

Haptic Beethoven

Nicholas Marston

On 10 December 1849 the Viennese War Department official and dedicated collector of manuscripts Aloys Fuchs (1799–1853) wrote in high dudgeon to his Berlin contemporary and fellow collector Friedrich August Grasnich (1798–1877). Grasnich had borrowed from him two of his most important manuscripts, of works by Handel and Bach, and had failed to return them punctually, so that Fuchs now did not have them available to show to others. He blamed himself as much as Grasnich (clearly this was not the first occasion of its kind), and vowed never to let such treasures out of his possession again: ‘It is quite simply inexcusable for me to allow such a *valuable* and utterly *irreplaceable* jewel as my Handel item [*Stück*] ever to leave the house.’

Few of us, being in Fuchs’s happy position, would disagree. But Fuchs did not leave it at that:

Incidentally, I must honestly confess that I do not entirely understand your exact purpose in pursuing this Handel item [*Stück*] so avidly; for it is of very inferior significance as a musical composition, whereas it is priceless simply as a *manuscript*.

Such was the innumerable number of published ‘great works’ by Handel that a human lifetime was not enough to make them one’s own; thus,

there is no reason to hunt down such youthful and occasional works of this master. Moreover, one would have needed only to find the time to compare my copy [*Kopie*] with the autograph to render the latter superfluous!¹

In all likelihood the manuscript in question was Fuch's handwritten copy (*Abschrift*) of the autograph of Handel's cantata *Aci, Galatea e Polifemo* (HWV 72), from which his later *Acis and Galatea* (HWV 49) derives.² Rather than the precise details of the case, however, what is of interest here is the distinction that Fuchs draws between early, ephemeral and 'great' works, and more so his distinguishing between the quality of the musical work itself and that of its particular notated form. Not all details are clear, though it would seem that the

¹ Translated from Richard Schaal, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Wiener Musiksammlung von Aloys Fuchs* (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Musikforschung, ed. Erich Schenk, 5; Vienna, 1966), 22. A translation also appears in [Ludwig van Beethoven,] *Grasnick 5: Beethoven's Pocket Sketchbook for the Agnus Dei of the Missa solemnis, Opus 123* [hereafter *Grasnick 5*] transcr. and ed. Patrizia Metzler and Fred Stoltzfus (Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield, 2016), 90.

² See Aloys Fuchs, 'Bemerkungen über G. Fr. Händel's Composition: "Azis und Galatea." ', *Allgemeine Wiener Musik-Zeitung*, 4 (1844), 53. The autograph manuscript, in Fuchs's time part of the Royal Collection, is now in the British Library, R. M. 20. a. 1/ Egerton 2953; Fuchs's *Abschrift* is Vienna, Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, Ms. VIII No. 18610.

importance to Fuchs of his copy was its (textual) superiority to Handel's own autograph; nevertheless, Fuchs's description of it as an '*irreplaceable* jewel' also suggests that the sheer aesthetic allure of the physical object held for him a value separate from what we might now term its musicological significance.

Despite the very high prices which they now command at auction, Beethoven's manuscripts might be said not to be objects of intrinsic aesthetic allure in the conventional sense; on the contrary, the very absence of such qualities typically goes hand in hand with their witness to greatness, their characteristic chaotic untidiness bearing the trace of the intractable struggle with the *daimon* of creativity. This is no less true of autograph scores, which rarely if ever catch the composition in a fixed, even provisionally terminal state, untouched by the continuing work of composition, than it is of the sketchbooks and sketchleaves to which we look primarily for the evidence of that work itself. That there is a continuity between sketch and autograph—that Beethoven's autograph scores not infrequently become the site of yet further sketch activity—was pointed out nearly half a century ago by Lewis Lockwood, has been frequently noted since, and is increasingly observable *in situ* thanks to the easier accessibility to these documents in the form of facsimiles and online digital images.³

³ Lewis Lockwood, 'On Beethoven's Sketches and Autographs: Some Problems of Definition and Interpretation', *Acta Musicologica*, 42 (1970), 32–47; repr. In Lockwood, *Beethoven: Studies in the Creative Process* (Harvard, Mass., 1992), 4–16.

Continuities abound, too, among the sketch sources themselves: not least between the contents of the large-format desk sketchbooks that Beethoven used indoors and the smaller, often homemade pocket books, designed perhaps primarily for outside use, which even in his lifetime were remarked upon by his contemporaries and captured in illustrations. The pocket books, their largely pencil entries sometimes all but obliterated by time and wear, their pages often distressed from folding and other handling, remain among the most intractable of the documents which make up the vast corpus of Beethoven's sketching legacy. These features, too, make them perhaps the least aesthetically alluring records of Beethoven's working processes, which eventually extended also to the production of large quantities of score sketches, the great majority of them produced in connection with the composition of the late quartets.⁴ While this fact has led to the term 'score sketch' generally being taken to connote a discrete, 'late' document type to be counted alongside desk and pocket sketchbooks, it should not go unnoticed that many such sketches are already to be found in the desk sketchbooks themselves, and not merely the late ones: again, we need to be alive to the porosity of the pragmatic distinctions we habitually bring to bear on these sources.⁵

⁴ The standard introduction to the Beethoven sketch sources remains Douglas Johnson, Alan Tyson, and Robert Winter, *The Beethoven Sketchbooks: History, Reconstruction, Inventory* [hereafter JTW], ed. Douglas Johnson (Oxford, 1985).

⁵ Several instances of score sketches for the Op. 18 string quartets, the autographs of which are lost, are to be found, for example, in the sketchbook Autograph 19e: see *Ludwig van Beethoven: A Sketchbook from the Summer of*

If score sketching ought not to be regarded as an exclusively 'late' practice, then, it nevertheless remains broadly true that Beethoven's sketching process increased in complexity during his career; the earliest pocket sketchbook belongs to 1811, but Beethoven's persistent use of these sources seems to have begun in 1815 or so.⁶ And it is not surprising that the amount and complexity of sketching for a given work run broadly parallel to the size and complexity of the work itself. In several cases—the new finale of the String Quartet in B flat, Op. 130 is a case in point—Beethoven even needed recourse to more than one autograph score.⁷ If one adds to all this a lengthy genesis, the total number of surviving sources available for consultation and study can be daunting.

Such is the case with the *Missa solemnis*, Op. 123, the composition of which occupied Beethoven on and off for four years, from 1819 to 1823. Yet the complexities of the source materials for this gigantic and, for some, recalcitrant work have not discouraged relatively sustained engagement with them. Already in 1952, the very first volume in the notoriously stalled Beethovenhaus sketchbook edition made available the first of the three pocket books BH 107,

1800, ed. Richard Kramer, 2 vols. (Bonn, 1996), especially the commentary at II, pp. 19–21.

⁶ See the chronological chart in JTW, pp. 332–34.

⁷ The two autograph scores of the new finale to Op. 130 are Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Mus. ms. autogr. Beethoven 19c and autogr. Grasnick 10.

108 and 109, albeit in a diplomatic transcription whose overly literal fidelity to the original largely obscured Beethoven's musical intentions.⁸ Twenty years later, all three books were available in similarly problematic transcribed form, now supplemented by facsimiles. Moreover, the 'Wittgenstein' desk sketchbook had also appeared in the same dual format, although only in its incomplete, unreconstructed state.⁹ The most recent (2010) Beethovenhaus publication has made available the reconstructed Artaria 197 in a far more valuable transcription and understandably better-quality facsimile, while the first volumes in William Kinderman's 'Beethoven Sketchbook Series' presented the preceding desk sketchbook, Artaria 195.¹⁰ Of the four desk sketchbooks, then,

⁸ *Beethoven: Drei Skizzenbücher zur Missa Solemnis I: Ein Skizzenbuch aus den Jahren 1819/20, SV 81*, ed. Joseph Schmidt-Görg (Bonn, 1952).

⁹ *Beethoven: Drei Skizzenbücher zur Missa Solemnis II: Ein Skizzenbuch zum Credo, SV 82*, ed. Joseph Schmidt-Görg, 2 vols. (Bonn, 1968 [facs.], 1970 [trans.]); *Beethoven: Drei Skizzenbücher zur Missa Solemnis III: Ein Skizzenbuch zum Benedictus und zum Agnus Dei, SV 83*, ed. Joseph Schmidt-Görg, 2 vols. (Bonn, 1968 [facs.], 1970 [trans.]); *Beethoven: Ein Skizzenbuch zu den Diabelli-Variationen und zur Missa Solemnis, SV 154*, ed. Joseph Schmidt-Görg, 2 vols. (Bonn, 1968 [facs.], 1972 [trans.]). The facsimile volume of BH 107 (*Drei Skizzenbücher . . . I*) appeared in 1968. On the shortcomings of the Beethovenhaus transcription policy at that time, see Robert Winter's review of *Beethoven: Ein Skizzenbuch . . . SV 154* in *JAMS*, 28 (1975), 135–38.

¹⁰ *Ludwig van Beethoven: A Sketchbook from the Year 1821 (Artaria 197)* [hereafter *Artaria 197*], ed. William Drabkin, 2 vols. (Bonn, 2010); *Artaria 195*:

only Artaria 201 remains unpublished; the remaining pocket sketches are more difficult to deal with, not least because of problems in reconstructing numerous unstitched gatherings of leaves.¹¹

The *Missa* also enjoys the advantage of having appeared in a fine new edition complete with *kritischer Bericht*, as part of the slow-moving new Beethoven *Gesamtausgabe* launched by the Beethovenhaus as far back as 1961 to replace the nineteenth-century Breitkopf text.¹² Among much else, Norbert Gertsch's exhaustive commentary includes a chapter-length survey of the sketch sources and their relationship to the autograph. And even if it remains the case, as Richard Kramer commented in the wake of the appearance of this new edition, that 'we are light-years away from having an edition of the extant sketches even for a *Missa solemnis*',¹³ the two new publications under review here make a considerable addition to the scholarly arsenal. A useful facsimile of the

Beethoven's Sketchbook for the Missa Solemnis and the Piano Sonata in E major, Opus 109, transcr. and ed. William Kinderman, 3 vols. (Urbana, 2003). See Richard Kramer, 'To Edit a Sketchbook', *Beethoven Forum*, 12 (2005), 82–96.

¹¹ See Drabkin's remarks in *Artaria 197*, II, p. 17.

¹² *Ludwig van Beethoven. Missa Solemnis*, Werke, Series 8, Vol. 3, ed. Norbert Gertsch (Munich, 2000).

¹³ Richard Kramer, review of *Missa solemnis*, ed. Gertsch, *Notes*, 59 (2003), 746.

autograph of the Kyrie appeared as far back as 1965;¹⁴ but it is utterly eclipsed by the sumptuous edition of the entire surviving score (the Gloria is lost) issued recently by Bärenreiter;¹⁵ if the manuscript itself might not unequivocally be regarded as a conventionally beautiful object, in Fuchs's sense, there is no question that this reproduction more than fits the bill.

Much the same is true of the facsimile and transcription of the pocket sketchbook Grasnick 5, which is the third offering in the 'Beethoven Sketchbook Series' launched some fifteen years ago by William Kinderman. The appearance of this edition is all the more valuable since Grasnick 5 was evidently used alongside Artaria 197; thus, Drabkin's edition of that book is now furnished with an important new context. While Kinderman's own edition of Artaria 195 was afforded the luxury of separate facsimile, transcription and commentary volumes, its successor, Lewis Lockwood's and Alan Gosman's edition of the famous 'Eroica' sketchbook Landsberg 6, confined its scholarship to two volumes; now, the smaller dimensions of Grasnick 5 allow Patrizia Metzler and Fred Stoltzfus (relative newcomers to Beethoven sketch research) to confine facsimile, transcription and commentary within the confines of a single hard

¹⁴ *Missa solemnis, opus 123: Kyrie. Faksimile nach dem Autograph*, ed. Wilhelm Virneisel (Tutzing, 1965). Virneisel's accompanying booklet is *Das Kyrie der Missa solemnis: Geschichte und Gestalt der Handschrift*.

¹⁵ *Ludwig van Beethoven: Missa Solemnis Op. 123. Autograph Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preussischer Kulturbesitz*, ed. Hans-Joachim Hinrichsen and Martina Rebmann (Kassel, Basle, London, New York, Prague, 2016).

cover. Three introductory chapters (Part 1, pp. 3–8) precede the edition of the sketchbook (Part 2, separately unpaginated), in which facsimile and transcription are accurately aligned page by page, allowing quick and easy comparison of the two. The Commentary (Part 3, pp. 89–106) consists of five further chapters and a Conclusion. This is followed by an Inventory (pp. 107–119) which painstakingly assigns each separate entry (as interpreted by the editors) to the corresponding bars of the final version. An added bonus is the complete facsimile and transcription, as part of the ‘Preface and Acknowledgements’, of the pocket manuscript Artaria 205 (6b), originally part of the sketchbook BH 109, which has been known in partial transcription from work on the *Missa* sketches by William Drabkin dating back to the early 1990s (p. [xiii], asterisked footnote).

In reviewing Lockwood’s and Gosman’s edition of Landsberg 6 I commented on the production values of Kinderman’s edition and also suggested that a firmer editorial hand might have ironed out a quantity of repetitive material spread across its sometimes very short chapters.¹⁶ Much the same criticism can be levelled at the present volume. One conspicuous example of this is the reappearance (p. 92; cf. p. xii) of a reference to Kinderman’s transcription of a marginal comment in BH 109 on the basis of which he fixes the chronology of that pocket book, and correspondingly the end of work in the desk sketchbook

¹⁶ Nicholas Marston, review of *Beethoven’s ‘Eroica’ Sketchbook: A Critical Edition*, transcribed, ed. and commentary by Lewis Lockwood and Alan Gosman, 2 vols. (Urbana, 2013), *Music and Letters*, 95 (2014), 289–91.

Artaria 195, to the period around late October/November 1820, which is earlier by some months than has usually been supposed.¹⁷ More important than the repetitiousness of their text, however, is the use that Metzler and Stoltzfus make of Kinderman's observation in relation to the chronology of Grasnick 5 and its relationship to other sources. This bears some discussion.

As the title of his edition of Artaria 197 makes clear, Drabkin follows Douglas Johnson, Alan Tyson and Robert Winter in dating the main use of that sketchbook to the year 1821, though he does acknowledge the chronological implication of Kinderman's claims for the marginal entry in BH 109. He also concurs with Johnson, Tyson and Winter in assigning Grasnick 5 to the same year, because of the parallelism of its contents with those of Artaria 197.¹⁸

Metzler and Stoltzfus, by comparison, are firmly in Kinderman's camp:

This [1821] chronology cannot be reconciled, however, with the intimate connection between the aforementioned Benedictus sketch and the related sources BH 109 and Artaria 205 (6b) or with the physical evidence from folding marks that these sources were bundled together.

(p. xii)

¹⁷ Cf. JTW, 263: 'A date of February or March 1821 seems plausible for the end of Artaria 195.'

¹⁸ JTW, 267; *Artaria 197*, II, pp. 16–17; JTW, 377–78, where the contents of Grasnick 5 are claimed to parallel those on pp. 1–62 of Artaria 197; Drabkin (*Artaria 197*, II, p. 18) confines the parallel to pp. 2–40 of the desk sketchbook.

The 'aforementioned' sketch for the Benedictus of the *Missa* is one which runs from fo. 5v, stave 11 to fo. 6r, stave 1; it is the only entry identified in the inventory to Grasnick 5 for any movement other than the Agnus Dei, and is thus decidedly anomalous. Beethoven marked it 'Nb: Benedictus' (or perhaps 'Benedictus Nb:'). Kinderman too notes this sketch, remarking that 'although advanced, [it] does not represent a revision to the autograph score.'¹⁹ In order to make full sense of Metzler's and Stolzhus's claims, though, one needs to leap forward from their Preface to Chapter 5 ('The Sketchbook and its Companion Sources': p. 92). Now we learn more about similar folds on the pages of BH 109, Artaria 205 (6b) and Grasnick 5, and are told that the incidence of these

similar folds in the three sketchbooks is surely the result of the move Beethoven made from his summer residence in Mödling to Vienna in late October 1820, when he would have needed to bundle the sketchbooks together for the purposes of transport.

But this is unsatisfactory on several counts. First, there are only two 'sketchbooks' at issue: Metzler and Stolzhus have just spent a paragraph enthusiastically endorsing Drabkin's assertion that the bifolium Artaria 205 (6b) originally formed part of BH 109. That it fell 'between pages 15 and 16 (according to the more recent pagination of that source)' (pp. 91–92) is further

¹⁹ *Artaria 195*, I, p. 42; for an alternative view, see below. Kinderman argues earlier in this chapter that entries in both Artaria 195 and BH 109 relate to the preparation of the autograph score of the Benedictus during November 1820. The Bärenreiter facsimile of the autograph now facilitates closer examination of these plausible claims.

inaccurate since pages 15 and 16 of BH 109 form two sides of a single leaf: the correct location for Artaria 205 (6b) is between the present pages 16 and 17. Then one needs to return to the Preface (p. xii) to find any reference to ‘deep and characteristic folds’ around fos. 5–6 and neither the facsimile nor the argument in the text really substantiates the claims being made here.²⁰ And notwithstanding all these reservations, the fundamental argument that Beethoven would have needed to bundle such small objects together in this way is not entirely convincing. Could it not be that these corner folds had some more obvious purpose, such as marking particular locations to which Beethoven might have wished to return easily?

There remains the matter of the ‘intimate connection’ between the anomalous Benedictus sketch on fos. 5v–6r of Grasnich 5 and its companion sources. We are never told wherein this intimacy lies. Indeed, the lone presence of this isolated sketch—the fact that it sits at the bottom of one page and the top of the next, preceded by three empty staves and followed by another, demands attention—among so much else for the Agnus Dei emphasizes its apartness rather than the reverse. Is the point merely that BH 109/Artaria 205 (6b) is principally concerned with the Benedictus, and thus that the presence of the Grasnich 5 sketch strengthens Kinderman’s argument that Beethoven’s use of BH 109 and

²⁰ One fold in the bottom corner of fo. 1 does not seem to match those in Artaria 205 (6b) and BH 109; numerous folded top corners are easily visible in the facsimile, including at fo. 5v; but Metzler and Stolzfuß seem interested only in lower-corner folds.

Grasnick 5 may have overlapped?²¹ Metzler and Stoltzfus do not ponder what this sketch is doing here, nor why Beethoven should have marked it 'Nb'.²² Equally, while they dutifully note that Grasnick 5 contains entries in 'pencil, ink over pencil, or ink alone' (p. 5), they never properly investigate why Beethoven might have chosen to reinforce some of his notations by overwriting them in ink.

An important exception to this is a series of musical and verbal entries on fo. 14r which were first written in pencil before being inked over, and which reappear in closely related form on page 33 of *Artaria* 197. These map out some of the larger shape of the Agnus Dei movement (cf. bars 174–89 in the final version), including the entry of the martial music in B^b following directly upon a climactic V/D, the march then being succeeded by the declamation of the text in recitative, closing with a sustained B major triad. This is one of a series of such 'concept sketches' in Grasnick 5 which Metzler and Stoltzfus consider in relation to 'The Shaping of Form' (Chapter 7, pp. 95–98). Given Beethoven's astonishing command of the possibilities of classical form, the potential insights into his compositional process in this regard which the sketches might afford have always been of major concern to scholars; indeed, Beethoven's own habit, in

²¹ Cf. *Artaria* 195, I, p. 42.

²² This version of the main Benedictus theme is distinguished principally from the final one by the initial dotted-minim (as opposed to dotted-crotchet) downbeat; the same feature, though with a different melodic continuation, is found in BH 109, p. 2 st. 8 and p. 6, st. 4–5, immediately opposite the marginal notation deciphered by Kinderman.

concept sketches, of seeking to establish an overview of large-scale formal design gives as clear an indication as one might wish that in this respect at least composerly intention and scholarly appetite coincide.²³

In the case of the sketch on fo. 14r and reprised in Artaria 197, one might wish to pay attention to the fact that Beethoven evidently envisaged the martial music commencing directly in (or on) B^b, creating a characteristic V–bVI motion, as opposed to the major-third drop from A to F (V/B^b) which, in the final version, allows the first part of the recitative to unfold over a passage of building dominant tension before the resolution to B^b with the entry of the trumpets (bars 164–86); only later, on fo. 19v, which is written entirely in ink without prior pencil, does this harmonic detail appear. Perhaps more significant is the envisaged further upward semitonal shift to a sustained B major harmony at the end of the recitative, to which Beethoven apparently assigned the text ‘agnus dei miserere nobis’. There is a B^b–B shift in the final version also; but this is in support of a diminished seventh harmony which, taking the soprano solo (‘Agnus Dei, dona . . .’) with it, begins the modulatory passage with chorus which leads back to D for the beginning of the sonata-form recapitulation.²⁴ Here in the

²³ Notable in the present context, and much cited by Metzler and Stoltzfus, is William Drabkin, ‘The Agnus Dei of Beethoven’s *Missa solemnis*: The Growth of Its Form’, in *Beethoven’s Compositional Process*, ed. William Kinderman (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1991), 131–59.

²⁴ See Drabkin’s tabular analysis of the Agnus Dei in William Drabkin, *Beethoven: Missa solemnis* (Cambridge, 1991), 90.

sketch the sense (note the fermata) of the gesture is one of culmination; aside from questions of tonal scheme, we might wonder whether Beethoven was striving here to create a sense of the transcendent by means of the sustained B-major harmony (note the triadic fifth, f^{#2}, in the uppermost voice), rather as in the finale of the Ninth Symphony, when the solo quartet celebrates the apotheosis of joy and universal brotherhood in a rapt B major which is immediately brought back to the reality of the home dominant as the final Prestissimo approaches.²⁵

Furthermore, elsewhere in Grasnick 5 Beethoven pondered whether to set the march itself in both B major and minor (see fos. 3v and 16r, for example). Metzler and Stoltzfus note this, and do not omit to mention the famous description in the Scheide Sketchbook of B minor as a 'schwarze Tonart' (p. 98). But in general their interpretative reach is decidedly limited. In discussing the concept sketch on fo. (not 'page') 14r, they comment that 'the annotation "erster Theil" signals the end of the first portion of the Dona nobis pacem (mm. 96–162)' (p. 96). This is not quite the same thing as saying that it, and its accompanying sustained A major triad, marks the end of the exposition of the underlying sonata-form design. As for the recitative indications, we are told that setting the text in this way 'underscores the dramatic intent of the passage. . . . The annotations in Grasnick 5 seem to underscore what musical recitative does most

²⁵ Other important relationships between the *Missa* and the Ninth Symphony are elucidated in William Kinderman, 'Beethoven's Symbol for the Deity in the *Missa solemnis* and the Ninth Symphony', *19th Century Music*, 9 (1985), 102–118.

emphatically: to declaim, narrate, and convey the essence of an idea in straightforward dramatic fashion.’ It is difficult to see quite how the single word ‘Recitativ’ followed by an outline of textual segments can be made to bear such weight. But then, an earlier, general remark informs us that

The relationship between the sketches in Grasnick 5 and the final version of the movement illustrates a noteworthy aspect of his compositional process. Many of the annotations, concept sketches, and motives prefigure important details in the final version of the Agnus Dei. In some cases, one can surmise how Beethoven developed his ideas in this sketchbook. Repeated iterations of a motive, each time varied in some way, show how his thought proceeded. (p. 95)

This is a curious mixture of statement of the obvious—did we really not know until now that there is a relationship between Beethoven’s sketches and his finished compositions?—and a warning that Metzler and Stoltzfus seem untroubled by the venerable discussions concerning the very nature of that relationship that are now at least forty years old.²⁶ Indeed, Nottebohm perhaps had the last word at the very outset well over a century ago: ‘The *daimon* has

²⁶ Metzler and Stoltzfus cite Douglas Johnson’s classic ‘Beethoven Scholars and Beethoven’s Sketches’, *19th Century Music*, 2 (1978–79), 3–17, but not the replies by William Drabkin, Sieghard Brandenburg and Johnson himself which appeared in the subsequent issue: see ‘Viewpoint: On Beethoven Scholars and Beethoven’s Sketches’, *19th Century Music*, 2 (1978–79), 270–79.

dwelt in the pages of these sketchbooks. The *daimon*, however, has vanished.’²⁷

The sketches record individual traces of a thought process; the process itself remains unknowable.

The reference above to ‘repeated iterations of a motive’ touches upon an important aspect of Metzler’s and Stoltzfus’s interpretation both of the Agnus Dei and of Grasnick 5. Although they never quite clarify what they mean when they write that the sketchbook ‘occupies a unique place in the compositional history of the *Missa solemnis*’ (p. 91), they are clear in their belief that one of its key functions for Beethoven was as a repository of musical themes and motives; indeed, ‘Grasnick 5 is almost exclusively focused on motivic elements’ (p. 99), and its contents document ‘the quest for the single most satisfying—from the composer’s perspective—embodiment of a given group of pitches’ (p. 100). To facilitate their analysis, they provide (Figure 3, p. 94) an inventory of 11 ‘Themes of the Agnus Dei’ which they further subdivide into various ‘motives’ which are briefly discussed in Chapter 8 (pp. 99–103).

While I am inclined to treat with some caution the claim that this or any other sketchbook was regarded by Beethoven as dedicated to any one specific compositional purpose or parameter, Grasnick 5 does bear out Metzler’s and Stoltzfus’s motivic interpretation at one particularly striking point. Starting on

²⁷ ‘In diesen Skizzenbüchern hat der Dämon gehaust. Der Dämon aber ist entwichen’, in Gustav Nottebohm, *Zweite Beethoveniana: Nachgelassene Aufsätze und Mittheilungen*, ed. Eusebius Mandyczewski (Leipzig, 1887), p. VIII.

stave 4 of fo. 2v and continuing through to the penultimate stave of the following fo. 3r, Beethoven aligned no fewer than eighteen versions of the setting of the opening words, 'Agnus dei'. Duple metre and key (B minor) are fixed, and (implied) clef and register indicate that this opening statement was already allotted to the bass voice. An almost constant feature is the beginning on a syncopated f#;²⁸ and the statement of the text is strictly confined to two bars. Transpositions to the subdominant, E minor, are found on fo. 3r, staves 5/6 and 11: the same transposition that would, in the final version, play out across 'Agnus 1' and 'Agnus 2' (bars 1–26 and 27ff.). Beethoven's experimenting with this moment is not confined to this part of Grasnich 5, but there is no escaping his purpose here.

Metzler and Stoltzfus discuss these sketches as instances of their 'Motive 2c', which they identify as the setting of 'qui tollis peccata', sung by the bass in bars 9–10 of the final version (Figure 3, p. 94, and pp. 100–101), and they count 49 appearances of this motive across the sketchbook. They point out the beginning on f#, and the frequent tritone g–c# (in one case—fo. 2v, stave 6—Beethoven tried out the diminished seventh g–A#). They do observe that the most striking

²⁸ In the one case—fo. 2v, stave 8—where the beginning is on the downbeat of the first bar, Metzler and Stoltzfus supply an editorial preceding f# and tie. They also transcribe fo. 3r, stave 3 in the bass clef, whereas the indication 'Melod[ie]' probably implies soprano clef, with accompanying bass on the stave below (as in the sketch immediately underneath, staves 5/6); uniquely in this case, then, the setting would begin on d² rather than f#.

aspect of Beethoven's treatment of this motive is his changed 'textual intent' for it, from 'Agnus Dei' to 'qui tollis peccata'. But this, however, is where their motive-driven approach rather leads them to miss the point. Rather than understanding these as sketches for bars 9–10 of Beethoven's movement but with different words, should we not rather ponder them as a series of (presumably) early attempts to fix the initial vocal statement of the movement: not 'qui tollis peccata' with different words, but rather 'Agnus Dei' with different notes?

From this perspective, we might notice how Beethoven appears to have first considered a harmonically closed setting, effectively moving V–I (note the frequent endings on B, or sometimes D) before opting for an open one, the eventually preferred concluding g–c# tritone probably supported by a bass A#.²⁹ The initial, closed version would have made for a very different beginning of this movement, which eventually realizes its open, dominant-oriented progression in a more extended fashion. The concluding tritone g–c# is now reversed and placed at the beginning, forming the melodic arc within which the upper part of the bass soloist's line unfolds (one can understand the voice leading here in terms of two unfolded intervals, c#/g–d/f#: Ex. 1). The syncopated opening envisaged in the tied f# which was a fixed element of the sketches would be realized in a more complex way, not just by the soloist's longer, tied c# but by the hypermetrical syncopation effected by the orchestral entry of the soloist's line already in bar 3, halfway through an anticipated four-bar phrase. The soloist's

²⁹ Compare the subdominant version on fo. 3r, staves 5/6).

entry just two bars later reestablishes the four-bar hypermetre, but at the cost of itself seeming to be syncopated against the orchestral phrase.

Ex. 1: Beethoven, *Missa solemnis*, Op. 123, Agnus Dei, bars 5–8

In any case, one should perhaps not entertain wildly ambitious hopes for the music-analytical reach of the commentary portion of a publication such as this. What is crucial for the user is the quality of the facsimile and of the transcription. As is the case with the preceding volumes of Kinderman's series, the facsimile here reproduces the original at full size (p. ix). The quality is high, so much so that anyone who has actually handled this or similar manuscripts can almost 'feel' the grain and weight of the paper. As to the transcription, it would be difficult to exaggerate the immensity of the challenge posed by the sketches for a work such as the *Missa*, and all the more so for a source of this kind, which, as opposed to the desk sketchbooks, is largely lacking in extended entries which often provide vital contextual clues to matters such as implicit key signatures, clefs and so on. The issue of clefs is particularly fraught in the case of the *Missa*, since Beethoven sometimes notates vocal lines in (unsupplied) C clefs, as in the final version, rather than relying solely on treble (G) and bass (F) clefs.

One curious clef-related error is to be found in the transcription of fo. 8v, stave 2. Here, outlining the very beginning of the movement, Beethoven writes f#¹–d¹–c#¹, in a clearly implied treble clef. For some reason these exact pitches are transcribed, but in an editorially supplied tenor clef, as are the repeated f#¹ minims at the end of the line. Further down the same page, Metzler and Stoltzfus

judge the ‘= de’ connective at the beginning of stave 6 to be cued from ‘Vi=’ at the end of stave 1. There appears to be no direct continuity here, and it seems more likely, at least in registral terms, that the proper referent is ‘Vi=’ on fo. 9r, stave 9, which they connect to ‘=de’ on fo. 8v, staves 11/12. This latter sketch may itself be the continuation of the idea on stave 1.

Misjudged clefs are also to be found on fo. 4v, where despite the ‘tenor’ indication Metzler and Stoltzfus transcribe yet another version of the opening ‘Agnus Dei’ statement, now outlining i–V, in bass clef, which also leads them to misread Beethoven’s pitches. What Beethoven plots here is an opening tenor statement answered at the subdominant by the soprano. Accordingly, stave 2 is surely to be read in treble clef, while ‘alt’ (mistranscribed as ‘et[c.]’) at the beginning of stave 4 is a clear indication that the following appearance of ‘Agnus Dei’ is to be read in the alto clef, placing it back in the tonic, B minor. Ex. 2 offers an alternative transcription of these two staves.

Ex. 2: Grasnick 5 (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz), fo. 4v, st. 2, 4

Here and there Beethoven does the decent thing and provides a clef himself. Such is the case on fo. 9r, stave 4, where Metzler and Stoltzfus correctly identify material, in an explicit alto clef, pertaining closely to the alto solo at bars 51–53 of the final version, though their Inventory (p. 110) gives the text as ‘Agnus Dei’ rather than ‘miserere nobis’. Even so, their transcription of this and the succeeding one and a half staves presents an interpretation that overlooks

details that are clear in the facsimile (the tie between the fourth and third pitches from the end of stave 4, for example, which dictates that both must be d^2), and fails to make the best sense of Beethoven's notation for a passage which appears in the final version beginning at bar 42, though this is not referenced in the Inventory (Ex. 3 presents my transcription). Of course, no two transcribers of such impenetrable material are likely ever to agree on every detail; but these few examples, along with other moments such as the bizarre combination of B and G^b in the transcription of fo. 5r, staves 3/4 (presumably both parts should be read in the bass clef; and the final note on stave 4 appears to be A^b rather than another B^b) may be sufficient to indicate that Metzler and Stoltzfus are perhaps not the surest guides through this inhospitable terrain.

Ex. 3: Grasnick 5 (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz), fo. 9r, st. 4–6

To move from consideration of a slim pocket sketchbook to the sprawling document that it is the autograph score of the *Missa* involves a major recalibration of scale in relation to physical dimensions, complexity of structure and of content, to say nothing of the sheer relative weight of the two published volumes that are my concern here. Yet it is important to remember that Beethoven himself had both documents (and more) in play while he was sketching the Agnus Dei in Grasnick 5. The autograph is undated, and its precise chronology, which can best be approximated by careful comparison with the sketch sources and conversation-book entries, remains debatable. Norbert Gertsch's painstaking consideration concludes the following:

Kyrie: begun April/May 1819, continued until February or March 1820;

Gloria (lost): begun November/December 1819, continued until spring or summer 1820;

Credo: begun not before summer 1820;

Sanctus and Benedictus: begun not before the start of 1821;

Agnus Dei: begun not before summer 1821.

Gertsch further posits that the last three movements were continued through 1822, and their completion must be considered coterminous with that of the complete manuscript;³⁰ in addition, he proposes that the textually important *Arbeitskopie* of the autograph, prepared by Wenzel Schlemmer, Wenzel Rampl and two unidentified copyists and with copious entries by Beethoven, could have commenced (with the Credo being copied first) already in September 1820. It is

³⁰ See *Missa Solemnis*, ed. Gertsch, 278–82 ('II: Zur Quellendatierung'), esp. 280L; cf. William Drabkin, 'The Sketches and Autographs for the Later Movements of Beethoven's *Missa solemnis*', *Beethoven Forum*, 2 (1993), 107: 'Beethoven must have begun the autograph score of the Credo after August 1821, . . . and finished the Agnus Dei before August 1822'. Kinderman's alternative chronology for Artaria 195 and 197 and their related sources proposes that Beethoven was writing the autograph of the Benedictus by November 1820: see *Artaria 195*, I, p. 38. See also Robert Winter, 'Reconstructing Riddles: The Sources for Beethoven's *Missa Solemnis*', in *Beethoven Essays: Studies in Honor of Elliot Forbes*, ed. Lewis Lockwood and Phyllis Benjamin (Cambridge, Mass., 1984), 217–50.

difficult to overstate the sheer textual complexity of the situation in which Beethoven by now found himself working, with the *Missa* already well past its initial 'sell-by' date of March 1820.³¹

The autograph score of the *Missa* was purchased by the publisher Domenico Artaria at the auction of Beethoven's effects which took place in Vienna on 5 November 1827. At some point thereafter the Gloria went missing, while the Kyrie entered the collection of Georg Pölchau (1773–1836), whence it passed to the then Königliche Bibliothek in Berlin in 1840. Not until 1901 would the Credo, Sanctus/Benedictus and Agnus Dei find their way to the same haven with the purchase of the Artaria Collection.³² Thus, what is presented in the facsimile as a single continuous document is in reality two physically separate manuscripts, catalogued today as Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Mus. ms. autogr. Beethoven 1 [Kyrie] and Artaria 202 [Credo, Sanctus/Benedictus, Agnus Dei].

This physical separation is matched by the different paper types and structures of the two manuscripts. The Kyrie is written on 20-stave upright format leaves,

³¹ On the dating of the *Arbeitskopie* see *Missa Solemnis*, ed. Gertsch, 282–83.

³² These details, widely known, are recapitulated in Martina Rebmann's essay 'On the History of the Beethoven Collection in Berlin', in *Ludwig van Beethoven: Missa Solemnis Op. 123*, 13*–14* (English), 28*–29* (German). Further page references to the autograph facsimile (English-language text only) are given in the main text.

while the remaining movements are on an unusual 20-stave landscape format paper of soft, fine quality on which the staves were stamped rather than drawn with a rastrum, as was more commonly the case. A consequence of this is that Beethoven's frequently heavy erasures of the musical text almost inevitably removed the staves supporting the notes, resulting in the need to repair the staves by hand: for an example taken entirely at random, see fos. 21v–22r of the Credo ('passus'). The structure of the two manuscripts, meanwhile, perhaps silently documents Beethoven's dawning awareness of the magnitude of the task in which he was now embroiled. Whereas the Kyrie was organized on the basis of gathered (nested) bifolia, sometimes from more than one sheet, from the Credo onward Beethoven worked with ungathered bifolia, placing one next to another—a process which made the replacement or removal of individual leaves or entire bifolia much less detrimental to the overall structure, as had been the case with the Kyrie.

This structural distinction is conveyed, in a somewhat roundabout way, in Hans-Joachim Hinrichsen's detailed and informative essay, 'Beethoven's workshop: Introduction to the work and autograph' which follows upon the facsimile itself (pp. 1*– 12*, esp. 6*, 9*); but his explanation suffers from the misleading claim (the problem is not one of the translation from German) that 'the basic unit of the entire compositional manuscript is the *large-format sheet (bifolium)* which is folded to form two leaves' (p. 6*L; emphasis mine), and the subsequent misapplication of the word 'sheet' (*Bogen*) to what those familiar with Beethoven manuscript studies know as a bifolium. The basic unit is indeed the large-format sheet; but these were typically folded twice and then cut along the top margin, to

produce two gathered bifolia: four leaves, eight sides or pages.³³ Hinrichsen's succeeding discussion of the structure of the Kyrie autograph is therefore rendered confusing; and the tabular presentation of this portion (p. 6*R) does not much help either. It is surprising, given the lavishness of the publication and the evident concern for detail, that a complete structural diagram of the *Missa* autograph such as that provided in Gertsch's edition, was excluded.³⁴

The first interruption to the new, simpler bifolium-by-bifolium structure established with the Credo came at fos. 17–18. The hitherto orderly sequence of bifolia here gives way to two single leaves, the first of which (fo. 17) is evidently part of the original layer, since it continues the wholesale revision of the solo flute part accompanying 'et incarnatus est', beginning in the last bar of fo. 16r: Beethoven was forced to use the empty oboe stave for the revision (Ex. 4), which is far plainer than that familiar from the final version, which first emerged in the *Arbeitskopie*.³⁵ (Unfortunately the original version in the autograph is too radically obliterated for detailed comparison with the revision to be possible.) Fo. 18, on the other hand, beginning with bar 145 (tenor solo: 'Homo factus est'), is almost completely devoid of emendations: Hinrichsen, here as elsewhere drawing upon Drabkin's earlier work on the *Missa* autograph, writes that it

³³ See JTW, 47.

³⁴ *Missa Solemnis*, ed. Gertsch, 338–39; also Drabkin, 'The Sketches and Autographs', 102–106.

³⁵ *Missa Solemnis*, ed. Gertsch, 313–14, from which Ex. 4 is taken, with slight modifications.

has the striking appearance of a fair copy and is therefore quite obviously a late replacement for the original leaf Clearly, then, the composer had encountered difficulties with the “Et homo factus est” (bars 145–52) contained in this leaf, although in this case no trace of a struggle with the material is to be found in the parallel sketches’ (p. 9*R).

Ex. 4: Beethoven, *Missa solemnis*, Op. 123, Credo, autograph score (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Sign. mus. ms. autogr. Beethoven Artaria 202), fos. 16r–17v (bars 134–44)

To broaden the context very slightly, we are dealing here with a passage following immediately upon what Gertsch calls ‘one of the most extensively discussed passages in the entire work’; Kramer terms it ‘a kind of lynchpin for Gertsch’.³⁶ The issue at stake is the scoring of the first statement of ‘Et incarnatus est . . . Maria virgine’ (bars 125–31: fos. 15r–16r). In the autograph score it is placed in the tenor chorus; in the *Arbeitskopie*, whether by error or instruction, it appears in the tenor solo, as it does also in the first edition, even though Gertsch cites evidence that in intervening sources, including the *Stichvorlage*, Beethoven had expressly indicated that it should indeed be sung by the tenor chorus. Gertsch’s firm belief is that the reading in the first edition, which in any case he regards as ‘without significance’ for a new text of the work, derives most probably from a wilful alteration made either by the engraver or by the

³⁶ Ibid. 313; Kramer, review of *Missa solemnis*, ed. Gertsch, 744.

proofreader, Ferdinand Kessler; Beethoven saw neither the proofs nor the edition in his lifetime.³⁷

In pondering Beethoven's difficulties with 'Et homo factus est'—and in the absence of the original second leaf of the bifolium beginning with fo. 17 we can but speculate as to what these may have been—it should be borne in mind that a striking aspect of Beethoven's setting of this part of the Credo is the distinct musical separation of those words from the preceding lines: it was common in the Viennese Mass tradition for the section 'Et incarnatus . . . homo factus est' to be treated as a single unit.³⁸ Beethoven's setting contrasts the bright, D major diatonicism of 'Et homo factus est'—the first reappearance of the work's tonic key since the end of the Gloria—with the antique, dorian-mode setting of 'Et incarnatus'. The trilling solo flute admittedly acts as a connective device, plunging down over two octaves from f#³ to d¹ as the tonic is confirmed; likewise, the additional, preliminary 'et' sung by the solo tenor within the preceding dominant chord (bar 143: this mirrors the similar situation at the beginning of 'Et incarnatus', bar 125) has something of a linking function; but the overall sense of contrast is not lost thereby.

³⁷ *Missa Solemnis*, ed. Gertsch, 297, 313.

³⁸ See, for example, Haydn's 'Theresienmesse' (1799) and 'Harmoniemesse' (1802).

While it may be true to say that no sense of struggle concerning 'Et homo factus est' is evident from the 'parallel' sketches (Drabkin refers to 'the late sketches'³⁹), early sketches show that the distinct musical separation of the fact of the Incarnation from its result was not always the case. The first appearance of this passage in the Wittgenstein sketchbook (November or December 1819, according to Gertsch's dating⁴⁰) envisages a D minor 'chorale' setting of 'Et incarnatus . . . homo factus est', settling on a dominant of A minor before a wrench up to F# minor for 'Crucifixus', marked '(hier menschlich)' by Beethoven: Ex. 5. Something much closer to the final version had already emerged, however, some twelve pages later, although the change to D major is not explicitly indicated and must be inferred (Ex. 6).⁴¹

Ex. 5: Beethoven, Wittgenstein Sketchbook (Bonn, Beethovenhaus, Sammlung H. C. Bodmer, HCB BSk 1/49), fo. 30r, st. 7/8–10/11

Ex. 6: Beethoven, Wittgenstein Sketchbook (Bonn, Beethovenhaus, Sammlung H. C. Bodmer, HCB BSk 1/49), fo. 35v, st. 3–10/11

³⁹ Drabkin, 'The Sketches and Autographs', 111.

⁴⁰ *Missa Solemnis*, ed. Gertsch, 280.

⁴¹ It is worth pointing out in the present context that the parallel pocket sketchbook, BH107, contains (p. 7, st. 6/7) a setting of the word 'virgine' marked 'tenori alle'.

The symbolism of the high-register flute, so heavily worked over in this passage in the *Missa* autograph, has aroused much comment in the literature, and particularly so from Warren Kirkendale, who long ago pointed out that its pastoral associations had been extended by Ignaz Seyfried as early as 1828 to encompass the notion that the instrument here depicts the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove. But Kirkendale went further than this, recalling the ancient tradition according to which the Virgin Mary conceived through the ear:

So literally did the medieval mind understand the pre-incarnate Christ as *logos*—the word enters the body through the ear.

...

At the end of the Incarnatus the flute becomes silent, and with the words 'Et homo factus est' we leave the mystic sphere of the medieval modes and return with an emphatic gesture to major-minor tonality, the realm of man.⁴²

Kirkendale admits that we do not know whether Beethoven was aware of this tradition; if we may imagine that he was, however, we might wonder what might have been the impact of such knowledge upon a composer who by this time was essentially completely deaf; the ear, the very vehicle of divine life according to

⁴² Warren Kirkendale, 'New Roads to Old Ideas in Beethoven's *Missa solemnis*', in *The Creative World of Beethoven*, ed. Paul Henry Lang (New York, 1970), 178. In his Addendum (199) Kirkendale, as have other scholars, links the remark '(hier menschlich)' on Wittgenstein fo. 30r with 'Et homo factus est' rather than with 'Crucifixus', as in my transcription in Ex. 5.

theological tradition, was for him a dead, lifeless organ. Certainly, we might register in this part of Beethoven's Credo a finely crafted image of human artistic creation. The invocation of modal harmony at 'Et incarnatus' was not purely for the purpose of giving 'a nimbus of awe and solemnity' to the text;⁴³ Beethoven here stages a potted history of music, 'dramatising' the emergence of the diatonic system from its modal predecessor. At the same time there is a progressive reduction, or intensification in expression, from the non-individualized choral tenor intonation through the solo ensemble to the solo tenor, emerging into the light as an individual being. Indeed, so removed from what precedes it is this moment that it is easy to construe the Latin text as 'and Man was made', rather than 'and [God] was made man', as though Beethoven were adverting here to the idea of the creative artist as rival to the divine creator. A telling detail in this respect may be Beethoven's correction from lower to upper case of the initial of the solo tenor 'Homo' in the autograph (bar 145).

Against this interpretation would need to be set the evidence of an important and relatively little-known source for the *Missa* upon which Hinrichsen touches in his commentary, referring in passing to the presently unpublished work of Birgit Lodes. The source in question is Berlin, mus. ms. autogr. Beethoven 35, 25, Beethoven's handwritten copy of the Mass text (as with the *Missa* autograph, the text of the Gloria is missing) with his own German-language translations of certain words and terms. Lodes, as reported by Hinrichsen, believes that Beethoven was in the process of making his own translation of the complete text,

⁴³ Ibid., 173.

in order to penetrate the meaning of the words as deeply as possible. For Hinrichsen, indeed, Beethoven's composition of the *Missa* was informed by 'an enormous rise in the aspiration to subject the Latin text of the Ordinary of the Mass, . . . to a completely new and very independent kind of musical exegesis. The intention to produce a nuanced exegesis of the text surpasses by far the concern for correct declamation'.⁴⁴ This aspect of the work is crucial for Hinrichsen, whose impatience with its various detractors (not least Adorno) is never more detectable than when he writes that 'anyone not recognising this absolute primacy of the text exegesis will neither come to terms with the *Missa solennis* nor have much joy in it' (p. 5*L).

The 'Et incarnatus . . . homo factus est' portion of the Credo appears on fo. 1v of autogr. Beethoven 35, 25. Beethoven glossed the word 'incarnatus', noting its derivation from *caro/carnis*, which he translates as *Fleisch*, thus giving *fleischig* for 'incarnatus'. The accentuation of 'Spiritu' and 'Maria' is marked; and 'Virgine' is glossed as *virgo*, defined as 'die noch bei keiner Manns Person geschlafen'. A subsequent detail (mirrored in the autograph score, fo. 18r, bar 145, as noted above) is the correction of the lower-case initial of 'homo' to an upper-case H. In

⁴⁴ *Ludwig van Beethoven: Missa Solemnis Op. 123*, 4*L. Preliminary remarks on autogr. Beethoven 35, 25 are in Birgit Lodes, *Das Gloria in Beethovens 'Missa Solemnis'* (Tutzing, 1997), 19ff.; a digital copy of the manuscript is available at http://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht?PPN=PPN726600091&PHYSID=PHYS_0001&DMDID=DM DLOG_0001)

Beethoven's German rendering (written to the right of the Latin text), the passage then became 'Vom heiligen Geiste aus der Jungfrau Maria eingefleischt worden und Mensch geworden ist', which leaves no doubt about the correct sense of 'et Homo factus est'.

We are in 'the realm of man', then; but we are invited to believe that this is a realm now infused by the divine: 'Great little one, whose all-embracing birth/Lifts earth to heaven, stoops heaven to earth', as Richard Crashaw put it.⁴⁵ And the descent of the Holy Spirit, symbolized by the elaborately figured solo flute within the 'incarnatus', relates closely to another descent that occurs in what is probably the most celebrated part of the *Missa*, namely the Benedictus with its sweeping violin solo. As the autograph shows (fo. 12v), Beethoven initially scored the accompaniment entirely for the clarinets, but subsequently chose to substitute the two flutes, the part for which had to be entered much further down the page, on the stave properly reserved for the solo tenor (this being only one of a myriad number of such cases of part-migration throughout the autograph).

'Whoever has followed the rhetoric thus far,' writes Kirkendale, will recognize the initial long, slow *katabasis* in the flutes and solo violin as the descent of Christ upon the altar. Is it the analogy to the Nativity that

⁴⁵ Crashaw, 'A Hymn of the Nativity, sung by the Shepherds', in *The Complete Works of Richard Crashaw*, ed. William B. Turnbull (London, 1858), 40.

leads so naturally to the style of the pastoral Mass, with its gently rocking trochaic melodies in 12/8 meter?⁴⁶

Kirkendale stops short here of explicitly linking the 'Benedictus' to the 'Et incarnatus' of Beethoven's Credo, but the similarities are worth pursuing. Once again, Beethoven presents a kind of creation story: but whereas the 'Et incarnatus' staged the 'birth' of diatonicism out of the old modal system, here we are presented in the 'preludium' (Beethoven's orthography in the autograph, fo. 10v) with one of those 'composed improvisations' familiar from works such as the Piano Sonatas in A, Op. 101 and B flat, Op. 106 ('Hammerklavier'), and the Cello Sonata in C, Op. 102 No. 1. In all three cases the improvisatory passage acts as a foil to a vigorous finale; and that finale, in the case of the two piano sonatas, is either cast as a fugue (Op. 106) or makes prominent use of fugal technique (Op. 101, development). The dynamic here in the *Missa* is different, but the sense is the same: 'improvisation' leads to worked-out 'composition'. In both cases, too—solo flute, solo violin—there is an emphasis on instrumental virtuosity, albeit of a rather quiet type. If we might be forgiven for imagining that Beethoven's 'Et incarnatus' risks celebrating Man become God, rather than the opposite, what we may hear at this holy moment in his Benedictus is the 'consecration' of wordless instrumental music by its undisputed master.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Kirkendale, 'New Roads', 187.

⁴⁷ Maynard Solomon has commented of passages such as that in the 'Hammerklavier' Sonata that 'the search for an ending enters an ambiguous, liminal domain, a threshold that by straddling the profane and the sacred permits passage from the former to the latter. Separated from the world and

The solo violin part was evidently well formulated before Beethoven came to enter it into the autograph: for the most part he was not reliant on a cue-staff on one of the bottom staves of each page, as was the case through much of the Kyrie, for example, which seems to have been largely composed in score without the support of pre-existing sketches (p. 9*L). That said, pencil markings and ink corrections show that he at some stage reconsidered the huge registral leap a³-c¹ in bars 128–29 (fos. 15v–16r); similarly, the parallel downward plunges at bars 156–58 and 195–97 required work, and the passage from bar 162 to 167 involved so much revision that the surface of the paper was worn through completely in three places (fo. 22).

William Drabkin has closely scrutinized the transitional bars between the ‘Praeludium’ (fos. 11r–12r, initially scored here for two violas, two cellos and bass plus bassoon) and the Benedictus, carefully explicating Beethoven’s efforts to establish a metrical relationship between the two sections, though neither he nor Hinrichsen comments on the heavily pencilled ‘Larghetto’ which is the only tempo marking present at the beginning of the ‘Benedictus’ itself (fo. 12v).⁴⁸

inoculated by faith against temptation, the traveler reaches the final stage of an exacting pilgrimage and achieves a state of holiness’: Solomon, ‘Intimations of the Sacred’, in Maynard Solomon, *Late Beethoven: Music, Thought, Imagination* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 2003), 204.

⁴⁸ Drabkin, ‘The Sketches and Autographs’, 115–118; *Ludwig van Beethoven: Missa Solemnis Op. 123*, 10*.

Drabkin also transcribes what he identifies as ‘an early version of the solo alto part in mm. 133–37’.⁴⁹ It is instructive of the limits of technology that even a facsimile of the exceptional quality of the Bärenreiter one cannot capture enough detail of the original to allow for an assessment of the accuracy of Drabkin’s transcription (and particularly of its second bar, which contains five dotted crotchets within the 12/8 metre). But if this may be assumed to be correct, then the forward-tied dotted minim on the first downbeat establishes a close connection with the unique ‘Nb: Benedictus’ sketch on fos. 5v–6r of Grasnick 5 discussed above, despite Kinderman’s claim that this is unconnected to any revision of the autograph.⁵⁰

In Drabkin’s assessment—and the facsimile bears him out—the Agnus Dei, to which Grasnick 5 had been devoted, ‘apparently gave Beethoven the greatest amount of trouble’. This is above all true of the ‘Dona nobis pacem’: the preceding part of the score (fos. 1r–10v) is remarkably clean, by Beethoven’s standards. The new facsimile allows for a much better appreciation of Drabkin’s detailed discussion of a number of mostly transitional moments which caused particular difficulty than do the reduced-size black-and-white images of two leaves from the autograph that accompanied his 1993 article.⁵¹ And the same is if anything even more true of Joel Lester’s discussion, now approaching its half-century, of revisions to the Kyrie, facilitated by the 1965 facsimile of that

⁴⁹ Drabkin, ‘The Sketches and Autographs’, 115 (Ex. 4).

⁵⁰ P. [X above], and *Artaria* 195, I, p. 42.

⁵¹ Drabkin, ‘The Sketches and Autographs’, 119–27, quotation at 119.

movement.⁵² Before reviewing Lester's work, however, it is well to consider Hinrichsen's own remarks on the very first page of the Kyrie score:

On the first page, one sees clearly that Beethoven had prepared four empty bars with confident and fine strokes before starting the writing-out. Only later was the number increased to seven with three [thicker] and wavy strokes. (p. 8*L)⁵³

Lester's reading is already different. Of the eight bar lines on fo.1r, he regards nos 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 8 as part of the original layer, while nos 3 and 5 are 'wavy and thicker, and were added after the first page had been laid out and scored in six measures'.⁵⁴ Hinrichsen's interpretation yields four original bars of roughly equal size (barlines 1–2, 2–4, 4–6 and 6–8); Lester's requires us to accept barline no. 7 as original, giving five original bars, the last two of which are about half the size of the first three. An argument in favour of barline 7 being a later addition could be mounted on the basis that it swerves rightward around the lower string notation of what is bar 6 of the final version, as though the barline had been drawn to accommodate the notation, and not the other way around (the added barlines 3 and 5 collide badly with other notations, which leaves no doubt of their non-original status). One could perhaps take it to have been a later

⁵² Joel Lester, 'Revisions in the Autograph of the *Missa solemnis Kyrie*', *JAMS*, 23 (1970), 420–38. For the earlier facsimile see n14 above.

⁵³ The translation erroneously gives 'figure' for 'dickeren': cf. 22*L, just as three and four lines later the translation gives 'minimum' where 'minim' is intended.

⁵⁴ Lester, 'Revisions', 427.

addition—maybe the slow minim tread in the violas and cellos/basses momentarily lulled Beethoven into thinking he was writing in 4/2—but not part of the layer of revision to which barlines 3 and 5 belong.

If barline 7 sits uncomfortably with the string notation, however, it accords perfectly well with the notation of the cue-staff on the lowest stave of the page (Ex. 7): the name is something of a misnomer in this case, however, since as Lester points out, ‘there is not a trace of the rhythmic detail of the cue staff in the score itself on fol. 1r’: what does survive is something of the pitch outline and its harmonic implications, which Lester along with other commentators takes as significant for the remainder of the *Missa*.⁵⁵

Ex. 7: Beethoven, *Missa solemnis*, Op. 123, Kyrie, autograph score (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Mus. ms. autogr. Beethoven 1), fo. 1r, st. 20

Lester’s reconstruction of the ‘initial score version’ of the opening bars of the Kyrie is given in his Ex. 4b, which obviously involves ignoring the added barlines 3 and 5. This retains

the same number of measures as the cue staff. Thus, from the opening to the beginning of the solo *Kyrie* motif [final version, bar 6] there are three measures. There is a three half-note structural upbeat to the end of the

⁵⁵ Ibid., 428–30, quotation at 430. The transcription of the original cue-staff layer in Ex. 6 differs slightly from Lester’s Ex. 1b (428).

Kyrie chords (m. 2) , and a three-measure structural upbeat from the beginning to the solo *Kyrie* motif.⁵⁶

Lester understands this version as motivated by the need to remove the ‘syncopated chords and the rapid harmonic rhythm of mm. 2 and 3 of the cue staff version’, something which Beethoven achieved by removing ‘the first chord change.’ An unsatisfactory consequence of this was that the important harmonic succession I–vi (D major–B minor) was lost, as also the triadic bass arpeggiation D–B–G. Lester’s interpretation relies, however, on the assumption that this harmonisation was already envisaged for the cue staff version; the Roman numerals supplied beneath the stave in Ex. 7 posit a more steady harmonic rhythm falling on each beat, and involving only chords I, IV and V.

The establishment of the final version involved the addition of barlines 3 and 5, creating two extra bars, the restitution of the I–vi–IV⁶/5–V progression and the melodic line of the cue staff; ‘the first version [was] crossed out, and the final version entered’. This final version is shown as Lester’s Ex. 4c. However, neither of his proposed versions makes sense of several details of the autograph that are actually shown in his Ex. 4a, which attempts to reproduce the full content of the string parts of bars 2–6 as they appear in the autograph: for example, the octave Ds in violin 1 and cello/bass (wrongly shown as crotchets rather than minims) and the deleted B octave and following crotchet rest in the cello/bass of bar 3. Ex. 8a–b offers alternative readings of the original layer in the outer voices of the

⁵⁶ Ibid., 430, from which page the further quotations below are also taken.

passage.⁵⁷ This suggests that Beethoven was working on the basis of a four-bar phrase leading up to what Lester calls the ‘*Kyrie motif*’ (final version, bar 6), and also that B minor (vi) remained part of the harmonic scheme throughout.

Ex. 8

- a: Beethoven, *Missa solemnis*, Op. 123, Kyrie, autograph score (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Mus. ms. autogr. Beethoven 1), fo. 1r, st. 9 (violin I)
- b: Beethoven, *Missa solemnis*, Op. 123, Kyrie, autograph score (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Mus. ms. autogr. Beethoven 1), fo. 1r, st. 12 (cello/bass)

The first bar of the four-bar model, like that of the final version, is of course missing its downbeat. In noting this, Hinrichsen recalls an observation of Thrasybulos Georgiades that the *Missa* begins ‘as if before the beginning of the measurement of time, before time’, to which the cadence at the end of the orchestral introduction (bar 20), likewise closing on the weak beat of the bar and proceeding from a tied-over dominant harmony, corresponds as ‘an overflowing,

⁵⁷ Although the two parts are aligned bar for bar in Ex. 8, they are not presented as a single reading since aspects of the alignment of individual elements—particularly in bar 2—suggest that they may have evolved independently of one another.

overhanging close, as if after time' (p. 8*L).⁵⁸ Whether or not one accepts Georgiades's 'semantic' interpretation, says Hinrichsen, the metrical disruption is the result of the additional two bars introduced in the autograph. This seems a peculiar claim: the added bars have nothing to do with the off-beat opening, which was envisaged even in the cue staff. Hinrichsen's discussion of the changes to this very first page of the autograph is in fact rather obscure without foreknowledge of Lester's much earlier investigation, even though that, as suggested above, is problematic. Lester's notion of a three-minim 'structural upbeat' to bar 2 is sound; but rather than understanding bar 3 as the beginning of 'a three-measure structural upbeat to the solo *Kyrie* motif [bar 6]', it seems more natural to hear bar 2 as the downbeat of a *four*-bar hypermetrical upbeat to that same moment. (By the same token, bars 0–1 might be considered 'beats' 3² and 4 of a further four-beat hyperbar that indeed precedes 'the beginning of the measurement of time'.)

That even the reconstruction of an original four-bar 'upbeat' suggested in Ex. 8 is not without its difficulties is symptomatic of the extreme difficulty of fully grasping the traces of the compositional process presented by the autograph of the *Missa Solemnis*. Even as he prepared that first page, and allowing too for the fact that the *Kyrie* was clearly more extensively composed in the autograph than were the subsequent movements, Beethoven must have known that what he was embarking upon was a working score that could not begin to approach the status

⁵⁸ Thrasybulos G. Georgiades, 'Zu den Satzschlüssen der *Missa Solemnis* (1970)', in Georgiades, *Kleine Schriften* (Tutzing, 1977), 157.

of a finished version or fair copy: this is to say nothing of the fact that it does not contain the organ or trombone parts, for example, nor even bars 211–212 of the Credo (see fos. 26v–27r).⁵⁹ Richard Kramer's claim, arising from the newly accepted fragility of an earlier 'categorical distinction between Work and Sketch', that 'the autograph, then, is recognized as a repository not only for a completed score, if not in its final redaction, but for earlier readings: sketches, by some definition', seems almost optimistic in relation to this particular manuscript.⁶⁰

Near the end of her contributory essay to the *Missa* facsimile, Martina Rebmann confirms that

every effort has been made to reproduce the surface appearance of the manuscript as closely as possible: in elaborate technical binding processes, the leaf stubs and fold-out pages have been reworked, and only thus can the 'fac-simile' be realized in its full and literal sense. No digital reproduction, and even less so a microfiche or copy, could reproduce the aesthetic and haptic impression of this Beethoven manuscript more adequately. (p. 14*)

Lurking behind this may be a concern to justify the very high cost of publications such as the two under scrutiny here in an age in which more and more libraries and archives (not least the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, home to the *Missa* autograph and so much more) are making their holdings available digitally. Certainly, the cost of the *Missa* facsimile, if not Metzler's and Stoltzfus's edition of

⁵⁹ *Missa Solemnis*, ed. Gertsch, 298–99, 315.

⁶⁰ Kramer, review of *Missa solemnis*, ed. Gertsch, 746.

Grasnick 5, will put it well beyond the pocket of most individuals. Also in Rebmann's sights may be digital projects such as 'Beethovens Werkstatt', which—picking up from Kramer's observations—'probes an edition concept that destabilizes the very notion of a (perfected) work while simultaneously setting Beethoven's oeuvre at the forefront of a technological revolution in music editing': a revolution that may convince us

that exhibit curation provides a better model for workshop studies than traditional critical editions, since the display and decipherment of these documents is undertaken not in order to establish authoritative readings, but only to make their texts intelligible and to bring compositional or occasion-specific performance sources into meaningful relation with finished works (however 'finished' is defined in each case).⁶¹

But Rebmann's attention to the aesthetic and haptic qualities of Beethoven's manuscripts also returns us to the issues raised at the very beginning of this essay. Indeed, the qualities which Rebmann attributes to the original are not lacking in the facsimile editions themselves; this is especially true of the *Missa* facsimile, which gives immense visual and tactile pleasure (the paper quality of the Grasnick 5 edition, good though it is, cannot compare), even if its sheer size and weight risk making it somewhat unwieldy to manipulate in the absence of a large desk or table. The silver lining here, though, is that this is not a volume that can easily be removed from the home: Fuchs would have been delighted.

⁶¹ Kristina Muxfeldt, review of 'Beethovens Werkstatt' [<http://beethovens-werkstatt.de>], *JAMS*, 69 (2016), 855–56.

