

Nineteenth-century Performance and Editorial Practice:  
A Study of Beethoven's *Sonata in C-sharp minor, Op. 27 No. 2*

by

King Yue Li

A Research Paper Presented in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Musical Arts

Approved April 2020 by the  
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Baruch Meir, Chair  
Robert Hamilton  
Kimberly Marshall  
Kay Norton

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2020

## ABSTRACT

During the nineteenth century, it was common for pianists to publish their own editions of Beethoven's piano sonatas. They did this to demonstrate their understanding of the pieces. Towards the end of the century, musicians focused their attention on critical editions in an effort to reproduce the composer's original intention. Unfortunately, this caused interpretive editions such as those created in the nineteenth century to fade from attention. This research focuses on situating these interpretive editions within the greater discourse surrounding the editorial development of Beethoven's piano sonatas. The study opens with the critical reception of Beethoven, his Sonata in C-sharp minor, Op. 27 No. 2, also known as the "Moonlight" Sonata, the organology of the nineteenth-century fortepianos and the editorial practices of subsequent editions of the piece. It also contextualizes the aesthetic and performance practice of nineteenth-century piano playing. I go on to analyze and demonstrate how the performance practices conveyed in the modern Henle edition (1976) differ from those in selected earlier interpretive editions. I will conclude with an assessment of the ways in which nineteenth-century performance practices were reflected by contemporary editions.

This study compares the First edition (1802) and seven selected editions of Beethoven's "Moonlight" Sonata by Ignaz Moscheles (1814), Carl Czerny (1846), Franz Liszt (1857), Louis Köhler (1869), Hugo Riemann (1885), Sigmund Lebert and Hans von Bülow (1896), and Carl Krebs (1898) with the Henle edition. It covers the tempo, rubato, articulations, phrasing, dynamics, fingerings, pedaling, ornamentation, note-stem and beaming, pitch, and rhythm. I evaluate these editorial changes and performance practice to determine that, compared to modern practice, the 19<sup>th</sup> century fostered a tendency of

applying rubato, longer slurs, diverse articulations, and expanded dynamic range.

Furthermore, the instructions of fingerings, pedaling and ornamentation became more detailed towards the end of the century.

## DEDICATION

For my parents, brother, sister-in-law, and three-month-old niece.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my committee members who were so generous with their knowledge and precious time. This research paper would not have been possible without the support of my committee chairman, Dr. Baruch Meir. His passion and knowledge have been a stimulation to my attention to nineteenth-century piano literature. Dr. Kimberly Marshall and Dr. Kay Norton, my supervisory committee members, have inspired my enthusiasm in performance practice. Their invaluable guidance always leads me to the appropriate sources beneficial to my research. Thank you, Prof. Robert Hamilton, for offering me significant help and insight on shaping my research. I would also like to thank Mr. Jayson Davis who reviewed my paper and saved me from many errors.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER	
1 LITERATURE REVIEW .....	1
Beethoven and His Music .....	1
Sonata in C-sharp minor, Op. 27, No. 2 .....	2
The Organology of the Nineteenth-century Fortepianos .....	4
Aesthetics and Performance practice in Piano Playing .....	6
Editorial Practice .....	22
The Publication Information of the Selected Editions .....	25
2 A COMPARISON OF THE SELECTED EDITIONS AND THE HENLE EDITION.....	32
Tempo and Metronome Mark .....	32
Rubato .....	35
Rhythm, Pitch, and Ornamentation.....	37
Articulation, Phrasing, Note-stem, and Beaming.....	41
Dynamics.....	51
Fingerings.....	57
Pedaling.....	63
Verbal Instructions and Footnotes .....	65

CHAPTER	Page
3 EVALUATION OF THE EDITORIAL CHANGES AND THE PERFORMANCE PRACTICE .....	67
Overview .....	67
Tempo, Rhythm and Rubato .....	70
Articulation and Phrasing.....	71
Dynamic .....	74
Fingering .....	75
Ornamentation.....	76
Pedaling.....	76
CONCLUSION .....	79
REFERENCES .....	80
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH .....	86

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. The Publication Information of the Selected Editions.....	25
2. Tempo and Metronome Mark .....	32
3. Rubato .....	35
4. Rhythm, Pitch, and Ornamentation.....	37
5. Articulation, Phrasing, Note-stem, and Beaming.....	41
6. Dynamics.....	51
7. Fingerings.....	57
8. Pedaling.....	63
9. Verbal Instructions and Footnotes .....	65

## CHAPTER 1

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### **Beethoven and His Music**

During his lifetime, Ludwig van Beethoven (1770-1827) was celebrated for being a remarkable composer of difficult and unconventional works.<sup>1</sup> His music displayed ascending energy and tension battling with descending tendencies, advanced melodic quality, formal and motivic coherence, and dynamic vitality.<sup>2</sup> As Beethoven's compositions spread across Europe, so did his acclaim and stylistic influence. Starting at the beginning of the nineteenth century, his music, mostly in the form of interpretative editions, was exported from Austria and Germany to Britain and beyond.<sup>3</sup> His influence continued to grow after his death. Between the years 1850 and 1880, more than forty-four complete editions of Beethoven's sonatas were published.<sup>4</sup> As these appeared, various performance styles emerged from different pianists. For instance, Carl Czerny (1791-1857) believed that Beethoven's works held a special position above other music. Consequently, Czerny asserted that players should not make any addition, abbreviation,

---

<sup>1</sup> George Kochevitsky, "Controversial Pedaling in Beethoven's Piano Sonatas," *The Piano Quarterly* 40 (Summer 1962): 27; Timothy Jones, *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 8.

<sup>2</sup> Willi Apel, *Masters of the Keyboard: A Brief Survey of Pianoforte Music* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1947), 212-216; George Barth, "The Fortepianist as Orator: Beethoven and the Transformation of the Declamatory Style" (DMA diss., Cornell University, 1988), 38.

<sup>3</sup> Paul Hirsh and C. B. Oldman, "Contemporary English Editions of Beethoven," *The Music Review* 14 (Feb 1953): 2-3; Alan Tyson, and Kurt Dorfmueller ed., "The Authentic Editions of Beethoven Published in Great Britain," in *Beiträge zur Beethoven-Bibliographie: Studien und Materialien zum Werkverzeichnis von Kinsky-Halm* (Munich: G. Henle, 1978), 196; Pamela Willetts, *Beethoven and England: An Account of Sources in the British Museum* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1970), 25-27.

<sup>4</sup> Bryna Donaldson, "Beethoven's Moonlight Fantasy," *American Music Teacher* 20, no. 4 (Feb/Mar 1971): 32; Elissa Miller-Kay, "The Virtuosity of Interpretation: The Performance History of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas in London, 1800-1880" (PhD diss., New York University, 2016), 245.

or alteration to them.<sup>5</sup> Franz Liszt (1811-1886) focused on the existing musical material in these works rather than repurposing them in an effort to show off his virtuosity and technical brilliance as he had done with Weber's piano pieces.<sup>6</sup> Liszt was lauded for treating Beethoven's piano sonatas with the utmost sensitivity.<sup>7</sup>

### **Sonata in C-sharp minor, Op. 27, No. 2**

Beethoven composed his Sonata in C-sharp minor, Op. 27, No. 2 in his early thirties. It was dedicated to Countess Gallenberg (1784-1856) and published in March 1802 by the Viennese music publishing firm Artaria.<sup>8</sup> Beethoven inscribed the sonata, "Sonata quasi una fantasia." This hinted at the piece's dual nature as both sonata and fantasy; the first movement is slow and fantasy-like, while the second and third movements demonstrate well-structured forms. According to Timothy Jones, Beethoven probably worked on the piece after the premiere of *Prometheus* (March 28, 1801), but the exact date remains unknown due to the loss of his sketch books and the first and last pages of the piece's manuscript.<sup>9</sup>

One of Beethoven's earliest piano works of the nineteenth century, the "Moonlight," which was named by the influential German music critic, Ludwig Rellstab (1799-1860) around 1830, became widely performed and led to various

---

<sup>5</sup> Barth, "The Fortepianist as Orator: Beethoven and the Transformation of the Declamatory Style," 66-67; William Newman, *Performance Practices in Beethoven's Piano Sonatas: An Introduction* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1971), 14-15.

<sup>6</sup> Wilhelm von Lenz and Philip Reder ed. and trans., *The Great Piano Virtuosos of Our Time* (London: Regency Press, 1971), 16.

<sup>7</sup> Harold Schonberg, *The Virtuosi: Classical Music's Legendary Performers from Paganini to Pavarotti* (New York: Vintage, 1985), 126.

<sup>8</sup> Otto Jahn, "Beethoven and the Various Editions of His Works: Beethoven's Works in the Edition Published by Breitkopf and Härtel," *The Musical World* 43, no. 14 (Apr, 1865): 205.

<sup>9</sup> Jones, *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*, 19-20.

interpretations.<sup>10</sup> It was so popular that there were even transcriptions of the piece made for piano duet, orchestra, voices, and other instruments.<sup>11</sup> Over the years, Beethoven's "Moonlight" has been studied and argued over extensively by scholars. For instance, William Newman (1912-2000) wrote about the pedaling of the piece whereas pianists James Friskin (1886-1967) and Irwin Freundlich (1908-1977) also commented on the tempo of the piece.<sup>12</sup> While pianist George Kochevitsky (1903-1993) examined the pedaling and agreed to use the damper pedal throughout the first movement,<sup>13</sup> some scholars such as Robert Winter think the practice is too impractical for the resonance of the modern piano.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, composer and music scholar Irwin Fischer (1903-1977) pointed out that there is controversy surrounding the note in m. 12 of the first movement. Some editions such as the First edition, the Hans von Bülow's (1830-1894), and the Eugen D'Albert's (1864-1932) gave a B note but the Peters's gave a C.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Jones, *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*, 44; Donaldson, "Beethoven's Moonlight Fantasy," 32; Miller-Kay, "Moonlight Reflections: A Performance History of the First Movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata Quasi Una Fantasia, Op. 27 No. 2," 36.

<sup>11</sup> Elissa Miller-Kay, "Moonlight Reflections: A Performance History of the First Movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata Quasi Una Fantasia, Op. 27 No. 2," *Proceedings of the Princess Galyani Vadhana International Symposium* 3 (2016): 37.

<sup>12</sup> Newman, *Performance Practices in Beethoven's Piano Sonatas: An Introduction*, 63; James Friskin and Irwin Freundlich, "Ludwig van Beethoven (1770-1827)," in *Music for Piano: A Handbook of Concert and Teaching Material from 1580 to 1952* (New York: Dover Publications, 1973), 86.

<sup>13</sup> Kochevitsky, "Controversial Pedaling in Beethoven's Piano Sonatas," 24.

<sup>14</sup> Arthur Alexander, "Beethoven and the Piano (2)," *Music Teacher and Piano Student* 47 (Dec 1968): 11-12; Robert Winter, "Performing Nineteenth-Century Music on Nineteenth-Century Instruments," *19<sup>th</sup>-Century Music* 1, no. 2 (Nov 1977): 168.

<sup>15</sup> Irwin Fischer, "A Note in Op. 27, No. 2," *Music & Letters* 32 (Jan 1951): 45.

## The Organology of the Nineteenth-century Fortepianos

Pianists have always guided the development of the piano.<sup>16</sup> Piano manufacturers worked with leading pianists to make improvements on their instruments while also advertising the finished products. Likewise, the mechanism of the instruments significantly impacted both compositional and performance styles.<sup>17</sup> Consequently, pianist Kenneth Drake who is an early exponent of playing a repertoire of the Classical period on period instruments believes the features of the pianos influenced Beethoven's style. This can be observed in Beethoven's exploration of sudden dynamic changes, open pedal, and legato style of playing. These compositional and performance techniques helped to solve the lack of sonority in nineteenth-century fortepianos.<sup>18</sup>

Steinway established the basic principles of the modern pianos in the 1860s. Large, felt hammers striking heavy, crossed steel strings that created enormous tension on a cast-iron frame created a singing tone that starts slowly with great richness while also possessing better sustaining power than earlier fortepianos.<sup>19</sup> Moreover, the bass proved

---

<sup>16</sup> Robin Stowell ed., *Performing Beethoven*, Cambridge Studies in Performance Practice 4 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 53; Robert Winter, "Orthodoxies, Paradoxes, and Contradictions: Performance Practice in the Nineteenth-Century Piano Music," in *Nineteenth-Century Piano Music*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, (New York: Routledge, 2004), 23; Andrew Woolley and John Kitchen, *Interpreting Historical Keyboard Music: Sources, Contexts and Performance*, Ashgate Historical Keyboard Series (Burlington: Ashgate, 2013), 222.

<sup>17</sup> Daniel Barolsky, "Romantic Piano Performance as Creation" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2005), 131; Clive Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 169 and 220; Jones, *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*, 1-2; Kenneth Hamilton, *After the Golden Age- Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 18-19; Arthur Tollefson, "Solving Interpretive Dilemmas," *Clavier* 17 (Feb 1978): 17; Kenneth Drake, "The Voice of a Contemporary," *Clavier* 2 (Nov/Dec 1963): 10-12; Winter, "Performing Nineteenth-Century Music on Nineteenth-Century Instruments," 173.

<sup>18</sup> Kenneth Drake and Frank Stillings ed., *The Sonatas of Beethoven: as He Played and Taught Them* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1981), 9-10.

<sup>19</sup> Barolsky, "Romantic Piano Performance as Creation," 131; Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 169 and 220; Jones, *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*, 1-2; Hamilton, *After the Golden Age- Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance*, 18-19.

to be more powerful, but cover a little the precision, than the previous models.<sup>20</sup> These developments allowed composers and pianists to explore different tone colors, textures, range and effects of dynamics, and articulations. For instance, legato playing replaced non-legato as the general touch of piano playing.<sup>21</sup> Additionally, the extended range and high volume of the instrument led to an increasing emphasis on virtuosic skills, rich timbre, and a broader sweep of melodic line in the music of this period.<sup>22</sup> Pianos in the nineteenth century underwent numerous modifications during the period, yet most of them still differed from modern pianos.<sup>23</sup> Due to these organological shifts, musicologist Derek Melville believes Beethoven's music sounds more genuine on an older fortepiano than a modern piano.<sup>24</sup> To remedy this concern, fortepiano specialist Malcolm Bilson fundamentally altered Beethoven's intentions when performing his music on a modern piano.<sup>25</sup> It is also worth noting that modern pianos have affected our conceptualization of Beethoven's aesthetic. Indeed, Beethoven's music in the context of nineteenth-century instruments and practices would have sounded more intimate than modern interpretations.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Bilson, "Beethoven and the Piano," 19-20; Hamilton, *After the Golden Age- Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance*, 208; Winter, "Orthodoxies, Paradoxes, and Contradictions: Performance Practice in the Nineteenth-Century Piano Music," 37-38.

<sup>21</sup> Oskar Bie, Ernest Kellert and Edward Naylor trans., *A History of the Pianoforte and Pianoforte Players* (London: J. M. Dent & Company, 1899), 200-201.

<sup>22</sup> Barth, "The Fortepianist as Orator: Beethoven and the Transformation of the Declamatory Style," 38-39.

<sup>23</sup> Rey Longyear, *Nineteenth-century Romanticism in Music*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1988), 351; Derek Melville, Denis Arnold, and Nigel Fortune eds., "Beethoven's Pianos," in *The Beethoven Reader*, (New York: Norton, 1971), 41.

<sup>24</sup> Melville, Arnold, and Fortune, "Beethoven's Pianos," in *The Beethoven Reader*, 43.

<sup>25</sup> Bilson, "Beethoven and the Piano," 19-20.

<sup>26</sup> Drake, "The Voice of a Contemporary," 10-12.

## The Nineteenth-century Aesthetics and Performance practice in Piano Playing

### Overview

The term “performance practice” came from the German term *Aufführungspraxis*. In the context of the late nineteenth century, this term centered around the act of rediscovering the performance conventions of Middle Ages and Renaissance music.<sup>27</sup> At that time, scholars’ primary concern was with studying music that represented a decisive break in the performing tradition.<sup>28</sup> Only since the 1960s have scholars begun valuing performance practices of the nineteenth century.<sup>29</sup>

Musicologist Daniel Barolsky whose research focuses on music historiography, music pedagogy, and the intersections between performance and analysis, and early music specialist Neal Peres Da Costa explored the nineteenth-century interpretive aesthetics through analyzing audio recordings from the late-nineteenth century and twentieth century.<sup>30</sup> Da Costa found that asynchronization of hands, un-notated chordal arpeggiation, various types of rhythmic alteration such as metrical rubato, and tempo modification were conventional in early recordings. He also compared the treatises of performance practice with these early recordings. He noted that many written texts failed to discuss performance practice, or the texts and the recordings are in contradiction.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Winter, “Orthodoxies, Paradoxes, and Contradictions: Performance Practice in the Nineteenth-Century Piano Music,” 19.

<sup>28</sup> Winter, “Orthodoxies, Paradoxes, and Contradictions: Performance Practice in the Nineteenth-Century Piano Music,” 20.

<sup>29</sup> Hamilton, *After the Golden Age- Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance*, 23-24.

<sup>30</sup> Barolsky, “Romantic Piano Performance as Creation,” 1-309; Neal Peres Da Costa, “Performing Practices in Late-nineteenth-century Piano Playing: Implications of the Relationship between Written Texts and Early Recordings” (PhD diss., University of Leeds, 2001), 1-431.

<sup>31</sup> Da Costa, “Performing Practices in Late-nineteenth-century Piano Playing: Implications of the Relationship between Written Texts and Early Recordings,” 429.

Barolsky pointed out that nineteenth-century pianists tended to treat their performance as an individual work of art. They considered these performances to be a co-creative combinations of efforts by both the performer and the composer (in some cases, they are the same person).<sup>32</sup> Since the early recordings were sometimes indecipherable, Da Costa's and Barolsky's findings did not deal extensively with the modifications of dynamic, articulation, and pedaling.

Musicologist and Bärenreiter editor Clive Brown made a thorough examination of pedagogical manuals, changing editions, reports, and theoretical treatises in order to explore the late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century performance practice. His studies included the execution of accentuation, articulation, phrasing, bowing, tempo modification, vibrato, and ornamentation.<sup>33</sup> However, due to his own musical background, Brown focused more on the violin performance practice of the period.

Pianist Friedrich Gechter wrote a dissertation about the performance and editorial practice on Beethoven's Sonata Op. 109.<sup>34</sup> He mainly focused on nine twentieth-century recordings from 1932 to 1999, all of which were performed on modern pianos: Artur Schnabel (1882-1951, recorded in 1932), Walter Gieseking (1895-1956, recorded in 1939-40), Heinrich Neuhaus (1888-1964, recorded in 1950), Alfred Brendel (recorded in 1962-64), Vladimir Ashkenazy (recorded in 1974), Maurizio Pollini (recorded in 1975), Awadagin Pratt (recorded in 1994), Robert Taub (recorded in 1996), and Helene Grimaud (recorded in 1999). He also examined ten editions of the work from the nineteenth and

---

<sup>32</sup> Barolsky, "Romantic Piano Performance as Creation," 6-7.

<sup>33</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 1-632.

<sup>34</sup> Friedrich Gechter, "Execution or Interpretation? A Study of Interpretive Approaches Through Selected Editions and Recordings of Beethoven's Sonata, Opus 109" (DMA diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2001), 7-9.

twentieth centuries: Hugo Riemann (1849-1919, Simrock, 1886), Liszt (Bosworth, 1898), Louis Köhler (1820-1886) and Adolf Ruthardt (1849-1934, Peters, 1910), D'Albert (Forberg, 1902, reprinted by Fischer, 1917), Bülow and Sigmund Lebert (1822-1884, Schirmer, 1923), Donald Tovey (1875-1940) and Harold Craxton (1885-1971, ABRSM, 1931), Schnabel (Simon and Schuster, 1935), Heinrich Schenker (1868-1935, Universal, 1975), Claudio Arrau (1903-1991) and Lothar Hoffmann-Erbrecht (Peters, 1978), Bertha Wallner (1876-1956, Henle, 1980). However, Gechter only provided a brief survey on their tempo and rubatos.<sup>35</sup> Leading into the twentieth century, there was an increasing respect for composers' original intentions. Specifically, this phenomenon applied most notably to tempo and rubato.<sup>36</sup>

### **Aesthetics**

The origin of the Romantic movement came from the German literary school of the late eighteenth century. Writers such as Georg Philipp Friedrich von Hardenberg (1772-1801) and Ludwig Tieck (1773-1853) featured topics such as valiant knights, gracious ladies, and pious monks from Medieval literature, all seeking relief from the realities of life.

This attitude soon influenced nineteenth-century musicians who were longing to express the individual emotions of their souls.<sup>37</sup> Consequently, piano performance emphasis more

---

<sup>35</sup> Gechter, "Execution or Interpretation? A Study of Interpretive Approaches Through Selected Editions and Recordings of Beethoven's Sonata, Opus 109," 2 and 18-19.

<sup>36</sup> Gechter, "Execution or Interpretation? A Study of Interpretive Approaches Through Selected Editions and Recordings of Beethoven's Sonata, Opus 109," 153.

<sup>37</sup> Apel, *Masters of the Keyboard: A Brief Survey of Pianoforte Music*, 231; Bie, *A History of the Pianoforte and Pianoforte Players*, 224; Elena Letnanova, *Piano Interpretation in the Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries: A Study of Theory and Practice Using Original Documents* (Jefferson: McFarland & Co., 1991), 154.

on the creative process enacted by the performer.<sup>38</sup> Thus, composing and performing had a more intimate association.<sup>39</sup>

Since the aesthetic of nineteenth-century music glorified individualism, inconsistencies of information regarding piano performance practice abound. Even students of the same teacher would express their ideas differently.<sup>40</sup> For instance, pianists would have their own interpretation on the existing music from the older eras.<sup>41</sup> In short, they treated the sheet music as an open-ended score rather than a fixed one. For instance, pianist Walter Rummel (1887-1953) interpreted J. S. Bach with his version of double octaves, punctuated inner voices, exaggerated dynamic swells, and manipulated time and space.<sup>42</sup> Liszt also interpreted Weber's piano music with the same romantic attitude by changing the piece to compliment his own style.<sup>43</sup>

## **Performance practice**

### **Tempo and metronome mark**

In the early part of the nineteenth century, musicians favored extreme tempos; fast movements were played rapidly, and slow movements were played with a broad tempo.

---

<sup>38</sup> Mine Dogantan-Dack, "Phrasing—the Very Life of Music: Performing the Music and Nineteenth-Century Performance Theory," *Nineteenth Century Music Review* 9, no. 1 (June 2012): 8-9, <https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/docview/1317916012/fulltext/7572D65C0DB34D1CPQ/1?accountid=4485>; Hamilton, *After the Golden Age- Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance*, 26.

<sup>39</sup> Bie, *A History of the Pianoforte and Pianoforte Players*, 161; James Clark, "Celebrating Music: Wilhelm Furtwängler, Edwin Fischer, Wilhelm Kempff and the German Romantic Performance Tradition" (PhD diss., University of Connecticut, 2005), 53-56; Hamilton, *After the Golden Age- Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance*, 181; Winter, "Orthodoxies, Paradoxes, and Contradictions: Performance Practice in the Nineteenth-Century Piano Music," 23.

<sup>40</sup> Kenneth Drake, "A Study of the Beethoven Piano Sonatas in the Light of Evidence Provided by Beethoven's Pupils" (DMA diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1970), 400-401.

<sup>41</sup> Clive Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 140.

<sup>42</sup> Barolsky, "Romantic Piano Performance as Creation," 182-183.

<sup>43</sup> Lenz and Reder, *The Great Piano Virtuosos of Our Time*, 16.

However, as the century progressed and tastes changed, tempos became more malleable.<sup>44</sup> They could be affected by the musical experience, taste, and training of the performer. Tempos were also dependent on related musical elements such as meter, tempo indications, note values, number of fast notes employed in the movement, musical character, and harmonic movement.<sup>45</sup>

Regarding meter, the pulse tended to be slower and heavier if the note value of the metrical unit was larger. For example, a 4/2 meter would be slower and heavier than a 4/4 meter. However, many composers would interpret *alla breve* to be twice as fast as common time. Moreover, the number of fast notes in a piece helped to dictate its tempo. Pieces with fewer fast notes would have a faster tempo than pieces that contained more fast notes.<sup>46</sup>

There are also some verbal instructions such as “*sostenuto*” which would affect the tempo. However, there are disagreements on the usage of some of these terms.<sup>47</sup> As an illustration, some composers treated “*allegretto*” similar to “*andante*”, while some considered it fast than the latter. Although tempo is one of the most complicated elements to be considered in music, many composers such as Beethoven initially refused to use a metronome and insisted that musicians should feel the tempos naturally. It was not until the expansion of the amateur market and the resulting misunderstandings over performance practice which that the use of metronome marks flourished.<sup>48</sup> Nevertheless,

---

<sup>44</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 288, 297, 369; Sandra Rosenblum, “Two Sets of Unexplored Metronome Marks for Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas,” *Early Music* 16 (Feb 1988): 62-63.

<sup>45</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 289, 295.

<sup>46</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 292-295 and 313-315.

<sup>47</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 340-366 and 372.

<sup>48</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 284, 303-305.

these metronome marks were more likely to be a general guide rather than showing an absolute speed. Indeed, many composers did not take their own markings literally.<sup>49</sup> Above all, the standard of “strict tempo” was different from the modern one. The underdeveloped recording technology in the nineteenth century required a more lax standard of “strict tempo” than the contemporary one.<sup>50</sup> Editors such as Czerny and Anton Schindler (1795-1864) have also agreed that in performance, tempo should be treated with a degree of flexibility.<sup>51</sup>

## **Rubato**

Evidence gathered from reviews, treatises, and editions suggests that around 1800, there was an increasingly common preference for modifying tempos of both older and new music.<sup>52</sup> This rubato, or tempo rubato, is a device which alternated the meter with acceleration or ritard in an effort to reinforce the expression and character of the music.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Deanna Joseph, “Nineteenth-Century Performance Practice: Reassessing Tradition and Revitalizing Interpretation,” *Choral Journal* 54, no. 9 (2014): 22-23, [https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1060&context=music\\_facpub](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1060&context=music_facpub); Miller-Kay, “The Virtuosity of Interpretation: The Performance History of Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas in London, 1800-1880,” 211-212, 223; Rosenblum, “Two Sets of Unexplored Metronome Marks for Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas,” 60.

<sup>50</sup> Drake, “A Study of the Beethoven Piano Sonatas in the Light of Evidence Provided by Beethoven’s Pupils,” 403-404; Schonberg, “String-Snapper, Hands, on High,” 84; Miller-Kay, “Moonlight Reflections: A Performance History of the First Movement of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata Quasi Una Fantasia, Op. 27 No. 2,” 38-39.

<sup>51</sup> Barth, “The Fortepianist as Orator: Beethoven and the Transformation of the Declamatory Style,” 48, 53, and 60.

<sup>52</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 283-283 and 376; Miller-Kay, “The Virtuosity of Interpretation: The Performance History of Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas in London, 1800-1880,” 201.

<sup>53</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 377; Miller-Kay, “The Virtuosity of Interpretation: The Performance History of Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas in London, 1800-1880,” 198-199; Miaoyin Qu, “Piano Playing in the German Tradition, 1840-1900: Rediscovering the Unnotated Conventions of Performance” (PhD diss., University of Leeds, 2015), 48.

This alternation could be executed on either a single beat as an agogic accent, or over certain measures.<sup>54</sup>

There are two types of rubato. The first type involves changing the entire tempo for a short period of time. Czerny lists some circumstances for applying this un-notated ritardando: a) before the main subject returns, b) when leading to a small part of singing line, c) on emphasized sustained notes followed by shorter notes, d) during the transition to a new tempo or movement, e) before a fermata, f) during the diminuendo from a lively passage to a short and delicate run, g) with many quick ornaments which cannot be played without extra time, h) when a strong crescendo leading to a new movement or ending the piece, i) with fantasy-like character, j) with “*expressivo*” marks, k) at the end of long trills or gentle cadences, or l) with words such as “*calando*” and “*smorzando*.”<sup>55</sup>

Nineteenth-century pianist and pedagogue Mathis Lussy (1828-1910) also gives instruction on rubato. He suggests that it is possible to speed up in cases such as: a) when the phrase or passage is interrupted by a pause and simultaneous syncopation, b) when “*piú mosso*” is marked, c) when the phrases or passages are exceptionally syncopated, d) wherever the phrase has chordal accompaniment after some broken chords, e) during the end of a vivid section when there is a small group of notes repeating, or f) in a passionate or agitated passage.<sup>56</sup> Furthermore, dynamics may affect the tempo, where louder could

---

<sup>54</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 51-53, 396.

<sup>55</sup> Carl Czerny and Paul Badura-Skoda ed., *On the Proper Performance of All Beethoven's Works for the Piano: Czerny's Reminiscences of Beethoven and Chapter II and III from Volume IV of the Complete Theoretical and Practice Piano Forte School Op. 500* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1970), 26; Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 386.

<sup>56</sup> Letnanova, *Piano Interpretation in the Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries: A Study of Theory and Practice Using Original Documents*, 163-165.

mean faster and softer could mean slower.<sup>57</sup> Pianist David Kim also points out that the crescendo and decrescendo hairpins symbols are equivalent to the markings *crescendo* and *diminuendo* in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. An open angle lines (<) indicates that the music is getting louder and a close one (>) means the opposite. However, the hairpins were usually associated with rhythmic inflection in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Thus, an opening hairpin may imply *accelerando*, and vice versa.<sup>58</sup>

The second type of rubato is characterized by changing the tempo of the melody while keeping the accompaniment steady, such as hands asynchronization and arpeggiation of chords.<sup>59</sup> Pianists may add them in performance, but not notate these devices in their editions. Hands asynchronization was often applied in slow and expressive music. It often occurred in the beginnings of phrases and measures, or in moments of dissonance.<sup>60</sup> For chord arpeggiation, it was usually applied to slow and sustained chords. Pianists would apply different rolling speeds and dynamics to specific chords in order to enhance the color and character of the passage. These decisions were made according to individual taste.<sup>61</sup> Although the use of rubato was a common practice in the nineteenth century, the trend started to fade gradually as the century concluded.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Joseph, "Nineteenth-Century Performance Practice: Reassessing Tradition and Revitalizing Interpretation," 23; Qu, "Piano Playing in the German Tradition, 1840-1900: Rediscovering the Unnotated Conventions of Performance," 60 and 64.

<sup>58</sup> David Kim, "The Brahmsian Hairpin," *19<sup>th</sup>-Century Music* 36, no. 1 (Summer, 2012): 46-47.

<sup>59</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 610-613; Joseph, "Nineteenth-Century Performance Practice: Reassessing Tradition and Revitalizing Interpretation," 23; Miller-Kay, "The Virtuosity of Interpretation: The Performance History of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas in London, 1800-1880," 181-184, 198 and 205; Qu, "Piano Playing in the German Tradition, 1840-1900: Rediscovering the Unnotated Conventions of Performance," 33 and 41.

<sup>60</sup> Qu, "Piano Playing in the German Tradition, 1840-1900: Rediscovering the Unnotated Conventions of Performance," 36-37.

<sup>61</sup> Qu, "Piano Playing in the German Tradition, 1840-1900: Rediscovering the Unnotated Conventions of Performance," 42.

<sup>62</sup> Miller-Kay, "The Virtuosity of Interpretation: The Performance History of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas in London, 1800-1880," 204.

## Rhythm

Works from the nineteenth centuries by Robert Schumann (1810-1856), Frédéric Chopin (1810-1849), Johannes Brahms (1833-1897), César Franck (1822-1890), Liszt, Hugo Wolf (1860-1903), Claude Debussy (1862-1918), and Sergei Rachmaninoff (1873-1943) demonstrate conventions for interpreting rhythm which were common to the time.<sup>63</sup> For example, dotted notes might have been over-dotted in a majestic passage. Performers would lengthen the dotted note by stealing the time value from the following short note.<sup>64</sup> Conversely, in other circumstances, dotted notes could be under-dotted. When other parts contained triplets, the dotted rhythm would be executed as triplets as well. Moreover, dotted rhythms could be played as triplets even in the absence of triplets in other parts, provided there are a significant number of triplets throughout the entire piece.<sup>65</sup> Furthermore, two notes of equal value under a slur were not intended to be performed evenly, and some long-short patterns were not supposed to be played as written.<sup>66</sup> The application of modified rhythms was dependent on other musical elements such as the harmony, character, and tempo of the passage.

## Articulation

In the nineteenth century, legato replaced non-legato as the common approach to keyboard articulation. This practice resulted in a sound which imitated a singing tone.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Gwilym Beechey, "Rhythmic Interpretation: Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert and Schumann," *The Music Review* 33 (Aug 1972): 248.

<sup>64</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 623-625.

<sup>65</sup> Beechey, "Rhythmic Interpretation: Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert and Schumann," 235-236.

<sup>66</sup> Clive Brown, "Rediscovering the Language of Classical and Romantic Performance," *Early Music* 41, no. 1 (Feb 2013): 73, <https://doi-org.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/10.1093/em/cat004>.

<sup>67</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 140, 172-173 and 177; Czerny and Badura-Skoda, *On the Proper Performance of All Beethoven's Works for the Piano: Czerny's*

Pianists would also decide their own articulation in order to display their individuality.<sup>68</sup>

Additionally, they considered musical characters and elements in their designs. For instance, the time signature might have affected how articulations were executed.

Composers such as Beethoven, Muzio Clementi (1752-1832), Czerny, Theodor Kullak (1818-1882), and Schindler all agreed that the subdivisions of each measure needed to be attended by a differentiation of volume and/or note-length.<sup>69</sup> However, some pianists from the latter part of the century such as Liszt and Brahms would occasionally violate this metrical regularity.<sup>70</sup>

### **Staccato, portato and tenuto**

Staccato marks, including both the staccato stroke and the staccato dot, indicated both separation and accent in the nineteenth century.<sup>71</sup> When dealing with Beethoven's notations, scholars tend to regard all of his staccato marks as a single form. Thus, they believe Beethoven only used one kind of staccato mark. However, in the nineteenth century, the differentiation of staccato marks increased. The majority of German and English composers regarded the staccato stroke to be shorter and stronger than the dot, but the French actually treated it more lightly than they did than the dot. In some cases,

---

*Reminiscences of Beethoven and Chapter II and III from Volume IV of the Complete Theoretical and Practice Piano Forte School Op. 500, 32; Hamilton, After the Golden Age- Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance, 140.*

<sup>68</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 140; James Cooke, *Great Pianists on Piano Playing: Study Talks with Foremost Virtuosos* (Philadelphia: Theo Presser Co., 1971), 67.

<sup>69</sup> Barth, "The Fortepianist as Orator: Beethoven and the Transformation of the Declamatory Style," 74; Drake and Stillings, *The Sonatas of Beethoven: as He Played and Taught Them*, 111; Letnanova, *Piano Interpretation in the Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries: A Study of Theory and Practice Using Original Documents*, 150 and 155.

<sup>70</sup> Letnanova, *Piano Interpretation in the Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries: A Study of Theory and Practice Using Original Documents*, 151.

<sup>71</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 97-98.

staccato marks were only used to prevent inequality in French music.<sup>72</sup> Staccato dots under slurs, or portato, indicated playing the note with slight stress for three-quarters of its duration. Some pianists would go so far as to delay the portato notes above the accompaniment to enrich the expressiveness of their playing. Accordingly, the combination of the delayed note and the accompanying note would create an arpeggiation effect.<sup>73</sup> The tenuto mark was rarely used before the middle of the nineteenth century. It indicated playing the notes with stress and holding them for almost more than their actual value.<sup>74</sup> Therefore, a staccato dot with a tenuto line was similar to portato, which implied certain degree of separation while stressing the note. In summary, tenuto, portato, staccato dot, and staccato stroke all indicated certain degrees of separation, while the durations of silence depended on the musical context.

### **Slur and phrasing**

Phrasing is the unified movement of a continuous flow of related notes. It helps the listener to understand the expression of the music.<sup>75</sup> Some composers used modified note-beaming to show accents and phrasing,<sup>76</sup> while others preferred to use slurs. There are two types of slurs. One is a shorter slur which spans over two to three notes. Slurs of this type invite performers to slightly emphasize the first note and then shortening and weakening the last note of the group.<sup>77</sup> The other type of slur is used in lyrical passages

---

<sup>72</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 100-101, 202 and 208.

<sup>73</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 246 and 252.

<sup>74</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 127-128.

<sup>75</sup> Dogantan-Dack, "Phrasing—the Very Life of Music: Performing the Music and Nineteenth-Century Performance Theory," 27-28.

<sup>76</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 42, 142-143 and 236.

<sup>77</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 30-32 and 231.

over several notes in order to indicate legato.<sup>78</sup> For example, eighteenth-century Viennese composers such as Beethoven used the first type of slur in order to show articulation rather than indicating the phrase. However, editors during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries added phrase marks over Beethoven's original slurs to "clarify" Beethoven's intent phrasing. Some would even go so far as to remove Beethoven's short slurs and replace them with a single long one.<sup>79</sup> These editors generally asked for less distinct separation of phrases than was practiced during the previous century.<sup>80</sup> Consequently, these editorial changes eclipsed the composer's original ideas of musical character, rhythmic effects, intension, and articulations.

## **Dynamics**

Composers from older generations usually expected performers to utilize their musical tastes in the application of additional dynamics. For example, Johann Hummel (1778-1837) and Lussy suggested playing ascending lines with crescendos, and descending ones with diminuendos unless the composer gave further instructions.<sup>81</sup> During the nineteenth century, there was an increasing application of explicit dynamic marks.<sup>82</sup> Composers took more control of the delivery of musical ideas rather than relying on the instincts of

---

<sup>78</sup> Eva Badura-Skoda, Robert Winter and Bruce Carr eds., "Performance Conventions in Beethoven's Early Works," *Beethoven, Performers, and Critics: The International Beethoven Congress, Detroit, 1977* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1980), 52-76; Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 233-235.

<sup>79</sup> Barth, "The Fortepianist as Orator: Beethoven and the Transformation of the Declamatory Style," 116-117; Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 145 and 238-239.

<sup>80</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 140.

<sup>81</sup> Bie, *A History of the Pianoforte and Pianoforte Players*, 187; Letnanova, *Piano Interpretation in the Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries: A Study of Theory and Practice Using Original Documents*, 155 and 168-169.

<sup>82</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 7.

performers. Accordingly, more types of dynamic markings can be found in publications from the nineteenth century including accent, *le Petit Chapeau* (^), rinforzando, sforzando, and fortepiano. These markings served to allow composers to indicate their musical intentions as clearly as possible.<sup>83</sup>

## Accents

During this period, there were two types of accents: metrical and expressive. Metrical accents presented the meter by slightly stressing the strong beat(s) of each measure. The frequency and strength of the stress were largely determined by the tempo of the passage. Expressive accents, on the other hand, highlighted musical elements such as notes from a foreign key, dissonances, particularly high or low notes, longer note values, or syncopations.<sup>84</sup> Further, the application of expressive accents on weak metrical beats softened the rigidity of the metrical hierarchy and smoothed melodic phrasing. In many mid to late nineteenth century publications, an increase in the use of accents can be observed.<sup>85</sup> *Le Petit Chapeau* (^) indicated a gentle accent in the early nineteenth century. During this time, it was less powerful than the accent mark (>), but during its more frequent application in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, composers treated it more powerfully than the previous generation.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 62.

<sup>84</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 8, 12-15 and 36-38; Letnanova, *Piano Interpretation in the Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries: A Study of Theory and Practice Using Original Documents*, 156.

<sup>85</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 27.

<sup>86</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 117-118.

Additionally, there were some dynamic markings which were also used to convey accents. For instance, a fortepiano (fp) implied a drop of volume at the end of a loud passage while also potentially indicating an accent on a single note.<sup>87</sup> A sforzando (sf) also represented an accent on a single note,<sup>88</sup> but a sequence of sforzandos could imply a crescendo for the given passage without emphasizing specific notes.<sup>89</sup> Rinforzando (rinf or rf) was the most complicated marking due to its conflicting usages throughout the century. Some composers used it to indicate a gentle accent on a single note while others treated it as a strong stress. Furthermore, some composers treated it as a crescendo, or even intensive crescendo on several notes.<sup>90</sup>

## **Fingering**

Generally speaking, early Romantic pianists used certain fingerings in order to enable their technical and musical needs.<sup>91</sup> However, the musical function of fingering declined in the nineteenth century.<sup>92</sup> For example, the uniform fingerings in the Czerny edition of Beethoven's Op. 2, No. 1 and the Lebert and Bülow edition of Op. 106 did not facilitate the musical effect of the pieces. Rather, their purpose was to assist the rapid execution of difficult passages and/or ease the process of memorization.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 75.

<sup>88</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 86.

<sup>89</sup> Kathryn Stuart, "Marks of Emphasis in Beethoven Piano Sonatas" (DMA diss., Cornell University, 1996), 79-80.

<sup>90</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 62, 78 and 87-93.

<sup>91</sup> Jeanne Bamberger, "The Musical Significance of Beethoven's Fingerings in the Piano Sonatas," *Music Forum* 4 (1976): 242.

<sup>92</sup> Bamberger, "The Musical Significance of Beethoven's Fingerings in the Piano Sonatas," 242.

<sup>93</sup> Bamberger, "The Musical Significance of Beethoven's Fingerings in the Piano Sonatas," 250, 253 and 258.

## Pedaling

There was an increasing emphasis on pedaling in the nineteenth century.<sup>94</sup> First, pianists including Jan Ladislav Dussek (1760-1812) and Beethoven established the use of pedals. Then, members of the next generation such as Friedrich Kalkbrenner (1785-1849) and Ignaz Moscheles (1794-1870) extended their usage. Finally, Chopin, Liszt, Sigismond Thalberg (1812-1871), and their contemporaries utilized pedals in their performance even more excessively. For them, pedals were an integrated component of their technique.<sup>95</sup>

In general, pianists from the English school used the damper pedal more liberally than their German contemporaries. The damper pedal was mainly used to create different color, but it could also reinforce accents, singing tone, sonority, and dynamic shading.<sup>96</sup> Moscheles favored a detached pedaling, or rhythmic pedaling, which created silences between pedaled notes. This was accomplished by clearing the previous harmony by an early release of the pedal and applying it again on the beat of the new one. This type of pedaling usually aligned with slurs, so there would be a brief breathing space between phrases.<sup>97</sup> Liszt used different pedaling techniques, such as flutter-pedaling and syncopated pedaling, to facilitate his “orchestral sound” on the piano. Flutter-pedaling was a technique which created a subtle resonance of sound through a constant fluttering motion on the pedal. Syncopated pedaling, a quick lifting and reapplication of pedal

---

<sup>94</sup> David Rowland, *A History of Pianoforte Pedaling* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 106 and 108.

<sup>95</sup> Miller-Kay, “The Virtuosity of Interpretation: The Performance History of Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas in London, 1800-1880,” 226-229, 232 and 238.

<sup>96</sup> Miller-Kay, “The Virtuosity of Interpretation: The Performance History of Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas in London, 1800-1880,” 223, 225 and 228-229; Letnanova, *Piano Interpretation in the Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries: A Study of Theory and Practice Using Original Documents*, 110.

<sup>97</sup> Rowland, *A History of Pianoforte Pedaling*, 110.

immediately after a change in harmony, created a legato sound which did not blur between harmonies.<sup>98</sup>

There were also techniques utilized such as “half-pedaling” which involved a partial depression of the sostenuto pedal so that the dampers would partially lift and barely touch the strings.<sup>99</sup> Some pianists refused to use the “*una corda*” pedal as it had the potential to put the nineteenth century piano out of tune. Although rarely indicated in the score, other pianists enjoyed using this technique as a method for changing tone quality. They treated it as a device which could create unique color as well soften the sound.<sup>100</sup>

## **Ornamentation**

In the nineteenth century, more composers began prescribing their own desired approaches to ornamental execution. They regarded ornaments to be an integral part of their musical intention, so they would write out the notes in which they wanted them to be realized.<sup>101</sup> There were three primary types of similar ornamentation during this period: grace-note, appoggiatura, and anticipation. Grace-notes were the most popular. The majority of nineteenth century German pianists preferred to play grace-notes on the beat, while some French pianists preferred a pre-beat execution. No matter the realization, grace-notes only occupied a very short time value on the note either before or after it. The appoggiatura was a single-note ornament placed a second above or below the

---

<sup>98</sup> Rowland, *A History of Pianoforte Pedaling*, 110.

<sup>99</sup> Rowland, *A History of Pianoforte Pedaling*, 110.

<sup>100</sup> Stowell, *Performing Beethoven*, 65-67.

<sup>101</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 490.

following note. Unlike the grace-note, this ornamentation would take a significant time value from the note which followed. Similarly, anticipations took a significant time value, but from the note which preceded it.<sup>102</sup>

Trills and turns had two primary functions during the nineteenth century. Those located at the beginning of a strong beat served as accenting ornaments. Contrariwise, those assigned to weak beats would act as connecting embellishments.<sup>103</sup> The number of notes within a trill, the rhythm of the shaking notes, and the trill endings depended on the taste of individual performers. Tracing back from the eighteenth-century convention, pianists during the early nineteenth century usually began trills with the upper note on the strong beat. Later, an increasing number of pianists preferred to start on the main note.<sup>104</sup> Turns were usually played rapidly either from above (direct) or below (inverted). During the middle of the century, more pianists explored the leisurely way of execution in order to fit their musical intentions.<sup>105</sup>

## **Editorial Practice**

### **Interpretative edition**

The decline of the patronage system led nineteenth-century musicians to rely on performance, teaching, and music publication for economic stability. The Industrial Revolution improved methods of transportation, and musical activities benefited from this phenomenon.<sup>106</sup> Furthermore, the rising demand for sheet music by both

---

<sup>102</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 478-480.

<sup>103</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 491.

<sup>104</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 491-499.

<sup>105</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 504-505 and 515.

<sup>106</sup> Longyear, *Nineteenth-century Romanticism in Music*, 333.

professionals and amateurs widened the music publication market.<sup>107</sup> According to Canadian pianist and musicologist Allison Star, there were two directions of publication practice: a) the interpretative editions prepared by famous piano virtuosos which contained editorial performance directions, and b) the critical editions prepared by scholars which aimed to represent scores authorized by the composer.<sup>108</sup> The editorial trend of the first half of the nineteenth century included the addition of small suggestions such as metronome marks and fingerings, but not to a degree which would have altered the composer's original intention. However, after the middle of the century, the public trend was to honor interpretative editions edited by celebrated pianists.<sup>109</sup> As a result, more interpretative editions were published.<sup>110</sup>

In these editions, pianists modified performance directions such as metronome marks, pedaling, articulation, phrasing, dynamics, voicing, stemming, and register of pitches in order to align with contemporary stylistic tastes as well as the capabilities of newly developed instruments.<sup>111</sup> Editors added their own pedaling to change the tone colors, increase the volume, or facilitate legato playing.<sup>112</sup> These editorial changes can be

---

<sup>107</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 147 and 153; Jones, *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*, 1-2; Miller-Kay, "The Virtuosity of Interpretation: The Performance History of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas in London, 1800-1880," 255.

<sup>108</sup> Allison Star, "Crosscurrents of Performance Practice in Early Nineteenth-century Editions of Beethoven's Piano Sonata in E Major, Opus 109," in *Musicological Explorations* (Spring 2004): 41-59; Gechter, "Execution or Interpretation? A Study of Interpretive Approaches Through Selected Editions and Recordings of Beethoven's Sonata, Opus 109," 1-3, 19 and 157; Kendall Taylor, "Beethoven Editions, and the 'Tempest' Sonata" (DMA diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, 2014), 25; William Newman, "A Chronological Checklist of Collected Editions of Beethoven's Solo Piano Sonatas Since His Own Day," *Notes* 33 (Mar 1977): 507.

<sup>109</sup> Newman, "A Chronological Checklist of Collected Editions of Beethoven's Solo Piano Sonatas Since His Own Day," 507.

<sup>110</sup> Gechter, "Execution or Interpretation? A Study of Interpretive Approaches Through Selected Editions and Recordings of Beethoven's Sonata, Opus 109," 19-20.

<sup>111</sup> Hamilton, *After the Golden Age- Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance*, 202; Jones, *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*, 36.

<sup>112</sup> Hamilton, *After the Golden Age- Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance*, 198.

classified within two groups. The first carried out the composer's intentions that were not originally indicated in the score, while the second group altered or deviated from the original markings.<sup>113</sup>

In order to provide an in-depth study, I selected editions from different categories. The first category includes the First edition (1802) and the Moscheles edition (1814), which were published before Beethoven's death in the early-nineteenth century. The second category includes three mid-nineteenth century editions edited by renowned pianists: Czerny (1846), Liszt (1857), and Köhler (1869). The last category includes three editions from the late-nineteenth century, which were published by editors with different expertise: Riemann (1885), Lebert and Bülow (1896), and Carl Krebs (1857-1937) (1898). These editions were edited by a music theorist, two pianists, and a musicologist, respectively.

### **Critical edition**

Since the end of the nineteenth century, critical editions have gained prominence once again.<sup>114</sup> A preference for Urtext editions has intensified and, over time, performers grew to reject the freedoms of their predecessors in favor of a literal interpretation of composers' original ideas.<sup>115</sup> Many music societies were formed in order to prepare

---

<sup>113</sup> Drake and Stillings, *The Sonatas of Beethoven: as He Played and Taught Them*, 85-100; William Drabkin, "The Beethoven Sonatas," *The Musical Times* 126 (Apr 1985): 216-217.

<sup>114</sup> Raphael Atlas, "Spelling in Early 19th-Century Piano Music: A Guide to Performance," *Journal of Musicological Research* 10 (1990): 204-206; Jones, *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*, 38.

<sup>115</sup> Brown, "Rediscovering the Language of Classical and Romantic Performance," 73; Louis Crowder, "Beethoven and the Editors," *Clavier* 5 (Jan/Feb 1966): 22-26; Benning Dexter and Charles Timbrell, "Another Look at Editions: The Piano Works of Twelve Important Composers," *The Piano Quarterly* 30 (Winter 1981-82): 39; Gechter, "Execution or Interpretation? A Study of Interpretive Approaches Through Selected Editions and Recordings of Beethoven's Sonata, Opus 109," 27, 158-160 and 163; Mischa Meller,

complete editions of music that were authoritative and uniform.<sup>116</sup> One of the notable Urtext editions of Beethoven’s ‘Moonlight’ Sonata was published by G. Henle Verlag in 1976. This edition’s high level of scholarship brought it much praise. Therefore, I have selected it as the control sample for my following study.

### The Publication Information of the Selected Editions

Table 1 Publication information of the selected editions

Editor	Publisher	Year of Publication
First edition	Vienna: Cappi and Diabelli	1802
Ignaz Moscheles	Hamburg: August Cranz	1814
Carl Czerny	London: Robert Cocks & Co	1846
Franz Liszt	Wolfenbüttel: Ludwig Holle	1857
Louis Köhler	Leipzig: Edition Peters	1869
Hugo Riemann	Berlin: Nikolaus Simrock	1885
Sigmund Lebert and Hans von Bülow	New York: Gustav Schirmer	1896
Carl Krebs	Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel	1898
Hans Schmidt-Görg and Joseph Schmidt-Görg	Munich: G. Henle Verlag	1976

Moscheles was a virtuosic pianist and pedagogue. Nineteenth-century music critic Oskar Bie (1864-1938) categorized Moscheles, whose playing was light, brilliant, intelligent, and metronomically precise, as one of the apostles of Viennese piano school.<sup>117</sup>

---

“Some Critical Comments on Modern Editions of the Piano Classics,” *American Music Teacher* 4 (Sept/Oct 1954): 25.

<sup>116</sup> David Hamilton, “A Comparison of Music Editions: Beethoven Scores,” *Musical Newsletter* 1 (Apr 1971): 16-17; Jahn, “Beethoven and the Various Editions of His Works: Beethoven’s Works in the Edition Published by Breitkopf and Härtel,” 205-206.

<sup>117</sup> Bie, *A History of the Pianoforte and Pianoforte Players*, 190-191, 217; Star, “Crosscurrents of Performance Practice in Early Nineteenth-century Editions of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E Major, Opus 109,” 44-46.

Moscheles created the first piano transcription of an orchestral piece,<sup>118</sup> and published his own etudes which encompassed aspects of both technique and musicality.<sup>119</sup> He was concerned with stylistic issues, so all of the performance directions in his publications were carefully marked.<sup>120</sup> Moreover, he introduced the concept of piano concerts without orchestra in 1837. This was an important step toward the eventual establishment of the piano recital.<sup>121</sup>

Moscheles had a close relationship with Beethoven. He first accessed Beethoven's music with a library subscription and eventually studied vocal composition for ten years with Beethoven's teacher Antonio Salieri (1750-1825).<sup>122</sup> Later, he studied with Beethoven himself<sup>123</sup> and subsequently edited Beethoven's *Fidelio* (Artaria edition) under the composer's supervision.<sup>124</sup> He would go on to edit the Cramer edition of Beethoven's complete piano sonatas in the 1830s, as well as the Stuttgart edition and the Hallberger edition in the 1850s.<sup>125</sup> His editorial changes were based on his own musical identity which included his memories of performances by Beethoven and his contemporaries.<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> Bie, *A History of the Pianoforte and Pianoforte Players*, 221-222.

<sup>119</sup> Carl Weitzmann, *A History of Pianoforte-playing and Pianoforte-literature* (New York: G. Schumer, 1897), 137.

<sup>120</sup> Sandra Soderlund, *How Did They Play? How Did They Teach?: A History of Keyboard Technique* (Chapel Hill: Hinshaw Music, 2006), 300.

<sup>121</sup> Bie, *A History of the Pianoforte and Pianoforte Players*, 199.

<sup>122</sup> Stephen Bergquist, "Some Portraits of Beethoven and His Contemporaries," *Music in Art* 37, no. 1/2 (Spring/Fall 2012): 211-212.

<sup>123</sup> Drake and Stillings, *The Sonatas of Beethoven: as He Played and Taught Them*, 20.

<sup>124</sup> Bergquist, "Some Portraits of Beethoven and His Contemporaries," 223.

<sup>125</sup> Jones, *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*, 35; Drake and Stillings, *The Sonatas of Beethoven: as He Played and Taught Them*, 23.

<sup>126</sup> Marten Noorduin, "Re-examining Czerny's and Moscheles's Metronome Marks for Beethoven's Piano Sonatas," *19<sup>th</sup>-Century Music Review* 15, no. 2 (Feb 2017): 12-13, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479409817000027>.

Like Moscheles, Czerny was a Viennese school pianist who had a long, close relationship with Beethoven.<sup>127</sup> While studying with him, Czerny studied some of the composer's piano sonatas such as "Moonlight."<sup>128</sup> He was also a piano pedagogue whose students included Liszt, Thalberg, as well as Beethoven's nephew, Karl. He went on to publish his own piano studies covering the mechanics and execution, and he was one of the earliest composers to emphasize techniques for the left hand.<sup>129</sup> Moreover, he prepared the texts of Beethoven's sonatas for Haslinger's and edited the Simrock's edition of the same pieces. His editorial changes included tempo, rubato, articulation, pedaling, fingering, and nuances of the music.<sup>130</sup> His metronome marks were based on his memory of Beethoven's playing,<sup>131</sup> however, he modified his interpretation of Beethoven's sonatas, publishing various sets of metronome marks in later editions.<sup>132</sup> Generally, the marks of his later editions are faster than his earlier ones.<sup>133</sup>

Liszt studied several of Beethoven's works with Czerny,<sup>134</sup> and would ultimately be recognized as the leading authority on Beethoven's music during the period.<sup>135</sup> He

---

<sup>127</sup> Rosenblum, "Two Sets of Unexplored Metronome Marks for Beethoven's Piano Sonatas," 59.

<sup>128</sup> Bie, *A History of the Pianoforte and Pianoforte Players*, 160; Drake and Stillings, *The Sonatas of Beethoven: as He Played and Taught Them*, 20; Newman, *Performance Practices in Beethoven's Piano Sonatas: An Introduction*, 29.

<sup>129</sup> Woolley and Kitchen, *Interpreting Historical Keyboard Music: Sources, Contexts and Performance*, 233, 240-241.

<sup>130</sup> Jones, *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*, 47-48; Soderlund, *How Did They Play? How Did They Teach?: A History of Keyboard Technique*, 257 and 260.

<sup>131</sup> Elder, "Serkin: As Interviewed by Dean Elder," 39.

<sup>132</sup> Soderlund, *How Did They Play? How Did They Teach?: A History of Keyboard Technique*, 257.

<sup>133</sup> Drake and Stillings, *The Sonatas of Beethoven: as He Played and Taught Them*, 35-45; Noorduyn, "Re-examining Czerny's and Moscheles's Metronome Marks for Beethoven's Piano Sonatas," 10-11; Jones, *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*, 35.

<sup>134</sup> William Newman, "Liszt's Interpreting of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas," *The Musical Quarterly* 58 (Apr 1972): 185-186; Wan-Hsuan Wu, "Beethoven Through Liszt: Myth, Performance, Edition," (DMA diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2007), 44.

<sup>135</sup> Wu, "Beethoven Through Liszt: Myth, Performance, Edition," 33.

held the first piano recital in 1839,<sup>136</sup> and invented the practice of placing the piano parallel to the stage.<sup>137</sup> In his recitals, he created an up-close musical experience for the audience by conversing with them from the stage and joining them during the intermission.<sup>138</sup> As a pedagogue, he was a significant figure whose students included Amy Fay (1844-1928), Bülow, and d'Albert. He was the first pianist to perform Beethoven's sonatas in public, and he utilized them as the focal point of his solo programs.<sup>139</sup>

Liszt first performed the "Moonlight" sonata in public at the Hôtel de Ville in Paris. During this performance, he replaced the first movement with an orchestral arrangement by conducting it himself before playing the second and third movement on the piano.<sup>140</sup> Moreover, he constantly varied the tempo in the Menuetto section of the second movement imitating a dialogue passing back and forth between instrumental groups.<sup>141</sup> He also modified the phrases in the third movement in his own way.<sup>142</sup> However, his attitude toward this revisionist practice changed suddenly a few years later as exemplified by his own published editions of Beethoven from 1857 to 1861. These editions contained relatively restrained editorial changes, which demonstrates his reverence for Beethoven's musical intention.<sup>143</sup> Similarly, his piano transcriptions of

---

<sup>136</sup> Bie, *A History of the Pianoforte and Pianoforte Players*, 286.

<sup>137</sup> Wu, "Beethoven Through Liszt: Myth, Performance, Edition," 41.

<sup>138</sup> Igor Lipinski, "From Liszt to Victor Borge: A Legacy of Unique Piano Performances," (DMA lecture recital, Northwestern University, 2015), 73.

<sup>139</sup> Wu, "Beethoven Through Liszt: Myth, Performance, Edition," vi, 22 and 34-35.

<sup>140</sup> Miller-Kay, "Moonlight Reflections: A Performance History of the First Movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata Quasi Una Fantasia, Op. 27 No. 2," 38.

<sup>141</sup> Arne Steinberg, "Liszt's Playing of the Moonlight Sonata," *The Piano Quarterly* 37 (Winter 1988-89): 53.

<sup>142</sup> Steinberg, "Liszt's Playing of the Moonlight Sonata," 52.

<sup>143</sup> Jones, *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*, 36-37; Gechter, "Execution or Interpretation? A Study of Interpretive Approaches Through Selected Editions and Recordings of Beethoven's Sonata, Opus 109," 22; Wu, "Beethoven Through Liszt: Myth, Performance, Edition," 58;

Beethoven's nine symphonies were praised for their high adaptability to the mechanism of the piano<sup>144</sup> as well as their remarkable resemblance to orchestral effects.<sup>145</sup>

Köhler was a German pianist who was part of the Liszt's circle in Weimar for decades.<sup>146</sup> In 1857, he published "Methode für Klavierspiel und Musik" which discussed the issues of thorough-bass, articulation, and piano techniques.<sup>147</sup> He would go on to also publish a pedaling treatise in 1882.<sup>148</sup> Compared to other editions from the nineteenth century, his edition contained less personal alteration.<sup>149</sup>

Riemann, a German theorist, explored more precise methods of phrase notation and applied them to his editorial works of late eighteenth and nineteenth century piano music.<sup>150</sup> Riemann differed from earlier editors in that he offered an edition of Beethoven's sonatas within a theoretical framework. It presented detailed analyses of phrasing and formal subdivisions within movements as well as harmonic and tonal clarifications of the music.<sup>151</sup>

Bülow was a German pianist who edited Beethoven's sonatas with Lebert. He studied with Liszt in Weimar in the early 1850s. Liszt praised him as a "true Beethoven

---

Newman, *Performance Practices in Beethoven's Piano Sonatas: An Introduction*, 15-16; Dean Elder, "The Piano Sonatas: Performance Insight-As told to Dean Elder by Claudio Arrau," *Clavier* 9 (Jan 1970): 22.

<sup>144</sup> Bie, *A History of the Pianoforte and Pianoforte Players*, 290; Lipinski, "From Liszt to Victor Borge: A Legacy of Unique Piano Performances," 73.

<sup>145</sup> Weitzmann, *A History of Pianoforte-playing and Pianoforte-literature*, 183.

<sup>146</sup> Hamilton, *After the Golden Age- Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance*, 171.

<sup>147</sup> Bie, *A History of the Pianoforte and Pianoforte Players*, 189.

<sup>148</sup> Rowland, *A History of Pianoforte Pedaling*, 105.

<sup>149</sup> Newman, "A Chronological Checklist of Collected Editions of Beethoven's Solo Piano Sonatas Since His Own Day," 507.

<sup>150</sup> Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, 239-240; Gechter, "Execution or Interpretation? A Study of Interpretive Approaches Through Selected Editions and Recordings of Beethoven's Sonata, Opus 109," 24-26.

<sup>151</sup> Jones, *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*, 37; Newman, "A Chronological Checklist of Collected Editions of Beethoven's Solo Piano Sonatas Since His Own Day," 507.

player and thinker.” Liszt also had great respect for Bülow’s acclaimed edition of Beethoven’s sonatas, using it as his preferred editions when teaching.<sup>152</sup> Bülow performed throughout Europe and the United States and gave regular master classes in Germany from 1884 to 1887.<sup>153</sup> Scholars have praised him as a great artist and teacher of Beethoven’s works who had incalculable influence on the subsequent generations.<sup>154</sup> As a performer, Bülow played Beethoven’s works liberally with his own fluctuations of time and modifications to dynamics, notes, and chords.<sup>155</sup> Although Bülow stated that his interpretation was informed by several sources, his interpretation and practical advice are far from Beethoven’s original intention.<sup>156</sup> Furthermore, his editorial changes of pedal, dramatic dynamics, and agogic inflections are evidence of Liszt’s influence.<sup>157</sup> Despite Bülow’s changes to Beethoven’s original compositional vision, his editorial decisions are highly musical and consistent.<sup>158</sup>

Krebs was a German musicologist who studied musicology and philosophy at the University of Berlin and studied piano at the Klindworth-Scharwenka Conservatory. He taught in Königl. Hochschule from 1895 to 1923, published several academic papers, and edited music including the complete Beethoven’s sonatas for Breitkopf and Härtel. His editions of Beethoven’s sonatas represent one of the first usages of the term “Urtext”

---

<sup>152</sup> Newman, “Liszt’s Interpreting of Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas,” 203-204.

<sup>153</sup> Richard Zimbars, “Hans von Bülow Explores Beethoven’s Piano Music,” *The Piano Quarterly* 32 (Spring 1984): 59.

<sup>154</sup> Bie, *A History of the Pianoforte and Pianoforte Players*, 295-297; Weitzmann, *A History of Pianoforte-playing and Pianoforte-literature*, 192.

<sup>155</sup> Jones, *Beethoven: The ‘Moonlight’ and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*, 36-37 and 50; Elder, “The Piano Sonatas: Performance Insight-As told to Dean Elder by Claudio Arrau,” 22.

<sup>156</sup> Hamilton, *After the Golden Age- Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance*, 202; Star, “Crosscurrents of Performance Practice in Early Nineteenth-century Editions of Beethoven's Piano Sonata in E Major, Opus 109,” 49; Zimbars, “Hans von Bülow Explores Beethoven’s Piano Music,” 29-31.

<sup>157</sup> Gechter, “Execution or Interpretation? A Study of Interpretive Approaches Through Selected Editions and Recordings of Beethoven’s Sonata, Opus 109,” 23.

<sup>158</sup> Drabkin, “The Beethoven Sonatas,” 217.

in this context.<sup>159</sup> Known for its reverence for the composer's original intention, Krebs's edition is the product of consultation and editing of the works while referencing the original editions as well as the first collected edition from the 1860s.<sup>160</sup> Pianists such as Friskin and Freundlich have affirmed this edition's status as a highly useful reference for the study and realization of Beethoven's sonatas.<sup>161</sup>

---

<sup>159</sup> Gechter, "Execution or Interpretation? A Study of Interpretive Approaches Through Selected Editions and Recordings of Beethoven's Sonata, Opus 109," 25-26.

<sup>160</sup> Jones, *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*, 38; Drabkin, "The Beethoven Sonatas," 217.

<sup>161</sup> Friskin, James, and Irwin Freundlich. "Ludwig van Beethoven (1770-1827)." Part II in *Music for Piano- A Handbook of Concert and Teaching Material from 1580 to 1952*, p. 82.

## CHAPTER 2

### A COMPARISON OF THE SELECTED EDITIONS AND THE HENLE EDITION

#### Tempo and Metronome Mark

Table 2 Tempo and metronome mark

	Tempo of I	Metronome of I	Time signature of I	Tempo of II	Metronome of II	Time signature of II	Tempo of III	Metronome of III	Time signature of III
Henle (1976)	Adagio Sostenuto		$\phi$	Allegretto; Trio		$\frac{3}{4}$ ; $\frac{3}{4}$	Presto Agitato		$c$
First edition (1802)	Adagio Sostenuto		$\phi$	Allegretto; Trio		$\frac{3}{4}$ ; $\frac{3}{4}$	Presto Agitato		$c$
Moschles (1814)	Adagio	$\text{♩} = 60$	$c$	Allegretto; Trio	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\frac{3}{4}$ ; $\frac{3}{4}$	Presto Agitato	$\text{♩} = 92$	$c$
Czerny (1846)	Adagio	$\text{♩} = 60$	$\phi$	Allegretto; Trio	$\text{♩} = 84$	$\frac{3}{4}$ ; $\frac{3}{4}$	Presto Agitato	$\text{♩} = 92$	$c$
Liszt (1857)	Adagio		$c$	Allegretto; Trio		$\frac{3}{4}$ ; $\frac{3}{4}$	Presto Agitato		$c$
Köhler (1869)	Adagio Sostenuto		$\phi$	Allegretto; Trio		$\frac{3}{4}$ ; $\frac{3}{4}$	Presto Agitato		$c$
Riemann (1885)	Adagio Sostenuto	$\text{♩} = 60$	$\phi$	Allegretto; Trio		$\frac{3}{4}$	Presto Agitato	$\text{♩} = 150$	$c$
Lebert & Bülow (1896)	Adagio Sostenuto	$\text{♩} = 52$	$c$	Allegretto	$\text{♩} = 56$	$\frac{3}{4}$	Presto Agitato	$\text{♩} = 88$	$c$
Krebs (1898)	Adagio Sostenuto		$\phi$	Allegretto; Trio		$\frac{3}{4}$ ; $\frac{3}{4}$	Presto Agitato		$\phi$

The tempo marks and time signatures in the First, the Köhler, and the Krebs editions are identical to Henle edition. However, Moscheles edited both factors in his edition. The tempo marking for the first movement is “*adagio*” rather than “*adagio sostenuto*” and the time signature is common time instead of “*alla breve*”. Moreover, he also added metronome marks to all the movements, which are “quarter note = 60,” “dotted half note = 76,” and “half note = 92,” respectively.

Similar to the Moscheles edition, the tempo marking of the first movement in the Czerny edition is “*adagio*” without the qualifying “*sostenuto*.” It also gives metronome marks for all three movements. The metronome marks for the first and third movements are the same as Czerny’s, however, the tempo of the second movement, “dotted half note = 84” is slightly different. Of all the sampled editions, the metronome mark of second movement suggested by Czerny is the fastest (Moscheles and Liszt suggest “dotted half note = 76,” and Lebert and Bülow suggest “dotted half note = 56”).

The time signature of the first movement in the Liszt edition is also in common time and the tempo mark is “*adagio*.” Different from the previous two editions, there are no metronome marks in the Liszt edition. Although the time signatures and tempo markings of the Riemann edition are the same as the Henle, Riemann added extra metronome marks for the first and third movement: “half note = 60” and “quarter note = 150,” respectively. The editor also reminded pianists about the “*alla breve*” time signature of the first movement. Pianists are instructed to count the half note as the metrical unit in order to prohibit the tempo from dragging. Interestingly, all the other sampled metronome marks count the quarter note as the metrical unit while the suggested

metronome marks are much slower than Riemann's. Specifically, both Moscheles and Czerny suggested "quarter note = 60," and Lebert and Bülow suggested "quarter note = 52" which is almost half the speed of the Riemann's. However, the situation in the third movement is the opposite. Riemann regarded the third movement as a night piece. He wanted to avoid having pianists count the half note as the metrical unit in an effort to prevent them from rushing the tempo. His metronome mark in the third movement—"quarter note = 150"—is much slower than the other samples.

In the Lebert and Bülow edition, the tempo marks are the same as the Henle edition, but there are additional metronome marks for all three movements: "quarter note = 52," "dotted half note = 56," and "half note = 88." Compared to other editions, the Lebert and Bülow suggests the slowest metronome mark for the first movement, "quarter note = 52," which is slightly slower than the editions of Moscheles's "quarter note = 60" and Czerny's "quarter note = 60," and is much slower than Riemann's "half note = 60." The second movement of this edition is also the slowest of the three. It is marked as "dotted half note = 56" while the Moscheles's is "dotted half note = 76" and the Czerny's is "dotted half note = 84." The third movement is, again, slower than both Moscheles and Czerny editions, but faster than the Riemann's. Similar to the Moscheles edition and the Liszt edition, the time signature of the first movement is common time. For the second movement, the title and the time signature of the trio section is omitted. Moreover, the returning minuet section is fully written instead of using the repeat sign and "*attacca*" is placed between the second and the third movement. Given this evidence, it is clear the editors did not treat this whole movement as a typical "minuet and trio" movement.

## Rubato

Table 3 Rubato

	Faster	Slower	Fermata
Henle (1976)		III: mm. 188-189 (Adagio)	I: m. 69; III: mm. 14, 115, 164, 166
First edition (1802)		III: mm. 188-189 (Adagio)	I: m. 69; III: mm. 14, 115, 164, 166
Moscheles (1814)		III: mm. 188-189 (Adagio)	I: m. 69; III: mm. 14, 115, 164, 166
Czerny (1846)		III: mm. 188-189 (Adagio)	I: m. 69; III: mm. 14, 115, 164, 166, 187
Liszt (1857)		III: mm. 188-189 (Adagio)	I: m. 69; III: mm. 14, 115, 164, 166, 187
Köhler (1869)		III: mm. 189-190 (Adagio)	I: m. 69; III: mm. 14, 115, 165, 167
Riemann (1885)		III: mm. 100-101 (rit), 188-189 (Adagio)	I: m. 69; III: 14, 115, 164, 166
Lebert & Bülow (1896)	III: mm. 43-56 (agitato), 91-93 (un poco più animato), 157-158 (animato), 175-176 (agitato), 196-200 (animato e tempestoso)	I: mm. 41 (poco riten), 67-69 (slentando); II: mm. 93-94 (riten); III: mm. 87-90 (tranquillo), 94-99 (tranquillo), 100-101 (molto tranquillo), 151-156 (più tranquillo), 166 (poco riten), 188-189 (Adagio), 190-193 (Tempo I, ma tranquillo)	I: m. 69; III: 14, 115, 164, 166
Krebs (1898)		III: mm. 188-189 (Adagio)	I: m. 69; III: 14, 115, 164, 166

The rubatos (ritards, accelerandos, and fermatas) of the First, Moscheles, Köhler, and Krebs editions are the same as the Henle edition. However, since there is an extra

measure in the Köhler edition, the measure numbers of the cells “slower” and “fermata” differ from the Henle table. The Czerny edition and the Liszt edition also have the same ritards and accelerandos as the Henle edition, but there is an extra fermata mark in m. 187 of the third movement in both editions. The Riemann edition presents the same fermatas as the Henle edition, and no accelerando have been added. However, Riemann suggests delaying the chord in m. 100 and adding an extra “rit” in mm. 100-101 of the third movement.

The Lebert and Bülow edition shares only the fermatas with Henle edition. This edition contains a great deal of tempo fluctuations. There are extensive editorial accelerandos in throughout the third movement: mm. 43-56 “agitato” and accelerating the second half of each measure in mm. 50-52, 91-93 “*un poco più animato*”, 157-158 “*animato*,” 175-176 “*agitato*,” and 196-200 “*animato e tempestoso*.” The editorial ritards of this edition can be found in mm. 41 “*poco riten*” and 67-69 “*slentando*” of the first movement, mm. 93-94 “*riten*” of the second movement. Those in the third movement may be observed at mm. 87-90 “*tranquillo*,” 94-99 “*tranquillo*,” 100-101 “*molto tranquillo*,” 151-156 “*più tranquillo*,” 166 “*poco riten*,” 188-189 “*Adagio*” (which means no more than twice as slow as the Presto movement), and 190-193 “*tempo I, ma tranquillo*.” Finally, because the editors believed that a strictly pedantic observance of time would be inappropriate to this style, they warn pianists not to rush the hand movement in mm. 32-33 of the first movement.

## Rhythm, Pitch, and Ornamentation

Table 4 Rhythm, pitch and ornamentation

	Modified rhythm	Modified notes	Modified ornament
Henle (1976)			
First edition (1802)	I: m. 5		III: mm. 23-24, 27-28, 36, 89-99, 175-176
Moscheles (1814)	III: mm. 25-28, 120-123		III: mm. 23-24, 36, 87-88, 91-99, 175-176
Czerny (1846)	III: mm. 25-28, 120-123		III: mm. 36, 87-88, 175-176
Liszt (1857)	II: mm. 25-28, 37, 120-123		III: mm. 23-24, 27-28, 87-88, 175-176
Köhler (1869)	I: m. 67	III: mm. 35, 135	
Riemann (1885)	I: mm. 67; III: mm. 25-28, 76-77, 80-82, 91, 117-123, 168-170, 172-174	III: mm. 35, 147-148, 162	III: mm. 59, 61-62, 89-99, 153, 155-156, 175-176, 187, 192, 194-196
Lebert & Bülow (1896)	I: mm. 22, 37, 67; III: mm. 25-28, 76-77, 80-82, 120-123, 163, 165, 168-170, 172-174	II: mm. 61-96; III: m. 143, 178, 180, 182	III: mm. 22-24, 27-28, 36, 59, 61-62, 72, 89-92, 95, 97, 99, 117, 131, 153, 155-156, 175-176, 192, 194-196
Krebs (1898)		I: m. 60	III: mm. 23-24, 27-28, 87-88, 175-176

The First edition is very similar to the Henle edition in that there are no modified notes, and only minor changes are made to rhythm and ornaments. In m. 5 of the first movement, the whole note breaks into two tied half notes because of the line feed. Also,

the tremolos in mm. 23-24, 27-28, 89-99, and 175-176 are written out, and there is a missing trill closure in m. 36.

The Moscheles edition reflects the similarities between the First edition and the Henle edition. There are only some changes of rhythm and ornamentation in the third movement. In mm. 25-28, and 120-123, Moscheles combined two tied eighth notes into a quarter note, which served to enhance the visual representation of the syncopation. The tremolos in mm. 23-24, 91-99, and 175-176 are written out while the repeated patterns in mm. 87-88 turn into tremolos. As is the case in the First edition, there is no trill closure in m. 36.

The Czerny edition takes a similar approach to rhythmic and ornamental revision. In the third movement, Czerny also opted to combine the two tied eighth notes into a syncopated quarter note in mm. 25-26 and 120-123. He also omitted the trill closure in m. 36, replaced the repeated pattern with a tremolo in mm. 87-88, and wrote out the tremolo in mm. 175-176.

The editorial changes of the Liszt edition also parallel those of previous editions. The tremolos in mm. 23-24, 27-28, and 175-176 of the third movement are fully written, and the repeated pattern in mm. 87-88 is presented as tremolos. Liszt also elected to combine the two tied eighth notes into a syncopated quarter note in mm. 25-28 and 120-123. Moreover, the half note in m. 37 breaks into two tied quarter notes. The Köhler edition does not contain any modifications to ornamentation. However, he provided alternative notes for pianists in m. 35, and added an extra measure in m. 135.

In the Riemann edition, the editor substituted the half note in m. 67 of the first movement with a whole note. Then, in the third movement, he combined the two tied

eighth notes in mm. 25-28 and 120-123 into syncopated quarter notes, and combined the pairs of a tied quarter note and an eighth note into dotted quarter notes in mm. 76-77, 80-82, 91, 117-119, 168-170, and 172-174. For ornamentation, Riemann changed some grace notes into arpeggiated chords in mm. 59, 61-62, 91, 95, 97, 153, 155-156, 192, and 194-196 of the third movement. He also added a grace note in m. 187, and in mm. 89-99 and 175-176, he depicted the written-out version of the tremolos. Moreover, he provided an edited version of the small notes showing the skeleton notes, timing, groupings, and dynamics of the cadenza passage in m. 187, and an alternative passage in mm. 35 and 147. In m. 162, he replaced the second sixteenth note E with a D-sharp.

The Lebert and Bülow edition differs greatly from the homogeneity illustrated in the previous examples. The most obvious difference is that they opted to write out the entire minuet twice rather than utilizing a repeat sign. This practice enabled them to add different performance directions for the return of the minuet section in mm. 61-96. Also, in the third movement, the editors added a G-sharp in m. 143 as well as harmonically-enriching chords in mm. 178 to 182. Specifically, they added a F-sharp minor triad in m. 178, a D major chord in first inversion in m. 180, and a diminished seventh chord in m. 182. In addition, the Lebert and Bülow edition calls for modified ornaments; they wrote out the tremolos in mm. 23-24, 27-28, 89-92, 99, and 175-176, as well as the grace notes in mm. 22, 72, and 117. In the case of the grace notes in mm. 59, 61-62, 91, 95, 97, 153, 155-156, 192, and 194-196, the editors changed them into chords. There are also additional grace notes in mm. 36 and 131. For the small notes in m. 187, the editors provided an editorial version with given rhythmic divisions, timing, articulations and dynamics in the footnotes. Rhythmically speaking, the two separate quarter notes in m.

22 of the first movement are combined into a half note, the dotted quarter note in m. 37 was changed to a quarter note, and in m. 67, a whole note substitutes a half note. In the third movement, the editors combined two tied eighth notes into a syncopated quarter note in mm. 25-28 and 120-123, and in mm. 76-77, 80-82, 163, 165, 168-170, and 172-174, they notated a dotted quarter note rather than a quarter note tied to an eighth note. The Krebs edition also possesses unique editorial qualities when compared to the previous samples. There are only a few editorial changes such as including a missing C-sharp in m. 60 of the first movement as well as some presentational differences in the tremolos in mm. 23-24, 27-28, 87-88, and 175-176 of the third movement.

## Articulation, Phrasing, Note-stem, and Beaming

Table 5 Articulation, phrasing, note-stem, and beaming

	Eliminated articulation	Additional articulation
Henle (1976)		
First edition (1802)	I: m. 62; II: m. 14; III: 26, 28, 37, 148, 196, 197	III: mm. 125, 133, 152
Moscheles (1814)	I: m. 4, 37; III: mm. 19, 20, 57, 69, 88-89, 114-115, 166, 187	I: mm. 14, 56; II: m. 23, 35-36, 57-58; III: m. 117, 125, 127, 155-156
Czerny (1846)	I: mm. 3-4, 7, 27, 37; II: mm. 20-22, 24-26, 35; III: mm. 8, 12, 13-15, 19- 21, 37, 43, 58, 75, 87-89, 94, 113- 114, 120, 159, 165-166, 171, 192	II: mm. 23, 56-57; III: mm. 22, 117, 125, 127, 153, 155-156, 194-195
Liszt (1857)	I: mm. 32-37, 55-56, 64-65; III: mm. 13-14, 19-21, 165, 178, 180, 182- 186, 196-198	I: mm. 1, 2, 5; II: mm. 35-36; III: mm. 9-10, 22, 59, 61-62, 127, 153, 155-156, 192, 194-195
Köhler (1869)	I: m. 3; II: m. 51; III: mm. 88-89, 91	I: mm. 1, 4-5, 14-15, 19-23, 55-60; II: mm. 1-4, 6-8, 9-20, 22-24, 27-28, 31, 33-56, 59-60; 32-43, 57-59, 61-68, 91, 95, 97, 102-107, 110-115, 125, 127-138, 152-154, 156- 163, 189-191, 193, 195-197
Riemann (1885)	I: mm. 7, 12-13, 25-27, 44, 49-50, 55-58; II: mm. 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16- 18, 20-22, 24-26, 28-35, 51, 58-59; III: mm. 13-14, 88-89, 112-115	I: mm. 1-31, 38-66, 68-69; II: mm. 1-4, 6-8, 9-20, 22-24, 27-28, 31, 33-56, 59-60; III: mm. 1-7, 9-19, 21, 25-47, 49-53, 57, 59-69, 71, 77-78, 91-95, 97-110, 112, 120- 141, 143-147, 151-163, 191-196, 199-200
Lebert & Bülow (1896)	I: mm. 5, 39, 67; II: mm. 10, 14, 26, 30, 59-60, 62, 70, 74; III: mm. 13-14, 43, 88-89, 114-115, 141, 160, 162	I: mm. 1-3, 14-15, 19-23, 26-27, 38-42, 48, 55-57, 59-61; II: mm. 9-11, 13-19, 26- 27, 31-32, 35-36, 45-48, 52-60, 69-71, 73-79, 86-87, 91-93, 95-96; III: mm. 2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 16, 18, 25-28, 34-35, 38-40, 44-46, 49-59, 61-63, 66, 68, 94-95, 97, 103, 105, 107, 110, 120-123, 128-131, 136-156, 159-160, 162, 183-185, 188-195, 199
Krebs (1898)	I: mm. 37, 44; III: mm. 7, 13-14, 48, 53, 60, 88-89, 98, 114-115, 121, 141	II: mm. 10, 32; III: mm. 72, 133, 167, 186

Modified articulation	Modified note-stem/ note-beaming
<p>I: mm. 7-8, 15-16, 25-26, 30, 41, 44-45, 49-54, 64-67; II: mm. 1-2, 50-52, 59-60; III: mm. 9-12, 19, 21, 25, 37, 75, 87-89, 111-112, 152, 159, 196</p>	
<p>I: mm. 15-18, 20-21, 25-27, 44-45, 49-50-54, 62-65; II: mm. 2-16, 19-22, 24-32, 39, 43, 49-58; III: mm. 1-2, 4, 6-8, 11, 14, 16, 18, 21, 25-28, 37, 43, 47-48, 53-56, 65-66, 68-71, 78, 83, 85-94, 102-103, 105, 107-110, 114-115, 120-123, 152, 141-142, 147-150, 159-160, 162, 167, 171, 175-176, 192, 196-200</p>	<p>III: mm. 13-14, 65, 114-115</p>
<p>I: mm. 15-18, 20-21, 25-26, 35-37, 45-46, 49-54, 62-65; II: mm. 2-16, 26-32, 39, 43, 50-52; III: mm. 1-2, 4, 6-8, 11, 13-16, 18, 21, 25-28, 43, 47-48, 53-57, 65-66, 68-70, 78-79, 83, 85-93, 102-103, 105, 107-109, 112-114, 120-123, 192, 141-142, 147-150, 159-160, 162, 167, 171, 175-176, 195-200</p>	<p>III: mm. 13-14, 44-47, 49, 114-115</p>
<p>I: mm. 7-8, 15-18, 20-21, 24-25, 27, 44-45, 51-54; II: mm. 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 28-30, 50-52; III: mm. 84-85, 87-91, 108, 110, 163-164, 167, 171, 177, 179, 181, 192</p>	<p>I: m. 23; III: mm. 13-14, 65, 114-115</p>
<p>I: mm. 7-9, 13, 15-18, 20-21, 25, 27, 29, 35-39, 44-45, 48-54, 57-58, 62-67; II: mm. 22-24; III: mm. 7-12, 19-24, 57-59, 69-86, 108-113, 116-119, 152-154, 164-175, 178-188, 191, 193, 197-199</p>	<p>I: mm. 23, 37; II: mm. 23, 27; III: mm. 13-14, 114-115</p>
<p>I: mm. 1-5, 11-23, 25-46, 48-60, 62-67; II: mm. 2-4, 6-24, 26-28, 30-36, 38-40, 42-44, 48-52, 59-60; III: mm. 1-28, 43, 47-48, 53-61, 65-87, 91-112, 114-115, 117-123, 132, 137, 141-142, 147-150-155, 159-162-190-194, 196-200</p>	<p>I: mm. 23, 28, 30, 37, 66; III: mm. 1-8, 10-19, 34-35, 37-40, 65-71, 75, 78, 83-86, 92-93, 102-109, 111-115, 128-130, 132-134, 159-163-166, 171, 175-177, 179, 181, 183, 196</p>
<p>I: mm. 3-5, 7-8, 13-22, 25-30, 33-39, 44-45, 49-59, 62-67; II: mm. 22-24, 30-31, 35-36, 51-52, 82-84, 90-91, 95-96; III: mm. 7-8, 10-13, 19-22, 56-58, 69-72, 78-79, 82-91, 108-113, 117, 119, 142-143, 151-154, 180, 183-186, 190-193, 196, 198-199</p>	<p>I: mm. 1, 4-5, 22-23, 28, 30, 37, 40-42, 64, 66; II: m. 60; III: mm. 13-14, 43-46, 49-52, 65, 92-93, 114-115, 137-140, 143-146, 159, 163-166, 183-185, 196</p>
<p>I: mm. 20-21, 25, 27-28, 30-31, 38-40, 62-65; II: mm. 16-18, 50-52; III: mm. 9, 171, 187, 196</p>	<p>III: mm. 13-14, 65, 114-115</p>

There are not many differences in articulation between the First edition and the Henle edition. Indeed, it seems that the reason for any modifications of articulation were mainly due to differing interpretations of Beethoven's handwriting. For instance, in the first movement, some of the slurs had their starting and ending points altered. One slur is missing in m. 62, two one-measure slurs in mm. 64-65 were combined to create a two-

measure slur, and one tie in mm. 66-67 was changed to a slur. In the second movement, two slurs are modified, two staccato strokes replaced two staccato dots, and the lone staccato dot in m. 14 is missing. The third movement contains several slur displacements, and some staccato dots in mm. 11, 25, 37, 87 and 159 were changed to staccato strokes while some dots in mm. 26, 28 and 37 are missing altogether.

The most notable differences between the Moscheles edition and the Henle edition may be observed in the ending points of slurs, the uses of staccato strokes and dots, and the slurring of ornaments. Specifically, there are many modified slur marks in the first movement. In the Henle edition, the slurs in the right-hand part usually end before the bar lines, but Moscheles preferred to end them after the lines. Moscheles also combined smaller slurs into bigger ones in mm. 44-45, 62-63, and 64-65. In the second movement, all articulations have been changed. Throughout the movement, Moscheles opted to utilize staccato strokes rather than dots. Also, he ended the slurs before the bar lines, while the slurs in Henle editions usually cross these lines. In the third movement, slurs were omitted in mm. 19, 20, 57, 69, 88-89, 114-115, 166, and 187, while some ornamental slurs were added in m. 117, 125, 127, and 155-156. Moscheles clearly preferred to interpret Beethoven's staccato marks as strokes. However, given the fact that he used staccato dots in m. 137, it is apparent that Moscheles used the two staccato symbols differently. Therefore, his use of staccato strokes in both the second and third movements should be considered to be his conscious interpretative choice rather than a mere misreading.

While the editorial articulations of the Czerny edition are quite similar to the Moscheles edition, Czerny's version contains a greater deal of variance in articulation. In

the first movement, there are some modified slur marks that tend to end after the bar lines as well as connections of smaller slurs into larger ones in mm. 35-36, 62-63, and 64-65. In the second movement, some slurs were modified to stop before the bar lines. There are also a few slurs which have been added or omitted throughout the movement. Additionally, all staccato dots have been replaced by strokes. The third movement abounds with slurs and staccato strokes. For instance, ornamental slurs were added in mm. 22, 117, 125, 127, 153, 155-156, and 194-195. Czerny primarily replaced staccato dots with strokes. He also used staccato dots in m. 137, implying that he also applied the two symbols differently according to his interpretative choice, reflecting the influence of the Moscheles edition.

The Liszt edition is quite different from the previous nineteenth-century editions since Liszt was more concerned with remaining loyal to Beethoven's markings. Although there are missing slurs and modified slur endings that reflect previous samples, Liszt did not change Beethoven's staccato dots. Furthermore, Liszt's treatment of the third movement contains significantly fewer modifications and additional articulations.

The first movement of Köhler edition presents substantially edited articulation such as additional slurs in mm. 1, 4-5, 14-15, 19-21, 22-23, 55-56, 56-58, and 59-60. There are also many modified slurs which end after the bar lines as well as connections of shorter slurs as seen in mm. 35-37, 48-50, 62-63, 64-65, and 67 of the first movement. The second movement incorporates fewer modified articulations, but in the Trio section, additional slurs in the left hand can be found in mm. 35-36, 37-40, 41-44, 45-49, 49-52, 53-56, and 57-59. With more than fifty additional slurs, the third movement is highly edited. Some of them, such as those in mm. 30, 32, 36, 59, 61-62, 91, 95, 97, 125, 127,

131-132, 154, 156-157, 193, and 195-197, function with the ornaments. The others are applied to both right-hand and left-hand parts. It is also worth noting that most of the slurs end on the strong beats. To a degree, Köhler utilized the same articulation approach as the Henle edition. For example, the slurs in the second movement usually end after the bar lines, and all the staccato marks are dots instead of strokes. To summarize, the Köhler edition is characterized by a substantial number of additional slurs, with Köhler preferring to end these slurs on the strong beats throughout all three movements.

There are many editorial changes within the Riemann edition. In the first movement, some slurs have been eliminated, while a good deal of articulations and modified slurs were added. Riemann indicated “legato” at the very beginning along with extra slurs in mm. 5-6, 9-11, 25-26, 27, 46-48, and 68-69. Moreover, there are staccato marks in mm. 5, 10, 11, 23-24, 28, 42-43, 46-47, and 60-63. This edition is particularly unique due to its use of tenutos; it is rife with tenuto staccatos and tenutos. For instance, there are tenuto staccatos in mm. 1-12, 14-24, 26-31, 38-39, 42-43, 45-57, 59-64, 66, and 68, and tenutos in mm. 4, 7-8, 12-13, 15-18, 20-21, 25, 27, 40-42, 44-45, 48-59, 63, and 65. Although there is a large quantity of additional articulations, Riemann was very careful in how he went about indicating them. He applied different marks note by note, which resulted in a wide variety of timbre.

The second movement of the Riemann edition contains the greatest quantity and variety of articulations among all sampled editions. In mm. 1, 4, 8, 12, 20, and 51, there are additional “legato” marks as well as additional slurs in mm. 2-4, 6-8, 36-38, 40-42, 44-48, and 52-56. However, slurs were also eliminated in mm. 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-22, 24-26, 28-35, 51, and 58-59. Instead of blindly linking all the notes together with

slurs, Riemann utilized different articulations, resulting in a colorful timbre. Specifically, he used both staccato dots and strokes, “legato” marks, slurs, as well as tenutos and tenuto staccatos. In mm. 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, 14-16, 26-28, 30-32, 39, 43-44, and 59-60, he replaced staccato dots with strokes while adding staccato strokes to mm. 9-16, 18, 20, 24, 27-28, 31, 33-34, 36, 39-40, 43-44, 49, 52, and 59-60, and staccato dots to mm, 16-19 and 23. Additionally, the editor applied tenuto staccatos in mm. 17, 19, 22, 24, 33, 37-38, 40-42, and 45-49, and tenuto marks in mm. 10-11, 15-16, 18, 20, 23, 27-28, 31, 33, 35, 37-40, 43-48, 50-51, and 59. There are also modified slurs in mm. 8-24, 26-28, 30-36, 38-40, 42-44, and 48-52.

While there are plenty of additional articulations in the third movement, there are only a few missing dots in mm. 13-14 and 114-115, and missing slurs in mm. 88-89 and 112-113. There is one “legato” mark in m. 21 and a myriad of additional slurs in mm. 1-7, 9-14, 15-19, 25-47, 49-53, 61-69, 91-95, 102-108, 112-116, 120-141, 143-147, 155-163, 194-196, and 199-200. There are also modified slurs in mm. 7-12, 19-25, 57-61, 69-87, 95-102, 108-112, 117-120, 151-155, 163-175, 177-187, 190-194, and 196-199. One of the more novel devices utilized by Riemann is having one note simultaneously function as the end of one slur and the beginning of the next. This can be seen in passages such as the octave in m. 124. There are additional dots in mm. 33, 35, 37, 39, 44-46, 49-52, 77-78, 95, 97-99, 112, 128, 130, 132, 134, 138-140, and 143-146. In m. 128, there is an added stroke for the right-hand chord and an added dot for the left-hand chord. The editor also used strokes to replace dots in mm. 1-8, but utilized dots after the first stroke in each measure in mm. 13-14, 15-19, 21, 25-28, 43, 47-48, 53-56, 65-71, 75, 78-79, 83, 85-87, 91-93, 102-109, 114-115, 120-123, 132, 137, 141-142, 147-150, 159-162, 167,

171, and 199-200. As with previous editions, this practice demonstrated that Riemann used staccato dots and strokes differently in the interest of timbral variety. In mm. 9, 16, 34-35, 37-40, 43-46, 49-53, 57, 65, 71, 110, 112, 128-130, 133-134, 137-140, 143-147, 151, and 196, there are additional strokes. In mm. 26-32, 36, 38, 41-42, 59-62, 95, 100-101, 121-124, 126, 131, 133, 135-136, 152-156, and 191-195, tenuto staccatos have been added. Moreover, there are different types of tenutos in this movement. In mm. 42 and 112, there are additional tenutos. In mm. 47-48, 53-56, 141-142, and 147-150, there are tenuto and dot pairs which replace slurs. In mm. 58, 60, 94, 96, 152, 154, 187, 191, and 193, tenuto staccatos stand in place of staccatos. There are marcato and dot pairs replaced slurs in mm. 175-176, a practice never replicated in other editions. It is noteworthy that Riemann largely enhanced the variety of articulations in his edition while there are no staccato strokes or tenuto staccatos whatsoever in the Henle edition.

To sum up, the innovative editorial changes in articulations within Riemann's edition largely enhanced the variety and usage of articulations. He applied many additional articulations, none of which were more unique than his use of tenutos and the pairing of marcatos and dots. In practice, the massive variety of articulations makes the best of nineteenth-century pianos. Finally, it is the first edition that treated the same note as both slur-ending and the beginning of the next slur, demonstrating the diminishing importance of metrical hierarchy in performance practice.

There is a significant number of editorial changes to articulation in the Lebert and Bülow edition, although not as many as in the Riemann. In the first movement, there are missing slurs in mm. 5, 39, and 67, additional slurs in mm. 1-3, 14-15, 19-23, 26-27, 38-42, 48, 55-57, and 59-60, and a "*sempre legatissimo*" added in mm. 60-61. Also, there are

modified slurs in mm. 3-5, 7-8, 13-22, 25-30, 33-39, 44-45, 49-59, and 62-67 which end after the bar line. In the second movement, the editors elected to use Beethoven's original staccato dots rather than replacing them with strokes. There are missing dots in mm. 10, 14, 26, 30, 62, 70, and 74, and additional ones in mm. 9-11, 13-16, 18, 26-27, 31-32, 59-60, 69-71, 73-79, 86-87, and 91-92. Among these dots, mm. 9-11, 13-16, 18, 26-27, 31-32, 69-71, 73-75, 86-87, and 91-92 only apply to the middle voices. There are also slurs added in mm. 35-36, 45-48, 52-58, 92-93, and 95-96 and additional tenutos in mm. 17, 19, 77, and 79. Modified slurs can be found in mm. 22-24, 30-31, 35-36, 51-52, 82-84, 90-91, and 95-96. In the third movement, dots and slurs have been omitted in mm. 13-14, 43, 114-115, 141, 160, and 162, and mm. 88-89, respectively. Additional slurs in the third movement are located in mm. 2, 4, 6, 16, 18, 33-35, 57-59, 61-62, 66, 68, 94-95, 97, 103, 105, 107, 128-131, 136-137, 151-156, 160, 162, 188-193, and 195. There are also additional dots in mm. 9, 11, 16, 18, 34-35, 38-40, 44-46, 49-56, 110, 129-130, 133, 137-150, 183-185, and 199, "*non (troppo) legato*" in mm. 63 and 159, and tenutos in mm. 25-28, 59, 61-62, 120-123, 155-156, and 194-195. The slurs contained in mm. 7-8, 10-13, 19-22, 56-58, 69-72, 78-79, 82-91, 108-113, 117, 119, 142-143, 151-154, 180, 183-186, 190-191, 192-193, 196, and 198-199, have all been modified.

The Krebs edition differs from the heavily edited editions which preceded it in that it reflected the minimalist touch employed in Henle edition. In the first movement, there are only two missing slurs in mm. 37 and 44, and modified slurs in mm. 20-21, 25, 27, 28, 30-31, 38-40, and 62-65. It must be noted that slurs in this edition lack notational consistency. For example, in mm. 20-21, Krebs broke a longer slur into two shorter ones,

while in mm. 62-65, he connected smaller slurs into longer ones. In m. 25, the modified slur stops before the bar line, while in mm. 38-40 the slur crosses the bar line.

In the second movement, there are two additional dots in mm. 10 and 32, and edited slurs in mm. 16-18, and 50-52. In the third movement, dots were omitted in mm. 7, 13-14, 48, 53, 114-115, 121, and 141 as were slurs from mm. 48, 60, 88-89, and 98. Krebs also added dots in mm. 133 and 167, and slurs in mm. 72, 133, and 186. Modified slurs are contained within mm. 9, 171, 187, and 196.

The note-stem and beaming of the First edition is identical to the Henle edition. Yet, in the third movement of the Moscheles edition, there are edits to note-stems and beamings. For instance, Moscheles broke the note beam of the first two sixteenth notes in m. 65. He also combined the two voices in the left hand into one voice in mm. 13-14, and 114-115. Czerny also employed this tactic in these measures. However, unlike previous samples, Czerny connected the first eighth notes in mm. 44-47, and 49 with the following eighth notes in the right-hand part.

In the Liszt edition, there is an additional stem on the F-sharp in m. 23 of the first movement. This serves to extend the right-hand melody after the bar line. Regarding Liszt's approach to note-stem and note-beaming, he also combined the two voices in the left hand into one voice in mm. 13-14, and 114-115 of the third movement, and broke up the beam in m. 65.

In the Köhler edition, the editor added a stem in m. 23 of the first movement, omitted a stem in m. 37, and changed a half note to a whole in m. 67. In the second movement, he added two additional stems in mm. 23 and 27. In the final movement, he

combined two voices into one in mm. 13-14 and 114-115, and also added pedaling in mm. 164-165.

In the Riemann edition, the editor put additional stems in mm. 23 and 28 of the first movement as well as mm. 75 and 171 of the third movement. He also eliminated stems in m. 37 of the first movement and mm. 163-166 of the third movement. Additionally, he separated the first eighth note from the triplet in mm. 28 and 30 and disconnected the C-sharp from the E in m. 66 of the first movement. In the third movement, he combined the two voice on the left hand into one voice in mm. 13-14 and 114-115. In addition, he frequently modified the beaming to visually reinforce the musical events such as grouping and articulation. Examples of this can be found in mm. 1-8, 10-13, 15-19, 34-35, 37-40, 65-71, 78, 83-86, 92-93, 102-109, 111-114, 128-130, 132-134, 159-162, 175-177, 179, 181, 183, and 196.

The Lebert and Bülow edition also contains a good deal of editorial changes. In the first movement, there are additional stems in mm. 1, 4-5, 22-23, 28, 30, and 40-42. However, some stems were erased in mm. 37, and 163-166. In mm. 64 and 66, the editors disconnected the C-sharp note from the E. There is an additional stem in m. 60 in the next movement. In the third movement, the editors combined two voices of the left hand into one in mm. 13-14 and 114-115. The first eighth note in m. 65 is connected with the following three notes. Similarly, the first sixteenth note in m. 196 is connected with the following three. There is a substantial amount of modified beaming in this movement in mm. 43-46, 49-52, 92-93, 137-140, 143-146, 159, and 183-185. Unlike the previous samples, the only examples of modified beaming in the Krebs edition are located in mm. 13-14, 65, and 114-115 of the third movement.

## Dynamics

Table 6 Dynamics

	Eliminated dynamic	Additional dynamic
Henle (1976)		
First edition (1802)	III: mm. 35, 39, 42, 81, 143, 145, 164	II: m. 45
Moscheles (1814)	I: m. 58; III: mm. 19, 35, 81, 84, 164, 187	III: mm. 81-82, 163, 186, 187
Czerny (1846)	I: m. 58; II: m. 34; III: mm. 15, 35, 42, 81, 84, 187	III: mm. 88-89, 163, 187
Liszt (1857)	I: m. 58; II: mm. 22, 40; III: mm. 35, 51, 71, 81, 84, 110, 187, 194	III: mm. 78, 80-82, 88-89, 163, 187
Köhler (1869)	III: mm. 7, 81, 195	
Riemann (1885)	II: m. 41; III: mm. 84, 132	I: mm. 2-3, 5-8, 10-17, 17-27, 30-40, 42-65; II: mm. 2-34, 36-58; III: mm. 1-22, 25-30, 32-93, 102-187
Lebert & Bülow (1896)	I: mm. 42, 58-59, 68; II: m. 60; III: m. 167, 179, 187, 197	I: mm. 3-4, 8-9, 12, 14, 16, 22-24, 31-36, 38-42, 44-47, 50-51, 53, 55-58, 63, 69; II: mm. 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17-20, 24, 26, 30-32, 38-40, 43, 51-52, 57, 59, 62, 66, 68, 70, 72, 74, 77-78, 84, 86, 90-92, 94; III: mm. 1-2, 4, 6-14, 16-22, 30, 32, 34-35, 40, 42, 44-48, 50, 52-57, 59-60, 63, 66, 68-72, 75-82, 84-85, 89-93, 103, 105, 107-115, 117, 124-131, 135-142, 144-151, 153-157, 159-160, 162-183, 187, 196-198, 200
Krebs (1898)	III: mm. 7, 81, 84, 187	II: mm. 45

Modified dynamic	Displaced dynamic
III: mm. 96-97, 197	I: mm. 16, 18, 25, 29-30, 52, 54, 60; II: mm. 37, 41, 53; III: mm. 14, 51, 115-116, 132, 137
II: m. 42; III: m. 65, 96-97, 101, 135-136	I: mm. 16, 18, 27-31, 42, 52, 54; II: mm. 20-22, 49, 53; III: mm. 14, 39, 56, 99, 102
III: mm. 9, 32-33, 65	I: mm. 16, 18, 27-31, 40, 42, 52, 54, 62-66; II: mm. 21, 37, 41, 49, 53; III: mm. 1, 14, 33, 39, 56, 94-99, 102, 116, 137, 149
III: mm. 41-42, 65, 96-97, 135-136	I: mm. 16, 18, 27, 29-31, 40, 42, 52, 54, 62-66; II: mm. 21, 37, 41, 49, 53; III: mm. 14, 22-24, 33, 39, 49, 56, 72-74, 78, 94-95, 98-99, 102, 115, 128, 133, 137
III: mm. 41-42, 98, 136-137	I: mm. 16, 18, 25, 28-31, 40, 48, 52, 54, 66; II: mm. 21, 37, 41, 49, 53; III: mm. 133-134, 158
II: mm. 33-34; III: mm. 7, 22-24, 35, 41-42, 51, 53-56, 72-74, 77-79, 81-82, 87, 98-99, 102, 135-136, 159, 179, 181	I: mm. 25, 27-31, 40; II: mm. 22-23, 37, 49, 53; III: mm. 63, 91, 95, 97, 133, 171, 175, 190, 194
I: mm. 48-49; II: mm. 36, 94; III: mm. 41-42, 50, 52, 65, 87, 98-99, 102, 135-136, 159, 165, 181, 188, 194	I: mm. 16, 18, 25, 28-31, 52, 54; III: mm. 33, 37-39, 63, 81-82, 94-97, 130, 144, 146, 187, 190
III: mm. 29, 86	I: mm. 16, 18, 25, 28-31, 40, 48, 52, 54, 60, 66; II: mm. 21, 37, 42, 49, 53; III: mm. 102, 130, 157, 175

With the exception of a few displacements and omissions, there are no dynamic differences between the First edition and the Henle. In the first movement, these dynamic displacements serve to amend the climactic points of crescendo-and-diminuendo hairpins. Furthermore, the positions of the dynamics are slightly changed in the second movement, changing the target voice of the marks. In the third movement, five crescendos, one forte, and one sforzando have been removed. A crescendo-decrescendo pair replaces hairpins, and a sforzando is instead marked as forte.

The dynamic revisions within the first two movements of the Moscheles edition are mainly comprised of displacements. In the first movement, there is a missing crescendo in m. 58 as well as some displaced hairpin pairs. Most notably in the second movement, the sforzando in m. 42 of the Trio was replaced by a crescendo. The third movement contains more editorial changes than the previous two movements. There are

three crescendo marks missing in mm. 19, 35 and 81, two sforzandos missing in mm. 84 and 164, and one piano missing in m. 187. Also, the “fp” in m. 65 was modified to a separate “f” and “p” and the crescendo-decrescendo pair in mm. 96-97 replaced the hairpins. Further modification can be seen in m. 101 where a piano has been replaced by a pianissimo, and in mm. 135-136 where all fortes were replaced by sforzandos. There are also additional dynamics such as extra hairpins in mm. 81, 82 and 186, and two fortissimos in mm. 163 and 187.

In the first movement of the Czerny edition, there are only some minor dynamic displacements and an omitted crescendo mark. Similarly, in the second movement, there are minor dynamic displacements along with a missing sforzando in m. 34. The pattern of dynamic displacements and missing dynamics continues in the third movement. There are modified dynamics, such as sforzando replace forte in m. 9, forte replace sforzando in m. 32, forte replace fortissimo in m. 33, and a “fp” separate into “f” and “p” in m. 65. Furthermore, dynamics are added in mm. 88-89, 163, and 187. Compared to the Henle edition, the Czerny editions nearly identical with the exception of a significant number of dynamic displacements.

The Liszt edition contains a great deal of additional and omitted dynamics compared to previous examples. In fact, the Liszt edition contains more editorial changes to dynamics than any edition published in the first half of the century. Although there are only three missing dynamics in the first two movements, many dynamic displacements can be observed throughout. In the third movement, there are a significant number of additional hairpin pairs and missing crescendo marks. Also, he replaced the fortes in mm. 41-42, and 135-136 and the hairpins in mm. 96-97 with crescendo-decrescendo pairs.

Additionally, in m. 78, a crescendo was placed in the middle of the staff along with two pairs of hairpins at the bottom which apply to the left-hand melody. This illustrates the care with which Liszt applied individual dynamics to each voice.

While the dynamic marks within the Köhler edition are very similar to the Henle edition, the Köhler is very different from other nineteenth-century performance editions in that it contains no missing dynamics and only a few modifications. For example, there are only minor dynamic displacements of hairpin peaks in the first movement. The second movement contains only a few dynamic displacements in the Trio section. For example, the “fp” is not located precisely at the tenor voice but is instead printed at the bottom of the staff. The dynamics of the third movement are also minimally edited. There are dynamic displacements in mm. 133-134, and 158, sforzandos replace the fortes in mm. 41-42, and 136-137, and a hairpin has replaced the crescendo in m. 98. Additionally, three crescendos were omitted in mm. 7, 81, and 195.

The first movement of the Riemann edition contains minimal dynamic displacements. However, there are a substantial amount of additional dynamics including many hairpins in mm. 2-3, 5-6, 7-8, 10-11, 12-14, 15-17, 17-19, 19- 22, 23-24, 32-40, 42-58, and 60-65. There is also an additional “meno p” in m. 30, and crescendos and decrescendos were added to mm. 25-27, and 31. Riemann placed additional crescendos and decrescendos alongside existing hairpins. As I observed in the Liszt edition, this practice demonstrates a delineation between the functions of crescendo/decrescendos and hairpins. Riemann continued this practice into the second movement in mm. 4-5, 20-21, 30-31, 45-48, and 57. Furthermore, almost every measure in this movement contains additional dynamic marks, mainly hairpin pairs. There are additional “p” markings in

mm. 2, 6, 16, 24, and 49, and crescendos in mm. 4-5, 30-31, 45-46, and 57. Measures 8, 12, and 48, contain dynamic additions of “mp”, “mf”, and “f”, respectively.

No movement of any other edition contains more additional dynamics than the third movement of the Riemann edition. Additional hairpins are found in mm. 1-22, 25-28, 32-56, 58, 60, 61-62, 64-72, 84-90, 92-93, 102-117, 120-123, 127-147, 152, 154-156, 158-172, 175-181, 183-186, and 193-198. There are many additional sforzandos as well. Examples can be found at the second block chord in m. 2 and in all similar figures throughout the movement: mm. 30, 32, 125, 127, and 183. Noteworthy is the fact that this edition contains additional “pf”s in mm. 70 and 109, and “mfp” in m. 91 as these symbols were rarely seen in previous decades. The agitated character of the movement is enhanced by the addition of accents in mm. 21-32, 71-81, 112, 116-127, 167-174, and 178-186. Additionally, different types of accents such as *le petit chapeau*, further enhances the forceful nature of the music.

The wide range of dynamics in Riemann edition serves to enhance the existing color of the piece. Pianissimos were added in mm. 63 and 157, as well as pianos in mm. 45, 57, 59, 61, 71, 75, 79, 104, 139, 151, 153, 155, 192, and 194. In mm. 67 and 106, mezzo pianos were added, in mm. 69, 108, 161, and 165, the editor opted for mezzo fortes, and in mm. 30, 43, 84, 110, 125, 137, and 182, extra fortes are utilized. A number of crescendos and decrescendos were added in mm. 29, 62, 82-83, 89, 93, 124, 157, 178, and 181. Furthermore, there is a decrescendo added to a hairpin in m. 156, while some hairpins replace crescendo-decrescendo pairs in mm. 7, 35, 51, 53-56, 78-79, and 81-82. In summary, the Riemann edition contains the highest number and widest variance of additional dynamics of any edition addressed by this research.

In the first movement of the Lebert and Bülow edition, the editors request the performer to project the melody with a firmer touch than the accompanying triplet figure. There are some missing and displaced dynamics along with a few modified dynamics including a “piano” changed to “subito p” and a “crescendo” which was augmented to “più crescendo”. Furthermore, there are many additional dynamics including hairpin, pianissimo, piano, mezzo forte, accent, crescendo and decrescendo which can be observed throughout mm. 3-4, 8-9, 12, 14, 16, 22-24, 31-36, 38-42, 44-47, 50-51, 53, 55-58, 63, and 69.

In mm. 17-20 of the second movement, Lebert and Bülow applied independent dynamics for different voices. They also added extra dynamics in mm. 66-75. Additionally, there is a piano marking missing from m. 60, and two modified marks were added to mm. 36 and 94. The third movement of this edition contains a substantial number of added accents and hairpins. Specifically, additional accents in mm. 10, 12, 44, 50, 52, 144, and 175-176 serve to subvert the existing metrical hierarchy. There are missing dynamics in mm. 167, 179, 187, and 197, dynamic modifications in mm. 41-42, 50, 52, 65, 87, 98-99, 102, 135-136, 159, 165, 181, 188, and 194, as well as dynamic displacements in mm. 33, 37-39, 63, 81-82, 94-97, 130, 144, 146, 187, and 190. Similar to previously discussed editions, the editors utilized crescendo-decrescendo pairs differently than hairpins. This is exemplified in mm. 98-99. While the Lebert and Bülow edition contains a great deal of dynamic additions, it is most notable for exemplifying the waning importance of metrical hierarchy in western European art music.

Countering the trends of previous decades, the dynamics in the Krebs edition are shaped almost exclusively by Beethoven’s own markings. The only alterations to the

dynamics of the first movement are shifting peaks of hairpin pairs in mm. 16, 18, 28-31, 52, and 54. The second movement is similarly revised. In the third movement, dynamics such as two crescendos in mm. 7 and 81, a sforzando in m. 84, and a piano in m. 187 have all been omitted. Moreover, there are two sforzandos replaced by fortes in mm. 29 and 86. The limited revisions in the Krebs edition clearly demonstrate the shift in focus from interpretive editions toward the recreation of Beethoven’s original intent.

## Fingerings

Table 7 Fingerings

	Henle (1976)	First edition (1802)	Moscheles (1814)	Czerny (1846)	Liszt (1857)	Köhler (1869)	Riemann (1885)	Lebert & Bülow (1896)	Krebs (1898)
Fingering					II: mm. 45-48	Yes	Yes	Yes	

The First, Moscheles, Czerny, and Krebs editions contain no added fingerings. The first edition to contain such additions is the Liszt wherein mm. 45-48 of the second movement, Liszt added a “2-1-2-1” in the tenor voice to create a legato chromatic line. This minimal addition led to substantial fingerings being included in later editions.

The Köhler edition, for example, provides many fingerings. Octave legato fingerings can be observed throughout the first movement. Furthermore, in mm. 1-4, the suggested fingering for the left hand is “4- (54)- \_-4-3-4,” where “(54)” is a finger substitution on the same note and “\_” is a note without a fingering. Other similar examples may be observed in mm. 10-12 “4-5-4-5-4,” 16 “5-4-5,” 18 “5-4-5,” 25 “4-5-4,” 40-41 “5-4-3,” 52 “4-5-4,” and 54 “4-5-4-(54).” In mm. 27-28, Köhler denotes a “5-5-4” fingering, which suggests a technique of sliding the finger from the black key to the

white. For the right hand's outer melodic line, Köhler preferred "4" and "5," but exceptions can be seen in mm. 15, 23, 28-29, and 37-39. For the triplet-accompaniment in mm. 23, 30, 32-37, 42, and 60-67, hand shifting and open/close palm techniques are employed to achieve a smoothness. A thumb slide was added in mm. 45-46 for the same purpose. Indeed, the suggested fingerings throughout the first movement of this edition are designed to create smooth manor of playing.

In the second movement, Köhler continues to suggest various techniques for legato playing. For instance, there is a left-hand thumb sliding "1-1" from D-flat to C linking the two notes together in m. 31. In mm. 45-48, legato finger crossings are to be employed over the bass line "5-4-5-4" and tenor voice "2-1-2-1". In other places such as mm. 8-9 "4-5," 12-13 "4-5," 24-25 "4-5-4," 28-34 "4-5-4-5" "4-5" "4-5" "5-4," 38-40 "4-5" "4-5," and 44 "5-4," "4" and "5" fingers are used frequently on the right hand for octave legato. Finger substitution on the same note is used for better linkages on the right hand in mm. 9-10 "(43)," 13-14 "(43)," 42-43 "(54)," 53 "(54)," and m. 58 "(31)" on the left hand. The fingerings in the second movement also feature other articulations beyond legato playing. The use of different fingers on the same note naturally changes its articulation. This can be observed in mm. 16-20 (right hand "2-1-2-1-\_-1-2-1"), mm. 18-19 (left hand "2-3-2"), m. 20 (left hand "3-2"), and mm. 32-33 (left hand "1-2"). Conversely, in mm. 10 and 39, the same fingering is used on different notes, creating a detached effect. This edition's second movement exemplifies the wide range of touch could be applied on the nineteenth-century pianos.

Köhler's third movement contains more of the same types of fingerings; hand shifting and open/close palm technique are called for throughout mm. 1-6, 15-20, 65-68,

88-89, 102-107, 160-163, 184-185, and 197-199. However, one of the fingerings in this movement is questionable. The fingerings in mm. 10 and 11 show the left hand (“1-2-1-1-2-1”) on F-sharp-E-A-G-sharp-F-sharp-F-sharp-E under one legato slur. Since it is impossible to play legato by using “1-1” from a white key to a black one, it is surprising that Köhler did not suggest “1-2-1-2-3-1” instead. This would have created a better linkage between A-G-sharp.

Some fingerings in the third movement serve to create a detached touch. For example, Köhler suggested changing fingers on repeated notes under different slur groups in the left-hand parts of mm. 76-78, 80, 82-86, 164, 166, and 169-171, and right-hand parts of mm. 7-8, 22-24, 69-70, 72-74, 91, 108-109, 117-119, 120, and 142. Moreover, in the left-hand part of mm. 13-14, 23-24, 27-28, 30-31, 73, 114-115, 118, 121, and 125-126, he suggested using “5” and “3” on the strong metrical beats and “4” on the weaker ones. This, along with the application of “5” on the bass notes in mm. 25, 29, 32, 36, 41, 120, 127, 131, 136, and 176-177, supports the music’s increasing tension. Furthermore, in mm. 43, 45, 138, and 140, Köhler suggested the use of the left thumb on the stronger beats of the repeated notes.

The Riemann is another good example that employs multiple fingering techniques. Generally, “4” and “5” alternation connects the outer melody of the first movement except m. 58, which contains a (5-5) sliding from black key to white. There are octave legato fingerings in the bass line in mm. 16, 18, 25, 27-28, 40-41, 48-49, 52-54, and 56-60, where “4” and “5” are used alternatively. In mm. 40-41, there are fingering substitutions on the same note in mm. 30 and 40-41. For the triplets in mm. 62-67, the fingerings provided enable one to play the notes smoothly. For the repeated notes

in mm. 6-7 and all similar figures, the fingerings “1-2-1” and “5-4-5” are used for quicker attacks. In this edition, the stronger fingers of the left hand “1” and the right “5” are used for stronger beats rather than using the weaker left “2” and right “4” fingerings.

In the second movement, legato fingerings are shown for the right hand in mm. 1-8 and 20-22, and for the left in mm. 8-9 and 12-13. Moreover, there are octave legato fingerings on the right hand in mm. 24-26, 28-30, 33-34, 44, and 51-52 with “4” and “5” alternating. As with the Köhler edition, Riemann used different fingers on the same note to change the articulations in certain places. For instance, “4” is used on weak beats and “5” on strong beats throughout mm. 16-22 (right hand), 24-25 (left hand), and 28-30 (left hand). In mm. 18-19, “3” is used on the tenuto A-flat, while “2” is used on the same note without tenuto. On the D-flat in mm. 35-36, “4” is used for the one without staccato stroke while “3” is used along with stroke. Likewise, the third movement shows a great variety of fingerings. Legato fingerings may be observed on the right hand in mm. 87-90, 173-174, and 176.

A unique element of Riemann’s fingerings in the third movement is how he used them to depict how and where notes are grouped. In the right-hand parts of mm. 1-6, 15-20, 65-68, 102-107, 159-162, and 196, Riemann used the thumb to show the starting note of each musical group. More in line with the fingering practices of other editions, Riemann utilizes the technique of changing fingers on the same note to give them a natural detachment. Examples of this can be found in the right-hand parts of mm. 7-8, 22-24, 26-28, 69-70, 72-74, 108-109, 117-119, and 121-123, and the left-hand parts of mm. 76-78, 80-86, 114-115, and 168-170. Similarly, in places such as mm. 43-56 and 137-150, alternating fingers are used on the same note to change its articulations.

Furthermore, in mm. 9, 11, 110, and 112 of the third movement, Riemann suggests “4” for staccato stroke, “3” for staccato dot, and “1” for tenuto on the left-hand B-sharp note. In mm. 34-35, “3” is used on the right-hand strong beat with staccato stroke. In mm. 184-185, “1” is used on the strong beat with accent. In the left-hand part of mm. 23, 27, 118, and 122, he utilizes “4” on weak beats and “3” on strong beats, yet in mm. 73, 171, 173, and 175-176, he suggests using “3” on weak beats and “4” on strong beats. In mm. 74, 87, 93, 99, and 176, he recommends “4” on weak beats and “5” on strong beats, while in mm. 119, 123, and 174 “5” on weak beats and “4” on strong beats. In m. 172, he used “2” on weak beats and “3” on strong beats. These fingerings subvert the system of “good fingers” on “strong beats” which was characteristic of the Baroque period. Rather, they employ the use of different fingers in various metrical moments. Moreover, the editor also assigned fingerings in order to enhance finger speed. In the right-hand part of mm. 75-83, and 167-170, changing fingers on the same note enables the performer to speed up their finger strokes.

The Lebert and Bülow edition contains a considerable amount of added fingerings. Compared to the Köhler and Riemann, the fingerings of this edition are fragmented to such a degree that, at times, their musical function cannot be analyzed. However, it is apparent that many of the fingerings in the Lebert and Bülow edition share similar purposes to the previous examples. For instance, the repeated notes in mm. 5-7, 23-25, 42-44, and 60-61 of the first movement, the fingerings “1-2-1” and “5-4-5” are used for left hand and right hand, respectively. This allows for quicker finger strokes. Examples of octave legato can be observed throughout the piece: “4-5” fingerings for the left hand in mm. 1-2, 10-12, and 25 (Movement I), “3-4” for the left hand in m. 57

(Movement I), “4-5” for right hand in mm. 8-9, 33-34, 38-39, and 42-43 (Movement II), “3-4” for the right hand in m. 44 (Movement II), and m. 176 (Movement III).

In mm. 45-48 of the second movement, there is a “2-3-4-5” fingering for a legato chromatic bass line. For better linkage between notes, the editors also applied finger substitutions in mm. 2, 8, and 45 of the first movement, mm. 9, 13, and 49-50 of the second movement, and mm. 59, 94, 110, and 192 of the third movement. Other legato fingerings include finger sliding “4-4” in mm. 89-90 of the third movement, the utilization of shifting hand position and open/close palm techniques in mm. 32-37, and 62-66 of the first movement, and twisting fingers in m. 30 “1-5-2-4” of the first movement and mm. 88-89 “3-4-3-5-4-5-4” of the third movement. Along with legato fingering, the editors also assigned specific fingerings for different articulations. In the right hand parts in mm. 17-20 and 76-80 of the second movement, as well as the left hand parts in mm. 8-9 and 12-13, it is suggested to change fingers on the same note for a better metrical accent. In mm. 18 and 78 of the second movement, the left hand fingering “4-3” is used in order to shift the articulation of the A-flat from legato to staccato. In mm. 20 and 80 of the same movement, left hand “3-2” is used on the G notes under different slurs. In mm. 9 and 110 of the third movement, left hand “2-1” assists the changes from staccato dot to legato on the B-sharp notes. In mm. 11 and 112, three B-sharp notes are played by the left hand “1-2-1”. In mm. 75-86, different fingers are used for the same notes under different slurs. Examples specifically for the right hand are contained within mm. 20 and 80 of the second movement, and mm. 22-24, 72-74, and 117-119 of the third movement. Further examples of this technique can be found in mm. 43-48, 53-56, 91,

137-141, 147, 149-150 and 167-170 of the third movement. The third movement also utilized fingerings to define the musical groupings within mm. 1, 3, 92-93, and 196.

## Pedaling

Table 8 Pedaling

	Pedaling
Henle (1976)	III: mm. 2, 4, 6-8, 16, 18, 66, 68-70, 103, 105, 107-109, 160, 162, 165-166
First edition (1802)	III: mm. 2, 4, 6-8, 16, 18, 66, 68-70, 103, 105, 107-109, 160, 162
Moscheles (1814)	III: mm. 2, 4, 6-8, 16, 18, 66, 68-70, 103, 105, 107-109, 160, 162
Czerny (1846)	III: mm. 2, 4, 6-8, 16, 18, 66, 68-70, 103, 105, 107-109, 160, 162
Liszt (1857)	III: mm. 2, 4, 6-8, 16, 18, 66, 68-70, 103, 105, 107-109, 160, 162
Köhler (1869)	III: mm. 2, 4, 6-8, 16, 18, 66, 68-70, 103, 105, 107-109, 161, 163-167
Riemann (1885)	III: mm. 2, 163-166
Lebert & Bülow (1896)	I: mm. 1 (una corda), 3, 6-8, 10 (una corda), 13, 16, 18, 19 (una corda), 23-24, 26-27, 28 (una corda), 30-31, 33, 35-37, 40 (una corda), 43-45, 47, 52-54, 56, 60 (una corda), 62-65, 67-68; III: mm. 2, 4, 6-9, 16, 18-20, 25-29, 31, 33, 37, 41-42, 47, 50, 52, 57-62, 64, 66, 68-70, 78, 84, 86-87, 95, 97, 99, 100-101 (una corda), 103, 105, 107-109, 115, 120-124, 126, 128, 132, 135-136, 144, 146, 151-158, 160, 163-166, 181-187, 196-200
Krebs (1898)	III: mm. 2, 4, 6-8, 16, 18, 66, 68-70, 103, 105, 107-109, 160, 162-166

With the exception of one missing mark in mm. 165-166 of the third movement, the pedalings depicted in the First, Moscheles, Czerny, and Liszt editions are virtually indistinguishable from the Henle edition. Similarly, the Krebs edition reflects the Henle with the exception of an additional pedal in mm. 163-164 of the third movement. Despite their overarching parallels, it is worth noting that the pedaling notations of the First edition, Czerny edition, and Liszt edition are labeled “*senza sord*” and “*con sord*” while the Köhler edition utilizes the label “*ped.*”

In the Riemann edition, the editor is quite liberal with their application of the pedal. He instructs pianists to play the whole first movement extremely gently, but with plenty of pedal use. He also suggests the release of the damper pedal in order to assist pianissimos and diminuendos. Moreover, the Riemann also omits a substantial number of pedaling as seen in mm. 4, 6-8, 16, 18, 66, 68-70, 103, 105, 107-109, 160, and 162 of the third movement.

The pedaling of the Lebert and Bülow edition differs from all other samples. In its footnotes, the editors insist upon an even more frequent use of the pedal than is marked. They also suggest not to take the original directions “*sempre senza sordini*” too literally. As one would expect, this edition contains extensive additional pedalings: mm. 3, 6-8, 13, 16, 18, 23-24, 26-27, 30-31, 33, 35-37, 43-45, 47, 52-54, 56, 62-65, and 67-68 of the first movement; and 9, 19-20, 25-29, 31, 33, 37, 41-42, 47, 50, 52, 57-62, 64, 78, 84, 86-87, 95, 97, 99, 115, 120-124, 126, 128, 132, 135-136, 144, 146, 151-158, 163-164, 181-187, and 196-200 of the third movement. “*Una corda*” pedaling is also requested in both of these movements: mm. 1, 10, 19, 28, 40, and 60 of the first movement; and mm. 100-101 of the third movement.

## Verbal Instructions and Footnotes

Table 9 Verbal instructions and footnotes

	Footnotes	Verbal instruction in I	Verbal instruction in II	Verbal instruction in III
Henle (1976)		si deve suonare tutto questo pezzo delicatissimamente e senza sordino; Semper pp Senza Sordino	la prima parte senza repetizione	
First edition (1802)		si deve suonare tutto questo pezzo delicatissimamente e senza sordino; Semper pianissimo Senza Sordino	la prima parte senza repetizione	
Moscheles (1814)		si deve suonare tutto questo pezzo delicatissimamente e senza sordino; Semper pianissimo Senza Sordino		
Czerny (1846)		si deve suonare tutto questo pezzo delicatissimamente e senza sordino; Semper pianissimo Senza Sordino		
Liszt (1857)		si deve suonare tutto questo pezzo delicatissimamente e senza sordino; Semper pianissimo Senza Sordino	la prima parte senza repetizione	
Köhler (1869)		si deve suonare tutto questo pezzo delicatissimamente e senza sordino; Semper pp Senza Sordino	la prima parte senza repetizione	
Riemann (1885)	Yes	si deve suonare tutto questo pezzo delicatissimamente e senza sordino; Semper pp Senza Sordino	la prima parte senza repetizione	
Lebert & Bülow (1896)	Yes	Sempre pp con sordini		
Krebs (1898)		si deve suonare tutto questo pezzo delicatissimamente e senza sordino; Semper pp Senza Sordino	la prima parte senza repetizione	

As with the Henle, the First, Krebs, and Köhler editions contains no footnotes and have deleted none of the existing verbal instructions. While no footnotes are included in the Moscheles or Czerny editions, these two have omitted the verbal instructions “*subito il seguente*” at the end of the first movement, and the “*la prima parte senza repetizione*” at

the beginning of the second movement. The Liszt edition reflects the Moscheles and Czerny editions in this regard, however Liszt chose to retain the “*la prima parte senza repetizione*.” The Lebert and Bülow edition includes the “*subito il seguente*” at the end of the first movement, but the “*la prima parte senza repetizione*” is omitted.

In the Riemann edition, both “*subito il seguente*” and “*la prima parte senza repetizione*” are presented. However, this edition is particularly significant because it was the first of these examples to provide footnotes explaining the tempo, pedaling, dynamics, ornamentation, and modified notes of the piece. This practice was also adopted in the Lebert and Bülow edition.

## CHAPTER 3

### EVALUATION OF EDITORIAL CHANGES AND PERFORMANCE PRACTICE

#### **Overview**

This chapter summarizes the findings detailed in Chapter 2. There are minor differences between the Henle and the First edition. Modified or eliminated articulations and pedaling can be found throughout the edition as well as an additional dynamic marking in the second movement and modified dynamics and articulations in the third movement.

The Moscheles edition contains significantly more editorial changes. It includes the time signature and tempo marking of the first movement and additional metronome markings for all movements. There are also editorial dynamics, numerous articulation changes, modified note-stems, beamings and rhythms along with realizations of tremolos, a missing pedal marking, and an omitted verbal instruction in the second movement concerning the repeat. Most of these editorial changes are mirrored in the Czerny edition. However, the Czerny contains more dynamic displacements, edits to articulations, as well as an extra fermata. It also reflects the First edition in that it utilizes “*senza sord*” and “*con sord*” pair to indicate usage of the damper pedal.

Surprisingly, the Liszt edition contains no metronome marks and few editorial changes to articulations. However, it does share many of the modifications described above: the addition of tempo markings and the time signature in the first movement; an extra fermata and a missing pedaling; editorial dynamics and articulations; modified note-stems, beamings and rhythms; written-out tremolos; and the use of “*senza sord*” and “*con sord*”. While the Liszt edition has a notable number of dynamic changes compared to previous samples, it also contains an additional note stem in the first movement which

lengthens the melodic line as well as one set of supplementary fingerings to highlight the left hand chromatic line in the second movement.

The Köhler edition presents the sonata differently from the previous samples because it omits metronome marks and modified ornaments. It also presents a minimal number of modified rhythms and dynamic changes. It does, however, include numerous changes to articulation, fingerings, and phrasing. The presence of an extra measure and an alternative passage further distinguishes this unique edition.

The Riemann differs from the Henle edition in the following ways: editorial tempo fluctuation, added metronome marks for the first and third movements, omitted time signature in the trio section, extra fingerings and footnotes, modified notes and rhythms, alternative passages, written-out tremolos and modified ornaments, substantial modified note-stem and beaming, and an extensive elimination of pedaling. Although it contains relatively few eliminated or displaced dynamics, the Riemann shows more additional dynamics, modified dynamics and articulations than any other sampled edition.

While the Riemann edition was, indeed, highly edited, no other edition contains more editorial changes than Lebert and Bülow. It presents a modified time signature in the first movement, eliminates the time signature and the title of the trio section, and links the second and third movement with “*attacca*”. It also includes numerous additional rubatos and metronome marks for all movements, and it omits verbal instructions in the first two movements. Furthermore, the Lebert and Bülow edition contains a myriad of extra dynamics and articulations, and modified notes and rhythms; supplementary fingerings and footnotes; modified ornaments, note-stems, and beamings; and additional pedaling including both damper and *una corda*.

Surprisingly, with more than seventy years ahead, the Krebs edition is very similar to the Henle edition. Its revisions include only minor changes of dynamics and articulations, a missing note, a few modified note-stems and beamings, as well as an additional pedaling.

An evaluation of the sources confirms that there were various interpretations of older music occurring during the nineteenth century. These diverse interpretations are reflected in the choices made by different editors. Spanning from the First edition through the Czerny edition, the growing acceptance of editorial changes was apparent in all aspects of the piece. Liszt's edition continued the growth of editorial dynamic changes, but he also introduced supplementary fingerings and additional note-stems. However, it is intriguing that Liszt included relatively few changes to articulation and no metronome marks whatsoever. The Köhler edition has a severe reduction of dynamic changes as well as an increase of modified notes, note-stems and beaming, editorial articulations, and additional fingerings. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the rapid increase of editorial changes reached its climax in both quality and quantity. Riemann applied the most diversified articulations of any edition, while Lebert and Bülow presented the highest number of editorial changes.

A clear trend of increasing editorial changes emerges from these selected editions. Editors were becoming freer in the ways they expressed symbols and verbal instructions within their editions. As I have demonstrated, this trend resulted in the inclusion of fingerings, footnotes, new articulation marks and realization of ornaments. These trends developed steadily, but gradually, so it would not be accurate to classify these editions as definitively critical or interpretative. The phenomenon of interpretative editions peaked in

the mid 1890s. It was during this time that editorial changes were at their most diverse and numerous. However, due to the Krebs edition's sharp changes in editorship, the opposite approach to editorial editions abruptly appears. The Krebs edition focused on being very loyal to the composer's original intention. It is for this reason that the Krebs edition would set the editorial standard for subsequent editions.

### **Tempo, Rhythm and Rubato**

Of the selected samples, the first application of a metronome mark appeared in 1814, but by the end of the century, the practice mostly ceased. The sporadic utilization of metronome marks during this century makes it impossible to measure any sort of patterns or trends in this respect. Of the four sets of metronome marks included in this research, the Riemann edition has the fastest first movement and is the only one which uses a half note as the beat. The Lebert and Bülow edition presents the slowest tempo for the first movement. In editions surveyed, only three sets of metronome marks are provided for the second movement. Among them, the Lebert and Bülow edition is, again, the slowest, but the fastest tempo is found in the Czerny edition. For the last movement, Riemann is the slowest. Additionally, this edition is unique in that it is the only edition which counts the beat with quarter note. Since no clear pattern of metronome marks can be observed in the selected samples, no definitive conclusion about tempo preference can be drawn.

Although there is no information from the selected samples about asynchronization of hands, un-notated rhythmic freedoms, and un-notated chordal arpeggiation, there are some instructions about rubato. In the Riemann edition, the editor asked for an extra agogic accent and ritard to be applied to the two sustained chords in

mm. 100-101 of the third movement, before the main theme returns. Moreover, there is an extra fermata in the third movement right before the cadenza passage in both Czerny's and Liszt's editions. The Lebert and Bülow edition provides many performance directions for both *accelerando* and *ritard*. For instance, in m. 41 of the first movement, there is a *ritard* before the main melody returns. In mm. 67-69 of the first movement and mm. 93-94 of the second movement, the music slows down towards the end of each movements. In the third movement, the lyrical passages in mm. 87-90, 94-99, 100-101, 151-156, and 190-193 are marked "*(più/ma) tranquillo*." There is also a *ritard* before the fermata in m. 166, and an "*adagio sostenuto*" on the long notes in mm. 188-189. There are also *accelerandos* in the third movement such as in mm. 157-158, where it facilitating the agitated musical character. In mm. 43-56, 91-93, 175-176, and 196-200 the music speeds up the sequential patterns in this vivid section.

To conclude, all the directions for *rubato* in these samples align with the nineteenth-century performance practices I summarized in the literature review. Furthermore, the Lebert and Bülow edition contains more *rubatos* than any other sample. Given that this edition was published in 1896, it is clear that further scrutiny should be applied to commonly-held belief that the trend of *rubato* faded gradually towards the end of the nineteenth century.

### **Articulation and Phrasing**

The articulations of the First edition are very similar to those in the Henle edition; the slurs of the first movement end prior to bar lines and those in the second movement end after the lines, and only two one-measure slurs are combined to make a two-measure slur

in the first movement. However, there are both staccato dots and strokes in the First edition, which may differ from Beethoven's intention. The slur endings in the Moscheles edition contradict those in the Henle edition in that they usually end after the bar lines in the first movement and stop before the lines in the second movement. Moreover, the editor combined some smaller slurs into bigger ones, and, similar to the First edition, both staccato strokes and dots are shown in this edition. The Czerny edition contains more combinations of small slurs. It also features more additional, ornamental slurs. Slurs usually end after the bar lines in the first movement but before the lines in the second movement, which is the same as the Moscheles edition. Moreover, it also has both staccato dots and strokes. The slur endings of the Liszt edition are the same as the Moscheles and Czerny editions. Liszt's slurs end after the bar lines in the first movement and before the lines in the second. There are additional slurs for the ornaments as well. However, Liszt only uses dots when labeling staccato notes.

Of all the selected samples, the Köhler edition was the first one to unify the slur endings in both first and second movements, all of which end after the bar lines. It is also the first edition to apply non-ornamental slurs to the notes. Furthermore, the editor connected smaller slurs into longer ones. As with Liszt, Köhler only used staccato dots throughout the piece. The Riemann edition presents slur endings in the same way as the Köhler edition. Moreover, it is the first sample to connect two slurs on the same note. There are also many additional slurs and "legato" signs in this edition. This shows that Riemann favored a more legato style playing than earlier editions called for. Besides slurs, Riemann applied various articulations to his edition of the "Moonlight" including staccato dots and strokes, tenutos, tenuto staccatos, and marcato staccatos.

Building upon the trend, Lebert and Bülow utilized tenutos, and ended the slurs in the first and second movements in the same way as Köhler and Riemann. This edition's utilization of additional slurs, "*sempre legatissimo*" signs, and connections of smaller slurs further demonstrates the trend of legato performance practice. While there are only dots labeling staccato notes, the editors gave noteworthy attention to the tenor part of the second movement by assigning staccatos to it.

The slurs within the Krebs edition are inconsistent and considerably few in number. Slurs in the first movement can be observed to end both before and after barlines. On the other hand, all the slurs of the second movement tend to end after bar lines. The Krebs edition also connects some small slurs into longer ones while breaking longer slurs into shorter ones. For staccatos, Krebs only applied dots in this edition.

To conclude, the majority of editors ended slurs after the bar lines, aligning with the performance practice of the era. With the exception of the Krebs edition, these editions illustrate the tendency to add and lengthen slurs to emphasize legato practice during the nineteenth century. Furthermore, in the case of marking staccatos, editors preferred using either only dots for all targeted notes or using both dots and strokes to differ the intended degrees of shortness and sharpness. Articulation significantly diversified after the 1860s as exemplified by Köhler's application of additional slurs for notes other than ornaments, Lebert and Bülow's added tenuto, and Riemann's inclusion of tenutos, tenutos staccatos, and marcato staccatos.

## Dynamic

The differences between the Henle edition and the selected editions from the first half of the century are minor: mostly displaced or omitted dynamics. The First edition is the closest to the Henle edition while additional dynamics began to emerge in the third movement of the Moscheles edition and the Czerny edition. Of these three editions, the Czerny edition presents the highest number of dynamic displacements. The Liszt edition does not depart much from the earlier editions. It erases or displaces some dynamics in the first two movements. Liszt's final movement is treated with an increase in additional dynamics. The Köhler edition is relatively loyal to Beethoven's intention. There is a negligible number of minor modifications and displacements, and no dynamics were added anywhere in the piece.

The Riemann edition represents an upsurge in editorial changes. Its additional dynamics are numerous and wide-ranging: accent, *le petit chapeau*, sforzando, pianoforte, hairpin, pianissimo, piano, meno piano, mezzo piano, mezzo forte, forte, crescendo and decrescendo. The dynamic range is also widened from pianissimo to forte in this edition. The Lebert and Bülow edition has many additional dynamics such as hairpin, pianissimo, piano, mezzo forte, accent, crescendo, decrescendo, subito p, and più crescendo. Most notable among these are the accents and hairpins. Above all, some editorial accents are on the weak metrical beats, which weaken the metrical hierarchy of the piece. Similar to Liszt and Riemann, Lebert and Bülow distinguished the function of hairpins from that of crescendos. As usual, Krebs's edition is closely aligned with Beethoven's original dynamic marks.

Beginning in the 1850s, editors began to distinguish between hairpin pairs and crescendo-decrescendo pairs, but up through the 1870s, general practice only permitted minor editorial additions to dynamics. However, the Riemann and Lebert and Bülow editions from the last quarter of the century demonstrate a flourishing growth of editorial changes. The diversity and quantity of additional dynamics bloomed vigorously, the dynamic range expanded, and more powerful accents were regularly used. Furthermore, these accents were applied outside of strong beats, weakening the metrical hierarchy.

### **Fingering**

Liszt's 1857 publication is the earliest of these selected editions to provide fingerings, but Köhler's 1869 edition greatly expanded upon Liszt's minimal fingerings. Varied fingerings featuring legato playing appear throughout the piece: octave legato, finger substitution, finger sliding, and finger crossing. Further, some fingerings in the second and third movements serve to facilitate other articulations. For instance, there are changing fingers on repeated notes to create a natural detachment and to alter the striking weight. Riemann continued Köhler's approach in his 1885 edition. Riemann applied legato fingerings such as octave legato, finger substitution, finger sliding and used different fingers playing the same note to vary articulations. His edition further promoted the usage of fingerings for musical purposes, such as using the thumb to show musical groupings, along with aiding in technical execution. The fingerings in the Lebert and Bülow edition also facilitate both musical effects and technical demands. However, their fingerings are fragmented which confuses some of their musical intentions. The last selected edition by Krebs stand in sharp contrasts due to its complete absence of

fingerings. In tracing the development and usage of applied fingerings during the nineteenth century, it becomes clear that trends were defined by the musical tastes of individual editors.

### **Ornamentation**

Between 1802 and 1857, there were realizations of tremolos only in the selected editions. It was not until the Riemann edition (1885) that editors began to modify the ornaments of the piece. Riemann changed some grace notes into arpeggiated chords, added an upper grace note before trill, and edited the cadenza passage of the third movement with editorial note-stems, rubato, musical groupings, and dynamics. Lebert and Bülow continued Riemann's editorial path in their 1896 edition, but the Krebs edition employed a different approach. It is obvious that editors from the last quarter of the nineteenth century made significant editorial changes to ornamentation. They sought to provide more information about the execution of their musical ideas. However, Riemann's editorial decision to begin his trills on the upper note upsets the sentiment that nineteenth century pianists would always start their trills on the main note.

### **Pedaling**

Most of the editions published before 1860s used "*senza sord*" and "*con sord*" to convey the application of damper pedal. As such, the pedalings found in these editions are almost identical to one another. Therefore, since there are no continuous pedal marks in these editions, it is not possible to classify any sort of preferences in pedaling technique.

Beginning in the 1860s, editions started to use "*ped*" to notate the damper pedal. In the Köhler edition, the pedalings are similar to earlier editions. By examining the pedaling in mm. 164-167 of the third movement, it can be argued that Köhler favored a detached pedaling. Although Riemann asked pianists to play with plenty of pedal use for the first movement of his 1885 edition, his labels for pedaling are actually quite infrequent. The only two notated pedalings are found in mm. 2 and 163-166 of the third movement. Although there is limited source of pedaling in this edition, the continuous pedalings in mm. 163-166 demonstrate that Riemann probably favored syncopated pedaling. The Lebert and Bülow edition is the only edition changing the verbal instruction "*semper pp senza sordino*" into "*Sempre pp con sordini*." This completely undermined Beethoven's original intention of holding the damper pedal down through the movement. Further, in their footnotes, the editors insisted that pianists should not take the original verbal instructions too literally, and they provided many additional pedaling in the first movement. The disconnected marks given by the editors show that they favored detached pedaling. Moreover, they gave a blurring effect in mm. 185-187 of the third movement by blending the chromatic scale with damper pedal. This is also the only edition to suggest the use of "*una corda*" pedal. Krebs's pedalings in his 1898 edition are antithetical to those in the Lebert and Bülow edition. Krebs's pedalings closely align with the Henle edition, but it also illustrates some late nineteenth century practices such as syncopated pedaling.

Based on the above findings, there is no solid evidence to prove that the use of the damper pedal increased throughout the nineteenth century. However, there are more instructions about the application of damper pedal towards the second half of the century.

It is also true that “*una corda*” pedal is rarely indicated. In addition, there are no instances which call for flutter-pedaling or half-pedaling in the selected samples. Moreover, there is no observable pattern in the usage of pedaling technique during this era; some editors favored detached pedaling while some preferred syncopated pedaling.

## CONCLUSION

Through examining the First editions and the selected nineteenth century editions edited by Moscheles, Czerny, Liszt, Köhler, Riemann, Lebert and Bülow, and Krebs, a gradual development of performance and editorial practices comes to light. Changes in articulations technically predate the practice of changing dynamics, but in the first half of the century, editorial changes in dynamics slowly developed with the earliest examples coming in the form of additional hairpins. In the second half of the century, some editors started to treat these hairpin pairs differently than crescendo-decrescendo pairs. Later, editors began utilizing instructions for pedaling and supplementary fingerings to more clearly express their musical intentions. The peak of editorial changes came in the mid 1890s, and a rich diversity of tempo, articulation, and dynamics interpretations can be found in editions from this period. However, Krebs presented an edition closer to Beethoven's intentions.

Along with the performance and editorial practices I have demonstrated, this study also shows the value of these nineteenth-century editions. A close examination of these publications can be as illuminating as an audio recording. While this research is limited to only a handful of editions, similar scholarship in the future should continue fleshing out the performance and editorial practices of this most fascinating and significant era for the piano.

## REFERENCES

- Alexander, Arthur. "Beethoven and the Piano (2)." *Music Teacher and Piano Student* 47 (Dec 1968): 11-12.
- Apel, Willi. *Masters of the Keyboard: A Brief Survey of Pianoforte Music*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1947.
- Atlas, Raphael. "Spelling in Early 19<sup>th</sup>-Century Piano Music: A Guide to Performance." *Journal of Musicological Research* 10 (1991): 199-237.
- Badura-Skoda, Eva, Robert Winter, and Bruce Carr, eds. "Performance Conventions in Beethoven's Early Works." *Beethoven, Performers, and Critics: The International Beethoven Congress, Detroit, 1977* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1980), 52-76.
- Badura-Skoda, Paul. "Was Beethoven Infallible?" *The Piano Quarterly* 21 (Fall 1973): 16-17.
- Bamberger, Jeanne. "The Musical Significance of Beethoven's Fingerings in the Piano Sonatas." *Music Forum* 4 (1976): 237-80.
- Barolsky, Daniel. "Romantic Piano Performance as Creation." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2005.
- Barth, George. "The Fortepianist as Orator: Beethoven and the Transformation of the Declamatory Style." DMA diss., Cornell University, 1988.
- Beechey, Gwilym. "Rhythmic Interpretation: Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert and Schumann." *The Music Review* 33 (Aug 1972): 233-48.
- Beethoven, Ludwig Van. *Sonata in C-sharp Minor, Op. 27, No.2*. Vienna: Gio. Cappi e Comp, 1802.
- Beethoven, Ludwig Van. *Sonata in C-sharp Minor, Op. 27, No.2*. Edited by Ignaz Moscheles. Hamburg: August Cranz, 1814.
- Beethoven, Ludwig Van. *Sonata in C-sharp Minor, Op. 27, No.2*. Edited by Carl Czerny. London: R. Cocks & Co, 1846.
- Beethoven, Ludwig Van. *Sonata in C-sharp Minor, Op. 27, No.2*. Edited by Franz Liszt. Wolfenbüttel: Ludwig Holle, 1857.
- Beethoven, Ludwig Van. *Sonata in C-sharp Minor, Op. 27, No.2*. Edited by Louis Köhler. Leipzig: C.F. Peters, 1869.

- Beethoven, Ludwig Van. *Sonata in C-sharp Minor, Op. 27, No.2*. Edited by Hugo Riemann. Berlin: Nikolaus Simrock, 1885.
- Beethoven, Ludwig Van. *Sonata in C-sharp Minor, Op. 27, No.2*. Edited by Sigmund Lebert and Hans von Bülow. New York: Schirmer, 1896.
- Beethoven, Ludwig Van. *Sonata in C-sharp Minor, Op. 27, No.2*. Edited by Carl Krebs. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1898.
- Beethoven, Ludwig Van. *Sonata in C-sharp Minor, Op. 27, No.2*. Edited by Hans Schmidt-Görg and Joseph Schmidt Görg. New York: Henle, 1976.
- Bergquist, Stephen. "Some Portraits of Beethoven and His Contemporaries." *Music in Art*, Vol. 37, No. 1/2 (Spring/Fall 2012): 207-231.
- Bie, Oskar, and Ernest Kellelt and Edward Naylor trans. *A History of the Pianoforte and Pianoforte Players*. London: J. M. Dent & Company, 1899.
- Bilson, Malcolm. "Beethoven and the Piano." *Clavier* 22 (Oct. 1983): 18-21.
- Bilson, Malcolm. *The Emergence of the Fantasy-Style in the Beethoven Piano Sonatas of the Early and Middle Periods*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1968.
- Brown, Clive. "Rediscovering the Language of Classical and Romantic Performance." *Early Music* 41, no. 1 (February 2013): 72–74. <https://doi-org.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/10.1093/em/cat004>.
- Brown, Clive. *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Clark, James. "Celebrating Music: Wilhelm Furtwängler, Edwin Fischer, Wilhelm Kempff and the German Romantic Performance Tradition." PhD diss., University of Connecticut, 2005.
- Cooke, James. *Great Pianists on Piano Playing: Study Talks with Foremost Virtuosos*. Philadelphia: Theo Presser Co., 1971.
- Crowder, Louis. "Beethoven and the Editors." *Clavier* 5 (Jan/Feb 1966): 22-26.
- Czerny, Carl, and Paul Badura-Skoda ed. *On the Proper Performance of All Beethoven's Works for the Piano: Czerny's Reminiscences of Beethoven and Chapter II and III from Volume IV of the Complete Theoretical and Practice Piano Forte School Op. 500*. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1970.
- Da Costa, Neal Peres. "Performing Practices in Late-nineteenth-century Piano Playing: Implications of the Relationship between Written Texts and Early Recordings." PhD diss., University of Leeds, 2001.

- Dexter, Benning, and Charles Timbrell. "Another Look at Editions: The Piano Works of Twelve Important Composers." *The Piano Quarterly* 30 (Winter 1981-82): 39-41.
- Dogantan-Dack, Mine. "Phrasing—the Very Life of Music: Performing the Music and Nineteenth-Century Performance Theory." *Nineteenth Century Music Review* 9, no. 1 (June 2012): 7-30. <https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/docview/1317916012/fulltext/7572D65C0DB34D1CPQ/1?accountid=4485>.
- Donaldson, Bryna. "Beethoven's *Moonlight Fantasy*." *American Music Teacher* 20 (Feb/Mar 1971): 32.
- Drabkin, William. "The Beethoven Sonatas." *The Musical Times* 126 (Apr 1985): 216-20.
- Drake, Kenneth. "A Study of the Beethoven Piano Sonatas in the Light of Evidence Provided by Beethoven's Pupils." DMA diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1970.
- Drake, Kenneth. "The Voice of a Contemporary." *Clavier* 2 (Nov/Dec 1963): 10-12.
- Drake, Kenneth, and Frank Stillings ed. *The Sonatas of Beethoven: As He Played and Taught Them*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1981.
- Elder, Dean. "The Piano Sonatas: Performance Insight-As told to Dean Elder by Claudio Arrau." *Clavier* 9 (Jan 1970): 18-23.
- Elder, Dean. "Serkin: As Interviewed by Dean Elder." *Clavier* 9 (Nov 1970): 8-15.
- Fischer, Irwin. "A Note in Op. 27, No. 2." *Music & Letters* 32 (Jan 1951): 45-46.
- Friskin, James, and Irwin Freundlich. "Ludwig van Beethoven (1770-1827)." Part II in *Music for Piano: A Handbook of Concert and Teaching Material from 1580 to 1952*. New York: Dover, 1973.
- Gechter, Friedrich. "Execution or Interpretation? A Study of Interpretive Approaches Through Selected Editions and Recordings of Beethoven's Sonata, Opus 109." DMA diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2001.
- Hamilton, David. "A Comparison of Music Editions: Beethoven Scores." *Musical Newsletter* 1 (Apr 1971): 16-19.
- Hamilton, Kenneth. *After the Golden Age: Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Hirsh, Paul, and C. B. Oldman. "Contemporary English Editions of Beethoven." *The Music Review* 14 (Feb 1953): 1-35.

- Jahn, Otto. "Beethoven and the Various Editions of His Works: Beethoven's Works in the Edition Published by Breitkopf and Härtel." *The Musical World* 43, No. 14 (Apr 1865): 205-206.
- Jones, Timothy. *Beethoven: The 'Moonlight' and other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Joseph, Deanna. "Nineteenth-Century Performance Practice: Reassessing Tradition and Revitalizing Interpretation." *Choral Journal* 54, no. 9 (2014): 18-31.  
[https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1060&context=music\\_facpub](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1060&context=music_facpub).
- Kim, David. "The Brahmsian Hairpin." *19<sup>th</sup>-Century Music* 36, No. 1 (Summer, 2012): 46-57.
- Kochevitsky, George. "Controversial Pedaling in Beethoven's Piano Sonatas." *The Piano Quarterly*, No. 40 (Summer 1962): 24-28.
- Lenz, Wilhelm, and Philip Reder, ed. and trans. *The Great Piano Virtuosos of Our Time*. London: Regency Press, 1971.
- Letnanova, Elena. *Piano Interpretation in the Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries: A Study of Theory and Practice Using Original Documents*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 1991.
- Lipinski, Igor. "From Liszt to Victor Borge: A Legacy of Unique Piano Performances." DMA lecture recital, Northwestern University, 2015.
- Longyear, Rey. *Nineteenth-century Romanticism in Music*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1988.
- Melville, Derek, Denis Arnold, and Nigel Fortune eds. "Beethoven's Pianos." Chap. II in *The Beethoven Reader*, edited by Denis Arnold, and Nigel Fortune. New York: Norton, 1971.
- Meller, Mischa. "Some Critical Comments on Modern Editions of the Piano Classics." *American Music Teacher* 4 (Sept/Oct 1954): 25.
- Miller-Kay, Elissa. "Moonlight Reflections: A Performance History of the First Movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata Quasi Una Fantasia, Op. 27 No. 2." *Proceedings of the Princess Galyani Vadhana International Symposium* 3 (2016): 33-42.
- Miller-Kay, Elissa. "The Virtuosity of Interpretation: The Performance History of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas in London, 1800-1880." Phd diss., New York University, 2016.

- Newman, William. "A Chronological Checklist of Collected Editions of Beethoven's Solo Piano Sonatas Since His Own Day." *Notes* 33 (Mar 1977): 503-530.
- Newman, William. "Liszt's Interpreting of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas." *The Musical Quarterly* 58 (Apr 1972): 185-209.
- Newman, William. *Performance Practices in Beethoven's Piano Sonata: An Introduction*. New York: Norton, 1971.
- Noorduyn, Marten. "Re-examining Czerny's and Moscheles's Metronome Marks for Beethoven's Piano Sonatas." *Nineteenth-Century Music Review* Vol. 15, No. 2 (August 2018): 209-235. <https://doi-org.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/10.1017/S1479409817000027>.
- Qu, Miaoyin. "Piano Playing in the German Tradition, 1840-1900: Rediscovering the Unnotated Conventions of Performance." PhD diss., University of Leeds, 2015.
- Rosenblum, Sandra. "Two Sets of Unexplored Metronome Marks for Beethoven's Piano Sonatas." *Early Music* 16 (Feb 1988): 58-71.
- Rowland, David. *A History of Pianoforte Pedaling*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Schonberg, Harold. "String-Snapper, Hands, on High." Chap. V in *The Great Pianists*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963.
- Schonberg, Harold. *The Virtuosi: Classical Music's Legendary Performers from Paganini to Pavarotti*. New York: Vintage, 1985.
- Soderlund, Sandra. *How Did They Play? How Did They Teach?: A History of Keyboard Technique*. Chapel Hill: Hinshaw Music, 2006.
- Star, Allison. "Crosscurrents of Performance Practice in Early Nineteenth-century Editions of Beethoven's Piano Sonata in E Major, Opus 109." in *Musicological Explorations* (Spring 2004): 41-59.
- Steinberg, Arne. "Liszt's Playing of the *Moonlight Sonata*." *The Piano Quarterly* 37 (Winter 1988-89): 52-57.
- Stowell, Robin, ed. *Performing Beethoven*. Cambridge Studies in Performance Practice 4. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Stuart, Kathryn. "Marks of Emphasis in Beethoven Piano Sonatas." DMA diss., Cornell University, 1996.
- Sumner, William. "Beethoven and the Pianoforte." *Music Teacher and Piano Student* 49 (Sept 1970): 9-10.

- Sumner, William. "Beethoven and the Pianoforte (2)." *Music Teacher and Piano Student* 49 (Sept 1970): 17-18.
- Taylor, Kendall. "Beethoven Editions, and the "Tempest" Sonata." DMA diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, 2014.
- Tollefson, Arthur. "Solving Interpretive Dilemmas." *Clavier* 17 (Feb 1978): 17-19.
- Tyson, Alan, and Kurt Dorfmueller ed. "The Authentic Editions of Beethoven Published in Great Britain." In *Beiträge zur Beethoven-Bibliographie: Studien und Materialien zum Werkverzeichnis von Kinsky-Halm*. Munich: G. Henle, 1978.
- Weitzmann, Carl. *A History of Pianoforte-playing and Pianoforte-literature*. New York: G. Schumer, 1897.
- Willetts, Pamela. *Beethoven and England: An Account of Sources in the British Museum*. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1970.
- Winter, Robert. "Orthodoxies, Paradoxes, and Contradictions: Performance Practices in Nineteenth-century Piano Music." In *Nineteenth-Century Piano Music, Second Edition*, 16-54. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Winter, Robert. "Performing Nineteenth-Century Music on Nineteenth-Century Instruments." *Nineteenth-Century Music* 1, No. 2 (Nov 1977): 163-75.
- Woolley, Andrew, and John Kitchen. *Interpreting Historical Keyboard Music: Sources, Contexts and Performance*. Ashgate Historical Keyboard Series. Burlington: Ashgate, 2013.
- Wu, Wan-Hsuan. "Beethoven Through Liszt: Myth, Performance, Edition." DMA diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2007.
- Zimbars, Richard. "Hans von Bülow Explores Beethoven's Piano Music." *The Piano Quarterly* 32 (Spring 1984): 59-63.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

King Yue Li was born in Hong Kong on April 20, 1990. He received his master's degree in piano performance at Temple University. In August 2017, he continued his Doctorate degree with Baruch Meir at the Arizona State University. He has performed extensively in Belgium, Germany, Hong Kong, Russia, Spain and the United States. Beyond performance, he also holds an education degree and a licentiate of music theory.