

Bangor University

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Czerny's interpretation of Beethoven's piano sonatas

Lee, Suan

Award date:
2003

Awarding institution:
Bangor University

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 11. Jul. 2024


CZERNY'S INTERPRETATION OF BEETHOVEN'S PIANO SONATAS

by Suan Liu Lee

UNIVERSITY OF WALES BANGOR

2003

I'W DDEFNYDDIO YN Y
LLYFRGELL YN UNIG
—
TO BE CONSULTED IN THE
LIBRARY ONLY



SUMMARY

The teaching of Carl Czerny was influential in the first half of the nineteenth century. His *Complete Theoretical and Practical Piano Forte School* and its supplement, *The Art of Playing the Ancient and Modern Piano Forte Works*, are especially relevant to the performance of Beethoven's piano sonatas. Much of the information in this monumental treatise reveals how Beethoven would have performed his sonatas. His pedalling techniques, for example, are similar to those described in Czerny's treatise. Although *The Art* was published in 1846, some of the ideas in this book date back to Czerny's Haslinger II edition of the late 1820s, thereby showing a certain consistency over a period of about twenty years. Most of Czerny's teaching on the performance of Beethoven's piano sonatas, as recorded in his piano treatise, stem from Beethoven's own practice. However, he sometimes altered Beethoven's directions because he considered his solution to be better (such as the fingering in the trio of Op. 2/1/iii), or because they did not conform to contemporary performing styles, or simply because they did not suit the more resonant pianos of his day.

2.2.4 Articulation and touch	41
<i>Legato</i>	43
<i>Tenuto and sostenuto</i>	43
<i>Legatissimo</i>	44
<i>Staccato</i>	45
2.2.5 Ornaments	48
Long and Short Appoggiaturas	48
Turn	49
Mordent	49
Trills	50
<i>Arpeggio</i>	51
2.2.6 Fingering and technical drills	54
2.2.7 Pedalling	56
2.2.8 Stylistic and expressive matters in performance	63
2.2.9 Summary of influences	65

CHAPTER 3 CZERNY'S INTERPRETATION, AS RECORDED IN HIS WRITINGS AND IN HIS EDITIONS OF BEETHOVEN'S PIANO SONATAS

[Introduction]	67
3.1 What is "correct interpretation"?	67
3.2 Following the text faithfully	71
3.3 The problems of finding authoritative nineteenth-century editions of the piano sonatas	73
3.4 Czerny's editions of Beethoven's piano sonatas	74
3.5 Czerny's editions of Op. 57 compared	83
Metronome marks	83
Dynamic markings and accents	84
Articulation	89
Fingering	93
Pedalling	95
3.6 Summary	101

CHAPTER 4 TEMPO AND TEMPO FLEXIBILITY

[Introduction]	104
4.1 <i>Alla breve</i>	106
4.2 Italian terms	108
4.3 Metronome - a provider of answers?	111
4.4 Maelzel's chart	113
4.5 Beethoven's speed	115
4.6 The application of metronome markings by Beethoven, Czerny and their contemporaries	115
4.7 The metronome markings of Czerny and Moscheles	117
4.8 Czerny's metronome markings compared with the deductions made by Kolisch and Gelfand	118
4.9 The validity of Czerny's metronome markings	120
Tempo flexibility	123
4.10 <i>Accelerando</i>	124
4.11 Instances where a slowing down is recommended	127
4.12 Instances where tempo deviations are discouraged	136
4.13 Summary	140
Appendix to chapter 4	143

CHAPTER 5 STYLE AND EXPRESSION – DYNAMICS AND TONAL CONTROL

[Introduction]	157
5.1 The range of dynamics, the character represented by each dynamic marking and the corresponding touches	157
5.2 Accentuation	161
5.3 <i>sf</i> , <i>rf</i> and <i>fp</i>	162
5.4 Unnotated accentuation	166
5.5 Annotations of Cramer Etudes	167
5.6 Beethoven's and Czerny's usages of accentuation	172
5.7 Czerny's advice on dynamics compared to Beethoven's usage in the piano sonatas	177

CHAPTER 6 STYLE AND EXPRESSION – ARTICULATION AND TOUCH

6.1 The basic touches used by Beethoven and Czerny	179
6.2 <i>Legato</i> or <i>non legato</i> ?	130
6.3 <i>Legatissimo</i>	183
6.4 The meanings of slurs and <i>legato</i>	187
6.5 <i>Tenuto</i> and <i>sostenuto</i>	193
6.6 <i>Staccato</i>	195
6.7 <i>Mezzo staccato</i>	199
6.8 Summary	202

CHAPTER 7 ORNAMENTATION

7.1 The relevance of Bach's <i>Essay</i> in the understanding of Beethoven's ornaments	204
7.2 Appoggiaturas	209
7.3 The <i>Schneller</i>	210
7.4 The trill	212

CHAPTER 8 FINGERING, HAND POSITION AND TECHNICAL EXERCISES

[Introduction]	226
8.1 Some technical exercises from Beethoven's sketches	227
8.2 Fundamental rules of fingering	232
8.3 The fingering of repeated or similar figures	239
8.4 Chromatic scale	242
8.5 Passages in thirds	243
8.6 The fingering of repeated monotones	245
8.7 Sliding from one key to another on the same finger	246
8.8 <i>Glissando</i>	247
8.9 The " <i>bebung</i> " effect	248
8.10 Summary	253

CHAPTER 9 PEDALLING

[Introduction]	255
9.1 The significance of Beethoven's pedal markings	257
9.2 The functions of the damper pedal	260
9.3 The <i>una corda</i> pedal	280
9.4 Czerny's authority on pedalling considered	283

CHAPTER 10 THE PIANO SONATAS IN THE HANDS OF FRANZ LISZT AND HANS VON BÜLOW

[Introduction]	284
10.1 Liszt's Approach to Beethoven's Piano Sonatas	284
10.2 The Choice of Pianos	289
10.3 A Review of Liszt's and von Bülow's Editions	292

CONCLUSION	300
-------------------	-----

SOURCES OF MUSICAL EXAMPLES	304
------------------------------------	-----

SOURCES FOR THE THESIS	313
-------------------------------	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	327
---------------------	-----

PREFACE

Throughout his adult life, Carl Czerny (1791-1857) played an active role in the promotion of Beethoven's music, especially the piano works. His zeal was fuelled by his love for Beethoven's music and a sense of mission to preserve its performance tradition in Vienna after the latter's death. The pianistic ability of Czerny and his first-hand knowledge of Beethoven's compositions would appear to be sufficient for him to be considered an authority on the interpretation of the latter's piano music. However, contemporary opinions are divided, because Czerny's writings may have been influenced by the changing styles of piano playing in his formative years. The rapid development in piano technology, achieved through the close partnership between the makers and composers/performers, inevitably led to a different style of playing. The change from the *non-legato* playing of Mozart to a more *legato* touch as practised by Beethoven is only one example.

The aim of this thesis is to investigate whether Czerny's opinions on the performance of Beethoven's piano sonatas reflect those of the composer. This subject is largely unexplored – surprisingly, considering the close friendship between Czerny and Beethoven, and the frequency with which Czerny's writings are used to support arguments of scholars: from Thayer and Nottebohm in the late nineteenth century to Brown, Drake, Rosenblum, and Newman in the twentieth century. In order to understand Czerny's interpretation of the piano sonatas, it is necessary to understand his personality, education, career, and relationship with Beethoven, and to identify important treatises which may have influenced his *Complete Theoretical and Practical Piano Forte School*, Op. 500 (1839), and its supplement *The Art of Playing the Ancient and Modern Piano Forte Works* (1846). These will be discussed in the first section. In the second, I will evaluate the extent to which Czerny's understanding of tempo indications, dynamic and articulation markings, his realization of ornaments, his ideals regarding tonal colours and technical dexterity, as well as the contexts in which he introduces pedalling, reflect the intentions of Beethoven. Czerny's various editions of Beethoven's piano sonatas will also be considered, with Op. 57 used as a case study. My conclusions about how Czerny perceived Beethoven's piano sonatas will be guided by the writings of Czerny, Beethoven and their contemporaries, by editions of the sonatas by Czerny, by intelligent deductions from the musical context (sometimes from

genres other than the piano sonatas), and by modern scholarship. And finally, a brief survey will be made to see whether Czerny's interpretation of the piano sonatas was passed on from one generation to another, especially from Czerny to Liszt and from Liszt to Bülow.

Beethoven's piano sonatas played a central role in the musical development of both Beethoven and Czerny. Throughout his life, the piano provided Beethoven with the means to experiment with compositional techniques. He was also an excellent improviser on the piano. The important role of the piano is made clear in those works written for other instrument(s) and piano, where the piano acts as an equal, if not dominant, partner. Czerny's particular interest in Beethoven's piano compositions is only to be expected, since he himself was an accomplished pianist. One must also bear in mind that Czerny's first introduction to Beethoven was as a piano student. It is for these reasons that this research is limited to the piano sonatas of Beethoven.

When interpreting music, the performers' duty is to realise its meaning through sound and this is undoubtedly shaped by their personalities, their environments and an understanding of historical and stylistic matters. By identifying Beethoven's and Czerny's views on various musical details such as tempo, dynamics, articulation, and pedalling, it is hoped that this research will help today's performers make informed decisions. Since Czerny is the closest reliable link we have to Beethoven, we should certainly take his suggestions seriously and use them as a starting point. The results of this investigation should by no means act as a set of rigid rules or be perceived as the only solution to the way Beethoven's piano sonatas should be performed. The ultimate decision regarding the meaning behind each sonata rests in the hands of the individual performer.

In this thesis, references to Czerny's piano treatise will be obtained mainly from the English translations, that is *Piano Forte School* and *The Art*, rather than the original German text. Apart from some misplaced punctuation, unusual capitalizations, and occasional additions by the translator (which do not alter the meaning of the original text) in the English version, these translations cannot be faulted. Since the *Neue Beethovenwerke* edition of Beethoven's piano sonatas has not been published, many of the musical examples are obtained from the Henle Urtext edition (1980) and facsimiles of the autographs. Where excerpts from the Urtext edition are used, only the fingerings in italics are Beethoven's. For clarity, the nineteenth-century English fingering

in some of the examples have been changed to the modern standard one. Sources for all the musical examples are listed at the end of this thesis. In general, I will be using the standard Helmholtz pitch notation, in which middle C = c¹, and each octave runs from C to the B above. However, where the octave is immaterial, as for instance, when fingering patterns are being discussed, which apply in any octave, capital letters are used. And finally, for the sake of convenience, nineteenth-century pianos are referred to as “pianos” rather than “fortepianos”.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As with all large-scale research, this thesis would not have been possible without the assistance of numerous people. First of all, the advice and helpful comments from my supervisor Dr Bruce Wood and from Professor Robert Pascall are greatly appreciated. I have also benefited greatly from the German to English translations which Professor Pascall and Mrs Helen Davies have so kindly helped me with.

I am deeply indebted to Mr Michael Freyhan for allowing me to play on two early nineteenth-century pianos in his private collection. I am also grateful to Ms Carol Barker, the Museum Assistant in the Royal College of Music, for the tour she conducted and the discussion we had. Many thanks also to Mr Richard Burnett for the informative and thoroughly enjoyable tour of the piano collections at Finchcocks, Goudhurst, and for the opportunity to play on some of the pianos there which have helped increased my understanding of early pianos.

I would also like to express my heartfelt gratitude to the staff of the University of Wales Bangor library, especially the music librarians Mrs Catherine Evans and the now retired Miss Elizabeth Bird, for their patience and guidance in helping me to find the material I need. My sincere thanks also to the staff in the British Library, Mrs Dorothea Geffert (from the Beethoven-Haus, Bonn) and Dr Otto Biba and Ms Ingrid Leis (from the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, Vienna) for their kind assistance. I am also grateful to Mr Nigel Simeone and, in particular, Mr Harvey Davies for lending me their books and music.

Finally, I wish to convey a special thank you to Mr Edward Davies and his wife for their constant support and encouragement throughout my PhD studies. I truly appreciate what they have done for me and I cannot thank them enough.

SECTION

I

CHAPTER 1: CZERNY'S BACKGROUND

Music was a major love in Carl Czerny's life. Throughout his career, he was not only an influential teacher, but also a competent performer, composer, writer, and music editor. Apart from a few trips abroad in the 1830s and 1840s, Czerny spent all his working life in Vienna. In 1837, upon Liszt's invitation, Czerny travelled to Paris and stayed there for a few months. His only other overseas travels were to Leipzig in 1836, to London in 1837 and to Lombardy in 1846. Czerny was an astute observer who integrated different stands of contemporary performing traditions which he considered to be good and made them into his own. The slight but gradual modifications of Czerny's performance ideals are evident in his writings, for example the realizations of trills (see section 7.4 below). Before these issues are discussed in the subsequent chapters of this thesis, we will first explore Czerny's formative years as well as his busy and varied career.

1.1 CZERNY'S EARLY MUSICAL EDUCATION

Carl Czerny was born in Vienna on 21 February, 1791. He was to spend all his childhood in that city, except for four years (1791-1795) when the family lived on a Polish estate. His father, Wenzel Czerny, a talented pianist, had taken up a teaching post there. The family eventually returned to Vienna to avoid political unrest in Poland. In his childhood, Carl Czerny was exposed to a wide variety of piano music played by his father – music by Bach, Clementi, Mozart, and Kozeluch, among others. He showed musical promise from an early age. When he was about ten years old, he already had a good command of the piano and knew much of his repertoire (including a great deal of music by Mozart, Clementi and other contemporary composers) from memory. This talent was carefully nurtured by his father. Czerny later recounted in his memoir that “My father had no intention whatever of making a superficial virtuoso out of me; rather, he strove to develop my sight-reading ability through continuous study of new works and thus to develop my musicianship”.¹

¹Czerny (1956), p. 303.

Czerny's exposure to eighteenth-century music was further encouraged from the year 1802 onwards, when Government Councillor Hess (a friend of Clementi and Mozart) offered the boy access to his private library. This library contained Bach's fugues, Scarlatti's sonatas, and many works that were difficult to obtain at that time. He was also granted the privilege of copying any music he wanted from the library.² It was around this time that Czerny started copying the orchestral works of Beethoven, Mozart and Haydn and began to realise the enormous benefits he received from this activity. Not only did he get a good grasp of instrumentation, it also gave him the opportunity to practise the art of notating music very quickly - something that proved very useful later on in his life when he started composing.

Besides his father, who played a major role in his early musical education, Czerny also benefited from contact with the various well-known musicians who frequently came to their house. Among them were the composer and teacher Johann Baptist Wanhall³ (1739-1813), the famous pianists Josef Gelinek (1758-1825) and Josef Lipavsky (1772-1810), and the violinist Wenzel Krumpholz (1750-1817). It was through Gelinek that Wenzel Czerny first learnt of Beethoven. Gelinek, who had been challenged to a "piano duel" by Beethoven, was most impressed with the latter's piano technique, improvisations and compositions. This prompted Carl to persuade his father to buy him all the available Beethoven compositions, such as the first three trio Op. 1, the Op. 2 piano sonatas dedicated to Haydn, several variations, and the song *Adeläide*. This piano duel is believed by some to have taken place soon after Beethoven's arrival in Vienna in 1792. However, there is evidence that it took place about six years later. All the works mentioned above were published between 1795 and 1797. Therefore, the Gelinek-Beethoven duel and Czerny's introduction to Beethoven's music probably took place in 1797. Carl Czerny was only six years old.

Although Gelinek was the first person to mention the name of Beethoven to the Czernys, Krumpholz deserves special mention here, because it was he who arranged the first meeting between the ten-year-old Czerny and Beethoven. He also played a further role by passing on his knowledge of Beethoven's performance practice to Czerny. Krumpholz, being a close friend of

²Ibid., pp. 307-308.

³In addition to this spelling, Vanhall, Vanhal and Wanhal are given as alternatives in Sadie (2001), xxvi, p. 254, s.v. "Vanhall".

Beethoven, was familiar with the latter's ideas and musical projects. Since Krumpholz visited the Czernys almost every day, Carl was able to play Beethoven's compositions to him regularly and learn from him. Although Krumpholz was not a pianist, he was a good musician. He was able to advise Czerny on matters relating to "tempo, manner of performance, intended effect, character, etc., since he had often heard them performed by Beethoven himself and had in most cases witnessed the process of composition".⁴

1.2 CZERNY LEARNS FROM BEETHOVEN

Czerny's first meeting with Beethoven in 1801 was a considerable success. Beethoven was impressed by the young boy's talent and agreed to teach him several times a week. Before his first piano lesson, Czerny was requested to get C. P. E. Bach's *Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen*. Czerny later recalled in his memoir:

During the first lessons Beethoven made me work solely on the scales in all keys and showed me many technical fundamentals, which were as yet unknown to most pianists, e.g. the only proper position of the hands and fingers and particularly the use of the thumb; only much later did I recognize fully the usefulness of these rules. He then went through the various keyboard studies in Bach's book and especially insisted on legato technique, which was one of the unforgettable features of his playing; at that time all other pianists considered that kind of legato unattainable, since the *hammered*, detached staccato technique of Mozart's time was still *fashionable*. (Some years later Beethoven told me that he had heard Mozart play on several occasions and that, since at that time the fortepiano was still in its infancy, Mozart, more accustomed to the then still prevalent *Flügel*, used a technique entirely unsuited for the fortepiano. I, too, subsequently made the acquaintance of several persons who had studied with Mozart, and found that Beethoven's observation was confirmed by their manner of playing).⁵

Unfortunately, these lessons did not last long because Beethoven was frequently busy with his compositions and had to cancel the lessons. By 1802, Czerny was left on his own. By then, however, the fundamental rules regarding proper playing posture, hand position and *legato*

⁴Czerny (1956), p. 305.

⁵Ibid., p. 307. Italicization original.

playing had been fully established and Czerny later duly passed them on to all his pupils.

In the meantime, Czerny continued to learn all Beethoven's piano compositions from memory. Concerts, both private and public, were another important feature of Czerny's education. From 1801-1804, he was a regular visitor to the musical soirées which were given by Mozart's widow.⁶ In addition, there were weekly morning concerts in the Augarten Hall during the summer which featured, among other things, the symphonies of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven. In the winter, these were replaced by quartet and quintet recitals.⁷ The concerts were performed to a high standard, and the premières of many of Beethoven's great works given in this forum made a lasting impression on Czerny.

Czerny's education took a different turn in 1804, owing to a chance meeting with Beethoven at Prince Lichnowsky's house. Czerny had been in the habit of playing to the Prince on most mornings. On these occasions he played everything, including the piano music of Beethoven, from memory.⁸ Beethoven, who was sometimes present, was worried that Czerny might overlook some of the expression markings: "Even if he plays correctly on the whole," Beethoven remarked, "he will forget in this manner the quick survey, the *a vista*-playing and, occasionally, the correct expression".⁹ However, Beethoven was said to be very satisfied with Czerny's progress and sight-reading skills, after the young boy succeeded in sight-reading the newly composed piano sonata Op. 53 from the manuscript. From then on, Czerny and Beethoven remained on mutually friendly terms, as seen by their regular correspondence. Czerny was even entrusted with the proof-reading of Beethoven's newly published works. Between 1810 and 1812, he again had the opportunity to study "several things" under Beethoven. He also revealed that Beethoven's corrections were still as precise as they had been ten years earlier; and had not been affected by his hearing loss.¹⁰ From 1816¹¹ to 1818, when Czerny was asked to teach Beethoven's nephew Karl, the frequency

⁶Ibid., p. 308.

⁷Ibid., p. 310.

⁸Ibid., p. 309.

⁹Thayer (1969), p. 391. Italicization original.

¹⁰Czerny (1970), p. 10.

¹¹Czerny gave the year he started teaching Karl as 1815 in "Recollections" (1956), p. 313. His memory for dates is unreliable: on p. 305, he gave 1819 as the date of Krumpholz's death; in fact, Krumpholz died in 1817. He also provided two different dates for the publication of his

of his meetings with Beethoven increased.

Beethoven was influential not only in developing the pianistic skill of the young Czerny, he also advised the latter in the art of arrangement. Czerny's first assignment in this field came in 1805, when he was asked to make a piano reduction of Beethoven's opera *Fidelio*. With Beethoven's guidance, Czerny was able to learn much from this project. Beethoven was obviously satisfied, for he entrusted Czerny with many more such tasks: for example, the arrangements of the Seventh and Eighth Symphonies for two pianos, which were both published in 1817. Eight years later, in 1825, Beethoven publicly announced his approval of Czerny's arrangements of the Overture *Die Weihe des Hauses*, Op. 124:

I consider it my duty to warn the musical public against an entirely misleading pianoforte arrangement for four hands of my latest overture, an arrangement which, moreover, is not faithful to the original score. This arrangement has been published by Trautwein in Berlin under the title 'Festival Overture by Ludwig van Beethoven'. This warning is the more necessary as the pianoforte arrangements for two and four hands made by Herr Carl Czerny, which are absolutely faithful to the score, will shortly appear in the only authentic edition.¹²

Beethoven was also impressed by the speed with which Czerny could complete these arrangements.¹³ And Czerny's skill was also respected by other musicians. When Halm was asked to make an arrangement of the "Grosse Fuge", Karl Holz, a violinist in the Schuppanzigh Quartet, suggested using Czerny's recently completed piano arrangement of the "Kreutzer" Sonata as a model. Unfortunately, Czerny's arrangements sometimes suffer from an excessive use of the piano's high register. It was believed to be for this very reason that Beethoven had rejected Czerny's arrangement of the "Grosse Fuge" for piano four hands.¹⁴ After Beethoven expressed his disapproval of Halm's arrangement, Artaria had approached Czerny. Apart from this overuse of the high register of the piano, Czerny's arrangements, on the whole, convey the appropriate

Op. 1 - 1806 on p. 312 and 1805 on p. 314. When writing the anecdotes for Otto Jahn in 1852, he admitted that the dates he quoted may be incorrect because he was writing from memory events that took place a long time ago. However, he emphasized that it was only with dates that he erred. See Czerny (1970), p. 10.

¹²Anderson (1961), iii, pp. 1442-1443.

¹³Ibid., iii, p. 1148.

¹⁴MacArdle (1958), p. 133; Schindler (1841) (ed. Moscheles), p. 169.

characters of the original compositions successfully.¹⁵

Czerny's love for Beethoven's music inspired him to make many arrangements, including all Beethoven's nine symphonies for piano duet. However, he did not limit his arrangements to the compositions of Beethoven. On his own initiative, he also made arrangements of works by Handel (*Messiah*), Haydn (*The Creation* and some of his symphonies),¹⁶ Mozart (the Requiem, at least six symphonies and ten string quartets), as well as works by Schubert, Spohr, Cherubini, Donizetti, and Mendelssohn, and others. At that time, there was great interest and enthusiasm among the aristocracy and middle class families to play arrangements of orchestral and chamber music, especially piano arrangements, at home for their own enjoyment. It was also a way for them to get to know great music. Czerny's arrangements certainly help cater for that market.

1.3 CZERNY'S CAREER AS A PERFORMER

In 1800, Czerny gave his public concert début as a pianist in Vienna, when he performed Mozart's C minor Concerto K. 491. The critics praised his playing: Schilling described it as "uncommonly fiery" and Hanslick considered him the third most important native Viennese pianist, after Hummel and Moscheles.¹⁷ Beethoven also admired Czerny's playing. He wrote a favourable testimonial for the boy in 1805.¹⁸ Even after 1806, when Czerny no longer actively performed in public, Beethoven still had faith in his pupil's pianistic abilities. He was the soloist in the first performance of Beethoven's Fifth Piano Concerto for a private audience in 1812. His performance impressed even Schindler, who commented that "as a result of Beethoven's coaching, [Czerny] brought out the very best in the music".¹⁹ Years later, Beethoven again turned to Czerny to perform the Adagio and Rondo from the same concerto, this time in a public venue,

¹⁵Among them are Czerny's piano duet arrangements of the nine symphonies, the Overture to the Tragedy of Coriolan and the Egmont Overture.

¹⁶CPM lists twelve symphonies (Nos. 93-104).

¹⁷Sadie (1980), v, p. 139, s.v. "Czerny".

¹⁸Anderson (1961), iii, p. 1414.

¹⁹Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), p. 160.

to “lend lustre to the whole concert”.²⁰ Unfortunately, Czerny had to refuse on the grounds that he had recently neglected his piano playing.²¹ This was inevitable when he started full-time teaching in 1806, and thus could not devote sufficient time to practice.

Although highly esteemed as a performer, Czerny preferred to lead a life away from the public eye. He gave the limp excuse that his playing “lacked that type of brilliant, calculated charlatany that is usually part of a traveling [*sic*] virtuoso's essential equipment”, a claim which he seems to contradict in his next sentence by stating that “brilliant virtuosity on the piano was at that time still an imperfect novelty”.²² He also cited several other reasons in his “Recollections”: his elderly parents, the uncondusive wartime conditions, and the lack of popularity of Beethoven's compositions with the public.²³ This last excuse is nevertheless rather weak. Czerny knew a vast repertoire of piano music, and could have easily performed more popular works if he had chosen to do so. Of all the explanations given above, it seems that the most plausible is the circumstance of his parents, who were too old to take him on tours. There may also be other hidden reasons: his poor health (it was impaired by childhood illnesses and by his overwork from 1806), and his wish to help his family financially, out of gratitude for the sacrifices his parents had made to ensure that he received a good education. The income from his teaching was very good, and this enabled him to improve his family's living conditions.

There were two distinct types of pianist at that time: the often flamboyant travelling virtuosos who performed for the public in the larger, newly built concert halls, and the less extrovert pianists who played in recitals held in private halls or chambers (usually associated with royal and noble patronage of the artists). The first category is typified by such artists as Dussek and Liszt. Czerny and Beethoven belong to the second category. Although Beethoven toured Prague, Dresden, Leipzig and Berlin, Pressburg (now Bratislava) and Pest (now Budapest) in 1796, and made another trip to Prague in 1798, he did not rely on such performances for his upkeep. Similarly, Czerny preferred to play for the entertainment of the nobility (such as he had done for

²⁰Anderson (1961), ii, p. 775. Although Anderson dates Beethoven's letter as 1818, Albrecht believes that 1824 is more accurate. See Albrecht (1996), iii, fn. 2 p. 37.

²¹Anderson (1961), ii, p. 775.

²²Czerny (1956), p: 311.

²³Ibid.

Prince Lichnowsky in 1804), and for private concerts organised by Beethoven and himself. Between 1818 and 1820, he organised weekly programmes at his home which were devoted exclusively to Beethoven's piano music. Beethoven himself sometimes attended these events. For his own pleasure, Czerny also played piano duets and duos both with prominent musicians (such as Ferdinand Ries who was a pupil of Beethoven, and also with Chopin when he visited Vienna in 1829) and with royalty and nobility (such as Queen Victoria in 1837).

1.4 CZERNY'S CAREER AS A TEACHER

Czerny was a well-respected and much sought-after teacher in Vienna. Besides Beethoven's nephew Karl, his list of pupils includes virtuosos and child prodigies, such as Theodor Döhler, Theo Kullak, Sigismund Thalberg, Stephen Heller, Ninette von Belleville-Oury, Leopoldine Blahetka, Theodor Leschetizky, and Franz Liszt. The last two names subsequently became highly influential figures in the musical world during the late nineteenth century. Leschetizky became a prominent teacher whose impressive list of pupils included Ignaz Paderewski, Benno Moiseiwitsch and Artur Schnabel. Although Liszt was better known for his virtuosity on the piano, he was also responsible for training numerous excellent pianists, Hans von Bülow and Eugen d'Albert among others. Czerny's career as a teacher began before he was fourteen years old, on occasions when his father was unable to teach. He started teaching in earnest a year later and he quickly established a good reputation. In 1807, he made the acquaintance of Andreas Streicher, the piano manufacturer. They had a mutual understanding and arrangement. It was agreed that Streicher would recommend good pupils to Czerny and he, in turn, would recommend Streicher's pianos to his pupils.²⁴

From 1816, Czerny taught from morning till night in the houses of the highest nobility and the leading families of Vienna. It was lucrative, but it badly affected his health. Eventually, in 1836, he gave up teaching entirely.

Czerny was a broad-minded man and a keen learner, who was always open to new ideas and

²⁴Ibid., p. 312.

suggestions. He also believed in exposing his students to different musical styles and not just those preferred by the teacher. He and Streicher frequently exchanged ideas on piano playing and on teaching. When Clementi visited Vienna in 1810, Czerny took the opportunity to learn from him by frequently visiting a family whose daughter Clementi was teaching. Czerny later wrote in his "Recollections":

Since I was very often present at these lessons, I became familiar with the teaching method of this celebrated master and foremost pianist of his time, and I primarily owe it to this circumstance that later I was fortunate enough to train many important students to a degree of perfection for which they became world-famous.²⁵

Czerny later entitled his study, Op. 822 (*Nouveau Gradus ad Parnassum*) in homage to Clementi's studies *Gradus ad Parnassum*.²⁶

Beethoven, too, thought highly of Clementi's studies and his *Introduction to the Art of Playing on the Pianoforte* (1801). When Carl Czerny suggested giving Karl van Beethoven a copy of Clementi's studies, Beethoven approved.²⁷ Beethoven also ordered two German-language copies of Clementi's piano method in the last few years of his life – once in 1825 and again, a year later. In the spring of 1826, he wrote to Stephan von Breuning regarding a good piano method for the latter's son, Gerhard. He advised them not to use Czerny's *Klavierschule* (published in 1826 by Haslinger), but to wait for Clementi's piano method which he had ordered on their behalf. Unfortunately, this letter has caused some confusion.²⁸ It has been generally assumed that Beethoven preferred Clementi's teaching to Carl Czerny's. However, Czerny's *Complete Theoretical and Practical Piano Forte School*, Op. 500, was not published until 1839. There is indeed no evidence that he wrote a *Klavierschule* in 1826. In that year, however, his contemporary by the same surname, Josef Czerny,²⁹ published a piano method *Der Wiener Klavier-Lehrer, oder: Theoretisch-practische Anweisung das Pianoforte nach einer neuen*

²⁵Ibid., p. 313.

²⁶Besides the studies by Clementi and himself, Czerny also recommends those by Bertini and Cramer to his pupils.

²⁷Thayer (1969), p. 680.

²⁸Anderson (1961), iii, p. 1279.

²⁹Josef was a composer, pianist, teacher and publisher who took over the teaching of Karl Beethoven from Carl Czerny in 1818.

erleichternden Methode. It is most likely that the *Klavierschule* that Beethoven objected to was in fact the one written by Josef Czerny.

Carl Czerny was not a rigid teacher. His aim was to create all-round musicians, competent not only in piano playing and public performance but also in the arts of improvisation and composition. He was very meticulous in his teaching, as his writings reveal. Both his *Complete Theoretical and Practical Piano Forte School*, Op. 500, and the *Letters to A Young Lady, On the Art of Playing the Pianoforte* are well-organised and follow a systematic plan. He had an overall teaching scheme which he adapted according to the needs of the individual pupil. The *Piano Forte School* is a compilation of piano playing methods and exercises based on his thirty years' teaching experience. It was written for the benefit of aspiring young teachers, and especially those poorer pupils who were unable to afford renowned teachers. The teaching in the *Piano Forte School* consists of explanations on aspects of playing and musical understanding which are exemplified in musical examples. Exercises are given at the end of each chapter for the pupil to practise with specific points in mind. A summary of the lessons taught is inserted at strategic points. *Letters to A Young Lady*, on the other hand, was written as a kind of Appendix to the *Piano Forte School*. It is made up of ten short letters to a fictitious twelve-year-old pupil, the talented and well-educated "Miss Cecilia", who was supposedly at a boarding school in the country. The letters not only sum up the systematic teaching that is recorded in the *Piano Forte School*, but are a revelation of his practical approach to teaching. Naturally, the language used is more informal.

Czerny's disciplined and systematic teaching method can also be seen in his approach to Liszt, as described in the "Recollections". Liszt's playing was apparently in a relatively bad state when he auditioned for Czerny in 1819. Czerny found it "irregular, careless, and confused, and he had so little knowledge of correct fingering that he threw his fingers over the keyboard in an altogether arbitrary fashion".³⁰ Nevertheless, Czerny recognised that Liszt was a highly gifted instinctive pianist and accepted him as a pupil. Like Beethoven, Czerny started his teaching programme by laying the foundations of piano playing systematically – he initially worked on regulating and

³⁰Czerny (1956), pp. 314-315.

strengthening Liszt's mechanical dexterity through the playing of scales.³¹ Liszt was eager, talented and hardworking, and before long he could play all the scales fluently. Czerny then proceeded to instil in him a sense of rhythm, a good control of touch and tone, correct fingering, and proper musical phrasing, using Clementi's sonatas as a basis for this work. In Czerny's opinion, these sonatas "will always remain the best school for the pianist, *if one knows how to study them in his spirit*".³² Once Liszt had mastered these basic techniques, Czerny allowed him to play the works of Hummel, Ries and Moscheles, followed by those of Beethoven and J. S. Bach. By then, the technical groundwork had been laid, so that Czerny was free to concentrate on familiarizing Liszt with the interpretative spirit and character of these composers. This aspect of interpretation is emphasized in the fourth volume of his *Piano Forte School*, entitled "*The Art of Playing the Ancient and Modern Piano Forte Works*".

In this last respect, Czerny's method of teaching with an emphasis on interpretative values echoes that of Beethoven as described in Ries' reminiscence:

If I made a mistake somewhere in a passage, or struck wrong notes, or missed intervals – which he often wanted strongly emphasized – he rarely said anything. However, if I lacked expression in crescendos, etc. or in the character of a piece, he became angry because, he maintained, the first was accident, while the latter resulted from inadequate knowledge, feeling, or attention. The first happened quite frequently to him, too, even when he played in public.³³

Also evident in Beethoven's oft-quoted letter to Czerny in 1817, in which he advised Czerny on how to teach Karl:

In regard to his playing for you, as soon as he has learnt the right fingering and can play a piece in correct time and the notes too more or less accurately, then please check him only about his interpretation; and, when he has reached *that point*, don't let him stop playing *for the sake of minor mistakes*, but point them out to him when he has

³¹The teaching of scales is an essential element in Czerny's instruction. Even the method of teaching in the first volume of *Piano Forte School* is founded on the study of scales. Besides familiarizing his pupils with the notes and key signature of all the major and minor keys, Czerny uses scales to teach the rules of fingering and to develop flexibility and agility of the fingers.

³²Czerny (1956), p. 315. Italicization original. Czerny also believes that every piece, in a way, is a study.

³³Wegeler and Ries (1988), p. 83.

finished playing the piece. Although I have done very little teaching, yet I have always followed this method. It soon produces *musicians* which, after all, is one of the chief aims of the art, and it is less tiring for both master and pupil.³⁴

And Czerny agreed with Beethoven:

Noteworthy in this interesting letter is the very correct view that one ought not to weary the talent of a pupil by too much petty concern (wherein much depends on the qualities of the pupil, it is true) as well as the singular fingering and its influence on interpretation.³⁵

Beethoven himself was usually present at Karl's lessons. The fact that Beethoven felt compelled to write this letter to Czerny suggests that they probably differed in their opinions regarding how much time a teacher should spend correcting technical problems. Although both agreed on the importance of teaching the pupil the correct "spirit" of a composition, Czerny's attention to technical details was perhaps too close for Beethoven's liking. Beethoven's own spirited but not technically flawless playing shows his attitude towards technical accuracy, as witnessed by Ries. Similarly, Czerny describes Beethoven's playing as inconsistent, as well as "lacking in cultivated purity and clearness in difficulties".³⁶ Elsewhere, he explains: "Although his playing was extraordinary when he improvised, it was often much less good when he played his published compositions, for he never took the time or had the patience to work something up again. Success, then, was mostly a matter of chance and mood."³⁷ Even before the onset of deafness, Beethoven's playing was not always distinct and fully worked up. In a letter to the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* dated April 1799, the writer describes Beethoven's playing as being "extremely brilliant but [it] has less delicacy [than Wölfl's], and occasionally he is guilty of indistinctness".³⁸ This observation is also supported by Moscheles (in 1814) and Friedrich Nisle (in 1808).³⁹ Czerny's emphasis in *The Art* on technical proficiency as a prerequisite in the interpretation of compositions by Beethoven, and the numerous books of studies he compiled for pianists of different technical ability to help them improve their technique, show that he was much

³⁴Anderson (1961), ii, pp. 742-743. Italicization original.

³⁵Thayer (1969), p. 680.

³⁶Czerny (1846), p. 32.

³⁷Czerny (1970), p. 16.

³⁸Thayer (1969), p: 205.

³⁹Newman (1988), p. 77.

more concerned than Beethoven with technical prowess.

Although a strict teacher, Czerny incorporated some humour into his lessons. One of his favourite tricks was to correct his young pupils' mistakes through teasing – he reproached them for “making a cat’s back”, that is, for hunching over the keyboard.⁴⁰ As a caution against accelerating out of control through the course of playing a piece, he likened the fingers to “little disobedient creatures, if they are not kept well-reined in[,] ... they are apt to run off like an unbroken colt as soon as they have gained some degree of fluency”.⁴¹ He always explained to his pupils how to practise and why it was necessary to do so. This was done through a variety of methods: by clear instruction, by analogy, by encouragement, and even by tempting and enticement. For instance, he gave the following explanation to the imaginary “Miss Cecilia” in the first two letters, about the virtues of scales and the need to overcome the initial difficulties:

Consider the matter, dear Miss Cecilia, as if you were for a time compelled to wend your way among somewhat tangled and thorny bushes, in order to arrive at last at a beautiful prospect, and a spot always blooming in vernal beauty.

At present, Miss Cecilia, you cannot form an idea of the beauty and effect which is produced by a pure, clear, rapid, and *strictly equal* execution of such runs; they are musical rows of pearls; and many great artists are more particularly distinguished on account of their peculiar excellence in the performance of them. You will no doubt have already remarked, that correct *fingering* is a very important part of pianoforte playing, and one which costs every pupil a good deal of labour. Now, the scales contain all the principal rules of fingering; and they are in themselves sufficient, in almost all cases, to shew the pupil the right path. What do you say to all these advantages? Is it not well worth the while to occupy yourself seriously with these same tiresome scales?⁴²

Throughout the first volume of the *Piano Forte School* and the *Letters to A Young Lady*, Czerny stresses the importance of relaxed playing so as to avoid physical injury. Relaxed muscles, he declares, will also help the pianist to vary his touch and tone when playing. And we shall see that Czerny’s emphasis on avoiding unnecessary body movements when playing was a result of the

⁴⁰Czerny (1848), p. 4.

⁴¹Ibid., pp. 23-24.

⁴²Ibid., pp. 3 and 15. Italicization original.

influence of Beethoven (see chapter 8) and Clementi (see section 2.1). Czerny expresses his clear displeasure at the contortions and grimaces displayed by many of his contemporaries, including even a number of good pianists. He complains that some try to

manifest their feelings by widely jerking out their elbows; or they mark the commencement of every bar by making a low bow with their head and chest, as if they were desirous of shewing reverence to their own playing. Others, after every short note, suddenly take up their hands as far from the keys as if they had touched a red hot iron. Many, while playing, put on a fierce and crabbed countenance; others, again, assume a perpetual simper, &c.⁴³

He was also a perfectionist, and the relative lack of technical facility displayed by some of his contemporaries in public performances frustrated him. In his *Piano Forte School*, he expresses his amazement at the number of performers who, in his opinion, could not even play the scale of C major perfectly.⁴⁴

One can form some idea of Czerny's personality from his writings on teaching, for he perceives a clear parallel between desirable qualities in a person both outside and during teaching. When he insists on avoiding unnecessary hand and body movements when playing the piano, he is revealing his admiration for moderation, decorum, sincerity, and elegance:

Do not suppose ... that you [Miss Cecilia] are to sit at the piano as stiff and cold as a wooden doll. Some graceful movements are *necessary* while playing; it is only the *excess* that must be avoided. ... the elegant deportment of polished life must always be transferred to the art; and the rule applies, generally, "that every movement which conduces really and essentially to our better playing is allowed; here, however, we must avoid all that is unnecessary and superfluous."⁴⁵

In his concluding remarks to the first volume of the *Piano Forte School*, he lists other traits that a good teacher should possess: good communicative skills, firmness, friendliness, warmth, and patience. He again draws the parallel between behaviour in life and in teaching: "Good temper is as advantageous in Teaching as in life in general".⁴⁶ A teacher must also be a competent

⁴³Ibid., p. 31.

⁴⁴Czerny (1839E), i, p. 219.

⁴⁵Czerny (1848), p. 32. Italicization original.

⁴⁶Czerny (1839E), i, p. 216. Capitalization original.

performer in order to demonstrate effectively to the pupil. One such occasion for such demonstration is before the pupil learns a new piece. The teacher should also be in a position to prepare pupils for public performances.

The effectiveness of Czerny's teaching met with a somewhat mixed response from his contemporaries. Liszt was very fond of Czerny. He acknowledged his indebtedness to Czerny throughout his life, often referring to his teacher as "my dear and beloved Master", or "my respected and beloved master".⁴⁷ Czerny's teachings were to remain with Liszt all his life. His own teaching reflected that of his teacher. On the other hand, Anton Schindler's and Karl van Beethoven's disapproval of Czerny's approach⁴⁸ may have been influenced by their prejudices. In fact, Czerny's *Letters to A Young Lady* and his *Piano Forte School* are very informative and enjoyable to read: they reflect his concern for the well-being of his pupils; they also show his interest in providing his pupils with the best education in line with their ability and the latest playing techniques. Throughout his writing, he further displayed all the necessary qualities of a good teacher. The large number of his pupils who achieved international fame as a performer, a teacher, or both, further bear witness to his success.

1.5 CZERNY'S OTHER MUSICAL ACTIVITIES

1806 was a historic year for Czerny, for this was the year he started full-time teaching and had his first taste of composition. His *Variations concertantes* for piano and violin, Op. 1, was based on a theme by Krumpholz. He wrote it without having taken any lessons, except for the occasional hint from Vanhall. He later taught himself the rules of composition by reading Albrechtsberger's book on thorough-bass.⁴⁹ Although Op. 1 sold well, his heavy teaching

⁴⁷See Liszt's letter of 15 February 1881 (to Dénes Pázmándy) for example. Czerny was more than merely a piano teacher to Liszt. Czerny showed compassion and gave Liszt free lessons as well as free board and lodging for some time. Liszt, in turn, showed kindness to his pupils from humble backgrounds. Liszt perhaps also perceived Czerny as a father figure. In the 1830s, Liszt continually invited Czerny to Paris and promised to do for Czerny what he would do for his own father.

⁴⁸MacArdle (1958), p. 130.

⁴⁹Czerny (1956), p. 312.

schedule prevented him from concentrating on composition.

A meeting with the publisher Anton Diabelli in 1818, however, re-ignited Czerny's zeal for composing and he used up his free time in the evenings to compose a large amount of music. This was on top of his twelve-hour teaching schedule during the day.⁵⁰ Czerny composed quickly and easily. By the end of his life, he had produced over a thousand works, including numerous arrangements, many of which are without opus numbers. In addition to his reputation as a teacher, Czerny was becoming increasingly famous as a composer, partly thanks to his willingness to write popular music which was in great demand. He composed numerous variations on famous themes by other composers (for example on the duet "La ci darem" from Mozart's *Don Giovanni*), and on folk melodies of various nations (including those of Austria, Ireland, Scotland, Bohemia, Poland, Russia, and France). He was also very fond of composing light-hearted character pieces, popular dances and marches, as well as pieces in the brilliant style, designed for the sole purpose of displaying the pianist's virtuosity. Although a large percentage of his output consists of small-scale compositions for the piano, he was equally capable of writing in large forms, such as the symphony, the string quartet and the mass.

Unfortunately, his enormous output of light, popular music, which had brought him fame, also brought him criticism from certain quarters. Chopin described him as "Vienna's oracle in the manufacture of musical taste".⁵¹ And Schumann was also rather unsympathetic. In his review of Czerny's "4 brillante Phantasien", Op. 434, in 1838, he states: "By all means let him retire and give him a pension; truly, he deserves it and would not [have to] write any more ... In a word, he's gotten stale; we've gotten fed up with his things".⁵² Beethoven was also not particularly impressed with Czerny's compositional style. In 1823, Beethoven admitted to Ries that he was not keen on compositions in the brilliant style, because they tend to promote mechanical playing in an unnatural manner.⁵³ When Czerny visited Beethoven in Baden two years later, he was advised to "get an appointment and to compose in the larger forms".⁵⁴ Czerny admitted that he

⁵⁰Ibid., pp. 313-314.

⁵¹Chopin (1988), p. 142.

⁵²Newman (1969), p. 181. Translated by Newman.

⁵³Wegeler and Ries (1988), p. 137; Anderson (1961), iii, p. 1064.

⁵⁴Thayer (1969), p. 956.

did not attach any real importance to his compositions for the reason that “he scribbled them down so easily, and that he took music from the publishers in exchange”.⁵⁵ This may be the case with the light-hearted pieces, but he certainly conceived his solo piano sonatas as serious compositions. In his letter of 1823 to the publisher C. F. Peters, he explains:

My solo piano sonatas, however many I plan to write, ought through [one separate] continuous numbering to comprise an entirety [in themselves], in which I want, little by little, to record my artistic views and experiences. Therefore I ask you to consider the 3^{ième} *Sonate*, sent to you, as one item of an over-all series, which I hope to make more and more significant.⁵⁶

Czerny's eleven solo piano sonatas were published between 1820 and 1843, even though the first sonata was composed in 1810. His third sonata in F minor, Op. 57, could be seen as a homage to his teacher. It shares not only the key and opus number of Beethoven's “Appassionata”, but also something of the energy, power and passion of its first movement. In all his piano sonatas and piano duets, Czerny exploits the range of sonority offered by the instrument. Sometimes, he contrasts the deep bass with the penetrating tones of the high treble. At other times, such as certain passages in the piano duets Op. 10/iii and Op. 54, he treats the piano like a full orchestra. Such plays of timbre, tessitura and colour are especially effective in the piano duet medium, as the use of four hands provide him with the opportunity to achieve full textures, harmonic richness, and the contrast between the tonal colours afforded by the different registers across the range of the piano.

In spite of his submissive reply to Beethoven's advice mentioned above, all Czerny's writings display a certain confidence in his own ability as a composer. He could indeed compose in any genre and was familiar with a wide range of compositional techniques. However, he generally seems unable to develop a thematic idea, preferring instead to change the accompaniment or the harmonic progression. The chordal section in the second movement of his fourth sonata in G major, Op. 65, for example, sounds almost like a harmony exercise. He also suffered from an overfondness for long stretches of passagework. The fourth movement of his first Piano Sonata in A flat major, Op. 7, is one such example.

⁵⁵Ibid.

⁵⁶Newman (1969), p. 181. Translated by Newman.

Czerny's ability as a composer, which has often been viewed in a rather unfavourable light, should be re-considered. The quality of compositions in his enormous output is, admittedly, not uniform. It is therefore important that one should differentiate the good ones from those which resemble compositional studies. His third sonata, for example, is worthy to be in the main piano repertoire. Many of his piano duets too deserve some recognition, such as his *Ouverture Caractéristique et Brillante in B minor*, Op. 54. His studies also should not be viewed as mere mechanical exercises. *Die Schule des Virtuosen*, Op. 365, for example, not only explores various technical difficulties over the whole compass of the keyboard, it can also help the pupil develop a wide and varied range of dynamics, articulation, tonal emphasis, and touch.⁵⁷

From the 1820s, Czerny began writing about music, piano playing, and composition. His writings from this period show him to be a well-rounded musician. He deals with the art of improvisation in the *Systematische Anleitung zum Fantasieren auf dem Pianoforte*, Op. 200 (1829), and *Die Kunst des Präludieren in 120 Beispielen*, Op. 300 (1833). The preludes and fugues in his *Schule des Fugenspiels*, Op. 400 (c1836), are intended to encourage the pianist to develop the skill of playing polyphonic compositions. As mentioned in the previous section, his three-volume *Vollständige theoretisch-praktische Pianoforte-Schule*, Op. 500 (1839), and its supplement *Die Kunst des Vortrags der älteren und neueren Klavierkompositionen* (1846), contain detailed instructions on piano playing and stylistic matters. They were both translated into English as *Complete Theoretical and Practical Piano Forte School* and *The Art of Playing the Ancient and Modern Piano Forte Works* respectively. Both translations were published in the same year as their original German treatises. Czerny's *Elementary Works for the Piano Forte*, published in London in 1840, is a simplified version of the *Piano Forte School*. As it was intended for the use of schools in Great Britain, its formula is similar to the treatises of Cramer and Clementi (see also section 2.1). Like all English treatises, it is relatively brief. The exercises, as in Cramer's treatise, are accompanied by concise instructions explaining the purpose of each exercise, or the technical difficulty involved, or how to overcome it. Czerny was obviously familiar with the music trade and the expectation of the music-buying public both on the Continent and in England. *Letters to A Young Lady*, as mentioned in the previous section, teaches music theory and piano playing from

⁵⁷For Kuerti's suggestion regarding some of Czerny's "serious" compositions which should be explored, see Kuerti (1997), pp. 493-497.

a practical viewpoint. Essentially using the same ideas, the different styles of writing and the different formulas of *Piano Forte School*, *Letters to A Young Lady* and *Elementary Works* show how adaptable Czerny was. He also possessed a sound knowledge of various compositional forms and genres, as well as of orchestration; all of which is recorded in his *Schule der praktischen Tonsetzkunst* or *School of Practical Composition*, Op. 600 (1848). Three years later, he published *Umriss der ganzen Musikgeschichte bis 1800*, Op. 815, a book which gives a list of musicians from the time of the birth of Christ until 1800, with a brief résumé accompanying each entry. In this book, he is able to combine the three passions of his life – music, literature and history. Each composer is placed within a carefully drawn historical context (including major political events), in parallel with the cultural history of the important literature and musical compositions of the period.

Czerny's linguistic competence in German, French, Italian, and Czech also became useful in later life. With a good knowledge of French, he was able to translate Antoine Reicha's *Traité de mélodie* (1814), *Cours de composition musicale* (c1816-1818), and *Traité de haute composition musicale* (1824-1826) into German. The bilingual edition of this compilation, entitled *Vollständiges Lehrbuch der musikalischen Composition*, was published in Vienna in 1832.⁵⁸ In addition to providing a German translation, he also added remarks and an Appendix. He frequently uses the works of well-known composers, such as Mozart, Haydn, Clementi and especially Beethoven, to aid his explanations. It is not only the aesthetics which Czerny admired in Beethoven's music, but also the latter's skill in thematic development, his harmonic language, his expert handling of various structures, and the overall unity in his compositions. Czerny also edited and translated Reicha's *Art du compositeur dramatique* (1833) which he published in 1835 as *Die Kunst der dramatischen Composition*. By acquainting himself with the writings of an important figure such as Reicha, as well as the compositions of his contemporaries and predecessors, Czerny may have been paving the way for his own composition treatise.

Similarly, Czerny's edition of A. E. Müller's *Grosse Fortepiano-Schule* (Leipzig, 1825) and *Kleines Elementarbuch für Klavierspieler* (Leipzig, 1830) were perhaps also preparations towards his own monumental treatise on piano playing. Müller's *Fortepiano-Schule* in particular

⁵⁸Newman (1969), p. 32.

has had an interesting history, having been revised many times. It was in fact first written by G. S. Löhlein and published in 1765 under the title *Clavierschule*. The sixth edition of this treatise was published in 1804 as Müller's *Klavier-und Fortepiano-Schule*. The eighth edition, entitled *Grosse Fortepiano-Schule*, and published twenty-one years later, was edited by Czerny. He added a large and comprehensive newly-written section on figured bass which incorporates the theories and views of prominent contemporary books, written for both the amateur and the educated musician. In order to incorporate changes in piano playing, extensive additions and alterations were made in the chapters on fingering, ornamentation and performance. In the chapter on fingering, he replaced many of the old exercises with new pedagogical doctrine concerning the study of scales, which he found, after a long period of testing, to be the best way for the development of finger dexterity. Out-of-date realizations of ornaments were replaced with newer ones. The section on performance was expanded to include the interpretation of classical compositions, a chapter which anticipates his *Piano Forte School*. The five classifications each for dynamics and articulation, his descriptions regarding the qualities and characteristics of each dynamic and articulation, and his remarks on the use of the pedals, are similar to those in the *Piano Forte School*. Czerny also modernised the *Kleines Elementarbuch* by adding exercises and supplementing the chapter on ornaments, but the revisions here were on a much smaller scale. Nevertheless, not all his editions of existing piano treatises received such extensive additions. In his edition of Pleyel's *Clavierschule*, published around 1860, he added a section to explain the *staccato* and *portato* notation, and some new exercises. Sometimes, his "editing" may simply consist of adding a new set of exercises at the end of a treatise, as in his edition of Jousse's piano treatise, Op. 420, published in London in 1836. Indeed, Czerny was also greatly respected in London. J. A. Hamilton, the man who translated Czerny's *Piano Forte School* into English, invited Czerny to compose new exercises for the 50th edition of his treatise, *Modern Instructions for the Pianoforte*. Prior to its publication in 1854, this treatise was sent to Czerny for revision. In the preface, Hamilton proudly declares that Czerny made only very few and insignificant corrections, thus indicating the latter's approval.

In addition to contemporary treatises, Czerny also edited the music of a number of prominent composers, from Bach and Scarlatti to Weber and Beethoven. His various editions of the complete piano sonatas of Beethoven will be discussed in chapter 3 below. In his editions of J.

S. Bach's *The Well-Tempered Clavier* (1837) and 200 of the sonatas by Domenico Scarlatti (1839), he attempted to reveal the character of each piece by inserting tempo markings, metronome markings, *crescendo* and *diminuendo* nuances, sudden accents, fingerings, and articulation marks (often favouring *legato*). His suggested dynamic range from *pp* to *ff* is significantly larger than Bach would have intended. Sometimes, Czerny encourages a rapid change from soft to loud and vice versa: in Prelude XV in G major from Book I, for example, the change from *p* to *f* and back to *p* happens within the space of two bars (from bars 7 to 9). From *p* at the beginning of bar 7, Czerny recommends a *crescendo* halfway through the bar which leads to *f* at the beginning of the next bar. This is followed by a *diminuendo* halfway through bar 8 to *p* at the beginning of bar 9. All these markings, which clearly reflect the early nineteenth-century approach to baroque music, are consistent with those found in contemporary compositions, especially Beethoven's. Another nineteenth-century trait which is found in Czerny's editing is the occasional thickening of the texture, such as his insertion of double octaves in the bass of bars 25-29 from the C minor fugue in Book I. In the Preface to his edition of *The Well-Tempered Clavier*, Czerny further reveals his indebtedness to Beethoven, that is, by using Beethoven's performances of the fugues as a basis for his editing. These performances evidently gave each part in a fugue an independent voice as well as highlighting the interplay between the parts.⁵⁹

In spite of the vast quantity of new music that was being composed in the nineteenth century, Czerny still felt that there was a lack of short pieces which would aid the development of sight-reading skills, or which could be used for the purpose of entertaining, or for one's amusement. As a result, the *Musikalisches Pfennig-Magazin* was started to fill this gap, with Czerny as editor between 1834-1836. The majority of compositions in the *Pfennig-Magazin* were by contemporary composers such as Beethoven, Moscheles, Dussek, Field, Clementi, Cramer, and particularly Czerny himself. The genres of these compositions are also very varied. Among them are rondos, variations, romances, bagatelles, polonaises, Austrian dances, cadenzas, and etudes. A few pieces by Bach and Scarlatti are also incorporated, as it is Czerny's intention to introduce the older composers who had been neglected into nineteenth-century repertoire. However, like his edition of Bach's *The Well-Tempered Clavier*, these pieces contain articulation marks, dynamics, and the occasional tempo change which have been inserted by Czerny. In his preface,

⁵⁹Bach (1837), preface.

he explains that it was necessary to revise the interpretative and performance of baroque pieces to suit modern taste.⁶⁰

Czerny's extensive creative output, with his editions of treatises and music which he sought to bring into line with contemporary taste, can be best summed up by his forceful and witty motto:

"Viel für Viele; Alles der Zeit".⁶¹

When translated into English, it means "much for [the benefit of] many; Time will bring all to fruition".

⁶⁰Czerny (1834-1836), preface.

⁶¹Ibid.

CHAPTER 2: MUSICAL INFLUENCES

Throughout his life, Czerny was exposed to a variety of musical styles. In the “Recollections” he acknowledges his indebtedness to C. P. E. Bach, Beethoven, Clementi and Hummel. In order to understand Czerny’s interpretation of Beethoven’s piano sonatas, it is essential that events or persons who influenced Czerny are first explored. In addition to the occasional remark in reminiscences, anecdotes or diaries, treatises provide an extensive source of information. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, Europe was swept by an enthusiasm among both amateurs and professionals for publishing treatises on playing an instrument – especially the piano, which was becoming increasingly popular. It was not uncommon for teachers in London (including even those without any standing) to publish treatises. Copyright law did not exist in Germany and Austria, so the less accomplished teachers usually resorted to copying the writings of well-established musicians. The craze for having one’s piano treatise published was partly encouraged by developments in piano manufacturing. New ways were explored to improve the mechanism of the instrument which, in turn, provided new opportunities and sound worlds to composers and pianists.

Improvements in transport and communication enabled the main musical centres in Europe, such as London, Paris and Vienna, to stay abreast of the latest developments. Translations of the more important treatises were made. For instance, Clementi’s *Introduction to the Art of Playing on the Piano Forte* (1801) was translated into both German and French in 1802 while Hummel’s *Ausführliche theoretisch-practische Anweisung zum Piano-forte Spiel* (1828) was translated into English the following year. Many musicians and publishers knew one another and were interested in new publications on piano playing. The subscribers to Hummel’s English translation of the *Anweisung* (1829), for example, include Clementi, Cramer, and Cocks and Co. (the company which published many of Czerny’s writings and compositions).

For the sake of discussion, I will compare eight important documents published over a 93-year period (1753-1846). The writers lived in England and in the German-speaking countries. They were composers, teachers, performers, publishers and piano manufacturers, or a combination of these as was customary then. The discussion begins with C. P. E. Bach’s *Versuch über die wahre*

Art das Clavier zu spielen (Berlin, 1753, 1762) and D. G. Türk's *Klavierschule oder Anweisung zum Klavierspielen für Lehrer und Lernende* (Leipzig, 1789), continuing with J. L. Dussek's *Instructions on the Art of Playing the Piano Forte or Harpsichord* (London, Edinburgh, 1796), Clementi's *Introduction to the Art of Playing on the Piano Forte* (London, 1801), A. Streicher's *Kurze Bemerkungen über das Spielen, Stimmen und Erhalten der Fortepiano* (Vienna, 1801), J. B. Cramer's *Instructions for the Piano Forte* (London, 1812), and J. N. Hummel's *Ausführliche theoretisch-practische Anweisung zum Piano-forte Spiel* (Vienna, 1828), leading to the culmination of Czerny's three-volume *Vollständige theoretisch-praktische Pianoforte-Schule*, Op. 500 (Vienna, 1839) and its supplement *Die Kunst des Vortrags der älteren und neuren Klavierkompositionen* (Vienna, 1846).¹ However, since some of the treatises contain very little information on pedalling, pedal markings in the music of these writers will be incorporated in the discussion.

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to study all the treatises written in that period. Among them are *Wiener Pianoforte-Schule* by Friedrich Starke (Vienna, 1819-1821), *Méthode pour apprendre le pianoforte* by Friedrich Kalkbrenner (Paris, 1830) and *Méthode des méthodes de piano* by Francois J. Fétis and Ignaz Moscheles (Paris, 1840). There were also many treatises which echo the writings of some of the above-mentioned authors. Johann P. Milchmeyer's *Die wahre Art das Pianoforte zu Spielen* (Dresden, 1797) is influenced by Bach's *Essay*,² Louis Adam's *Méthode nouvelle pour de piano* (Paris, 1802) reflects ideas in Clementi's *Introduction*³ and Pleyel's *Méthode pour le Pianoforte* (Paris, 1797) echoes concepts in Dussek's *Instructions on the Art*.

2.1 BACKGROUND OF THE TREATISES TO BE STUDIED

Clementi's *Introduction to the Art of Playing on the Piano Forte* (1801) deals with elementary

¹References from German treatises made in this chapter are mainly extracted from the English translations. The third edition of Cramer's *Instruction for the Piano Forte* (1820) is used instead of the original, of which the British Library copy has been mislaid. I am using the 1800 edition of Dussek's treatise which has a list of Italian terms; this list is not in the 1796 edition.

²Bach (1974), p. 7.

³Clementi/Rosenblum (1974), p. ix.

music theory, fingering, sitting and playing position, and ways to practise effectively. He repeatedly lays emphasis on a “quiet” hand and the usefulness of practising scales evenly. This emphasis is made more pronounced in later editions. Starting from the seventh edition (1812-1814), the sentence regarding the unnecessary motion of the hand is printed in capital letters. Clementi and one of his pupils, Cramer, extol the virtue of practising scales to train technical facility. Dussek also upholds these basic principles. Besides teaching finger agility, Dussek explains that the practice of scales will help familiarise the pupil with the keyboard, fingering and a knowledge of the keys. By the time Czerny wrote *Piano Forte School*, the role of scales had been extended. They were no longer practised merely to enable neat and rapid execution. Czerny uses them to develop expressive playing: *legato*, the different degrees of *staccato*, a wide range of dynamic levels, and the ability to produce any tones at will. He also trains his pupils to play scales in the circle of fifths, thus developing a sense of V-I harmonic progression. The taboo surrounding the placing of the thumb or the little finger on black keys unless it is absolutely unavoidable, taught by Türk, Dussek and Clementi, is still evident in *Piano Forte School*.⁴

Although Clementi is often considered “the father of the pianoforte”, many of the principles in his *Introduction* have their roots in C. P. E. Bach’s *Essay*.⁵ Bach teaches the correct sitting position. He understands the importance of the correct hand position in order to play properly. He maintains that the thumb should always remain close to the hand while unnecessary bodily gestures should be avoided. Bach discourages the performer from adopting ugly grimaces.⁶ Before the publication of Clementi’s treatise, Bach was already teaching that the left hand should be intelligently exercised so that it has equal facility with the right. This last point and the art of fingering are perhaps the most important principles to influence later teachers. At the time of writing the *Essay*, the art of fingering was “almost a secret art, ... known and practiced [*sic*] by very few”.⁷ Bach obviously considers fingering to be a very important element in performance because the *Essay* begins with a large chapter on fingering. He uses both the old and the new

⁴Bach (1974), p. 45; Türk (1804), p. 17; Cramer (1835), p. 2; Cramer (c1820, treatise), pp. 5 and 34; Dussek (1800), pp. 9 and 31; Czerny (1839E), i, pp. 46-77 and ii, p. 3.

⁵Clementi himself admitted “Whatever I know about fingering and the new style, in short, whatever I understand of the pianoforte, I have learned from this book”. See Bach (1974), p. 14.

⁶Bach (1974), pp. 30, 31, 41-44, and 152.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 41.

method of fingering scales. In those with no or very few sharps and flats, he expresses his preference for the old method, that is, of vaulting the third finger over the fourth, and the second finger over the thumb. Nevertheless, in keeping with new developments, he considers the turning of the thumb and the crossing of the longer fingers over the thumb to be the most important element in the study of fingering.⁸ Unlike the options of fingering available for the easier scales, those with many sharps and flats permit only the new fingering. It is this new method of fingering that was later developed and used as the basis of piano technique, first by Clementi, then by Cramer, Hummel,⁹ and Czerny. Another method that they adopt is Bach's recommendation on how to practise technical exercises. First, the exercises are practised slowly, the speed is then gradually increased until the fingering of such passages becomes second nature to the player.

Bach's *Essay* concerns itself mainly with the responsibility of the keyboard player within an ensemble and the art of improvisation. In contrast, nineteenth-century treatises emphasize the virtuosity of the solo concert pianist. Bach must have noticed the tendency towards mechanical playing by the early 1750s when he warns that the performer must "[p]lay from the soul, not like a trained bird!"¹⁰

Bach's and Türk's treatises follow the format of many contemporary German tutors. They are lengthy, with rather few or no practical exercises. Bach offers advice on the mechanisms of the harpsichord and clavichord, tuning, and care of the instruments. An experienced performer, he gives hints on how to prepare for public performances. Clementi's and Dussek's, on the other hand, follow the basic arrangement used by most late eighteenth-century English instruction books. They are simple and concise. Music theory, fingering, piano technique, and ornaments are taught first. This is sometimes followed by fingered scales and/or a few exercises. At the end of the treatises, a small number of pieces or lessons are added. English tutors were considered in their time as dictionaries of elements. Lessons would be selected at the discretion of the teacher and in the order that he saw fit. Cramer's treatise follows this principle loosely. It is concise and simple but has a slightly different format. From his teaching experience, he found that

⁸Ibid., pp. 45-46.

⁹Hummel shows an awareness of Bach's system of fingering when preparing his own chapter on the subject. See Hummel (1829), ii, p. 224.

¹⁰Bach (1974), p. 150.

it was more beneficial to teach music theory through music. Therefore, each exercise is followed by explanation and instructions. Hummel's *Theoretical and Practical Course* and Czerny's *Piano Forte School* incorporate the format of both the German and English tutors: comprehensive theoretical knowledge is supplemented by numerous exercises and pieces. Unlike the English tutors, Czerny sets out the topics in *Piano Forte School* according to the order in which they would be taught in lessons. In his opinion, a teacher is unnecessary if the pupil follows the lessons closely. Like Bach, Hummel and Czerny give counsel on the mechanism and care of the piano, and how to prepare for a public performance. The resemblance between the structure of Czerny's *Piano Forte School* and Hummel's *Theoretical and Practical Course* is striking. Both are divided into three sections: basic theoretical and practical knowledge, fingering, and the styles of advanced performance. The only obvious difference is where the discussion of ornaments is introduced. Hummel places it in the third part of his treatise, together with matters relating to advanced performing styles. Czerny, on the other hand, introduces ornaments towards the end of the first volume of *Piano Forte School*. In contrast, Streicher's booklet is short and precise. It covers four main areas: basic playing position, tone production, the mechanics of the piano, and the tuning and general maintenance of the instrument.

Bach's *Essay* and Streicher's *Notes on the Playing, Tuning and Maintenance of the Fortepiano* are said to be aimed at amateurs. As J. F. Rochlitz explains, the word "amateur" was used to indicate one who truly understands and enjoys music, as opposed to a "professional", one who constantly criticizes.¹¹ The high standard expected of a performer as set out in the writings of Bach and Streicher is therefore understandable. Although its market is unspecified, Türk's *Treatise* is probably written for the same category of performers. Dussek's, Clementi's and Cramer's treatises are written for beginners. They are easy to read but lack instructions on the finer nuances of playing. Therefore, it is difficult to determine the writers' ideals on such matters. Hummel's *Theoretical and Practical Course* and Czerny's *Piano Forte School*, however, are more comprehensive. They are written for pupils at all stages of proficiency, from beginners' level to that of the advanced pianist.

¹¹Rochlitz (1832), p. 295.

2.2 A COMPARISON OF THE TREATISES

2.2.1 TEMPO

Indications of Speed - Italian terms, time signature and the metronome

About a century before the advent of the metronome, Italian terms were introduced to indicate the speed of a piece. Originally, these terms were used as a description of mood. By the middle of the eighteenth century, some of the Italian terms also carried implications of speed. In some cases, speed became more important than the term's original meaning. *Allegro* is an example. The literal meaning of *allegro* is "cheerful". In 1789, Türk defines *allegro* as "quick".¹²

The meanings of Italian terms constantly evolve with time. Even the degree of quickness or slowness associated with these terms became blurred in time. There was disagreement as to whether *largo*, *adagio* or *grave* was the slowest tempo. Türk considers *largo* to be the slowest tempo. Clementi is more conservative. He prefers to follow the practice of Corelli, thereby listing *adagio* as the slowest tempo. In his subsequent editions of *Introduction*, he repeatedly defended this practice. He and Cramer were among the minority who followed the *adagio-largo* tradition. The others, including Dussek, Hummel and Czerny, regarded *largo* or *grave* as the slowest tempo. The speed conveyed by *andantino* was also problematic. Türk, Dussek, Clementi, and Cramer, who stand in opposition to Czerny, insist that *andante* is slightly quicker than *andantino*. In the hope of clearing up this misunderstanding, Hummel explains that it is erroneous to perceive *andantino* as quicker than *andante* because the former is the diminutive of the latter.¹³

Speeds may be classified in three main groups - slow, moderate and fast. Slow tempos are represented by *grave*, *largo*, *adagio*, and *lento*. Fast tempos are expressed by *allegro*, *presto*, and sometimes by *vivace* and *prestissimo*. The meaning of *vivace* at this time was ambiguous. Türk defines *vivace* as a tempo marking which is slower than *allegro*. Clementi contradicts him

¹²Türk (1804), p. 14.

¹³Türk (1804), p. 14; Clementi (1801), p. 13; Clementi/Rosenblum (1974), p. xxix; Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 52; Dussek (1800), pp. 44-45; Hummel (1829), i, pp. 68-69; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 156.

by listing *vivace* as a quicker tempo than *allegro* but slower than *presto*. Dussek and Czerny, on the other hand, consider *vivace* an adverb to the main tempo headings. Dussek defines *vivace* as “with life and spirit” while Czerny interprets it as “lively, with warmth”.¹⁴ The terms *andante*, *andantino*, *allegretto* and *moderato* lie between the slow and the fast tempos. An analysis of the table of speed as listed in the treatises reveals the similarity between Hummel’s and Czerny’s. Compare the two lists, starting with the slowest tempo:

Hummel: *Grave* - *largo* - *adagio* - *andantino* - *andante* - *allegretto* - *allegro* - *vivacissimo* - *presto* - *prestissimo*

Czerny: *Grave* - *largo* - *adagio* - *andante* - *andantino* - *allegretto* - *allegro* - *presto* - *prestissimo*.¹⁵

Although choosing an appropriate speed is an important criterion in performing, the decision may sometimes be rather difficult. Speed varies according to time and place. In the second edition of *Klavierschule*, Türk observes that a more moderate tempo was expected of a piece marked *allegro* composed fifty years earlier. The trend of increasing the speed of *allegro* and reducing the speed of *adagio* continued throughout the nineteenth century. This was noticeable even in the mid-eighteenth century, for Bach complains of considerable differences in the speeds of *allegro* and *adagio*, depending on the location. According to him and Türk, speed may also be deduced from the character of the piece and its smallest note value. These last two points are also observed by Czerny.¹⁶

The influence of the time signature in the choice of tempo was more significant in the eighteenth than in the nineteenth century. The only time signature used in the nineteenth century with a relationship to the proportions was the *alla breve*. As with the Italian terms, there were many contrasting views regarding the meaning of this time signature and its tempo implication. To complicate matters further, distinctions were rarely made between the sign of common time, C, and the *alla breve*, C . Dussek retains the late seventeenth-century meaning of common time by

¹⁴Türk (1804), p. 14; Clementi (1801), p. 13; Dussek (1800), p. 47; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 156

¹⁵Hummel (1829), i, pp. 68-69; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 156.

¹⁶Bach (1974), pp. 148, 151 and 414; Türk (1802), p. 106; Türk (1804), p. 14; Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 69.

assigning C, ♩ and ♩ as indications of this time signature.¹⁷

Apart from Dussek, all the writers studied in this chapter agree that *alla breve* contains two minim beats in a bar. Dussek holds on to the old meaning of *alla breve*, that is, “a movement that has one Breve, and two semibreve etc. in a bar”.¹⁸ There were two ways of interpreting this time signature in performance. Türk and Czerny are of the opinion that the notes in *alla breve* should be played twice as fast as they would otherwise be in common time.¹⁹ In the seventh edition of the *Introduction*, Clementi decides to embrace the other meaning associated with *alla breve*. He writes:

A composition marked thus ♩ was ANCIENTLY performed as fast again as when marked thus C; but now ♩ is performed somewhat faster than C.²⁰

Such confusion prompted musicians to experiment with ways of measuring the exact speed of each piece. Türk’s *Treatise* lists some of these methods: using the ticking of a watch and writing the time needed to perform a piece.²¹ In 1752, Johann Quantz proposed using the “pulse beat at the hand of a healthy person”.²² Pendulums and chronometers were also used to measure tempo – Loulié’s *chronomètre* (1696), for example, had a calibrated frame with a peg on the fixed end of the cord that could be plugged in at a number of points on the frame. This would then adjust the length of the pendulum.²³ In 1724, William Turner suggested setting tempos in terms of a clock whereby the speed of crotchets in reversed ♩ mensuration should be counted “as fast as the regular Motions of a *Watch*”.²⁴ A more sophisticated version of this idea included a two-mètre high clockwork *chronomètre musical* by Jacques-Alexandre-César Charles in 1786 and patents by various inventors such as Anthony George Eckhardt in 1798 and G. E. Stöckel in 1800. Some of the patents, such as Stöckel’s proposal to build a device resembling a large wall-

¹⁷Dussek (1800), p. 4.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 44.

¹⁹Türk (1804), p. 12; Czerny (1839E), i, pp. 110 and 119.

²⁰Clementi (1801), p. 4 (capitalization original); Clementi/Rosenblum (1974), p. xxv.

²¹Türk (1804), pp. 14-15.

²²Quantz (1966), p. 283. See his discussion in Quantz (1966), pp. 282-294.

²³For a list of the devices used to measure tempo before the invention of the metronome, please see Sadie (2001), xvi, pp. 532-535.

²⁴Sadie (2001), xvi, p. 534, s.v. “Metronome”. Italicization and capitalization original.

clock with a 61 cm pendulum, audible hammers and bells, were never carried out.²⁵ Until the invention of the metronome in 1816, none of those earlier experiments were universally accepted. Hummel and Czerny were among the many musicians who recommended the use of the metronome and praised its virtues. They wrote about it with authority and understanding. Hummel cautions that practising with the metronome is useful as long as the player does not follow the beats mechanically. Some relaxation of pulse should be allowed, dictated by the taste and feeling of the performer. The most important role of the metronome, according to Czerny, is the opportunity it provides composers to notate the exact speed of their compositions. The metronome can also be used to aid practice. Perhaps as a reaction against the excessive use of *tempo rubato* employed by some performers, Czerny sees the metronome as an instrument to correct this fault. He elaborates that practising with the metronome helps strengthen the fingers and gives additional certainty in performance.²⁶

The meanings of *adagio* and *allegro*

In general, *adagio* is often seen as an expressive movement while *allegro* is cheerful and lively. By the 1830s, movements marked *adagio* and *allegro* had such diverse characters that qualitative terms were sometimes used. Both Hummel and Czerny reveal that the moods implied by *allegro* range from tranquil and thoughtful, through majesty and warmth, to brilliance and liveliness. Czerny also describes three types of *adagio* - expressive but sad, sentimental, and elegant.²⁷

In the eighteenth century, movements marked *adagio* and *allegro* were characterised by different types of articulation. The general rule was to express *adagio* through broad, slurred notes and *allegro* through detached notes. In the nineteenth century, this distinction was achieved through finger action and tone. Hummel and Czerny teach that a piece marked *allegro* should be precise, neat and brilliant. The execution of *adagio* is more subtle. The character of the piece should be communicated through a variety of tones that are controlled by finger pressure.²⁸ The notes are more sustained and the melody must have a singing quality. Czerny explains that

the Player must know how to fascinate his Audience by the finest

²⁵Ibid., p. 535.

²⁶Hummel (1829), iii, pp. 65-67; Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 66-68.

²⁷Hummel (1829), i, pp. 68-69; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 156 and iii, pp. 69-79.

²⁸Bach (1974), p. 149; Hummel (1829), iii, pp. 41-42; Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 70 and 74.

possible quality of tone, by correct accentuation and phrasing of the melody, by a pellucid fullness and close connection of the harmonies, by feeling and delicacy, and by the appropriate expression of tender or sublime emotions; and, according to the contents of the composition, operate on their hearts or their understandings.²⁹

Some Italian terms which affect the speed and/or character of a piece

Rallentando and Ritardando

Clementi, Cramer and Czerny agree that both *rallentando* and *ritardando* refer to a gradual slowing down. Hummel believes that both terms not only imply a gradual decrease in speed, but in intensity as well. This dual meaning is more commonly associated with the terms *smorzando*, *calando*, and *morendo* (see pp. 40-41). Dussek may have been able to clarify this matter, for he equates *rallentando* with *calando*. Unfortunately, the meaning of *calando* is not given in the list of Italian terms in his treatise, possibly owing to an oversight on the part of the publisher.³⁰

Cantabile

The term *cantabile* is used to emphasize the lyric character of a piece: to reveal this lyric character to the player, and encourage him or her to bring it out. Its specific meaning, however, is determined by the type of keyboard used. Türk's definition of "pleasingly, pleasantly" is more suited to the early keyboard. In the eleventh edition of *Introduction* (1826), Clementi refines the original meaning from "in a singing and graceful manner" to "in a singing, graceful and expressive manner". This is in line with the adoption of *legato* as the normal touch (see pp. 42-43). Cramer's and Hummel's definitions carry the same meaning as Czerny's: "in a singing style. Melodiously".³¹

Con anima and con espressione

Cramer, Hummel and especially Clementi all emphasize the expressive intention and shaping denoted by *con espressione* and *con anima*. In the first edition of *Introduction*, Clementi asks that passages marked with either of those two terms be played:

²⁹Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 74. Capitalization original.

³⁰Dussek (1800), p. 46; Clementi (1801), p. 14; Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 53; Hummel (1829), i, p. 71; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 190.

³¹Türk (1804), p. 15; Clementi (1801), p.14; Clementi/Rosenblum (1974), p. xxx; Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 52; Hummel (1829), i, p. 72; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 156.

[w]ith expression; that is, with passionate feeling; where every note has its peculiar force and energy; and where even the severity of time may be relaxed for extraordinary effects.³²

And in his seventh edition, the *con anima* has become more expressive: “CON ANIMA, with great expression”. While the meaning of *con espressione* is the standard indication for “with expression”, the meaning of *con anima* is slightly elusive. Hummel’s *con anima*, like Clementi’s, is “full of soul, impassioned”. However, Czerny’s definition, written only ten years later, is rather different. In his opinion, *con anima* means “moving with spirit, life and vivacity”.³³

2.2.2 TEMPO FLEXIBILITY

A performance is often enhanced by a slight slowing down, accelerating or both. Bach, Hummel and Czerny agree that such flexibility should not affect the overall tempo. In other words, the piece should start and end in the same tempo, with slight tempo changes within the music.³⁴ The degree of tempo changes, however, vary according to the character of the piece and the taste of the individual performer.

Many instances of tempo flexibility in performance are not notated. Since this practice is determined by contemporary taste, which constantly changes, it is a “lost” art-form, save for some guidelines laid down in treatises. Bach suggests that accelerating and retarding the tempo can be effective at each transposition of a melody in octaves. The tempo should be broadened at the repetition of passages in a minor key that was originally in the major mode and at a fermata. Slow notes, caressing or sad melodies and dissonant chords call for the use of *tempo rubato*.³⁵

Bach defines *tempo rubato* as the addition or subtraction of note values, where one hand plays against the beat and the other strictly with it. Türk gives three definitions of *tempo rubato*,

³²Clementi (1801), p. 14.

³³Clementi/Rosenblum (1974), p. xxv (capitalization original); Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 52; Hummel (1829), i, p. 72; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 190.

³⁴Bach (1974), p. 161; Hummel (1829), iii, p. 47; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 118.

³⁵Bach (1974), p. 161.

Bach's definition being one of them. Türk's second type of *rubato* occurs when the accent is placed on weaker rather than stronger beats. The third is achieved by delaying or accelerating the speed. Although this last type is employed by Bach, he does not classify it as *tempo rubato*.³⁶

Türk gives many instances where tempo flexibility can be used. *Accelerando* is recommended in pieces of a fiery, violent and furious character, in the strongest passages and in passages played stronger at the repeat. *Ritardando* is effective in very tender, languishing and plaintive passages, before embellished pauses, towards the end of a piece or a part of it, and in passages marked *diminuendo*, *diluendo*³⁷ or *smorzando*. Certain passages should be played in strict time but a little slower than the original speed. Among them are embellished passages marked *senza tempo* or *ad libitum*, a transition passage, a softer passage at the repetition, and a soft and poignant passage between two lively ones.³⁸

Similarly, Hummel believes that melodious passages in pieces marked *allegro* should be played imperceptibly slower. Conversely, in pieces with florid right hand passages, the left hand must play in strict time. The examples in *Theoretical and Practical Course* reveal that Hummel uses tempo flexibility sparingly to enhance the overall shape of a phrase. He warns that *tempo rubato* should not affect the neatness, grace and delicacy of a performance.³⁹

Czerny considers tempo flexibility to be the most important means of expression. Unlike his predecessors, he seems to favour a broadening of tempo. He explains that it is more common to slow down than to increase the speed, because the former is less likely to disfigure the character of a piece. In contrast to the numerous instances where a slowing down is favourable, he suggests only two examples where *accelerando* may be employed: firstly, in the transition to a theme which consists of rapid runs or quick *legato* notes; secondly, in pieces of a fiery, violent or furious nature.⁴⁰ The latter recalls one of Türk's examples.

³⁶Bach (1974), pp. 161-162; Türk (1804), p. 40.

³⁷Türk defines *diluendo* as "extinguishing" (see Türk (1804), p. 35).

³⁸Türk (1804), p. 40.

³⁹Hummel (1829), iii, pp. 41-53.

⁴⁰Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 31, 33 and 38.

Like Türk, Czerny recommends a slight *ritardando* in sad, tranquil and tender passages. In addition, he advises that slowing down is effective in the following cases:

- (a) In those passages which contain the return to the principal subject.
- (b) In those passages, which lead to some separate member of a melody.
- (c) In those long and sustained notes which are to be struck with particular emphasis, and after which quicker notes are to follow.
- (d) At the transition into another species of time, or into another movement different in speed from that which preceded it.
- (e) Immediately after a pause.
- (f) At the Diminuendo of a preceding very lively passage; as also in brilliant passages, when there suddenly occurs a trait of melody to be played piano and with much delicacy.
- (g) In embellishments, consisting of very many quick notes, which we are unable to force into the degree of movement first chosen.
- (h) Occasionally also, in the chief *crescendo* of a strongly marked sentence, leading to an important passage or to the close;
- (i) In very humorous, capricious and fantastic passages, in order to heighten the character so much more.
- (k) Lastly, almost always where the Composer has indicated an *espressivo*; as also
- (l) At the end of every long shake which forms a pause or Cadenza, and which is marked diminuendo.⁴¹

In some ways, this list is similar to Türk's guidelines. The main difference is the absence of playing certain passages slower but in strict time. Examples (a), (b), (f), and (g) are places where Türk would have played the whole passage slower rather than gradually slowing down. It is observed that Czerny frequently equates soft passages and chords or those marked *diminuendo* with a broadening of the tempo. One must bear in mind that the list above merely serves as a guide. Take the transition to the main theme as an example. The variation of speed when approaching the subject is determined by the performer's judgment and the musical context. According to Czerny's list (ex. (a)), the transition passage should be played slower and slower. Elsewhere in *Piano Forte School*, he clarifies this, stating that if the transition consists of notes played *staccato* or of chords, the performer should *ritard* towards the end. On the other hand, transition passages which contain rapid runs or quick *legato* notes should be played in strict time or *accelerando*.⁴²

⁴¹Ibid., iii, pp. 33-34. Capitalization and punctuation original. Incidentally, Czerny omitted the letter (j) as was customary then.

⁴²Ibid., iii, p. 38.

The abuse of *tempo rubato*, a common mistake, met with strong disapproval from Hummel and Czerny. Nevertheless, the boundaries of what was acceptable were extended throughout the nineteenth century. Towards the end of the 1820s, Hummel states that an excessive use of *tempo rubato* ruins a performance. Slightly over ten years later, Czerny also finds the exaggerated use of *accelerando* and *ritardando* particularly offensive. In comparison to Hummel's, Czerny's examples of *tempo rubato* in *Piano Forte School* are significantly more numerous. He advises a slight tempo change in almost every bar. Hummel and Czerny do not even agree on the rendition of passages with florid right-hand figurations. Hummel states that the two hands must act independently, with the left hand keeping strict time. Although Czerny also recommends the two hands to be independent from each other, he allows the left hand to slow down with the right hand. The accompaniment, however, must be unornamented so as not to blur the pulse.⁴³

2.2.3. DYNAMICS

The range of dynamics in use

At the time of writing their respective treatises, all the writers surveyed set the soft and loud limits at *pp* and *ff* respectively. In his *Essay*, Bach still speaks of terraced dynamics. It is only in his later compositions that the terms *crescendo* and *diminuendo* are used. This was in line with the development in the second half of the eighteenth century, when both terms were used with increasing frequency. There was also an expansion in the dynamic range, as the piano increasingly allowed for a wider contrast between soft and loud, and more varied tonal possibilities. Clementi was open-minded to this new development. In the seventh edition, he introduces *ppp* and *fff*. However, this practice was not immediately followed by later writers, including Cramer and Czerny.⁴⁴

Mezza voce, *mp*, *mf*, and *sotto voce* are among the terms used to define the volume between soft

⁴³Hummel (1829), iii, pp. 47, 51-53; Czerny (1848), p. 31; Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 32, 35 and 46.

⁴⁴Bach (1974), p. 162; Türk (1804), p. 35; Dussek (1800), pp. 44-47; Clementi/Rosenblum (1974), p. xxv; Cramer (c1820, treatise), pp. 52-53; Hummel (1829), i, p. 70; Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 3.

and loud. Türk, Dussek, Cramer, and Czerny agree that *mezza voce* is in the middle, between soft and loud. Bach, Clementi and Hummel do not mention the term. The contradictory definitions given by Clementi, Cramer and Dussek show that a standard meaning did not exist. Clementi considers *mp* to mean “rather soft”, Cramer sees it as “a medium between soft and loud” while Dussek, curiously, claims that *mp* is “softer than *piano*”. On the whole, this marking is more commonly used in England than in the German-speaking countries. Bach and Türk define *mf* as “half loud” and “half strength” respectively. Dussek, Clementi, Cramer, and Hummel define it as “rather loud” while Czerny interprets it as “moderately loud”. *Sotto voce* is a less significant term than *mezza voce* and *mf*. Like *mp*, its meaning at this time was ambiguous. Türk considers it a soft dynamic. In contrast, Dussek likens it to *mezza voce*. In other words, it represents the medium between soft and loud.⁴⁵ Of these four intermediate dynamic terms, *mf* was the only indication that was universally adopted at the time.

There are two possible reasons why intermediate dynamic indications were rarely used. The relatively small dynamic range available on the early pianos made it difficult to obtain different moderate volumes. Therefore, the soft and loud limits may have represented a broader spectrum of sound than they do today. *P* may represent anything from *pp* to *mp* while *f* may be anything from *mf* to *ff*. This boundary became clearer in time as composers wrote more specific instructions.

Functions of dynamics

However, the role of dynamics is not so much the volume it represents but its contribution to the overall performance of a piece. Volume is adapted to suit the character of the music. Türk gives a general guide: lively pieces must be played strongly while tender and singing passages should be softer. Within these pieces, the touch must be adapted accordingly. He explains:

Compositions of a cheerful, joyous, lively, sublime, splendid, proud, bold, courageous, serious, fiery, wild, furious, and the like, character all require a certain degree of loudness. This degree must even be increased or decreased according to whether the feeling or passion is represented more intensely or

⁴⁵Bach (1974), p. 162; Türk (1804), p. 35; Dussek (1800), p. 46; Clementi (1801), p. 9; Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 52; Hummel (1829), i, p. 70; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 184 and iii, p. 3.

more moderately. ... in each composition itself different gradations are again necessary, all of which must be in a suitable relation to the whole. A *forte* in an *Allegro furioso* must therefore be considerably louder than in an *Allegro* in which only a moderate degree of joy prevails, etc.

Compositions of a gentle, innocent, naive, pleading, tender, moving, sad, melancholy, and the like, character all require a softer execution. The degree of loudness [in 1802, "of softness"], however, must correspond accurately to the prevailing sentiment and therefore is different in most of the cases just named.⁴⁶

Hummel's and Czerny's teaching is in the same vein. Again, this manner of playing had been anticipated in Bach's *Essay*.⁴⁷

Dynamics also serve to emphasize the structure of a piece. On a small scale, both Hummel and Czerny ask that ascending lines be played *crescendo* and descending ones *diminuendo*, unless otherwise indicated by the composer.⁴⁸ Türk and Bach advise highlighting modulations, dissonances and an unexpected turn of a melody.⁴⁹ Türk recommends using different dynamics at the repeat of phrases to provide contrast:

If a passage be repeated, it is played the second time softer, if it was played strong the first time. On the contrary, a repeated passage may sometimes be played stronger the second time, particularly if the Composer has enlivened it by additions.⁵⁰

Although Czerny agrees that the choice of dynamics at repeats is determined by circumstances, he is particularly fond of playing the repeat softer, with little or no *crescendo* and *diminuendo*. This plan is also applied to formal structures, such as the repeat in a scherzo and trio movement.⁵¹

Accentuation

Accentuation consists of metrical, expressive and structural accents. Metrical accents can be

⁴⁶Türk (1804), p. 36. The translation is taken from Rosenblum (1988), p. 61.


⁴⁷Bach (1974), pp. 163-164; Hummel (1829), iii, pp. 40-42; Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 74-79.

⁴⁸Hummel (1829), iii, p. 42; Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 15.


⁴⁹Bach (1974), p. 163; Türk (1804), pp. 34 and 36.

⁵⁰Türk (1804), p. 36. Capitalization original.


⁵¹Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 16 and 85.

further divided into two groups: accents which are determined by the time signature and note divisions. The first type is self-explanatory. The second type of metrical accent is usually not indicated. Players are expected to accentuate the first of a group of notes, such as . In addition, Hummel and Czerny (as shown in exs. 2.1a and 2.1b respectively) propose varying the accentuation of a repeated motivic phrase for interest's sake.

Ex. 2.1a



Ex. 2.1b



Czerny also uses the same treatment at the repetition of a simple melody. The melody is first played *semplice* (this is not included in the musical example below). The placement of emphasis is then varied so that the melody appears new and interesting (ex. 2.2).

Ex. 2.2



Similarly, many expressive and structural accents are implied rather than indicated. Türk lists a number of instances when expressive accents can be used effectively: dissonances, syncopations,

and prominent notes (in terms of length, pitch and depth). Accents at the beginning of phrases have a structural function. Accents on notes which indicate modulations are of an expressive and a structural nature. Bach, Hummel and Czerny also use accents in similar contexts. Accents highlight details of musical interest as well as help the performer keep time. Hummel explains that by so doing, the fingers can play with more precision. This also allows more scope for refined expression.⁵²

Italian terms with dynamic implications

Dolce

Clementi and Czerny classify *dolce* under “dynamics”. Czerny simply describes it as “soft”. On the other hand, Clementi is more concerned with the expressive element of this term. In the first edition of the *Introduction*, he defines *dolce* as “sweet, with taste; now and then SWELLING some notes”. Its meaning is refined in the eighth edition - “sweet, with taste; SWELLING and DIMINISHING some notes”. Türk lists it with other terms which denote the character of a passage or a piece. Hummel lists *dolce* under both headings. Hummel’s definition, as with Türk’s, reflects an overlapping of the two categories - “sweetly, with softness”. Cramer’s definition is the only one that does not have a dynamic implication. He translates *dolce* as “sweetly”. On the whole, it can be concluded that *dolce* implies a soft dynamic.⁵³

Smorzando, calando and morendo

The original meanings of *smorzando*, *calando* and *morendo*, as recorded by Türk, refer to a decrease in volume. Hummel retains the original meanings of *smorzando* and *calando*⁵⁴ but *morendo* is grouped together with *ritardando* and *rallentando*. It has now acquired a new significance, that is, one of speed. Prior to the publication of Hummel’s treatise, the original

⁵²Bach (1974), p. 163; Türk (1804), pp. 33, 34, and 37; Hummel (1829), i, p. 59, ii, p. 2 and iii, pp. 54-61; Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 6-13.

⁵³Türk (1804), p. 15; Clementi (1801), p. 9 (capitalization original); Clementi/Rosenblum (1974), p. xxvii (capitalization original); Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 52; Hummel (1829), i, p. 72; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 184.

⁵⁴Rosenblum points out the weakness of this definition. She argues that the indications *calando, in tempo* appear in Hummel’s Piano Sonata Op. 81 (1819) and his Piano Concerto Op. 85 (c1821). See Rosenblum (1988), p. 83. This indicates that Hummel associated some slowing down with the term *calando* at least nine years before he published his treatise.

meanings of *smorzando* and *morendo* are used in Clementi's and Cramer's writings. Instead, it is the term *calando* that has the speed implication. While Clementi ruminates on one of the three possible meanings of *calando* (the sounds should die away gradually, or it may involve a slight slackening of the speed, or both), Cramer confidently declares that it refers to a gradual decrease in both tone and speed. Some confusion might be expected when the meanings of these terms were evolving in the first three decades of the nineteenth century. However, the trend towards adopting a meaning associated with speed was inevitable. By 1839, Czerny groups *smorzando*, *calando* and *morendo* together once more. They now share a common meaning – one that relates to a decrease in both tone and speed.⁵⁵

2.2.4 ARTICULATION AND TOUCH

Among the many touches described in Bach's *Essay* are *legatissimo*, *legato*, semi-detached and detached tones. Crotchets and quavers in moderate and slow tempos are normally played with the most common touch: the semi-detached. They are played firmly, with fire and a slight accentuation.⁵⁶

A suitable articulation can be deduced from the tempo, the notated lengths of notes and the dynamics. Both Bach and Türk recommend using different touches to characterise the *allegro* from the *adagio*. As mentioned on p. 31, the general rule is to play detached notes in *allegros* and broad, slurred notes in *adagios*. Türk elaborates that slow or solemn pieces require a heavier touch than fast and lively pieces or those of a plaintive character. He prefers to use the terms "heavy and light Expression" to refer to *legato*, and semi-detached (or *staccato*) respectively. In general, notes of longer duration, such as semibreves and minims, are to be heavier than those of shorter duration, such as quavers and semiquavers. Similarly, the time signature is also a factor which influences the choice of articulation. Pieces with an *alla breve* time signature are to be played lightly. Another influential factor is dynamics. Soft and pleasant passages should be

⁵⁵Türk (1804), p. 35; Clementi (1801), p. 14; Cramer (c1820, treatise), pp. 52-53; Hummel (1829), i, p. 71; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 190.

⁵⁶Bach (1974), pp. 148-160.

played with light expression while loud ones are played with heavy expression. Türk recognises two other important factors: the nationality and style of composers. German compositions require a heavier touch than those by French or Italians. Contrapuntal compositions by Handel or J. S. Bach also require a heavier expression than Classical pieces.⁵⁷

Although Bach and Türk agree that the common touch is neither *legato* nor *staccato*, they differ in their descriptions with regard to its length. According to Bach, the notes are held for half their value. Türk's semi-detached touch, which is already progressing towards the *legato* touch, is held for three-quarters of its notated length.⁵⁸ By the beginning of the nineteenth century, most treatises recognise *legato* as the normal touch. The revisions which Clementi made to his Op. 2 piano sonatas over a period of forty years record this move towards *legato* playing. Short slur patterns, consistent with those found in the works of Haydn and Mozart, are the dominant traits of articulation in the early editions of Op. 2. In the revisions, these were replaced with long slurs.⁵⁹

Clementi's decision to change towards *legato* playing may have had its roots in the famous contest between himself and Mozart on 24 December 1781 in Vienna. Clementi's virtuosic technical display of double notes in the right hand did not impress Mozart who wrote to his father in January 1782 complaining:

Clementi plays well, as far as execution with the right hand goes. His greatest strength lies in his passages in thirds. Apart from that, he has not a kreuzer's worth of taste or feeling – in short he is a mere mechanic.⁶⁰

One and a half years later, Mozart still had not changed his mind about Clementi's playing. In his letter dated 7 June 1783, he once again criticized Clementi's mechanical playing which produced "an atrocious chopping effect" and accused him of lacking in expression, taste or feeling.⁶¹ In 1806, Clementi admitted to his student Ludwig Berger that until that occasion, he had never heard anyone perform with "so much spirit and grace" and he was also overwhelmed by the way Mozart

⁵⁷Bach (1974), pp. 149 and 154; Türk (1804), pp. 36-38.

⁵⁸Bach (1974), p. 157; Türk (1804), p. 37.

⁵⁹Harrison (1998). I am grateful to Professor Robert Pascall for sharing this information.

⁶⁰Anderson (1966), ii, p. 792.

⁶¹Ibid., ii, p. 850.

played an Adagio.⁶² He also admitted that, in his youth, he enjoyed showing off his ability to play bravura passages. However, he later adopted a more “cantabile and refined style of performance by listening attentively to singers celebrated at the time, and also through the gradual perfection particularly of the English pianos, whose earlier faulty construction virtually precluded a cantabile, legato style of playing”.⁶³ This change in Clementi’s manner of playing is also reflected in his compositions from the mid-1780s onwards (beginning with the Op. 13 sonata).

Legato

Cramer’s definition of *legato* is representative of those given by Dussek, Clementi, Hummel, and Czerny: *legato* notes must be “played in a smooth, connected style, keeping down each note its full length”.⁶⁴ Technical execution apart, there is a sound ideal associated with this touch. In his fifth edition, Clementi advises that *legato* passages must “imitate the BEST style of singing”. The human voice is also a model for Dussek,⁶⁵ Hummel and Czerny. Another source of inspiration for Czerny is the smooth tone of wind instruments. Both models can be traced to C. P. E. Bach, who emphasizes the advantages of listening to distinguished singers and instrumentalists.⁶⁶

Tenuto and sostenuto

In general, Bach, Türk, Dussek, Clementi, Cramer, and Hummel use *tenuto* to indicate that a note should be held its full length. Czerny adds that when *tenuto* is placed over single notes, these notes must be struck with emphasis, and then firmly held down. Many of them equate the meaning of *tenuto* with *sostenuto*. Clementi’s and Czerny’s definitions of *sostenuto* also carry tempo implications. In the first edition of *Introduction*, Clementi explains that *sostenuto* means “to sustain, or hold on, the notes to their full length”. In his seventh edition (c1812-1814), he adds the words “in steady time”. This qualification is modified to “in steady, moderate time” in the twelfth edition (1830). The addition may have been inserted as a reaction against the

⁶²Rosenblum (1988), p. 25. Her translation.

⁶³Ibid. Her translation. Plantinga translates Clementi’s new way of playing as “melodic and noble” (see Plantinga (1972), p. 314).

⁶⁴Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 20.

⁶⁵W. J. Tomášek who witnessed Dussek’s playing in 1802, admired the latter’s singing quality on the piano.


⁶⁶Bach (1974), pp. 151-152; Clementi/Rosenblum (1974), p. xiii (capitalization original); Hummel (1829), iii, p. 39; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 189 and iii, p. 19.

tendency to hold back the tempo in *sostenuto* passages in the nineteenth century, as is reflected in Czerny's definition of *sostenuto*, "holding on. Keeping back".⁶⁷

Legatissimo

The context in which Bach permits the prolongation of notes is exemplified in ex. 2.3 below. The first example concerns an arpeggiated chord, the second a broken chord and the third a repetitive figure made up of broken chords.⁶⁸

Ex. 2.3



Türk, Clementi, Hummel,⁶⁹ and Czerny also prolong notes in certain figurations. Hummel suggests holding notes of melodic interest longer than their notated value, thus giving a sustained effect (ex. 2.4).

Ex. 2.4 . . . N.B. Notes marked * are held longer than their notated value.



Sometimes notes are prolonged for a practical reason which indirectly results in a better musical execution. In ex. 2.5, Hummel explains that the thumb must remain on the key longer than the notated length while the other fingers play on. This helps to stabilise the hand, which in turn helps to produce a richer and more harmonious passage.⁷⁰

⁶⁷Bach (1974), p. 157; Türk (1804), p. 15; Dussek (1800), p. 47; Clementi (1801), p. 14; Clementi/Rosenblum (1974), pp. xxv and xxxi; Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 25; Hummel (1829), i, pp. 68 and 70; Czerny (1839E), i, pp. 156 and 189.

⁶⁸Bach (1974), pp. 155, 156 and 160.

⁶⁹Rosenblum (1988), p. 157; Hummel (1829), ii, p. 8.

⁷⁰Hummel (1829), ii, p. 67.

Ex. 2.5



Czerny too works on the same principle. Certain notes are sustained in passages which contain consonant arpeggiated chords in order to increase the fullness of the harmony (ex. 2.6).⁷¹

Ex. 2.6




Staccato


There are many ways of indicating *staccato*. The notes can be separated by rests, the passage can be marked *sempre staccato*, or the notes can be marked with dashes (‘’) or dots (‘’). Hummel does not differentiate between the dashes and the dots, which Clementi and Cramer believe represent different degrees of shortness. Türk is in agreement with Hummel but acknowledges that some composers use dashes to indicate a shorter touch. Czerny also does not differentiate

⁷¹Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 19.

between the two signs, even though there has been some confusion regarding this matter. He clearly states in the first volume of *Piano Forte School* that “*Punkte*” (notated as both dots and dashes) indicate *staccato*. In the third volume of the same treatise, however, he uses the term “*Pünktchen*” to refer to *staccato* indications. J. A. Hamilton unfortunately translates this term as dashes, without any reference to dots. Since Czerny shows that “*Punkte*” refers to dots and dashes, the term “*Pünktchen*” must surely cover both signs. Perhaps instead of “dashes”, this term should be translated into English as “little dots and little dashes”. Czerny’s edition of Pleyel’s *Clavierschule* also support this conclusion. In the section on *staccato* which he added, Czerny made no distinction between the *staccato* implied by dots or that by dashes. In his *Piano Forte School*, Czerny also mentions another type of *staccato*. This very percussive touch, known as *martellato* or *staccatissimo*, is to be struck as short as possible. It is generally employed in octaves, chords and in passages in which the notes are far apart (ex. 2.7).

Ex. 2.7




This touch, as described by Czerny, probably stems from the *bravura* style which was popular in the nineteenth century. It does not resemble the very short *staccatos* described by Clementi and Cramer. In the examples and explanations given, Clementi and Cramer use this *staccato* (indicated with dashes) in a group of notes in close succession, such as .⁷²

The debate that surrounds the different sharpness of a *staccato* notation (whether it is indicated by a dot or by a dash) may have resulted from a practice during C. P. E. Bach’s time. Ironically, he suggests the use of dots instead of dashes to indicate *staccato* so as to avoid confusion with

⁷²Türk (1804), p. 36; Clementi (1801), p. 8; Cramer (c1820, treatise), pp. 27 and 38; Hummel (1829), i, p. 65; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 186 and iii, pp. 27-28; Czerny (1839G), i, p. 142 and iii, pp. 21-23; Pleyel (c1860), p. 8.

the fingering.⁷³

Another type of *staccato*, known as the *mezzo staccato*, appears with slur marks. The manner of performance of this *staccato* was not universal. Türk teaches that “the notes must be touched smoothly and distinctly”. Clementi and Cramer classify it as the least detached, after the dash and the dot. Hummel’s and Czerny’s definitions of the *mezzo staccato* resemble the meaning hitherto associated with *portato*. Hummel reveals that this touch is generally found in *cantabile* passages. The notes are gently detached, with each receiving an increasing degree of emphasis: . Czerny describes two types of *mezzo staccato*. In slow tempos, the notes are slightly emphasized and are held for two-thirds their value. When this *staccato* occurs in light, fast passages, the fingers should make a “scratching” motion.⁷⁴

In spite of the different meanings which certain writers associate with the *staccato* indications, they agree that the shortness of *staccato* depends on the musical context in which it occurs. Many of the factors listed by Bach and Türk on pp. 41-42 still apply in piano playing of the nineteenth century. Take Czerny’s explanation as an example. He believes that *staccato* is influenced by the tempo and the character of a piece. In his opinion, *mezzo staccato* is mainly employed in pieces marked *molto allegro* or *presto* while *martellato* (or *staccatissimo*) is reserved for pieces of a brilliant character.⁷⁵

Besides the *staccato* signs already mentioned, Czerny proposes using the term *sciolto* to indicate *staccato*. This is because the double meaning of *sciolto* (untied or loosened; or free, light and supple) sums up the characteristic of the *staccato*. However, he is alone in this. Türk, Dussek and Hummel do not mention this term in their writings. Clementi includes it for the first time in his seventh edition but he associates it with a slightly different meaning: “SCIOLTO means FREE, neither Legato nor Staccato”. Cramer states that notes marked *sciolto* should be played in a

⁷³Bach (1974), p. 39.

⁷⁴Türk (1804), p. 36; Clementi (1801), p. 8; Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 35; Hummel (1829), i, p. 66; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 186 and iii, pp. 24-26.

⁷⁵Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 27-29.

distinct manner.⁷⁶ Although this term was not universally adopted, it shows how Czerny expects *staccato* to be played.

2.2.5 ORNAMENTS

Bach's description of ornaments differs from that of Dussek, Clementi, Cramer, Hummel, and Czerny. Bach is concerned with the correct context in which each ornament can be employed. Dussek, Clementi and their contemporaries, however, concentrate on the realizations of ornaments; the variable factor being the tempo and character of the piece in question. The shift in the way ornaments are dealt with in treatises is the result of the new practice, whereby composers write out the ornaments. Türk's treatise bridges this development by showing the context in which the ornaments occur as well as their realizations.⁷⁷

Long and Short Appoggiaturas


The main ornaments used in the mid-eighteenth century which survive into the nineteenth are the long and short appoggiaturas, turns, mordents, and trills. The most common ornament and the function of ornaments in the nineteenth century, however, differ from those in the eighteenth. Bach and Türk pay the most attention to the appoggiaturas because of the diversity and the frequency with which they occur in music. The realization of appoggiaturas from Dussek's treatise onwards is similar to those found in modern-day textbooks. The long appoggiatura has half or two-thirds of the value of the principal note. The accent falls on the appoggiatura rather than the principal note. Bach's practice, in which the appoggiaturas should take the length of the note while the principal note is played after the appoggiaturas (after a tie or a slur as shown in exs. 2.8a and 2.8b respectively) or during the ensuing rests (ex. 2.8c), had become obsolete.⁷⁸

⁷⁶Clementi/Rosenblum (1974), p. xxv (capitalization original); Czerny (1839E), i, p. 189; Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 53.

⁷⁷Bach (1974), pp. 79-146; Türk (1804), pp. 24-30; Dussek (1800), p. 6; Clementi (1801), pp. 10-12; Cramer (c1820, treatise), pp. 21, 32, 34, and 38; Hummel (1829), iii, pp. 1-13; Czerny (1839E), i, pp. 160-172.

⁷⁸Bach (1974), pp. 90-91; Türk (1804), p. 24; Dussek (1800), p. 6; Clementi (1801), p. 10; Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 21; Hummel (1829), iii, p. 11; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 161.

Ex. 2.8



Bach, Türk and Clementi use the same notation for both the long and short appoggiaturas. In their opinion, a different notation for each type of appoggiatura is unnecessary because each can be recognised from the context in which it occurs. Dussek, whose treatise was published before Clementi's, is probably one of the first to use a different indication for the short appoggiatura. The notation of the short appoggiatura as a small quaver note with a diagonal stroke through the tail was later adopted by Cramer, Hummel and Czerny. Unlike the long appoggiatura, the accent of the short appoggiatura falls on the principal note while the appoggiatura itself is played as quickly as possible.⁷⁹

Turn

Bach and Türk recognise that the turn may have a pleasing or animated quality, depending on the tempo. As the nineteenth century progressed, ornaments became motivic decorations instead of essential elements of music. The change in this trend is reflected in the way ornaments are described in some late eighteenth-century and especially in nineteenth-century treatises. Dussek, Clementi, Hummel and Czerny are concerned only with the realizations of the ornaments. The beauty of the ornaments is no longer considered an important factor. The various realizations of turns and inverted turns have remained unchanged since the nineteenth century.⁸⁰

Mordent


Bach and Türk employ both long and short mordents. By the nineteenth century, only the short mordent was used. The name and notation of this ornament were inconsistent. Bach calls it a mordent, Türk calls it a beat, Cramer and Czerny call it a transient shake, Clementi refers to it as

⁷⁹Bach (1974), fn. 5 p. 91; Türk (1804), p. 25; Dussek (1800), p. 6; Clementi (1801), p. 10; Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 38; Hummel (1829), iii, p. 12; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 160.

⁸⁰Bach (1974), pp. 112-127; Türk (1804), pp. 29-30; Dussek (1800), p. 6; Clementi (1801), pp. 10-11; Hummel (1829), iii, pp. 9-10; Czerny (1839E), i, pp. 164-165.

a short shake (ex. 2.9a) or a transient shake (ex. 2.9b), while Hummel calls it by any of three names: mordente (*sic*), transient shake or short beat. The notation of the mordent also varies, from w (Bach, Türk and Hummel) and tr (Cramer) to the accepted notation today, w (Czerny). Sometimes, a composer may employ more than one type of notation. As shown in ex. 2.9, Clementi acknowledges three different indications. These variants, however, are insignificant as long as the performers understand the intention of the composers. In spite of the numerous names and indications, the writers agree on its realization, which remains unchanged to this day.⁸¹

Ex. 2.9



Trills

Unlike Bach and Türk, nineteenth-century writers consider the trill to be a more important ornament than the appoggiatura. They emphasize the difficulty of executing the trill satisfactorily. Thus, they concentrate their efforts on teaching finger exercises that will aid the successful execution of the various trills. This is necessary as technical demands increased, with the use of double trills, simultaneous trilling accompanying a melody played by one hand, and the like.

Bach, too, recognises that trills are the most difficult ornaments. They must be played evenly and rapidly as well as with lightness and clarity. He recommends training all the fingers to play this ornament even though some fingers are naturally more suited to trilling. This train of thought is followed by all the writers studied in this chapter.⁸²

⁸¹Bach (1974), p. 127; Türk (1804), p. 28; Clementi (1801), p. 11; Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 34; Hummel (1829), iii, contents page and pp. 1, 8 and 9; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 163.


⁸²Bach (1974), pp. 101-102; Türk (1804), pp. 26-27; Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 32; Hummel (1829), iii, pp. 2-3; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 171; Czerny (1848), p. 33.

The first two to three decades of the nineteenth century were a time of transition in the way trills started and ended. The accepted eighteenth-century practice was to start the trill on the upper note with the option of finishing it with a turn. In general, Dussek, Clementi and Cramer followed the old practice of starting the trill on the upper note. By the time Hummel and Czerny wrote their treatise, it was common to start the trill on the principal note. It was also usual in the nineteenth century to end the trill with a turn. Dussek, Clementi, Cramer, and Czerny use a turn at the end of the trill. Türk and Hummel continue to use trills with either endings.⁸³

Arpeggio

Türk classifies *arpeggio* under “graces” while the other writers consider it a performance direction. According to Türk, *arpeggio* is indicated with $\{$ or small notes. The rapidity in spreading the chord depends on the speed and the character of the piece. Among the indications of *arpeggio* during Bach’s time are the word *arpeggio*, $\{$ and L . The notes are overlapped (ex. 2.10a), except when the notated note values within the chord are different (ex. 2.10b).⁸⁴

Ex. 2.10




Nineteenth-century performers, however, are divided on this matter. Clementi and Hummel follow Bach’s practice of holding down all the notes for the duration of the chord which have $\{$ (and in Hummel’s case, also L and the term *arpeggio*) prefixed to it. Clementi, however, does not assign a name to this method of playing. Cramer, who refers to it as *appoggiando*, maintains that it is indicated by small notes, as shown in ex. 2.11. Cramer’s *arpeggio*, on the other hand,

⁸³Bach (1974), pp. 100-101; Türk (1804), pp. 26-27; Dussek (1800), p. 6; Clementi (1801), p. 11; Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 32; Hummel (1829), iii, pp. 1 and 3; Czerny (1839E), i, pp. 171-172.

⁸⁴Bach (1974), pp. 159-160; Türk (1804), p. 31.

Ex. 2.11




is identified by (or } or is marked by a stroke through the stem. Unlike Bach, Clementi and Hummel, Cramer insists that the notes in an *arpeggio* should not be held down (ex. 2.12). He also explains that the speed of the spread is determined by the character of the piece.⁸⁵

Ex. 2.12



Czerny agrees with Cramer that *arpeggios* are indicated with { or with a stroke across the chord, and the notes should not be prolonged. In Czerny's opinion, the most important factor to influence the speed of the spread is, surprisingly, dynamics. This is exemplified in the following excerpt (ex. 2.13), which recalls the opening of Beethoven's "Tempest" Sonata, Op. 31 No. 2.

Ex. 2.13



⁸⁵Clementi (1801), p. 9; Hummel (1829), i, p. 66; Cramer (c1820, treatise), pp. 41 and 50.

Marked *pp*, the spread should be played slowly, with the possibility of a *rallentando*. If the passage were marked *ff*, the *arpeggio* should be played quickly, or not employed at all, unless indicated by the composer. In general, he suggests two ways of playing an *arpeggio*: it can be held down for a long duration or quickly detached. This is usually combined with playing it either softly and gradually slower, or loudly and “hard” respectively.⁸⁶

Cramer specifies that chords are arpeggiated only where indicated. Czerny is more liberal. Where indications are not given, the musical context should be taken into account. In contrapuntal passages, a single, slow, and full chord which has to be emphasized may be arpeggiated. The chords marked + in ex. 2.14 may be arpeggiated with moderate quickness, but the spread must not interrupt the *legato*. Unnotated *arpeggio* is also allowed in two types of chordal passages.

Ex. 2.14

The first is in a slow passage of sustained chords. All the chords in ex. 2.15 may be arpeggiated at a moderate speed, except the last chord in the fourth bar, which closes the section. When arpeggiating these chords, Czerny warns, the smooth flow of the melody must not be disturbed. The second context is a long, sustained chord which precedes a succession of quick chords, as in ex. 2.16 (the chords marked + may be arpeggiated).⁸⁷

Ex. 2.15

⁸⁶Czerny (1839E), i, p. 138 and iii, pp. 55-56.

⁸⁷Ibid.

Ex. 2.16



Czerny's description of *arpeggio* suggests that it is used for expressive purposes. None of the above writers pays as much attention to this aspect of playing as Czerny.

2.2.6 FINGERING AND TECHNICAL DRILLS

The importance of fingering in the art of performance is acknowledged by all the writers surveyed. Some, however, consider fingering primarily from a technical or aesthetic point of view. Türk and Hummel are two such writers. In contrast, Clementi's priority is to select fingerings which produce the smoothest connection and the effect intended by the composer. Sometimes, the easiest and the most natural fingering may be unsuitable. Czerny's standpoint is in the middle, though perhaps leaning closer to that of the first group.⁸⁸

On the whole, technical exercises in the early nineteenth century were aimed at improving finger agility, strength, precision, and independence of fingers. Technical difficulty and the style of playing should not affect elegance in performance. The playing must be neat, and the tone produced, smooth, clear and varied.


The basic exercises specified by Bach, Türk, Dussek, and Clementi deal with repetitive five-finger patterns, extension and contraction of the hand, scales, chords, arpeggios, leaps, silent finger-changing, sliding from a black to a white key with the same finger, repetition on a monotone,

⁸⁸Bach (1974), p. 41; Türk (1804), p. 17; Clementi (1801), p. 14; Hummel (1829), ii, p. 1; Czerny (1839E), ii, p. 4.

quick repetition of double notes, and hand crossing. Initially, most of these exercises were meant for the training of the right hand. Throughout the early nineteenth century, there was an increasing expectation of training the left hand to be as proficient as the right. The revised editions of Clementi's *Introduction* echo this ideal, with many exercises written specifically for the left hand. Among them are exercises which aim to secure the independence of fingers by holding down some notes while repeating a monotone; others emphasize the playing of parallel thirds and sixths, chromatic runs in contrary motion, *legato* octaves and arpeggiated diminished-seventh chords. This trend of raising technical competence, set by Clementi, was quickly followed by Cramer, Hummel and Czerny.

Training in technical proficiency continued to be intensified. By the time Hummel published his treatise in 1828, he had widened the boundaries to include exercises with a range of up to an eleventh for each hand, double trills and their variants, finger patterns which are played simultaneously with held chords, and the passing of a short finger under a longer one (the fifth finger under the fourth, as in ex. 2.17). The exercises in Czerny's *Piano Forte School* are no less

Ex. 2.17



impressive. Exercises include chromatic runs in double notes, extensions bigger than an octave and, in order to exploit the more durable piano with an enlarged dynamic range, the striking of a loud note with two fingers. While composers and performers searched for more challenging technical demands, they continued to intensify and vary the training in the basic exercises listed by Bach. This was necessary because of the unsatisfactory action of the piano hammers. The quick repetition of notes was especially difficult. This problem was caused by the slow return of the hammer after striking the string. As a result, the slightest holding back of the finger action would affect equality.⁸⁹

⁸⁹Czerny (1839E), i, p. 9.

Hummel (ex. 2.18) and Czerny also mention a peculiar way of playing, that of gliding the fingers on a succession of white keys. Czerny explains that when playing the so-called double-note *glissando* (in fact double thirds, sixths or octaves), the fingers should be kept stiff, but the hand

Ex. 2.18



and the arm must remain relaxed and flexible (see also section 8.8 below).⁹⁰ In spite of its overtly virtuosic nature, this mode of playing is by no means a nineteenth-century invention. In 1797, Milchmeyer writes in *Die wahre Art das Pianoforte zu Spielen*:

As part of showmanship in the playing of the pianoforte I include glissando passages in thirds, sixths, and octaves, which can only be played in C major and on a keyboard without a deep key dip. If one wants to participate in this foolishness, which, however, some might consider an admirable skill, then one must turn the right hand quite far outwards in going up, so that the fingers that slide over the thirds, sixths, or octaves come virtually to lie on the keys; at the same time the thumb must be kept stiff and straight. Further, it is necessary that one give the two fingers playing a certain strength or elasticity so that they do not open and close with the thrust that one gives to the hand with the arm while playing.⁹¹

His account suggests that this method of playing was already fairly well-established by then.

2.2.7 PEDALLING

Although pedals were already available by 1789, Türk did not consider them of sufficient importance to be included in his treatise. His younger contemporary Dussek also appears to treat the subject of pedalling with caution. Under the list of Italian terms, he describes *mezzo* in an unexpected manner. This term, he explains, indicates that the pedal of the grand piano forte should be employed, taking off only one string. His apparent detachment in this matter gives the

⁹⁰Hummel (1829), ii, pp. 254-255; Czerny (1839E), ii, pp. 29-30.

⁹¹Rosenblum (1988), p. 202. Rosenblum's translation.

impression that Dussek hardly used pedals. In fact, this could not be further from the truth, for Czerny testifies that Dussek was one of those responsible for bringing the pedal into general use at the beginning of the nineteenth century.⁹² Kalkbrenner's report that Dussek frequently employed the damper pedal in his playing also supports Czerny's statement.⁹³

Similarly, Clementi mentions pedal markings for the first time in his fifth edition (1811), but does not elaborate on their use. In spite of Clementi's brevity on this subject, we know from Czerny that Clementi employed the pedal frequently in his latter works.⁹⁴ This is true, but pedal indications are also found in early compositions which were revised by Clementi. His revision may consist of changing the articulation (see p. 42 above) or adding fingering (as in Op. 11) and pedalling (the set of two piano sonatas Op. 34). The first edition of Op. 34 was published in 1795 without any pedal indications. At the beginning of the first movement of the first sonata in his revised edition, published by Artaria about twelve years later, he adds a statement to explain the pedal symbols used. Pedal markings were added in both sonatas. His first piano sonata to incorporate the use of the damper pedal is Op. 37, published in 1798, in which he uses the terms "Open Pedal" and "without Pedal". These terms were soon dropped in favour of paired symbols such as "Ped" and "⊕" (or "✱") or ⊕ and ✱.

Cramer's treatise is slightly more helpful. He recommends that the *tremando* (presumably he means *tremolando*) be played with the "open pedal, [because] swelling and diminishing the sound produces a great effect in some passages". Apart from that, the damper pedal is primarily used in slow movements when the same harmony is to be prolonged.⁹⁵ In addition, Czerny reveals that Dussek and Cramer use the damper pedal in broken chord passages.⁹⁶ An examination of the pedal markings of the authors surveyed show that the use of the pedal in *tremolando* passages and arpeggiated figures was common in the nineteenth century. The damper pedal was also used to sustain a bass note to enable the left hand to play another line. All these effects can be seen in ex. 2.19 below, from variation 8 of Cramer's *Introduction and Variations on Mozart's air "Vedrai*

⁹²Dussek (1800), p. 46; Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 64.

⁹³Rosenblum (1988), pp. 118-119.

⁹⁴Clementi/Rosenblum (1974), p. xxiii; Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 64.

⁹⁵Cramer (c1820, treatise), pp. 50-51.

⁹⁶Czerny (1846), p. 2.

Carino" (from the opera *Don Giovanni*). This example also reveals how Cramer pedals arpeggiated passages. In bars 9, 10, 13, and 14, the pedal remains depressed after the dominant-seventh arpeggios and the ensuing semiquaver rests. The finale of Dussek's Sonata *Le Retour*
Ex. 2.19

12 Var: 8.
Lento assai

The musical score consists of seven systems, each with a circled bar number (1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 15, 17) at the beginning of the first staff. The notation includes:

- System 1 (Bar 1):** Treble and bass staves with arpeggiated chords. Pedal markings are present in both staves.
- System 2 (Bar 4):** Similar arpeggiated patterns. Pedal markings are present.
- System 3 (Bar 7):** Arpeggiated chords. Pedal markings are present.
- System 4 (Bar 10):** Treble staff has an *8va* marking. Bass staff has *loco* and *Cres* markings. Pedal markings are present.
- System 5 (Bar 13):** Arpeggiated chords. Pedal markings are present.
- System 6 (Bar 15):** Treble staff has a *Dim* marking. Bass staff has a *Cres* marking. Pedal markings are present.
- System 7 (Bar 17):** Arpeggiated chords. Pedal markings are present.

à Paris, Œuvre 64, similarly, exploits the same effects. In bars 117-120, the pedal is used to sustain the bass notes, while in bars 308-311 (ex. 2.20), Dussek prolongs the pedal through the arpeggios and the rests. The examples in Czerny's *Piano Forte School* show that he, too, follows this practice.⁹⁷ Hummel, however, prefers not to prolong the resonance beyond the arpeggiated figure (ex. 2.21).

Ex. 2.20

Musical score for Ex. 2.20. The score is in G major and 3/4 time. It consists of two staves: a treble staff and a bass staff. The treble staff contains arpeggiated chords and rests, with dynamics [f] and pp. The bass staff contains sustained notes and rests, with a 'Ped.' marking and a '3' at the end. The text 'mo ren do' is written below the bass staff.

Ex. 2.21

Musical score for Ex. 2.21. The score is in G major and 3/4 time. It consists of two staves: a treble staff and a bass staff. The treble staff contains arpeggiated chords and rests, with dynamics rf and markings for 8va and loco. The bass staff contains sustained notes and rests, with a marking for 8va and loco.

In ex. 2.22 below, Cramer intentionally omits the release sign at the end of the movement to allow the resonance to dissipate naturally. This is also a favourite effect with Dussek (ex. 2.23),

⁹⁷Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 58, 61 and 62.

Clementi, Hummel, and Czerny when the ending consists of only one harmony.⁹⁸

Ex. 2.22

Ex. 2.23

The principal rule of pedalling, as observed by Clementi, Cramer, Dussek, Hummel, and Czerny, requires the pedal to be changed along with the harmony.⁹⁹ Occasionally, this rule is violated to create a special effect. According to Hummel and Czerny, this is especially desirable in very soft passages of slow movements, especially when the damper pedal is not changed through several passing chords with different harmonies,¹⁰⁰ as shown in bars 5-6 of ex. 2.24. Hummel

⁹⁸See the end of the second movement of the first sonata from Clementi's *Trois Sonates Pour le Forte Piano*, Œuvre 42 (it is actually Op. 40), Hummel (1829), iii, p. 63 and Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 63.

⁹⁹Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 51; Hummel (1829), iii, p. 63; Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 57.

¹⁰⁰Hummel (1829), iii, p. 63; Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 61.

occasionally pedals through tonic and dominant harmonies without changing the pedal (ex. 2.25). He employs this effect only sparingly, since clarity is his ideal. In contrast, Clementi's blurring of tonic-dominant harmonies is significantly more extensive and adventurous (see exs. 9.3 and 9.4). While many would advise that blurring should be confined to soft passages, Clementi does not follow this rule. In his Op. 34/2/iii/104-106 (ex. 2.26), the pedal is depressed for two bars. Although the harmony in the bass is static, the chromatic scale in the treble, especially in a *fortissimo* passage, gives rise to much blurring.

Ex. 2.24

Largo.

The musical score for Ex. 2.24 consists of two systems of piano and treble staves. The tempo is marked *Largo.* The piano part begins with a *pp* dynamic and features a chromatic scale in the right hand. The treble part starts with a *pp* dynamic and includes a *trem:* marking. Dynamics in the piano part include *pp*, *fz*, *pp*, and *cres*. The treble part includes *pp*, *cres*, and *pp*. There are asterisks (*) and circled symbols above the treble staff, likely indicating specific performance techniques or markings.

Ex. 2.25

Both the damper pedal and piano pedal pressed down.

Adagio.

The musical score for Ex. 2.25 consists of two systems of piano and treble staves. The tempo is marked *Adagio.* The piano part features dense chordal textures and includes a *pp* dynamic. The treble part includes a *p* dynamic. Above the piano staff, there are circled symbols and triangles, with a note indicating that both the damper and piano pedals are pressed down. Asterisks (*) are also present above the treble staff.

Ex. 2.26

Musical score for Ex. 2.26. The score is in G major, 2/4 time. It consists of two staves. The upper staff begins with a circled measure number '104'. The instruction '[fff] Ped.' is written above the first few notes. The music features a melodic line in the right hand and a supporting bass line in the left hand, both with a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes.

Czerny shares Hummel's ideal of clarity in playing, but allows blurring in the high registers of the piano, as long as the harmony in the bass is the same (ex. 2.27, see also ex. 9.25).¹⁰¹ This also appears to be Dussek's principle, for example in *Œuvre* 64/iv/117-120 (ex. 2.28).

Ex. 2.27

Musical score for Ex. 2.27. The tempo is marked 'Allegro.' The score is in C major, 2/4 time. It consists of two staves. The upper staff begins with a dynamic marking of 'ff' (fortissimo) and later changes to 'pp' (pianissimo). The music features a melodic line in the right hand and a supporting bass line in the left hand, both with a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes.

Ex. 2.28

Musical score for Ex. 2.28. The score is in B-flat major, 2/4 time. It consists of two staves. The upper staff begins with a circled measure number '117' and a dynamic marking of 'fp' (fortissimo-piano). The instruction 'Pédale' is written below the first few notes. The music features a melodic line in the right hand and a supporting bass line in the left hand, both with a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes.

Czerny mentions another role of the damper pedal: that of connecting chords when *legato* cannot be achieved by the fingers (see ex. 9.6 below).¹⁰² The other writers surveyed probably employed

¹⁰¹Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 59-61.

¹⁰²Ibid., iii, p. 63.

the pedal in this manner also, though this cannot be confirmed. Neither their treatises nor pedal markings in their music offer any clue.

According to Cramer, the other main pedal (that is, the shifting pedal or the *una corda*) is mainly employed in *p*, *diminuendo* and *pp* passages.¹⁰³ As a result of the expanded tonal possibilities of the pianos in the 1830s, the role of this pedal has been adapted accordingly. Although it is still used in soft and delicate passages, Czerny sees its function as one of creating special effects. It is particularly effective in melodic passages with slow-moving harmonies. It can also be used to create a gradual *crescendo* and *diminuendo* (usually indicated by *poco a poco 3 corde* and *poco a poco una corda* respectively). When combined with the damper pedal, it creates a pleasing effect in arpeggiated chords and passages. However, Czerny warns that since this pedal is employed mainly for special effects, its use should be sparing. He also emphasizes that the soft, light and delicate tone should be produced solely by the fingers. The *una corda* is used to add another colour to the tone.¹⁰⁴

One must bear in mind that the guidelines given by these writers are by no means comprehensive. For example, the use of the damper pedal in broken-chord passages by Dussek and Cramer is revealed not by themselves, but by Czerny. In addition, pedal markings in the music of these writers (except for Czerny) are significantly more extensive and varied than the explanations found in their treatises. Nevertheless, they are informative and they show how the functions of the pedals became more varied over time.

2.2.8 STYLISTIC AND EXPRESSIVE MATTERS IN PERFORMANCE

Bach believes correct fingering, good embellishments and what he terms good performance are important factors which lead to expressive playing. While correct fingering and good embellishments are self-explanatory, good performance covers a vast area. It refers to the ability to play the keyboard in a vocal manner, to correctly understand the content of the piece and to

¹⁰³Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 51.

¹⁰⁴Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 57-65; Czerny (1846), p. 3.

transmit this understanding to the audience. This last point is affected by dynamics, articulation, accents, tempo, and *tempo rubato*. In addition, all the notes and embellishments should be played in correct time with a touch that is in accordance with the true content of the piece in question. The sound produced must be round, clear and forthright. Rage, anger and other passions are portrayed through harmonic and melodic means rather than by an exaggerated, heavy attack.¹⁰⁵

Contemporary descriptions of Bach's playing further reveal some finer details in his performance. He was praised for his expressive and singing playing in *adagio* movements. His rendition of very soft passages was not only soft but distinct. In the *Essay*, he cautions against rough playing in loud passages. Johann Cramer was also impressed by Bach's facility to create "endless nuances of shadow and light ... [in] his performance".¹⁰⁶

Although Bach expresses his preference for the clavichord, he recognises the potential of tonal variety on the newly-invented piano. His teaching on keyboard playing remained influential upon future generations of teachers and performers. Türk's teaching faithfully follows the principles laid down by Bach. In Bach's opinion, a musically sensitive performance is more satisfying than a technically accurate one.¹⁰⁷ However, the importance of technical skill is already noticeable in Türk's treatise. Although brief, Clementi's comments on this matter are along similar lines. Numerous pianists, including Hummel, experimented with tonal colour on the piano, but none with a greater passion than Czerny.

Both Czerny and Streicher frequently exchanged ideas on piano playing and ways to improve the mechanisms of the instrument. Since Czerny adapts piano technique according to improvements made to the piano, Streicher's views on this matter should be considered. The latter built his instruments to emulate the fullness of sound produced by the richness of the human voice or a wind instrument. This fullness, he believes, is responsible for affecting the feelings of the listener. His instrument is also capable of every type of tonal gradation, if played by someone with an understanding of the instrument and with the necessary finger control. A quiet and supple hand,

¹⁰⁵Bach (1974), pp. 16, 30, 148, and 149.

¹⁰⁶Bach (1974), fn. 33 p. 164. See also fn. 14 p. 36.

¹⁰⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 36 and 150.

with minimal but precise finger motion, is required for a good touch. He constantly warns against excessive hard playing in very loud passages. *Ff* must be achieved through full-voiced harmonies rather than by pounding on the keys. Equally, the soft passages must not descend to a mere whisper: rather, the notes must be light but played with certainty. Streicher likens the sound produced in *ff* passages to an organ or a full orchestra, and the *pp* passages to the glass harmonica. The *staccato* must be quick and light, but with a rounded tone. Every note and ornament must be clearly and fluently executed.¹⁰⁸ It is clear from this description that Streicher's ideal is similar to Bach's and Czerny's.

2.2.9 SUMMARY OF INFLUENCES

From this study, it is obvious that the eight treatises represent the personal preferences of the writers during the period of flux in performance, with the writings of Türk and Dussek serving as transitions between the performance aesthetics of Bach's and Clementi's time. The contributions of Bach and Clementi, especially in fingering, articulation and matters relating to style and expression, have been vital in helping to shape the way in which keyboard instruments are played.

On a personal level, Czerny himself acknowledges using Hummel as a model, hence his emphasis on clarity and technical facility. Other similarities can be observed between Hummel's *Theoretical and Practical Course* and Czerny's *Piano Forte School*. Besides the almost identical structure of both treatises, the authors agree on the order of tempo indications (beginning from the slowest to the fastest). They encourage the performer to create a variety of nuances by altering the pressure of the fingers, to shape ascending and descending lines through the use of *crescendo* and *diminuendo* respectively, to vary the placing of accents at repetitions to add interest, to prolong notes in arpeggiated figures beyond their notated length to increase the fullness of the passage, and to use double-note *glissando* on white keys.

¹⁰⁸Fuller (1984), pp. 463-465.

In some instances, Czerny was inclined to follow the new ways of playing the piano: the manner in which *tempo rubato* is treated, for example. The numerous fluctuations (sometimes with the left hand following the speed of the right) which he recommends, occurring at short intervals, are akin to mid- and late nineteenth-century convention. In other respect, such as pedalling, Czerny's practice merely reflects that of his contemporaries. He is more communicative than his contemporaries on this subject, but on close examination, *Piano Forte School* does not offer any innovations.

By far the most influential factor to shape Czerny's approach to piano playing is the development of the piano. Thicker strings had improved the tone quality of the middle and especially the high registers of the piano. This, together with the improved hammer action, allowed him to extend the scope of technical showmanship. The sturdier frame of the instrument, with stronger strings, enable the *bravura* style of playing to be developed. The breakthrough in finding a suitable material for covering the hammers meant that more variety of timbre could be obtained from the touch-sensitive keys. In short, the Viennese piano in the 1830s, with its large dynamic range, was capable of numerous possibilities of tonal shading and articulation. Very short and sharp touches such as *martellato* became possible. At the other end of the scale, *legatissimo* could create fuller harmonies.

Piano playing, as described in *Piano Forte School*, was the result of constant experiment, and of refinements both in the instrument itself and in piano technique. It required the close cooperation of performers, composers and piano makers. In order to obtain the best tone from the piano, Czerny, through his own experiments, improved on discoveries made by his predecessors and contemporaries.

SECTION

II

CHAPTER 3: CZERNY'S INTERPRETATION, AS RECORDED IN HIS WRITINGS AND IN HIS EDITIONS OF BEETHOVEN'S PIANO SONATAS

After Beethoven's death, Czerny expressed concern regarding a lack of understanding of his style in many performances outside Vienna.¹ Czerny's wish to preserve the correct performance of Beethoven's music, especially that for piano, must have been the main driving force for his numerous editions. Even the *Piano Forte School*, which deals with many aspects of performance and music theory, contains ideas which can be traced back to Beethoven, especially on fingering and pedalling (see chapters 8 and 9). This is only to be expected, since Czerny had studied many of Beethoven's compositions with the composer, including the piano sonatas Op. 13, Op. 14/1, Op. 14/2, Op. 31/2, Op. 57, Op. 101, and the *Andante* from Op. 28, and all his piano concertos with the exception of Op. 19. Badura-Skoda adds that Czerny was probably also aware of Beethoven's performance intentions for Op. 26, Op. 27/2, Op. 31/2, Op. 31/3, Op. 53, Op. 81a, Op. 106, the Diabelli Variations Op. 120, and the "Kreutzer" Sonata Op. 47.²

3.1 WHAT IS "CORRECT INTERPRETATION"?

According to Countess Giulietta Guicciardi, Beethoven's teaching was centred around correct interpretation.³ But what does "correct interpretation" embody? Merely accurate playing does not seem to be Beethoven's main concern (see pp. 11-12). When Schuppanzigh complained about the technical difficulty of a passage in one of the "Razumovsky" Quartets, Beethoven replied: "Does he believe that I think of a wretched fiddle when the spirit speaks to me?"⁴ Similarly, Ignaz von Seyfried recalled that during orchestral rehearsals, Beethoven did not mind if certain passages went amiss. However, he was

very meticulous with regard to expression, the more delicate shadings,
an equalized distribution of light and shade, and an effective *tempo*

¹Czerny (1846), p. 68.

²Czerny (1970), p. 3.

³Sonneck (1967), p. 33.


⁴Kerst (1964), p. 25.

rubato, and without betraying the slightest impatience always took pleasure in discussing them individually with the various musicians.⁵

This passage shows that, to Beethoven, “correct interpretation” involves conveying the appropriate expression of a piece which should be achieved through tonal colours, dynamics and tempo flexibility. To this list, of course, must be added articulation marks. As Beethoven’s letter to the violinist Karl Holz in 1825 makes clear, his notation of dynamic and articulation markings is very specific, for it either denotes essential elements in the structure of the piece or reveals the expressive content of the music. This letter, quoted below, refers to the String Quartet in A minor, Op. 132, where Beethoven also bemoans the ignorance and carelessness of copyists:


Most Excellent Second Violin!

The passage in the first violin part of the first Allegro is as follows:




So make it exactly like that.

And in the first Allegro as well you must add in the four parts these expression marks



All the notes are correct – but do read me correctly – *Volti Subito*. Well, now for your copy, my dear fellow.

Obbligatissimo – but for the marks $p \leftarrow$ \rightarrow etc. etc. have been horribly neglected and frequently, very frequently, inserted in the wrong place. No doubt, haste is responsible for this. For God’s sake please impress on Rampel to copy everything exactly as it stands. If you will just have a look now at what I have corrected, you will find everything that you have to tell him. Where there is a dot above the note a dash must not be put instead and vice versa – ($\overset{\cdot}{|}$ $\overset{\cdot}{|}$ $\overset{\cdot}{|}$ and $\overset{\cdot}{|}$ $\overset{\cdot}{|}$ $\overset{\cdot}{|}$ are not identical). Sometimes the \leftarrow are inserted intentionally after the notes. For instance,



⁵Sonneck (1967), p. 41.

The slurs should be exactly as they are now. It is not all the same whether it is like this



or like this



In the Adagio it is predominantly thus



Pay attention to what those who know better are telling you – ⁶

In addition to the four factors mentioned above, Czerny states that good interpretation depends on the pianist possessing an excellent technique, and having a good understanding of the character of a piece and the style of the composer.⁷

Czerny is aware of the importance of being acquainted with the styles of earlier composers in order to have a better understanding of contemporary music. The style characteristic to each composer is carefully described in the *Piano Forte School* and its supplement, *The Art*. He divides the music of his contemporaries into six different styles and schools: (a) Clementi, (b) Dussek and Cramer, (c) Mozart, (d) Beethoven, (e) Hummel, Kalkbrenner and Moscheles, and (f) Thalberg, Chopin and Liszt. Some of the differences are underlined below:

Clementi ... was able to unite brilliant bravura execution with tranquility and a regular position of the hands, solidity of touch and tone, great address and flexibility of finger, clear and voluble execution, correctness, distinctiveness, and grace of execution; and in his day he was always allowed to be the greatest Player on the Piano-forte ... The [English] Pianos of that day possessed for their most distinguished properties, a full Singing quality of tone; but as a counterbalance to that, they had also a deep fall of the keys, a hard touch, and a want of distinctness in the single notes in rapid playing. This naturally led Dussek, Cramer, and a few others to that soft, quiet, and melodious style of execution, [with] beautiful Cantabile, a fine legato combined with the use of the Pedals, [and] an astonishing equality in the runs and passages, for which they, and likewise their compositions, are chiefly esteemed, and which may be looked upon as the Antipodes of the modern, clear, and brilliantly piquant manner of playing. Mozart[']s style, which approached nearer to the latter mode, and which was brought to such exquisite perfection by Hummel, was more suited to those

⁶Anderson (1961), iii, pp. 1241-1242.

⁷Czerny (1846), p. 118.

[German-Viennese] piano-fortes which combined light and easy touch with great distinctness of tone, and which were therefore more suited for general purposes, as well as for the use of Youth. [This style revealed a] distinct and considerably brilliant manner of playing, calculated rather on the Staccato than on the Legato touch. [It required] an intelligent and animated execution [but the] Pedal [was] seldom used, and never obligato. Meantime, in 1790, appeared Beethoven, who enriched the Piano-forte by new and bold passages, by the use of the pedals, by an extraordinary characteristic manner of execution, which was particularly remarkable for the strict Legato of the full chords, and which therefore formed a new kind of melody; _ [punctuation sic] and by many effects not before thought of. His execution did not possess the pure and brilliant elegance of many other Pianists; but on the other hand it was energetic, profound, noble, with all the charms of smooth and connected cantabile and particularly in the Adagio, highly feeling and romantic. His performance[,] like his Compositions, was a musical painting of the highest class, esteemed only for its general effect. The means of Expression is often carried to excess, particularly in regard to humorous and fanciful levity. The piquant, brilliant, and shewy manner is but seldom applicable here; but for this reason, we must more frequently attend to the total effect, partly by means of a full, harmonious Legato, and partly by a happy use of the Pedals, etc. Great volubility of finger without brilliant pretensions, and in the Adagio, enthusiastic expression and singing melody, replete with sentiment and pathos, are the great requisites in the Player.⁸

Czerny confidently declares in *The Art* that:

... in the present case there can be only *one* perfectly correct mode of performance, and we have endeavoured, according to the best of our remembrance, to indicate the time, (as the most important part of correct conception,) and also the style of performance, according to Beethoven's own view.⁹

Unlike modern research on performance practice, which places arguably too much emphasis upon the minute details of the music, Czerny is more concerned with the result of the performance as a whole. Advice on musical details is given where appropriate. This is due to his belief that only a performer with sufficient technique on the piano should attempt Beethoven's piano sonatas. He insists that Beethoven's compositions were usually inspired by visions and images, which were

⁸Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 99-100. The text from the two pages has been condensed to avoid repetition. Spelling, capitalization and punctuation original.

⁹Czerny (1846), p. 119. Italicization and punctuation original.

drawn from reading, nature or from his own imagination, an account supported by Ries and Louis Schläsler.¹⁰ Unfortunately, Beethoven was rather uncommunicative on such matters, his reason being that if he divulged what inspired each composition, it might force the audience to experience the said object, thus restricting their musical experiences. Czerny, however, believes the necessity to know (where possible) the source of these inspirations, in order to understand the compositions and their performances.¹¹ It is therefore not surprising that he feels his duty is to help the performer understand and convey the “correct” spirit of the compositions.

Contrary to his earlier claim to preserve Beethoven’s view in performances, Czerny admits that the appropriate conception of Beethoven’s works had changed in time:

... the mental conception acquires a different value through the altered taste of the time, and must occasionally be expressed by other means, than were then demanded.¹²

By this he means the new possibilities afforded by the improved pianos. It appears that Czerny’s claim regarding the “one perfectly correct mode of performance” is a partial adaptation of Beethoven’s original conception. It is also possible that some of these images are invented. In *The Art*, he remarks that the two recitative passages in Op. 31/2/i “must sound like one complaining at a distance”.¹³ However, he is also believed to have told Theodor Kullak (Franz Kullak’s father) that Beethoven intended these recitative passages to create the effect of “someone speaking from a cavernous vault, where the sounds, reverberations, and tones would blur confusingly”.¹⁴ The two different remarks suggest that, in this instance, Czerny is trying to invent images to explain the music. Based on Beethoven’s pedal markings, Czerny’s second description will convey the effect more convincingly.

3.2 FOLLOWING THE TEXT FAITHFULLY

In the performance of his [Beethoven’s] works ... the player must by no means allow himself to alter the composition, nor to make any

¹⁰Wegeler and Ries (1988), p. 67; Sonneck (1967), p. 147.

¹¹Czerny (1846), p. 60. Schindler is also of the same opinion; see Schindler (1841) (ed. Moscheles), pp. 80-82 and Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), pp. 398-400.

¹²Czerny (1846), p. 32.

¹³Ibid., p. 53.

¹⁴Quoted in Newman (1988), p. 246. His translation.

addition or abbreviation.¹⁵

Czerny's stern warning in his introduction to the performance of Beethoven's piano music in *The Art* has its roots in an incident that took place on 11 February 1816. Czerny, who was playing the piano in the Quintet for piano, oboe, clarinet, horn, and bassoon, Op. 16, had embellished the piano part with additional notes, octave doublings and the like.¹⁶ This act so offended the composer that Czerny was reproached in front of the other members of the quintet. The next day, Beethoven apologised to Czerny in a letter:

... I was very sorry ... [b]ut you must forgive a composer who would rather have heard his work performed exactly as it was written, however beautifully you played it in other respects.¹⁷

Beethoven was not the only one who reacted against this prevailing nineteenth-century practice. Years earlier, Milchmeyer had expressed his disapproval.¹⁸ In fact, Beethoven was so specific with his indications in Op. 16, he even wrote out the *Eingang*. According to Ries, Beethoven asked him to add notes to his compositions on only two occasions: the first, in the Rondo of Op. 13 and the second, in the Rondo theme of his First Piano Concerto, Op. 15. Beethoven decided that adding double notes to the concerto would make it more brilliant. On the whole, Ries observed that Beethoven rarely added notes or embellishments when playing.¹⁹ However, there were occasions when he broke this rule. Beethoven's outburst was rather harsh, considering he himself could not resist the temptation of improvising in a public performance of this same work, much to the annoyance of his colleagues.²⁰ Nevertheless, Beethoven's reproof left a lasting impression on Czerny, through whose writings this message was passed on to future generations.

Czerny also strongly objects to the other common practice, that is, of altering Beethoven's earlier piano pieces which were written for the five-octave instruments, when six or six-and-a-half octave pianos became the norm.²¹ Beethoven was of the same opinion. He explains in a letter to George Thomson that he refrains from rewriting his compositions, because every change in the details of

¹⁵Czerny (1846), p. 32.

¹⁶See Thayer (1969), pp. 640-641; Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), p. 415.

¹⁷Anderson (1961), ii, p. 560.

¹⁸Milchmeyer (1797), p. 8.

¹⁹Wegeler and Ries (1988), p. 94.

²⁰Ibid., p. 69; Thayer (1969), p. 350.

²¹Czerny (1846), p. 32.

his compositions will change the character of the whole piece.²²

3.3 THE PROBLEMS OF FINDING AUTHORITATIVE NINETEENTH-CENTURY EDITIONS OF THE PIANO SONATAS

Beethoven's correspondence with his publishers shows that, throughout his career as a composer, he consistently tried to correct errors in the fair copy or those which have crept in during engraving. In spite of his efforts, some were retained in the published edition. Pirated copies of his music, often with inaccuracies, were also widely circulated. The common practice in the early nineteenth century of using the same plates in different publications further propagated the problem. Steiner's 1815 plates for Op. 90 were also used by Breitkopf and Simrock in their editions dating from the same year. Steiner, in partnership with Haslinger, later made a second printing with changes to some details, including the articulation markings. Although such alterations were made without the authority of the composer, this second print became the basis of Clementi's London edition after 1823.²³ Unfortunately, this was not an isolated case where publishers took the liberty of changing the text without Beethoven's consent. More than a decade earlier, Nägeli had decided to "improve" the music by adding four extra bars in the coda of the first movement of Op. 31/1.²⁴

In 1803, Beethoven publicly denounced a Mainz engraver's attempt to publish a pirated edition of his collected works for piano and strings. In the same article, published in the *Wiener Zeitung*, he declared his intention of undertaking such a project, which he himself would supervise.²⁵ However, it was another seven years before he approached Breitkopf & Härtel for the publication of "an authentic edition" of his collected compositions. Although it did not come to fruition, his wish for a correct version of his compositions and, possibly, for financial reasons, led him to pursue the matter with other publishers. Between 1816 and 1825, he negotiated with Simrock,

²²Kerst (1964), p. 30.

²³Beethoven (1993), pp. 37-40.

²⁴Wegeler and Ries (1988), p. 77.

²⁵Anderson (1961), iii, p. 1435.

C. F. Peters, Schott, and Hofmeister.²⁶ Unfortunately, his efforts were unsuccessful, because this undertaking would most likely have proved unprofitable for the publishers. The public was more interested in newly-composed works than in corrected copies of music which had already been published.

3.4 CZERNY'S EDITIONS OF BEETHOVEN'S PIANO SONATAS

From the 1820s until his death in 1857, Czerny was involved in at least four editions of the complete piano sonatas of Beethoven. According to Moscheles, he supervised the edition published by Haslinger (1828-1832).²⁷ This company also published another edition of the collected sonatas at about the same time (1828-c1840). For the sake of convenience, from now on, the first edition will be referred to as Haslinger I and, the second as Haslinger II. The plates used for the printing of Haslinger II were those of Haslinger I, but additional editorial markings were inserted. As with its predecessor, the editor of Haslinger II was not named on the title page but, as will be shown below, Czerny was involved. In the meantime, Cocks in London published a collection of Beethoven's piano sonatas from 1835 to about 1880, with Czerny as the named editor. Towards the end of his life, Czerny again turned his attention to a new edition of the complete piano sonatas, this time with Simrock as the publisher (1856-1868).²⁸

Czerny's activities as an editor of these sonatas were by no means restricted to complete editions. Many sonatas sold separately, which named Czerny as the editor, were also published both in Europe and in America. Some of these editions carry the inscription "revised from the New Vienna Edition" or "carefully revised from The Original Vienna Editions", thus acknowledging their affinity to the Haslinger edition(s). The edition published by Wessel in London around 1852-1854 is one such example. On the title page of the 1856-1868 Simrock edition, as well as on some sonatas published individually,²⁹ Czerny is credited with the insertion of metronome marks

²⁶See also a draft he prepared in 1822 to justify the reasons for this project in Anderson (1961), iii, pp. 1450-1451; Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), p. 400.

²⁷Schindler (1841) (ed. Moscheles), ii, p. 107.

²⁸The dates of the Haslinger and Simrock editions are given in Newman (1976-1977), pp. 510-512.

²⁹For a list of these sonatas, see *ibid.*, pp. 510-516.

Ex. 3.2

86

mf

f

89

cresc.

mf

92

mf

dimin.

95

cresc.

97

p

dimin.

100

ff

BEETHOVEN, I. N° 11.

Ex. 3.3

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 3.3, measures 85-100. The score consists of four systems, each with two staves. Measure 85 is circled. Performance markings include 'rit.' and 'cres.' in measures 86 and 87. The notation is dense with many notes and slurs.

There are other instances where the editorial markings in Haslinger II are consistent with Czerny's other editions but deviate from the composer's markings. The pedal marking in the last bar of Op. 109/iii in Haslinger II, for example, is identical to that in the Cocks edition (ex. 3.4). However, this is different from the autograph, in which Beethoven reveals that only the last chord

Musical score for Ex. 3.4, measures 203-204. It shows two staves in treble and bass clef with a key signature of three sharps. Measure 203 is circled and marked 'ritard.'. A 'Ped' marking with a slur is placed over the final chord in both staves.

should be pedalled (see ex. 9.15 below). Similarly, the pedal markings of Op. 101/iii in Haslinger

I, Haslinger II (ex. 3.5) and Cocks are the same but, again, they are different from Beethoven's (ex. 3.6). It is for all these reasons that the editor of Haslinger II must be Czerny.

Ex. 3.5

Mit einer Saite.
Sul una corda.

♩ = 58.

Langsam
und
Sehnsuchtsvoll.
Adagio
ma non troppo
con affetto.

①

④

⑨

⑬

⑮

⑳

pp

p

Ped.


Ped. cresc.

cresc.


Nach und nach mehrere Saiten

Beethoven I. N° 27.

There are also many similarities between Czerny's Cocks edition and *The Art*. The fingering of the left-hand accompaniment in the opening bars of Op. 14/1/iii, for example, are exactly the same in the two sources.³² For the left-hand pattern in thirds in Op. 81a/iii/1, he indicates 3-1 in both Cocks (ex. 3.7) and *The Art*.³³ In Cocks, this finger pattern is maintained throughout the first four



bars. Czerny's fingering of this passage also reflects his reluctance to place the thumb on black keys. The choice of fingering in Op. 7/iv/76 and 83 in Cocks (ex. 3.8) is almost identical to that in *The Art* (ex. 3.9). Czerny clearly prefers the older method of fingering, whereby the fourth finger crosses over the fifth. The only difference between Cocks and *The Art* is the fingering of the note preceding the fifth finger. In general, Czerny does not indicate exactly the same fingering in different editions of the same sonatas, but the principle of fingering is usually consistent. There



³²Beethoven (c1835-1880), i, p. 9; Czerny (1846), p. 44.

³³See Beethoven (c1835-1880), ii, p. 10; Czerny (1846), p. 61.

Ex. 3.9

The image shows two systems of handwritten musical notation. The first system consists of a piano (right) staff and a bass (left) staff. The piano staff begins with a circled '65' and contains four measures of chords with fingerings: 1 2 4 5 4 3 2 3, 1 2 3 5 4 3 2 3, 1 2 4 5 4 3 2 3, and 1 2 3 5 4 3 2 3. Dynamics are marked as ff, sf, sf, sf, sf, and sf. The bass staff has notes corresponding to the piano chords, with dynamics ff, sf, sf, sf, sf, and sf. The second system also has a piano and bass staff. The piano staff starts with a circled '16' and contains six measures with fingerings: 1 2 4 5 4 3 2 3, 1 2 4 5 4 3 2 3, 1 2 4 5 4 3 2 3, 1 2 3 5 4 3 2 3, 1 2 3 5 4 3 2 3, and 1 2 3 5 4 3 2 3. Dynamics are marked as ff, sf, sf, sf, sf, and sf. The bass staff has notes with dynamics ff, sf, sf, sf, sf, and sf. The piece concludes with 'and so on.' and a circled '15' below the bass staff.

is another similarity between *Cocks* and *The Art*: Czerny maintains that the first six bars of Op. 31/3/i has a free tempo. In the *Cocks* edition, the metronome marking is printed not at the beginning, as is the norm, but on the seventh bar. This reflects Czerny's remark in *The Art*:

The opening resembles a question (the answer to which follows in the 7th bar) and must, on that account, have a certain indeterminate cast, both in time and expression; which, after the pause, and particularly in the 16th and following bars, yields to a decided style of performance and then the beats of the Metronome can be duly observed.³⁴

Sometimes, Czerny's editorial markings in *Cocks*, though based on the same principle as *The Art*, are slightly modified. His pedal indication at the abrupt modulation in Op. 7/iv/155-156 in *Cocks* supports his advice in *The Art*. The two sources, however, disagree on the length of the pedalling. In *The Art*, Czerny states that the pedal should be depressed for two-and-a-half bars,³⁵ but in the *Cocks* edition, the pedal is released after two bars (ex. 3.10).

³⁴Czerny (1846), p. 55. Capitalization original.

³⁵*Ibid.*, p. 39.

Ex. 3.10

Musical score for Ex. 3.10, consisting of two systems of piano music. The first system is numbered 151 and the second 156. The notation includes various dynamic markings: *f*, *sf*, *ritard.*, *f*, *f >*, *pp*, and *Ped*. The music is written in a grand staff with treble and bass clefs.

Although most of Beethoven's fingerings are incorporated in the Cocks edition, a few (for example in Op. 81a/i/5 and Op. 111/ii/174) are omitted. By the 1830s, Czerny had already made the decision to modify Beethoven's fingering of Op. 2/1/iii/59-62 (ex. 3.11). His fingering of this passage in Cocks (ex. 3.12) is largely the same as that in *The Art* (ex. 3.13), but these minor deviations do not affect the overall fingering pattern. In *The Art*, Czerny retains Beethoven's fingering in bars 61-62, but in his earlier Cocks edition, he makes two small alterations in these two bars. It is interesting to note, however, that there are no changes to his fingering of the double fourths in bars 59-62 between Cocks and *The Art* (see also the discussion in chapter 8).


Ex. 3.11

Musical score for Ex. 3.11, showing a single system of piano music. The score includes handwritten fingering numbers above the notes and dynamic markings *ff* and *p*. The system is numbered 59.

Ex. 3.12

Musical score for Ex. 3.12, showing a single system of piano music. The score includes handwritten fingering numbers above the notes and dynamic markings *ff*, *dim.*, and *p*. The system is numbered 59.

Ex. 3.13



The similarities which *The Art* shares with the editorial markings in Haslinger II and in the Cocks edition of the piano sonatas show that many of the ideas in *The Art* were already sown by the late 1820s. These were consolidated through the Cocks edition, begun in the 1830s, before being finally written down in *The Art* in the 1840s. In the Simrock edition, Czerny chose to concentrate on adding fingerings and, as in all the other editions, metronome markings. There are hardly any additional expressive markings in this edition, apart from a few accents. None of his four editions contains all his ideas, but collectively they offer, in conjunction with his advice in *The Art*, a fairly good picture of his approach to Beethoven's piano sonatas.

3.5 CZERNY'S EDITIONS OF OP. 57 COMPARED

In this section, Op. 57 will be used as a case study to exemplify Czerny's editing from the 1820s to the 1850s. As mentioned on p. 65, this was one of the sonatas which Czerny had studied with Beethoven. The five editions used for this study are Haslinger I, Haslinger II, Cocks, Wessel, and Simrock. These editions will also be considered alongside Czerny's advice in *The Art* and Beethoven's autograph of this sonata.

Metronome marks

<u>First movement</u>	<i>Allegro assai</i>
Haslinger I	♩.=120
Haslinger II	♩.=108
Cocks	♩.=120
Wessel	♩.=138; <i>Più allegro</i> ♩.=160
Simrock	♩.=120

Second movement *Andante con moto*

Haslinger I	♩=120
Haslinger II	♩=108
Cocks	♩=120
Wessel	♩=92
Simrock	♩=112

Third movement *Allegro ma non troppo*

Haslinger I	♩ =138	
Haslinger II	♩ =138; <i>Presto</i>	♩ =92
Cocks	♩ =138	
Wessel	♩ =152; <i>Presto</i>	♩ =100
Simrock	♩ =144; <i>Presto</i>	♩ =96

As can be seen from this table, the metronome markings in Cocks are identical to those in Haslinger I. Although Haslinger II was published at about the same time as Haslinger I, the metronome markings of the first two movements are slower. However, in Haslinger I, Haslinger II and Cocks, Czerny's markings consistently demonstrate the tempo relationship between the first two movements, where the basic pulse of the second movement is always the same as the first. This is, surprisingly, no longer the case in editions published in the 1850s. The metronome markings in Wessel swing wildly from being extremely quick in the first movement to being significantly slower in the second movement. This is again followed by a very quick tempo in the third movement. Although the metronome markings in the Simrock edition were published later than Wessel, the speeds of the three movements are, once again, more compatible. Czerny had obviously reconsidered his metronome markings on various occasions, and one can only conjecture as to why the markings in Wessel lie outside the range of his other four editions (see also the discussion of Czerny's metronome markings in sections 4.6-4.9 below).

Dynamic markings and accents

Many of the dynamic markings in these five editions are the same as those in the autograph. Occasionally, however, one of Beethoven's terms is replaced by another. In bar 226 of the third

movement, Beethoven's *rinforzando* is replaced by either *ritard.* or *ritardando* in all the five editions surveyed. This error initially appeared in the first edition of this sonata and may have been overlooked in Czerny's editions. In four out of the five editions, the *rinforzando* \blacktriangleleft in bar 14 of the second movement (ex. 3.14) is replaced with *sf* \blacktriangleleft . Although the dynamic marking in Wessel is the same as in the autograph, the *diminuendo* begins earlier (ex. 3.15). We have seen on pp. 68-69 how particular Beethoven was with regard to the type of dynamic marking used as well as where it begins. In addition, as will be outlined in section 5.3 below, he did not employ *rinforzando* as an alternative term to *sf* and vice versa.

Ex. 3.14



Ex. 3.15



It is not unusual to find editorial dynamic markings and accents in Czerny's editions. A hairpin is added to reflect the ascending and descending figure in bar 50 of the first movement in the


Simrock edition. His recommendation for the use of hairpins in such instances has been documented in his treatise (see p. 38). There are significantly more dynamic markings in Haslinger II than in Haslinger I. For example, Haslinger II adds $\langle \rangle$ in bars 22-23, \langle in bar 28 and *dim.* in bar 30 of the second movement of Op. 57. Haslinger I does not have any of these additional dynamic markings. In the first movement, the *sf* markings on the third and fourth beats of bar 15 in Haslinger II (ex. 3.16) are not found in Haslinger I. The *sf* on the first beat of bar 18 is not found in the autograph, nor in any of Czerny's other four editions. The *sf* on the first beat of bar 16, however, appears in both Haslinger I and Haslinger II. At this point, the autograph (ex. 3.17) and Wessel have *p*. Another discrepancy occurs on the first beat of bar 14: *fz* in Haslinger II but only *f* in the autograph.

Ex. 3.16

Ex. 3:17

In bars 53-54 of the first movement, a *crescendo* is added to accompany the ascending bass line in Haslinger II (see ex. 3.31 below), but this marking does not appear in Haslinger I or in Czerny's other editions. Accents are also inserted in bars 135-137 in the third movement of this sonata in Haslinger II. The As are accented because they are dissonant against the other parts (ex. 3.18).

Ex. 3.18



In Haslinger II, rhythmic accents are added in bars 113-115 (ex. 3.19) and the semiquavers in the first time bar beginning in bar 300 of the last movement. Simrock is the only other edition which has accents in these two passages. In the Simrock edition, rhythmic accents are also inserted in two other passages from this movement: bars 96-97 and bars 100-101.

Ex. 3.19



Accents of an expressive nature can also be found in Czerny's Simrock edition. In bars 105-107 of the first movement, he accents the syncopations (ex. 3.20), while in bar 206, he highlights a foreign harmony note (ex. 3.21). In bars 37 and 111, accents are placed over long notes (ex.

3.22a). The accent on this long note, which was added by Czerny, had also appeared in an extract published more than a decade earlier in *The Art* (ex. 3.22b). This suggests that Czerny possessed a remarkable memory. In addition, as listed in section 5.6 below, all the above-mentioned usages of unnotated accents are consistent with the precepts in his *Piano Forte School* and in *The Art*.

Ex. 3.20

Musical score for Ex. 3.20, numbered 105. It features a grand staff with piano and bass staves. The piano part includes a long note with an accent and a dynamic marking of *f*. The bass part includes a *cres* marking and various fingerings. The score is enclosed in a large oval.

Ex. 3.21

Musical score for Ex. 3.21, numbered 205. It features a grand staff with piano and bass staves. The piano part includes a *cres* marking and a complex rhythmic pattern. The bass part includes a *cres* marking and a complex rhythmic pattern. The score is enclosed in a large oval.

Ex. 3.22a

Musical score for Ex. 3.22a, numbered 35. It features a grand staff with piano and bass staves. The piano part includes a *dolce* marking and a complex rhythmic pattern. The bass part includes a *cres* marking and a complex rhythmic pattern. The score is enclosed in a large oval.

Ex. 3.22b

Musical score for Ex. 3.22b, showing piano and bass staves. The piano part includes a complex rhythmic pattern. The bass part includes a complex rhythmic pattern. The score is enclosed in a large oval.

Articulation

Articulation marks in Czerny's editions, especially the length of slurs, sometimes bear no resemblance to the autograph. One example is the slurs in bars 33-40 in the second movement of Op. 57. Since Haslinger I and II (ex. 3.23) are printed from the same plates, the slurs are the same. From bars 33-37, the slurs both in the treble and in the bass are shorter than in the autograph (ex. 3.24). The slurring of the bass in bars 33-40 is the same in Simrock (ex. 3.25), Cocks and Wessel, but it is longer than Beethoven intended. In all three editions, the long slur in the treble is also missing.

Ex. 3.23

Ex. 3.23 shows two systems of musical notation. The first system, starting at bar 33, features a treble clef staff with a long slur over the first four bars and a shorter slur over the last two bars. The bass clef staff has a slur over the first two bars and another over the last two bars. The marking "1º sempre legato." is written in the treble staff, and "sfz" is written in the bass staff. The second system, starting at bar 39, shows similar slurring patterns in both staves, with markings "1ma" and "2da" above the treble staff.

Ex. 3.24

Ex. 3.24 shows two systems of handwritten musical notation. The first system, starting at bar 33, features a treble clef staff with a long slur over the first four bars and a shorter slur over the last two bars. The bass clef staff has a slur over the first two bars and another over the last two bars. The marking "p: sempre legato" is written in the treble staff, and "sfz" is written in the bass staff. The second system, starting at bar 38, shows similar slurring patterns in both staves.

Ex. 3.25

The lengths of the slurs in bars 76-95 of the third movement are also different in all five editions. Beethoven consistently slurs the bass motif either in groups of 2+2+4+1+1 or of 2+2+4+2 (ex. 3.26). Haslinger I and Haslinger II (ex. 3.27) are faithful to the composer's slurring in bars 76-85, but in the next phrase, the slur covers virtually the whole phrase. The slurring in Simrock (ex. 3.28), Cocks and Wessel is inconsistent and the slurs are essentially longer than in the autograph.

Ex. 3.26

Ex. 3.26 (con't)

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 3.26 (con't). It consists of two systems of staves. The first system starts with a circled measure number 88. The second system starts with a circled measure number 93. The notation is dense and includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings like *dimin.* and *f*.

Ex. 3.27

Printed musical score for Ex. 3.27, consisting of four systems of piano accompaniment. Each system begins with a circled measure number: 74, 80, 86, and 92. The notation includes treble and bass clefs, notes, rests, and dynamic markings such as *cresc.*, *sfp*, *loco.*, and *dimin.*. Some systems also feature an 8-measure rest indicated by a dashed line.

Ex. 3.28

Ex. 3.28 shows three systems of piano accompaniment. The first system (measures 76-82) features a right hand with a complex melodic line and a left hand with a quaver accompaniment. Dynamics include 'fp' and 'cres'. The second system (measures 83-89) continues the accompaniment with 'dimin:' markings. The third system (measures 90-96) shows further development with 'fp' and 'cres' dynamics.

Two-note slurs and *staccato* dots are added to the quaver accompaniment in bars 25-26, 28 and 31-32 in the first movement of the Haslinger II edition (ex. 3.29). This articulation is not included at this juncture in the other four editions. However, in the Simrock edition, slurs are added in bars 94-95 in the development section, but without the *staccato* sign (ex. 3.30). Even without this indication, according to Czerny's teaching (see section 6.4 below), the second note of the slur is expected to be detached. This shows that in spite of the twenty- to thirty-year gap between the publication of these two editions, Czerny still holds to a similar manner of performing those quavers.

Ex. 3.29

Ex. 3.29 shows three systems of left-hand accompaniment. The first system (measures 25-27) shows quaver accompaniment with slurs. The second system (measures 28-30) continues the pattern. The third system (measures 31-32) shows further development with slurs and staccato dots.

Ex. 3.30



Staccato signs are also added to the ascending bass figure in bars 53-54 of the first movement in three of Czerny's editions – Haslinger I, Haslinger II (ex. 3.31) and Simrock. The same articulation is marked in Haslinger II every time this motif appears, albeit sometimes incomplete. In Haslinger I and in Simrock, *staccato* signs are also added in bars 192-193, thus confirming the articulation of this passage.

Ex. 3.31



It is observed that Haslinger I and Haslinger II use dots to indicate *staccato*, while Cocks prefer the dash. Simrock and Wessel employ both signs in this sonata. In Simrock, *staccato* is usually represented by the dash. However, in passages where Czerny has made additions, such as the ascending bass figure in bars 53-54 and bars 192-193 in the first movement, or the ascending quaver figure in bars 266-267 in the third movement, dots are used. It is possible that the engraver originally indicated *staccato* with dashes but, perhaps, another engraver may have added dots at a later stage before printing, so as to incorporate Czerny's suggestion. It is unlikely that dashes and dots were used to represent different degrees of sharpness or that Czerny had specifically asked for a particular type of sign to be used.

Fingering

Of the five editions surveyed, only the Simrock edition contains fingering added by the editor. One mode of fingering is unusual. As will be discussed in section 8.6 below, different fingers are normally used in passages with repeated monotones. Throughout the first movement of this sonata, Czerny requests only one finger in such passages: the thumb in bars 24-28, 33, 94-97 (ex.

3.30 above), 134, 135, 149, 166, and 172, and the second finger in bars 150 and 173. In the two instances where the second finger is employed rather than the thumb, it is to facilitate the fingering of the figure which follows, as shown in ex. 3.32.

Ex. 3.32

The image shows two musical staves. The top staff is for measure 147, starting with a circled '147'. It contains a treble clef with a complex, rapid passage of notes. Below the treble clef, there is a 'cres' marking and a fingering sequence: '1 4 3 6 4 3 5'. The bottom staff is for measure 150, starting with a circled '150'. It contains a bass clef with a 'p' marking and a 'f' marking. The bottom staff of both measures shows a continuous bass line with repeated notes.

In *The Art*, Czerny advises that the repeated Cs in the bass of Op. 57/i/134-139 be struck with one finger, or preferably, with the thumb.³⁶ In the Simrock edition, he reinforces this idea by repeatedly marking 1s over the Cs in bars 134, 135 (ex. 3.33) and 149 (see ex. 3.32 above). Why does Czerny insist on this fingering? He explains in *The Art* that if the fingers are changed, a less convincing effect would be produced.³⁷ Presumably he envisages an insistent, rumbling, almost ominous-sounding bass, and the thumb would be the best candidate. He studied this sonata with Beethoven “several times”³⁸ so it can be assumed that Beethoven conceived this effect and, most probably, requested this fingering.

Ex. 3.33

The image shows two musical staves for measure 134, starting with a circled '134'. The top staff is for the treble clef, containing a 'P' marking and a 'dimin.' marking. The bottom staff is for the bass clef, containing a 'pp' marking. The bass clef staff shows a series of repeated notes, likely Cs, with '1' markings above them. The treble clef staff shows a few notes and rests.

³⁶Ibid., p. 59.

³⁷Ibid.

³⁸Czerny (1970), p. 3.

Pedalling

Although many of the pedal markings in Czerny's editions of Op. 57 correspond to the autograph, the exact place for the pedal release is not always as precise as Beethoven would have liked. The latter was meticulous in his notation, sometimes even marking where the pedal should be released during a rest (see chapter 9, especially pp. 256-257 below). Towards the end of the first movement, Beethoven uses the pedal to link the *adagio* section to the *più allegro* at bar 238. The pedal release on the first chord of the *più allegro* is faithfully observed in Cocks, Wessel (ex. 3.34) and Simrock, but not in Haslinger I nor Haslinger II (ex. 3.35), where the pedal is released before the beginning of the quicker section.

Ex. 3.34



Ex. 3.35



The lack of accuracy in the positioning of the pedal release signs probably results from a lack of understanding of Beethoven's notation and intentions on the engraver's part rather than Czerny's. The pedalling of the arpeggiated figure in bars 176-183 of the third movement, for example, varies from edition to edition, and sometimes even within the same edition. In the autograph, Beethoven asks for the pedal to be depressed through the rests, including the two empty bars 179 and 183 (ex. 3.36). In Haslinger I, Haslinger II and Simrock (ex. 3.37), the pedal release signs appear at the end of bars 178 and 182, that is, a bar earlier than is specified in the autograph. The pedal is

to be released even earlier in Cocks – on the last quaver of the bar 178 (ex. 3.38). Wessel is rather inconsistent (ex. 3.39); the pedal release in bar 179 is according to Beethoven's autograph, but that in bar 183 is a bar early.

Ex. 3.36

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 3.36, showing measures 176, 182, and 188. The score is written on three systems of staves. The first system (measures 176-177) shows a complex texture with many notes and some markings like 'ped.' and 'p.'. The second system (measures 182-183) includes markings such as 'ped.', 'p.', and 'ff'. The third system (measures 188-189) shows a continuation of the texture with 'ped.' markings. The handwriting is dense and somewhat messy, typical of a working draft or autograph.

Ex. 3.37

Printed musical score for Ex. 3.37, showing measures 175 and 184. The score is written on two systems of staves. The first system (measures 175-177) includes markings such as 'Ped.', 'ff', and '* 1'. The second system (measures 184-186) includes markings such as 'Ped: p', 'dimin:', and 'sempre Ped:'. The score is clean and clearly printed, with some performance instructions and dynamics.

Ex. 3.38

Musical score for Ex. 3.38, measures 173-185. The score is in G major and 4/4 time. It features a complex piano accompaniment with various textures and dynamics. Measure 173 is marked *8va* and *loco*. Measure 178 includes a first finger pedaling instruction (*Ped. 1*) and a fortissimo (*ff*) dynamic. Measure 185 includes a first finger pedaling instruction (*Ped. 1*) and a piano (*p*) dynamic. The score concludes with the instruction *sempre pp / sempre Ped.* and a *dimin.* marking.

Ex. 3.39

Musical score for Ex. 3.39, measures 173-187. The score is in G major and 4/4 time. It features a complex piano accompaniment with various textures and dynamics. Measure 173 is marked *8va* and *loco*. Measure 179 includes a first finger pedaling instruction (*Ped. 1*) and a fortissimo (*ff*) dynamic. Measure 187 includes a first finger pedaling instruction (*Ped. 1*) and a piano (*p*) dynamic. The score concludes with the instruction *sempre pp / sempre Ped.* and a *dim.* marking.

Wessel occasionally has additional pedal markings, such as those in bars 17-22 (ex. 3.40a) and in bars 152-161 (ex. 3.40b) of the first movement. These markings do not appear in the other four editions, but they reflect Czerny's advice in *The Art* where, in the first movement, the pedal must be used in "all concurring, [and] energetic passages, (as in bars 14, 17, 20 &c.)".³⁹ There are, however, two obvious mistakes in the Wessel edition. Based on Czerny's remarks in *The Art* and on most of the pedalling in these two passages in Wessel, the pedal release sign in bar 19 should be at the end of the third beat of the previous bar, while in bar 155, it has been accidentally omitted. Both are engraving errors.

Ex. 3.40a

The image displays three systems of musical notation for piano, numbered 15, 18, and 22. Each system consists of a grand staff with a treble and bass clef. System 15 (bars 15-17) features dynamics of *f*, *p*, and *ff*. System 18 (bars 18-20) features dynamics of *p*, *ff*, and *p*. System 22 (bars 21-22) features a dynamic of *p*. Pedal markings include "Ped:" and "* Ped:". There are also handwritten annotations: "trmn" above the staff in bar 19 and bar 22, and "trmn" above the staff in bar 20. The notation includes various note values, rests, and articulation marks.

³⁹Czerny (1846), p. 59. Punctuation original.

Ex. 3.40b

The image displays three systems of musical notation for piano. Each system consists of a grand staff with a treble and bass clef. The first system, starting at measure 149, features a 'cres.' marking and dynamic markings of *f*, *f*, *f*, *p*, and *pp*. The second system, starting at measure 152, includes *ff* and *p* markings, with 'Ped:' markings and asterisks below the bass staff. The third system, starting at measure 157, includes *f*, *p*, *ff*, and *p* markings, also with 'Ped:' markings and asterisks. The notation includes various rhythmic values, slurs, and articulation marks.

The pedalling from bars 123-139 in the first movement of the Wessel edition (ex. 3.41) is probably another error. According to the autograph, there should be a pedal release sign on the first beat of bar 132. There is then no pedal marking until bar 218. If the additional pedal marking in Wessel, from bars 140-143, is credited to Czerny, then, in the previous phrase, the pedal should be depressed anew in bar 136. Simrock also has additional pedal markings in this passage, but only in bars 132-133 (ex. 3.42). The pedal is changed every bar. The pedalling of this passage in the other three editions is the same as the autograph.

Ex. 3.41

Musical score for Ex. 3.41, measures 122-140. The score is written for piano and includes various dynamics and performance instructions.

Measures 122-123: *ff* Ped. *8va*

Measures 124-125: *8va* *sempre Ped.*

Measures 126-128: *8va* *sempre Ped.*

Measures 129-131: *ff*

Measures 132-134: *p* *dim.*

Measures 135-137: *pp* *pp* *trm* *pp*

Measures 138-140: *Ped.* *trm*

Ex. 3.42

122

125

128

131

567..

3.6 SUMMARY

Throughout chapters two and three of *The Art*, Czerny emphasizes the importance of observing Beethoven's tempo, dynamic and articulation markings. It is therefore perplexing that Czerny insisted on this when a "correct" edition of the sonatas did not exist. It was common to share plates among the publishers because it was expensive and time-consuming to re-engrave. Unfortunately, mistakes were sometimes overlooked and were retained in new editions, such as Clementi's London edition of Op. 90. However, from the various editorial changes which Czerny made, it is possible to form a more comprehensive understanding of his approach. There may be

some discrepancies among his various editions, but many of the main principles remained unchanged.

Czerny's editing of Beethoven's piano sonatas was more thorough than originally thought. He added not only fingering and metronome marks, as many of the titles suggest, but also pedal markings, accents, articulation, and dynamic markings. The additional pedal markings in Op. 57/i/17-22 and 152-161 from the Wessel edition are exactly the same as those he suggests in *The Art*. Accents are added in Op. 57/iii/113-115 in Haslinger II and Simrock. *Staccato* and *crescendo* marks are also added to the ascending bass figure in Op. 57/i/53-54 in Haslinger I, Haslinger II and Simrock. The dynamic markings in the last eight bars of Op. 26/i/var. 2 in Haslinger II correspond closely with Czerny's advice in *The Art*. These markings, together with numerous other similarities which Haslinger II share with *The Art* and Czerny's other editions, also lead us to the identity of its editor – Czerny.

There is a certain consistency among Czerny's various editions and his comments in *The Art*. Apart from the features already mentioned in the previous paragraph, the similarities also extend to Czerny's fingering and tempo indications. His advice of using only one finger to play the repeated bass monotones in the first movement of Op. 57, first published in *The Art*, is consistently reinforced through his fingering of this movement in the Simrock edition. The old method of fingering, whereby the fourth finger crosses over the fifth, is employed in Op. 7/iv/76 in both Cocks and *The Art*. The importance of maintaining a free tempo in the first few bars of Op. 31/3/i is also emphasized both in Cocks and in *The Art*.

Such consistency also reflects the serious study which Czerny must have undertaken. Some of the ideas on the performance of Beethoven's piano sonatas in *The Art* can be traced back to the Haslinger II edition from the late 1820s through to the Cocks edition in the 1830s. Although this supplement to his monumental *Piano Forte School* was not published until 1846, Czerny's comments in *The Art* appear to consolidate his earlier editings. In addition, it was an opportunity to elaborate on the character of the individual sonatas and also to provide some solutions to technical problems.

Sometimes, however, Czerny's editing contradicts Beethoven's indications, such as his fingering of the double fourths in the trio of Op. 2/1/iii. Although the composer's fingering was retained in the two Haslinger editions, reverence gave way to a more modern fingering by the 1830s, in the Cocks edition. This was then slightly modified in *The Art*. This proves that Czerny had been consistently studying the sonatas and, in the process, reviewing his understanding of them. In *The Art*, he did not simply try to recall what he had learned with Beethoven almost two decades after the latter's death. Rather, he was committing to paper his understanding of those compositions from when Beethoven was still alive, albeit with some modifications.

CHAPTER 4: TEMPO AND TEMPO FLEXIBILITY

When a work of Beethoven had been performed, his first question was always, "How were the tempi?" Every other consideration seemed to be of secondary importance to him.¹

There is clearly some truth in this statement by Schindler. Beethoven sometimes altered tempo markings after the first performances. His three successive versions of the finale of *Fidelio* "Wer ein holdes Weib errungen" (1804-1805, 1805-1806 and 1814) show an increase in speed and liveliness. Hermann Beck observes that the original tempo marking for the finale was *maestoso*. "Lebhafteres Tempo" (more lively tempo), which was written at the edge of the first version, was changed to *maestoso vivace* in the second, and *allegro ma non troppo* in the third.² Frustrated by the different meanings associated with some Italian terms, he later used metronome markings as well as tempo markings. Metronome markings which he assigned to his compositions had often been carefully chosen. He considered the possibility of MM [\downarrow] = 108 or 120 as the speed of the first movement of his final symphony, but eventually decided on \downarrow = 88.³ Time signatures can also influence the speed, so it is important to choose one which is the most appropriate. In the trio of the Ninth Symphony, for example, Beethoven made sketches in both 2/4 and 4/4 time signatures, before deciding that the accentuation implied by *alla breve* was more appropriate.⁴ Even when his deafness became pronounced, the violinist Joseph Böhm recounted that the composer's "eyes followed the bows [of the string quartet so closely that] ... he was able to judge the smallest fluctuations in tempo or rhythm and correct them immediately".⁵

This concern with tempo was shared by many musicians, Czerny being one of them. He acknowledges that:

[a]ny musical piece produces its proper effect only when it is played in the exact degree of movement prescribed by its Author; and any even inconsiderable deviation from that time, whether as to

¹Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), fn. p. 423.

²Rosenblum (1988), p. 324.

³Barth (1992), p. 52.

⁴For a detailed discussion, see Stadlen (1967), pp. 341-342.

⁵Thayer (1969), pp. 940-941. This event took place during a rehearsal of the Quartet in A minor, Op. 132, in 1825.

quickness, or slowness, will often totally destroy the sense, the beauty, and the intelligibility of the piece.⁶

By requesting that “the exact degree of movement” be preserved, Czerny is obviously referring to the necessity of observing the tempo which has been “prescribed” by the composer. However, the meaning of his next point is slightly ambiguous. “[A]ny ... inconsiderable deviation from that time, whether as to quickness, or slowness, will often totally destroy the sense, the beauty, and the intelligibility of the piece” could be understood to mean either (i) the initial tempo selection or (ii) the initial tempo selection and the strict maintenance of that tempo throughout a performance.

As discussed in chapter 2, the treatise writers from C. P. E. Bach to Czerny unequivocally recommend some pressing on and holding back within a piece for expressive purposes. They caution that such tempo flexibility, though desirable, should not distort the overall tempo. In other words, a piece should begin and end in the same tempo. Both Hummel and Czerny also spoke out against excessive accelerating or slowing down (see p. 36). If tempo flexibility were to be completely forbidden, they would have expressed their remarks in a different and more comprehensive way. Therefore, when Czerny asks for a whole movement to be played in “strict time”, such as the slow movement of the “Tempest” Sonata, Op. 31 No. 2,⁷ he meant what we might today term a steady rhythm which tolerates interpretive tempo flexibility without, however, carrying it to excess. Had he wished for one tempo to be maintained relentlessly throughout this movement, he would not have requested the use of *accelerando* and *rallentando*, both of which are not notated by Beethoven, in bars 55-58. Unfortunately, it is terms such as “strict time” which led George Barth to accuse Czerny of encouraging the strict observance of a single speed throughout a piece or movement. He also criticizes Czerny for distorting a tradition, or at least, helping to establish a new one.⁸ Czerny’s suggested performance of Op. 31/2/ii (mentioned above) and his explanations of tempo flexibility in his treatise, are sufficient to prove that both Barth’s accusations are completely baseless.

⁶Czerny (1839E), i, p. 157. Capitalization original.

⁷Czerny (1846), p. 53.

⁸Barth (1992), pp. 1-2, 55-57 and 80-81.

4.1 *ALLA BREVE*

Like Beethoven, Czerny also understands the relationship between time signature, especially the *alla breve* (C), and tempo. According to Czerny, movements with the *alla breve* time signature should be played a degree quicker than indicated, often with an increase in liveliness. Although Op. 14/2/ii is marked *andante*, he advises that since “the measure is *alla breve*, the time should be a tolerably lively *Allegretto*”.⁹ Similar instructions are given to two works with this key signature: the second movement of Beethoven’s Piano Concerto No. 1, Op. 15, and the first movement of Op. 27 No. 2.¹⁰ Czerny knew Beethoven’s intentions in all three works, having studied at least two of them with the composer. Czerny elaborates that *alla breve* movements composed during Beethoven’s “second period”, however, “must be distinguished more by beauty of tone and performance, than by excessive rapidity”.¹¹

Even short *alla breve* passages, introduced within a movement which begins with a different time signature, are to be played quicker. This was certainly Beethoven’s intention. In the scherzo of the Ninth Symphony, Beethoven alternates between 3/4 (*molto vivace*) and *alla breve* (*presto*) sections. A reminder of the *alla breve* accentuation is given through *forte* marks at every half bar for the first two bars of this section. A brief passage of *alla breve* is also inserted towards the end of the 3/4 scherzo and trio movement of the Third Symphony. In both symphonies, the 3/4 sections are marked $\text{♩} = 116$, while the *alla breve* sections are $\text{○} = 116$. According to Beethoven’s metronome markings, the basic pulse in both the 3/4 and the *alla breve* sections is the same. As a result, he could not have adopted the old meaning associated with *alla breve*, because his metronome markings inform us that the *alla breve* sections is only somewhat quicker than the 3/4 section which precedes it. As mentioned on pp. 29-30, there were two meanings associated with this time signature at this time. Beethoven’s metronome markings in these two symphonies show that he, like Clementi, embraces the newer meaning: that of playing an *alla breve* passage quicker than notated, but not necessarily twice as fast.


⁹Czerny (1846), p. 45.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 49 and 104.

¹¹Ibid., p. 87.

Czerny is more conservative. In an article that appeared in *Cocks Musical Miscellany* (1 April 1853), he complains of the tendency to play the *alla breve* passage from the scherzo of the Third Symphony (ex. 4.1) too slowly. However, he appears to be unaware of Beethoven's metronome markings for this passage when he explains that the minims in the *alla breve* passage should be played as crotchets¹² (as if the time signature were 2/4). Here, he is using the old definition of this signature. His example below (ex. 4.2) shows how the *alla breve* should proceed from the 3/4 section. Although Czerny's suggested speed of the *alla breve* section is questionable, he correctly points out the accentuation denoted by the time signature. He deduces that the accentuation is the most "likely reason why Beethoven preferred the white notes *alla breve* to the ordinary crotchets".¹³

Ex. 4.1



Ex. 4.2

Ex. 4.2 shows two staves of musical notation. The first staff is in 3/4 time, starting with a circled measure number 372. The notes are G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4. The second staff is in 4/4 time, starting with a circled measure number 380. The notes are G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4. The first note of the 4/4 section is marked with a circled 'ff' and a downward-pointing triangle above it. There are also downward-pointing triangles above the second and third notes of the 4/4 section. The dynamic markings 'ff', 'sf', 'sf', 'sf', 'p' are written below the notes. Above the first staff, there is a handwritten note 'M.M. 9['] = 116'.

N.B. The first notes of the *alla breve* section in exs. 4.1 and 4.2 are as written in *Cocks Musical Miscellany*. Both notes are extracted from the E flat major chord. The inconsistency between the two examples suggests that Czerny quoted the extracts from memory.

Although Czerny gives the old meaning of *alla breve* in his *Piano Forte School*, he does not slavishly follow this rule in practice. The speed of the *alla breve* may depend on the musical structure, as is in the case of Op. 53/iii. Czerny's advice is to play the "[p]restissimo finale

¹²Cocks (1853), pp. 29-30.

¹³Ibid., p. 30.

[marked *alla breve*] ... with the greatest possible rapidity”¹⁴ rather than measure it in relation to the beginning of the movement.

Beethoven and Czerny both construe *alla breve* to imply a quicker tempo. Regarding the speed an *alla breve* section should be played, however, they have a small disagreement.

4.2 ITALIAN TERMS

A piece which is played too fast or too slow loses all its effect, and becomes quite disfigured. Where the time is not marked according to Maelzel’s metronome, the player must look to the Italian words which indicate the degree of movement; as *allegro*, *moderato*, *presto*, etc. and likewise to the character of the composition, and gradually learn by experience to know their real significations.¹⁵

Unfortunately, the “degree of movement” and the “real significance” denoted by Italian terms were not always straightforward. Their meanings, as discussed in section 2.2.1, were constantly changing. Against this background, are the definitions of the main Italian terms given by Czerny likely to be those of Beethoven? The answer, in the majority of cases, is affirmative.

Both Beethoven and Czerny consider *largo* a slower tempo than *adagio*. Beethoven’s metronome marking of Op. 106 and his notation of smaller note-values in the *largo* section show that he considers *largo* to be slower than *adagio*. Similarly, Czerny places *largo* as a slower tempo of the two in the first volume of *Piano Forte School*.¹⁶ They were also frustrated by the general public’s tendency to exaggerate the slow movements. In 1810, Beethoven asked Breitkopf to add *ma non troppo* to the existing *adagio* indication on the heading of the second movement of the String Quartet Op. 74.¹⁷ In *The Art*, Czerny frequently cautions that slow movements (that is, those marked *largo* or *adagio*) should not be “spun out” or played in a “dragging manner”.

¹⁴Czerny (1846), p. 57.

¹⁵Czerny (1848), pp. 46-47.

¹⁶Czerny (1839E), i, p. 156.

¹⁷Anderson (1961), i, p. 285.

“In gehender Bewegung, doch mit viel Ausdruck” (with walking movement, but with expression) is the German instruction Beethoven assigned to the second movement of Op. 81a, also marked *andante espressivo*. The German indication in this instance is a direct translation of the Italian term, so *andante*, as understood by Beethoven, refers to “a walking pace”. Czerny’s definition of “moving onward slowly; less so however than Adagio”¹⁸ gives the impression that he may have played *andante* more slowly than Beethoven. However, his metronome markings of the *andante* movements in Beethoven’s piano sonatas are fairly brisk. In spite of the choice of wordings in his definition of this term, Czerny’s *andante* must have been taken at a speed comparable to Beethoven.

The meaning of *andantino* was more problematic. In 1813, Beethoven wrote a letter to the Scottish publisher George Thomson, asking him whether he understood *andantino* to be quicker or slower than *andante*.¹⁹ In spite of this uncertainty, Beck discovers that Beethoven’s twenty-three uses of *andantino* suggest that it is more often used to mean quicker instead of slower than *andante*.²⁰ Czerny also adopts the same meaning of *andantino*. He defines it as “progressing with a tolerably slow pace” but still considers it quicker than *andante*.²¹

Czerny’s definition of *allegretto* as “somewhat lively, cheerful, yet not hurrying onward”²² also reflects Beethoven’s usage of the term. This is exemplified in the first movement of Op. 101, marked *allegretto ma non troppo*. Its German indication “etwas lebhaft und mit der innigsten Empfindung” means “somewhat lively and with deepest feeling”.

In a letter to Mosel (c1817), Beethoven complained that the original meaning of *allegro*, that is “merry”, had been frequently ignored.²³ Beethoven even resorted to using German indications to convey the spirit of some of his compositions. In order to clarify the meaning of *allegro* in the last movement of Op. 101, he includes the German translation “Geschwinde, doch nicht zu

¹⁸Czerny (1839E), i, p. 156. Capitalization original.

¹⁹Anderson (1961), i, p. 406.

²⁰Newman (1988), p. 101.

²¹Czerny (1839E), i, p. 156.

²²Ibid.

²³Anderson (1961), ii, p. 727.

sehr, und mit Entschlossenheit" (fast, but not too much, and with decision). This is one of the rare occasions when Beethoven specified the character of a piece marked *allegro*. Czerny's textbook definition of *allegro* is simply "Fast, Lively, with Agility".²⁴ In the third volume of *Piano Forte School*, he elaborates on the wide range of emotions embodied by the term, all of which are recognisable features in the piano sonatas of Beethoven:

- (a) Tranquil, soft, and coaxing
- (b) Thoughtful or Enthusiastic
- (c) Sorrowful, or harmoniously intricate
- (d) Majestic, grand, and even sublime
- (e) Brilliant, yet without aiming at too much movement or rapidity
- (f) Light, cheerful and sportive
- (g) Hasty and resolute
- (h) Impassioned, excited, or fantastic and capricious
- (i) Stormy, hasty; in a serious as well as in a sportive sense
- (k) Extremely wild, excited, and unbridled or furious.²⁵

During Beethoven's lifetime, *vivace* was used in two ways; some (such as Türk and Clementi) used it to indicate speed, while others (such as Dussek) used it as an adjective to the main tempo headings. *Vivace* appears fairly frequently in Beethoven's piano sonatas, usually as a qualifier to two of the main tempo indications, *allegro* and *allegretto*. This is the case in Op. 2/2/i, Op. 28/iii, Op. 31/1/i, Op. 31/3/ii, Op. 78/ii, and Op. 109/iii/var. 3. Sometimes, Beethoven uses *vivace* on its own (as in Op. 79/iii) or with other qualifiers (in Op. 101/ii, *vivace* is used with *alla marcia*, in Op. 106/ii, *assai*, and in Op. 109/i, *ma non troppo*). In every instance, he uses *vivace* as an adjective rather than as a main tempo indication, even when it is used on its own. Czerny's definition of *vivace* "lively, with warmth" correctly describes the character of all the movements with this marking. He too uses it as an adjective.²⁶

The following list by Czerny, on the degree of movement implied by the main tempo headings, can be said to echo that of Beethoven (beginning with the slowest tempo):

*Grave – largo – larghetto – adagio – andante – andantino – allegretto – allegro – presto – prestissimo.*²⁷

²⁴Czerny (1839E), i, p. 156. Capitalization original.

²⁵Ibid., iii, p. 69. Capitalization original. Again, (j) was omitted as was then customary.

²⁶Ibid., i, p. 156.

²⁷Ibid.

Although Czerny agrees with Beethoven on the meanings of these Italian terms, he has other ideas regarding the meaning of *assai*. Rosenblum, Stewart Deas and Clive Brown are convinced that Beethoven often uses *assai* to indicate “enough” or “rather”. Czerny, on the other hand, defines the term with “very”.²⁸ This is more in line with the usage of Mozart, Clementi and Hummel.

4.3 METRONOME – A PROVIDER OF ANSWERS?

Beethoven expressed his support for the metronome publicly (in 1813) even while it was still in the process of being made. Thayer claims that Beethoven was at first “not well disposed to the instrument, notwithstanding he had joined Salieri and the other composers in strongly recommending the ‘chronometer’ in 1813”. Beethoven believed that “[i]t is silly stuff; one must feel the tempos”.²⁹ Eventually, he changed his mind. On 6 February 1817, *Wiener Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* named numerous “celebrated masters” including Beethoven, who pledged to include metronome markings in their future compositions. In December of the same year, he wrote a letter to Mosel, praising the invention and vowed to help spread its use. He also published two pamphlets on a *Fixation of Tempo* in terms of Maelzel’s metronome. The first one, published in 1817, contains metronome markings for the Septet, Op. 20 and all his symphonies, except the as yet unwritten Ninth. The second pamphlet, published two years later, has metronome markings for his first eleven quartets. Metronome markings were also inserted in some of his compositions written after the publication of the pamphlets, namely in the Ninth Symphony, the “Hammerklavier” Sonata and the Diabelli Variations.

Another public endorsement of the metronome, this time as a teaching aid, appeared in the *Wiener Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* (14 February 1818):

Maelzel’s metronome has arrived! The usefulness of his invention will be proved more and more. Moreover, all the composers of Germany, England and France have adopted it. But we have not considered it quite superfluous to voice our conviction and to recommend the metronome as a useful, nay, an indispensable aid to all beginners and pupils, whether in

²⁸Rosenblum (1988), p. 320; Deas (1950), pp. 333-336; Brown (1999), p. 302; Czerny (1839G), i, p. 118.

²⁹Thayer (1969), p. 687.

singing or for the pianoforte or any other instrument – By using it they will learn to judge and to apply in the easiest possibly way the value of a note, and in the shortest time they will be enabled to perform without difficulty to any accompaniment and without becoming confused. For since the pupil observing the suitable method and directions provided by the teacher, must not in the latter's absence arbitrarily sing or play out of time, by means of the metronome his feeling for time and rhythm will quickly be so guided and corrected that he will soon have no further difficulties to encounter in this respect – we think that we should acclaim this invention of Maelzel's, which indeed is so useful from this point of view also, for it seems that for this particular advantage it has not yet been sufficiently appreciated.³⁰

Schindler tried to play down the advantages of the metronome. He claims that Beethoven had assigned two different sets of metronome markings (on separate occasions) for the Ninth Symphony. When asked about the discrepancy, Beethoven was supposed to have replied “No more metronome! Anyone who can feel the music right does not need it; and for anyone who can't, nothing is of any use; he runs away with the whole orchestra anyway”.³¹ This remark is now generally assumed to be another of Schindler's inventions. It is also possible that Beethoven did utter those words, but Schindler quoted them out of context. Beethoven may have been busy and perhaps lost his temper when asked this question, because he did not want to be disturbed. Whatever the interpretation of Schindler's remark, Beethoven certainly continued to advocate the use of the metronome up to the time of his death.

From February 1825 to February 1827, Beethoven repeatedly promised to send metronome markings of the Ninth Symphony, the Mass in D major, Op. 123 and the string quartets Opp. 127 and 131 to his publisher Schott. Unfortunately, he managed to fulfil his promise only in respect of the Ninth Symphony. His deteriorating health, his problematic relationship with his nephew, and the frequency with which his metronome broke, are possible causes. He also attributed the success of the first performance of the Ninth Symphony in 1826 to metronome markings.³² The markings for this work which he sent to Moscheles in March 1827 further bear witness to his endorsement of the metronome.

³⁰Anderson (1961), iii, pp. 1441-1442.

³¹Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), pp. 425-426.

³²Anderson (1961), iii, p. 1325.

4.4 MAELZEL'S CHART

In September 1821, Maelzel published a chart of metronome marks and Italian terms in the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* (the *Intelligenz-Blatt*, No. 8). Comparisons were made regarding the speeds favoured by some of the leading composers. It is clear from Table No. 3 in Maelzel's chart (shown below) that Beethoven was inclined towards fast tempos (see also section 4.5 below). For example, Beethoven's *presto* ($\downarrow=224$) is twice as fast as Clementi's *presto* ($\downarrow=96$). The chart also shows the large range of speed implied by each Italian term: for example, Cramer's *moderato* 2/4 covers $\downarrow=63-116$, while Beethoven's *presto* C covers a range of $\downarrow=152-224$. It also reveals the relationship between speed, time signature and Italian terms. Although the smallest predominant note value in each composition is not included as a speed factor in the table, its presence is suggested by the large range of speeds associated with each Italian term.

Maelzel's claim that the metronome markings were taken from actual markings by the various composers is rather dubious. For a start, there are no examples of metronome markings left by Beethoven for *presto* movements in common time. However, since the signs for common time and *alla breve* were used interchangeably at the time, it makes sense to consider three metronome markings for *presto* movements in *alla breve* time by Beethoven which were published prior to 1821. Of the three metronome markings, that for the finale of the String Quartet in E minor, Op. 59/2 ($\circ=88$) and the fourth movement of the Fifth Symphony in C minor, Op. 67 ($\circ=112$) are within Maelzel's range of $\downarrow=152-224$, while the finale of the Septet, Op. 20 ($\downarrow=112$) is outside the lower limit. Beethoven's metronome marking for the second movement of the Ninth Symphony, published a few years later, also lies within Maelzel's range.

It is peculiar that Maelzel gives several figures which lie outside the upper limit of the metronome (that is, 160), and even more so that he attributes the metronome indications in Table No. 3 to those respective composers. Even more curious is the inclusion of this chart by Hummel in his treatise, accompanied by a brief explanation of the three tables, but without any correction, or acknowledgment to Maelzel. In spite of these eccentricities, the chart is useful in the sense that it provides information on the varying speeds which were employed and the factors which influence tempo.

4.5 BEETHOVEN'S SPEED

In the early nineteenth century, fast tempos were more moderate in Vienna than they were in Germany. Joseph Fischhof, a Viennese pianist and music historian, wrote that from the 1820s, German orchestras played Beethoven's compositions more quickly than they were performed in Vienna.³³ However, Beethoven's own playing was considered fast by his contemporaries. A concert of Beethoven's Fourth Piano Concerto which Reichardt attended on 22 December 1808 left a favourable impression. He also considers the then new piano concerto "of immense difficulty, which Beethoven, with astounding command, executed in the fastest possible tempi".³⁴ This is in spite the fact that neither the first nor the third movement of the concerto is marked *prestissimo*: they carry the indications *allegro moderato* and *vivace* respectively. The large difference between Beethoven's fast tempo and that of some of his contemporaries is also confirmed by Maelzel's chart. The fast tempo, however, should never be extreme, as Moscheles makes clear. He was saddened by the extremities of tempo set by Wagner in the early 1840s:

I know many think me old-fashioned, but the more I consider the tendency of modern taste, ... the more strenuously will I uphold that which I know to be sound art, and side with those who can appreciate a Haydn's playfulness, a Mozart's Cantilena, and a Beethoven's surpassing grandeur. What antidotes have we here for all these morbid moanings and overwrought effects! ... Here as elsewhere I miss the right "Tempi," and look in vain for the traditions of my youth. That tearing speed which sweeps away many a little note; that spinning out of an Andante until it becomes an Adagio, an "Andante con moto," in which there is no "moto" at all, and "Allegro comodo" which is anything but comfortable. ...³⁵

4.6 THE APPLICATION OF METRONOME MARKINGS BY BEETHOVEN, CZERNY AND THEIR CONTEMPORARIES

In an article in the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* (1821), Maelzel explains that the metronome could be used to communicate a correct tempo at the beginning of a piece. He also stresses that

³³Rosenblum (1988), p. 334.

³⁴Sachs (1953), p. 325.

³⁵Moscheles (1873), ii, p. 286. Capitalization original.

mechanical rigidity could not be imposed on tempo.³⁶ Beethoven also uses the metronome for this purpose. He indicates at the head of the autograph to the song “Nord oder Süd”, WoO 148 (1817): “100 according to Mälzel; yet this can only apply to the first measures, since feeling also has its beat, which cannot be conveyed wholly by a number (that is, 100)”.³⁷

Moscheles is also of the opinion that metronome markings must not be applied strictly throughout a piece. He reveals how metronome marks were viewed by nineteenth-century performers and conductors:

Its object is to show the general time of a movement, particularly at its commencement; but it is not to be followed strictly throughout; for no piece, except a march or a dance, would have any real life and expression, or light and shade, if the Solo performer, or the orchestra under its conductor, were strictly to adhere to one and the same *tempo*, without regard to the many marks which command its variations ... The player or conductor, who enters into the time and spirit of the piece must feel *when* and *where* he has to introduce the necessary changes; and these are often of so delicate a nature, that the marks of the metronome would become superabundant, not to say impossible.³⁸

Czerny's metronome markings are also intended to convey the speed of a piece only in the first few bars. Therefore, they should serve only as a guide. For example, the *prestissimo* section in the third movement of Op. 53 is marked $\circ=88$. Czerny then comments that this finale “must be played with the greatest possible rapidity”.³⁹ The same advice is given regarding the last movement of the Piano Trio Op. 1 No. 3, also marked *prestissimo*. Here, the metronome marking is $\text{♩}=152$.⁴⁰ Both metronome markings probably reveal the speed at which Czerny could play those movements. It is unlikely that he meant them to be dogmatic indications which must be followed slavishly.

³⁶Allgemeine (1821), pp. 53-56.

³⁷Newman (1988), p. 113.

³⁸Schindler (1841) (ed. Moscheles), p. 111. Italicization and capitalization original.

³⁹Czerny (1846), p. 57.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 94.

4.7 THE METRONOME MARKINGS OF CZERNY AND MOSCHELES

As listed in the Appendix at the end of this chapter, Czerny's metronome markings for the fast movements are fairly consistent over the five sets, with the exception of Op. 27/1/ii, Op. 27/2/iii and Op. 78/i. His markings for these movements are significantly slower in *Proper Performance*⁴¹ (a difference of three notches or more is considered significant). Moscheles had faith in Czerny's authority and approved of his metronome markings in the Haslinger I edition.⁴² The majority of the markings by Moscheles are similar to those of Czerny. About 25 % of the metronome markings in Haslinger I are very fast, while less than 10% of Moscheles' markings are quicker than Czerny's. Today, most of their markings in the fast movements appear to be too fast. The lighter key-dip of the piano has often been cited as a possible factor. Moscheles states that he tries to avoid the extremely fast speeds favoured by some,⁴³ and yet his metronome markings are not significantly different from Czerny's. This implies that the speeds suggested by Czerny's metronome markings would have been conceivable.

Czerny's suggested speeds for the slow movements are rather brisk. This, of course, was the norm in the early nineteenth century. The two sets of metronome markings by Moscheles, which are generally either the same or slightly quicker than Czerny's, also lend credibility to the latter's markings.

On the whole, Czerny's slowest metronome markings are found mainly in *Proper Performance*. Many of the markings in Simrock confirm those in Haslinger I, but the former occasionally has slightly quicker indications. All the metronome markings in Czerny's Cocks edition are derived from Haslinger I, except Op. 26, Op. 31/3, Op. 101, the *prestissimo* section of Op. 109, and the *maestoso* section of Op. 111. Out of these, all the metronome markings, with the exception of Op. 26, are exactly the same as Haslinger II. Apart from the third movement of Op. 26, the metronome markings of the other three movements are the same as Simrock's. In most cases,

⁴¹*Proper Performance*, which is made up of chapters two and three of *The Art*, is the more commonly used title in reference books. Therefore, I shall use the former in subsequent discussions in this chapter for the sake of uniformity.

⁴²Schindler (1841) (ed. Moscheles), p. 107.

⁴³*Ibid.*

the inconsistencies are rarely significant. Perhaps the most striking difference is the metronome markings of Op. 49/1 between Haslinger I and Simrock. Czerny had completely changed his concept of this sonata.

In the majority of cases, the metronome markings of Czerny and Moscheles are internally consistent. Discrepancies over the seven sets are usually negligible. It is therefore safe to accept that Czerny's markings of the slow movements and many of the fast movements are based on the speed at which Beethoven would have played them.

4.8 CZERNY'S METRONOME MARKINGS COMPARED WITH THE DEDUCTIONS MADE BY KOLISCH AND GELFAND

Rudolf Kolisch (1896-1978) was a pioneer in the deductions of the tempo for all Beethoven's compositions, based on the few metronome markings left by the composer. Factors such as time-words, the character of a piece, time signature, the prevalent note values and the texture of the music were taken into account. His results were first published in 1943. Each composition was categorized under a particular broad range of speed. This method was refined, and when the revised version was published in 1993, precise metronome markings were assigned to every movement.⁴⁴ In 1985, Yakov Gelfand carried out a similar investigation, but he used a slightly different approach. He chose to calculate metronome markings by using his own elaborate formula which took into account the same factors as Kolisch.⁴⁵ Unity of the whole work, especially in the last three piano sonatas, was also taken into consideration.

Such a study is relevant since Beethoven was certainly aware of the relationship between the time signature, tempo indication and the prevalent note values. On a draft for the *minore* of his song "Klage", WoO 113, which dates from about 1790, he contemplates:

That which now follows will be sung still more slowly, *adagio* or, at the most *andante quasi adagio*. *Andante* in 2/4 time must be taken much faster than the tempo of the song here. As it appears, the latter

⁴⁴See Kolisch (1943) and Kolisch (1993).

⁴⁵Gelfand (1985), pp. 92-129.

cannot remain in 2/4 time, for the music is too slow for it. It appears best to set them both in ♩ time.

The first [part], in E major, must remain in 2/4 time, otherwise it would be sung too slowly.

In the past, longer note values were always taken more slowly than shorter ones; for example, quarters slower than eights.

The smaller note values determine the tempo; for example, sixteenths and thirty-seconds in 2/4 time make the tempo very slow.

Perhaps the contrary is also true.⁴⁶

The existence of this relationship is also implied in Maelzel's chart.

A comparison between Czerny's metronome markings with those deduced by Kolisch and Gelfand reveal many similarities. Many of them complement those of Czerny. It is interesting to note that Kolisch and Gelfand sometimes arrive at the same figure as Czerny's marking in the Haslinger I edition. The first movement of Op. 10/3 is an example (see the Appendix). In twenty-one instances, Czerny's metronome markings are significantly quicker than those by Kolisch and Gelfand. In nineteen cases, the significant differences are in Haslinger I, with the majority in fast movements. On the other hand, fourteen of Kolisch's markings of fast movements are significantly quicker than even Haslinger I. Gelfand's markings are more moderate than Kolisch's: only three fast movements have a quicker marking than Czerny's. Gelfand's interpretation of *allegretto* movements is different from Czerny's and Kolisch's. His markings are frequently on the slow side (Op. 10/2/ii, Op. 14/1/ii and Op. 27/2/iii). In the scherzo of Op. 31/3, his markings are significantly quicker. It is only in Op. 22/iv that he agrees with Czerny's Haslinger I and Simrock markings. Many of Gelfand's slow movement markings are also not within the range of Czerny and Kolisch.

The investigations of Gelfand and Kolisch are by no means infallible. Some of the contrasting results of Kolisch and Gelfand can be explained by their different personal opinions when grouping compositions with the same musical ideas. However, the fact that they reinforce some of the quick markings in the fast movements prove that Czerny's tempo choices were influenced by Beethoven. Gelfand's markings in the slow movements are less helpful, for they display a strong bias towards the trend in the twentieth century for slower speeds in *allegretto* and slow

⁴⁶Kramer (1975), p. 75.

movements. Similarly, some of Kolisch's slow movement markings are also slower than Czerny's.

4.9 THE VALIDITY OF CZERNY'S METRONOME MARKINGS

Nottebohm described Czerny as an honest and knowledgeable musician, gifted with an excellent memory. He considered Czerny's teaching reliable, but had doubts on the authenticity of the latter's metronome markings in *Proper Performance*:

Although not of authentic validity, still these indications can lay claim to a certain confidence, especially for those works of which we know that Czerny either heard them played by Beethoven or studied [them] under his instruction. ... Anyone who knew Czerny personally, who had the opportunity to observe his nature, which was above all directed toward the practical, will believe him capable of impressing firmly on his memory a tempo that he had heard, and will have noticed the certainty that he had in such outwardly tangible musical matters.⁴⁷

This is a curious criticism considering that Nottebohm did not hear Beethoven play. He also did not explain why he considered those metronome markings "not of authentic validity". Had he based this conclusion on performance traditions in the mid and late nineteenth century? Or perhaps, he chose this term because the markings were not notated by Beethoven himself. Schindler was also dissatisfied with Czerny's metronome markings. His argument, however, is very weak. He admits that the new London edition by Moscheles approximates to the composer's original intentions. He then compares the two sets of metronome markings of Czerny's Haslinger I edition with the new London edition:⁴⁸

		<u>Op. 27 No. 2</u>	
<u>Haslinger, Vienna</u>			<u>New London Edition</u>
1) Adagio	♩ =60		♩ =60
2) Allegretto	♩ =84		♩ =76
3) Presto agitato	♩ =92		♩ =92

⁴⁷Rosenblum (1988), p. 329. Translation and bracket insert by Rosenblum.

⁴⁸Schindler (1841) (ed. Moscheles), pp. 109-112.

Op. 27 No. 1

Haslinger, Vienna

New London Edition

1) Andante	♩ =72	♩ =69
2) Allegro 6/8	♩ =116	♩ =104
3) Allegro molto vivace 3/4	♩ =138	♩ =126
4) Adagio	♩ =69	♩ =76
5) Finale, allegro vivace	♩ =160	♩ =132

With the exception of the finale of Op. 27 No. 1, all the metronome markings are within three notches. Since the differences are largely insignificant, according to Schindler's opinion of the markings in the New London Edition, Czerny's metronome markings should also resemble Beethoven's intentions. After all, Moscheles himself had complete confidence in Czerny's metronome markings, in the Haslinger I edition at least (see p. 117). On the whole, there is only a small difference between the metronome markings of the two men.

The metronome markings deduced by Kolisch and Gelfand also complement many of those by Czerny. The main difference lies in Gelfand's deductions of the speeds in the slow movements. His thinking was influenced by the twentieth century's practice of playing slow movements at a slower speed than they would normally have been played in the early nineteenth century. Although these comparisons are not fool-proof, they show that Czerny's metronome markings had been carefully considered and they were based on the knowledge he received from Beethoven.

Czerny had great respect for Beethoven. He was reluctant to alter Beethoven's metronome marking for the first movement of Op. 106 even though he found it "unusually quick and impetuous".⁴⁹ Rather, he defended Beethoven's markings by declaring that the suggested speed was not impossible in performance. He insisted that the speed indicated could be achieved through practice.

⁴⁹Czerny (1846), p. 64.

In spite of Czerny's best intentions to indicate the "correct" speeds of Beethoven's piano sonatas by using the metronome, he may have experienced difficulties one way or the other. After the Haslinger I edition, he published at least another four sets of metronome markings. He may have slowed down the speeds of the fast movements in Haslinger II and *Proper Performance*, because he considered those markings too fast in Haslinger I. The Cocks edition uses existing metronome markings from both Haslinger editions, except for Op. 26. The suggested speed of the "Marcia funebre" in the Cocks edition is strikingly slower than the two Haslinger editions and *Proper Performance*. Did Czerny then decide in the 1850s that his previous attempts failed to convey Beethoven's intentions satisfactorily? Is that the reason for the more moderate metronome markings in the fast movements of the Simrock edition, which are generally quicker than in Haslinger II and in *Proper Performance*, but are slower than in Haslinger I?

The difficulty in searching for a "correct" tempo does not necessarily imply that Czerny had trouble recalling his lessons with Beethoven. Nottebohm and modern-day scholars all agree on Czerny's good memory. A more likely explanation, therefore, is Czerny's changing perceptions of the sonatas at different stages of his life. As his view changes, the "correct" speed alters accordingly. This is why there is a significant drop in the speed of Op. 49 and Op. 14/2/ii between the Haslinger and the Simrock editions, even though Czerny had studied the latter with Beethoven. It is also possible that with maturity, Czerny became increasingly concerned with the beauty of tone (rather than speed), even in the fast movements of the sonatas. As adjustments were made to project the tones of the piano and to strengthen the frame of the instrument, the key-dips gradually became heavier. This development would have made very fast playing slightly more difficult in the 1830s than in the early nineteenth century. These will explain why Czerny's metronome markings in the fast movements of Haslinger II, in *Proper Performance* and in the Simrock edition are less extreme than in the Haslinger I edition. However, Czerny's markings for the slow movements are largely consistent over the five sets. The lack of major discrepancies in the majority of cases commands sufficient confidence for one to conclude that these markings resemble the speeds Beethoven intended in the slow movements.

TEMPO FLEXIBILITY

Given the vague and varying meanings linked with *tempo rubato* in the first half of the nineteenth century,⁵⁰ the term “tempo flexibility” will be used in the following discussion.

Czerny states clearly that

[m]any passages will not produce their intended effect, unless they are played with a certain gradual slackening; holding back, or retarding of the Time: just as others require that the degree of movement shall be gradually accelerated, quickened, or hurried onwards.⁵¹

Contemporaries' description of Beethoven's playing, and that of the performers he approved, corroborate Czerny's teachings on the type of tempo flexibility to be used in the performances of Beethoven's piano sonatas. According to Ries, Beethoven generally

played his own compositions most capriciously, though he usually kept a very steady rhythm and only occasionally, indeed, very rarely, speeded up the tempo somewhat. At times, he restrained the tempo in his *crescendo* with a *ritardando*, which had a beautiful and most striking effect.⁵²

Dorothea von Ertmann (one of Beethoven's favourite pianists)⁵³ and the Schuppanzigh Quartet also employed tempo flexibility to highlight particular features or the climaxes in a piece. Sometime between 1815 and 1816, the violinist Michael Frey witnessed a performance by the Schuppanzigh Quartet:

They played it [Op. 59/2] with great precision and skill, so that one need wish for nothing more. In menuetts in general, in the playful places they sometimes exaggerate the playful and casual [elements] in the performance. They usually do it twice in a row, which does not make a good effect since something like that can only be pleasing once in quick passing.⁵⁴

⁵⁰For a history of *tempo rubato* and its meanings in the early nineteenth century, see Hudson (1994) and Rosenblum (1988), chapter 10.

⁵¹Czerny (1839E), i, p. 189. Capitalization original.

⁵²Wegeler and Ries (1988), p. 94.

⁵³Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), pp. 209-211.

⁵⁴Rosenblum (1988), p. 386. Translation and square bracket inserts by Rosenblum.

In addition, Frey's comments reveal that tempo flexibility was not introduced haphazardly.

Czerny also differentiates between performances with and without an audience. If a performer is playing to an audience who is unfamiliar with the piece, he must play in strict time. However, if he is playing only for his own amusement, he should play with greater tempo flexibility. He stresses that a difference between the two types can, and must, exist.⁵⁵ If this is the case, perhaps Beethoven did not normally play, as Schindler claimed he did,⁵⁶ with a high degree of freedom with regard to tempo (even to the extent of obscuring the basic pulse). It is true that Beethoven's compositional style had developed to include greater fluidity in his late works. Terms such as *accelerando*, *ritardando* and *rallentando* are also more numerous. However, when Beethoven was playing in the presence of Schindler, he allowed himself greater freedom since he was playing only to himself and a friend. Even then, it is still highly unlikely that Beethoven could have allowed himself so much freedom as to make the music incomprehensible. This would also contradict the account of Beethoven's playing as given by Ries.

4.10 ACCELERANDO

Beethoven's written indications of *accelerando* in his music are as sparing as his use of this effect in his playing. Czerny's cautious use of *accelerando*, as mentioned in section 2.2.2, is therefore in line with Beethoven's. This term is notated when tempo change is not apparent, such as the unusual ending of Op. 90/ii (ex. 4.3), whereby Beethoven indicates *ritardando*, *accelerando* and *a tempo*. In his comments, Czerny asks the player to observe Beethoven's markings. He writes: "The conclusion is remarkable, as the last eight notes almost disappear, strictly in time, but *pianissimo* and unexpectedly, and thus the piece must close".⁵⁷ The difficulty lies in determining where *accelerando*, when it is not indicated, can be introduced. Sometimes, Czerny requests that

⁵⁵Czerny (1846), p. 38.

⁵⁶Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), p. 412.

⁵⁷Czerny (1846), p. 62.

Ex. 4.3

an ending be played quicker in order to obtain the maximum excitement and intensity in a finale, for example, the conclusions of the first and third movements of the “Waldstein” Sonata Op. 53, the third movement of Op. 57, and the fourth movement of Op. 110.⁵⁸ He elaborates on how this can be achieved:

The present Finale [Op. 57/iii] must not be played too fast. The passages are to be performed with distinct equality and lightness, only slightly *legato*, and but [*sic*] seldom impetuously. The movement and power first continually increase on the repetition of the second part and towards the conclusion, and the *Presto* winds up the Sonata with all the power which can be elicited from the Pianoforte, by employing all its means.⁵⁹

In addition, Czerny uses *accelerando* to create tension, such as in the *crescendo* passage of Op. 31/2/ii/55-58 (ex. 4.4). Here, it is paired with *ritardando*. Czerny suggests that the *crescendo* in bars 55-57 should be played with increasing rapidity, while bar 58 (marked *p*) should be slowed down gradually.⁶⁰ Sometimes, *accelerando* is used on its own, for example Op. 27/2/i/32-35 (ex. 4.5),⁶¹ in which the ascending figuration and dissonances demand a quicker pace. Beethoven also uses *accelerando* in certain passages to increase the sense of excitement, such as Op. 101/iii/26-28, Op. 106/iv/10 and Op. 111/i/128-131 (ex. 4.6).

⁵⁸Ibid., pp. 56-57, 60 and 67.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 60.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 54.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 49.

Ex 4.4

Musical score for Ex 4.4, measures 66-68. The score is in G major and 3/4 time. Measure 66 starts with a piano dynamic and a *[cresc.]* marking. The right hand features a melodic line with a slur and a fermata over the first two notes. The left hand has a bass line with fingerings 1 3 1, 3 2, and 3. Measure 67 continues the melodic line in the right hand with a *f* dynamic and a slur. The left hand has fingerings 1 3 1, 4, 3, 5, 4, 5, 2, 1. Measure 68 begins with a piano (*p*) dynamic. The right hand has a melodic line with a slur and a fermata. The left hand has fingerings 2 1, 1, 3, 3, 3, 7, 7, 7.

Ex. 4.5

Musical score for Ex 4.5, measures 31-35. The score is in D major and 3/4 time. Measure 31 shows a melodic line in the right hand with a slur and a fermata, and a bass line with a slur and a fermata. Measure 33 continues the melodic line in the right hand with a slur and a fermata, and the bass line has a slur and a fermata. Measure 35 shows a melodic line in the right hand with a slur and a fermata, and the bass line has a slur and a fermata.

Ex. 4.6

Although it is difficult to determine conclusively where Beethoven expected unnotated *accelerando* to be introduced, a certain amount of speeding up was probably used to increase the excitement of a passage. *Accelerando* is therefore suitable in certain *crescendo* passages or those with a dissonant, ascending line. Czerny's advice of introducing *accelerando* in the concluding bars of a movement, however, may have been influenced by the popular nineteenth-century *bravura* style of playing.

4.11 INSTANCES WHERE A SLOWING DOWN IS RECOMMENDED

Czerny explains that a slowing down is usually indicated by *ritardando* or other equivalent expressions, such as *rallent*, *ritenuto*, *smorzando*, *calando*, etc. The difference lies in the varying degrees of slowing down implied by each term.⁶² Both Beethoven and Czerny did not make any distinction between *rallentando* and *ritardando*. In Op. 2/2/i, Beethoven notates *rallentando* in the exposition and *ritardando* in the parallel passage in the recapitulation. Czerny also uses both terms interchangeably in *The Art*.

In general, Czerny suggests the use of *rallentando* to mark important structural junctures in a piece, or to increase its atmospheric or poetic effects. Examples of the former can be found in


⁶²Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 34.

the few bars before the quaver section beginning in bar 89 of Op. 13/i, during the small climax of Op. 27/2/iii/55-56, and the three bars before the introduction of the *allegro* section in Op. 81a/i.⁶³ In Op. 31/2/i, Czerny suggests some slowing down in the last ten bars in order to produce an effect reminiscent of thunder dying away in the distance.⁶⁴

Czerny warns that the degree of slowing down should not, in the majority of cases, disturb the basic pulse; it should be achieved through “a very small, gradual, and equally progressive degree ..., so that the prescribed time is scarcely varied by a 1/4 or 1/6 part”.⁶⁵ How do Czerny’s recommendation on the following eleven instances compare with Beethoven’s markings in the piano sonatas?

(a) “In those passages which contain the return to the principal subject”.⁶⁶ In the transition passage of Op. 2/2/i/221-224 (ex. 4.7), Beethoven writes *calando*.

Ex 4.7



(b) “In those passages, which lead to some separate member of a melody”. In Op. 2/2/i/48-53 (ex. 4.8) and Op. 90/i/54 (ex. 4.9), Beethoven requests a slowing down (respectively *rallentando* and *ritardando*) to ensure a smooth connection to the new idea.

⁶³Czerny (1846), pp. 43, 49 and 61.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 53.

⁶⁵Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 33. Incidentally, the same principle applies to the use of *accelerando*.

⁶⁶Ibid.

Ex. 4.8

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 4.8. The top staff is a vocal line with lyrics: "ral - - - len - - - tan - - - do". The bottom two staves are piano accompaniment. A circled measure number "48" is written above the first measure of the piano part. A circled measure number "54" is written above the first measure of the second system of the piano part. The key signature has two sharps (F# and C#), and the time signature is 4/4.

Ex. 4.9

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 4.9. The score consists of two staves for piano accompaniment. A circled measure number "53" is written above the first measure. The first measure has a dynamic marking "ff". The second measure has markings "ritard. dimin.". The third measure has a marking "in tempo". The key signature has two sharps (F# and C#), and the time signature is 4/4.

(c) "In those long and sustained notes which are to be struck with particular emphasis, and after which quicker notes are to follow".⁶⁷ Indeed, passages such as Op. 2/3/i/249-251 (ex. 4.10) and Op. 101/ii/50 (ex. 4.11) would benefit from a slight holding back.

Ex. 4.10

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 4.10. The score consists of two staves for piano accompaniment. A circled measure number "249" is written above the first measure. The first measure has a dynamic marking "ff". The key signature has two sharps (F# and C#), and the time signature is 4/4.

⁶⁷Tbid.

Ex. 4.11

Musical score for Ex. 4.11, showing a piano passage. The score is in G major and 3/4 time. It begins with a circled measure number 49. The first staff (treble clef) contains a melodic line with a crescendo bracket [cres] and dynamic markings *ff*, *sf*, and *p*. The second staff (bass clef) contains a bass line with various rhythmic patterns. The passage ends with a fermata over the final note.

(d) “At the transition into another species of time, or into another movement, different in speed from that which preceded it”.⁶⁸ In Op. 106/ii/164-167 (ex. 4.12), the 3/4 section ends with *un poco ritardando*, and is followed by the *alla breve* section marked *presto*.

Ex. 4.12

Musical score for Ex. 4.12, showing a piano passage. The score is in G major and 3/4 time. It begins with a circled measure number 163. The first staff (treble clef) contains a melodic line with dynamic markings [p] *dim.*, *pp*, and *Cresc.*. The second staff (bass clef) contains a bass line with various rhythmic patterns. The passage ends with a fermata over the final note. Below the first system, a circled measure number 168 is marked with the tempo change *Presto*. The second system (bass clef) shows the beginning of the *presto* section with a simple bass line.

(e) “Immediately after a pause”.⁶⁹ Beethoven is very specific about the speed immediately after a pause which serves to clarify the structure of a movement. In Op. 31/2/i/1-9, the tempo change from *largo* or *adagio* to *allegro*, and vice versa, is carefully indicated. In other compositions, he may require a return to the original speed, as in Op. 53/i/293-295. There are, however, many instances where no indication is given. In Op. 31/3/iv/317-322, the pause in bar 318 is followed by *poco ritardando*, then *a tempo* (the last line of ex. 4.13). The preceding passage (bb. 308-318) does not have any tempo indication even though it follows a pause. Does Beethoven expect the

⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹Ibid.

original speed in that passage, or should we take Czerny's advice, that is, to slow down imperceptibly? If we were to examine Op. 57/i/16 and Op. 78/ii/175-178 (ex. 4.14), two out of the many occurrences in the piano sonatas which do not have a tempo indication immediately after a pause, there is some truth in Czerny's advice. In all three cases, it is plausible to ease the speed a little immediately after a pause, before resuming the original speed soon after that.

Ex. 4.13

Ex. 4.13 consists of three systems of piano music. The first system, starting at measure 307, features a piano introduction with dynamics *ff*, *p*, *p*, and *f*. The second system, starting at measure 313, shows a series of chords with dynamics *sf*, *sf*, *sf*, *sf*, and *ff*. The third system, starting at measure 318, includes the vocal line with lyrics "poco ri - tar - dan - do" and dynamics *p*, *cresc.*, and *a tempo*. The piano accompaniment in this system includes dynamics *p* and *cresc.*.

Ex. 4.14

Ex. 4.14 consists of two systems of piano music. The first system, starting at measure 175, features a piano introduction with dynamics *cresc.* and *f*. The second system, starting at measure 178, shows a series of chords with dynamics *f* and *p*.

(f) “At the Diminuendo of a preceding very lively passage; as also in brilliant passages, when there suddenly occurs a trait of melody to be played piano and with much delicacy”.⁷⁰ The following passage from the first movement of Op. 90 (ex. 4.15) is an instance. Beethoven does not furnish such passages with speed indications, but the use of a small amount of slowing down cannot be ruled out.

Ex. 4.15

(g) “In embellishments, consisting of very many quick notes, which we are unable to force into the degree of movement first chosen”.⁷¹ This is clearly exemplified by the elaborate right-hand ornamentation in Op. 111/i/118 (ex. 4.16) which is indicated *meno allegro* by Beethoven.

Ex. 4.16

⁷⁰Ibid. Capitalization original.

⁷¹Ibid.

(h) “Occasionally also, in the chief *crescendo* of a strongly marked sentence, leading to an important passage or to the close”.⁷² In Op. 101/iii/214-223 (ex. 4.17), the numerous *sf* markings act as a “braking device” to emphasize the build-up towards bar 232. As quoted on p. 123, Ries recalled witnessing Beethoven using this effect.

Ex. 4.17

The image shows a musical score for piano, consisting of two systems of staves. The first system covers measures 213 to 220. The second system covers measures 220 to 223. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and ornaments. Dynamic markings include *sf* (sforzando), *cresc.* (crescendo), and *ff* (fortissimo). Technical annotations include fingerings (e.g., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) and trills (*tr*). A 'Contra E' marking is present at the bottom of the second system. The score is in a key with one sharp (F#) and a 3/4 time signature.

(i) “In very humorous, capricious, and fantastic passages, in order to heighten the character so much more”.⁷³ Humour in the language of the time means “whim” or “fancy”, as seen in Czerny’s description of Op. 10/1/iii:

This Finale is altogether written in that fantastical humour which was so peculiar to Beethoven. This feature may be displayed particularly in the middle subject (from the 17th bar) by a humorous retardation of single notes, though, in the whole, we must there also remain true to the rapid time.⁷⁴

Beethoven himself asks for retardation in a similar context in his late works, such as in Op. 110/ii/33-35 and Op. 111/i/22-23 (see exs. 4.18 and 4.19 respectively). As mentioned on p. 123, this effect was also used by the Schuppanzigh Quartet.

⁷²Ibid.

⁷³Ibid.

⁷⁴Czerny (1846), p. 40. Capitalization original.

Ex. 4.18

Musical score for Ex. 4.18, showing piano accompaniment for two systems. The first system (measures 19-20) features a treble clef with chords and a bass clef with a walking bass line. The second system (measures 21-24) includes vocal lines with lyrics "rilar dan do" and piano markings "a tempo", "ff", and "sf". It also shows first and second endings.

Ex. 4.19

Musical score for Ex. 4.19, showing piano accompaniment for two systems. The first system (measures 17-19) is titled "Allegro con brio ed appassionato" and includes a "cresc." marking. The second system (measures 20-23) includes piano markings "sf", "mezzo p poco ritenente", and "a tempo cresc.". It features complex rhythmic patterns and triplets.

(k) "Lastly, almost always where the Composer has indicated an *espressivo*".⁷⁵ Beethoven appears to use *espressivo* in two ways. It can either be used to refer to a slight slowing down or to tempo flexibility. The context in which the former occurs is easily recognisable since Beethoven often writes *a tempo* to follow *espressivo*, for example Op. 109/ii/120-124 (ex. 4.20). Similarly, *espressivo* and *poco ritenente* in Op. 111/i/34 and 99 are followed by *a tempo* in bars 35 and 100 respectively. In most cases, tempo flexibility is implied. This is often apparent from the music itself, such as the opening bars of Op. 79/ii and Op. 81a/i (ex. 4.21). Where Beethoven uses *espressivo* as a tempo heading, as in Op. 81a/ii and Op. 110/i, it is a directive to the

⁷⁵Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 34. Capitalization original.

performer to include an element of tempo flexibility.

Ex. 4.20

Musical score for Ex. 4.20. The score is in G major (one sharp) and 4/4 time. It consists of two staves. The first staff has a circled measure number '120' above the first measure. The piece is marked 'p' (piano) and 'espressivo' (expressive). The tempo is marked 'a tempo' at the end of the piece. The music features a melodic line in the right hand and a supporting bass line in the left hand, with various articulations and dynamics.

Ex. 4.21

Musical score for Ex. 4.21. The score is in B-flat major (two flats) and 2/4 time. It consists of two staves. The tempo is marked 'Adagio'. The piece is marked 'p' (piano) and 'espressivo' (expressive). The music features a melodic line in the right hand and a supporting bass line in the left hand, with various articulations and dynamics.

(1) "At the end of every long shake which forms a pause or Cadenza, and which is marked *diminuendo*".⁷⁶ In Op. 54/i/132-136 (ex. 4.22), *mezza voce*, rather than *diminuendo*, is used to indicate a sudden decrease in volume and intensity.

Ex. 4.22

Musical score for Ex. 4.22. The score is in B-flat major (two flats) and 4/4 time. It consists of two staves. The first staff has a circled measure number '133' above the first measure. The piece is marked 'f' (forte) and 'cresc.' (crescendo). The tempo is marked 'Adagio'. The second staff has a circled measure number '136' above the first measure. The piece is marked 'mezza voce' (mezzo voce) and 'Tempo I'. The music features a melodic line in the right hand and a supporting bass line in the left hand, with various articulations and dynamics.

⁷⁶Ibid. Capitalization original.

This also applies to the trill in Op. 27/1/iii/26 (ex. 4.23). A perfect cadence is formed when this dominant-seventh chord of E flat major resolves to the tonic at the beginning of the next movement. Beethoven again ends this cadenza-like bar much softer than it began.

Ex. 4.23

The image displays two systems of musical notation. The first system consists of a grand staff with a treble clef on the upper staff and a bass clef on the lower staff. The upper staff begins with a circled number '25' and contains a trill. The lower staff has a few notes. Handwritten annotations include 'cresc.' under the first measure, 'sf' above the second measure, and 'pp' above the final measure. A bracket spans the entire first system. Below the first system, the tempo 'Allegro vivace' is written with a circled '1'. The second system also has a grand staff. The upper staff has a 2/4 time signature and contains a few notes. The lower staff has a 2/4 time signature and contains a sequence of chords. Handwritten annotations include 'p' above the first measure, 'tr' above the second measure, and 'Attacca subito l'Allegro vivace' written across the bottom of the system.

Through their analyses, Barker and Drake⁷⁷ each found an instance which they do not consider corresponds with Beethoven's musical language. Barker believes that Czerny's statement given under (f) above reflects piano playing after Beethoven's death, while Drake has doubts about example (l). Their assertions cannot be accepted, because musical examples from the piano sonatas can be found in every instance listed by Czerny. The various markings inserted by Beethoven to indicate a slowing down serve only to strengthen Czerny's recommendations. In addition, even Schindler, given his tendency to criticize the writings of his contemporaries, approves⁷⁸ of Czerny's discussion on tempo modification in the third part of *Piano Forte School*.

4.12 INSTANCES WHERE TEMPO DEVIATIONS ARE DISCOURAGED

Although tempo flexibility was widely used in performances, Czerny did not encourage its introduction in certain passages:

⁷⁷See Barker (1996), p. 71 and Drake (1972), p. 71.

⁷⁸Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), pp. 411-412.

(a) passages with a marked/march-like character, such as the second subject group of Op. 28/ii.⁷⁹

(b) Passagework, for example Op. 31/3/i/177-182 (ex. 4.24).⁸⁰

Ex. 4.24

The musical score for Ex. 4.24 consists of three systems of piano music. The first system, labeled '176', spans measures 177 to 182. It features a treble clef with a melodic line and a bass clef with a supporting line. Fingerings are indicated with numbers 4, 5, 2, 5, and 12. The second system, labeled '179', continues the melodic line with a trill-like figure in the final measure. The third system, labeled '183', shows a short melodic phrase in the treble clef and a supporting phrase in the bass clef.

(c) recitative-like passages.⁸¹ This is supported by Beethoven's direction in bar 8 of the last movement of the Ninth Symphony: "[i]n the manner of a recitative, but in tempo" (ex. 4.25).

⁷⁹Czerny (1846), p. 51.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 55.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 53.

Ex. 4.25

The musical score for Ex. 4.25 is arranged in three systems. The first system includes Flutes I and II, Oboes I and II, Clarinets I and II (in $S\flat/B$), Bassoons I and II, and Contrabass. The second system includes Cor Anglais (in Re/D), Clarinets III and IV (in $S\flat/B$), and Clarinets I and II (in Re/D). The third system includes Trumpets, Violins I and II, Viola, and Cello/Double Bass. The Cello/Double Bass part begins with a forte (f) dynamic and includes markings for *dimm.* and p . Performance instructions include "Selon le caractère d'un Recitativ mais, in tempo." and a footnote: "*) Autograph: no tie / kein Haltebogen."

(d) The second subject group/expressive themes. Czerny insists that second subject groups which are melodious and have a tranquil character must not be played perceptibly more slowly. The expression is obtained through beauty of tone, rather than an alteration of speed.⁸² In the three-bar linking passage of Op. 106/i/198-200 (ex. 4.26), Beethoven asks for a gradual diminution in volume and speed. This ensures a smooth transition to the second subject group in bar 201. The

⁸²Ibid., p. 93.

a tempo at the beginning of this melody suggests that Beethoven, like Czerny, may have expected melodies to be played in time.

Ex. 4.26

193 8 [ff] Ped. *

197 8 *a tempo* *dimin.* *poco ritardando* *p cantabile* *

203 12 *espressivo*

(e) If the character of a passage is less effectively conveyed when tempo flexibility is used. Czerny asks that *rallentando* be avoided in the conclusion of Op. 31/3/ii (ex. 4.27),⁸³ probably because any slowing down would destroy the mischievous humour.

Ex. 4.27

162 3 *cresc.*

166 1 *decresc.* *p* *pp*

⁸³Ibid., p. 55.

4.13 SUMMARY

On the whole, Beethoven and Czerny use *alla breve* to imply a quicker speed. Where *alla breve* is introduced during the course of a piece, Beethoven appears to have adopted the new meaning associated in his day with that time signature. On the other hand, Czerny may have employed both the old and new meanings of *alla breve*, depending on the context in which it occurs. However, there is a strong possibility that Czerny preferred the old meaning or employed it more frequently.

Czerny's definitions of the main tempo headings correspond closely to Beethoven's. Both of them reacted against playing *adagio* movements too slowly. Czerny also succeeds in capturing the spirit implied by each term, for example, the vast emotional range encompassed by *allegro*. In spite of his definition of *andante*, he probably had a similar understanding of the term to Beethoven's. However, his definition of *assai* as "very" instead of "rather" or "enough" betrays his allegiance to the tradition of Mozart and Hummel.

Nottebohm praised the honesty and good memory of Czerny, but had less confidence in the latter's metronome markings. Unfortunately, he did not explain why he considered Czerny's markings in *Proper Performance* to be unauthentic. Although discrepancies exist among the five sets of metronome markings by Czerny, his markings for the slow movements are trustworthy. They show no sign of being influenced by the Wagnerian trend in the 1840s, where the speeds of slow movements were exaggerated.

Many of Czerny's metronome markings of the fast movements are also relatively consistent over the five sets. Allowing for Czerny's varying moods on the different occasions the markings were prepared, the discrepancies are usually insignificant. Although some markings appear to be too fast, this is not the case when compared with the two sets by Moscheles. Only a few in Haslinger I are significantly quicker than those by Moscheles. One must bear in mind that a quick tempo was by no means a foreign concept to Beethoven. Reichardt was astounded by the very fast tempi in which Beethoven played his Fourth Piano Concerto. These, together with Moscheles' approval of Czerny's Haslinger I metronome markings, confirm that most of the latter's markings are a true

reflection of Beethoven's style.

Occasionally, the discrepancy between two of Czerny's metronome markings is so large, such as Op. 49/1, that he must have changed his concept of this composition completely. This was inevitable as Czerny's experiences increased and the styles of performance changed. The slightly heavier key-dip of the piano from the 1830s, as compared with the earlier instrument, is also a contributory factor. Unfortunately, the deductions of modern scholars, such as Kolisch and Gelfand, fail to provide satisfactory answers. Although some of their results confirm Czerny's markings, they are, on the whole, too subjective to be helpful. In some instances, Kolisch's markings are so fast that they become impractical. Gelfand, who tried to avoid this problem in his calculation, produced markings for the slow movements which are more in the style of modern-day performance than that of Beethoven.

If a literal adherence to Czerny's metronome markings of the fast movements results in manic performances, that is unlikely to be the intention of Beethoven or Czerny. Czerny's metronome markings could serve only as a guide to performers. It is the performer's decision to choose a "correct" tempo that would enable the character of a piece to be conveyed successfully.

Although George Barth accused Czerny of creating a tradition of performers who play with mechanical rigidity throughout a piece, the numerous examples of tempo flexibility recorded in *Piano Forte School* and its supplement prove Barth wrong. Czerny, who is usually thorough in his explanations, fails to make clear the meanings of the metronome indications and the term "strict time" in his writings. Their meanings may have been obvious to nineteenth-century readers. Unfortunately, there is a tendency to take everything literally nowadays. As Moscheles, Maelzel and Beethoven explained, the metronome markings were understood to refer only to the first few bars of a piece. Playing in strict time is an aspect which Czerny constantly emphasizes in *The Art*. However, "strict time", when used to refer to an entire movement, was not meant to be taken literally. For example, Czerny advises Op. 31/2/ii to be played in "strict time", but asks for tempo flexibility later in the movement. This means that when "strict time" is applied to a whole movement, it is used to refer to the ability to maintain a steady rhythmic flow throughout the movement. Where appropriate, a slight accelerating or slowing down should be introduced.

These are also characteristic of Beethoven's piano playing, as described by Ries. The literal meaning of "strict time" is only intended when this term is used in relation to short passages.

According to Michael Frey's description of a performance by the Schuppanzigh Quartet, unnotated tempo flexibility was introduced at certain instances, but these had been planned beforehand. Czerny manages to list numerous instances where *accelerando* and *rallentando* would be effective. This imperceptible change of speed is necessary to highlight important structural features or to emphasize a particular character, such as the evocation he mentions of thunder dying away in the distance. All his guidelines capture Beethoven's style, with the possible exception of the use of *accelerando* to produce a very high level of excitement and intensity.

Although Czerny's list of unnotated *rallentando* is supported by musical examples in Beethoven's music, it is difficult to determine whether the type and degree of tempo flexibility taught by Czerny correspond with those of Beethoven. In this matter, Czerny receives endorsement from an unexpected quarter – Schindler.

With regard to those passages in which strict time (in its literal sense) is preferable, the only confirmations we have from Beethoven is on the treatment of recitative-like passages and expressive melodies. On the whole, Czerny's advice on this matter is convincing.

In short, most of Czerny's advice on tempo and tempo flexibility (or the lack of it) is modelled on Beethoven's playing and teaching. Czerny may have made certain changes based on the *bravura* style and perhaps the frequency in which tempo flexibility occurs, but the essence of his understanding was shaped by Beethoven.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER 4

CZERNY'S METRONOME MARKINGS COMPARED TO THOSE BY MOSCHELES AND THE DEDUCTIONS OF GELFAND AND KOLISCH

KEY

HasI	= Haslinger I	C	= Cramer
HasII	= Haslinger II	Hall	= Hallberger
Cocks	= Cocks edition	Gel	= Gelfand
P.P	= Proper Performance	Kol	= Kolisch (1993 version)
Sim	= Simrock		

Works

	Metronome Markings								
	Czerny			Moscheles					
Op. 2 No. 1	<u>HasI</u>	<u>HasII</u>	<u>Cocks</u>	<u>P.P.</u>	<u>Sim</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Hall</u>	<u>Gel</u>	<u>Kol</u>
Allegro	♩ J = -	-	112	104	108	108	108	108	120
Adagio	♩ J = -	-	88	80	84	100 ¹	100 ²	72	80 ³
Menuetto, Allegretto	♩ J = -	-	58	69	72	72	72	69	63
Prestissimo	♩ J = -	-	112	104	108	112	112	116	144

¹Given as J = 50.

²Given as J = 50.

³Given as J = 40.

	Czerny				Moscheles				
	Hasl	HasII	Cocks	P.P.	Sim	C	Hall	Gcl	Kol
Op. 2 No. 2									
Allegro vivace	$\frac{2}{4}$ J=	-	126	132	138	144	144	126	132
Largo appassionato	$\frac{3}{4}$ J=	-	88	80	88	88	88	69	80 ⁴
Scherzo, Allegretto	$\frac{3}{4}$ J.=	-	69	63	66	60	60	58	69
Grazioso	c J=	-	144	132	144	144	144	120	120
Op. 2 No. 3									
Allegro con brio	c J=	-	84	80	80	76	76	72	84 ⁵
Adagio	$\frac{2}{4}$ J=	-	60	50	56	56	56	48	50
Scherzo, Allegro	$\frac{3}{4}$ J.=	-	84	80	76	88	88	80	88
Allegro assai	$\frac{6}{8}$ J.=	-	120	116	116	116	116	112	116
Op. 7									
Allegretto molto e con brio	$\frac{6}{8}$ J.=	-	126	116	126	116	126	116	132
Largo, con gran espressione	$\frac{3}{4}$ J=	-	84	80	84	100 ⁶	100 ⁷	76	80 ⁸
Allegro	$\frac{3}{4}$ J.=	-	80	72	80	80	80	80	76
Poco Allegretto e grazioso	$\frac{2}{4}$ J=	-	66 ⁹	60	66 ¹⁰	138	138	63	69

⁴Given as J = 40.

⁵Given as J = 168.

⁶Given as J = 50.

⁷Given as J = 50.

⁸Given as J = 40.

⁹Given as J = 132.

¹⁰Given as J = 132.

	Czerny				Moscheles				
	<u>Hasl</u>	<u>HasII</u>	<u>Cocks</u>	<u>P.P.</u>	<u>Sim</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Hall</u>	<u>Gcl</u>	<u>Kol</u>
Op. 10 No. 1									
Allegro molto e con brio	$\frac{3}{4}$ J. = 80	69	80	72	76	76	76	69	69 ¹¹
Adagio molto	$\frac{3}{4}$ J. = 63	72	63	69	72	72	72	69	64 ¹²
Prestissimo	ϕ J. = 112	96	112	96	100	108	108	92	100
Op. 10 No. 2									
Allegro	$\frac{2}{4}$ J. = 108	100	108	104	108	96	112	96	112
Allegretto	$\frac{3}{4}$ J. = 76	72	76	72	76	72	72	56	76
Presto	$\frac{2}{4}$ J. = 96	88	96	80	80 ¹³	80 ¹⁴	80 ¹⁵	80	84 ¹⁶
Op. 10 No. 3									
Presto	ϕ J. = 152	132	152	126	132	132	132	152	152
Largo e mesto	$\frac{6}{8}$ J. = 66	76	66	72	76	72	72	76	72 ¹⁷
Menuetto, Allegro	$\frac{3}{4}$ J. = 84	80	84	76	84	84	84	80	76
Allegro	ϕ J. = 160	152	160	152	152	152	152	138	132

¹¹ Given as J = 207.

¹² Given as J = 32.

¹³ Given as J = 160.

¹⁴ Given as J = 160.

¹⁵ Given as J = 160.

¹⁶ Given as J = 168.

¹⁷ Given as J. = 24.

	Czerny				Moscheles				
	<u>Hasl</u>	<u>HasII</u>	<u>Cocks</u>	<u>P.P.</u>	<u>Sim</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Hall</u>	<u>Gel</u>	<u>Kol</u>
Op. 13									
Grave	c ♩ = 58	58	-	46 ¹⁸	63	60	60	54	-
Allegro di molto e con brio	♩ = 152	152	-	144	144	144	144	160 ¹⁹	152
Adagio cantabile	$\frac{2}{4}$ ♩ = 54	60	-	54	60	60	60	76	72 ²⁰
Allegro	♩ = 112	100	-	96	104	104	104	92	132
Op. 14 No. 1									
Allegro	c ♩ = 144	132	144	132	144	152	152	144 ²¹	152
Allegretto	$\frac{3}{4}$ ♩ = 72	72	72	69	72	72	72	56	69
Allegro comodo	♩ = 100	100	100	-	96	80 ²²	80 ²³	88	84

¹⁸Given as ♩ = 92 because the lower limit of Czerny's metronome is 50.

¹⁹Given as ♩ = 80.

²⁰Given as ♩ = 36.

²¹Given as ♩ = 72.

²²Given as ♩ = 160.

²³Given as ♩ = 160.

	Czerny				Moscheles				
	<u>HasI</u>	<u>HasII</u>	<u>Cocks</u>	<u>P.P.</u>	<u>Sim</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Hall</u>	<u>Gel</u>	<u>Kol</u>
Op. 14 No. 2									
Allegro	88	80	88	80	80 ²⁴	80 ²⁵	80 ²⁶	80	92
Andante	132 ²⁷	132 ²⁸	132 ²⁹	116	112	84	96	72	100 ³⁰
Scherzo, Allegro assai	88	88	88	80	88	88	88	80	84
Op. 22									
Allegro con brio	84	80	84	76	84	92	84	76	80 ³¹
Adagio con molta espressione	112	104	112	100	116	132	116	132	120 ³²
Minuetto	126	120	126	120	126	132	126	120	116
Allegretto	76	69	76	69	76	76	76	76	69

²⁴ Given as ♩ = 160.

²⁵ Given as ♩ = 160.

²⁶ Given as ♩ = 160.

²⁷ Given as ♩ = 66.

²⁸ Given as ♩ = 66.

²⁹ Given as ♩ = 66.

³⁰ Given as ♩ = 50.

³¹ Given as ♩ = 160.

³² Given as ♩ = 40.

	Czerny				Moscheles				
	Hasl	Hasll	Cocks	P.P.	Sim	C	Hall	Gel	Kol
Op. 26									
Andante con Variazioni	$\frac{3}{8}$ ♩ = 80	80	80	76	80	80	80	88	92
Scherzo, Allegro molto	$\frac{3}{4}$ ♩ = 104	92	88	92	88	88	88	92	108
Marcia funebre	c ♩ = 72	72	58	72	66	60	60	76	60 ³³
Allegro	$\frac{2}{4}$ ♩ = 152 ³⁴	132	120	132	120	120	108	138 ³⁵	120
Op. 27 No. 1									
Andante	ψ ♩ = 72	72	72	66	69	69	76	72	92 ³⁶
Allegro	$\frac{6}{8}$ ♩ = 116	108	116	104	104	104	104	104	-
Allegro molto e vivace	$\frac{3}{4}$ ♩ = 138	126	138	112	120	126	126	120	116
Adagio con espressione	$\frac{3}{4}$ ♩ = 69	66	69	66	72	76	76	60	72 ³⁷
Allegro vivace	$\frac{2}{4}$ ♩ = 160	138	160	132	132	132	120	120	144
Op. 27 No. 2									
Adagio sostenuto	ψ ♩ = 60	63	60	54	60	60	60	72	60 ³⁸
Allegretto	$\frac{3}{4}$ ♩ = 84	80	84	76	80	76	76	69	76
Presto agitato	c ♩ = 92	84	92	80	92	92	92	84	88 ³⁹

³³ Given as ♩ = 30.

³⁴ Given as ♩ = 76.

³⁵ Given as ♩ = 69.

³⁶ Given as ♩ = 46.

³⁷ Given as ♩ = 36.

³⁸ Given as ♩ = 30.

³⁹ Given as ♩ = 176.

	Czerny					Moscheles			
	<u>Hasl</u>	<u>HasII</u>	<u>Cocks</u>	<u>P.P.</u>	<u>Sim</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Hall</u>	<u>GeI</u>	<u>Kol</u>
Op. 28									
Allegro	$\frac{3}{4}$ J. = 76	72	76	72	72	69	69	76	72
Andante	$\frac{2}{4}$ J. = 92	92	92	84	88	104	104	88	92
Scherzo, Allegro vivace	$\frac{3}{4}$ J. = 104	92	104	96	100	100	100	104	108
Allegro ma non troppo	$\frac{6}{8}$ J. = 96	84	96	88	88	92	92	96	88
Op. 31 No. 1									
Allegro vivace	$\frac{2}{4}$ J. = 80	80	80	72	76 ⁴⁰	80 ⁴¹	80 ⁴²	69 ⁴³	72 ⁴⁴
Adagio grazioso	$\frac{9}{8}$ J. = 126	116	126	116	126	132	132	132	120 ⁴⁵
Allegretto	ψ J. = 108	100	108	96	100	76	84	84	88

⁴⁰ Given as J = 152.

⁴¹ Given as J = 160.

⁴² Given as J = 160.

⁴³ Given as J = 138.

⁴⁴ Given as J = 144.

⁴⁵ Given as J. = 40.

	Czerny				Moscheles				
	<u>Hasl</u>	<u>Hasl</u>	<u>Cocks</u>	<u>P.P.</u>	<u>Sim</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Hall</u>	<u>Gel</u>	<u>Kol</u>
Op. 31 No. 2									
Largo	♩ J = 44 ⁴⁶	44 ⁴⁷	44 ⁴⁸	-	50	50	50	60	-
Allegro	♩ J = 112	104	112	104	108	126	126	120	120
Adagio	$\frac{3}{4}$ J = 92	92	92	84	92	92	92	92	88 ⁴⁹
Allegretto	$\frac{3}{8}$ J. = 84	76	84 ⁵⁰	76	88	88	88	72	88
Op. 31 No. 3									
Allegro	$\frac{3}{4}$ J = 180 ⁵¹	152	152	144	152	160	160	144	160
Scherzo, Allegretto vivace	$\frac{2}{4}$ J = 88	80	80	80	88	92	92	104	88 ⁵²
Menuetto	$\frac{3}{4}$ J = 96	96	96	88	96	112	112	80	116
Presto con fuoco	$\frac{6}{8}$ j. = 116	104	104	100	96	96	96	96	88 ⁵³

⁴⁶Given as J = 88, but corrected to a ♩ in the second state.

⁴⁷Given as ♩ = 88.

⁴⁸Given as ♩ = 88.

⁴⁹Given as J = 44.

⁵⁰The dot is missing from the dotted crotchet.

⁵¹Given as j. = 60.

⁵²Given as ♩ = 176.

⁵³Given as J. = 176.

	Czerny				Moscheles				
	<u>Hasl</u>	<u>HasH</u>	<u>Cocks</u>	<u>P.P.</u>	<u>Sim</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Hall</u>	<u>Gel</u>	<u>Kol</u>
Op. 49 No. 1									
Andante	$\frac{2}{4}$ J = 92	88	-	-	60	60 ⁵⁴	69	50 ⁵⁵	72
Allegro	$\frac{6}{8}$ J = 108	100	-	-	60	60	100	104	104
Op. 49 No. 2									
Allegro ma non troppo	$\frac{4}{4}$ J = 104	104	-	-	104	80 ⁵⁶	80 ⁵⁷	88	80
Tempo di Menuetto	$\frac{3}{4}$ J = 112	112	-	-	112	126	126	120	120
Op. 53									
Allegro con brio	$\frac{6}{8}$ J = 88	88	88	88	88	88	88	76	88 ⁵⁸
Adagio molto	$\frac{6}{8}$ J = 54 ⁵⁹	54 ⁶⁰	54 ⁶¹	56	60	60	60	63	62 1/2
Allegretto moderato	$\frac{2}{4}$ J = 100	92	100	88	100	112	112	96	120 ⁶²
Prestissimo	$\frac{4}{4}$ J = 88	80	-	88	84	84	80	84	-

⁵⁴Note value mistakenly given as a ♩.

⁵⁵Given as ♩ = 100.

⁵⁶Given as J = 160.

⁵⁷Given as J = 160.

⁵⁸Given as J = 176.

⁵⁹Given as ♩ = 108.

⁶⁰Given as ♩ = 108.

⁶¹Given as ♩ = 108.

⁶²Given as J = 60.

	Czerny				Moscheles				
	<u>Hasl</u>	<u>HasII</u>	<u>Cocks</u>	<u>P.P.</u>	<u>Sim</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Hall</u>	<u>Gel</u>	<u>Kol</u>
Op. 54									
In Tempo d'un Menuetto	-	120	120	108	108[?] ⁶³	126	120	116	116
Allegretto	152 ⁶⁴	152 ⁶⁵	152 ⁶⁶	144	120[?]	108	108	120 ⁶⁷	120 ⁶⁸
Op. 57									
Allegro assai	120	108	120	108	120	138	126	120 ⁶⁹	132
Andante con moto	120	108	120	108	112	92	92	116	132 ⁷⁰
Allegro ma non troppo	138	138	138	132	144	152	152	132 ⁷¹	132
Presto	-	92	-	-	96	100	100	92	-
Op. 78									
Adagio cantabile	76	76	76	72	76	76	76	63	-
Allegro ma non troppo	132	132	132	116	138	138	138	132	126
Allegro vivace	144	138	144	132	132	132	132	144 ⁷²	144

⁶³Presumably the metronome markings were mistakenly reversed by the engraver.

⁶⁴Given as $\text{♩} = 76$.

⁶⁵Given as $\text{♩} = 76$.

⁶⁶Given as $\text{♩} = 76$.

⁶⁷Given as $\text{♩} = 60$.

⁶⁸Given as $\text{♩} = 60$.

⁶⁹Given as $\text{♩} = 60$.

⁷⁰Given as $\text{♩} = 66$.

⁷¹Given as $\text{♩} = 66$.

⁷²Given as $\text{♩} = 72$.

	Czerny					Moscheles			
	<u>HasI</u>	<u>HasII</u>	<u>Cocks</u>	<u>P.P.</u>	<u>Sim</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Hall</u>	<u>Gel</u>	<u>Kol</u>
Op. 79									
Presto alla tedesca	88	84	88	-	84	84	84	84	84 ⁷³
Andante	56	56	56	-	56	46 ⁷⁴	46 ⁷⁵	48	50
Vivace	152	138	152	-	138	160	138	132	152
Op. 81a									
Adagio	72	66	72	63	72	76	72	58	-
Allegro	126	116	126	112	126	108	108	132	120
Andante espressivo	72	66	72	72	72	76	72	56	72
Vivacissimamente	116	108	116	108	108	108	108	92	120
Op. 90									
Mit Lebhaftigkeit und durchaus mit Empfindung und Ausdruck	160	160	160	160	198 ⁷⁶	180 ⁷⁷	198 ⁷⁸	144	168
Nicht zu geschwind und sehr singbar vorgetragen	92	92	92	88	96	96	96	92	90

⁷³ Given as J = 252.

⁷⁴ Given as J = 138.

⁷⁵ Given as J = 138.

⁷⁶ Given as J = 66.

⁷⁷ Given as J = 60.

⁷⁸ Given as J = 66.

	Czerny					Moscheles			
	<u>HasI</u>	<u>HasII</u>	<u>Cocks</u>	<u>P.P.</u>	<u>Sim</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Hall</u>	<u>Gel</u>	<u>Kol</u>
Op. 101									
Allegretto, ma non troppo	$\frac{6}{8}$ J = 80	80	80	72	72	66	72	69	72
Vivace alla Marcia	$\frac{C}{4}$ J = 168 ⁷⁹	144 ⁸⁰	144 ⁸¹	152 ⁸²	132	132	132	138	152
Adagio, ma non troppo, con affetto	$\frac{2}{4}$ J = 54	58	58 ⁸³	60	60	60	60	50	48
Allegro	$\frac{2}{4}$ J = 132	120	120	132	132	132	132	132	126

Op. 106 (Beethoven's metronome markings are observed, except the first movement in the Hallberger edition)

Allegro	ψ J = -	138	-	138	138	138	69 ⁸⁴	138	138
Scherzo, Assai vivace	$\frac{3}{4}$ J = -	80	-	80	80	80	80	80	80
Adagio sostenuto	$\frac{6}{8}$ J = -	92	-	92	92	92	92	92	92
Largo	$\frac{C}{4}$ J = -	76	-	-	-	76	76	76	76
Allegro risoluto	$\frac{3}{4}$ J = -	144	-	144	144	144	144	144	144

⁷⁹ Given as J = 84.

⁸⁰ Given as J = 72.

⁸¹ Given as J = 72.

⁸² Given as J = 76.

⁸³ Given as J, but this must be a mistake.

⁸⁴ Given as J = 138. However, he confessed that neither Beethoven's metronome marking nor the one he suggested here could successfully convey the character of the first movement. He had retained the number 138 out of respect for Beethoven. In his opinion, J = 116 would be a more suitable marking. See Schindler (1841) (ed. Moscheles), fn. p. 252.

	Czerny					Moscheles		<u>Kol</u>	
	<u>HasI</u>	<u>HasII</u>	<u>Cocks</u>	<u>P.P.</u>	<u>Sim</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Hall</u>		<u>Gel</u>
Op. 109									
Vivace, ma non troppo	$\frac{2}{4}$ J = 100	100	100	100	112	112	112	108	116
Adagio espressivo	$\frac{3}{4}$ J = 66	66	66	66	66	72	72	60	-
Prestissimo	$\frac{6}{8}$ J = 152	138	138	160 ⁸⁵	160	160	160	184 ⁸⁶	176
Andante molto cantabile ed espressivo	$\frac{3}{4}$ J = 72	72	72	63	66	66	66	60	63
Var. 1, Molto espressivo	$\frac{3}{4}$ J = -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Var. 2, Leggiermente	$\frac{3}{4}$ J = -	-	-	-	84	84	84	-	-
Var. 3, Allegro vivace	$\frac{2}{4}$ J = 152	152	152	132	138	120	138	144 ⁸⁷	-
Var. 4, Etwas langsamer als das Thema	$\frac{9}{8}$ J = 66 ⁸⁸	66 ⁸⁹	66	-	56	56	56	48	-
Var. 5, Allegro ma non troppo	ψ J = 69	69	69	-	76	76	76	96	-
Op. 110									
Moderato cantabile molto espressivo	$\frac{3}{4}$ J = 80	80	80	76	63	63	63	72	76
Allegro molto	$\frac{2}{4}$ J = 120	120	120	120	112	108	112	132	126
Adagio ma non troppo	$\frac{6}{8}$ J = 66	66	66	66	69	69	69	72	64 ⁹⁰
Arioso dolente	$\frac{12}{8}$ J = 58	58	-	-	60	60	60	50	50
Allegro ma non troppo	$\frac{6}{8}$ J = 100	100	100	100	92	76	92	100	92

⁸⁵Given as J. = 80.

⁸⁶Given as J. = 92.

⁸⁷Given as J = 72.

⁸⁸The dot for the dotted crotchet is missing.

⁸⁹Ibid.

⁹⁰Given as J = 32.

	Czerny					Moscheles			
	<u>HasI</u>	<u>HasII</u>	<u>Cocks</u>	<u>P.P.</u>	<u>Sim</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Hall</u>	<u>Gel</u>	<u>Kol</u>
Op. 111									
Maestoso	c J = 54 ⁹¹	60 ⁹²	60 ⁹³	54 ⁹⁴	56	52	52	72	-
Allegro con brio ed appassionato	c J = -	132	132	132	126	125	126	144	152
Adagio molto semplice e cantabile	$\frac{9}{16}$ J = 63	63	63	63	60	52	60	48	'50

⁹¹ Given as J = 108.

⁹² Given as J = 120.

⁹³ Given as J = 120.

⁹⁴ Given as J = 108.

CHAPTER 5: STYLE AND EXPRESSION - DYNAMICS AND TONAL CONTROL

According to Czerny, “style” and “expression” in interpretation are influenced by dynamics (that is the varied degrees of shading, loudness and softness), attack, articulation, and by the use of *accelerando* and *ritardando*.¹ In the previous chapter, we saw how tempo flexibility was used to heighten the effect of a piece. Articulation (which will be discussed in chapter 6) and dynamics were also used to characterise a piece or passage, but in a different way.

5.1 THE RANGE OF DYNAMICS, THE CHARACTER REPRESENTED BY EACH DYNAMIC MARKING, AND THE CORRESPONDING APPROACH TO PIANISTIC TOUCH

Czerny does not describe dynamics simply in “mechanical” terms of volume but, more importantly, its impact on colour and expression, as tonal and interpretative qualities:

(a) The Pianissimo (*pp*) which indicates the gentlest touching of the keys, so however, as not to become indistinct or inaudible. It bears the character of secrecy, mystery, and when executed with the utmost perfection, it is capable of producing on the hearer the pleasing effect of music at a great distance, or of an echo.

(b) The Piano (*p*) Loveliness, Softness, tranquil equanimity, or quiet sorrow, manifest themselves by the still soft and tender, though yet somewhat firm and expressive mode of touch with which the keys are to be struck.

(c) The Mezza voce (*m.v.*) This degree lies exactly in the middle between soft and loud, and may be compared to the tranquil speaking tone used in narration; and without descending into a whisper or declaiming in a loud tone, it will interest us more by the matter to be played, than by the style of the performance.

(d) The Forte (*f*) denotes the expression of self-sufficing firmness and power, without excess or presumption; Passion within the limits of proper dignity; as also, according to rule, whatever is brilliant and shewy, may be executed with this degree of power.

¹Czerny (1839E), i, p. 184; Czerny (1848), p. 30.

(e) The Fortissimo (*ff*) That even the highest degree of force must always rest within the limits of what is *beautiful*, and never be allowed to degenerate in a coarse thumping, or ill treatment of the instrument, has already been said. Within these bounds, it expressed the exaltation of joy to extacy, of grief to rage; just as it also elevates what is brilliant to absolute splendor and *Bravura*.²

Czerny's insistence that dynamics are to be used to convey mood clearly stems from Beethoven. However, this does not mean that Czerny allows only the expressive qualities equated to each dynamic level as described in the above generalization. For example, all three movements of Op. 14 No.1 begin with *p*. Instead of following the general guide above, he comments on the tempo and character of the individual movements, describing the first movement as "serene", "noble" and "lively", the second as a kind of "sad humour" which must be played "in an earnest, but lively manner", while the finale is "very gay and lively, but with a certain playful facility".³ Even the recurring theme in the second movement of Op. 90, marked *p* and is often accompanied by either *dolce* or *teneramente*, requires different treatment each time. Czerny's advice regarding the performance of this movement is as follows:

The utmost sweetness and feeling is here required, which can be produced by a delicate touch, fine *cantabile*, and a light performance of the quicker notes. As the theme is frequently repeated, the player must each time endeavour to deliver it with a different gradation of tone, but always with delicacy.⁴

Although not expressly written into the score, the different gradations of tone are understood to include a slight change in character, and this idea is not unlike Schindler's description of Dorothea von Ertmann's performance of this movement: he was impressed by the imaginative way she introduced a different nuance at each recurrence of the main theme in this movement, so that it was sometimes coaxing and caressing, at other times more melancholic.⁵

Even before the turn of the nineteenth century, Beethoven's extreme concern with tone colour is evident in his letter of 19 November 1796. He thanks Streicher for the receipt of a piano, but jokes that it is "far too good" for him because it "robs me of the freedom to produce my own

²Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 5. Spelling, italicization and capitalization original.

³Czerny (1846), p. 44.

⁴Ibid., p. 62.

⁵Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), p. 210.

tone”.⁶ According to Cipriani Potter, Beethoven produced different tone qualities by varying the finger pressure.⁷ Thus Czerny also echoes his teacher’s method of producing different qualities of touch: through varied finger pressure. Czerny considers the second movement of Op. 10 No. 3 as

... one of Beethoven’s grandest but most melancholy, and [one that] must be played with the most attentive expression. In the performance of pieces of this kind it is not sufficient that we put ourselves into the proper disposition; the hands and fingers must bear on the keys with a different, and heavier weight, than is necessary in lively, or tenderly expressive compositions, in order to produce that significant kind of tone, which may duly animate the slow course of an earnest *Adagio*.⁸

In fast and lively movements, the touch should again be varied accordingly. Czerny recommends a more “brilliant” touch in the “humorous, merry and facetious” second movement of Op. 78.⁹ In non-brilliant passagework, he often prefers a pearl-like effect, reminiscent of Hummel’s manner of playing. Beethoven does not disapprove of this, but reminds Czerny that sometimes a “different kind of jewelry” is desired (an excerpt of this letter is quoted on p. 241).¹⁰

Czerny’s instructions on tonal colour can be traced back to Beethoven, but the variety of shadings which Czerny proposes is a result of the improvements made to the piano (for a discussion of some of these improvements, see section 10.2 below). He admits that the extent of tonal modifications in performance is greater between 1820-1830 because of the improvement in hammer coverings.¹¹ He even goes so far as to declare that “... we are able to produce at least one hundred different degrees of loud and soft in striking any one note ... by the *mere touch* alone!”¹² His advice on the colours of dynamics given above is thus an extension of what Beethoven could have achieved on the pianos at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It would be mere speculation to conclude whether Beethoven would have endorsed the use of a larger variety of tonal colours.

⁶Anderson (1961), i, p. 24.

⁷Sonneck (1967), p. 110.

⁸Czerny (1846), p. 42.

⁹Ibid., p. 61.

¹⁰Anderson (1961), ii, p. 742.

¹¹Czerny (1846), p. 3.

¹²Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 3. Italicization original.

Modern-day researchers have difficulties defining the meaning of *mezza voce*, as understood by Beethoven. Rosenblum believes that the term refers to a level of soft sound. Barker is in partial agreement. He argues that the more important connotation of Beethoven's *mezza voce* is its reference to the singing quality of a passage.¹³ Although *mezza voce* is usually found in passages which are melodious, expressive and/or serene, this term was used by Beethoven to indicate a restrained level of tone. In the second movement of the String Quartet in C sharp minor, Op. 131, *mezza voce* is introduced in bars 194-195 – a non-melodious passage (ex. 5.1). This implies that Beethoven uses this term as a dynamic marking. In addition, Schindler, a contemporary of Beethoven, also uses *mezza voce* to indicate a relatively soft dynamic level.¹⁴

Ex. 5.1



In the third movement of Op. 106, its expressive quality is indicated not by *mezza voce*, but by *appassionato e con molto sentimento*. In the third movement of another late piano sonata, Op. 109, *mezza voce* indications in bars 15 (ex. 5.2) and 31 are preceded by a set of hairpins, again suggesting its role as a dynamic marking. The expressive quality of the theme and the first variation is marked by *molto cantabile ed espressivo* and *molto espressivo* respectively.

¹³Rosenblum (1988), p. 58; Barker (1996), pp. 155-159.

¹⁴Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), p. 283.

Ex. 5.2

Gesangvoll, mit innigster Empfindung
Andante molto cantabile ed espressivo

The musical score consists of three systems of piano accompaniment. The first system is marked *mezza voce* and includes measures 43, 21, and 8. The second system includes *cresc.* and *p* markings and measures 12 and 5. The third system includes *cresc.*, *sf*, and *mezza voce* markings and measures 25, 13, 3, 5, 4, 3, 1, 1, and 5.

The degree of softness implied by this term, however, varies. In ex. 5.1 above, *mezza voce* lies between *p* in bar 191 and *pp* in bar 197. This term is also used in the third movement of Beethoven's last symphony. The opening melody, which is introduced by the first violin, is marked *mezza voce*, while the accompaniment is marked *p*. In this instance, the melody, although soft, would have to be slightly louder than *p*. Beethoven's *mezza voce*, therefore, refers to a soft dynamic level, ranging from *pp* to *mp*. This range, of course, is lower than Czerny's suggested level: the "middle between soft and loud". On the other hand, the character Czerny associates with this term – "the tranquil speaking tone used in narration" – suitably reflects the character of the passage where *mezza voce* is used.

5.2 ACCENTUATION

The importance of correct accentuation in Beethoven's music can be seen from the vast array of markings in his compositions: *>*, *sf*, *fz*, *fp*, *ffp*, *f*, *rinf* or *rf*, and occasionally *mfp*. Reichardt also

draws attention to the use of accentuation, among other things, in his description of a performance by the Schuppanzigh Quartet in 1808:

Herr Schuppanzigh himself has an original, interesting [*pikant*] style that is very well suited to the imaginative [*humoristisch*] quartets of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven; or rather, perhaps, it has resulted from the spirited [*launig*] manner of performance suited to these masterpieces. He plays the most difficult passages clearly, although not always absolutely in tune, about which the local virtuosos seem, on the whole, not to care. He also accents very correctly and meaningfully. His cantabile, too, is often quite singing and full of feeling. Likewise, he skillfully leads his well-chosen colleagues, who truly enter into the spirit of the composer. ...¹⁵

This so-called “correct” and “meaningful” accentuation which Schuppanzigh employed would refer to rhythmic and expressive accents; both types are often unnotated. The context in which such accentuation can be applied will be discussed in sections 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6.

5.3 *sf*, *rf* AND *fp*

While *sforzando* (*sforzato* or *sf*) and *fp* are used to emphasize the note which carries the indication, Czerny’s explanations of *rinforzando* (*rinforzato*, *rf* or *rinf*) are inconsistent. In the third volume of *Piano Forte School*, he equates *rinf* to the accent, *fp*, *sf*, and *fz*, that is, to emphasize only one note. He contradicts himself later in an example in *Piano Forte* by asking for the *rinf* in bar 9 to be sustained for two bars (ex. 5.3).¹⁶

¹⁵Rosenblum (1988), p. 386. Spelling and italicization original. Square bracket in Rosenblum.

¹⁶Czerny (1839E), i, p. 184 and iii, pp. 6 and 76.

Ex. 5.3

The image shows three systems of musical notation for piano. The first system is marked "Adagio non troppo" and "p" (piano). It features a treble and bass staff with a 3/4 time signature. A slur covers the first two measures, with the word "espress." written above it. The second system is marked with a circled "6" and "f" (forte). It also has a treble and bass staff in 3/4 time. The third system is marked with a circled "11", "dim." (diminuendo), and "smorz." (ritardando). It continues with treble and bass staves in 3/4 time.

Both meanings of *rinf* were acceptable in the early nineteenth century. Although Czerny gave only one of the definitions in *Piano Forte School*, ex. 5.3 above shows that he employed both.

An examination of the piano sonatas reveals that Beethoven applies *sf* to single notes only (see for example, Op. 53/iii/99, 103 and 107 and Op. 53/ii/10 and 12), while *rinf* can be used either on single notes or on a succession of notes, depending on the context. Beethoven does not appear to interchange *sf* and *rinf* haphazardly. *Rinf*, which is used much less frequently than *sf*, occurs mainly in slow, expressive movements, and it only occasionally appears in fast, flowing movements. *Rinf* can be employed in a particular context in order to highlight the yearning quality of a note, such as Op. 27/1/iii/7 (ex. 5.4); the slur determines that the first of the two notes is given a stronger, but (in this case) not harsher, tone. When *rinf* is used in this context, it is very

Ex. 5.4

likely that Beethoven intends *rinf* to signify a more delicate accent than *sf*. In Op. 7/ii/59-65 (ex. 5.5), the build-up of the phrase is determined by the relationship between *rinf* and *sf*. The accentuation increases every two bars until the climax of the phrase in bar 64. As stronger accents are required with each statement, *sf* marks are chosen in preference over *rinf* (see bb. 62

Ex. 5.5

and 64). In Op. 10/3/ii/44-48 (ex. 5.6), on the other hand, the shape of the right-hand motif as well as Beethoven's dynamic markings suggest that the emphasis denoted by *rinf* is sustained over a few notes. When *rinf* occurs in fast movements, as in Op. 14/2/i/190 and Op. 111/i/33-34, its second meaning – to strengthen a few notes – is intended.

Ex. 5.6

The image shows two systems of musical notation for piano. The first system, starting at measure 44, features a treble staff with a melodic line and a bass staff with accompaniment. Dynamics include *p* and *rinf.* (ritornello). The second system, starting at measure 47, continues the piece with a *decresc.* (decrescendo) marking and a *p* marking. The bass staff includes a 7-chord symbol.

While *fp* does not appear as frequently as *sf* in Beethoven's music, it too has its own meaning. In contrast to Czerny's convenient definition whereby all the markings which indicate an emphasis has the same meaning, Beethoven uses *fp* in two different contexts. The first is to emphasize the note it indicates, but it is a more delicate accent than *sf* (Op. 2/2/iii/58-68 and Op. 28/i/40-62) or even *rinf* (ex. 5.4 above). The second meaning, which is also used more frequently, is as an abbreviation of *forte* followed immediately by *piano*. This is confirmed by the *p* marking which is placed on the second quaver in the bass of Op. 57/i/93: the note which immediately follows the *fp* chord (ex. 5.7). Although *fp* is employed at the climax of a passage which incorporates a succession of *sf* markings during the build-up, it would be erroneous to conclude that *fp* is a stronger accent than *sf*. Occasionally, the two meanings of *fp* may be used in the same passage, for example in Op. 27/2/iii/78-87 (ex. 5.8). In bar 79, it indicates that the first beat of the bar should be emphasized, while in bar 87, it not only crowns the climax of the passage commencing in bar 71, but also marks the soft beginning of the next phrase.

Ex. 5.7

The image shows a single system of musical notation for piano, starting at measure 92. The treble staff has a melodic line with *sf* (sforzando) markings. The bass staff has a rhythmic accompaniment with a *fp* (forte piano) marking. The piece concludes with a 7-chord symbol in the bass staff.

Ex. 5.8

5.4 UNNOTATED ACCENTUATION

Schindler claims that Beethoven laid much emphasis on rhythmic accents in his teaching. He writes:

As for Beethoven's particular style of accentuation, the author can speak partly from Beethoven's critical remarks on Czerny's playing and partly from the piano instruction that Beethoven gave to him directly. It was above all the rhythmic accent that he stressed most heavily and that he wanted others to stress. He treated the melodic (or grammatic, as it was generally called) accent, on the other

hand, mostly according to the internal requirements. He would emphasize all retardations, especially that of the diminished second in *cantabile* sections, more than other pianists. His playing thus acquired a highly personal character, very different from the even, flat performances that never rise to tonal eloquence.¹⁷

The importance of accentuation is further stressed in the annotations of Cramer's Etudes (see section 5.5 below) because, in Schindler's opinion, it helps convey the deep poetry in Beethoven's music.¹⁸ Although the annotations are, given Schindler's reputation as an insecure and jealous man who forged some of the entries in the Conversation Books, viewed with suspicion, his comments on accentuation are not without basis. In his day, Cramer was admired for the vocal quality and accentuation in his playing; both are features which probably attracted Beethoven to Cramer's playing. In addition, Beethoven's "Rolland" Sketchbook, which dates from the late summer or autumn 1823, contains "two melodies in C major with the inscription 'auf Sylbenmasse Instrumental Melodien (schaffen) machen'" (to create instrumental melodies according to syllabic meter).¹⁹

5.5 ANNOTATIONS OF CRAMER ETUDES

The annotations of Cramer's Etudes are signed by Schindler, with some remarks attributed to Beethoven. They deal mainly with rhythmic and melodic accents, which are derived from a stronger touch and are often accompanied by the prolongation of the accented note. Beethoven is supposed to have written the following instructions for Etude no. 3 (ex. 5.9):

The melody is nearly always to be found in the third note of each group; but the rhythmical accent must be given uniformly on the first note. On account of binding, the finger should dwell on this accented note.²⁰

¹⁷Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), p. 416. Barth correctly observes that Schindler is mistaken in equating "melodic" accent with "grammatical" accent. See Barth (1992), p. 130.

¹⁸Cramer/Shedlock (1893), p. ii.

¹⁹Rosenblum (1988), p. 100. Rosenblum's translation.

²⁰Cramer/Shedlock (1893), p. 7. See also the comments regarding Etude no. 21.

Ex. 5.9

Moderato. $\text{♩} = 100.$

3. *p*

il basso legato

These suggested rhythmic accents in the Etudes do not necessarily fall only on the first note of each group, or conform to the strong and weak beats suggested by the time signature. Rather, it appears that there is more concern to place the accents in strategic places in order to bring out the melodic (or scalic) line. The suggested rhythmic accents sometimes override the importance of the metrical accent, as shown in the following passage from Etude no. 16 (ex. 5.10).²¹

Ex. 5.10

Moderato con espressione. $\text{♩} = 132.$

16. *p*

rf

poco più f

²¹Ibid., p. 27.

Accents are also inserted to mark syncopation, for example the syncopated C-E dyads in Etude no. 1 (ex. 5.11). In Etude no. 6 (ex. 5.12), accents are used to help clarify the rhythm and the polyphony (according to the comments attributed to Beethoven, the study up to bar 15 is in four voices).²²

Ex. 5.11

Ex. 5.12

²²Ibid., pp. 3 and 13.

Ex. 5.12 (con't)

Ex. 5.12 (continued) shows three systems of piano etude notation. Each system consists of a treble and bass clef staff. The notation includes various rhythmic patterns, fingerings (numbers 1-5), and accents. System 7 (top) features a circled '7' and includes fingerings like 1, 4, 4, 5, 4, 3, 4. System 10 (middle) features a circled '10' and includes fingerings like 4, 5, 4, 3, 5, 3, 5, 2, 5, 3, 5. System 13 (bottom) features a circled '13' and includes fingerings like 5, 3, 2, 2, 5, 3, 5, 2, 2, 5, 3, 5, 2, 2, 5, 3, 5. A 'p' dynamic marking is present in the bass staff of system 13.

Dissonances are usually highlighted in this manner, as in Etude no. 21 (ex. 5.13):

Attention must be paid to the accent of the fifth note of each group which mostly appears as a minor second. Trochaic measure forms the basis of each group: the first note accented and long, but less so the fifth.²³


Ex. 5.13

Ex. 5.13, Etude no. 21, is a single system of piano etude notation. It features a treble and bass clef staff. The tempo is marked 'Moderato' with a quarter note equal to 84. The notation includes various rhythmic patterns, fingerings (numbers 1-5), and accents. A 'cresc.' marking is present in the bass staff. The score is numbered '21.' in the left margin.


²³Ibid., p. 31.

Sometimes, the notated rhythms are altered so that a “melody” can be formed, such as Etude nos. 7 (ex. 5.14) and 24 (see section 6.3). Since the first and third notes of each group in Etude no. 7 carry the melody, the first note must be held for the length of two quavers, thus giving the effect shown in ex. 5.15.²⁴

Ex. 5.14



Ex. 5.15



This study is also considered to be in four voices even if it is not explicitly notated thus, with the tenor supporting the soprano, so the alto and bass should be played with a lighter touch.

Schindler claims that Beethoven considered these Cramer Etudes “the best preparation for his own works”.²⁵ Beethoven is also believed to have written that “... all *nuances* cannot be indicated, neither can they in other pieces. These studies provide counsel and help for all cases”.²⁶ When compared to the functions of accents found in Beethoven’s sonatas (see section 5.6 below), the “counsel and help” in the annotations of Cramer’s Etudes are rather limited; they deal only with rhythmic accents, syncopations and dissonances. In addition, these Etudes are confined largely to passagework, with a few studies in polyphony and cantabile melodies.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 15 and 35.

²⁵Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), p. 379.

²⁶Cramer/Shedlock (1893), p. 27. Italicization original.

5.6 BEETHOVEN'S AND CZERNY'S USAGES OF ACCENTUATION

Czerny's comments in *The Art* also reveal his concern for correct accentuation in Beethoven's piano sonatas. Czerny's advice on the use of unnotated accentuation can be divided into the following categories:

(a) to emphasize the highest note in a phrase or motif.

In the third movement of Op. 14/1 (ex. 5.16), Czerny instructs that the highest notes in the right hand (in the G major section) should be well marked.²⁷ This corresponds with the *staccato* marks left by Beethoven. Before > became universally accepted as the sign for the light accent, the *staccato* sign (both the dot and the dash) was one of the indications used. If the *staccato* notation is understood literally, it would cause unnecessary hiccups in the phrases. Sometimes, Beethoven combines two types of notation for accentuation. In the minor section of Op. 2/3/iii, he marks the highest note of the arpeggiated figures with both a *staccato* and an *sf*.

Ex. 5.16

(b) to emphasize notes of longer duration.

Among Czerny's many examples of unnotated accents on a long note are Op. 14/2/ii/2 and 4, Op. 14/2/iii/3, Op. 26/ii/6, and Op. 57/i/37 and 39. The sign ^ in ex. 5.17 (an excerpt of Op.

²⁷Czerny (1846), p. 44.

31/1/iii/1 and 5), a strong accent, is inserted by Czerny.²⁸ Beethoven also subscribed to this usage, as shown in Op. 57/iii/228-256 where the minims are marked *sf* (in the rhythm $\text{♩} | \text{♩} \text{ } \text{♩} \text{ } \text{♩}$).


Ex. 5.17



(c) to highlight dissonances

Beethoven frequently marks dissonances with accents or *sf* markings, as in Op. 14/1/ii/3 and 43 and Op. 14/2/iii/121 and 123. Therefore, Czerny's request for the emphasis of the a^b in the alto voice of Op. 22/iv/12-13 (ex. 5.18)²⁹ is valid because it forms an unexpected diminished seventh with the bass and makes the g^2 an accented neighbour note.

Ex. 5.18




(d) to highlight notes of harmonic interest

Both Beethoven and Czerny employ accents when a note of harmonic interest occurs, such as to mark the dominant (at the cadence points) of Op. 28/i/310-311, or to highlight the shift to the dominant in Op. 14/2/ii/6-7 (ex. 5.19). Czerny's comments on the fourth movement of Op. 26 echo this idea:


²⁸Ibid., pp. 45, 47, 52, and 59.

²⁹Ibid., p. 46.

The two quavers  in the bass, in the 6th bar, must be marked with a certain degree of emphasis. Similarly, wherever they occur either as a perfect or as an imperfect cadence _ as in the 12th 20th 28th 30th 32nd & 34th bars etc. In Beethoven's works we often find that he grounds the structure of his pieces on single and apparently unimportant notes, and by bringing out these notes in the performance, as he himself was accustomed to do, we shall impart the true unity and colouring to the whole.³⁰

Beethoven himself marks these notes *staccato*. As mentioned above, *staccato* is one of the signs used to signify an accent.

Ex. 5.19




Musical score for Ex. 5.19, showing a piano passage with dynamic markings like 'cresc. sf' and 'p'.

(e) to emphasize syncopations

According to Czerny, the syncopated notes in the last twenty-two bars of Op. 10/1/ii must be slightly marked.³¹ Beethoven does not mark any accents in this syncopated passage, but in Op. 27/1/i/4 and 28 (ex. 5.20), he reveals that it is necessary to accent the syncopated $b\flat^1$ in the treble.

Ex. 5.20



Musical score for Ex. 5.20, showing a piano passage with an accent mark (>) over a note in the treble.

³⁰Ibid., p. 48. Punctuation original. Although Czerny correctly observes that those notes at cadential points must be accented, I do not agree with his reference to them as "unimportant notes".

³¹Ibid., p. 40.

(f) metric accents

Czerny advocates the use of metric accents, as shown in his directions on the first phrase of Op. 10/2/iii and the bass of Op. 31/3/i/174-175 (ex. 5.21).³² The accents in ex. 5.21 are Czerny's. Metric accents are often understood, and therefore not indicated. Occasionally, Beethoven adds accents to his music to emphasize the strong beats, as in Op. 90/ii/223-224, Op. 106/iv/102-110 and in the bass of Op. 78/i/20-23.

Ex. 5.21



In contrast to the Schindler/Beethoven annotations in the Cramer Etudes, Czerny does not mention lengthening the first of a group of notes in brilliant passagework as a means of accentuation. It is only in passages with consonant arpeggiated chords that the lengthening of the first note is permitted, because such passages would benefit from full, resonant tones.³³ He also does not teach the accentuations of selected notes (even if they fall on weak beats) in order to form a scalar or melodic line. Nevertheless, his advice on varying the placement of metric accents at the repetition of passagework (see pp. 38-40) is supported by an example from Beethoven's Op. 109/iii/107-108 (ex. 5.22).

³²Ibid., pp. 41 and 55. The metric accents in the bass of Op. 31/3/i must surely begin in bar 170.

³³Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 3, 9, 12, and 19.

Ex. 5.22

(g) to highlight the lowest bass notes when they form a meaningful line

Czerny gives Op. 31/1/iii/36-42 and 132-140 as examples.³⁴ This is sound advice, judging from the *staccato* marks, evidently having their alternative function as accents, applied to the lowest bass notes in bars 132-140 (ex. 5.23). Op. 26/i/111-116 and Op. 54/ii/37-44 are another two instances where Beethoven highlights the bass lines.

Ex. 5.23

According to Schindler, Beethoven is said to have criticized Czerny for “false” accentuation.³⁵ This is most probably another misleading accusation: the above comparisons show that Czerny used accents in the same contexts as Beethoven.

³⁴Czerny (1846), p. 53.

³⁵Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), p. 416.

5.7 CZERNY'S ADVICE ON DYNAMICS COMPARED TO BEETHOVEN'S USAGE IN THE PIANO SONATAS

In general, Czerny asks for the careful observance of Beethoven's dynamic markings, probably because he recognises the relationship between Beethoven's dynamic markings, the structure and character of a piece. Of Op. 31/2/iii, he remarks that the movement can be enlivened only "by an exact observance of the *piano*, *forte*, *crescendo* and *diminuendo* ...". Again, in Op. 57/ii, he reminds the reader that the "*crescendo* and *forte* must be well observed".³⁶

Sometimes, Czerny's statements serve to reinforce the markings already in the score. He may have found this necessary either because Beethoven's dynamic markings produce an unexpected effect, or simply because he wishes to emphasize the importance of observing the large-scale functioning of the dynamic markings. For example, Czerny states that the exposition of Op. 53/i ends softly, thus confirming that the *crescendo* must be cut off abruptly both times. He also confirms the unexpected soft ending of Op. 90/ii. In the Trio of Op. 2/1/iii, he emphasizes the importance of maintaining a soft dynamic³⁷ (as indicated by Beethoven). Czerny also shows an understanding of the musical structure when he observes that bars 68-89 of Op. 2/1/i "must be performed with constantly augmented power and vivacity".³⁸ Even though Beethoven does not mark this passage *crescendo*, his intended build-up in these bars is clear from his use of insistent *sf* markings and sequences until the climax in bar 90 when he releases the tension by writing *decrescendo*.

Where no dynamic marking is given, Czerny (like Hummel, see p. 38) is fond of using *crescendo* in an ascending line and *diminuendo* in a descending line, as is shown in his advice for Op. 10/2/ii, Op. 14/1/ii and Op. 26/i/var. i.³⁹ Occasionally, he deviates from this general rule; in the first phrase of the scherzo of Op. 2/3, he recommends a *crescendo* from bar 5 up to the *forte* in bar 13,⁴⁰ even though bars 7 and 8 are made up of a descending line. Beethoven also follows this rule of using

³⁶Czerny (1846), pp. 54 and 59.

³⁷Ibid., pp. 33, 56 and 62.

³⁸Ibid., p. 33.


³⁹Ibid., pp. 41, 44 and 47.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 37. See also his musical example of the first phrase of Op. 14/1/i.

crescendo and *diminuendo* to suggest different nuances according to the rise and fall of the line for small-scale structures, such as the short motifs at the beginning of Op. 101/i. Where a passage has a larger structural function, such as the descending line in Op. 54/ii/61-65, Beethoven would choose the appropriate dynamic level. In this case, a *crescendo* is more suitable because the descending line leads to a climax in bar 65.

Occasionally, Czerny's advice contradicts Beethoven's notation. We have seen on pp. 75-77 that although Czerny's comments on the last eight bars of Op. 26/i/var. ii is a legitimate interpretation, since the last four bars act as an answering phrase to the preceding four, his ideas are the opposite of Beethoven's. By not cancelling the *crescendo* in bar 89 with another direction (see ex. 3.3 above), this implies that Beethoven intends the *crescendo* to last until the end of this variation. It is also very strange that Czerny should ask for the first note of the third bar of Op. 7/iii to be played very loudly⁴¹ when Beethoven clearly indicates *p* and *dolce* (ex. 5.24).

Ex. 5.24



On the whole, Czerny has a very good understanding of the functioning of Beethoven's dynamics and, where such markings do not exist in the composer's hand, he often knows when to introduce the appropriate dynamics or accentuation. However, one must be wary of his occasional deviations from Beethoven's indications.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 38.

CHAPTER 6: STYLE AND EXPRESSION - ARTICULATION AND TOUCH

6.1 THE BASIC TOUCHES USED BY BEETHOVEN AND CZERNY

From the three main type of touch specified by Czerny – prolonged, connected and detached – he and Beethoven exploit the numerous variations available, some of which are described by Czerny as follows:

- LEGATO Gliding one into another; smoothly connected.

- LEGATISSIMO and MOLTO LEGATO *Very connected; nearly approaching to the prolonged touch.*

- TENUTO (*ten*) *Held on, is sometimes placed over single notes, which in that case, must be struck with emphasis, and then be firmly held down.*

- STACCATO Detached, separated.

- MARCATO and BEN MARCATO With peculiar emphasis; generally united with staccato, though also applicable to the Legato.

- LEGGIERMENTE and LEGGIERO *free, light, agile; is most properly employed in quick movements and in the somewhat staccato style or touch; though it may also be applied to the Legato as well as to the Staccato.*

- MARTELLATO *Hammered. The highest degree of Staccato; this term is employed but seldom, and but by a few authors; although it certainly deserves to be introduced into general use.¹*

¹Czerny (1839E), i, p. 189. Italicization and capitalization original.

All the above touches, with the exception of *martellato*, can be found in Beethoven's piano sonatas. Czerny is more enthusiastic than Beethoven about the use of *martellato*, a characteristic touch in compositions of the brilliant type (see p. 46). Beethoven, on the other hand, consistently expressed his disapproval of introducing virtuosity for its own sake (see pp. 16, 231 and 232).

6.2 LEGATO OR NON LEGATO?

Schindler and Moscheles testify that Beethoven always insisted on *legato* as the normal touch.² In 1796, Beethoven wrote a letter to Streicher, expressing his objection for the piano to be treated like the harp. This clearly indicates his wish for a smoother, connected sound. In the same letter, he strongly emphasizes the necessity of making the piano "sing".³ In Archduke Rudolph's instruction book, Beethoven again admits to using good singing as a model:

Good singing was my guide; I strove to write as flowingly as possible and trusted in my ability to justify myself before the judgment-seat of sound reason and pure taste.⁴

Schindler also confirms that Beethoven "adopted the methods of *cultivated* singers" in *cantilena* sections. In addition, when Beethoven is faced with a difficult passage, he would overcome the problem by assigning "appropriate words to a perplexing passage and singing it, or listening to a good violinist or wind player play it".⁵ The vocal quality of Beethoven's playing in slow movements is confirmed by many of his contemporaries. He was not the only pianist to draw his inspiration from excellent singers and instrumentalists. As was mentioned in chapter 2, C. P. E. Bach had given this advice in his mid-eighteenth century *Essay*, a treatise which Beethoven held in great respect. So strong was his belief in this method that he passed on this idea to Czerny (the latter's ideals have been discussed on p. 43).

It is therefore no surprise that Czerny recognises the singing, *legato* tones needed to perform the slow movements of Beethoven's piano sonatas. As mentioned on p. 3, Czerny recalled that in his

²Schindler (1841) (ed. Moscheles), p. 129.

³Anderson (1961), i, pp. 25-26.

⁴Kerst (1964), p. 25.

⁵Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), p. 416.

first lesson, Beethoven insisted on, among other things, *legato* technique. A *cantabile* passage in a Beethoven's piano sonata, even those without slur marks, therefore, should be played *legato*. This certainly applies to the slow movement of Op. 57 (ex. 6.1). Czerny's advice regarding the performance of the opening theme, as expected, involves the use of *legato*.⁶

Ex. 6.1

The same assumption, however, should not be made to passagework without slur marks. The absence of slurs in such passages frequently indicates Beethoven's wish for the *non legato* touch. In Op. 31/3/iv/275 (ex. 6.2), for example, Beethoven uses the term *non legato* to confirm that the omission of slurs in this passage is intentional. Again, the shift from *legato* to *non legato* in Op. 53/i/196-215 is conveyed through the presence and the absence of slurs respectively. However, Ex. 6.2

one has to be aware that it is not unusual to have slur marks inserted only at the beginning of a stylistically uniform passage, with the same articulation expected in the rest of the section. For example, the lack of slur marks in Op. 53/iii/450-451 (ex. 6.3) does not indicate a *non legato* touch, rather these two bars are expected to be slurred in the same manner as bars 442-443 and 446-447.

⁶Czerny (1846), p. 59.

Ex. 6.3

On the whole, many of Czerny's advice on the use of *legato* conform with Beethoven's notation. Schindler's accusation that Czerny "never sustain his notes"⁷ is without basis, considering the emphasis and frequency with which Czerny recommends *legato* playing in the performance of Beethoven's piano works in *The Art*. Sometimes, Czerny would sacrifice the rhetoric of a phrase in favour of an unbroken *legato* line (see section 6.4 below). Even when he occasionally deviates from the composer's indications, as in Op. 22/ii, it is *legato* that he always asks for. In ex. 6.4, the bass from Op. 22/ii is marked *mezzo staccato*, but Czerny states that it should be played *legato*.⁸ He is mistaken here because Beethoven most probably intends the accompaniment to resemble soft, rhythmic drum strokes, rather than smoothly connected triads. These prove that, far from Czerny's playing showing, as Schindler claims, a lack of "binding", perhaps there is sometimes a danger that Czerny is over-fond of it.

Ex. 6.4

⁷Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), p. 416.

⁸Czerny (1846), p. 46.

6.3 LEGATISSIMO

In *The Art*, Czerny recommends the use of *legatissimo* in certain passages even though directions for it is not specified by Beethoven. Nevertheless, Czerny is careful not to overuse this touch, reserving it only for *cantabile* melodies or choral-like passages (Op. 2/3/iv/103-118, Op. 13/ii/9-16 and the theme of Op. 111/ii), arpeggiated chords (Op. 27/2/i), and as a means to project counter-melodies in the bass (Op. 7/iv/150-154). Sometimes, Czerny couples accents with *legatissimo*, such as in Op. 7/iv/150-154 (ex. 6.5).⁹

Ex. 6.5

Beethoven evidently wishes for some degree of sustained tones in all these passages because he marks them with slurs, or uses the terms *sostenuto* (Op. 27/2/i) or *cantabile* (Op. 111/ii).

The notation of Op. 31/2/iii, with its extensive use of sustained notes, could perhaps offer an insight into Beethoven's uses of *legatissimo*. Notes are lengthened to contribute to the overall resonance, to highlight the bass line, to show the harmonic progression (note for example the tonic and dominant harmonies supported by the sustained a in the bass of ex. 6.6a), and to increase the impact of the dominant-seventh and diminished chords (ex. 6.6b).

Ex. 6.6a

⁹Ibid., pp. 37, 39, 43, 49, and 67.

Ex. 6.6b

The image shows three systems of musical notation for piano. Each system consists of a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The first system begins at measure 167, the second at measure 172, and the third at measure 177. The music is characterized by broken chords and melodic lines with accents and dynamic markings such as 'sf' and '(cresc.)'.

Besides accents, which were discussed in the previous chapter, the lengthening of notes is another aspect which is emphasized in the Schindler/Beethoven annotations of the Cramer Etudes, for example, Etude no. 2 (ex. 6.7). The annotation to this etude lends support to Czerny's use of *legatissimo* in broken chord passages:

In the four introductory bars the thumb adheres firmly to the fundamental note, so that the broken triad, and in a similar manner all broken chords, may be made clear. In order to obtain binding, the triplet figure in the left hand must be dealt with in the same way.¹⁰

¹⁰Cramer/Shedlock (1893), p. 5.

Ex. 6.7

Presto. $\text{♩} = 100.$

Notes may also be sustained to form “unwritten” melodies, as seen in the comments regarding Etude no. 24:

In the first five bars the first note of the first triplet and the third note of the second triplet must be connected together in the best possible manner, so that the melody may stand out thus:

The finger, therefore, must remain on the long note.¹¹

Etude no. 24, however, appears as follows:

Ex. 6.8

Con moto $\text{♩} = 92$

¹¹Ibid., p. 35. The rhythm rather than is probably meant, seeing that the time signature is 2/4.

Many of the annotations of the Cramer Etudes reveal that notes which carry the metric accents and those with melodic interest are often held longer than their notated value (see also section 5.5 above). If the validity of these annotations can be determined, they will confirm that Czerny's advice regarding the use of accents and *legatissimo* to bring out the melodic line in the bass of Op. 7/iv/150-154 comes to us directly from the tradition of Beethoven.

Legatissimo was a common early nineteenth-century practice but the reason or the context in which it was introduced may have varied from person to person. It is interesting to note that the role of this touch in the Cramer annotations is to give rhythmic or motivic clarity, while to Czerny, it is to increase resonance even when applied to arpeggiated chords in fast movements. He adds that *legatissimo* is used mainly in fairly soft passages, rarely in *forte* or *fortissimo* ones.¹² Instances in Beethoven's piano sonatas reveal that the composer also uses this touch to increase the resonance of a passage. However, unlike his pupil, Beethoven is not shy about using it in loud passages, such as Op. 53/i/114-115, 118-119 (ex. 6.9) and similar bars. Here, and in numerous other instances, Beethoven seems to notate the lengthening of broken chords only when they remain "static" for a bar or two. Why does he not sustain the arpeggiated chords in bars 116-117 or those in bars 104-113? Does he expect performers to sustain them instinctively, as Czerny probably would have done?

Ex. 6.9

¹²Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 19 and 21.

Beethoven would have expected performers to lengthen certain notes according to contemporary convention. Unfortunately, only a few guidelines have survived, based on the Schindler/Beethoven annotations and Czerny's writings. Czerny's advice on *legatissimo* is not unlike the advice contained in the annotations and in the limited musical examples found in Beethoven's piano sonatas, and therefore demands due consideration.

6.4 THE MEANINGS OF SLURS AND *LEGATO*

The difficulty in understanding slurs lies not in the touch they represent, but in whether the last note of each slur is to be detached. Of the two main types of slurs found in Beethoven's music, the performance of two- and three-note slurs is more straightforward than that of the longer ones. According to Czerny, the last note of a two- or three-note slur should be detached, especially when it is marked *staccato*. He continues in this vein in *The Art*, giving the same advice on Op. 15/iii, Op. 27/1/ii, Op. 28/iii, and Op. 78/ii.¹³ Some of Beethoven's notation indeed confirms Czerny's teaching, for example, the dot on the last note of a two- or three-note slur in Op. 7/iii/71-79, Op. 10/3/iii/74-85, Op. 28/i/448-453, and Op. 53/i/146-153.

Beethoven often constructs whole movements from one or two basic ideas which are recognisable partly through his use of short slurs. In fast movements, these short basic motifs are developed in a way that increases the liveliness, excitement or intensity of the climax. Czerny shows an understanding of this important role of short-slurred motifs when he stresses that the last note of the two-note slurs in the scherzo of Op. 28 should be detached,¹⁴ presumably because he considers it an essential element in conveying the liveliness and humour of this movement.

It has been established that the long slurs in Beethoven's music refer to *legato* rather than phrasing.¹⁵ In addition to slurs, *ligato* and *sempre ligato* are some of the common indications of *legato*; the exact degree of "binding", however, is determined by the musical context. These

¹³Ibid., i, p. 187; Czerny (1846), pp. 50, 51, 61, and 104.

¹⁴Czerny (1846), p. 51.


¹⁵Newman (1988), p. 134; Rosenblum (1988), p. 168.

different degrees of *legato* are recognised by Czerny: his description of this touch ranges from a slight *legato* (Op. 57/iii) through *legato* (the trio of Op. 7/iii) to very or extremely *legato* (the *vivace* from Op. 109/i and Op. 106/iii).¹⁶

Since Czerny considers slur marks to indicate both *legato* and *legatissimo*,¹⁷ he often relies on his musical instincts when deciding on the degree of *legato* to be employed in each passage. There is also a strong possibility that Czerny equates passages which carry the indication *sempre legato* (or *sempre legato*), irrespective of whether long slurs are present, with an almost prolonged touch. For example, Czerny recommends a “very (or extremely) *legato*” touch for the trio in Op. 26/ii and Op. 57/ii/33-48; both are passages which are marked with long slurs and *sempre legato* (or *sempre legato*). Similarly, he asks for a “very *legato*” touch in Op. 109/i/2-3¹⁸ – a passage which also carries the indication *sempre legato*, but does not have long slurs.

The most hotly-debated issue regarding the performance of Beethoven’s long slurs is whether the last note of the slur should be detached, as is the case with the short slurs. This question, which started in the nineteenth century, continues to baffle researchers to this day. A. B. Marx¹⁹ contradicts Czerny by stating that the last note of long slurs should be detached. Although the latter recognises the importance of observing Beethoven’s articulation in order to achieve the appropriate style and expression, Czerny is also influenced by the change from *non legato* to *legato* as the normal touch. He writes:

When, however, slurs are drawn over several notes, although the slurs are not continuous, but are broken into several lines, they are considered as forming but, one, [punctuation *sic*] and no perceptible separation must take place.



¹⁶Czerny (1846), pp. 38, 60, 64, and 65.

¹⁷Czerny (1839E), i, p. 186 and iii, p. 21.

¹⁸Czerny (1846), pp. 47, 59 and 65.

¹⁹Marx (1863), pp. 53-54.

Here the last note of each bar must not be played short or detached; but it must, on the contrary, be connected with the following one. Should the Composer desire to make it detached, he must place a dot or dash over it.²⁰

By ending the long slurs in Op. 28/i/20, 39 etc. with a dot, Beethoven makes his intention clear. Unfortunately, most of the long slurs in his piano sonatas do not end with a dot. Beethoven's notation of long slurs (which is a combination of the old and new ways of writing)²¹ also makes it difficult to establish whether the last note of every long slur should be detached. Some of his relatively long slurs, such as those in Op. 10/3/iv/41-45 (ex. 6.10), conform to the late eighteenth-century tradition by not crossing the bar line. A separation at the end of each slur will undoubtedly result in this phrase sounding disjointed. This passage is similar to the example in Czerny's *Piano Forte School*, quoted above, where he advises the use of continuous *legato* irrespective of the slurs. Others, especially the very long ones in *cantabile* or chordal passages

Ex 6.10

The image displays two systems of musical notation for piano. The first system, starting at measure 41, features a treble and bass staff. The treble staff has a long slur over a series of eighth notes, with dynamic markings *ff* and *ff₂*. The bass staff has a long slur over a series of eighth notes, with dynamic markings *ff* and *decresc.*. The second system, starting at measure 44, also has a treble and bass staff. The treble staff has a long slur over a series of eighth notes, with dynamic markings *p* and *pp*. The bass staff has a long slur over a series of eighth notes, with dynamic markings *p* and *pp*.

(the trio of Op. 26/ii and Op. 109/i/21-35), are akin to what became the nineteenth-century style of slurring. Closer inspection of Beethoven's slur notation, however, suggests that there cannot be a standard method of performing his long slurs. The decision on whether the last note of a long slur should be detached will depend on the context in which it is used.

²⁰Czerny (1839E), i, p. 187. Capitalization original.

²¹Newman (1988), pp. 127, 135 and 136; Drake (1972), p. 122.

It is not unusual to find slurs of one or two bars' length in slow movements, and it is now believed that such notation reflects Beethoven's intention of creating rhetorical expression.²² Some of the slow movement themes (Op. 13/ii), and even *cantabile* passages in the fast movements (Op. 2/3/iv/103-110 and Op. 53/i/35-42), certainly benefit from a slight feeling of "breathing" at the end of the slurs. Although the last note of each slur in these instances should be gently detached, the overall shape and phrasing of the melody must not be distorted. In Op. 2/3/i (ex. 6.11), if the last note of bar 47 is detached, attention will be focussed on the highest pitch of this two-bar motif (this, as was mentioned on pp. 40 and 172, was normal practice). Since this idea is again presented over the next two bars, a slight separation between bars 48 and 49 will clearly define the beginning of the motif. Beethoven then inserts a long slur over the second half of this phrase, from bars 51 to 55, to balance the preceding four one-bar slurs. The smooth, continuous *legato* implied by this long slur also provides a contrast with the slightly "breathless" effect created by the shorter slurs.

Ex. 6.11

The image shows a musical score for piano, consisting of two systems of staves. The first system covers measures 48 to 50. The second system covers measures 51 to 55. The music is written in treble and bass clefs. In measure 49, the word "dolce" is written below the staff. The score includes various slurs and fingerings (e.g., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) to indicate phrasing and articulation.

In a lively passage, slurs can be used to enhance the articulation and to highlight the harmonic progression, such as the transition passage in Op. 2/3/i/27-37 (ex. 6.12). By detaching the last notes in bars 27 and 33, the shortness and crispness of the acciaccature in bars 28 and 34 will be emphasized. If the last note of bar 29 is discreetly separated from the beginning of the following bar, the pianist will help highlight the change of harmony. Incidentally, the slurs in bars 35 and 36 have the same function.

²²See the discussion in Rosenblum (1988), pp. 182-183; Barth (1992), pp. 108-117; and Drake (1994), pp. 17-32. I agree with Newman, who rejects Mies and Grundmann's suggestion that the irregular slurring in Op. 13/ii serves to mask the regular eight-bar phrase.

Ex. 6.12

Czerny's concept of long, seamless melodies originated in the decades after Beethoven's death, probably as a result of Wagner's influence. In *The Art*, Beethoven's slurs for the opening themes of Op. 57/i and Op. 101/i have been ignored in favour of longer slurs. In Op. 57/i, for example, Czerny's slur marks indicate the phrase structure (ex. 6.13a), while Beethoven's common practice, as is shown in ex. 6.13b, is to end a long slur before a cadence. The latter most probably used the slurs to simulate vocal declamation because, as was mentioned in section 6.2, good singing was his guide. The intensity of this phrase is better maintained by slightly detaching the end of bar 2 from the beginning of bar 3 (according to Beethoven's slur marks) than by playing *legato* throughout the first four bars. Unfortunately, since the top of the page of the autograph has been slightly trimmed off, the first slur seems to disappear temporarily in bar 2. However, the end of this slur can be discerned at the end of this bar. In addition, its sequence, from bars 5 to 8, is slurred in exactly the same manner, with the slur ending at precisely the same juncture in the next phrase.

Ex. 6.13a

Handwritten musical score for guitar, consisting of six staves. The notation includes chords, melodic lines, and lyrics. The lyrics are: "A la salida de la casa de mi padre me fui a la escuela de música". The score is written in a cursive style with various musical notations such as notes, rests, and bar lines. There are some corrections and scribbles in the lower part of the page.

6.5 TENUTO AND SOSTENUTO

In contrast to some nineteenth-century theorists who equate *tenuto* with *sostenuto* (see pp. 43-44), Beethoven and Czerny use the two terms differently. They employ *sostenuto* as an adjective to the main tempo headings. The indication *adagio sostenuto* in Beethoven's Op. 27/2/i and Op. 106/iii prove that he uses *sostenuto* as an adjective to *adagio*. The debatable factor is whether Beethoven conceives *sostenuto* as meaning "holding on. Keeping back" as defined by Czerny.²³

Tenuto, on the other hand, can be used in two ways. The first is to indicate a deeper tone (or a slight emphasis) on single notes or chords. Secondly, it is used to indicate a smooth connection on a succession of chords. The *tenuto* markings in Op. 53/ii/1 (ex. 6.14) and in Op. 81a/i/18 and 111 are examples of the former. Their function is to enhance the expression. Like Beethoven, Czerny²⁴ also perceives that *tenuto* on single notes signifies that they should be emphasized. In later works, *tenuto* on single notes is also used to mark a key change, as in Op. 110/iii/6 (ex. 6.15). The *tenuto* in bar 9 from the *Largo* of Op. 106 deserves special mention: it is placed on

Ex. 6.14

Ex. 6.14 is a musical score for piano, titled "Adagio molto". It consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The key signature is B-flat major (two flats) and the time signature is 6/8. The score begins with a piano (*pp*) dynamic marking. The first staff contains a melodic line with several notes, and the second staff contains a bass line with chords and single notes. A "ten." marking is placed above a note in the first staff. The score is divided into two measures by a bar line.

Ex. 6.15

Ex. 6.15 is a musical score for piano, titled "Menu adagio". It consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The key signature is D major (two sharps) and the time signature is 4/4. The score begins with a piano (*pp*) dynamic marking. The first staff contains a melodic line with several notes, and the second staff contains a bass line with chords and single notes. A "ten." marking is placed above a note in the first staff. The score is divided into two measures by a bar line. The tempo marking "Adagio ten" is placed above the second measure. The dynamic markings "cresc.", "dim.", and "smorzando" are placed below the second staff.

²³Czerny (1839E), i, p. 156.

²⁴Ibid., i, p. 189.

a tied chord (ex. 6.16). At a glance, this appears to be a curious and most unsuitable place. Would it not be more appropriate to introduce *tenuto* on the first of this series of chords (in b. 8)? However, the significance of this notation becomes apparent if one considers the possibility that Beethoven may have used *tenuto* to mark the point of modulation as well as the first beat of bar 9. Here, *tenuto* has ceased to be an expressive marking. It has taken on a different meaning: one with a structural function.

Ex. 6.16

The image shows a musical score for a piano piece. It consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The key signature has three sharps (F#, C#, G#). The tempo is marked 'Tempo I'. The score begins with a circled number '8' above the first measure. The right hand plays a series of chords, with a 'p' (piano) dynamic marking. A 'tenuto' marking is placed over a series of chords starting in the second measure. The left hand plays a rhythmic accompaniment of eighth notes. There are some triplets in the right hand later in the score.

If *tenuto* is required over two or more chords, Beethoven would space out the marking, as is the case in Op. 7/ii/50 (ex. 6.17) and in Op. 78/i/24 and 83. Alternatively, he uses the term *tenuto sempre* or *sempre tenuto* to sustain a succession of chords, such as Op. 2/2/ii/1-5, 13-16, 32-36, 44-47 and 58-59 and Op. 7/ii/25 (ex. 6.18). In both instances, the right-hand melody, marked *tenuto sempre* or *sempre tenuto*, has an accompaniment marked *staccato sempre* or *sempre staccato*. Czerny also employs *tenuto* in this manner, as witness his instructions regarding the Funeral March of Op. 26:

As a funeral march on the death of a hero, this movement must be performed with a certain earnest grandeur, which is expressed not only by the slow time, but also by a heavy pressure of the chords in the strictest *tenuto*, by which the fulness of the same is produced in every degree of *piano* and *forte*.²⁵

Ex. 6.17

The image shows a musical score for a piano piece. It consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The key signature has three sharps (F#, C#, G#). The score begins with a circled number '50' above the first measure. The right hand plays a series of chords, with a 'pp' (pianissimo) dynamic marking. The word 'te - nu - to' is written below the notes in the right hand. The left hand plays a rhythmic accompaniment of eighth notes.

²⁵Czerny (1846), pp. 47-48.

Ex. 6.18

②⑤ *sempre ten.*
sempre stacc.

②⑦ *sf*

6.6 STACCATO

Much research has been conducted in the last one-and-a-half centuries in an attempt to decipher Beethoven's *staccato* notation. The aim is to determine whether dots have a different meaning from dashes. Nottebohm, Unger, Keller, Unverricht, Zaslaw, Newman, and Fischer suggest that dots refer to a light *staccato* and dashes a heavier one. Although Nottebohm states that Beethoven made a distinction between dashes and dots at least from 1813 (possibly even by 1800), Newman claims that such distinctions already exist in an early work for four hands (1791) – in bars 59-60 of Beethoven's *Variationen über ein Thema des Grafen von Waldstein*, WoO67.²⁶

In 1957, Mies opposed the idea that Beethoven's dots and dashes represent different degrees of *staccato*. He reasons, in my opinion correctly, that Beethoven would have used dots and dashes

²⁶Nottebohm (1872), pp. 107-125; Unger (1926), p. 26; Keller (1973), pp. 100-101; Unverricht (1960), pp. 56-63; Brown and Sadie (1989), p. 210; Newman (1988), pp. 139-144; Fischer (1990), pp. 154-166. Fischer claims that Beethoven also employs the wedge.

in a systematic and consistent manner if a difference had been intended. Nevertheless, he observes that Beethoven's *staccato* notation is sometimes affected by the expression of the passage – dashes become increasingly longer and heavier in loud passages while the *staccato* markings are often smaller and more dot-like in soft passages. It is this same observation which led Newman to arrive at the opposite conclusion – that Beethoven consciously differentiated between dots and dashes. He insists that dots are mainly used in softer, gentler music, and in passages marked *ritardando* and/or *diminuendo*. Dashes, in his opinion, are associated with brighter, more accented sounds.²⁷ The example he uses, quoted from Op. 26/i/77-81 (ex. 6.19), unfortunately serves to contradict rather than support his theory. It is true that Beethoven's notation was influenced by the emotions of the passage he was writing at the time, but the *staccato* at the beginning of this passage is clearly notated with small dashes rather than dots as claimed by Newman.

Ex. 6.19

The image shows a handwritten musical score for Op. 26/i/77-81, specifically measures 69, 72, 76, and 79. The score is written on four systems of staves. Each system consists of a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The notation is dense and includes various rhythmic values, accidentals, and dynamic markings. Measure 69 is marked with a circled '69' above the staff. Measure 72 is marked with a circled '72' above the staff. Measure 76 is marked with a circled '76' above the staff. Measure 79 is marked with a circled '79' above the staff. The notation includes staccato markings, which are small dashes or dots placed above or below the notes. The score is written in a cursive, handwritten style, characteristic of Beethoven's original manuscript.

A convincing explanation on this mystery surrounding the supposedly haphazard manner in which

²⁷Mies (1957), pp. 83-95; Newman (1988), pp. 143-145.

Beethoven notates his *staccato* marks can be found in an unpublished thesis by Riggs. He concludes that, on the whole, Beethoven uses dashes to indicate *staccato* over single notes, while dots are used with slurs to indicate *portato*. His view is also shared by Rosenblum, Drake and Brown. They maintain that dashes are employed in all instances where single notes are to be detached, irrespective of the degree of *staccato* desired. Although Newman, who had not read Riggs' thesis, has the opposite viewpoint regarding *staccato* notation over single notes, he agrees that dots and slurs are employed to indicate *portato*.²⁸

Although they arrive at opposing results, the two "groups" above often rely on the oft-quoted letter which Beethoven sent to Holz in 1825 (see pp. 68-69), and the composer's corrections in a set of orchestral parts for Symphony No. 7 in A major, Op. 92, to support their arguments. When commenting on the letter of 1825, Riggs and Brown clarify that Beethoven consistently replaced dashes under slurs with dots when correcting the copyists' work on the String Quartet Op. 132, but did not make any changes to the dashes placed over single notes. A similar observation is made regarding the orchestral parts for the Seventh Symphony: Beethoven changed all the dashes under slurs to dots. In addition, Riggs notices that when correcting the parts prepared by his copyists, Beethoven was very careful to change dashes under slurs (*portato*) to dots, but was not concerned about altering his copyists' dots to dashes (to indicate *staccato*) over single notes unless the two types of articulation occur in close succession. Investigations on this subject have also benefitted from the discovery of the manuscript of Op. 132 which was copied by Holz (it was unavailable when Nottebohm and Unverricht presented their views).²⁹

A page from the autograph of Op. 90/ii (ex. 6.20) shows how Beethoven clearly differentiates between round dots under slurs for *portato* and long dashes for *staccato*. Allowance must be given, however, for the irregularities in the shapes and sizes of Beethoven's *staccato* and *portato* indications which could be caused by writing fatigue, or the varying sizes of the pen nips, or the "emotional drive" of the passage he was notating. Writing a dot with a quill pen can be difficult, especially if the end of the nip has been sharpened so many times that the hole becomes rather

²⁸Riggs (1987), pp. 245-269, 308-319 and 348-349; Rosenblum (1988), p. 186; Drake (1972), p. 136; Brown (1999), p. 252; Newman (1988), p. 143.

²⁹Riggs (1987), pp. 257-310 and 348-349; Brown (1993), p. 202; Brown (1999), p. 252; Drake (1972), p. 136; Rosenblum (1988), pp. 186-187.

large. In the autograph of Op. 101/iii, the two dots under a slur towards the end of bar 17 have been lengthened to the extent that they look like dashes (see ex. 3.6). If one studies the writing carefully, the ink is much darker and the lines are much thicker than in ex. 6.20. This suggests that the pen nip at this stage was much larger. Consequently, it is much more difficult to write the dots under a slur. This apparent “inconsistency” is obviously not intentional on the part of the composer.

Ex. 6.20



Beethoven's *staccato* notation was also consistent throughout his career as a composer. While he was proofreading a work, the *staccato* marks which were added in pencil could shed some light on this debate (the problems which could sometimes result from a large pen nip have been discussed in the previous paragraph). In his corrections of the three early sonatas from about 1783 (a set of sonatas which he dedicated to the Elector of Köln Maximilian Friedrich), the added *staccato* markings to the first sonata is particularly relevant. In bars 19-21 and again in bar 66 in the first movement of this sonata, long dashes are boldly added in pencil. His *staccato* notation was still the same thirty-three years later. The *staccato* markings, added in pencil, in Op. 101/ii/54

(ex. 6.21) are also in the shape of long dashes.

Ex. 6.21



Even though Beethoven does not vary his signs to indicate different degrees of *staccato*, performers should be able to decipher the composer's intentions based on the musical context. Czerny's solution is exemplary. In all his explanations regarding the choice of the different degrees of touches and articulation, it is the character of the individual passages and/or of the overall movement which is the deciding factor. The third movement of Op. 2/3 and the bass in the second movements of Op. 28 and Op. 31/1, for example, are all marked *staccato*. Czerny correctly observes that the *staccato* in the lively scherzo of Op. 2/3 must be "light and short". In contrast, the bass in the march-like second movement of Op. 28 should be "very short, light, and remarkably *staccato*". In the graceful second movement of Op. 31/1, the *staccato* is delicate, and he likens it to the accompaniment of a guitar.³⁰

6.7 MEZZO STACCATO

Czerny considers *mezzo staccato* (usually notated thus: $\overset{\frown}{\cdot\cdot\cdot}$, or when applied to single notes, —) as a touch between the smooth *legato* and the pointed *staccato*. Each note, struck with

³⁰Czerny (1846), pp. 37, 51 and 52.

a slight emphasis, should be held for two-thirds of its full note-value. In slow movements, the effect of this touch would resemble “a speech interrupted by sighs”,³¹ and would thus be appropriate in Op. 27/1/iii/19. His advice can also be applied to movements of moderate speed, for example, Op. 10/2/ii/38-40, 43-44, 47-48 (ex. 6.22) and Op. 26/i/209-212 (ex. 6.23). Note how effectively Beethoven changes the character of bars 205-208 at its modified repetition in bars 209-212 of ex. 6.23, primarily through the use of a different articulation.

Ex. 6.22

The image shows a musical score for Ex. 6.22, consisting of two staves (treble and bass clef) with a grand staff bracket. The music is in a minor key and features a series of chords and melodic lines. A circled number '34' is placed above the first measure. The notation includes various articulation marks such as slurs and accents, and a dynamic marking 'pp' (pianissimo) is visible in the first measure.

Ex. 6.23

The image shows two systems of musical notation for Ex. 6.23, each consisting of two staves (treble and bass clef) with a grand staff bracket. The first system is marked with a circled '205' above the first measure, and the second system is marked with a circled '209' above the first measure. The notation includes various articulation marks such as slurs and accents, and dynamic markings like 'pp' are present.

In addition to the “sighing effect”, Beethoven may have used this notation to convey a psychological message. He often uses it on repeated chords, for instance, in ex. 6.22 above and in Op. 53/ii/4, 18, 20, 26, and 27. In this context, Beethoven implies that an almost *legato* effect is needed even though the finger has to be lifted before the second chord is played. Sometimes, *mezzo staccato* chords are separated by rests, as in Op. 2/2/i/221-224 (ex. 6.24) and in Op.

³¹Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 20, 24 and 25.

7/ii/82-83. It is obvious that Beethoven does not intend that the chords in ex. 6.24 should be psychologically segregated even though they have to be physically disconnected, because they form a vital link between the development section and the recapitulation. The slurs over the dots, therefore, refer to a coherent phrasing leading to the recapitulation.


Ex. 6.24



In florid figurations, such as those found in Op. 31/1/ii/2, 4 (ex. 6.25) and similar bars, and in Op. 53/ii/11 and 13, another type of *mezzo staccato* is used. Czerny calls it the *lingering staccato*. He describes this method of playing as follows:

Here the fingers must rest on the keys for one half the duration of the notes, and the hand must remain as tranquil as in the *legato*; so that the notes are shortened only by a gentle withdrawing of the tips of the fingers.³²

Ex. 6.25



Czerny also states that *mezzo staccato* should be employed in very fast passages marked *leggiermente* or *leggierissimo*. To achieve this touch,

[e]ach finger must make contact with the keys with its soft and fleshy tip. By a rapid action, make a movement like that used in scratching or tearing off something. The tone must be clear, pearly and equal.³³


Apart from Op. 78/i/8-10 and 60-64 and Op. 79/i/12-23 and 134-144 which are in fast

³²Ibid., i, p. 186.

³³Ibid., iii, pp. 26-27.

movements, *leggiermente* usually occurs in demisemi-quaver passages of either slow movements or those of moderate speeds, for example in Op. 31/1/ii/10, 12, 74, and 76, Op. 110/i/12-19 and Op. 111/ii/72-80 (ex. 6.26).

Ex. 6.26



Even though it is difficult to assess the authenticity of Czerny's instructions on *mezzo staccato* owing to a lack of contemporary writings on this matter, his advice is plausible and seems to suit the various passages in the piano sonatas with this touch.

6.8 SUMMARY

Both Beethoven and Czerny employed a wide range of articulation (from *legatissimo* to *staccato*), but elected *legato* as the normal touch. Beethoven also taught Czerny the important lesson of obtaining a good tone when playing the piano, especially one that imitated excellent singers. Czerny's enthusiasm for the use of *martellato*, however, was probably not shared by his teacher. The latter repeatedly voiced his objection on composers and pianists who introduced virtuosity for its own sake.

In *The Art*, Czerny shows a strong understanding on the performance of short slurs in Beethoven's piano sonatas. By asking for the last note of these two- or three- note slurs to be detached, the appropriate character of the movement (such as humour) will be successfully conveyed. However, his advice for a smooth *legato* in *cantabile* or chordal passages is questionable. By extending Beethoven's longer slurs, Czerny chooses to sacrifice rhetorical expression for continuous *legato*.

Czerny and Beethoven, in contrast to many of their contemporaries, treated *sostenuto* and *tenuto* as two different terms. *Sostenuto* was used as an adjective to the main tempo headings, while *tenuto* was applicable to either single notes (or chords), or to a short chordal passage. When *tenuto* appears over single notes or chords, this signifies that the note or the chord should be emphasized. Beethoven also employs *tenuto* as an indication to sustain a succession of chords. Beethoven's two main usages of *tenuto* are correctly understood by Czerny.

Czerny recognised both the dash and the dot as indications of *staccato*. Beethoven differentiated between the two signs, but only as far as using dashes for *staccato* and dots under slurs for *portato*. The degree of shortness of a *staccato*, therefore, is derived not from the notation, but from the context it is used in the music.

On the whole, many of Czerny's suggestions on *legato* and *staccato* conform with Beethoven's notation. His advice also reflects a strong understanding of Beethoven's style and the distinct character of each movement. In some instances, however, Czerny's comments betray a personal preference, especially in the performance of long slurs.

CHAPTER 7: ORNAMENTATION

7.1 THE RELEVANCE OF BACH'S *ESSAY* IN THE UNDERSTANDING OF BEETHOVEN'S ORNAMENTS

The general survey of early nineteenth-century performance practice, as outlined in chapter 2, reveals their state of uncertainty in many areas. By no means the smallest issue is that of ornamentation, as the role and realizations of ornaments were undergoing a period of transition. Such change is clearly reflected in Beethoven's treatment of ornaments. In spite of his high regard for Bach's *Essay*, some of the ornaments in Beethoven's early compositions show that he was, to some extent, already departing from the tradition Bach had established.


The first obvious difference lies of course in the notation of ornaments. During Bach's lifetime, indications of ornaments were few, since performers were expected to introduce embellishments at their own discretion, including those unnotated but obligatory ornaments at the cadential trill and the fermata. Beethoven was more particular in his indications as to the type of ornament and the context in which each occurs. While Bach used small notes to indicate both the long and the short appoggiatura (the difference between the two ornaments had to be deduced from the musical context), Beethoven preferred to notate his long appoggiaturas in large notes. Only the short appoggiaturas were indicated by small notes in order to avoid any confusion that may have arisen as a result of the dual function of these small notes.

From his first set of piano sonatas with opus number, there is already a hint that he did not necessarily agree with Bach on the context in which he should introduce his ornaments. The way the *Schneller* is employed is an example. Bach states that this short trill (which he calls a *Pralltriller*) appears only in a descending second. It is found either over the second note of a two-note slur (ex. 7.1a) or in descending passages of three or more notes (ex. 7.1b) and should never appear over detached notes.¹ Since it is placed over rapid notes, its function is to add "life and brilliance to a performance".²


¹Bach (1974), pp. 110-112.

²Ibid., p. 110.

Ex. 7.1a




Ex. 7.1b




Although Beethoven retains the quick and brilliant characteristics of this ornament, the *Schneller* in his piano sonatas always begin on the first rather than the second note. For example, Op. 2/2/iv/27 and 29 (ex. 7.2), Op. 7/iv/43 and 136 and Op. 79/iii/7 and 41. He even uses the *Schneller* in ascending figures in two of his piano sonatas – Op. 2/3/i/58-59, 190, 191-192 and Op. 22/i/10 and 137 (ex. 7.3).³ In addition, Newman concludes that Beethoven's *Schneller* consists not of four notes as suggested by Bach (ex. 7.1a above), but of three (see also the discussion on the placement of the *Schneller* in relation to the beat in section 7.3 below).³

Ex. 7.2




³Newman (1976), pp. 446-450; Bach (1974), p. 110.

Ex. 7.3



Beethoven's treatment of slides, however, is less radical. Bach divides slides into two categories - one consists of two notes and the other of three. The two-note slide, which is usually played quickly, is "always used in a leap which it helps to fill in". The three-note slide is also used to fill the gap in a leap but its speed is determined by the character of the movement and the tempo. It is suitable not only in rapid movements but also in slow and expressive ones. The two-note slide can be indicated by small notes or by \sim (ex. 7.4). Similarly, the three-note slide can either be written out or indicated with a \curvearrowright (ex. 7.5). This slide may be followed by a leap or a note in stepwise motion. Both types of slide are performed before the beat.⁴

Ex. 7.4



Ex. 7.5



The three-note slide, as described by Bach, is used frequently in Beethoven's piano sonatas written by 1800. It sometimes appears alongside modified versions of this ornament, such as

⁴Bach (1974), pp. 136-138.


those derived from triads or broken chords in Op. 10/1/i/9-13 (ex. 7.6). Such slides are relatively

Ex. 7.6




common in all his piano sonatas. It is also observed that many two-note slides in the piano sonatas do not conform to Bach's rules, with the exception of those in Op. 31/1/ii/42, 44 and 46. While Bach uses the two-note slide to fill the gap of a leap, Beethoven sometimes uses it as a decoration (often without a leap), as in Op. 13/iii/5-6, 66-67, 125-126, and 175-176, and Op. 31/1/ii/33 and 97 (ex. 7.7). He also uses a succession of two-note slides, again as decorations to

Ex. 7.7



the main notes, for example in Op. 7/ii/38 and 40-41 (ex. 7.8), Op. 27/2/iii/61-62, 155-156 and 194-196 and Op. 110/i/25-26 and 84-85. Although Bach states that the two-note slide is often performed quickly, Beethoven's two-note slide in Op. 7/ii/14 and 74 (ex. 7.9) appears at the climax of the phrase, which invites a natural broadening of the tempo. Beethoven also extends

Ex. 7.8



Ex. 7.9

the number of notes in a slide, turning it into a florid figuration which fills the gap in a leap in Op. 10/1/ii/17, 19, 21, 62, 64, and 66 and Op. 31/2/ii/5 and 94 (ex. 7.10).

Ex. 7.10

A number of Bach's rules governing the appropriate contexts for the inclusion of particular ornaments, their realizations and characteristics, are only loosely observed by Beethoven. Sometimes they are modified, as is the case with the *Schneller* and the slide. This has serious implications, for it calls into question the extent to which modern scholars can rely on Bach's *Essay* as a basis of understanding the realization of Beethoven's ornaments, especially trills. Even in an early composition such as WoO40 (see exs. 7.29a and 7.29b below), his fingerings for the three trills indicate not only an upper-note start (as Bach practised) but a main-note one as well. A lack of universal consensus on the realization of ornaments in the early nineteenth century makes it equally unhelpful to consult contemporary treatises. Even some of the few fingerings which Beethoven added over his trills have given rise to more questions than answers, as will be discussed in section 7.4 below. The only alternative, therefore, where Beethoven's instruction is unavailable, is the study of the musical contexts in which these ornaments occur (even if this may sometimes be rather subjective). Unfortunately, it is not possible to compare Beethoven's and Czerny's realizations of every ornament, since the former did not leave sufficient directions


regarding their realizations. For this reason, discussion of the performance of the turn is not included here.

7.2 APPOGGIATURAS


While many of Beethoven's long appoggiaturas are written out, he prefers to use small notes with or without a stroke across the stem (♫ and ♪) to indicate the short appoggiatura. The two signs seem to be used interchangeably. In the exposition of Op. 13/i/51-71, for instance, he notates the short appoggiatura with a ♫ but in the analogous passage in the recapitulation (bb. 221-241), he uses ♪. Czerny accepts the two signs to represent the short appoggiatura except in the contexts shown in ex. 7.11.⁵

Ex. 7.11



A few years later, Czerny again asks for the same realization of an appoggiatura similar to the third instance in ex. 7.11 above. With regard to the passage in Op. 10/3/i/53-55 (ex. 7.12), he specifies that “the little note is a long appoggiatura [*sic*] and must therefore be played as a quaver ”.⁶ Unfortunately, it is not possible to deduce Beethoven's intentions here because he always assigns the appoggiatura sign to the same descending figure.

Ex. 7.12



⁵Czerny (1839E), i, p. 161; Czerny (1846), p. 42.

⁶Czerny (1846), p. 42.

Nevertheless, Czerny's instruction that the short appoggiatura should be accented on the second note⁷ can be safely applied to Beethoven's compositions. The *sf* or > markings on the main notes of Op. 2/i/i/5-6, Op. 2/2/iv/4, 28 and 125, Op. 7/iii/36, 38 and 40, and Op. 13/i/53-54 and in similar bars (ex. 7.13) determine that the second note of the short appoggiatura receives the accent.

Ex. 7.13

7.3 THE SCHNELLER

According to Czerny, the *Schneller* (he refers to it as the transient shake) is made up of three notes. The two small notes added to the written note must be played very quickly, with an emphasis on the third or written note.⁸ He consistently gives the same advice regarding this ornament, using the same explanation for this ornament in the third movement of Op. 31/2. His recommended realization of the ornament beginning in bar 43 is shown in ex. 7.14.⁹

Ex. 7.14

⁷Czerny (1839E), i, p. 161.

⁸Ibid., i, p. 163.

⁹Czerny (1846), p. 54.

By suggesting that the bass “must come out smartly after the two small notes”,¹⁰ he is implying that the *Schneller* should be played before the beat. As mentioned in section 7.1, Beethoven introduced this ornament in a different context from Bach, suggesting that the former might have had a different realization in mind. However, do Czerny’s recommendations above represent the way in which Beethoven would have realized the *Schneller*? Although scholars of performance practice accept Czerny’s suggestion that this ornament consists of three notes, they question his claim that it should be played before the beat and that the accent should fall on the third note. Newman cites Op. 7/i/109-110 (ex. 7.15) in which, he believes, the semiquavers in bar 108 prevent the first two notes of the *Schneller* from being introduced before the first beat of the following bar.¹¹

Ex. 7.15

Kullak and Newman also believe that the accent should be on the first beat, rather than the third.¹² Their doubt is not without basis. If Czerny’s advice regarding the passage in ex. 7.14 is to be taken literally, playing the *Schneller* before the beat and placing an accent on the third note would shorten the length of the ensuing quaver. The rhythm of the two equal quavers would be distorted. In this case, it is more suitable to place the accent on the first note. In addition, the position in which they occur in Beethoven’s music could further clarify this matter. Many of his *Schneller* are on the first of a two- or three-note slur, so according to the rule governing short slurs as discussed in section 6.4, the first note of the slur (and therefore the first note of the *Schneller*) is to be slightly accented.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Newman (1988), pp. 213-214.

¹²Kullak (1973), pp. 77-78; Newman (1988), pp. 213-214.

7.4 THE TRILL

Czerny lists three possible ways of starting a trill - on the note above, on the main note or on the note below. Unlike his invariable advice on the realizations of the appoggiatura and the *Schneller*, his view on the performance of the trill in the 1830s and 40s differs from that in the 1820s, as is outlined below.

According to Czerny's *Piano Forte School*, a trill may begin on the main note when it is preceded by rests or by any note apart from the principal note itself. If the latter occurs, a start on the upper note is advisable. The trill may also begin on the lower auxiliary note when it is preceded by a lower appoggiatura prefix. Double trills also begin on their respective main notes.¹³ A summary of these rules appeared two years later, in his introductory remarks to the *School for the Practice of the Shake*, Op. 632: a work which contains twelve exercises for the practice of the trill. The notable difference is his advice on the starting note of the trill which accompanies a melody, to be played by the same hand. In the *Piano Forte School*, his advice is to start this trill on the upper note.¹⁴ In Op. 632, he asks for trills of this type to begin on the main note.¹⁵

Although Czerny is insistent in the *Piano Forte School* and in Op. 632 that most trills should begin on their main notes, his earlier emphasis, as specified in his preface to the *Grand Exercise for the Practice of the Shake*, Op. 151 (c1828), is to begin them on their upper notes. Of the three possible beginnings for a trill, he expresses in Op. 151 a preference for the upper-note start. The vast majority of fingering in the exercise of Op. 151 refers to an upper-note start, including those which accompany a melody to be played by one hand, and a succession of trills quitted by skips (ex. 7.16). By the time *Piano Forte School* was written, he had decided to adopt a main-note start for trills which were quitted by leaps.¹⁶

¹³Czerny (1839E), i, pp. 171-175.

¹⁴Ibid., i, p. 176 and ii, pp. 128-130.

¹⁵Czerny (1841), p. 4.

¹⁶Czerny (c1828), preface and p. 5; Czerny (1839E), ii, p. 129.

Ex. 7.16



Czerny's view on the automatic inclusion of a suffix to end a trill was also different in the 1820s. In the preface to Op. 151, he states that when a suffix is not notated, the trill should be performed without it. Eleven years later, he had changed his mind. In the *Piano Forte School*, he instructs that irrespective of whether a suffix is notated, the trill should end with it.¹⁷ As mentioned in chapter 2, there was a definite trend in the early nineteenth century towards adopting a main-note start for the trill and ending it with a suffix. Although Hummel embraced both upper-note and main-note starts, he expressed a preference for the latter. He also began embracing this new practice ahead of Czerny. In the same year that Hummel published his German treatise (1828), Czerny's Op. 151 still endorses the upper-note start, with the trill finishing without a suffix unless notated.

A comparison of the preface of Op. 151 with Czerny's comments in the *Piano Forte School* further reveal subtle changes to the rapidity and the qualities which he claims constitute a good performance of a trill. In his explanation on the realization of a descending chain of trills in Op. 151 (ex. 7.17), each trill consists of five notes. The same realization in the *Piano Forte School* shows each trill with nine notes (ex. 7.18),¹⁸ suggesting an increase in the rapidity of the trill. His choice of adjectives also confirm this change in approach. In Op. 151, he instructs that successive trills in the grand exercise must be played "quite *legato*, and in a light, graceful, style". By 1839, he is more concerned with trills being "quick, equal and distinct".¹⁹ This shows a significant change in attitude even after consideration is given to his qualifying statement following ex. 7.18 in the *Piano Forte School* – the number of notes in a trill varies depending on the context.

¹⁷Czerny (c1828), preface; Czerny (1839E), i, p. 171.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Ibid.

Ex. 7.17

Ex. 7.18

Czerny's theoretical writings display his conscious efforts gradually to incorporate the new ways of performing trills. Unfortunately, his fingerings in some of the examples in the second volume of *Piano Forte School* contradict his guidelines in the first volume of the same treatise. For example, according to the first volume, single trills over double notes should begin on their respective main notes, as shown in ex. 7.19 below.²⁰

²⁰Czerny (1839E), i, p. 174.

Ex. 7.19

Musical score for Ex. 7.19, showing a piano arrangement. The score is in 3/4 time and consists of two systems. The first system shows the right and left hands with trills indicated by a wavy line and a 'tr' symbol. The second system shows the right and left hands with trills and fingerings. The right hand has fingerings 3, 4, 3, 4, 3, 4, 3, 4, 3, 2, 1, 2, 3, 2, 1, 2. The left hand has fingerings 2, 4, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 3, 2, 1, 2, 3, 2, 1, 2, 3, 2. The score is in 3/4 time and consists of two systems. The first system shows the right and left hands with trills indicated by a wavy line and a 'tr' symbol. The second system shows the right and left hands with trills and fingerings. The right hand has fingerings 3, 4, 3, 4, 3, 4, 3, 4, 3, 2, 1, 2, 3, 2, 1, 2. The left hand has fingerings 2, 4, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 3, 2, 1, 2, 3, 2, 1, 2, 3, 2.

The same type of trill in the second volume, however, begins on the upper note (ex. 7.20).²¹

Ex. 7.20

Musical score for Ex. 7.20, showing a piano arrangement. The score is in 3/4 time and consists of two systems. The first system shows the right and left hands with trills indicated by a wavy line and a 'tr' symbol. The right hand has fingerings 4, 3, 2, 3, 2. The left hand has fingerings 5, 3. The score is in 3/4 time and consists of two systems. The first system shows the right and left hands with trills indicated by a wavy line and a 'tr' symbol. The right hand has fingerings 4, 3, 2, 3, 2. The left hand has fingerings 5, 3.

Incidentally, it is common for Czerny to add prefixes to trills in his theoretical writings (such as in Op. 632) and in his arrangements of Beethoven's compositions, including the "Kreutzer" Sonata, Op. 47, and the Septet, Op. 20. In the third movement of the Septet, Czerny adds the upper appoggiatura prefix in bar 20 (ex. 7.21). Beethoven's original score does not have a trill at this point, but unlike wind instruments, once a piano key is struck, the tone decays very quickly. As a result, a trill, instead of an unembellished long-held $b\flat^2$, is more appropriate in the piano arrangement. The added upper-note prefix clearly confirms Czerny's position with regard to the starting note of the trill.


²¹Ibid., ii, p. 132.

Ex. 7.21



All Czerny's double trills in the second volume of *Piano Forte School*, except the ascending and descending chains of double trills, begin on their upper notes. This is in direct opposition to the precepts he himself listed in the first volume of his treatise. Discrepancy also exists with regard to Czerny's realization of a trill which is sandwiched vertically between two notes in the same hand. In the first volume of this 1839 treatise, he insists that the double trills should start on the main notes (ex. 7.22) while in the second volume, the same type of trill begins on the upper note.²²

Ex. 7.22



The fingering in ex. 7.23 below, from the second volume of *Piano Forte School*, not only contradicts Czerny's instructions in the first volume of the same treatise (see ex. 7.24), it is also inconsistent within the passage itself.²³ The fingering in the first bar of ex. 7.23 points to a main-note start (both in the right hand and the left) while in the third bar, an upper-note start is

²²Ibid., i, pp. 175 and 177 and ii, pp. 130 and 132-134.

²³Ibid., i, p. 176 and ii, p. 138.

Ex. 7.26

Franz Kullak was one of the first to observe the inconsistencies in Czerny's realizations of trills. He initially considered Czerny's remarks in the *Piano Forte School* to be valid advice on the realizations of trills in Beethoven's piano music, but the results of his investigations convinced him otherwise. He was shocked and disgusted that Czerny's fingering of the trills in the "Kreutzer" Sonata, Op. 47, differed in two separate editions. The majority of the trills in Czerny's arrangement of the Variations from the "Kreutzer" Sonata (Kullak dates the publication date c1821), which have double fingerings or added prefixes, begin on the upper notes. Later, in his score edition of the same sonata (published by Simrock), Czerny had removed many of the double fingerings and the added prefixes, replacing them with single fingerings. Only one passage in the Simrock edition (from var. 4) has double fingerings. In contrast to Czerny's earlier preference for upper-note starts, the double fingerings in this Simrock edition indicate that the trills should begin on their main notes. Kullak assumes that the other trills with only single fingerings in this passage would also begin on their main notes.²⁵ We have seen in the previous paragraph how erroneous this assumption may be, given Czerny's fondness for different starting notes. In addition, the second volume of the *Piano Forte School* reveals that when single fingerings are indicated, they may not necessarily refer to the starting note of the trills. To aid his discussion on the appropriate fingerings for trills, Czerny recommends the combination of 42-31 for a trill in thirds, but his single fingering does not refer to the starting note (ex. 7.27).²⁶

Ex. 7.27

²⁵Kullak (1973), pp. 83-86.

²⁶Czerny (1839E), ii, p. 133.

In spite of a gradual change towards the preference for a main-note start in his theoretical writings from the 1830s, Czerny shows a lack of consistency in practice. His fingerings, and his own addition of prefixes which may vary from one arrangement to another (as is the case with the “Kreutzer” Sonata), often contradict the very rules which he emphasized in Op. 151 and in the *Piano Forte School*. The added prefix to the trill in his arrangement of the Septet, Op. 20 (ex. 7.21 above) indicates an upper-note start. It is noted with interest that this arrangement was made about a year before the publication of the *Piano Forte School*, in which he strongly favoured a main-note start. These inconsistencies raise many questions. Could he merely be recalling how this trill was realized during Beethoven’s lifetime? Are Czerny’s inconsistent suggestions of starting notes a reflection of Beethoven’s own practice or are they simply dictated by his own fancy?

Unfortunately, Beethoven’s practice on this matter is not entirely clear either. The comment and the few fingerings he left on the matter have served not to secure agreement but to divide opinion among modern scholars. In bar 8 of the piano part from the Piano Trio in B flat, WoO39, published in 1812, Beethoven’s fingering is a direction for the trill to begin on the upper note (ex. 7.28).

Ex. 7.28

Beethoven also inserts fingerings for three trills in his Variations for Piano and Violin, WoO40 (1793). Even in an early work such as this, only two of his three fingerings reveal an upper-note start. The trills in bars 59-60 (first in the treble, then in the bass) both begin on their upper notes (ex. 7.29a). In contrast, his fingering in bar 74 implies a main-note start (ex. 7.29b).

Ex. 7.29a The trill begins in bar 49.

Musical score for Ex. 7.29a. The top staff is for the Violin (Vn.) and the bottom two staves are for the Piano (Piano). The key signature has one flat (B-flat). The violin part starts with a circled '59' above the first measure. The piano part has a trill in the right hand starting in the second measure, marked with a circled '12' and a wavy line. The left hand has a bass clef and a few notes.

Ex. 7.29b

Musical score for Ex. 7.29b. The top staff is for the Violin (Vn.) and the bottom two staves are for the Piano (Piano). The key signature has one flat (B-flat). The violin part starts with a circled '14' above the first measure. The piano part has a trill in the right hand starting in the first measure, marked with '3 3' and a wavy line. The left hand has a bass clef and a few notes.

The fingering of the trill in Op. 119/7/1-2 in Starke's *Wiener Piano-Forte Schule* (1819-1821) and in the authentic English edition published by Clementi (1823) are the same. They are believed to have been inserted by Beethoven but, here again, the two trills begin on their main notes (ex. 7.30).

Ex. 7.30

Musical score for Ex. 7.30. The top staff is for the right hand and the bottom staff is for the left hand. The key signature has one flat (B-flat). The right hand has a trill starting in the first measure, marked with a circled '12' and a wavy line. The left hand has a bass clef and a few notes.

An early miscellaneous sketch by Beethoven (no later than 1792) contains two double-note trills in which the second finger crosses over the thumb (ex. 7.31).²⁷

Ex. 7.31

The image shows a musical sketch on a grand staff. The first system contains a treble clef, a key signature of one sharp (F#), and a common time signature. It features a double-note trill starting on G4 and A4. Above the notes, the fingering '5 4 1 2' is written for the upper note and '5 4 1 2' for the lower note. A handwritten note above the first trill reads 'Triller ist schwer'. The second system contains a treble clef, a key signature of one flat (F), and a common time signature. It features a double-note trill starting on F4 and G4. Above the notes, the fingering '5 4 1 2' is written for the upper note and '5 4 1 2' for the lower note. A handwritten note above the second trill reads 'Triller ist nicht möglich mit dem Fingersatz zu machen.' Below the first system, the fingering '5 4 1 2' is written again. The sketch ends with a double bar line.

The trills, according to Beethoven's fingerings, begin on their upper notes. Although he considered the second trill to be impossible with the 51-42 fingering, he must have decided that it was the most suitable for double trills of smaller intervals. In two of his published compositions, he again returns to this fingering: a double trill in thirds in WoO40 (see ex. 7.29a above) and a double trill in fifths in Op. 111 (see ex. 7.32 below).

One fingering by Beethoven which have caused the most debate is that of his double trill in the treble of Op. 111/ii/112 (ex. 7.32). Winter, Beyschlag, Drake, Grundmann and Mies believe that the fingering (52-41) indicates a crossed fingering as shown in Beethoven's early illustration in ex. 7.31 above, where both notes of the double trill begin on their upper notes. Newman, however, is unconvinced. He suggests a rather peculiar alternative, that the trill on the soprano a^{b2} should begin on the upper note while the alto d^2 should begin on the main note.²⁸ The realization of this double-note trill should be viewed within the context of its modulation to E \flat major. The lower prefix to the trill in bar 106 would result in $c\sharp^2 d^2 e^2 d^2 e^2 d^2$ being its first few notes. If one then chooses to begin the trill two bars later on the upper note (with an e^b2 as indicated), this will lead smoothly into the double note trill in bar 112 (with upper-note starts for both notes). The faint fingering (1-2) in the tenor part of this bar has also been a source of debate, this time regarding whether it was inserted by Beethoven.²⁹ Assuming that the fingering is by Beethoven, the trilling of this chord, with the upper-note starts, will act as V_4^6 . The music then passes briefly through the first inversion of the tonic in bar 118, ii^7 in bar 119, V^7 in bar 120, and finally the resolution to I in the following bar.

²⁷Newman (1988), p. 194; Nottebohm (1887), p. 359.

²⁸Winter (1977), pp. 492-494; Beyschlag (1908), p. 217; Drake (1972), p. 167; Grundmann and Mies (1966), pp. 125-126; Newman (1978), p. 100; Newman (1988), p. 194.

²⁹For a list of sources which contains this argument, see the list in fn. 28.

Ex. 7.32

The musical score consists of three systems of piano music. The first system, measures 106-118, begins with a trill in the right hand starting at measure 106. Dynamics include *f*, *p*, *dim.*, and *pp*. The second system, measures 119-120, continues the trill with dynamics *p cresc.*, *sf*, *p cresc.*, and *dim.*. The third system, measure 120, is marked *espressivo* and *p*. Fingerings and articulation marks are present throughout.

Various hypotheses have been put forward in an attempt to discover how Beethoven may have intended his trills to be performed. Although Rosenblum recognises that the starting note of a trill can be determined by the melodic line, she is convinced that dissonance is the most important and influential factor. Winter also places much emphasis on the importance of dissonance. Although Newman acknowledges the function of trills as dissonant appoggiaturas in Beethoven's early compositions, he prefers to deduce the starting note of a trill from melodic and technical factors. He considers that using dissonance as a factor is too subjective and therefore unreliable.³⁰

³⁰Rosenblum (1988), pp. 250-255; Winter (1977), pp. 483-504; Winter (1979), pp. 111-116; Newman (1988), pp. 196-202; Newman (1976), pp. 440-446 and 451-453; Newman (1978), pp. 98-103.

These explanations, though intelligent, are all subjective. Take for example Beethoven's fingering for WoO39 (ex. 7.28 above). Following Newman's and Rosenblum's guidelines, which would take into account the descending line and the harmonic progression in bar 8, they would probably advise a main-note start. In asking for the trill to begin on the upper note, Beethoven clearly does not follow the same rules. Consider his suggestion regarding one of the trills within the long series towards the end of the third movement of Op. 53 (ex. 7.33).

Ex. 7.33

The musical score for Ex. 7.33 consists of four systems of piano music. The first system (measures 473-475) shows a trill in measure 473 starting with a piano (pp) dynamic, followed by a crescendo (cresc.) in measure 474 and a forte (f) dynamic in measure 475. The second system (measures 476-478) shows a decrescendo (decresc.) in measure 476, a piano (p) dynamic in measure 477, and a crescendo (cresc.) in measure 478. The third system (measures 479-480) shows a piano (pp) dynamic in measure 479 and another piano (pp) dynamic in measure 480. The score includes various fingering suggestions and dynamic markings throughout.

At the end of the autograph, Beethoven suggests that the trill in bar 485 should begin on the upper note (exs. 7.34a and 7.34b) but does not provide any instruction on the starting note of the trill beginning in bar 477. It also offers the insight that he, unlike Czerny, is not unduly concerned about playing the trill (which accompanies a melody) at a slower pace than usual:

N. B. Those for whom the trill is too difficult, here where the theme is joined with it, may facilitate the trill in the following manner [ex. 7.34a], or, according to the extent of their capability, also double it [ex. 7.34b]

Ex. 7.34a



Ex. 7.34b



Of these sextuplets two are played to each quarter in the bass. Generally it is not important if this trill also loses something of its usual speed.³¹

If one were to apply Newman's arguments that Beethoven generally preferred to begin his trills on the main note and his (as well as Rosenblum's) guideline regarding the preservation of the melodic line, the trill in bar 477 should begin on the main note. Although the trill in bar 485 has no prefix, Beethoven's suggestion shows the trill beginning on the upper note. This would give rise to an apparently indiscriminate choice of a main-note start in bar 477 followed by an upper-note continuation in bar 485. There is, however, another solution. A closer examination of the score reveals that the Rondo theme accompanied by a lower trill in the right hand has been announced three times previously (bb. 55, 168 and 337). Each time, the entry of the theme is preceded by four bars of descending semiquavers in the bass and a trill on a held g^2 in the right hand. In all three instances, Beethoven conscientiously notates an upper appoggiatura ($a \sharp^2$) to each trill. The trill on g^2 in bar 477, however, is not preceded by an upper appoggiatura, perhaps because Beethoven considered it to be understood. Therefore, by starting the trill in bar 477 on the upper note, one will be able to maintain a consistent pattern whereby the Rondo theme suddenly "appears" from a long, seamless trill. In addition, the tie joining g^2 in bars 484 to 485 shows that Beethoven wishes for the trill to continue smoothly into bar 485. This can be achieved

³¹Drake (1972), p. 165. Drake's translation.

only if the trill in bar 485 were to begin on the upper note.

By initially starting the trill in bar 485 on the main note, before crossing it out and opting for the upper note (see exs. 7.34a and 7.34b above), Beethoven gives the impression of being indecisive. Drake reasons that the shade of the ink on the g^2 natural and the slant of the handwriting suggests that Beethoven automatically thought of the trill beginning on the main note.³² This is a perfectly plausible explanation except that it does not reveal why Beethoven eventually decided to start on the upper note. One reason could be, as is explained in the previous paragraph, that he expected this trill to be treated in the same manner as those three earlier statements.

Although Czerny's usage of a combination of starting notes in exs. 7.25 and 7.26 above is now considered eccentric, the possibility remains that Beethoven himself might have done the same. In the long trill passage from Op. 53/iii (bb. 493-514), the latter requests for an upper-note start in bars 493, 501 and 507, but a lower-note start in bar 511. Similarly, the trills in Op. 57/i/44-46 have different starting notes; the trill in bar 44 is preceded by a lower appoggiatura while those in bars 45-46, by upper appoggiaturas. Beethoven leaves no doubt as to his intended starting notes of trills when they are preceded by appoggiaturas, but how does he expect performers to realize those trills without prefixes? Could the "inconsistent" starting notes in the passages where trills are preceded by appoggiaturas be a clue that the performer has the freedom to choose the starting note of the trills which are not preceded by a prefix?

The views of Winter, Rosenblum, Drake, Newman and other present-day scholars cannot be entirely conclusive. The fact that the limited fingerings which Beethoven left do not favour one starting note over the other suggests that he did not strictly practise either the eighteenth-century or the nineteenth-century system. He continued to use all three ways of starting a trill throughout his creative output. The theory that the starting note of a trill (without a prefix) can be chosen by studying the harmony (often the starting note of the trill is expected to create dissonance with the harmony) or by following the logical path of the melodic line does not seem to apply to every trill which has been fingered by the composer. Perhaps Beethoven, like Czerny, employed one of the three starting notes according to his "fancy".

³²Ibid.

CHAPTER 8: FINGERING, HAND POSITION AND TECHNICAL EXERCISES

As discussed in section 1.2, Czerny's first lesson with Beethoven was on correct hand position and fingering. That correct fingering is a fundamental aspect of playing is again emphasized in Beethoven's oft-quoted 1817 letter to his pupil.¹ Beethoven's contemporaries, including Sir John Russell, Gerhard von Breuning and Friedrich Wieck, all agree that he played with curved fingers², and in Schindler's words "[h]is hands and the upper portion of his body were held [in a] quiet [manner]"³. Therese Brunsvik, who had lessons with Beethoven in 1799, relates how Beethoven "never grew weary of holding down and bending my fingers, which I have been taught to lift high and hold straight"⁴. Willibrord Joseph Mähler, a prominent portrait painter who heard Beethoven in 1803, later recalled how he "played with his hands so very still; wonderful as his execution was, there was no tossing them to and fro, up and down; they seemed to glide right and left over the keys, the fingers alone doing the work"⁵. Even when the music is not in a close five-finger shape, as shown in an early sketch which dates from about 1793 (ex. 8.1), Beethoven's direction reveals that he expects the hand to be always held in a close position.

Ex. 8.1 *Die Hand so sehr als möglich zusammen gehalten.*

The image shows a handwritten musical sketch for piano in 2/4 time. It consists of two systems of staves. The first system has a treble clef on the top staff and a bass clef on the bottom staff. The treble staff contains a series of notes with fingerings (1-2-3-4-5) and a dynamic marking 'pp'. The bass staff contains a few notes with fingerings. The second system continues the treble staff with more notes and fingerings, while the bass staff has a few notes. A large handwritten annotation 'die Hand so sehr als möglich zusammen gehalten.' is written above the first system, with a curved line underlining it. Another handwritten annotation 'pp auf das strengste legato' is written below the first system.

¹Anderson (1961), ii, p. 742.

²Sonneck (1967), pp. 115 and 128; Breuning (1992), p. 78; Czerny (1956), p. 307.

³Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle), p. 415. See also Czerny (1970), p. 15.

⁴Thayer (1969), p. 235.

⁵Ibid., p. 337.

Using correct fingering, adopting a quiet hand position and playing with curved fingers are also aspects of playing the piano which are frequently stressed in Czerny's writings. In his *Letters to A Young Lady*, he shows the relationship between correct fingering, a quiet hand position and playing with curved fingers:

In general, that mode of fingering must be chosen by which we may most easily and naturally be able to maintain a tranquil and fine position of the hands, a firm and perpendicular percussion, as well as a correct holding down of the keys, and a beautiful and connected performance of the melody and of the scales and runs.⁶

Once the art of fingering is mastered, Czerny promises that the pianist will be able

to execute the most rapid runs, the most intricate passages, consisting often of numberless notes, the boldest skips, the most delicate and complicated embellishments [...] with the same perfect equality, connection, and volubility, as if nature had bestowed upon him at least *fifty* fingers.⁷

The large collection of studies by Czerny further testifies to the importance he places on correct fingering when practising technical exercises. He tirelessly inserts fingerings in all the exercises in the *Piano Forte School*, right from the very first pages. In the second volume of this treatise, he even prepares a comprehensive list of the fundamental rules of fingering. However, since Czerny considers the rules of fingering to be influenced by the development of mechanical dexterity,⁸ this chapter (from section 8.2 onwards) will compare his teaching with the few fingerings provided by Beethoven in compositions which involve the piano.

8.1 SOME TECHNICAL EXERCISES FROM BEETHOVEN'S SKETCHES

Throughout his creative years, Beethoven experimented with various sound worlds and technical difficulties, noting down some of the results in sketchbooks. He sometimes resorted to unconventional means to achieve his goal, such as using two fingers to play a single note for a

⁶Czerny (1848), pp. 25-26. See also Czerny (1839E), i, pp. 2 and 44-46 and ii, p. 5.

⁷Czerny (1839E), ii, p. 2. Italicization original.

⁸Ibid.

stronger and fuller tone, as shown in bars 25-31 from a sketch of 1793/early 1794 (lines 3 and 4 in ex. 8.2). This method of playing remained in use even after his death, as it was still mentioned in Czerny's *Piano Forte School*.⁹

Ex. 8.2

①

3 alle Noten durchaus mit dem 3ten Finger

*Note unclear in manuscript

②⑤


alle diese Noten mit dem 3ten und 4ten Finger zusammen gegriffen

⁹Ibid., ii, p. 169.

In the first nine bars of ex. 8.2 above (see the first two lines), Beethoven demonstrates an understanding of the natural characteristics of the fingers. In order to obtain a powerful *fortissimo* on the single bass notes, he not only chooses the strongest finger, but by assigning one finger to all these notes, he is also using the weight of the arm to make the notes louder and fuller.

Many of Beethoven's sketches from 1790-1803 contain innovative finger patterns, accompanied by remarks on effective ways to execute these patterns (including the art of fingering). The results of these explorations, which benefitted Czerny, provide the foundation for his numerous studies. In addition to training technical facility through all conceivable passages and finger patterns, Czerny also encourages the repetition of such exercises to develop the strength and agility of the fingers, and to strive for greater evenness in playing. His preoccupation with practising repeated figures can also be traced to Beethoven, who in his sketch of October 1790 (ex. 8.3), indicates that the motif is to be played many times.

Ex. 8.3



The finger patterns in the various sketches by Beethoven below, obtained from his Kafka and Kessler sketchbooks, as well as from a miscellaneous leaf in Nottebohm's *Beethoveniana*, can be found in any of Czerny's studies for the advanced pianist. As a young man of about twenty-one, Beethoven made a sketch on rapid *staccato* octaves (ex. 8.4). This exercise, to be played "up and down through all major and minor keys in as fast a tempo as possible"¹⁰ is practicable only if one plays with a flexible arm. The same applies to his exercise on octave leaps (ex. 8.5) which has to be played by throwing the hand. Exs. 8.6, 8.7 and 8.8 below require the combination of light, agile finger action and a relaxed arm for the leaps.

¹⁰Rosenblum (1988), p. 207. Her translation.

Ex. 8.4

staccato sempre

durch alle Tonarten moll und dur sowohl herauf als herunter in so geschwindem Zeitmasse als möglich.

Detailed description: This exercise is written on a grand staff (treble and bass clefs). It consists of a series of chords and single notes, all marked with a vertical line above the notehead to indicate staccato. The notes are arranged in a sequence that moves through various tonalities, as indicated by the handwritten text below. The tempo is marked 'staccato sempre'.

Ex. 8.5

mit der Hand geworfen

Detailed description: This exercise is written on a single treble clef staff. It features a sequence of notes with specific fingerings indicated by numbers 2, 4, 2, 4, 2, 4 above the notes. The notes are slanted downwards, and the instruction 'mit der Hand geworfen' (thrown with the hand) is written below the staff.

Ex. 8.6

rechte H.


usw.

Detailed description: This exercise is written on a single treble clef staff. It contains a continuous sequence of notes, likely a scale or arpeggio exercise. The instruction 'rechte H.' (right hand) is written above the staff, and 'usw.' (etc.) is written at the end of the line.

Ex. 8.7


Detailed description: This exercise is written on three staves, representing the grand staff for piano. The top staff is in treble clef, and the bottom two are in bass clef. It features a complex arrangement of chords and melodic lines, with some sections marked with double slashes (//) indicating repetition or continuation. The exercise is divided into several measures across the three staves.

Ex. 8.8



Nevertheless, Beethoven was mindful not to neglect the training of the left hand. He wrote exercises in contrary motion based on the pattern in bars 7-8 from ex. 8.7 above. In another contrary motion exercise (ex. 8.8 above), the left hand is again expected to match the virtuosity of the right. Even as early as 1790, Beethoven already required the left hand to be as agile as the right (ex. 8.9). Czerny not only emphasizes this training of the left hand in his *Piano Forte School*,¹¹ but also provides ample studies, including a few which are written specifically for this purpose.¹²

Ex. 8.9



However, as was mentioned on p. 16, one must bear in mind that Beethoven never allowed technical showmanship to be more prominent than the expression of music. Ernst Pauer, a pianist,

¹¹See Czerny (1839E), i, p. 51.

¹²Grand Studies for the Improvement of the Left Hand, Op. 399; Easy Studies for the Left Hand, Op. 718; and Etudes, in Thirds, for the Left Hand, Op. 735.

writes:

They say that his performance was not so much “playing” as “painting with tones,” while others express it as recalling the effect of “reciting,” all of which are attempts to state the fact that in his playing, the means, – the passages, the execution, the technical appliances, – disappeared before the transcendent effect and meaning of the music. ... He was not particular in polishing and refining his performance, as were Hummel, Wölffl, Kalkbrenner, and others: indeed, such “special” artists he satirically calls “gymnasts,” and expresses the opinion that the “increasing mechanism of pianoforte playing would in the end destroy all truth of expression in music.”¹³

Czerny is often accused of embracing the ideal described in the last sentence. It is true that, as was mentioned in chapter 2, he thought more highly of the clarity and neatness of Hummel’s playing than of Beethoven’s. He also placed more emphasis on good technique than Beethoven (see pp. 11-12). However, one must not automatically assume that Czerny was interested only in drilling the fingers. His comments in *The Art* regarding the performance of Beethoven’s piano music reflect his sensitivity to the distinct character of each section and the complete movement. By insisting on good technique and an understanding of the composer’s style, he tries to get the best of both worlds by expressing the poetic content of the music through technical skill.

8.2 FUNDAMENTAL RULES OF FINGERING

Czerny declares that

[e]very passage which may be taken in several ways, should be played in that manner which is the most suitable and natural to the case that occurs, and which is determined partly by the adjacent notes, and partly by the style of execution.¹⁴

Indeed, his choice of fingering for the exercises and examples in the second volume of *Piano Forte School* and in the sonata excerpts in *The Art* often helps the pianist to obtain the smoothest connection of notes. He takes into account the highest note of each figure, the character of each passage, and its style (polyphonic passages, for example, require a particular fingering). He also

¹³Quoted in Gerig (1974), p. 98. Punctuation original.

¹⁴Czerny (1839E), ii, p. 4.

sympathizes with pianists who has small hands¹⁵ and, therefore, find it difficult to play broken octave passages in Op. 2/2/i/84-85, 88-89, 304-305 and 308-309 (ex. 8.10a) or the octave *glissando* in Op. 53/iii beginning in bar 465. For these pianists, he offers alternatives: either divide the passage between two hands (as in Op. 2/2/i) or play single notes instead of octaves (in Op. 53).¹⁶ Nevertheless, he reminds the reader that the suggested alternative way of playing the octave figure in Op. 2/2/i (ex. 8.10b) should not alter the character of the passage.¹⁷ Beethoven's Ex. 8.10a

Ex. 8.10a is a musical score for a piano piece, likely from Beethoven's Op. 2, No. 2, first movement. It consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The key signature is two sharps (F# and C#), and the time signature is 7/8. The score is marked with a circled '84' at the beginning. The first staff contains a series of eighth notes with various fingering numbers (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) written above them. Dynamics include *ff* (fortissimo) and *sf* (sforzando). There are also markings for *m.s.* (mezzo-soprano) in both hands. The second staff continues the melodic line with similar fingering and dynamics.

Ex. 8.10b is a musical score showing an alternative way of playing a passage. It consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The key signature is two sharps (F# and C#). The score is marked with a circled '89'. The first staff shows a melodic line with dynamics *sf* (sforzando). The second staff shows a bass line with dynamics *sf*. The passage is shorter than Ex. 8.10a, focusing on the dynamic and articulation of the notes.

Ex. 8.10b

Ex. 8.10c is a musical score for a piano piece, likely from Beethoven's Op. 2, No. 2, first movement. It consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The key signature is two sharps (F# and C#), and the time signature is 7/8. The score is marked with a circled '84' at the beginning. The first staff contains a series of eighth notes with various fingering numbers (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) written above them. Dynamics include *ff* (fortissimo) and *fz* (forzando). There are also markings for *m.s.* (mezzo-soprano) in both hands. The second staff continues the melodic line with similar fingering and dynamics.

¹⁵He even dedicates two sets of studies (Opp. 748 and 749) to those with small hands.

¹⁶Czerny (1846), pp. 34 and 57.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 34.

fingerings reveal that he too considered all these factors when choosing a suitable fingering. In WoO50/i/13-17 and WoO39/5, 10, 13, and 15 (ex. 8.11), he arranges his fingering in such a way so as to allow the fifth finger in the right hand to play the highest note of each phrase. Very often, so as to accommodate hands of different sizes and shapes, he provides more than one set of fingering, for example Op. 28/iv/205 and 208 (exs. 8.12a and 8.12b) and Op. 90/ii/132.

Ex. 8.11

The image displays a musical score for three instruments: Violine (Violin), Violoncello (Cello), and Klavier (Piano). The score is divided into four systems, each containing staves for the Violine, Violoncello, and Klavier. The tempo is marked 'Allegretto' at the beginning of each system. The Klavier part is marked 'p dolce' and includes various fingering numbers (1-5) and dynamic markings such as 'cresc.' and 'p'. The Violine and Violoncello parts also include fingering numbers and dynamic markings like 'cresc.' and 'dolce'. The score is written in a single system with multiple staves for each instrument, showing the interaction between the strings and the piano accompaniment.

Ex. 8.12a

Musical notation for Ex. 8.12a, showing a piano exercise in D major. The exercise is marked with a circled number 305. The treble clef staff contains a sequence of notes with fingering numbers: 4, 3, 2, 1, 5, 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 3, 5. The bass clef staff contains notes with fingering numbers: 4, 2. The dynamic marking 'sf' is present in the treble staff.

Ex. 8.12b

Musical notation for Ex. 8.12b, showing a piano exercise in D major. The exercise is marked with a circled number 308. The treble clef staff contains notes with fingering numbers: 2, 1, 2, 5. The bass clef staff contains notes with fingering numbers: 2, 4, 5, 1, 2, 3, 5. The exercise is marked with a '12' in the bass staff and a '5' in the treble staff.

Czerny's rules on fingering in the passage below, quoted from the *Letters to A Young Lady*, are the same as those in the *Piano Forte School*:

First. When several keys are to be played one after another, either in ascending or in descending, and that [*sic*] five fingers are not sufficient for this purpose, the four longer fingers must never be turned over one another; but we must pass the thumb *under*, or pass the three middle fingers *over* the thumb.

Secondly. The thumb must never be placed on the black keys.

Thirdly. We must not strike two or more keys one after another with the self-same finger; for each key must retain its own finger.

Fourthly. In runs, the little finger should never be placed on the black keys.

Fifthly. In chords and wide extensions, however, the thumb, as well as the little finger, may occasionally fall upon the black keys.

Sixthly. The fingering given for the *scales* must be resorted to everywhere, and as much as possible.

Seventhly. At each note that we strike, we must consider whether, for the following notes, the appropriate fingers stand in readiness.¹⁸

Both Czerny (rule (2) above) and Beethoven conform to the general taboo surrounding the use of the thumb on black keys except when there is no alternative. Beethoven indicates 1-5-1 or 2-5-1 in the octave passage of Op. 2/2/i/84-85, 88-89, 304-305 and 308-309 when the first and third notes are on white keys, but chooses 2-4-2 when the two outer notes are on black keys (see ex. 8.10 above). Similarly, he uses 5-1 to connect the gaps in the passagework in Op. 111/i/27-28 except when the second note of the leap is on a black key. When this happens, he employs the second finger (ex. 8.13). However, in a piece with many sharps, such as in Op. 78/ii, he does not

Ex. 8.13

The image shows a musical score for a piano passage, likely from Beethoven's Op. 78/ii. It consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The music is in a key with one flat (B-flat). The passage starts with a circled number 27. The first four measures are marked with *sf* (sforzando) and have fingering numbers 2 1 5, 1 3 5, 1 3 5 2 1, and 5 1 2 3. The fifth measure is also marked with *sf* and has fingering numbers 1 3 5. The sixth measure is marked with *p* (piano). The score includes various note values, including eighth and sixteenth notes, and rests.

have any choice but to employ the first finger on black keys where necessary (see his fingerings in bb. 116-117 and 120-121 in ex. 8.17).

Newman suggests that, in his later compositions, Beethoven appeared to prefer placing the thumb on black keys. He quotes Op. 110/ii/71, in which he reasons that by indicating 4 on the first right-hand note, the following note (a b¹) would undoubtedly be played by the thumb (ex. 8.14).¹⁹ We have seen in the previous paragraph how in the next piano sonata, Op. 111, Beethoven still avoided the thumb on black keys. One must also bear in mind that the passage in Op. 110/ii/64-72 is in E flat minor, so as in Op. 78/ii, it would be almost impossible to play fast passagework without the use of the thumb on black keys.

¹⁸Czerny (1848), p. 25. Italicization original; see also Czerny (1839E), ii, pp. 2-4.

¹⁹Newman (1988), p. 288.

Ex. 8.14

As shown in ex. 8.15 below, Beethoven's fingering in the right hand of WoO39/95 confirms Czerny's rule (6) above, that one should employ the normal fingering for scales as much as possible. The system of fingering scales as we know it today was established during Beethoven's Ex. 8.15 The piano part only.


and Czerny's lifetime. The main difference between this system and that of the first half of the eighteenth century is the role played by the thumb, as described in Czerny's rule (1) above. By passing under the fingers, the thumb is the all-important finger which enables the smooth and easy execution of passagework.²⁰ Although this method was already known to a few musicians in the early eighteenth century, including Francois Couperin and Marpung, it was not widely adopted. The general practice then was to use the thumb and the fifth finger sparingly, choosing instead to rely heavily on the three middle fingers and frequently vaulting a long finger over a shorter one.²¹

²⁰This movement of the thumb is constantly emphasized in Czerny's writings, see for example Czerny (1839E), i, p. 43.

²¹Bach (1974), pp. 12-13.

Although turning the thumb under the fingers was the preferred method of fingering, Beethoven, from time to time, continued to use the old system of vaulting the third finger over the fourth. In his *Wiener Piano-Forte Schule*, Starke had published a shortened version of Beethoven's Op. 28, with fingerings in the excerpts attributed to the latter. In bar 77 from the second movement of this sonata (b. 31 in Starke's shortened version), he specifies that the third finger should cross the fourth from a white to a black key (ex. 8.16). The Variations on "Es war einmal ein alter Mann" (WoO66/ix/8-9) is another instance where Beethoven uses this type of fingering: the fourth finger crosses the fifth, again from a white to a black key. Although this method of fingering is not included in Czerny's list of rules above, he nevertheless continues to use it sparingly in practice. In Op. 7/iv/68-69, 76-79, etc. (see ex. 3.9 above), he repeatedly asks for the fourth finger to cross the fifth (from a black key to a white and from a white to another white key). Similarly, in Op. 13/ii/5, he indicates that the fourth finger should cross the fifth from a white to a black key.²² Beethoven did not leave fingerings for either passage.

Ex. 8.16



Modern scholars such as Bamberger and Hiebert insist that Beethoven's fingerings must be considered within the context in which they occur. They are convinced that his fingerings are based on musical considerations. Bamberger believes that his fingerings help define phrase structure, show metrical stress, convey the character and are a way to generate dynamics, accents and articulation. Hiebert agrees and adds that Beethoven's fingerings also enable scales to be executed fluently as well as provide clues as to the starting note of trills (as discussed in the previous chapter). Newman agrees but adds that the composer's fingerings help clarify the emphasis of particular rhythmic groupings.²³

²²Czerny (1839E), ii, p. 34 and Czerny (1846), pp. 39 and 43.

²³Bamberger (1976), pp. 242, 245, 249, 250, and 261; Hiebert (1985-1986), pp. 5-6; Newman (1988), p. 290.

The trio from Op. 2/1/iii/59-62 is a much-discussed case, and one in which Beethoven's fingering is believed to contribute to the *crescendo*. Bamberger concludes that Beethoven's consecutive 5-1 fingering of the double fourths in bar 60 (see ex. 3.11 above) will generate a forward push with the whole arm, thus generating a *crescendo* towards the *fortissimo* in the following bar. Although the double notes are not physically connected, the movement of the arm will give the impression of *legato*. She correctly observes that it was common practice in the nineteenth century to indicate uniform fingerings which were easy to learn and easy for the fingers to memorize. Hiebert agrees with her on these issues, and goes on to criticize Czerny's fingering of this passage in *The Art* (see ex. 3.13 above). She argues that in his quest for fingerings which enable long smooth *legato* lines to be played, Czerny ignores the role of fingering to clarify dynamics.²⁴ Czerny's fingering is exactly the same as Beethoven's in bars 61-62. However, he slightly alters Beethoven's fingering in bars 59-60 in order to avoid the consecutive fingering in bar 60 (see Czerny's rule (3) above). Beethoven's fingering is not included in *The Art* because Czerny must have considered his suggestion to be better. Although a different set of fingering is offered, Czerny would still expect a similar musical result, whereby the *crescendo* is created by the fingers (see the discussion on tonal control in chapter 5), rather than by the arm as implied by Beethoven's fingering.

8.3 THE FINGERING OF REPEATED OR SIMILAR FIGURES

In certain passages, such as the succession of double fourths in Op. 2/3/iv/269 and in Op. 101/iii/248-250, Beethoven employs a consistent pattern of fingering. In both cases, he uses a combination of 5-2 and 4-1. Even when the intervals vary, as is the case with the semiquaver motif in Op. 78/ii/116-117 and 120-121 (ex. 8.17), his decision to use a consistent pattern of fingering is further proof of the importance of maintaining a quiet hand position.


²⁴Bamberger (1976), pp. 250-254; Hiebert (1985-1986), pp. 9-10.

Ex. 8.17




It is therefore perplexing that the fingering for the second inversion of a tonic major seventh in Op. 106/i/96-97 should be inconsistent (ex. 8.18).

Ex. 8.18



His instruction accompanying a sketch of a diminished-seventh arpeggio on B (ex. 8.19) – “in long, wide ranging or extended passages [keep] the same fingering as much as possible”²⁵ – gives the impression that he expects uniform fingering throughout. He is true to his word for virtually the whole arpeggio, but for some unknown reason (possibly a scribal error), he fingers the last note of the sketch 2 instead of the expected 3, thus disrupting the consistent 1-2-3-4 pattern he had been using.

Ex. 8.19



Perhaps his letter of 1817 to Czerny could provide some answers. He asks for all the fingers to be trained and advises Czerny that pearl-like runs, although desirable, should be varied. The clarification in brackets which follows this description, “i.e. with only a few fingers”, imply that


²⁵Rosenblum (1988), p. 212. Her translation. See also Grundmann and Mies (1966), p. 117 and Newman (1988), p. 288.

he was referring not only to tonal colour (see p. 159) but also to uniformity in fingering:

In certain passages, such as



I should like him also to use all his fingers now and then, and in such passages too as



so that he may slip one finger over another. Admittedly such passages sound, so to speak, as if they were “played like pearls (i.e. with only a few fingers) or like a pearl” – but occasionally we like to have a different kind of jewelry.²⁶

This letter also demonstrates that in spite of his annotation accompanying the sketch of the diminished-seventh arpeggio mentioned above, Beethoven sometimes chooses to use irregular fingering in repeated or similar figures to obtain a different effect. Sometimes, there may be interpretive or technical considerations, as Newman and Bamberger point out. According to Bamberger, the irregular fingering in Op. 2/1/iii/60-62 is necessary to implement the irregular slurring and to emphasize the dynamic climax.²⁷ We have also seen in section 8.2 how Beethoven changes the fingering in the octave passages of Op. 2/2/i to avoid placing the thumb on black keys.

In addition, Beethoven’s caution, mentioned above, implies that Czerny prefers to use the same fingering for repeated motives, a suspicion which is confirmed by the latter’s fingerings in the exercises of the *Piano Forte School* and in his studies. Czerny provides two sets of fingering for a repeated motivic pattern in his *Piano Forte School*, as shown in ex. 8.20 below. In one set, the fingering pattern is regular. The other is modified, so as to avoid placing the thumb on black keys. All passages derived from dominant-seventh and diminished-seventh arpeggios in the *Piano*

²⁶Anderson (1961), ii, p. 743.

²⁷Bamberger (1976), p. 252; Newman (1988), pp. 288-289.

Ex. 8.20

[RH] 3 1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4 1 2 3
 [CR] 4 2 3 4 5 2 1 3 1 4 2 5 2 3 4 5 2 1 3 1
 [LH] 1 3 2 5 2 5 2 4 1 3 3 5 2 4
 [ORA] 1 4 3 2 1 4 3 2 1 4 1 4 1 4

Forte School are also given consistent fingerings throughout. However, Czerny again provides alternative fingerings where black keys are involved, so as to avoid placing the thumb on them (ex. 8.21).

Ex. 8.21

1 2 3 5 1 2 3 5 2 1 2 4 1 2 3 5 2 5 4 2 1 3 2 1 2
 5 3 2 1 5 3 2 1 5 3 2 1 3 1 2 3 5 1 2 3 5 1 2 3 5 1 2 3
 4 3 2 1 3 2 1 2 5 2 1 2 3

8.4 CHROMATIC SCALE

In an early sketch, Beethoven offers two ways of fingering a chromatic scale beginning on B flat. The first is to finger every note while the second makes use of finger sliding (ex. 8.22).

Ex. 8.22

2 1 2 3 1 3 4 5 2 1 2 3 - 4 - 5

Newman observes that the chromatic scale with the finger sliding is marked with a slur and arrives at the conclusion that the finger sliding enables a “super legato not unlike the velvety, slithering sort identified later with the Chopin style”.²⁸ Nevertheless, Beethoven’s fingering in WoO39/114, 115 and 118 (ex. 8.23) indicates that the first system of fingering can also be used to obtain a

²⁸Newman (1988), pp. 292-293.

smooth *legato*.

Ex. 8.23 The piano part only.

The fingering of the chromatic scale in ex. 8.23 above is the one most commonly recommended in nineteenth-century treatises, but Czerny is less than enthusiastic about it. In his *Piano Forte School*, he lists four ways of fingering a chromatic scale (including the one chosen by Beethoven, shown above), but favours the fingering which relies heavily on the combination of the thumb and the index finger,²⁹ as shown in ex. 8.24.

Ex. 8.24


8.5 PASSAGES IN THIRDS

As is the case with chromatic scales, Czerny specifies four ways of fingering passages in thirds, explaining the advantages and disadvantages offered by each:

²⁹Czerny (1839E), i, p. 49 and ii, pp. 30-31.

(a) right hand: 1-3-1-3-1-3-1-3; left hand: 3-1-3-1-3-1-3-1 (ex. 8.25)

Ex. 8.25



He comments that this fingering, which is applicable to thirds in C major only, will enable the hands to remain tranquil and the notes to be played with equal power and rapidity. In other keys, the thumb may be placed on the lower notes if they are on white keys. Otherwise, the second finger should be used (in combination with the fourth finger). The right hand fingering for an ascending third in B flat major, for example, should be 2-4-1-3-1-3-2-4 1-3-1-3-1-3-2, while for the left hand it is 3-1-4-2-3-1-3-1 3-1-4-2-3-1-3.


(b) right hand: 2-4-2-4-2-4-2-4; left hand: 4-2-4-2-4-2-4-2

Although this fingering will also maintain a quiet hand position, Czerny believes it is more difficult to play a passage which requires much power. It is also inconvenient and therefore not recommended.

(c) right hand: 1-3-2-4-1-3-2-4 (accent on the thumb); left hand: 4-2-3-1-4-2-3-1 (ex. 8.26)

This is suitable mainly for the right hand in passages which require an emphasis on the first note of each crotchet beat (played with the thumb). Czerny elaborates that it is applicable only in C major, because the thumb cannot be placed on black keys.

Ex. 8.26



(d) right hand: 1-3-2-4-3-5; left hand: 5-3-4-2-3-1

According to Czerny, this fingering cannot be employed in keys with more than two sharps or flats. However, if the accented note is a black key, the thumb may be used (ex. 8.27).³⁰

³⁰Ibid., ii, pp. 36-37.

Ex. 8.27

Handwritten musical notation for Ex. 8.27. The right hand (RH) is shown on a treble clef staff with notes G4, A4, B4, C5, D5. Fingerings are 1, 3, 2, 4, 3, 5. The left hand (LH) is shown on a bass clef staff with notes G3, F3, E3, D3, C3. Fingerings are 5, 3, 4, 2, 3, 1.

Of the four ways listed in the *Piano Forte School*, the first method was probably preferred by both Czerny and Beethoven. In the ascending bass figure at the beginning of Op. 81a/iii, Czerny recommends the combination of 3-1.³¹ Similarly, Beethoven specifies that 1-3-1-3-1-3 should be used in the ascending thirds of Op. 31/1/ii/10 and 74, a passage in C major, thus lending weight to Czerny's explanations above.

8.6 THE FINGERING OF REPEATED MONOTONES .

Czerny lists three main ways of fingering repeated monotones, all of which makes use of different fingers. The first way (ex. 8.28a) is used to repeat an even number of notes, such as 2, 4, 6, etc. The second (ex. 8.28b) is suitable for fingering triplets or when the same key is to be struck three times. When the key is to be struck twice, the third type of fingering may be employed (ex. 8.28c).³² Unfortunately, Czerny's third example (ex. 8.28c) is not as clear because it lists four notes, like the first example, rather than two. The only example of Beethoven's fingering of repeated monotones, Op. 28/ii/9 (ex. 8.29), supports Czerny's suggestion of using different fingers.³³

Ex. 8.28a

Handwritten musical notation for Ex. 8.28a. The right hand (RH) is shown on a treble clef staff with notes G4, A4, B4, C5, D5, E5. Fingerings are 4, 3, 2, 1, 4, 3, 2, 1. The left hand (LH) is shown on a bass clef staff with notes G3, F3, E3, D3, C3, B2. Fingerings are 4, 3, 2, 1, 4, 3, 2, 1.

Ex. 8.28b

Handwritten musical notation for Ex. 8.28b. The right hand (RH) is shown on a treble clef staff with notes G4, A4, B4. Fingerings are 3, 2, 1, 3, 2, 1. The left hand (LH) is shown on a bass clef staff with notes G3, F3, E3. Fingerings are 3, 2, 1, 3, 2, 1.

Ex. 8.28c


Handwritten musical notation for Ex. 8.28c. The right hand (RH) is shown on a treble clef staff with notes G4, A4, B4, C5. Fingerings are 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1. The left hand (LH) is shown on a bass clef staff with notes G3, F3, E3, D3. Fingerings are 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1.

³¹Czerny (1846), p. 61.

³²Czerny (1839E), ii, p. 111.

³³Starke (1819-1821), ii, p. 56.

Ex. 8.29



Czerny suggests using the same finger occasionally, especially in *portato* passages or if it is impossible to employ different fingers (ex. 8.30).³⁴

Ex. 8.30



8.7 SLIDING FROM ONE KEY TO ANOTHER ON THE SAME FINGER


Although Czerny prefers not to use the same finger successively, this is sometimes unavoidable. In such situations, he recommends that the finger slide from a black key down to a white because it is more difficult to slide from one white key to another. The latter, in his opinion, should be used only in contrapuntal passages to be played *legato*.³⁵

Beethoven was also familiar with this technique. In the bass of Op. 111/i/12 and 14, he asks for the fifth finger to slide from a black key to a white one. A similar finger action is intended in his sketch of a chromatic scale beginning on B flat (see ex. 8.22 above) in which the third and the fourth fingers slide from black keys down to white ones. Sometimes, he uses the same finger to slide from one white key to another. The five instances where this technique is used in his piano sonatas – Op. 28/ii/70 or bar 24 in Starke's shortened version (ex. 8.31), Op. 2/1/iii/60, Op. 81a/i/5, Op. 81a/iii/53 and 61-62, and Op. 110/iii/107 – all endorse Czerny's guideline above in that they occur in *legato* polyphonic passages.

³⁴Czerny (1839E), ii, p. 120.

³⁵Ibid., ii, pp. 159-160.

Ex. 8.31




Incidentally, Beethoven also uses the 1-1 fingering in Op. 81a/i/5 and in Op. 81a/iii/146-147 even though it is impossible to slide from a white key to a black one.

8.8 GLISSANDO

Czerny states that octave *glissando* played *legato*, is applicable only in C major and is generally effective only in quick passages. In order to execute an ascending octave *glissando*, the fifth finger should be slightly bent, with the thumb following on its fleshy surface. The reverse takes place in a descending *glissando*: the thumb leads by gliding on the nail. The fingers must be stiff, but the hand and the arm should remain relaxed and flexible.³⁶ The context in which this type of *glissando* can be used, as described by Czerny, is remarkably similar to Beethoven's Op. 53/iii/465-475 (ex. 8.32), so it is natural that Czerny should recommend this technique there.³⁷ Beethoven's series of 1-5 fingering, and the fact that Czerny sight-read the manuscript of this sonata to the composer himself in 1804, strongly suggest that Beethoven may have intended an octave *glissando* here.

Ex. 8.32



³⁶Ibid., ii, pp. 29-30.

³⁷Czerny (1846), p. 57.

8.9 THE “BEBUNG” EFFECT³⁸

Regarding the scherzo of Beethoven’s Sonata for ’cello and piano Op. 69 (ex. 8.33), Czerny’s oft-quoted comment regarding the performance of a slur binding two notes of the same pitch (frequently referred to as *bebung*) remains controversial. The 4-3 fingering below is by Beethoven.

Ex. 8.33

The image shows a musical score for a piano piece. The tempo is marked 'Allegro molto' with a quarter note equal to 108. The time signature is 3/4. The score consists of two staves: a right hand (treble clef) and a left hand (bass clef). The right hand has a slur over two tied notes, with a 4-3 fingering indicated. The left hand has a similar slur and fingering. A circled '3' is above the first note of the right hand.

Czerny writes in *The Art*:

The ties in the right hand and the fingering placed over them, here signify something wholly peculiar. Thus, the second note is repeated in an audible manner with the 3rd finger, so that it sounds nearly as follows:-

The image shows a musical score for a piano piece. The tempo is marked 'Allegro molto' with a quarter note equal to 108. The time signature is 3/4. The score consists of two staves: a right hand (treble clef) and a left hand (bass clef). The right hand has a slur over two tied notes, with a 4-3 fingering indicated. The left hand has a similar slur and fingering. A circled '3' is above the first note of the right hand.

that is, the first note (with the 4th finger) very *tenuto*, and the other (with the 3rd finger) smartly detached and less marked: _ and so elsewhere. The 4th finger must therefore glide aside and make way for the third.³⁹

³⁸Newman objects to the misuse of the term *bebung* and proposes the name “repeated-note slur” to describe the peculiar situation where Beethoven indicates a 4-3 fingering over what appears to be two tied notes. See Newman (1988), pp. 295-297. *Bebung* is used here as the term is generally understood to describe this notation.

³⁹Czerny (1846), p. 88. Punctuation and italicization original.

Schnabel, Tovey, Newman, and Barker accept Czerny's advice, but others consider the *bebung* as tied notes (Schenker, Bamberger and Badura-Skoda). Bamberger agrees with Schenker's explanation that the two tied notes carry psychological implications. They believe that the notation would help performers feel the required "restlessness" of the passage. Badura-Skoda also sees this notation as having a psychological effect, but he believes it to be a direction for the performer to sustain the note for a *legato* effect. Drake, in his 1972 book, agrees with Badura-Skoda. However, two decades later, he changes his mind. He is now of the opinion that the 4-3 fingering in Op. 110/iii, for example, is inserted to convey the "speaking quality of the passage". The second note, therefore, has to be played. Badura-Skoda also wrongly reasons that since Czerny had not studied Op. 69 with Beethoven, this technique may not have been taught by the composer.⁴⁰ In fact, Thayer reveals that Czerny had played this composition at a concert in 1816, graced by the presence of the composer.⁴¹

Czerny's suggestion for the second note of the "tie" to be sounded can be produced on early nineteenth-century pianos. As an innovative composer, Beethoven did not always follow traditional rules. In an interesting early sketch, dating from 1793, Beethoven asks for the third finger to lie across the fourth until the latter withdraws and the third takes its place (ex. 8.34).

Ex. 8.34

Hier] bei muss der 3te Finger über dem 4ten solange kreuzweiss liegen, bis dieser wegzieht und alsdann der 3te an seiner Stelle kömmt.

* Beethoven crossed out the sharps

This fingering is not a precursor of the *bebung* because both the second monotone (d² in b. 2 and e² in b. 6) are not tied to the first note. The second d² is also accompanied by a *sf* mark, confirming that it should be struck. In addition, none of the *bebung* in the piano sonatas has a double fingering over the first of the two "tied" notes, because there is insufficient time to

⁴⁰Beethoven (1935), ii, p. 808; Beethoven (1931), ii, pp. 68-69 and iii, p. 216; Newman (1988), pp. 295-299; Barker (1996), p. 295; Beethoven (1972), pp. 64-72; Bamberger (1976), pp. 246-249; Drake (1972), pp. 125-126; Drake (1994), p. 21; and Badura-Skoda (1988), pp. 84-88. See also the discussion by Grundmann and Mies (1966), pp. 126-131.

⁴¹Thayer (1969), p. 641.

withdraw the fourth finger, as directed by his annotation to the sketch shown above. In bars 3-4, the repeated c²s are to be played by two different fingers (the second and the third), but which finger should be used to play the following d²? If the fourth finger is used, d² will be detached from the note in the next bar. Alternatively, Beethoven might have envisaged a *legato* line by playing the d² with the fifth finger, while the third and fourth fingers cross it to play the next note, a technique not unfamiliar to Beethoven (see section 8.2 above). This sketch raises many questions, but it shows, like many of his sketches mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, that he did not always adhere to convention. Therefore, the *bebung*, probably the result from one of his many experiments with fingering and technique, must be treated as a special case, and not a tie.

Beethoven must have intended the second note of the *bebung* to be sounded, because he conscientiously indicates a different finger over each second “tied” note. Such careful and consistent fingerings would not have been necessary if the “tie” was to be played according to normal convention. Why did he also take the trouble to notate two semiquavers when one quaver would suffice? All these suggest that he was trying to notate a manner of playing which was different, perhaps the slurring of a monotone (with the second note joined to the first, but to be played less strongly). Since the slurs in Op. 110/iii/5 and 125 (ex. 8.35 and ex. 8.36 respectively) do not extend to the following pair of semiquavers, it is likely that each pair of semiquavers is to be slightly detached from its neighbour. Although the second note in each pair of semiquavers is weaker than the first, this articulation must not hinder the overall phrasing of the passage. In exs. 8.35 and 8.36 below, each pair of semiquavers must be carefully graded to create the *crescendo* and a *diminuendo* indicated by Beethoven. In Op. 106/iii/165 (ex. 8.37), the *bebungs* are at the peak of the *crescendo* which begins three bars earlier. Here, one must guard against losing the intensity at this climax as a result of the second note of the slur being weaker.

Ex. 8.35

⑤ Adagio

4 3

ritar - dando

cantabile

tutte le corde

dimin.

una corda

sempre tenuto

And. Meno adagio

cresc.

*

Detailed description: This musical score for Ex. 8.35 consists of two systems. The first system is for piano and violin. The piano part (left) features a series of chords, with a dynamic marking of 'sempre tenuto'. The violin part (right) begins with a circled '5' and 'Adagio', followed by a melodic line with slurs and fingerings '4' and '3'. It includes performance directions such as 'tutte le corde' (all strings), 'dimin.' (diminuendo), and 'una corda' (one string). The tempo changes to 'ritar - dando' (ritardando) and 'cantabile'. The second system continues the piano part with 'And.' and 'Meno adagio' markings, and a 'cresc.' (crescendo) instruction. A small asterisk '*' is placed below the piano part.

Ex. 8.36

125

4 3

4 3

p

cresc.

dim

127

p

Detailed description: This musical score for Ex. 8.36 consists of two systems. The first system is for piano and violin. The piano part (left) starts with a circled '125' and a dynamic marking of 'p' (piano). It features a melodic line with slurs and fingerings '4 3' and '4 3'. The violin part (right) provides harmonic accompaniment with chords and a melodic line. Performance directions include 'cresc.' (crescendo) and 'dim' (diminuendo). The second system continues the piano part with a circled '127' and a dynamic marking of 'p'. The violin part continues with harmonic support.

8.10 SUMMARY

On the whole, Czerny shares many of Beethoven's views regarding the basic playing position and the fundamental rules of fingering. They emphasize the importance of maintaining a "quiet" hand position, using economical body and hand movements, and choosing correct fingering to ensure that passagework is executed accurately and fluently. Czerny's studies, which deal with a variety of finger patterns, octave passages and trills, are intended to train evenness in playing as well as to develop strength and agility in the fingers through repetition. This idea of training technical competence through repetition, of course, was already known to Beethoven by the time he was twenty. Czerny, therefore, prepared the necessary "training material" for this idea to be put into practice. However, they differ in their choice of fingering of repeated motives. Although Czerny sometimes provides an alternative fingering so as to avoid placing the thumb on a black key in such passages, he generally prefers to use uniform fingering. In contrast, Beethoven's fingering of repeated motives may be irregular. His decision may be based on technical considerations or those of a more expressive nature.

While Beethoven may not have been as fastidious as Czerny in following a strict set of rules, his fingerings of numerous passages are not unlike Czerny's. Of passages in thirds on white keys, for example, they prefer using the pattern 1-3-1-3 or 3-1-3-1. Their suggested fingerings of scalar passages are often based on passing the thumb under the fingers and crossing a longer finger over the thumb. They avoid, where possible, placing the thumb on black keys. They also encourage using different fingers when playing repeated monotonies. Finger sliding is used sparingly. Although it is more common to slide from a black key down to a white, they occasionally slide a finger from one white key to another in polyphonic passages. They even occasionally resort to using the eighteenth-century fingering of vaulting a long finger over a shorter one. It is also very likely that Czerny's description of playing the *bebung*, in which the second note is slightly audible, is exactly how Beethoven would have expected it to be played.

Although heavily influenced by his teacher, Czerny was also a progressive man. While Beethoven's fingering in Op. 2/1/iii/59-62 suggests the use of the arm to create the *crescendo*, Czerny prefers to use the fingers. The latter's fingering will also avoid Beethoven's consecutive

fingering in bars 61-62, another taboo in Czerny's rulebook. Czerny also disagrees with Beethoven on the best fingering of chromatic scale. Beethoven prefers the fingering which uses mainly the thumb and the third finger. Czerny, who is rather dismissive of this fingering, chooses instead to recommend the fingering which relies on the partnership of the thumb and the index finger.

In conclusion, Czerny's choice of fingering largely reflects that of Beethoven. It is only in a very small number of cases that he disagrees with his teacher, either because Beethoven's fingering is old-fashioned, or simply because of a different personal preference.

CHAPTER 9: PEDALLING

Of the numerous pedals available on early nineteenth-century pianos, Beethoven indicates only two in his compositions – the damper and the *una corda*. In addition to these, Czerny recommends the occasional use of the buff (also known as the muffle or piano pedal) in *tremolando* passages.¹ All the other pedals, he declares, are “childish toys of which a solid Player will disdain to avail himself”.²

In his compositions before 1802, Beethoven employed the terms *senza sordino* to indicate that the dampers should be raised, and *con sordino* when the dampers should be returned to the original position. Czerny explains that this was the case only when Beethoven meant knee-levers.³ The indications *Ped.* and *O* first appeared in the autograph of the “Kreutzer” Sonata, Op. 47 (composed between 1802-1803), but there is a possibility that Beethoven adopted the new indications in an earlier work. Indications for the foot pedal are found in the first edition of the Piano Sonata Op. 31/2 (composed in 1801-1802); but with the holograph lost, it is impossible to determine whether the markings were inserted by Beethoven himself or by Nägeli the Swiss publisher.⁴

Even as a young composer, Beethoven already realized the potential of the pedal. In a sketch of 1790-1792, he asked for the dampers to be raised with the knee during a series of repeated chords. Newman believes this to be the earliest known request by any composer for damper control.⁵ We also have Czerny’s testimony that Beethoven used the pedal extensively, even when it has not been indicated in his compositions.⁶

As will be seen in section 9.2, the damper pedal is given a prominent role in the piano sonatas, carrying out a variety of functions. As an accomplished pianist, Beethoven knew the precise

¹Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 57.

²Ibid., iii, p. 65. Capitalization original.

³Czerny (1846), p. 57.

⁴Rosenblum (1988), p. 118.

⁵Newman (1988), p. 66.

⁶Czerny (1846), p. 2.

effect he wished to create. He was very meticulous in his pedal directions, marking the exact position where the pedal should be depressed and released. In Op. 57/i/218-221, the pedal is always released on the penultimate quaver rest (bb. 219 and 221) before the change of harmony, while in bars 222-223, where the harmony changes at every half bar, the pedal is released on the last quaver before the introduction of the new harmony (ex. 9.1). Kenneth Drake points out that

Ex. 9.1

in the autograph of Op. 53/iii, Beethoven changed the crotchet rest in bar 113 to two quaver rests so as to place the pedal release sign precisely on the second quaver rest.⁷ Rosenblum also notices other corrections in the autograph of this movement. Beethoven moved the beginning of the

⁷Drake (1972), p. 151.

pedal indication from the last semiquaver in the bass of bar 8 to the first note at the beginning of the following bar. In bars 57 and 174, he decided against the initial idea of starting new pedal markings for the continuation of the descending scale, choosing instead to have them without the pedal.⁸ Very often, his pedal markings in analogous passages are also consistent. The two *staccato* quavers in the opening motif of Op. 27/2/iii, for example, are always accompanied by *senza sordino*.

9.1 THE SIGNIFICANCE OF BEETHOVEN'S PEDAL MARKINGS

While the numerous investigations into Beethoven's pedalling in the second half of the twentieth century have led to a clear understanding of their functions, many important questions remain unanswered. Did Beethoven notate pedalling only when they differ from the norm, as proposed by Kochevitsky, Goldstein and Barker?⁹ Should we refrain from pedalling passages which do not carry the composer's pedal markings, as suggested by Grundmann and Mies?¹⁰ Or should we, as encouraged by Martin Hughes,¹¹ apply the principle of Beethoven's pedalling, which has been deduced from his markings, to similar passages in his other works? The answer to this last question must surely be of the affirmative because, as mentioned above, Czerny recalls that Beethoven did not confine pedalling solely to passages with pedal markings. This does not mean, however, that one could use the pedal indiscriminately. Of the two arpeggiated diminished-seventh chords in bars 163-166 of Op. 27/2/iii, only the second one is pedalled (ex. 9.2).¹² Since all four bars also share the same dynamic level (that is, *p*), the aim of the pedal in bars 165-166 must be to provide a different timbre from the preceding two bars, which are unpedalled. This is an instance where Grundmann and Mies' caution against the employment of the pedal in passages without pedal markings is justified.

⁸Rosenblum (1988), p. 122.

⁹Kochevitsky (1962), p. 24; Goldstein, (1988), pp. 104-105; Barker (1996), pp. 266-267.

¹⁰Grundmann and Mies (1966), pp. 27-28.

¹¹See Stowell (1994), pp. 236-237.

¹²In the autograph, bar 163 is marked *con sordino*.

Ex. 9.2

The image shows two systems of musical notation for piano. The first system, starting at measure 163, features a right-hand melody with slurs and ornaments, and a left-hand arpeggiated accompaniment. A dynamic marking of [p] is present. The second system, starting at measure 165, continues the piece with similar textures. A 'Ped.' marking is placed below the left-hand line in the second system, indicating a sustained bass note. Both systems end with a double bar line and a fermata over the final notes.

In contrast to the view held by Kochevitsky, Goldstein and Barker, Beethoven did not indicate only pedallings which were different from contemporary practice. As shown in section 2.2.7, the practice of depressing the pedal on tonic chords at the end of movements, even through rests, can also be found in the compositions of Clementi, Cramer, Dussek, and Hummel. They, like Beethoven, sometimes allow the resonance to decay naturally at the end of movements by not indicating a release sign. Sustaining a bass note with the pedal while the left hand plays another line, and pedalling arpeggiated passages to help increase the resonance, are two of the most common uses of the pedal in the early nineteenth century. Even the pedalling of alternating tonic and dominant harmonies over a common bass note (thus causing blurring), excessive by Hummel's standard, are not extravagant when compared with Clementi. An example is the revised version of Clementi's Op. 34/2/i/125-130 (ex. 9.3), published about 1807, in which he added pedal markings. The lengthy pedalling in his Op. 37/3/iii/1-31 (ex. 9.4), published in 1798, is further evidence of his boldness in using the pedal to achieve colouristic effects. These special effects are unusual only because they depart from the normal practice of changing the pedal with the harmony. In both exs. 9.3 and 9.4, the pedal remains depressed through changes at the two opposite ends of the dynamic range, a device later adopted by Beethoven in the last fifteen bars of Op. 53/iii (see ex. 9.16 below). There is another similarity between the pedalling of Beethoven's Op. 53/iii and Clementi's Op. 37/3/iii: the opening themes of these two movements

are always accompanied by the pedal.

Ex. 9.3

Musical score for Ex. 9.3, consisting of two systems of piano and forte dynamics. The first system starts at measure 115 and ends at 135. The second system starts at measure 130 and ends at 135. The tempo is marked "Largo legato". The score includes various dynamics such as *p*, *fz*, *ff*, *mf*, and *dim.*. Pedal markings are indicated by "Ped:" with a circled cross symbol. The key signature is one sharp (F#) and the time signature is common time (C).

Ex. 9.4

Musical score for Ex. 9.4, titled "FINALE". The tempo is marked "Presto". The score is in 2/4 time with a key signature of one sharp (F#). It consists of six systems of piano and forte dynamics. The first system is marked "Piano" and "Open Pedal". The second system starts at measure 9. The third system starts at measure 19. The fourth system starts at measure 29. The score includes various dynamics such as *p*, *fz*, and *ff*. The instruction "without Pedal" is written below the fifth system. The key signature is one sharp (F#) and the time signature is 2/4.

9.2 THE FUNCTIONS OF THE DAMPER PEDAL

In this section, Beethoven's exploitation of the pedal to help achieve *legato*, to enhance dynamic contrasts, to increase the resonance of a passage, to highlight important structural elements, and for special effects will be discussed. These principles will also be compared with Czerny's instructions in his *Piano Forte School* and *The Art*.

The damper pedal can assist in connecting notes when this cannot be achieved with the fingers. Without the help of the pedal to connect large leaps in Op. 101/iii/14-16, for example, Beethoven would not have been able to achieve *legato* from the end of one bar to the beginning of the next. Sometimes, he uses the pedal to link two contrasting sections (Op. 57/i/238 from *adagio* to *più allegro*) or two movements (the end of the first movement of Op. 109 to the beginning of the second). In both instances, the lingering resonance from a soft chord increases the element of surprise at the entry of the ensuing *fortissimo* chord, accompanied by a change in character and speed. In Op. 109, Beethoven springs another surprise by introducing an abrupt modulation to the tonic minor (ex. 9.5). Czerny also uses the pedal to achieve *legato*. In his *Piano Forte School*, he shows and explains how this can be done, that is, by depressing the pedal at the same time as the first chord and releasing it when the next chord is struck (ex. 9.6).¹³ His technique is exactly the same as Beethoven's, for the indications in ex. 9.6 correspond to Beethoven's (compare with ex. 9.5).

Ex. 9.5

The image shows a musical score for a piano piece, likely from Beethoven's Op. 109. It consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The key signature is three sharps (F#, C#, G#). The score is divided into two sections. The first section starts with a circled number 97. It features a series of chords and melodic lines. Dynamic markings include *sf* (sforzando), *p* (piano), and *ff* (fortissimo). A handwritten 'Ped.' with a downward arrow indicates the damper pedal is to be depressed. The second section begins with a circled number 98 and is marked *Prestissimo*. It features a more rapid melodic line. A handwritten 'ben marcato' with an asterisk indicates a strong, marked articulation. The score ends with a final chord.

¹³Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 63.

Ex. 9.6

In slow movements, the pedal can also be used to sustain long-held chords or passages with slow-moving harmonies, as shown by Beethoven's pedal markings in Op. 57/ii/96-97 (ex. 9.7) and Op. 81a/ii/37-42. Although he does not insert any pedal markings in Op. 31/2/ii (see ex. 7.10 above), some pedalling is necessary, for example on the dotted minim chords in bars 1, 3 and 5. Therefore, Czerny's advice to use the pedal in suitable places in this movement to help sustain the harmonies¹⁴ is within the style.

Ex. 9.7

A favourite effect, used frequently by both Beethoven and Czerny, is to create the impression of richer textures by sustaining the bass note with the damper pedal while the left hand plays another line. Op. 53/iii/251-284 and 287-312 (ex. 9.8) and Op. 79/i/67-74, 91-98 and 111-118 are two

¹⁴Czerny (1846), p. 54.

Ex. 9.8

Ex. 9.8 shows two systems of piano music. The first system, starting at measure 251, features a treble clef staff with a melodic line and a bass clef staff with accompaniment. The dynamic marking 'sempre pp' is present. The second system, starting at measure 255, includes 'Ped.' markings with asterisks and 'sempre pp'.

instances where Beethoven employs the pedal in this manner. Czerny undoubtedly visualizes a similar effect in Op. 31/1/i/170-193.¹⁵ Although this passage has no pedal marking, the dynamic markings in the bass of Op. 31/1/i/170-193 (ex. 9.9) offers vital clues as to what Beethoven's intention might be. All the low bass notes in bars 170, 174 and 178 are marked *f*, while the notes

Ex. 9.9

Ex. 9.9 shows three systems of piano music. The first system, starting at measure 168, includes dynamic markings *f* and *p*. The second system, starting at measure 176, includes *f* and *p* markings. The third system, starting at measure 180, includes *pp* and *ff* markings.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 52.

immediately following them are marked *p*. This confirms that the three low bass notes marked *f* should be sustained with the pedal, thus creating a richer texture. Czerny's pedal technique to achieve this effect is also the same as Beethoven's. In the following example (ex. 9.10) from the *Piano Forte School*, Czerny declares that the pedal must be depressed at exactly the same moment as the note which is to be sustained: in this case, the bass octaves. Otherwise, they will remain short and dry. In order for the octaves to be sustained throughout the bar, the pedal must not be released before the last quaver of each bar. It must then be immediately resumed with the next octaves.¹⁶ Czerny's instruction here (and his pedalling in ex. 9.10) is remarkably similar to Beethoven's pedal markings in similar contexts (including ex. 9.8 shown above), indicating that Czerny must have learned this pedalling technique from his teacher. With this in mind, Czerny's suggested pedalling of Op. 31/1/i/170-193 must obviously be accepted as reflecting the intention of the composer.

Ex. 9.10

Beethoven often uses the pedal to differentiate between alternating loud and soft passages, as in Op. 78/ii/57-63 and 116-122 and Op. 106/i/17-23 and 176-197 (ex. 9.11). Similarly, Czerny employs the pedal to highlight dynamic contrasts. He recommends that in Op. 31/2/i/21-41, only the *forte* passages should be pedalled.¹⁷

¹⁶Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 58-59.

¹⁷Czerny (1846), p. 53.

Ex. 9.11

The image shows two systems of musical notation for piano. The first system starts at measure 16 and the second at measure 21. Both systems feature complex textures with multiple voices in both hands. Dynamic markings include *f*, *sf*, *p*, and *cresc.*. Pedal markings are indicated by asterisks (*) and the word 'Ped.' with a downward-pointing line. Some measures have circled numbers (16, 21, 28, 35) and some have circled numbers (4, 5, 2, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35) above them. The key signature is B-flat major.

The pedal can also be used to increase the power of a *crescendo*, as witness Beethoven's marking in Op. 106/i/403-405 (ex. 9.12). Czerny's example for this type of pedalling is found not in the Ex. 9.12

The image shows a musical exercise for piano, numbered 402. It consists of two systems of notation. The first system has four measures with dynamic markings *pp sempre*, *ppp cresc.*, *ff*, and *p*. The second system has four measures with dynamic markings *pp*, *ppp*, *cresc.*, and *ff*. Pedal markings are indicated by asterisks (*) and the word 'Ped.' with a downward-pointing line. The key signature is B-flat major.

piano sonatas, but in the 32 Variations in C minor. He advises that, in the last two variations, the pedal should be used to intensify the *crescendo* leading to the *ff*.¹⁸ Another function of the pedal is to enhance accentuation, as shown by Beethoven's pedal indications which accompany the C major chords in Op. 106/i/91 and 93 and the E \flat major chords in bars 323 and 325 from the same movement. In the autograph of Op. 27/2/iii, he carefully and consistently marks *senza sordino* on the two *sforzando* quaver chords in the opening theme and *con sordino* immediately after these

¹⁸Ibid., p. 70.

quavers. The pedalling of these two quavers throughout this movement is confirmed by Czerny in *The Art*. He also asks for the *sf* B♭s in Op. 26/iii/33-34 to be pedalled,¹⁹ even though Beethoven left no such indications. Although he uses the pedal to emphasize accentuation, Czerny appears to have overlooked this function in his *Piano Forte School*.

Increasing the fullness of a passage, especially if it is chordal or arpeggiated, is one of the most common and popular uses of the pedal in the early nineteenth century. This application, which Czerny describes as harmonious pedalling, is frequently recommended, even in Beethoven's early piano sonatas.²⁰ As he explains, this term refers to the use of the pedal for the duration of a consonant harmony.²¹ Op. 2/3/i/218-223, Op. 31/2/iii and the trill passage towards the end of Op. 53/iii²² are only some of the many instances where he suggests the use of "harmonious pedalling". Examples of Beethoven's pedal indications in the piano sonatas show that he too uses the pedal to enrich the harmony in arpeggiated (Op. 57/i/123-132, 218-233 and 228-232, and Op. 81a/iii/29-30, 33-34, 122-123, 126-127, and 193-195) and chordal passages (Op. 106/i/1-4). They also support Czerny's counsel of changing the pedal when a different harmony is introduced.

Czerny's pedalling of the first four bars of an arpeggiated passage in his *Piano Forte School* (ex. 9.13) also bears a striking resemblance to that of Beethoven's Op. 57/iii/176-204 (see ex. 3.36 above). Both composers direct that the pedal be depressed on the first note/chord of the arpeggio, sustaining the resonance until the rests. By maintaining the same pedal pattern in both loud and soft passages, they are sharing the idea that fullness of harmony is not restricted to loud passages only.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 48.

²⁰Op. 26 is the first piano sonata where Beethoven requests the use of the damper pedal.

²¹Czerny (1846), p. 113. See also p. 2.

²²Ibid., pp. 36, 54 and 57.

Ex. 9.13

The image shows four systems of musical notation for piano. The first system is marked *Lento* and begins with a dynamic of *f*. It features a treble clef and a common time signature. The music consists of a series of ascending and descending lines, with a *pp* dynamic marking and a *rit.* marking. The second system starts with a dynamic of *ff* and includes a *pp* dynamic and a *calando.* marking. The third system begins with a *pp* dynamic. The fourth system includes a *smorz.* marking. Various musical symbols such as asterisks, circled symbols, and slurs are used throughout the score.

Pedalling through rests, and allowing the resonance to die away naturally at the end of movements, are two special effects frequently exploited by Beethoven. In achieving both types, he always changes the pedal with the harmony. In Op. 53/iii/98-113, Op. 57/iii/176-191 (see ex. 3.36 above), Op. 81a/iii/130-137, and Op. 106/i/133-137, the resonance from the chords/notes is prolonged through the rests. The dynamic may be soft, or loud, or may even cover the whole dynamic range, as in Op. 53/iii/98-113. Interminable pedal markings at the ends of movements which consist of only one harmony, such as Op. 26/iv/166-169 (ex. 9.14), Op. 110/ii/155-158 and Op. 111/i/157-158, are another favourite with him. Occasionally, he may wish for the resonance of only the tonic chord to linger on, as in Op. 31/2/i/226-228 and Op. 109/iii/203 (ex. 9.15). Although all the examples quoted thus far have a soft dynamic, Beethoven does not restrict these

effects solely to soft passages. Other instances include the *fortissimo* A flat major arpeggio finale of Op. 110/iii/209-213 and the exuberant F minor ending in Op. 57/iii/353-361. These two effects can also be seen from bar 529 to the end of Op. 53/iii (ex. 9.16) where Beethoven marks pedalling through the C major chord and its inversions (some of them *staccato*) across the whole dynamic range, and through rests, and allows the full resonance of the tonic chord to vibrate at the end. By pedalling through *staccato* chords, he makes it clear that his aim here is for a mass of sound rather than precise articulation. Czerny's explanation of such pedallings at the end of movements

Ex. 9.14

Musical score for Ex. 9.14, starting at bar 164. The score is in G major (one sharp) and 3/4 time. It features a decrescendo (*decresc.*) and a *pp* (pianissimo) dynamic marking. The piece concludes with a C major chord and its inversions, with a *Ped.* (pedal) marking indicating the sustained resonance of the tonic chord.

Ex. 9.15

Musical score for Ex. 9.15, starting at bar 202. The score is in D major (two sharps) and 3/4 time. It features a *ritard.* (ritardando) marking and a *Ped.* (pedal) marking at the end.

Ex. 9.16


Musical score for Ex. 9.16, starting at bar 529. The score is in C major and 3/4 time. It features a *ff* (fortissimo) dynamic marking, a *decresc.* (decrescendo) marking, and a *pp* (pianissimo) dynamic marking. The piece concludes with a C major chord and its inversions, with a *Ped.* (pedal) marking indicating the sustained resonance of the tonic chord.

with only one harmony where the resonance is allowed to dissipate by itself, however, is confined to soft passages. In the following example from the *Piano Forte School* (ex. 9.17), he asks for the pedal to remain depressed at the end “so long as the last chord sounds distinctly”.²³ This is Ex. 9.17



the same effect as Beethoven would have intended, except that his notation often omits the release sign at the end. Czerny also applies this principle to Beethoven’s early piano sonatas where there are no pedal indications. His advice regarding the pedalling of the last four bars of Op. 7/iv (ex. 9.18)²⁴ is in accordance with Beethoven’s style. This passage, with its arpeggiated tonic chord and a *decrescendo* to *pp*, is not unlike the last few bars of Op. 26/iv (see ex. 9.14 above). He also visualizes a “gently murmuring” effect at the end of Op.10/1/ii²⁵ (presumably he means the last five bars) through the combination of the damper pedal and the *una corda*. Although Czerny does not elaborate whether the resonance should be allowed to linger on indefinitely at the end of the two movements, there is a very strong possibility, based on existing examples mentioned above, that Beethoven would have wished for such an effect.

Ex. 9.18



²³Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 63.

²⁴Czerny (1846), p. 39.

²⁵Ibid., p. 40.

In addition to aiding *legato*, highlighting dynamic contrasts and increasing the resonance of a passage, pedalling also provides Beethoven with a means to underline important structural elements. He employs it to colour main themes (such as the Rondo theme of Op. 53/iii), to link sections or movements (as discussed on p. 260), to enhance a change in the character of a motif, and to highlight a modulation or the introduction of an unexpected chord. In Op. 101/iii/87-90 and 276-279, the pedal helps to emphasize the contrast between a very soft, melodious motif, and a strong, energetic idea. In the second movement of the same sonata, the pedal at bars 30-34 (ex. 9.19) marks not only the change from a strong, march-like character to one of repose, it also coincides with the arrival of the flattened submediant. Similarly, the unexpected move to a diminished chord in Op. 57/ii/96 is also accompanied by a pedal marking. The harmonic progression of the passage beginning in bar 89 is identical to that beginning in bar 9, but instead of a resolution to the subdominant in bar 96, as in bar 16, Beethoven introduces a diminished chord. Czerny is also aware of the use of the pedal in emphasizing structural features, as reflected in his advice regarding the use of the damper and the *una corda* in the unexpected modulation of Op. 7/iv/155.²⁶

Ex. 9.19

The image shows a musical score for piano, consisting of two systems of staves. The first system (measures 30-34) features a treble clef with a key signature of one flat (B-flat major/C minor). It includes markings for *dim.* (diminuendo), *p sempre legato* (piano, always legato), and a *Ped.* (pedal) marking. The second system (measures 35-38) includes markings for *pp* (pianissimo) and *poco cresc.* (poco crescendo). The score contains various musical notations such as notes, rests, slurs, and dynamic markings.

As the pedal undoubtedly adds a different character to the sound, nineteenth-century composers/performers enthusiastically experimented with different colouristic effects. In *tremolando* passages, Czerny insists that the pedal was “almost always necessary” but it must be changed with the harmony.²⁷ In addition to the *tremolando* passages in Op. 26/iii, Beethoven

²⁶Ibid., p. 39.

²⁷Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 61.

indicates pedal indications in *tremolando*-like passages, such as Op. 106/ii/113-115 and Op. 109/iii/105-107 and 112 (ex. 9.20).

Ex. 9.20

The image shows two systems of musical notation for piano. The first system starts at measure 104 and includes a first ending bracket labeled '2.'. It features a treble clef with a key signature of two sharps (F# and C#) and a common time signature. The bass clef part has a dynamic marking of 'pp' and several 'Ped.' (pedal) markings, some with asterisks. The second system starts at measure 106 and includes a 'sempre pp' marking, a 'Cresc.' (crescendo) marking, and three 'sf sf sf' (sforzando) markings. It also contains several 'Ped.' markings with asterisks. The notation includes various note values, rests, and articulation marks.

In all these three sonatas, confirming Czerny's assertion, Beethoven changes the pedal with the harmony. Another special effect which Beethoven employs is the blurring of soft, dissonant notes, for example Op. 106/iii/44 (ex. 9.21a). It is, however, surprising that he does not pedal the whole of bar 129 (ex. 9.21b) to achieve the same effect. The result of this blurring would be similar to the "soft undulating effect of the Eolian Harp, or of very distant music"²⁸ which Czerny has in mind when pedalling through a succession of soft, dissonant chords, without a common bass note (ex. 9.22).

Ex. 9.21a

The image shows a single system of musical notation for piano. It starts at measure 44, indicated by a circled number. The key signature is two sharps (F# and C#) and the time signature is common time. The notation includes a 'dimin. ritard.' (diminuendo ritardando) marking and an 'a tempo' marking. There are several 'Ped.' (pedal) markings with asterisks. The music features a mix of note values and rests, with some notes beamed together.

²⁸Ibid.

Ex. 9.21b

Ex. 9.22

Apart from occasional special effects which involve blurring, Czerny's fundamental rule is for the pedal to remain depressed only as long as the harmony is the same.²⁹ This is because "[c]lear and distinct playing must always be considered as the Rule, all the rest is merely by way of exception".³⁰ The majority of Beethoven's pedalling, some of which are quoted in the numerous examples above, also follow this rule (the harmonic blurrings will be discussed below). As the treble was weaker on early pianos, it is permissible for the pedal to remain depressed through various passing notes in the treble, as long as the harmony in the left hand is static. This is clear from Czerny's recommended pedalling in Op. 7/iv/155-157 (see ex. 3.10 above). Beethoven's pedalling in Op. 110/iii/114-116 (ex. 9.23), beginning with the G minor arpeggio, followed by chords, and finally a melody (including two non-harmony notes in the treble) over the same harmony, is also based on the same principle.

²⁹Ibid., iii, p. 59.

³⁰Ibid., iii, p. 63. Capitalization original.

Ex. 9.23

The recitative passages in Op. 31/2/i/143-148 and 153-159 (ex. 9.24) present a much larger scale of blurring caused by numerous non-harmony notes in the treble. Beethoven's pedalling will sustain the bass chord, announced at the beginning of each recitative, while the soft dynamic will help reduce the harshness of the dissonance. The wash of sound in these two passages is intentional, a fact confirmed by Czerny.³¹

Ex. 9.24

³¹Czerny (1846), p. 53.

According to Czerny, it is sometimes permissible for the pedal to be sustained through two harmonies in a soft passage. In spite of the $V6/4 - V^7 - I$ harmony in Op. 7/iii/3-4 (see ex. 5.24 above), he states that the pedal may be depressed for the two bars.³² In ex. 9.25, taken from his treatise, no pedal change is required half-way through bar 7 (at the introduction of a different harmony) because, as he explains, the octave Es in the bass have to be sustained.³³ This is further

Ex. 9.25

The musical score for Ex. 9.25 is presented in four systems, each with a circled number (1, 3, 5, 7) in the left margin. The first system is marked 'Andantino.' and 'p dot.' in the bass staff. The second system has a circled '3'. The third system has a circled '5' and is marked 'espress:'. The fourth system has a circled '7' and is marked 'pp' and 'smorz:'. The score includes various musical notations such as 'gva', 'hr', 'cres', and 'loco', and asterisks in the bass staff indicating pedal points.

evidence of Beethoven's influence, see for example, Op. 101/ii/30-34 (ex. 9.19 above) and Op. 53/iii. The pedal in the opening Rondo theme of Op. 53, for example, not only sustains the low bass, it also blurs the alternating tonic and dominant harmonies. In bars 13-23, Beethoven further

³²Ibid., p. 38.

³³Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 60.

varies the effect by alternating between dominant and tonic minor or tonic major (ex. 9.26). That he fully intended a wash of sound from two harmonies is confirmed by his annotation at the beginning of the autograph to Op. 53, a caution against using the split pedal mechanism: ‘Nb. Wherever ‘ped.’ occurs, the whole damping, that is, treble and bass, should be raised. ‘O’ signifies that it should be allowed to fall again.’³⁴ The function of the pedal as an essential feature of this movement is fully recognised by Czerny.³⁵

Ex. 9.26

Rondo
Allegretto moderato

Most of Beethoven’s harmonic blurring occur in soft passages. Sometimes, as in Op. 110/iii/4 and 5 (ex. 9.27), he employs the *una corda* to help reduce the effect of the dissonance. Strict

³⁴Stowell (1994), p. 59. Rowland’s translation.

³⁵Czerny (1846), p. 57.

Ex. 9.27

Adagio ma non troppo

una corda

Recitativo più adagio Andante

cresc.

Adagio ritar dando cantabile

tutte le corde dimin. una corda

sempre tenuto

pedal change with the harmony is always the norm in loud passages, such as Op. 57/i/218-223, Op. 106/i/34-38 and 176-197, and the theme of Op. 53/iii. As shown in ex. 9.26 above, the blurring of the tonic and dominant harmonies, an inherent part of the theme's identity, is found mainly in soft passages. When the theme enters *fortissimo* in bars 55 and 168 (ex. 9.28), only the tonic harmony is pedalled. However, there is one exception, where Beethoven takes the liberty of allowing extensive blurring in a very loud announcement of the opening material – bars 313-320 (ex. 9.29) – presumably to increase the resonance. But he again shows restraint in the subsequent bars (bb. 321-328). Such blurring, even on an early instrument, is quite noticeable. A lighter touch on the bass notes, apart from the Cs in bars 313 and 317, may be necessary to help reduce the “muddiness” of the sound, and to allow the weaker but penetrating treble to be heard.

Ex. 9.28

Ex. 9.28 shows two systems of piano music. The first system begins at measure 55 and the second at measure 59. Both systems are written for piano with a treble and bass clef. The music features various dynamics, including *ff* (fortissimo), and includes markings for the sustain pedal (Ped.). There are also some asterisks (*) and a circled measure number 7 in the first system.

Ex. 9.29

Ex. 9.29 consists of three systems of piano music. The first system starts at measure 311, the second at measure 319, and the third at measure 321. The music is written for piano with a treble and bass clef. Dynamics include *f* (forte), *ff* (fortissimo), and *p* (piano). There are also markings for the sustain pedal (Ped.) and asterisks (*) throughout the score.

*) Dyn. Zeichen T. 314-327 nach Eigenschr. (s. aber Fußn. S. 104); in Orig.A. fehlen sie. T. 321: *pp*, wie in fast sämtl. Drucken, weder in Eigenschr. noch Orig.Ausg. *) Dyn. marks b. 314-327 as in autogr. (but S. 104). Not in orig.ed.. Bar 321: *pp* as in most print.ed., not in autogr. or orig.ed. *) Signes de dyn. mes. 314-327 d'apr. autogr. (v. ann. p. 104) manquent dans éd. orig. M. 321: *pp*, comme dans presque t^{tes} impr., ni dans autogr. ni éd.orig.

Another instance where Beethoven avoids pedalling through two harmonies is where the low bass note is insistently sounded at the beginning of every bar, even if the dynamic is *p*, as is the case in Op. 79/i/67-74, 91-98 and 111-118 (ex. 9.30).

Ex. 9.30

The image shows two systems of musical notation for piano. The first system, labeled (67), consists of two staves (treble and bass clef) with a key signature of one sharp (F#). The music is marked 'dolce [p]' and includes a 'Ped.' instruction with an asterisk. The second system, labeled (72), also consists of two staves with the same key signature. It includes a 'f' dynamic marking and another 'Ped.' instruction with an asterisk. The notation shows a consistent low bass note in the left hand across both systems.

The much-discussed case of Op. 27/2/i, however, is different from the above examples of harmonic blurring. Beethoven's direction for the dampers to be raised throughout the movement has raised many questions. Should it be taken literally, that is, depress the pedal throughout the movement? Or should the pedal be used throughout the movement, but with changes, as dictated by the change in harmony?

The harmonic blurrings found in the other piano sonatas are in passages where a low bass note is sustained by the pedal with changes of harmony above it (as in Op. 53/iii, see ex. 9.26 above), or in those with no more than two different harmonies but are not announced in close succession (Op. 110/iii/5, see ex. 9.27 above). Beethoven's direction, together with the predominantly soft dynamic throughout the first movement of Op. 27/2, strongly suggests that he intends the pedal to be used to blur the harmonies. Since he has never asked for a whole movement to be pedalled

without any changes, there is a strong possibility that he intended the pedal to be depressed for the duration of each phrase, as he did with the theme of Op. 37/ii, or for large sections. Czerny's recollection that Beethoven pedalled through the entire theme of the slow movement from Op. 37 (ex. 9.31) corroborates the latter's pedal indications in this concerto. The numerous chord changes in the bass would have sounded painfully confused on the more resonant pianos of the 1830s. Czerny's solution, therefore, is for "the damper pedal to be employed anew; at each important change of harmony; but in such a manner that no cessation of the sound may be observed: for the whole theme must sound like a holy, distant and celestial harmony".³⁶

Ex. 9.31



Czerny also offers the same advice for Op. 27/2/i by requesting that the pedal be re-taken "at each note in the bass".³⁷ Although he accepts the blurring in passages with a bass accompanied by changing harmonies above it (Op. 53/iii) and those with a succession of soft, dissonant chords (see ex. 9.22 above), the extensive blurring that resulted from Beethoven's instruction in Op. 27/2/i and his pedal markings in Op. 37/ii had become unacceptable on the more powerful pianos of the 1830s. This is the beginning of the departure from the original blurring of harmonies intended by Beethoven.

Nevertheless, even taking into account the bigger and more resonant pianos after Beethoven's death, the principles of pedalling, as taught by Czerny, still have roots deep in the early nineteenth century. Both composers use the damper pedal to obtain *legato* when it is physically impossible for the fingers to do so, to sustain slow-moving harmonies, to sustain a low bass note while the left hand plays another line, to connect movements or sections, to emphasize dynamic contrast,

³⁶Ibid., pp. 107-108.

³⁷Ibid., p. 49.

to strengthen a *crescendo*, to intensify an accent or *sforzando*, to increase the resonance of arpeggiated passages, to allow a natural decay at the end of movements, and to highlight important structural elements, modulations or a change of mood/character. The damper pedal is also used for colouristic purposes (as in *tremolando* passages). In many of these instances, both Beethoven and Czerny observe the accepted fundamental rule of pedalling, that is, to change the pedal with the harmony. As a result, blurring can be successfully used as a special effect. Czerny accepts Beethoven's request for the blurring of passing notes in the treble over one harmony in the bass (Op. 31/2/i) and the blurring of passages with changing harmonies over a low bass note (Op. 53/iii). However, he rejects Beethoven's lengthy pedalling through different harmonies with frequent changes in the bass (Op. 27/2/i and Op. 37/ii), which would result in such extensive blurring as to make the passage indistinct on the increasingly resonant pianos after the latter's death. This is the only instance where Czerny knowingly ignores Beethoven's practice and his original intention. Apart from this, Czerny's pedalling technique is virtually identical to Beethoven's, including where the pedal should be depressed and released to sustain a bass note and to achieve *legato*. Some of Czerny's examples on pedalling in his *Piano Forte School* are similar to passages from Beethoven's piano sonatas; for instance, the pedalling of arpeggiated passages which are followed by rests is remarkably similar to Beethoven's Op. 57/iii/176-204.

Several of Czerny's instructions in *The Art* also reaffirm Beethoven's pedal markings, for instance, the pedalling of the *ff* chords in the opening motif of Op. 27/2/iii, and the pedalling in the last ten bars of Op. 31/2/i. Czerny also requests that the pedal be depressed from the *largo* to the beginning of the *allegro* section in Op. 31/2/i, as marked by Beethoven. In Op. 101/iii; he reinforces Beethoven's indications by requesting the use of both the *una corda* and the damper pedal. Czerny's pedal markings in the first four bars of Op. 106/i and at the beginning of the *largo* of Op. 106/iv are also the same as Beethoven's.³⁸ Czerny's remarks on the pedalling of Beethoven's piano sonatas, with the exception of the "clean" pedalling he suggests for Op. 27/2/i, can thus be considered to be a true reflection of Beethoven's intentions.

³⁸Ibid., pp. 49, 53, 63, and 64.

9.3 THE *UNA CORDA* PEDAL

Even before the *una corda* became a standard pedal on Viennese and German pianos, Beethoven had asked for it to be made available. In his letter of 1802 to Nikolaus Zmeskall, he praises Walter's pianos but expresses a wish for the maker to include the device which enables the "tension with one string" effect on his instruments.³⁹ When Beethoven was presented with the Erard in 1803, a piano with four pedals of which the *una corda* was one, he soon made use of this pedal – in the performance of the Third Piano Concerto in the same year. Indications for this pedal are also inserted in his next piano concerto, where he asks for the *una corda* to be employed throughout the second movement, as well as *due e poi tre corde* at bar 54, *a 3 corde* in the next bar, and *due, poi una corda* four bars later. The changing colours obtained as a result of a gradual shift from one string to three, and vice versa, are also used in his late piano sonatas, namely Op. 101/iii, Op. 106/iii and Op. 110/iii. All these three instances of *una corda* are faithfully observed by Czerny. He instructs that Op. 101/iii must always be played with this pedal, while the indication *una corda* appears in the excerpts of Op. 106/iii and Op. 110/iii in *The Art*.⁴⁰ Although he does not mention the gradual shifting from one string to three and vice versa, he is aware of this effect, as he uses it in an example in his *Piano Forte School*.⁴¹

Beethoven uses the *una corda* sparingly, generally in soft passages, and as a device to alter the tone colour rather than the dynamic level. The contrast between *una corda* and *tutte le corde*, as well as the gradual shifting from one string to three and vice versa, is exploited to the full in Op. 106/iii. If Beethoven had associated *una corda* with a soft dynamic, he would have requested *tutte le corde* at the appearance of the first lengthy *crescendo* (bb. 8-12). In bar 27, he introduces a new idea with detached accompaniment and a sentimental melody. This provides a sharp contrast from the tranquil, chordal first section. Beethoven's decision to indicate *tutte le corde* in bar 27 shows that the two pedals are used to highlight the different moods. Similarly, he maintains the use of *tutte le corde* through the *dimin.* and the *pp* G minor chord in bar 59. Again, the indication *una corda* is introduced only at the beginning of the next section, in bar 60 (ex.

³⁹Anderson (1961), i, p. 82.

⁴⁰Czerny (1846), pp. 63, 64 and 67.

⁴¹Czerny (1839E), iii, pp. 64-65.

9.32).

Ex. 9.32

The use of the *una corda* in soft *legato* passages, as a means of providing a different timbre, is strongly emphasized by Czerny. He also warns that the pedal should be used sparingly and not in every soft passage.⁴² All of these points are in accordance with Beethoven's own usage of the *una corda*.

The *una corda*, in Czerny's opinion, may be used effectively in delicate, melodious passages with slow-moving harmonies, especially ones with a polyphonic texture.⁴³ How does this compare to Beethoven's practice? His frequent request for the *una corda* in soft, chordal or polyphonic passages, such as Op. 101/iii, Op. 106/iii/1-26 and Op. 109/ii/83-104, serve only to confirm Czerny's advice. In addition, Beethoven uses this pedal to highlight the contrast between a calm passage and an energetic or lively one (such as Op. 106/iv and Op. 109/ii) and to obtain a different tonal colour in fugal sections (Op. 110/iii).

Czerny also suggests using the *una corda*, in combination with the damper pedal, in arpeggiated chords and passages which resemble arpeggios.⁴⁴ The third and fourth bars in his accompanying

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³Ibid., iii, p. 64.

⁴⁴Ibid., iii, p. 65.

illustration (ex. 9.33) in the *Piano Forte School*, for example, with the arpeggiated accompaniment in the bass and a scalar figure in the treble, closely resembles a passage from the second movement of Beethoven's Fourth Piano Concerto: bars 47-50 (ex. 9.34), like the rest of this second movement, are to be played with the *una corda*, in accordance with Beethoven's direction found at the beginning of the movement. Indications for the damper pedal show that it is to be changed on the last semiquaver prior to the introduction of a new harmony, a practice carefully preserved by Czerny in his example, as shown in ex. 9.34.

Ex. 9.33

The image shows two systems of musical notation for Ex. 9.33. The first system consists of two staves: a treble staff with a scalar figure and a bass staff with an arpeggiated accompaniment. The tempo is marked 'Andante.' and the dynamics are 'pp una corda'. The word 'legato.' is written above the treble staff. The second system continues the piece with similar notation. There are asterisks and a circled cross symbol in the bass staff of both systems, likely indicating pedal changes.

Ex. 9.34

The image shows a single system of musical notation for Ex. 9.34. It consists of two staves: a treble staff with a scalar figure and a bass staff with an arpeggiated accompaniment. The notation includes various musical symbols like notes, rests, and dynamic markings. The word 'Ped.' is written below the bass staff, indicating a damper pedal change. There are asterisks and a circled cross symbol in the bass staff, likely indicating pedal changes.

It is clear that Czerny's explanations of the *una corda* in the *Piano Forte School* are a true record of Beethoven's own practice. Czerny's suggestions for using this pedal in compositions which do not contain such indications, for example the *pp* passages in Op. 53/iii and Op. 57/ii/33-48,⁴⁵ are most likely to be accurate representations of Beethoven's intentions. As for compositions

⁴⁵Czerny (1846), pp. 57 and 59.

published before 1803, Beethoven would probably have approved of the *una corda* being employed since, as mentioned on p. 280, he was enthusiastic for it to be made available on Walter's pianos. Czerny's direction for this pedal to be used in the last twenty-two bars of Op. 10/1/ii,⁴⁶ a melodious section with polyphonic writing (which is the type of passage Beethoven would use the *una corda*), can therefore be safely adopted.

9.4 CZERNY'S AUTHORITY ON PEDALLING CONSIDERED

The results of this study clearly contradict Robert Winter's claim that Czerny's viewpoint was influenced by the changing tastes of the 1840s.⁴⁷ Rowland's doubt regarding Czerny's authority on this subject should also be reviewed. He argues that, in the 1790s, when pedal technique was advancing very quickly, Czerny was not yet a pupil of Beethoven.⁴⁸ There is no denying that the range of effects offered by the pedal was enthusiastically explored in the 1790s, but this was by no means the climax or the end of the period of experimentation and development. Czerny's early instruction from the violinist Krumpholtz, who was also a good friend of Beethoven (see pp. 2-3), would have given the young boy an advantageous starting point in Beethoven's manner of performance, if perhaps not specifically in pedal technique. And in any case, his direct contact with Beethoven from 1800 onwards would have provided him with ample opportunity to learn, either through instruction or from his teacher's playing. It would have been surprising if a pupil as eager as Czerny did not acquaint himself with Beethoven's pedal technique.

As has been shown throughout this chapter, Czerny abides by the same general principles as Beethoven in the way they both employ the damper pedal and the *una corda*. Czerny also accepts all Beethoven's pedal indications except those which would cause an intolerable wash of sound on more resonant later pianos. In short, in spite of the considerable lapse of time between the publication of the *Piano Forte School* and *The Art*, Czerny's remarks on pedalling remain essentially faithful to the composer's practice.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 40.

⁴⁷Brown and Sadie (1989), p. 353. See also Rowland (2001), pp. 2-3.

⁴⁸Stowell (1994), p. 57.

CHAPTER 10: THE PIANO SONATAS IN THE HANDS OF FRANZ LISZT AND HANS VON BÜLOW

Czerny's efforts to preserve the performing tradition of Beethoven's music are indeed very noble. His writings and editions of the piano sonatas are informative and offer later generations of performers a glimpse of that tradition. One of Czerny's most celebrated pupils Franz Liszt (1811-1886) also worked tirelessly to promote the compositions of Beethoven, especially the late piano sonatas and the Ninth Symphony. In 1851, he encouraged his pupil Hans von Bülow (1830-1894) to begin an in-depth study of Beethoven's large-scale sonatas.¹ Liszt and Bülow were eminent pianists, conductors and teachers whose interpretation of Beethoven's music was influential and widely respected. They also prepared their own editions of the piano sonatas in the second half of the nineteenth century. However, how far did Liszt and Bülow continue the performing tradition which Czerny tried so hard to preserve?

10.1 LISZT'S APPROACH TO BEETHOVEN'S PIANO SONATAS

Liszt, like his teacher Czerny, held Beethoven in very high esteem. When Liszt was ten years old, he even attempted to play the "Hammerklavier" Sonata, Op. 106. He admitted that he played it "very badly, but with passion – without anyone being able to guide me in it. My father lacked the experience to do it, and Czerny feared confronting me with such a challenge".² However, from 1822 to 1823, Czerny instilled the understanding of Beethoven's style in the young Liszt³ and this formed a useful foundation for Liszt in later life as he continually sought to understand Beethoven's late piano sonatas.

By the time Liszt was twenty, all Beethoven's piano sonatas were in his repertoire. However, Liszt was not content to be simply able to play well. He had a hunger to understand everything as the author intended it, be it music, religion or literature. Joseph d'Ortigue (1802-1866), a

¹Williams (1990), p. 274.

²Walker (1985), p. 218.

³Czerny (1956), p. 315.

friend, critic and musicologist reveals that Liszt would read a dictionary in the “same voracious and restless manner as he did a poet, bringing the same investigative and inquiring mind to bear upon Boiste as upon Lamartine, and reading both for four hours at a time. Then, when he believed he had entered into the author’s thought, he would go and ask him for his own explanation of what he had written.”⁴ Those who heard Liszt play were all touched by the sheer beauty, magic and life that he brought into his performances. Such captivating and moving performances were a result of his intense and profound study of the music. Once he understood the character of the music, he would then attempt to communicate this understanding through his playing. He also found inspiration in literature and his environment. In order to understand every emotion, he would even visit hospitals, lunatic asylums and prisons.⁵ After hearing Paganini in March 1832, Liszt worked even more feverishly, studying Homer, the Bible, Plato, Locke, Byron, Hugo, Lamartine, Chateaubriand, Beethoven, Bach, Hummel, Mozart, and Weber and meditating on them. In addition, he would practise exercises in thirds, sixths, octaves, tremolos, repeated notes, and cadenzas for four to five hours a day.⁶ In his quest to understand an unfamiliar piece of music, Liszt would experiment in various ways until he found a satisfactory solution, even if this meant changing the expression markings on the score. Thus when Wilhelm von Lenz (1809-1883), a Russian amateur pianist, called on Liszt in 1828, he recalled that when Liszt was faced with Weber’s Sonata No. 2 in A flat for the first time, he experimented with different articulation in order to achieve the desired effect and also with ways to make the music sound coherent. Lenz wrote:

The first part he tried out again and again in the most different ways. At the passage (in the dominant) in E flat at the end of the first movement, he said: “It is marked *legato*, but perhaps it would be better to make it *pianissimo* and *staccato*? It is also marked *leggermente*.” He experimented in all possible ways.

“It is very difficult”, said Liszt, “but still more difficult the coda, and how to pull the *whole thing* together, here in the centrifugal figure” (13 bars before the end). “This passage” – in the second section, naturally in the main key of A flat – “we accordingly shan’t make *staccato*, which would be too affected, not yet *legato*, for which it is too thin; we’ll make it

⁴Williams (1990), p. 41.

⁵Ibid., pp. 49 and 282.

⁶Ibid., pp. 50-51.

spiccato, and thus swim between the two waters.”⁷

Liszt may have approached Beethoven’s late piano sonatas in a similar way, but when he did eventually understand them, his performance could, if he so chose, be completely faithful to the score. When Liszt played the “Hammerklavier” Sonata, Op. 106 for the first time in public at the age of twenty-five, Hector Berlioz (1803-1869) was impressed by the young virtuoso pianist’s understanding of the sonata. He also showed great respect for the composer by refraining from omitting or adding any notes or expression marks. Berlioz wrote in the *Revue et Gazette musicale* in 1836:

In support of my opinion I appeal to the judgement of all those who have heard him play the great Beethoven sonata [Op. 106], that sublime poem which until now has been the riddle of the Sphinx for almost every pianist. Liszt, a new Oedipus, has solved it in a manner which would have made the composer, had he heard it in his grave, thrill with pride and joy. Not a note was omitted, not one added (I followed, score in hand), not a single alteration made to what was indicated in the text, not an inflexion or an idea weakened or changed from its true meaning. In the Adagio above all ... he remained constantly at the level of the composer’s inspiration.⁸

As was discussed in section 3.2, Czerny was told by Beethoven to play his music the way he had notated it, a lesson which was still fresh in Czerny’s memory a few decades later when he wrote *The Art*. Perhaps Czerny instilled this respect for Beethoven’s scores in Liszt in the early 1820s. After his successful performance of the “Hammerklavier” Sonata in 1836, Liszt continued to develop. His performances of Beethoven’s works in Vienna in 1839 were so convincing that his interpretation was hailed as a model. Heinrich Adami (1807-1865) wrote in the *Allgemeine Theaterzeitung* (4 December):

For younger listeners in particular, who never had the opportunity of hearing Beethoven himself in his piano sonatas and concertos, Liszt’s renderings are of exceptional interest, and from them they are best able to study these works, often capable of so multifarious an interpretation, and to form a correct view for themselves.⁹

Nevertheless, if Liszt were in the mood to enthrall his audience, he would not hesitate to take

⁷Ibid., pp. 37-38. Italicization original. The text has been compressed.

⁸Ibid., p. 78.

⁹Ibid., p. 115.

liberties with the music, even that of his idol Beethoven. Carl Reinecke (1824-1910), a pianist, attended a concert given by Liszt in Hamburg in 1840. He was impressed by the sensitivity shown by Liszt in the first two movements of the “Moonlight” Sonata, Op. 27 No. 2: “His marvellous, unsurpassed bravura and virtuosity were always blended with poetic feeling and the keenest musical intelligence. Boldness, passion, grace, elegance, humour, simplicity of expression – all were there when appropriate, compelling a boundless admiration”. However, he was astonished by the rhythmic liberties Liszt took in the last movement of the sonata.¹⁰ Two years later, Mikhail Glinka (1804-1857) had a similar experience. Sometimes, Liszt’s playing was inspirational, at other times, it was unsatisfactory because he distorted the expression, stretched the tempi, and added tasteless and frivolous embellishments to the compositions of Beethoven, Chopin, Weber, and Bach.¹¹

In later years, Liszt’s performances of Beethoven’s works were again faithful to the text. At the Beethoven Festival in Bonn in 1845, Karl Schorn (1818-?), a law student and music enthusiast, observed that Liszt conducted Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony strictly according to the original score. Moscheles was also satisfied with Liszt’s energetic and spirited performance of Beethoven’s Fifth Piano Concerto. Also present was Charles Hallé (1819-1895), a German pianist, who remarked that Liszt “adhered scrupulously to the text, and a finer and grander reading of the work could not be imagined”.¹² Liszt also insisted that his pupils observe Beethoven’s expression marks carefully. In 1883, Siegfried Ochs (1858-1929), a German composer and chorus-master witnessed Liszt telling one of his pupils that Beethoven considered *piano* to be very different from *pianissimo* while the difference from *piano* to *forte* was so large that it could be compared to the distance between North and South poles.¹³

Liszt always took into account the different styles of the composers when interpreting their music. If a pupil played a sonata by Beethoven, Liszt always insisted on a performance which reached the soul of the composition. If a piece by Chopin were played, it had to be delicate with exquisite but restrained *rubato* at the places marked by the composer and never at the player’s fancy.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 145.

¹¹Ibid., p. 187.

¹²Ibid., p. 218.

¹³Ibid., p. 621.

However, with Liszt's own Rhapsodies, he would encourage his pupil to play with "careless bravura" even if that was not specifically notated in the score.¹⁴ Liszt's lessons with Czerny where he was taught to differentiate the characteristic styles of various leading composers, including Beethoven, Bach, Clementi, and Hummel (see p. 11), would have provided him with a very good starting point.

Liszt treated the piano as if it were an orchestra, extracting a large variety of tonal colour and emotions,¹⁵ an aspect of playing encouraged by both Czerny and Beethoven (see section 5.1 above). The expression in Liszt's playing is derived not only from an understanding of the character of the piece and the style of the composer, but also through his sensitivity to the harmonies and, where appropriate, accentuation. Caroline Boissier, whose daughter Valérie had been taking lessons from Liszt in 1832, wrote in her diary that when Liszt played, he was "plumbed so deeply [into] the depths of art and the mysteries of harmony" that "under his fingers the piano renders up unaccustomed sounds".¹⁶ A vivid account by William Mason (1829-1908), a pianist from America, demonstrates how Liszt brought life to his performance through accentuation. Mason had played Chopin's Ballade in A flat major followed by a fugue in E minor by Handel during his first lesson with Liszt in 1853. He recalled how Liszt taught him the importance of accentuation:

I found at this first lesson that he was very fond of strong accents in order to mark off periods and phrases, and he talked so much about strong accentuation that one might have supposed that he would abuse it, but he never did. When he wrote to me later about my own piano method, he expressed the strongest approval of the exercises on accentuation.

While I was playing to him for the first time, he said on one of the occasions when he pushed me from the chair: "Don't play it that way. Play it like this." Evidently I had been playing ahead in a steady, uniform way. He sat down, and gave the same phrases with an accentuated, elastic movement, which let in a flood of light upon me. From that one experience I learned to bring out the same effect, where it was appropriate, in almost every piece that I played. I eradicated much that was mechanical, stilted, and unmusical in my playing, and developed an

¹⁴Ibid., p. 552.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 342-343.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 47.

elasticity of touch which has lasted all my life, and which I have always tried to impart to my pupils.¹⁷

From Liszt's editings of Beethoven's piano sonatas, it is clear that he considered accentuation to be a very important element in performance. He added accents in numerous places to highlight the beginning of phrases, rhythmic groupings, dissonance, syncopation, notes with long note values, and notes of melodic interest. In short, his accentuation is in line with that of Beethoven and Czerny which were discussed in section 5.6 above.

10.2 THE CHOICE OF PIANOS

The rapid development of the piano throughout the nineteenth century meant that the instruments available to Beethoven, Liszt and Bülow were all rather different. Although Beethoven was presented with an Erard grand piano in 1803 and a Broadwood grand piano in 1818, he had always preferred the Viennese pianos. The early nineteenth-century Viennese pianos had a lighter action and a more effective damping system than the English and French pianos. While the majority of Viennese pianos were bichord-strung, English and French pianos (including Beethoven's Broadwood and Erard) were triple strung throughout to give them more resonance. The frames of Viennese, English and French pianos, however, were made of wood.

In Bonn, Beethoven had played on Stein's pianos.¹⁸ When Czerny auditioned for Beethoven in 1801, he noticed a Walter piano in the composer's room.¹⁹ Anton Walter (1752-1826) and Johann Andreas Streicher (1761-1833) were the two most prominent piano makers in Vienna at the time. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Beethoven certainly preferred Walter's pianos over Streicher's. In a letter to Nikolaus Zmeskall, dated November 1802, Beethoven expressed his willingness to buy a piano by Walter even though he could have a piano free of charge from other makers.²⁰ From 1809 onwards, however, Beethoven considered Streicher's

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 287-288.

¹⁸Thayer (1969), p. 105.

¹⁹Czerny (1956), p. 306.

²⁰Anderson (1961), i, p. 82.

pianos to be the best. Although Beethoven did not own a piano made by Streicher, he rented his instruments and was full of praises for them.²¹ Beethoven was dissatisfied with the relatively deep and heavy touch on the Erard piano and even asked Streicher to alter it. Unfortunately, the result was far from satisfactory.²² By the time Beethoven received the Broadwood piano, he was already quite deaf and could not fully appreciate the tonal qualities of the instrument. Since he was unhappy with the action on the Erard which is essentially based on the English model, it is very likely that he would have had the same complaint about the Broadwood piano. He had to thump on the piano because of his hearing impairment. As a result, Streicher's brother-in-law Matthäus *alias* André Stein (1776-1842) was given the task of completely overhauling Beethoven's Broadwood piano in 1824. Two years later, the piano had to be repaired again, this time by André's son Karl Andreas Stein (1797-1863).²³

The pianos favoured by Beethoven – those by Walter and towards the end of the first decade of the nineteenth century, by Streicher – offers us an insight into his sound ideals. Walter's pianos, which were more robust and powerful than Streicher's, were more suitable for virtuosic playing. Streicher's pianos, on the other hand, had a sweeter tone. Soft, melting tones and a range of expression could be achieved on them. In 1796, the writer in the *Jahrbuch der Tonkunst von Wien und Prag* describes the player who prefers Streicher's instruments as those who seek "nourishment for the soul".²⁴

Czerny also preferred Viennese pianos, especially those made by Streicher (see also pp. 64 - 66). However, the demand for stronger and louder pianos forced piano makers to increase the heaviness of their hammers and dampers, as well as to strengthen the soundboard structure. Streicher even used a system of iron bars in his pianos in 1835 but, on the whole, Viennese makers preferred to use wooden frames. Therefore, the pianos which Czerny used the 1830s onwards were more resonant than those played by Beethoven.

At the same time, the most prominent makers in Paris, Sebastian Erard, (1752-1831) and Pierre

²¹See Anderson (1961), i, pp. 292 and 300 and ii, p. 686.

²²Cole (1998), p. 140.

²³Clive (2001), pp. 58 and 351.

²⁴Komlós (1995), pp. 11-12.

Erard (1794-1855) were also constantly looking for new ways to strengthen his pianos. Apart from the last few years of his life when Liszt was introduced to overstrung pianos by Steinway, Bechstein and Bösendorfer, he had always favoured pianos by Erard. These instruments had a double-escapement mechanism which allowed rapid repetition of notes to be produced as well as enhanced the keys' responsiveness to the player's touch, a device patented by Erard in 1822. From the 1830s, the frames of the piano were enlarged and strengthened, the hammers became heavier, thicker strings were used, and the string tension was increased in order to make the instrument more powerful, durable and resonant. In the process, the dynamic range and the range of tones available to the pianist became progressively larger. As a result, Liszt could vary his tones and expression ranging from very soft ghostly or celestial-like tones to very powerful, majestic ones, a range which was much larger than that on the Viennese pianos available to Beethoven.

From the mid-nineteenth century, the influence of Erard, Streicher and Broadwood began to wane and was gradually replaced by Steinway and other companies which embraced the new technology. Bülow played on overstrung, one-piece iron frame pianos such as those made by Bechstein, Steinway and Bösendorfer. Although he preferred the tonal flexibility and the timbre of the Bechstein pianos, he felt it his duty to encourage other "worthy and respectable industrial endeavour" including Steinway, Bösendorfer and Chickering.²⁵ These pianos were much more powerful than the wooden frame pianos available to Beethoven and to some extent, Liszt.

Although Beethoven used the piano when composing, his compositions were not based on the tones of specific pianos; rather, his ideas were derived from the sound world of his imagination. His frustration with the limitations of the early nineteenth-century Viennese pianos are well known. However, the more mellow English and Parisian pianos did not satisfy him either. As a result, Liszt and particularly Bülow were justified in using the larger and more powerful pianos of their time as they could more successfully convey the character of the pieces. However, adjustments had to be made, especially to tempo and pedalling, and these will be discussed in the following section.

²⁵Hildebrandt (1988), pp. 140-142.

10.3 A REVIEW OF LISZT'S AND VON BÜLOW'S EDITIONS

Liszt's edition of Beethoven's piano sonatas was published in 1857, a year after Simrock began publishing Czerny's new edition. In his edition, Liszt inserted metronome markings at the beginning of movements, accents, nuances, and fingering. In 1894, Bülow, together with Sigmund Lebert, published an edition of the sonatas. They shared the workload and Bülow was responsible for the editing of Op. 13, Op. 26, Opp. 27, Op. 31/3, Op. 53, Op. 54, Op. 57, Op. 78, Op. 79, Op. 81a, Op. 90, Op. 101, Op. 106, Op. 109, Op. 110, and Op. 111. Bülow's editings are more extensive than Liszt's. Besides adding accents, nuances and fingerings, he also inserted comments for each sonata (including ways of practising difficult passages), metronome markings to convey the opening tempo as well as fluctuations of tempo within the movement and pedal markings.

Although Bülow's edition was published towards the end of the nineteenth century, some of his comments still echo Czerny's ideas. Bülow's references to Czerny in his comments show that he was certainly aware of Czerny's thoughts on the performance of the piano sonatas, either through the latter's writings and editions, or through Liszt. Bülow recommends using Czerny's preliminary rhythmic exercise to practise the awkward passage in bar 10 from the last movement of Op. 106 (ex. 10.1).²⁶ To those who lack a sense of pulse, Bülow, like Czerny and Beethoven Ex. 10.1



(see pp. 31, 111 and 112), suggests that they use the metronome in their practice to help them overcome this problem.²⁷ Although Bülow expounds the virtues of using tempo flexibility to

²⁶Beethoven (1894), ii, p. 596. Czerny's exercise in *The Art* (p. 65) is notated an octave lower than Bülow's.

²⁷Beethoven (1894), ii, p. 476.

enhance the expression of a passage, he also warns that the performer should always maintain the overall tempo and mood throughout a piece or movement.²⁸ As was mentioned in section 2.2.2, Czerny also followed this principle. Some of Bülow's editings are similar to Czerny's suggestions earlier in the century. In Op. 31/3/iv/20-34, Bülow accents the e b s in the bass as Czerny did in his Haslinger II and Cocks editions (see p. 75). Bülow inserts pedal markings in Op. 57/i/17-22, the bars with the *fortissimo* chords in order to increase the resonance of the passage. This is in line with Czerny's Wessel edition and his advice in *The Art* (see p. 98). In the four bars leading up to the second subject group of Op. 53/i in bar 35, Czerny suggests using *ritardando*.²⁹ Similarly, Bülow inserts *poco ritardando* in bars 33-34 (ex. 10.2).

Ex. 10.2

The image shows two systems of musical notation for piano. The first system, starting at measure 30, features a treble and bass staff with complex chordal textures. It includes markings for 'decresc.' (decrease) and 'poco ritardando.' (slightly slower). The second system, starting at measure 34, includes a tempo marking 'al (♩ = 132.)' and a performance instruction 'dolce e molto e legato.' (sweet and very legato). It also features 'cresc.' (crescendo), 'sf' (sforzando), and 'p' (piano) markings. The notation includes various fingerings and articulations throughout both systems.

Bülow also cautions against altering passages which Beethoven had to compromise because of the limited range on his then five- to five-and-a-half-octave piano, a warning emphasized by Czerny in *The Art* (see section 3.2). Their reasons, however, are different. Czerny, after his reproach by Beethoven, issued the warning out of reverence and deference to the composer. Bülow's caution stems from his admiration for the imaginative variants which Beethoven thought of as alternatives.³⁰

²⁸Ibid., ii, p. 506.

²⁹Czerny (1846), p. 56.

³⁰Pfeiffer (1894), p. 35.

When Czerny was preparing his editions of the piano sonatas and the comments on performance in *The Art*, he was trying to record Beethoven's performance ideals as he remembered them albeit with some modifications to take into account the relatively more resonant piano from the 1830s. However, Bülow's approach was rather different. Although he respected Czerny for his first-hand knowledge of Beethoven's performing tradition, Bülow's aim was not to preserve the teachings of Czerny but to present an effective way of playing the sonatas. Many of Bülow's comments reflect his own decision on how the sonatas should be played. His suggestions to thicken the texture of a passage, to adopt a slower tempo, or to modify Beethoven's pedal markings were made to suit the late nineteenth-century pianos which were, as outlined in the previous section, more powerful and resonant than Czerny's. In his edition of Op. 57, Bülow recommends octave doublings in the bass of bars 130-134 (ex. 10.3). In some cases, such as Ex. 10.3

The image shows three systems of musical notation for measures 130, 132, and 134. Each system consists of a grand staff with a treble and bass clef. Measure 130 is marked with a circled '130' and the instruction 'ff e seruce'. Measure 132 is marked with a circled '132' and a star symbol. Measure 134 is marked with a circled '134', 'ritornando al tempo primo', 'f p', 'sempre dim.', and 'pp'. The bass line in measure 134 includes fingerings: 3 2 1 3 2 1 1 1.

Beethoven's metronome markings of Op. 106, Bülow proposes a different marking which, in his opinion, would be more appropriate. Regarding the metronome marking of the first movement of Op. 106, Bülow declares:

In his metronomic markings, which coincide essentially with the character of the principal theme, the Editor stands in decided opposition to Carl

Czerny (in his “Kunst des Vortrags”, Part IV of the Pianoforte Method, Op. 500), who, in his capacity as the first and contemporary interpreter of Beethoven’s latest pianoforte-works, deserves to be consulted as an authority, even if not a wholly infallible one. Czerny’s tempo $\text{♩} = 138$, so little in harmony with the ponderous energy of the theme, and apparently too rapid even for such divisions of this movement as are capable of considerable acceleration, may be justified in a sense by the lack of sonority in the Vienna pianos then in vogue. On one of our best modern concert-grands _ and such an one (a substitute for the orchestra, as it were) is requisite for a proper execution of this sonata _ the Czerny tempo would have a confusing and blurring effect.³¹

In the second movement of Op. 106, Bülow acknowledges Beethoven’s metronome marking of $\text{♩} = 80$ but suggests a slightly slower tempo: $\text{♩} = 66$. In his opinion, this tempo will not only enable the performer to bring out the animated character of this movement but also make it more distinct.³² He also permits the performer to take a slower tempo than that suggested by Beethoven in the third movement of this sonata if a very sonorous piano is used.³³

Since the heavier key action on the pianos of Bülow’s day also does not permit playing the octave *glissando* in the last movement of Op. 53, he decides to simplify it and offers the following passage as alternative (ex. 10.4):

Ex. 10.4

The image shows two systems of musical notation for piano. The first system is labeled with a circled '465' at the beginning. It consists of two staves (treble and bass clef) with piano (pp) dynamics. The second system is labeled with a circled '471' at the beginning. It also consists of two staves with piano (pp) dynamics and includes a 'cresc.' marking towards the end. The notation includes various musical symbols such as slurs, accents, and dynamic markings.

Liszt retained the *glissando* in his edition because, on his Erard, this manner of playing was still possible.

³¹Beethoven (1894), ii, p. 563.

³²Ibid., ii, p. 577.

³³Ibid., ii, p. 582.

Czerny's influence is also evident in Liszt's edition of the piano sonatas. Liszt's choice of fingering in Op. 7/iv/68-69 and 76-77 whereby the fifth finger crosses over the fourth is identical to Czerny's solution (see ex. 3.9 above). Liszt also uses Czerny's suggested fingering for Op. 22/iii/12-13 (ex. 10.5) in his edition.³⁴ In the trio section of this movement, Liszt marks the first beat in the bass of bar 39 with an *sf* marking. In *The Art*, Czerny also recommends this note to be accented.³⁵ In the fourth movement of Op. 22, Liszt accents the $a \flat^1$ in the alto part of bars 12-13 to highlight the dissonance. This was also Czerny's advice in *The Art* (see ex. 5.18 above).

Ex. 10.5

Czerny's articulation of two-note slurs and *staccato* in the bass of Op. 57/i/25-32 (as shown in ex. 3.29 above) are retained in the editions of Bülow and Liszt. Liszt's and Bülow's dynamic markings and articulation marks in Op. 57/i/53-54 and 57-58 are also similar to the editing in Czerny's Haslinger II edition (see ex. 3.31 above).

In the *leggieramente* passages of Op. 31/1/ii, however, Liszt prefers a different finger pattern from Beethoven and Czerny. This is one of the few passages where Beethoven inserts fingerings. His preferred fingering of 1313 was replaced with 1324 in Liszt's edition. Bülow is in two minds. He suggests the pattern 1324 in bars 10 and 12 but in bars 74 and 76, he offers 1313 as an alternative.

³⁴Ibid., ii, p. 178.

³⁵Beethoven (1857), p. 179; Czerny (1846), p. 46.

Special effects which involve blurring of different harmonies with the pedal, such as the recitative passages in Op. 31/2/i and the Rondo theme of Op. 53/iii have been shortened by Liszt. In both passages, the pedal marking in Liszt's edition prolong only one harmony at a time. Similarly, Bülow also encourages pedal change with the harmony at the beginning of Op. 53/iii (ex. 10.6) in order to reduce the blurring on the more resonant late nineteenth-century pianos. Compare this pedalling with Beethoven's as is shown in ex. 9.26 above. As was discussed in chapter 9, Czerny reveals that blurring with the pedal is an inherent element of the Rondo theme (see pp. 273-274). Although he was not keen on the extensive blurring of Op. 27/2/i, he did not try to change the pedal markings in Op. 53/iii. Bülow's comment regarding the Rondo theme does not take into account the extensive pedalling. Instead, he merely expresses the importance of viewing the first bass note as part of the theme.³⁶

Ex. 10.6

Rondo.
 Allegretto moderato. (♩ = 106.)

a) *sempre pianissimo.*


pp

pp

³⁶Beethoven (1894), ii, p. 405.

As was discussed in section 10.1 above, Liszt's performances of Beethoven's music could either be faithful to the text or it could contain some additions. A comment by Bülow regarding the last movement of Op. 106 reveals the "touching up" which Liszt and Bülow himself could introduce should the fancy take them. Bülow had great respect for his teacher and dedicated his edition of the piano sonatas to "Franz Liszt, as the fruits of his teaching". Instead of the notated single notes in Op. 106/iv/388, Bülow recommends introducing "Liszt's octaves" (ex. 10.7) in order to add brilliancy to the *crescendo* passage, an effect he had learned from Liszt. However, Liszt, in his own edition, had not altered this bar to include the octaves.³⁷

Ex. 10.7



As an editor, Liszt's approach to Beethoven's piano sonatas was different. Czerny held the view that it was important to learn the piano sonatas according to the order that they were published in order to increase the performer's understanding of Beethoven's development as a composer. He classifies Beethoven's compositions into three stylistic periods:

up to his 28th work (about 1803) he adhered, in a certain degree, to the style of Mozart and Haydn; from then however until about his 90th work (from 1803 to 1815) he fully displayed his true peculiarity, and from that time until his death (in 1827) he again took a new direction, which is not less grand, though it differs materially from the two former.³⁸

Liszt, on the other hand, arranged the sonatas in his edition in order of difficulty, beginning with Op. 49/2 and ending with Op. 106.

On the whole, even though the editions of Liszt and Bülow still display some elements of Czerny's teaching, the emphasis is on the preferences of the editors rather than authenticity, sometimes even to the extent of overriding Beethoven's markings. The development of more powerful and resonant pianos throughout the nineteenth century also contributed to a changing

³⁷Beethoven (1894), ii, p. 614; Beethoven (1857), p. 556.

³⁸Czerny (1846), p. 32.

perception on the way Beethoven's piano sonatas should be played so that in spite of Czerny's untiring efforts to record Beethoven's performing styles, his writings and editings did not make such a lasting impression on future generations as he had hoped.

CONCLUSION

Carl Czerny was undoubtedly an important witness to the character and manner of Beethoven's performing style. The question is, how much of Czerny's piano treatise is really based on this tradition? The answer is probably: most of it. Czerny learned the proper playing posture and the most advantageous hand position from Beethoven. Both men encouraged pianists to avoid unnecessary hand and body movements when playing. They produced a variety of tonal colours by varying finger pressure. They trained the left hand to be as agile as the right. When fingering a passage, wherever possible they avoided placing the thumb and the fifth finger on black keys. *Legato*, in their opinion, was the normal touch. They insisted on the use of tempo flexibility and a careful observance of dynamic and articulation markings in order to convey the full range of expression of a piece. Czerny's definitions of the main tempo headings and their speed implications were broadly the same as Beethoven's. The speeds denoted by the former's metronome markings for the slow movements of Beethoven's piano sonatas are within the style. Many of the principles of pedalling and its technique as expounded in Czerny's *Piano Forte School* can also be traced back to Beethoven.

However, since there was not one universal performing style in the early nineteenth century, but many styles characterised by the personality, musical training and ideals of the individual performer, this could sometimes result in hybrids of styles. The spirit and grace in Mozart's playing caused Clementi to re-think his approach to performance and he eventually abandoned sheer virtuosity to embrace a more *cantabile* and refined manner of playing. Czerny also adopted a hybrid of style, combining the power, energetic, expressive *legato* playing of Beethoven with the clarity and neatness playing of Hummel, a pupil of Mozart. Even in the performance of Beethoven's piano compositions, Czerny sometimes recommends a light, even and "pearly" touch in passagework, to some extent reminiscent of Mozart's and Hummel's playing. Czerny also shared Hummel's definition of *assai* as "very" instead of Beethoven's "enough" or "rather".

The improvements made to the construction of the piano, the use of thicker strings and better hammer coverings and so on, not only made the instrument sturdier and more resonant, it also offered a wider dynamic range and a larger compass of tonal colours. These advances in piano

technology were welcomed and exploited by Czerny. Sometimes, however, he had to adapt or modify piano technique in order to incorporate the new sonic resources of these changes. Pedalling is an example. Although he recognised that Beethoven had employed the damper pedal in order to create special effects through blurring, the increased resonance created by the Viennese pianos in the 1830s and 1840s made extensive use of this technique difficult and sometimes, even undesirable. The trend of curtailing Beethoven's pedal markings which caused considerable blurring continued with Liszt and his pupil Bülow. Czerny, Liszt and Bülow were progressive men by nature and accepted that, with the increasingly powerful pianos at their disposal, changes to the performance of Beethoven's piano sonatas had to be made. However, with the emergence of overstrung, one-piece iron frame pianos such as Bechstein and Steinway which were used by Bülow, the changes which he had to make were far greater than that by Czerny. The sonorous pianos with a heavier key dip meant that Bülow preferred a slower tempo than Czerny and Beethoven, and had to abandon the octave *glissando* in Op. 53, a practice which could not be preserved beyond Czerny and Liszt.

Apart from pedalling, Czerny also made other changes to keep up-to-date with contemporary performing styles. On the whole, the metronome markings for Beethoven's piano sonatas which he published in *The Art* (1846) were significantly slower than his other sets of markings. This may have resulted from the trend for slower speeds, a trend begun by Wagner. Between the 1820s and the 1830s, Czerny also changed his mind about the starting note of the trill and whether it should end with a turn. In 1828, Czerny was still teaching that the trill should begin on the upper note; and unless a suffix is specifically notated, the trill should not have one. But by the 1830s, Czerny was gradually adopting main-note starts, and the confused state of affairs during this transition is clearly recorded in his *Piano Forte School*, in which his fingerings sometimes contradict his written guidelines. He also emphasized that all trills should end with a suffix, whether or not it is specifically notated. Fingerings were also modernised. Czerny preferred to use uniform fingering in repeated patterns, arpeggios, diminished-sevenths and dominant-seventh figures. Beethoven's fingerings in such passages, on the other hand, were often irregular. Although Czerny occasionally resorted to the old system of fingering (where a long finger vaults over a shorter one), most of his fingerings were based on the modern system of passing the thumb under the fingers or crossing a longer finger over the thumb. In his editions of the piano sonatas, Czerny

normally retained Beethoven's fingerings. In the Cocks edition of the trio of the F minor sonata (Op. 2/1/iii), however, Czerny changed the composer's fingering in order to avoid using the same fingers consecutively. The use of an alternative fingering in this awkward passage of double fourths was later confirmed in *The Art*. While Czerny observed most of Beethoven's articulation marks, he sometimes lengthened Beethoven's slurs, especially in overtly melodious passages. By so doing, Czerny chose to sacrifice highly articulate, rhetorical expression in favour of a smooth *legato* line.

Some of Czerny's decisions, of course, were influenced by personal preference. Beethoven would finger a chromatic scale by alternating the thumb and the third finger. Czerny expressed his objection to this fingering and suggested a fingering which used the combination of the thumb and the index finger. Although Beethoven was one of the pioneers in the training of finger dexterity, as we have seen, Czerny placed still more emphasis on the attainment of such skills. His numerous studies bear witness to this. He was also interested in the *bravura* style of playing, a style which did not meet with Beethoven's approval. However, this does not mean that Czerny was interested only in the display of virtuosity for its own sake. When discussing the performance of Beethoven's piano sonatas in *The Art*, he constantly emphasized the importance of understanding and communicating the character of a piece. Conveying the spirit of a piece was, of course, considered by Beethoven to be one of the most important aspects of piano playing.

Czerny's wish to preserve the "correct" mode of performing Beethoven's piano music resulted in numerous editions of the latter's piano sonatas. Czerny's editorial markings in these editions display a certain consistency from the late 1820s to the 1850s and are therefore reliable. Many of them also correspond to his suggestions in *The Art* and in the *Piano Forte School*. In addition, some of the ideas in *The Art* are the same as his editorial markings in the Haslinger II edition from the late 1820s. This edition was published soon after Beethoven's death, so the editorial markings in it, and many of the remarks in *The Art*, probably reflect the composer's ideas and, in part at least, his intentions. Another source which anticipates some of the ideas in the *Piano Forte School* is Czerny's edition of Müller's *Grosse Fortepiano-Schule* (1825). This is not as comprehensive a treatise as *Piano Forte School*, but Czerny's concepts regarding the interpretation of classical compositions, pedalling and the classifications and descriptions of

dynamic and articulation markings were already established by the mid-1820s.

On the whole, Czerny's editorial markings, especially those which appeared in more than one of his editions over a period of time, are invaluable in giving us an insight into certain of Beethoven's habits of thought. Czerny obviously modified some of the principles he had learned from Beethoven, but the majority of his teachings are a loyal record of that performance tradition. But within thirty years of Beethoven's death, the gradual modification of aesthetic outlook, and a decisive departure from his performing style had already begun. With each generation, this departure became increasingly more marked. However, while Czerny's interpretation was largely based on his recollections of Beethoven's teaching and performances, Liszt and to a larger extent, Bülow had to discover the meanings of the sonatas (especially the late sonatas) for themselves. This together with the new technology of piano construction led to effective interpretations of Beethoven works but which were not necessarily entrenched in the early nineteenth-century performing style of the composer.

In short, Carl Czerny is the only reliable witness we have of Beethoven's style. We can learn much about Beethoven's intentions and performance ideals from his writings and editings as long as we bear in mind the areas where he had departed from this tradition.

SOURCES OF MUSICAL EXAMPLES

N. B. [] indicates that no bar numbers have been given in the original, but, for the sake of clarity, I have added them to the musical examples.

CHAPTER 2

- Ex. 2.1a Hummel (1829), iii, p. 61.
Ex. 2.1b Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 12.
Ex. 2.2 Ibid., iii, p. 11.
Ex. 2.3 Bach (1974), pp. 155, 156 and 160.
Ex. 2.4 Hummel (1829), ii, p. 8.
Ex. 2.5 Ibid., ii, p. 67.
Ex. 2.6 Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 19.
Ex. 2.7 Ibid., iii, p. 28.
Ex. 2.8 Bach (1974), pp. 90-91.
Ex. 2.9 Clementi (1801), p. 11.
Ex. 2.10 Bach (1974), p. 160.
Ex. 2.11 Cramer (c1820, treatise), p. 41.
Ex. 2.12 Ibid., p. 50.
Ex. 2.13 Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 56.
Ex. 2.14 Ibid.
Ex. 2.15 Ibid.
Ex. 2.16 Ibid.
Ex. 2.17 Hummel (1829), ii, p. 245.
Ex. 2.18 Ibid., ii, p. 255.
Ex. 2.19 Cramer (1819), *Introduction and Variations* [bb. 1-19] of var. 8, p. 12.
Ex. 2.20 Dussek (1807), *Œuvre 64/iv/[308-311]*, p. 18.
Ex. 2.21 Hummel (1829), iii, p. 63.
Ex. 2.22 Cramer (1820, variations), *New Variations* [bb. 28-34] of var. 8, p. 10.
Ex. 2.23 Dussek (1807), *Œuvre 64/ii/[104-106]*, p. 30.
Ex. 2.24 Hummel (1829), iii, p. 63.
Ex. 2.25 Ibid.

- Ex. 2.26 Clementi (c1807), Op. 34/2/iii/[104-107], p. 34.
 Ex. 2.27 Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 61.
 Ex. 2.28 Dussek (1807), Œuvre 64/iv/[117-120], p. 24.

CHAPTER 3

- Ex. 3.1 Beethoven (c1835-1880), Op. 31/3/iv/[20-24], ii, p. 18.
 Ex. 3.2 Beethoven (1828-1840?), Op. 26/i/[86-102], i, p. 5.
 Ex. 3.3 Beethoven (1895), Op. 26/i/[85-102], p. 6.
 Ex. 3.4 Beethoven (c1835-1880), Op. 109/iii/[203], ii, p. 19.
 Ex. 3.5 Beethoven (1828-1840?), Op. 101/iii/[1-20], ii, p. 7.
 Ex. 3.6 Beethoven (1998), Op. 101/iii/[1-22], pp. 13-14.
 Ex. 3.7 Beethoven (c1835-1880), Op. 81a/iii/[1-4], ii, p. 10.
 Ex. 3.8 Ibid., Op. 7/iv/[76] and [83], i, p. 23.
 Ex. 3.9 Czerny (1970), Beethoven Op. 7/iv/[68-69] and [76-77], p. 29.
 Ex. 3.10 Beethoven (c1835-1880), Op. 7/iv/[151-159], i, p. 26.
 Ex. 3.11 Beethoven (1980), Op. 2/1/iii/59-63, i, p. 15.
 Ex. 3.12 Beethoven (c1835-1880), Op. 2/1/iii/[59-63], i, p. 11.
 Ex. 3.13 Czerny (1970), Beethoven Op. 2/1/iii/[59-63], p. 23.
 Ex. 3.14 Beethoven (1971), Op. 57/ii/[13-14], p. 20.
 Ex. 3.15 Beethoven (1852-1854), Op. 57/ii/[8-16], p. 14.
 Ex. 3.16 Beethoven (1828-1840?), Op. 57/i/[14-18], ii, p. 2.
 Ex. 3.17 Beethoven (1971), Op. 57/i/[14-18], p. 2.
 Ex. 3.18 Beethoven (1828-1840?), Op. 57/iii/[133-137], ii, p. 22.
 Ex. 3.19 Ibid., Op. 57/iii/[108-117], ii, p. 21.
 Ex. 3.20 Beethoven (1856-1868), Op. 57/i/[105-108], p. 333.
 Ex. 3.21 Ibid., Op. 57/i/[205-208], p. 337.
 Ex. 3.22a Ibid., Op. 57/i/[35-39], p. 331.
 Ex. 3.22b Czerny (1970), Beethoven Op. 57/i/[35-39], p. 49.
 Ex. 3.23 Beethoven (1828-1840?), Op. 57/ii/[33-42], ii, p. 16.
 Ex. 3.24 Beethoven (1971), Op. 57/ii/[33-42], p. 21.
 Ex. 3.25 Beethoven (1856-1868), Op. 57/ii/[32-43], p. 340.
 Ex. 3.26 Beethoven (1971), Op. 57/iii/[68-97], pp. 28-29.

- Ex. 3.27 Beethoven (1828-1840?), Op. 57/iii/[74-97], ii, pp. 20-21.
- Ex. 3.28 Beethoven (1856-1868), Op. 57/iii/[76-96], p. 344.
- Ex. 3.29 Beethoven (1828-1840?), Op. 57/i/[25-32], ii, p. 3.
- Ex. 3.30 Beethoven (1856-1868), Op. 57/i/[92-95], p. 333.
- Ex. 3.31 Beethoven (1828-1840?), Op. 57/i/[53-54], ii, p. 4.
- Ex. 3.32 Beethoven (1856-1868), Op. 57/i/[147-151], p. 335.
- Ex. 3.33 Ibid., Op. 57/i/[134-135], pp. 334-335.
- Ex. 3.34 Beethoven (1852-1854), Op. 57/i/[238-239], p. 12.
- Ex. 3.35 Beethoven (1828-1840?), Op. 57/i/[236-238], ii, p. 13.
- Ex. 3.36 Beethoven (1971), Op. 57/iii/[176-191], pp. 32-33.
- Ex. 3.37 Beethoven (1856-1868), Op. 57/iii/[175-192], p. 346.
- Ex. 3.38 Beethoven (c1835-1880), Op. 57/iii/[172-192], ii, p. 23.
- Ex. 3.39 Beethoven (1852-1854), Op. 57/iii/[173-195], p. 23.
- Ex. 3.40a Ibid., Op. 57/i/[15-24], p. 2.
- Ex. 3.40b Ibid., Op. 57/i/[149-161], p. 8.
- Ex. 3.41 Ibid., Op. 57/i/[122-143], pp. 7-8.
- Ex. 3.42 Beethoven (1856-1868), Op. 57/i/[122-134], p. 334.

CHAPTER 4

- Ex. 4.1 Cocks (1853), Op. 55/iii/[381-385], p. 30.
- Ex. 4.2 Ibid., Op. 55/iii/[372-385], p. 30.
- Maelzel's Chart Albrecht (1996), ii, pp. 140-141.
- Ex. 4.3 Beethoven (1980), Op. 90/ii/278-290, ii, p. 210.
- Ex. 4.4 Ibid., Op. 31/2/ii/54-60, ii, p. 38.
- Ex. 4.5 Ibid., Op. 27/2/i/31-36, i, p. 250.
- Ex. 4.6 Ibid., Op. 111/i/127-132, ii, p. 315.
- Ex. 4.7 Ibid., Op. 2/2/i/220-227, i, p. 27.
- Ex. 4.8 Ibid., Op. 2/2/i/48-58, i, p. 23.
- Ex. 4.9 Ibid., Op. 90/i/53-56, ii, p. 197.
- Ex. 4.10 Ibid., Op. 2/3/i/249-252, i, p. 54.
- Ex. 4.11 Ibid., Op. 101/ii/49-52, ii, p. 215.
- Ex. 4.12 Ibid., Op. 106/ii/163-168, ii, p. 244.
- Ex. 4.13 Ibid., Op. 31/3/iv/307-324, ii, p. 72.

- Ex. 4.14 Ibid., Op. 90/i/104-113, ii, p. 198.
- Ex. 4.15 Ibid., Op. 111/i/118, ii, p. 315.
- Ex. 4.16 Ibid., Op. 101/iii/214-226, ii, p. 223.
- Ex. 4.17 Ibid., Op. 110/ii/21-40, ii, p. 297.
- Ex. 4.18 Ibid., Op. 111/i/17-23, ii, p. 310.
- Ex. 4.19 Ibid., Op. 109/ii/120-125, ii, p. 279.
- Ex. 4.20 Ibid., Op. 81a/i/1-4, ii, p. 179.
- Ex. 4.21 Ibid., Op. 54/i/132-138, ii, p. 124.
- Ex. 4.22 Ibid., Op. 27/1/iii/25-26 and iv/1-2, i, p. 240.
- Ex. 4.23 Ibid., Op. 31/3/i/176-183, ii, p. 53.
- Ex. 4.24 Beethoven (1999), Op. 125/iv/8-16, p. 196.
- Ex. 4.25 Beethoven (1980), Op. 106/i/193-208, ii, p. 233.
- Ex. 4.26 Ibid., Op. 31/3/ii/162-171, ii, p. 63.

CHAPTER 5

- Ex. 5.1 Beethoven (1955), Op. 131/ii/[189-198], iv, p. 8.
- Ex. 5.2 Beethoven (1980), Op. 109/iii/1-16, ii, p. 281.
- Ex. 5.3 Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 76.
- Ex. 5.4 Beethoven (1980), Op. 27/1/iii/5-8, i, p. 239.
- Ex. 5.5 Ibid., Op. 7/ii/59-64, i, pp. 82-83.
- Ex. 5.6 Ibid., Op. 10/3/ii/44-48, i, p. 135.
- Ex. 5.7 Ibid., Op. 57/i/92-93, ii, p. 135.
- Ex. 5.8 Ibid., Op. 27/2/iii/76-87, i, p. 257.
- Ex. 5.9 Cramer/Shedlock (1893), Etude no. 3 [bb. 1-5], p. 6.
- Ex. 5.10 Ibid., Etude no. 16 [bb. 1-5], p. 26.
- Ex. 5.11 Ibid., Etude no. 1 [bb. 7-11], p. 2.
- Ex. 5.12 Ibid., Etude no. 6 [bb. 1-15], p. 12.
- Ex. 5.13 Ibid., Etude no. 21 [bb. 1-2], p. 30.
- Ex. 5.14 Ibid., Etude no. 7 [bb. 1-5], p. 14.
- Ex. 5.15 -
- Ex. 5.16 Beethoven (1980), Op. 14/1/iii/47-51, i, p. 173.
- Ex. 5.17 Czerny (1970), Beethoven Op. 31/1/iii/[1-5], p. 42.
- Ex. 5.18 Beethoven (1980), Op. 22/iv/11-14, i, p. 208.

- Ex. 5.19 Ibid., Op. 14/2/ii/5-8, i, p. 184.
 Ex. 5.20 Ibid., Op. 27/1/i/3-4, i, p. 234.
 Ex. 5.21 Czerny (1970), Beethoven Op. 31/3/i/[174-177], p. 45.
 Ex. 5.22 Beethoven (1980), Op. 109/iii/106-109, ii, p. 286.
 Ex. 5.23 Ibid., Op. 31/1/iii/132-134, ii, p. 24.
 Ex. 5.24 Ibid., Op. 7/iii/1-4, i, p. 84.

CHAPTER 6

- Ex. 6.1 Beethoven (1980), Op. 57/ii/1-8, ii, p. 146.
 Ex. 6.2 Ibid., Op. 31/3/iv/273-276, ii, p. 71.
 Ex. 6.3 Ibid., Op. 53/iii/442-451, ii, p. 117.
 Ex. 6.4 Ibid., Op. 22/ii/1-3, i, p. 202.
 Ex. 6.5 Czerny (1970), Beethoven Op. 7/iv/[150-155], p. 29.
 Ex. 6.6a Beethoven (1980), Op. 31/2/iii/215-224, ii, p. 45.
 Ex. 6.6b Ibid., Op. 31/2/iii/167-180, ii, p. 44.
 Ex. 6.7 Cramer/Shedlock (1893), Etude no. 2 [bb. 1-5], p. 4.
 Ex. 6.8 Ibid., Etude no. 24 [bb. 1-3], p. 35.
 Ex. 6.9 Beethoven (1980), Op. 53/i/112-117, ii, p. 93.
 Ex. 6.10 Ibid., Op. 10/3/iv/41-45, i, p. 142.
 Ex. 6.11 Ibid., Op. 2/3/i/46-55, i, p. 46.
 Ex. 6.12 Ibid., Op. 2/3/i/27-41, i, p. 46.
 Ex. 6.13a Czerny (1970), Beethoven Op. 57/i/[1-4], p. 48.
 Ex. 6.13b Beethoven (1971), Op. 57/i/[1-13], p. 1.
 Ex. 6.14 Beethoven (1980), Op. 53/ii/1-2, ii, p. 102.
 Ex. 6.15 Ibid., Op. 110/iii/6-7, ii, p. 300.
 Ex. 6.16 Ibid., Op. 106/iv/8-9, ii, pp. 256-257.
 Ex. 6.17 Ibid., Op. 7/ii/50-51, i, p. 82.
 Ex. 6.18 Ibid., Op. 7/ii/25-28, i, p. 81.
 Ex. 6.19 Beethoven (1895), Op. 26/i/[69-84], p. 5.
 Ex. 6.20 Beethoven (1993), Op. 90/ii/[23-40], p. 16.
 Ex. 6.21 Beethoven (1998), Op. 101/ii/[46-54], p. 9.
 Ex. 6.22 Beethoven (1980), Op. 10/ii/39-46, i, p. 117.
 Ex. 6.23 Ibid., Op. 26/i/205-212, i, p. 223.

- Ex. 6.24 Ibid., Op. 2/2/i/220-226, i, p. 27.
 Ex. 6.25 Ibid., Op. 31/1/ii/1-3, ii, p. 12.
 Ex. 6.26 Ibid., Op. 111/ii/72-73, ii, p. 322.

CHAPTER 7

- Ex. 7.1a Bach (1974), p. 110.
 Ex. 7.1b Ibid., p. 111.
 Ex. 7.2 Beethoven (1980), Op. 2/2/iv/27, i, p. 36.
 Ex. 7.3 Ibid., Op. 22/i/10-11, i, p. 193.
 Ex. 7.4 Bach (1974), p. 136.
 Ex. 7.5 Ibid.
 Ex. 7.6 Beethoven (1980), Op. 10/1/i/9-15, i, p. 96.
 Ex. 7.7 Ibid., Op. 31/1/ii/33, ii, p. 14.
 Ex. 7.8 Ibid., Op. 7/ii/37-41, i, p. 82.
 Ex. 7.9 Ibid., Op. 7/ii/13-15, i, p. 81.
 Ex. 7.10 Ibid., Op. 31/2/ii/1-7, ii, p. 36.
 Ex. 7.11 Czerny (1839E), i, p. 161.
 Ex. 7.12 Czerny (1970), Beethoven Op. 10/3/i/[53-55], p. 32.
 Ex. 7.13 Beethoven (1980), Op. 13/i/51-55, i, p. 148.
 Ex. 7.14 Czerny (1970), Beethoven Op. 31/2/iii/[43-45], p. 44.
 Ex. 7.15 Beethoven (1980), Op. 7/i/108-111, i, pp. 73-74.
 Ex. 7.16 Czerny (c1828), p. 5 .
 Ex. 7.17 Ibid., preface.
 Ex. 7.18 Czerny (1839E), i, p. 171.
 Ex. 7.19 Ibid., i, p. 174.
 Ex. 7.20 Ibid., ii, p. 132.
 Ex. 7.21 Czerny (1838), p. 25.
 Ex. 7.22 Czerny (1839E), i, p. 175.
 Ex. 7.23 Ibid., ii, p. 138.
 Ex. 7.24 Ibid., i, p. 176.
 Ex. 7.25 Czerny (c1828), p. 9.
 Ex. 7.26 Czerny (1839E), i, p. 172.
 Ex. 7.27 Ibid., ii, p. 133.

- Ex. 7.28 Winter (1977), WoO39/7-8, p. 489.
- Ex. 7.29a Rosenblum (1988), Beethoven WoO40/59-60, p. 250.
- Ex. 7.29b Ibid., Beethoven WoO40/74-75, p. 250.
- Ex. 7.30 Winter (1977), Beethoven Op. 119/7/1-2, p. 491.
- Ex. 7.31 Newman (1988), p. 194.
- Ex. 7.32 Beethoven (1980), Op. 111/ii/106-121, ii, pp. 325-326.
- Ex. 7.33 Ibid., Op. 53/iii/473-494, ii, p. 118.
- Ex. 7.34a Drake (1972), p. 165.
- Ex. 7.34b Ibid.

CHAPTER 8

- Ex. 8.1 Rosenblum (1988), Sketch Fischhof 4r, p. 205.
- Ex. 8.2 Ibid., Sketch Kafka 139v, p. 207.
- Ex. 8.3 Ibid., Sketch Kafka 88r, p. 204.
- Ex. 8.4 Ibid., p. 208.
- Ex. 8.5 Ibid., Sketch Kafka 89v, p. 208.
- Ex. 8.6 Ibid., Sketch Kafka 40r, p. 208.
- Ex. 8.7 Ibid., Sketch Kafka 40v, p. 209.
- Ex. 8.8 Ibid., Sketch Kessler 23v, p. 209.
- Ex. 8.9 Ibid., Sketch Kafka 88v, p. 204.
- Ex. 8.10a Beethoven (1980), Op. 2/2/i/84-91, i, p. 24.
- Ex. 8.10b Czerny (1970), Beethoven Op. 2/2/i/[84-91], p. 24.
- Ex. 8.11 Hiebert (1985-1986), WoO39/1-18, p. 15.
- Ex. 8.12a Starke (1819-1821), Op. 28/iv/[205], ii, p. 63.
- Ex. 8.12b Ibid., Op. 28/iv/[208], ii, p. 63.
- Ex. 8.13 Beethoven (1980), Op. 111/i/27-29, ii, p. 310.
- Ex. 8.14 Ibid., Op. 110/ii/65-72, ii, p. 298.
- Ex. 8.15 Hiebert (1985-1986), WoO39/95-96, p. 19.
- Ex. 8.16 Starke (1819-1821), Op. 28/ii/["31"], ii, p. 57.
- Ex. 8.17 Beethoven (1980), Op. 78/ii/116-118, ii, p. 168.
- Ex. 8.18 Ibid., Op. 106/i/96-97, ii, p. 230.
- Ex. 8.19 Grundmann and Mies (1966), p. 117.
- Ex. 8.20 Czerny (1839E), ii, p. 23.

- Ex. 8.21 Ibid., ii, p. 78.
- Ex. 8.22 Newman (1988), Sketch Kafka 39v, p. 292.
- Ex. 8.23 Hiebert (1985-1986), WoO39/113-119, pp. 20-21.
- Ex. 8.24 Czerny (1839E), ii, p. 30.
- Ex. 8.25 Ibid., ii, p. 35.
- Ex. 8.26 Ibid.
- Ex. 8.27 Ibid., ii, p. 37.
- Ex. 8.28 Ibid., ii, p. 111.
- Ex. 8.29 Starke (1819-1821), Op. 28/ii/[9], ii, p. 56.
- Ex. 8.30 Czerny (1839E), ii, p. 120.
- Ex. 8.31 Starke (1819-1821), Op. 28/ii/["24-25"], ii, p. 56.
- Ex. 8.32 Beethoven (1980), Op. 53/iii/462-469, ii, p. 118.
- Ex. 8.33 Czerny (1970), Beethoven Op. 69/ii/[1-8], p. 78.
- Ex. 8.34 Rosenblum (1988), Sketch Kafka 39v, p. 206.
- Ex. 8.35 Beethoven (1980), Op. 110/iii/5-6, ii, p. 300.
- Ex. 8.36 Ibid., Op. 110/iii/125-127, ii, p. 305.
- Ex. 8.37 Ibid., Op. 106/iii/156-167, ii, p. 254.

CHAPTER 9

- Ex. 9.1 Beethoven (1980), Op. 57/i/218-223, ii, p. 143.
- Ex. 9.2 Ibid., Op. 27/2/iii/163-166, i, p. 261.
- Ex. 9.3 Clementi (c1807), Op. 34/2/i/[115-131], p. 25.
- Ex. 9.4 Clementi (1798), Op. 37/3/iii/[1-38], p. 36.
- Ex. 9.5 Beethoven (1980), Op. 109/i/97-99 and Op. 109/ii/1-4, ii, p. 276.
- Ex. 9.6 Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 63.
- Ex. 9.7 Beethoven (1980), Op. 57/ii/96-97, ii, p. 149.
- Ex. 9.8 Ibid., Op. 53/iii/251-258, ii, p. 111.
- Ex. 9.9 Ibid., Op. 31/1/i/168-196, ii, p. 8.
- Ex. 9.10 Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 58.
- Ex. 9.11 Beethoven (1980), Op. 106/i/16-25, ii, p. 227.
- Ex. 9.12 Ibid., Op. 106/i/402-405, ii, p. 239.
- Ex. 9.13 Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 62.
- Ex. 9.14 Beethoven (1980), Op. 26/iv/164-169, i, p. 233.

- Ex. 9.15 Ibid., Op. 109/iii/202-203, ii, p. 290.
- Ex. 9.16 Ibid., Op. 53/iii/528-543, ii, p. 119.
- Ex. 9.17 Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 63.
- Ex. 9.18 Beethoven (1980), Op. 7/iv/180-183, i, p. 95.
- Ex. 9.19 Ibid., Op. 101/ii/28-36, ii, p. 215.
- Ex. 9.20 Ibid., Op. 109/iii/104-107, ii, p. 285.
- Ex. 9.21a Ibid., Op. 106/iii/44-46, ii, p. 246.
- Ex. 9.21b Ibid., Op. 106/iii/129-131, ii, p. 252.
- Ex. 9.22 Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 61.
- Ex. 9.23 Beethoven (1980), Op. 110/iii/114-116, ii, p. 304.
- Ex. 9.24 Ibid., Op. 31/2/i/143-149, ii, p. 33.
- Ex. 9.25 Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 60.
- Ex. 9.26 Beethoven (1980), Op. 53/iii/1-24, ii, p. 103.
- Ex. 9.27 Ibid., Op. 110/iii/1-5, ii, p. 300.
- Ex. 9.28 Ibid., Op. 53/iii/55-62, ii, p. 104.
- Ex. 9.29 Ibid., Op. 53/iii/311-325, ii, p. 113.
- Ex. 9.30 Ibid., Op. 79/i/67-75, ii, p. 171.
- Ex. 9.31 Czerny (1970), Beethoven Op. 37/ii/[1-8], p. 97.
- Ex. 9.32 Beethoven (1980), Op. 106/iii/57-63, ii, p. 47.
- Ex. 9.33 Czerny (1839E), iii, p. 65.
- Ex. 9.34 Beethoven (1996), Op. 58/ii/47-51, iii, Band 3, p. 49.

CHAPTER 10

- Ex. 10.1 Beethoven (1894), Op. 106/iv/[10], ii, p. 596.
- Ex. 10.2 Ibid., Op. 53/i/[30-40], ii, p. 390.
- Ex. 10.3 Ibid., Op. 57/i/[130-136], ii, p. 448.
- Ex. 10.4 Ibid., Op. 53/iii/[465-475], ii, p. 421.
- Ex. 10.5 Beethoven (1857), Op. 22/iii/[9-14], p. 178.
- Ex. 10.6 Beethoven (1894), Op. 53/iii/[1-22], ii, p. 405.
- Ex. 10.7 Ibid., Op. 106/iv/[388-391], ii, p. 614.

SOURCES FOR THE THESIS

(I) MUSIC

- Bach (1837) Bach, Johann S., *Das Wohltemperierte Klavier*, edited and fingered by Carl Czerny (Leipzig: C. F. Peters, 1837)
- Beethoven (1828-1840?) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Sonatas Pour le Piano Forte Seul* (2 vols, Vienna: Haslinger, 1828-1840?)
- Beethoven (c1835-1880) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Beethoven's Masterpieces: being the entire of his Grand Sonatas for the Piano Forte*, ed. by ... Carl Czerny (2 vols, London: Cocks, c1835-1880)
- Beethoven (1852-1854) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Grande Sonata Appassionata, Op. 57*, carefully revised from the original Vienna Editions with Metronome Tempos by Charles Czerny (London: Wessel, 1852-1854)
- Beethoven (1856-1868) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Sonates pour le Pianoforte*, Edition revue, corrigée, métronomisée et doigtée par Ch. Czerny (Berlin: Simrock, 1856-1868)
- Beethoven (1857) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Sonaten für Pianoforte solo*, ed. by Franz Liszt (Leipzig: Bosworth & Co., 1857)
- Beethoven (1894) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Sonatas for the piano*, revised and fingered by Hans von Bülow and Sigmund Lebert (2 vols, New York: G. Schirmer, 1894)
- Beethoven (1895) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *As-dur Sonate Op. 26*. Facsimile, ed. by Erich Prieger (Bonn: F. Cohen, 1895)

- Beethoven (1931) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Sonatas for Pianoforte*, ed. by Donald Tovey and Harold Craxton (3 vols, London: The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music, 1931)
- Beethoven (1935) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Sonatas for the Pianoforte*, ed. by Artur Schnabel (2 vols, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1935)
- Beethoven (1955) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *The String Quartets Complete in Four Volumes*, Urtext Edition, iv (New York: Lea Pocket Scores, 1955)
- Beethoven (1971) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Klaviersonate F-moll Opus 57, Im Faksimile der Urschrift* (Leipzig: Peters, 1971)
- Beethoven (1972) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Die letzten fünf Sonaten von Beethoven, Sonate As dur Op. 110, Erläuterungsausgabe*, ed. by Heinrich Schenker (Vienna: Universal, 1914), revised edition, ed. by Oswald Jones (Vienna: Universal, 1972)
- Beethoven (1980) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Beethoven Klaviersonaten*, ed. by B. A. Wallner, Urtext edition (2 vols, Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1980)
- Beethoven (1993) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Klaviersonate e-Moll op. 90. Faksimile des Autographs*, ed. by Michael Ladenburger (Bonn: Beethoven-Haus, 1993)

- Beethoven (1996) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Beethoven Werke*, ed. by Joseph Schmidt-Görg, etc., Abteilung III Band 3 “Klavierkonzerte II” (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1996)
- Beethoven (1998) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Klaviersonate A-dur, Opus 101*. Faksimile Nach dem Autograph im Besitz des Beethoven-Hauses Bonn, ed. by Sieghard Brandenburg (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1998)
- Beethoven (1999) Beethoven, Ludwig van, *Symphony No. 9 in D minor, op. 125*, ed. by Jonathan Del Mar, Urtext Edition (Kassel, Basel, London, New York, Prague: Bärenreiter, 1999)
- Clementi (1798) Clementi, Muzio, *Three Sonatas, for the Piano Forte*, Op. 37 (London: Longman and Broderip, 1798)
- Clementi (c1807) Clementi, Muzio, *Deux sonates pour le forte-piano*, Oeuvre 34 (Vienna: Artaria, c1807)
- Cramer (1819) Cramer, Johann B., *Introduction and Variations on Mozart's air “Vedrai Carino”* (from the opera *Don Giovanni*) (London: The Regent's Harmonic Institution, 1819)
- Cramer (1820, variations) Cramer, Johann B., *New Variations on Mozart's Favorite [sic] Air, “Deh Prendi un dolce amplesso”* (from *La Clemenza di Tito*) (London: Royal Harmonic Institution, 1820)

- Cramer/Shedlock (1893) Cramer, Johann B., *Selection of Studies by J. B. Cramer* with comments by Ludwig van Beethoven and preface, translation, explanatory notes and fingering by Shedlock (London: Augener, 1893)
- Czerny (c1828) Czerny, Carl, *Grand Exercise for the Practice of the Shake*, Op. 151 (London: Cocks, c1828)
- Czerny (1834-1836) Czerny, Carl (ed.), *Musikalisches Pfennig-Magazin für das Pianoforte* (Vienna: Haslinger, 1834-1836)
- Czerny (1838) Czerny, Carl, *Beethoven Grand Septet in E flat*. Newly arranged for two performers on one piano forte ... by Charles Czerny (London: Cocks, 1838?)
- Czerny (1841) Czerny, Carl, *School for the Practice of the Shake*, or 12 New Exercises, preceded by some Introductory Remarks on the nature of that Important Embellishment, Op. 632, tr. by John Bishop (London: Cocks, 1841)
- Dusseck (1807) Dussek, Jan L., *Le Retour à Paris*, Œuvre 64 (Paris: Pleyel, 1807)

(II) BOOKS, CONFERENCE PAPERS AND ARTICLES

- Albrecht (1996) Albrecht, Theodore (tr. and ed.), *Letters to Beethoven and other correspondence* (3 vols, Lincoln, London, 1996)
- Allgemeine (1821) *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, the *Intelligenz-Blatt*, no. 8 (September 1821)

- Anderson (1961) Anderson, Emily (tr. and ed.), *The Letters of Beethoven* (3 vols, New York, 1961)
- Anderson (1966) Anderson, Emily (tr. and ed.), *The Letters of Mozart and His Family* (2 vols, London, 2nd ed., 1966)
- Bach (1974) Bach, Carl P. E., *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments*, tr. and ed. by William J. Mitchell (London, 1974)
- Badura-Skoda (1988) Badura-Skoda, Paul, "A tie is a tie is a tie", *Early Music* xvi (1988), pp. 84-88
- Bamberger (1976) Bamberger, Jean, "The Musical Significance of Beethoven's Fingerings in the Piano Sonatas", *Music Forum* iv (1976), pp. 237-280
- Barker (1996) Barker, Tallis, *Aspects of Notation and Performance Practice in the Keyboard Works of Beethoven*, unpublished PhD thesis (Oxford University, 1996)
- Barth (1992) Barth, George, *The Pianist as Orator* (Ithaca, London, 1992)
- Beyschlag (1908) Beyschlag, Adolf, *Die Ornamentik der Musik* (Leipzig, 2nd. ed., 1908)
- Breuning (1992) Breuning, Gerhard von, *Memories of Beethoven: From the House of the Black-Robed Spaniards*, ed. by Maynard Solomon, tr. by Henry Minns and Maynard Solomon (Cambridge, 1992)

- Brown (1993) Brown, Clive, "Dots and strokes in late 18th- and 19th- century music", *Early Music* xxi (1993), pp. 593-610
- Brown (1999) Brown, Clive, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900* (Oxford, 1999)
- Brown and Sadie (1989) Brown, Howard M. and Sadie, Stanley (eds.), *Performance Practice: Music After 1600* (London, 1989)
- Chopin (1988) Chopin, Frédéric, *Chopin's Letters*, tr. by E. L. Voynich (New York, 1988)
- Clementi (1801) Clementi, Muzio, *Introduction to the Art of Playing on the Piano Forte* (London, 1801)
- Clementi/Rosenblum (1974) Clementi, Muzio, *Introduction to the Art of Playing on the Piano Forte*, new introduction by Sandra Rosenblum (New York, 1974). A reprint of the first edition, second issue (London, 1801)
- Clive (2001) Clive, Peter, *Beethoven and his world: a biographical dictionary* (Oxford, 2001)
- Cocks (1853) *Cocks Musical Miscellany* (London, 1853)
- Cole (1998) Cole, Michael, *The Pianoforte in the Classical Era* (Oxford, 1998)
- Cramer (c1820, treatise) Cramer, Johann B., *Instructions for the Piano Forte* (London, 3rd. ed., c1820)

- Cramer (1835) Cramer, Johann B., *Useful Extract* (London, 4th. ed., 1835)
- Czerny (1839E) Czerny, Carl, *Complete Theoretical and Practical Piano Forte School*, Op. 500, tr. by J. A. Hamilton (3 vols, London, 1839)
- Czerny (1839G) Czerny, Carl, *Vollständige theoretisch-praktische Pianoforte-Schule* (3 vols, Vienna, 1839)
- Czerny (1846) Czerny, Carl, *The Art of Playing the Ancient and Modern Pianoforte Works*, A Supplement to the *Royal Pianoforte School*, Op. 500, tr. by John Bishop (London, 1846)
- Czerny (1848) Czerny, Carl, *Letters to A Young Lady, On the Art of Playing the Piano Forte*, tr. by J. A. Hamilton (London, 1848)
- Czerny (1956) Czerny, Carl, "Recollections From My Life", tr. by Ernest Sanders, *The Musical Quarterly* xlii (1956), pp. 302-317
- Czerny (1970) Czerny, Carl, *On the Proper Performance of all Beethoven's Works for the Piano*, ed. by Paul Badura-Skoda (Vienna, 1970)
- Deas (1950) Deas, Stewart, "Beethoven's 'Allegro assai'", *Music and Letters* xxxi (1950), pp. 333-336
- Drake (1972) Drake, Kenneth, *The Sonatas of Beethoven as he played and taught them* (Bloomington, 1972)

- Drake (1994) Drake, Kenneth, *The Beethoven Sonatas and the Creative Experience* (Boomington and Indianapolis, 1994)
- Dussek (1800) Dussek, Jan L., *Instructions on the Art of Playing the Pianoforte or Harpsichord* (with a "Dictionary of Italian and other words, used in Music") (London, Edinburgh, 1800)
- Fischer (1990) Fischer, Johannes, "Textkritik und Interpretation (II) das Staccato in Ludwig van Beethovens Klaviersonaten", *Musikalische Aufführungspraxis und Edition: Johann Sebastian Bach, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Ludwig van Beethoven* (Regensburg, 1990), pp. 151-167
- Fuller (1984) Fuller, Richard A., "Andreas Streicher's notes on the fortepiano", *Early Music* xii (1984), pp. 461-470
- Gelfand (1985) Gelfand, Yakov, "On Tempo Indications: Based on Beethoven's Music", *College Music Symposium* xxv (1985), pp. 92-129
- Gerig (1974) Gerig, Reginald R., *Famous Pianists and Their Technique* (Washington, New York, 1974)
- Goldstein (1988) Goldstein, Joanna, *A Beethoven Enigma: Performance Practice and the Piano Sonata, Opus 111* (New York, 1988)
- Grundmann and Mies (1966) Grundmann, Herbert, and Mies, Paul, *Studien zum Klavierspiel Beethovens und seiner Zeitgenossen* (Bonn, 1966)

- Harrison (1998) Harrison, Bernard, "The revision of Clementi's Op. 2 and the transformation of piano performance style", a talk given in the Tenth International Nineteenth-Century Conference (Bristol, July 1998)
- Hiebert (1985-1986) Hiebert, Elfrieda, "Beethoven's Fingerings in the Piano Trio in B-Flat, WoO39", *Early Keyboard Journal* iv (1985-1986), pp. 5-27
- Hildebrandt (1988) Hildebrandt, Dieter, *Piano Forte: A Social History of the Piano* (London, Melbourne, Auckland, Johannesburg, 1988)
- Hudson (1994) Hudson, Richard, *Stolen Time* (Oxford, 1994)
- Hummel (1829) Hummel, Johann N., *A Complete Theoretical and Practical Course of Instructions on the Art of Playing the Piano Forte* (3 vols, London, 1829)
- Keller (1973) Keller, Hermann, *Phrasing and Articulation*, tr. by Leigh Gerdine (New York, 1973)
- Kerst (1964) Kerst, Friedrich, *Beethoven: The Man and the Artist, as revealed in his own words*, tr. and ed. by Henry Edward Krehbiel (New York, 1964)
- Kochevitsky (1962) Kochevitsky, George, "Controversial Pedaling in Beethoven's Piano Sonatas", *The Piano Quarterly* xxx (1962), pp. 24-28

- Kolisch (1943) Kolisch, Rudolf, "Tempo and Character in Beethoven's Music", *The Musical Quarterly* xxix (1943), pp.169-187 and pp. 291-312
- Kolisch (1993) Kolisch, Rudolf, "Tempo and Character in Beethoven's Music", *The Musical Quarterly* lxxvii (1993), pp. 90-129 and pp. 268-342
- Komlós (1995) Komlós, Katalin, *Fortepianos and their Music* (Oxford, 1995)
- Kramer (1975) Kramer, Richard, "Notes to Beethoven's Education", *Journal of the American Musicological Society* xxviii (1975), pp. 72-101
- Kuerti (1997) Kuerti, Anton, "Carl Czerny: In the Shadow of Beethoven", *Queens Quarterly* civ (1997), pp. 487-497
- Kullak (1973) Kullak, Franz, *Beethoven's Piano Playing: With an Essay on the Execution of the Trill*, tr. by Theodore Baker (New York, 1973)
- MacArdle (1958) MacArdle, Donald W., "Beethoven and the Czernys", *The Monthly Musical Record* lxxxviii (1958), pp. 124-135
- Marx (1863) Marx, Adolf B., *Anleitung zum Vortrag Beethovenscher Klavierwerke* (Berlin, 1863)
- Mies (1957) Mies, Paul, *Textkritische Untersuchungen bei Beethoven* (Bonn, 1957)

- Milchmeyer (1797) Milchmeyer, Johann P., *Die wahre Art das Pianoforte zu Spielen* (Dresden, 1797)
- Moscheles (1873) Moscheles, Charlotte, *Life of Moscheles with Selections from His Diaries and Correspondence*, tr. by A. D. Coleridge, ii (London, 1873)
- Newman (1969) Newman, William S., *The Sonata Since Beethoven: The Third and Final Volume of a History of the Sonata Idea* (Chapel Hill, 1969)
- Newman (1976) Newman, William S., "The Performance of Beethoven's Trills", *The Journal of American Musicological Society* xxix (1976), pp. 439-462
- Newman (1976-1977) Newman, William S., "A Chronological Checklist of collected editions of Beethoven's solo piano sonatas since his own day", *Notes* xxxiii (1976-1977), pp. 503-530
- Newman (1978) Newman, William S., "Second and One-Half Thoughts on the Performance of Beethoven's Trills", *The Musical Quarterly* lxiv (1978), pp. 98-103
- Newman (1988) Newman, William S., *Beethoven on Beethoven* (New York, London, 1988)
- Nottebohm (1872) Nottebohm, Gustav, *Beethoveniana*, i (Leipzig, 1872)
- Nottebohm (1887) Nottebohm, Gustav, *Beethoveniana*, ii (Leipzig, 1887)

- Pfeiffer (1894) Pfeiffer, Theodor, *Studien bei Hans von Bülow* (Berlin, 5th ed., 1894)
- Pleyel (c1860) Pleyel, Ignaz, *Clavierschule*, neuste Auflage, durchgesehen, neugeordnet, und mit angemessenen Uebungsstücke von den besten Meistern, vermehrt von Carl Czerny (Vienna, c1860)
- Quantz (1966) Quant, Johann J., *On Playing the Flute*, tr. by Edward R. Reilly (London, 1966)
- Riggs (1987) Riggs, Robert D., *Articulation in Mozart's and Beethoven's sonatas for piano and violin: Source Critical and analytical studies*, unpublished PhD dissertation (Harvard University, 1987)
- Rochlitz (1832) Rochlitz, Johann F., "Karl Philipp Emanuel Bach", *Für Freunde der Tonkunst* iv (1832), p. 295
- Rosenblum (1988) Rosenblum, Sandra P., *Performance Practices in Classic Piano Music: Their Principles and Application* (Bloomington, Indianapolis, 1988)
- Rowland (2001) Rowland, David, *Early Keyboard Instruments: A Practical Guide* (Cambridge, 2001)
- Sachs (1953) Sachs, Curt, *Rhythm and Tempo* (London, 1953)
- Sadie (1980) Sadie, Stanley (ed.), *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (London, 1st. ed., 1980)

- Sadie (2001) Sadie, Stanley (ed.), *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (London, 2nd. ed., 2001)
- Schindler (1841) (ed. Moscheles) Schindler, Anton, *The Life of Beethoven*, ed. by Ignaz Moscheles (London, 1841)
- Schindler (1966) (ed. MacArdle) Schindler, Anton, *Beethoven as I Knew Him*, ed. by Donald W. MacArdle (London, 1966)
- Sonneck (1967) Sonneck, Oscar G. T., *Beethoven: Impressions by his Contemporaries* (New York, 1967)
- Stadlen (1967) Stadlen, Peter, "Beethoven and the Metronome", *Music and Letters* xxxviii (1967), pp. 330-349
- Starke (1819-1821) Starke, Friedrich, *Wiener Pianoforte-Schule* (3 vols, Vienna, 1819-1821)
- Stowell (1994) Stowell, Robin (ed.), *Performing Beethoven* (Cambridge, 1994)
- Thayer (1969) Thayer, Alexander W., *Thayer's Life of Beethoven*, ed. by Elliot Forbes (Princeton, New Jersey, 1969)
- Türk (1802) Türk, Daniel G., *Klavierschule, oder Anweisung zum Klavierspielen für Lehrer und Lernende* (Leipzig, Halle, 2nd. ed., 1802)
- Türk (1804) Türk, Daniel G., *Treatise on the art of teaching and practising the pianoforte*, tr. and abridged by C. G. Naumburger (London, 1804)

- Unger (1926) Unger, Max, *Beethoven's Handschrift* (Bonn, 1926)
- Unverricht (1960) Unverricht, Hubert, *Die Eigenschriften und die Originalausgaben von Werken Beethovens in ihrer Bedeutung für die moderne Textkritik* (Kassel, 1960)
- Wegeler and Ries (1988) Wegeler, Franz and Ries, Ferdinand, *Remembering Beethoven*, tr. by Frederick Noonan, foreword by Christopher Hogwood, introduced by Eva Badura-Skoda (London, 1988)
- Walker (1985) Walker, Alan, "Franz Liszt I: The virtuoso years, 1811-1847, Reply to a review", *The Musical Quarterly* lxxi/2 (1985), pp. 211-219
- Williams (1990) Williams, Adrian, *Portrait of Liszt: By Himself and His Contemporaries* (Oxford, 1990)
- Winter (1977) Winter, Robert, "Second Thoughts on the Performance of Beethoven's Trills", *The Musical Quarterly* lxxiii (1977), pp. 483-504
- Winter (1979) Winter, Robert, "And Even More Thoughts on the Beethoven Trill ...", *The Musical Quarterly* lxxv (1979), pp. 111-116

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albrecht, Theodore (tr. and ed.), *Letters to Beethoven and other correspondence* (3 vols, Lincoln, London, 1996)

Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung, the Intelligenz-Blatt, no. 8 (September 1821)

Anderson, Emily (tr. and ed.), *The Letters of Beethoven* (3 vols, New York, 1961)

Anderson, Emily (tr. and ed.), *The Letters of Mozart and His Family* (2 vols, London, 2nd ed., 1966)

Arnold, Dennis and Fortune, Nigel (eds.), *The Beethoven Companion* (London, Boston, 1973)

Bach, Carl P. E., *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments*, tr. and ed. by William J. Mitchell (London, 1974)

Badura-Skoda, Paul, "Playing the early piano", *Early Music*, xii (1984), pp. 477-480

Badura-Skoda, Paul, "A tie is a tie is a tie", *Early Music* xvi (1988), pp. 84-88

Baillie, Lauren, *The Catalogue of Printed Music in the British Library to 1980* (London, München, New York, Paris, 1982)

Bamberger, Jean, "The Musical Significance of Beethoven's Fingerings in the Piano Sonatas", *Music Forum* iv (1976), pp. 237-280

Barker, Tallis, *Aspects of Notation and Performance Practice in the Keyboard Works of Beethoven*, unpublished PhD thesis (Oxford University, 1996)

Barth, George, *The Pianist as Orator* (Ithaca, London, 1992)

- Bilson, Malcolm, "The Viennese fortepiano of the late 18th century", *Early Music* viii (1980), pp. 158-162
- Beyschlag, Adolf, *Die Ornamentik der Musik* (Leipzig, 2nd. ed., 1908)
- Brendel, Alfred, *Musical Thoughts and After Thoughts* (Sussex, Princeton, 1976)
- Breuning, Gerhard von, *Memories of Beethoven: From the House of the Black-Robed Spaniards*, ed. by Maynard Solomon, tr. by Henry Minns and Maynard Solomon (Cambridge, 1992)
- Brown, Clive, "Dots and strokes in late 18th- and 19th-century music", *Early Music* xxi (1993), pp. 593-610
- Brown, Clive, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900* (Oxford, 1999)
- Brown, Howard M. and Sadie, Stanley (eds.), *Performance Practice: Music After 1600* (London, 1989)
- Brown, Peter A, "Celerio, le Dieu de Clavecin: An Appraisal of Clementi?", *The Musical Times* cxx/1638 (Aug 1979), pp. 645-647
- Chopin, Frédéric, *Chopin's Letters*, tr. by E. L. Voynich (New York, 1988)
- Clementi, Muzio, *Introduction to the Art of Playing on the Piano Forte* (London, 1801)
- Clementi, Muzio, *Introduction to the Art of Playing on the Piano Forte*, new introduction by Sandra Rosenblum (New York, 1974). A reprint of the first edition, second issue (London, 1801)
- Clive, Peter, *Beethoven and his world: a biographical dictionary* (Oxford, 2001)
- Cocks Musical Miscellany* (London, 1853)

Cole, Michael, *The Pianoforte in the Classical Era* (Oxford, 1998)

Cooper, Barry (ed.), *The Beethoven Compendium* (London, 1991)

Cramer, Johann B., *Instructions for the Piano Forte* (London, 3rd. ed., c1820)

Cramer, Johann B., *Useful Extract* (London, 4th. ed., 1835)

Czerny, Carl, *Systematische Anleitung zum Fantasieren auf dem Pianoforte*, Op. 200 (Vienna, 1829)

Czerny, Carl, *Sixty Progressive Exercises for the Piano Forte*, composed as a sequel to Jousse's tutor, Op. 420 (London, 1836)

Czerny, Carl, *Complete Theoretical and Practical Piano Forte School*, Op. 500, tr. by J. A. Hamilton (3 vols, London, 1839)

Czerny, Carl, *Vollständige theoretisch-praktische Pianoforte-Schule* (3 vols, Vienna, 1839)

Czerny, Carl, *Elementary Works for the Piano Forte*, tr. by John Bishop (London, 1840)

Czerny, Carl, *The School of Taste and Embellishment*, A Collection of National Airs, with Graces and Ornaments, for the use of Persons who are desirous of playing with Elegance and Expression, on the Piano Forte, Op. 575 (London, 1840)

Czerny, Carl, *The Art of Playing the Ancient and Modern Pianoforte Works*, A Supplement to the *Royal Pianoforte School*, Op. 500, tr. by John Bishop (London, 1846)

Czerny, Carl, *Letters to A Young Lady, On the Art of Playing the Piano Forte*, tr. by J. A. Hamilton (London, 1848)

Czerny, Carl, *School of Practical Composition*, Op. 600, translator anon. (London, 1849)

Czerny, Carl, *Umriss der ganzen Musikgeschichte bis 1800* (Mainz, 1851)

Czerny, Carl, "Recollections From My Life", tr. by Ernest Sanders, *The Musical Quarterly* xlii (1956), pp. 302-317

Czerny, Carl, *On the Proper Performance of all Beethoven's Works for the Piano*, ed. by Paul Badura-Skoda (Vienna, 1970)

Czerny, Joseph, *Der Wiener Klavier-Lehrer*, Op. 151 (Vienna, 1826?)

Dale, Kathleen, "The Three C's: Pioneers of Pianoforte Playing", *The Music Review* vi (1945), pp. 138-148

Dannreuther, E., *Musical Ornamentation*, (3 vols, London, 1895)

Deas, Stewart, "Beethoven's 'Allegro assai'", *Music and Letters* xxxi (1950), pp. 333-336

Donington, Robert, *The Interpretation of Early Music* (London, 1963)

Drake, Kenneth, *The Sonatas of Beethoven as he played and taught them* (Bloomington, 1972)

Drake, Kenneth, *The Beethoven Sonatas and the Creative Experience* (Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1994)

Dusseck, Jan L., *Instructions on the Art of Playing the Pianoforte or Harpsichord* (with a "Dictionary of Italian and other words, used in Music") (London, Edinburgh, 1800)

Ferguson, Howard, *Keyboard Interpretation from the 14th to the 19th century* (Oxford, New York, Melbourne, 1975)

Fischer, Johannes, "Textkritik und Interpretation (II) das Staccato in Ludwig van Beethovens Klaviersonaten", *Musikalische Aufführungspraxis und Edition: Johann Sebastian Bach, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Ludwig van Beethoven* (Regensburg, 1990), pp. 151-167

Fuller, Richard A., "Andreas Streicher's notes on the fortepiano", *Early Music* xii (1984), pp. 461-470

Gelfand, Yakov, "On Tempo Indications: Based on Beethoven's Music", *College Music Symposium* xxv (1985), pp. 92-129

Gerig, Reginald R., *Famous Pianists and Their Technique* (Washington, New York, 1974)

Goldstein, Joanna, *A Beethoven Enigma: Performance Practice and the Piano Sonata, Opus 111* (New York, 1988)

Grundmann, Herbert, and Mies, Paul, *Studien zum Klavierspiel Beethovens und seiner Zeitgenossen* (Bonn, 1966)

Hamilton, J. A., *Hamilton's Modern instructions for the pianoforte*, arranged and fingered by Czerny (London, 34th ed., 1853)

Hamilton, J. A., *Hamilton's Modern instructions for the pianoforte*, revised, enlarged, improved and fingered by Carl Czerny (London, 50th ed., 1854)

Harrison, Bernard, "The revision of Clementi's Op. 2 and the transformation of piano performance style", a talk given in the Tenth International Nineteenth-Century Conference (Bristol, July 1998)

Hess, W., "The Right Tempo: Beethoven and the Metronome", *The Beethoven Newsletter* iii (1988), pp. 16-17

Hiebert, Elfrieda, "Beethoven's Fingerings in the Piano Trio in B-Flat, WoO39", *Early Keyboard Journal* iv (1985-1986), pp. 5-27

Hildebrandt, Dieter, *Piano Forte: A Social History of the Piano* (London, Melbourne, Auckland, Johannesburg, 1988)

Hudson, Richard, *Stolen Time* (Oxford, 1994)

Hummel, Johann N., *Ausführliche theoretisch-practische Anweisung zum Pianoforte Spiel* (Vienna, 1828)

Hummel, Johann N., *A Complete Theoretical and Practical Course of Instructions on the Art of Playing the Piano Forte* (3 vols, London, 1829)

Jones, Timothy, *Beethoven: The "Moonlight" and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31* (Cambridge, 1999)

Keller, Hermann, *Phrasing and Articulation*, tr. by Leigh Gardine (New York, 1973)

Kerst, Friedrich, *Beethoven: The Man and the Artist, as revealed in his own words*, tr. and ed. by Henry Edward Krehbiel (New York, 1964)

Kochevitsky, George, "Controversial Pedaling in Beethoven's Piano Sonatas", *The Piano Quarterly* xxxix (1962), pp. 24-28

Kolisch, Rudolf, "Tempo and Character in Beethoven's Music", *The Musical Quarterly* xxix (1943), pp.169-187 and pp. 291-312

Kolisch, Rudolf, "Tempo and Character in Beethoven's Music", *The Musical Quarterly* lxxvii (1993), pp. 90-129 and pp. 268-342

Komlós, Katalin, *Fortepianos and their Music* (Oxford, 1995)

Kramer, Richard, "Notes to Beethoven's Education", *Journal of the American Musicological Society* xxviii (1975), pp. 72-101

Kuerti, Anton, "Carl Czerny: In the Shadow of Beethoven", *Queens Quarterly* civ (1997), pp. 487-497

Kullak, Franz, *Beethoven's Piano Playing: With an Essay on the Execution of the Trill*, tr. by Theodore Baker (New York, 1973)

Lawson, Colin, and Stowell, Robin, *The Historical Performance of Music: An Introduction* (Cambridge, 1999)

Le Huray, Peter, *Authenticity in Performance: Eighteenth-Century Case Studies* (Cambridge, 1990)

Leicher-Olbrich, Anneliese, *Untersuchungen zu Originalausgaben Beethovenscher Klavierwerke* (Wiesbaden, 1976)

Levin, Thomas Y, "Integral interpretation: Introductory notes to Beethoven, Kolisch and the question of the metronome", *The Musical Quarterly* lxxvii (1993), pp. 81-89

Loesser, Arthur, *Men, Women and Pianos: A Social History* (New York, 1954)

Lott, R. Allen, "A continuous trance: Hans von Bülow's tour of America", *The Journal of Musicology* xii/4 (1994), pp. 529-549

MacArdle, Donald W., "Beethoven and the Czernys", *The Monthly Musical Record* lxxxviii (1958), pp. 124-135

Mansfield, O. A., "Some Mysteries and Queries Concerning Muzio Clementi", *The Musical Times* lxvi (1925), pp. 807-809

Marx, Adolf B., *Anleitung zum Vortrag Beethovenscher Klavierwerke* (Berlin, 1863)

Mies, Paul, *Textkritische Untersuchungen bei Beethoven* (Bonn, 1957)

Milchmeyer, Johann P., *Die wahre Art das Pianoforte zu Spielen* (Dresden, 1797)

Mitchell, Alice Levine, "A Systematic Introduction to the Pedagogy of Carl Czerny", *Music and Civilization: Essays in Honor of Paul Henry Lang* (New York, 1984), pp. 262-269

Moscheles, Charlotte, *Life of Moscheles with Selections from His Diaries and Correspondence*, tr. by A. D. Coleridge (2 vols, London, 1873)

Müller, A. E., *Grosse Fortepiano-Schule*, Achte Auflage mit vielen neuen Beyspielen und einem vollständige Anhang von Generalbass versehen von Carl Czerny (Leipzig, 1825)

Müller, A. E., *Kleines Elementarbuch für Klavierspieler*, mit Zusätzen von Carl Czerny (Leipzig, 1830?)

Newman, William S., "About Carl Czerny's Op. 600 and the 'First' description of 'Sonata Form'", *Journal of the American Musicological Society* xx (1967) , pp. 513-515

Newman, William S., *The Sonata Since Beethoven: The Third and Final Volume of a History of the Sonata Idea* (Chapel Hill, 1969)

Newman, William S., *Performance Practices in Beethoven's Piano Sonatas: An Introduction* (New York, 1971)

Newman, William S., "The Performance of Beethoven's Trills", *The Journal of American Musicological Society* xxix (1976), pp. 439-462

Newman, William S., "A Chronological Checklist of collected editions of Beethoven's solo piano sonatas since his own day", *Notes* xxxiii (1976-1977), pp. 503-530

Newman, William S., "Second and One-Half Thoughts on the Performance of Beethoven's Trills", *The Musical Quarterly* lxiv (1978), pp. 98-103

Newman, William S., *Beethoven on Beethoven* (New York, London, 1988)

Nottebohm, Gustav, *Beethoveniana*, i (Leipzig, 1872)

Nottebohm, Gustav, *Beethoveniana*, ii (Leipzig, 1887)

Pascall, Robert, "Playing Brahms, A Study in Nineteenth Century Performance Practice", *Papers in Musicology No. 1* (Nottingham, 1991)

Pestelli, Georgio, *The Age of Mozart and Beethoven*, tr. by Eric Cross (Cambridge, 1984)

Pfeiffer, Theodor, *Studien bei Hans von Bülow* (Berlin, 5th ed., 1894)

Philip, Robert, *Early Recordings and Musical Style; Changing tastes in instrumental performance, 1900-1950* (New York, 1992)

Plantinga, Leon, "Clementi, Virtuosity, and the 'German Manner'", *Journal of the American Musicological Society* xxv (1972), pp. 303-330

Plantinga, Leon, *Clementi: His Life and Music* (London, 1977)

- Pleyel, Ignaz, *Clavierschule*, neuste Auflage, durchgesehen, neugeordnet, und mit angemessenen Uebungsstücke von den besten Meistern, vermehrt von Carl Czerny (Vienna, c1860)
- Pollens, Stewart, *The Early Pianoforte* (Cambridge, 1995)
- Quant, Johann J., *On Playing the Flute*, tr. by Edward R. Reilly (London, 1966)
- Reicha, A. J., *Course of Musical Composition ... with remarks of Carl Czerny*, tr. from *Lehrbuch der musikalischen Composition ... Aus dem Französischen ... übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen* von C. Czerny (1840?) by Arnold Merrick and ed. by John Bishop (London, 1854)
- Riehn, Rainer, "Beethovens Verhältnis zum Metronom", *Musik-Konzepte* xiii (1979), pp. 70-84
- Riehn, Rainer, "Beethovens originale, Cernys und Moscheles' auf Erinnerung gegründete, Kolischs und Leibowitz' durch Vergleiche der Charaktere erschlossene Metronomisierungen", *Musik-Konzepte* xiii (1979), pp. 85-96
- Riggs, Robert D., *Articulation in Mozart's and Beethoven's sonatas for piano and violin: Source Critical and analytical studies*, unpublished PhD dissertation (Harvard University, 1987)
- Ringer, Alexander L., "Beethoven and the London Pianoforte School", *The Musical Quarterly* lvi (1970), pp. 742-758
- Rink, John (ed.), *The Practice of Performance: Studies in Musical Interpretation* (Cambridge, 1995)
- Rink, John, *Musical Performance* (Cambridge, 2002)
- Rochlitz, Johann F., "Karl Philipp Emanuel Bach", *Für Freunde der Tonkunst* iv (1832), p. 295

- Rosen, Charles, *Beethoven's Piano Sonatas: A Short Companion* (Yale, New Haven, London, 2002)
- Rosenblum, Sandra P., *Performance Practices in Classic Piano Music: Their Principles and Application* (Bloomington, Indianapolis, 1988)
- Rowland, David, *A History of Pianoforte Pedalling* (Cambridge, 1993)
- Rowland, David (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Piano* (Cambridge, 1998)
- Rowland, David, *Early Keyboard Instruments: A Practical Guide* (Cambridge, 2001)
- Sachs, Curt, *Rhythm and Tempo* (London, 1953)
- Sadie, Stanley (ed.), *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (London, 1st. ed., 1980)
- Sadie, Stanley (ed.), *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (London, 2nd. ed., 2001)
- Schindler, Anton, *The Life of Beethoven*, ed. by Ignaz Moscheles (London, 1841)
- Schindler, Anton, *Beethoven as I Knew Him*, ed. by Donald W. MacArdle (London, 1966)
- Schnapp, Friedrich, "Ein autobiographischer Brief Carl Czernys aus dem Jahre 1824", *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* lviii (1941), pp. 89-96
- Schnabel, Artur, *My Life and Music* (Letchworth, 1970)
- Sheer, Miriam, "Dynamics in Beethoven's Late Instrumental Works: A New Profile", *The Journal of Musicology* xvi/3 (1998), pp. 358-78

Sitwell, Sacheverell, *Liszt* (New York, 1967)

Sonneck, Oscar G. T., *Beethoven: Impressions by his Contemporaries* (New York, 1967)

Stadlen, Peter, "Beethoven and the Metronome", *Music and Letters* xxxviii (1967), pp. 330-349

Stadlen, Peter, "Beethoven and the Metronome", *Soundings* ix (1982), pp. 38-73

Stanley, Glenn (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Beethoven* (Cambridge, 2000)

Starke, Friedrich, *Wiener Pianoforte-Schule* (3 vols, Vienna, 1819-1821)

Stowell, Robin (ed.), *Performing Beethoven* (Cambridge, 1994)

Thayer, *Chronologisches Verzeichniss der Werke Ludwig van Beethoven's* (Berlin, 1865)

Thayer, Alexander W., *Thayer's Life of Beethoven*, ed. by Elliot Forbes (Princeton, New Jersey, 1969)

The New Grove Dictionary of Musical Instruments: The Piano (London, 1988)

Todd, R. L. (ed.), *Nineteenth-Century Piano Music* (New York, 1990)

Türk, Daniel G., *Klavierschule, oder Anweisung zum Klavierspielen für Lehrer und Lernende* (Leipzig, Halle, 2nd. ed., 1802)

Türk, Daniel G., *Treatise on the art of teaching and practising the pianoforte*, tr. and abridged by C. G. Naumburger (London, 1804)

Tyson, Alan, "Moscheles and his 'Complete Edition of Beethoven'", *Music Review* xxv (1964), pp. 136-141

Tyson, Alan, review: "Cramer, Johann Baptist, 21 *Etüden*, ed. 'from Beethoven's copy' by Hans Kann. With keyboard exercises by Beethoven (Vienna, 1974)", *Music and Letters* lviii (1977), pp. 247-249

Unger, Max, *Beethoven's Handschrift* (Bonn, 1926)

Unverricht, Hubert, *Die Eigenschriften und die Originalausgaben von Werken Beethovens in ihrer Bedeutung für die moderne Textkritik* (Kassel, 1960)

Walker, Alan (ed.), *Franz Liszt: The Man & His Music* (London, 1970)

Walker, Alan, *Franz Liszt: The Virtuoso Years 1811-1847* i (London, 1983)

Walker, Alan, *Franz Liszt: The Weimar Years 1848-1861* ii (London, 1989)

Walker, Alan, *Franz Liszt: The Final Years 1861-1886* iii (London, 1997)

Walker, Alan, "Franz Liszt I: The virtuoso years, 1811-1847, Reply to a review", *The Musical Quarterly* lxxi/2 (1985), pp. 211-219

Watson, Derek, *Liszt* (London, 1989)

Wegeler, Franz and Ries, Ferdinand, *Remembering Beethoven*, tr. by Frederick Noonan, foreword by Christopher Hogwood, introduced by Eva Badura-Skoda (London, 1988)

Williams, Adrian, *Portrait of Liszt: By Himself and His Contemporaries* (Oxford, 1990)

Wehmeyer, Grete, *Carl Czerny und die Einzelhalf am Klavier oder die Kunst der Fingerfertigkeit und die industrielle Arbeitsideologie* (Kassel, 1993)

Winter, Robert, "Second Thoughts on the Performance of Beethoven's Trills", *The Musical Quarterly* lxxiii (1977), pp. 483-504

Winter, Robert, "And Even More Thoughts on the Beethoven Trill ...", *The Musical Quarterly* lxxv (1979), pp. 111-116