there occur some significant changes in

36 The only change was the cancellation of forte in the first-violin part at measure 11. Perhaps it is the same dynamic that is obliterated at the analogous measure 15.

37 He added it to the viola line at measure 11/3; this word had been written in ink at the analogous measure 15/3.

38 In the first-violin part, Brahms shortened the slur (which originally concluded on the first beat of measure 35).

39 Apart from the correcting of an obvious error in the left-hand line at measure 115.
instrumentation. All are to be found in the first seventeen measures (67-84/1) of the fugato. The Subject (measures 67-71/1), Countersubject (measures 71-76/1), and the staccato contrapuntal line (measures 80-84/1) were all transferred from the cello part to that of the viola. In addition, Brahms shifted to the viola part the contrapuntal line that he had originally transcribed for the second violin at measures 76-80/1; this was done probably to contrast this line with the presentation of the Subject in the first-violin part. Later, Brahms wondered whether this counterpoint might make an even more effective contrast if it were played by the cello.  

Expression words, phrasing and articulation remained unaltered. There is one small change in dynamics, affecting a contrapuntal line in measures 76-80/1 of the fugato.  

Trio. The only change in notes concerns the octave in the right-hand line of the piano part at measure 225/4; Brahms transposed it up an octave so that it doubles the opening of the contrasting motive in the violin parts.

Dynamics, expression words, and articulation were not revised.

A small alteration in phrasing appears at measure 245, in the return of the theme.  

---

40. In lead, he notated in the cello part the first few notes, and added "V. C." beneath measure 76. He wrote "NB" and "NB?" beside the cello part, in the margin.

41. The line that was originally notated in the second-violin part had been designated sempre piano. Brahms did not retain that dynamic marking when he transferred the line to the viola part; the pianissimo sempre of measure 71 was allowed to stand.

42. In the first-violin part, the slur that begins at the first eighth-note had originally concluded (probably erroneously) with the last eighth-note; another slur had begun on the first beat of the next measure. Brahms connected the two slurs in lead.
The most significant changes in notes are the excision of the measure which Brahms had added to the opening imitative passage (see page 35), and the lowering of the tessitura of the violin parts in measures 486-89 of the Coda. A transposition of the violin parts occurs in another climactic passage (see Table 14, measures 363-64).

There are a few other changes in notes, all of them concerning the thinning of material in the left-hand line of the piano part. At the canonic elaboration of the Second Theme, Brahms cancelled harmony notes (see Table 14, measures 127 and 131). Some upper-octave doubling was deleted in the syncopated closing passage (see Table 14, measures 145-48).

Expression words were added or cancelled in many instances. The most significant change was the insertion of poco ritenuto at the end of the triplet concluding passage (measures 159-60, repeated at 317-20), followed by Tempo I for the return of the Main Theme (measures 161ff and 321ff). Perhaps because of the remark made by Levi, Brahms deleted espressivo at one place in the Main Theme, at several points in the Second Theme, and at the piano transformation of both themes (see Table 12, measures 65, 108, 266, 270, and 445). He cancelled legato at the opening of the Second Theme, and replaced it with tranquillo at the pianissimo transformation of the Main Theme (see Table 12, measures 94, 96, 252, 256, and 321).  

As he had done when he revised the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata, Brahms transposed the melodic line (in the first-violin part) down one octave. The second-violin part was also altered; see Table 14, measures 486-87 and 489.

Brahms supplied un pochettino più animato for the return of the Second Theme at measures 251ff.
TABLE 14
BRAHMS'S ALTERATIONS IN THE AUTOGRAPH OF OPUS 34,
STAGE 4\textsuperscript{C}, PHASE I (FINALE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Phras. &amp; Artic.</th>
<th>Dynamic Markings</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*5ff</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/3-4</td>
<td>Vns I &amp; II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-04/1</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127, 131/1</td>
<td>Pi/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145/2-46/1</td>
<td>Pi/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363/5-64/3</td>
<td>Vns I &amp; II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366/4-68/1</td>
<td>Pi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Imitative dialogue restored to same length as that which appears in Duo-Piano Sonata
- Constant crescendo toward climax at measure 29
- Slight impetus given to commencement of sequential descent in Vn I?
- Bass material thinned
- Triplet accompaniment in bass register made less ponderous
- High tessitura maintained in climactic passage
- Slurs (which originally concluded at first chord in measure 367) are extended to climax
TABLE 14—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Instrument(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Phras. &amp; Artic.</th>
<th>Dynamic Markings</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Vn I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening of a transformation of the Second Theme is made less emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486-87</td>
<td>Vn II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harmony notes replace lower-octave doubling of first-violin part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486-89; 489</td>
<td>Vn I; Vn II</td>
<td>8,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tessitura lowered, perhaps to enhance the effect of the final chords</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changes in expression words are shown in Table 12, measures 65, 94, 96, 108, 159-60, 161, 252, 256, 266, 270, 317-20, 321, and 445.
Brahms made a few minute refinements in dynamics (see Table 14, measures 27 and 423). Phrasing and articulation remained virtually unaltered (see Table 14, measures 366 and 103).

**Stage 4C, Phase II: Correction of Galley Proofs and Revision of Autograph Manuscript**

Although the autograph manuscript served as the Stichvorlage, it includes refinements which do not appear in the Erstdruck or in later issues. Some of these changes were inserted by Brahms in the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata. The presence of these alterations in the Piano Quintet autograph but not in the printed editions suggests that Brahms added them in the autograph after it had been engraved. However, this manuscript became the property of the publisher after it had served as the Stichvorlage, and would normally have been returned to the composer only for the checking of the galley proofs.

One must conclude, therefore, that the changes in question occurred to Brahms when he was comparing the proofs with the autograph. Knowing that he was permitted only to correct the engraver's errors in the proofs, he inserted the desired alterations in his autograph.

**First Movement**

Brahms added to the Exposition some dynamic markings which originally had been notated only in the Recapitulation, and vice versa, just as

---

45 The refinements in question are not present in the third (last) issue, and therefore must not have been incorporated in the second.

46 E.g., the staccato dots that indicate portato execution in the third measure of the Main Theme of the second movement, and the two-note slurs at measure 38 of the same movement.
he had done earlier in the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata (see Chapter V, fn. 43). A few refinements in dynamics were made in the lower three string parts: melodic lines were affected in two instances, and the entries of the viola and the second violin at measures 268 and 269 in the Coda were emphasized slightly.

Second Movement

Brahms concerned himself exclusively with small revisions in articulation. He indicated that a few notes in each of the two themes were to be played portato rather than legato, and added two slurs in the triplet countermelody to the Second Theme. The only other significant alteration is to be found in the piano part at measure 124, where Brahms changed the staccato of the left-hand line to portato.

Third Movement

Scherzo. In this movement, too, the changes made by Brahms concern details of articulation, all of which occur in the passages which elaborate the opening ascent of the Main Theme (measures 38-45 and 125-43).

---

47 In the viola part at measure 56, Brahms added a crescendo sign for the first two beats, and a decrescendo sign for the last two. At measure 185 in the cello part, he inserted a crescendo sign for the first two beats.

48 For the first four notes of the entry in the viola part, Brahms inserted a crescendo sign followed by a decrescendo. The dynamic level of the second-violin entry was raised from pianissimo to piano.

49 Brahms indicated that the last two notes in the third measure of the Main Theme (repeated at measures 77 and 85), and the last two notes in measure 40 of the Second Theme, should be played portato. Two-note slurs were inserted at measure 38 in the second-violin part, for the second and third triplets.

50 Also in the piano part, Brahms added staccato dots to emphasize the first chord in the climactic measures 94 and 98.
The accompaniment in the piano part was emphasized by the addition of staccato dots for the notes on the first beat of each measure. Brahms indicated that the notes which conclude the ascending lines in the viola and cello parts at measures 134-41 should be played portato rather than legato.\(^51\)

No revisions were made in the Trio.

**Finale**

In the finale, Brahms added dynamic markings for clarity (as he had done in the first movement), gave further consideration to articulation, and occasionally cancelled lower-octave doubling notes in the piano part in the left-hand line at the canonic elaboration of the Second Theme,\(^52\) and in the right-hand line at measures 141-42 of the triplet concluding passage.\(^53\) The only refinement in articulation was the addition of staccato dots to the upper string parts at the forzato chord in measure 29.

---

\(^{51}\) I.e., the quarter notes in measures 135, 137, 139, and 141. In the fugato, Brahms supplied staccato dots for the eighth notes in the viola part at measures 76-79, and for each note in the cello part at measures 85 and 87.

\(^{52}\) eb and f were cancelled on the first beat of measures 126 and 130 respectively.

\(^{53}\) At the end of each measure, c' was deleted from the open octave c'-'c''.
CHAPTER VII

THE CREATIVE PROCESS, PART IV: FURTHER REVISION
OF THE SONATA FOR TWO PIANOFORTES

In the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata there appear many refinements that would also have been appropriate for the Piano Quintet, but were incorporated in neither the autograph nor the galley proofs of that work. However, some changes made by Brahms in the autograph of the Piano Quintet were added by him to the Duo-Piano Sonata either in the working draft or the copyist's manuscript. Therefore it seems that, after the publication of the Piano Quintet, the composer made further refinements in the Duo-Piano Sonata,¹ (Stage 4d).

As in almost all of the earlier phases, Brahms was mainly concerned with perfecting details of texture and balance in the outer movements and the Scherzo, and with inserting or revising expression words affecting

¹He did not bother to add these refinements to his Handexemplar of either the Piano Quintet or the Duo-Piano Sonata. In the former, he did nothing more than correct two mistakes which he himself had made in the autograph (and had not noticed in the galley proofs). Several engraver's errors remained unobserved. Similarly, in his Handexemplar of the Duo-Piano Sonata he simply inserted one missing accidental and corrected another. Again, other engraver's errors passed unnoticed. It has been observed that "Brahms was haphazard in marking in all needed revisions in the Handexemplare, . . . he also frequently made later refinements in his musical texts and placed the variants in one or another autograph, without taking the time to add them also to his Handexemplare." See Donald M. McCorkle, in collaboration with Margit L. McCorkle, "Five Fundamental Obstacles in Brahms Source Research," Acta Musicologica 48 (1976): 262.
tempo in the second movement. He altered the shape of some accompanimental or melodic lines in the outer movements and the Scherzo, as he had done in Phase II of Stage $3^b$ and Phase I of Stage $4^b$. In one instance, a change was made in harmony (see below, first movement). Phrasing and articulation which Brahms had continued to refine even during the last phase of Stage $4^b$, received further consideration in all four movements. Dynamic signs and abbreviations, which had been given less and less attention during Stage $4^b$, underwent scarcely any revision.

Nearly all of the changes were made in the working draft, because it alone remained in Brahms's possession after he sent the copyist's manuscript to Princess Anna in late October 1864. The princess returned that manuscript to him in September 1871; however, he was anxious to proceed with publication as soon as possible, and only took time to occasionally cancel the word "espressivo" in the first two movements before forwarding it to Rieter-Biedermann. The publisher would have returned the manuscript to Brahms only briefly for the correcting of the galley proofs.

**First Movement**

A clarification of texture is particularly evident in (1) the \textit{fortissimo} statement of the Principal Theme, in which Brahms deleted harmony notes from the first beat of several measures, and (2) in a brief passage of the Coda in which the lower-octave doubling was cancelled.\footnote{See his letter of 23 September 1871 in the Appendix, p. 256.} A single \footnote{The cancellations in the Principal Theme affect measures 12-13, the analogous 174-75, and measures 16-17. In the Coda, deletions appear in the right-hand of the \textit{Secco} at measures 295-296. See Textual Notes.}
harmony note was removed from the Second Theme (see Textual Notes, measure 35). In two instances, Brahms made reiterated pedal-points less prominent by either cancelling octave doubling or transposing material up an octave.  

Brahms made a single alteration in harmony: the fortissimo chord which opens the Principal Theme was changed from a dominant seventh to a simple dominant (see Textual Notes, measure 11).

The shape of the sixteenth-note passagework in measure 291 of the Coda (see Textual Notes) was slightly altered. Very minor revisions were made in an accompanimental voice within the Transition (see Textual Notes, measure 30).

One of two noteworthy changes in phrasing and articulation was the adoption of two-note slurs and staccato dots, such as had been used in the Piano Quintet, for the triplet accompaniment at measures 151-54. Brahms slightly softened the end of the Recapitulation by inserting a tie for every two e's common to the open sixths and fifths that alternate in the right hand of the Secondo.

Expression words were not altered in the working draft, although in the copyist's manuscript, as mentioned above, Brahms sometimes cancelled the word "espressivo" which he had used so frequently in this movement. As he had done in the Piano Quintet, he deleted it at the

---

4At the end of the Development, the dominant pedal-point which Brahms had earlier changed from a constant repetition of C into an alternation of C and c (refer to Table 1, measures 155-61) underwent further transposition. The pedal-point reiterated in octaves at measures 63-64 of the Third Theme was reduced to single notes. See Textual Notes.

5Such ties appear in the autograph of the Piano Quintet at the analogous measures 258-60.
opening of the Third Theme (measure 57), at measure 231 in the return of
this theme, and at the imitative dialogue that develops from the Closing
Theme (measure 253). He cancelled it or replaced it with legato in the
Second Theme, and in the Transition (see Table 9, measures 51, 213, 69,
and 185).

Second Movement

Brahms's insertions of expression words affecting tempo call to
mind the additions made during Phase II of Stage 3. The composer
slightly increased the tempo after the opening of the Second Theme, and
made the accelerando of the forte episode more pronounced (see Table 10,
measures 36 and 47). The preparation for the return of the Main Theme
was broadened by the addition of poco a poco più sostenuto at measure 55.
A small refinement appears at the climax of the Coda (see Table 10,
measure 116).

In this movement, as in the first, Brahms occasionally cancelled
the word "espressivo" in the copyist's manuscript without bothering to
cancel it in his working draft. He removed them from the closing period
of the Main Theme (measure 23 and the analogous measure 118), and from
the episode (measure 49).

Neither notes nor dynamics were altered. The only refinement in
phrasing was the addition of slurs to produce a more legato rendition of
the Second Theme.  

Brahms inserted a slur to span the last two notes of measure 36
and the first triplet of measure 37; another slur was added in the
analogous position at measure 37-38. Two-note slurs, like those
already present in measures 39-40, were inserted in the second triplet
of measure 37 and in the last two triplets of measure 38.
Third Movement

Scherzo. Brahms again turned his attention to the climactic measures of the fugato. In the working draft, he made the high treble counterpoint less powerful at measures 97-99/1 by removing lower-octave doubling. He increased the prominence of the Subject by indicating, in the galley proofs, that it should continue to be transposed up an octave until the middle of measure 100.

The only significant refinements in phrasing and articulation were the addition of *pedale* at measure 53 for the ascent to the first *fortissimo* transformation of the Second Theme, and the insertion of slurs for the countermelody at measures 150ff.

Dynamics and expression words remained unaltered.

Trio. Brahms's very few revisions concern phrasing and dynamics. At the return of the theme (measure 242) he cancelled the original *forte piano*, indicating instead that the theme should begin *forte* then decrease to *piano* at the end of measure 243. The only significant alteration in phrasing is the insertion of slurs at measures 209/4-210/1 of the *Primo*, connecting the two chords which initiate the repetition of the theme.

---

7 For greater harmonic interest, the tied octaves were changed into sevenths by the substitution of $f''$ for $e^b'''$ at measures 96-97 and $b''''$ for $a^b'''$ at measures 98-99.

8 In both his working draft and the copyist's manuscript, he had clearly indicated that the transposition should cease after the first two sixteenth-notes in measure 99.

9 Brahms added six slurs, spanning measures 150, 151, 152, and the identical measures 154, 155, and 156.

10 Slurs were also added to connect the last octave in measure 241 to the first in measure 242, in the left-hand part of the *Secondo*. 
Brahms's concern for thinning and clarifying texture prompted the cancellation of octave doublings or harmony notes at various places in this movement. Generally, he devoted his attention to passages which had undergone revision at an earlier stage(s). He deleted lower-octave doubling deep in the bass at the conclusion of the canonic elaboration of the Second Theme (measures 133-137/1). Near the climax of the syncopated closing passage that follows, he made the treble chords less heavy by removing harmony notes or lower-octave doubling; during Stage 3b, Phase II, he had cancelled octave doubling in both treble and bass elsewhere in this passage (see Table 4, measures 141ff and 149ff). Octave doubling in the bass had also been cancelled at measures 423/5-438/3 of the Coda; Brahms now clarified the harmonies in the subsequent measures by removing pedal-points.

The most significant revisions in this movement are embodied in a new reading for the opening of the final a tempo in the Secondo. This material had been problematical at earlier stages. To thin the texture, Brahms had revised the first five measures (467-471) of both piano parts several times before sending the working draft to the copyist, giving him instructions for further changes (see Chapter I, pages 5-6).

The cancellations occur in the right-hand part of the Primo. Open octaves remain in measures 149-51 and 153-54, and open sixths in measures 152-53/1. In the recapitulatory section at the analogous measures 307-13 of the Secondo, Brahms had made such deletions before sending the working draft to the copyist. Perhaps he simply forgot at that time to make the cancellations in measures 149-54.

He deleted the g' and g pedal-points in the two hands of the Secondo at measures 439/4-445/1. He also cancelled the c in measure 445 of the left-hand part, and the C sustained in measures 446-47 of the same.
Finally, Brahms cancelled the reading for the *Secondo* in the working draft, and wrote a new version on the *verso* of the same leaf, after the conclusion of the movement. The bass line, pared down to one or two voices, is similar to the one which Brahms had notated for the piano in the final transcription. The tied notes that had appeared in the right hand at measures 469/6-470/1 and 471/6-472/1 are omitted, so that the treble material in the *Primo* can be heard more clearly.

Example 23. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, finale (Poco sostenuto; Allegro non troppo; Presto non troppo), new reading for measures 467-474 of the *Secondo*

---

13 The original reading appears on the *recto* of the last (twenty-eighth) folio. Brahms cancelled the *Secondo* from the beginning of the *a tempo* until the end of the *recto* (measures 467-474 inclusive). Beneath measure 467 he wrote *V.S.* (volti subito, turn quickly), and drew an arrow extending beneath the cancelled measures to the end of the *recto*. Thus, the pianist playing the *Secondo* part was to turn the folio just before measure 467, revealing measures 467-74 rewritten on the *verso*. Measures 472-74 are identical to the original reading.
Brahms did not make any significant changes in phrasing and articulation. However, he indicated a more pronounced staccato for the chords and octaves in the climactic measures 476-90 of the Coda by changing the original staccato dots into wedges.\textsuperscript{14}

Minute refinements in dynamics were made at measure 22 of the Introduction, and at measure 214 in the return of the Main Theme.\textsuperscript{15} Expression words were not altered.

\textsuperscript{14}Wedges appear for the two left-hand parts in measures 476-81, and for the two right-hand parts at measures 482-90/1.

\textsuperscript{15}The decrescendo sign for the melody in the Primo was cancelled at measure 22. At measure 214, Brahms added decrescendo signs to both hands in the Primo to prepare for the pianissimo of measures 215ff.
CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS

Brahms clearly considered the "perfecting" of a work to be an important part of the creative process.

One ought never to forget that by actually perfecting one piece one gains and learns more than by commencing or half-finishing a dozen. Let it rest, let it rest, and keep going back to it and working it over and over again, until it is completed as a finished work of art, until there is not a note too much or too little, not a bar you could improve upon. Whether it is beautiful also, is an entirely different matter, but perfect it must be. You see, . . . I never cool down over a work, once begun, until it is perfected, unassailable.¹

Brahms had indeed turned time and again to the material of the original String Quintet, transcribing it as a Duo-Piano Sonata, retranscribing it as a Piano Quintet, and continually revising it until he succeeded in creating not just one, but two works which were eminently satisfying both to himself and to his close friends.

During each phase of the various stages of revision discernible in the three extant manuscripts, Brahms simultaneously considered for alteration notes, phrasing and articulation, dynamics and expression words; at no time did he concentrate solely on just one of these elements. The numerous revisions preserved in the manuscripts were prompted by four factors: (1) constructive criticisms solicited from

his trusted friends, (2) varying instrumental sonorities, (3) an intense desire that each work be expressively rendered in its initial performance, and (4) the impending publication of each work and the need to perfect it before exposing it in final form to thorough public review and criticism.

Advice solicited from his friends was often of paramount importance in stimulating Brahms to make revisions. The influence of Joseph Joachim seems to have been largely responsible for Brahms's decision to transcribe the String Quintet. Hermann Levi suggested the medium of piano quintet for the final transcription, and subsequently advised the making of several changes in this version. On Levi's recommendation, Brahms altered the distribution of material in the Second Theme of the second movement, and lessened the frequency of the word "espressivo" in the outer movements. Later, he likewise cancelled some occurrences of this word in the copyist's manuscript of the Duo-Piano Sonata. Unlike Joachim and Levi, Clara Schumann simply offered encouragement by praising the String Quintet and the two transcriptions in very general terms, rather than attempting to present specific criticisms. The published correspondence shows, however, that it was she who first advised Brahms to recast the Duo-Piano Sonata. Although he did not transcribe it for orchestra as she suggested, he evidently took to heart her recommendation that a new version be written.²

Varying instrumental conditions and sonorities may have given rise to many of the changes made in the extant autographs of the Duo-

² However, Brahms by no means accepted every suggestion made by his friends. He did not shorten the Coda of the finale by reducing the last ninety measures, as Levi had urged him to do. Nor did he alter the Second Theme of this movement, as Clara had suggested. See Levi's and Clara's letters of 9 and 10 November 1864 in the Appendix, pp. 252-54.
Piano Sonata and Piano Quintet. Brahms's utilization of a more powerful piano, the Streicher, may have caused the cancellation and transposition of bass notes in the piano part of the final transcription. The subsequent deletion of a few pedal-points, doubling notes, and harmony notes in the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata may also be attributable to his playing of this work on the Streicher. Similarly, many of the cancellations and changes in register which Brahms had earlier made in this draft might have arisen from the varying sonorities of different pianos utilized by him in Vienna, Hamburg, and Baden-Baden.

The composer's seeming preoccupation with making refinements in expression perhaps indicates an intense concern that the Duo-Piano Sonata and the Piano Quintet be performed as effectively as possible. Indeed, his countless alterations and insertions of phrasings, articulations, dynamics, and expression words provide more detailed instructions for performance, but do not significantly alter the sound of the material. Perhaps Brahms's anxiety that both works be expressively rendered was partially due to the criticism that had been levelled at the original String Quintet. The supply of expression words in the Piano Quintet is even more generous than in the Duo-Piano Sonata, probably because the première performance of the latter had been a failure.

The presentation of both works to the public involved not only performance, but publication. This, too, may have prompted Brahms's repeated re-evaluation of each composition. He occasionally changed his mind about revisions he had made in the notes of the Duo-Piano
Sonata,\(^3\) and excised the material he had added in the Piano Quintet.\(^4\) In both works, he gave further consideration to some changes he had made in phrasing and in expression words.\(^5\) Several passages of the Duo-Piano Sonata underwent repeated revision,\(^6\) as did some in the Piano Quintet.\(^7\) In the latter version, Brahms generally devoted his attention to adjusting the balance between the piano and the strings in passages that had not been altered in the Duo-Piano Sonata.

\(^3\) He had difficulty only with two bass pedal-points in the first movement, at measures 155-61 and 258-62. See Chapter V, p. 88, and Chapter VII, fn. 4. It is possible that his repeated revision of these pedal-points was caused by his playing of the work on various pianos; see p.83.

\(^4\) At the sequential dialogue that develops from the Closing Theme in the first movement, and at the imitative opening of the finale. See Chapter VI, pp. 141 and 154.

\(^5\) E.g., the poco ritardando that Brahms added in the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata was later changed to poco sostenuto (measure 116 of the slow movement). Brahms very rarely cancelled changes that he made in phrasing, except in some of the thematic material of the first movement. In the Closing Theme at measures 76, 238, and 242, he added two-note slurs before sending the working draft to the copyist; he cancelled these slurs in the copyist's manuscript. The opening announcement of the Principal Theme of this movement underwent numerous changes in phrasing. After the copying of the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata, Brahms shortened the slur in the second measure; when he made the final transcription, he initially adopted this shorter slur in both the first and the second measures. However, before sending the autograph to the engraver, he reverted to the phrasing that he had originally notated in the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata. See Chapters V and VI.

\(^6\) In particular, the tessitura of the Subject in the climactic measures 93-100/1 in the fugato of the Scherzo (see Chapter V and VII); the opening of the a tempo section in the Coda of the finale (measures 467-71; see Chapters V and VII); and the register of the right-hand line of the Primo in measures 486-87 and 489 of the finale (see Chapter V). Brahms continued to alter measures 486-89 in the Piano Quintet (see Chapter VI).

\(^7\) Accompanimental voices in measures 33-34 and 36-38 of the second movement; distribution of material in measures 76-80 of the fugato of the Scherzo, and the cancellation of notes to thin the texture in measures 184-91 of the same movement. See Chapter VI.
After undertaking the task of transcription, Brahms made major alterations and revisions, and finally devoted considerable time to the polishing of details concerning expression. The appearance of the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata suggests that he transcribed the String Quintet quickly (with very few changes) and then returned repeatedly to the transcription to make numerous revisions in pitch, expression, and distribution of material. Instructions for further changes were evidently communicated by Brahms to the copyist; the composer subsequently made alterations both in the copyist's manuscript and in the working draft.

Levi's comments indicate that the Duo-Piano Sonata, in turn, was hurriedly transcribed for piano quintet: Brahms wrote the string parts in score, but made only a sketch of the piano part (now lost). The String Quintet probably affected the writing of the Piano Quintet. Even if the composer did not have the score of the original work at hand when he made the final transcription, he surely would have remembered the Quintet, and would have been reminded of it as he reconsidered the two manuscripts of the Duo-Piano Sonata. After Brahms had written the full score of the Piano Quintet, he made numerous changes in notes and expression, and altered the distribution of material.

---

8 Naturally, Brahms did not necessarily transcribe an entire movement before starting to make the desired revisions. It is obvious that some alterations in the Exposition of the first movement were executed before Brahms transcribed the Recapitulation. See Chapter V, p.86.

9 It is obvious that both manuscripts of this work were utilized in the writing of the Piano Quintet. See Chapter V, pp.105-06 and 120-21.
amongst the strings in a few passages. Later, when he was checking the galley proofs of this work, he notated ideas for further revisions in his autograph.

Even after the publication of the Piano Quintet, Brahms continued to revise the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata (the only manuscript of either transcription that remained in his possession). When the copyist's manuscript of the Duo-Piano Sonata was returned to him in September 1871, he made some alterations in expression words, then sent this score to the engraver (see Example 1).

In both transcriptions, most of the changes in content consist of the cancellation of doubling and harmony notes, the deletion of pedal-points, and the transposition of accompanimental or melodic material up or down an octave. Generally, these alterations served to thin the texture, or to solve relatively minor problems of sonority and balance that had arisen when each transcription was made. Themes underwent revision only during the elaboration of the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata (Stage 3 b, Phase II). No significant changes in harmonies were allowed to stand.

As Brahms returned again and again to the working draft or

10 See Stage 3 b and Phase I of Stage 4 b in Chapter V; Stage 3 c and the first phase of Stage 4 c in Chapter VI.

11 Significant alterations were made at the opening of the Second Theme in the Recapitulation of the first movement, at the beginning of the Scherzo, and in the Second Theme of the latter (see Chapter V).

12 The only important changes in harmonies would have occurred in the sequential dialogue that follows the Closing Theme in the first movement. When Brahms made the final transcription, he extended this dialogue by a few measures. However, before sending the autograph to the engraver, he obscured the added material with paste-overs in the Exposition and Recapitulation. See Chapter VII.
copyist's manuscript of Op. 34bis, and then to the autograph of Op. 34, he made fewer and less significant changes in notes, although he continued to refine phrasing and articulation, and expression words. Dynamics underwent scarcely any change after the writing of the Piano Quintet autograph. When Brahms was correcting the galley proofs of this work, very few revisions in either notes or expression occurred to him. However, when he subsequently returned to the working draft of the Duo-Piano Sonata, he experienced new insights that led to many refinements, some of which appear in passages hitherto unaltered. Perhaps the most significant change was the notation of a slightly different reading for a few measures in the Coda of the finale, similar to the version which had appeared in the Piano Quintet. Brahms later cancelled some expression words in the copyist's manuscript of the Duo-Piano Sonata, as he had done in the Piano Quintet autograph (see page 161).

The three extant manuscripts of Opp. 34 and 34bis thus reveal Brahms's constant efforts to improve his initial creative impulses. This striving for perfection was the result of his personality and his artistic convictions combined. Although most of the changes made during the many months of intensive effort concerned refinements in sonority and expression, these changes, coupled with the important alterations in themes and accompanimental material, resulted in the skillfully polished compositions which even now stand as magnificent testimony to Brahms's creative genius.

13 E.g., at the opening of the fortissimo statement of the Principal Theme in the first movement (measures 11-13, recapitulated at measures 173-75). See Chapter VII.

14 See Chapter VII, P. 166.
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TEXTUAL CRITICISM

The first movement of both Opp. 34 and 34bis has been chosen for revision because it underwent the most alteration in the three extant manuscripts. It therefore best exemplifies the various kinds of changes made by Brahms in notes and expression.

The following is a list of the sources (and their acronyms) which are utilized in the revised scores.

For Op. 34bis:


For Op. 34:

PQA Autograph manuscript signed. Title page by Brahms: "Quintett / für / Pianoforte / 2 Violinen, Bratsche Ú Violoncello / componirt und / Ihrer königlichen Hoheit / der Frau Prinzessin Anna von Hessen / gewidmet / von / Johs Brahms. / Op. 34. /
[Around title page in hand of Rieter-Biedermann:] Eilt sehr [etc.]
38 leaves (Title p., 70 pp. music, 4 blank pp. at end), 24.7 × 33 cm., wrappers, 25.5 × 33 cm. Washington, D.C., Library of Congress (No. ML 30 .8b .87 Op. 34 Case). Used by Rieter-Biedermann as engraver’s layout (Stichvorlage) for the first edition.


PQ3 Rieter-Biedermann edition, third issue. Title page:

In his Handexemplar (author's copy) of each work,1 Brahms made neither changes nor corrections in the first movement.

Numerous alterations in notes and expression were made by the composer in the working draft of Op. 34bis after the publication of Op. 34 (see Chapter VII). Those which appear in the first movement have been incorporated in the revised score which follows, and are acknowledged in the Textual Notes. Some refinements in expression seemed equally suitable to the Piano Quintet; they have been distinguished as editorial emendations in the revised score, and are explained in the Textual Notes.

It was not possible to revise the musical text of the first movement

1Both Handexemplare (in the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, Vienna) were examined by the late Donald M. McCorkle. Brahms’s only changes in the copy of Op. 34bis consist of two small corrections in the finale. Two minor corrections were made in the copy of Op. 34 (both occur in the finale).
of Op. 34 as it appears in the Erstdruck;<sup>2</sup> the third issue has therefore been utilized. This issue is virtually identical to the Erstdruck; it differs from the latter only in a few minute details of expression. The Erstdruck itself contains very few flaws. In the first movement, there are only two small errors (both concern slurs; see measures 79 and 234). However, neither the Erstdruck nor the second and third issues include the refinements notated by Brahms in his autograph when he was checking the galley proofs (see Chapter VI). His alterations in the first movement concern dynamic markings.

The second issue of the first edition of Op. 34bis contains many significant errors which originated in the copyist's manuscript. Although both Brahms and Rieter-Biedermann made corrections in this manuscript,<sup>3</sup> it seems that neither of them compared it carefully with the working draft. The copyist had often overlooked a note in an inner voice or in a chord;<sup>4</sup> because the absence of such a note was not immediately obvious, neither Brahms nor Rieter-Biedermann noticed the omission. However, when a note was mistakenly absent from a melody line, or when its absence left a measure rhythmically incomplete or even entirely blank,<sup>5</sup> the

<sup>2</sup>The xerographic copy of the Erstdruck available for examination did not yield a xerox copy suitable for inclusion in this study.

<sup>3</sup>Missing rests were supplied; all of them appear to have been written by Brahms. Both the composer and Rieter-Biedermann added accidentals (often simply for clarity) and made a few note-corrections.

<sup>4</sup>E.g., the lower voice in the right-hand part of the Primo at measure 23 in the first movement.

<sup>5</sup>First movement, measure 32: g'' missing on the fourth beat in the right-hand part of the Primo; finale, measures 92: d missing from the left-hand part of the Secondo; finale, measure 31: D♭ and slur missing from the left-hand part of the Secondo.
omission was easily perceived, and was corrected.

Similarly, the obvious absence of a slur was almost invariably detected, but the existing slurs were not always examined carefully. This initially becomes apparent in the opening measures of the Principal Theme in the first movement: Brahms supplied the slur missing from measure 15, but failed to notice that the slurs in measures 12-13 had been copied incorrectly. The composer evidently was more concerned with refining expression than with checking the accuracy of the copyist's work.

Before sending this manuscript to Princess Anna sometime after mid-October 1864, Brahms did not bother to incorporate the many revisions he had subsequently made in the working draft (see Chapter V). When the copyist's manuscript was finally returned to him in September 1871, he was anxious not to delay publication. Accordingly, he forwarded the manuscript to Rieter-Biedermann without taking time to add the late revisions executed in the working draft (see Chapter VII).

The galley proofs of Op. 34bis arrived early in December 1871; Brahms promised to attend to them "as soon as possible." He must have corrected them from the copyist's manuscript, for the errors which had passed unnoticed in the latter remained unrectified.

6"bald möglichst." See Brahms's letter to Rieter-Biedermann in the Appendix, p. 257. The composer dated this letter "Nov. 71," but Wilhelm Altmann, the editor of this correspondence in the Brahms Briefwechsel, suggests that it was written on 2 December.
First Movement, Op. 34bis

5, 6, 8-10, 11, 12, 20-22, 135, 182-84, II and/or I: Staccato dots changed to wedges by Brahms when revising SC.

8/2 & 4, 9/2 & 4, II: Originally no dynamics in SA. Copyist added $f$ in 8/2 and 9/4 (see SA at 5/2). Later Brahms added $fz$ to 8/2 & 4 and 9/2 & 4 in SA; $sf^+$ inserted in galley proofs.

9/2, II/R: SA includes $d''$-flat (not seen identical m. 171 of Recap.). Omitted from 9/2 on Brahms's instructions to copyist?

11/4, I & II: Originally a $V^7$ in SA and SC. Later Brahms cancelled B-flat's in SA, replacing all but one (in I/L) with a G or an E-natural.

12/1, 13/1, I, & 174/1, 175/1, II: A-flat's cancelled.

12/1, 13/1, II/L: A-flat's cancelled; replaced by F's.

12/2-3, 13/2-3, 14/2-3, II/R, & 174/2-3, 175/2-3, 176/2-3, I: Copyist's error rectified by lengthening of each slur to agree with SA and PQA. Copyist's erroneous accent sign deleted from 12/3, II/R.

16/1, 17/1, II/L: B-flat cancelled.

19-21/1, I: Copyist's error rectified by lengthening of each slur to agree with SA.

19/4, I/R: Articulation signs occur in SA at the identical m. 181 in the Recapitulation.

20/1, II/L: Copyist's erroneous accent sign deleted.

20, II/L: Marcato for the identical material in PQA.

20/2-21/2: Sketch in lead appears on blank stave below system for left-hand part of Primo (see Example 24). Sketch that is notated beneath the recapitulation of this material at m. 182-83 lacks the b' (which would require a double-flat sign) in the second figure, but otherwise is identical to the sketch shown in Example 24.

22/3, I/L: SA has C-C-c. PQA originally had C-c, which Brahms later transposed down an octave.

23/1 & 3, I/R: Copyist omitted a'-flat and g' on first and third beats respectively. Both present in SA and PQA.

23-32/2, I/L, and 23-26/1, II/R: Copyist's error rectified by lengthening of slurs to agree with SA and PQA.
Example 24. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, 1st movement (Allegro non troppo), sketch for left-hand part of the Primo at measures 20-21/2

23-26/1, II/L: Each note is doubled at the lower octave in SA. Doubling probably omitted on Brahms's instructions to copyist. See Chapter V.

25/3-4, I & II: Copyist erroneously added a decrescendo sign in I. The same sign was added to the accompaniment (II) in the galley proofs. Neither sign is present in either SA or PQA.

30/2-4, II/R: SA originally had a-flat to begin the triplet on the second beat, and a-flat as the lowest note of the triad reiterated on the third and fourth beats.

31/3, 32/3, I/R: SA has a'-flat in both instances. Omitted from SC on Brahms's instructions?

33/1, II/R: SC has staccato dot, erroneously added by copyist. Not present here or in Recapitulation, in either SA or PQA.

34/1, II/L: Sketch, written and cancelled in lead, appears in SA on the blank stave below the left-hand part (see Example 25).

Example 25. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, 1st movement (Allegro non troppo), cancelled sketch for the left-hand part of the Secondo at measure 34/1
35/anacrusis, I: a" cancelled in SA. Left-hand part in this measure not written out; it is indicated by the abbreviation "in 8va."

37/2, II/R: In SC copyist erroneously continued slur unbroken until 38/4. However, in both SA and PQA (see Va line) a new slur is begun on m. 37/4. The slurs in the analogous m. 199 of the Recapitulation were correctly copied in SC.

38/4, I: d"-sharp and b'-sharp restored to I/R, and to I/L, which still plays "in 8va." Copyist mistook the half note on the second beat for a dotted half note; evidently he did not observe the two eighth-notes that complete this inner voice on the 4th beat. He copied the analogous m. 199 in the Recapitulation correctly.

45, II: Different reading notated in lead (indicated by parentheses in Example 26).

Example 26. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, 1st movement (Allegro non troppo), measures 45-46 of the Secondo

Perhaps Brahms never made up his mind that he preferred this new version, for the original reading remained uncancelled.

47/4, I/R: c'-sharp cancelled.

49/4, I: In SA, this slur begins on the 1st beat of the next measure in the right hand (the left-hand part is not written out, but plays "col [I/R]"). Brahms may have instructed the copyist to begin the slur in both parts on the anacrusis, for this is what appears in SA at the analogous m. 211 of the Recapitulation, and in both Exposition and Recapitulation in PQA.

51/4-55, II/L: Accompaniment clarified by transposition of notes in every other triplet. Original pattern and new reading are shown side by side in Example 27. Alterations were made in m. 53/4-55 of SA, then in m. 51/4-53/2 of SC.
Example 27. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, 1st movement (Allegro non troppo), alteration of triplet accompaniment in the left-hand part of the Secondo at measure 51/4

51, II/L: Slurs in SA and PQA are restored. Copyist erroneously wrote a single slur spanning the entire measure.

53/2, I/L: Slur restored to begin on 2nd beat, as in SA and PQA. Copyist erroneously lengthened it, starting it on the 1st beat.

54-55, II/R: Slurs restored to length found in SA. Copyist erroneously lengthened the first slur, extending it to the first beat of m. 55. He therefore began the next slur on the second beat instead of the first.

59/1, I/L: Slur restored to length found in SA. Copyist erroneously began it one beat late.

63, II/L: After SA had been copied, Brahms gave further considerations to the reiterated octaves and made cancellations to produce an alternation of c-sharp and c'-sharp (see Example 28).

Example 28. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, 1st movement (Allegro non troppo) left-hand part of the Secondo at measure 63

The continuation of these octaves in m. 64 was left untouched, and no alterations were made in the analogous m. 225-26 of the Recapitulation. The reading that appears in SC and S2 has therefore been allowed to stand.

68/3-4, I/R: The notes doubling the top line of the right hand at the lower third and sixth were left uncanceled—perhaps accidentally—in SC, but were cancelled in lead in SA. See Chapter V, p. 88.
76-77/1, 80-81/1, 238-39/1, 242-43/1, II/L or I/L: Staccato dots for bass octaves absent in SA but present in SC. Those in m. 238-39 and 242-43 are in lead; those in m. 76-77 and 80-81 seem to be in ink. Brahms may have instructed the copyist to add them.

78/2, I/R: Slur extended to agree with SA and PQA.

79/3, I/R: In accordance with SA and PQA, a new slur is begun on the third beat. Copyist erroneously wrote an unbroken slur.

93/2-96/2 of prima volta, 93/2-94/2 of seconda volta, II: Staccato dots added by copyist. Brahms probably intended that they be present, since he himself had written them at the beginning and end of this passage, in m. 91-92 and 95-96 of SA.

105/2-07/1, II/L: SA does not have lower-octave doubling notes. Brahms may have instructed copyist to add such doubling, since he himself had written it for the analogous material at m. 102/2-103/1 and 104/2-05/1.

121/1, I/R: SA has g''-flat instead of d''-flat. Brahms used d''-flat in PQA.

121-22/3, II/L: SA has a slur spanning the octaves in m. 121 alone. The copyist continued this slur until the third beat of m. 122; this was perhaps done according to Brahms's instruction, for the latter used this long slur in PQA.

122, I/L: f' appears in SA as a whole note; the copyist notated it as a half note. In SC, either Brahms or Rieter-Biedermann added a second half note but forgot to insert a tie.

122/3, II/L: F, found in SC is removed, in accordance with SA and PQA.

122/anacrusis-133/4, II/L: In SA this line was originally entirely in octaves, the low doubling notes either written out or indicated by the number "8" or by "col 8va." After SA had been copied, Brahms returned to this passage and made revisions in lead to cancel the upper note of each eighth-note octave, as far as the end of m. 129. In m. 130-33 his alterations are somewhat ambiguous. Since the revised version of m. 122/anacrusis-129 appears in PQA as the original reading, the present editor has considered the next four measures in PQA as representing what the composer intended in m. 130-33 of SA. The latter passage is shown in Example 29 as it appears in SA: lead markings are given as dotted lines, or are enclosed in parentheses.......

129/3, 130/3, 131/3, I/R: Accents added by copyist on Brahms's instructions?

129/4-30/4, I/R: Fingering present in SC only, some written by the copyist and some added in lead by Brahms.
Example 29. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, 1st movement (Allegro non troppo), left-hand part of the *Secondo* at measures 130-33

136/1, II/R: Staccato dot, present in SC but in neither SA nor PQA, has been deleted.

145/4, I/R: Slur extended to 146/1 to agree with SA and PQA.

148/1, I/L: g' overlooked by copyist. Present in SA and PQA.

150/4, II/L: Open octave G-g transposed down an octave.

151/4, I/L: c overlooked by copyist. Present in SA and PQA.

151-54/3, I/L & II/L: Three-note slurs changed into two-note slurs followed by staccato dots.

156/1-2, 158/1-2, 161/1-2, II/L: Reiterated C transposed up an octave.

164/4, II/L: Copyist's error rectified by shortening of slur to agree with SA and PQA.

173/4, II: B-flat's cancelled; replaced by g'' and e. See also m. 11/4.

176/1, 177/1, I/R: g' and f' overlooked by copyist; present in SA, as in identical m. 14 and 15 of Exposition.

181/4-82/2, II/R: Copyist mistakenly notated unbroken slur.

182-83/2, II/L: Sketch notated below left-hand part is virtually identical to that which appears in the Exposition. See discussion of m. 20-21/2 I/L.

186, II/L: Staccato dots added in lead. Present in analogous m. 184-189 of PQA.
207/2, II/R: After completion of SC, Brahms in SA connected this slur to the one on 207/3. This change was not made in analogous m. 208, and not incorporated in PQA.

214/2-16, I & II: Crescendo and decrescendo signs added by Brahms in SC.

215, 216, II/L: Slurs corrected to agree with SA and with analogous measures in PQA. In SC, copyist erroneously began a new slur on 215/3 and 216/3.

227/4-28/1, II/R: Engraver's error corrected. In both SA and SC, slur is unbroken.

228/4, I/L: Copyist's error corrected. Copyist mistakenly extended slur to 229/1.

255, II: Descrescendo sign cancelled.

256-62, II/L: See Chapter V, pp. 92 and 107. Copyist evidently was instructed in the manner of interpreting cancellations made by Brahms in SA.

262, II concludes a system in SA. At the end of this measure, in the margin, Brahms notated the sketch shown in Example 30. (Insertions made in lead are enclosed in parentheses and indicated by broken lines.)

Example 30. Johannes Brahms, Opus 34bis, 1st movement (Allegro non troppo), sketch following measure 262 of the Secondo

280/4, I/L & II/L: Copyist mistakenly continued slurs to 281/1. Corrected here to agree with SA and PQA.

290/4, I/L: SA has open octave D'-flat-D-flat. Transposed up an octave in SC on Brahms's instructions to copyist?
291/2, II: D-flat's replace B-flat's at the end of 291/2.

291/4, II: Final 'G's of figure cancelled; E-natural's inserted as third note.

295/2-97/1, II/R: Lower-octave doubling cancelled at beginning of each beat.

298-300, II/L: Arpeggiation signs and half notes added in m. 298-99; arpeggiation signs added in m. 300.

299/4, I/R: c''' present in SA; absent in SC and in PQA. Omitted in SC on Brahms's instructions to copyist?
First Movement, Op. 34

1-2, Vn I, C, & Pi: Phrasing altered before engraving of PQA. See Chapter VI.

11/4, 172/4, Pi/R: Arpeggiation sign deleted; present in neither PQA nor PQ1.

22/3, 183/3, 149/4, Pi/L: Originally up one octave in PQA. Revised before engraving.

27/4-28/1, Vn I: Dynamic markings added in SA, after completion of SC, for same material in I/R.

56, Va: Original decrescendo sign cancelled before engraving of PQA.

57/1, Va: Espressivo cancelled before PQA engraved.

59-60, Pi/L: Initially down one octave in PQA. Revised before engraving.

63/1, Vn I: Espressivo cancelled before PQA engraved.

63, 65/1, Pi/L: Original lower-octave doubling in PQA cancelled.

64, Pi/L: Originally down one octave in PQA. Revised before engraving.

66/2, Vn II: Slur continued unbroken; Brahms revised it before sending PQA to engraver.

70/1-2, Pi: Absent in PQA but present in both PQ1 and PQ3.

79/2-3, C: Slurs corrected to agree with PQA. Engraver had mistakenly extended first slur to C, and had begun second slur on D-flat.

80/1, C: p absent in PQA and PQ1.

83-87, Tutti: Present reading notated on "paste-over" in PQA. See Chapter VI.

90-95, Vn I, Vn II, Va, & C: Staccato dots cancelled before engraving of PQA.

104-05/1, Pi/L: Upper-octave doubling cancelled before engraving of PQA.

159/4-61, Vn II: Line doubling Va at unison added before engraving of PQA.
197/3-98/2, Vn I: Originally spanned by unbroken slur. Revision made before engraving of PQA.

200/1, Va: **Espressivo** cancelled before PQA engraved.

204/1, Vn II: **Espressivo** cancelled before PQA engraved.

204/1, C: Lower-octave doubling note cancelled before engraving of PQA.

210/4-11, Vn I: Originally spanned by single slur; revised before engraving of PQA.

218/1, Va: **Espressivo** cancelled before PQA engraved.

222/1, C: **Espressivo** cancelled before PQA engraved.

226/2, 4, Pi/L: e-flat and g cancelled before engraving of PQA.

228, Pi: Added in SA after completion of SC.

229/3, Vn I: New slur originally began on a'' in PQA; revised before engraving.

230/1, Vn I, Va, C: **Espressivo** cancelled before PQA engraved.

230-35/1, Va: Lower-octave doubling of Vn I added before engraving of PQA.

230/4, Pi/R: Slur continues unbroken in PQA, although new slur begins on 231/1 in both PQ1 and PQ3.

234/1, Va: Slur corrected to agree with PQA. In both PQ1 and PQ3 it begins on 234/2.

245-50, Tutti: Present reading notated on paste-over. See Chapter VI.

251/4, Vn I, Va, C: **Espressivo** cancelled before PQA engraved.

258/2-61/1, Pi/R: Ties notated for common e's in PQA; engraver mistook them for slurs. Ties later added in analogous measures of SA.

270/2, Vn I: Slur extends to 270/4 in PQA, but not in PQ1, PQ3, SA, SC, or S2.

273/2, C: Slur originally began on 273/1 in PQA: revised before engraving occurred.

279/4, Pi: **Crescendo** cancelled in PQA; rewritten in next measure.

290/1-2, 291/1-2, Vn II: Lower-octave doubling of Vn I cancelled before engraving of PQA.
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APPENDIX

Information concerning the history of Opp. 34 and 34bis appears in letters scattered through five volumes of the Brahms Briefwechsel, in volume I of the Clara Schumann—Johannes Brahms Briefe, in the English translation of selected letters from Joseph Joachim's correspondence, and in the books by Albert Dietrich and Max Kalbeck. The pertinent excerpts from these letters have been arranged chronologically in order to create the following documentary history of the original String Quintet and the two transcriptions.

Although many of the letters were not dated by their authors, dates for such letters were often suggested by the editors of the published collections of correspondence. These dates have been adopted in

the following chronology (with two exceptions, see below). Because Dietrich and Kalbeck did not always propose dates for the letters included in their books, this author has supplied approximate dates, which are discussed below.

Andreas Moser, the editor of the Brahms-Joachim correspondence in the *Brahms Briefwechsel* (volumes V and VI) seems to have dated inaccurately two of Brahms's letters. The first letter in question, an urgent request for the return of the String Quintet manuscripts, was dated by the composer "abermal Freitag" (Friday again). Moser suggested that it was written on 7 November 1862,² after Brahms had acknowledged Joachim's letter dated "London, 5. November." However, in the "abermal Freitag" letter Brahms complained: "In my thoughts I . . . see four weeks gone by, and me without a letter from you and [without] the Quintet."³ Moser is surely incorrect in suggesting that the composer acknowledged the arrival of Joachim's letter, and then wrote again that day to ask why he had heard nothing from his friend. His reference to the passing of four weeks' time suggests that he was writing at the end of October, for the Quintet had been sent to Joachim in late September. Thus, "abermal Freitag" probably does not refer to 7 November,⁴ but to 31 October, on which day Brahms had written a letter insisting that Joachim

² See *Brahms Briefwechsel* V (cited above), #245, pp. 327-28.
³ "Ich sehe in Gedanken . . . vier Wochen verflossen und mich ohne Brief von Dir und Quintett." Ibid., p. 327.
⁴ In the first edition of this volume (published in 1908 by the Deutsche Brahms-Gesellschaft m. b. H.) Moser had suggested an equally implausible date for this letter: 14 November. However, the date given for Brahms's acknowledgement of Joachim's letter---9 November---is perhaps more reasonable than 7 November. It is unlikely that Joachim's letter, mailed in London on the fifth or sixth, could have been delivered in Vienna on the seventh. In the documentary history, this author has
return the String Quintet manuscript. It therefore seems that the composer, on that same Friday, wrote yet a second letter repeating this request.

In the letter dated "abermal Freitag," Brahms remarked: "I will write again the day after tomorrow." Moser was probably correct in assuming that the promised letter was the one which consists of a single sentence demanding the return of the Quintet. Since the "abermal Freitag" letter can now be dated 31 October (not 7 November), one can suggest that this subsequent request for the Quintet dates from circa 2 November.

Approximate dates for two of Brahms's letters quoted in Albert Dietrich's book are now being supplied for the first time. One letter was evidently written soon after the composer's thirtieth birthday, which would place it shortly after 7 May 1863. The next letter which Dietrich quotes, dated "1863" by the composer, was written before Brahms learned that he had been appointed conductor of the Wiener Singakademie. Thus, it must have been written before June 1863.

Therefore suggested 9 November as the date of Brahms's letter of acknowledgement.


"Ich schreibe übermorgen wieder." Ibid., p. 328.

Ibid. (Letter #246.)

Not 7 or 8 November, as Moser's chronology indicates.

Dietrich mentioned Brahms's celebration of his thirtieth birthday, then quoted this letter, in which the composer thanked him for his birthday greeting. See Erinnerungen, pp. 48-49.

Brahms was informed of the appointment at the end of May, and mentioned it to Dietrich in the next letter quoted by the latter. See ibid., pp. 51-52.
Kalbeck quotes a letter written by Brahms at Baden-Baden in the autumn of 1865. I have dated it *circa* 20 October on the basis of Brahms's statement that he would be with Hermann Levi at Carlsruhe "after about fourteen days."\(^{11}\)

\(^{11}\)"nach etwa vierzehn Tagen." See Kalbeck, *Johannes Brahms*, II/1: 199. Brahms had arrived in Carlsruhe by 3 November, on which day he gave a concert with Levi (ibid., p. 203).
EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS DOCUMENTING THE
HISTORY OF OPP. 34 AND 34BIS

[20 June 1862]; Brahms, [Bad Münster-am-Stein], to Joseph Joachim
[London] (Brahms Briefwechsel V, 1974 reprint of 1921 edition, #236,
pp. 316-17)

Now I am sitting in an inn on the Nahe, at the foot of the Ebernburg, where Franz von Sickingen died and Ulrich von Hutten is working on ... a Ballade for chorus and orchestra. I am sorry to say that I cannot think of notes, but am abundantly enjoying air and freedom.

Across the Nahe, in [Bad] Münster, are staying [Woldemar] Bargiel [Clara Schumann's step-brother] and Frau Schumann; I would really like you to be there, too.

You will have read about the beautiful music festival at Cologne; ... It was very gratifying being together with so many pleasant colleagues, because of this I'll never let myself miss a music festival. . . .

I don't know how long I'll rove about here. . . .

We'll all probably still be together [for] 8-14 days.

1 July 1862; Clara Schumann, [Bad Münster-am-Stein], to Joachim [London] (Letters from and to Joseph Joachim, pp. 253-54)

After the Musical Festival at Cologne Johannes, . . . Dietrich and Woldemar came here. . . . Johannes and Dietrich spent a fortnight here and lived right in the country. . . . They liked it so much that they were very loth to go. Johannes regretted that he had not brought any real work with him so as not to loaf about, which he cannot stand for long, as you know. They all left the day before yesterday (Herr von Sahr had joined them) for a walking tour in the Palatinate; . . .

Johannes sent me a little time ago . . . the first movement of a Symphony with this bold opening:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{etc. . . .}
\end{align*}
\]
Besides this he sent me *Magelonenlieder*. I suppose you know his Variations for four hands on Robert's last theme? When he came here himself and played all this and many things besides, as well as playing with me the D minor Quartette, C major Quintette and Octette of Schubert's several times, I was very happy.

29 August 1862; Clara, Interlaken [Switzerland], to Brahms [Hamburg] (Clara Schumann—Johannes Brahms Briefe I, #198, p. 405)

Only a few lines today, dear Johannes, [to explain] why my thanks . . . for your beautiful parcel has failed to appear for so long. I received the latter, to my joy, on the very morning of my departure from Rigi[-Kaltbad], where we could no longer hold out because of the cold. In Luzern I rented a house by the lake, telegraphed for an upright piano from Zürich and already was looking forward to the quiet enjoyment of your Quintet, which looked quite rich, then suddenly there came a beautiful day, everyone prophesied good weather, and we set off, with a small [travelling-]bag, on a walking tour. Unfortunately we have already been sitting here for a few days now, absolutely rained in, . . . Now we have neither music nor my scribblings [Schreibereien] with me, naturally we took along nothing at all, because we thought we would rove about in the mountains—it is enough to drive one crazy, although it is heavenly beautiful here. . . . We will wait until early tomorrow, [and] if it is still wretched, then we will go directly back to Luzern, but if it is lovely, then I will not come there till Monday [1 September]. My first concern will then, naturally, be the Quintet, and my writing to you about it. Meanwhile I sometimes play to [Theodor] Kirchner, on a miserable upright piano, this or that from your [Piano] Quartets.

3 September 1862; Clara, Luzern, to Brahms [Vienna] (Clara Schumann—Johannes Brahms Briefe I, #199, pp. 407-08)

I really don't know how I ought to begin to calmly tell you what joy your Quintet gives me. I have played it many times, and my heart is quite full of it! It grows ever more beautiful, more magnificent. What inner strength, what richness [there is] in the first movement, how quickly the first motive so completely seizes one! How beautifully [it is scored] for the instruments, how I can see them fiddling perfectly. You should send yourself along with each composition, so that one could talk about every measure properly with you. Here again how wonderfully everything is woven together. How bold is the transition at letter B, how heartfelt the second [part of the] first theme [measures 23ff], then the second [theme] in C-sharp minor [measures 34ff], how wonderfully the instruments blend in the development of this and [in] the transition back to the first [theme], and at the close the dreamy place [Poco sostenuto], then the accell. [sic] and the bold, passionate ending—I cannot tell you how it moves me, takes hold of me so strongly. And what an Adagio, it joyfully sings and rings from beginning to end! I keep starting it again and would like never to stop. I love the Scherzo very much, too, only the Trio seems to me a little
short? And when is the last movement coming? Yesterday I played it [the uncompleted Quintet] to Kirchner and [Julius] Stockhausen—they are just as charmed by it, and afterwards we toasted you with champagne. Don't be angry with me for not writing to you about it sooner, but I really couldn't because my heart was too full—how can one write properly when everything is singing and ringing inside one. Now today you must be content, [knowing that] I feel it better than I can express. A 1,000 thanks, and please, send me the ending soon!

[Shortly before 8 September 1862]; Brahms, [Hamburg], to Albert Dietrich [Oldenburg] (Quoted in Kalbeck, Johannes Brahms I/2, 1976 reprint of 1921 ed., p. 479)

The C-minor Symphony is not finished, but on the other hand [I have completed] a String Quintet (2 Violoncellos) in F minor, which I would most gladly send you and have [you] write to me about it, but nevertheless I'd rather take it with me.


I have been in Vienna for nearly fourteen days, and your letter came to me too late for me to be able to answer you in England. However, the hurried answer was not so necessary, since after "Symphony by J. B." you may place a ? for the time being. On the other hand I want to send you something behind which you can put what you like.

You may see . . . [as] a proof, which is never necessary, of unchanged conviction [in the value of your musical judgement], [the fact] that the enclosed Quintet may by no means look around in the world until you have seen it.

Now I would wish, of course, [that] you would have time one of these days to look at it, since I would like to have it back as soon as possible, and [to] know what you think of it.

Should you fancy playing it, I ask that you have it copied at my expense. Only in this case, too, do it quickly, so that I can have it back soon and hear about its effect.

In this event I would also have to ask you to correct the bowing signs and the double stops and whatever [else] you wish. Naturally, everything that you do will be all right with me.

14 October [1862]; Joachim, [London], to Clara [Gebweiler] (Letters from and to Joseph Joachim, pp. 275-76)

I had really quite firmly made up my mind, . . . that you and Johannes (of whom I have only heard indirectly through [Theodor] Ave[-Lallemant] at Hamburg) had given me up altogether. . . . I wrote to Johannes from Hastings asking him to let me know as soon as possible (at the latest in a week's time) whether he would like to rehearse and conduct his Symphony for the first time in Hanover. I told him I was very anxious to know this before I went to Hanover. . . . But no answer came whatever. . . . Scholz says in
his letter to-day that there is a parcel there for me from Brahms from Vienna. I have asked him, of course, to send it on here at once. Hurrah! perhaps it is the Quintette! I know nothing about the Symphony yet; it may be that after all.

[mid-October 1862]; Brahms, [Vienna], to Joachim [London] (Brahms Briefwechsel V, 1974 reprint of 1921 ed., #241, pp. 322-23)

It is now indeed four weeks since I sent you a Quintet, [so] now I would just like to inquire what has become of it.
At that time, I thought that you would be very busy in Hannover and therefore would desire rest above all, thus I would not have sent it [the Quintet] to you if you had not written about the Symphony.
Therefore don't trouble yourself in the slightest, but rather let Rabe [Joachim's servant] simply pack it up and bring it to the post-office. Just now I would really like to try it here and want to still be pleased with it when you speak with me about it.
In Hellmesberger's first quartet [evening] I am playing mine [i.e., my Piano Quartet, Op. 25] in G minor . . . And everyone urges that I give a concert myself, in the end it will take place. . . .
So I ask you for word and [for] the Quintet as soon as possible.

[ca. 23 October 1862]; Joachim, [London], to Bernhard Scholz [Hannover] (Letters from and to Joseph Joachim, p. 277)

As, up to the present, I have neither received the manuscript from Brahms which I begged you to send at once, nor had any news of the fate of a letter to the King . . . , I am rather uneasy about these two matters, which are of importance to me. Have my communications not reached you? . . . You mention a parcel of letters for me, but I have seen nothing of that either.

[31 October 1862]; Brahms, [Vienna], to Joachim [London] (Brahms Briefwechsel V, 1974 reprint of 1921 ed., #242, pp. 323-24)

Highly annoyed, I can only sit down again and write concerning my Quintet:
I earnestly ask for and demand it, and you can bear in mind that I have the right to feel more [anxious] about this work than [about] others, the manuscripts of which are with you.
I have [had] quite enough and would only wish [that] the whole matter would be at an end, with me having my music, that I could begin to ruminate on the angry feelings of these days.
If only I could believe you were [still] in England!

Friday again [Lamberton dating = 31 October 1862]; Brahms, [Vienna], to Joachim [London] (Brahms Briefwechsel V, 1974 reprint of 1921 ed., #245, pp. 327-28)

In my thoughts I again see four weeks gone by, and me without a letter from you and [without] the Quintet.
Otherwise, knowing my things are with you is such a pleasant
feeling to me, [that] now, not knowing for such a long time whether a glance has fallen [on the Quintet], I cannot become free of most unpleasant thoughts. I feel as if I [had] called out into soundless emptiness, from whence I awaited a friendly echo. Therefore I ask most urgently that you devote a minute of [your] time to it, to tell Rabe my address and to give [him] the Quintet so that it can be packed and taken care of.

Very soon it will scarcely be possible to ask the people here for a rehearsal, since daily there is more to do for the concerts.

I will write again the day after tomorrow.

[Lamberton dating = 2 November 1862]; Brahms, [Vienna], to Joachim [London] (Brahms Briefwechsel V, 1974 reprint of 1921 ed., #246, p. 328)

I want and demand my Quintet.

3 November 1862; Clara, Düsseldorf, to Brahms [Vienna] (Clara Schumann—Johannes Brahms Briefe I, #200, p. 412)

You surely have had news from Joachim! You know, he . . . wanted to stay in London until January, but now the King [of Hannover] is standing on his rights, and now he must come back in December, . . . He wrote to me that he hoped to soon play your new Quintet for me, [he] expected [to receive] it anytime now.


Just yesterday, after frequent reminding [from me] that a manuscript from you [which had] arrived in Hannover was supposed to be sent here to me, I received your Quintet! It is—this much is immediately clear to me—a piece of [the] deepest meaning, full of manly strength, and lofty [in] construction. All the movements [are] significant, complementing one another. I congratulate [you], and will be happy to hear the work. In the event that you now need the Quintet in Vienna, write, or telegraph . . . , and I will send it at once. Of course I would prefer that I might play it for you first; because (between us there need be no restraints) Hellmesberger would not play it suitably for you. He lacks [the] boldness and strength that are necessary for all your works. It is difficult, this Quintet, and I am afraid that, without energetic playing, it will sound a little unclear. If it is all right with you, I would [like to] have your work copied here, and take [it] with me to Hannover at the beginning of December—and play it for you when? I await your instructions in this matter.


I am not surprised that you were very astonished and annoyed over the absence of your Quintet. You are not accustomed to such a thing from me, and would never have had the occasion for such [an] experience, were it not for unusual circumstances.
Immediately after [receiving] the news from Hannover that there was a manuscript from you, I had sent [an] urgent request to Scholz to immediately send your music to London. He wrote me [that] it would arrive soon—but only after three reminders did it come into my hands just eight days ago! It had not been my fault. Your three letters of reminder arrived just now from Hannover: I don't know where they tarried, either, since I had enjoined [Scholz] to immediately forward all letters to me. One can rely on no one as [one can] upon oneself. I am sincerely sorry, from the bottom of my heart, that I have perhaps upset your wish for a performance [of the Quintet]; such a thing would be upsetting to me, too.—However, since the Viennese know neither your [String] Sextet [in B-flat major, Op. 18] nor other things [of yours], which to them would be easier to understand than the Quintet (not to me, whose taste it suits extraordinarily well), then it is not so bad a result after all, that with this mail you will see the work again...

I most sincerely beg your pardon, and hand your Quintet over to you.

[9 November 1862]; Brahms, [Vienna], to Joachim [London] (Brahms Briefwechsel V, 1908 ed., #242, pp. 319-20)

... I [have] received your letter [of the fifth] and would really like to have my Quintet, as you would surely have been able to see from my letters. I hope [that] now, at least, no further difficulties will intervene. A performance at my concert has, of course, no doubt become impossible in any case, since the work is difficult and I would have to be able to thoroughly test it at my leisure. However, now I would really like to dare to hope that I will have it in a few days...

You are right about Hellmesberger, and here (certainly because of Wagner) music of excited character is much preferred;...

If my letters look as angry as they were meant [to be], console yourself with knowing that I, in my thoughts, wanted to write even more angrily, and I will truly be on my guard against becoming angry again at your unreliability. Which [unreliability] will hopefully be found quite comprehensible [in the end].

10 November 1862; Clara, Frankfurt a/M [am Main], to Joachim [London] (Letters from and to Joseph Joachim, p. 279)

I suppose you have had his [Brahms's] Quintette by now? He is to play it, or rather to have it played at Hellmesberger's at the end of this month. I should like to hear you play that one day!


The music dealer Chappell, to whom I gave your Quintet last week for forwarding by the most direct manner through the post-office, and who packed it in my presence and attended to it the same day, now tells me that (against my express wish) he did not stamp it, because the agent thought it would reach its destination faster and more safely [if it were] unstamped [sagt mir jetzt, dass er es
(gegen meinen ausdrücklichen Wunsch) deshalb nicht frei gemacht habe, weil der Agent es unfrankiert für schneller und sicherer zum Ziele gelangend hielt. This is not due to inattentiveness on my part, which you might be inclined to admit.

On 9 December I am travelling from here directly to Hannover.

18 December 1862; Clara, Berlin, to Brahms [Vienna] (Clara Schumann--Johannes Brahms Briefe I, #203, pp. 418-19)

... I want to tell you at once how delighted I was again with your Quintet; I find the last movement magnificent, finishing the whole, full of verve, the introduction quite beautiful, the 2nd theme such a pleasing contrast to the first, and in the development again such [an] ingenious meshing of all the themes, in short, [it is] even quite masterly. If only I could just hear it once, for playing [it] so laboriously at the piano is so very unsatisfying. Have you heard it in Vienna then? Aren't you sending the parts to Joachim? Do that, then in January, it would certainly have to be in the first days of January, I could hear it. Joachim, as you will know, arrived in Hannover on the 10th. . . .

N.B.: Should I send the Quintet to Dietrich or perhaps preferrably to Joachim? Have you received an honorarium from Simrock?

19 December 1862; Clara, Berlin, to Joachim [Hannover] (Letters from and to Joseph Joachim, pp. 283-84)

... [Brahms] hurt me deeply this summer in the same way that he hurt you, and about the very same Quintette. I received it just as I was starting on a tour in the Bernese Oberland. Knowing I should not have a minute to spare on a tour like that, and that I should not find a piano on which to play the Quintette, and being nervous besides of carrying such a valuable manuscript about in my trunk, I left it with my things at Lucerne. But I came back in four days' time, studied it very carefully and wrote to him most warmly about it; whilst I was away I had written to tell him I had received it, etc., etc. (out of consideration for him and for fear he should be expecting to hear). Meanwhile I got, in answer to this note, a letter from him saying he had not known I travelled with so little luggage nowadays, that a few scraps of music paper would not have overburdened me, and that I knew, besides, how he disliked letting his manuscripts out of his hands for any length of time, etc. That was a heart-breaking blow; . . . But the Quintette is beautiful—I have it with me now and will bring it to you, for surely I shall see you again now. I told the King . . . that I should come again at the beginning of January.

[29 December 1862]; Brahms, [Vienna], to Joachim [Hannover] (Brahms Briefwechsel V, 1974 reprint of 1921 ed., #249, pp. 331-32)

At Christmas there could come to me nothing dearer than your greeting, dear Joseph. . . .

Hopefully you threw my unnecessary letters into the fire long ago and forgot my equally unnecessary agitation.

... It probably is best [that] I immediately send the thing
which has given me so much annoyance and so little joy. If I had surplus money, or if I could earn some up there, I would prefer to come at once with it myself, . . .

Everything is very good here, but I will be glad to go back to Hamburg.

[end of January 1863]; Joachim, [Hannover], to Brahms [Vienna] (Brahms Briefwechsel V, 1974 reprint of 1921 ed., #250, p. 333)

The day before yesterday we played through your Quintet for the second time, and want to do it a third time, for Prell [a chamber musician in Hannover] wants to practice his 2nd bass [i.e., cello] part at home. Already it was much clearer, the energy broke through with less grumbling and growling in the depths; much charmed me, particularly the vigorous, sturdy Scherzo. May I keep the score and the parts? Please, dearest Johannes, reply immediately about this, and tell me briefly when you are leaving Vienna, and what you think you will do for the summer. I am longing to come into regular communication with you again. . . .

This letter is just an ice-breaker; soon I will write in more detail, also about the Quintet.

[12 February 1863]; Brahms, [Vienna], to Joachim [Hannover] (Brahms Briefwechsel V, 1974 reprint of 1921 ed., #251, pp. 333-35)

Up to now your ice-breaker has unfortunately been followed by nothing, so in the meantime my thanks for it. Also, I think such machinery is not necessary!

Where will I be in the summer?

. . . I don't know what will happen. I am going to . . . leave the Prater and the mountains and go [home] to Mother. . . .

To hear something about my Quintet would, of course, be very dear to me.

Good Friday [3 April 1863]; Brahms, [Vienna], to Joachim [Hannover] (Brahms Briefwechsel VI, 1974 reprint of 1912 ed., #254, pp. 4-5)

. . . I ask [that] you might . . . send my Quintet, so that it doesn't remain quite forsaken and alone in Hannover.

Considering the circumstances I also ask only, but very much, [that] you might simply place some NBs in the score for me; I will surely observe what they mean. Of course, you have already tacitly inserted the clearest NB. It certainly cannot be presented to the public, and so it is much better for it to sleep. . . .

I am going to Hamburg shortly.

[7 April 1863]; Joachim, [Hannover], to Brahms [Vienna] (Brahms Briefwechsel VI, 1974 reprint of 1912 ed., #255, p. 6)

Isn't Hannover near Hamburg? . . . I am going to Hamburg on the 21st and 23rd, to give two soirées there with my quartet; how splendid [it would be] if we could be together there. You would come [back] here with me then, . . . I am venturing, under the prevailing circumstances, to keep your Quintet with me, and [to]
play it for you soon. However, should you want to have it in Vienna, telegraph word [to me], and it would fly to you immediately. . . . As it is, I would not like to produce it publicly—but only because I hope you will alter here and there some roughnesses [which seem] too great even to me, and will lighten the coloring here and there. I am not talking rashly, since we have played it two times.

[13 April 1863]; Brahms, [Vienna], to Joachim [Hannover] (Brahms Briefwechsel VI, 1974 reprint of 1912 ed., #256, p. 8)

If I had received . . . [your] letter and your news a bit earlier, I could have had the benefit of all kinds of things. But it came to me too suddenly [for me to arrange to meet you in Hamburg]. Yesterday and the day before I was still occupied with concerts etc. . . .

Therefore I ask that you might send my Quintet here [Brahms gives an address]. . . .

I prefer this, [and] am coming, after all, for the purpose of hearing [the Quintet] without superfluous roughnesses, if possible. So I ask for [the] MS. MS. MS. MS.

[15 April 1863]; Joachim, [Hannover], to Brahms [Vienna] (Brahms Briefwechsel VI, 1974 reprint of 1912 ed., #257, p. 9)

Reluctantly I am relinquishing the Quintet, without having played it for you. It would have been the best, yes, the only way for you to profit by it. But then I don't like to be pedantic about details in a work which in every line gives evidence of an almost wanton creative power, which is full of spirit through and through. Sound-charm [Klangreiz], to approximately characterize it with a word, is what, to me, is missing from serene enjoyment [of the work]. And I believe [that] with quiet listening over a period of time this would have to become perceptible to you, too. Right at the second line, for example, the instrumentation seems to me not sufficiently energetic for the mighty rhythmical moves; it sounds almost faintingly weak for the ideas. Often again, everything stays too thick for uninterrupted stretches. You yourself must [surely] hear where the ear lacks [a sense of] repose, and I will repeat it, preferrably here, where we certainly would play it lovingly for you. Only the place in the last movement with the Baroque Scheinfifths [Scheinquinten] (page 39) and the insignificant melody is really unsympathetic to me; also the restless canononic presentation on the next page. This surely cannot please you; it sounds affected!

[April 1863]; Brahms, [Vienna], to Dietrich [Oldenburg] (Erinnerungen an Johannes Brahms, p. 47)

Do write to me by all means, [and tell me] how long you are staying in Oldenburg, perhaps I will make a little excursion from Hamburg to you! . . .

. . . I am enclosing some works from an Easter cantata [Lazarus]
by Schubert, which I copied for myself from the manuscript, . . .
You can keep it, perhaps until I go to Hamburg, . . .
Finally I am enclosing in addition a Quintet, too, [for you] to keep until I come to Hamburg.

[29 April 1863]; Brahms, [Vienna], to Joachim [Hannover] (Brahms Briefwechsel VI, 1974 reprint of 1912 ed., #258, p. 10)

I think I will leave here Friday evening [1 May] and therefore probably will be in Hannover early Sunday, . . . Can't you, in any case, have quar-quintet [i.e., quartet- and quintet-playing] at your place Sunday morning or afternoon? Because I naturally am staying no longer [than that].

[Lamberton dating = shortly after 7 May 1863]; Brahms, [Blankenese], to Dietrich [Oldenburg] (Erinnerungen an Johannes Brahms, p. 49)

Very many thanks for your friendly greeting on 7 May [Brahms's birthday]. . . .
I'd like to ask you not to try my Quintet, but on the contrary to send [it] to me here, so that I can change around some more things in it [damit ich noch etwas darin herumwirthschaften kann], which unfortunately is very necessary. . . .
For the present I will live in Blankenese, two hours from Hamburg, on the Elbe.
. . . Address [your letters] to my parents (Fuhlentw. 74) in case you write, which, I hope, will happen, and NB. the Quintet!

[Lamberton dating = before June 1863]; Brahms, Hamburg, to Dietrich [Oldenburg] (Erinnerungen an Johannes Brahms, p. 50)

With the heartiest greetings to you, your wife, . . . and all [my] good friends in Oldenburg, I am here forwarding to you the promised Quintet.

26 May [1863]; Joachim [Hannover], to Clara [Lichtental] (Letters from and to Joseph Joachim, p. 307)

It is a long time since your delightful visit, . . . He [Brahms] was here for three days, and was very charming and sympathetic. . . . I was able to have his Quintette played for him. It is a great pity that the general effect of this piece, in spite of so much that is remarkable in it, should be unsatisfactory, and I was glad that Johannes, on hearing it himself, wished to alter it. A man of his strong character cannot accept anything on hearsay.

[27 February 1864]; Brahms, [Vienna], to Breitkopf & HärTEL [Leipzig] (Brahms Briefwechsel XIV, #85, p. 93)

As soon as I have some leisure, I will write further, as I then will also have to offer [a set of] piano "Variations" ("on a Theme of Paganini" [Op. 35] and e.g. a grand "Sonata" for 2 pianos [Op. 34bis] which I should have [played] this very day, and truly intend to play with Carl Tausig as soon as possible.
evening of 10 March 1864; Clara, [St.] Petersburg [Leningrad], to Brahms [Vienna] (Clara Schumann—Johannes Brahms Briefe I, #210, p. 442)

I cannot quite understand what you have written me about your Quintet. Did you have it performed and was it a flop? And would you for that reason have made a Duo out of it? [If this is so,] it must not have pleased you yourself in its original state [Gestalt], or rather in [its] sound? Could you not have altered it easily and yet have left it as a Quintet, after all there were only spots which did not sound well, but again [there was] much [that was] quartet-like! I would very much like to play it with you, but that will have to keep until next winter.

4 April 1864; Brahms, Vienna, to Clara [Russia] (Clara Schumann—Johannes Brahms Briefe I, #211, p. 444)

Unfortunately we [the Wiener Singakademie] have another concert on the 17th of April, and unfortunately I had reasons to agree to the committee's proposal to give nothing but "Brahms"!

[The concert will include the] Ave Maria, Marien-lieder and other choral pieces, a motet, solo quartets, the String Sextet, and finally my sonata for 2 pianos [which I will play] with Carl Tausig.

[19 June 1864]; Brahms, [Hamburg], to Adolf Schubring [Lübeck] (Brahms Briefwechsel VIII, #11, p. 203)

Above all I must now ask if you cannot take a few days' holiday at this time and spend them here. [If so] I would immediately send you the sonata for two pianos, with which you could prepare yourself.

23 June 1864; Clara, Baden-Baden, to Brahms [Hamburg] (Clara Schumann—Johannes Brahms Briefe I, #214, p. 456)

Do send me your Duo, dear Johannes—I will study it, so that I will be familiar with it when you come. To be sure, I don't have two grand pianos standing side by side, but [one of] these days [I] am getting a new upright piano from Scheel in Cassel, ... since I don't have space for two grand pianos in my room. So your Duo will be doubly welcome to me, since right now I also can try it with [Nicolas] Rubinstein, but, please, don't make me wait long for it—there is certainly no one in Hamburg with whom you can play it!


My thanks for the Duo. You are wrong, if you think [that] I would not have worked hard with it—on the contrary, I have made myself giddy with it for two whole days, because I was anxious to play it with Rubinstein and, since only one part was written out, [I] had to play it from your first score, and that really was not
easy. I was, however, richly rewarded by the joy I found in playing it, and Rubinstein grew wholly enthusiastic about it, too; the first movement in particular charmed me, but really I love all the movements, only here and there I find in the arrangement something overdone, and hardly comprehensible for the listener if he is not sufficiently familiar with it, [and] then it seems to me very difficult technically here and there, which can easily be altered without in any way impairing the effect but certainly furthering the work's distribution [of material]. Don't you want to wait with the printing until we [have] played it a few times here, where this or that in addition will perhaps occur to you yourself. You know yourself that seeing such a work printed can only make me happy. I don't like to send it, since I wanted to play it again with Rubinstein tomorrow, but I don't wish to keep you waiting, and so you will receive it together with the Bach volume. . . .

I am sending the Duo the day after tomorrow, [because] I hope to play it tomorrow with Rubinstein once again, if I can get hold of him.

22 July 1864; Clara, Baden-Baden, to Brahms [Vienna] (Clara Schumann—Johannes Brahms Briefe I, #216, p. 461)

After the delightful hours which I spent with [Hermann] Levi over your sonata, I must, dear Johannes, say a few more things about it, which I have very much at heart. The work is so wonderfully outstanding, interesting throughout in its most ingenious combinations, masterful in every respect, but—it is not a sonata, but [rather] a work whose ideas you might—[in fact, you] must!—strew, as if from a horn of plenty, over the whole orchestra. A multitude of the most beautiful ideas get lost on the piano, [being] recognizable only to the musician [and] not enjoyable to the public. At the first playing I got the feeling of an arranged work, but [I] thought I was prejudiced and said nothing about it. Levi, however, said the same thing quite decidedly, without my having uttered a word. If only I could adequately point out all the passages which delight me. One, the change to the 6/8 time, to me surpasses all description! After playing the work, I feel as if I had read a tragic history! But please, dear Johannes, follow [my advice] just this once, [and] rearrange the work once more, and if you don't feel fresh enough for it now, lay it aside for 1 year and then take it up again—surely the work will [eventually] give the greatest joy to you yourself.

I am reluctantly sending it, but I hope [that] you will bring it back with you, so that we can play it together, then I intend to show you many more things (I hope), which will speak for my contention.

15 August 1864; Brahms Baden[-Baden], to Clara [Switzerland] (Clara Schumann—Johannes Brahms Briefe I, #217, p. 463)

... my double-sonata [Doppel-Sonate] does not appear, and [will be] lost to the whole world, if my writing-finger does not have patience.
If, as I hope, you have in your possession my F minor sonata for two pianos, send it to me immediately. If you wish, write a few lines about it, and tell me whether you think the work should be printed???

I have gotten stuck here, and since Frau Schumann will return shortly from Switzerland, I will probably stay.

I really have bad luck with your enclosed piece; this time I must earnestly beg your pardon for sending it several days later. You would indeed wish to play it with Frau Clara. If only I were there! I was exceedingly pleased by everything in the composition, excepting the second theme of the last movement, with which I have still not made friends.

Recently I told the princess [Anna von Hesse] that you wished to dedicate the Sonata to her, at which she displayed a truly childlike joy. When she came yesterday, she asked me if I really thought that she would receive the first copy, and I quite naturally answered in the affirmative.

For a couple of days I have been spending every quiet hour at the Quintet in order to be able to send it to you. But I am never allowed a moment's peace, one hindrance and disturbance after another, and visit upon visit. And now Rieter[-Biedermann] and one of [Friedrich] Rückert's daughters besides, who are tearing up the remaining scraps of my time...

I have a beautiful grand piano from Streicher. He wished to in this way acquaint me with new advancements, and I hope, when he similarly provides you [with an instrument], you will be pleased. And so farewell, I am so sorry that I cannot today produce the finished Quintet for you, but just now I have absolutely no peace.

... how delighted we are to have magnificent Quintet. Levi and [Ferdinand] David sit copying [it] as if nailed [to their chairs], and Levi tells me how wonderfully it is scored. By good fortune it has chanced that I can stay here a few more days, and on Sunday morning [6 November] we want to try it at Levi's—and be with us then in your thoughts, as we [will be] with you [in ours].
The Quintet is, in addition, a very special joy to me, since even during the [process of] creation itself [it] became to you the purest, highest joy, [and] it brings to you yet another, which is not among the lowest. I made use of a moment of the princess' enthusiasm over the dedication to suggest a beautiful gift for you, and the moment was propitious, and she immediately commanded me to buy it. . . . Hopefully she will send it to you soon, [as] I have just brought it to her. . . .

I told her that the Sonata had now become a Quintet, then she asked in which form it was now dedicated to her? Whereupon I naturally answered, "in every [form]." Then, [she asked] if she would receive the first copy? I naturally [replied] "yes."

Who is going to print it now? Hopefully you are not offering it to HärteIs [i.e., Breitkopf & HärteIs]?

9 November 1864; Hermann Levi, Carlsruhe, to Brahms [Vienna] (Brahms Briefwechsel VII, #1, pp. 11-14)

The Quintet is incomparably beautiful; anyone who has now known [it] in the earlier versions, String Quintet and Sonata, will not believe that it was imagined and written for other instruments. Not a single note gives me the impression of an arrangement, all the ideas have a much more suggestive coloring; from the monotony of two pianos has grown a perfect example of sound-beauty [Klangschönheit], from a piano-duo accessible only to a few musicians, [has grown] a tonic for every dilettante who has music in his bones, a masterwork of chamber music, [such] as we have not been able to produce since the year 28 [i.e., 1828, the year of Schubert's death]. If I did not see before my very eyes the ironically quivering corner of your mouth, I would say other things besides! I wish you could have seen our faces at the first playing. Clara grinned and rocked back and forth on her piano stool even more than usual; after the trial reading I went with David and [Julius] Allgeyer to the Erbprinz, and got drunk on champagne; David, of course, thought it was pure vanity on my part, because I was responsible for the new arrangement [Arrangement], or because I positively wanted to get into the biography [i.e., the biography of Brahms that would be written]; but I assure you that, despite the ensured position [in the biography], I still understand something about music, and that, if I didn't know that you are laughing at me, I could keep on writing about the Quintet for pages. [On] Sunday Clara played it here, and yesterday [she played it] with [the violist] Koning in Mannheim; naturally I was there too, although David thought I was the real commis-voyageur [travelling salesman] and dealt "in Brahms."--

Now I would still like to tell you a few trifles; a real Kapellmeister, as you know, cannot easily leave something unpicked, but to me the pen, rather than contortion [of the limbs], is customary for the expressing of my thoughts. The strettto of the last movement still gives me the same impression as [it did] earlier; after the ff-chord [on] page 66 [measure 403] I feel the need of a speedy, brilliant (sit venia verbo) [let it be briefly stated] closing; what now follows gives the impression of [being] labored, deliberate; after all that has preceded I can no more think of signs such as
p. tranquillo than of a stop. But we have already spoken enough of this face-to-face. In the Talmud, to the left of the entrance is written: "["If someone comes and says: You are a mule, do not believe him, but if someone else comes and [also] says: You are a mule, [then] buy yourself a saddle and let yourself by ridden.""
--In German that means: If Frau Schumann or I make an observation, don't listen to us; but if, as I believe [is true] in this case, every musician or a friend such as Joachim says the same thing, then don't spare the labour, and change and reduce the last 4 pages.
Considered in and for itself, the entire [section in] 6/8 time is to me no less attractive than all the others, only as a closing passage it seems to me unsuitable (from the designated place onwards).--The stringed instrument's solo passages [on] page 23 [i.e., in the first movement, measures 273ff] sound wonderful.--The triplet theme in the E-major section of the Andante is very difficult for cello; would viola be too weak? Should the passage be thrown out? [At] bar 7 [on] page 36 [third movement, measure 60] I feel the need of a fuller bass. (Cello arco?).--But I see [that] this really cannot be discussed in writing. You have been especially generous this time with signs; don't you find that places such as

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{p} & \quad \text{sotto voce espressivo} \\
\end{align*} \]

[first movement, measures 39-40]

don't look good? Just once, count how many espressivo's appear in the first part of the first movement; to me it seems almost like a vote of non-confidence against the performers. Another thing: In the first bar of p. 17 [first movement, measure 190] the piano's taking possession of the motive sounded flat to me in performance; pay attention to this sometime. In the [string] parts there will be a few more flaws. Make sure that I get the printed [score] as soon as possible. Whenever you have something ready, send it here to me; (if not to the friend, then to the copyist?) Hopefully you will give nothing more to HÄrtels! The miserly Philistine, the philistine miser! . . . I am happy about her [Clara's] joy over the Quintet.

10 November 1864; Clara, Mannheim, to Brahms [Vienna] (Clara Schumann--Johannes Brahms Briefe I, #222, pp. 475-76)

I would most have liked to let a few lines fly away to you last Sunday, my dear Johannes--my heart was full enough, but we wanted
first to play the Quintet once again with better forces, at least [with] a better first violin, and we did that yesterday and cele­brated hours of rapture! The first three movements sound wonderful throughout (a couple of quite small places excepted), the first move­ment [is] charming, the Development, how good it is now, how clear it becomes, what sounds! How wonderfully beautiful you have made everything! If only I could properly tell you how delightful it was. But, dearest Johannes, you still must alter the last movement somewhat, there are just a few places where the work falls so very dryly on one's warm heart! Just think what [kind of] mood one is in, after living through three such movements! There is in the last movement (in the 2nd theme) no real tension (i.e., before the 6/8-time), and yet again I would not want to do without it; only after the somewhat more agitated 2nd motive one should not have to become slower again! But Levi wants to write [about] this to you in complete detail, and he can [do] it much better and more clearly and with the qualification of understanding side-by-side with feeling. But let me implore you, don't let the work, the wonderfully beautiful [work], be ruined by the last movement! You can [do] anything that you like, and if you aren't in the mood now, wait a little while, the mood will come back to you; and now thanks once again that you gave us the joy of sending the Quintet. You will now get it back through Levi, as you wished.

5/7 December 1864; Clara, Hamburg, to Brahms [Vienna] (Clara Schumann—Johannes Brahms Briefe I, #223, pp. 481-82)

I am very happy that you finally have the G minor Symphony [by Mozart, K. 550]. The princess seems scarcely to have parted with it. Isn't it written delightfully neatly? And how triumphant you must have felt over the ink-wipes—now, I will henceforth say no more! It amused me. . . .
In Carlsruhe the other day it was very funny to see the princess depart with the score (wrapped in blue paper) under her arm. . . . How is it going with the last quintet-movement? I would love to know!

22 December 1864; Clara, Düsseldorf, to Brahms [Vienna] (Clara Schumann—Johannes Brahms Briefe I, #224, p. 484)

How is it going with the Quintet?

4 February 1865; Levi, Carlsruhe, to Brahms [en route to Hamburg?] (Brahms Briefwechsel VII, #4, p. 20)

What is happening with the Quintet, . . .?

[22 July 1865]; Brahms, [Baden-Baden], to J. Melchior Rieter-Biedermann [Winterthur, Switzerland] (Brahms Briefwechsel XIV, #101, pp. 113-15)

Here come the "Quintet," "Variations" [Variations on a Theme by Paganini, Op. 35], and some marginal notes. Above all I ask once again [that you] hasten the engraving as much as possible, and have a usable
copy of the "Quintet" reach me as soon as possible (perhaps after the 1st revision). Joachim is coming here and really would like it to be played.

NB. The [string] parts of the "Quintet" must still be corrected after the score.

Furthermore, I would like us to keep in mind [the possibility of publishing] the work as "Sonata for 2 Pianos." To me and [to] everyone who [has] played or heard it has, after all, a special appeal in this form, and might be very well received as an interesting work for 2 pianos. In any case I can give you a 4-hand [one-piano] arrangement [of the Piano Quintet] (but for later publication).

... Your letter came just now.—Shortly I will write more.

For the present please [use] the opus numbers 34, 35.

[30 September 1865]; Brahms, [Baden-Baden], to Schubring [Lübeck] (Brahms Briefwechsel VIII, #13, p. 209)

[My] Quintet [op. 34], Sextet [op. 36], Cello Sonata [op. 38], and various things will appear shortly.


The proofs of my Pianoforte Quintet (F minor) have just arrived. This [work], too, is at the disposal of [either] Hellmesberger or Laub, and I especially stress that. . . . After about fourteen days address [any communications to]: Carlsruhe, Kapellmeister Levi.


Since I arrived here yesterday and found your parcel, [containing the]"Quintet" and "Variations," I send you my thanks. If [Her] Royal Highness [the Princess Anna von Hessen] renders kind words in return, please let me know! Strictly speaking, it would be an offence to you on her part [if she did not do so].

4 February 1866; Clara, Vienna, to Brahms [Hamburg] (Clara Schumann—Johannes Brahms Briefe I, #245, pp. 529-30)

I received the Horn Trio just the day before yesterday, as well as the Quintet, which I had left in Düsseldorf, for I took it for granted that I would find it here with Hellmesberger, as it was on his program for months. What pettiness and intrigues I had to encounter! . . . Just imagine, we are practising it on Friday (it had arrived an hour before the rehearsal)—but the gentlemen are behaving so indifferently with it that I finally say to them: "Gentlemen, I must ask you to tell me when you [will] have time to study this piece with me, because I refuse to have anything to do with a perfunctory rehearsal." Hereupon the gentlemen (Hellmesberger
at their head) declare [that] they would have absolutely no time, [that] the rehearsal next day (the last) would be before the public, and so it would be impossible to study any more. So then I had to let the Quintet alone and insisted upon the A major Quartet.

I then heard that from the beginning H. [Hellmesberger] had said he did not want to play the Quintet, and a lot of other gossip. But I think he will have to hear much more about it, particularly from Hanslick, who was most angry.

[13] November 1868; Brahms, [Hamburg], to Rieter-Biedermann [Winterthur] (Brahms Briefwechsel XIV, #140, p. 165)

I am making inquiries myself about the "Sonata for 2 Pianos," since I do not have it in my possession.

28 [October 1869]; Brahms, Vienna, to Rieter-Biedermann [Winterthur] (Brahms Briefwechsel XIV, #155, p. 183)

In Carlsruhe I recently played our "Quintet." If the audiences everywhere were so well-disposed toward me and the work, I would go on tour with it.

[20 June 1870]; Brahms, [Vienna], to Rieter-Biedermann [Winterthur] (Brahms Briefwechsel XIV, #160, p. 189)

Between ourselves: I am not particularly glad that he [Kirchner] is arranging my "Quintet," since I have my special fondnesses for the 4-hand principle—which his 4 ms [i.e., his arrangements à 4 mains] do not give me. But since one knows [how] to value being arranged so creditably—I would ask most of all that you don't hurry him. Maybe this is enough.

[15] October 1870; Brahms, [Vienna], to Rieter-Biedermann [Winterthur] (Brahms Briefwechsel XIV, #161, p. 191)

So far I have tried in vain to obtain my "Quintet" (for 2 pianofortes), but I hope to have it soon.

However, I would particularly like you to publish this work as "Sonata for 2 Pianofortes" instead. Below [this] on the title page [could appear:] after the "Quintet" Op. ?

I think it would be played very readily, whereas a 4-hand arrangement would in any case be extremely uncomfortable, unplayable and obscure [undeutlich]. Naturally only one score would be printed, so that two identical copies would be needed for playing together, as e.g. with the 9th Symphony [of Beethoven], arranged by Liszt.

[23 September 1871]; Brahms, [Baden-Baden], to Rieter-Biedermann [Winterthur] (Brahms Briefwechsel XIV, #164, pp. 195-96)

Before I depart from here, I have . . . managed to be able to send you our "Quintet" as "Sonata for 2 Pianos:"

I'll never leave a manuscript with princesses again!

If you now have the inclination to print the thing in this form as
well, I ask you not to feel awkward [about it]. Naturally it will be published only in single score, so that 2 identical copies are needed for playing together. . . . You know that I consider a 4-hand arrangement impractical and hardly possible, for this [work] is always played with much passion.

[As payment] for it, I would like to have requested for myself 20 Napoleons and one [more]. The 21st [being] namely, that you help me pay [for] some of the beautiful, but very expensive, copying.

September [more likely 5 October] 1871; Brahms, [Lichtental], to Rieter-Biedermann [Winterthur] (Brahms Briefwechsel XIV, #165, pp. 196-97)

My hearty thanks for the very friendly trio-letter [i.e., written by Rieter-Biedermann, his wife, and his daughter]. . . . Title No. 1 [for the duo-piano version of the Piano Quintet] unfortunately does not seem quite right to me now, [but we may use] approximately No. 2. You may do as you like with the dedication.

November [more likely 2 December] 1871; Brahms, [Vienna], to Rieter-Biedermann [Winterthur] (Brahms Briefwechsel XIV, #172, p. 205)

The proofs of op. 34[bis] have just come and shall be attended to as soon as possible.
### ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS USED IN TABLES

**Instruments**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Primo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Secondo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/R</td>
<td>right hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/L</td>
<td>left hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vn I</td>
<td>First Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vn II</td>
<td>Second Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va</td>
<td>Viola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pi</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Categories of Alterations**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mel.</td>
<td>Melody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trn.</td>
<td>Transposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dbl.</td>
<td>Doubling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrm.</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dst.</td>
<td>Distribution of Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phras.</td>
<td>Phrasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artic.</td>
<td>Articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slr.</td>
<td>Slur(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stc.</td>
<td>Staccato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard abbreviations are used for dynamic markings and expression words.

### Symbols

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>unison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>octave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'</td>
<td>up one octave; at the upper octave (always preceded by another symbol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>down one octave; at the lower octave (always preceded by another symbol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>shortened (applies to slur or to time-value of note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>extended (applies to slur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>divided (applies to slur that is changed into two or more shorter slurs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>dynamic abbreviation and/or expression word(s) absent (see Tables 9-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>×</td>
<td>alteration could not be indicated by the symbols listed above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>see text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>flat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS USED IN REVISED SCORES
AND IN TEXTUAL NOTES

Revised Scores

Opp. 34 and 34bis

[ ]  Editorial emendation

( )  Non-editorial addition (i.e., one made by Brahms, Rieter-Biedermann, or, in Op. 34bis, by the copyist).

*  See Textual Notes

**  Different in autograph manuscript.  See Textual Notes.

†  Present in autograph but not added to the other sources.

Op. 34

‡  Present in autograph and in Erstdruck, but not in third issue of first edition.

Op. 34bis

‡*  Revision made in autograph after completion of copyist's manuscript.  See Textual Notes.

(†)*  Sketch appears in autograph manuscript.  See Textual Notes.

Textual Notes

I  Primo

II  Secondo

/R  right hand

/L  left hand

Vn I  First Violin

Vn II  Second Violin

Va  Viola

C  Cello

Pi  Piano
Manuscript Sources

SA  Duo-Piano Sonata, autograph manuscript signed (working draft).

SC  Duo-Piano Sonata, copyist's manuscript, revised by Brahms. Used by Rieter-Biedermann as Stichvorlage (engraver's layout) for the first edition.

PQA  Piano Quintet, autograph manuscript signed. Used by Rieter-Biedermann as Stichvorlage for the first edition.

Printed Sources

S2  Duo-Piano Sonata; first edition, second issue.

PQ1  Piano Quintet; Erstdruck (i.e., first impression/first state/first issue of the first edition).

PQ3  Piano Quintet; first edition, third issue.

Other Abbreviations

m.  measure(s)

The standard abbreviations are used for dynamic markings.