

Re-examining Czerny's and Moscheles's Metronome Marks for Beethoven's Piano Sonatas

Marten Noorduin
University of Manchester
marten.noorduin@manchester.ac.uk

Shortly after Beethoven's death, several of his closest associates provided performance indications for editions of his works. Previous discussions of Carl Czerny's and Ignaz Moscheles's metronome marks for Beethoven's piano sonatas have highlighted the importance of these indications for our understanding of the intended performance practice of these works. Nevertheless, the provenance and meaning of these metronome marks have remained unclear, which has led to some confusion in the literature.

By presenting new evidence, including the discovery of what are most likely the metronome marks intended for the missing sonatas from the first 'complete' edition by Tobias Haslinger, the article presents a more complete overview of the indications in these editions, as well as their chronology. In addition, it also discusses to what degree the editors seem to have influenced each other, which indications are most likely representative of Beethoven's intended speeds, as well as why the metronome fell out of favour later in the nineteenth century. Finally, it discusses the meaning of these metronome marks for modern performers, and how these editions give options to disentangle the author from the text.

It is difficult to overestimate the position that Beethoven's piano sonatas occupy in the western performance tradition: at a stock taking in 1977 no less than 131 editions were counted,¹ and dozens more appear to have been published since, probably making these sonatas the most often published pieces in history. Many of the earliest editions of these works contain metronome marks by Carl Czerny and Ignaz Moscheles, which can be found in the Table in the Appendix. Czerny's marks have received the most attention, and are included in amongst others Barry Cooper's edition of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas as a rough guide to the intended tempos.² Nevertheless, the exact relationships between the two editors, their editions and Beethoven's intentions remain unclear. This article will discuss to what extent Czerny's and Moscheles's metronome marks are likely to reflect Beethoven's intentions, focusing on the merits of the individual editions.

The importance that Beethoven ascribed to the notion of a 'correct' speed is well known: he was among the first composers to embrace publicly the chronometer,

¹ William S. Newman, 'A Chronological Checklist of Collected Editions of Beethoven's Solo Piano Sonatas Since His Own Day', *Notes* 33/3 (1977): 503–50.

² Barry Cooper, ed., *The 35 Piano Sonatas* 3 volumes (London: The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music, 2007). Czerny's metronome marks in this edition are provided with commentary or interpretation, and a number of anomalous markings have been excluded.

an early version of the metronome.³ He also defended the metronome in correspondence, such as in the famous letter to Mosel from November 1817:

As for me, I have long been thinking of abandoning those absurd descriptive terms, Allegro, Andante, Adagio, Presto; and Maelzel's metronome affords us the best opportunity of doing so. ... I do not doubt that we shall be howled down as *tyrants*. If only the cause itself were thus served, it would still be better than to be accused of feudalism.⁴

Beethoven never makes his definition of this musical feudalism explicit, but it presumably refers to the system under which the musical world operated until the invention of the metronome. Much like medieval feudalism, its musical counterpart consisted of different (but in this case often overlapping) groups: the composers who wrote the music, teachers who taught music, and performers who performed it. The communication between these groups depended in part on words that indicate tempo, which Beethoven described elsewhere in the above letter as 'stemming from the age of musical barbarism'.⁵ Different teachers and performers had contrasting definitions of these words,⁶ which presumably caused them to choose different tempi than the composer had in mind, something of which Beethoven disapproved.⁷

Beethoven's proposed solution was to ensure the widest possible dissemination of the metronome, to the extent that 'every village school master [would] encourage the use of the metronome'.⁸ In this state of 'tyranny', the composer's metronome marks are a much more reliable source of the intended tempo, and by the end of his life, Beethoven had produced metronome marks for the nine Symphonies, the first 11 String Quartets, and many other works.⁹ Furthermore, eyewitness accounts confirm that at least some of the early performances of the symphonies were played at a speed close to the metronome marks.¹⁰ Finally, there is also evidence from Beethoven's correspondence that he intended to provide metronome marks for almost every work written after 1818,¹¹ and that tempo considerations seem to have occupied his mind until the end of his life.¹²

Several scholars have since argued that these marks provide valuable information about how Beethoven thought his works should be performed, in spite of

³ Anon, 'Mälzel's Chronometer', *Wiener allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 1/41 (13 October 1813): 626–8.

⁴ Sieghard Brandenburg, ed., *Ludwig van Beethoven Briefwechsel Gesamtausgabe* (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1996): vol. 4, 130–31: Letter 1196. All translations are my own, unless indicated otherwise.

⁵ *Briefwechsel*, vol. 4, 130: Letter 1196.

⁶ See Clive Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performance Practice 1750–1900* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999): 340–44 and 368.

⁷ See for instance *Briefwechsel*, vol. 2, 275: Letter 586.

⁸ *Briefwechsel*, vol. 4, 131: Letter 1196.

⁹ Opp. 20, 106, 112, 121b, 137 and WoO 104, 148, 149, 150 also contain metronome marks.

¹⁰ Louis Spohr, 'Das Schreiben des Hrn. Schindler', *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 13/45 (2 December 1840): 180.

¹¹ This includes the *Missa solemnis* (*Briefwechsel*, vol. 6, Letter 2244), the Piano Sonatas opp. 109, 110 and 111 (vol. 4, Letter 1476), the String Quartet op. 127 (vol. 6, Letter 2110), and various other works.

¹² See for instance Letter 2244 to Schott from December 1826.

some printing errors and incorrect transmissions.¹³ In addition, many observed that in providing metronome marks Beethoven appears to have been guided by certain underlying principles: movements with similar note values, tempo indications, and metres often have similar metronome marks by the composer, regardless of their instrumentation.¹⁴ These comparisons, as well as corroborating evidence from the conversation books,¹⁵ have led scholars to believe that Beethoven set these speeds either at the piano or in his head.¹⁶ Beethoven provided only one piano sonata with metronome marks: the 'Hammerklavier' Sonata op. 106, of which the ♩ = 138 of the first movement has caused considerable controversy.¹⁷

The editorial metronome marks by Czerny and Moscheles for the remainder of the sonatas have also attracted scholarly attention. Sandra Rosenblum discussed the speeds in Czerny's first four editions in her 1988 article 'Two Sets of Unexplored Metronome Marks for Beethoven's Piano Sonatas',¹⁸ in which she makes several claims. Firstly, she argues that 'a comparison of [Beethoven's] suggestions with other contemporary information – including metronome marks by Moscheles and Beethoven's own indications for other works – seems to demonstrate that on the whole, Czerny's indications are a fair representation'.¹⁹ This point is further elaborated in her book of the same year *Performance Practices in Classic Piano Music: their Principles and Applications*, which suggests that there are three editions of Beethoven's piano sonatas edited by Moscheles, two of which are mentioned explicitly.²⁰ Secondly, she claimed that 'we may never know much more about the rationale for the changes in [Czerny's] sets of metronome marks'. Thirdly, according to Rosenblum, either the first or last editions contain the most

¹³ See for instance Clive Brown, 'Historical Performance, Metronome Marks and Tempo in Beethoven's Symphonies', *Early Music* 19/2 (1991): 247–58.

¹⁴ Compare for instance the Adagios from the Septet op. 20 and the String Quartet op. 18 no. 2 (both ♩ = 72), and the Scherzo third movements of the String Quartet op. 18 no. 3 and the Symphony op. 36 (both ♩ = 100).

¹⁵ Dagmar Beck et al., ed., *Ludwig van Beethovens Konversationshefte* (Leipzig: Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1993): vol. 10, 244.

¹⁶ Peter Stadlen, 'Beethoven and the Metronome [i]', *Music & Letters* 48/4 (1967): 332; and Brown, 'Historical Performance', 249.

¹⁷ Donald Tovey and Hans von Bülow have criticized this speed as 'impossible' and 'so little [agreeing] with the ponderous energy of the theme', respectively. On the other hand, Czerny, who studied the sonata with and performed it to Beethoven, while acknowledging that the speed is 'unusually quick', simply recommends 'attentive practice'. Furthermore, Charles Rosen has also stated that 'the notorious 138 to the half note of the Allegro of op. 106 is in fact a perfectly normal Mozart Allegro; the stumbling block comes above all from the fact that Beethoven is both more difficult to play and more complex to hear than Mozart'. See Donald Tovey, ed., *Beethoven Sonatas for Pianoforte* (London: The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music, 1931): vol. 3, 136; Hans von Bülow ed., 'Sonate für das Pianoforte (Grosse Sonate für das Hammer-Klavier) von L. von Beethoven', tr. John Henry Cornell, in *Sonaten und andere Werke* (New York: Edward Schuberth & Co., 1891): vol. 5, 23; Carl Czerny, *On the Proper Performance of All Beethoven's Works for the Piano*, ed. Paul Badura-Skoda (Vienna: Universal, 1970): 16 and 54; Charles Rosen, *Beethoven's Piano Sonatas: A Short Companion* (London: Yale University Press, 2002): 46.

¹⁸ Sandra P. Rosenblum, 'Two Sets of Unexplored Metronome Marks for Beethoven's Piano Sonatas', *Early Music* 16/1 (1988): 58–71.

¹⁹ Rosenblum, 'Two Sets', 59.

²⁰ Sandra P. Rosenblum, *Performance Practices in Classic Piano Music: Their Principles and Applications* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988): 330.

reliable indication regarding Beethoven's own tempi: the former because it is closest in time to Beethoven, the latter because it represents 'Czerny's considered opinion'.²¹

Rosenblum's title notwithstanding, Czerny's metronome marks had been discussed five years earlier in an article by Herbert Seifert,²² who refers to five editions by Czerny and eight by Moscheles, all of which can be found in the Appendix to this article, along with some additions that will be discussed later. Seifert's article is primarily expository in nature, reporting not only the metronome marks for all the piano sonatas, but also those for chamber music, concertos and various other works that appear in Czerny's or Moscheles's editions. Seifert's primary conclusion, based on simple statistical analysis of the metronome marks, is that Moscheles and Czerny must have influenced each other to a certain degree,²³ but he does not discuss the respective merits of their contributions.

Several other authors have also touched on either Czerny's or Moscheles's metronome marks in their editions of Beethoven. Alan Tyson's article 'Moscheles and his "Complete Edition" of Beethoven' focuses on Moscheles's Cramer edition, and points out various inaccuracies in Moscheles's editing of the sonatas.²⁴ George Barth's book, *The Pianist as Orator*, and his subsequent article, 'Carl Czerny and Musical Authority', primarily focus on Czerny's pedagogical publications, his *Complete Theoretical and Practical Piano Forte School* – specifically *On the Proper Performance of Beethoven's Works for the Piano* – and his *School of Practical Composition*.²⁵ Barth concludes that despite Czerny's intimate knowledge of Beethoven's works, the performance instructions provided in these treatises contradict the evidence from Beethoven's own time in many cases. This leads Barth to conclude that Czerny's metronome marks do not represent Beethoven's sound, way of playing, or even the score – as these are all things that Czerny changes – but that it is the 'conception', the 'spirit of the work', that Czerny seeks to communicate.

The claim that Czerny's and Moscheles's metronome marks for Beethoven's piano sonatas are comparable to the composer's speeds for similar movements needs to be examined in greater detail. This comparison is often difficult, as there are few obvious similarities between piano sonata movements on the one hand and other works with metronome marks by Beethoven on the other. Among the few movements which are similar, there are some that seem to support Rosenblum's claim: for instance, the third movement of the Eighth Symphony (*Tempo di Menuetto*, ♩=126) is indeed similar in speed to Czerny's and Moscheles's metronome marks for the Menuetto of op. 22 ♩=120–126 and ♩=126–132, respectively).²⁶

²¹ Rosenblum, 'Two Sets', 66.

²² Herbert Seifert, 'Czernys und Moscheles' Metronomisierungen von Beethovens Werken für Klavier', *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft*, 34 (1983): 61–83.

²³ Seifert, 'Czernys und Moscheles' Metronomisierungen', 83.

²⁴ Alan Tyson, 'Moscheles and his "Complete Edition" of Beethoven', *The Music Review* 25/2 (1964): 136–41.

²⁵ George Barth, *The Pianist as Orator: Beethoven and the Transformation of Keyboard Style* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992) and 'Carl Czerny and Musical Authority: Locating the "Primary Vessel" of the Musical Tradition', in *Beyond "The Art of Finger Dexterity": Reassessing Carl Czerny*, ed. David Gramit (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2008): 125–38.

²⁶ For more on the intended speeds of minuets, see Chapters 4 and 5 in Marten Noorduyn, *Beethoven's Tempo Indications* (PhD dissertation, University of Manchester, 2016).

However, there are also cases in which Czerny's and Moscheles's marks are quite different from those by Beethoven. A good example is Rosenblum's own comparison of Czerny's marks for the *Adagio con molta espressione* of op. 22, on the one hand, with the *Adagio affettuoso ed Appassionato* ($\text{♩} = 138$) from the String Quartet op. 18 no. 1 and the *Adagio cantabile* from the Septet op. 20 ($\text{♩} = 132$), on the other – three $\frac{3}{4}$ movements with very similar figurations, range of note values, and tempo indications. She concludes that Czerny's marks ($\text{♩} = 100\text{--}116$) are 'significantly slower than Beethoven's for the two comparable movements',²⁷ but misses the fact that one of Moscheles's speeds ($\text{♩} = 132$) is in the same range.

As there are relatively few movements that can be compared directly, it may be better to see if Czerny's and Moscheles's metronome marks have been guided by the same principles as Beethoven's. Several scholars have in fact published metronome marks for the piano sonatas based on Beethoven's marks in other genres, and comparing these to Czerny's and Moscheles's seems to be a fair test of Rosenblum's claim that their similarity is an argument for their trustworthiness. The best known of these is Rudolf Kolisch,²⁸ who published metronome marks for almost all of Beethoven's works with opus numbers based on what he perceived to be the character of that particular piece, which according to him 'manifests itself in musical configuration'.²⁹ Although Kolisch never defines 'musical configuration', in practice, he groups together works with similar note values, metres and tempo indications.

Kolisch's suggestions, however, are often nowhere near those of Czerny and Moscheles: for the opening *Allegro* of op. 2 no. 1, Kolisch suggests $\text{♩} = 152\text{--}176$, while Czerny's and Moscheles's metronome marks indicate a speed of $\text{♩} = 104\text{--}120$. Conversely, the first movement of op. 2 no. 2 is given $\text{♩} = 96$ by Kolisch,³⁰ while Czerny's marks are $\text{♩} = 126\text{--}138$, with Moscheles recommending a wider range of $\text{♩} = 112\text{--}144$. Furthermore, the first movement of op. 53, a work which Czerny claims he played to Beethoven,³¹ is given $\text{♩} = 88$ by both editors, while Kolisch's movements that have a similar 'musical configuration' are marked $\text{♩} = 100\text{--}112$.³²

So although some metronome marks by Czerny and Moscheles are indeed close to Beethoven's speeds for comparable movements, these similarities are not frequent and consistent enough to support the claim that these editorial metronome marks are a fair representation of Beethoven's intentions generally. The reasons behind these similarities – whether they occurred by chance or whether they were the result of either editor remembering Beethoven's instructions or performance – also remain unclear, as do the reasons for the changes in

²⁷ Rosenblum, 'Two Sets', 64.

²⁸ Rudolf Kolisch, 'Tempo and Character in Beethoven's Music', trans. Arthur Mendel, *The Musical Quarterly* 29/2–3 (1943): 169–87 and 291–312. Another approach, by Yakov Gelfand, 'On Tempo Indications: Based on Beethoven's Music', *College Music Symposium* 25 (1985): 92–129, has similar results in certain cases, but also relies implicitly on Czerny's metronome marks (see the footnotes on pages 95 and 112) and is therefore not appropriate to use in this context.

²⁹ Kolisch, 'Tempo and Character', 183.

³⁰ Kolisch, 'Tempo and Character', 291.

³¹ Czerny, *On the Proper Performance*, 5.

³² Kolisch, 'Tempo and Character', 293. Presumably to accommodate this movement, Kolisch widens the lower end of the range to $\text{♩} = 92$, without reference to any mark by Beethoven.

subsequent editions. This of course does not mean that Czerny's and Moscheles's editions cannot represent Beethoven's intended tempos, but it does indicate that the evidence used to support that claim is more problematic than previously thought. The following sections will re-evaluate this evidence, contextualized by a discussion of the publications in which Czerny's and Moscheles's metronome marks can be found.

Czerny's Marks

As Otto Erich Deutsch documented in 1930,³³ Beethoven suggested the idea of a complete edition of his works as early as 1810.³⁴ Only in 1828, however, after Beethoven's death, did Tobias Haslinger manage to begin publication of said edition, starting with the piano sonatas.³⁵ The announcement for this 'complete' edition states that metronome marks and corrections were supplied by Carl Czerny, Ignaz Schuppanzigh and Carl Holz.³⁶ Since the last two were violinists, it seems very likely that it was Czerny who prepared the metronome marks for the piano sonatas. Unfortunately, as Haslinger was unable to obtain the rights to opp. 2, 7 and 106, which were held by Artaria,³⁷ the edition never included all piano sonatas.

Haslinger's edition exists in two imprints, each of which contains a different set of metronome marks.³⁸ Establishing when these sets were published, however, has proven difficult. William Newman suggested 1832/3 as the date the first imprint was completed,³⁹ but Rosenblum considers it also possible that the first 22 sonatas were not published until 1837, as these are the only ones to appear in a review in Haslinger's own periodical, *Allgemeiner musikalischer Anzeiger*.⁴⁰

The earliest information indicating a publication date is from a subscription announcement in Haslinger's publication catalogue from December 1828, which announces that 'from the first series, which contains the sonatas for solo piano, already eight have been published'.⁴¹ On 12 January 1831, the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* reported that 14 sonatas had been published, including WoO 47, opp. 13, 26, 27 no. 1 and 31 no. 2.⁴² The entire set (except opp. 2, 7 and 106, which were not included for reasons stated above) is listed in the *Handbuch der musikalischen Literatur* of 1834 as issued between January 1829 and the end of 1833,⁴³ which suggests that the first imprint containing all 30 sonatas was published by

³³ Otto Erich Deutsch, 'Beethovens gesammelte Werke. Des Meisters Plan und Haslingers Ausgabe', *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 13/2 (1930): 60–79.

³⁴ Brandenburg, *Briefwechsel*, vol. 2, 150: Letter 465.

³⁵ Deutsch, 'Beethovens gesammelte Werke', 66–7.

³⁶ Deutsch, 'Beethovens gesammelte Werke', 66.

³⁷ Deutsch, 'Beethovens gesammelte Werke', 68–9.

³⁸ Rosenblum, 'Two Sets', 61.

³⁹ Newman, 'A Chronological Checklist', 510.

⁴⁰ Anon., 'Sonaten von Ludwig van Beethoven, für Pianoforte ohne Begeleitung ...' *Allgemeiner musikalischer Anzeiger* 9/8–11 and 13 (1837): 30–31, 37–8, 41–2, 49–51.

⁴¹ Deutsch, 'Beethovens gesammelte Werke', 66.

⁴² Anon., 'L. v. Beethoven's sämtliche Werke', *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 33/2 (12 January 1831): 30–31.

⁴³ Anton Hofmeister, ed., 'Sonaten und andere Stücke in deren Form (arrangirte Concerte, Sinfonien etc.) für das Pianoforte allein', *Handbuch der musikalischen Literatur* 2 (1834): 129.

that time. It therefore seems likely that the second imprint was published between 1833 and Haslinger's death in 1842, after which the editions were published under Carl Haslinger's name.⁴⁴ The review of 22 sonatas in Haslinger's periodical could therefore be referring to the second imprint only. As Rosenblum observed, out of the four sets of metronome marks she discussed, the one in Haslinger's first edition has the fastest speeds for most of the movements, while the second set suggests slower tempi for almost all of these.⁴⁵ Whether these changes were made by Czerny or by another editor is unknown, but it is conceivable that they were influenced by the reception of some of Czerny's own compositions with similarly fast metronome marks, which was sometimes critical of his tendency to recommend overly fast speeds.⁴⁶

The next set of metronome marks is certainly by Czerny, and is found in the fourth volume (1846) of his *Complete Theoretical and Practical Piano Forte School*, op. 500, published in 1846, of which two chapters on Beethoven's works for piano were later independently published as *On the Proper Performance of all Beethoven's Works for the Piano*. The first chapter discusses the works for solo piano, and the second covers works that also include one or more other instruments; both chapters include metronome marks for most works.⁴⁷ Czerny's final metronome marks were published in an edition by Simrock in Bonn, which William S. Newman dated as follows: 'Opp. 2–57 ... except 22 and 54, were published in 1856; all remaining sonatas through Op. 101 in 1862, and the last 4 in 1868'.⁴⁸ Since Czerny died in 1857, the last two sets were published posthumously. Nevertheless, Newman, Rosenblum and Seifert do not doubt that these metronome marks are really by Czerny's, and they seem to assume that Czerny had written down all of the metronome marks before his death. This claim will be further explored later in this article.

Shortly after Czerny's death, Robert Cocks in London – who also published the English editions of Czerny's *Piano School* and various other works composed or edited by Czerny – published an edition of all of Beethoven's piano sonatas except the three WoO 47 Sonatas and op. 106,⁴⁹ which has not been discussed in the literature. The title page claims that the editing was done by Czerny, but his input seems to have been limited to supplying the metronome marks, most of which are identical to those in the first Haslinger edition. Exceptions to this are opp. 31 no. 3, 101, 109 and 111, which are found in the second Haslinger, and opp. 2 and 7, for which this edition provides speeds that are all fairly similar to those found in the Simrock edition, except that some of them are on the fast side, much like several speeds in the first Haslinger. A particularly good example is the ♩ = 120 for the first movement of op. 2 no. 1. A possible explanation for this could be that Cocks obtained the metronome marks that were initially intended for the first Haslinger

⁴⁴ Alexander Weinmann, 'Haslinger', in *Grove Music Online*. *Oxford Music Online*, www.grovemusic.com (accessed June 5, 2014).

⁴⁵ Rosenblum, 'Two Sets', 61–2.

⁴⁶ See Marten Noorduyn, 'Czerny's "Impossible" Metronome Marks', *The Musical Times* 154 (2013): 19–46, here 32.

⁴⁷ Czerny, *On the Proper Performance*.

⁴⁸ Newman, 'A Chronological Checklist', 511.

⁴⁹ Carl Czerny, ed., *Beethoven's Masterpieces, Being the Entire of his Grand Sonatas for the Piano Forte*, 5 volumes (London: R. Cocks and Co., c. 1858–59). The edition, which also includes the Fantasy op. 77, was advertised in *Leader. A Political, Literary, and Commercial Weekly Newspaper*, and *Record* 10/461 (22 January 1859): 127.

edition, which included the hitherto unpublished speeds for opp. 2 and 7. As such, the metronome marks for these sonatas found in the Cock's edition have been included in the Appendix in the same column as the first Haslinger edition.

Around 1863, Tobias Haslinger's son Carl started publishing another series of Beethoven's piano sonatas.⁵⁰ As this edition is entirely posthumous, it seems unlikely that the metronome marks in this edition were based on a re-evaluation by Czerny himself. Furthermore, all of the speeds in this edition are identical to the last edition that Tobias Haslinger published, with the exception of the last three movements of op. 26, which take their metronome marks from *On the Proper Performance*.

In summary, there are five different sets of metronome marks published under Czerny's name. There seems to be little doubt that those in the first Haslinger edition and *On the Proper Performance* were made by Czerny alone, but due to the differences between the first and second set by Haslinger, the degree of Czerny's involvement in the latter is open to question. Also, the speeds intended for the first Haslinger seem to have formed the basis for a posthumous edition in London by Czerny's long-time English publisher Cocks. Although there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of Czerny's metronome marks in the first part of the Simrock edition, the posthumously published sonatas need further investigation. Finally, Carl Haslinger's edition contains only speeds copied from earlier editions.

Moscheles's Marks

There were at least eight different editions of Beethoven's piano sonatas published in Moscheles's lifetime that contained the latter's metronome marks. The first edition that included all piano sonatas (with the exception of the three WoO 47 works, for which Moscheles never supplied metronome marks) was published by Cramer in London between 1834 and 1838/9.⁵¹ Soon after that, between 1839 and 1844, Johann Peter Spehr published a selection of five sonatas in Braunschweig, which contains the same metronome marks as the Cramer edition.⁵²

According to Newman, there were two more publishers around this time who used Moscheles's metronome marks in their editions of Beethoven's piano sonatas: August Cranz in Hamburg, and Gottfried Meyer Jr. in Braunschweig. In both cases the sonatas were published separately, and with the exception of 'opp. 13, 22, and 26, [Meyer's issues] seem to have run exactly parallel to those of Cranz in Hamburg ..., suggesting a close relationship'.⁵³ Cranz, who published opp. 2 through 90, included metronome marks for at least opp. 10 no. 2, 26, 27 no. 2, 28, 49 no. 1, 54, 57 and 90, which Seifert was able to find and document. In addition to those, it seems likely that opp. 7, 13, 27 no. 1, 53 and 79 were also published with metronome marks, as they are announced as such in Adolph Hofmeister's *Musikalisch-literarischer Monatsbericht* as published in 1838,⁵⁴ with op. 79 being

⁵⁰ Anon., 'Verlag von Carl Haslinger in Wien ...', *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 1/20 (13 May 1863): 348.

⁵¹ Newman, 'A Chronological Checklist', 510–11.

⁵² Newman does not mention this edition. The dates come from Seifert, who presumably found them in J.P. Spehr, *Musikalien-Verlags-Catalog von J. P. Spehr in Braunschweig bis Ostern 1849* (Braunschweig, 1849).

⁵³ Newman, 'A Chronological Checklist', 510.

⁵⁴ Adolph Hofmeister, ed., *Musikalisch-literarischer Monatsbericht* 5/1, 2, 4, 5, 8–9, 12 (1838): 5, 21, 54, 69, 118, 181, respectively.

announced in August 1841.⁵⁵ All of the sonatas published by Cranz that Seifert found have metronome marks identical to those in Cramer, which makes it likely that the missing sonatas also took their metronome marks from Moscheles's London edition,⁵⁶ presumably with Moscheles's permission.⁵⁷ This statement will have to be tested if these missing editions are ever rediscovered.⁵⁸

For Meyer's editions, the reverse seems to be true: Seifert was able to find three sonatas with metronome marks that were not announced in the *Monatsbericht*, unlike many other publications by Meyer. Two sonatas, opp. 2 no. 1 and 10 no. 2, have the same metronome marks as the Cramer edition, but op. 2 no. 2 has unique speeds. Since the editions published after Cramer all have the same speeds for the first three movements, it seems likely that the Meyer edition of op. 2 no. 2 precedes the one published by Cramer. Here, too, more light might be shed on this claim if any additional issues are rediscovered.

In 1853, Ludwig Holle bought the rights to Spehr's edition,⁵⁹ and by the end of the year started offering the first 23 sonatas (opp. 2 to 57) for subscription. Although the edition was published as 'Nouvelle Edition, revue et metronomisée par I. Moscheles', Moscheles himself published a letter saying that he had never had any contact with Holle, and that he had not revised the edition as the title page said.⁶⁰ Holle's defence was that since he bought the rights to Spehr's edition, he was free to use those metronome marks, and because a few mistakes were corrected, it could be called a new edition.⁶¹

The statement that he had used the metronome marks from Spehr's edition is probably deceptive, as – unless Spehr published 18 sonatas that have not yet been found – that edition contained speeds for only five works. Holle was therefore using metronome marks from editions to which he had not bought the rights. Most of the speeds in his edition can be found in other editions by Moscheles, but the last movement of op. 2 no. 2 – a work that Holle claimed contained 'a few mistakes'⁶² – is especially curious in this context, as the same speed is found only in *On the Proper Performance* by Czerny, which had just been published a few years earlier.

⁵⁵ Hofmeister, ed., *Monatsbericht*, 8/8 (1841): 117.

⁵⁶ An interesting exception would be op. 106, which was announced in the *Monatsbericht* 26/6 (1859): 92, as 'Nouv. Edit. corr. et métron. p. J. Moscheles'.

⁵⁷ The fact that Cranz published several first editions by Moscheles seems to suggest that the two had a good business relationship. After hearing Moscheles's *Die Erwartung* op. 122 in 1851, Cranz supposedly said 'I need to have this piece, just name your price'. *Aus Moscheles's Leben* (Leipzig, 1872): 223.

⁵⁸ Anton Schindler lists the Cranz edition, along with editions by Haslinger, Johann André, Simrock and Bote and Bock as 'Complete editions of the sonatas (with the exception of opp. 106, 109, 110, and 111) [that] were undertaken shortly after Beethoven's death'. Anton Schindler, *Beethoven as I Knew Him*, trans. Constance S. Jolly, ed. Donald W. MacArdle (London: Faber and Faber, 1966): 442. Notice that this is at least partially incorrect, as Haslinger did not include op. 2, and Cranz misses out op. 101.

⁵⁹ *Börsenblatt für den Deutschen Buchhandel* 20/136 (31 October 1853): 1738, item 11875. Newman does not mention this edition, and Seifert dates it after 1857, without providing a source.

⁶⁰ Ignaz Moscheles, 'An die Redaction des Signale für die musikal. Welt', *Signale für die musikalische Welt* 12/8 (16 February 1854): 60.

⁶¹ Ludwig Holle, 'An die Redaction des Signale für die musikal. Welt', *Signale für die musikalische Welt* 12/13 (28 March 1854): 107.

⁶² Holle, 'An die Redaction des Signale für die musikal. Welt'.

Not satisfied with the financial success of this deception,⁶³ Holle published another edition that supposedly had metronome marks by Moscheles. This time, however, the name of the editor, Heinrich Wilhelm Stolze, was explicitly mentioned on the title page, perhaps to avoid litigation by Moscheles. Where the previous edition borrowed from Czerny, this edition contains a number of unique metronome marks, for example for the first and last movements of op. 7. Given the previous dispute between Moscheles and Holle, it seems most likely that Stolze was responsible for these changes.

Perhaps to counter these illegitimate practices, around 1858 Moscheles produced a new set of metronome marks for the sonatas for *Hallberger's Pracht-Ausgabe der Klassiker Beethoven, Clementi, Haydn, Mozart in ihren Werken*. Moscheles's contributions appear to date from January 1858, the date on the preface.⁶⁴ The first volume was published before 1860 and is mentioned in the third edition of Schindler's Beethoven biography,⁶⁵ while the full set was listed in the 1868 Hofmeister *Handbuch* as finished before the end of 1867.⁶⁶ Finally, between 1867 and 1869, Carl Weinholtz in Braunschweig published an edition with the metronome marks identical to those in the Cramer edition. Here too, there is no evidence of Moscheles's involvement.

In summary, Moscheles's earliest metronome marks are probably found in a number of individually published sonatas by Meyer. The Cramer edition of all sonatas with opus number dates from soon after, and was the basis for the five sonatas published by Spehr and probably more than 13 by Cranz. Furthermore, Holle and Weinholtz published several unauthorized editions using Moscheles's speeds. Finally, towards the end of his life Moscheles produced a new set for Hallberger covering the same works as Cramer.

It becomes clear that Seifert has used too many editions in his analysis, as he seems to consider the editions by Carl Haslinger, Holle and Weinholtz authentic. Rosenblum, on the other hand, misses those by Cranz and Meyer, and therefore lacks context. Furthermore, despite being aware of the influence of both editors on each other, neither Rosenblum nor Seifert discuss the relationship between their editions in any depth. The following section will explore this connection in detail.

Re-Evaluating Czerny's and Moscheles's Metronome Marks

Both Rosenblum and Seifert discuss the relationship between the metronome marks by Czerny and Moscheles in terms of their similarity, a characteristic that, according to Rosenblum, supports the statement that these speeds are a fair representation of Beethoven's intentions. Although there is little doubt that the authors were in a good position to know which speeds the composer intended for at least some of these works, whether they actually used this expertise in their

⁶³ See Annette Opperman, *Musikalische Klassiker-Ausgaben des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001): 135.

⁶⁴ Newman, 'A Chronological Checklist', 512. See also Moscheles's wife's description in Charlotte Moscheles (ed.), *Recent Music and Musicians as Described in the Diaries and Correspondence of Ignaz Moscheles*, trans. A.D. Coleridge (New York: Henry Holt, 1879): 394.

⁶⁵ Anton Schindler, *Biographie von Ludwig van Beethoven*, (Münster: Aschendorff, 1860), volume 1: 171–172.

⁶⁶ Adolf Hofmeister, ed., 'Sonaten, Rondos, Variationen u. s. w. für Pianoforte allein', *Handbuch der musikalischen Literatur* 6 (1868): 133.

editions – and if so, which of these editions is most likely to represent Beethoven's intentions – is a completely different question. The similarity of Czerny's and Moscheles's speeds for Beethoven's piano sonatas can show that their marks are likely to approximate Beethoven's intended speeds, but only if they produced these speeds independently, without copying or influencing each other. As several editions, such as those by Carl Haslinger and Ludwig Holle, used Czerny's and Moscheles's names primarily as a means to bolster sales without either having an active role in the publication, the similarity between Czerny's and Moscheles's speeds requires closer scrutiny.

The fact that the Simrock edition uses so many speeds close or identical to the Cramer and Hallberger editions warrants more investigation than it has been given in the literature so far. In the set that Simrock published in 1856, containing opp. 2 to 14, opp. 26 to 53, and 57, almost every sonata contains a metronome mark that is unique,⁶⁷ while almost always still being in the same range as the Haslinger editions. For example, the *Grave* section from op. 13 has ♩ = 63 in Simrock, compared to ♩ = 58 in Haslinger. The other sonatas were published in 1862 and 1868, five and 11 years after Czerny's death respectively, and the implicit assumption of Rosenblum and Seifert appears to be that Czerny sent the metronome marks for all sonatas to the publisher before his death. The evidence, however, seems to contradict this assumption: almost all of the sonatas published in 1856 contain a unique metronome mark, but none of those published 1862 or 1868 do. The marks in opp. 22, 54, 90, 101, 110 and 111 are in fact identical to those in Moscheles's Hallberger edition. Op. 79 is identical to the second state of Haslinger, and the first two movements of op. 81a are identical to the first state, with the finale presumably copying both the speed for the *Vivacissimamente* (♩ = 108 in all editions except Haslinger's first) and the *Poco Andante* (♩ = 69, for which until then Moscheles had been the only one to give metronome marks) from Cramer. Finally, Simrock's op. 109 uses the speeds in Hallberger for every movement except the second, for which it recommends the same speed that occurs in the other editions by Czerny.

So it appears that the metronome marks in the two later sets are copied primarily from editions by Moscheles, and are not by Czerny at all. It seems possible, however, that Simrock was already copying some of Moscheles's marks when Czerny was still alive, as there are several suspicious cases in which the Simrock edition gives a speed identical to one found in an edition by Moscheles, despite the fact that earlier marks indicate a completely different speed. A good example is the concluding *Presto* of op. 27 no. 1, for which Czerny's only other metronome mark is ♩ = 120 in Haslinger, while the Simrock edition contains a much slower ♩ = 96, the same speed that is found in Moscheles's Cramer edition. Similarly, the *Largo* section in the first movement of op. 31 no. 2, which is marked ♩ = 88 in Haslinger and which has no speed in *On the Proper Performance*, has ♩ = 50 in Simrock, the same speed as in Cramer. A final example can be found in op. 49 no. 1, in which both movements have speeds identical to the Cramer edition (♩ = 60 and ♩ = 60), which are completely different from Czerny's earlier marks in Haslinger (♩ = 88–92 and ♩ = 100–108).

⁶⁷ Unique speeds are found in op. 2 no. 1/II and IV, op. 2 no. 2/I and III, op. 7/II, op. 10 no. 1/III, op. 13/I (*Grave*), op. 14 no. 1/III, op. 14 no. 2/II, op. 27 no. 1/II (*Allegro molto vivace*), op. 28/II, op. 31 no. 1/I, op. 31 no. 2/I, op. 31 no. 3/IV, op. 49 no. 1/I and II, op. 53/II.

It is likely that the three examples given above are not isolated examples, but are simply the ones that are most easily detected due to the relatively large differences in speed between the earlier metronome marks by Czerny and Moscheles. In a number of other individual movements, the similarities between Simrock on the one hand and Cramer on the other seem to suggest a certain degree of borrowing too: in op. 13, for instance, all speeds in Simrock are identical to the ones in Cramer, except the one for the opening *Grave*. Another example is op. 10 no. 2, which has ♩ = 96 and 80 in the first Haslinger and *On the Proper Performance*, respectively, and ♩ = 160 in Simrock, exactly the same way in which it is given in all of Moscheles's editions.⁶⁸ In these cases, the similarities between these editions are generally less obvious, but they are still suspicious.

All in all, of the 87 metronome marks published in the first set of Simrock, 21 are identical to speeds published for the first time in Cramer. These similarities could be explained by a wide range of possible causes, including Czerny consciously or unconsciously being influenced by Moscheles's Cramer edition; Simrock copying from Moscheles to compensate for Czerny not providing a speed for certain sections, something which would happen more prominently in the two later Simrock sets; or simply because of pure chance. The evidence for these explanations is circumstantial, but they do undermine the notion that the Simrock edition was made independently from Moscheles's editions. This in turn weakens the support for the claim that the Simrock edition represents Beethoven's intended speeds.

The Simrock edition, however, is not the only one which is suspected of having been influenced by previous editions. Moscheles's Cramer edition appears to rely to some degree on Czerny's Haslinger, as can be seen in a passage that Rosenblum partially quotes,⁶⁹ Moscheles's English translation of Schindler's *Life of Beethoven* of 1841:

I hope I may be permitted to state, that in superintending for Messrs. Cramer & Co the new edition of his works, and in metronomizing the several compositions, I have not merely listened to my own musical feelings, but been guided by my recollections of what I gathered from Beethoven's own playing, and that of Baroness Ertmann, whom I have heard perform many of his works in his presence, and to his entire satisfaction, at the musical meetings [at Czerny's] ... and Mr. Zmeskal's. In some of the quick movements, I have purposely refrained from giving way to that rapidity of piano-forte execution, so largely developed at the present time. It is with satisfaction that I add that the tempi that I have ventured to give differ very slightly from those affixed to Haslinger's Vienna edition, by Carl Czerny, whom I consider a competent authority in the matter.⁷⁰

Moscheles admits of several different sources for his metronome marks: his own musicality, his memories of the performances of Baroness Ertmann and Beethoven

⁶⁸ The movements in which Simrock takes a speed that has appeared first in Cramer are op. 2 no. 1/I and III, op. 2 no. 2/II and IV, op. 2 no. 3/II and IV, op. 7/III, op. 10 no. 1/I, op. 10 no. 2/III, op. 13/IV, op. 26/II and IV, op. 27 no. 1/I and IV (Presto), op. 28/III, op. 31 no. 2/I (Largo) and III, op. 31 no. 3/IV, op. 49 no. 1/I and II, op. 53/III (Presto).

⁶⁹ Partially in Rosenblum, 'Two Sets', 59; in full in Rosenblum, *Performance Practices*, 330.

⁷⁰ Ignaz Moscheles, ed., *The Life of Beethoven* (London; Henry Colburn, 1841): vol. 2, 106–107.

himself. The influence of these last two sources, however, was probably limited: Moscheles met Beethoven in 1810,⁷¹ but only in 1814 did they form a closer connection.⁷² In the autumn of 1816, Moscheles left Vienna and did not meet Beethoven again until late 1823, by which time they are only able to communicate in writing.⁷³ The only time that Moscheles could have heard Beethoven play is therefore limited to before autumn 1816, a period during which the only performance by Beethoven that Moscheles's diaries mention is of the Piano Trio op. 97, Beethoven's last public appearance as a pianist. Of Beethoven's playing on this occasion, Moscheles writes that 'apart from the spirit prevailing in it, [it] satisfied me less [than the composition itself], for it lacks clearness and precision; still I observed several traces of the grand style of playing which I had long since recognized in his compositions'.⁷⁴ The fact that Moscheles compares Beethoven's playing to a particular aspect of his compositions, rather than to any actual performances that he might have heard, suggest that Moscheles did not have many opportunities to hear Beethoven play. In his preface to *Life of Beethoven*, Moscheles admits that he only heard Beethoven play a few times – he only specifies the third piano concerto and the choral symphony as pieces that he heard, presumably at public concerts – and that Beethoven was extremely reluctant to explain his music to him.⁷⁵

The musical meetings at Czerny's apartment took place between 1816 until 1820,⁷⁶ while those at Zmeskall's seemed to have started at least as early as 1808, with an unknown end date. Baroness Ertmann seems to have performed at both of these venues until February 1817, when she left Vienna.⁷⁷ The programmes of these concerts are not always known, but it seems likely that the sonata op. 27 no. 2 was played, as this seems to have been one of Ertmann's favourite pieces.⁷⁸ It seems therefore plausible that Czerny and Moscheles both heard her play this work, which could explain the similarity between the first Haslinger edition on the one hand (♩ = 60, ♪ = 84, and ♫ = 92, respectively) and all of Moscheles's editions on the other (♩ = 60, ♪ = 76, and ♫ = 92). However, since it is unknown how often Moscheles attended these concerts – Ertmann's and Zmeskall's names do not seem to occur in his diaries at all – and since he left Vienna in the same year that Czerny started to organize house concerts, he had far fewer opportunities to hear Baroness Ertmann than Czerny did.

For the Cramer edition, however, another source had emerged not previously available to him: the metronome marks by Czerny in the first Haslinger edition. Moscheles is ambiguous about whether he produced the speeds for the Cramer edition before checking those by Czerny, or whether he – maybe in a few cases in which his memory failed him – based his metronome mark on his colleague's. The latter would have been very tempting, as Czerny's edition was most likely finished by the time Moscheles started working on his. Furthermore, a letter by

⁷¹ Moscheles, ed., *Life of Beethoven*, vol. 1, ix–x.

⁷² Moscheles, ed. *Recent Music and Musicians*, 10.

⁷³ Moscheles, ed. *Recent Music and Musicians*, 59.

⁷⁴ Moscheles, ed. *Recent Music and Musicians*, 8–9.

⁷⁵ Moscheles, *Life of Beethoven*, vol. 1, xiii–xiv.

⁷⁶ See Brandenburg, ed., *Briefwechsel*, vol. 4, 37: comments on Letter 1093. See also *On the Proper Performance*, 16.

⁷⁷ Brandenburg, ed., *Briefwechsel*, vol. 4, Letter 1093.

⁷⁸ Peter Clive, *Beethoven and his World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001): 103.

Moscheles's wife reveals that Czerny came to visit Moscheles in London sometime before May 1838, and that they discussed music together.⁷⁹ This might explain the difference between Moscheles's earliest metronome marks for op. 2 no. 2 in the Meyer edition, which were likely only based on Moscheles's memory and musicality, and the Cramer edition, for which he had the opportunity to discuss these works with Czerny. It seems therefore possible that it was Czerny's visit that prompted Moscheles to reconsider the speeds for this movement.

However, the degree of Czerny's influence should also not be overstated, as there are several speeds in the Cramer edition that Moscheles seems to have invented independently. This is most clearly the case with the sonatas opp. 101 and following, which were published after Moscheles had left Vienna, and for which Moscheles had only his own musical feelings to determine the tempo. This seems a reasonable explanation for the fact that the speeds of first two movements of op. 101 are much slower in Cramer than in the first Haslinger: ♩ = 66 compared to ♩ = 88 for the first movement and ♩ = 132 compared to ♩ = 84 for the second, respectively. There are comparable differences between several of the other movements of the late sonatas,⁸⁰ but there are also some noticeable similarities. The last two speeds for op. 101, for instance, are very similar in Cramer and the first Haslinger: ♩ = 60 and ♩ = 54 for the third movement, respectively, and ♩ = 132 from both editions for the fourth. It seems possible that these similarities are the result of chance, with Moscheles essentially guessing the same speed as Czerny, but it is also possible that these similarities are the result of the two editors discussing these movements. Either way, with Moscheles having no source available for the speeds of the late sonatas other than his own musicality and Czerny's suggestions, his metronome marks for these works are of no value for determining Beethoven's intended tempi. This leaves only the early and middle sonatas as works which Moscheles could have heard performed by either Baroness Ertmann or Beethoven himself. By extension, these are the only works for which any similarity in editorial speed could be explained by both Czerny and Moscheles having independent insider knowledge. A comparison of different editions will show how likely this is.

Out of 95 metronome marks given to the sonatas with opus numbers between 2 and 90 in Czerny's and Moscheles's earliest editions – assuming that those found in Cocks's edition where indeed intended for the first Haslinger – in 41 cases there is a difference of 10 per cent or more. In other words, in about 43 per cent of the movements that both Czerny and Moscheles could have heard from either Beethoven or Baroness Ertmann, there is a substantial difference between the speeds in the first Haslinger and the Cramer editions. These differences, however, do not all remain in subsequent editions: in five cases in which Czerny's and Moscheles's speeds in their respective first editions differ more than 10 per cent, Moscheles

⁷⁹ Moscheles, *Recent Music and Musicians*, 239.

⁸⁰ Other large differences are found in op. 109/I and IV (var. 3: *Allegro vivace*), and op. 110/I, II and V. Furthermore, in *Life of Beethoven*, vol. 2, 252, Moscheles argues that the controversial tempo of the first *Allegro* of op. 106, ♩ = 138, is a mistake, due to the fact that Beethoven removed *Assai* from the tempo indication when adding the metronome mark. Instead, he recommends ♩ = 112. This comment seems to be based on a misunderstanding of Beethoven's *Allegro assai*, which is slower than *Allegro*, in contrast with for instance Mozart's use of the term. See Steward Deas, 'Beethoven's "Allegro assai"', *Music & Letters* 31/4 (1950): 333–6.

changes his speed in a subsequent edition to a speed closer to Czerny's.⁸¹ An example of this is the second movement of op. 22 discussed previously. In the Cramer edition, Moscheles gives a speed of ♩ = 132, much faster than the ♩ = 112 in the first Haslinger. In the next edition by Hallberger, however, Moscheles lowers his speed to ♩ = 116, closer to Czerny's speed, but also further away from Beethoven's metronome marks for the *adagios* in the String Quartet op. 18 no. 1 and the Septet op. 20, which have a similar range of note values and speeds of ♩ = 138 and ♩ = 132, respectively.

In 13 cases in which there is a large difference between Cramer and Haslinger, *On the Proper Performance* (which was published after the Cramer edition, but before Hallberger) approaches the speed in Haslinger,⁸² while the first set of Simrock closes the gap in 11 movements by using a speed similar or close to the one in Cramer or Hallberger.⁸³ In the remaining 12 movements, the disagreement between the two editors remains unresolved.⁸⁴ From this it is possible to conclude that since two thirds of the large differences in speed between the early editions are eventually resolved, it seems very likely that Czerny and Moscheles indeed influenced each other, and that this is the main cause of the similarity that Rosenblum perceived, which is primarily found in the later editions.

In summary, Moscheles's Cramer and Hallberger editions are likely only partly based on Beethoven's or Ertmann's playing, as Moscheles seems to have had relatively little access to either. Of the sonatas that Moscheles could have heard performed by either of these, only slightly more than half the speeds are actually similar to Czerny's, whose speeds in subsequent editions seem to be influenced by Moscheles. This makes the claim that Czerny's and Moscheles's speeds for these sonatas are similar increasingly problematic, as their similarity appears to be more caused by their mutual influence than the fact that both editors observed Beethoven or Baroness Ertmann perform. The corroborating evidence that Rosenblum has used to substantiate the claim that Czerny's metronome marks are a 'fair' representation of Beethoven's intentions, which besides Moscheles's metronome marks included the earlier discussed comparison with Beethoven's own for similar movements, has therefore largely disappeared.

However, there is still the matter that Czerny studied with Beethoven, and he probably heard Ertmann and Beethoven play much more often than Moscheles did. It therefore seems likely that he was aware of Beethoven's intentions for many of these works. This point was made in particular by the Beethoven scholar Gustav Nottebohm, who met Czerny and who had the following to say about the metronome marks in *On the Proper Performance*:

Although not of authentic validity, still these indications can lay claim to a certain trustworthiness, especially for those works of which we know that Czerny either heard them played by Beethoven or studied [them] under his instruction. Czerny claims (on page 35 and 121 [in the fourth volume of his *Piano School* op. 500]) that he tried to represent the tempo that Beethoven himself took to the best of his memory.

⁸¹ Op. 10 no. 2/I, op. 22/I, op. 22/II, op. 57/I and III.

⁸² Op. 2 no. 1/I, op. 2 no. 2/I and III op. 10 no. 1/II, op. 10 no. 2/III, op. 10 no. 3/I, op. 10 no. 3/III, op. 26/II, op. 27 no. 1/II (*Allegro molto vivace*) and IV (*Allegro vivace*), op. 31 no. 3/IV, op. 53/II, op. 81a/II.

⁸³ Op. 26/III and IV, op. 27 no. 1/III (*Adagio con espressione*) and IV (*Presto*), op. 31 no. 2/I (*Largo*), op. 31 no. 3/I and IV, op. 49 no. 1/I and II, op. 53/II, op. 54/II.

⁸⁴ Op. 7/II, op. 14 no. 1/III, op. 14 no. 2/II, op. 28/II, op. 31 no. 2/II, op. 31 no. 3/III, op. 49 no. 2/I and II, op. 53/III, op. 57/II, op. 79/II.

Anyone who knew Czerny personally, who had the opportunity to observe his nature, which was above all directed towards the practical, will believe him capable of impressing firmly on his memory a tempo that he had heard, and will have noticed the certainty that he had in such outwardly tangible musical matters.⁸⁵

Nottebohm furthermore highlights the works which Czerny claims to have studied with or played for Beethoven. Among these are the Sonatas op. 13, op. 14 no. 1 and 2, op. 31 no. 2, op. 101, and the second movement of op. 28;⁸⁶ but as Paul Badura-Skoda has observed, this list should probably be supplemented by op. 53, op. 57 and op. 106.⁸⁷

Czerny's metronome marks for these works have been the source of some confusion, as they appear to change about as much as the works that he did not study with Beethoven. George Barth has even gone so far as to conclude from this that Czerny must have had 'considerable difficulty in recalling even those tempi he had learned from Beethoven'.⁸⁸ This conclusion, based at least in part on Rosenblum's naïveté concerning Simrock's editions, seems a bit rash, especially if one only takes those metronome marks of that certainly come from Czerny: the first Haslinger edition, *On the Proper Performance*, and part of Simrock. In op. 13, for instance, this comparison shows that Haslinger and Simrock are very similar – not counting Simrock's speed for the last movement, which is suspected of being taken from Moscheles – while those in *On the Proper Performance* are far slower. With only few exceptions,⁸⁹ all works that Czerny studied with Beethoven have very similar speeds in the first Haslinger and Simrock editions, and the only divergence is found in *On the Proper Performance*. It therefore seems that Czerny really had no difficulty in remembering what Beethoven taught him, and that *On the Proper Performance* represents something other than Czerny's memories.

There is ample evidence for this, and most of it has been discussed by Barth himself, as well as by James Parakilas. One example is found in Czerny's discussion of Beethoven's own way of performing, in which he writes that

[Beethoven's] performance depended on his constantly varying frame of mind, and even if it were possible exactly to describe his style of playing, it would not always serve us as a model (in regard to the present otherwise cultivated purity and clearness in difficulties); and even the mental conception acquires a different value through the altered taste of the time, and must occasionally be expressed by other means than were then demanded.⁹⁰

By Czerny's own admission, *On the Proper Performance* does not always represent Beethoven's way of playing. Instead, it represents an update of that style, tailored to the time in which Czerny published his piano school. A further example of how

⁸⁵ Gustav Nottebohm, *Beethoveniana* (Leipzig and Winterthur: J. Rieter-Biederman, 1872): 136.

⁸⁶ Nottebohm, *Beethoveniana*, 136.

⁸⁷ Czerny, *On the Proper Performance*, 3.

⁸⁸ Barth, *The Pianist as Orator*, 62.

⁸⁹ Op. 14 no. 2/II, op. 31 no. 2/I, and op. 53/II. The last two speeds are probably copied from Moscheles, as are all speeds in op. 101. In the case of op. 14, it seems possible that an arithmetic error based on the change in note value (crotchets instead of the earlier minims) is responsible for the difference in speed, and that Simrock intended to express the same speed as in Haslinger.

⁹⁰ Czerny, *On the Proper Performance*, 22.

Czerny departs from Beethoven's style can be seen in his discussion of the Piano Concerto op. 15:

With the present perfection of the Pianoforte, which, in power and fullness of tone, vies with the instruments of the orchestra, the performance of a Concerto is more easy and grateful than at the time when Beethoven himself played this first Concerto at the *Kärtnerthor* theatre, in Vienna (in 1801). We can now therefore produce effects of which we had then no idea.⁹¹

Although Czerny does not explicitly say how he departs from Beethoven's style of performance, there is evidence that these changes affect more than one aspect. George Barth's comparisons of Czerny's versions in *On the Proper Performance* to the first editions of the same works have shown that Czerny often changes the articulation and dynamics. Furthermore, the articulation in the Simrock edition is much more authentic than in *On the Proper Performance*,⁹² which adds to the impression that despite Czerny's statement that 'the player must by no means allow himself to alter the composition',⁹³ his pedagogical work often changes the effect that the composer had in mind, a point that Parakilas has also made.⁹⁴ For this reason, *On the Proper Performance* is of little value for determining Beethoven's intentions for the piano sonatas.

It does, however, raise an interesting question about the notion of authenticity. The changes that Czerny made in *On the Proper Performance* appear to be primarily fuelled by developments in organology and aesthetics, and indicate that the notion of an authentic performance in Beethoven was considered to be changeable, at least in Czerny's eyes. As Parakilas has observed, Czerny was therefore clearly being less than honest when he wrote that 'there can be only *one* perfectly correct mode of performance',⁹⁵ especially considering the different speeds that Czerny suggested in the editions discussed in this article. Nevertheless, it is possible to make sense of this statement by adding two caveats, the first being that this statement only represents the opinion of its author. The second caveat is that this opinion can change over time, as the above examination of the metronome marks in Czerny's editions has shown.⁹⁶ This points towards an explanation for the controversial status of metronome marks in general and Beethoven's in particular: since these are not easily reinterpreted in the way that the traditional Italian tempo indications are, changes in aesthetics or in the instruments themselves can easily make these speeds problematic for performers. It subsequently becomes tempting to reject the metronome altogether, which is what many composers have done.⁹⁷

The relationship between Beethoven's intended tempos and the speeds by Czerny and Moscheles is more complicated than some have realized. On the one hand, there

⁹¹ Czerny, *On the Proper Performance*, 93.

⁹² Barth, *The Pianist as Orator*, 87–97.

⁹³ Czerny, *On the Proper Performance*, 22.

⁹⁴ James Parakilas, 'Playing Beethoven His Way', in *Beyond "The Art of Finger Dexterity": Reassessing Carl Czerny*, ed. David Gramit (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2008): 117–23.

⁹⁵ Parakilas, 'Playing Beethoven His Way', 122.

⁹⁶ For similar observations on performance practices in the twentieth century, see amongst others Robert Philip, *Early Recordings and Musical Style: Changing Tastes in Instrumental Performance (1900–1950)* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), and Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, 'Recordings and Histories of Performance Style', in *The Cambridge Companion to Recorded Music*, ed. Nicholas Cook, Eric Clarke, Daniel Leech-Wilkinson and John Rink (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009): 246–62.

⁹⁷ Barth, *The Pianist as Orator*, 62–5.

is little corroborating evidence in the editions to support the notion that Czerny's memory is besides consistent also correct: no other source that Rosenblum mentions – Beethoven's own indications for other movements, as well as Moscheles's editions – is able to put this issue to rest, as there are often considerable differences with Czerny's marks. On the other hand, if one ignores *On the Proper Performance* and those speeds in Simrock that seem to be copied from Moscheles, Czerny is actually fairly consistent in his speeds for these sonatas, especially for those works he studied with Beethoven. This in turn undermines Barth's argument that Czerny had trouble remembering Beethoven's tempo, and makes it seem somewhat more plausible that these are indeed consistent with Beethoven's intentions.⁹⁸ Does this, however, mean that the speeds in the other editions are useless for performers interested in historically informed performances?

Of course not: these editions are in fact very useful for disentangling the author from the text. They allow performers to leave the composer out of the picture altogether, and to focus on the person who provides the metronome marks for the edition, and the time in which this took place. In that way, the first Haslinger edition – with the extra metronome marks from Cocks – represents Czerny's opinion on Beethoven's sonatas shortly after the composer's death, while the first set of Simrock is his opinion on those works shortly before his own passing. Moscheles's editions could also be of use here, simply to show which speeds a highly successful concert pianist with an international career spanning several decades considered to be most effective. Each edition, and not only *On the Proper Performance*, therefore represents the proper performance according to its editor at that time. An historically informed performance does not necessarily have to represent the intentions of the composer – in fact, the controversy surrounding some of Beethoven's own metronome marks, as well as the descriptions of his playing by Czerny and Moscheles seem to suggest that to do so would not always be particularly effective in a modern concert setting anyway. Whereas a focus on the composer's intentions can run the risk of narrowing the range of performance practices, these editions by Czerny and Moscheles can actually enrich historical performance practice, as they provide multiple workable and historical answers to well-known questions.

Appendix: Editions by Czerny and Moscheles

Editions that contain metronome marks by Czerny:

C1: *Sonate pour le Piano-Forte par L. van Beethoven. Noevelle Édition exacte, / Sonate ... für das Pianoforte von L. van Beethoven*, Vienna: Tobias Haslinger, 1828–1832. The presumed intended metronome marks for opp. 2 and 7 are found in *Beethoven's Masterpieces: Being the Entire of his Grand Sonatas for the Piano Forte*. Edited by his Friend and Pupil Carl Czerny, London: R. Cocks & Co, around 1858–59.

C2: *Sonate ... für das Pianoforte von L. van Beethoven*. Vienna: Tobias Haslinger, 1837–1842.

C3: Czerny, Carl, *Die Kunst des Vortrags des ältern und neuen Claviercompositionen oder: Die Fortschritte bis zur neuesten Zeit. Supplement oder 4ter Theil zur grossen Pianoforte-Schule*. Op. 500, Vienna: A. Diabelli, 1846.⁹⁹

⁹⁸ In fact, almost all of these are consistent with the model of Beethoven's intended tempo as described in Noorduyn, *Beethoven's Tempo Indications*.

⁹⁹ For the relevant section on Beethoven in volume 4 see Czerny, *On the Proper Performance*.

C4: *Sonates pour le Piano, composes ... par Louis van Beethoven. Edition revue, corrigée, metronomisée et doigtée par Ch. Czerny*, Bonn: N. Simrock, 1856–1868.

C5: *Clavier–Sonaten von Ludwig van Beethoven. Neueste, genau revidirte, wohlfeile Original–Ausgabe / L. van Beethoven's Clavier–Sonaten zu 2 Händen. Neue wohlfeile Original–Ausgabe*. Vienna: Carl Haslinger q[uonda]m Tobias, around 1863.¹⁰⁰

Moscheles's metronome marks can be found in the following editions:

M1: *Sonate pour le Pianoforte, composée par L. van Beethoven. / Sonates pour le Pianoforte seul, composes par Louis van Beethoven. Nouvelle édition très correcte. Metronomisée par I. Moscheles*. Hamburg: A. Cranz, [Probably 1828–1841].

M2: *Sonates pour le piano, composées par Louis van Beethoven. Nouvelle édition très correcte. Metronomisée par I. Moscheles*. Braunschweig: G.M. Meyer jr. [probably 1828–1843]

M3: *Beethoven's Works. Edited by I. Moscheles. Complete Edition*. J.B. Cramer, Addison & Beale, 1834–1838/39.

M4: *Sonates pour le Piano seul, composées par Louis van Beethoven. (Metronomisées par I. Moscheles.) Edition à meilleur marché, brillante et correcte*. Braunschweig: Johann Peter Spehr, 1839–1844.

M5: *Ludwig van Beethoven's sämtliche Sonaten für Pianoforte. Neu herausgegeben mit Bezeichnung des Zeitmasses und Fingersatzes van J. Moscheles, Professor am Conservatorium zu Leipzig/Hallberger's Pracht–Ausgabe der Classiker...*, Stuttgart: Eduard Hallberger, 1858?–1867 by the latest.

M6: *Sonates pour le Pianoforte seul composées par Louis van Beethoven. (Nouvelle Edition, revue et metronomisée par I. Moscheles.)/Stereotyp–Ausgabe classischer Musikstücke Nr. 11–42*, Wolfenbüttel: Ludwig Holle, 1853–before 1858.

M7: *Sonates pour le Pianoforte seul composées par Louis van Beethoven, metronomisées par I. Moscheles. Deuxième Edition stereotype et revue (par H. W. Stolze.)/ Stereotyp–Ausgabe classischer Musikstücke / Wolfenbüttel: Ludwig Holle, 1858–1868.*

M8: *Sonaten für das Pianoforte von L. van Beethoven*, Braunschweig: C. Weinholtz, 1867–1869.¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰ With the exception of the metronome marks obtained from the Cocks edition, C1–4 are also found in Rosenblum, 'Two Sets' and Seifert, 'Czernys und Moscheles' Metronomisierungen'; C5 is only in Seifert.

¹⁰¹ All found in Seifert, 'Czernys und Moscheles' Metronomisierungen'. Rosenblum, *Performance Practices* lists only Cramer and Hallberger. The speeds in the Cramer editions in the Sibley Music Library at the Eastman School of Music and the Bodleian Libraries in Oxford confirm Seifert's and Rosenblum's findings.

Czerny's and Moscheles's Metronome Marks for Beethoven's Piano Sonatas.

Opus		Tempo Indication	Metre	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8
WoO 47,1	i	Allegro cantabile	c	$\text{♩} = 69$	$\text{♩} = 69$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 69$	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	ii	Andante	2/4	$\text{♩} = 108$	$\text{♩} = 108$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 108$	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	iii	Vivace	6/8	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 104$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 104$	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
WoO 47,2	i	Larghetto maestoso	♩	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
		Allegro assai	c	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	ii	Andante	2/4	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 104$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 104$	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	iii	Presto	2/4	$\text{♩} = 92$	$\text{♩} = 92$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 92$	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
WoO 47,3	i	Allegro	c	$\text{♩} = 152$	$\text{♩} = 152$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 152$	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	ii	Sostenuto	3/4	$\text{♩} = 108$	$\text{♩} = 108$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 108$	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	iii	Scherzando	2/4	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
2,1	i	Allegro	♩	$\text{♩} = 120$	*	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 108$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 108$	$\text{♩} = 108$	*	$\text{♩} = 108$	$\text{♩} = 108$	$\text{♩} = 108$	*
	ii	Adagio	3/4	$\text{♩} = 84$	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 84$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 50$	$\text{♩} = 50$	*	$\text{♩} = 50$	$\text{♩} = 50$	$\text{♩} = 50$	*
	iii	Menuetto. Allegretto	3/4	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	$\text{♩} = 69$	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	*
	iv	Prestissimo	♩	$\text{♩} = 112$	*	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 108$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 112$	$\text{♩} = 112$	*	$\text{♩} = 112$	$\text{♩} = 112$	$\text{♩} = 112$	*
2,2	i	Allegro vivace	2/4	$\text{♩} = 126$	*	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 138$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 112$	$\text{♩} = 144$	*	$\text{♩} = 144$	$\text{♩} = 144$	$\text{♩} = 144$	*
	ii	Largo appassionato	3/4	$\text{♩} = 88$	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 88$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 96$	$\text{♩} = 88$	*	$\text{♩} = 88$	$\text{♩} = 88$	$\text{♩} = 88$	*
	iii	Scherzo. Allegretto	3/4	$\text{♩} = 69$	*	$\text{♩} = 63$	$\text{♩} = 66$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 144$	$\text{♩} = 60$	*	$\text{♩} = 60$	$\text{♩} = 60$	$\text{♩} = 60$	*
	iv	Grazioso	c	$\text{♩} = 144$	*	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 144$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 120$	$\text{♩} = 144$	*	$\text{♩} = 144$	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 132$	*
2,3	i	Allegro con brio	c	$\text{♩} = 84$	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 76$	*	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 76$	*
	ii	Adagio	2/4	$\text{♩} = 60$	*	$\text{♩} = 50$	$\text{♩} = 56$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 56$	*	$\text{♩} = 56$	$\text{♩} = 56$	$\text{♩} = 56$	*
	iii	Scherzo. Allegro	3/4	$\text{♩} = 84$	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 76$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 88$	*	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 76$	*
	iv	Allegro assai	6/8	$\text{♩} = 120$	*	$\text{♩} = 116$	$\text{♩} = 116$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 116$	*	$\text{♩} = 116$	$\text{♩} = 116$	$\text{♩} = 116$	*

Opus		Tempo Indication	Metre	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8
7	i	Allegro molto e con brio	6/8	$\text{♩} = 126$	*	$\text{♩} = 116$	$\text{♩} = 126$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 116$	*	$\text{♩} = 126$	$\text{♩} = 126$	$\text{♩} = 112$	$\text{♩} = 116$
	ii	Largo con gran espressione	3/4	$\text{♩} = 84$	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 84$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 50$	*	$\text{♩} = 50$	$\text{♩} = 50$	$\text{♩} = 50$	$\text{♩} = 50$
	iii	Allegro	3/4	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 80$
	iv	Poco Allegretto e grazioso	2/4	$\text{♩} = 132$	*	$\text{♩} = 60$	$\text{♩} = 132$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 138$	*	$\text{♩} = 138$	$\text{♩} = 138$	$\text{♩} = 126$	$\text{♩} = 138$
10,1	i	Allegro molto e con brio	3/4	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 69$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 76$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 76$	*	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 76$	*	$\text{♩} = 76$
	ii	Adagio molto	2/4	$\text{♩} = 63$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 69$	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	$\text{♩} = 72$
	iii	Prestissimo	♩	$\text{♩} = 112$	$\text{♩} = 96$	$\text{♩} = 96$	$\text{♩} = 100$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 108$	*	$\text{♩} = 108$	$\text{♩} = 108$	*	$\text{♩} = 108$
10,2	i	Allegro	2/4	$\text{♩} = 108$	*	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 108$	*	$\text{♩} = 96$	$\text{♩} = 96$	$\text{♩} = 96$	$\text{♩} = 96$	$\text{♩} = 112$	$\text{♩} = 112$	*	$\text{♩} = 96$
	ii	Allegretto	3/4	$\text{♩} = 76$	*	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 76$	*	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	$\text{♩} = 72$
	iii	Presto	2/4	$\text{♩} = 96$	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 160$	*	$\text{♩} = 160$	$\text{♩} = 160$	$\text{♩} = 160$	$\text{♩} = 160$	$\text{♩} = 160$	$\text{♩} = 160$	*	$\text{♩} = 160$
10,3	i	Presto	♩	$\text{♩} = 152$	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 126$	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 132$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 132$	*	$\text{♩} = 132$
	ii	Largo e mesto	6/8	$\text{♩} = 66$	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 76$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	$\text{♩} = 72$
	iii	Menuetto. Allegro	3/4	$\text{♩} = 84$	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 84$	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	$\text{♩} = 72$
	iv	Allegro	♩	$\text{♩} = 160$	$\text{♩} = 152$	$\text{♩} = 152$	$\text{♩} = 152$	$\text{♩} = 152$	*	*	$\text{♩} = 152$	$\text{♩} = 152$	$\text{♩} = 152$	$\text{♩} = 152$	*	$\text{♩} = 152$
13	i	Grave	♩	$\text{♩} = 58$	$\text{♩} = 58$	$\text{♩} = 92$	$\text{♩} = 63$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 60$	$\text{♩} = 60$	$\text{♩} = 60$	$\text{♩} = 60$	*	$\text{♩} = 60$
		Allegro molto e con brio	♩	$\text{♩} = 152$	$\text{♩} = 152$	$\text{♩} = 144$	$\text{♩} = 144$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 144$	$\text{♩} = 144$	$\text{♩} = 144$	$\text{♩} = 144$	*	$\text{♩} = 144$
	ii	Adagio cantabile	2/4	$\text{♩} = 54$	$\text{♩} = 60$	$\text{♩} = 54$	$\text{♩} = 60$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 60$	$\text{♩} = 60$	$\text{♩} = 60$	$\text{♩} = 60$	*	$\text{♩} = 60$
	iii	Allegro	♩	$\text{♩} = 112$	$\text{♩} = 100$	$\text{♩} = 96$	$\text{♩} = 104$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 104$	*	$\text{♩} = 104$
14,1	i	Allegro	♩	$\text{♩} = 144$	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 144$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 152$	*	$\text{♩} = 152$	$\text{♩} = 152$	*	*
	ii	Allegretto	3/4	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 69$	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	*
	iii	Allegro commodo	♩	$\text{♩} = 100$	$\text{♩} = 100$	*	$\text{♩} = 96$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	$\text{♩} = 160$	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	*





















Opus		Tempo Indication	Metre	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8
14,2	i	Allegro	2/4	$\text{♩} = 88$	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 160$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	$\text{♩} = 160$	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	*
	ii	Andante	♩	$\text{♩} = 66$	$\text{♩} = 66$	$\text{♩} = 116$	$\text{♩} = 112$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 84$	*	$\text{♩} = 96$	$\text{♩} = 96$	*	*
	iii	Scherzo. Allegro assai	3/8	$\text{♩} = 88$	$\text{♩} = 88$	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 88$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 88$	*	$\text{♩} = 88$	$\text{♩} = 88$	*	*
22	i	Allegro con brio	c	$\text{♩} = 84$	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 84$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 94$	*	$\text{♩} = 84$	$\text{♩} = 84$	*	*
	ii	Adagio con molta espressione	9/8	$\text{♩} = 112$	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 100$	$\text{♩} = 116$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 132$	*	$\text{♩} = 116$	$\text{♩} = 116$	*	*
	iii	Menuetto	3/4	$\text{♩} = 126$	$\text{♩} = 120$	$\text{♩} = 120$	$\text{♩} = 126$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 132$	*	$\text{♩} = 126$	$\text{♩} = 126$	*	*
	iv	Allegretto	2/4	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 69$	$\text{♩} = 69$	$\text{♩} = 76$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 76$	*	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 76$	*	*
26	i	Andante	3/8	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	$\text{♩} = 80$
		1. Variation		*	$\text{♩} = 96$	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 88$	*	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 88$	$\text{♩} = 88$	*	*	
		2. Variation		$\text{♩} = 92$	$\text{♩} = 92$	$\text{♩} = 92$	$\text{♩} = 100$	$\text{♩} = 92$	$\text{♩} = 104$	*	$\text{♩} = 104$	*	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 104$	*	$\text{♩} = 104$
		3. Variation		$\text{♩} = 84$	$\text{♩} = 84$	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 92$	*	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 92$	$\text{♩} = 92$	*	*	
		4. Variation		$\text{♩} = 100$	$\text{♩} = 100$	$\text{♩} = 92$	$\text{♩} = 100$	$\text{♩} = 100$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 100$	$\text{♩} = 100$	*	*	
	5. Variation	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 92$	*	$\text{♩} = 92$	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	$\text{♩} = 92$		
	ii	Scherzo. Allegro molto	3/4	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 92$	$\text{♩} = 88$	$\text{♩} = 92$	$\text{♩} = 88$	*	$\text{♩} = 88$	*	$\text{♩} = 88$	$\text{♩} = 88$	*	$\text{♩} = 88$
iii	Marcia funebre	c	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 66$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 80$	*	$\text{♩} = 60$	*	$\text{♩} = 60$	$\text{♩} = 60$	*	$\text{♩} = 80$	
iv	Allegro	2/4	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 120$	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 120$	*	$\text{♩} = 120$	*	$\text{♩} = 108$	$\text{♩} = 120$	*	$\text{♩} = 120$	
27,1	i	Andante	♩	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 72$	$\text{♩} = 66$	$\text{♩} = 69$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 69$	$\text{♩} = 69$	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 69$	*	$\text{♩} = 69$
		Allegro	6/8	$\text{♩} = 116$	$\text{♩} = 108$	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 104$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 104$	$\text{♩} = 104$	*	$\text{♩} = 104$
	ii	Allegro molto vivace	3/4	$\text{♩} = 138$	$\text{♩} = 126$	$\text{♩} = 112$	$\text{♩} = 120$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 126$	$\text{♩} = 126$	$\text{♩} = 126$	$\text{♩} = 126$	*	$\text{♩} = 126$
	iii	Adagio con espressione	3/4	$\text{♩} = 69$	$\text{♩} = 66$	$\text{♩} = 66$	$\text{♩} = 72$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 76$	$\text{♩} = 76$	*	$\text{♩} = 76$
	iv	Allegro vivace	2/4	$\text{♩} = 160$	$\text{♩} = 138$	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 132$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 132$	$\text{♩} = 120$	$\text{♩} = 132$	*	$\text{♩} = 132$
		Presto	2/4	$\text{♩} = 120$	$\text{♩} = 120$	*	$\text{♩} = 96$	*	*	*	$\text{♩} = 96$	$\text{♩} = 96$	$\text{♩} = 88$	$\text{♩} = 96$	*	$\text{♩} = 96$

Opus		Tempo Indication	Metre	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8
27,2	i	Adagio	♩	♩= 60	♩= 63	♩= 54	♩= 60	*	♩= 60	*	♩= 60	♩= 60	♩= 60	♩= 60	*	♩= 60
	ii	Allegretto	3/4	♩= 84	♩= 80	♩= 76	♩= 80	*	♩= 76	*	♩= 76	♩= 76	♩= 76	♩= 76	*	♩= 76
	iii	Presto agitato	c	♩= 92	♩= 84	♩= 80	♩= 92	*	♩= 92	*	♩= 92	♩= 92	♩= 92	♩= 92	*	♩= 92
28	i	Allegro	3/4	♩= 76	♩= 72	♩= 72	♩= 72	*	♩= 69	*	♩= 69	*	♩= 69	♩= 69	*	♩= 69
	ii	Andante	2/4	♩= 92	♩= 92	♩= 84	♩= 88	*	♩= 104	*	♩= 104	*	♩= 104	♩= 104	*	♩= 104
	iii	Scherzo Allegro vivace	3/4	♩= 104	♩= 92	♩= 96	♩= 100	*	♩= 100	*	♩= 100	*	♩= 100	♩= 100	*	♩= 100
	iv	Allegro ma non troppo	6/8	♩= 96	♩= 84	♩= 88	♩= 88	*	♩= 92	*	♩= 92	*	♩= 92	♩= 92	*	♩= 92
		Più Allegro quasi Presto	6/8	*	*	*	*	*	♩= 112	*	♩= 112	*	♩= 112	♩= 112	*	♩= 112
31,1	i	Allegro vivace	2/4	♩= 80	♩= 80	♩= 72	♩= 152	*	*	*	♩= 160	*	♩= 160	♩= 160	*	♩= 160
	ii	Adagio grazioso	9/8	♩= 126	♩= 116	♩= 116	♩= 126	*	*	*	♩= 132	*	♩= 132	♩= 132	*	♩= 132
	iii	Allegretto	♩	♩= 108	♩= 100	♩= 96	♩= 100	*	*	*	♩= 76	*	♩= 84	♩= 84	*	♩= 84
		Adagio		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	♩= 69	*	♩= 69
Presto		*		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
31,2	i	Largo	♩	♩= 88	♩= 88	*	♩= 50	*	*	*	♩= 50	*	♩= 50	♩= 50	*	♩= 50
		Allegro	♩	♩= 112	♩= 104	♩= 104	♩= 108	*	*	*	♩= 126	*	♩= 126	♩= 126	*	♩= 126
	ii	Adagio	3/4	♩= 92	♩= 92	♩= 84	♩= 92	*	*	*	♩= 92	*	♩= 92	♩= 92	*	♩= 92
	iii	Allegretto	3/8	♩= 84	♩= 76	♩= 76	♩= 88	*	*	*	♩= 88	*	♩= 88	♩= 88	*	♩= 88
31,3	i	Allegro	3/4	♩= 60	♩= 152	♩= 144	♩= 152	♩= 152	*	*	♩= 160	*	♩= 160	♩= 160	*	♩= 160
	ii	Scherzo. Allegretto vivace	2/4	♩= 88	♩= 80	♩= 80	♩= 88	♩= 80	*	*	♩= 92	*	♩= 92	♩= 92	*	♩= 92
	iii	Menuetto. Moderato e grazioso	3/4	♩= 96	♩= 96	♩= 88	♩= 96	♩= 96	*	*	♩= 112	*	♩= 112	♩= 112	*	♩= 112
	iv	Presto con fuoco	6/8	♩= 116	♩= 104	♩= 100	♩= 96	♩= 104	*	*	♩= 96	*	♩= 96	♩= 96	*	♩= 96

Opus		Tempo Indication	Metre	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8
49,1	i	Andante	2/4	= 92	= 88	*	= 60	*	= 60	*	= 60	*	= 69	= 60	*	= 60
	ii	Allegro	6/8	= 108	= 100	*	= 60	*	= 60	*	= 60	*	= 100	= 60	*	= 60
49,2	i	Allegro ma non troppo		= 104	= 104	*	= 104	*	*	*	= 160	*	= 160	= 104	*	= 160
	ii	Tempo di Menuetto	3/4	= 112	= 112	*	= 112	*	*	*	= 126	*	= 126	= 112	*	= 126
53	i	Allegro con brio	c	= 88	= 88	= 88	= 88	*	*	*	= 88	*	= 88	= 88	*	= 88
	ii	Adagio molto	6/8	= 108	= 108	= 56	= 60	*	*	*	= 60	*	= 60	= 60	*	= 60
	iii	Allegretto moderato	2/4	= 100	= 92	= 88	= 100	*	*	*	= 112	*	= 112	= 112	*	= 112
		Prestissimo		= 88	= 80	= 88	= 84	*	*	*	= 84	*	= 80	= 84	*	= 84
54	i	In tempo di Menuetto	3/4	= 120	= 120	= 108	= 120	*	= 126	*	= 126	*	= 120	= 126	*	= 126
	ii	Allegretto	2/4	= 76	= 76	= 144	= 108	*	= 108	*	= 108	*	= 108	= 108	*	= 108
		Più Allegro	2/4	*	*	*	*	*	= 116	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
57	i	Allegro assai	12/8	= 120	= 108	= 108	= 120	*	= 138	*	= 138	*	= 126	= 138	*	= 138
		Più Allegro	12/8	*	*	*	*	*	= 160	*	= 160	*	= 160	= 160	*	= 160
	ii	Andante con moto	2/4	= 120	= 108	= 108	= 112	*	= 92	*	= 92	*	= 92	= 92	*	= 92
	iii	Allegro ma non troppo	2/4	= 138	= 138	= 132	= 144	*	= 152	*	= 152	*	= 132	= 152	*	= 152
		Presto	2/4	*	= 92	= 92	= 96	*	= 100	*	= 100	*	= 100	= 100	*	= 100
78	i	Adagio cantabile	2/4	= 76	= 76	= 72	= 76	*	*	*	= 76	*	= 76	= 76	*	= 76
	ii	Allegro ma non troppo	c	= 132	= 132	= 116	= 138	*	*	*	= 138	*	= 138	= 138	*	= 138
	iii	Allegro vivace	2/4	= 144	= 138	= 132	= 132	*	*	*	= 132	*	= 132	= 132	*	= 132

Opus		Tempo Indication	Metre	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8
79	i	Presto alla tedesca	3/4	♩= 88	♩= 84	*	♩= 84	*	*	*	♩= 84	*	♩= 84	♩= 88	*	*
	ii	Andante	9/8	♩= 56	♩= 56	*	♩= 56	*	*	*	♩= 138	*	♩= 138	♩= 56	*	*
	iii	Allegro Vivace	2/4	♩= 152	♩= 138	*	♩= 138	*	*	*	♩= 160	*	♩= 138	♩= 152	*	*
81a	i	Adagio	2/4	♩= 72	♩= 66	♩= 63	♩= 72	*	*	*	♩= 76	*	♩= 72	♩= 76	*	♩= 76
		Allegro	♩	♩= 126	♩= 116	♩= 112	♩= 126	*	*	*	♩= 108	*	♩= 108	♩= 108	*	♩= 108
	ii	Andante espressivo	2/4	♩= 72	♩= 66	♩= 72	♩= 72	*	*	*	♩= 76	*	♩= 72	♩= 76	*	♩= 76
	iii	Vivacissimamente	6/8	♩= 116	♩= 108	♩= 108	♩= 108	*	*	*	♩= 108	*	♩= 108	♩= 108	*	♩= 108
		Poco Andante	6/8	*	*	*	♩= 69	*	*	*	♩= 69	*	♩= 69	♩= 69	*	♩= 69
90	i	Mit Lebhaftigkeit, und durchaus mit Empfindung und Ausdruck	3/4	♩= 160	*	♩= 160	♩= 66	*	♩= 60	*	♩= 60	*	♩= 66	♩= 60	*	♩= 60
	ii	Nicht zu geschwind und sehr singbar	2/4	♩= 92	*	♩= 88	♩= 96	*	♩= 96	*	♩= 96	*	♩= 96	♩= 96	*	♩= 96
101	i	Etwas lebhaft und mit der innigsten Empfindung. Allegro ma non troppo	6/8	♩= 80	♩= 80	♩= 72	♩= 72	*	*	*	♩= 66	*	♩= 72	♩= 66	*	*
	ii	Zimlich lebhaft. Marschmässig. Vivace alla marcia	c	♩= 84	♩= 72	♩= 76	♩= 132	*	*	*	♩= 132	*	♩= 132	*	*	*
	iii	Langsam und sehnsuchtsvoll. Adagio ma non troppo, con affetto	2/4	♩= 54	♩= 58	♩= 60	♩= 60	*	*	*	♩= 60	*	♩= 60	♩= 60	*	*
	iv	Geschwinde, doch nicht zu sehr und mit Entschlossenheit. Allegro	2/4	♩= 132	♩= 120	♩= 132	♩= 132	*	*	*	♩= 132	*	♩= 132	♩= 138	*	*

Opus		Tempo Indication	Metre	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8
109	i	Vivace ma non troppo	2/4	= 100	= 100	= 100	= 112	*	*	*	= 112	*	= 112	= 112	*	*
		Adagio espressivo	3/4	= 66	= 66	= 66	= 66	*	*	*	= 72	*	= 72	= 72	*	*
	ii	Prestissimo	6/8	= 152	= 138	= 80	= 160	*	*	*	= 160	*	= 160	= 160	*	*
	iii	Gesangvoll, mit innigster Empfindung. Andante molto cantabile ed espressivo	3/4	= 72	= 72	= 63	= 66	*	*	*	= 66	*	= 66	= 66	*	*
		2. Variation. Leggieramente	3/4	*	*	*	= 84	*	*	*	= 84	*	= 84		*	*
		3. Variation. Allegro vivace	2/4	= 152	= 152	= 132	= 138	*	*	*	= 120	*	= 138	= 120	*	*
		4. Variation. Etwas langsamer als das Thema	9/8	= 66 (sic)	= 66 (sic)	*	= 56	*	*	*	= 56	*	= 56	= 56	*	*
		5. Variation. Allegro ma non troppo	♩	= 69	= 69	*	= 76	*	*	*	= 76	*	= 76	= 76	*	*
110	i	Moderato cantabile, molto espressivo	3/4	= 80	= 80	= 76	= 63	*	*	*	= 63	*	= 63	= 80	*	*
	ii	Allegro molto	2/4	= 120	= 120	= 120	= 112	*	*	*	= 108	*	= 112	= 120	*	*
	iii	Adagio	c	= 66	= 66	= 66	= 69	*	*	*	= 69	*	= 69	= 66	*	*
		Adagio ma non troppo	12/16	= 58	= 58	*	= 60	*	*	*	= 60	*	= 60	= 58	*	*
		Allegro ma non troppo	6/8	= 100	= 100	= 100	= 92	*	*	*	= 76	*	= 92	= 100	*	*

Opus		Tempo Indication	Metre	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8
111	i	Maestoso	c	 = 108	 = 120	 = 108	 = 56	*	*	*	 = 56	*	 = 56	 = 120	*	*
		Allegro con brio ed appassionato	c	*	 = 132	 = 132	 = 126	*	*	*	 = 126	*	 = 126	 = 132	*	*
	ii	Adagio molto semplice e cantabile	9/16	 = 63	 = 63	 = 63	 = 60	*	*	*	 = 52	*	 = 60	 = 63	*	*