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ABSTRACT

Beethoven ha composto due finali estremamente differenti per il quartetto in Si bemolle maggiore, op. 130. Il finale originariamente concepito, la Grosse Fugue, è un grande e importante movimento in più sezioni, mentre il secondo finale, cosiddetto ‘piccolo’, è un più leggero rondò-sonata, dalle caratteristiche ibride. La cospicua bibliografia prodotta intorno al quando e al perché Beethoven abbia composto i due movimenti, quasi sempre ha sostenuto la polarizzazione tra le due conclusioni. Tuttavia, è possibile identificare punti di contatto stringenti tra i due movimenti, più di quanto è stato riconosciuto in precedenza. In particolare, l’articolo mette in evidenza allusioni multiple o similitudini tra i due finali, in termini di elementi melodici, ritmici e formali, di texture, che esistono nella versione definitiva e che possono essere rintracciati a ritroso negli schizzi preparatori per il secondo finale. Il potere dell’allusione ci permette di collegare la distanza tra questi finali e ci aiuta a leggere il secondo finale come un ‘tardo’ non convenzionale lavoro, accanto all’originale.

SUMMARY

Beethoven composed two strikingly different finales for his string quartet in B-flat Major, Op. 130. The original Grosse Fugue finale is an immense and heavy multi-sectioned movement, while the second so-called “little” finale is a lighter sonata-rondo hybrid. The extensive body of scholarship surrounding when and why Beethoven composed both movements almost always promotes the polarity of the two endings. However, I argue that these two movements are more closely related than previously recognized. Specifically, I uncover multiple allusions, or similarities between these finales in terms of melodic and rhythmic contour, texture, and form, that exist in the final versions and which can also be traced back to Beethoven’s sketch material for the second finale. The power of allusion allows us to bridge the gap between these finales and helps to promote the second finale as both a ‘late’ and non-conventional work alongside the original.
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The contrasts between Ludwig van Beethoven’s two different finales for his string quartet in B-flat Major, Op. 130 are well known. The original Grosse Fuge finale (hereafter F1) is an immense multi-sectioned movement which Beethoven later authorized to be published as a work in its own right, Op. 133, while the second, so-called ‘little’ finale (hereafter F2) is a lighter, hybrid sonata-rondo. Extensive research into when and why Beethoven composed both finales spans questions of biography, reception history, source material, and technical analysis. These studies typically highlight the polarity of these finales and often promote one over the other as the ‘proper’ ending to Op. 130.1 In regards to their reception as ‘late’ style works, F1’s perceived incomprehensibility, a feature initially seen as a detriment, rather quickly became accepted as one of its most valued features.2 Alternatively, F2 has long been considered something of an outsider to the composer’s late style due to its surface-level simplicity.3 Leonard Ratner creatively summarized F2 as “a calisthenic exercise rather than a turn of ballet, more of the commonplace, less of the substantive than in Beethoven’s other quartet music.”4 Although one of the parameters of Beethoven’s late style is indeed the use of convention, considerations of F2 as stylistically adequate are often limited to how its simplicity allowed Beethoven to create innovations around order in this quartet, i.e. the shifting of weight.5

While the differences between the two finales are obvious enough, I argue that the two movements are more closely related than previously recognized. I begin with an analysis of both finales and uncover multiple allusions Beethoven makes...
to F1 in F2. Allusion best describes the similarities of these finales through a central motif in terms of melodic and rhythmic contour, texture, and form. The composer’s interest in making such allusions can be traced back to early F2 sketch material and grows in significance as he draws nearer to the completed version. In light of these revelations, I provide one possible answer to the question of why Beethoven would be committed to preserving the legacy of F1 in F2, namely that he was inspired by Homer and his poetry and viewed himself as heroic in attending to the legacy of his F1 achievements.

In bridging the gap between these finales, perhaps we accomplish an initial step in understanding these paired works as Beethoven had intended for us as active listeners. In his final compositions, the composer shifted towards principles of hermeneutics, where the responsibility of understanding was on the listener in comparison to rhetoric, where the composer was tasked with reaching the listener. Understandings of both finales are needed from this perspective of active listeners. The power of allusion offers us the opportunity to view F2 as both a ‘late’ and non-conventional work alongside F1, worthy of such interpretation.

Final Versions

Scholarship on the similarities between the two finales is limited largely to showing how each functions as an ending to Op. 130. In 1984 Stefania de Kenessey pointed out that the large-scale harmonic design of the quartet as a whole is based on a six-note collection, whereby both finales provide closure to the B♭-A-Ab-G descent and F-F♯-G ascent that feature prominently in the opening movement. A few years later Lewis Lockwood argued that the g’s that conclude the Cavatina movement or «contemplative ‘aria’» prior to the finale help set the stage for the g that emerges in the opening of both finales – «either the powerful opening unison g of the monumental fugue or the playful pianissimo octaves with which the viola begins the substitute finale».

Lockwood went further in 2003 in identifying a similarity between the two endings in their own right. He claimed that the A-flat major episode of F2 – the «capstone of the movement» that makes it hybrid in form – presents a four-note figure

with [a] characteristic shape (two notes in stepwise relationship, then a large upward leap, the downward by step), [that] is nothing less than a nonchromatic version of the same shape that underlies the opening of the Quartet Opus 132.

---

6 My broad understanding of allusion derives from Peter Burkholder’s definition of this term. See BURKHOLDER, Allusion.
7 See BONDS, Irony and Incomprehensibility, pp. 329-335.
8 See KENESSEY, The Quartet, the Finale, and the Fugue, pp. 306-312.
9 LOCKWOOD, On the Cavatina, p. 217.
the principal subject of the Grand Fugue – and (before this finale was written) in the great fugato first movement of Opus 13110

This link can be explored in Examples 1.1–1.4 below, where the four-note figure of F2 is labelled as Motif A. Lockwood’s idea fits within a larger framework of observed thematic links among the late quartets that began in the mid-nineteenth century.11 It also builds upon Michael Steinberg’s suggestion in 1994 of Beethoven’s «casual reference» to F1’s theme in F2 as «readily recognizable» yet with «shuffled» intervals.12 While Motif A indeed resembles the opening subject of F1, I argue that it is more closely related to additional material across F1, namely the \textit{meno mosso e moderato} sections. This allusion extends beyond thematic content to include similarities in relative location and break with surrounding activity, accompanying textures, and key.

Example 1.1. First Appearance of Motif A in Op. 130 VI (Violin 2, mm. 132-134)

Example 1.2. Fugue Subject of Op. 133

Example 1.3. Opening of Op. 132 (Cello, mm. 1-2)

Example 1.4. Opening of Op. 131 (Violin 1, mm. 1-3)

Motif A is heard across all four \textit{meno mosso} sections of F1, and in the C sections of F2 (see Tables 1.1 and 1.2).13 The essence of Motif A is characterized by

10 \textsc{Lockwood}, \textit{Beethoven}, p. 467.
11 For an overview of this phenomenon including comments by Gustav Nottebohm, Ivan Ma-haim, and Paul Bekker, see \textsc{Kerman}, \textit{The Beethoven Quartet}, pp. 226, 280. For the most recent attempt to trace thematic parallels between the late quartets see \textsc{Cooke}, \textit{The Unity of Beethoven’s late Quartets}.
12 See \textsc{Steinberg}, \textit{Notes on the Quartets}, p. 244. In 2008, Leah Gayle Weinberg mimicked this idea concerning the resemblance of F1’s theme in F2 despite some intervallic differences. See \textsc{Weinberg}, \textit{Beethoven’s Janus-faced Quartet: Opus 130, the Große Fuge and the Allegro}, pp. 46, 49.
13 This contrasts with Ratner’s observation that strictly «the thematic cantus layout of part of the Great Fugue (see mm. 159-232) is reminiscent of the episode of F2. See \textsc{Ratner}, \textit{The Beethoven String Quartets}, p. 231.
four slurred quarter notes separated by a large ascending leap in-between the second and third pitches, at least a minor sixth (compare Examples 1.1 and 1.5).\textsuperscript{14} The first and last two pitches are separated by mostly minor seconds. In both finales, this Motif A also follows the same pattern in regard to the spread of interval content for the middle leap: m6, M6, m7 and m10.

Table 1.1. Analysis of Grosse Fuge, Op. 133\textsuperscript{15}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>TEMPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overtura</td>
<td>1-30</td>
<td>G-B flat major</td>
<td>Allegro; \textit{Menos mosso}; Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Double fugue</td>
<td>31-158</td>
<td>B-flat major</td>
<td>Allegro $\frac{1}{4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Double fugato</td>
<td>159-232</td>
<td>G-flat major</td>
<td>\textit{Menos mosso} $\frac{1}{4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Episode ('March')</td>
<td>232-272</td>
<td>B-flat major</td>
<td>Allegro molto e con brio $\frac{5}{8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Double fugue</td>
<td>273-414</td>
<td>A-flat major</td>
<td>Allegro molto e con brio $\frac{5}{8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 'Fantasy'</td>
<td>415-492</td>
<td>E-flat major</td>
<td>Allegro molto e con brio $\frac{5}{8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Double fugato</td>
<td>493-510</td>
<td>A-flat major</td>
<td>Reprise of Section 3 (\textit{Menos mosso} $\frac{7}{8}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Transition</td>
<td>511-532</td>
<td>Preparing B-flat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. &quot;March&quot;</td>
<td>533-564</td>
<td>B-flat major</td>
<td>Reprise of Section 4 (Allegro molto e con brio, $\frac{7}{8}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Coda 1</td>
<td>565-662</td>
<td>B-flat major</td>
<td>Allegro molto e con brio, $\frac{7}{8}$; brief contrasting tempos at 657-662 with \textit{Menos mosso} at 660-662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Coda 2</td>
<td>663-741</td>
<td>B-flat major</td>
<td>Allegro molto e con brio, $\frac{7}{8}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2. Analysis of Op. 130 VI in Hybrid Sonata-Rondo Form\textsuperscript{16}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>KEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1-32</td>
<td>(c minor) B-flat major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>33-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>39-96</td>
<td>F major, B-flat major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{14} Variants of Motif A exist in both finales, such as in the first lengthy \textit{menos mosso} section beginning in m. 159, where Motif A emerges first in a condensed sixteenth-note pattern, growing into its original form in mm. 17-19, or an abbreviated version of Motif A appears in the viola (mm. 660-662).

\textsuperscript{15} Adapted from LOCKWOOD, Beethoven, p. 464. For an early analysis of the finale as a fugue see KIRKENDALE, The ‘Great Fugue’ Op. 133, pp. 14-24. The fugue has also been considered as a multi-movement work in its own right, and in sonata form.

\textsuperscript{16} The second finale has also been understood differently as either rondo or sonata form, such as in Edward Cone’s analysis where he suggests that different aural experiences have a great impact on the listener’s interpretation. See CONE, Schubert’s Beethoven, p. 781.
Both of these sections that contain Motif A are similar in that they break with the surrounding formal and harmonic arrangement of their respective movements. The \textit{meno mosso} is in effect a \textit{fugato}, a break from the strict fugal sections of the movement. As Kerman suggested, there is not a clear “harmonic intention” until the fourth fugal entry. This “\textit{Qua fugue…Gb} movement…spends more than half of its time on a serene, meandering exposition, the greater part of which neglects to be even contrapuntal, let alone fugal…After the strenuousness of the B♭ fugue, the effect is of an almost blinding innocence”.\footnote{\textit{Kerman}, \textit{The Beethoven Quartets}, p. 287.} Similarly, the A-flat major episode in F\textsc{♭} serves as a break from clear sonata form. Ratner summarized that in the little finale, “both the episode and the key are invasive of the sonata form”.\footnote{\textit{Ratner}, \textit{The Beethoven String Quartets}, p. 231.}

The entrance of Motif A in both finales also aligns with a turn to a more serious lyrical melody with homophonic texture against the lighter activity of the quartet. In F\textsc{♭} Motif A appears as the main melody at least once in each part and is accompanied by rapidly moving sixteenth notes. In F\textsc{♮} it appears only in the first and second violin and is accompanied by moving eighth notes. As a final point of comparison, Motif A proceeds through similar harmonic modulations in both finales: G\textsc{♭} to A\textsc{♭} to B\textsc{♭} in F\textsc{♭} (repeating the final two keys as if a coda), and A\textsc{♭} to B\textsc{♭} in F\textsc{♮}, a condensed version of F\textsc{♭}’s progression. My findings thus offer us a way to hear the two finales connected through multiple allusions based around Motif A.
Creative Process for F2

Sketch material offers a unique perspective into the layers beneath Beethoven’s allusion to F1 in F2. Specifically, study of F2 sketch material indicates that he was interested in including Motif A early on and found ways throughout the compositional process to emphasize it and its connections to F1 through thematic, formal, textual, and harmonic considerations. The material we have to draw upon for F2 include sketches (Autograph 24, SPK, Berlin; the Kullak Sketchbook and MS 62/66, BN, Paris), score sketches (Artaria 209, SPK, Berlin; Mh 104, BH, Bonn; A 53, GdM, Vienna; Ms 35, BN, Paris), a composing score (Autograph 19c, SPK, Berlin [Mus.ms.autogr. Beethoven, L. v. 19c]), and autograph manuscript (Grasnick 10, SPK, Berlin [Mus.ms.autogr. Beethoven, L. v. Grasnick 10]). These sketches are largely from the summer of 1826, while the composing score and autograph manuscript are from October and November of the same year. To date, the only major studies to discuss these sources are Barry Cooper’s article on the nearly two-dozen sketch ideas for both finales combined, and my master’s thesis, which examines the late stage development of this movement through evaluation of the composing score and autograph manuscript.

The first appearance of Motif A in sketches for F2 appears in Bonn Mh 104 and Artaria 209. In Bonn Mh 104 there is an A-flat major section including a passage with a similar texture as Motif A in the final version (see Example 1.6). Here the lyrical melody is in the upper voices with moving eighth notes underneath. The score sketches continue with Artaria 209 and include a reprise of the A-flat major episode with a closer version of Motif A (see Example 1.7). The lyrical melody is in the upper voices in quarter notes. If we condense the melodic content of the first violin, we arrive at a similar melodic contour to Motif A as it appears in the reprise of the final version (see Example 1.8). Note that the first two pitches are reinforced by the second violin.

19 DORFMÜLLER et al., eds., Ludwig van Beethoven: Thematisch-bibliographisches Werkverzeichnis, pp. 852-860; PORTER JOHNSON et al., The Beethoven Sketchbooks, pp. 453-547, 503-508. The library abbreviations are as follows: Berlin, SPK = Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin (West); Bonn, BH = Beethovenhaus (Beethoven-Archiv), Bonn; Paris, BN = Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; and Vienna, GdM = Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, Vienna. Reproductions of Autograph 19c and Grasnick 10 are available online at the Staatsbibliothek digital collection and of Bonn Mh 104 at the Beethoven-Haus digital archives. I am thankful to the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv for allowing me to reproduce images from both of these manuscripts here.

20 Cooper, The Two – Or Two Dozen – Finales and ROSS, The Second Finale.

21 The key change to A-flat is listed in the viola part in m. 114 on p. 1 of Bonn Mh 104.
Example 1.6: Transcription of Bonn Mh 104, pp. 2-3

Transcription Notes:
[1] Written in pencil
[2] Last two notes originally C and B
[3] In 8va written in by Beethoven to indicate the doubling of the cello line
[4] Half note D turned into two quarter notes: C and B natural
[5] Stemming added by author
[6] There are two previous ideas to the right of the half note: Four eighth notes – A-flat, G-flat, (F, E-flat) or (B, A-flat)

Example 1.7: Transcription of Artaria 209, f. 25v, mm. 376-384

Transcription Notes:
[1] Originally, this last note was C (more precise recalling of Motif A)
[2] Originally, this three-note motif was written an octave lower as G, F, A-flat. Beethoven then changed the last note to F
[3] Originally G

Example 1.8: Condensed Melodic Contour of First Violin mm. 377-384

Beethoven arrived at Motif A as it appears in F1 (and the final version of F2) on f. 25r of Autograph 19c (see Figure 1.1a). After fully committing to this allusion, he took steps to emphasize it by raising it up an octave in the first violin part,
mm. 138-139 (see Figure 1.1b). Note that the key change to A-flat major now occurs in the eventual place, m. 109. These changes clearly occurred at the composing score stage as the autograph manuscript reveals a clean version of this passage.

Figure 1.1a. Autograph 19c, f. 25r, mm. 128 to 142 (reproduced with permission by Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv)

Figure 1.1b. Violin 1, mm. 134-136 (reproduced with permission by Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv)

The development of Motif A in the reprise is more complicated and offers us an example of late-stage revisions where Beethoven worked between the composing score and autograph manuscript. Specifically, there are four variants

22 This process was common for Beethoven and occurs other times throughout F2. For example, I previously showed how Beethoven moved between the composing score and autograph
(labelled A through D) that Beethoven considered for this motif before arriving at the final version (see Examples 1.9-1.12). To begin, in Layer 1 of Aut. 19c f. 36r and 36v, Beethoven originally considered having a variation of Motif A only once in this section in the first violin, mm. 378-380 (see Figures 1.2-1.3 and Example 1.9). As shown in Layer 2 of Aut. 19c, he then substituted the half note F in m. 381 in lieu of a quarter note and rest, and he cancelled the quarter note in m. 382 and the first quarter note of m. 383 (see Example 1.10). Given the similarities both layers have, this stage reveals the proposed state of the leaf prior to Beethoven arriving at the first layer of Grasnick 10 (see Figure 1.4 and Example 1.11). The main difference is the addition of Motif A in the second violin part, mm. 376-379, and the raised octaves for the half-notes beginning in m. 382. It is probable that at this point, Beethoven decided upon creating a clear reprise of Motif A in the coda to further substantiate this section; in the second layer of Grasnick 10 and final version, there is an addition of Motif A in the first and second violin, replicating its appearance in the A-flat major episode.

Prior to adding Motif A fully into the autograph manuscript, it appears that Beethoven tested out his ideas in the composing score. As shown in Layer 3 of Aut. 19c in Example 1.12 below, Beethoven inscribes «8va» in m. 379 above the first violin part to indicate the familiar Motif A melodic contour. He also added Motif A theme in the second violin, mm. 380-382. Finally, he pushed the entrance of the rising half-note figure from m. 383 to m. 384 so that he could add one more iteration of Motif A in the first violin. Similar to m. 140 in the first episode, Beethoven included an elision seamlessly connecting Motif A with the following phrase in m. 384. All of these new additions are then copied over into Grasnick 10 and appear in the final version.

Figure 1.2. Autograph 19c, f. 36r, staves 6-9 (reproduced with permission by Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv)

This elision is perhaps the reason for Beethoven’s inclusion of a pasted down measures 147 (Grasnick 10, f. 8) and 391 (Grasnick 10, f. 19v). These added measures help to account for the 8-bar phrasing in this section. At one point it appears that Beethoven’s copyist was confused with the elision because there exists penciled in numbers counting the inexact phrase length beginning in m. 369.

---

23 This elision is perhaps the reason for Beethoven’s inclusion of a pasted down measures 147 (Grasnick 10, f. 8) and 391 (Grasnick 10, f. 19v). These added measures help to account for the 8-bar phrasing in this section. At one point it appears that Beethoven’s copyist was confused with the elision because there exists penciled in numbers counting the inexact phrase length beginning in m. 369.

---
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Figure 1.3. Autograph 19c, f. 36v, staves 1-4 (reproduced with permission by Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv)

Figure 1.4. Grasnick 10, f. 19 (reproduced with permission by Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv)

Example 1.10. Variant B, Autograph 19c, Layer 2, violin 1 and 2, f. 36r-36v, mm. 376-384

· 33 ·
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In addition to opting for a more confident return to Motif A in the coda, Beethoven also made revisions to the larger movement to focus the listener’s attention on the upcoming A-flat major section with Motif A. Specifically, he created greater balance between the episode and the sonata-form sections by cancelling f. 51 of Autograph 19c entirely from the development section. This leaf would have extended the development by twelve measures with primary theme material. All of these steps help to paint a picture of Beethoven’s larger interest in connecting the two finales musically through explorations of how Motif A could present itself in F2 with similar melodic, rhythmic, textural, and harmonic features as in F1.

**Biographical Context**

While study of the final versions of F1 and F2 alongside the latter’s sketch material reveal how Beethoven arrived at these allusions, the question remains, why did he make them in the first place? While it is difficult to answer this query with certainty, further analysis of Beethoven’s initial sketches for F2 in the context of his biographical circumstances provide us with one possible motivation.

Let us rewind to one of the first sketches for F2. In addition to the seven ideas Cooper identified that were drafted for the main theme, there are other potential sketches Beethoven completed for the movement’s opening including an unidentified passage in 2/4 on staves 1–2 of f. 52r of the Kullak sketchbook (see Example 1.13). The lower line resembles the bouncing octave g’s that open F2, and the top line also shares similarities with the rhythm of the opening melody. Although

---

Example 1.11. Variant C, Grasnick 10, Layer 1, violin 1 and 2, f. 19, mm. 376-384

Example 1.12. Variant D, Autograph 19c, Layer 3, violin 1 and 2, f. 36r-36v, mm. 376-384

---

24 For extended analysis of f. 27 see Ross, *The Second Finale*, pp. 41-60.

25 For an overview of these sketches and their timeline see Cooper, *The Two – Or Two Dozen – Finales*, pp. 40-49.
this passage is in F minor, it is likely Beethoven considered this idea at some point for F2 given its aforementioned resemblances to the final version, and also, its proximity to another F2 sketch on stave 10 of the same folio labelled «Finale in B». As Hans-Günter Klein rightly indicates, this $\frac{2}{3}$ sketch is also repeated at the bottom of f. 51v. Significantly, above this sketch Beethoven inscribed «Metrik d[e]s deutschen von Voß» or with the «Metric of the German by Voss».

Example 1.13: Kullak, f. 52r, staves 1-2

While the composer’s interest in connecting his music to prosody is evident throughout his career, this example is particularly striking given the reference to the esteemed and contemporary German poet, Johann Heinrich Voss (1751-1826). Beethoven would have known Voss’s translation of Homer in two different volumes: the Odyssey (1781), of which Beethoven’s copy is preserved in Berlin, and the Iliad (1814). Several of the composer’s Tagebuch entries from 1812–18 contain text from Voss’s translations, but only two sketches set Voss’s transcriptions to music. In the Scheide sketchbook (1815-16), Beethoven included a brief musical setting of Homer’s Iliad with ‘hexameter’ written above it. Federica Rovelli characterizes this moment as an «exercise for the musical setting of this form of verse». The second known example is discussed by Hans Boettcher as vocal in nature and exists in the Egerton Sketchbook (1825). Here Beethoven sets text from Homer’s Odyssey in a $\frac{3}{4}$, F major canon. Together, the Egerton and Kullak sketches suggest that Beethoven may have been interested in returning to Voss’s translation of Homer’s poetry during the time he was composing Op. 130.

26 See COOPER, The Two – Or Two Dozen – Finales, p. 42.
27 See KLEIN, Ludwig van Beethoven, p. 86.
28 I am indebted to Federica Rovelli for her help with this transcription.
29 For more on Beethoven’s use of prosody see KRAMER, Beethoven, pp. 235-237.
30 See ROVELLI, Progetti abbandonati, p. 454. See also SOLOMON, Beethoven’s Tagebuch, pp. 254; For more information on Beethoven’s relationship to Homer in general see GRIGAT, Die ‘Odyssee’.
31 Excerpt is from Book 23, verse 274 of Voss’s 1814 translation of the Iliad: «wär es ein anderer dem wir Danaer ehren mit Weltkampf». The sketch is located in the Scheide sketchbook, M. 130, p. 49. For a transcription see Example 2 in ROVELLI, Progetti abbandonati, p. 453.
32 «Un esercizio per la messa in musica di questa forma di versificazione» (ROVELLI, Progetti abbandonati, p. 453).
33 See BOETTCHER, Beethovens Homer-Studien, p. 484.
While it remains impossible to know what verses from Homer’s poetry Beethoven may have had in mind while composing this F2 sketch, one entry in his Tagebuch stands out as a potential point of inspiration; it is from Voss’s translation and uniquely contains scansion marks for a potential yet unrealized musical setting. The text is from Book 22 of the Iliad:

nun aber erhascht mich das Schicksal[!] daß nicht arbeitslos in den Staub ich sinke[,] noch ruhmlos[,] Nein erst großes vollendet [vollendend], wovon auch Künftige hören.

[But now Fate catches me! Let me not sink into the dust unresisting and inglorious, But first accomplish great things, of which future generations too shall hear.]35

Set against the backdrop of Beethoven’s life, this quote speaks to one possible path the composer saw himself following during his journey from F1 to F2. Although «fate» in the form of poor reception of F1, deafness, deteriorating health, and other societal and familial pressures impacted the composer’s life while working on these two finales, he would not «sink into the dust unresisting and inglorious», but rather, focus his efforts on creating great musical works for future audiences. For Solomon, this passage is one of many in Beethoven’s lifetime that spoke to the composer and «gave voice to his own sentiments, offering guidance, wisdom, and the solace necessary for one who has accepted a stoical solution to unyielding existential questions». Specifically, he linked Homer’s experiences as a blind poet to that of Beethoven’s as a deaf composer, explaining how the poet served as an inspiration to Beethoven as an artist who in spite of his disability achieved great success.36 The legacy of Beethoven’s beloved fugue would not evaporate amidst the criticism, and perhaps he hoped, live on in F2.37

My brief account of the story surrounding Beethoven’s coming to terms with the «fate» of Op. 130 showcases this journey as possibly more ‘Homeric’ – which is to say, heroic – than previously considered. From the start, Beethoven was not interested in altering F1 in spite of negative feedback. At the first rehearsal for this quartet in January 1826 members of the Schuppanzigh Quartet expressed concern about performing this piece, yet Beethoven did not offer to change it in any way.

34 Solomon points out Beethoven’s references to Voss’s translations in Beethoven’s Tagebuch, pp. 254, 259, 271, 294. For more on Beethoven’s use of scansion marks see SOLomon, Late Beethoven, p. 269, n. 40.
35 According to Solomon, «Beethoven entered scansion marks, evidently for a projected musical setting» (SOLomon, Beethoven’s Tagebuch, p. 259). For a transcription of the scansion marks as Beethoven entered in his Tagebuch see SOLomon, Beethoven’s Tagebuch of 1812-1818, p. 232.
36 Solomon, Late Beethoven, p. 6. Outside critics also made links between both men, especially as a way to understand Beethoven’s final works of music through readings of his life. For example, we might consider Hector Berlioz’s account of the Paris premiere of Op. 131 on March 24, 1829 in BERlioz, Berlioz: Selected Letters, ed. MacDonald, pp. 53-54. For the entire original French text see Lettres des Années Romantiques. For more cultural context on this phenomenon see ROss, The Late Quartets.
37 The idea of Beethoven creating a legacy that would survive him is particularly resonate in Lockwood’s biography on the composer. See Lockwood, Beethoven.
way.38 The crowd at the first public performance of this work in Vienna on March 21, 1826 was just as stunned; one audience member later claimed the work was «incomprehensible like Chinese».39 When Holz met the composer after the concert at a nearby pub to let him know that only the short transition movements were repeated Beethoven reportedly exclaimed, «What, these trifles! Why not the fugue? That alone should be repeated. Cattle! Asses!»40 Again, he was unwilling to alter the work and sent it to Prince Galitzin as is later that month.41 Additionally, when he agreed to have a four-hand arrangement of F1 in April, he took over and completed the task from arranger Anton Halm amid a series of personal difficulties and a busy work schedule – his nephew Karl attempted suicide on July 30 and was admitted to a hospital on August 7, and the composer was also occupied with completing new works including his String Quartet in C-sharp minor, Op. 131.42 When he handed his new arrangement to Holz, the dedicatee, he included a joke canon: «Das ist das Werk. Sorgt um das Geld» («Here is the work. Attend to the money»). Although cheerful with voices counting out numbers from one to twelve indicating Beethoven’s pay in ducats for this piece, the sentiment of this joke canon is clear – this is the work, not Halm’s.

By the time Beethoven arrived at his decision to compose a new finale and separate out Op. 130 in September, he had already shown an interest in preserving the legacy of F1 by authorizing no changes to the original work and keeping ownership as the sole composer for its four-hand arrangement.43 Perhaps

---

38 Violinist Karl Holz reported after the fact that lead violinist Ignaz Schuppanzigh «had quite a struggle with the difficult first violin part». See Lenz, Beethoven, p. 218: «Schuppanzigh hatte manchmal einen harten Kampf mit Schwergriffen der 1. Violine, worüber Beethoven in ein homerisches Gelächter ausbrach». The Conversation Books reveal that Beethoven and Holz also discussed peculiarities of the fugue such as the presence of two eighth notes instead of a dotted quarter note. For a complete translation of this review see Wallace, The Critical Reception, pp. 41–42.


40 Lenz, Beethoven, pp. 218–219; Translated by Lockwood, Beethoven, 545, n. 36: «Ich erzählte ihm, daß die hierden Stücke wiederholt warden müssen. ‚Ja! sagte er hierauf ärgerlich, diese Leckerbissen! Warum nicht die Fuge?‘» See also Ivan Mahaim’s citation of Holz’s story where Beethoven apparently said: «Et pourquoi n’a-t-on pas bissé la Fuge? – Elle seule devait être répétée! Les boeufs! Les ânes!» (Mahaim, Beethoven, p. 419); Solomon believes that Mahaim’s account may be «apocryphal» (Solomon, Beethoven, 2nd ed., p. 485, n. 124).

41 Lockwood, Beethoven, p. 460.

42 For entries in the conversation book from Beethoven’s publisher Mathias Artaria leading up to this decision for a four-hand arrangement see Solomon, Beethoven, p. 422, n. 127. For more information about Halm’s appointment see Forbes, ed., Thayer’s Life of Beethoven, p. 975. Musical considerations behind Beethoven’s decision to take over the task of the four-hand arrangement from Anton Halm, such as to eliminate voice crossing between hands, are discussed by Robert Winter and Elisa Novara. See Winter, Recomposing the Grosse Fuge and Novara, Freilich war der Effekt ganz derselbe.

43 It was Holz who successfully convinced Beethoven to write a new ending arguing that it would be easy and profitable if the composer could let go of some of his presumptions about high art. Holz entered into the conversation books passages such as «You could easily have made two [quartets] from the B-flat Quartet», and «When one thinks so highly of art as you do, it cannot be any other way; but it would be more money for you, and the publisher would have to pay...
Beethoven saw his journey from F1 to F2 as triumphant because he was able to preserve F1 and also give the critics an alternative finale that was both more readily comprehensible and kept the memory of F1 alive through ingenious allusions. Even Beethoven’s selection of Motif A from the *meno mosso*, one could argue, was part of the cleverness of the allusion for it was the most subdued part of F1 and therefore easier to mask. The joke, one could say, is on the future generations who missed the embedded message of F1’s legacy in F2 by dismissing further interpretation of this seemingly simple alternative finale.

It is my hope that by uncovering allusions to F1 in F2 we can now hear both finales as two different yet musically connected works. The status of F2 can now be ‘elevated’ into a new context of Beethoven’s late style. Indeed, my mentor Lewis Lockwood was onto something when he said: «The undeniable air of charm and insouciance in the ‘little finale’ is deceptive».

Through the power of allusion we now have a better understanding of why
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