Piano Sonata in A Major, Op. 101

LITERATURE

“cri-cri-cri-cri-ti-ti-ti-ti-cize-cize—not until the end of time, that you cannot.”

BEETHOVEN, letter of October 9, 1911

Nottebohm (see “Preliminary Remarks”) comments as follows on the sketches for the second movement:

Later (pp. 76–85), we find work on the second movement of the Sonata in A Major, Op. 101. No sketches are present for a large portion of the movement, except for the canon. One sees almost nothing but fragmentary work. Every sketch breaks off. It would be difficult to establish an interconnection between the individual sketches, to find all of their relationships, if one did not know the printed work. Nevertheless, in work of this kind Beethoven had in view—if not at the very outset, still very early—a plan for the whole layout, for the modulatory progression, and the like.

The sketch appearing first, which because of partial illegibility cannot be well reproduced, but which shows an unmistakable similarity to the first three or four bars of the printed movement, bears the title:

2nd Stück, Allegro marcia (2nd Movement, Allegro Marcia)

From this title it is clear that the first movement had been begun earlier or was already finished. Sketches to this movement have nowhere been found. This is the basis for the assumption expressed earlier that the leaves somewhat close to the beginning of the sketchbook could have contained sketches for it.
According to a comment standing with a different sketch:

Erster Teil in A ohne \( \text{f\ f} \) repet. (First part in A without \( \text{f\ f} \) repetition)

the first part of the movement was to close in A major and not be repeated. Beethoven later changed his mind.

It cost Beethoven some effort to find the continuation of the first bars of the first part. Several attempts were made at this. We present two sketches in which many alterations were made; first this (p. 80):

![First sketch image]

and then this (p. 84):

![Second sketch image]
(The original draft appears underneath, the places later modified above.) At the end of the last sketch is noted:

Hernach in A dur them.
(Afterward in A major, theme.)

Here too, then, the key of A major was taken as a goal. Obviously Beethoven considered establishment of the key to be important. In the finished version as well it is established, except at a point different from the one indicated in the sketches.

The canon also required extra effort. Here (p. 85) the beginning of a sketch.
During work on the second movement, suggestions and attempts for the last movements of the sonata appeared. The third movement was originally to begin as follows:

For the last movement only two interrupted sketches are found, first this (p. 77):

And shortly after, this (p. 78)

As we see, only the principal motif was found, although it does not, as in the published version, appear as an independent member, but rather as a component of a longer section. Beethoven continued the work on the last movement in a different sketchbook.¹

¹ We are indebted to Nottebohm as well for an “almost literally” reproduced communication from Czerny (see Zweite Beethoveniana, pp. 356–357): “Once Beethoven played his Sonata in A major, Op. 101, for a gathering. He played it very beautifully, but said later that he himself had heard nothing of his playing.” But if we contrast with this what Czerny remarks in his Grosse Pianoforteschule, Part IV (Supplement) about Op. 101
Schindler writes in his Beethoven biography\(^2\) (reprint, p. 287):

Our wonder will only increase at the consistently maintained sentiment in the immediately following Sonata in A major, Op. 101, called “the sensitive sonata” by Marx. Noteworthy about this work is that among all sonatas by Beethoven, it was the only one that was publicly performed during the lifetime of the master. This occurred in a concert organized by Schuppanzigh in February, 1816, at which the composer was present as well. He had entrusted the performance to an artistically trained dilettante, Stainer von Felsburg,\(^3\) having first introduced him to the work, which is poetically rich and, in its first and third movements, uncommonly difficult to project. These two movements the master marked “Träumerische Empfindungen” (“dreamy feelings”); their performance requires a free tempo.

Insofar as they pertain to factual matters, Schindler’s statements have already been disproven (see Nottebohm, p. 344; Nohl; cf. also the annotation to letter No. 518, Vol. III of the Beethoven letters). Still less may an actual introduction to a Beethoven art-work be expected from him; the two words “träumerische Empfindungen,” which he attributes to Beethoven, certainly cannot count as such. It is just a shame that the master’s performance instructions to Herr Stainer have not been preserved for us, even though it is a foregone conclusion that they would have suffered the same fate as the work. Schindler writes in all the more detail of the dedicatee, Frau Baroness Ertmann.\(^4\) He was also the one who first published the letter of dedication:

My dear and valued Dorothea-Cecilia,

No doubt, you often had to misjudge me, from my apparently forbidding manner; much of this arose from circumstances, especially in earlier days, when my nature was less understood than at present. You know the manifestations of

and especially about the first movement: “Through a way of playing that maintains restraint but also tonal richness, and a smooth performance calculated for overall effect, the important aspects of this composition, which dispenses with all superficial embellishment, will best be brought out. It should neither be allowed to drag in performance nor be distorted by a vacillating tempo”—we must doubt whether Beethoven’s performance too is thereby depicted. Apart from many other reasons that point to the contrary, which lie in the composition itself and in Czerny’s personality, it is just the contrast between the here recommended performance and that of Frau Baroness Ertmann [see below] that must make even those who judge superficially distrustful of Czerny.


\(^3\) Johann Baptist Steiner von Felsburg (1756–1832).

\(^4\) Compare Mendelssohn’s letter to his family of July 14, 1831, and from it the following: “She plays the Beethoven pieces very beautifully, although she has not studied for a long time; often she exaggerates the expression a bit, and retards too much, then hurries ahead again; yet she again plays individual parts excellently, and I think I have learned something from her”—but see above, Czerny’s comments.
those self-elected apostles who promote their interests by means very different from those of the true Gospel. I did not wish to be included in that number. Receive now what has been long intended for you, and may it serve as a proof of my admiration of your artistic talent, and likewise of yourself! Not having heard you recently at Cz—[Czerny’s] was owing to indisposition, which at last appears to be giving way to returning health.

I hope soon to hear how the . . . are regarded at St. Pölten [where her husband’s regiment was at that time quartered], and whether you think highly of your admirer and friend,

L. van Beethoven.

My kindest regards to your esteemed husband.  

*Marx (Biography, Part II, p. 265):*

Right away the first movement, marked *Allegretto ma non troppo* and next to it *etwas lebhaft und mit der innigsten Empfindung*, does have the ordinary form of a first movement of a sonata, although not its character, but rather that of the *Adagio*, of introversion.”

The “ordinary form” of a first movement? Just show me a companion-piece, or—show me the contrast!—a more *un*-ordinary form. If I concede that Marx must have recognized the ternary division of the sonata movement (First Part, Development, Reprise), I cannot concede that he may have meant this particularly with the above words. Thus it will immediately be clear that not even the *ordinary* could have been known to him, just because the *extraordinary* was out of his reach. But anyway, whether in ordinary or non-ordinary form, how can a first, dynamic sonata-movement carry adagio character? Such a quid-pro-quo of both forms, such unnaturalness! Wouldn’t that mean in effect bidding fire to flow like water, or water to flicker upward like fire? Even Marx immediately refutes himself with the following statement:

There is melody of longing, of yearning in it—already the first theme rests on the dominant and its significance—; but it is not the melody of only one voice: each of the voices sets its eloquent and congenial melody alongside the principal voice; this movement is imbued with feeling, with

---

harmonious sentiment and melody. At the same time there prevails a rather nervous excitement, indeed breathlessness, which surges over each cadential point, whenever a reasonable tarrying (bar 4 on the last three eighths; bar 5 especially on the three last eighths; bar 6 altogether; bar 9 on the first tone; bars 12, 15, and 16 likewise; then bar 19 on the first, phrase-final tone) may seem fitting. This excitement is more of an inner nature, would prefer to conceal itself rather than to obtrude—a life without any apparent purpose, turned back into itself and withdrawn. Therefore it is inexhaustible; that cadence (bar 19) turns into a deceptive cadence, the melody of the voices flows on, attempts to cadence two more times (bars 24 and 26) and finally succeeds in the twenty-eighth bar. Such an expansive range for this one, quiet, secretive sentiment, unchanging, practically without intensification!

Earlier Marx spoke of an Adagio, now he speaks of a “rather nervous excitement, indeed breathlessness, which surges over each cadential point,” etc.—but can these be reconciled? How little still has Marx heard Beethoven’s allegro sonata movements if he has not yet even heard as their driving principle the dramatically forceful pointedness, which, far from letting the individual themes make the most of their lives, instead must draw blood from each theme, so to speak, for the next one, just as in the actual battle for life, the present must always make sacrifices for the imminent future. And how little, on the other hand, has he heard adagios—those of Beethoven!—if he doesn’t know that their innermost desire is, as it were, to extend a present moment, as though the headlong rush of the heart’s bloodstream were pacified to a measured pulsation and stilled: the adagio—the immortality of a present moment, an instant; the sonata movement on the contrary—the plummeting life with its continuous lockstep of present and future. It is not only this contradiction, though: Marx immediately forgets the “breathlessness” that “surges over each cadential point” etc., and his hermeneutist mentality swings toward the other side: “ . . . this one, quiet, secretive sentiment, unchanging, practically without intensification.” How deaf mustn’t Marx’s perception have remained in the face of that force of genius, which, though indeed creating from most intimate feeling, nevertheless piles up consequent of the first theme, modulation, and second theme with overpowering force as though upon only a single point! Because it is intimacy that so tears boundaries asunder, makes such a tremor, should its consequence be called here any less an “intensification” than for example in a case where the thematic boundaries are breached with less passion and daring, but more noise is summoned up in the process?
Marx adds: “It is the secretiveness and speechlessness of Ottilie,\(^6\) but without the uproars that this noblest creation of Goethe’s experienced. One has to combine a perceptive soul with a most refined understanding of each emotion and the most sensitive fingers.”

“. . . Ottilie, but without . . .”—such a hermeneutist-pillory, this laughably irreverent expression. Although brought into the world through spiritual procreation and surviving only in words, Ottilie still enjoys an eternal life, as well and genuinely as immortality can be imparted to a human being born of a mother’s womb. And in exactly the same way—depending, of course, on the spiritual father—a being can as well be born in musical notation to life and immortality. And now the question arises whether one who fails even to form an accurate picture of its physicality may speak of this or that creature of the mind—one who knows not where the creature comes by (so to speak) its eyes, hands and feet? Just consider:

The subordinate theme, which in particular Beethoven marks with “Espressivo e semplice,” then continues the story. Which story?—well, the same. For in this tender soul there is no particular experience; it is itself its only content, except that the movement stirs still more gently, almost seeming—in the syncopes—to come to rest completely.

What is already the last exhalation of the theme thus strikes Marx as the subordinate theme itself, as though the last word of a sentence could be taken as the whole sentence, or the last syllable of a word as the whole word. About the further course of the content, we then read:

In the second part the principal theme drifts upward, soon high above, over the softly droning depths. Here follows the first moment where this fading manner rises to metallic force; the second moment swells in the much extended series of syncopes\(^7\) (p. 5 of the original edition by Steiner). All the rest belongs to the quietness of the beginning. That this quietness intensifies out of the subtlest resemblance to penetrating force is a deeply-felt and necessary trait in the whole. The creature that here speaks out should emerge as tender, indeed nervous, but not weak. Weakness can arouse compassion, but not that sympathy on which Beethoven is counting. The business of the performer is to make us sense, through finely measured, yet perceptible

\(^{6}\) [A character in Goethe, *Wahlverwandtschaften* (Tübingen, Germany: J. G. Cotta, 1809).]

\(^{7}\) [The beginning of the second movement.]
emphasis in the most delicate sections, and through intensification of the pace at the proper point, the power that is yet to be manifested. And by the same token, it is his duty in the intensification to maximum strength not to forget the foundation of tenderness from which the strength gathers. In none of the compositions up to now have moderation and the most delicate contour of swelling and sinking, avoidance of any hasty transitions and sharp contrasts, been so necessary as here.

And the auguries of intrinsic power have not deceived.

Nowhere does Marx notice any extended fortissimo, but he already knows for certain that in the second movement, with its march-like character, power too will show its face. What could now be more obvious than for him to foretell, in good Gypsy talk: “...to make us sense... the power that is yet to be manifested” and “the auguries of intrinsic power have not deceived.” Oh, how facile the hermeneutists’ art of foretelling, when they have the engraver tip them off to what is coming. And of all his idle words, none should be so resented of him as the one about a “deeply-felt and necessary trait in the whole.” How a hermeneutist here veritably slaps the master on the shoulder: Bravo, Herr Beethoven! How organic, how compelling, everything you write!—but I ask: is such a gesture appropriate coming from a man who, since he understands neither the whole nor a single feature, is absolutely incapable of a judgment about necessity?

Marx devotes the following to depiction of the second movement:

The second movement, which normally with Beethoven, if not an Adagio, is a scherzo, appears here as a march (“Lebhaft, Marschmäßig”). And what a march! There is nothing to be found in it of that splendor or obstinacy, nothing of the impact of material and volume inherent in every march, even the funeral march of the sonata Op. 26. It is not the actual deed that is sketched here, but the imagining of deeds that could have been done—deeds merely fancied, but which high-mindedly and daringly reach up to the stars.

An odd ambiguity, this pageant of heroes, which occurs only in imagination. Everything about it is bold: the flickering onset, the flickering continuation from one broadly placed accent to the next, the incessant upward drive of the melody, the upward climb of the bass through three octaves. At the same time, though, everything is carried out more mentally than physically: the first onset is marked $f$, and $sf$; but $p$ follows immediately; then cresc. is indicated, but it leads not to forte, but into a tonal region which is denied particular strength; then, soon after the first cresc., a second follows, but this leads to nothing other
than an explicitly marked *piano*. And all of that is not merely by instruction, but lies by compelling necessity in the content.

Marx senses specifically that true creation means creation with necessity, and now he extols Beethoven’s genius so highly because he believes himself to be on the track of knowledge of the interconnections and necessities in the latter’s works. Since nothing is so rewarding as insight into such interconnections, one may eagerly await what has been advertised:

It is as though bold decisions, strong words were secretly whispered into the ear. The performer, who—for this sonata as for all of the last sonatas by Beethoven—must have long since outgrown any apprenticeship, may be moved by his imagination into this secretive exuberance.

The whole march is of this nature. What completes the character of this design is the interpenetration of two and three independent voices in place of one principal voice that one can follow undistracted.

Now is this a revelation of those sacred mysteries? How could Marx even form those words in his mind, in his pen, when, as we see, in place of life and procreation, he can offer nothing but coldest lifelessness? How wretchedly man is constituted that in the dark of ignorance he must at once also maculate himself with disgusting self-deception. Not even for the last (simple enough) cadence is Marx intellectually equipped, as he writes:

and where the second part finally wings itself upward to stable power and remains there (the fifth bar from the end), the bold step sinks back in pitch and modulation to the subdominant, into the twilight of renunciation.

The following pertains to the Trio:

Strangely alien the effect of the Trio (*pardon the craft-expression!*), which, with its two canonically long-winded voices, seeks, gloomily and broodingly, the exit from these peculiar visions.

Word by word as good as gravestone upon gravestone over murdered truths; and only when Marx writes: “Nevertheless, they will return,” he returns to the usual ploy of the hermeneutist of representing himself as the clairvoyant, where he has

---

8 [A direct continuation of the previous quotation.]
already pored over the engraver’s fait accompli. We smile about an ordinary meteorology that prophesies clearing after rain and vice versa, but how superior it is anyway, given that it predicts the dates, to the music meteorology of the hermeneutists, which need venture nothing, since it certainly wastes not a word about things to come before it views them on arrival.

About the third and fourth movements Marx comments as follows:

Is it the feeling of pain that speaks from the third movement? Is it regret that the time, the strength for real deeds is past?—Who would presume to divulge all secrets of tonal life? Beethoven applied the heading Langsam und sehnsuchtsvoll to the movement. Whatever the interpretation might be, the grieving mood of the melody will be felt and understood by all who approach such works.

It is the turning back into the inner self that is achieved here. That becomes a certainty when, as introduction to the last movement, the first is recollected through its initial phrase. Here a rich, soothing life-stream pours copiously forth, in great lineament, with renewed courage, indeed sometimes illuminated by bright lights. Yet it is more spiritual life, like the immaterial spiritual life that we sometimes picture in imagination as the reflection of the actual life that we mentally-physically struggle through, whether in joy or in suffering.

Just why so many words, when in the end he must say: “Who would presume to divulge all secrets of tonal life.”

Lenz writes as follows about the first movement:

Etwas lebhaft und mit der innigsten Empfindung. Allegretto ma non troppo 8, 102 bars, no repeat. A major. How dry the Italian marking, how eloquent the German! The Halle edition gives only the Italian, as a result of which a Beethovenian intention is lost. An enchanting instrumental sonnet! A singing soul in every note!

Why precisely “sonnet” and not, for example Ode or Gazelle or the like? Certainly Lenz wouldn’t have known either. It is just hermeneutist-niggling and -affectation, which deserves rebuff by a foreign word: word-frou-frou. And further:

We are indebted to a communication from Professor Schindler for the valuable note that Beethoven himself had given the movements of the sonata the following epigraphs: 1. Dreamy feelings; 2. Invitation to the deed; 3. Return of dreamy feelings; 4. The deed. Whether this was meant seriously, Professor
Schindler adds, I would not presume to say. Beethoven was of course a notorious joker, and only bitter irony could have made him say that the sonata Op. 111 was incomplete with two movements (cf. ‘Op. 111’).

Inane chitchat of two Beethoven-aliens (or of the “Beethoven-deaf,” to use Lenz’s own expression). Now to his own discussion of the content:

Construction. Profound content, yet significantly shortened. The melodic conception assigned to the [principal] motif (first and following bars), not, as more usually, to the countermotif (twenty-fifth and following bars, *espressivo e semplice*). Middle section thirty-fifth to fifty-eighth bar. Return (fifty-eighth bar) masked. Let us designate by this term the phenomenon characteristic of Beethoven’s last period of using one or several bars of the motif for the return, or of having the motif return complete, but in an altered organization, register, accompaniment—in a word, modified (Opp. 106, 110). In Op. 101 the return holds to the first bar of the motif with twists that expand on it (fifty-ninth and following bars), contrasting theme in the tonic, seventy-seventh bar, appendix 89–102.

Not a word is correct. If the expression “significantly shortened” pertains to the 102 bars of the movement, then that is a purely superficial way of speaking, even if this bar count, compared with that in other sonata movements, should prove in fact shorter by ten, thirty, or fifty bars. We ourselves know, of course, in which different and deeper sense a shortening is present here: in the invention of a merely four-bar antecedent, whose smaller size could suffice here, however, only because within it, two bars are set against another two, each pair with its own meaning; and moreover in the interpenetration mentioned several times before of consequent, modulation, and second theme. That Lenz asserted the shortening only because of the visible dimension of 102 bars, however, happened only because he understands the “contrasting theme” (subordinate theme) not before the closing theme, which would have had to lead him to speak on the contrary of a significant expansion (rather than of a shortening) of the consequent of the first theme.

He incorporates into the Development the first three bars of the Reprise (bars 55–57, which, as we know, represent the antecedent). Thus naturally the Reprise had to seem “masked” to him (the word fits, to be sure, in a different sense).

When Lenz speaks of “the first bar of the motif with twists running riot beyond it (fifty-ninth and following bars)” — those are bars 7ff. of the First Part—, one thereby

---

9 [The second (or subordinate, or “contrasting”) theme.]
finds only too clearly confirmed once more that he has no notion of the completely unique synthesis (whereby the shortening came about) of the passage in question in the First Part. And incidentally, if what happens in bars 59ff. were decoration, merely filler, Lenz could rather venture the leap into the phrase with a word like “twists,” but how this denigrates that which is to be taken as a most important issue, as the main event! Can such as this be taken for note-reading competence?

He reads “appendix” from bar 89, thus cutting a living cadence in half and interrupting where the idea still lacks the final scale degrees, the last words, with a period. Yes, that’s the way a hermeneutist reads notes. Oh, if only language had the power to defend itself against man when he sets out to misuse it, to press it into false service! Oh, if only it would refrain, and would bring forth at most three words, to scream into his face: you speak falsely!

Now follows a satyr spectacle:

What influence the ingeniously shortened layout exerted on Mendelssohn is shown by a glance at his E-major solo sonata, whose first movement is one of the most inspired, although transparent, plagiarisms that we have.

Had Lenz understood only a little of the tonal world, he would have had to grasp that a plagiarism of a musical product such as this first movement represents would have been impossible not only for a Mendelssohn but even for Beethoven himself, so unrepeatable, so unique the preconditions of its shortenings and intermeshings and so unique also the consequences drawn from them. Not to mention that Master Mendelssohn, who in so much chamber music wrote a sonata movement of true genius such as could have been written only by the greatest masters, just in his E-major sonata still follows paths that, because all too lyrical, run counter to a sonata movement. When all is said and done, then, the plagiarism remark by Lenz boils down to a contradiction of his first word “significantly shortened,” a contradiction that almost exactly resembles the one by Marx between the assumption of an “adagio character” on the one hand and the “nervous energy” on the other.

Concerning the second movement, Lenz writes:

Lebhaft. Marschmässig. Vivace alla Marcia $\frac{4}{4}$ F major. (Modulation to the major third below; f the lower third of a, tonic of the sonata), two parts with reprises; the third, not called Trio, in B♭ major.

The enthusiasm soars pindarically into the heights, where Polyhymnia lives. The marking marschartig pertains to the energy indispensable to the Olympian expression. All of these eighth-note values, which appear so innocent and yet satiate the minds of whole generations of artists—to bring them
out in performance with their content of fiery Beethovenian language requires a whole, great virtuoso-presence. The rumbling in the second part appears as though twenty-voiced up to the climax of the rapture in $D_b$ major (nineteenth and following bars); third part canonic: $e_b$, $d$, $c$, $b_b$ (upper voice against the eighth-note figure in the bass, fourth bar); $e_b$, $d$, $c$, $b_b$ (bass, against the eighth-note figure in the upper voice, fifth bar); $g$, $b_b$, $c$, $b_b$ (upper voice); $g$, $b_b$, $c$, $b_b$ (bass, sixth bar), etc.

The question that must be posed here is: what does poetic inspiration bring to fructification in the mind?—not whether here the inspiration is a scherzo in $\frac{2}{4}$ meter (cf. the scherzos in $\frac{2}{4}$ and $\frac{4}{4}$, Op. 31, No. 3, Opp. 110, 130, 131).

All of this means nothing but that in the case of a piece like the second movement here, it is not a question of the nomenclature, nor of the difference in ordering by comparison with other sonatas, but only of the content of the piece. But Lenz would not be the hermeneutist that he is if he failed to express it in words whose noise waves he obviously confuses with light waves of insight. Incidentally, it may perhaps also be interpreted as a confession of ignorance when he continues with this:

Given the intelligence of Beethoven, one must condemn nothing out of failure to understand his idea. Beethoven applied the Horacian dictum with full force: *odi profanum vulgus et arceo*!10 ——

I must admit that of all the thoughts Lenz has written, none pleases me so well as this particular one, except that I would recommend—although certainly not in order to astound with something outlandish—adding the following supplement to the thought: given the intelligence of Beethoven one must praise nothing out of failure to understand his idea. For indeed, it is not a matter of condemning and perhaps also not of praising, but—exactly for the sake of Beethoven's intelligence—of the understanding of his tonal world. Especially as that understanding signifies not only an obligation to the work, but also the proper expression of deepest modesty toward the genius, through which the understander rises into closest proximity to the understood. But it is characteristic of the hermeneutist soul, after a sentence of such complete humility as the one just quoted, to follow immediately with thoughts like the following:

The idea pulsating in the grandiose Intermezzo (Scherzo) to the point of bursting all blood-vessels—a high flight of human imagination—is the matter of

10 ["I hate the common people and avoid them." Odes 3.1.]
interest, not which musical denomination befits the movement. But one must know how to erect proudly the proud edifice of ideas, so that no doubt should remain about its solidly architectonic line. This can be successfully attained only by excellent humans among the excellent piano virtuosi. One will at all attain a correct understanding of the five last solo sonatas (Opp. 101, 106, 109, 110, 111) only when one hears them correctly performed, which is among the greatest musical rarities. There are legions of pianists who fancy that their technique alone will be able to yield performances for which an equally great perfection of all mental powers of the human being is every bit as indispensable.

The pianist who is capable of realizing these works in their tonal representation dedicates himself to higher aspirations; he becomes a priest of art, who speaks to the world in the language of the spirit.

In particular, what about “the solidly architectonic line” in Lenz’s talk when he fails to portray it, and awaits it only from the oh-so-rare “priest of art”? and how much quintessentially hermeneutic naïveté is required to assume that a correct performance would just by itself alone compel proper understanding on the listener’s part when neither the “correct” composition nor the so correct and brilliant notation of a Beethoven were able to suffice?

Now to the third movement:

Third movement. Langsam und sehnsuchtsvoll. Adagio ma non troppo, con affetto (no language adequately conveys Sehnsucht), A minor, 20 bars.

In the pre-Beethoven era the introductions that precede the fugues for the purpose of a setting-off through contrast (commonly marked Adagio) had the function of focusing attention on the fugue. Here Beethoven establishes alongside the fugal finale—where his idea is put to the ultimate test of the strict style—a section in slow tempo which, by reason of its content, is drawn into the overall form of the tonal poetry. A fantasy-play of nameless longing.

Since the last movement is no fugue, however, this reflection on the Adagio proves irrelevant.

Scarce has the Adagio movement begun when, after a one-voice succession (quintuplets), the first four bars of the first movement enter, and tie the end to the beginning in the oneness of the overall conception. Is the latter the triumph of the artistic soul over the unhappy human in the tonal poet?—Is the deed (see above) this fateful combat of legitimate ideas dear to the heart? Nothing of the debility of sentimentality, into which the world was about to
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drift like some French examples, like the Dreamer on Lake Geneva! All is emotional health; dignity of the undesecrated genius.

Und hinter ihm in wesenlosem Scheine Lag, was uns alle bändigt, das Gemeine.
(And behind him, in the insubstantial appearance, Lay that which binds us all, the Common.)

If only Lenz too could be credited with emotional health! Instead of this linguistic debility of a hermeneutist.

Fourth movement. Geschwind, doch nicht zu sehr, und mit Entschlossenheit (Fast, but not to excess, and with decisiveness). Allegro (why not with the supplementary ma non troppo?) $\frac{2}{4}$. A major, 319 bars, Reprise. Considerably more voluminous than the first three movements together (cf. Op. 110). Imitative style in double counterpoint: e, e$\#$, treble (first bar after the introductory series of trills), e, e$\#$, bass after the fermata, eighth and ninth bar. The contrasting theme (fiftieth and following bars) in free style, which opens horizons to the fugal style that were unknown in the dominions of the old masters.

Imitative style in double counterpoint, however, is not the same thing as a fugue (therefore the last proud idea expressed by Lenz is completely wrong). He could easily have convinced himself of this, incidentally, had he but confronted the “cadastre” of a Haydn [or] Mozart with more understanding, where he would necessarily have found innumerable cases of a similar successful mixture of imitative and free style.

Middle section (second part) Outbreak of the fugato prepared by the imitative style (C major—third-modulation—c, upper third of a). The thus far imitatively treated motif as subject (dux), free entrance of the answer (comes) on g (fourth bar) instead of on b (the subject had entered on e in C major, not on c). Return, A major. Tarrying with artistic delight on the fermatas, filled with longing, that delay the return (two-hundred seventh bar). Contrasting theme in the tonic, two-hundred twenty-eighth and following bars. Appendix. After the last fermata, the motif in F major; certainly as recollection of the key of the second movement. Conclusion in a rain of fire (written-out trill) of the basses as organ-point. The trill is Beethoven-intensification; a war-machine—compare the conclusions of the sonatas Opp. 106, 109.

Here Lenz again speaks of a fugato: now what, for Heaven’s sake, are we dealing with here, a fugue or a fugato (since the two are not the same)? But a hermeneutist couldn’t

11 [A sobriquet for Jean-Jacques Rousseau.]
care less about that sort of thing; he decides the matter merely according to the state at the given moment of what occurs to him in rhetorical terms, according to the effect of the words alone, which to him is everything. With what a gesture, one that nearly outdoes Beethoven himself, he utters the word “tonality” too as he speaks of an “appendix”: “the motif in F major; certainly as recollection of the key of the second movement.” How utterly funny here the cocksure little word “certainly,” showing, however, with the specification “F major” that nothing is more alien to him than the concept of tonality—to say nothing of the fact that, because of the fermatas, he assumes a special division just at a point where the passing phenomenon is, so to speak, in progress.

The character of the countermotif in the Finale is decidedly military. Distant fanfares (pp), powerful responses close by (f). After all, Beethoven writes to the publisher: Reply concerning la Ertmann, mind you, in the storm-march at the end. A state of mind that is explained by the times of war, as by the dedication to the wife of an officer.

Now these words sing quite a different tune. With such a bulwark of phrases there is no way to get to the hermeneutist—one can only laugh.

Let us answer here, on occasion of the first sonata-fugue in Beethoven, the oft-posed question: why does Beethoven tend in the last period predominantly to the fugue, and why does he begin this trend with the twenty-eighth solo sonata?

A Finale has to counterbalance the first movement. A Finale to Op. 101 in free style would have avoided eclipsing the first movement only if it had been of the same approximate scope. A Finale so abbreviated, however, was inappropriate, because a first, but not a last, movement may obviously leave something to be awaited. Furthermore, Beethoven transferred the focal point of his idea to the Finale (Op. 102, No. 2; Opp. 106, 110, 127, 130, 131, 132, 135; Choral Symphony). With use of the fugue for the Finale in Op. 101 any comparison with the spaciousness of the first movement disappeared, because the fugue measures by different standards. Now if a short, crystal-clear movement like that first movement could at all be appropriate with good effect, a last movement of thicker texture would not have suited the grace of the original idea: accordingly, the fugue alone offered a satisfying conclusion, especially considering that with the Beethovenian emancipation of fugal style so fruitful for the content, the free style (in which the counter-motif\textsuperscript{12} appears) was not ruled out (cf. the fugue in Op. 106, Op. 110). The fugal style also

\textsuperscript{12} [The second theme-group of the sonata form.]
concentrated the substance of the first movement, which could otherwise easily have appeared all too “fragrant.” Only Beethoven is able in this manner to make the fugal style subservient to a content of the free style; his fugal style becomes the climax of the idea in the content.

This is the significance of the phantom of the first movement that appears at the beginning of the Finale. A precursor, indeed, of the recitative-based phrase constructions in the large of the last quartets (Opp. 130, 131, 132; cf. Op. 102, No. 1, Op. 109).

Let us understand the Beethovenian fugal style as the sublimation of the fantasy-formations of his free style, from the vantage point of the strict. Beethoven thereby becomes the creator of a new literature, undreamt of by the earlier musical world—one of a strict style that perfects the free in the content.

This organic, non-accidental progress of musical art in the person of Beethoven may explain the specific predominance of the fugal style in the third period of his musical thinking, not any closer acquaintance on the part of the Great Reformer with Bach. Beethoven was not the man to let himself be defined by anything outside himself. A so predominantly thematic mind was naturally (organically) enticed to celebrate in the fugue, this highest expression of thematic style, the highest expression of himself as well. Beethoven may anyway have regarded his free style (in which nary an intention went missing) as a kind of psychic fugue, from which it was only a step to the formal one. The fugue for Beethoven is yet another enhancement of that higher (psychic) variation-form which constitutes the essence of the final period (cf. Opp. 109, 111, 120).

We thus understand—though not without qualification—the jotting by K. Holz that has come down to us: the employment of the fugue in the last sonatas, he said, was the consequence of a closer scrutiny of Bach, at which point Beethoven is supposed to have averred that until that time it had all been mere outpouring of emotion, that he wanted now to begin to work for Art, and to have done with the ungrateful instrument (the pianoforte).

If Beethoven wanted ever anew to open fresh paths for Art, we must understand his new forms not by the historical ones, but for themselves.

Now, however, Lenz speaks for a change once again of a fugue and not of a fugato, just in order to be able to go back to the thought already expressed earlier, according to which Beethoven allegedly for the first time made “the fugal

---

13 [Karl Holz (1799–1858), violinist and friend of Beethoven. He was second violinist in the Schuppanzigh Quartet.]
style subservient to a content of the free style.” And there the hermeneutist lan-
guage overtops the riverbanks. From the remaining discussion, let us cite only the
following brief samples:

Let us call the style of Opp. 101, 109, 110 Pompeiian, that of Opp. 106, 111
Colossian.

[…]

What this means for Opp. 101, 109, 110 is that in these more restricted instru-
mental spatialities, everything is object per se (spiritual motif, idea), without mak-
ing its effect in addition—as in Opp. 106 and 111—through size and power of
manifestation (form).

[…]

Let us assimilate the light colors on a dark ground in Pompeiian frescos to the
sonic beauties in Opp. 101, 109, 110 as they strew fragrant pollen while at the
same time expressing most profound content.

[…]

Or:

The differentiation that we have arrived at on the one hand for the group
Opp. 101, 109, 110, on the other hand for the group Opp. 106, 111 regarding
the inner motivations behind their form is definitive also for performance.
Only by exception will a pianoforte virtuoso who possesses the attributes
required for Op. 106, 111 have a similarly easy command of those needed for
Opp. 101, 109, 110.

Or:

So infinitely distinct, not only from others but from itself, is the ever more
multifaceted concept burgeoning up in the last period: Beethoven.

[…]

This mind could well have said of itself: I am a mountain in God and I must
climb myself!

Let it not go unmentioned too that Lenz directs polemics at Elterlein,14 Oulibisches,
15 Marx, etc.

14 [Ernst von Elterlein, Beethovens Clavier-Sonaten (Leipzig, 1856).]
15 [Alexandre Oubilicheff, Beethoven, ses critiques et ses glossateurs (Leipzig and Paris, 1857).]
Nagel:

Just as we found in the first movement of Op. 90 an extensively spun-out core-idea, here too we find the same thing [here a quotation of bars 1–2]. But if we want here [meaning Op. 101, of course] to apply the traditional division into antecedent and consequent (which will hardly do) and count the former as lasting up to the first fermata. . . . [p. 217]

The first fermata sticks the interpreter so sharply in the eye that, just for its sake, he even ignores the half cadence in bar 4—how would one judge the ignoring of a comparable caesura in language?—; Nagel would like to begin the consequent with the fermata, but actually he doesn’t want to either (“which will hardly do”); granted, this sort of thing will hardly do.

. . . then we find [in Op. 101] in a sense the inverse relationship to that sonata: here the consequent takes up a far greater space than the antecedent . . .

Here again Nagel reads past nothing less than the modulation and the subordinate theme, both of which together he labels merely as consequent of the first theme.

. . . Where in Op. 90 the tonal unity of the theme was preserved, in the A-major sonata that is not the case.

If Nagel now assumes two different keys—and that is the case if he finds the tonal unity not to be preserved—, then logically he must also assume two themes; so why does he speak here of only one theme, which after all presupposes adherence to one key?

Anybody who wants to be completely aware of the intrinsically fluctuating expressive content of the music, which temporarily, in a subordinate phrase, gives way to a more definite tonal level . . . [p. 218]

—what is the “subordinate phrase”? perhaps subordinate theme, second theme? And do the words “give way to a more definite tonal level” stand for “modulating”? But what, then, is meant by “temporarily . . . gives way to a more definite tonal level”? Where, please, is any such thing to be found, outside the foolish textbooks Nagel has drawn on?
. . . must above all be completely clear about not only the melody with its continuous state of flux, its upward and downward undulation, the impressive deceptive cadences and the characteristic tying, but also the tonality of the setting.

In relation to the same theme Nagel just a moment ago found the tonality not to be preserved, but now, even with temporary excursion into a more definite tone, yet once again preserved—so what does tonality mean to him?

It begins in its principal phrase on the dominant of the controlling key; the passing motion via d♯ to the seventh, d, is sensed by the ear as modulation to the key of the lower fifth.

Where a dominant is found, its key must automatically be implied; but where a key is so understood, a modulation cannot at the same time be “sensed.” To assert all of this nevertheless at once, therefore, flies in the face of logic. . . .

This, the key of the whole, is at first touched on in its tonic triad only in passing; nevertheless, despite all modulatory digression of harmony, the relationship to it is always maintained, until the definite signpost to the actual dominant key of E major appears.

Where the main key, as precisely in bars 1–6, appears so clearly and simply secured with the progression V—I—V in the antecedent and V—VI in the consequent, Nagel’s strangely devious and tentative language only misleads the reader; its tentativeness, however, clearly derives from the wrongheaded assumption of a “modulatory digression of harmony.” All the more gratifying, then, that at least the definiteness of the “actual dominant harmony” did not elude him. And yet, with so many words and such a leisurely pace in his discussion, nowhere does he devote so much as a single word to the modulation from A major to E major, which doubtless must have arisen even for an interpretation such as his. So where is it? Where there was none, he saw one; where one is present—is and must be present—he sees none. Or does “definite signpost” stand for the modulation? Suppose it does: but then why does he speak of such a definite signpost only so tentatively, so indefinitely, where a modulation is, after all, probably the most important occurrence in the course of a First Part of the sonata, since it segregates the first theme from the second?

With the twenty-fifth bar, the principal theme ends . . .
—that, then, was the gist of the matter! Only because here Beethoven does not single out the second theme so sharply and distinctly for the eye as he often does, Nagel (exactly as Marx, Lenz, see above) mistrusts even such a compelling and decisive modulation to E major as Beethoven expressly presents to effect the segregation. Thus it happens that even despite modulation (of which in fact he does not speak) and the key, nevertheless assumed to be definite, of the dominant (of which he also does not speak), he means to hear, as a foregone conclusion, only one theme up to bar 25. And because he means to hear in this way, since he knows no better, he muddles together the concepts of tonality, modulation, subordinate theme, interprets them now one way, now another as needed, and plays the merriest game of contradictions with them. But anybody who knows the error and deficiency of the existing theories understands also that it is they above all that had to seduce Nagel onto such erroneous and circuitous paths.

... and the subordinate theme begins, if one wants at all to apply this term to the brief formation [here a quotation of bar 25ff.]. One would then have to designate the ensuing syncopations [here a quotation of bar 29ff.] as a closing theme, to which the Development section is joined at the appearance of the primary motif in the upper bass voice. [Pp. 218–219]

Most serious errors on the point of the analyst, which, however, after all that has been said thus far, were unavoidable; they are so bad that they rouse his own conscience. Clearly, as one can gather from his words, a dark resistance arises in him, which, however, is finally overcome by the severity of the error.

Now here, however, the usual terminology must be abandoned ... —such a renunciation of the usual terminology is here still completely unfounded; there is no lack of a first theme, a modulation, a second and a closing theme: they are indeed present, except that they are to be read differently from how Nagel reads them. Had theory but been able better to carve out the sense of sonata form and to state that it is more especially a matter of the modulation and the contrast of a different key than of a contrast of the theme as well—as I have often already had occasion to explain, and hope to show more exactly in the “Outline of a New Theory of Form” —, the sense of the modulation would perhaps at once have been clear also

16 [An inexplicable indictment: Nagel has just been quoted above as speaking of “the signpost to the actual dominant key of E major.”]
17 [Entwurf einer neuen Formenlehre. The work was not completed; notes for it are preserved in the Oster Memorial Collection, New York Public Library for the Performing Arts, Folder 83.]
to the interpreter here, and through it, also the treatment of the subordinate and closing themes.

... the thematic complex designated as closing theme grows out of the conclusion of the bass line of the subordinate theme, as the latter too, in its cadential formula, relates to the cadence of the primary strain; moreover, with the syncopating chords, a completely alien element enters the content of the movement, from which Beethoven also eschews a return to the actual beginning of the movement. If, therefore, we cannot speak of a regularly constructed sonata movement with thematic contrasts, the influence of sonata form on the Allegretto is nevertheless unmistakable.

The writer’s undoing is most clearly brought to light in his very words by his notion of a “regularly constructed sonata movement with thematic contrasts.” But where, for the rest, he might glimpse the unmistakable “influence of sonata form” on the first movement must, according to what precedes, remain a puzzle not only for the reader but even for Nagel too. After all, he writes (in an earlier passage, p. 216):

If in the earlier Beethoven sonatas, even the most freely composed ones, recollection of the typical form appeared still to be observed, the A-major sonata shows outwardly scarcely a relationship any more to the “sonata.” In place of the first sonata movement with its taut organization and its two themes, there appeared here a formation from which a consistently carried out dichotomization of the themes that serve as the basis is lacking.

Or on p. 220:

The subordinate them is, so to speak, the confirmation of the preceding conclusion. It is, if you will, a null, a mere cadential formula. But what could in its place serve better and more appropriately to mark the peaceful and constant mood?

Then, however, all further effort toward illumination of the movement is in vain. Thus Nagel accordingly takes refuge in bars 18–24 in the quandary-expression “continuations,” speaks of “upward-striving lines, which are all derived from the just-quoted motif” (meaning the motif of bars 16 and 17!), at bar 29ff. even of an organ point, and so on.

18 [That is, the usual repeat sign is lacking.]
On the Development, the following can be heard from Nagel:

It is to be noted that the primary motif gradually attains higher levels, and begins first from e, then from e#, then from f#. From there on, the path to the theme itself is ever more distinctly articulated.

A hermeneutic prophecy merely, for the distinctly articulated path is unfortunately not so clear to him that he could [not] have articulated it more distinctly, as we see:

For some time this particular, undulating mood prevails and is manifested also in sharply different dynamic markings; but then—as Beethoven uses only the second half of the motif: \( \text{\textit{\textsuperscript{f}} \text{\textit{\textsuperscript{f}}} \)} \)—a line leading downward emerges, a powerful presence, and with its appearance the syncopation ends.

. . . That we have before us here no development in the usual sense—none that operated with all resources of musical dialectic—is clear from the start. [P. 221]

No, the Development here is such, even in the usual sense, except that it is indeed short.

As to the Third Part,\(^{19}\) Nagel says the following:

Where does the Third Part of the movement begin? Obviously after the fermata, where the modulation has reached the dominant harmony of C# minor. For this passage [here a quotation of bar 52ff.] leads back into the principal strain. Thus here too any recollection of the old, typical form of the sonata is relinquished. [P. 222]

Misread. Even in this point the typical form of the sonata is preserved, although of course only that of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, not the schematic one of the non-geniuses and theorists, which Nagel has in mind.

The cadential extensions—just as rapidly as the dynamic eruption came about, calm has returned—use motives already employed before, and end in a long ritardando and crescendo, during which the melody, longingly swelling, loses itself in the heights. [Pp. 222–223]

\(^{19}\) [The Reprise.]
Occasionally Nagel, it goes without saying, provides a great deal of the hermeneutical, the psychological, and so forth; only too often does he assure the reader that the situation is “clear,” “simple,” which—particularly where through special sur-reptitiousness he fails completely or in part to treat the material—has a completely amusing effect.

His discussion of the second movement too shows the same picture. Apart from such superfluous phrases as, for example:

To anyone who, meticulously following Beethoven’s specifications down to the last detail, has become steeped in the movement and is aware of the motivically unified conception, the sense of the whole and its relationship to the preceding movement will easily be disclosed. [P. 225]

or:

Only from within can this music be appreciated and understood; to anybody who cannot meet this requirement and seeks after superficial features in it, it will in some passages appear baroque, perhaps even unpleasant. [P. 226]

or:

Formally, the first section of the principal strain is organized in a remarkably simple and clear way.

or:

How the sections are formally combined is clear. [P. 227]

which taken together only show again how little Nagel even has any notion of the difficulty of the material—apart from such phrases, I say, the purely factual presentation—one could say: accordingly—is completely wrong:

It seems almost unbelievable that Beethoven developed the rich and multifaceted life of this movement from the only motif, that of the sharply dotted rhythm of the beginning; only a sundry few bars are untouched by this motif. [P. 226]

Is the sharply dotted rhythm perhaps itself the motif, or does Nagel also have in mind a tonal series? If so, which one?
The movement is divided into two parts by the dominant-cadence, of which the second, through the return to the governing key, is two bars longer than the first. In the second part, which can be called the Development, the primary motif at first appears shortened in its spatial aspect through compression of its values into one bar, and imitated at the fourth by the lower voice.

To the following, which belongs to the major key of the major upper third of the overall tonic, another [segment] is joined, which starts from D minor; in it the imitation of the upper by the lower voice takes place at a greater distance than before, and during the imitation, the upper voice takes free flight. The modulation touches C major, and the section leads to E major, but the major third is immediately replaced by the minor, and by means of descending tonal successions with melodic neighboring tones we move, always maintaining the dotted rhythm, into a new structural division, which once again departs from D minor, but soon arrives at remote keys. The imitation of the leading motif takes place here twice in each bar. The lower voice abandons the initial rhythmic version in the third bar, and harmonic filler-notes are added to the inner voice. Later the setting becomes four-voiced, the lower voice loses all resemblance to its original form, and the upper voice imitates only the beginning of the motif. [P. 227]

In the space of only so few bars—such crowding, such a tussle of keys: A major, D minor, C major, E major, “again D minor,” “remote keys” (which ones?)—; are chord and key always the same, then, or isn’t, for example, a major triad on A something different from A major? If only the harmony textbooks could speak a little more of these things instead of trafficking in idle, meaningless combinations of voices!

Add to this the confused swarm of terms, like “upper and lower voices,” “descending tonal successions,” “leading motif,” etc., in which one clearly observes how they bring with them the murkiness out of which they arise.

Continuing, Nagel assumes at bar 30ff. a “new section in D♭ major,” and indeed a “canon”; at bar 36ff. an “organ-point on C” (all of which is wrong); is surprised that after “conclusion” of the organ-point the repetition of the first part doesn’t arrive (as though it had not already arrived); speaks regarding bar 40ff. of an “answering of the motif in fugal style” (at the same time, however, also of a “three-fold imitation”), regarding bar 44ff. of a “new strain” (!), whose “conclusion to the dominant harmony leads to B♭ major” (he means the subdominant of the main key, which stands in the service of the final cadence), and ends with enviable courage:

10 [The fourth below: a² of bar 12 is answered by e¹ of the same bar.]
The cadential addenda lead back to the last bars of the first part, and thus to the end of the main movement, at whose rhythmic energy as well as harmonic richness we can never cease to marvel. [Pp. 228–229]

Concerning the middle movement we read in Nagel:

The form is perfectly clear. The motif [here a quotation of bar 55] serves as introduction, it is the soil from which the whole structure sprouts. Joined to the lead-in is a two-part second motif [here a quotation of bars 57–58] accompanied by a counterpoint in eighths: the second section appears in the ensuing bars in inverted voice-positions and begins the descending first section of a setting in strict canonic structure, which leads to F major. Here a new section of the canon begins [here a quotation of bar 65ff.]; appearing as counterpoint is the second half of the second motif of the beginning. In a further section the new, rhythmically striking figure [here a quotation of bars 70–71] joins in, which immediately afterward yields to more subdued combinations. [P. 230]

The designation “section” here, as we see, is applied only out of discomfiture and (lastly) even to—a passing tone etc.

If we skip over everything that Nagel, at odds with his own words “this mystical-profound tonal language does not admit of a definite interpretation,” nevertheless presents by way of hermeneutic deliberations, we find the following explanation as what is obviously intended to be purely factual:

The formal organization of the Adagio is simple and transparent. The first section is formed from an eight-bar setting, which, departing from the dominant of the main key, cadences in its relative key. The second section uses chiefly the motif of the upper voice from the first bars, but dispenses, from the fourth bar on, with the adjacent accompanimental motif. Beethoven’s contemplative way and the dogged persistence with which he adheres to an idea are manifested here quite distinctly in the maintenance of the pitch level of the motif, which is begun in six successive bars if not in the same octave, at least with the same tone g, but swathed in ever darker colors. In addition, easily overlooked tonal steps appear in the short grace-notes of the bass, which however are not in the least subordinate, but are a primary element. Taken together, they yield the line descending to the dominant [here a quotation of bar 12ff.], upon which the whole edifice rests harmonically. In the three final bars Beethoven dispenses with the primary motif. [Pp. 232–233]
By no means, however, do these words bring to light the actual meaning of the musical content: they come rather from an eye that merely skims the notational fields, and are in turn taken in by such eyes.

Or:

And now the “non presto,” that aimless gliding of the hands over the keys, with which the last trace of nocturnal shadows vanishes as quietly as a breath of air, as if they had never existed. What is more natural than reawakening of the memory of the source of all this poetry and dreaming? And thus the beginning of the first movement is here truly and convincingly appended. [P. 233]

Ad nauseam the same soothsayer trick. The work of a hermeneutist would remain unrewarding, though, if he were not to indulge from time to time in the satisfaction of stretching himself to a lofty height from which he, as one accustomed to clap even a Beethoven on the shoulder, could peer down with pride on others:

Aimless play! Anybody who thinks he has found here an opportunity to give a bravura passage should not touch this pure creation at all. But how few even among musicians sense the deeper meaning of such poetry! If in fact, according to a beautiful aphorism of Goethe’s, education that aims to instill reverence is the highest mission of all instruction (and which aim could be higher and more beautiful!), musicians and dilettantes who pursue music still have infinitely much to learn. [P. 234]

From his discussion of the last movement, let only those reflections be highlighted whose faultiness provides the opportunity for clarification of important compositional points. Thus Nagel comments as follows on bar 25ff.:

This leads back into the core idea, or rather into its consequent phrase. Its form, too, is not as previously; the melodic figuration, in which one will notice the imitations, leads over into a new phrase.

Nagel may choose to label this part as consequent, but in that case he should not have overlooked that the consequent, as its most essential characteristic, leads up to an authentic cadence, so that it is inappropriate to say that it “leads over into a new phrase.” Bar 33ff. he imagines as follows:

This, [here a quotation of bar 33ff.] insofar as it takes over the motif of the rising sixteenth-note groups from what has preceded, offers no new element;
but these groups are not kept in the original version, and soon the merely per-
functorily cadencing upper voice develops into a melody that is spun out in a
sequential manner, which, with the accompanying voices, presses forcefully
upward and carries the modulation to the dominant harmony of E major.

Thus Nagel is unable to say in what relation this “new phrase” stands to what pre-
cedes; he thus lacks the most important precondition for a judgment about the form
of the whole. That I do not condone the concept of sequence, which Nagel here
invokes, may well already be known to my readers (see detailed reflections on this
in Counterpoint I, p. 26f./40, and in II, the section “free composition”). Nagel
continues:

All of this is to be interpreted as transition to a second theme; but nothing
of the sort commences yet. So powerful is the life-impulse, so great the joy
to express itself that here, as in similar cases noted earlier, there appears to be
no end to the new phrase-formations. Once again an interlude presents itself,
and again Beethoven chooses for it the imitative manner. The phrase marked
“dolce” [here a quotation of bar 49ff.] comprises nine bars. The harmony of its
opening is latent; from the context, however, it is clear that the harmonic basis
of the beginning is the dominant harmony just touched upon. Characteristic
too is that Beethoven does not touch the key of the subordinate theme until
the end. The attempts, everywhere evident, at fugal treatment of the motif
are noteworthy; one might say that here everything drives toward polyphonic
treatment. At first, of course, it stops short of this. Beethoven dispenses with
the fugal treatment as early as the antecedent of the last-mentioned section,
and forms the consequent through a somewhat military character of the motif,
as though the whole were to turn into a merry march.

The same failure again (as in the first movement) vis à vis the master’s brilliant
power to combine a modulation with the second theme, or, more accurately: to
make the second theme emerge from the modulation in such a way that not a
trace of any seam is noticeable to the ear. Now Nagel, who cannot partake of
such a great stroke of synthesis, had no choice but to take refuge in nomencla-
ture that is most noncommittal in all respects. Thus he first explicitly states of a
second theme that “nothing of the sort commences yet,” then writes, with added

---

21 [Schenker originally planned to write a third volume of Kontrapunkt, which would include the treatment
of free composition. Later, however, he decided instead to make the latter a third volume of the series Neue
musikalische Theorien und Phantasien and to give it the title Der freie Satz.]
emphasis, of an “interlude”—but what is that supposed to mean?—then, imme-
diately, of a “phrase,” but then suddenly also of a “subordinate theme”—is this
concept not synonymous with the second theme that he has just eschewed?—of
an “antecedent” and “consequent” (of which theme?); and is it possible that the
two bars 57–58 alone already count as a consequent? . . . all of which, however,
doesn’t deter him from finally exclaiming:

How a bold exuberance of form speaks from all of this, though, and what
insouciantly relaxed content, free of all taint of reflection!

Unfortunately this cheerful feeling does not instill a kindred clarity in him as well,
as we gather from the following avowals pertaining to bar 59ff.:

The theme that now commences [here a quotation of bar 59ff.] is likewise a
direct product of the principal motif. It comprises eight bars and does not
leave the key of E major. In its consequent it is noticeably more sharply pointed
through splitting of the first quarter into eighths.

How discreetly absolute the use of the word “theme” here! That all of these short-
comings, however, are to be traced back to that [central] failure, however, emerges
only too clearly from the following:

It is obvious that here, in this first part of the movement, we are not deal-
ing with an actual second theme: apart from the brief episodic interlude
before the last E-major section, everything is an outgrowth of the principal
motif. If the form of the movement is therefore free insofar as it does not
use twofold and by nature contrasting thematic material for the organic
constitution of the whole, it is in its modulatory plan nevertheless—and
not insignificantly—completely bound to sonata form. From the rondo it
borrows the light and to some extent pleasant tone, which avoids the dense
texture of profound harmonic combinations, while on the other hand the
movement seems noteworthy precisely for the reason that everywhere in it
impulses toward polyphonic construction protrude. Despite this diversity,
however, uniformity of mood is fully maintained.

Nagel simply cannot imagine such a thing as a sonata without “contrasting thematic
material” of the first and second themes, which, however, as I have often mentioned,
is the fault of the vexatious textbooks.
Regarding bar 89, Nagel speaks—really inexcusably—of a “six-four chord of the tonic triad” instead of a suspension over $V: V\frac{1}{3}$, just because he cannot catch sight anywhere of a $V\frac{1}{3}$, and the concept of an elision fails to occur to him.

Of the development section he speaks only casually: “It [the fugato] stands in place of the development section, or rather constitutes it.”; here again he goes wrong in the naming of the keys: thus he speaks, for example, regarding bar 101ff. of C major—F major—D minor; regarding bar 109ff. of D minor—C major—A minor; regarding bar 118ff. of C major—F major—D major etc.; uses strangely ill-suited nomenclature like “appendix” etc. etc.—what could be more reasonable that he should escape to the safe haven of a Bülow quotation: “the player must, as v. Bülow rightly comments, possess polyphonic tone-sensing and -thinking to do justice to the movement.” That this invocation provides him no support at all, however, need not be substantiated with further quotations. It should be explicitly mentioned, though, that he does not grasp the internal organization so clearly projected in the development, and uses, in his depiction, the crutch of individual words like “subdivision,” “new beginning” (for bar 141ff.), “section” (for bar 150ff.), “... just here the ... stretto connects,” and so forth.

As to the Reprise of the last movement, Nagel writes:

One may perhaps say that after the gigantic formations of the Development section the third part of the finale appears all too pale. In fact the Development exerted a smaller influence on the repetition-section of this movement than we have found it to do in previous works. But what is shown therein—is it not a well-considered trait? Precisely because a powerful mass of difficult to understand music had accumulated there, the third part had to be reined onto smoother paths if the evolutionary path of the entire work was not to be imperiled. The latter path is, however, one that is in the highest sense altogether humoristic.

Or, for example, regarding bar 279ff.:

These bars bring the surprising digression to the dominant-seventh harmony of D major [here a quotation of bar 279ff.]; the principal motif enters successively on a-f# and (piano) on a-f, then, with the pianissimo that presents the primary motif in the low register and unaccompanied, appears to aim once again for a fugal setting. But this doesn’t happen: the serious things of what has preceded are reflected as if in mild, serene afterglow. Nothing essentially new is introduced by the appendix; only the one and the other motif are slightly varied. Up to the end of the movement the primary motif remains present in its first form
or merely suggested by the rhythm. We have already spoken too often of the way in which Beethoven’s humoristic manner is expressed as still to consider it necessary to mention in detail the many contrasts that are typical of it.

_Bekker_ writes:

The Fantasy-Sonata opens the series: Op. 101, A major, in principle of construction the exact double of the Eb-major sonata Op. 27 [No. 1]. Here as there, three preparatory movements: the Allegretto ma non troppo of the new work corresponds to the Andante of the earlier one, the Vivace alla Marcia to the Allegro molto vivace. Both Adagios are lead-ins to the closing movement, and the latter brings in both works the goal of the foregoing evolvement. The “quasi una Fantasia” Beethoven dispenses with here. It long ago became for him an implicit precondition. He gives indications of it in the German expressive instructions which render unnecessary any attempt at explanation. From the “innige Empfindung” of the beginning through the “lebhaft marschmäßige” Vivace and the “sehnsuchtsvoll” Adagio to the “Entschlossenheit” of the Rondo—that is the program of this Fantasy, the program of the whole Beethoven. The predecessor Op. 27, too, evinces a similar line of intensification with regard to its content. Yet how completely different the unfolding here of the individual movements by dint of their motivic life.

What with Marx is “Ottilie, but without—— —,” with Lenz the Mendelssohn plagiarism, is in Bekker’s case Beethoven’s Op. 27: a comparison “the exact double” with the trailing “yet how completely different.” So accordingly, all that is left to discuss is the difference between the two sonatas being compared; let us attend:

How the A-major prelude\[22\] does grow out of the intimate initial theme, the sentiment now intensifying into joyous energy, now immersing itself, through vacillating syncopes, in the twilight of musings, so as then to rise to the confidently soothing conclusion. The tenderly gliding quartet-like treatment of the voices; the free, yet nowhere disconcerting harmonic line; the predominance of hazy, gently wafted colors; the absence of all abrupt dynamic contrasts—these qualities lend the whole a mellow, dreamlike mood. The consciousness of reality dies away—only the most delicate nerve-vibrations are audible in the stillness.

\[22\] [The first movement of Op. 101.]
This depiction of the first movement of Op. 101—given the bond that links all works by Beethoven to the same program (from the “innige Empfindung” . . . all the way to “Entschlossenheit”)—is it supposed to be in and of itself sufficient illumination of the difference in particular between the respective first movements of Opp. 27 and 101?

The Vivace too is tuned to fantastic shades. A vigorously rushing melody sounds—only the rhythmic suggestion of a march, imitatively repeated by the individual voices, scantily sketched harmonically. They are hastily flitting phenomena, which form a clearly demarcated picture for a moment only at the cadence.

It goes without saying that with “a vigorously rushing melody” Bekker represents only an impression, absolutely not an accomplished musical fact (the reader is really not supposed to ask: which melody?); on the other hand, he appears at least to have heard the final cadence—which of course does not count for much—actually as cadence, as musical fact (“clearly demarcated”), and thus one now understands why the phenomena before the cadence convey to him the impression of “flitting phenomena”: what appears “clearly demarcated” to him is what he actually hears; what on the other hand must appear to him as merely a “flitting phenomenon” is that of which he grasps less, or nothing at all. Precisely therein—that it naturally cannot be otherwise—lies from case to case the (admittedly easy) integrity and honorability of the hermeneutist.

The trio-melody stops cold before its completion. A canonic interlude-dialog, repeated with the voices inverted, concludes with indistinctly questioning expression. The animated March-like mood begins anew.

Our hermeneutist hears no further than the third bar of the melody—thus he quickly records in the book of musical facts: “the trio-melody stops cold before its completion”; are there, then, other facts than those of one’s own impression? Thus again a case of sincerity of the hermeneutist, which must be tolerated until a marvel causes him to recognize how it is by no means the melody that stops cold, but only his hearing.

Conspicuous in particular is the final sentence. We know that the hermeneutist gets into a difficult position when music pursues its repetitions, as for example in a three-part song form the repetition of the first part, the reprise in sonata form (symphony, overture, etc.). Music proceeds in those cases as it absolutely must (for the purpose of becoming Art—see *Harmony*, p. 4ff./4ff.); it did...
so, to be sure, even at a time when no hermeneutics yet nosed so intrusively into it. But can the interpretational narrative do the same and, like music, simply pick up from the beginning, then? Such a silly effect, when the narrative concludes, but the music has arrived only at the end of the First Part or the Development (see, e.g., Wagner’s interpretations of Beethoven symphonies, overtures, and the like.)! What to do, then, to conceal this rift between music and interpretation? How is a Third Part to be interpreted? In this unavoidable difficulty, a respectable hermeneuticism hit upon the idea of justifying the purely musical repetition by representing it too as foreseen in the chain of events, which of course is duplicity. Nonetheless, this is very much the rule—only too understandable considering the enormous scope of the sonata, symphonic, and overture literature—, and if a hermeneutist has nothing else at all to trot out, then he surely succeeds in boldly forecasting what is to come. All the more noteworthy, as I mentioned already, that Becker contents himself in that sentence with following the returning “march-like mood” rather than clairvoyantly leading the way.

There follows one of those brief, touching Adagio-intermezzi, such as appeared already in Op. 53, beginning with the questioning sixth-chord of the dominant triad, dreamily spinning out in mysterious timbre (una corda) a poignant motif, closing on the dominant triad by way of sequences of painfully animated diminished-seventh chords. The ideas play with recollections, the tender theme of the Prelude resurfaces. But from its closing phrase the artist gains new strength. In a hasty ascent, the motif is intensified and ends on a trill that struggles upward chromatically. Distinct chord-strokes of the left hand announce the awakening of a fresh energy.

There we have it, then: our hermeneutist as clairvoyant—“the ideas play with recollections”—yes, yes, we know, the honesty is only a coincidence.

With zestfully upbeat anacruses and firm downbeats, the forceful theme begins. Imitating, the left hand confirms. The struggle to emerge from dreams of a now intimate, now vivid, now longing nature into goal-directed creative activity—that is the poetic train of thought of this work.

But why, after the program already proclaimed above of the “whole Beethoven,” after an unveiling of the ultimate secret, waste time with such minutiae as “anacrusis,” “downbeats,” etc.? To what purpose?
Literature

The theme of the final movement, with its characteristic alternation of hurriedly rising seconds and strikingly rhythmicized, downward-leaping fifths suggests a decisiveness that is more bold than joyous.

Oh, how finely differentiated!

Only in the working-out does the quietly cheerful serenity of the artist appear. Above the continuously active sixteenths of the theme, a lyric melodic line stretches itself and soon the energetic principal theme is shaped into the almost flirtatiously sweet subordinate theme.

Bekker grasps the secret of the “subordinate theme,” then, and thus knows what none before him knew and what nobody knows up to this day. Yet he prefers to speak of it as if by chance rather than taking the bull by the horns (which is the only possibility in the world of facts) and stating point blank from which bar to which bar the subordinate theme extends. Does he do this out of tact, in deference to the ignorant, or are the musical facts just so difficult to fit into the pictorial tendencies of a refined hermeneutics-language?

The antecedent spreads itself out in vivacious joy—then the happy sentiment is suddenly broken by the tempestuous incursion of the initial motif inflected to minor. A brooding minor-fugato begins, starting in the dark bass regions, climbing ever higher—a bleak shadow-play, continuously circling around a theme that suddenly, with elemental vehemence, breaks out in its original form above upward-rolling chord-passages, and now leads to the joyously self-restorative conclusion.

Oh, I smell disaster . . . what kind of “antecedent,” whence? [W]here? The “minor-fugato”—consequent of that antecedent? I smell disaster . . . Bekker is visibly at a loss, hastens to close, and thus has done so more hastily than Beethoven: isn’t “. . . and now leads to the joyously self-restorative conclusion” more Bekker’s close than Beethoven’s? Why the rush?

In order to represent accurately the inner line of evolvement of this as well as the preceding movements, one would have to break down the work bar by bar, show clearly, and justify the transformations of the motif by means of a fascinating expressive technique.
This tries one’s patience! “one would have to . . . break down the work bar by bar”—Bekker bluff’s here, for he cannot do what he would have to do, what he not only would have to be able to do, but would have to do. But he cannot do it, for he who can, doesn’t expostulate about it the way Bekker has always done thus far.

Here the path toward decipherment of this marvelous language can only be briefly suggested.

“Here . . . can only . . .”—the constant crutch of authorial perplexity; who doesn’t recognize it from daily misuse? Certainly, even in the world of ideas the law of physics applies according to which, for example, on the place where I sit down, somebody else cannot sit at the same time. Certain too is that where Bekker sets down the words conveying his impression, he cannot at the same time offer the “decipherment of the marvelous language,” but why does he decide in favor of non-decipherment? Is Beethoven’s marvelous language something less to him than his own? But why should the reader be deprived of Beethoven’s Best and perhaps Bekker’s Very Best? Why doesn’t this scribbler sometime take up in a different venue, in a different book, the neglected obligation and prefer to rant about things which really do not concern him, as for example about the progress of the art of today, where not even the progress of the past is known to him?

Finally, even if this gibberish were to be tolerated, can and may the reader excuse the fact that Bekker pretends to have “briefly suggested” the “path toward decipherment of this marvelous language”? Has even a single word been dropped that could count as such a path? Where? Was it perhaps the few technical expressions (wrongly used in any case) like: “A-major prelude,” “vacillating syncopes,” “quartet-like treatment of the voices,” the “vigorously rushing melody,” etc. etc., that Bekker deems to hold such a power of path-revelation? Isn’t his presentation (whether with or without technical expressions)—because it is hermeneutic—also impersonal at the same time? but how was it possible, then, that such no-man’s-words could lead precisely to the uniqueness and particularity of a Beethoven? Let us, incidentally, hear Bekker himself:

Only a brief glimpse can be given of how Beethoven develops a whole sonata movement, conceived in grand dimensions, from the spinning-out of a single theme, and how nevertheless this thought-process, intensified to the highest degree of acuity, rests, down into its finest structural details, on poetic intentions.

---

[To “decipher. . . .”]
Yes, Bekker speaks gladly and often of the “poetic intentions,” but why not more exactly about the “single theme,” about the “thought-process,” by which alone (if at all) he could have provided a “glimpse” of Beethoven’s tonal language? All that has been proved, then, is that it is very important to him that the reader believe him about the “glimpse.”

Riemann’s discussion is obscure; just to be able to present it here, I was obliged to impose a certain amount of order. In his sketch—that the line given therein, mainly the upper voice, has nothing in common with that which I call Urlinie (see “Preliminary Remarks”), the reader will already infer from the few examples provided below—he divides the first movement into eight periods:

I: bar 1–8
II: bar 9–16
III: (“2nd Theme”) bar 16–34

of which bars 25–33 is labeled as “epilog” and bars 33–34 as “general upbeat”;

IV: bar 35–52
V: bar 52–61

at bar 55 “head-theme”;

VI: bar 61–68
VII: (“2nd Theme”) bar 68–85

at bar 77ff. “Epilog”;


About this, we read:

The first movement of Op. 101 . . . shows throughout instead a particularly unrestricted modern nature and continues the “galant style,” which is not bound to a specific number of voices, in a characteristic manner. The head-strain is four-voiced, and, as a result of open spacing, makes use of a large portion of the keyboard. The same texture is maintained also by the second period (evolutional strain).

The modulation, however, as I indicated above, begins not as late as bar 9, but already in bar 7, and furthermore: bar 8 resembles bar 1, and indeed in such an important sense that it is inconceivable how with bar 9—in the middle of the theme!—a new theme, a new period could at all have been begun.
On the other hand the third period, which we must regard as the second theme, shows a manifestly “dispersed treatment.” The melodic thread leaps back and forth between high and low registers in the most unconstrained manner.

The reasons that a second theme cannot be assumed here have likewise been presented earlier. The last sentence appears to state a truth, but when we look at the sketch:

![Musical notation]

we note that Riemann is by no means able to present the melodic thread precisely, which explains his so reticent language.

The melody, moving primarily in eighths, is here and there harmonically supplemented by filler-tones, and the rhythmic demeanor is to a large extent free.

Expressed in such a way, the idea remains incomprehensible; one would have to read into it a content which, however, would make it again nonsensical.

The second theme already initiates Period III with independent motivic construction.

An unpardonable mistake. Nevertheless, Riemann is in the right against Nagel when he says:

Nagel is mistaken in finding the second theme only after bar 25; the [here a quotation of bars 25–27] instead begins the Epilog. The motif of the latter is still recognizable even in the syncopated reformulation [here a quotation of bars 31–33].

Riemann now continues:

The stasis in the dominant harmony e+ in III, 7e–8e, leads, given that the repeat is suppressed (which would have entered at 8e = 1), to the Development, and indeed with the sense of a general upbeat or curtain:

His expression “curtain” has become a fashionable word; at this point it serves no purpose of elucidation.
This formation is then immediately repeated twice more at the beginning of the Development and brings several three-bar segments, which naturally somewhat hampers understanding of the construction if one fails to grasp the curtains as such. A genuine bar-triplet then ushers in Period IV at 2b—4, as the harmony convincingly demonstrates:

\[ \begin{align*}
  &c^# | \ldots a^6 | .5 | d^+ \\
  &T | \ldots =D^6 | .5 | T \\
  (2) \text{ (bar-triplet) (4)}
\end{align*} \]

and two bars later a single \( \frac{3}{8} \) bar (three dotted quarters) appears as a triplet of beats, which brings the half cadence on \( d^# + \):

![Musical notation](image)

About the motivic activity Riemann is silent, as we see; and yet it would have been only correct, even from the standpoint of his bar-triplets etc., first to gain an awareness of the meaning of bars 48–49.

The bars that then ensue as well are of more complicated construction, as my sketch of the analysis shows.

(This concession by Riemann should provide the reader with food for thought.)

First the half-cadence on \( g^# + \) is confirmed in two bars, and the \( d^# \) with fermata leads ahead to Period V, which, quite unnoticeably and unexpectedly, leads back to the head-theme, so that the end of the Development and beginning of the Third Part are at hand. (Lenz V [the *kritischer Katalog*], p. 7, very sensitively describes the return to the first theme as “masked,” and in any event sees through the construction better than does Nagel.)

After such preparations (by the Development), the head-theme certainly does not arrive unexpectedly, though—but be that as it may, it cannot escape notice that Riemann recognizes the head-theme in bar 55, while he failed with respect to the head-theme in bar 8. Granted, the case of bar 8 was more difficult.

Not to be overlooked is the slight confusion that the \( (4 = 3) \) in Period V brings (\( D^9 \) at 4a). Comparison with Period I shows that the slack arrangement of
Period I is reproduced in Period V completely reshaped (in place of the con-
nective motif in I, 4 there appears here the interpolation of 4a; the ritardando
and the fermata of I, 5—6, disappear).

In place of the metric study, a more accurate presentation of the content would
under all circumstances have been desired; after all, the slight confusion of which
Riemann speaks here is above all a product of the content.

But with the chromatic ascent of bars 7–8 the strict correspondence to Period
I is again achieved, and Period VI is already joined to Period V with \( 8 = 2 \)
just as Period II to Period I, but transposed to the lower fifth, so that the fur-
ther course of the movement can occur strictly according to the schema. In an
entirely natural way, a small Coda grows out of the Epilogs (Period VIII with
8e = 2 connecting to Period VII), which at 4 = 6 brings an attractive bar-triplet
and ends with one further suggestion of the second theme.

Missing again are conclusions about the content, for which Riemann—clearly to
alay insecurity—substitutes metric studies.

An immersion in the quite oddly elusive nature of the melodicism in the first
movement of Op. 101 is particularly suited as introduction to the style of the
last music of Beethoven, and is therefore most warmly to be recommended.

Would it not have been exactly Riemann’s calling—Riemann’s precisely as a theorist,
as a historian—, however, to introduce his readers to the style of the last Beethoven?
That his escape by appeal to Lenz cannot suffice for this purpose, is evident:

Lenz is right when he speaks of an ingeniously shortened layout of the first move-
ment, which, despite its brevity (102 bars of \( \frac{6}{8} \)) still shows the fully-featured
sonata form. A repeat is lacking; but the place it could have occurred is easily
identifiable (Period III, 8e).

Nor can the following remark:

Reinecke has already pointed out the encounter with Schumann (ibid., p. 88).
In particular the (first movement, Period V): [here a quotation of bar 52ff.].
Yet several other passages seem to me more Schumannesque than these, espe-
cially Period IV, 1 b ff.: [here a quotation of bar 41ff.], where one immediately
feels the need to add Schumann’s instruction “bass very light” (last movement of *Kreisleriana*).

Concerning the second movement, Riemann writes:

The second movement of Op. 101 is, to be sure, marked Vivace alla Marcia, or first of all in German: “Lebhaft, marschmäßig,” but certainly is no actual march. Only the persistence of the dotted rhythm \( \frac{3}{4} \) establishes its march-like character. For the rest, one must agree with Lenz (V, p. 16) when he calls the march “the most untypical of all”; instead of full-voiced chordal texture, it shows a predominantly two-voiced texture, instead of a simple organization in easily perceptible, strictly symmetrically formed sections, it poses problems of period-construction throughout. A conspicuous feature is the open spacing, the large distance between upper voice and bass, the employment of the entire range despite a certain spidery-leggedness of the overall structure.

What was conspicuous to Riemann here is exactly that which makes the texture polyphonic (and not, as he says, “predominantly two-voiced”; this is aside from the fact that a keyboard texture cannot so easily be kept to two voices, since the instrument normally attends to polyphony automatically through its own keyboard-style composing out. The comment on “problems of period-construction” may count as admission of a certain insecurity.

He divides the movement into four “periods”:

I bars 1—11
II (“A major”) bars 12—19 “with half-cadence on e+”
III bars 19—30 “with cadence to D♭ major”
IV (“D♭ major”) bars 30—54.

He appends the following comments:

Here we have in the key-structure, namely in the two third-related keys A major and D♭ major, together with the main key F major, again an element pointing to Schumann. A major as a contrast ushers in Period II after the authentic cadence on f+ at I,8; D♭ major was reached already in the Appendix to Period III (7a—8a), but emerges just as strikingly at the beginning of Period IV through a new motivic formation, imitative within each bar.
The suitable approach to an assessment of this interpretation was provided above, in the main text. After a longer discussion of the metric questions, Riemann finally ventures an actual depiction of the motivic:

That it is above all the retention of the mannerism of dotting \(\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{Note} & \text{Dot} & \text{Rest} \\
\hline
\text{Note} & \text{Dot} & \text{Rest} \\
\end{array}\) that causes blurring of contours and avoidance of distinct caesurae is probably unmistakable. But the setting thereby gains a closer spiritual relationship to the first movement, and is, despite the archaic effect of the dotting-mannerism, just as evanescent and elusive as the latter. That is ever more perceptible in the subsequent course of events. “The enthusiasm soars pindarically into the heights, where Polyhymnia lives,” says Lenz, and he eschews decipherment of “all of these eighth-note values, which appear so innocent and yet satiate the minds of whole generations of artists.”\(^{24}\) That will scarcely be attainable by us either, yet we will at least attempt to make the overall formation-process accessible.

How much more readily we welcome this tone of voice than that of Nagel, not to mention that of Bekker! But even without this laudable admission, the repeated invocation of Lenz as an authority would alone have exposed Riemann’s insecurity. He continues:

Opposite the first Period, which modulates to the dominant C major but returns in the appendices\(^{25}\) to F major (1—6, 6a—8, 8a, 8b, 8c), the second appears as contrasting, in A major. With compressed single-bar imitation in the antecedent (1—2\([=1a]\)—2a, 3—4)\(^{26}\) and with more expansively constructed two-bar motives in the consequent, which leads to a half-cadence on e\(^\text{+}\) (5—6\([=7]\)—8). Still more difficult to understand is Period III, with its demanding feminine endings. The primary motif has taken on the form: [here a quotation of bars 19–21]. That is heavy fare, and one may agree with Lenz when he says that a clear presentation of the content of these formations in fiery Beethovenian language would require a whole, great virtuoso-presence. A new consequent (beginning with 8\(=4\)) leads the strain, which is in the relative key and ends with a half-cadence on e\(^\text{+}\), to the authentic cadence in D\(\sharp\) major that Period IV, with motivic formation similar to that of Period II, takes up, but leading back, altogether undetectably, to the main key and also restoring the

\(^{24}\) [See above, p. 13.]

\(^{25}\) [Bars 9–11.]

\(^{26}\) [The single-bar interval of imitation in Period I becomes a half-bar interval in Period II.]
melodic treatment of the consequent of Period I, so that the march-section is rounded off in the manner of song-form (a b a).

From this sentence it is clearly inferable that the motif of the piece is completely unknown to Riemann, and thus he must also fall short in regard to the tonality, as follows especially crassly from the words “leading back, altogether undetectably, to the main key.” All that is correct is merely the identification of the three-part song-form.

Borrowing from what has preceded, a four-bar, grandly descending motif [here a quotation of bars 44–46] twice leads to the cadence, which twice receives two-bar confirmation in the manner of the cadence of Period I.

The primary motif, which has prevailed from the very beginning, is to him a “borrowing” one here, thus obviously a new one.

A reprise from Period II on underscores the significance of the A major-and D♭ major-traversing large middle section, and compels an understanding of the form of the whole march-part as an a b a (a in F major, b in A major and D♭ major, a² again in F major).

We can see all that he has suffered, though, when we consider the following images from his sketch:
The Trio is subdivided as follows by Riemann:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>55–56</td>
<td>“actual Curtain”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>57–75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>76–86</td>
<td>(at bars 84–85, “Curtain”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87–94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

His comments:

The trio that now follows in B\textsuperscript{b} major (subdominant) is in its main core a two-voiced canon at the octave, to which, however, a kind of Curtain is prefixed, which gradually interweaves the canonic treatment. The actual Curtain comprises the two bars before Period V [here a quotation of bars 55–56]. The next three bars, on the other hand, stake a claim to thematic significance, as the beginning of Period VI reproduces them. The same bars form a brief antecedent (3—4, 4a), whose consequent then introduces the canon.

The blatant perplexity shows in the vacillating nomenclature; thus Riemann calls

bars 55–59 “a kind of Curtain”;
bars 55–56 “actual Curtain”;
bars 57–59 “brief antecedent”;
bars 60ff. “main core” ——

Then in continuation:

It begins the first time with the harmony c\textsuperscript{7} and cadences to F major: [here a quotation of bars 60–61]. At (8b=5) the lower voices takes the lead and
returns to B♭ major, proceeding ultimately to the half-cadence on f+ (trill, Period VI). Further along the reproduction of the canon follows, initiated by the lower voice (VI, bar 5ff.), and it is shown clearly that only the canonic consequent of Period V is intended as the true principal theme of the canon, for after it a Coda follows, which begins with the motif of the Curtain (see above) and then leads back with a new strain (Period VII) to the March part.

Here we even encounter a new formal conception: “true principal theme.” Riemann is again done proud by the manner in which he introduces his consideration of the final movement:

Very difficult to puzzle out is the closing movement, which is introduced by a heavenly Adagio ma non troppo, con affetto (“langsam und ausdrucksvoll” is the German heading, which appears first) that leads at the end into a brief suggestion of the first movement, and thence, with a chain of trills, to the actual concluding movement Allegro $\frac{2}{4}$ (“Geschwind, doch nicht zu sehr, und mit Entschlossenheit”).

In what follows, and indeed again at the expense of discovery of motives, Riemann unfortunately indulges no end in his metric studies, and finally himself declares:

That is a matter which will be grasped once further advancement will be made accessible to the understanding. Words cannot convey further results. Here it is seriously a question of expanding the rhythmic power of comprehension so as to be able to follow the profusion of most intimate expression.

Since, as I have already said, a definition of the motives is lacking in his account, a comparison like the following, which presupposes nothing less than the most accurate knowledge of the motivic, must be completely vacuous:

If we first stop to consider the Adagio, it can perhaps be compared to the introduction of the closing rondo of Op. 53, to which it even actually makes reference to some extent with its longing, upward-striving motifs.

The question of whether the last movement is to be regarded as a fugue or not is treated by Riemann in several passages—altogether needlessly, to be sure, first in respect to the principal motif, bars 1–2, for it really does not require a comparison with the closing movement of Op. 27, No. 1 to demonstrate that the imitations at the beginning of the first theme have nothing in common with a fugue. Concerning
Beethoven’s tendency toward fugal form in his last sonatas in general, Riemann writes as follows:

But next to such decidedly romantic elements, others notably appear in this sonata which point back to the early classical composers, namely explicit contrapuntal mannerisms in the second movement, the persistent development of the dotted eighth-note rhythm \( \frac{3}{4} \), and, in the second and closing movements, canonic treatments and fugal process. The most noteworthy, however, is that these mannerisms in no way have an archaic and stylistically contrasting effect, since the overall treatment is such a thoroughly free one that we are bound to concede that Beethoven stands above the temporal styles and actualizes a program which he formulated around this time (1817) to Karl Holz as follows (Lenz, *Beethoven* V, p. 219): “the imagination also wants to assert its right, and today a truly poetic element has to enter into the forms adopted from olden times.” If we leave open the question of whether Holz’s or Lenz’s report is completely accurate, and if we don’t forget that Beethoven thought far too highly of Bach and Handel to find an absence of a poetic element in their work, then we must admit that Beethoven’s handling of fugal form is a very free one, that he uses it as though only casually, not actually as a fixed form, but more as a type of processing, so that the formative principles of sonata form, rondo form, and so forth, are not called into question by its use. We will have to return to this repeatedly, since in the five last sonatas, of which Op. 101 is the first, several fugal movements do of course occur, and Beethoven’s intention to draw on Bach stands beyond doubt.

Here Riemann’s subdivision of the closing movement:

| “Adagio Periods” | I: | bars 1–8 |
|                 | II: | bars 9–14 |
|                 | III: | bars 14–20 |
|                 | IV: | bars 21–32 |
| A. Allegro (“Exposition”) | V: (“First Theme”) | bars 1–8 |
|                 | VI: | bars 9–16 |
|                 | VII: | bars 17–24 |
|                 | VIII: | bars 25–37 |
|                 | IX: (“Evolution”) | bars 37–48 |
|                 | X: (“Second Theme”) | bars 48–74 |
|                 | XI: (“Epilog”) | bars 75–81 |
| B. (“Development”) | XII: | bars 82–90 |
|                 | XIII: (“A minor”) | bars 92–98 |
Regarding the first theme Riemann states:

In the midst of the first theme Period VII arrives, a gently conciliatory theme [here a quotation of bars 17–18], which has, within the theme, the sense of a mixolydian interlude (Period V, VI, and VII), so that the song-like organization \( a a b a \) results.

To represent a dominant of the A major key as mixolydian bespeaks a misunderstanding both of the old modes and of a dominant-seventh chord in general.

A monstrosity, of course, is Riemann’s demarcation of periods VIII and IX: bars 33–37, the beginning of a completely new element, are crammed into VIII, and with the continuation of precisely this new element he begins Period IX, which, however, he again follows only to the middle of the theme. Nor will the reader be edified on hearing the following:

In comparison to the fugue-like treatment, this part [meaning the first theme] acts as divertissement, similarly to several other formations which are placed in
contrast to the head-theme (e.g., VIII, 5—8b). Yet I would not want to place undue emphasis on this fugue-like presentation, since interpretation in the sense of the sonata form of the movement is doubtless more important.

It is noteworthy that Riemann devotes not a word to the modulation!

Regarding Period X, “second theme,” we read:

Quite remarkable is the structure of the second theme (Period X). Likewise for Period XXVII in A major. Upon the broadly expansive, leisurely antecedent there follows a quixotic, clipped consequent as though in a different tempo. At the least, the effect of the concluding two-bar group is that of something abbreviated or like an “a tempo” after a preceding ritenuto. I shall not neglect to point out the relationship of this structure to the coupling of heterogenic elements within a narrow framework, which Beethoven accomplishes in several of his Bagatelles, particularly in Op. 126\textsuperscript{VI} and Op. 119\textsuperscript{II}; Op. 33\textsuperscript{VI} and 33\textsuperscript{VII} also offer points of contact.

Riemann hears an acceleration, but knows not how to interpret its origin, because he lacks any conception of the motif. To have Period XI begin in the midst of a cadence is irresponsible.

Regarding Period XII we find the following comment:

The beginning of the Development (Period XII) takes up, in the familiar Mozartean manner, the motivic formation of the last bars before the repeat-sign, but—as should be noted well—with alteration of placement in the overall metric structure.

With ignorance of the content, however, the music history must be a false one. Riemann eschews a characteristically fugal subdivision of the Development; he simply paces off his eleven Periods one after the other, appending comments of a mainly metric variety, without devoting a single word to the relation of the Periods to one another.

He places Period XIII in the middle of a passing event\textsuperscript{27}

He speaks of Period XIX only as of a “new thematic entrance” in C major.

Regarding Period XX, he notices merely the curtailment, which of course cannot be missed, but not the enlargement, which here is far more crucial.

\textsuperscript{27} [The C bass of bar 92 divides the falling fifth from E (bars 89–90) to A\textsubscript{1} (bar 95) that expresses V—I in A minor.]
Period XXI he labels as “a reshaping of the head-theme that moves in sixteenths,” and the sketch shows that he has no notion of the melodic line:

XXII begins in the midst of the cadence, and that Riemann didn’t know which motif he was dealing with is shown by his words:

Of the formations in the Development, our interest is drawn especially to the last ones, which are furthest removed from strict adherence to the theme—thus the cadence of Period XX, which sets against the flutter-effect of the theme deprived of its long notes (see above) the broad, syncopating motif [here a quotation of bar 157ff.], which in Period XXII returns twice more in notes half so long.

And Riemann speaks again with just such complete confusion regarding XXIII as well:

The forms that contrast most sharply with these are taken up by the primary motif at the end of the Development (Period XXIII at 8=4), namely the potent lengthening which demands a halt to the bustling activity of the middle section.

Despite all of this circumspection in his discussion of the Development, Riemann nevertheless does not shy away from a detour into history, which of course is doomed to miscarry:

Once it has been noted that the movement does after all have sonata form, the fugue-like treatment is shown in a completely different light—namely as a form of thematic work originating in fugal art. The way was immediately
paved to this enduring veneration of fugal working by the first creators of the modern style, which was responsible for the antiquation of the fugue itself, namely Johann Stamitz and Franz Xaver Richter, and Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven took it up and perfected it.

Regarding XXVI, Riemann is overcome by the desire to propose a small improvement on Beethoven (p. 280):

I was struck by a questionable note, namely Period XXVI, bar 6, the e\(^2\), which would certainly be better read as f#\(^2\), as the formation is a sequence, which the e spoils.

This, then, is how Beethoven’s Op. 101 was read since its publication a century ago! Can we seriously call that an ability to read at all? That those whose non-reading-capability has been demonstrated here bear one name or the other, can that still in any way come into question in the face of the fact that the masterwork has proved inaccessible to them? Now let the reader draw conclusions, and he will certainly reap the possibility of judging whether generations who have not even educated their organs of reception for works of genius are entitled to the insanity of “progressing,” to say nothing of progressing beyond the genius. And if a proof of this self-deception is needed: the “noise of progress,” that is the roar which fills all byways, schools, newspapers, books, scores, and so forth! True progress has a quiet footfall, which is heard only by few. . . .