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Heinrich Koch completed his treatise in 1793, a pioneering work regarding the musical phrase as well as a sonata form description (lacking that term). Composition of Opus 18 began in 1798, a momentous project for several reasons in Beethoven’s early career. Here, the theories expressed in Koch’s *Versuch* are taken as an analytic springboard into a thorough analysis of the first movement of the quartet published no. 3, which was the first composed; additionally, nos. 1 and 6 are explored to a lesser degree. This study in phrase-analysis demonstrates significance in the fundamental ideas of Koch as applied to a masterwork of the turn of the 19th century.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION
Statement of Topic

Heinrich Koch (1749-1816), in his Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition (Introductory Essay on Composition, in three volumes, 1782-1793), was the first writer to establish a systematic theory of formal structure in music (from a strictly musical perspective, as a clear departure from past considerations), from small “grammatical” units to large-scale forms. Koch’s most important ideas on musical form are found in his discussion of periodic structure (the construction and combination of musical segments), which emphasizes the lengths and harmonic endings of phrases, and, in turn, provides the basis for his consideration of the larger musical forms. Koch then outlined those forms in use during the latter part of the eighteenth century, reserving the most detailed attention for that which is known today as “sonata form”¹ (or “sonata-allegro form” or “first-movement form”). As explained in the Versuch, this type of composition is firmly rooted in the genre of the symphony, but then becomes the prototype for the first movements of other instrumental genres, such as the solo sonata, duet, trio, and quartet. Although this pedagogical treatise does not appear to have been particularly well-known during or soon after Koch’s lifetime (in contrast to his more famous Musikalisches Lexikon of 1802), history indicates that its influence – direct and indirect – was in fact profound in regard to the treatment of musical structure for writers of the next several decades, and its pronounced influence continued well beyond. After Koch, theorists would pursue the topic of sonata form

with special attention, as it became the most important large-scale form in the musical language of the classical period and even the remainder of the nineteenth century.

Just five years after the publication of the final volume of Koch’s treatise, Beethoven began working on his Opus 18 string quartets, an opus that would be of tremendous significance regarding his early years in Vienna. According to the norm established most preeminently by the practice of Haydn and Mozart, the first movements of these quartets correspond to sonata form. This document shall present a detailed examination of the structure of the first movement of Opus 18, no. 3 (and comment on other movements), with regard to the formal theory described by Koch in the *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*. Furthermore, it will explore the relationship between the two, not in terms of direct influence – it is presumed that Beethoven had no knowledge of the *Versuch* – but in terms of the significance of their comparison as a sort of formal discourse of their period, noting that the *Versuch*, in fact, was intended to be a truly pedagogical text (even an “introductory” tutorial) on composing music. This document, therefore, shall investigate the idea that the theoretical writings concerning musical form contained in Koch’s treatise are both an appropriate and highly useful medium for examining this early and momentous landmark of Beethoven. Through its application, this document will elucidate a historically informative understanding of the inner workings of structural relationships, in terms of phrase structure mainly but also the larger formal dimensions, thereby affirming the validity of much of the formal theory of Koch to the musical repertoire that came even after the writing of the Versuch, even while the opus 18 immediately stretches the limits of these structural ideas.

The present document comprises four chapters. This first chapter is introductory, stating the topic, providing historical background for Heinrich Koch (and the *Versuch*) and the opus 18
quartets, and providing some additional groundwork for the topic to be investigated. Chapter 2 provides a detailed and synthetic presentation (with commentary) of the ideas on musical form expressed in the Versuch, insofar as they relate to the topics of periodicity (phrase-structure) and first-movement allegro form. Chapter 3 is a detailed and thorough analysis of the first movement of Opus 18, no. 3, in regard to both phrase-structure and the larger form. Chapter 4 contains briefer comments on the first movements of nos. 1 and 6, followed by a summary and concluding remarks.

Musical Form, Heinrich Koch

Applied to movements found typically to be the first of a multi-movement work (but not exclusively relegated to this position, or even only within a three- or four-movement work at all), a basic definition for sonata form that one might find in a “modern” text describes three distinct sections, more often than not labeled Exposition, Development, and Recapitulation.²

² Some 50 texts were considered in the formulation of this section, ranging from those intended for use as college textbooks in theory/analysis, history, and introductory music classes, to more serious texts that treat musical form. It needs to be mentioned that what follows is a very generalized distillation from these representative texts, but the vast majority of them emphasize that their descriptions are themselves generalizations of a quite dynamic “form,” taken up with varied usage not only through history in certain respects, but even in practice at any given time in somewhat lesser respects. Relevant material has been considered especially from the following, whose fuller bibliographic information can be found in the bibliography: Ebenezer Prout, Applied Forms (1895); Clarence Lucas, The Story of Musical Form (1908); Percy Goetschius, Lessons in Musical Form (1904); Percy Goetschius, The Larger Forms of Musical Composition (1915); Hugo Leichtentritt, Musical Form (1951); Norman Demuth, Musical Forms & Textures (1953); William Newman, Understanding Music (1953); Douglas Moore, A Guide to Musical Styles (1962); Robert Tyndall, Musical Form (1964); Paul Fontaine, Basic Formal Structures in Music (1967); Willi Apel, Harvard Dictionary of Music (1972); Ellis Kohs, Musical Form (1976); Allen Winold, Delone, and Christ, Introduction to Music (1976); Jere Hiches-gnu, Musical Form and Analysis: A Programmed Course (v.2 1977); Leon Stein, Structure & Style (1979); Leonard Ratner, Classic Music (1980); Joel Lester, Harmony in Tonal Music (v.2 1982); John White, The Analysis of Music (1984); Wallace Berry, Form In Music (1986); Joel Lester, The Rhythms of Tonal Music (1986); Ian Bent, Analysis (1987); Charles Rosen, Sonata Forms (1988); Stefan Kostka, Dorothy Payne, Tonal Harmony (1989); Joseph Kerman, Listen (1992); Bruce Benward, Gary White, Music in Theory and Practice (v.2, 1993); Donald Grout, Claude Palisca, A History of Western Music (1996); William Caplin, Classical Form (1998); Robert Ottman, Advanced Harmony (2000).

³ Distinct in function, but not always clearly demarcated in the musical work.

⁴ Although this naturally suggests a three-part structure, many texts consider the overall scheme as binary in conception, with the Development and Recapitulation constituting the second part. Two reasons are given for
This basic textbook definition also considers generally the content of the Exposition to contain a first “group” (or “theme” or “subject” – “group” will be used here), a second group, and often a closing group or codetta. The second group establishes a secondary key: generally the dominant, or the relative major if the primary key is minor. A transition between the first and second groups serves to modulate to that key. Furthermore, many writers remark that the second group often consists of or includes a theme that is more lyrical or “singing” in nature. The closing (third) group and/or a codetta often rounds out the Exposition and more firmly establishes the new key (even if by no further means than temporal balance and cadence), bringing the music to the arrival of the Development.

Generally speaking, in modern “textbook” presentations, less attention is specifically given to the Development and Recapitulation. In the Development, thematic/motivic material from the Exposition is subjected to varied treatment of potentially any aspect of its character, including mode, harmony, texture, rhythm, and all sorts of twists, turns, and combinations. This takes place while traversing through a variety of tonal areas, but eventually establishing a dominant preparation (sometimes called a “retransition”) for the return to tonic, after which the Recapitulation commences. The Recapitulation has the purpose of firmly re-establishing the home key, and (usually) restates all groups from the Exposition – (usually) in their original order – in the primary key. Most writers note that the transition found in the Exposition here requires such a bipartite consideration. First, the larger tonal plan of the form can be seen to support this scheme, the first part presenting a motion from primary to secondary key, the latter part functioning as a return to and final establishment of the primary key. Second, many writers find the historical/evolutionary roots for sonata form in the more simple binary (or rounded binary) form. Additionally, the two parts are often demarcated by repeat signs, although this practice gradually diminishes throughout the nineteenth century. Two items are worth noting. First, not all discussions of the evolution of the more complex form from a simpler one are given in terms of historical practice; some are based on a synchronic (structural) progression that gradually expands and elaborates the smaller forms to the larger. A.B. Marx, for example, used such a path in his derivation of sonata form as a ternary construct – tracing its structural origins through the rondo form, with no attempted historical grounding. Second, there is even further debate as to whether the “rounded binary” form should be considered as 2-part or 3-part (see William Caplin’s discussion in Classical Form, NY: Oxford University Press (1998), 195, 71ff).
an adjustment or may be omitted entirely, since the function of modulating is unnecessary in the Recapitulation. In addition to these three main sections, an Introduction – commonly slow – often opens the movement, and/or a Coda (which may itself incorporate developmental procedures) may close it.

In general, both modern and historical descriptions of “sonata form” (by whatever terminology it is given) correspond to this brief sketch. In the analysis of sonata form, most of the focus today – indeed of the last 150 years, and clearly seen in this “textbook” definition – falls on the occurrence, combination, and development of themes. However, the earliest conceptions of the form found in theoretical writings, as well as the origins of what may be considered modern formal theory, were considered on the basis of periodic structure.

In terms of the history of the theory of musical form, the most significant development took place in the second half of the eighteenth century, initially expressed by Joseph Riepel (1709-1782), but systematized by Koch. It is with Riepel (in a lesser role but nevertheless first) and Koch (essentially the father of systematic theory on musical structure) that the point of demarcation is found between ancient theories of structure, based on rhetoric and social function, and the so-called modern sense of formal construction, based on (emphatically, at first) musical periodicity. Koch’s theories, expressed much more clearly and thoroughly than those of Riepel,......
fully laid down a basis upon which others would build, or from which they might depart, including both phrase structure and the treatment of the sonata form.

Although social function placed obvious demands on the form music took, it was the development of musical rhetoric in the sixteenth century (with antecedents dating back to the thirteenth century) that first generated discussion on musical form. Nikolaus Listenius introduced the term *musica poetica* in 1537; Gallus Dressler equated the organization of music with the divisions of oration (*exordium, medium, finis*) in 1563; and Joachim Burmeister, at the turn of the 17th century, wrote at length on the equation of musical figures with spoken rhetorical ones, and is regarded as setting the first “formal” analysis of a musical work based on rhetorical as well as modal and contrapuntal aspects, followed by his division of the work into nine periods, in the form of an oration. Even Johann Mattheson, in *Der vollkommene Capellmeister* of 1739, divided what he called “well-developed” compositions into five (rhetorical) parts: *Inventio, Dispositio, Elaboratio, Decoratio,* and *Executio.* Significantly, Mattheson was also the first to publish a book on the composition of melody, in his *Kern melodischer Wissenschaft* of 1737. The contents, later incorporated into *Der vollkommene Capellmeister,* discussed many important details of melodic construction, but were still firmly entrenched in the older formal scheme of musical rhetoric. Therefore, as Joel Lester points out, a thorough reading of Mattheson’s theory on melody can leave one more attuned to the theory of oratory than to that of music.

In his *Anfangsgründe zur musicalischen Setzkunst* of 1752-1768, Riepel outlined his view of musical structure in terms of phrases and their relationships. Not interested in the scientific-

---

Modern Concept of Musical Period – A New Perspective on 18th Century German Theories of Musical Periodicity (Part One),” *Theoria,* ed. Frank Heidberger, 13 (2006), 5-41.


Ibid.


speculative theories of music such as the overtone series, tuning ratios, and mathematically calculated arguments on consonance-dissonance (the full title of his treatise is “Elements of Musical Composition, indeed not according to the traditional mathematical speculations of the theorists adhering to the supremacy of the circle of fifths [keys], but rather illustrated throughout with clear examples”\(^\text{12}\)), his intention was to present purely practical guidelines for composition. The treatise was originally to comprise ten chapters, but only five were completed. In these, Riepel divides the study of music into two areas: *Tactordnung*, dealing with rhythmic and metric organization; and *Tonordnung*, dealing with pitch organization.\(^\text{13}\) What is more, he discusses two-measure segments, four-measure phrases, and eight-measure groupings, with particular harmonic or bass motions. Extensions and repetitions were common as well as other deviations from the norm, although overall balance and symmetry were most necessary. For Riepel, melody is the governing force in music, for which harmony serves the purpose of articulating its divisions: he classifies cadences according to both melodic content and harmonic motion.\(^\text{14}\) He also shows how phrases can be transformed by modifying their endings, their motives, their meter, their ornamentation, their connections to preceding or following material, by repetition (complete or partial), extension, “abbreviation,” or insertion. All discussion focuses on or leads back to melody. It is in his concentration of melody where he differs so much from his contemporaries, who – with the notable and influential exception of Mattheson\(^\text{15}\) – assign much

\(^{12}\) *Anfangsgründe zur musicalischen Setzkunst, nicht zwar nach altmathematischer Einbildungsart der Zirkel-Harmonisten, sondern durchgehens mit sichtbaren Exempeln abgefasst*; Nola Jane Reed translates *Zirkel-Harmonisten* as “theorists adhering to the supremacy of the circle of fifths,” which is probably somewhat over-presumptuous, beyond simply “…circle of keys.”

\(^{13}\) Nola Jane Reed, “The Theories of Joseph Riepel as Expressed in His ‘Anfangsgründe zur musicalischen Setzkunst’,” Ph. D. diss., University of Rochester (Eastman School of Music), Rochester, NY (1983), 3-4.

\(^{14}\) Ibid., 7-9, 21-22.

\(^{15}\) Mattheson took melody as the basis for composition, treating it extensively in *Der vollkommene Capellmeister* (1739), including the use of punctuation symbols, as would both Riepel and Koch.
more significance to thoroughbass, counterpoint, and harmony.\textsuperscript{16}

It is difficult to estimate the extent of Riepel’s direct influence. His works were reviewed and at least seem to have been generally known (or known of) from the time they were published, yet the only notable impact they appear to have had was on Koch.\textsuperscript{17} Marpurg wrote positive reviews of the first three chapters as they were released, but also noted that Riepel’s works were not easily available, reporting that many of his readers had been unable to obtain copies. And there are other factors which may have kept Riepel’s work from being more noticed.\textsuperscript{18} Despite all of those, the influence they carried to Koch was both direct and major.

Heinrich Christoph Koch was born on 10 October 1749 in Rudolstadt (Thuringia), Germany. At age 15, he followed both his father and grandfather as an instrumentalist in the court chapel of their small hometown. Starting as second violinist but gradually ascending in rank, Koch received his first lessons in composition from the Rudolstadt Kapellmeister, Christian Gotthelf Scheinpflug, himself a minor composer whose works Koch would later excerpt for musical examples in his writings (Scheinpflug’s works were never published in their own right). Scheinpflug counseled Koch to study the scores of master composers as part of his training, an activity that Koch would later advise for beginning composers in his \textit{Versuch}.\textsuperscript{19}

Koch studied composition (and violin) further during a brief tour through Weimar, Dresden, Berlin, and Hamburg in 1773, but little is specifically known about the details of this trip or any of the training received. After these travels Koch returned to Rudolstadt, where he

\textsuperscript{16} Lester, 266.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid, 267-269.
\textsuperscript{18} One of these is the current changes taking place in musical style and the outdated quality of many of his musical examples. Another factor is a somewhat “low-brow” style of prose. See Nola Jane Reed, “The Theories of Joseph Riepel as Expressed in His ‘Anfangsgründe zur musicalischen Setzkunst’,” (Ph. D. diss.) 173; also, Joel Lester, \textit{Compositional Theory in the Eighteenth Century}, 267-269.
remained until his death on 19 March 1816, fulfilling the musical duties of performing, composing, and writing on music. He was appointed Kapellmeister in 1792, but after just a year at this post he was permitted to return to the orchestra as first violinist at his own request, possibly to better devote himself to composing and theoretical writing.  

Although Koch’s musical compositions are now lost, the more important body of theoretical and critical writings remain. Koch wrote many articles and reviews for various periodicals (some anonymously); he conceived and edited the short-lived *Journal der Tonkunst* (lasting only two issues) in 1795; his *Musikalisches Lexikon* of 1802 was a far-reaching encyclopedia of music, the work for which Koch was best known until the mid-twentieth century; but the *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*, in three volumes published in 1782, 1787, and 1793, was his most significant and pioneering work, even though it was not read by as wide an audience as some of his other writings.

Koch’s central aim in writing his *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition* was to provide comprehensive instruction in composition. In the *Versuch*, Koch claims to build on the theories of Rameau (through Marpurg). And although Koch accepts many of Marpurg’s ideas, he does take exception to some, most significantly the primacy of harmony over melody, that harmony is the generating force of all music.

In the first two volumes of *Versuch*, Koch establishes his designation of key or mode, derived from the series of overtones and string divisions, as “simple harmony” (*einfache Harmonie* – or “basic harmony”), this being the primary building block of music. In the raging debate of eighteenth century theorists over the predominance of melody versus harmony, Koch effectively grants them equal status: if such tones occur simultaneously, then harmony is

---

20 Ibid., 112.
21 Ibid., 114.
22 Ibid., 114-115.
generated; if heard successively, then melody. And while the first part of his treatise does discuss harmony, the longer second portion (taking up most of the second and third volumes) deals with the mechanical rules of melody.23

It is this second portion, in fact titled “The Mechanical Rules of Melody” (*Von den mechanischen Regeln der Melodie*), that contains the theorist’s most influential ideas. Koch does use some of the terminology from rhetoric and grammar to present his views on the nature of melody, but only for lack of a better terminology, and certainly not to situate melody within the rhetorical mode of expression.24 Koch acknowledges Riepel’s *Anfangsgründe zur musicalischen Setzkunst* as the first work to discuss the periodic units of music and the ways in which they are joined. He then builds upon Riepel’s ideas with his own theory of phrase construction and relationships. To Koch, the structural essence of a phrase is determined by two characteristics: its length, and the quality of its ending based on melodic and harmonic formulae. The combination of phrases creates a kind of phrase rhythm, or periodicity, which is most balanced with phrases of equal length, four bars being Koch’s preferred basic unit.25 Thus, balance is achieved by means of phrase length, coherence by harmonic endings. The primary operative building block for musical structure, then, is the phrase. Chapter 2 of this document shall further present Koch’s theories on phrase structure, as expressed in the *Versuch*.

One important item that is often glossed over is that of the basic four-measure phrase: this simple and balanced measurement (four bars) is of paramount importance to the theories of not just Koch but virtually every writer on the topic of musical structure from his time to the present. Concerning the lengths of phrases, it is important to distinguish between the basic

---

24 Baker, “From Teil to Tonstück,” 166.
phrase, or the phrase proper, and an extended or compound phrase. For Koch, the basic phrase is one that contains “only as much as is absolutely necessary for it to be understood and felt as an independent section of the whole,” and the length that is most common, useful, and pleasing is four measures.26

To be sure, Koch is not the first or only theorist to recognize the four-bar phrase as that which is most usual and pleasing. Just before, Riepel had established the four-measure phrase as the norm, and discussed certain means by which it can be altered; and just afterwards, Kirnberger would note that the best melodies are those whose phrases contain four measures, although he does discuss those of three and five measures as well.27

While these theorists and others (as well as most textbooks today that treat music of the classical period) agree on the primacy of the four-bar phrase, none offers a reason why, outside of its desired affect on one’s senses. In reality, however, this sense of roundness and proportion in phrasing is a natural consequence of the classical aesthetic of the time. Not only is there the number four for measures but, as Riepel first suggested, overall balance and symmetry are what count.

The classical aesthetic that prevailed from approximately the second quarter of the 18th century to the onset of the 19th century has been applied in music most preeminently to the mature styles of Haydn and Mozart. This classicism, analogous to the art of the Greeks and Romans, referred to such art that possesses “the qualities of noble simplicity, equilibrium, perfection of form, diversity within unity, seriousness, and freedom from excesses of

ornamentation and frills.”\textsuperscript{28} Besides the term “classic,” the music of this style was also labeled as galant by such writers as C.P.E. Bach, Marpurg, Quantz, and Kirnberger, characterized by “an emphasis on melody made up of short-breathed, often repeated motives…combined into larger periods, accompanied with simple harmony, and punctuated by frequent cadences.”\textsuperscript{29} This is in stark contrast to the music of the Baroque, based on motivic variation and thorough-bass accompaniment. A typical excerpt from a (non-dance) Baroque piece would announce a musical idea from the outset, to be “spun out” through a number of devices such as layering (perhaps in a fugal treatment) and stretto, and using various permutations – all with cadential gestures at decidedly irregular and prolonged intervals, i.e. lacking the sense of any kind of normative musical periodicity (that is, in the classical sense as described here).\textsuperscript{30}

The seeds of this musical aesthetic were sown by the philosophers and essayists of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, who eschewed the doctrine of affections and embraced the object itself as a thing of beauty. Among them, Lord Shaftesbury (1671-1713) termed this “disinterested attention,” a concept of perception without self-interest, where “love of truth, proportion, order and symmetry in things without” became the hallmark of expression.\textsuperscript{31} In this arena of Enlightenment thought priority was placed on such ideals as order, unity, sensibility, balance, logic, and simplicity. Leonard Ratner summarizes the classical ideal of the latter part of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century as emulating – in all the arts – the qualities of clarity, balance, focus, objectivity, austerity, noble simplicity, purity of style, and lack of disturbing irregularities or mixtures (some of which apply more to the music of this time than others).\textsuperscript{32} Overall these “Enlightened” traits were shown most clearly in

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid, 446.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid. 447.
music in the area of form and the short, periodic, articulated phrase. Charles Rosen sums up the
attractiveness of the four-measure phrase during this time: “…its supremacy was purely practical
– it was neither too short nor too long, and it was easily divisible into balanced and symmetrical
halves as three- and five- measure phrases were not. But there is no magic number four, 33 and
what is important is the periodic breaking of continuity.” 34

And so, after defining the “basic phrase,” Koch details and illustrates various modes of
treatment of the phrase: their division into incomplete segments; interruption with “incises”;
repetition, with or without variation; extension through sequence and other formulae; and
combination with other phrases, through which larger periods are formed. 35 It is this last pursuit
that brings Koch into his discussion of larger musical forms.

Koch’s presentation of the larger musical forms is actually the deeper content of a
description of current musical genres, beginning with vocal and moving to instrumental. While
these larger forms found in the types of works described are considered in terms that often stress
harmonic motion, this discussion is entirely based on an understanding of what had gone before
in the Versuch in terms of the phrase. In the portion of his treatise, “The Mechanical Rules of
Melody,” section IV (“The connection of melodic segments, or the construction of periods”),
chapter IV (“The Connection of Melodic Sections into Periods of Greater Length, or the
Arrangement of Larger Compositions”), Koch turns to the topic of larger musical forms with the
introductory statement,

Melodic sections are connected in compositions of greater length according to the
punctuation [endings] and rhythmical rules and maxims which were introduced in the preceding chapters. Nevertheless, much yet remains to be said of their connection in

33 I.e., there is no divine mysticism to “4”; its attractiveness lies in its utility within a given aesthetic.
periods of greater length, the most necessary of which is to make up the contents of this chapter.\textsuperscript{36}

Koch never used the term “sonata form” – it was still a half-century prior to its coinage by A.B. Marx – but did give a formal description of it as the first allegro movement of a symphony, which in turn became a model for the first movement of other instrumental genres (including the quartet). His description of this movement provides for its having two main sections, the first of which has one main period, the second of which has two main periods. These periods are separated into their constituent parts (“sections,” “periods,” or “phrases”) and described according to placement, tonal area, and strength of function. The first main period (again, synonymous with the first main section) is divided into two key areas, each with two smaller sections.\textsuperscript{37} There may additionally be a slow introduction and/or an appendix, and one of the smaller sections may be a more singing phrase. This first main period usually ends in the key of the fifth, or the third if the work is in a minor key.\textsuperscript{38}

The second and third main periods comprise the second main section. The second main period may be characterized as greatly diverse in structure, but returns to the key of the tonic. The third main period repeats the main melodic ideas, all in the key of the tonic, but now compressed. There is a shift to the key of the fourth (subdominant), after which the material from the first main section that had been in the key of the fifth is now in the tonic as well, “and then the end is reached.”\textsuperscript{39} (Koch’s description of this first-movement allegro will be treated at greater length in Chapter 2 of this document.)

Koch’s treatment of the larger forms is unique among theorists of his time. Earlier writers such as Scheibe, Mattheson, and Riepel had briefly presented the harmonic outlines of a

\textsuperscript{37} Baker, “From Teil to Tonstück,” 264.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., Vol. III. §102-103 (trans. Baker, 199-201).
piece, while the information that Kirnberger and Schulz provided about the great, bold, and powerful symphonies contained vagaries that left much to ponder. Koch draws from many of these writers, especially concerning their aesthetics, but then elaborates his description with a more detailed outline of the genre in terms of both harmonic and melodic aspects.\(^{40}\)

Few prominent writers acknowledged the impact of Koch’s theories. However, his ideas on periodicity and phrase construction certainly had a pronounced effect upon the theories that followed, direct influence or not. His systemization of periodic structure and pioneering description of what we call “sonata form” resonate in textbooks today.

For example, Anton Reicha not only failed to acknowledge Koch, but claimed that not a single treatise had been written to date which treated melody (in his *Traité de mélodie*, 1814). Yet his discussion of melodic structure bears an uncanny resemblance to that of Koch.\(^{41}\) Likewise, Gottfried Weber claimed (in his *Versuch einer geordneten Theorie der Tonsetzkunst*, 1817-1821) that his own theories were uninfluenced by other theorists, and has mostly critical remarks for Koch specifically.\(^{42}\) Nevertheless, much of his own theories carry a definite Kochian stamp, including those on harmony and rhythm. In terms of rhythm, he even praises Koch’s treatment of the topic, although without acknowledging the extent to which he looted it for his own.\(^{43}\) A.B. Marx drew from Koch and Weber for his theory of rhythm (in *Allgemeine Musiklehre*, 1839),\(^{44}\) and Hugo Riemann (in *System der musikalischen Rhythmik und Metrik*, 1839).

\(^{40}\) Baker, “From Teil to Tonstück,” 15.
1903) utilized much of Koch’s system of melodic segments and phrase-rhythm. François Fétis was one of the few theorists to appreciate the contributions made by Koch, his recognition coming a half-century after the *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition* (in *Biographie universelle des musiciens et Bibliographie générale de la musique, 1835-44*).

Regarding sonata form in particular, although no later theorist expressly refers to Koch on this subject, none really diverges far from his original description either. To be sure, aside from certain differences in finer points of detail, there would take place two important changes in the perception of sonata form. One is a more thematic (and motivic) view, in that certain themes are identified and their particular uses and developments traced. The other, integrally related to the first, is the rising significance (and overall length) of the Development section. Yet Koch’s original description of the large-scale plan of the movement is never negated (and, even more, Koch’s discussion is sprinkled with the seeds of many of the issues to be taken up by later writers).

Beethoven, Opus 18

The decade of the 1790s saw the last installment of the *Versuch*, the death of Mozart, the rise to pre-eminence of Haydn within the musical establishment of that cultural center, Vienna, and Beethoven’s move to the same city – to study with Haydn. Merely half a decade transpired between the release of the last volume of Koch’s treatise and Beethoven’s first efforts on Opus 18. Over the decade Haydn had turned out his greatest quartets, and in 1798 was still writing for

---


the genre. The string quartet was, after all, a genre that he had almost single-handedly brought out of the shadows and into its own as a demanding, intimate, and elite medium, even to become one of the major symbols representing what we now call the classical style. His opera 71 and 74 were surely known to Beethoven (and most likely Op. 76 as well). And so it was the early autumn of 1798 when the younger composer, having been commissioned by Prince Lobkowitz (who also, incidentally, commissioned Haydn’s incomplete Op. 77 quartets), set to work on his opus 18. After much labor and extensive revision this set of six quartets was ready for publication in 1801 and subsequently printed in two installments, nos. 1-3 in June, 4-6 in October. As Beethoven put it to his friend Karl Amenda, he had “now learned to write quartets.”

Of course, the primary reason Beethoven moved to Vienna in 1792 was to embark on his apparently ill-fated study with Haydn. Well-known is the letter penned by Count Waldstein to the composer from Bonn in October of that year, prophesying that Beethoven would “receive the spirit of Mozart from Haydn’s hands.” Although Haydn and Beethoven ended their tutorial relationship less than cordially, and even the nature of Haydn’s instruction is generally given little worth, the value of this brief formal relationship from late 1792 to early 1794 can only be speculated upon, lacking evidence that sweeping generalizations require. Moreover, it would be naïve to suggest that on the whole Beethoven learned very little from the teacher, even if the chief influence came only by way of the music itself. Mozart himself had been influenced by the music of Haydn, and paid tribute accordingly, not the least token being his quartets bearing the elder’s namesake (a set about which Heinrich Koch wrote admiringly, in his Versuch).

---

48 Briefwechsel, No. 67 (7/1/1801), cited in Lockwood, 164; this remark by Beethoven specifically regards his revisions of the first quartet, but is logically applicable to his writing thereafter.
Regarding Opus 18 itself, although none of the autographs have been found, extensive sketches remain to testify to the chronology and labor of the set. The sketchbooks relating to these (mainly nos. 1-3 and 5) date from mid-1798 to the end of 1799, with remarkably little sketched along with them, including nothing else at all in sonata form, save some early work on the Septet, Op. 20, near the end of this period. It is therefore not much of a stretch to conclude that these quartets were Beethoven’s primary occupation for some 18 months.\textsuperscript{50}

Up to this point Beethoven had written a number of songs, some chamber music for winds, violin and cello sonatas, string trios, the Op. 4 String Quintet, piano trios, piano variations, two piano concertos for his own performance, and, most significantly, the piano sonatas; he had yet to compose in the most prestigious genres of the time (at which, of course, Haydn had excelled if not defined), the symphony and quartet, as well as any work for the stage.\textsuperscript{51} Opus 18 would signify a turning point, on the heels of which his first symphonies and stage works followed quickly, transporting Beethoven into those territories formerly ruled by Mozart and Haydn. Viewed in this light, this set can, perhaps should, be viewed as the most significant single compositional project of his first decade in Vienna.\textsuperscript{52}

As for the chronology, the published order of these quartets is not that in which Beethoven composed them. The order of their composition, as evidenced in the sketchbooks, is 3, 1, 2, 5, and 6, with number 4 being uncertain (it does not appear in any of the surviving sketches; some suggest that its origin is possibly earlier than the other five, though any speculation is difficult to substantiate).\textsuperscript{53} Number 6 also does not appear with the sketches of the others, but rather on some other sheets, along with work for his Grande Sonate in Bb, Opus 22,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., 11.
\item Lockwood, 162.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
suggesting that it was in fact the last of the six to be composed.⁵⁴ The set was, as mentioned, published in two installments in 1801, 1-3 in the summer, and 4-6 just a few months later. It is not difficult to see why number 1, in F major, though composed second, was given the primary position by Beethoven, with its brilliance and tremendous display of technique.

This document shall consider in detail the first movement of the quartet published as no. 3, with some further comments reserved for the allegros of nos. 1 and 6 – these three representing chronologically the first, second, and last to be composed (not including no. 4 for reasons already stated). Or, stated another way, the three under consideration are the first composed, the last composed, and the one which likely best reflected Beethoven’s ambition in this genre at the time (or at the very least was held in high esteem by the composer). If only space permitted, an expanded study of all six first movements would be fascinating indeed (each of them taking the shape of sonata form).

The question will be asked: what is to be gained from analyzing these quartets on the basis of the theories expounded in the *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*? The historical significance of Koch’s treatise has already been touched on. Also notable is the body of current or recent composers that Koch drew from for his musical examples, and/or otherwise referred to extensively: flipping through the pages of Volume I alone yields examples from and references to Haydn (1732-1809), Mozart (1756-1791), C.P.E. Bach (1714-1788), Dittersdorf (1739-1799), Pleyel (1757-1831), Stamitz (1745-1801), Hiller (1728-1804), Benda (1722-1795), Türk (1750-1813), Hoffmeister (1754-1812), Rosetti (1750-1792), Schweitzer (1735-1787), Holzbauer (1711-1783), and Schmittbaur (c1717-1809). It is out of his consideration of their music – music representative of the Germanic masters of the budding and early classical style – that Koch has created this composition manual. While this manual is intended for beginners, it no less makes

⁵⁴ Kerman, 71.
severe claims on the music of his time. Accordingly, while Beethoven was no beginner as he undertook the Opus 18 project, even he worked out his genius in the musical culture into which he was born and the tradition he inherited.

And why Opus 18? This work holds immense significance for Beethoven for many reasons, a number of them already noted. This set of quartets is his first opus in a major genre previously “ruled” by Haydn and Mozart. Furthermore, it is with the composing of these works that he commences on the steady and regular use of sketchbooks. It is likely that the labor with which he composed these was unprecedented, and set the tone for his practice from that point on.\footnote{Lockwood, 125.}

How do the comparisons between Koch’s treatise and this set of quartets bear on the significance of either? Again, this question is addressed by the remainder of this document. While Koch represents the genesis of modern theory on musical periodicity (with Riepel serving as a catalyst), this early Beethoven example becomes an adequate tapestry on which to view and evaluate the formal theory contained in the Versuch – even as Op. 18 already stretched its limits.
CHAPTER 2

THE VERSUCH EINER ANLEITUNG ZUR COMPOSITION: KOCH’S THEORY ON MELODY (PHRASE STRUCTURE) AND FIRST-MOVEMENT ALLEGRO FORM

One might call attention to the fact that for its own sake a theory on melody may not seem to be naturally synonymous with one on phrase structure; after all, while the relationship of melody and meter/rhythm are undeniably important, can a theory of harmony be left out of any thorough discussion of phrase structure? In answer, it is precisely Koch’s conception of melody (and, more specifically, the generation of it) that provides for harmony’s inclusion, even as a tacit member. In a 23-page discussion within Part I of Volume II (“The Aim and the Inner Nature of a Composition, and Particularly the Way in which it Arises”), Koch addresses how the composer ought to conceive of his melody, illustrating the “ability to conceive of melody harmonically.”

Koch begins by stating that there are different ways of inventing “melodic sections” of a composition. One might only consider a melodic succession of notes, or (sort of the opposite) merely connect a selection of chord-tones from a pre-formulated series of chords. Set above both of these is the skill of “inventing melodic sections in such a way that one is simultaneously able to pay attention to … the harmony.” This is what Koch calls “the ability to conceive of melody harmonically.” Of the two lesser methods noted, the former leads to dry and uninteresting melodies whose frequently redundant harmonies are the cause of forced and inappropriate bass and middle voices. The latter method Koch takes as analogous to “forcing a poet to construct a poem on a series of given rhymes.” Admittedly, this may result in something that has the character of poetry, but such is not “true poetry.” Koch provides for this method as

one having been practiced in the past with certain positive results for an earlier style, but it must be considered wrong and to be avoided for the plan of modern compositions.

Conceiving of melody harmonically, then, is considered the “highest degree of perfection of the creative mind of the composer.” Specifically, it is “to invent it in such a way that one is also simultaneously able to imagine the principal features of its harmonic accompaniment,” likened to a painter (“a Raphael”) who conceives of a subject’s head with its color and position while simultaneously grasping a view of the garments with which the rest of the body is to be clothed. Accordingly, says Koch, such a composer of music must be able to imagine the voices that accompany his melody in order to “create a more complete entity in which all components help to promote the proposed aim.” To underscore and illustrate this point once more, Koch writes,

The highest level of skill of a composer to conceive melody harmonically manifests itself when he invents the essential portions of the expression of the feeling to be aroused in a composite picture, that is, in the inseparable union of two or more melodies. This manner of invention assumes the composer is thoroughly trained through long practice and has a very lively imagination. An example of this kind of inventing would be [a]… phrase from a vocal duet, in which both the upper voices are necessarily inseparable for the ideal of the composer and for the effect which the phrase is to have.57

It is clear that in Koch’s view harmony and melody work together in the formulation of a “more complete entity.” Such a view of this relationship of melody and harmony should not be surprising, consistent as it is with – or a consequence of – his earlier remarks on the equal relationship of melody and harmony to the “simple harmony” (einfache Harmonie) of the key, which is the “primary matter of music” (Urstoff der Musik).

The manner with which Koch parses his three volumes of the Versuch is curious. One might say that a clearer numbering of the volumes would have been I, II-a, and II-b. This can be seen in that Koch elaborates his treatise within a hierarchical structure of Part [Abtheilung]:

Section [Abschnitt]: Chapter [Kapitel], as well as occasional further divisions, and whereas his numbering of these elements begins anew at the outset of Volume II, those from the second volume carry on with subsequent numbering into and throughout the whole of the third volume. Volume III is, in fact, a continuation of the second part of Volume II, “The Mechanical Rules of Melody.” It is interesting to note that while the three volumes are separated into four major parts, that of “The Mechanical Rules of Melody” occupies over 750 pages out of around 1300 total.

Incidentally, the first portion of Volume II was not originally a part of the master design for his treatise. In the introduction to Volume II of the Versuch Koch enlightens his reader to the purpose of the present volume, including his change of plan for the inclusion of “The Aim and the Inner Nature of a Composition…” This introductory remark is brief but insightful:

In the introduction to the first volume when I explained the plan for the teaching of melody, I said that discussions of genius and taste and their judgment are not a part of my proposed design because I wished to expound only on the mechanical rules of art. Now the beginning composer wishes himself to compose and thus to let his genius and his taste operate. On reconsidering the matter, I find I can make these mechanical rules of melody far more useful to him and can warn him of many wrong ways if I do not pass over these matters in silence; hence the slight alteration of my plan.

Thus the teaching of melody contains two parts. As much as the length and the more precise purpose of these pages permits, I will in the first one try to explain the inner nature […] of melody, and in general the spirit of compositions, which must animate them if they are to attain their proper aim. In this first part, therefore, I deal with the aim, the inner nature and, above all, the mode of origin of compositions. Whereas in the second part I intend to explain the external nature of the melody and will try to show how it is connected with regard to mechanical rules.58

It is the second part of Koch’s volume that occupies the remainder of this chapter (Chapter 2) of the current study.

---

Melody (Phrase Structure)

In Part II ("The Mechanical Rules of Melody"), Koch submits that there are two main characteristics by which melodic sections are distinguished: their endings, or the character of their resting points, and their lengths. Regarding their lengths, he adds that they should be considered "together with a certain proportion or relation between them which can be found in the number of their measures once they are reduced to their essential components."59 This small tag is of paramount significance because it introduces two key aspects of Koch’s theory on melody: the idea of proportional hypermeter (phrase-rhythm) among the sections of a work, and the concept that a phrase can be expressed in a most basic form.

It is also important to realize that although Koch is very thorough in his detailing of phrase structure in terms of both lengths and resting points, he makes no claim to being exhaustive. Rather, he emphatically remarks that it would be impossible to be so, as the decisive factors to their determination are, surprisingly, subjective in the end. Even as the aim of section 3 is to "necessarily first become acquainted with the material nature of the sections which form the periods of melody,"60 he comments just a few paragraphs later that the determination of resting points – both their location and their “nature” (quality) – can only be made generally by feeling. Koch prepares the reader for a presentation of punctuation formulae and lengths, but does not hesitate to disclose that through these it is still impossible to distill any objective criteria for defining “not only the place where a resting point is present in the melody, but also the completeness or incompleteness of the sections thereby arising.”61

Not wanting the import of this to be lost, and to stave off objections to his disclaimer, Koch provides these comments with an extended footnote, which begins as follows:

60 Ibid., §77 (trans. Baker, 1).
61 Ibid., §81 (trans. Baker, 3-4).
No doubt to many of my readers it may be remarkable that I lead the beginner before the tribunal of feeling for the discrimination of the sections of melody. But through what aid should he otherwise get to know not only the resting points which are not followed by a rest, but also the completeness or incompleteness of the sections which thereby arise? The number of measures generally cannot determine where in the melody resting points must be which divide the whole into sections in order to let it be felt distinctly. The ending formulas of these sections are so various and can be formed in such manifold ways that it would be very questionable to decide, by means of these figures, where resting points are present in the melody; not to mention that such figures in the melody also can be used where there is no resting point. In short, nothing concrete can determine the places where they are in melody.62

This waiver now signed, Koch proceeds to elaborate on the mechanics of all these matters. Even in the midst of the following chapters, he will add to these uncertainties of evaluating musical phrases when discussing the means by which the caesuras involved with incises, endings, and extensions can be disguised or blurred concerning their degree, placement, or even their existence.

**Phrase-Endings**

In Volume II, §79, Koch distinguishes between three types of smaller melodic divisions: the “incise” [Einschnitt], the “phrase” [Absatz], and the “closing phrase” [Schlußsatz]. A segment which itself cannot be considered complete is an incise, to which another incise must be added in order to obtain a complete thought. A section that is considered a full and basic unit in itself but yet cannot end an entire period is a phrase. (By “period” Koch indicates not a certain combination of phrases in the modern sense, but, rather, a major section of a work, which can stand complete on a higher level than a phrase, of which two or three would generally comprise a

---

62 Koch does not make clear whether he is speaking of the activity of composition (perhaps on an intuitive level) or analysis of musical phrases, but on the surface the latter seems to be more likely. Koch never specifically addresses analysis per se, but does recommend studying musical works. Although it is a text on composing, the Versuch does in fact contain a great deal of music analysis (even as an activity utilized solely for instructive purposes, is not the goal of analysis always to understand music?). Koch’s theory in terms of analysis will later be taken up at more length.
And a section which is not only complete, but can also bring to close an entire period, is a closing phrase.

Table 1: Koch’s Phrase-Endings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Einschnitt</td>
<td>“incise”</td>
<td>incomplete unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absatz</td>
<td>“phrase”</td>
<td>full basic unit, not fully complete in ending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlußsatz</td>
<td>“closing phrase”</td>
<td>full basic unit, complete in ending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sole distinction between a mere (interior) phrase and a closing phrase is the “ending formula” – what most of today’s texts refer to as the cadence. To illustrate, Koch explains that a phrase can be transformed into a closing phrase, and vice-versa, by simply changing its ending.64

Koch further takes up these endings, or “punctuation signs,” in §§93-104 (Vol. II). First he introduces a generic term for all points of rest, regardless of their degree (inclusive of the incise, phrase, and closing phrase): the “caesura” [Cäsur or Schnitt]. The present discussion is not concerned with the endings of incises, which Koch treats rather liberally in any case. For the phrase, Koch describes that whose ending calls for a tonic triad as a “I-phrase” [Grundabsatz], and the phrase ending on the triad of the fifth (scale degree) a “V-phrase” [Quintabsatz].65 Notably, he does allow for a rare phrase ending with triad on the fourth degree, on the basis of its perceived sense of completion. From this reasoning, we could speculate that phrases ending on other triads might possibly have been found acceptable to Koch as well. He also states that

---

63 For example, a larger binary work would contain two main periods. Works that are described today as pertaining to “sonata form” were described by Koch as containing three main periods – but two main sections. This will be discussed at greater length in Part 3 of this document.


65 Ibid., §100 (trans. Baker, 36). Koch also states in the same section, “If a piece which is followed by another is closed with a V-phrase, either with or without the help of a fermata, then many composers tend to call this V-phrase a half cadence.” (c.f. Vol. II, §113) This, of course, is a more narrow definition for “half-cadence” than that of most modern texts.
phrase endings typically occur in root position, though “now and then” they may appear in first inversion. It is only the ending formula of the closing phrase which Koch calls the “cadence” [Cadenz]. Koch specifically describes this formula as properly containing three operative notes in the melody. The first, falling on the strong part of the measure, is the “note of preparation”; the second, situated on the weak part of the measure, is the “cadential note,” so designated “as it will imminently ‘fall’ onto the keynote”; and the third note, found in another metrically strong position, is the “closing tone” or “caesura note of the cadence.” Koch illustrates this with his example numbered 115a-b:66

Example 1: Koch’s examples 115a-b from the Versuch.

Koch additionally allows for any of these notes to be “often decorated with susidiary notes,” though the note of preparation is decorated far more often than the cadential note. Furthermore, this ending formula is often found to be diminished or augmented in length.

Koch makes an important distinction between the ending of a V-phrase and a V-cadence, which must be understood in order to avoid confusion: the former indicates that which we today designate a half-cadence, whereas the latter indicates a full (“authentic”) cadence in the dominant key. Koch additionally provides for the decoration, augmentation, diminution, and extension of the cadence formula, as will be taken up here momentarily.

Finally, Koch also describes what he calls a “deceptive cadence,” as in those cases where the cadence to a closing phrase is repeated, either with the same or new material, and “one …

places a different tone than the caesura note in one of the last cadences and thus deceives the ear
in its expectation of the closing tone.” This can arise from either the upper voice or the bass.67

Table 2: Terms Related to Phrase-Types in Regard to Endings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Endings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cäsur (or Schnitt)</td>
<td>“caesura”</td>
<td>a point of rest, regardless of strength or quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundabsatz</td>
<td>“I-phrase”</td>
<td>a phrase whose ending calls for tonic harmony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintabsatz</td>
<td>“V-phrase”</td>
<td>a phrase whose ending calls for dominant harmony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadenz</td>
<td>“cadence”</td>
<td>the ending formula for the closing phrase*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trugschluss</td>
<td>“deceptive cadence”</td>
<td>that where the ear is deceived in its expectation of the closing tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*At times Koch uses this term (Cadenz) to indicate the entire phrase that possesses such an ending (e.g., in §93, quoted below) but its meaning, as defined by Koch, is usually taken as the ending formula itself.

What remains to be discussed are the types of alterations to resting points that Koch sees as being commonly found. In §93 Koch reminds his reader that a caesura “should properly always fall on the strong part of the measure” (the downbeat), and now explains why:

…[S]imultaneously with the genesis of an idea, those stressed tones which necessitate this or that metrical division are already determined. Now the caesura of a phrase is a point of division in itself because it divides larger portions of the whole into smaller sections, and it must have its proper emphasis as a point of division… If the caesura note of cadences, phrases, and incises were introduced on the weak part of the measure, a contradiction would arise between the nature of such a caesura note, which has an inner emphasis as a point of division, and the nature of the measure, which is only capable of this emphasis in the downbeat. In most cases, this offends our feelings in a very perceptible way.68

However, exceptions do occur without the offense of our feelings, as Koch proceeds to investigate in §§94-99. These can all fundamentally be boiled down to the embellishment of the

caesura tone, for which there are too many means for Koch to detail; therefore, he reduces them to three main types.

The first is an “after-strike” [Nachschlag], whereby the caesura note is intoned on the proper downbeat, but followed after by one or more other tones of its supporting triad. This can be decorated with a variety of possible rhythmic figures, and/or repeated tones, which provide the caesura with an “overhang” [Ueberhang], or a “feminine ending,” which, in turn, can even be further elaborated with passing tones and appoggiaturas. This elaboration can also extend into the weak part of the measure.

The second method is the use of a “suspension” [Vorhalt] or “appoggiatura” [Vorschlag], “through which the caesura note is displaced from its proper position.”69 Once again, subsidiary notes can be mixed in, and can also be combined with a feminine ending70. It can even be accompanied by its own bass/harmony. Koch reminds the reader, however, that “[i]n all these cases, the phrase still ends in the strong part of the measure.” In other words, the point of demarcating the end of a phrase is that measure-unit – which can only be defined by the placement of its downbeat – which contains a caesura. In addition, because of the great number of possibilities for embellishing the caesura, including those which may hide all external evidence of resting points, it is important for one to rely on his feeling for the determination of such places.

The third method of decorating the caesura note is by filling in the space between the caesura note (whether or not struck on the downbeat) and the tone with which the following phrase begins. This causes the phrases to become more closely joined, but should not be

---

69 Baker points out that although Koch carefully defines Vorhalt and Vorschlag in this section, he winds up using them interchangeably, along with the written-out Wechselnote (29, note).
70 For Koch, the “feminine ending” – as seen here and in the previous paragraph – simply indicates melodic material that continues after the caesura tone, whether the caesura tone is intoned “properly” on the downbeat (per the Nachschlag) or held off (per the Vorhalt/Vorschlag).
confused with the compounding of two phrases (to be discussed shortly). There is no special
term for this method.

It has already been mentioned that the ending formula for closing phrases consists of
three metrical units. Koch also discusses means by which the final cadence tone is elaborated.
Similar to that of the caesura described above, a cadence may contain an *Überhang*, which may
extend into an “appendix” [*Anhang*], serving to strengthen the close itself. Koch even mentions
that in fully scored pieces, (“for example in symphonies and concertos,”) this may entail the triad
on the keynote (tonic) repeated several times, or alternated with the triad on the fifth.\(^{71}\)

There is an additional procedure that Koch fails to mention in this section of his treatise
(a rather glaring omission given its great importance and high occurrence, as well as the fact that
he mentions it in other places). It is that whereby the caesura tone of a phrase is simultaneously
the beginning of the following phrase – at least metrically, if not the actual melodic caesura tone
– so that a formal phrase-ending is not actually (separately) heard. An important result of this is
the “dropping” of a measure, since one bar serves both functions. Koch refers to this initially in
his discussion of compound phrases, and later in his description of the first allegro of a
symphony (in Volume III), with the effect that “these melodic sections… are more attached to
each other and flow more forcefully than in the periods of other pieces, that is, they are linked so
that their phrase-endings are less perceptible.”\(^{72}\) Koch calls this procedure the “stifling of a
measure” [*Tacterstuckung*] or “suppression of a measure” [*Tacterunterdrückung*].\(^{73}\) Later, still,
Koch describes the usage of this important technique further, and relates it to the affect of the
piece in general:

---


Now because in the first allegro of [the symphony] a noble or, more often, forceful feeling prevails, most I- and V-phrases are not formally left at rest (even if this could take place without offending the feeling); rather they are passed over by means of suppression of a measure, so that the melody becomes all the more continuous.\footnote{Koch, Vol. III, §147 (trans. Baker, 229-230; bracket is Baker’s).}

In the analytical discussion of the present document (Chapter 3), this procedure will be referred to as an elided phrase or elided cadence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nachschlag</td>
<td>“after-strike”</td>
<td>further material follows the downbeat-caesura tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorhalt</td>
<td>“suspension”</td>
<td>both of these devices serve to suspend the caesura tone into falling on the weak part of the measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorschlag</td>
<td>“appoggiatura”</td>
<td>both of these indicate the procedure whereby the caesura tone is simultaneously the beginning of the next phrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There is no term given for the method described of merely filling in the space between the caesura tone and the downbeat of the next phrase.

**Phrase-_lengths**

The second major characteristic by which melodic sections are classified (the first being the quality of their endings) is their lengths. In this regard Koch writes, “Completeness in melodic phrases manifests itself in different ways,” and immediately offers three:\footnote{Koch, Vol. II, §80 (trans. Baker, 3).} a “basic phrase” [enger Satz], which contains “only as much as is absolutely necessary for it to be understood and felt as an independent section of the whole;” an “extended phrase” [erweiterter Satz], which contains “a clarification, a more complete definition of the feeling;” and a “compound phrase” [zusammengeschobener Satz], which combines “two or more phrases,
complete in themselves... so that externally they appear in the form of a single phrase.” The term *enger Satz* connotes, literally, a narrow “definition” for such a phrase and Koch uses this term throughout this part of the treatise (and somewhat problematically, as will be seen shortly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>enger Satz</em></td>
<td>“basic phrase”</td>
<td></td>
<td>contains “only as much as is absolutely necessary ... as an independent section of the whole”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>erweiterter Satz</em></td>
<td>“extended phrase”</td>
<td></td>
<td>contains “a clarification, a more complete definition of the feeling”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>zusammengeschobener Satz</em></td>
<td>“compound phrase”</td>
<td></td>
<td>combines “two or more phrases, complete in themselves ... [so that] they appear in the form of a single phrase”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before moving right into the following detailed discussion of phrase-lengths, it is necessary to have an understanding of Koch’s concept of “simple meter.” According to the section entitled, “The nature of meter in general and the various types and classes of it” (in “The Mechanical Rules of Melody,” section II), a simple meter is defined as one where each measure contains one downbeat or strong part, with examples being 2/4, 3/4, and 3/8. Typically, measures of 4/4 and 6/8 represent compound meters which are derived from the omission of a bar line. In these cases, the “original” measures retain their phrase-relationships. In other words, a measure expressed in 4/4 meter is actually two measures in regard to phrase-structure relationships. This principle can lead to several possible expressions of the four-measure phrase. For example, it can be given as four measures of 2/4 meter, two measures of 4/4 time, or even four measures of 4/4 where the proper meter (per Koch) should have been 2/2.

76 Baker, 10 (footnote).
The “Basic Phrase” [enger Satz]

The first chapter heading of “The Mechanical Rules” takes up these “enger Sätze” specifically; the first subheading is “The Length of Basic Phrases [enger Sätze] and the Incises Contained in Them,” and describes/derives such phrases with lengths of four, five, six, and even seven bars. In the Versuch the universal aesthetic preference for the four-bar phrase resonates unmistakably: “Most common, and also, on the whole, most useful and most pleasing for our feelings are those basic phrases which are completed in the fourth measure…”

The five-bar (basic) phrase can arise in three possible ways:

1. Extension of a four-bar phrase, “by means of the extension of two metrical units to two measures”
2. “[F]rom the joining of two unequal segments, of which each is incomplete in itself and in which there is no extension”
3. Extension of a four-bar phrase, whereby “the motive in a measure… is continued in the subsequent measure” by repetition of melodic or rhythmic figure (Koch admits this to be an extended phrase rather than a basic phrase, but includes it here because the decoration of the repeat can make it unnoticeable as such.)

The six-bar (basic) phrase can also occur in three possible ways:

1. Extension of a four-bar phrase in the same fashion as method #1 concerning five-bar phrases
2. “Through the joining of two still incomplete segments of three measures” (similar to method #2 for five-bar phrases)
3. “Through the connecting of a complete phrase of four measures with a preceding incomplete segment of two measures”

A seven-bar (basic) phrase can arise in the following manner: a four-bar phrase is first made into a five-bar phrase by method #3, after which it is extended two more measures by

method #1 of the six-bar derivation.80 Any other phrase of seven bars must be derived from a “complete phrase of four measures with a preceding incomplete segment of three measures.”81 This, of course, is essentially the same as method #3 of the six-bar derivation.

Finally, Koch does allow for a basic phrase of eight measures, remarking that it must be “either an extended [phrase] or a compound phrase consisting of two phrases complete in themselves…”82

At this point a few comments are in order. If Koch takes the basic phrase to be “only as much as is absolutely necessary for it to be understood and felt as an independent section of the whole” (§80), or that which is left when a phrase is pared down to its “essential components” (§78), then only method #2 for a five-bar phrase and method #2 for a six-bar phrase genuinely result in a “basic phrase”; all of the remaining methods, including those for the seven-bar phrase and the eight-bar phrase, produce phrases that are derived from four-bar units that would seem to represent true basic phrases. The fact alone that Koch uses the term Vierer in the first methods for five- and six-bar phrases (“extension of a four bar phrase”), is indicative to Koch’s inconsistency here, much less the more obvious problem of his describing these phrases as so clearly derived (especially both #3 methods). Koch’s remark after method #3 of five-bar phrases only exacerbates the problem by admitting to intermix phrase-types in this instance, and throwing into confusion what is actually meant by his “basic phrases” of five, six, and seven measures. Given his later treatment of extended and compound phrases (see below), it would have been better to consider all but the second methods of five- and six-bar phrases under the categorical descriptions for extended and compound phrases.

80 Again, method #1 is really the same for the six-bar derivation as for that of five, except that the result for one is to add two measures and for the other a single measure. It is only because in order to go from five bars to seven requires two that Koch cites the six-measure method.
82 Ibid., §91 (trans. Baker, 19).
Additionally, Koch’s description of the eight-bar phrase is further confusing. First, if it is considered an extended phrase, does he then mean to call it a basic eight-measure phrase at all (the remark begins, “A complete phrase of eight measures is…” [Ein vollständiger Satz von act Tacten ist…])? Second, if it is a compound phrase of two complete phrases, then, once again, is this to be thought of now as one complete phrase? This second question can be thought of separately because Koch’s description of compound phrases in general is problematic and will be taken up with that discussion below.  

The “Extended Phrase” [erweiterter Satz]

“A phrase is extended when it contains more than is absolutely necessary for its completeness.” The purpose of extending a phrase is to define more precisely the feeling contained in the phrase. Over the next 14 section-divisions, Koch gives some detail to four techniques by which a phrase can be extended:

1. “[R]epetition of a segment of a phrase”
2. “[T]he addition of an explanation, an appendix”
3. “[A]n idea… [is] immediately carried further”
4. “[T]he insertion of unessential melodic ideas between the segments of a phrase”

These techniques are not exclusive of one another; for example, the repetition of a cadence is at the same time the first and second technique listed. Furthermore, Koch explains that in practice more than one means of extension may be applied to a single phrase.

The first of these, taken up in §§105-109, is “repetition of a segment of a phrase.” This can be a literal repetition or one on different scale degrees, or on a different “key” (Koch does

---

83 In Part 3 of the current document, only five- or six-bar phrases that do not present themselves as derivations from four-bar phrases will be labeled as basic phrases of those lengths.
not mean actual change of key, but of harmony, even with the use of chromatic pitches).\textsuperscript{85} It can be a single figure or measure, or a longer segment. It can form a sequence \textit{Progres\textit{s}ion}, or be embellished, or have voices inverted. If the repetition of a single bar is the same or nearly the same, the repeated measure is not numbered in the length of the phrase; conversely, if the repetition is less noticeable, it is to be numbered with the rest of the measures of the phrase.\textsuperscript{86} On the other hand, the repetition of an incise (far more common than a single measure, and typically two measures) is never lost on the listener. Thus, a four-bar phrase extended to six in this manner is still considered as four measures “with respect to the rhythmic relations of phrases.” Koch revisits the topic of extension in Volume III, §§47-72, but there states that a four-measure phrase extended to five “can be treated very arbitrarily with regard to its rhythm” (length), as there is no definite rule which prescribes the length of the surrounding phrases – even though regarding it as four seems to prevail in practice. Also, in the later discussion he adds that the practice of extension through repetition most frequently finds the material repeated insofar that it does more closely resembles that of the original occurrence; however, Koch takes care to point out that repeated material can exist in a (non-extended) basic phrase.

The second technique of extension, discussed in §§110-115, is “the addition of an explanation, an appendix, which further clarifies the phrase.” The added material can be derived from the phrase itself (which “makes the meaning of the phrase more emphatic”) or it can be altogether new material (“which is able to define [the phrase] more closely”). Even the appendix itself can be repeated. This appendix usually serves to produce two (or more) phrase endings,

\textsuperscript{85} Even though he calls this “transposition”\textit{[Transposition]}, in §109, it can be seen clearly from his examples that by it he does not mean that a new key center has been established.

\textsuperscript{86} This appears confusing at first glance, but evidently the reason for this is that such a repetition is then disguised as such (hence, the measure “numbered” with the length of its phrase). This description is rooted in the primary point of view of the composer, not the listener (or analyst). This also helps to clarify the value of the next sentence.
which, though generally on the same harmony, differ in degree of completeness by the sounding of a different tone or possibly by change in decoration. It is possible for the phrase ending to end on a different harmony than that of the original phrase proper (even so far as a cadence to a closing phrase being supplanted by an appendix with a V-phrase ending, or a deceptive cadence), in which case it is the ending of the (last) appendix which is “taken into consideration with respect to interphrase punctuation.” However, when considering the rhythmical value of the phrase (relative to other phrases), the appendix is not counted toward its length. It is indeed curious to think that an extended phrase might be understood, in consideration of its “interphrase punctuation,” by the phrase proper in regard to its length but by the appendix in regard to its ending. By not bringing more attention to this intriguing circumstance Koch appears initially to pass over this with little thought. However, the last paragraph on this method (§115) demonstrates that Koch is well aware of all this, as it is a reminder that the length of a phrase does not consider an appendix (in terms of rhythmical relations). Moreover, Koch reinforces all of these points in Volume III (§§58-60). In that later discussion he also adds that the space between the end of the initial caesura tone and the beginning of the appendix may be filled in with notes.

The third means of extension, discussed briefly in §116, is that where “an idea contained in a phrase is… immediately carried further…” The ways by which this might be executed are (1) “through undefined and mixed figures of notes,” (2) by “pursuing a rhythmic formula present in the idea,” and (3) by “maintaining a single figuration.”

The last method for extending a phrase (presented in this section), which is also discussed the most briefly, in §117, is that of “parenthesis, or the insertion of unessential melodic ideas between the segments of a phrase.” In his discussion of Volume III, he defines “parenthesis” as
“the interpolation of incidental melodic sections … [which can be] placed either between the segments of a phrase or between a complete melodic section and its repetition.” According to Koch, parenthesis is most often used with the repetition of complete phrases, and Koch even goes so far as to argue that such a parenthesis might even be in the form of a complete phrase(!). In §71 of Volume III, Koch explains a special type of parenthesis, namely “the insertion of melodic sections of a simple meter in a piece composed in a compound meter.” With this technique, a section appearing as uneven in length can actually be even when the proper meter is considered.

Curiously, Koch fails to mention here two more very important and distinct methods of extension that he alludes to elsewhere in the treatise: (1) the extension of two metrical units to two measures, or augmentation of a figure or segment, which is mentioned both earlier and later in the treatise; and (2) the insertion of an incomplete segment before the phrase proper, an “introduction” (the opposite of an appendix). Moreover, both of these seem to be quite common in music.

The “Compound Phrase” [zusammengeschobener Satz]

In §§120-125, the last pages of the second volume of the Versuch, with perhaps some of the volume’s less-clear writing, Koch presents the compound phrase. Throughout this discussion, he seems ambiguous (or inconsistent) in regard to whether a compound phrase is to be considered as a single phrase or plural phrases in terms of rhythmic relations. Confusion on this matter has already been foreshadowed in reference to the eight-measure phrase, as a product

---

87 Volume II, §§89-90, in conjunction with five- and six-measure basic phrases.
88 Volume III, §49, though mentioned only in passing.
89 Mentioned also in the derivation of six-measure “basic phrases” (method #3).
90 As seen, for example, in the analysis of Part 3 of this document.
of combining/compounding two phrases. Here is Koch’s definition of the compound phrase:

Two or more phrases, of which each is complete in itself, may be connected with one another so that they either appear in the form of a single phrase or ought to be considered as only a single phrase within the period. I call such a melodic section which consists of two complete ideas a compound phrase.\(^91\)

Already in this definition, he states that the compound phrase contains two (or more) “complete ideas” (suggesting consideration as two units, altered to appear as one), yet appear in the form of a single phrase, or “ought to be considered as only a single phrase” (suggesting consideration as one unit, though originally conceived from two).

Koch offers four means by which compound phrases arise. The first and most common is that which has already been referred to above as Tacterstickung or Tactunterdrückung, i.e. “stifling” or “suppressing a measure.” As noted earlier, this occurs when the caesura tone of the first phrase is one and the same as the initial tone of the second. In this case, Koch considers the last measure of the first phrase to be omitted, while the beginning of the second phrase “is at the same time considered as the omitted caesura tone.” Koch notes that this is just as common with closing phrases as with internal phrases. Unfortunately, Koch does not make clear whether this would be regarded, in terms of rhythmic relations, as 4 + 4 (two phrases), 3 + 4 (two phrases), 8 (one phrase) or 7 (one phrase).\(^92\) It does seem as if Koch considers the result as two separate phrases, superficially appearing as one. Koch’s discussion of the allegro movement that was already cited with regard to the effect of Tacterstickung or Tactunterdrückung on phrase-endings (Vol. III, §101, which will be taken up again later) also supports this view, as this practice causes the melodic sections to be “more attached to each other and flow more forcefully” because “they are linked so that their phrase-endings are less perceptible.”

\(^92\) Even though seven measures in length, it might be considered as eight. Recall that in terms of extended phrases, additional measures are not counted in the length. Unfortunately, Koch does not specifically address the length of measures that have been truncated or diminished.
The second means of compounding two phrases is to remove the quality of completeness from the ending of the first phrase, thus requiring the second to complete it. “By this means, two complete phrases are given the form and the value of a single, integral phrase, that is, they are compounded.” With this method it now seems clearer that the resulting section is actually not viewed as two phrases, since it has the “value” [Werth] of a single phrase.

The third technique for compounding results in what Koch calls an “entangled phrase.” Here, a segment from the first phrase is brought into the second and one from the second brought into the first. Koch declines to elaborate on this technique, except to provide an example where two four-measure phrases are combined into one compound (entangled) phrase. Koch cautions that this procedure must be handled with care, and generally it is the segment ending the first phrase which must be brought into the second in exchange for a segment lacking a clear caesura. Koch’s example follows this as well, exchanging measures 3-4 of the first phrase with 1-2 of the second. Again, Koch later mentions that this method, as well as the one described next, are not to be readily imitated, as the attempt to do so can cause one to fall easily into bad taste. In regard to phrase structure, the result of this method produces “the form of a single phrase,” obviously not favoring a two-phrase analysis.

The final technique for setting two phrases as a compound phrase is to split open the first phrase and insert the whole of the second phrase. Koch illustrates this with an example, and, again, refrains from further elaboration. But, even more than the third technique, this one seems to lend itself to more unsatisfactory results than satisfactory ones, and his example also demonstrates the necessity of a very selective choice of phrases on which to use this method. This technique may be the most difficult to detect from an analytic perspective, and Koch leaves no further hint as to its relative structure as one or two phrases.
In terms of the rhythmical relationships of phrases (hypermeter), never does Koch outright state whether compound phrases are to be universally considered as single phrases comprising the length of both units (with or without truncated measures?), or as plural phrases that merely appear as a single section but are taken as multiples in regard to their hypermeter. In his discussion throughout most of the treatise he seems to suggest both answers. Perhaps at these points the issue is not of great importance to him, which would be surprising, or it is an issue to be taken case by case, which would be only slightly less surprising.\(^9\) A possible solution may be gleaned from Koch’s discussion of extended phrases by way of repetition, cited above, whereby the distinction is made between the genesis of a phrase and its result. In other words, a compound phrase may well be derived from two complete phrases without, in the final form, being able to be discerned as anything other than a single phrase (even, it would thus be supposed, one of large length). As plausible as it sounds, however, Koch later seems to disallow this explanation when, near the end of Volume III of the *Versuch*, he submits an intriguing – and somewhat confusing – clarification on this issue (in the midst of a discussion on the connection of sections in the first main period of a longer composition). Here Koch states that the result of the compounding of phrases is “that they either (1) appear in the outer form of a single phrase, or (2) indeed affect our feeling as two different phrases, but in the structure of the period can only be treated as a single main punctuation section.” The former option initially offers no answer to our questions, but the latter clarifies that even when two phrases are felt, they are considered as one in terms of periodic structure. This second option also likely implies that the first option should also be considered as a single phrase. Koch’s either-or construction here refers simply to how the compound phrase appears on the surface, since the essential structure of both is as a

\(^9\) This shall be revisited specifically in regard to my own analysis in Part 3 of this document.
singular (basic) phrase.\textsuperscript{94} Still, when all is said and done of the \textit{Versuch}’s presentation of compound phrases, one must wonder if the intended meaning of what Koch presents on this topic was altogether consistent with itself.\textsuperscript{95}

Further remarks concerning special treatment of phrases will be taken up in the next chapter’s discussion of first-movement Allegro form.

First-Movement Allegro Form

Having taken up the basic materials of harmony and counterpoint, followed by the inner nature of composition and the substance and structure of melody, Koch devotes the final chapter of his three-volume treatise to “The Connection of Melodic Segments in Periods of Greater Length, or the Arrangement of Longer Compositions.”\textsuperscript{96}

It is not the purpose of this document to summarize all of the material of this final chapter in the \textit{Versuch}, but, rather, that which is especially relevant to Koch’s discussion of the first-movement allegro form (a discussion that theorists would later develop toward model called sonata form).\textsuperscript{97} Koch provides the most information concerning this form in his discussion of the symphony, but it cannot be isolated from the larger context of the “Mechanical Rules” concerning phrase ending and length, nor from certain other comments found in Section IV (Volume III) leading up to it.

\textsuperscript{94} Therefore, this would indeed suggest that there is such a thing as a true basic phrase of eight measures.
\textsuperscript{95} In all fairness, this matter is one of several complex issues treated by Koch: a certain degree of incongruity between distanced passages is not terribly shocking for this time given the difficulty of organizing and publishing written theoretical documents of a large scale. While a thorough exposition of the topic requires one to handle such discrepancies, such challenges need not call into question the intellectual credibility of Koch.
\textsuperscript{96} This is situated within the overall scheme of the \textit{Versuch}:
- Part II (“The Mechanical Rules...,” begun in Volume II)
- Section IV (“The Connection of Melodic Segments, or the Construction of Periods”)
- Chapter IV (“The Connection of Melodic Segments in Periods of Greater Length...”)
\textsuperscript{97} It should be noted that form is not yet a concept as in the 19th century (with all its attached aesthetics), but a description of musical practice.
The preceding second chapter of this section is entitled “The Connection of Melodic Segments in Periods of Small Size, or the Arrangement of Short Compositions.” By short compositions, Koch specifically means,

1. “[C]urrent dance melodies”
2. Melodies to odes and songs
3. All short pieces arbitrarily arranged with respect to the meter, the rhythm, the length, the punctuation, and the tempo

Of these, Koch states, “The knowledge of these forms is useful to the beginning composer not only in itself but also with regard to the larger products of the art; for these forms are at the same time representations in miniature of larger compositions.”

Yet, when the reader reaches that final fourth chapter, even though Koch’s first sentence reads, “Melodic sections are connected in compositions of greater length according to the punctuation and rhythmical rules and maxims which were introduced in the preceding chapters,” the very next paragraph amends,

Even a slight attention to larger compositions shows that their various main periods are very different in their manner of connection and treatment. Thus not only the arrangement of the larger compositions with regard to their main periods, but also the ways of connecting melodic sections in these various main periods must be examined more closely in this chapter.

Therefore, while it would be insightful to see how Koch frames the relationship of the larger forms to the smaller, it is not necessary for the purpose of this paper to summarize his details concerning these smaller forms, since they are not strictly adopted into the composition of larger ones.

100 Ibid., §73 (trans. Baker, 165).
101 Koch reminds the reader here by footnote that “[b]y a main period I mean the connection of several phrases, of which the last closes with a formal cadence either in the main key or in one closely related to it.”
Koch first divides larger compositions into two types: vocal and instrumental. After discussing the three types of vocal composition (recitative, aria and its species, chorus), Koch then moves into his discussion of instrumental music, also relegating it to three types: opening or preparatory pieces, sonatas, and concertos. Opening pieces would include the overture and the symphony, while sonatas would include works for solo player (with or without accompaniment), duet, trio, or quartet. (A concerto may be for a solo player with orchestra or concerto grosso.) It is in Koch’s discussion of the symphony (which “nowadays… has… almost entirely supplanted” the [French] overture) where his presentation on the first-movement allegro lies.

Koch spends a great deal of time describing the symphony, and justifies the amount of space taken by it, “because the symphony is one of the most important compositions for those composers who wish to occupy themselves only with instrumental pieces…” In his opening paragraph on the symphony, Koch submits that “[f]or the most part, the character of magnificence and grandeur belongs to the first allegro,” and spends more time in the description of this movement than any other. It will be seen that the form of this movement is also the basis for the first movement of the other instrumental types of composition (the sonata and concerto). Here is an examination of Koch’s description of that form, “the first allegro of the symphony,” which commonly today is called “sonata form” (or “sonata-allegro form”).

The first allegro of a symphony (described in §§101-103) contains two “sections” [Theile], but three “main periods” [Hauptperioden]: one in the first section and two in the

---

103 Koch also states that “…he who wishes to study vocal composition must have attained first a certain degree of skill in instrumental composition.” (Vol. III, §82 [trans. Baker, 169])

104 How much of the sinfonia that preceded Italian and Italianate operas Koch may have had in mind is not clear, but certainly the somewhat larger symphonic works that were being cultivated were the object of his admiration in his description of the first-movement allegro.


second. As it turns out, the three main periods are what today’s texts label as the “exposition,” “development,” and “recapitulation,” whereas the two sections represent a division by the traditional location of the repeat sign. As to the debate that would range over the next 200 years of whether or not “sonata form” is a two-part or three-part construct, Koch actually embraces both. Without saying in such terms – but describing so nonetheless – the two sections correspond to the “tonal” plan of the movement (basically I-V, V-I), while the three main periods correspond with to the “thematic” plan (expo., dev., recap.).

Table 5: Plan for “The First Allegro of the Symphony”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Plan</th>
<th>Divisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tonal</td>
<td>I-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theile</strong></td>
<td>“Section” 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hauptperioden</strong></td>
<td>“Main Period” 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Thematic”</strong></td>
<td>Exposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Section” 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Main Period” 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Main Period” 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the content of the first main period (which, again, is equal to the first section), “the main melodic phrases are presented in their original order and afterwards a few of them are fragmented. Following the cadence a clarifying period is often appended that continues and closes in the same key in which the preceding one also had closed.”

Indeed, the reference here is to the main themes/ideas presented in the movement; however, not themes solely, but transitional sections as well. Koch gives a much more detailed account of this period (today’s “exposition”) in the next paragraph:

---

107 It is worth noting that Koch uses *Theil* and *Perioden* in reference to these larger sections and periods, but also the same terms are used in a more generic sense in reference to smaller divisions of the music; the context makes clear just what Koch refers to at any given time (the meaning of *Hauptperioden*, however, is exclusive in this discussion).

108 Koch first mentions “theme” in his concluding “remark” to §79, where he states that “[a]mong the various phrases of a melody, the first usually contains the main idea, which, as it were, defines the feeling the whole should arouse. This will be called the theme or the main phrase.” It does not differ from other phrases in regard to length or ending.
The structure of this period, as also of the other periods of the symphony, differs from that of the sonata and the concerto not through modulations to other keys, nor through a specific succession or alternation of I- or V-phrases. Rather it differs in that (1) its melodic sections tend to be more extended already with their first presentation than in other compositions, and especially (2) these melodic sections usually are more attached to each other and flow more forcefully than in the periods of other pieces, that is, they are linked so that their phrase-endings are less perceptible. For the most part, a melodic section is directly connected with the caesura tone of the preceding phrase. Very often no formal phrase-ending is written until the rushing and sonorous phrases are exchanged for a more singing phrase, usually to be played with less force. Thus many such periods are found in which a formal phrase-ending is not heard until there has been a modulation into the most closely related key. For the main melodic sections are all presented in the main key just as infrequently in the symphony as in other compositions. Rather, after the theme has been heard with another main phrase, the third such phrase usually modulates to the key of the fifth – in the minor mode also towards the third – in which the remaining sections are presented, because the second and larger half of this first period is devoted particularly to this key.109

This paragraph begins by showing the symphony’s distinct character of extended melodic sections which frequently are elided into one another, but then moves into the matter of the specific content of this period. Koch writes of “rushing and sonorous phrases” which give way to a “more singing phrase” which is found to be in “the most closely related key.” He then says that it is the third main phrase, heard after the theme and another main phrase, which modulates. From these it can be inferred that in today’s terminology the second main phrase actually refers to the transition between the first and second theme. But does Koch actually mean that this singing phrase actually serves the function of modulating, or that it is in the dominant, the music having already undergone a modulation? This is a very important question because by the conception of the form in today’s texts, the transition, i.e. Koch’s second main phrase, is that which modulates (actually effects the modulation), whereas the second theme, i.e. Koch’s third main phrase, is in the new key. One would assume that the true meaning of Koch here is that the second theme is in a new key, with the service of modulation having already taken place.

Furthermore, Koch states that the “larger half of this first period is devoted” to the closely related

---

key, which would include the second theme and the “clarifying period,” or appendix to the
period, mentioned earlier. This appendix would be a codetta in today’s textbooks. Koch has
described the following plan:

Table 6: Summary of Plan for Allegro’s First Period, as per Versuch

| “1st main phrase” → “2nd main phrase” → “3rd main phrase” → “clarifying period” |
| “rushing and sonorous phrases” → “more singing phrase” (modulates) “appendix” to main period |
| key area: I | I – V | V | V |
| [first theme] | [transition] | [second theme] | [codetta] |

Additionally, “newer symphonies” tend to begin\(^{110}\) with a brief, slow, and serious
introductory passage, which can utilize any or no figures from the rest of the symphony as well
as any meter, but staying within the main key (“[d]iscounting passing modulations”) and ending
with a V-phrase or cadence. The ending may have a fermata or even be elided with the first
phrase of the allegro.

For the second section, consisting of the second and third main periods, Koch provides
less specific detail.\(^{111}\) Regarding the first of these periods (the Development in today’s texts),
Koch describes it initially as tending “to have greatly diverse structures,” and then provides two
types of treatment for it, the second of which is more characteristic of “modern symphonies.”

The first type of treatment for this main period has it beginning in the key of the fifth (if
the main key is minor, then the minor fifth or third [relative major]\(^{112}\) with “the theme” (the first
main phrase of the first main period) or, occasionally, with another main melodic idea also. The
melody (melodies) may appear “note for note, in inversion, or also with other more or less

\(^{110}\) To be precise, Koch actually says they tend “to be preceded by…”
\(^{111}\) This is not unlike today’s textbooks.
\(^{112}\) Koch generally takes for granted the major mode as the main key.
considerable alterations,” after which it goes to “the minor key of the sixth, or also to the minor key of the second or third” by way of either material in the main key or through a passage of sequence or extension using passing modulations.\textsuperscript{113} After this other key is reached, “a few of those melodic sections that are best suited for presentation in one of these keys … are repeated or dissected in another form or combination than they had in the first period, whereupon the period ends in this key.”

The second type of treatment is indeed that which corresponds more closely with the description of the Development section found in today’s texts:

The other method of building this […] period frequently used in modern symphonies is to continue, dissect, or transpose a phrase contained in the first section – often only a segment of it – that is especially suitable for such treatment. This is done either in the upper part alone or also alternately in other parts. There may be passing modulations in several keys, some closely and some distantly related, before the modulation into that key in which the period is to end. [Koch does not specify what key this is; perhaps he means the submediant, mediant, or supertonic, as in the case of the first type of treatment, but this cannot be assumed]\textsuperscript{114} This happens either only until the ending of the V-phrase in this key, or the phrase is continued in a similar manner until the close of the entire period. …However, if the fragmentation of such a phrase is carried only to the end of the V-phrase in that key in which this period will close, then a few melodic ideas of the first period, usually changed somewhat, are presented in that [closing] key before the cadence arrives.\textsuperscript{115}

To clarify, the primary difference in these two methods of treating the second main period is that in the second treatment a single phrase of the first period is more extensively developed, either until the end of the period or just to the end of a V-phrase; in the case of the latter, “a few melodic ideas of the first period, usually changed somewhat, are presented… before the cadence arrives.” Even in this latter case, Koch seems to suggest an emphasis on the

\textsuperscript{113} Later, in §§152-154, Koch revisits this main period, describing three types of treatment. But there is no essential difference, as Koch merely separates these two possible means by which this key of vi, iii, or ii is reached (though ii is not included in the later discussion) into two separate descriptions of the period. Problems related to the later description will be taken up shortly.
\textsuperscript{114} (Tompkins)
development of a single particular phrase. In contrast, the first treatment has several of the main melodic phrases altered and recombined in a journey through different key areas. It is tempting to say that the second method is that which holds true for the music in the decades after the Versuch, but such a grand statement cannot here be made.

Koch adds, in reference to both types of treatment, that a “short passage” connects the second main period to the beginning of the third main period, “which consists of a segment of a main melodic idea drawn out in a sequential way,” and through this means modulates back to the main key. Today’s texts, if they give a term at all, call this the “retransition.”

Of the last main period, Koch’s description is the most succinct. It is “devoted above all to the main key,” and typically begins with the theme, but can also begin with another “main melodic idea.” “The most prominent phrases are now compressed” and a shift to the key of the fourth takes place (precisely how/where, Koch does not elaborate), shortly returning to the main key. Then the second half of the first period, which had been originally in the key of the fifth, is repeated in the main key, “and with this the allegro ends.” This, of course, is the Recapitulation of today’s texts. Koch does not mention the occurrence of a following, distinctive coda section.

After his discussion of the other genres (to which we shall return shortly), Koch takes up “The Connection of Melodic Sections in the First Main Period” – then, “in the Remaining Periods” – “of Larger Compositions,” as the last topics of the treatise. Unfortunately, these sections are problematic because while they claim to apply to all larger compositions, most of the other types of composition would not fit well to this discussion (of a movement with three main periods). Even if taken as relating to the first-movement allegro of the symphony, it is

---

116 By what means precisely (dominant preparation, full [tonic] cadence, or otherwise), Koch does not elaborate.
117 §§128-159.
118 Koch describes these other movements in terms of a binary form (two main periods), rondo, theme and variation, and even his earlier dance-form is basically binary, but with an added trio section.
somewhat overly simplistic and would not add anything of substance to what Koch already described in regard to its structure.

Koch treats the quartet within the category of the sonata. He states that “[t]he sonata, with its various species – the duet, trio, and quartet – has no definite character, but its main sections, namely, its adagio and both allegros, can assume every character, every expression which music is capable of describing.”¹¹⁹ He then compares its general aesthetic character with that of the symphony:

Because in the composition of sonatas the main parts are only set simply… the melody of a sonata must be extremely developed and must present the finest nuances of feelings, whereas the melody of the symphony must distinguish itself not through such refinement of expression, but through force and energy. In short, the feelings must be presented and modified differently in the sonata and symphony.¹²⁰

Concerning the form of the movements written for the sonata, Koch states that their external arrangements need not be examined, “for the sonata assumes all the forms which already have been described before in connection with the symphony,” – and he uses the first allegro as an example with the first section containing “one main period, the second section … two, and all follow the same course of modulation as the main periods of the symphony.” Still, as much as they are thus in common, “in the number of periods and the course of modulation, as different, conversely, is the inner nature of the melody in the two. This difference, however, can be better felt than described.” The only observable external characteristic difference is that the sonata more commonly has clearer phrases demarcated with clearer phrase endings, while the symphony contains more extensions.

Regarding the quartet, here is Koch’s full entry:¹²¹

The quartet, currently the favorite piece of small musical societies, is cultivated very assiduously by the more modern composers.

If it really is to consist of four obbligato voices of which none has priority over the others, then it must be treated according to fugal method.

But because the modern quartets are composed in the gallant style, there are four main voices which alternately predominate and sometimes this one, sometimes that one forms the customary bass.

While one of these parts concerns itself with the delivery of the main melody, the other two [melodic voices] must proceed in connected melodies which promote the expression without obscuring the main melody. From this it is evident that the quartet is one of the most difficult of all kinds of compositions, which only the composer who is completely trained and experienced through many compositions may attempt.

Among the more modern composers, Haydn, Pleyel, and Hoffmeister have enriched the public the most with this type of sonata. The late Mozart also had engravings made in Vienna of six quartets for two violins, viola, and violoncello with a dedication to Haydn. …Among all modern four-part sonatas these most closely correspond to the concept of a true quartet and are unique on account of their special mixture of the strict and free styles and the treatment of harmony.

Beethoven’s would wait just five years.
CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS OF OPUS 18, NO. 3, MVT. I

Before plunging headlong into the analysis of the first movement of Opus 18, no. 3, an explanation of the layout of this Chapter 3 is in order. First, I shall consider the question as to the validity of applying the ideas contained in Koch’s treatise on composition to music analysis, after which I will present some necessary further explanation of a few general key terms and concepts as they relate to the Versuch, and how they will be applied analytically to the Beethoven movement (no further introductory remarks are needed for the movement itself). In the analysis, the movement will first be taken up according to its phrase structure and then according to its large-scale form, after which a key feature of the movement will be brought out in special consideration to the overall study of this document.

It is conceivable that one would object to the use of Koch’s teaching on composition as a basis for analyzing music, especially given the fact that it can be easily shown that some of the compositional devices of which he writes can be disguised so that their actual genesis is hidden. Indeed Koch speaks of this himself from the very outset of his section on “The Nature of Melodic Sections,” when he refers to the resting points of both speech and the fine arts as “more or less noticeable.” It has also been seen in the discussion of compound phrases that this contrived phrase can so disguise the two (or more) generating phrases as to make its real origins (and therefore its derivation) undetectable. Furthermore, Koch outright states this problem in his later discussion/recapitulation of melodic means of extension, in Volume III:

123 As I noted in Part 2, although Koch keeps the reader in confusion through most of the treatise regarding how the compound phrase is to be viewed from a phrase-structural standpoint, he finally seems to overcome his ambiguity and vagueness by (somewhat) making clear that a compound phrase which is “in the form” of a single phrase (not easily divisible into two separate phrases) is to be taken as a single phrase itself (again, in terms of phrase-rhythm).
The extension of a complete phrase occurs either so that a technical means of extension can be specified without doubt or in such a way that no specific means can be perceived. Nothing definite can be said concerning this latter type of extension of a complete phrase; rather it must be studied in the works of composers. Usually the phrases extended in this way are so constituted that they cannot actually be reduced into basic phrases.

In response, two points may be offered. First, there is no de facto reason to assume that a compositional method cannot also be the basis for an analytic method, especially when the former is expressly concerned with the organization of musical material. It really depends on the compositional method. For example, if the method is to construct a melody with the throw of dice, irrespective of musical (or aesthetical) considerations, then an attempt to analyze such music in reverse process is unlikely to bear fruit in terms of expressed musical relationships (i.e., regarding conventional musical systems such as the common practice conception of “tonality”). All the more, a compositional method which is based on an understanding of (or a theory of) musical relationships certainly might prove useful in the study of music which manifests such relationships clearly. A compositional approach can serve as an analytic approach insofar as the analytical objective is clearly defined, relevant, and observable in “reverse process.” This idea of “reverse process” (of applying compositional method to analysis) can have two meanings: more literally, it can mean taking the finished work and tracing it back in a certain way to its genesis and uncovering the compositional process. But it can also mean merely taking the compositional method as a tool for discovering certain structures and/or features of the music and how it works to affect the listener. It is the latter idea that is embarked upon in the present document. Moreover, it is likely that Koch himself might well endorse such an undertaking. As noted in Chapter 2 regarding compound phrases, a distinction is made in the Versuch itself between structural relationships in the compositional process and those which are

---

125 However, even in this case, armed with an understanding of the method, one could possibly discover insights into the genesis and related structure of such music.
perceived by the listener, at which place Koch does not shy away from providing some guidance on how to view those relationships from the point of view of the listener.\textsuperscript{126}

The second point is that the true value of Koch’s treatise renders the above objection moot. The historical significance of the \textit{Versuch} lies not in a legacy left to any school of composition (or any known influence at all in the area of composition), but, rather, as a pioneering and influential theoretical work, specifically in regard to phrase structure.\textsuperscript{127} Furthermore, Koch happens to apply his own theory to the analysis of a large amount of music. Although this is done primarily to illustrate compositional procedures, it is nonetheless a significant \textit{analytical} activity that Koch engages in (i.e., his theory in “reverse process”).\textsuperscript{128} The purpose is composition pedagogy, but along the way he dissects music to show musical relationships strictly in terms of the theory he exposit.

A few clarifications are needed regarding the terminology to be used in the analytical discussion of this chapter. By the term “period” is meant a group of phrases ending with a (full) cadence, which is as Koch used the term. It has been noted\textsuperscript{129} that in the “first-movement allegro” type of movement (i.e., sonata form, in today’s texts) the “main periods” of Koch are what are nowadays referred to as the Exposition, Development, and Recapitulation. Since the movement to be considered (as well as the other two additionally discussed more briefly) is of such a type, and because these modern terms are so engendered to today’s reader, these three divisions of the movement will often be referred to by today’s terminology in the analytical

\textsuperscript{126}In this light, Koch’s statement that some phrases “are so constituted that they cannot actually be reduced into basic phrases” can be reconsidered: for the purpose of getting back to the originally conceived basic phrases this is a plausible statement, but for the purpose of evaluating musical phrases within their relationships in the completed musical work this is not so evident. I submit that while some phrases may be challenging, even extremely difficult, to break down in terms of a basic phrase, a plausible answer (or more than one) can be arrived at that will bring about a view of the essential phrase-structural relationships.

\textsuperscript{127}The reception and influence of the \textit{Versuch} is touched on in Part 1 of this document.

\textsuperscript{128}To be sure, Koch does not go to any length to expound on his succinct analyses; nor does he ever take up the topic of analysis per se.

\textsuperscript{129}In Part 2 of this document.
discussion. Also, the term “main section” shall refer to one of the two larger sections of the first-
movement allegro described in the last chapter, although more commonly the word “section” will still be used in a generic sense (as Koch does the same, without confusion).

The term basic phrase will be used in the strictest sense, according to Koch’s original definition: “only as much as is absolutely necessary for it to be understood and felt as an independent section of the whole,” or, the phrase when stripped of all extraneous extensions and alterations. This also excludes those phrases that Koch labels as basic phrases but clearly shows their derivation from smaller phrases by means of extension.

In the treatment of “endings” – those which Koch calls (weaker) phrase-endings as well as (full) cadences – Koch’s description shall be adhered to fairly closely with one exception: as referred to in the discussion, Koch passes over the distinction of an interior phrase that ends with the melody and bass both on the keynote (today’s “authentic” designation), although he recognized this formula for cadences at the end of periods. Therefore the following phrase-types shall be observed in respect to their endings: “V-phrase,” “I-phrase,” “I-phrase (p.a.)” (p.a. = perfect authentic), and the “cadence” (reserved for only the ending formula/phrase of a period). The endings themselves shall generally be referred to by the modern terminology,130 since the Versuch does not provide distinct labels for these.

A special note needs to be given in regard to the elided phrase. Koch states that their use has the effect of preventing the music from coming to a pause, allowing it to have a sort of quicker feeling. This is, of course, true, but there are some important considerations with this that Koch does not address. For one, the recurrence of elided phrases within a larger structure that favors four-bar regularity will necessitate that the elided phrases tend to be five measures in length (that is, to keep four-bar regularity). Thus, the five-measure elided phrase is a quite

130 E.g., “perfect authentic cadence,” etc.
common occurrence, although Koch fails to bring this out in the *Versuch*. On the other hand, when a phrase of four bars is elided with its next phrase, it causes the rhythm of phrases to be awkwardly adjusted. Furthermore, when a square four-measure phrase is changed to a five-measure elided phrase (in order to keep the four-bar regularity while at the same time desiring the affect of eliding), the basic harmonic character – as well as the melody – of the phrase must be altered in order to effect the putting of the cadence for an extra measure. This will be seen more clearly in the present analysis but, again, it is something that fails to be mentioned in Koch’s treatise.

**Opus 18, no. 3, First Movement**

*Structure of Phrases*

The three “main periods” of this movement are divided as follows:

- Period I (Exposition), measures 1-104
- Period II (Development), mm. 108-157
- Period III (Recapitulation), mm. 158-235
- A fourth period (Coda), as an appendix, 239-269

Before diving into a detailed discussion of phrases, it is important to note these larger-scale divisions since cadences which are to be expected to come to fullest closes are only those falling at the end of these periods.

At this point the phrases themselves are to be considered in terms of their individual structure, after which summary tables are provided. Following this, the analysis will turn to the

---

131 Koch naturally does not account for the large-scale extended codas that would generally come into practice after the publication of his treatise (a topic which will be brought up further in the analytical discussion below). It is curious to note, however, that nowhere in the *Versuch* does Koch describe or even mention a coda at all in his discussion of the first-movement allegro.
larger formal aspects, with further commentary then offered.

Italicized letters are be used to designate phrases. The measure numbers of the phrases are initially indicated as well, with an “e” either before or after the measures to indicate that a phrase is elided with the phrase to follow.

Phrase \(a\), 1-10

The opening phrase of this movement, phrase \(a\), is completed in the tenth measure, with an imperfect authentic cadence in the tonic key, D major. A V-I harmonic motion concludes the phrase, with the caesura note (the close of the melody), the third (\(f\#\)), preventing a full closure. This would, therefore, be considered (per Koch) as a I-phrase in the tonic, a Grundabsatz.

Example 2: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 1-10 (score).

The length of this phrase immediately requires interpretation in order to be understood in a Kochian sense, since Koch did not allow for a 10-measure phrase. In this regard, the first two bars will naturally draw one’s attention and prompt the question as to whether they actually begin the phrase proper or instead serve as an anacrusis to the phrase.\(^{132}\) The addition of the

\(^{132}\) Right off it should be stated that the answer to this question poses no relevancy to two other important issues: (a) that the material of these two measures appears motivically in a variety of manners throughout the movement, in terms of its literal appearance (and/or transposition) as well as the simple minor-seventh interval, and (b) the
other three voices in the third measure, as well as the shape of the bass line itself, provide assistance in answering this question, since considering these entrances to be on a third measure of a ten-bar phrase makes very little sense compared to simply an eight-bar phrase with a two-bar anacrusis or introduction\(^{133}\) (i.e., one can listen to measures 3-10 (without 1-2) and sense that a complete, round, eight-bar phrase has passed).\(^{134}\) But this still leaves another challenge to be addressed since Koch did not allow for a basic phrase of eight measures, except perhaps a compound phrase, which this phrase is not. I will submit that (by Koch’s definition) this phrase is to be taken as a simple four-bar phrase in terms of phrase-structure analysis and comparison, with the four measures augmented to eight. To put it another way, every other bar line could be removed, presenting four bars of 4/2 time (or, as Koch disregarded quadruple time, the meter would be rendered 2/1). Also note that the harmonic plan/rhythm of this phrase (with one chord per measure: I – V\(^4\)_\(^3\) - I\(^6\) - IV - I\(^6\)_\(^4\) - V - I {- I}) does not disqualify this view when compared to the motion of four-bar phrases elsewhere in the movement.

It is important to clarify that this phrase is not merely four bars expressed as eight, but that they are augmented to eight. The importance of this distinction will become more evident later. Furthermore, if all the above exposition of this phrase seems initially to be somewhat tedious, bear in mind that later I shall address at greater length the hypermetrical relations as a key feature of this movement, in terms of phrases in the form of four bars versus those in eight. In the table below (Table 7) as well as in this discussion, I shall continue to render such phrases

---

\(^{133}\) When such an “anacrusis” is a full measure or more (even more especially when two full measures), it is difficult not to call such an introduction, unless by that term one might expect a more formal harmonic ending, even if elided with the phrase proper or a half cadence. I shall therefore continue to refer to such as anacruses.

\(^{134}\) It is possible that one might argue that the first note of the melody, the dissonant g, sounds awkward (and I would disagree), to which I would simply suggest the addition of an anacrusis. To make this point more lucid, if one were to take the first two bars and diminish their value (even perhaps augment them) in one of various ways, it would not upset the rhythmical orientation of measures 3-10.
as eight (or nine, elided), pending my later explication.

Phrase $a^2$, 11-27e

Example 3: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 11-27 (reduction).

The analysis of this phrase presents several difficult challenges, and serves as an exceptional example of the intricacies of applying Koch’s theory “in reverse.” Because it is

---

Two points: First, it may be prudent to remind the reader once again that the purpose of this analysis is not to discover the process by which Beethoven must have actually composed these phrases, much less the movement, but to understand how this music works in respect to the concepts by which it is analyzed. Second, as an illustration of the complex nature of the analysis of this phrase, in my first attempts to evaluate this phrase, I sought to make the most direct correspondence possible to the initial phrase $a$ (mm. 1-10), not merely in the superficial regard of shared melodic material but the more substantial melodic-harmonic plan, hoping to align measures, or groups, according to their “function” or accentuation within the phrase. Only after a great deal of effort toward this end and some vague “conclusions” did I suspect that although the second phrase had as the basis for its main melodic material the melody of the opening phrase, the essential nature of this phrase was quite different, leading me to abandon this initial approach. Instead I chose to evaluate phrase $a^2$ on its own terms and the result was quite different – and more convincing.
essentially based on the same melody, it is given as $a^2$ (instead of $b$)\textsuperscript{136}; it also possesses the same two-bar anacrusis. Still, without even taking into consideration the fact that this second phrase also contains an extension, these two phrases function quite differently on a basic (or basic phrase) level. This phrase’s length of 17 measures is a product of extension, but the material and even location of the extension are not easy to see at a cursory glance. While recognizing the possibility of alternate views, my examination of the phrase in terms of its melodic-harmonic content results in the following structure. Reduction to its basic phrase renders a nine-measure unit; the odd number is not surprising given its elided cadence, and the large number is not surprising given the precedent of phrase $a$. Arriving at a basic phrase length of nine measures both does and does not come from an a priori view of phrase structure. While not strictly looking for a way to whittle down 17 measures into something that appears “more round,” like eight or nine bars, (1) it can be virtually assumed that a 17 measure phrase is quite unwieldy in terms of an understood (or “felt”) phrase-rhythm; (2) the material itself suggests that the phrase has been significantly extended because (a) its placement directly after the established first phrase (the effect would be quite different if this phrase were heard first), and (b) the motion of the line itself, with the prolonged (stagnant) predominant function and the coinciding new melodic material (moreover, highly figurative melodic material); (3) it has been established (via Koch and others, as well as commentated upon by writers today),\textsuperscript{137} ultimately according to our “senses,” the necessity to understand phrases in terms of a regular phrase-rhythm – not a total necessity for round phrases themselves, but for them as the foundation for a hypermetrical

\textsuperscript{136} Admittedly, it would not be unreasonable to denote this phrase as $b$: it shares the opening material with phrase $a$, but little else. The label of $a^2$ has ultimately been chosen due to its initial melodic thrust as a sibling to the first phrase. It also breaks apart the initial material of the first phrase (anacrusis plus first measure) by utilizing the anacrusis minor seventh motivically and the eighth notes as a separate motive in its own “micrometer” groupings of six.

\textsuperscript{137} See the discussion of 4-bar phrasing in Part 1 of this document.
paradigm.

It is point “2-b” above that helps determine the length and location of the extension. Even without knowing that Koch describes the technique of extension as, among other possibilities, the repetition of a segment (from the basic phrase or new material), even a rhythmic figure, possibly in sequence, one could perceive the several measures from m17 as an extension to the primary melodic line. The material of these bars is outside of the character of the melody and lacking in the melody’s forward momentum, due to its repeated figural nature over a stagnant harmonic underpinning. The question is, where does the extension end and the “real” melody return, especially with this $a^2$ boasting a different ending than the first phrase? The cadence (perfect authentic I-phrase ending) is on measure 27 and so the melody directly leading to it, even though it too is of a sequential nature, belongs to the “real” (“basic”) melody. The phrase’s momentum (with the return of harmonic motion) most certainly reemerges no later than 25, if not a bar or two sooner. Picking up at the point of a cadential gesture confirms that measure 17 itself is to be considered essential, as it provides the predominant harmony to the phrase; its melody is not excluded since when the basic phrase returns eighth-note figures are used for the melody. At this point we can also say that this melody from 17 more naturally leads into measure 24, which might be taken as a strong assertion of V harmony and good introduction to the cadential gesture. But 23 seems to be less the end of a (miniscule) musical event and more the beginning of a gesture due to the lower three parts, the real (first) assertion of V harmony, and new melodic material linked with 24; and thus 23 is a poor choice for the end of the inserted extension and 23-24 really belong together. Therefore, I would view 23-24 as a unit, with 24 as the essential melodic return from 17, and 23 as a sort of introductory extension to 24 itself. The overall structure of this phrase is as shown below, with measures 18-22 denoted as an extension
(which Koch would call “parenthesis”). Because of its ending, a perfect authentic cadence on D, I will call this phrase a 1-phrase (p.a.).

Table 7: Overall Structure of Phrase $a^2$, 11-27e

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>vii$^6$</td>
<td>I$^b$</td>
<td>vii$^6$/ii</td>
<td>ii$^b$ (prolonged $\rightarrow$)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>I$^b_4$</td>
<td>(ii$^6$)$\rightarrow$</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic meas. anacrus.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>extension</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (m. 23-24), the “real” measure for the basic phrase is m. 24, with m. 23 to be taken as an (extension by means of) “introduction” to 24.

Phrase $b$, 27-31e

Example 4: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 27-31 (reduction).

Again, a key feature of this movement (to be taken up later) is the interplay of phrases the length of 8/9 bars with those of 4/5 bars. This phrase ($b$), measures 27-31, is the first to appear of one of the shorter lengths. Elided with both the preceding and following phrases, it is five bars long and contains a simple harmonic motion, I – V/IV – IV – V – I (changing each bar). The melody is a bit more complex, not showing itself until the second measure of the phrase. While this might suggest a four-bar interpretation of the phrase, this particular melodic material (with its subtle beginning) along with the more overt general motion of the phrase with

138 Indeed, by itself this melody might sound like a ready-made four-bar phrase, easily harmonized in terms of four measures. But Beethoven utilizes a different functional motion. A plausible alternate view is that this phrase is four measures in length, extended to five by augmenting the first measure; this would provide the opportunity/necessity for the elided cadence (in keeping an even-numbered measuring of phrase-rhythm).
its harmonic basis and bass line indicate the basic length of five measures, which is not awkward with its elided imperfect authentic cadence (“I-phrase”).

Phrase \(b\), 31-35

This phrase is essentially a repetition of 27-31, but the melody and bass sound an octave higher and some figuration is added to the interior vlnII voice. It might be added that one can see that the endings of phrases with similar functions (in the sense of the present discussion) commonly possess quite differing senses of finality. Here the mere repetition of material, with octave difference, has a rounding effect that would become more evident if one were to simply extract 27-31 or 31-35 from the score and give another hearing.

Another point here concerns the connection of 31-35 with 27-31. While these two phrases are elided, they don’t actually share melodic space (if the melody actually begins in the second measure of the phrase). This illustrates how two phrases can be elided by sharing temporal space, perhaps with common harmonic underpinning, without literally overlapping in terms of main melody.

Phrase \(c\), 36-39

Example 5: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 36-39 (reduction).
This tidy phrase is four measures in length with a simple harmonic plan, ending with an imperfect authentic cadence on the tonic.

Phrase $c^2$, 40-45e

Example 6: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 40-45 (reduction).

Modeled after $c$, but immediately in the tonal area of b minor, this four-bar phrase with two-bar extension is at first an exact transposition of $c$ (in minor mode), with the same cadence after four bars. But it immediately springs into a repetition of the last two bars – with melody now in the viola – but transposed to the key area of a minor, and the end of the phrase is the imperfect authentic cadence on a, rendering this phrase a “I-phrase” in this key area. Additionally, the phrase is “elided” with the following phrase in an unusual way: the caesura tone belongs only to phrase $c^2$, but the next phrase begins in the middle of bar 45.$^{139}$

Phrase $d$, m45-m51e

Example 7: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 45-51 (reduction).

$^{139}$ This could be viewed as not being an elision at all, but merely an “early” or off-set entry of the next phrase.
In this case the label of “phrase” is taken to mean only a segment, as these bars are really three two-measure segments essentially repeated, none of which could be said to constitute a fully-fledged phrase (nor do they together).\textsuperscript{140} They do present a threefold half cadence, but come closer to an appendix to the ending of the last phrase. Still, seeming to stand as a somewhat distinctive “unit,” I regard this as a link, simply standing between the previous and following sections with relatively unessential material (that is to say, apart from its function as a link).\textsuperscript{141} By unessential I do not mean insignificant or unimportant, but that it lacks any substantial melodic or harmonic content, and hence is not a true (whole) phrase. However, it is still vital in regard to placing the next phrase precisely where Beethoven wants it temporally, and greater attention is granted the link by setting it metrically “off” by half of a measure. Incidentally, the ending of “phrase” \textit{d} is truly elided with the next phrase – even though the caesura tone of the melody is not the first melodic tone of the following phrase, they occur simultaneously, as the melody is passed off to another voice (or perhaps two voices, the violin I and cello).

Phrase \textit{e}, 51-57

Example 8: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 51-57 (reduction).

\textsuperscript{140} To put it another way, it does not seem possible to conceive of this material in terms of a full phrase without forcing a fairly awkward interpretation.

\textsuperscript{141} A layman’s term might be that this segment is “filler.”
Although this phrase could be seen as being derived from a four- or eight-measure basic phrase (and it might be more satisfying to our sense of time),\textsuperscript{142} this phrase is best taken as a true seven-measure phrase. To state from another perspective, although the ear is likely to hear such a phrase-length as one-less-than-eight in terms of its length, it is constructed as seven measures.\textsuperscript{143} Furthermore, the eighth notes in 57 are not really a part of the phrase proper, but, rather, a figure that links to the next phrase. As cited in the previous chapter, Koch wrote about the decoration of the caesura note by several methods, one being the filling in of the space between it and the beginning tone of the following phrase. One might possibly say that the melodic part to measure 57 is really an anacrusis to the next phrase, beginning in 58; then again, those are nearly the same (the former implies the latter, although the reciprocal is not necessarily true). The ending is a perfect authentic cadence on A major, designating the phrase not a V-phrase, but a I-phrase (p.a.) in A.

Phrase $e^2$, 58-68e

Example 9: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 58-68 (reduction).

\textsuperscript{142} Indeed, there a number of ways to view this phrase taking into account various possibilities for perceived compression/augmentation devices.

\textsuperscript{143} One way of possibly viewing this as derived from eight is that the tonic ending could easily be stretched into a second bar (possibly also taking the eighth-notes as quarter-notes to fill up the two measures). After all, the first phrase of the movement ends with two measures of tonic harmony (though suspended in the first bar). However, the component of the cadential gesture preceding the tonic in the first phrase, $I^7\rightarrow V$, spanned two measures as well, whereas that of this phrase, $ii^7\rightarrow V$, spans only one.
The basic phrase here could be read as seven measures in length (although it has a virtual full-measure anacrusis in bar 57), but despite the melody’s being modeled on phrase \( e \), this phrase is quite different in “functional” content, as it directs the music to an altogether different ending, modulatory in purpose and elided with the following phrase. In terms of seven measures, a logical interpretation might be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>67</th>
<th>68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic meas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-------OR-------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>64</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>67</th>
<th>68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This phrase can clearly be divided into two parts. The first part extends six measures (58-63), the first four being virtually identical to the first four bars of phrase \( e \) (51-54), and 62-63 reiterate 60-61 except for a very important chromatic adjustment to the e, raising to e#. This initiates the modulatory process, but because the melody and interior voices are substantially the same, and the harmony is still given to the key center of A (the e# adding, enharmonically, a flatted-9 to the dominant harmony), only at 64 is the impression given that another segment has begun – with the melody, interior voices, and key center all notably different. The second part (64-68) truly effects the modulation initiated at the end of the first. At 64-65 the note-rhythms have changed to eliminate that highest e, which would now be a strong dissonant reminder of the
left-behind key of A, Also, the e# is now spelled as f-natural, the “correct” spelling for this chord-tone of the vii\(^{o}\) harmony to C major (becoming outright V7 with the cello’s g in 67), our new key (to be confirmed in the forthcoming cadence), and the previous c# and g# have now been adjusted down to conform to the new key as well.\(^{144}\)

I would submit, however, that the second portion of this phrase is better read as five measures instead of three, which provides a nine-measure basic phrase:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>67</th>
<th>68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic meas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for this is that the modulation being effected is not to be hurried even in the basic phrase. We should be reminded that if the basic phrase should be seven here, two extra measures should create a sort of awkwardness to the “felt” length of the phrase. In this case, the five measures – themselves a sort of 4+1 in terms of the prolonged dominant harmony and the melodic f, both finally resolving at 68, with the outset of the next phrase – seem entirely appropriate, though not in comparison with the structure of other phrases the length of four or five measure (64-68 are not, after all, the full phrase) but in terms of its relationship to the rest of the phrase, with its four (plus two) antecedent length of 58-63 also prolonging dominant harmony.\(^{145}\)

Phrase \(f\), 68-71

The following musical example (example 9) presents two phrases, \(f\) and \(f^2\):

\(^{144}\) It may also be said that this modulation is by way of fully-diminished pivot, as the \(V_b9/A\) also contains the vii\(^{o}\)/C. This reading would be impeded if bar 64 were taken as an actual dominant harmony, with the conspicuous adjustment of g# to g, although it might still be said that the suggestion of this sort of relationship is still present.

\(^{145}\) As mentioned, it would be inappropriate to compare the structure of 64-68 with those of the shorter phrases. A more pertinent comparison would be to phrase \(e\) (51-57) with regard – ironically – to its antecedent part (51-54) consisting of four measures of prolonged dominant harmony as well.
Measures 68-75 are slightly challenging in determining whether they comprise a single phrase or two four-bar phrases (forming today’s textbook-definition “parallel period”). The slur markings which cross the bar-line between measures 71 and 72 are an argument to support the single-phrase view. However, each segment of four certainly contains enough harmonic motion to establish a full unit, and these units do sound complete (obviously not so totally complete as ending on I). The slurs turn out to serve another important purpose, in facilitating the connection of these phrases, making the modulation back to A major (through a minor) more subtle as it is taking place (initially sounding as vi/C). Phrase $f$, therefore, is a four-measure V-phrase.\textsuperscript{146}

Phrase $f^2$, 72-75

This phrase closely resembles 68-71, but in a minor. In addition, the cadential formula, in the last two bars of the phrase, is adjusted (though not the melody) to present a stronger gesture: (74-75) $i^6 - ii_{4}^{04} - i^6_{4} - V$, versus the former (70-71) $I^6 - V^6 - I - V$. Furthermore, it is

\textsuperscript{146} Phrases $f$ and $f^2$ do form what most textbooks today call the “parallel period,” as do phrases $b$ and $b^2$ (27-35). It is only brought up in reference to the present phrases in elucidating the interpretive challenge of 68-75 as one or two phrases (whereas the distinction of $b$ and $b^2$ as separate phrases was never called into question).
tempting to view this as a five-measure elided phrase, with an authentic cadence culminating in bar 76. However, the break between 75 and 76 is quite clear – the melody does not run over between these bars – and the parallel nature of phrases $f$ and $f^2$ makes this interpretation more natural.

Phrase $g$, 76-81

This next example also presents two phrases, $g$ and $g^2$:

Example 11: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 76-90 (reduction).

This V-phrase (as well as the next) perfectly illustrates Beethoven’s capitalizing on the interplay between four-measure and eight-measure phrases to affect a slower or faster hypermeter, which will be discussed specifically below as a key feature of this movement. This phrase is an awkward six measures in length, and not merely because of its length. The phrase lacks a clear sense of consistent rhythmic drive, almost herky-jerky in the drastic slowing of 78-79 followed by a drastic quickening with the pickup to 81. The melodic and harmonic motion
might have been clearly and logically set in terms of either four or eight measures in a great number of manners, including the following.\textsuperscript{147}

Example 12a-b: Plausible 4- & 8-measure configurations for mm. 76-81.

(a) 8-measure configuration (melody & bass-line):

(b) 4-measure configuration (melody & bass-line):

Once again, this phrase shall be taken up further in the final comments of this chapter.

Phrase \( g^2 \), 82-90e

Like the preceding phrase, this elided phrase shows a clear break of the phrase’s “tempo” in measures 84-87. These measures could have continued the same pitches in half the value – and the following bars (88-89) could have doubled the values of their pitches.\textsuperscript{148} The result would be an elided nine-bar phrase – just as it appears in literal length, but with a very different construction from the current one:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{cccccccc}
Measure & 82 & 83 & 84 & 85 & 86 & 87 & 88 & 89 & 90 \\
Basic meas. & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{147} These could be exchanged for one another simply by halving and doubling the rhythmic values of the pitches – this has been given thus to show two slightly different possibilities also set alternatively as four or eight bars.

\textsuperscript{148} There are other ways to speculate on the rhythmical-metrical happenings here, such as the appearance of 84-87 as an expansion of 78-79, which would make for a fairly different interpretation. What seems clear is that Beethoven has (intentionally) upset the temporal drive of his piece. What this author suggests is that it is self-evidently not random.
Furthermore, this phrase is the last “real” phrase of the Exposition, and as such ends with a cadential formula (perfect authentic, end of “period”), one that Koch would actually label as a cadence. But since there are appendices added to strengthen the cadence, only the last one is really considered as the true cadence-ending.

Phrase $h$, 90-94e; Phrase $h$, 94-98e; Phrase $i$, 98-104e

Example 13: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 90-104 (reduction).
Measures 90-104 contain three phrases, all elided, and all serving the primary purpose of strengthening the arrival into the dominant key area. Phrase $h$ is a tidy five measures in length with the simple, regular motion I – IV – ii – V – I. It is elided into the next phrase\textsuperscript{149}, essentially a repetition of $h$, which then is also elided into phrase, $i$. However, the cadence in 98 shall be considered the formal cadence to the period since, as indicated below, phrase $i$ should not be properly considered a true phrase. It might be mentioned that although the table given later shall indicate the ending as “A: cadence,” Koch would call this a “V-cadence” (full cadence in the secondary key).

Measures 98-104, as just mentioned, can hardly be called a phrase. This segment is no more than a cadential extension, although still based on a basic five-measure unit, bars 98-102, with its own extension of three measures (still totaling seven measures because of an elision of its interior fragments). This segment brings about the close of the Exposition, or Koch’s first main period.

It might be argued that in terms of Koch phrase $i$ should not even be considered as an individual entity, but, instead, that the phrase beginning in 94 should include these measures as an extension. In other words, after phrase $h$ of 90-94e should be phrase $h^2$ of 94-104e, this latter phrase with a basic length of five measures with 98-104e as an extension (appendix) – the basic portion of the phrase even elided with its extension. This interpretation is in fact entirely appropriate. I have chosen merely to separate 98-104e because the repetition 90-94e is more clearly shown, as well as the fact that 98-104e can stand as a separate unit (though weakly) in terms of its harmonic content, length and its unique melodic material.

\textsuperscript{149} This is a case (as first mentioned regarding phrase $b$ in 27-31 / 31-35) where the elision of phrases is in their sharing of temporal space and not specific melodic tones. Although the melodic lines may not begin until the triplet 16\textsuperscript{th}. notes leading to 91 and 95, the downbeat of the phrases are 90 and 94 (to illustrate crudely, if one were keeping beat of strong beats with his foot he might begin with beat 1 of each measure; asked to augment this feeling to the level of every other bar, the foot would beat on measures 90, 92, 94, etc.).

This segment, more than any other in the movement, is not a true phrase. These measures serve only as a short link between the end of the Exposition and the beginning of the Development section (in 108), with which its cadence is elided. Harmonically this “phrase” is quite necessary, as it renders the modulation: the Exposition ended as expected, but the Development shall begin straight away in the slightly surprising key of d minor – not surprising as the parallel minor to the tonic key, but in that a considerable amount of effort was expended to prepare the listener for the dominant key of A.


Phrase $a^3$, 108-122
This phrase, the start of the Development section, is based on the original theme (phrase \textit{a}): measures 108-116 contain the equivalent melody of the opening nine bars of the movement, but in the minor mode. But at 116, a deceptive cadence occurs (the e\# from m9 = f-natural!), and the music turns to a B\textsubscript{b} tonal center, with a wandering melody that extends (reinforces the establishment of) B\textsubscript{b}, with a cadence at 122. The structure of this phrase is:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{cccccccccccc}
Basic meas. & anacrus. & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & (inserted) & 8 & 9 \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Phrase \textit{c}, 123-126

Example 16: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 123-126 (reduction).

This phrase (\textit{c}) is the same as measures 36-39, but in B\textsubscript{b}.

Phrase \textit{c}\textsuperscript{3}, 127-134e

This phrase, its material taken from \textit{c}, is eight bars in length only because segments are essentially repeated (transposed). Taken originally from four measures and elided with the next phrase, the structure is:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{cccccccc}
Measure & 127 & 128 & 129 & 130 & 131 & 132 & 133 & 134 \\
Basic meas. & 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 3 & 4 \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

This phrase also moves the music into the new key of g minor.
Example 17: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 127-134 (score).

Phrase k, 134-138e; Phrase k, 138-142e

Example 18: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 134-142 (reduction).
With these simple, elided five-measure phrases of 134-138 and 138-142, the music achieves a heightened intensity, with more agitated melodic material and faster modulations. Each phrase serves to modulate up a step, and as the second $k$ picks up where first leaves off, the end result is a move from g minor in 134 to b minor (through a minor) in 138.

Phrase $k^2$, 142-150e

Example 19: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 142-150 (reduction).

This phrase utilizes the basic material from $k$, minus the triplet figures, to move even more quickly now through the key areas of b minor (two bars), G major (two bars), and finally to f# minor, where its half cadence is elided with the next phrase. The texture of this phrase might be described as polyphonic, or perhaps better yet as a duet between the violins, who together carry what would probably be considered the melody. In this regard, the melodic content of this phrase seems only barely to constitute an actual phrase, its shape lacking a certain sense of real direction, and being more in the vein of spinning out the momentum of what has been building
while traversing these key areas before arriving at a half-cadence ending (which itself will be elaborated and strengthened in 150-157).

Phrase $l$, 150-157

Example 20: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 150-157 (reduction).

Another segment that lacks the substance of a true phrase, phrase $l$ simply prolongs the dominant harmony of the half-cadence, initially announced at the end of the previous phrase (150), and elided with this one. Still, it should be pointed out that this segment is constructed in terms of two bars essentially repeated plus four more measures, two of which serve to give a final added push to the ending and two that hold out the final tone of the ending, or:

$$4 (=2 \times 2) + 4 (=2 + 2)$$

This phrase, in common with phrase $i$, might have been interpreted as an appendix to phrase $k^2$, but due to mainly the same reasons as $i$ has been taken as a separate segment. Here, by
separating l, the relationship of k and k^2 can be made more clearly, and 150-157 stand as a separate unit in terms of its harmonic content, length and its unique melodic material.

Phrase \(a^4\), 158-167

Example 21: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 158-167 (reduction).

With this new version of phrase \(a\), which brings in the Recapitulation section, one might begin to wonder if the theme will ever again appear in its original form. In its two-bar anacrusis, the c# in the cello – the root of the V/f# ending of the preceding phrase – unexpectedly becomes the third of a new V7 chord to affect the abrupt return to D major. The melody is altered from the opening theme, beginning in vln II, taken up by vln I, and ending with a downward appoggiatura instead of the original upward one. Moreover, this phrase ends on b minor harmony (vi) – presenting a seeming deceptive cadence. This cadence turns out to be doubly deceptive, as the cadential tonic resolution still does not follow but instead the music veers off into the key of G major. I suppose that in reference to the following phrase, one might offer the possibility of referring to this phrase as a iii-phrase, but this is a real stretch.\(^{150}\) Rather, it is simply heard as a vi-ending (deceptive), with the typical eventual resolution to tonic absent (the

---

\(^{150}\) Initially one might assume that Koch would not approve of any designation as a iii-phrase, but recall that Koch did allow for the rare ending on IV, leading to the speculation that perhaps he would allow for other (open) endings.
deceptive cadence normally serves to delay a tonic resolution), supplanted by an immediate change of tonal center in the next phrase.

Phrase $a^5$, 168-182c


Here is yet another version of the theme, this phrase perhaps more resembling $a^2$ than it does the original in terms of its structure. It shares with the earlier phrase its harmonic motion in the first several measures – although utilizing a different version of the melody – as well as the location of its extension, following the fifth bar; also in common is the length of the basic phrase, nine measures, and its elided ending. The most significant difference besides its different quality of ending, on a half cadence, is that this phrase modulates back to D major. For sake of comparison, here is the structure of $a^2$ (11-27), followed by that of the current $a^5$ (168-182):
Table 8: Phrase Construction of Phrase $a_2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>vii$^6$</td>
<td>I$^6$</td>
<td>vii$^6$/ii</td>
<td>ii$^6$ (prolonged $\rightarrow$)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>I$^6_4$ (ii$^6$-)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic meas.</td>
<td>anacus.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>extension</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Phrase Construction of Phrase $a_5$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>168</th>
<th>169</th>
<th>170</th>
<th>171</th>
<th>172</th>
<th>173</th>
<th>174</th>
<th>175</th>
<th>176</th>
<th>177</th>
<th>178</th>
<th>179</th>
<th>180</th>
<th>181</th>
<th>182</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>V$^7$</td>
<td>I$^6$</td>
<td>ii$^6$</td>
<td>to D major:</td>
<td>vii$^6_7$</td>
<td>I$^6$</td>
<td>vii$^6_7$</td>
<td>vii$^6_7$/V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic meas.</td>
<td>anacus.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>extension</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noteworthy is the fact that the modulation in $a_5$ actually takes place in the extension (parenthesis) itself: this extension seems to be obviously necessary. However, as the function of 174 is reinterpreted in 178, with both harmonies essentially on A, the extension can now be seen as “dispensable”; i.e. the a-minor harmony of 174 can be exchanged (omitted) for that of the $^6_7$ of D, and this taken as a simple pivot into the key of D major.

Measures 182-239 are identical to measures 51-108, but down a perfect fifth, meaning that these phrases (e through j) are generally centered around the D major instead of A major.

Phrase $a_6$, 239-247e

Example 23: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 239-247 (reduction).

![Example 23: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 239-247 (reduction).]

This phrase begins as did $a_3$ (but for a fifth lower), which was the start of the Development section. Here in g minor, it breaks with the earlier phrase after the seventh
measure and appears as if it will stay in this key (unlike $a^3$, which modulated), perhaps even produce the ending for a I-phrase. However, another “unresolved” deceptive cadence takes place and immediately moves to the key of Eb major, the ending being elided with the next phrase which picks up this key. The structure is really based on the original theme of two plus eight measures, but with the elided cadence, the last measure is really lopped off altogether. Therefore, the basic phrase (after the anacrusis) for this is actually eight measures, although appearing as only seven here.

Phrase $f$, 247-250

Example 24 presents two phrases, $f$ and $f^3$:


This phrase is almost exactly the same as measures 68-71, but in the key of Eb major. The caesura tone of deceptive cadence to the preceding phrase becomes the immediate point of departure for the new key, with the submediant harmony of g minor immediately reinterpreted as the tonic.

Phrase $f^3$, 251-255e

This phrase functions as the consequent phrase of this eight-measure period (in the modern sense of period), as did $f^2$ before. But it differs from that earlier phrase in two significant respects. First, it effects the final modulation back to the main key, D major (from Eb major).
Second, as phrase $f^2$ was tempting to regard as five measures elided with its following phrase, this phrase truly is just that: a five-bar elided phrase, observable particularly in consideration of the cello and vln I voices sounding the tonic on the down-beat of 255 before falling silent (i.e., these tones on the downbeat of 255 have no relation to the following phrase, and so must be viewed in terms of the current one).

Phrase $a^7$, 255-269

Example 25: Op. 18, no. 3, mm. 255-269 (score).

This final phrase is indeed a remarkable one. Confirming that the theme was to never again be heard in its original form, this final installment goes beyond any of the other derivations
from phrase $a$ by placing what was the anacrusis into the phrase proper: the rising a-g is again in a predominant melodic position, but now initiated with tonic harmony (and immediate forward thrust). The second violin states the four-measure melodic opening, with the cello restating in stretto, and when the first violin answers also, it alters the melody in order to set up the next segment to begin on the dominant. Therefore, the structure of this phrase sees measures 255-262 as essentially four measures expanded through this stretto technique, followed by four measures expanded into seven (two expanded to four plus two expanded to three):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>255</th>
<th>256</th>
<th>257</th>
<th>258</th>
<th>259</th>
<th>260</th>
<th>261</th>
<th>262</th>
<th>263</th>
<th>264</th>
<th>265</th>
<th>266</th>
<th>267</th>
<th>268</th>
<th>269</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic meas.</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>5 (prolonged)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the interplay of four/five- versus eight/nine-measure phrases is in full swing with this phrase, as the four-bar segment used initial stretto is constructed so that it could even be taken as an elided five-measure phrase, with its entries in violin II, cello, and violin I ending on tonic, but the last entry in violin one ending with a half-cadence. However, the more proper interpretation of this phrase is indeed the extended eight (as shown above), which is itself an augmentation of four bars in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>255</th>
<th>256</th>
<th>257</th>
<th>258</th>
<th>259</th>
<th>260</th>
<th>261</th>
<th>262</th>
<th>263</th>
<th>264</th>
<th>265</th>
<th>266</th>
<th>267</th>
<th>268</th>
<th>269</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic meas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>extension</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>extension</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further discussion of the phrasing of this movement will take place after a closer look at its larger formal structure. But before leaving this portion, the following table is provided, summarizing the phrase structure as detailed above: displayed is each phrase’s label (Ph., e.g., $a$, $e^2$), measures in the movement (Measures), the literal length of the phrase (L), the distilled basic length of the phrase stripped of extraneous material (BL), the phrase type as determined by its
ending (Type (ending)), and any comments. Phrase types include “cadence” (per Koch, perfect authentic cadence at the end of a major period), “I-phr” (interior phrase with imperfect authentic cadence), “I-phr(p.a.)” (interior phrase with perfect authentic cadence), and “V-phr” (half cadence). Any deviations from these should be referred to the discussion of the phrase in question. An “e” after measure numbers indicates that the phrase ending is elided with the following phrase (the “m” of 45-51 indicates this segment’s beginning and ending in mid-measure). Of course, information contained on this table should be taken on with consideration of the written comments on each phrase above. Parenthesis around phrase-labels denotes the phrase is not a “true” phrase in substance (refer to the discussion above). And, as a for the benefit of the reader, especially in view of the forthcoming discussion of the larger form, the sectional breakdown is also indicated for Exposition (with smaller divisions), Development, and Recapitulation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Ph.</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>Type (ending)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPOSITION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>D: I-phr</td>
<td>2 bar anacrusis + 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a'</td>
<td>11-27e</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>D: I-phr(p.a.)</td>
<td>2 bar anacrusis + 9, w/ extension (parenthesis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>27-31e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>D: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>36-39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c'</td>
<td>40-45e</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4e</td>
<td>a: I-phr</td>
<td>phrase c in bm, last 2 bars repeated in am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>m45-m51e</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(2e)</td>
<td>a: V</td>
<td>a link; 2 bars repeated twice, offset metrically by ½ a bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>51-57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A: I-phr(p.a.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e'</td>
<td>58-68e</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>C: I-phr</td>
<td>structure: 1-2-3-4-3-4, 5-6-7-8-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>68-71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f'</td>
<td>72-75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>a: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>76-81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>A: V-phr</td>
<td>could be viewed from four or eight bars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g'</td>
<td>82-90e</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>A:(cadence)</td>
<td>constructed w/ combination of augmentation/diminution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>90-94e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>A: cadence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>94-98e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>A: cadence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>98-104e</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(5e)</td>
<td>A: cadence</td>
<td>an extension to the cadence, 5 + extension (appendix)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j)</td>
<td>104-108e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>d: V</td>
<td>a modulatory link to Development (no real structure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a^3</td>
<td>108-122</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bb:I-phr(p.a.)</td>
<td>w/ insertion (parenthesis): establishes/reinforces Bb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>123-126</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bb:I-phr</td>
<td>same as 36-39, but in Bb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c^3</td>
<td>127-134e</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4e</td>
<td>g: I-phr(p.a.)</td>
<td>structure: 1-2-1-2, 3-4-3-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>134-138e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>a: I-phr(p.a.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>138-142e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>b: I-phr(p.a.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k^3</td>
<td>142-150e</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>f#: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l)</td>
<td>150-157</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>f#: V</td>
<td>essentially a cadential extension, 4(2x2) + 4(2+2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECAPITULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a^4</td>
<td>158-167</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>D: (vi-phr)</td>
<td>deceptive cadence (non-resolved)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a'</td>
<td>168-182e</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D: V-phr</td>
<td>w/ extension (parenthesis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>182-188</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D: I-phr(p.a.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e'</td>
<td>189-199e</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>F: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>199-202</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f'</td>
<td>203-206</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>d: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>207-212</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>D: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g'</td>
<td>213-221e</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>D:(cadence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>221-225e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>D:(cadence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>225-229e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>D: cadence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>229-235e</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(5e)</td>
<td>D: cadence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CODA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a^6</td>
<td>239-247e</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8e</td>
<td>g: (VI-phr)</td>
<td>basic phrase, 8(-1)e; deceptive cadence (non-resolved)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>247-250</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eb: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f'</td>
<td>251-255e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>D: I-phr(p.a.)</td>
<td>consequent phrase to f, but unlike f' , five measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a'</td>
<td>255-269</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>D: cadence</td>
<td>anacrusis now part of basic phrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structure of Larger Form

The larger formal structure of this sonata-form movement divides as follows, (using modern terminology):

Table 11a-b, Larger Structure: Op. 18, No. 3, Mvt. I, 269 Bars

(a) Larger sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-104</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>104 bars</td>
<td>(a, a^2, b, b, c, c^2, d, e, e^2, f, f^2, g, g^2, h, h, i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104-108</td>
<td>Bridge to Development</td>
<td>5 bars</td>
<td>(j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108-157</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>50 bars</td>
<td>(a^3, c, c^3, k, k^2, l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158-235</td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>78 bars</td>
<td>(a^4, a^5, e, e^2, f, f^2, g, g^2, h, h, i^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235-239</td>
<td>Bridge to Coda</td>
<td>5 bars</td>
<td>(j^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239-269</td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>31 bars</td>
<td>(a^6, f, f^2, a^7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*182-239 \((e-j)\) a fifth lower from original phrases

(b) Division of the Exposition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-35</td>
<td>First Group</td>
<td>35 bars</td>
<td>(a, a^2, b, b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-68</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>32 bars</td>
<td>(c, c^2, d, e, e^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-90</td>
<td>Second Group</td>
<td>23 bars</td>
<td>(f, f^2, g, g^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-104</td>
<td>Codetta</td>
<td>15 bars</td>
<td>(h, h, i)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before a comparison of this movement to Koch’s first-movement allegro description is undertaken, it must be recalled that his detailed description came in the context of his discussion of the symphony. The quartet is a type of sonata, the melody of which, because of its fewer parts than a symphony, “must be extremely developed and must present the finest nuances of feelings,” as compared to the more forceful and energetic symphony.\(^{151}\) Koch does, though,
expressly regard the sonata genres as utilizing the same basic forms as the symphony, and specifically cites the first-movement allegro as a prime example. And so, as much as they have in common (that is, the sonata genres and the symphony) regarding “the number of periods and the course of modulation,” they differ on “the inner nature of the melody.” Unfortunately, little on the latter distinction can be described, “being better felt,” with the exception that the sonata more commonly has phrase endings which, due to their own clarity, more plainly demarcate phrases from one another, whereas the symphony contains more extensions and techniques of linking the phrases in such a way as to disguise their actual ending points.

Given Koch’s comments, making an analytical distinction of Beethoven’s Op. 18 quartet from Koch’s first-movement allegro of a symphony would prove virtually impossible for a plurality of reasons. First, the point given just above highlights more of a distinction in degree than much of anything that is quantifiable – the general structure of the two remains the same. Second, that singular point is the only firm distinction Koch makes between sonata and symphony – all other distinguishing traits are relegated to “feeling.” A third reason is that in Koch’s description of the quartet itself, he notes an emerging “modern” style, exemplified in the works of Haydn, Pleyel, Hoffmeister, and Mozart, with Mozart’s “Haydn quartets” representing the pinnacle to date. His mention of these four composers is an indication of the consideration he had for newer works \(^{152}\) – even if their strategies were not yet able to be fully assimilated into his theories. As a result, the description given in the *Versuch* \(^{153}\) provides no further information to firmly distinguish this modern style of quartet writing, except to say that it is not according to the older fugal style (and thus better corresponds to the symphonic description).

\(^{152}\) Cf Baker, 207 footnote regarding Hoffmeister and Pleyl.

\(^{153}\) Koch’s entry on the quartet is quoted in full at the end of my preceding chapter.
Regarding the main sections of the Opus 18, no. 3, first movement – the Exposition, Development, Recapitulation (and Coda), as seen in Table 10 – their structure (and structures) are consistent with Koch’s description of the first-movement allegro (as detailed in Chapter 2), with one important exception: the Coda, which shall be taken up further with the consideration of the Recapitulation. Each section of the movement shall now be given a closer look.

The Exposition section lasts from measure 1 (there is no introductory passage) to 104. Chapter 2 illustrated how the modern concept of the Exposition is synonymous with what Koch called the first main period of the movement, and we shall see how this correspondence holds true in this movement.\textsuperscript{154} According to Koch, this section should take us to the repeat sign and end in the secondary key (typically the “key of the fifth” – the dominant). This movement does fulfill these criteria, with the addition of a short bridge (or “link”) from 104-108 before the repeat sign, falling after the last cadence and functioning to transform the key so as to allow the Development to begin in the unexpected key of d minor.

As for the interior arrangement of the Exposition, Table 11(b) shows the locations of first group, transition, second group, and codetta. I have chosen the term “group” rather than “theme” because each group may comprise more than one melodic idea which themselves may or may not always appear together. It is possible that Koch’s use of the term “theme” stems from his conception of it in terms of a single phrase, originally. In his description of the first-movement allegro of the symphony, though, he remarks that one way in which it differs from the sonata and the concerto is that “its melodic sections tend to be more extended already with their first presentation than in other compositions.” Here, the use of the phrase “melodic sections” rather

\textsuperscript{154} For discussion of the music, the reader should, of course, refer to a score; but referring to the table of phrases above might also be of use.
than “phrases” may indicate that these sections may actually contain more than one literal phrase, as opposed to merely the technique of extension to a single phrase.¹⁵⁵

In Chapter 2, Koch’s description of the first main period (the Exposition) was summarized with the following table (with the term “group” now added to the earlier “theme”):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“1st main phrase” →</th>
<th>“2nd main phrase” →</th>
<th>“3rd main phrase” →</th>
<th>“clarifying period”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“rushing and sonorous phrases” →</td>
<td>“more singing phrase” (modulates)</td>
<td>“appendix” to main period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key area: I</td>
<td>I – V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[first theme/group]</td>
<td>[transition]</td>
<td>[second theme/group]</td>
<td>[codetta]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this period, the Exposition, “the main melodic phrases are presented in their original order,” meaning the first theme/group, the transition, and the second theme/group. While it would appear that the codetta is not considered among the “main melodic phrases” since it is merely an “appendix” or “clarifying period,” it is not excluded from any of the later potential treatment of phrases in the movement, and is clearly included in the Recapitulation; and so, there are four of these main melodic phrases.

The partitioning of the Exposition of this quartet movement indeed falls in line with this description. The phrases of the first group \((a, a'^2, b, b)\) are related by the uniform key and a shared melodic motive (the opening minor seventh upward leap from \(a\) to \(g\) now in two other forms in \(a'^2\): the cello’s minor seventh leap from \(d\) to \(c\), and the first violin’s upward leap to \(g\) from \(d\); all of these are in the rhythm of two whole notes). The transition (phrases \(c, c'^2, d, e, e'^2\)) takes on a different character, but, more significantly, has the modulatory feature of moving somewhat rapidly through the key areas of D major, a minor, A major, and, finally, C major.

¹⁵⁵ I suspect that Koch’s conception of these extended melodies includes both the former and the latter.
(with authentic cadences in these tonalities). Then begins a clearly new section, the second group \((f, f^2, g, g^2)\) – Koch’s third main phrase – though still in C major, not finally reaching the dominant key area of a (first minor, then major) until the second phrase. The closing group comprises material whose main function is to strengthen the cadence in and establish the dominant key, A-major. Thus, the sections are indeed well-defined, and function according to the description given by Koch, with two possible exceptions: first, the full arrival of the dominant key being held until the second phrase of the second group; second, the length of the Exposition from the beginning of the second group to the end is actually not longer than that which precedes it, as Koch suggested, although with such a suggestion (and that made virtually in passing) it is plausible to think that he may have not been exceptionally dogmatic about it.\(^\text{156}\)

Between the Exposition and Development lies an elided five-bar “phrase,” though these five block chords (one per measure) separated by rests do not compose a true phrase. Moreover, there is no melodic content whatsoever and the segment essentially lies outside the larger structure of the movement. Its sole purpose is to add a certain temporal character to the modulation to d minor that allowed Beethoven to retain both the given ending of the Exposition and beginning of the Development, and without adding any further meaning or distraction – a technique which falls altogether outside the scope of Koch’s description.

It must be acknowledged that even with this distinctive characterization of “phrase” \(j\), it is not lacking in internal connection with the rest of the movement. Not just a random sampling of chords, the countrapuntal activity has the bass line ascending chromatically from A to C# even

\(^{\text{156}}\) In this specific regard, two observations are to be made: 1) if one simply recognizes the place from where the tonic key is departed as the point of division (bar 40, which leads to an imperfect authentic cadence in m45 in the first new tonal area, a minor), then the second “half” is indeed longer than the first; 2) if the point of demarcation were placed at the first authentic cadence in A major, this would be m57, a bit closer to the true halfway point. Even so, Koch’s indication in the Versuch is that from the “third main phrase” to the end this “main period” (the Exposition) is a greater length than that of the first two “main phrases.”
as the A major tonic is quickly transformed into V7 of D (to be an even more unexpected minor mode of d). In the midst of all this, the minor seventh motif plays out in the top line, with the charter pitch-classes a and g. These appear to bring us full circle (prematurely), leading into precisely the same anacrusis to start the Development as that which began the movement.

The Development section – Koch’s second main period – begins, then, not in the dominant key but in the minor tonic (d minor). The reader may wish to refer back to the discussion in Chapter 2 of the Versuch’s description of the Development section in regard to the two different ways it is treated by composers: one with several of the main melodic phrases altered and recombined in a journey through different key areas, the other with an emphasis on the development of particular melodic material (such as a single phrase). It is the latter which Koch considers to be more modern.

This Development section by Beethoven matches up with Koch’s account in rather interesting fashion. It might be mentioned that the section is short: 50 measures of the movement’s 269 (104 for the Exposition and 112 for the Recapitulation plus Coda). True, this in itself has nothing to do with Koch’s description, as he made no strict observations regarding the length of this second “main period”; but it may be a symptom (i.e., a result) of another significant feature that is somewhat skewed to Koch’s description: the Development of this movement is more than anything based on the minor seventh motive, which in the Versuch is not accounted for – except for possibly the mention of “often only a segment” of a phrase being taken for development. Even that remark is not likely to be referring to the type of motivic development seen here. For one, Koch does not imply a distinctive technique, which motivic development is; second, motivic development was not a common practice until the time of Beethoven.
Beginning in the key of the minor tonic (d minor), the Development brings out a modified (and unpaired) a phrase ($a^3$, mm. 108-122) that moves to the key of bVI (Bb major), followed by two c phrases, the first a transposition (to Bb) of the original and the second a new modified version ($c^3$) that cadences at m134 in the minor subdominant (g minor). After these, what appears to be entirely new melodic material is introduced, in a minor, with phrase $k$ (134-138), which is repeated a step higher (b minor) and then significantly modified in $k^2$ (142-150) so as to provide a half cadence in the key of iii ($f#$ minor). Closer inspection reveals, however, that the minor-seventh idea is present in many forms. It occurs in phrase c in the upper voice somewhat inconspicuously in m125, but soon becomes the outer range of the triplet figures passed among the upper three parts, in phrase $c^5$. The triplet range changes to a diminished seventh at 137, temporally offset from a prominent minor-seventh leap in the cello, and first violin melody finds its bold conclusion (before the added material of the cadential extension beginning in m150) in the downward leap of a diminished seventh to the leading tone of C#.

Beethoven also forgoes the “short passage” as described in the Versuch (the retransition in modern terminology) in lieu of an abrupt common-tone modulation on c#, as the root of the dominant of f# and the third of the dominant of D (the leading tone of the key).

The Recapitulation to Opus 18, no. 3, now “returns” to a closer adherence to Koch’s description, although that description was the least detailed of any of the three “main periods.” Again, the third main period of Koch’s treatise is “devoted above all to the main key,” typically begins with the theme, and contains the “most prominent phrases… now compressed.” Furthermore, in repeating the material from the first main period an upward shift of a fourth

---

157 Another point of comparison: this key area would not fit with Koch’s first description of the period. While the second description technically leaves room for any key here, none others are mentioned for what would be a significant departure from the first description, and so it is safe to assume that Koch had in mind a dominant key area for the beginning of the second method of treatment as well.
takes place, allowing the material which was previously heard in the dominant key to now be in the tonic.

This current movement is indeed devoted almost entirely to the tonic key, with the 58 measures that ended the Exposition transposed, in measures 182-239, exactly down a fifth (up a fourth) in order to remain faithful to the tonic, aside from the excursion of phrases $e^2$ and $f$ (measures 58-61 and 189-202), which modulated to tonal centers up a third and back at both locations. The first melodic idea of the Recapitulation (from m158) is heard in modified fashion, phrases $a^4$ and $a^5$, but no further material brought forward from the Exposition deviates from its original hearing outside of transposition.

For Koch, the movement would now be over, but this quartet movement has 30 bars remaining: the Coda. Koch does not mention a Coda, as an appendix to the Recapitulation nor as a distinctive section. This is, therefore, another major point of departure between the Versuch and the Opus 18, no. 3, first movement (not to mention much of the music of the rest of the nineteenth century). Simply continuing his transposed repetition of the material ending the Exposition right on into the bridge (from 104-108), Beethoven begins this coda at just the place relative to where he had began the development, and even commences with another modification to the $a$ phrase. In this section no brand new material is introduced, but the phrases with which he began the first group and second group of the Exposition are modified, with the material from the second group sandwiched between two different $a$ phrases: $a^6, f, f^3, a^7$.

At this time I would like to provide some remarks about a most significant feature of this movement, specifically regarding its phrase rhythm. As shown in Table 10, there is great variety in the lengths of phrases, not only in terms of their literal spans but, more significantly, in the basic phrase-lengths, with phrases numbering four, five, seven, eight, and nine measures in
length. I would submit, and demonstrate, that by utilizing a combination of phrases that are rooted in four- and eight-measure lengths Beethoven is effecting an intentional – and clearly felt – slowing and speeding of the pace of motion to this movement, the tempo of the phrase rhythm. Moreover, the exchange between four and eight is not simply between a length and another twice as large, but explicitly four measures versus four augmented to eight, strengthening (and more precisely defining) the feeling of this fluctuation of tempo.

First, it must be understood that there are only two levels, or types, of phrase lengths to this movement: four and eight. Already stated, the elided phrases of five and nine measures lend themselves to a regular hypermetrical motion of four and eight measure intervals, even as the individual phrases “hang over” and overlap. Additionally, it has been explained for phrase e (the phrase of 7 bars) how the length of seven measures still reference the felt motion of eight. This issue will be given a bit more treatment shortly, as pertaining specifically to the phrase structure of this movement. Related to this, the repetition of phrase b (31-35), five measures not elided, is still associated with the four-measure norm, as the first b was an elided five, and the non-elision of measure 35 results in a perceivable hiccup to the regularity of the phrase rhythm (especially since it is not paired with another five-measure, non-elided phrase, as Koch would recommend).

The other abnormality to mention here is phrase c², whose basic length is an elided four measures. This can be set aside as well since its original form, c, was a normal non-elided four-bar phrase, and its caesura tone does not actually coincide with the beginning of the next phrase. It is the location of the next phrase (d) which upsets the normality of the phrasing by giving the impression of “jumping the gun” on its entrance, beginning in the middle of measure 45.

It was illustrated in the discussion of phrase a, 1-10, how its essential eight measures (following the two-bar anacrusis) are in actuality an augmentation of a basic phrase of four
measures. The melody and bass can be diminished to four bars easily and, even more, the
harmonic rhythm of the phrase in comparison to that of the literal four-bar-rooted phrases is
revealing. Here our comparison is expanded, beginning with phrases $a$ and $a^2$, of eight and nine
measures respectively (disregarding their anacruses):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>vii$^6$</td>
<td>I$^6$</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>I$^6_4$</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic m. (8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic m. (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>vii$^6$</td>
<td>I$^6$</td>
<td>vii$^6$/ii</td>
<td>ii$^6$(-IV) (prolonged $\rightarrow$)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>I$^6_4$</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic m. (8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>extension</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic m. (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* measures 23-24 could be taken as an anacrusis to basic measure “4,” with measure “3” only really on predominant
harmony.\footnote{This is strikingly similar to the relationship of measure 23 to 24 in the original eight-bar consideration, discussed
earlier.}

Here it can be seen that these reductions of eight and nine measure do provide active, but quite
plausible four- and five-measure phrases. Now consider the four-measure phrase that starts the
second group of the Exposition, phrase $c$, as well as the five-measure phrase, $h$, from the
Exposition’s codetta:
Observe that the harmonic rhythm these phrases express, representative of the other “shorter” phrases, is more akin to the larger phrases when those phrases are reduced than how they actually appear, as eight- or nine-bar phrases.

It should then be clarified that phrase b (27-31) offers no contradiction even though it is similar to phrase a not only in a shared motive but also in that, as noted earlier, its five bars contain a simple harmonic motion, I – V4/2/IV – IV6 – V6 – I, with one chord per measure. At first appearance it may seem like it has the slower type of motion that the eight- and nine-bar phrase have, but only a slightly closer comparison of their structures reveals that it is in fact nearly identical to the five-measure reduction of phrase a2.

It can also be added now that the seven-measure phrase is related to the eight-measure phrase as an augmented four – and not only in mere feeling, but in a plausible structural relationship – analogous to the nine-measure phrase being reduced to essentially five measures. In the cases of both seven and nine, their augmented phrases seem to leave off the last half of the
(shorter phrase’s) bar, because when augmented the final harmony of the cadence would last two measures.

Given all of this, I submit that the effect, very much intended, is that Beethoven has created another subtle level of tension within this movement by accelerating and slowing down the tempo (or pace) of phrases. Two more items should be brought out. First, the effect of changing the pace of phrases between four and eight measures does not necessitate that the eight-bar phrases actually be derived from the augmenting of four-measure phrases (and Koch allows for other methods of creating eight-bar phrases). Really, any eight-bar phrase would work for this (to a lesser degree), which is why it is an even more specialized technique taking place in this movement, one that better elicits the idea of literally stretching out these four measure phrases into eight, and heightens the ensuing tension.

Second, if there would be any doubt that this technique is quite consciously a compositional choice by Beethoven, measures 76-90 must put these doubts to rest. As noted above in the discussion of phrase g, measures 76-81 capitalize on this interplay of four- and eight- bar phrases by offering six measures whose melodic and harmonic content could have been presented in fact more logically in a phrase the length of either four or eight bars. As I stated above, the phrase in its current form is awkward, lacking a clear sense of rhythmic drive, almost herky-jerky in its slowing down of 78-79 and then speeding up with the pickup to 81. In the section above I even present two plausible versions of the phrase. In the phrase that follows this, \( g^2 \), nearly the exact opposite takes place: nine measures equals nine measures, but only by speeding up and slowing down in such fashion that it “just happens” to turn out at the end. Here again is the graph presented in the earlier discussion of this phrase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic meas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The measures according to the basic phrase line up such that its first four measures occupy six measures in the music, the latter five occupying just three. This takes place by the same means that the previous phrase was so awkwardly treated, and all of this demonstrates that Beethoven was well aware of the temporal relationships that he was manipulating in order to bring about a temporal tension (not fully resolved in this movement) in work. I would even suggest that these two phrases offer a rare window into the workshop of Beethoven’s practice regarding the temporal relationships of phrases.
CHAPTER 4

FURTHER REMARKS AND CONCLUSION

Having taken a detailed look at the first movement of Opus 18, no. 1, now briefer comments can be given for the other two movements mentioned in the opening portion of this document: the first movements of nos. 1 and 6. For the reader, a score will be necessary for this section.

Opus 18, No. 1, Mvt. I

Table 17 presents the phrase structure of the first movement of quartet no. 1. Space will not permit a great amount of detailing on this movement, but some revealing observations can certainly be made.

The primary motive for the entire movement is presented at the outset (mm1-2), by all four voices in unison (in two octaves):

Example 26: Primary motive for Op. 18, no.1, mvt. I.

This motive saturates the entire movement, phrases f and h being the only true phrases not based on it. Not only is this primary motive presented right from the start, but so too is another feature that drives this movement: a pounding metrical beat of two-measure segments, the first measure of which is strong, the second weak. This two-bar propulsion does deviate at times, in hemiola passages, silent pauses, and phrases whose departures from this norm are anything but subtle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Ph.</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>Type (Ending)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gp. 1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F: V-phr</td>
<td>m1, germinal motive for entire movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a'</td>
<td>9-20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F: I-phr</td>
<td>extended: 13-16 are an “insertion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brg</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>21-29e</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(9e)</td>
<td>F: I</td>
<td>BRIDGE to 2nd group, a weak phrase in terms of melody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>29-41e</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>Ab: I-phr</td>
<td>suggests I-phr in F for 9th bar, but appends deceptively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>41-49e</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>c: V-phr</td>
<td>(8-1) simply a cadential extension, 1 bar repeated x7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>49-55e</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>c: V</td>
<td>2-bar anacrusis to next phrase; also slows momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group 2</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>55-56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2e)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2-bar anacrusis to next phrase; also slows momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>57-60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C: vii\textsuperscript{vii}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f'</td>
<td>61-64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f''</td>
<td>65-68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>c: vii\textsuperscript{vii}7</td>
<td>slightly altered from 57-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f''</td>
<td>69-72e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>c: i-phr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td>72-84e</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>C: I-phr</td>
<td>2-bar momentum set aside during insertion (hemiola use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C: vii\textsuperscript{vii}</td>
<td>silent measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>89-92e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>92-95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>C: vii\textsuperscript{vii}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C: I-phr</td>
<td>silent measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td>97-101e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>C: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>101-109e</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(9e)</td>
<td>C: I</td>
<td>cad. ext.; primary mot.: in bass, from 30, now off-set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td>109-114</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>C: I prolonged I/C; hemiola use (similar to 78-81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l')</td>
<td>115-119e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(5e)</td>
<td>Bb: I</td>
<td>apparent deceptive cadence - modulation to Bb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a'</td>
<td>119-128</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>(Bb: vii\textsuperscript{vii}/vi)</td>
<td>*basic phrase cut off: basic mm. = 1-2-3-4-5-6-6-5-6-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>129-151e</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>bb: i-phr</td>
<td>129-34=1-6; 135-40=1-6; 141-46=1-6; 147-51=7-8-7-8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>151-159e</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>f: i-phr</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} half in bb, 2\textsuperscript{nd} half in f (through \textit{bII})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>159-167e</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>c: i-phr</td>
<td>C will become V/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(o)</td>
<td>167-178</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>F: V</td>
<td>dominant (of F) prolongation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>179-186</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>187-198e</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7(8)e</td>
<td>Gb: I-phr</td>
<td>basic mm. = 1-2-3-4-3-4-3-4-3-5-6-7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c''</td>
<td>198-210e</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>f: i-phr</td>
<td>207-210 = modulating appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>210-216e</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>F: V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>216-217e</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2e)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>218-221e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F: vii\textsuperscript{vii}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f'</td>
<td>222-225e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f''</td>
<td>226-229e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>f: vii\textsuperscript{vii}7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f''</td>
<td>230-233e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>f: i-phr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td>233-245e</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>F: I-phr</td>
<td>210-270 = 49-109, a fifth lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>245-248e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>F: vii\textsuperscript{vii}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>250-253e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>253-256e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>F: vii\textsuperscript{vii}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td>258-262e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>F: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>262-270e</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(9e)</td>
<td>F: I</td>
<td>slightly altered from original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td>270-274e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(4e)</td>
<td>F: I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(q)</td>
<td>274-281e</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>F: V</td>
<td>4 + 4, 4 voice unison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bridge</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>282-293e</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>(F: vii\textsuperscript{vii}/vi)</td>
<td>*basic phrase cut off after 6\textsuperscript{th} basic measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td>294-302e</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>F: I-phr</td>
<td>last 3 bars dually serve to complete phrase r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(t)</td>
<td>302-310e</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(9e)</td>
<td>F: I</td>
<td>prolonged I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(u)</td>
<td>310-313e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>F: I</td>
<td>prolonged I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phrase c (mm 29-41), which serves as the point of departure for the “transition,” is interesting in two respects. First, there is the question of where this phrase actually begins, which is related to the question of the metrical stress of the phrase: is measure 29 an anacrusis or part of the phrase proper? Is the strong metrical beat rightly “felt” on bar 29 or 30? At the arrival of measures 29/30 the stress is unclear. One clue might be from where the melodic figure itself comes. The bass figuration, of course, is the primary motive. The melodic figure, however, comes from mm. 17-18. Here, 17 is the strong bar, 18 the weak one, which would correspondingly suggest that measure 30 is strong, 29 being an anacrusis. This is corroborated by the placement of the primary motive in the bass, sounding every other bar from 30. However, the playing out of the phrase turns out the contrary view. The climbing melodic line brings strong emphases to the downbeats of bars 31, 33, and 35, with the descent from 35 to 37 hinting at a “felt” elided cadence on 37 (though it takes a deceptive turn at that point). This cadential implication has the effect of clarifying the phrase leading to it, as a supposed 9-bar elided phrase. Thus, measure 29, perhaps “introductory” in terms of the greater motion and melody of the phrase, is no anacrusis. It should also be observed that the primary motive, found here in the bass, was earlier heard in such a metrically “off-set” position in just the preceding phrase (mm21-29), and is even more prominently and clearly set in the phrase to follow (mm41-49).

The second aspect of this phrase that deserves mention was alluded to above, in that the phrase brings the listener to expect an elided cadence in bar 37, a cadence on the tonic in F. Instead, the cadence is deceptively put off – and not with the D-minor submediant, but with A-major V/vi. This propels a circle progression, A – d – G – c (V/vi – vi – V/V – v?), which at first seems a run-of-the-mill harmonic extension leading back to the cadence initially suggested. However, the Eb in bar 40 subverts the dominant, and Beethoven now uses a melodic role-
reversal to enact this common-tone modulation to Ab: whereas the melodic A in 37 was to have been the third of F harmony, becoming instead the root of the mediant harmony (V/vi), now the melodic C of 40, representing the root-dominant of F, becomes the third of the flat-mediant (Ab) harmony – and ensuing (short-lived) tonal center – in the next measure.

Regarding this latter aspect, Table 3 indeed reflects how Koch would render such a phrase: in regard to its length, it retains the basic-phrase consideration of 9 bars (elided); in regard to its ending, the cadence in Ab becomes the operative feature. This shows the essential function of the phrase and demonstrates the usefulness of Koch’s seemingly curious deliberation of such phrases where an appendix brings about a different ending than that of the original basic phrase: again, the phrase is considered according to its “original” length in relation to other phrases, but according to the new ending in regard to its quality and coherence with other phrases.

There are two simple 4-bar phrases in mm. 57-64. It is plausible to combine these as a single 8-bar phrase due to the viio ending at m60, but it is significant that these 4-bar units can stand as units, which, repeated, form simple parallel periods (for that matter, mm. 57-72 form an elementary 16-bar double period).

One noteworthy happening that takes place in the Development is in mm. 119-151. At 119, a phrase begins that is a derivative of the original a-phrase (mm1-8), but the phrase never completes. Not only does it fail to end in the fashion of anything like the original a, but as a phrase it is truncated after 128. The alignment of measures with their corresponding “basic” measures is thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score measure #</th>
<th>119</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>121</th>
<th>122</th>
<th>123</th>
<th>124</th>
<th>125</th>
<th>126</th>
<th>127</th>
<th>128</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of basic phrase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At m. 129 an altogether new phrase begins (though related motivically – few phrases in this movement are not!). But even this phrase is initially truncated after 6 bars, before restarting on another tonal level, and then again six bars later, finally to finish on its third attempt. Even the finishing three measures to this phrase is extended to five, so as to continue around the circle of fifths one additional time, the cadence not arriving until the ninth bar of the basic phrase (m151):

Table 18: Op. 18, No. 3, Mvt. I, mm. 129-151

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score measure #</th>
<th>129</th>
<th>130</th>
<th>131</th>
<th>132</th>
<th>133</th>
<th>134</th>
<th>135</th>
<th>136</th>
<th>137</th>
<th>138</th>
<th>139</th>
<th>140</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of basic phrase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality</td>
<td>dm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bbm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar incident takes place in the movement’s Coda, at mm. 282-302 “coincidentally” lopping off the initial phrase after the sixth “basic” measure, upon same harmony of vii°(7)/vi.

Like the first movement to no. 3, this movement contains a combination of 8-bar basic phrase-types and 4-bar basic phrase-types, begging the question: how can these phrase-lengths be viewed in relation to one another? Does Beethoven merely combine phrases whose “basic” lengths measure 4/5 bars with those of 8/9 bars, or are the longer lengths also an augmentation of the shorter? At least in terms of the harmonic underpinning, this question can be answered with some certainty. Looking closely at the 8/9-bar phrases, one finds that the harmony moves about every other measure, perhaps with a faster harmonic rhythm as the cadence is approached. On the other hand, the phrases numbering 4/5 bars have a harmonic rhythm of about every measure, often more rapid as the cadence is approached. In other words, the longer phrases have a
harmonic rhythm that is roughly twice as slow – and roughly the same types of overall motions are taking place. Therefore, it can be said from the standpoint of harmonic construction that indeed the longer phrases are augmentations of the shorter phrases, as opposed to merely being twice as long (from containing twice as much material).

Table 18(a-b) displays the large-scale breakdown of this movement as well as the parsing of the Exposition section.

Table 19a-b: Larger Structure: Op. 18, No. 1, Mvt. I, 313 bars
(a) Larger sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-114</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>114 bars</td>
<td>$a, a^2, b, c, c^2, d, e, f, f^2, f^3, g, h, i, h, j, k, l$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115-178</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>64 bars</td>
<td>$l^2, a^3, m, n, n, o$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179-274</td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>96 bars</td>
<td>$a, p, c^3, d, e, f, f^2, f, f^3, g, h, i, h, j, k, l^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274-281</td>
<td>Bridge to Coda</td>
<td>8 bars</td>
<td>$q$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282-313</td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>32 bars</td>
<td>$r, s, t, u$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 210-270 $(d-k)$ a fifth lower from original phrases

(b) Division of the Exposition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Phrases</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>First Group</td>
<td>20 bars</td>
<td>$a, a^2$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>Bridge to Transition</td>
<td>9 bars</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-55</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>27 bars</td>
<td>$c, c^2, d$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-84</td>
<td>Second Group</td>
<td>30 bars</td>
<td>$e, f, f^2, f, f^3, g$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-114</td>
<td>Closing Group</td>
<td>31 bars</td>
<td>$h, i, h, j, k, l$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This movement provides no interpretive challenges concerning the larger structure with regard to our discussion, as far as anything too different from the first movement of no. 3. Overall, the tonal dimensions may be considered a bit simpler: outside of a skirting diversion in
Gb major (phrase $p$, mm. 187-198), and another in $Ab$ major (not far-related at all to the home-key’s parallel minor), this F-major piece finds secondary and auxiliary tonal centers only in parallel major and minor keys on the dominant and subdominant degrees.

The main sections of this movement are roughly the same proportional lengths as those in no. 3, mvt. 1. However, the breakdown of the Exposition is a bit different, in two ways most notably. The first group here is simpler and shorter than that of the earlier piece, which may logically correlate to the fact that the overall melodic profile is significantly more direct and accessible from a listening standpoint, as well as the high degree of motivic saturation of this movement, compared with the more complex and longer-arching character of the melodic content for no. 3. The second difference is in their respective third groups: that in 3:i has been designated a “codetta” and extends 15 measures, while that in 1:i lasts 31 bars and is labeled as “closing group.” What these passages have in common is their lack of substantial new material or particularly strong melodic content: that of the latter (quartet no. 1) has more of it, and treats it in a more interesting fashion.

A minor point of interest, to contrast with the no. 3 opening, deals with the Coda. The codas to these pieces are nearly identical in length, 31 and 32 measures. But the Coda to no. 1 contains all-new material, whereas the Coda to the first movement of no. 3 has none, reusing earlier material from the movement. Still, Koch allowed for either technique (or their combination).

Opus 18, No. 6, Mvt. I

The briefest comments are reserved for this movement, the last of the set to be composed (and the simplest in design).
Table 20: Opus 18, No. 6, Mvt I (B♭ Major), Phrase Construction (with larger sections indicated):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Ph.</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>Type (ending)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>B♭: I-phr</td>
<td>*could be viewed as 3: mm. 1-5 = 1, 2, 3(-4), 2, 3(-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>6-18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B♭: V-phr</td>
<td>repetition &amp; appendix; mot. in metrically new position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>19-23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B♭: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b'</td>
<td>24-33e</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4e</td>
<td>C: I-phr</td>
<td>after repetition of bars 1-2, bar 3 is expanded to modulate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>33-37e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>C: I-phr</td>
<td>appendix added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c'</td>
<td>37-44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>C: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>45-48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d'</td>
<td>49-52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d''</td>
<td>53-56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F: III / A♭: I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d'''</td>
<td>57-64e</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4e</td>
<td>F: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>64-68e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>F: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e'</td>
<td>68-80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clo</td>
<td>b1</td>
<td>81-91e</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4e</td>
<td>F: I-phr</td>
<td>combines material from b and c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a'</td>
<td>91-102e</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>g: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a')</td>
<td>102-106e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>g: vii°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a''</td>
<td>106-110e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>g: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>110-113</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c''*</td>
<td>114-139</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>b♭: V</td>
<td>*or many elided variants of c, through g-F-E♭-Eb-D♭-bb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>140-174</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B♭: V</td>
<td>taken from h, dissolves into imitative gradual motion to V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>175-179</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B♭: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>180-192</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B♭: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>193-198e</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4e</td>
<td>E♭: I-phr</td>
<td>193-194 introductory to basic phrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>198-202e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>E♭: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i''</td>
<td>202-206e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>b♭: V-phr</td>
<td>same “subject” as i, “predicate” modulates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>206-210e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>F: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c''</td>
<td>210-217</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>F: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>218-221</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B♭: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d''</td>
<td>222-225</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>b♭: V-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d'''</td>
<td>226-229</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>b♭: III / D♭: I</td>
<td>206-264 = 33-91, a fifth lower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d''''</td>
<td>230-237e</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4e</td>
<td>B♭: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>237-241e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>B♭: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e''</td>
<td>241-253</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>B♭: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b''</td>
<td>254-264</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4e</td>
<td>B♭: I-phr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPOSITION

DEVELOPMENT

RECAPITULATION
One special feature of this movement is the metrical placement of the short double-neighbor-note motive that is introduced at the end of the first bar. Initially it falls as an anacrusis to the second measure of the phrase. Throughout the piece, it will be found alternately situated in such fashion or as an anacrusis to the first measure of phrases. This alternating placement is a way that Beethoven has made a musical game of the metrical stresses for the listener. This is played on especially in the Development, where phrase \( a \) is brought back (in the dominant) with the metrical function (and overall metrical stress of the phrase) very much clouded.

The very first phrase of this movement deserves special attention. Five bars in length, it can easily be reduced to a three-bar phrase repeated with an overlapping measure (an elision) in the middle. I suggest that the repetition really fills out this phrase and helps give it a sense of totality that it would otherwise lack. In the same manner that a 7-bar phrase assumed an implied eighth bar, as discussed with regard to 3:i, this 3-bar phrase (in “basic” terms) implies a fourth measure. This hardly solves the phrase, as two problems remain: the proposed basic phrase lacks any melodic “predicate” after the downbeat of the third bar, and the phrase lacks any harmonic motion whatsoever. As far as the former, this may in fact account for the construction Beethoven has chosen. This movement moves at an extremely rapid pace, and a dull predicate to this phrase simply would not do, so Beethoven breaks in on the phrase with the repetition of the first “half” to subsume this “second half.” As far as the lack of harmonic motion, this criterion for determining the completeness of a phrase should be taken as not without exceptions.

Consider the opening bars of Beethoven’s Piano Concerto No. 3:

Example 27: Opening melody to Beethoven Piano Concerto No. 3.
This antecedent phrase sounded in unison strings, to be answered in the winds (harmonized on the dominant), carries no harmonic motion. Yet it is not without a sense of direction or melodic trajectory, or without some feeling of completion. Being harmonically static, it begs either an answer or some further treatment (receiving both in the music to follow). In the opening phrase from quartet no. 6, the melodic aspect is quite different, generating another type of trajectory, as just discussed. The harmonic dimension still requires attention, a concession provided in the remainder of the movement.

The Development section utilizes a polyphonic texture, which is put to great use in both fleshing out the primary motive of the piece and stumping the listener as to the metrical stress-cycle that was so prevalent in the Exposition. Distinct, well-rounded phrases are therefore hard to distinguish at times, sometimes stumbling over each other in a sort of stretto fashion, other times dissolved entirely into a Baroque-style “spinning” through a progression of keys.

A significant contrast of this movement from the other two quartets is that there is no mixing of phrases of 8/9 measures with 4/5 measures. This entire movement is based on phrases whose basic lengths are 4/5 measures, thus providing a more constant drive throughout the movement. This allows the play on metrical accentuation to be a more emphatic source of tension, as well as providing a more stark contrast in the phrasing of the Development from that of the outer sections. That the movement lacks a Coda section is just another reflection of the simple, clear dimensions framing the piece.

Conclusion

This would be a good time to remind the reader that sweeping generalizations of any radical nature have been and will be avoided in this current document. The scope of this
document is the treatise and works at hand. The research shown here would be well-suited to many, many other works, especially in terms of hypermetrical observations and possible deeper studies of affect associated with these temporal devices.

Although Heinrich Koch’s treatise was intended to provide guidance to composers, he makes a distinction between the idea of a phrase in conception and that idea which is finally expressed. Moreover, Koch makes clear that the musical idea (or phrase) that is expressed as a result of however the composer has chosen to set his original idea is, in the end, the operational force in generating phrase rhythm (regardless of that original conception).

Although this document has taken phrase analysis considerably further than any used in the *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*, the analysis here is based on ideas originally systematized by Koch. Furthermore, Koch’s theory can be a springboard to still other types and levels of phrase analysis. A more comprehensive theory on harmonic construction of phrases would be a fruitful device for analysis: e.g. the temporal placement of varying harmonic functions and other musical devices that may be associated with such, as well as distinguishing traits of certain types of phrases (e.g., elided versus non-elided phrases, or odd- versus even-numbered phrases).

For all that Koch brought to the theory of musical structure, he just missed discussing an aesthetic theory of phrase-rhythm. No stranger to aesthetic considerations, Koch mentions the phenomenon of phrase-rhythm, then discusses phrase construction and then larger works. But at the doorstep of discussing the affective considerations of phrase-rhythm, he either misses or declines the opportunity. It is not as though Koch ignores aesthetics altogether. When, for example, Koch discusses extension of phrases, he states that their purpose “is to more precisely define the feeling contained in the phrase.” However, the larger result of the adjusted phrase-
rhythm from any affective point of view is ignored. Another reason this is surprising is that, as previously discussed, the idea of the primacy of the four-measure phrase was firmly grounded in aesthetic considerations of the rhythm and/or symmetry of the music – i.e. temporal aesthetics.

As a result, Koch’s theory, though anything but insignificant, is left somewhat shallow. He refers to “rhythmical relations” of phrases throughout his discussion of phrase construction without clearly defining what exactly rhythmic relations are or what purpose they might serve. Moreover, such a theory might come in handy in his discussion of genres and the different sections of the first-movement allegro.

Still, Koch’s theory serves as an invaluable basis for discussing the matter of phrasing in musical works, such as these Beethoven quartet movements. A comprehensive understanding of the concepts set forth in the *Versuch* can lead to insightful observations about the construction and relationships of phrases and can potentially provide deep insights into the composer’s workshop. As an analytic tool, his theory has illuminated remarkable aspects of the temporal character and traits of the works considered here, providing a unique – and important – glimpse at the Beethoven genius that is largely ignored.

The Beethoven movements, composed shortly after the final installment of the *Versuch*, also show that Koch was not merely writing for the past. Of course, he never thought that he was, setting a manual for composition, using examples from so many recent and current composers. But, these analyses of Opus 18 indicate that as a theoretical work the *Versuch* would maintain at least some value for understanding the music of the future. Indeed, as the 19th century stormed onward, with the propensity for greater and greater regularity of phrases, perhaps Koch’s treatise might find an increasing value as a theoretical work on periodicity.
Regarding Koch’s description of what would be called sonata form, it holds its value for mainly historical reasons. Though Koch’s description is impressive, the first-movement allegro as a form would undergo significant development even in Koch’s own time. These Beethoven works help to illustrate this, particularly in the inclusion of clear Coda sections and more extended Development sections. Koch had never seen a first movement on the scale of what Beethoven would eventually write, a scale which would raise the bar for all who came after.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Works Concerning Basic Definition of Sonata Form


