melodic lines, and with a flair for text setting. It is encouraging to sense enthusiasm in the first paragraph of Margaret Bent's Foreword. Let us hope that the Society's enterprise and Karl Kroeger's dedication will find fruit in a more general appreciation of Billings, first in the wider musicological community, then in the musical world at large.

Nicholas Temperley
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign


A LARGE SCALE STUDY DEVOTED ALMOST ENTIRELY TO ONE-THIRD OF A movement from a single work (one-fourth in terms of duration) demands some explanation, whatever the grandeur of the work. In the course of his investigations, Otto Zickenheiner throws up a plethora of justifications, including 1) the unusualness of vocal fugue in the classical period, 2) the rich historical tradition underlying the cultivation of vocal fugue, 3) the unified compositional technique and the unified text of the section studied, 4) the "clear separation" of the fugue from the other sections of the Credo, and 5) the vast array of source materials left by the composer. Although the same arguments could be applied with equal logic (or illogic) to sections from other works, the temptation to treat in segments a work as sprawling and encyclopedic as the Missa solemnis is readily understandable. 1

Since the pathbreaking publications of Nottebohm in the nineteenth century, source studies of Beethoven's music have focused on his instrumental creations. 2 For the most part, the choral music has endured respectful neglect. 3 Zickenheiner's researches, though far from complete, provide the first extended evaluation of any of the primary musical materials for the work that Beethoven referred to in 1822 as "the greatest . . . which I have

1Zickenheiner explains his exclusion of the analogous and equally weighty In gloria Dei Patris fugue by arguing—not unconvincingly—that it is integrated more closely into the Gloria than is the "relatively independent" fugue of the Credo into its movement.


composed thus far."4

Zickenheiner’s study is the most recent in a sporadic but sizeable group of monographs issued over the last three decades under the general editorship of the Beethovenhaus in Bonn. It is perhaps the last in which an author will acknowledge as primary stimulus the late Joseph Schmidt-Görg, the founding father of the Beethoven-Archiv. The Missa solemnis served as the ritornello throughout Schmidt-Görg’s long and distinguished career (including a 1948 monograph).5 It was Schmidt-Görg who, between 1952 and 1972, published in transcription (and, later, in facsimile) three pocket sketchbooks and a large desk sketchbook for the Mass, all presently in the possession of the Beethovenhaus.6 Schmidt-Görg’s efforts were both pioneering and flawed (see my review, this JOURNAL 28 [1975]: 135–38), though Zickenheiner’s study is unthinkable without Schmidt-Görg’s substantial down payment.

The years since the 1970 bicentennial have brought an increasing sophistication in source studies, with tools such as paper types, handwriting characteristics, reconstruction and collation of sources, and layered transcriptions now de rigueur. Under the leadership of Martin Staehelin and, especially, Sieghard Brandenburg, the Beethoven-Archiv has regained a position of central importance in Beethoven research, most dramatically in the area of sketch studies.

Although more than two-thirds of the current study is devoted to a detailed look at the sketches, the book as a whole turns out to be transitional, both in methodology and results. Zickenheiner begins promisingly by placing the “Second Mass” in a larger liturgical context. He recounts the widely held views of writers like Karl Gustav Fellerer and Harry Goldschmidt, in which Beethoven created a work that outstripped any realistic hope of being performed in his lifetime. But Zickenheiner argues that Beethoven doubtless began a work he fully intended to have performed at the Archduke’s installation. It was typical for “solemn Masses” destined for special festivities to exceed substantially the scope of Masses performed on more routine occasions. Zickenheiner also reminds us of the new vogue at just this time for performing liturgical works in public concerts. At the end of 1819 the Viennese inaugurated their version of the Concert spirituel, and its programs regularly commingled symphonies with Mass movements and oratorios. Beethoven’s own C-major Mass received concert performances in Vienna, Passau, Mannheim, Leipzig, and Cologne during his lifetime. The conversation books betray Beethoven’s irritation with the censor’s proscription of “Mass” movements for his May 1824 academy, since Ignaz von Seyfried had already performed entire Masses in public concerts. At all events, it required only a disingenuous re-naming of the Kyrie, Credo, and Agnus as “3 sacred hymns” to satisfy the Viennese authorities. In St. Petersburg, where the work received its complete premiere the month before, it was referred to without exception as an “oratorio”.


5Missa solemnis (Bonn, 1948).

Zickenheiner devotes a dozen pages to placing the *Credo* in a stylistic context (he has little to say about the other movements of the work). His review of the sparse secondary literature turns up a bewildering variety of perceived forms. Although most writers postulate a Trinity-inspired tripartite structure and place the *Et incarnatus* (mm. 125 ff.) at the start of the second section, there is no agreement about where the third and final section begins. Lucie Dikenmann-Balmer\(^7\), governed by textural considerations, proposes the return of the *Credo* motto (mm. 265 ff.).\(^8\) Rudolf Gerber\(^9\) places the beginning of the third section at the emphatic tempo change at *Et resurrexit* (mm. 185 ff.). Adalbert Schütz\(^10\) argues for *ascendit* a few bars later (mm. 194 ff.). Others, such as Werner Korte\(^11\), see a four-part structure.

More important than where the final section begins is how it functions, and to both of these questions Zickenheiner proposes a novel and more musical solution. He notes that the return of the *Credo* motive at *Credo in spiritum sanctum* begins clearly in the key of the dominant (still sharing its key signature with the *Et incarnatus*), and that the motto is then subjected to modulatory, developmental procedures. The F-major cadence before the fugue is equally strong and conspicuously follows the completion of the text. By extending the second section to m. 300, Zickenheiner sees the fugue functioning in third position as an extended tonal reprise, borrowing in important respects from sonata procedures. To extend his analogy, bars 306–9 function as a retransition, anticipating thematically (in the oboe and bassoon) the fugue subject in the same way that the retransitions of the first movements of the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh symphonies anticipate the thematic material of their returns. Further, the *Credo* fugue functions as both recapitulation and coda, assuming greater structural importance, for example, than the parallel and, in some respects, more substantial *Gloria* fugue.

Paradoxically, this greater structural importance freed Beethoven to outfit the *et vitam venturī* with a "shrinking" of tempo and dynamics that disturbed contemporary reviewers. Zickenheiner quotes Ignaz von Seyfried's wan remark in 1828 that "among the fugues the one on the words *et vitam venturī saeculi* begins somewhat feebly and tediously; later, however, when the movement accelerates, influenced by the colorful and crisp countersubjects, it inclines almost to incoherence."\(^12\) With almost no historical precedent, Beethoven chose to forego the celebratory, extroverted dimensions implied by the promise of eternal life by framing his portrayal with its devotional and mystical aspects.


\(^8\)Numerous composers, including Tomascheck, Weber, Cherubini, and Diabelli, used the same motive for the *Credo* recurrences throughout the movement.


\(^12\)Unter den Fugen  llingt jene auf die Worte: *et vitam venturī saeculi* anfangs etwas matt und schleppend; später aber, bey beschleunigerter Bewegung, vermöge der bunten und krausen Figuren des Contrasubjects, neigt sie fast zur Undeutlichkeit." *Caecilia* 9 (1828): 230.
Having made his best case for the autonomy of the fugue, Zinkenheiner proceeds to a more thoroughgoing analysis of its structure—from the subject, countersubject, and answer, to the contrapuntal workings out, to the sharply differentiated tripartite structure. This schematic approach runs the risk—to which it sometimes succumbs—of being reduced to descriptive minutiae without any unifying thread. Indeed, the lack of such a thread on Beethoven’s part supplies much of Zinkenheiner’s analytical overview. The subject, as the author establishes in meticulous detail, is remarkably well-behaved for Beethoven. The first half with its four repeated notes and descending tonic triad, is conventional to the point of blandness. The pattern of descending thirds (F-D-B♭-G-♭♭-C-A-F) disguised by an upward sixth at its midpoint (g'–e') would have proved familiar syntax to any eighteenth- or early nineteenth-century composer (Zinkenheiner draws parallels to specific fugues of Handel, Haydn, and Cherubini). The placement of the stepwise filling-in between tones 3–4 and 6–7 of this pattern is one of its few asymmetries. The tonal answers require the minimum adjustment in both subject and countersubject, aided by the almost measure-and-a-half delay in the entrance of the stepwise countersubject. The SATB succession of initial entries falls into regular four-bar groups.

The only contrapuntal curiosity is Beethoven’s unnecessary raising, in the answer, of the second tone in the countersubject from a second to a third above the first tone, an eventuality not foreseen in the composer’s studies with Albrechtsberger twenty-five years earlier. Here it serves to prolong the dominant harmony, imparting a greater sense of tonic resolution in the following bar (m. 316). Inexplicably, Zinkenheiner fails to note in his analytical overview that the major textual distinction between subject and countersubject is the appropriation by the subject of the entire et vitam text, while the countersubject intones only amen.13

The overall form of the fugue is to Zinkenheiner as unconventional as the thematic material is orthodox. He finds no theoretical precedent in the writings of Marpurg, Albrechtsberger, or Sulzer for Beethoven’s structure of three highly differentiated sections. This layout led at least one early reviewer, F.J. Fröhlich in 1828, to recommend that the second section (mm. 373–438) be omitted in performance. Zinkenheiner (p. 81) points out that, for Beethoven, this non-unified procedure was normative, encompassing not only every fugue from the late period (with the possible exception of that which opens Op. 131), but earlier ones as well, such as the conclusion of the Op. 35 piano variations.

The first section, the only one to pay obeisance to traditional fugal procedures, is marked by a nearly continuous string of entries with no audible formal junctures (prompting the sole “graphic” in the volume, and illustrating how resistant fugues are to description). The second section, with its diminutions of the reworked subject and countersubject, compounded by suspensions, syncopations, and metric shifts, seems to relate only dimly to that which came before. The coda, rather than consolidating the thematic workings out, dissolves the fugue subject into a series of “contrastless” scales and arpeggios entirely on amen.

13 This fact is noted on p. 157, almost sixty pages into the discussion of the sketches, but would seem to be one of the most obvious points in any basic description of the finished work.
So much for this useful background and analytical overview. Because these are placed first in the volume and occupy the lesser portion, it is no easy task to relate them to the much lengthier discussion of the sketches that follows. Is the analysis simply an introductory framework that facilitates understanding of the sketches? Or are the sketches an important vehicle through which we achieve unique insights into the finished work? Although this issue is not raised at all during the first hundred pages, Zickenheiner opens his discussion of the sketch sources by facing it head-on—only to shy away from forging his own point of view.

He begins by acknowledging that differences of opinion have existed since Nottebohm. But he cites Douglas Johnson's dispassionate and witty dismemberment of the assumed relationship between sketch studies and the analysis of finished works only for its summaries of various viewpoints. Summarize Johnson does, but he also raises hard questions for which answers must be found. Instead, Zickenheiner falls back on Arnold Schmitz's vague formulation that the sketches can provide "valuable help in the compositional/technical investigations of the finished work." Elsewhere the author quotes Siegfried Kross's shrewd observation that "to inquire after Beethoven's working process means a dynamization of previous methods of observation, in that not isolated stages, but the progress between them is investigated." The author also professes agreement with Sieghard Brandenburg's "cautiously optimistic" viewpoint that "the sketches and autographs offer, contrary to earlier views, several points of reference, even if perhaps they do not provide exhaustive evidence." But Brandenburg's carefully worded statement makes little sense in the absence of the detailed line of argument that preceded it, to which Zickenheiner does not refer.

By the time his summary concludes, the author has quoted more than a half dozen authorities, embracing each in turn. Forswearing controversy, he argues only that "the Beethoven sketches permit to a modest degree insights into the compositional history of his works and therefore also into the creative process of a composer." But this timid claim is diluted further by the ensuing remark that "in the following sketch investigations of the Credo fuge the individual sketches should not be regarded as incomplete prelim-


18Zickenheiner, 104. This and subsequent translations of Zickenheiner are by the author.
inaries or premonitions of the final version, but as various formulations of attempted solutions to compositional/technical and stylistic problems" (p. 106). This remark seems to cut the sketches adrift from the finished work, which—the author adds as an afterthought—is "a necessary aid in the identification, transcription, and ordering of individual sketches" (p. 106). Are we, in essence, to view the compositional process in reverse? Is the continuity that surely existed in the composer's mind between every stage in the composition, culminating in the finished work, to be surrendered so easily?

These are vexing questions, and there are no easy answers. But the odds of success are diminished by the dated argument that "this inquiry stands in contrast to the oft expressed viewpoint that all evaluations of the sketches must be preceded by the exact reconstruction of the former sketchbooks. By this assumption sketch research would be limited for a long time to fundamental paper and watermark investigations, and substantive researches would be reserved for a small group of specialists or would have to be postponed until the publication of the successful reconstruction efforts" (p. 103, n. 14).

The irony is that the source problems for this relatively narrow band of sketches are by no means insurmountable, and the author is, for the most part, well aware of them. But he demurs from descending into the trenches where the nitty-gritty transcription wars are fought and the close-range interrelationships are uncovered. This painstaking process demands a considerable degree of identification on the part of the researcher with the act of composition itself. Far more useful than a lengthy, undifferentiated A-through-Q listing of the sources for the entire Mass would have been a single hierarchical schematic showing how the sketches for the Credo fugue relate to one another musically and chronologically. The surviving sketches for this section of the Mass are relatively straightforward, being found towards the end of the standard-format Wittgenstein Sketchbook and on pages 7-33 of the following sketchbook, Artaria 195. Parallel sketches in pocket format are found in BH 108 and on smaller groups of unstitched leaves, largely in the collection Artaria 180+200. A few odd sketches in standard format appear on loose leaves. Throughout his discussion, Zickenheiner refers constantly to "earlier" and "later" sketches, and he is generally right. But the effect is that of piecing together small clumps of a jigsaw puzzle without ever seeing the whole picture.

Instead, Zickenheiner's trek through the sketches follows the path of his more general analysis: from subject to answer to countersubject, and so forth. In some respects, of course, a process proceeding from the particle to the atom to the molecule is bound to reflect some aspects of the broad development of a work. But Beethoven is renowned for having projected

19These interrelationships would have been clarified by a more rigorous adherence to the stated policy of transcribing layered sketches through various sized noteheads (p. 127). The transcriptions in general are musically plausible and well thought out, but many simply omit previous or later emendations to the same sketch by Beethoven.

musical plans beyond the immediate availability of building materials, and the switching back and forth among various structural levels during the evolution of his works is the rule rather than the exception. Compartmen-
talizing the genesis of a work may appeal to our sense of tidiness, but it reflects little light upon the compositional process.

The result throughout Zickenheiner's examination is that sketches made by Beethoven within close temporal proximity are discussed dozens of pages (and sometimes much more) apart. And when we finally reach the level of “various structural plans” a scant sixteen pages before the end of the text, we learn that there were none. The author offers as a partial explanation the “division of sketches from various stages throughout a series of large books, booklets and single leaves, whose internal relationships are extremely opaque” (p. 246). What, then, do we make of the even more disparate and complex groups of sketches for the late quartets, which are nonetheless riddled with continuity drafts?

Although literal examples of such drafts for the Credo fugue do not seem to have survived (the notion of a “continuity draft” for a fugal work is inherently problematic), there is an intriguing series of extended sketch sets that Zickenheiner inexplicably refers to only in passing. They are without doubt the most interesting sketches for the fugue to survive, and include all of those on pp. 16–29 of Artaria 195. Unlike any others preserved for this fugue, they are—like the score sketches for the late quartets—disposed in four parts. Though largely textless and entirely clefless, the musical context stipulates the conventional vocal clefs (soprano, alto, tenor, bass). The first bar of p. 16, where the draft commences, begins with the third bar of the fourth entry in the bass (cf. m. 324). Since the remaining three voices are already active, it may be safe to assume an SATB order of entries, as in the final version. The autograph, Artaria 202, though littered with the final casualties of Beethoven’s contrapuntal battles, shows no related signs of struggle. It is unlikely that Beethoven began the draft here, although it probably commenced only a few dozen bars before.

The most remarkable feature of these extensive sketches is that, although they share features with the first section of the finished work, they bear no concrete resemblance to anything in it. They tell us that Beethoven had scarcely begun to flesh out the fugue that we know. It seems inconceivable that they were the last (or the first) sketches of this kind for a work of such intricacy. Beethoven makes sparing use of timesaving elements like those found in the “permutation” fugues of J.S. Bach. Although subject entries are prominent, they share the spotlight in Beethoven's draft with other types of “free” counterpoint. It is virtually impossible to distinguish “continuation

21 Except for a brief discussion and example showing two “rhythmically displaced themes” from this complex (Zickenheiner, 163), there is no evaluation or even acknowledgment of its considerable importance. Apart from the example alluded to above, there is no discussion of any sketches beyond p. 14 in Artaria 195.

22 Zickenheiner’s apparent lack of belief in the symbiosis between sketch and autograph leads him to omit even a mention of this remarkable document, much less its role in the evolutionary chain. Several of the important structural decisions he fails to find addressed in the sketches are resolved only in the autograph itself.

sketches" from groups of entries, since the entries are nearly continuous and themselves undergo major modifications. All of this increases the likelihood that we are probing the genesis of this section minus the services of a substantial amount of lost score sketches. Fugal movements are unevenly represented among Beethoven's sketches, but those that survive suggest the compositional process was intensive and protracted.

Zickenheiner's focus turns out to hinge on foreground issues raised by the subject and its immediate counterpoint. Within this limitation, there is much of interest to be gleaned from his excavations. The use of 3/2 meter was assumed from the start, and the pattern of descending thirds is rarely absent. (This stands in sharp contrast to the great variety of entries that precede the selection of the subject outline in the Gloria fugue.) The author traces almost fifty entries for this four-bar theme, the vast majority of which descend through the octave from $f''$ to $f'$, moving harmonically from tonic to dominant.

Likewise, from its moment of conception the countersubject carried the marker of stepwise motion in even quarter notes. The decision to delay its entry until the second bar grew, as might be expected, out of the decision to employ a tonal answer to the subject. Rhythmically, the third bar (reckoned from the beginning of the subject) was pivotal. While he wished to maintain a sense of pure, even flow, Beethoven's allegiance to classical phraseology led him to numerous experiments that provide the subject in this bar—and thus in the phrase—with a dash of animation. The solution included a counterbalancing diminishment of motion in the countersubject.

Beethoven's sensitivity to contrapuntal aspects meant that even shorter sketches were in two or more voices. This led him in one sketch (Artaria 195, p. 13, st. 13–16) to notate over the countersubject, using figured bass symbols, thirteen intervals in the space of four bars. Proper declamation was no less a preoccupation, which accounts for his careful copying of the text beforehand. Tradition (including Beethoven's own C-major Mass) called for the placement of strong beats on the syllables $vi$-, $tu$-, $sae$-, and $a$-. After sticking doggedly to this layout throughout all of the preliminary stages, he finally realized that triple meter demanded a softer accent pattern; the moving of $sae$- to the final beat of the second bar not only broke the squareness, but provided the harmonic surprise of the lowered seventh degree with its own syllable.

In Zickenheiner's study we are left with an interesting—often insightful—but partial account of a small portion of the Missa solemnis that itself cannot be fully represented in the sketches. These limitations are rendered more limiting by the lack of any indexes. At the very least a general index and a source index would prove indispensable for scholars wishing to pursue further avenues with this volume at their side (I compiled a rough source

---

24 For the freer material linking the more schematic sets of entries in Bach's choral fugues, see Marshall, The Compositional Process, 141ff.

25 A rare transcription error (p. 128) leads Zickenheiner to conclude that Beethoven may have considered a homophonic rather than a fugal treatment. Zickenheiner transcribes Beethoven's remark in Wittgenstein (p. 60, between staves 4 and 5) as "et vitam venturi in 8va oder harmonie," but what he clearly wrote is "et vitam venturi erst in 8va oder harmonie"—which would presumably have been followed by fugal treatment.

26 Autogr. 35, 25 in Berlin D: Bds.
index in about three hours). As it is, only patience recalling that of Job will permit direct comparisons of discussions inside the volume with anything outside.

Otto Zickenheiner deserves our admiration for leaping in where many others have feared to tread, and if his analytical yield falls short of providing the last word, he has done a masterful job of portraying the difficulties inherent in dealing with the primary sources for this most enigmatic of masterpieces—and along the way he has added more than incidentally to our knowledge of it.

ROBERT S. WINTER
University of California, Los Angeles


Just over twenty years have passed since the renaissance of interest in the performance and serious study of the works of Alexander Nikolaevich Scriabin. A number of reasons for this renaissance could be cited. The general mood of the 1960s may have encouraged renewed interest in such works as the rather blatantly erotic Poem of Ecstasy, or Prometheus, with its nascent multimedia character. The beginnings of the “New Romanticism” might also be given some credit for bringing the mystical and solipsistic fervor of Scriabin’s expressive nature back into favor with performers and public alike. In addition, cultural changes inside the Soviet Union have allowed Scriabin to approach once more the front line of attention that he had frequently occupied during his lifetime.

In the world of scholarship, one event that affected the Scriabin “revival” was the Russian publication, in 1965, of a complete edition of his correspondence, followed four years later by Faubion Bowers’ two-volume biographical study, much of which was influenced by the author’s access to that new edition of the letters. The occasion of the centennial of the composer’s birth in 1972 was greeted in January of that year by a series of articles in Sovetskaia Muzyka and was also responsible for a new Soviet biography, a commemorative collection of essays by leading Soviet musicologists and music theorists, and a large number of other books and articles in a variety of languages, chiefly English, German and, of course, Russian.

The spate of new material—as well as of performances and recordings—did not cease with the passing of the centennial. A hint of the extent and variety of this new scholarly attention can be provided by mentioning the

4Viktor Del’son, *Scriabin: Ocherki Zhizni i Tvorchestva* (Moscow, 1971).