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Abstract

The numerous piano figurations, exercises and experimental ideas that are found throughout the leaves of Beethoven’s sketchbooks remain a largely unexplored area within the field of Beethoven sketch-scholarship. Their existence is commonly known, but the purpose for which they served the composer has not been explored fully. Moreover, there has been little attempt to catalogue these ideas in order to make them more accessible and approachable.

This study is divided into two parts. Part one provides the biographical context in which the subsequent analysis of the figurations is based. It presents an assessment of Beethoven as a student, performer and teacher by evaluating contemporary sources and including a discussion on performance anxiety. This evidence is used to demonstrate that Beethoven could be prone to lapses in technique; that he undertook his studies with complete dedication; and that he also created exercises for some of his pupils, which supports the notion that a number of the figurations could have been designed as piano exercises.

Part two analyses the figurations, classifying them by type and grouping them into themes related to specific areas of piano technique. The analysis establishes that many of the figurations are highly inventive; that occasionally developments can be traced (in particular the evolution of the ‘Beethoven’ trill); and that in many cases there are parallels with Beethoven’s published works for piano, which proves that a single classification for the figurations is often problematic. The analysis further reveals that a significant number of the figurations were written in 1793 and, in conjunction with the earlier biographical study, strongly suggests that Beethoven’s move to Vienna was a major impetus for their creation.

Volume two presents a separate catalogue of the transcribed piano figurations, some of which are previously unknown. Within the catalogue, the figurations are arranged by type to correspond with the categories discussed in the analysis and ordered chronologically to enable them to be examined alongside the accompanying text.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Background to the Study

Beethoven's sketches form an extensive and valuable contribution to his legacy. The many drafts and revisions he made for his works have resulted in a plethora of material that has proven a popular, sometimes controversial, subject with scholars.¹ In total there are around seventy sketchbooks, which have often been given names such as Wielhorsky, Kessler, Petter and Boldrini, plus many more loose leaves that, in some cases, originally belonged to a sketchbook and have since been detached.² Amongst this material, however, there are a large number of short, as yet unidentified, sketches that have received comparatively little attention. Surrounded by a mixture of ideas for unfinished works and miscellaneous jottings, a large quantity of piano figurations exists that do not fit easily into a classification. Sometimes only a few bars in length, they present themselves as seemingly autonomous ideas that do not appear to be related to either Beethoven’s published or unfinished works. Gustav Nottebohm (1817-82) was the first scholar to raise awareness of a small number of these sketches in his pioneering examination of Beethoven’s sketchbooks,³ and although their existence is widely known, thanks largely to his research, there has been little attempt to provide full transcriptions of them and few scholars have studied them in depth. The emphasis on Beethoven sketch-studies has been devoted largely to examining sketches for either completed or unfinished works. As a result, the anomalous sketches remain a relatively untouched area.

These piano figurations are often identifiable by their layout, fingering indications and labelling of the individual hands. In some cases, however, such indications do not exist, which renders a number of the sketches particularly difficult to categorise. Similarly, as the nature of these sketches is so varied—some are believed to be piano exercises, some appear to be figurative experiments, others could be ideas for unfinished or undeveloped works and others do not have a function that is immediately apparent—in many cases, the specific purpose of the sketch is unclear, and several equally plausible interpretations are possible.

² See Johnson, Tyson and Winter, The Beethoven Sketchbooks. The names given to the sketchbooks have been used widely amongst scholars and will also be used throughout this study.
Owing to the paucity of existing scholarship on these small sketches, there is no universally accepted name, such as ‘concept sketches’ or ‘continuity drafts’, to accompany the terms already coined for Beethoven’s other sketches.⁴ Out of convenience they are often referred to as unidentified or unknown sketches because they cannot be linked to a specific work. The term ‘exercise’ used to describe a number of them is perhaps an apt description but this terminology does imply a function that has not been supported sufficiently by research. Although it may never be possible to discover Beethoven’s precise reasons for writing this type of sketch, it may be possible, through analysis and an examination of their context within Beethoven’s life and compositional output, to suggest the manner in which they served the composer. Taking the sketches presented by Nottebohm as a guide, this study will present a large number of them in the hope that gathering such a sizeable collection will facilitate an investigation into the questions that exist over their nature and use. For this reason, throughout the duration of this study, this particular group of sketches will be referred to as ‘figurations’. This choice has been governed by the desire to avoid any unfounded connotations that other labels may convey. The term ‘figuration’ provides an apt description of their physical structure but does not suggest any, as yet unsupported, intention for their use. At times, ‘experimental’ is also used to describe the figurations. This term is used to denote unusual figurations that could be adapted into a work at some point, and often were, but do not appear to have been originally intended to improve technique through practice.

Nottebohm’s collection of these figurations drew attention to specific aspects of piano technique such as scales, trills, double thirds and octaves. On occasion, these figurations are accompanied by annotations in Beethoven’s hand which clarify their execution or provide an explanation of the effect they produce when executed on the piano. There is a second group, however, which is not as easy to define. This group is more musical in nature and appears to focus on sonority and texture. In fact, both groups are particularly hard to classify exactly, as there are a number of sketches which could fit into multiple categories and others which initially may appear to belong to one of these groupings but, on closer examination, have a definite purpose that excludes them from consideration in this study. Examples of this type include Beethoven’s cadenza sketches, thematic ideas, or those which do not have any particular association with the keyboard. As a result, the figurations that have been included in this study have a predominantly technical, figurative or sonorous element.

These figurations have seldom been taken as a complete body in their own right, but in the literature where they have been discussed, individual sketches are often used to support a wider area of research, commonly related to Beethoven’s sketches for his works or areas of performance practice. There has been no comprehensive study of them that analyses their structural content, attempts to put them into a biographical context and categorises them by type.

1.2 Aims and Issues

The primary aim of this thesis is to try and determine why Beethoven wrote such a large quantity of these figurations and for what purpose he used them. The findings of this investigation will then be used to establish whether the term ‘exercise’ is an accurate description. Considering that so many of the figurations exist, it appears they served some purpose, and it is the aim of this study to attempt to establish why Beethoven was writing them down in such large numbers without appearing to use them directly in his published works. In addition, for a number of the figurations Beethoven has written comments on their effectiveness or the sound they produce. Figurations such as these do not appear to be exercises, since they have not been devised to improve technique. Instead, they are more observational or experimental but often have been grouped under the same discussion without differentiation. The aims of this study, therefore, are best expressed in the desire to answer a series of questions posed by the existence of the figurations.

The term ‘exercise’ implies that the figurations had a practical, as opposed to compositional, role. But who were they written for? Did Beethoven intend to use the figurations for himself? If this assessment is correct, the first question that needs to be addressed is why he felt the need to write his own exercises, which then leads one to ask how and why he was he using them. Were they part of a regular practice regime, were they used only in preparation for concerts, or were they part of a concerted effort by Beethoven to improve his general technique? If it is possible to establish whether they were used in preparation for concerts, do they bear any resemblance to the works that he performed, or are they completely independent from his published works?

Alternatively, if Beethoven wrote the figurations as exercises for his pupils, this study must find the evidence to support this theory and determine how he transferred the
information to them. Were Beethoven’s pupils made to read the exercises off his sketch-leaves, or did he note the figurations down in his sketches in preparation for a lesson and then teach by rote?

If the figurations are exercises, they could display the kind of development or increase in technical complexity that would be expected from a set of exercises. Conversely, if no discernible sense of development is present, this might imply that the figurations were not exercises or that the exercises were being used by someone who already had reached their full potential as a pianist. If the figurations concentrate on one specific technique, or a limited number of areas, this may suggest that a weakness in these spheres had been detected by Beethoven and that the figurations were devised specifically for this purpose. In order to reveal the nature of the figurations, a clearer appreciation of Beethoven as a piano student, as a performer and as a teacher also needs to be assimilated. Similarly, if the figurations did serve a practical, as opposed to compositional, purpose, a decline in their frequency might coincide with the decline in his activities as a performing pianist. Alternatively, if they were experimental ideas, a decline in Beethoven’s performing activities should not adversely affect their frequency.

The majority of questions presented above rely on the supposition that the figurations were designed with technical mastery in mind. If this is true, it is possible to hypothesise that there may be relatively few, if any, of these figurations in the pocket sketchbooks, as they would most likely have been conceived at the piano. If it does transpire that there are no figurations in the pocket sketchbooks, this discovery may help determine that they were devised with the aid of the piano: either through improvisation and experimentation or in their assessment and development after their initial conception.

If the figurations are not exercises, however, other possibilities for their existence need to be examined. The most obvious suggestion is that they were small ideas that may have occurred to Beethoven whilst working on another project, and that he wrote them down in order to preserve them for use at a later date. If he was utilising this practice, then ideas from the figurations may be present in contemporaneous or later works. Alternatively, if he was consciously generating the figurations at set times there may be a concentration of the figurations only on certain sketch-leaves. Even if the figurations do not appear amongst the sketches for a particular work, they still might have informed its conception in some way.
Another theory is that they may have been ideas for improvisations. Beethoven’s former pupil Carl Czerny (1791-1857) has recounted how Beethoven could improvise in three different ways: in the form of a first movement or rondo, in free variation form or in a mixed form with one idea following the other like a potpourri. Crucially, however, Czerny reports that ‘often a few insignificant tones were enough to improvise a whole piece’. It is possible, then, that some of the figurations could have been used as inspiration for such improvisations.

In summary, there are a number of theories that revolve around these figurations, each with a slightly different interpretation of their intended function, although each with a largely practical, as opposed to theoretical, basis. It is impossible to ascertain with absolute certainty how these figurations served Beethoven. This study, however, will seek to validate or disprove the theories presented above through a more comprehensive survey than currently exists.

The second aim of the study is to produce a much larger collection of the figurations than has ever been attempted before. This takes the form of a catalogue, presented as ‘Volume Two’, in which the figurations will be arranged as far as possible by type and then ordered chronologically in order to make relationships that might exist between them more visible.

1.3 Previous Research on Beethoven’s Sketches and Piano Figurations

On the occasions where the figurations have been considered, individual figurations are usually included as part of a discussion on a wider topic to substantiate a general theory. This practice has resulted in a small group of the figurations appearing relatively frequently in a number of studies, but a glut of other figurations that have never been examined before.

Gustav Nottebohm was the first scholar to note the worth of studying Beethoven’s sketchbooks. Although considerably scholarly for the time, Nottebohm’s work was never designed to provide an in-depth analysis of the sketches. His perceptive comments describe the musical content of the sketches but are often frustrating for scholars seeking a more analytical and erudite approach:

6 Nottebohm’s studies led to the publication of a thematic catalogue of Beethoven’s works by Breitkopf & Härtel (1868) but he is most noted for his two monographs: Ein Skizzenbuch von Beethoven (Leipzig, 1865) and Ein Skizzenbuch von Beethoven aus dem Jahr 1803 (Leipzig, 1880) along with a series of articles on Beethoven’s sketchbooks, which originally appeared in various journals and were later revised and incorporated into two books: Beethoveniana (1872) and Zweite Beethoveniana (published posthumously in 1887).
He plainly withheld much information, he printed for the most part curtailed transcriptions which happened to make his own particular points, and he indulged his famous laconic manner to the point of shunning exact manuscript references, among other things, with exasperating regularity.7

It is, however, a testament to Nottebohm’s work that he dominated the field of Beethoven sketch-scholarship until the 1960s and was the first scholar to note the existence of, and to transcribe, a number of the piano figurations. The examples presented in his ‘Clavierspiel’ chapter date from 1782-938 and frequently have been quoted by others, forming the core set of figurations that have received the most scholarly attention. Nottebohm’s transcriptions exhibit figurations which contain written annotations but, as noted by Kerman above, do not contain exact manuscript references, which makes a precise identification of their location challenging.

Nottebohm’s assessment is quite brief but contains a number of perceptive comments concerning the physical appearance of the figurations and suggestions for their intended use. Prefacing his assessment with an appraisal of Beethoven’s pianistic style and the statement ‘Ohne Uebung kein Meister’ (‘No master without practice’),9 Nottebohm’s belief that the figurations served a practical function is clearly evident. He is the first scholar to refer to them as ‘Uebungen’ (‘exercises’) and suggests that they are geared towards ‘the development of refined, fluent, powerful, legato or staccato playing and demonstrate that Beethoven did not neglect piano technique’.10 Nottebohm observes that the figurations are mainly short and show nothing outlandish; that they comprise mostly scale exercises, for individual and both hands; that they can be ascending and descending; that they are written in thirds, octaves, sixths and tenths; and that they may feature contrary motion, whilst others concern double thirds and sixths, trills, double trills, leaps, interlocking and crossed hands. He also identified a second group of figurations, suggesting that they reveal how Beethoven was speculating over sound effects and experimenting with lingering sounds. Nottebohm also recognised that some of the figurations have the style and form of Czerny’s daily exercises, implying that they may have originated from his lessons with Beethoven.

In 1892, a series of articles in The Musical Times by John South Shedlock (1843-1919) detailed the contents of the Kafka Miscellany11 and briefly highlighted a small number of the

---

7 Kerman, ‘Beethoven’s Early Sketches’, p. 515.
8 Nottebohm, Zweite Beethoveniana, pp. 356-63.
9 Nottebohm, ‘Clavierspiel’, p. 357.
10 ‘die Entwicklung eines fertigen, geläufigen, kräftigen, gebundenen oder abgestossenen Spiels gerichtet sind und die beweisen, dass Beethoven die Technik des Clavierspiels nicht vernachlässigt hat’. Nottebohm, ‘Clavierspiel’, p. 358. All translations are those of the present author except where indicated otherwise.
many piano figurations that can be found in there.\textsuperscript{12} He deliberately intended his articles as ‘not extracts from, but rather a supplement to Nottebohm’s’\textsuperscript{13} and, accordingly, Shedlock relies heavily on and quotes extensively from him. Like Nottebohm, Shedlock transcribed a small number of them, but made no attempt to provide an analysis or discussion. His sole comment is an acknowledgement that ‘Beethoven was keen on jotting down ideas in sequential form’\textsuperscript{14} and that one particular example ‘would make a capital “Rosalia” study’.\textsuperscript{15} Shedlock does not enter into a discussion over their presence within the sketches or what purpose they may have served. Nor does he distinguish any figurations by type. He does not make any reference to their precise location within the Kafka Miscellany. He simply states that ‘Quite a little series of similar studies might indeed be culled from our Notirungsbuch. Nottebohm … has quoted many. Two more are added here’.\textsuperscript{16}

It was not until 1970, when Joseph Kerman’s transcription and facsimile of the Kafka Miscellany was published, that any further significant reference to the piano figurations appeared. In the ‘Introduction’ to his transcription and in a supplementary article appearing the \textit{The Musical Quarterly},\textsuperscript{17} Kerman became the second scholar to attempt a broad analysis of the figurations. He felt that they should be distinguished as separate entities from Beethoven’s sketches for works and offered a number of reasons for this hypothesis. Firstly, he observed that, when compared to other sketches, the figurations are surprisingly neat and fully formed, in terms of the inclusion of clefs, time signatures and dynamics. Beethoven’s sketches have proven notoriously difficult to read, and for Kerman the figurations in the Kafka Miscellany stand out because of their completeness and clarity. Secondly he noted that, whereas the main sketches are concerned with linear and thematic development, the figurations are primarily explorations of piano figuration and texture. They are usually based upon simple alternating harmonies or sequential patterns, and there is no attempt to develop them. This lack of development is a significant feature of their physical appearance. Kerman felt that ‘the function of these notations in piano score is not clear’,\textsuperscript{18} but did suggest that they could be either piano exercises for Beethoven himself or for his students, or memoranda for

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p. 332.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 589.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 590.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{17} Kerman, \textit{Autograph Miscellany} and ‘Beethoven’s Early Sketches’.
\textsuperscript{18} Kerman, \textit{Autograph Miscellany}, Vol. II, p. xviii.
improvisations. His preference is for the latter explanation and whilst insightful, the description of the piano figurations and his suggestions for their use is conspicuously brief. In addition, after stating that they should be distinguished separately from Beethoven’s other sketches, Kerman incorporates them, without distinction, in a separate section at the end of his transcription entitled ‘Part 2: Shorter Sketches, Exercises, and Miscellaneous Notations’. Here, the piano figurations are interspersed with sketches for other instruments, unfinished works and other seemingly random notations. After remarking on their different, somewhat unique appearance, therefore, Kerman still bundles them together with dissimilar sketches, without clarifying which are piano exercises or memoranda for improvisations and which are not.

Until recently, the broadest coverage of the piano figurations was presented in the introduction to Hans Kann’s edition of J. B. Cramer’s piano studies, published in 1974, in a section entitled ‘Zu den Fingerübungen von Beethoven’. Kann transcribed thirty-five figurations as part of a complementary study. He took his examples from Nottebohm, the sketchbooks and leaves that had been published by the Beethovenhaus, and the Wielhorsky Sketchbook, but like Nottebohm and Shedlock he failed to provide details of their specific locations. Kann surmises that whilst Beethoven was writing such virtuosic works as the ‘Eroica’ Variations Op. 35 and the ‘Waldstein’ Sonata Op. 53, he was also thinking about technical problems and how to overcome them. Although his reference to the specific works cited above does not cover the existence of figurations prior to this date, Kann’s idea that the figurations were devised to overcome technical problems is plausible and complements Nottebohm’s assessment that they are exercises. He also suggests that the figurations may have been written down quickly in the sketchbooks during Beethoven’s piano lessons with his pupils and thus implies that they could have been used as teaching material too.

Kann noted similar characteristics to Nottebohm, namely that the figurations show a predilection for overcoming technical problems, discovering new combinations and experimenting with sound possibilities, but believed there were too few to get a complete picture of Beethoven’s ideas on piano technique. He concludes that identifying the exercises is troublesome:

20 The Wielhorsky Sketchbook is located in the Glinka Museum in Moscow.
21 Kann, Etüden für Klavier, p. x.
One needs to recognise that it is not possible to make a truly complete collection of the finger exercises, because a clear definition is not always possible.22

In his Ph.D dissertation and subsequent book on the Fischhof Miscellany,23 Douglas Johnson also noted the presence of the piano figurations but omitted them from his discussion and transcription in both editions, without convincing reasoning:

No specific description is offered of the unidentified smaller sketches and miscellaneous notations which appear on the majority of the pages.24

The observation that they appear on ‘the majority of the pages’ should have alerted him to their potential significance and justified their inclusion, if not in his discussion, at least in his transcription of the Fischhof Miscellany. As a result, with the exception of a select few that have been transcribed elsewhere, the piano figurations in the Fischhof Miscellany have remained largely unknown.

After the explosion of activity in the field of sketch-scholarship during the 1960s and 1970s, which produced the monumental reference book by Douglas Johnson, Alan Tyson and Robert Winter,25 a steady stream of literature continues to emerge. But the piano figurations remain largely neglected: scholars have focused primarily on using the sketches to reveal details about Beethoven’s sketching habits, to determine the chronology and genesis of specific works and to examine the internal relationships within these works.26

Most detailed sketch studies have focused on sketches for particular works or groups of works in order to limit the scope of the respective projects. Another pragmatic issue, which has resulted in a concentration of scholarship on Beethoven’s later works, is that the sketches for these works are simply more extensive than those he produced earlier in his career. For example, the sketches for the Piano Sonata Op. 109 have been studied by Heinrich Schenker,
Allen Forte, Nicholas Marston and William Meredith. Studies such as these, which have produced the hypothesis that the first movement was originally conceived as an independent composition, and which also have been used to inform decisions on aspects of performance and dynamics, have demonstrated that sketch-studies can juxtapose the boundaries of biography, analysis and performance.

The three main catalogues of sketch collections produced by Hans Gunther Klein, Hans Schmidt and Eveline Bartlitz group the piano figurations with other sketches under the labels ‘unidentified’ and ‘unknown’. Schmidt does, however, include a section entitled ‘Studienarbeiten’, which lists the location of some of these figurations (namely the ones that are most exercise-like) but provides no details of the others. In contrast, Klein’s catalogue often records if an unknown sketch is intended for piano and provides the key or time signature, but again does not reveal any further information that could distinguish the figurations pertinent to this study.

A subsidiary area, arising from the attention given to sketches for Beethoven’s published works, is the interest in sketches for unpublished and unfinished works. Here, studies have examined sketches for works that were never finished but were developed enough to enable a general overview of their structure to be discerned and, in some cases, a reconstruction of that work. Studies of this kind have been undertaken by Richard Kramer, Nicholas Cook, Nicholas Marston and Barry Cooper.

William S. Newman, Sandra Rosenblum and Tilman Skowroneck are notable scholars who have used the occasional piano figuration to help highlight or substantiate their arguments. Newman was particularly adept at picking out figurations which helped support his views on fingering styles and trills. Both Newman and Skowroneck have produced detailed accounts of Beethoven’s pianos and his instrumental preferences, how the individual characteristics of the piano influenced his writing for it, his beliefs on performance practice

29 Schmidt, ‘Skizzenverzeichnis’, p. 128. The smaller sketch leaves examined in this study have been labelled with their corresponding SV catalogue numbers.
31 Cook, ‘Beethoven’s Unfinished Piano Concerto: A Case of Double Vision’.
32 Marston, ‘ “In the Twilight Zone”: Beethoven’s Unfinished Piano Trio in F Minor’.
33 Cooper, ‘Newly Identified Sketches for Beethoven’s Tenth Symphony’.
34 Newman, *Beethoven on Beethoven: Performing His Music His Way,* is a collected and expanded edition of previously published material.
and assessments of his known performances by contemporaries. As part of this research, they have discussed individual figurations that were pertinent to their arguments but have not entered into an in-depth discussion about their purpose or use. Their discussions have tended to concentrate on individual figurations rather than regarding them as a collection in their own right.

In her book on performance practices, Rosenblum devoted a small section to ‘Beethoven’s Exercises and Other Fragments’ but took her examples almost exclusively from Nottebohm and Kerman’s transcription of the Kafka Miscellany. Rosenblum’s inclusion of the word ‘fragment’ is particularly problematical, however, as it implies that the figurations are unfinished and, as observed by Kerman, one of the distinguishing features of these figurations is their ostensibly self-contained nature. Rosenblum’s comments are also concerned primarily with the physical realisation of the figurations. In her brief discussion, she begins by stating that ‘Beethoven never wrote the piano method he had mentioned to his good friend Gerhard von Breuning’ before going on to preface her subsequent discussion of the figurations in the following way:

[Beethoven’s] interest in digital facility and strength, in new pianistic patterns and sounds, in virtuosic challenges, and in innovative fingerings to help achieve those ends is displayed in fragments of piano writing and actual exercises found in his sketchbooks.

Her initial statement, regarding Beethoven’s desire to write a piano tutor-book, is not referred to again, and her subsequent discussion does not make clear whether she believes the figurations could have acted as material for this tutor book, whether they are symptomatic of Beethoven’s general interest in piano technique or a combination of both. Similarly, her choice of the terms ‘fragment’ and ‘actual exercises’, and how they differ, is never defined.

Rosenblum does recognise that it is possible to group together some of the figurations thematically. She labels some as experiments in technique and regards others as experiments with sonority, notices that some ‘provide a sampling of exercises in which Beethoven concentrated on the challenges of rapid octave playing’, interprets others as utilising ‘alternately

---

36 The only exception is a figuration taken from the Kessler Sketchbook. See p. 209.
the fingers on each side of the hand’ and perceives others as incorporating ‘increasing and decreasing skips with the hands’.\(^{38}\)

Lewis Lockwood acknowledges the existence of the unidentified sketches and figurations in his biographical study of Beethoven but, again, refers to the idea of exercises without delving into a deeper investigation of them. He does, however, concur with Kerman’s suggestion that the figurations may also have been ideas for improvisations and compositions, describing them as:

A large mass of closely packed sketches, patches of musical ideas, little pieces, unfinished torsos … exercises, some verbal memoranda, and jottings of all kinds. They provide a window into Beethoven’s early workshop and the ferment of musical material with which he was beginning to forge his professional identity, reflecting his aspirations as composer, pianist, and improviser …

One striking feature of the “Kafka” papers is the mass of keyboard “exercises” or jottings that he wrote down on his sheets of loose music paper where he could sandwich them in among other musical ideas for actual compositions. These exercises, which cover about ninety pages in a modern edition of the whole material, range from two or three to about twenty measures. They are always written for keyboard two hands, and almost none of them can be traced directly to any of his sonatas, keyboard chamber works, or other finished compositions, although they often resemble some of the figuration patterns that he needed for his piano works. They form an arsenal of ideas for keyboard writing that he could use for either composition or for improvisation—the two were not fully divided, then or ever in Beethoven’s creative life—and he probably wrote them out to fix them in memory and create a written mass of material that he could examine, study, and use as a stimulus to framing means of continuity and contrast in keyboard works.\(^{39}\)

Lockwood’s comments follow the trend set by other scholars of stating that the figurations are exercises and that they could also have been used for improvisational purposes, but do not expand further on this suggestion.

Skowroneck’s thesis is arguably the most comprehensive survey of information specific to Beethoven as a performer.\(^{40}\) In this study he has noted that a large number of the figurations date from the 1790s, when Beethoven was most active as a performer, and has proposed that their existence may be as a direct result of his competition with the Viennese Klaviermeister.

Beethoven’s main professional concern during his first years in Vienna … was apparently the competition with the Viennese Klaviermeister … [this] coincides with a flood of sketches with technical or pianistic patterns of various kinds that survives from around the same time.\(^{41}\)

---


\(^{39}\) Lockwood, *Beethoven: The Music and the Life*, p. 64.

\(^{40}\) Skowroneck, ‘Beethoven the Pianist: Biographical, Organological and Performance-Practical Aspects of his Years as a Public Performer’, Gothenburg, 2006, revised and abridged as *Beethoven the Pianist*, Cambridge, 2010. All subsequent references will refer to the original Ph.D dissertation, since it is more comprehensive.

This observation provides a precise impetus for their conception alongside Nottebohm’s, Kann’s, Kerman’s and Rosenblum’s assertion that they are piano exercises. Unfortunately, however, Skowroneck does not delve further into this proposition or produce transcriptions of any of the figurations to support this theory.

To date, the most recent, and most detailed, study of the piano figurations has been conducted by Luca Chiantore for his Ph.D dissertation. Chiantore has provided by far the most transcriptions of the figurations and has divided his discussion of them into categories commensurate with their execution: ‘The action of the Finger’, ‘The mobility of the Hand and the Articulation of the Wrist’, ‘Lateral, Longitudinal and Axial Arm Movement’, ‘The Interest in Dynamics’, ‘Towards the Silence’, ‘The Pedal: a New Frontier’ and ‘Impossible Sonorities’. He presupposes the figurations are exercises, however, naming his thesis ‘Los ejercicios técnicos de Beethoven: Entre composición, improvisación e investigación sonora’ (The technical exercises of Beethoven: between composition, improvisation and sonorous investigations). His discussion, therefore, concentrates primarily on their physical execution and the pianistic techniques that Beethoven may have been exploring with each of the figurations discussed. Whilst these comments are informative (he frequently notes how Beethoven’s exploration of technique was in advance of his time), Chiantore rarely relates the figurations to Beethoven’s published works or to his life. This information would have provided a fuller picture of how they fit within the context of his activities as a pianist, teacher and composer and would potentially have provided the necessary information to explain their existence. One noteworthy exception, however, is his observation that the occurrence of the figurations seems to fall into two distinct chronological periods: 1790-95 and a second phase beginning in 1800, which reaches a peak in the years 1802-03. Chiantore echoes Skowroneck’s claim that the first group of figurations appear when Beethoven moved to Vienna and had most success as a pianist, and then suggests that the second group is linked to the gestation period of the Piano Sonatas Opp. 53, 54, 57 and the Fourth Piano Concerto Op 58.

In general, however, the piano figurations appear to have been neglected because they do not belong to sketches for Beethoven’s published or unfinished works. Owing to their self-

---

42 Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos de Beethoven: Entre composición, improvisación e investigación sonora’.
43 ‘La acción del dedo’ (p. 161); ‘La movilidad de la mano y la articulación de la muñeca’ (p. 170); ‘Desplazamientos laterales, longitudinales y axiales del antebrazo’ (p. 176); ‘El Interés por la dinámica’ (p. 195); ‘Hacia el Silencio’ (p. 202); ‘El Pedal: Una Nueva Frontera’ (p. 206) and ‘Sonoridades Imposibles’ (p. 211).
44 Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, p. 132.
contained nature, they do not appear to have been intended for any works at all and consequently have often been overlooked or dismissed as unidentified sketches. The theories put forward by Nottebohm, Kann, Kerman, Rosenblum and Chiantore that they were either designed as technical exercises or as improvisational memoranda, along with Skowroneck’s idea that they were a direct result of his competition with the Viennese Klaviermeister, have not been supported with chronologically investigated research, with the result that any ideas concerning their reason for existence are largely hypotheses.

The small amount of literature relating specifically to the piano figurations lacks depth and, especially with the earlier studies of Nottebohm, Shedlock and Kann, omits the specific locations of the figurations. A small number of figurations do, however, appear periodically in existing literature, having been much influenced by Nottebohm’s initial presentation of them (see Tab. 1.1). Until now there has not been a dedicated catalogue that transcribes the figurations and gives their precise location along with the date they were written. Where transcriptions have been presented, the editorial methods differ from scholar to scholar and have resulted in different versions of the same figurations being produced.\(^{45}\) Chiantore’s study is currently the most comprehensive, but his method of presenting the transcriptions in-text hampers an appraisal of whether any development or technical progression occurs within them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURATION (USING CAT. NUM TAKEN FROM VOL. II)</th>
<th>LOCATION OF SKETCH</th>
<th>PAGE NO. IN NOTTEBOHM</th>
<th>USED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 4</td>
<td>Kafka Miscellany f. 39v 1(3)</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>Newman, Rosenblum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 5</td>
<td>Kafka Miscellany f. 39v 15</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>Gerig,(^{46}) Jonas,(^{47}) Drake,(^{48}) Grundmann and Mies, Kann, Newman, Chiantore,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le. 13</td>
<td>Kafka Miscellany f. 40r 6(6)</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>Kann, Rosenblum, Chiantore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{45}\) Chiantore presents seven different transcriptions of Fi. 5, which have appeared in the literature since Nottebohm: ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, p. 203.

\(^{46}\) Gerig, *Famous Pianists and their Technique*, p. 92.


\(^{48}\) Drake, *The Sonatas of Beethoven As He Played and Taught Them*, p. 16.
1.4 Methodology

The easiest way to present this study has been to divide the thesis into two volumes. The first contains an analysis of the figurations and the second comprises a catalogue of transcriptions, thus enabling the figurations to be consulted simultaneously alongside the analysis.

49 This figuration has not been included as it does not fit into any of the categories discussed in this study.
The analysis of the figurations is preceded by a biographical study of Beethoven as a student (Chapter Two) and as a performer and teacher (Chapter Three). These areas were included in order to establish whether the assumption that the figurations are exercises is plausible. The information presented is used to determine whether Beethoven was a diligent student, if there were perceivable weaknesses in his technique and if there is evidence that confirms he used exercises when teaching. The main sources of information consulted have been the Fischer Manuscript, Beethoven’s letters, and reminiscences by friends and acquaintances.

1.4.1 Selection Process of the Sketches

Given the abundance of sketches that Beethoven left behind, it is beyond the parameters of this thesis to consult all of them, and so a selection has been chosen. The main consideration when making this selection has been to ensure that a broad cross-section of Beethoven’s total sketch output could be examined in order to assess the validity of the theories discussed above. If only sketches from the period when he was active as a pianist were examined, the findings would automatically lead to the conclusion they served a practical purpose. Sketch collections from during and after the time he was active as a public performer have deliberately been chosen in order to avoid adversely influencing the findings. Similarly, Skowroneck’s and Chiantore’s observations that a concentration of figurations appears in the early 1790s and in 1800-03 have also been taken into account: sketch collections dating from these periods have been chosen alongside those of much later dates, in order to provide evidence that will either support or refute these claims.

The different formats that Beethoven used when sketching have been considered, since an unbalanced examination could again affect any conclusions. As stated earlier, the loose leaves that Beethoven used during his early years were largely replaced by home-made and bound sketchbooks as his sketching habits became more concentrated and structured. Alongside these were the pocket sketchbooks used when he was sketching outside.

---

52 Kopitz, *Beethoven aus der Sicht.*
53 The first bound sketchbook is Grasnick 1, which dates from 1798-99. Prior to this date Beethoven used loose leaves.
54 The first pocket sketchbook is Artaria 205/2, dating from August-September 1811. F. 96 of the Kafka Miscellany, however, has been folded into four and contains pencil sketches on the verso suggesting that
pocket sketchbooks were primarily reserved for drafting ideas in preparation for larger works, and it is less likely that piano figurations will appear in them, since it would be more difficult to envisage such physical gestures without the tactile point of reference that a piano would provide. Moreover, the figurations which comment on feasibility of execution or the effect produced on the piano, along with those that appear to be investigations into sonority, are most likely to have been composed whilst sitting at the piano. The pocket sketchbooks cannot automatically be discounted without examination, however, and so a representative selection has been included.

Table 1.2 indicates the sketch collections that have been consulted. They have been chosen to represent a cross-section of Beethoven’s sketch collections, in order to provide a general overview of his sketching habits. The selection is neither restricted to a single period nor confined to one format. It is, however, important to concede that, by selecting collections in this way, figurations in other collections may be missed. Where particularly pertinent individual figurations are already known to exist in other collections, they have been included in the following examination regardless of their location. The comprehensiveness and breadth of sketches selected has been devised to guard against any undiscovered figurations significantly affecting the overall conclusions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKETCH COLLECTION</th>
<th>ORIGINAL FORMAT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>FORMAT CONSULTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wegeler Collection, SV 329</td>
<td>Loose Leaves</td>
<td>c.1790</td>
<td>BNba</td>
<td>Digital Photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. C. Bodmer Collection, SV 75</td>
<td>Loose leaves</td>
<td>1790-92</td>
<td>BNba</td>
<td>Digital Photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer Collection, SV 361</td>
<td>Loose Leaf</td>
<td>c.1794</td>
<td>Private Collection, Paris</td>
<td>Photograph55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 105</td>
<td>Loose leaves</td>
<td>c. late 1794</td>
<td>BNba</td>
<td>Digital Photograph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beethoven may have used this leaf in a similar way. This leaf has been dated to c.1790-92 and so could be a very early example of this practice.

55 The photograph used for examination is found in the appendix of: Chopin, *Esquisses pour une Méthode de piano*, ed. Jean-Jacques Eigeldinger.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Format/Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kafka Miscellany, SV 185, London Add. 29801 ff. 39 – 162</td>
<td>Loose Leaves</td>
<td>Up to 1798</td>
<td>Lbl</td>
<td>Facsimile and transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischhof Miscellany, SV 31, SBPK Autograph 28</td>
<td>Loose Leaves</td>
<td>Up to 1798</td>
<td>Bsb</td>
<td>Microfiche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasnick 2, SV 46</td>
<td>Desk Sketchbook</td>
<td>Early 1799-Apr. 1800</td>
<td>Bsb</td>
<td>Facsimile and transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autograph 19e, SV 29</td>
<td>Desk Sketchbook</td>
<td>May-Aug. 1800</td>
<td>Bsb</td>
<td>Facsimile and transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsberg 7, SV 61</td>
<td>Desk Sketchbook</td>
<td>Summer/autumn 1800-March 1801</td>
<td>Bsb</td>
<td>Microfiche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kessler, SV 263</td>
<td>Desk Sketchbook</td>
<td>c. December 1801-c. June-July 1892</td>
<td>Wgm</td>
<td>Facsimile and transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wielhorsky, SV 343</td>
<td>Desk Sketchbook</td>
<td>Autumn 1802-May 1803</td>
<td>Mcm</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsberg 6, SV 60</td>
<td>Desk Sketchbook</td>
<td>May 1803-Mar. 1804</td>
<td>Kj</td>
<td>Microfiche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasnick 32, SV 58</td>
<td>Loose Gathering</td>
<td>c. 1808</td>
<td>Bsb</td>
<td>Microfiche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonn BH 124, SV 98</td>
<td>Loose Leaf</td>
<td>c. 1808</td>
<td>BNba</td>
<td>Digital Photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsberg 5, SV 59</td>
<td>Desk Sketchbook</td>
<td>March-Oct. 1809</td>
<td>Bsb</td>
<td>Facsimile and transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheide, SV 364</td>
<td>Desk Sketchbook</td>
<td>c. March 1815-c. May 1816</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>Digital Photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boldrini</td>
<td>Pocket Sketchbook</td>
<td>Autumn 1817-April 1818</td>
<td>Now lost</td>
<td>Nottebohm’s survey in Zweite Beethoveniana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonn BH 107</td>
<td>Pocket Sketchbook</td>
<td>c. Nov. 1819-Apr. 1820</td>
<td>BNba</td>
<td>Digital Photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonn BH 110</td>
<td>Pocket Sketchbook</td>
<td>Late spring/early summer 1819</td>
<td>BNba</td>
<td>Digital Photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaria 195, SV 11</td>
<td>Desk Sketchbook</td>
<td>Apr. 1820-late 1820</td>
<td>Bsb</td>
<td>Facsimile and transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonn BH 108</td>
<td>Pocket Sketchbook</td>
<td>Apr.-June 1820</td>
<td>BNba</td>
<td>Digital Photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonn BH 109</td>
<td>Pocket Sketchbook</td>
<td>Autumn 1820</td>
<td>BNba</td>
<td>Digital Photograph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56 The examination of the sketches in Autograph 19e also includes the leaves that were previously extracted but have since been reconstructed in Richard Kramer’s facsimile and transcription, *A Sketchbook from the Summer of 1800*.
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Classifying what belongs to the particular group of figurations examined in this study is problematical, and there are many grey areas regarding the suitability of the figurations. The following discussion will highlight specific problems associated with identifying appropriate figurations and will set out the selection criteria upon which the subsequent research has been based.

Whilst any sketches that have already been identified as clearly belonging to a work can easily be discounted, attempting to classify large numbers of small individual sketches by type is problematical, as some sketches resist categorisation and do not fit easily into one specific category or may appear to serve numerous functions. The generalised classification of Beethoven’s sketches has been observed before (concept sketches, continuity drafts, variants, synopsis sketches, score sketches, Brouillons, random notations and the piano figurations), but ambiguity of individual sketches is a frequently occurring problem and is a theme that will recur throughout this study.

Sketches that were not designed for piano or those that were initial ideas for unfinished or undeveloped works have also been discounted. For example, those that were labelled Sonata, Rondo, Konzert or Trio etc. were immediately discounted since, even though they have not been assigned to a known work, their function is immediately apparent. Cadenza figurations were excluded for the same reason: they were written for a specific purpose that has already been established. For example, a sketch taken from Autograph 19e is marked ‘le dernier morceau d’un concert’ (Ex. 1.1) and appears to show a possible finale for a concerto. Although never used for his published works, the function of this sketch appears to have been clear from the beginning: it was not experimental in the sense that it is not an unusual figuration and it does not look like a conventional piano exercise.

---

58 For a detailed discussion of the different categories see Cooper, *Beethoven and the Creative Process*, pp. 104-19.
Ex. 1.1: Autograph 19e, f. 13r, 6 & 7.

A sketch highlighted by Nottebohm and Kann as an exercise and labelled by Kerman as a “Study” fails the criteria set out for this study. The sketch, found on folio 153r of the Kafka Miscellany, has been classified as an exercise on account of Beethoven’s label (‘exercise for the fist’) (Ex.1.2). The subsequent passages that follow, however, strongly suggest that the sketch was a set of piano variations (seven in total) on a 16-bar theme that is not present. The sketch consists of over seventy bars of material, including major and minor variations, based around this theme. It seems that Nottebohm’s, Kann’s and Kerman’s interpretation of the sketch as a study stems entirely from the inclusion of the word ‘übung’. In addition, Nottebohm and Kann have taken the sketch out of context by presenting only the first variation. It is clearly a set of variations, however, and not an individual piano figuration. ‘Zur übung der faust’, literally meaning ‘for the practice of the fist’, could have been a partial or misremembered reference to the title of the theme. How one may practise the fist as a piano technique is perplexing and the contents of the sketch do not appear to reveal this challenge either: the variations primarily consist of triplets, octaves and scale runs. Alternatively, Beethoven’s label may be a reference to Goethe’s Faust, implying that the theme for the variations was based on a related song. Irrespective of the two interpretations for ‘Faust’, the sketch is clearly a set of piano variations and so has not been included in the study, since it does not adhere to the selection criteria presented above.

Ex. 1.2: Kafka Miscellany, f. 153r, 1 & 2.
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Kerman has also classified a sketch on folio 60r of the Kafka Miscellany as a study,\textsuperscript{60} but again the selection criteria preclude its inclusion in the subsequent analysis. The sketch travels through a variety of keys, develops the opening gesture into a variety of forms and contains a contrasting end section. All of these features are characteristics of unused sketches for a work, and the length of the sketch (over fifty bars) again distinguishes its appearance from the majority of the figurations. As an interesting aside, this sketch is noteworthy as it contains one of the earliest markings of an accelerando in Beethoven’s music (Ex. 1.3).

Johnson has dated this leaf to c.1794,\textsuperscript{61} whereas Beethoven’s earliest-known accelerando in a published work is the ‘sempre più allegro’ marking found in the Piano Sonata Op. 57/1/304.\textsuperscript{62}

\textbf{Ex. 1.3: Kafka Miscellany, f. 60r, 15(10-11) & 16(10-11).}

Sometimes deciding whether a figuration was written for piano has proven difficult, especially if it was written on one stave instead of two. There are many cases where the instrumentation for the figurations is ambiguous and in these situations a degree of discretion has been used. For example, a figuration taken from the Kafka Miscellany (Ex. 1.4) produces numerous interpretations. The first problem is Beethoven’s omission of a clef. If the sketch was written for bass clef, the final bars would ascend from $b$ through $b$-sharp to $c'$. This reading is obviously unfeasible and so a treble-clef reading is evident. Trying to interpret the length of the octave marking in bar 1 is also problematic. It seems likely that Beethoven intended the mark to apply to the whole passage given that a fall of a seventh occurs if played as written and that the marking indicates an octave to be played above the written notation (compare with Ex. 1.6). A tremolo marking as indicated in the sketch is rare in piano writing of this period but more commonly found for violin. Similarly, the compass range of the passage would extend

\textsuperscript{60} Kerman, \textit{Autograph Miscellany}, Vol. II, p. 164.
\textsuperscript{61} Johnson, \textit{Beethoven’s Early Sketches}, p. 118.
\textsuperscript{62} See also Tr. 1 (Chapter 6.1).
beyond that which was normally used by Beethoven. These details suggest, therefore, that the sketch may not have been designed for piano. The range of the figuration, along with the tremolo markings, implies that it may have been designed for violin instead: the sequence descends only to g (the lowest note available on the violin), before rising again. Consequently, this figuration has not been included in the study, since it seems unlikely that it is written for piano.

Ex. 1.4: Kafka Miscellany, f. 161r, 14(7).

Another problematic sketch, again taken from the Kafka Miscellany, displays what appear to be triple trills (Ex. 1.5). If this figuration were to be performed on the piano, the trills would need to be divided between the hands but the notation does not make this intention clear: the stem direction is uniformly pointing downwards. Beethoven, however, does not always follow conventional rules regarding stem direction, which may account for this lack of separation. Similarly, he may have felt there was not enough space on the folio to indicate upward-pointing stems. In this instance the actual layout and content of the folio has been taken into consideration, and Beethoven’s other trill figurations, included in this study, have also been consulted in order to see whether similar figurations were sketched elsewhere (see Chapter 6.1). In both cases, the implication is that this figuration could have been intended for piano and so has been included in this study but its ambiguous nature serves to highlight one of the many grey areas encountered throughout the thesis and underscores the reality that, in some cases, a definitive answer cannot be found.

Ex. 1.5: Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 13(3).

---
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There is a risk of a circular argument, as it could be suggested that only the figurations which look like piano exercises have been selected for analysis. There is no clear definition, however, of what can actually be considered an exercise *per se*, since with a little inventiveness technical exercises can be found in any musical notation. Moreover, the figurations which focus on sonority and those which contain explanations and observations regarding execution and the characteristics of the piano are not ostensibly exercises and yet they have been included in the present study. The figurations chosen, therefore, have been selected because they share the features listed below:

i) Sense of being self-contained

Many of the figurations are only a few bars in length but have a sense of being self-contained as they often finish with a perfect cadence. Although a perfect cadence could indicate the end of a phrase rather than the completion of an idea, there is usually a sense of completion. The actual length of the sketches will also be used as an indicator: many of the figurations are remarkably concise. If the idea is continued for many bars, however, it has been judged to have changed from a figuration into a partially-developed idea for a work and so has not been included.

ii) Sequential figurations followed by ‘usw.’

In contrast to figurations which appear to be self-contained, there are a large number which are marked ‘usw.’ (etc.). In these cases, if the idea is sequential or is designed to travel through clearly specified keys it has been included. In other cases ‘usw.’ could be used when an initial idea for a work has been recorded, which was then intended to be continued in a similar vein as set out in the sketch. These sketches will be distinguished from those that will be selected by using a combination of the other factors indicated above.

iii) Repeat marks

A number of the figurations are bracketed by repeat marks, suggesting that they should be practised repeatedly until their execution has been perfected.

---

64 The longest figuration in this study is twenty-two bars (Eq. 5).
iv) Instructional comments regarding execution

Beethoven occasionally writes comments regarding execution and articulation, provides specific fingerings or describes techniques that need to be employed to execute the figurations in the desired manner.

v) Comments relating to the effect of the idea or sound

Sometimes, he assesses the effect of an idea or makes a note of particular observations and sound characteristics specific to the piano. In these cases the sketches have been regarded as initial experiments in sonority and texture.

Even with the definitions listed above, there are still grey areas where a figuration may be concise enough to fulfil the specified criteria but could also be regarded as an unused idea for a work. In these cases, when the figuration has been included, its ambiguous nature will be discussed. Figurations such as these are common in the Fischhof Miscellany, which contains many unidentified and undeveloped notations for piano. Klein catalogues sketches of this type as ‘Nicht identifizierter Themen-Entwürfe’ (not identified theme-drafts), suggesting that they may have been ideas for works, although this classification has yet to be established. As a result, only the most noteworthy examples have been included.

Additionally, figurations that appeared to fulfil the criteria provided above were eventually omitted from the study when a specific function was determined. One example was found on folio 1r of the Wegeler Collection SV 329 (Ex. 1.6). A close examination revealed that it was a sketch for the song Urians Reise um die Welt Op. 52/1 (Ex. 1.7), and for this reason the sketch was removed from the study. This procedure was also followed when functions for other figurations were determined after their initial selection.

Ex. 1.6: Wegeler Collection SV 329, Koblenz, f. 1r, 5(6) & 6(6) (c.1790).
1.4.2 Categorisation and Chronological Ordering of the Figurations

The most efficient way to present the figurations has been to classify them according to content and then order them chronologically within each thematic area. The chronological dating of the sketches was driven by the desire to make any developments within the sketches more transparent. The dating of the figurations has been based on two methods: the early loose leaves, the Kafka and Fischhof Miscellanies, and the desk and pocket sketchbooks, have been dated in accordance with Johnson’s handwriting and paper-type analysis. The dating of the leaves in the Kafka Miscellany have also been cross-referenced with Barry Cooper’s ink analysis, and where there are multiple sketches dating from the same year, those that appear to have been written in the same ink have been grouped together. With Grasnick 32 and the remaining loose leaves often no date has been established, and so the handwriting styles, paper types and content of the sketches were examined in order to establish an approximate date. The individual leaf from the Meyer Collection in Paris (SV 361) and NE 105 have been dated to c.1794 owing to their lack of barlines and Beethoven’s use of an m-type double bar, which are handwriting features specific to this year. The loose-gathering Grasnick 32 has been dated to the year c.1808 on account of its paper-type being the same as the gathering HCB Mh 75, which contains sketches for the song Sensucht WoO 134/2 written late 1807-early 1808.

The dates provided, however, should be regarded as tentative, as opposed to definitive, assessments. In some cases there may be a discrepancy of a number of months, but in others, especially where the loose leaves are concerned, it might be more than a year.

Many of the figurations lend themselves particularly well to thematic classification. Rosenblum has already identified characteristics within her small selection of figurations, and

---

65 Johnson, *Beethoven’s Early Sketches*, and *The Beethoven Sketchbooks*.
66 Cooper, ‘The Ink in Beethoven’s “Kafka” Sketch Miscellany’.
68 A copy had been sent to the engravers by the end of February 1808. See Kinsky-Halm, *Das Werk Beethovens*, pp. 598-99.
these shared features continue with the larger scale encompassed by this study. Considering that such a large number of the figurations fall into specified categories, this seems to be the best way of dealing with them. There are, however, a number that have been difficult to place into one specific category. In these cases, it has been recognised that another category, sometimes more than one, would be equally as applicable. The categories have been grouped into broader areas of ‘Fundamental Skills’, ‘Keyboard Geography’, ‘Extended Techniques’ and ‘Experimental Sonorities’ and these categories have been used to form the chapter headings for the subsequent analysis.

Chapters 4-7 present an analysis of the figurations, drawing attention to any particularly noteworthy features and exposing if any links can be made with Beethoven’s published works. Each thematic category begins with a discussion of how contemporary tutor books presented similar themes, in order to assess if Beethoven’s figurations were comparable to those of his predecessors and contemporaries. The contemporary tutor books that have been included are as follows:

i) C. P. E. Bach’s *Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen*. Originally published in two parts in 1753 and 1762. Part One was revised in 1787 and Part Two in 1797. This work became a definitive guide for fingering, piano technique and performance practice. This book was known by Beethoven, and, when he began teaching Carl Czerny, he went through Bach’s exercises with him.69

ii) Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg’s *Anleitung zum Clavierspielen*. This book was published in Berlin in 1765 and was credited by Beethoven’s teacher Christian Gottlob Neefe for helping him learn his art.70 The work has been included in this study under the assumption that some of its practices may have been transferred to Beethoven through his lessons with Neefe.

iii) Daniel Gottlob Türk’s *Klavierschule* was first published in 1789 and then revised in 1802. There is no evidence that Beethoven used Türk’s book, but he did make use of Türk’s *Kurze Anweisung zum Generalbassspielen*, which implies that he was aware of his writings. The *Klavierschule* has been included in the present discussion as a further reference point for contemporary thinking on piano technique.

---

69 Kopitz, *Beethoven aus der Sicht*, p. 204.
iv) Johann Milchmeyer’s *Die wahre Art das Pianoforte zu Spielen* first published in Dresden in 1797. This treatise was the first tutor book in Germany exclusively devoted to the piano, as opposed to the harpsichord or clavichord, and contains many musical examples. It has been included firstly because it deals specifically with piano technique and secondly because its conception is more closely contemporaneous with Beethoven’s figurations than any of the previous treatises. If Beethoven’s figurations were symptomatic of general keyboard practices at the time of their conception, they may also be reflected in this treatise.

v) Muzio Clementi’s *Introduction to the Art of Playing on the Pianoforte*, first published in England in 1801 and translated into German in 1802. Of the increasing number of keyboard methods that were published at the end of the eighteenth century, Clementi’s achieved the greatest popularity and widespread use. Beethoven actively sought a copy of this method for Gerhard von Breuning, declaring to the latter’s father that ‘If he uses it in the way I shall instruct him to do later on, it will certainly produce good results’. This implies that Beethoven was in favour of its contents and, as such, it may have reflected his own beliefs on piano technique.

If Beethoven’s figurations resemble those from these treatises, the notion that the figurations were technical exercises will be strengthened. Alternatively, if they do not, the differences between Beethoven’s figurations and those of the treatises may help to reveal why he felt the need to write these figurations and thus help to explain the reason for their existence. Similarly, the piano exercises of Czerny will also be consulted in order to assess the validity of Nottebohm’s statement that they share similarities in style and form.

A comparison of Beethoven’s figurations with works by other composers, both contemporary and pre-Beethoven, lies outside the scope of this study and will need a separate investigation. The present study, however, will enable such an investigation to take place in the future. Some of the figurations are obviously common, such as scales, but it must be noted that a large proportion are of a novel or strange character such as triple trills, which tend not, if at all, to have been widely used before.

---

71 For a comparison of the other treatises see the introduction by Rosenblum in: Clementi, *Introduction*, p. v.
72 Anderson, *The Letters of Beethoven*, A-1532; Brandenburg, *Briefwechsel Gesamtausgabe*, B-2203. Subsequent references will provide only the abbreviated form of the editor and letter number.
1.4.3 Transcription of the Sketches and Editorial Method

A number of the sketchbooks have been published in facsimile and transcription. This is true of Grasnick 2,73 Autograph 19e,74 Landsberg 5,75 the Wielhorsky Sketchbook,76 the Kessler Sketchbook,77 Artaria 19578 and the Moscow pocket sketchbook.79 The editorial method of these transcriptions differs considerably, however, as does the quality of the facsimiles, with all but Artaria 195 being printed in monochrome. For example, whilst Kerman’s is notable for its judicious editorial approach, he does not reproduce exactly the idiosyncrasies in Beethoven’s choice of stem direction. This may seem trivial, but stem direction can prove invaluable when trying to determine how a figuration should be divided between the hands.

No transcriptions exist for the remaining sketchbooks and loose leaves. Of this type are Landsberg 6 and the Scheide sketchbooks, Grasnick 32, and all of the loose leaves. In addition, although much of the Fischhof Miscellany has been transcribed by Johnson, his omission of the figurations has ensured that very few have ever been transcribed.80 In all cases, the transcriptions presented in this study are the present author’s and where differences occur with those that have been previously published, the originals were consulted and decisions were made in accordance with the editorial method set out below.

Beethoven’s notorious omissions of clefs, key signatures and time signatures have provided frequent vexation. Although the meaning is usually clear, sometimes several possibilities appear to be equally valid. This is true of the often ambiguous and erratic placement of note-heads, and whilst Beethoven’s regular omission of accidentals is usually easy to rectify, questions still remain even in published works.81 Cooper’s description of the sketches as ‘being generally written in a kind of telegraphic style in which much is implied rather than being explicitly stated’82 is an astute assessment of the situation. As such, a transcription of Beethoven’s sketches can only ever represent one interpretation and cannot

74 Kramer, *A Sketchbook from the Summer of 1800*.
76 Fischmann, *A Sketchbook (Wielhorsky) of Beethoven from the years 1802-1803*.
77 Brandenburg, *Ludwig van Beethoven: Kéßlersches Skizzenbuch*.
79 Ivanov-Boretzky, ‘Ein Moskauer Skizzenbuch von Beethoven’.
80 A small number of transcriptions from the Fischhof Miscellany do appear in Chiantore’s thesis. These will be highlighted in the subsequent analysis.
81 Possibly the most notorious example is the question of missing naturals in the ‘Hammerklavier’ Sonata Op. 106/i/225-26.
always be viewed as definitive. A clearly defined editorial method, however, can help show what is clear, what is ambiguous and what was intended but not included.

Transcribing sketches from reproductions, instead of from original manuscripts, creates further problems. The quality of the microfiches, facsimiles and digital photographs is variable and can make reading fine details quite difficult. This is especially true of pencil markings that have faded considerably and where numerous corrections have been written over the top of the original notation. On the occasions where the ink has seeped through from the reverse of the folio or has been offset from the facing page, it is sometimes uncertain how to distinguish the original mark from the imprint, particularly in monochrome facsimiles. The greatest limitation presented by consulting such reproductions, however, occurs when trying to use differences in ink colouration as an aid to establishing chronology. In this respect, Cooper’s assessment of the Kafka Miscellany has proved invaluable for suggesting a chronology of figurations dated to the same year by Johnson’s paper-type analysis.

Owing to the variability of previous editorial methods of scholars who have produced abridged forms of the figurations when using them as examples in texts, the aim of the present catalogue has been to reproduce, as closely as was feasible, Beethoven’s intentions. Where editorial decisions have been necessary, they have been governed by the following principles:

Labelling of the Figurations
The figurations have been given an individual catalogue number that refers to their category and their chronological location within that category. The location from where the figuration has been taken, along with the folio or page, the lines on which the figuration starts and, in brackets, the bar of that particular line have been provided for each figuration. For single-stave figurations only one number will appear, whereas for two-stave figurations the details of both staves are indicated, since in some cases the bar numbers for each line are not identical. An approximate date of conception has then been placed at the end:

Kafka Miscellany, f. 46r, 5(4) & 6(4) (1793)
(sketch collection) (folio) (line(bar) & line(bar)) (date)

Clefs and Key signatures
Beethoven’s inclusion of clefs and signatures is often erratic and appears to follow no set principle. It is possible to surmise that he frequently omitted treble clefs but usually included...
bass clefs or wrote ‘Linke Hand’ to make this intention clear. Where clefs have not been provided, a suggestion has been made with a bracket situated to the right of the clef. When the figuration continues over more than one system, the clefs on subsequent systems do not contain further editorial brackets, as this was deemed unnecessary.

The same principles have been applied to key signatures. If the harmonic content of the figurations implies that Beethoven has omitted a key signature in its entirety, a suggestion has been made at the beginning of the figuration and incorporated into the bracket with the clef. In the cases where a clef has been included but no key signature or where a partial key signature has been included, any further amendments have been included in square brackets.

**Time Signatures**
All time signatures presented in the figurations are original. Where no time signature has been included by Beethoven, this procedure has also been adhered to in the transcriptions as it was decided that an editorial time signature was unnecessary.

**Barlines**
Original barlines have been maintained, and where no barlines exist or the inclusion or barlines is erratic, this principle has been reproduced in the transcription. Differentiation between Beethoven’s final m-type and s-type double barlines, in contrast to his separating double barlines, has been made in accordance with the following procedure:

- m-type and s-type double barlines: thin-thick final barline
- separating double barlines: two thin barlines

This principle has also been applied to Beethoven’s repeat markings, and his preference for dashes, instead of dots, to indicate repeats has been reproduced.

**Beaming and Stem Direction**
Stem direction follows that of the original sketch. This decision was taken as it may show clues about hand distribution. Likewise, the original beaming of quavers, semiquavers and demisemiquavers has been retained. Exceptions occur only where Beethoven has employed

---

83 See Cooper, ‘Beethoven and the Double Bar’.
the use of cross beaming between staves and on the same stave. In these cases, where this style of beaming was feasible, it has been included but in others, the diagonal line interfered with the reading of the notation and was changed to standard beaming. The original distribution of notes between staves has also been retained.

**Accidentals**

Beethoven’s rare uses of cautionary and redundant accidentals have been preserved. Where it appears that accidentals are missing, a suggestion has been made in square brackets.

**Articulation**

All articulation marks are Beethoven’s. His distinction between small wedges and dots, where applicable, has been retained.

**Written Instructions, Tempo Indications and Observations**

All written comments are Beethoven’s own. Every effort has been taken to ensure that the positioning and spacing of the text replicates Beethoven’s. In some cases this has necessitated double-spacing letters and words. Where Beethoven’s comments run over onto more than one line, the structure of the lines has been replicated. The idiosyncrasies in Beethoven’s choice of words, grammar and spelling mistakes have been reproduced, along with his fingerings. This includes his occasional preference for writing dots over thumb markings.

**Ink Blobs, Unidentified and Ambiguous Marks**

In the cases where ink blobs and ambiguous marks or tears to a leaf have impacted upon the reading and interpretation of a text, their position has been included in the transcription in square brackets. Where no easily discernible impact has been made, such markings have not been mentioned. If a word or comment has proven impossible to decipher, its location has been noted in the transcription.
2 Beethoven the Student

Previous research relating to Beethoven as a student has concentrated on his compositional rather than instrumental studies, as they produced readily available evidence in the form of counterpoint exercises and sketches. Extensive studies on his composition teachers have also been carried out. In contrast, very little is known about the instrumental teaching Beethoven received and the nature of these lessons. The fact that Beethoven’s keyboard lessons appear to have ceased after he moved to Vienna is also problematic, since the documentary evidence that exists from his time in Bonn is limited: Richard Kramer succinctly notes that it is ‘known to us only through fragile reconstruction and inference’.

Although Beethoven’s keyboard teachers have already been discussed by a number of scholars, this chapter will re-examine the evidence in order to determine if there were any perceptible deficiencies in his training that may have resulted in gaps in his technique. In addition, the different keyboard instruments Beethoven played will be examined to ascertain if they could have impacted upon his technical development. Thirdly, the accounts revealing Beethoven’s attitude towards his studies will be evaluated in order to establish whether he approached them with diligence. Finally, the repertoire and tutor books that were accessible to Beethoven will be examined.

2.1 Beethoven’s Piano Teachers

Evidence that provides details about the nature and content of Beethoven’s instrumental lessons is minimal. This evidence comes from the Fischer manuscript; the recollections of Ferdinand Ries (1784-1838) and Franz Gerhard Wegeler (1765-1814), which were published in
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84 The most comprehensive study is Nottebohm, Beethoven’s Studien.
85 See Worsley, Investigating the Influence of Christian Gottlob Neefe; Schiedermair, Der Junge Beethoven; and Nottebohm, Beethoven’s Studien.
86 It is thought that Beethoven may have received violin lessons from Ignaz Schuppanzigh (1776-1830). In his memorandum book he wrote: ‘Schuppanzigh, 3 times a W. [and] Albrechtsberger, 3 times a W’, suggesting that he was receiving lessons from both Schuppanzigh and Albrechtsberger. See Thayer-Forbes, p. 146.
87 Kramer, ‘Notes to Beethoven’s Education’, p. 73.
88 See in particular: Nottebohm, Beethoven’s Studien and Skowroneck, ‘Beethoven the Pianist’.
89 The Fishers began writing their recollections in c.1838 and finished the manuscript in 1850. It remained in the city of Bonn’s archives and was first published by Joseph Schmidt-Görg as Des Bonner Bückermeisters Gottfried Fischer Aufzeichnungen über Beethovens Jugend, Bonn, 1971.
a letter written in 1783 by Beethoven’s teacher Christian Gottlob Neefe (1748-98), and finally by Beethoven himself in the dedication he wrote at the beginning of the Piano Sonatas WoO 47.

It is well known that Johann van Beethoven (c.1739-92) gave his son his first lessons at the keyboard and, until recently, attention has focused on the harsh regime he inflicted upon him. Skowroneck has challenged this belief, however, by suggesting that Johann’s approach was usual at that time. The extent of Johann’s keyboard skills is questionable, given Wegeler’s statement that he was ‘no Klavier player’. He must, however, have been proficient enough to establish a reputation as a keyboard teacher in Bonn, and Gottfried Fischer recalled that, under Johann’s tutelage, Beethoven had made sufficient progress to play ‘neatly’ the music that was given to him, suggesting that Johann, at least, was adept enough to teach the basic principles. Skowroneck presents a case that implies his teaching methods were actually quite systematic: he has analysed the oft-cited anecdote from the Fischer manuscript, where Johann scolds Beethoven for his attempts at improvising by declaring that he should concentrate on learning the basics first, and has compared it with Quantz’s remarks in his *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen*, concluding that:

While lacking all of Quantz’s sophistication, Johann’s insistence that the young Ludwig learn the necessary steps in the good order—in order to let the effort of learning to play amount to something of some “use”—is thus quite the opposite of a haphazard music-pedagogical approach.

Skowroneck’s assessment transforms the common assumption that Johann was trying to stifle his son’s improvisational abilities, and reinterprets the scenario as a method for promoting discipline whilst following a logical step-by-step learning procedure. This is a plausible assessment and works well with the idea that Johann did have a strict regime in mind when educating his son.

---

90 Biographische Notizen über Ludwig van Beethoven, Koblenz, 1838. A second edition with a ‘Nachtrag’ by Wegeler was published in 1845.
91 The letter appeared in Carl Friedrich Cramer’s *Magazin der Musik* on 2 March 1783.
92 Skowroneck, ‘Beethoven the Pianist’, p. 41.
95 ‘so das er zuletzt, was er ihm vorlägt, rein abspiele konnte’, ibid., p. 43.
96 Skowroneck, ‘Beethoven the Pianist’, p. 46.
Evidence concerning the content of Beethoven’s lessons with his father is particularly inadequate. Excepting the few reminiscences from Fischer, there is no detailed account of the methods, materials used or the structure of Beethoven’s lessons with his father. All that can be gleaned from the available information is that Johann’s lessons seemed to be systematic, since Beethoven was said to have had daily lessons on the Klavier and violin, and owing to Johann’s reluctance to allow Beethoven to improvise without music, some form of notation was used.

It seems, then, that Johann was adept as a keyboard teacher but was not skilled enough to continue his son’s instruction for any length of time, and that he viewed Beethoven’s early attempts at improvisation as unnecessary excursions away from the prescribed training he had intended. Johann, however, did enough to initiate his son’s musical education before acknowledging his own limitations and searching for further help.

Tobias Pfeiffer (c.1751-1805), an actor, keyboardist, oboist and flautist, came to Bonn in 1779 and took over as Beethoven’s teacher. Bernhard Joseph Mäurer (1757-1841) states that Pfeiffer possibly introduced Beethoven to the work of Johann Philipp Kirnberger (1721-83), although specific details about the actual content of these lessons are lacking. It does seem, however, that they may have been quite intensive considering they were said to have lasted through the night and that they contained both practical and theoretical content. Wegeler thought Beethoven owed much to Pfeiffer and remembered how, from Vienna, he provided him with financial support. Beethoven’s generosity, therefore, suggests that his relationship with Pfeiffer was cordial. Fischer also supports the view that Beethoven had learned much from Pfeiffer and even calls him his ‘main master from who he had received everything’.

Beethoven’s first taste of music education, therefore, appears to have been in the fundamentals of general musicianship, or, as Skowroneck states, ‘apprenticeship rather than artistry [and] tradition rather than novelty’, since neither Johann nor Pfeiffer were specialist keyboard players. This initial training was nevertheless proficient enough to enable Beethoven

---

100 A cellist at the Bonn court.
102 Ibid.
to perform ‘various clavier concertos and trios’ in 1778, suggesting that he had already reached a high standard.\textsuperscript{106}

The first keyboard player of note to instruct Beethoven appears to have been Gilles van den Eeden (1708-82). Van den Eeden was a court organist and composer and is thought have taught Beethoven in the late 1770s. Mäurer states that van den Eeden began teaching Beethoven when he was 11-12 years old and that he would send him to church to accompany Mass on the organ.\textsuperscript{107} The content of these lessons again must be deduced and thus it is likely that Beethoven would have studied both the Klavier and organ with van den Eeden, along with thoroughbass. Van den Eeden’s confidence to send Beethoven to church in his place suggests that, by this time, Beethoven was already proficient in the art of accompaniment.

The duration of the lessons with van den Eeden is not known. Thayer calls him a ‘totally colourless picture in the history of Beethoven’s youth’,\textsuperscript{108} but one can presume that he would have added a little more artistry and concentration on the development of technical skill than Johann or Pfeiffer on account of Schlosser’s description of him as ‘the best Klavier player in Bonn’.\textsuperscript{109}

Arguably the most well-known of Beethoven’s keyboard teachers is Christian Gottlob Neefe (1748-98).\textsuperscript{110} Neefe is known in large part thanks to Beethoven’s letter written in 1793, in which he expressed his gratitude towards his teacher:

I thank you for the advice which you have so often given me during my progress in my divine art. Should I ever become a great man, you shall also share in it.\textsuperscript{111}

Neefe introduced him to Bach’s \textit{Well-Tempered Clavier} and C. P. E. Bach’s \textit{Versuch}, promoted his abilities as a keyboard player by enlisting him as deputy court cembalist in 1783 and advocated him as assistant court organist in 1784.\textsuperscript{112} Neefe’s contribution to Beethoven’s development appears to have been to nurture his gift as a keyboard player by promotion, encouragement

\textsuperscript{106} Taken from the announcement of a concert at the Sternengasse in Cologne. The concert took place on 26 March, 1778. See Thayer-Forbes, pp. 57-58.
\textsuperscript{107} Kopitz, \textit{Beethoven aus der Sicht}, p. 570.
\textsuperscript{108} Thayer-Forbes, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{110} For a detailed appraisal of Neefe see Schiedermair, \textit{Der Junge Beethoven}, pp. 140-62.
\textsuperscript{111} ‘Ich danke Ihnen für Ihren Rath, den Sie mir sehr oft bei dem weiterkommen in meiner göttlichen Kunst erheilten. Werde ich einst ein grosser Mann, so haben auch Sie Theil daran’. The original letter is now lost. These sentences can be found in the \textit{Berlinische Musikalische Zeitung}, xxxix (1793), p. 153, in a footnote for the article ‘Musikal. Nachtrichten aus Bonn’. Also provided in A-6, B-6.
\textsuperscript{112} Thayer-Forbes p. 66.
and creating opportunities for him. His use of C. P. E. Bach’s *Versuch* was not revolutionary considering it was the most accessible piano method available at that time. Instead, his most significant contribution to Beethoven’s education was arguably the introduction of critical thinking and philosophy into his ideology: whilst a student, Neefe had become acquainted with the pedagogical beliefs of Johann Adam Hiller (1728-1804) and they came to influence his own teaching in Bonn.\(^{113}\)

Questions over the year in which Neefe took over as Beethoven’s teacher, the frequency of the lessons, if he taught him keyboard as well as composition and whether the lessons continued until Beethoven left for Vienna, have been raised. Most recently, Skowroneck has analysed the language used in Neefe’s report published in Cramer’s *Magazin der Musik*, where he briefly refers to Beethoven,\(^{114}\) and has concluded that:

\[\text{[Neefe] does not mention giving Beethoven keyboard instruction at all. He merely states his interest in Beethoven’s talent, and that he gave him Bach to play … the lack of details in Neefe’s letter suggests that, by 1783, any keyboard tuition by Neefe (if it ever took place) belonged to the past.}\]\(^{115}\)

This is a fair evaluation if one relies solely on the language used in Neefe’s account, although the use of the phrase ‘Mr Neefe has also … given him some instruction in thorough-bass’\(^{116}\) implies that some form of practical teaching had taken place, since it follows an assessment of his abilities at the keyboard. The ‘also’ implies that thorough-bass instruction was additional to standard training. Moreover, it is rather unlikely that such a diligent teacher would have handed Beethoven Bach’s *WTC* without discussing it at some level or monitoring his progress with it. Skowroneck defends his view by stressing that ‘Beethoven was already a very advanced player when Neefe entered his world’.\(^{117}\) Beethoven, however, still could have consulted Neefe on matters concerning interpretation.

Whether Beethoven’s lessons with Neefe persisted until he left for Vienna is not known and their regularity is also in doubt, as demonstrated by Skowroneck’s questioning of their

---

\(^{113}\) Hiller’s pedagogical beliefs focused on creating well-rounded musicians and, like Neefe, he adopted a paternalistic approach towards his students. It is possible that Neefe’s approach to Beethoven was derived from his own experiences with Hiller.

\(^{114}\) The report is dated 30 March 1783 and is presented in full in Schiedermair, *Der junge Beethoven*, pp. 72-83. The paragraph on Beethoven appears on p. 81.

\(^{115}\) Skowroneck, ‘Beethoven the Pianist’, p. 74.


\(^{117}\) Skowroneck, ‘Beethoven the Pianist’, p. 74.
existence at all. Since Beethoven was already an advanced keyboard player by the time he came into contact with Neefe, the amount of technical instruction he could provide was most likely limited. Neefe’s role, therefore, seems to have been to broaden Beethoven’s musical knowledge by introducing him to new works and to develop the skills he already possessed by providing him with opportunities at court.

With Neefe, Beethoven’s education again seems to have followed a traditional direction with the added ingredient of critical reflection. Consequently, his keyboard training may have been hampered by the fact that he does not appear to have had a virtuoso keyboard player as a teacher: his father was only mediocre; Pfeiffer, although seemingly a talented musician, was not primarily a keyboard player; van den Eeden, although much more skilled as an organist was, by the time Beethoven began lessons with him, advanced in years (approximately seventy); and Neefe, although a diligent teacher, was perhaps only able to offer intellectual guidance and create opportunities for Beethoven. In Bonn, there was no Clementi or Mozart who could offer their virtuosic technical expertise. As such, the advanced technical skills that Beethoven possessed were most probably the result of a combination of natural ability and private study.

Beethoven’s desire to learn from a virtuoso is evident in the journey he made to Vienna in 1787, with the intention of taking lessons from Mozart. Although very little is known about this journey, Dieter Haberl has recently examined evidence and has suggested that Beethoven could have arrived in Vienna on 14 January 1787 and stayed until 28 March at the latest.\(^\text{118}\)

Ries also verifies the meeting by stating that ‘during his first stay in Vienna Beethoven had received some lessons from Mozart but, he complained, Mozart had never played for him.’\(^\text{119}\) In contrast Beethoven’s remark to Czerny, that he had heard Mozart play several times,\(^\text{120}\) supports the notion that the meeting happened, given there is no further evidence that explains where else he could have heard him, but contradicts Ries’s assertion that Mozart had never played for Beethoven. It is possible, therefore, that Mozart might not have played for Beethoven, but that Beethoven could have heard (or overheard) him play the piano, perhaps at a soirée whilst in Vienna and thus enabling him to form his opinion of Mozart’s ‘choppy style’:

---

\(^\text{118}\) Haberl, ‘Beethovens erste Reise nach Wien’.
Ries statement that Beethoven complained Mozart had never ‘played for him’ suggests that this may have been in a private situation.

Given the lack of information surrounding this visit, it is also difficult to establish if Beethoven travelled to Vienna with the intention of seeking compositional lessons, instrumental lessons or both. If Beethoven’s intention were to visit Mozart and solicit his advice, considering the latter was both a virtuosic performer and renowned composer, it is highly likely that Beethoven would desire instruction in both fields, since he had the same aspirations. Determining the exact nature of the journey is virtually impossible. It does prove, however, that Beethoven wanted to further his studies, perhaps feeling that he had exhausted the resources available to him in Bonn, and so felt he needed to travel. This course of action was also recommended to him by Neefe in 1783.\textsuperscript{121} Beethoven’s second visit to Vienna in 1792 was made with the explicit intention to study composition with Haydn. Why he did not also seek out a keyboard teacher is not known. With the death of Mozart in 1791, he may have felt that there was no keyboard teacher of note that could help him further or, most likely, that he felt he would be able to improve by himself with diligent practice. Since Beethoven’s style of playing was already perceived as being quite different from other musicians, he may also have felt that he was the best person to guide his own studies. Carl Ludwig Junker’s report in 1791 recounted that Beethoven had expressed his disdain at the abilities of so-called \textit{virtuosi} he had encountered:

He confessed that on his journeys, which the Elector had enabled him to make, he rarely found in the playing of the best-known good piano players what he believed he had a right to expect.\textsuperscript{122}

Junker’s recollection appears to confirm the suggestion that Beethoven’s expectations were quite different from others and, therefore, supports the notion that he might have felt only he could help himself progress any further.\textsuperscript{123}

Once in Vienna, Beethoven effectively became his own piano teacher. His development as a pianist, and the impression he would create on the Viennese audiences, was in his own hands. It seems that he almost immediately felt a sense of competition with other pianists (See Chapter 3.3). In order to distinguish himself from his rivals, Beethoven would

\textsuperscript{121} See Schiedermair, \textit{Der Junge Beethoven}, p. 81.
\textsuperscript{122} ‘Indes gestand er doch, daß er auf seinen Reisen, die ihn sein Kurfürst machen ließ, bei den bekanntesten guten Klavierspielern selten das gefunden habe, was er zu erwarten sich berichtig t geglaubt hätte’, Kopitz, \textit{Beethoven aus der Sicht}, p. 500.
\textsuperscript{123} See also quotation given on p. 17 above.
need to execute technically-challenging and inventive figurations that would set him apart from other pianists. Skowroneck suggests that Beethoven’s main concern during these first years in Vienna was this competition with other pianists and that the concentration of technical exercises found in the sketches during these early years is as a direct result of the challenge he felt to compete with them.\textsuperscript{124} Beethoven could only establish a reputation for himself by being at the height of his pianistic capabilities, which was only achievable through diligent practice and the ability to distinguish himself by means of innovative ideas and technical wizardry. It seems, then, that Beethoven’s only option was to teach himself, since he had outgrown all of his previous teachers and, after the death of Mozart, there was no readily accessible or suitable teacher in Vienna.

2.2 Available Piano Methods and Tutors

There were minimal method books available in eighteenth-century Germany and their dissemination was often limited. Moreover, only C. P. E. Bach’s \textit{Versuch} was specifically concerned with keyboard playing and thus was considered the authoritative book on keyboard technique until the end of the eighteenth century. Two further important keyboard treatises, however, were published at the end of the eighteenth century: Türk’s \textit{Klavierschule} and Johann Peter Milchmeyer’s \textit{Die wahre Art das Pianoforte zu Spielen} (See Tab. 2.1 for full details). Although Türk’s and Milchmeyer’s books were published after Beethoven had completed his initial training, they are useful for observing contemporary thoughts and as a comparison to C. P. E. Bach. Significantly, Milchmeyer’s book was the first method book to specify ‘pianoforte’ as opposed to ‘Clavier’ in the title and thus represents a marked shift in instrumental preference.

The impact of C. P. E. Bach’s *Versuch* is clearly evident in the endorsement it received from Mozart: ‘He is the father, we are the children. Those who do anything right learned it from him. Whoever does not own this is a scoundrel’. Given that Neefe introduced Beethoven to the *Versuch*, it is likely that he would initially have been using the first edition of

---

the work. Beethoven’s use of the book when teaching Czerny, however, implies that he would also have known the revised edition.\textsuperscript{126}

The \textit{Versuch} is divided into two parts: part one is a largely narrative structure providing detailed advice and interpretation on aspects of fingering, embellishments and performance. Specific examples, such as the realisation of ornaments and appropriate fingerings, are provided. Scales in each key are discussed in turn and include fingering for both hands whilst examples are used to highlight performance-practice conventions. Part two follows a similar format with short examples being provided to clarify the narrative. Longer extracts do appear in the chapters on accompaniment and the realisation of figured bass. The most striking omission from the \textit{Versuch}, however, is basic technical exercises that could be used to strengthen and promote independence of the fingers. The intended user of the \textit{Versuch} appears to have been one who had progressed beyond a rudimentary level, although the comprehensive inclusion of scales with appropriate fingerings does seems at odds with this concept.

The subsequent tutor books offered by Marpurg and Türk also follow this predominantly narrative format and cover many of the same areas. Both Marpurg and Türk provide examples for fingering scales and realising ornaments but do not provide specific exercises. Türk’s ‘12 Pieces for use in Instruction’ are simple pieces that are not technically challenging. Milchmeyer and Clementi’s later contributions are again in a similar vein, with much time spent on providing fingering for scales and ornaments. The fingering examples, however, do tend to include figurative ideas.\textsuperscript{127} Owing to the later publication dates of both Milchmeyer and Clementi’s books, Beethoven would not have been aware of them when he was initially learning the keyboard or when he was competing with the Viennese Klaviermeister.

It seems then, that the tutor books customarily provided a narrative description followed by short practice pieces. The idea of isolating technical exercises seems only to have become fashionable at the turn of the century.\textsuperscript{128}

\textsuperscript{126} Czerny, \textit{On the Proper Performance}, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{128} Komlós, \textit{Fortepianos and their Music}, p. 126, has surmised that the fundamental difference between eighteenth-century German and English keyboard tutors was that ‘the former concentrated on expression and execution, the latter focused on instrumental technique’.
2.3 Repertoire

The repertoire that Beethoven practised and performed cannot be ascertained with any certainty, excepting Neefe’s statement that he had introduced him to Bach’s *WTC*. No record of the repertoire he performed, or when he played ‘various clavier concertos and trios’, can be found either. It is likely that Beethoven would have studied the practice pieces taken from C. P. E. Bach’s *Versuch*, given that Neefe had introduced Beethoven to it, yet the music he played beforehand for his father and Pfeiffer cannot be identified. There is little doubt, however, that, in addition to practising specific works, he would have sight-read a great deal.

Neefe’s admiration of C. P. E. Bach may have guided him to offer Beethoven other works by the composer, and it is likely that he may even have offered his own compositions as additional material. Beethoven certainly seemed well acquainted with C. P. E. Bach’s music by 1809 when he requested all of his works.\(^{129}\)

Beethoven’s role as an organist would have provided him with a schooling in church music and his thorough knowledge of this music is discussed by Sieghard Brandenburg.\(^{130}\) Within the Kafka Miscellany, there is also a leaf upon which Beethoven has copied out the chant for the *Lamentations of Jeremiah* and then proceeded to construct different accompaniments with a variety of highly chromatic harmonisations underneath.\(^{131}\) This work would have been performed during Holy Week and can be dated 1790-92.\(^{132}\) The chromatic progressions have been related to Wegeler’s account of Beethoven trying to throw off the singer Ferdinand Heller’s intonation,\(^{133}\) but also provide definite proof of a work that Beethoven would have played whilst performing his duties in church. The different keyboard instruments Beethoven played and their various musical roles within the court would also have enabled him to play a wide variety of repertoire and provided him with a range of different skills: his role as court cembalist would have developed his sight-reading, his expertise at extemporizing over figured bass and the proficiency with which he was able to direct from the keyboard.

---

\(^{129}\) A.81, B.474.

\(^{130}\) Brandenburg, *The Historical Background to the “Heiliger Dankgesang”*.

\(^{131}\) Kafka Miscellany f. 96r.


In addition, Beethoven openly declared his admiration for Mozart, and there are a number of his early works which display his influence, demonstrating that he was familiar enough with elements of Mozart’s style to have assimilated them into his own works. Moreover, a number of sketches in the Kafka Miscellany confirm that Beethoven studied Mozart’s style by copying out certain passages. Anton Reicha’s tale of acting as a page-turner for Beethoven where he was ‘mostly occupied in wrenching out the strings of the piano’, reveals that Beethoven was ‘playing a Mozart piano concerto’ at the time, although does not provide details about which one.

Beethoven is also recorded as playing a Mozart piano concerto at the Burgtheater on 31 March 1795, for a concert organised by Constanze Mozart. Thayer believed the concerto to be No. 20 in D minor K. 466, which ‘Beethoven loved especially’ although this cannot be verified as the advertisement for the concert merely reads ‘Hr. Ludwig van Beethoven will play a Concerto of Mozart’s composition on the Pianoforte’. Beethoven did write cadenzas for this concerto for Ries (WoO 58), but there is no evidence that directly links K. 466 with the performance in 1795.

Beethoven also appears to have had the opportunity to play a number of Haydn’s works at the home of Johann Gottfried von Mastiaux (1726-98), a member of the Finance Department in Bonn, who was a self-taught musician and devoted admirer of Haydn, owning a large collection of his works. In his description of von Mastiaux, Neefe records that ‘every musician is his friend and welcome to him’. This implies that Beethoven would have been able to make use of von Mastiaux’s library. A more explicit link to the von Mastiaux family can be found through Johann Gottfried’s son, Anton von Mastiaux (1766-1828), who is described as being ‘a good pianoforte player and a friend of Beethoven’s’. This direct connection with the family strengthens the notion that Beethoven was able to borrow music from von Mastiaux.

---

134 For example the Three Quartets for piano and strings, WoO 36 (1785); the Trio for piano, flute and bassoon, WoO 37 (1786); and the Rondo for Wind, WoO 25 (1793). See Cooper, Beethoven, pp. 36-41 for a discussion of their similarities.
135 Mozart’s Canon ‘O du eselhafter Martin’ appears on f. 142v (mid 1796) and ‘Der Vogelfänger bin ich ja’ appears on f. 89v (1793).
137 Thayer-Forbes, p. 175.
138 Neefe describes this by saying ‘in his large collection of music there are already 80 symphonies, 30 quartets and 40 trios by that master’. Ibid., p. 37.
139 Ibid., p. 37.
140 Ibid., p. 92.
Mastiaux and thus become acquainted with the works of Haydn prior to his residency in Vienna.

In addition, Cooper has authenticated annotations in Beethoven’s hand in a copy of J. C. Bach’s *Six Sonates pour le Clavecin ou le Piano Forte*.\(^{141}\) Although the exact date from which Beethoven owned this copy, and annotated it, is difficult to establish from an analysis of his handwriting alone, it is possible that he could have owned the score as early as 1783: Cooper has pointed out similarities in the structure of Beethoven’s earliest piano sonatas WoO 47, with J. C. Bach’s. This collection of sonatas, therefore, represents another tangible example of the repertoire that Beethoven could have played in Bonn.

Clementi may also have attracted Beethoven’s attention. Beethoven was said to have had the greatest admiration for him and, according to Schindler, possessed nearly all of his sonatas. Significantly, in the late 1780s, Clementi was regarded as ‘the pianist with the greatest international reputation’.\(^{142}\) Since Beethoven had similar aspirations, and given Clementi’s widespread recognition, it is likely that he would have been aware of Clementi and that he would have played through and perhaps even studied as much of Clementi’s music as possible in order to gain an understanding of why he had developed the reputation he had. Clementi’s Piano Sonatas Op. 7 were published by Artaria in 1782; Op. 10 was published in 1783 and Op. 9 c.1783, confirming that Beethoven would have had at least partial access to some of these works.\(^{143}\)

It is likely, therefore, that Beethoven would have studied a variety of music by listening, reading the scores and playing it through on the piano. In addition, Neefe and von Mastiaux may have introduced him to composers of whom he might otherwise have been unaware of. Although the variety of roles in which he performed as a keyboardist would have broadened his general musicianship skills, one area which appears to have been neglected is the provision of technically challenging and virtuosic exercises: Beethoven’s teachers were accomplished musicians but they were not virtuoso keyboard players. They would not have been able to show him innovative ideas or technical skills that would amaze audiences. His training appears to have been that of a standard court musician. Beethoven’s desire to innovate, however, is

---

141 Cooper, ‘Beethoven’s Copy of J. C. Bach’s Six Sonatas, Op. 17’.
143 The publication dates of Op. 7 and Op. 10 can be dated by their announcements in the *Wiener Zeitung*: Op. 7 was announced on 25 September 1782 and Op. 10 was announced on 5 July 1783. No announcement was made for Op. 10 but Artaria advertised the sonatas on 24 May 1783. For further details see Tyson, *Muzio Clementi Thematic Catalogue*, pp. 17, 43, 45 and 46.
evident from an early age in his fondness for improvising, his pleasure in trying to throw the singer off key in his harmonisations of the *Lamentations of Jeremiah*, and in the search for a virtuoso teacher on his first visit to Vienna. It appears that Beethoven’s desire to extend and expand his keyboard skills was often found wanting in the teachers he was provided with or the repertoire he was able to play; hence his predilection for improvising. After his move to Vienna, his development would be of his own making, and the sense of competition he felt towards others appeared to act as a catalyst that pushed him to produce technically challenging pieces. Given that Beethoven would be performing his own works, he needed to be at the peak of his pianistic powers in order not to embarrass himself. In addition to inventing new virtuosic figurations, therefore, he would also need to train himself to execute them successfully. Wegeler’s account of Sterkel’s doubt over whether he actually could play his ‘Righini’ Variations WoO 65 is one such example:

> Then he was asked to play but only complied when Sterkel intimated that he doubted whether even the composer of the Variations could play them all the way through. Beethoven played not only these variations, as far as he could remember them (Sterkel could not find the music), but also a number no less difficult.\(^{144}\)

Writing technically challenging works was one thing, but Beethoven would have to ensure that he was able to play them in order to silence the *Klaviermeister* wanting to seize any chance to embarrass him.

### 2.4 Assessment of Beethoven as a Student

Despite often being viewed as head-strong and a somewhat difficult pupil,\(^ {145}\) testimonies from Beethoven’s teachers, his written exercises, and his own beliefs and views expressed in his writings, suggest that in fact Beethoven was a diligent and conscientious student. Johann’s strictness in his initial musical training is often viewed as unnecessarily harsh, but instilling him with such a disciplined approach to his musical studies could actually have been beneficial.

\(^{144}\) ‘Nun sollte auch erspielen, tat dieses jedoch erst dann, als Sterkel ihm zu verstehen gab, er zweifle, daß selbst der Compositur obiger Variationen sie Fertig spielen könne’, Wegeler and Ries, *Biographische Notizen*, p. 22.

\(^{145}\) Ries recalled how Albrechtsberger and Salieri complained that he ‘was always so stubborn and so bent on having his own way that he had to learn many things through hard experience which he had refused earlier to accept through instruction’. Ibid., p. 103 (‘Beethoven sei immer so eigensinnig und selbstwollend gewesen, daß er Manches durch eigene harte Erfahrung, habe lernen müssen, was er früher nie als Gegenstand eines Unterrichts habe annehmen wollen’).
Beethoven’s mother also appears to have influenced his attitude towards disciplined study. Gottfried Fischer remembered how she taught Beethoven the slogan ‘without suffering there is no struggle, without struggle there is no victory, without victory no crown’. This ethos seems to have remained with Beethoven throughout his life. He refers to it in his letters and it can be seen frequently in his Tagebuch, where he has copied numerous passages that refer to endurance and how success can be achieved through great deeds. He even writes that the desire to educate himself originated in his childhood:

> From my childhood I have striven to understand what the better and wiser people of every age were driving at in their works. Shame on an artist who does not consider it his duty to achieve at least as much.

With such strong sentiments emanating from his parents, it is likely that Beethoven approached his musical studies with the belief that, if he was disciplined, he would receive the rewards his mother had alluded to. When taking over the guardianship of Karl, he even passed this outlook onto his nephew:

> Admittedly, I also mourn for your Father, however the best way for both of us to honour his memory is for you to continue your studies with the greatest zeal and to become a decent and first-rate man.

This letter verifies that the ethics imbued in him from his parents remained with Beethoven throughout adulthood and, rather significantly, were used in the first letter he wrote to Karl after the death of his brother. In another letter addressed to Cajetan Giannatasio del Rio, the owner of the boarding school attended by Karl, Beethoven expresses his concern over the length of time Karl devotes to his musical studies and by doing so reveals more about his own work ethic:

---

149 ‘freylich betraure auch ich deinen Vater, allein wir können sein Andenken beyde nicht beßerehren als indem du mit größtern Eifer deine Studien fortsezest u. dich bestreiben rechtlicher u. vorzüglicher [?] Mensch zu werden’, A-673, B-998.
150 Karl’s father died on 15 November 1815 and the aforementioned letter is dated late November 1816.
In regard to his hours for practising the pianoforte I beg you always to ensure that he put in the time ... 'La musica merita d'esser studiata' ... the few hours which he is allowed at present for his musical studies are really not sufficient.\textsuperscript{151}

The suggestion that a ‘few hours ... are not really sufficient’ implies that Beethoven believed practising the piano should take many hours. This is confirmed in Czerny’s recollection that he had ‘often told me that he practised prodigiously as a youngster, usually until well past midnight’.\textsuperscript{152} The key word in Czerny’s recollection is ‘often’ which implies that such excessive amounts of practice were a regular occurrence for Beethoven and not sporadic events.

Beethoven explicitly revealed his attitude towards his studies when he acknowledged that he derived pleasure from overcoming adversity, which echoes the ‘without struggle there is no victory’ element from his mother’s slogan:

I felt to a certain extent the pleasure I always feel when I have overcome some difficulty successfully.\textsuperscript{153}

The dedication that Beethoven applied to his musical studies is evident in a number of sources and, rather than suggesting he undertook them begrudgingly, demonstrates how he enthusiastically embraced and seemed to derive pleasure out of them. Mäurer’s account, which describes how Beethoven often had his lessons with Pfeiffer ‘in the middle of the night’,\textsuperscript{154} can be viewed as an example of the harsh regime to which his father subjected him. Yet, considering Beethoven provided Pfeiffer with financial aid after he had moved to Vienna, the action implies he was not offended by this situation and thus further strengthens the notion that he was devoted to his studies.

Beethoven’s decision to move to Vienna, and his willingness to adopt a back-to-basics approach with Haydn and Albrechtsberger at the rather advanced age of twenty-two, in order to improve his understanding of harmony and counterpoint, perhaps best exemplifies his dedication to his studies. Thayer has noted that, in Beethoven’s memorandum book, he

\textsuperscript{151} ‘was seine Stunden in dem Klawier über betrifft, so bitte ich sie, ihm selbe immer zu halten ... „la Musica merita d’esser studiata“ die paar Stunden, die ihm jetzt zu seinem Musikstudium getet sind, klecken ohnedern nicht’, A-767, B-1091.

\textsuperscript{152} Czerny, \textit{On the Proper Performance}, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{153} ‘Jede hatte ich zum Theil wieder vergnügen, wie immer, wenn ich war glücklich überstehe’, A-373, B-582.

\textsuperscript{154} Kopitz, \textit{Beethoven aus der Sicht}, pp. 569-70.
recorded his thrice weekly lesson with Albrechtsberger\textsuperscript{155} and has inserted a quote from Theodor Frimmel on the nature of these exercises:

Every line of his exercises bears witness that he entered into his studies with complete interest and zeal. (Once Beethoven writes an unprepared seventh-chord with a suspension on the margin of an exercise and adds the query: “Is it allowed?”) This was particularly the case in his exercises in counterpoint and imitation, where he strove to avoid errors.\textsuperscript{156}

Beethoven’s critical assessment of his work is likely to have derived from his lessons with Neefe and thus offers an insight into how he may have approached his musical education in general. Ignaz Seyfried examined the counterpoint exercises produced by Beethoven and also remarked that his studies continued with ‘tireless persistency’.\textsuperscript{157}

Beethoven’s practice of incessantly writing down ideas and questions appears to have been his method of learning. As was customary for the time, he educated himself by copying the works of others and noted down details from articles, advertisements and concerts too. Thus his Tagebuch and sketchbooks are full of such extracts. Beethoven even admitted this practice by declaring it was a ‘bad habit I formed in childhood of feeling obliged to write down my first ideas immediately’.\textsuperscript{158} Notably, he copied out passages from Philipp Dornaus’s article on the natural properties of the horn which was published in the Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung in 1801. These notes form a collection of studies on instrumental problems that can be found in Artaria 153 and Autograph 63, and demonstrate that he was interested in the technical properties of instruments.\textsuperscript{159}

The devotion that Beethoven gave to his studies, however, may not have derived entirely from his love of the subject. Two comments in his Tagebuch suggest that he used study as a means of escapism:

The best way not to think of your woes is to keep busy.

No time passes more quickly, rolls by faster, than when our mind is occupied or when I spend it with my Muse.\textsuperscript{160}

\textsuperscript{155} Thayer-Forbes, p. 146. In the same passage Beethoven records that he also was taking thrice weekly lessons with the violinist Ignaz Schuppanzigh.
\textsuperscript{156} Ibid., p. 147.
\textsuperscript{157} Ibid., p. 146.
\textsuperscript{158} ‘die über Gewohnheit von Kindheit an meine ersten Einfälle gleich niederschreiben zu müßen’, A-558, B-824.
\textsuperscript{159} AMZ, iii (1801), columns 308-13 and the editorial supplement on columns 313-14. See also Georg Schünemann, ‘Beethovens Studien zur Instrumentation’.
\textsuperscript{160} Paragraphs 7a and 31. Solomon, ‘Beethoven’s Tagebuch’, pp. 248 and 255.
Although the comments were written in 1813 and 1814, when Beethoven’s compositional activities were his main priority, it is possible that he applied the same ethos to his early studies on the keyboard when faced with the familial difficulties of his youth. The idea that Beethoven used practice as a form of escapism is evident in Mäurer’s observation that he preferred to practise alone when his father was not present.\(^\text{161}\) The absence of Johann would have prevented his interference in the content and structure of his son’s practice, but also would have given Beethoven the opportunity to lose himself in his musical world.

2.5 Beethoven’s Instruments

Thus far, Beethoven has been referred to as a keyboard player and the instruments he played upon as Klaviers, since the generalised use of the term ‘Klavier’ during the eighteenth century denoted clavichord, harpsichord or fortepiano. Although ‘Klavier’ was often used to signify any keyboard instrument,\(^\text{162}\) the technique and touch required to play each varies considerably.

Skowroneck has examined the available evidence in an attempt to provide an account of Beethoven’s early keyboard instruments and has surmised that Beethoven would have had access to a clavichord and harpsichord within his home, that organs were readily available around Bonn for him to practise upon and that he must have been acquainted with the fortepiano by the time he visited Mozart, since he had apparently impressed him so much with his playing.\(^\text{163}\) Schiedermair has also noted that Neefe started an agency for fortepianos and clavichords,\(^\text{164}\) which would have given Beethoven access to a variety of instruments and also, perhaps, to observe the technical developments within them. If Beethoven did have such contact, he would also have witnessed the different strengths, weaknesses and characteristics of individual instruments in a more concentrated way than encountering a variety of pianos at different performing venues. Experience of this kind would increase his understanding and appreciation of the instrument and could have informed the insightful comments written to Streicher concerning the technical and musical capabilities of the piano.\(^\text{165}\)

\(^{161}\) ‘für s. allein übte, am liebsten, wenn d[er] Vater nicht zu Hause war’, Kopitz, Beethoven aus der Sicht, p. 570.

\(^{162}\) For a detailed discussion of this see: Maunder, ‘Terminology’ in: Keyboard Instruments in Eighteenth-Century Vienna, pp. 6-16.


\(^{164}\) Schiedermair, Der Junge Beethoven, p. 69.

\(^{165}\) A-17, B-23; A-18, B-22; and A-257, B-440.
Beethoven would have been accustomed to playing organ, clavichord, harpsichord and fortepiano, which was not unusual and was considered normal practice for an eighteenth-century keyboard player. At this time in Germany, however, it was recommended that initial keyboard training take place on a clavichord. Türk specifically advocates this practice for the initial stages of learning:

The earlier one begins to play the clavichord, the further one may progress, at least with regard to dexterity.\(^{166}\)

The clavichord is unquestionably best suited for learning, for on no other keyboard instrument is it possible to achieve finesse in playing as well as on this one.\(^{167}\)

These statements confirm that clavichords were used to develop flexibility of tone production and were favoured for their expressive capabilities. Adlung observed that clavichords were also more practical because they held their tuning better and the performer did not have to replace quills frequently as one did on a harpsichord.\(^{168}\) It is also easier to switch from playing the clavichord to the organ and harpsichord than vice versa, since the sensitivity of touch required to play a clavichord already has been cultivated. C. P. E. Bach observes this point with the remark ‘A good clavichordist makes an accomplished harpsichordist, but not the reverse’.\(^{169}\)

For Beethoven to be practising ‘enormously, often until long after midnight’,\(^{170}\) the implication that this was done on a clavichord is strong, given its naturally quieter dynamic range than either a harpsichord or fortepiano.\(^{171}\) It appears that commencing keyboard lessons on the clavichord was a conventional practice, as it was believed this instrument would provide the best grounding for cultivating a sense of musical expression and sensitivity of touch. By performing on both the harpsichord and the fortepiano, Beethoven arguably would have developed greater strength in his fingers as both instruments have a heavier touch than the clavichord. This point is made by Türk:

If, in addition, a harpsichord or a good pianoforte could be acquired later, the pupil would gain even more, for by playing on these instruments, the fingers achieve more strength and elasticity.

\(^{166}\) Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, p. 17.
\(^{167}\) Ibid., p. 19.
\(^{171}\) Skowroneck has also made this point. See: ‘The Keyboard Instruments’, p. 157.
One must however, not play on the harpsichord exclusively, because execution might suffer. Whoever is not able to have both instruments should choose the clavichord.\textsuperscript{172}

The same advice is given by C. P. E. Bach:

\begin{quote}
The clavichord is needed for the study of good performance, and the harpsichord to develop proper finger strength.\textsuperscript{173}
\end{quote}

Since both writers express the virtues of using the harpsichord to develop finger strength and the clavichord to develop musicality, it appears that this practice was common.

Again, Beethoven’s introduction to the keyboard seems to have adhered to a traditional path. It is likely that he would have started his training on the clavichord, which would then have been closely followed by the harpsichord, if Skowroneck is correct that the Beethoven household possessed both instruments.\textsuperscript{174} The organ and fortepiano would have followed, contributing to the strengthening of his fingers and supplementing his general keyboard training.\textsuperscript{175}

It seems, then, that the lack of existing tutor books which concentrated on advanced technical skills, the diligence that Beethoven possessed towards his studies and the competition he faced in Vienna, combined to produce a stimulus to hone his technique. Mozart’s death prior to Beethoven’s arrival in Vienna, signified that there was no pre-eminent pianist who could assist him: the only possibility was for Beethoven to forge his own path in his instrumental studies and thus invent his own exercises.

Beethoven’s predilection for prolonged hours of practice indicates that he was starting to separate the two fields of composition and instrumental performance, which was at odds with standard practice and thus demonstrates his forward-thinking approach. The present study, therefore, has demonstrated that Beethoven had been instilled with the belief that, in order to succeed and triumph in a chosen field, one must commit himself with purpose.

\textsuperscript{172} Türk, \textit{School of Clavier Playing}, pp. 19-20.
\textsuperscript{173} ‘Man muß also das Clavichord zur Erlernung des guten Vortrags und den Flügel, um die gehörige Kraft in die Finger zu kriegen, brauchen’, Bach, \textit{Versuch}, Vol. 1, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{175} Morrow, \textit{Concert Life in Haydn’s Vienna}, p. 197, has noted that ‘as a solo instrument in public concerts, the fortepiano appears to have completely replaced the harpsichord by the 1780s’. As Vienna was considered one of the leading musical cities, it is likely they would have been at the forefront of new technology. For Beethoven in Bonn however, the introduction of the fortepiano would not have been as widespread but given Neefe’s establishment of a fortepiano company, it is likely that there would have been a number of fortepianos available.
3 Beethoven the Performer and Teacher

Through an examination of contemporary letters, reminiscences and accounts, this chapter will further seek to determine whether Beethoven may have needed to write technical exercises, and if so why. The chapter is divided into two parts: the first part assesses the capabilities of Beethoven as a performer and investigates the competitive nature of the Viennese music environment in order to establish whether this environment impacted upon his piano playing. Part two examines Beethoven’s pedagogical beliefs in order to ascertain whether the figurations could have been used as exercises for his pupils.

Owing to the fact that Beethoven did not leave any significantly detailed comments on the strengths and weaknesses of his own playing or his thoughts on teaching, this chapter is forced to rely largely on observations and reminiscences by those who witnessed his performances, and accounts by those who were taught by him. There are, however, advantages in using secondary sources, since they are likely to provide a more accurate and impartial account; it is difficult to assess one’s own capabilities objectively.

Part One: Beethoven the Performer

3.1 Criticism of Beethoven’s Piano Playing

Beethoven’s performances have been discussed a number of times by various scholars. These studies have produced an assortment of views on his capabilities as a pianist. Most recently, Skowroneck has arranged the contemporary accounts of these performances in chronological order and has argued that the notion Beethoven was always a rough pianist is incorrect. These accounts tend to focus on general stylistic areas rather than precise technical details and so their potential to help explain why Beethoven was writing the figurations has never been fully explored. They do, however, produce a consistent narrative that provides significant insights into his technical capabilities. The information presented below is not designed to provide a complete overview of these accounts. Instead, it will draw out particular points that may help to clarify the existence of the figurations.

\[176\] See for example: Sonneck, Impressions, and Newman, Beethoven on Beethoven.

The accounts testify that Beethoven’s performances excelled in their musicality: in a concert given for the Elector of Saxony during 1796, Clemens August von Schall (1758-1814) recalls how Beethoven ‘enchanted’ his audience and that the Elector Friedrich August III of Saxony (1750-1827) was ‘exceptionally content’.178 The use of the word ‘enchanted’ is significant. If Beethoven’s performance had been more notable for its technical bravura or virtuosic displays then the words ‘astonished’, ‘amazed’ or ‘astounded’ may have been used instead. The word ‘enchanted’ implies that it was the audience’s sentiments that were touched and, accordingly, that it was Beethoven’s musicality that was the outstanding feature.

Beethoven’s high degree of musicality was also noted by Czerny, who remembered that:

Beethoven’s playing of the adagio and of legato in sustained style had an almost enchanting impression on everyone who heard it; so far as I know, it has been surpassed by no one.179

In such movements the pianist’s ability to create colours, nuances in sound and interest with only minimal material is often exposed to the extreme, and thus it is significant that Czerny highlighted this as an area in which Beethoven excelled.

When criticism of his skills does arise, however, it focuses on his technical ability and when compared to other prominent pianists, Beethoven’s opponents repeatedly seemed to have had the technical edge. A reviewer for the *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* noted that:

Wölfl has advantages in that he … plays passages which seem impossible to execute with an ease, precision and clarity that cause astonishment.180

Cramer surpassed Beethoven in the perfect neatness, correctness and finish of his execution.181

The observations recorded above suggest that Beethoven’s performances lacked the cleanliness achieved by his opponents and imply that he did not execute passages accurately. The reviewer’s observation that Wölfl accomplished technical difficulties with ease implies that Beethoven may have discernibly struggled with similar passages. This idea is supported by Czerny’s recollection that Beethoven’s ‘playing did not possess that clean and brilliant elegance

---

181 Thayer-Forbes, p. 209.
of some other pianists’. It is not uncommon for professional pianists to play wrong notes; the fact that Beethoven’s inaccuracies are discussed, however, suggests that their frequency was higher than those of his contemporaries.

If Beethoven’s high degree of musicality was noted by others, it would suggest that he would also have been aware that his musicality outshone his technical capabilities and could have been working to balance the two skills. Beethoven’s technique, however, was not poor: Skowroneck’s list demonstrates that, until the beginning of the nineteenth century, the majority of the accounts are favourable. An article published in 1793 in the *Berlinische Musikalische Zeitung* describes Beethoven as being ‘beyond doubt now one of the foremost Klavier players’, and Seyfried’s remark that, prior to 1800, he was already ‘rated a first-class pianist in Vienna’ attest to this. Instead, it appears that his technical ability merely was surpassed by his extraordinary musicality. This knowledge, therefore, might have motivated him to improve his technique through the use of exercises. The majority of critiques also appear to commence from the time he moved to Vienna and, as such, would have made him more aware that his skills were being assessed and compared to others. This is at odds with the seemingly honoured position he held in Bonn, where he had few, if any, rivals.

### 3.2 Performance Anxiety and Lack of Preparation

Beethoven’s frequent refusals to perform on command may have been a reaction to the fiercely competitive Viennese musical environment in which he found himself. He continually frustrated his friends and acquaintances when he refused their requests to perform, but this does not appear to have been the case in his youth. When Beethoven visited the church of Marienforst with a group of friends, Ferdinand Wurzer (1765-1844) recalled later how they had persuaded him to play on the newly-renovated organ and that ‘he soon yielded to the request’. Although Beethoven seems to have taken some persuading, he did not refuse outright as he may have done in later years. Wegeler also implies that Beethoven would

---

184 Sonneck, *Impressions by His Contemporaries*, p. 35.
185 ‘Seine große Gutmüthigkeit gewährte bald unsere Bitte’, dated summer of 1790 or 1791, Kopitz, *Beethoven aus der Sicht*, p. 1105.
sometimes perform on request whilst residing in Bonn but that his unwillingness grew once he had moved to Vienna:

Later on, after Beethoven had become prominent in Vienna, he developed a similar, if not even stronger, aversion to being asked to play at social occasions, and each time he was asked his good humour disappeared entirely. Many times he came to me, gloomy and upset, complaining that he was forced to play even if the blood burned under his nails.\(^\text{186}\)

Wegeler was recalling a situation in which Beethoven was trying to avoid his teaching duties, but the account reveals much about his attitude towards performance. Wegeler implies that Beethoven was occasionally willing to perform whilst living in Bonn, but not in Vienna. This view is also supported by Wurzer’s account. Beethoven’s reluctance to give unplanned performances after he had moved to Vienna, however, only seems to have developed after he had secured his reputation. Whilst in Bonn, Beethoven would have been surrounded by the supportive and relatively comfortable atmosphere of his friends. Yet when he moved to Vienna, he placed himself in the heart of European musical society amongst many talented musicians who were all trying to establish their reputations and promote their musical abilities.

Viennese audiences would be critically discerning and the atmosphere would be quite competitive and in some circumstances, as will be demonstrated later, rather hostile. This change in environment could have caused Beethoven to feel pressurised into performing to the best of his abilities at all times. Therefore, it is highly probable that, on moving to Vienna, he would have been working diligently to impress his peers, excel in his performances and thus secure his reputation. Beethoven needed to be at the height of his pianistic capabilities and so would inevitably have engaged in considerable amounts of practice. Once his reputation was secure, he may have relaxed his practice routine slightly and his focus may have been switching towards composition. Trying to stage an impromptu performance successfully, with enough mastery to dazzle the Viennese audiences, would have been a daunting feat at any time; if Beethoven was asked to perform when he was not practising regularly, the performance might not have been of his usual standard and could have damaged his reputation. This worry may also explain why, on the occasions when he did perform, he improvised. If he had not been practising specific works, it is unlikely that they would be up to performance standard. His astonishing ability to improvise, however, never seemed to falter and remained with him until

\(^{186}\) Trans. is Noonan’s: Wegeler and Ries, Remembering Beethoven, pp. 24-25. For original see Biographische Notizen, pp. 24-25.
the end of his life.\textsuperscript{187} This idea is corroborated by Czerny, who recalled that ‘so extraordinary was his playing when he improvised, it was often much less successful in the performance of his published compositions, for he never took the time or had the patience to work something up again’.\textsuperscript{188}

Several instances that suggest a lack of preparation may have adversely affected Beethoven’s performance have been found: in 1803, an article in the \textit{Zeitung für die Elegante Welt} reports that Beethoven ‘who is otherwise known as an excellent pianist’ performed his Third Piano Concerto, Op. 37 at a concert on 4 April and that his performance was ‘not completely to the public’s satisfaction’.\textsuperscript{189} Yet just over a month later, his performance of the ‘Kreutzer’ Sonata Op. 47 received a very different response: the violinist George Polgreen Bridgetower (c.1779-1860) performed with Beethoven and made a note in his copy of the score that ‘Beethoven’s expression in the Andante was so chaste, which always characterised the performance of all his \textit{slow movements}, that it was unanimously hailed to be repeated twice’.\textsuperscript{190} Again Beethoven’s musical interpretation seems to have been the stand-out feature of the concert. For these two performances to have been in such close proximity but fundamentally different in terms of their success, however, it seems that it may have been his preparation that was questionable and not his pianistic ability.

Beethoven’s performance of the Third Piano Concerto was given at the concert where \textit{Christus am Ölberge} received its premiere, which also marked his first public appearance as a dramatic vocal composer. There are a number of accounts relating to this concert that attest to its lack of preparation: Ries recalled how he was called to Beethoven’s rooms early in the morning on the day of the concert and found him in bed still writing the trombone parts. He then continues to explain how poorly rehearsals had gone.\textsuperscript{191} Seyfried’s account of being asked to turn pages for Beethoven is also telling:

\begin{quote}
I saw almost nothing but empty leaves; at the most on one page or the other a few Egyptian hieroglyphs purely unintelligible to me scribbled down to serve as a reminding guide for him; for he played nearly all of the solo part from memory, since, as was so often the case, the time was too
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{187} See the accounts by Friedrich Wieck dating from 1823 and George Smart dating from September 1825 in Kopitz, \textit{Beethoven aus der Sicht}, pp. 1094 and 919.
\textsuperscript{188} ‘So außerordentlich sein Spiel im Improvisieren war, so war es oft weniger gehungen beym Vortrag seiner bereits gestochenen Compositionen denn da er sich nie die Geduld u Zeit nahm, etwas wieder zu exercieren’, Ibid., p. 233.
\textsuperscript{189} Thayer-Forbes, p. 330.
\textsuperscript{190} Ibid., p. 333.
\textsuperscript{191} Wegeler and Ries, \textit{Biographische Notizen}, pp. 90-91.
short to complete it on paper. So he gave me a clandestine wink whenever he was at the end of one of the invisible passages.\(^\text{192}\)

That Beethoven was performing from ‘Egyptian hieroglyphs’ does not in itself suggest a lack of preparation: he could have committed his part to memory without needing to write it out in full. Spending the larger part of the day supervising rehearsals, however, in addition to being engaged in the early hours of the morning with writing the trombone parts, does suggest that he may not have had the time to prepare himself fully for his performance. This could either have been physically, in that he did not have time to rehearse or warm up sufficiently, or that he may not have felt prepared mentally: he could have been pre-occupied firstly with concerns over completing the oratorio and secondly with the reception it would receive. These circumstances provide a series of extramusical factors that could have affected his performance.

The notion that performance aptitude is affected in a public situation was acknowledged by C. P. E. Bach in his \textit{Versuch} when he wrote:

\begin{quote}
All difficulties in passage work should be mastered through repeated practice … Regardless of finger dexterity, never undertake more than can be kept under control in public performance, where it is seldom possible to relax properly even to maintain a fitting disposition. Ability and disposition should be gauged by the most rapid and difficult parts in order to avoid an overexertion, which will surely result in a breakdown of the performance. Those passages which are troublesome in private and come off well only occasionally should be omitted from public performance unless the performer finds himself in a particularly favourable frame of mind. Also, the instrument should be tested beforehand with trills and other ornaments. There are two reasons for these several precautions: they will assure an agreeable, flowing performance; they will help to remove the anxious mien which, far from enlisting the listener’s sympathy, will only annoy him.\(^\text{193}\)
\end{quote}

As already discussed, Beethoven’s practical preparation for his performance of the concerto may have been hampered by trying to finish writing the music for the concert. C. P. E. Bach’s observation that it is usually rapid passages that cause a ‘breakdown in public performance’, is significant given that Beethoven was performing a concerto which is characterised by highly intricate and rapid figurations, and thus making it a stereotypical example of the type of piece C. P. E. Bach was warning against. His acknowledgement that passages of this type can

\(^{192}\) ‘ich erblickete fast lauter leere Blatter; höchstens auf einer oder der anderen Seite ein paar, nur ihm zum erinnernden Leitfaden dienende, mir rein unverständliche egyptische Hieroglyphen hingekritzelt; den er spielte beynahe die ganze Prinzipal-Stimme bloss aus dem Gedächtnisse, da ihm, wie fast gewöhnlich der Fall eintrat, die Zeit zu kurz ward, solche vollständig zu Papiere zu bringen. So gab er mir also nur jedesmal einen verstohlenen Wink, wenn er mit einer dergleichen, unsichtbaren Passage am Ende war’, Kopitz, \textit{Beethoven aus der Sicht}, p. 881.

succeed if the performer is in a ‘particularly favourable frame of mind’ is also at odds with the events surrounding Beethoven’s performance: he appears to have been pre-occupied with other concerns relating to the success of the concert and also having to rush to finish writing the parts. Beethoven’s performance at this particular concert, therefore, had all three features listed by C. P. E. Bach as contributing factors that affect the quality of a performance, and this is perhaps the reason why it was ‘not completely to the public’s satisfaction’.

In addition, modern tests have proven that mental preparation is a significant part of performance and is arguably as important as physical preparation. Researchers in performance anxiety have discovered that ‘negative thinking has a bad effect on performance quality. Worry leads to poor concentration, diverting attention and … possibly also acting as a cue to increase anxiety further’. The events surrounding Beethoven’s unsuccessful performance suggest that his capabilities as a pianist suffered when he was not fully prepared. Whether this was due to a lack of physical or mental preparation is a matter that will be considered in more detail as the chapter progresses.

When Camille Pleyel heard Beethoven perform in 1805, he observed that:

he has infinite execution, but he is not schooled, and his execution is not polished, that is to say his playing is not unblemished. He has a lot of fire, but he slaps a little too much. He accomplishes diabolical difficulties but not completely cleanly.

This statement again could be used as evidence to suggest that Beethoven’s technique was not secure. Skowroneck, however, has noted that in July 1805, shortly before Pleyel heard Beethoven play, the composer had written to Zmeskall explaining that he was unable to meet the Pleyels because he had been feeling ill for several days and that he was getting worse. If Beethoven had been feeling ill before meeting the Pleyels, this is a factor which could have affected the quality of his performance: he may not have been able to play the piano for several days and could have felt unprepared or may still have been feeling ill and was not able to concentrate fully. The object here is not to provide excuses for criticism of Beethoven’s performances, but to demonstrate that when extramusical factors prevent him from either
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195 ‘Il a infiniment d’exécution, mais il n’a pas d’école, et son exécution n’est pas finie, c’est-à-dire que son jeu n’est pas pur. Il a beaucoup de feu, mais il tape un peu trop; il fait des difficultés diaboliques, mais il ne les fait pas tout à fait nettes’, Camille Pleyel in Kopitz, _Beethoven aus der Sicht_, pp. 643-44. Newman, _Beethoven on Beethoven_, p. 80, points out that this quote is often mistakenly attributed to Ignaz Pleyel.
196 A-119, B-227, dated June 1805.
being able to practise or disturb his mental preparation, his technical execution appears to suffer.

In addition to lack of practice, technical facility is more susceptible to the effects of performance anxiety because the common physical symptoms include shaking, trembling, racing heartbeats and muscular stiffness. These side-effects are detrimental to a performer’s dexterity and control over their instrument, and are the result of the over-arousal of the autonomic nervous system. There are various stimuli for performance anxiety: a fear of public performance can occur if ‘too close an identification of self-esteem with performance perfection, even the belief that self-worth is conditional upon success’, but another form of anxiety, known as reactive anxiety, is the result of inadequate preparation. Beethoven’s career was founded on performing and composing, and his fame and success were partially dependent on his ability to excel in performance. Accordingly, in the situations presented above, he possesses the two common triggers for performance anxiety and subsequently exhibits their result: a lack of technical control.

Musical performance anxiety is also linked to social phobias and neuroticism. Evidence which suggests that Beethoven displayed these characteristics too can be deduced from the unfounded suspicions of theft and general mistrust of his housekeepers, the prolonged pretence of nobility and his infamous outbursts. After 1800, a number of accounts report a marked decline in Beethoven’s performances. He was said to have ‘failed’ in a concert where he was improvising and, after another performance, stood up ‘pale, trembling and exhausted’. Skowroneck concludes that these accounts suggest ‘a true change had in fact taken place’ and that ‘the only connecting factor that can explain the change of tenor in the

198 Ibid., p. 169.
‘it is not surprising to find that of all phobias, it is most closely related to social phobias’ and ‘individuals who are generally anxious (neurotic), introverted, and prone to social phobias are more likely to suffer from performance anxiety’, Wilson, ‘Performance anxiety’, ibid., p. 231.
‘Musicians’ anxiety appears to manifest itself particularly in emotional instability and a form of frustrated tension, but suspiciousness and low self-sentiment also feature as important components’. Kemp, The Musical Temperament, p. 106.
200 See: A-789, B-1142; A-809, B-1869; A-813, B-1146.; A-821, B-1172; A-829, B-1228; A-833, B-1201; A-865, B-1173; A-884, B-1221; A-886, B-1230; A-904, B-1260; and A-905, B-1261.
reports … is the decline of his health: both his increasing deafness and the change in his psychological condition’.  

At the beginning of the nineteenth century Beethoven had started to admit that he was suffering from hearing difficulties and the treatments he was undergoing were visible to others. If he felt that audiences were listening intently to detect any sign that his hearing was impeding his performance, his anxiety could have been increased further. The more severe symptoms of performance anxiety include palpitations, shortness of breath, hyperventilation and dizziness, which are all symptoms that could account for Beethoven’s ‘pale, trembling and exhausted state’. Moreover, Wilson has highlighted that, in established professionals, performance anxiety can take the form of ‘“burn-out” – the feeling that once on a pedestal there is nothing left but to be knocked off it again, and that only a disaster would be newsworthy’. Given that he already seemed predisposed towards feelings of anxiety, the realisation that his deafness was hindering his performing ability and that his audiences would be listening for any perceptible change in his pianistic capabilities, these worries could have caused a catastrophic effect on his psychological state, which would lead to the perceptible decline in his performances.

Beethoven appears then, to display the characteristic tendencies of one who may have suffered from performance anxiety. Consequently, in addition to being aware that his musicality was outshining his technical ability, he also may have recognised that his technique was adversely affected by inadequate preparation and anxiety. This acknowledgment could have acted as a further impetus to hone his technique. Owing to the fact that early accounts of Beethoven’s performances dating from the 1790s are largely favourable and it is only later, when Beethoven was performing less in public, that negative reports begin to appear, this implies that his practice-regime did have a large impact upon his technical capacity and that during the 1790s he was actively working on his technique.

204 See letters to Wegeler and Amenda written in 1801: A-51, B-65 and A-53, B-67. Czerny also remembered that when he went to visit Beethoven for the first time he noticed that he had ‘cotton wool in both of his ears which seemed to have been bathed in a yellow liquid’ (‘daß er in beyden Ohren Baumwolle hatte, welch in eine gelbe Flüssigkeit getaucht schien’), Kopitz, Beethoven aus der Sicht, p. 203.
3.3 Sense of Competition and Piano Duels

When Beethoven relocated to Vienna he found himself in a highly competitive environment. Surprisingly, the pressure felt by him to impress, excel and ultimately defeat may have had a beneficial effect on his performances. As expressed earlier, the reviews of Beethoven’s performances prior to 1800 were favourable, and would have been written at the time he was overtly competing against other pianists. Accordingly, it is possible to infer that when Beethoven felt threatened, his determination increased and his level of performance appears to have been enhanced. A number of anecdotes exist that support this view:

Beethoven was also obliged to play and chose the D minor Sonata (Opus 31), which had just been published. The princess who probably expected that Beethoven too would make a mistake somewhere, now stood behind his chair while I turned pages. In bars 53 to 54 Beethoven missed the entry, and instead of descending two notes and then two more, he struck each quarter note in the descending passages with his whole hand (three or four notes at once). It sounded as if the piano was being cleaned. The princess rapped him several times on the head, not at all delicately … He started again and performed marvellously.207

This account suggests that Beethoven had a competitive nature which, when challenged, worked to enhance his focus and concentration. It is notable that again it was his technical competency that faltered in his first rendition of the sonata. As such, it is likely that when he arrived in Vienna and found himself competing against the Viennese Klaviermeister, knowing that his technical ability was not as strong as his musicality, he would have been practising fiercely to perfect his skills in order to compete with and outclass his rivals. This competitive streak was tested directly in the piano duels in which he took part during the years 1793-1800.

Beethoven participated in duels with three pianists: Abbé Joseph Gelinek (1758-1825) in 1793, Joseph Wölffl (1772-1812) in 1799 and Daniel Steibelt (1765-1823) in 1800.208 Piano duels posed a direct challenge to the capabilities of a pianist and were often ferociously contended. They were a sparring contest whereby each pianist would try to outclass the other so that they might emerge the victor.209 Beethoven’s piano duels would, therefore, have acted as three very definite occasions when his capabilities were put to the test. If the figurations are technical exercises, there may be a concentration of them prior to these events as Beethoven

---

207 Trans. is Noonan’s: Wegeler and Ries, Remembering Beethoven, pp. 81-82. For original see Biographische Notizen, pp. 111-12.
208 Thayer-Forbes, pp. 139-41, 205-7 and 257. See also DeNora, ‘The Beethoven-Wölffl Piano Duel: Aesthetic Debates and Social Boundaries’ in Beethoven and the Construction of Genius, pp. 147-69.
209 For a detailed description of the piano duel format, see the letter written by Mozart to his father, dated 16 January, 1782. Spaethling, Mozart’s Letters, Mozart’s Life, p. 301.
prepared himself for battle. Out of the three competitors, Wölffl appears to have posed the greatest threat to Beethoven: born in 1773, he was younger than Beethoven but, at the time of their meeting, had enjoyed more recognition as a performer and composer. On a personal level Beethoven may even have been envious of Wölffl’s career: in 1780 he had performed a violin concerto in public\textsuperscript{210} whereas Beethoven only displayed a competent level on the violin. During the years 1783-86 Wölffl was also a chorister at Salzburg Cathedral\textsuperscript{211} whilst Beethoven was renowned for his terrible singing voice. He was friends with Mozart\textsuperscript{212} whereas Beethoven had only had the opportunity to meet him briefly and Wölffl could span a thirteenth easily\textsuperscript{213} whilst Beethoven could only manage a tenth.\textsuperscript{214} Wölffl’s compositions had also enjoyed more recognition in Vienna during the 1790s than Beethoven’s\textsuperscript{215} and, in addition, he was regarded socially as more amiable than Beethoven. This difference in personalities was publically acknowledged in an article published in the Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung:

That Wölffl likewise enjoys an advantage because of his amiable bearing, contrasted with the somewhat haughty pose of Beethoven, is very natural.\textsuperscript{216}

If Beethoven was regarded as ‘haughty’ by the public, Wölffl may also have enjoyed the more popular support, which could have made Beethoven even more determined to succeed.

Beethoven’s competitive nature would have made him determined to triumph, and thus it seems very likely that he would try to improve his technique, as it appeared to be his only weakness. The three piano duels, therefore, provided a very direct challenge to his capabilities as a pianist, but they were not isolated events. During the 1790s, his daily life in Vienna appears to have been a continual battle to assert his name, elevate his reputation and triumph over the Klaviermeister who had found their home in, or travelled to, the city.

Beethoven expressed this sense of rivalry with other pianists in a letter written to Eleonore von Breuning in 1794. He states:

The variations will be rather difficult to play, and particularly the trills in the coda … I should never have written down this kind of piece, had I not already noticed fairly often how some people

\begin{footnotes}
\item Thayer-Forbes, p. 204.
\item DeNora, Beethoven and the Construction of Genius, p. 153.
\item Ibid.
\item Tomascok, ‘Selbstbiographie’, p. 380.
\item Czerny, On the Proper Performance, p. 16.
\item DeNora, Beethoven and the Construction of Genius, pp. 153-54.
\item ‘Dafs Wölfl durch sein anspruchsloses, gefälliges Betragen über Beethovens etwas hohen Ton noch ein besonderes Uebergewicht erhält – ist sehr natürlich’, letter dated 22 April 1799, AMZ No. 33, 15 May 1799.
\end{footnotes}
in Vienna after hearing me extemporise of an evening would note down on the following day several peculiarities of my style and palm them off with pride as their own. Well, as I foresaw that their pieces would soon be published, I resolved to forestall those people. But there was yet another reason, namely, my desire to embarrass those Viennese pianists, some of whom are my sworn enemies. I wanted to revenge myself on them in this way, because I knew beforehand that my variations would here and there be put before the said gentlemen and that they would cut a sorry figure with them.217

This letter is valuable for a number of reasons. Firstly, it demonstrates that Beethoven did feel a strong sense of rivalry with other pianists in Vienna. He states these pianists would pass his ideas off as their own, which not only suggests that the environment was quite ruthless, but also that his performances were being carefully scrutinised by other pianists. This would add to the pressure he felt to succeed. Secondly, the letter demonstrates that he was actively taking steps to ensure his survival against these rivals by publishing his music first before anyone else had the chance to copy it. The variations in question are the Variations for Piano and Violin WoO 40 and the style of the trills will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.1.3. Most revealing, however, is the fiercely competitive language he uses. Beethoven refers to the Klaviermeister as his ‘sworn enemies’ and states that he wanted to ‘embarrass’ them. From the evidence given in this letter and the situations presented above, it seems that being placed in such a ruthless setting appears to have made him more determined to succeed and excel: he openly admits that the competition encouraged him to write complicated pieces in an attempt to embarrass his rivals, but it is highly likely that it also would have inspired him to hone his skills at the keyboard.

3.4 Beethoven’s Practice Regime

The evidence presented above suggests that if Beethoven had a pianistic weakness, it was in his technical ability, and that his technique appears to have been adversely affected by a lack of preparation and/or symptoms that could be attributable to performance anxiety. In addition, Beethoven’s competitive nature has been highlighted as a motivational factor that could have driven him to improve his keyboard skills. Evidence will now be presented that, in conjunction with the material already discussed in Chapter 2, supports the notion that he practised diligently and that he was concerned with improving his skills further after moving to Vienna.

217 Trans. is Anderson’s: A-9, B-11.
Czerny’s claim that Beethoven ‘often told me that he had practiced prodigiously in his youth, mostly often until late after midnight’\textsuperscript{218} confirms that he did work hard, and it is well documented that Beethoven’s father subjected him to a harsh practice regime as a child.\textsuperscript{219} This evidence implies that Beethoven may not have been a naturally technically-gifted pianist and needed to practice prodigiously in order to achieve the level of perfection asked of him by both his father and himself.

Evidence which confirms Beethoven had been working to improve his keyboard skills is found in a comment made by August von Schall, who had previously known Beethoven in Bonn. He wrote a letter to Elector Maximilian Franz explaining that Beethoven ‘is believed to have improved infinitely’.\textsuperscript{220} In 1801 Beethoven also wrote a letter to his friend Karl Amenda and declared that he had ‘very much perfected my piano playing’.\textsuperscript{221} The object of Beethoven’s letter was to encourage Amenda to join him on a concert tour and so he would have been keen to portray himself in a favourable light. The choice of words is significant, however, for several reasons: firstly, Beethoven seems to feel the need to declare that he had improved. This suggests that he may not have been satisfied with his skills prior to that point. Secondly, he uses the phrase ‘auch mein Klavierspielen habe ich sehr Vervollkommnet [sic]’.\textsuperscript{222} The verb ‘vervollkommnnen’ (to perfect), suggests that Beethoven was referring to his technique, since interpretation is subjective and, arguably, cannot be perfected. He also uses ‘sehr’, which reinforces his statement that considerable progress had been made and intimates that he had devoted much time to improving his technique. Given that many of the accounts describing Beethoven’s performances highlight his musicality as the outstanding feature, it would seem that musicality was a skill that Beethoven already possessed in the highest degree. As a result, he should not have felt the need to declare that his musicality had improved and therefore the notion that it was his technique that he had been practising is most likely.

The instances given above provide specific times when Beethoven appears to have been concentrating on his technique, but were these isolated occasions rather than the norm? His overriding concern with expression and musical artistry could have dominated his practice

\textsuperscript{218} ‘er sagte mir oft, daß er in seiner Jugend ungeheuer, oftmotens bis spät über Mitternacht, exerziert hatte’, Kopitz, \textit{Beethoven aus der Sicht}, p. 232.
\textsuperscript{220} ‘Er soll sich unendlich gebeßert haben’, Kopitz, \textit{Beethoven aus der Sicht}, p. 761.
\textsuperscript{221} A-51, B-65 but Anderson’s translation is ‘My pianoforte playing too has considerably improved’. Skowroneck, ‘Beethoven the Pianist’, p. 235, prefers ‘substantially perfected his piano playing’.
\textsuperscript{222} Brandenburg, \textit{Briefe}, B-65, p. 85.
sessions and caused him to neglect the necessary mechanical practice needed to achieve technical fluency. A certain amount of technical laziness can be inferred from Czerny’s declaration:

Although his playing was extraordinary when he improvised, it was often much less good when he played his published compositions for he never took the time or had the patience to work something up again. Success, then, was mostly a matter of chance and mood.223

Beethoven was renowned for his ability to improvise and also the amount of time that he would spend improvising at the piano.224 This activity appears to have appealed much more to him than practising mechanics. In this respect, a comparison can be drawn directly with Schumann who also struggled with the feeling that he had to sacrifice his artistry in order to succeed technically: he would have happily spent many hours improvising instead of undertaking mechanical practice.225

When deconstructing deliberate practice, Krampe and Ericsson have identified a ‘motivational constraint’ that impedes a musician’s ability to focus on specific aspects of their playing:

The *motivational constraint* acknowledges that deliberate practice is not intrinsically motivating or enjoyable, but is undertaken to achieve specific goals, principally improved performance. Deliberate practice must be distinguished from both recreational music-making and certain unavoidable professional duties, neither of which directly encourages the further development of skills.226

Czerny’s pronouncement that Beethoven ‘never took the time or had the patience’ to work something up again, suggests a dislike of the kind of structured and mechanical practice defined by Krampe and Ericsson as ‘deliberate’,227 and could account, to some extent, for Beethoven’s less than perfect technique. Although he would spend many hours improvising, this activity in itself would not necessarily improve his technical ability and could be considered

223 “So außerordentlich sein Spiel im Improvisieren war, so war es oft weniger gelungen beym Vortrag seiner bereits gestochenen Compositionen denn da er sich nie die Geduld u Zeit nahm, etwas wieder zu exercieren, so hing das Gelingen meistens von Zufall u Laune ab”, Kopitz, *Beethoven aus der Sicht*, p. 233.
224 See reminiscences of Frau von Bernhard who recalls Beethoven playing the piano “for hours, but always "without notes"”, and Treitschke’s account of Beethoven improvising for hours in Kopitz, *Beethoven aus der Sicht*, pp. 59 and 1000.
225 See Macdonald, ‘Schumann’s Piano Practice: Technical Mastery and Artistic Ideal’.
227 Krampe and Ericsson define deliberate practice as ‘a highly structured activity with the explicit goal of improving some aspect of performance. In deliberate practice, the performance is carefully monitored for weakness and specific tasks are devised to combat them’, ibid., p. 86.
as the ‘recreational’ music-making that Krampe and Ericsson distinguish as a separate activity from deliberate practice. For Czerny to state that Beethoven ‘never had the patience’ suggests that he may also have found mechanical practice frustrating.

If Beethoven did succumb to technical laziness, this may also explain why, when he was challenged, his technique appears to have improved. When provided with a direct challenge or a specific occasion when his pianistic ability would be assessed, as in the piano duels, Beethoven’s determination to succeed may have overridden his dislike of the mechanical and worked to focus his attention on structured and deliberate practice. The concentration of technical figurations in the 1790s, which has been observed by Skowroneck and Chiantore, therefore could have been a direct result of Beethoven’s desire to impress his peers and outclass the Viennese Klaviermeister.

If Beethoven was striving to perfect his technique, then the question of exactly how he was accomplishing this arises. As discussed in Chapter 2, the most accessible piano tutor book was C. P. E. Bach’s Versuch, but it does not contain any technical exercises. In their study of piano technique in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Gellrich and Parnicutt have noted the absence of the term technische Übung (technical exercise) in German pedagogical literature. The term ‘passage exercise’ or Passagenübung was used instead. If Beethoven wanted to use practical exercises that focused on specific aspects of technique, therefore, he would need to write his own: there was no piano method available at the end of the eighteenth century that provided advanced technical exercises. Given that Beethoven would initially have been performing his own works, he would also have been in the best position to isolate the techniques required for these pieces and devise exercises that would aid their execution. This point is supported by Miklaszewski, whose study of an advanced pianist’s preparation demonstrated that technical problems were mastered by a series of exercises specifically designed to aid the execution of the desired performance.

228 See Chapter 1.
229 Krampe and Ericsson discovered that deliberate practice was motivated by a desire to improve rather than being a source of pleasure (p. 92). The challenge of the Klaviermeister could, therefore, have provided Beethoven with the desire to improve that would instigate such structured practice.
231 Miklaszewski, ‘A Case Study of a Pianist Preparing a Musical Performance’.
Moreover, there appears to have been an established tradition of creating one’s own exercises. In his *L’art de toucher le Clavecin*, Couperin provided guidelines for creating exercises,\(^{232}\) whereas Hummel’s *Ausführliche theoretisch-praktische Anweisung zum Piano-Forte-Spiel*, first published in 1828, consisted of the exercises he had invented over the course of his career, which creates an interesting parallel to the possibility that Beethoven was also doing the same. Even after the explosion of piano exercises that appeared in the mid-nineteenth century, Clara Schumann was said to have spent hours improvising her own exercises and passages,\(^{233}\) and so further strengthens the notion that such practices were well established. The evidence presented above, therefore, suggests that it was highly likely that Beethoven could also have been creating his own exercises and, moreover, that it may have been common practice.

**Part Two: Beethoven the Teacher**

The accounts which provide an insight into Beethoven’s teaching methods and ideals are fewer in number than those that describe his performing style. Nevertheless, a significant amount of information can still be gleaned from their content. Although he expressed an aversion to piano teaching,\(^{234}\) Beethoven appears to have prepared his students diligently and also took an interest in the training of his friend’s pupils; in a letter to Johann Streicher he asks:

> One thing more, I trust you will not take it amiss, most excellent St, if I too take a little interest in her training?—or, rather, if I am anxious about her progress?—For without wishing to flatter you, I must say that I know of nothing more or better to tell her than that you should supervise her progress and encourage her on my behalf.\(^{235}\)

In his correspondence with the piano-building Streicher family, Beethoven clearly expresses his views on what he perceives to be the strengths and limitations of the piano. These comments are often used as evidence for his dissatisfaction with the instrument, but they can also be used to reveal his beliefs on how the instrument should be treated and played, and therefore provide an insight into the techniques he may have employed himself or taught his pupils.

In a letter dating from 1796, Beethoven complains that the current manner of treating the piano is similar to that of the harp, which implies that the accepted performing style lacked

\(^{232}\) Couperin, *L’art de toucher le Clavecin*, pp. 18-22.

\(^{233}\) From the memoirs of her daughter Eugenie: *The Schumanns and Johannes Brahms*, pp. 17-18.


\(^{235}\) Trans. is Anderson’s: A-18, B-22.
a legato touch. He also writes that the pianoforte ‘is still the least studied’ of all instruments.\textsuperscript{236} Taken together these statements suggest that Beethoven took an active interest in contemporary techniques and pedagogy. His dissatisfaction with the existing way of treating the piano also implies a belief that there was a problem with current technique.

3.5 Nature of Beethoven’s Piano Lessons

The accounts that detail the content of Beethoven’s piano lessons show a marked degree of similarity.\textsuperscript{237} At their heart lay the notion that a fundamentally correct technique must first be achieved and only then could interpretation be worked on. Both Czerny and Therese Brunsvik recall how initially he spent considerable amounts of time teaching the correct position of the hands and how to use the fingers and thumb in the desired manner. Each account stresses that basic technique was addressed first and that interpretation was only discussed once the former had been mastered. Unfortunately these accounts do not explicitly state that Beethoven provided technical exercises he had written himself or taken from a secondary source.\textsuperscript{238} A letter written by Joseph Leopold Blahetka (1782-1857) to Schindler in 1839, however, describes how Beethoven provided his daughter with piano lessons and that he did create specific exercises for her to practise:

\begin{quote}
Amongst my music in Vienna can still be found exercises, suggested by Beethoven for Leopoldine, they are dots on the stave and from them she had to construct figurations of many types in all keys for both hands …. Of musical works, he forbade her from playing anything but Mozart for a year, whose piano works she played all of.\textsuperscript{239}
\end{quote}

The description of the notes as ‘dots’ suggests they may have been without stems and the explanation that Blahetka’s daughter had to construct figurations out of them suggests that

\textsuperscript{236} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{237} Lesson of Countess Therese Brunsvik, recounted in her memoirs written in 1846, in Kopitz, \textit{Beethoven aus der Sicht}, pp. 160-61; Lesson of Countess Gallenberg, recounted in an interview by Otto Jahn in November 1852 and taken from Thayer-Forbes p. 291; Czerny’s recollections in Kopitz, ibid., pp. 204 and 232; and a letter to Czerny dating from 1817, expressing how he would like Karl’s lessons to proceed, A-878, B-912.
\textsuperscript{238} Czerny does explain that Beethoven ‘went through the practice pieces in Bach’s treatise with me making me particularly aware of the legato of which he had such an unrivalled command’ (‘Hierauf ging er mit die zu diesem Lehrbuch gehörigen Übungsstücke durch und machte mich vorzüglich auf das Legato aufmerksam, daß er selber in einer so unübertrefflichen Art in seiner Macht hatte’), Kopitz, \textit{Beethoven aus der Sicht}, p. 204.
\textsuperscript{239} ‘Unter meinen Musikalien in Wien werden sich noch Übungen finden, die Beethoven Leopoldinen durch bloße Punkte auf dem Notensystem andeutete und worauf sie sich selbst Figurationen für beide Hände auf mannigfaltige Weise in allen Tonarten konstruieren mußte … Von Tonstücken verbot er ihr ein ganzes Jahr alles andere als Mozart, dessen Klavierwerke sie alle spielte’, Kopitz, \textit{Beethoven aus der Sicht}, pp. 74-75.
they were used as a creative impetus for improvising different ideas. The implication that they were designed as technical exercises is strong, given that they were to be practised with both hands and in a variety of keys. Moreover, if the description offered by Blahetka of these exercises mirrors the physical characteristics of some of the figurations, this statement will support the theory that some of the figurations were used by Beethoven as technical exercises for his pupils.

Further evidence which suggests Beethoven was concerned with technique can be deduced from Czerny’s statement that he made him concentrate ‘exclusively on scales in all the keys’ for the first lessons, and in Beethoven’s letter to Czerny concerning Karl’s progression in which he provides musical passages as examples in which he wanted Karl to use all of his fingers. For Beethoven to have felt he needed to highlight explicitly certain passages suggests his ideas on execution were not accepted practice. Given that Beethoven also taught Czerny, it is perplexing to find that he is checking Czerny’s methods and either suggests an over-concern with Karl’s progress or that Czerny’s pedagogical beliefs may have differed slightly from Beethoven’s.

In his recommendations for a tutor book for Gerhard von Breuning, Beethoven also dismisses Czerny’s Klavierschule, which further strengthens the idea that he was not completely satisfied with Czerny’s methods. It is clear, however, that Beethoven was concerned with fingering and that the manner of fingering he suggested facilitates the legato he was famed for. He also appears to have been fond of advocating the practice of scales and exercises in a variety of keys. This approach would help build finger independence and recognition of the different patterns of white and black notes for the various keys.

Beethoven’s division of performance into two areas, and his insistence that technique should be conquered first, demonstrate that he regarded this as a fundamental area. However, once the lessons had progressed onto the discussion of expression and interpretation, his change of attitude is particularly revealing in light of the evidence presented above. Ries’s account encapsulates the situation:

> Sometimes he made me repeat a thing ten times or even more often. In the Variations in F major … (Opus 34), I had to repeat the last adagio variations entirely seventeen times. Still he was not satisfied with the expression in the little cadenza … If I made a mistake somewhere in a passage, or

---

240 ‘In den ersten Lekzioen beschäftigte mich Beethoven ausschließlich nur mit den Scalen in allen Tonarten’, Kopitz, Beethoven aus der Sicht, p. 204.
241 A-878, B-912.
242 Carl Czerny acted as Karl’s piano teacher from 1816-18 and was eventually replaced by Joseph Czerny in 1820.
struck wrong notes, or missed intervals—which he often wanted strongly emphasised—he rarely said anything. However, if I lacked expression in crescendos, etc. or in the character of a piece, he became angry because he maintained, the first was accident, while the latter resulted from inadequate knowledge, feeling, or attention. The first happened quite frequently to him, too, even when he played in public.244

It is evident that Beethoven understood that technical proficiency was fundamental but also knew, from personal experience, that inevitably sometimes wrong notes are struck and therefore tolerated such mistakes. His remark that ‘the chief aim of the art’ was to produce ‘musicians’245 underlines this belief: technique was important but could be fallible whereas interpretation should never be wrong or neglected.

As noted earlier, Beethoven did recommend the use of piano tutors for his pupils. Initially he advocated C. P. E. Bach’s Versuch for Czerny and then latterly dismissed Pleyel’s and Czerny’s Klavierschule in favour of Clementi’s School of Pianoforte Playing for Gerhard von Breuning.246 Beethoven’s note to Stephan von Breuning, that ‘If he uses it in the way I shall instruct him to do later on, it will certainly produce good results’,247 implies that he was familiar with the book and had considered which areas were most productive. He may even have embellished or added his own ideas to the content of Clementi’s book. This implies that he found the tutor books were not sufficient in themselves and is an idea which is confirmed by Gerhard von Breuning, who remembered that Beethoven’s dissatisfaction with Pleyel’s method was the same ‘as with all the others’.248 The notion that Beethoven took the time to consider the value of existing piano methods but was ultimately displeased with them, therefore, provides compelling evidence that he displayed an interest in piano pedagogy and its available resources. He may even have been consulting the methods for private use.

---

244 Trans. is Noonan’s: Wegeler and Ries, Remembering Beethoven, pp. 82-83. For original see Biographische Notizen, pp. 113-14.
245 A-878, B-912.
246 See Breuning, Aus dem Schwarzpanierhause, pp. 69-71; Wegeler and Ries, Biographische Notizen, pp. 219-21; and A-1473, B-2107 and A-1532, B-2203. On 30 September 1825 Beethoven also wrote to Tobias Haslinger enquiring about the cost of the German translation of the Clementi method (A-1432, B-2201).
247 A-1532, B-2203.
3.6 Desire to Write a Piano Tutor

In his biography of Beethoven, Schindler states that the composer intended to write his own piano tutor,249 and although Schindler’s assertions are often spurious, Wegeler and Ries reproduce a letter from Gerhard von Breuning which provides the evidence to corroborate his claim:

[Beethoven] said to me once when I was sitting at his bedside: ‘I felt like writing a piano tutor myself once, but never found the time for it; I would have written something quite unconventional though’.250

Enough evidence has been presented to verify the idea that Beethoven was dissatisfied with existing piano tutors. It is noteworthy, however, that Beethoven claimed that his piano tutor would be ‘quite unconventional’. He appears to have felt his ideas were different from the piano tutor books that had thus far been published. Schindler recalled Beethoven’s ‘pronounced aversion to all theoretical prolixity, together with the even longer-winded practical appendages in the form of Etudes, which must inevitably make pupils machines’.251 The compactness of the figurations could, therefore, be a product of Beethoven’s aversion to ‘long-winded etudes’ and thus strengthens the claim that the figurations were technical exercises. Moreover, the belief that excessively long etudes cause automation, underpins Beethoven’s desire to create musicians and not machines. Technical proficiency was important, but above all Beethoven’s aim, in both his teaching and his own playing, was to produce performances that were resplendent with musical artistry and expression. Unfortunately, the reliability of Schindler’s claim falters when he states:

If [Beethoven] had ever carried out his intention of writing a piano tutor book, these etudes would have constituted most of the practical examples, because he regarded them the best preparation for the playing of his own works.252

---

252 ‘Wäre es je zu Ausführung seiner Absicht gekommen, selbst eine Clavier-Schule zu schreiben, so hätten diese Etüden den wichtigsten Theil der praktischen Beispiel darin ausgemacht, denn er betrachtete sie als die geeignetste Vorschule zu seinen eigenen Werken’, ibid., p. 182.
Schindler was referring to the selection of Cramer studies which were purportedly used by Beethoven when teaching Karl. The existing manuscript of the studies is an 1824 reprint with annotations in Schindler’s hand that he claims were sourced from Beethoven.253 There has been a fruitful discussion on the authenticity of these annotations,254 yet one important point appears to have been overlooked when considering the validity of notion that they would have formed the basis Beethoven’s piano tutor. After proclaiming that the Cramer studies would have provided the fundamental material for Beethoven’s textbook, Schindler’s pronouncement that Beethoven disliked ‘long-winded’ etudes undermines this idea for one simple reason: the Cramer studies are all at least two pages in length and would therefore most likely have appeared to Beethoven as ‘long-winded’. This point further supports the arguments that Schindler’s assertion is another one of his fabrications. The notion that Beethoven wished to write such a volume, however, is corroborated by Breuning’s statement. Given the already-noted brevity of the piano figurations and Beethoven’s dislike of lengthy studies, it is plausible that he may have intended to use ideas derived from the figurations as material for this projected volume.

Summary

The object of this chapter was to ascertain if the figurations were technical exercises that Beethoven wrote for himself or provided for his pupils. The information presented above intimates that some of them could have been used for either purpose: the accounts testify that Beethoven appears to have struggled with his technique and that he experienced periods when his playing was much more accomplished than at others. Significantly, the piano duels in which he competed and the sense of competition he felt when living in Vienna provided him with the impetus to improve and work on his skills, which is supported by August von Schall’s and Beethoven’s own claims that his playing had improved. Owing to the dearth of pedagogical material that provided prescribed exercises, his apparent dissatisfaction with existing piano tutors, and the established tradition of creating one’s own exercises, it is highly likely that Beethoven would have created his own exercises.

253 The original manuscript was discovered by J. S. Shedlock who published the first edition as Selection of Studies by J. B. Cramer, with Comments by L. van Beethoven in 1893.
254 For a discussion of the Cramer annotations see Newman, ‘Yet Another Major Beethoven Forgery’.
Although he expressed a preference for the musical over the technical, and a desire to create musicians as opposed machines in his teaching, he was nevertheless concerned that a fundamentally correct technique should first be mastered. A preoccupation with the correct position of the hands and use of the fingers, coupled with his disapproval of existing pedagogical methods and styles of performance, suggest that his ideas were different from those which had gone before. Breuning’s statement that the piano tutor he expressed a desire to write would have been ‘quite unconventional’ corroborates this idea. Similarly, the suggestion that Beethoven found mechanical practice frustrating and rarely had the time, or perhaps the inclination, to do it, in conjunction with Schindler’s claim that he disliked long-winded etudes, further strengthens the idea that some of the figurations could be exercises: their compact and concentrated nature could have been intentionally designed to focus on specific areas of technique without unnecessary length. In addition, shorter exercises are less prone to produce automation.

This explanation, however, does not provide a purpose for some of the other figurations, such as those that are concerned with sonority and so it can be regarded only as provisional and a partial suggestion for their existence. The subsequent analysis will help to clarify whether this assertion is plausible.

Perhaps most significant is Blahetka’s letter which appears to confirm that Beethoven did provide technical exercises for his pupils. Blahetka gives a physical description of these exercises, which, if it matches the characteristics of some of the figurations presented in this study, could support the notion that Beethoven used them for teaching.

This chapter, therefore, has provided a significant amount of evidence that suggests Beethoven wrote and used technical exercises for the benefit of his pupils. In addition, it has provided a wealth of evidence which supports the idea that he had difficulties with technique and that if he used exercises for himself, he would have been likely to write his own. Moreover, by highlighting Beethoven’s views on pedagogy, performance styles and his apparent dislike of deliberate and structured practice, this chapter has shown how the length of the figurations is befitting of both Beethoven’s need and desire for brevity.
This chapter begins the analysis of the figurations with an examination of those which cover the basic techniques of scales (4.1), arpeggios (4.2), fingering (4.3), finger speed (4.4) and equalisation of the hands (4.5). Defining the difference between scales and finger speed figurations has been problematical as they often have shared features. Scale figurations have been defined as those which involve scale movement covering an octave or more. In the cases where Beethoven has embellished the line, producing a slightly altered or transformed version of a traditional scale, if the fundamental movement remains scalic, the figuration has been included in this category. Conversely, where Beethoven has written a scale but provided fingering for it, these figurations will be included in Chapter 4.3. This decision stems from the fact that figurations with fingerings are comparatively rare. In cases where figurations could have been included in multiple categories, their ambiguous nature will be discussed in the course of the analyses.

4.1 Scales (See Vol. II pp. 292-98)

Thirty-two figurations fall into this category and they range from c.1790 to 1815/16 with concentrations appearing in c.1794/95 and 1803/04 (see Tab. 4.1). Interestingly, these concentrations are located within particular sketchbooks or on a particular leaf. The sketchleaf SV 361 (1794) contains four scale figurations (Sc. 13-16) whilst Landsberg 6 (1803-04) contains five scale figurations (Sc. 25-29). Out of these, four (Sc. 26-29) are located on one page (p. 107).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1790-92</td>
<td>Sc. 1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Sc. 6-12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794-95</td>
<td>Sc. 13-21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799-1800</td>
<td>Sc. 22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802-03</td>
<td>Sc. 23-24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803-04</td>
<td>Sc. 25-29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Sc. 30-31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815-16</td>
<td>Sc. 32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five figurations contain tempo markings ranging from adagio molto (Sc. 2), to andante (Sc. 11), presto (Sc. 17) and prestissimo (Sc. 4 and 5). The figurations are largely written in major key signatures, particularly C major (Sc. 13, 14, 16, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 32) and distribution between the hands is not equal. Two-hand figurations total eighteen whereas single-stave figurations, divided into treble and bass clef, total ten.\(^{255}\) The figurations have been subdivided into the following categories: single-stave scales, parallel motion scales, contrary-motion scales and scale runs (Tab. 4.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Stave Figurations</td>
<td>Sc. 2, 5, 7, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 23 24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel-Motion Scales</td>
<td>Sc. 6, 26, 27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrary-Motion Scales</td>
<td>Sc. 1, 3, 10, 17, 18, 20, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Runs</td>
<td>Sc. 4, 8, 11, 12, 19, 21, 22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contemporary tutor books usually addressed this area first, and thus it is covered by C. P. E. Bach, Marpurg, Türk, Clementi and Milchmeyer. C. P. E. Bach’s inclusion serves primarily to teach good fingering practices:

The correct application of these two techniques [movement of the thumb and crossing of the fingers] can be learned most readily from the patterns of scales. In playing these and runs based on them our precepts find their principal employment. It is understood that in the performance of scalewise runs which begin or end differently from those illustrated here the performer must allocate his fingers so that they will come out correctly without his feeling obliged always to use the assigned finger on a given tone.\(^{256}\)

He provides examples of all twenty-four scales (major and melodic minor) ascending and descending with numerous fingering possibilities along with different rhythmic patterns for C

\(^{255}\) The single stave figurations have been classified by their clef, as opposed to hand, because only in Sc. 9 does Beethoven state explicitly that he wanted the left hand to be used. In all other cases, it could be argued that both hands could play the figuration independently. This will be shown to be common practice in Clementi’s method book.

major and A minor only (Ex. 4.1). Marpurg also follows C. P. E. Bach by producing a table of major and melodic minor scales with fingerings for the left and right hands.²⁵⁷

Ex. 4.1: C. P. E. Bach, *Versuch*, Figs. 1 and 2.

Türk explains how scales are constructed in his first chapter²⁵⁸ before offering numerous examples of major and minor scales in the second chapter on fingering. He provides between one and three different methods of fingering for each scale.²⁵⁹ Clementi, like C. P. E. Bach and Türk, also uses scales to teach ‘the art of fingering’²⁶⁰ and again writes out the twenty-four major and melodic minor scales, providing fingering for both hands (Ex. 4.2).²⁶¹ Unlike C. P. E. Bach, however, Clementi does not consistently provide full sets of alternative fingering for each hand. This only happens on a number of occasions (see Ex. 4.3). He does, however, advise that ‘Scales in all the MAJOR keys, with their relative MINORS … ought to be practised daily’,²⁶² that they ‘should be extended, in practising, 2 or 3 octaves more’²⁶³ and also includes one example for each hand of a chromatic scale (Ex. 4.3).

Ex. 4.2: Clementi, *Introduction*, p. 15.

²⁵⁷ Marpurg, *Anleitung*, Tab. X-XIV.
²⁵⁸ Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, pp. 61-70.
²⁵⁹ Ibid., pp. 144-53.
²⁶¹ Clementi uses the English style of fingering where ‘+’ denotes the thumb and ‘1-4’ indicates the index-fifth fingers.
²⁶² Ibid., p. 15.
²⁶³ Ibid., p. 17.
Milchmeyer continues this trend by writing out twenty-six scales in their major and melodic-minor forms complete with fingering for both hands (Ex. 4.4). Like Clementi, he also provides one example of a chromatic scale with two different fingering systems but is also the only writer of these tutor books who does not start all of his diatonic scales on the tonic: he begins on the third before falling to the tonic.

Excepting Milchmeyer's slight variation, scales were presented in their basic forms and were used primarily to demonstrate different fingering styles. All writers presented both major and melodic minor forms and also gave one example of a chromatic scale. From the outset, therefore, Beethoven’s scale figurations differ from those presented in the tutor books in one definite way: out of thirty-two figurations only one, Sc. 32, starts its descent and ends on its tonic in an unembellished form. The remaining figurations either contain some form of embellishment or begin and end on intervals other than the tonic (See Sc. 2 and 7).

---

264 Milchmeyer includes different examples for E-flat minor and D-sharp minor, and F-sharp major and G-flat major scales.
266 Türk does this on occasion but is not consistent. When writing the scales with fingering he tends to start on the tonic and begin their descent after the twelfth.
Modern scholarly interest in the scale figurations has been fair: six have been discussed by Skowroneck, Rosenblum and Chiantore. Sc. 4 was first presented by Nottebohm and has also been discussed by Rosenblum and Chiantore, and included by Kann. Chiantore provides the most examples, also highlighting Sc. 5, 10 and 11 whereas both Skowroneck and Rosenblum have used Sc. 2 in their discussion of legato. In addition, Nottebohm transcribed Sc. 26-29 and Sc. 32.

4.1.1 Single-Stave Figurations.

Ten figurations fall into this category (see Tab. 4.2) but only one (Sc. 9) designates which hand is to execute the scale. Hand designation in the remaining figurations is slightly ambiguous. In cases where clefs are supplied, it is logical to presume that those written in the bass clef were for the left hand and those in the treble were for the right. Given the similar presentation of scales in the contemporary tutor books, however, it is possible that Beethoven intended the figurations to be played with both hands either individually or simultaneously.

Sc. 2 (SV 329, f. 1r, c. 1790) appears to be an early experiment with legato. Beethoven has written an E-major scale, starting on the dominant and covering virtually all of the keyboard range available at that time. Although the placement of the key signature implies that he was originally thinking in the treble clef, the succeeding inclusion of a bass clef suggests that he changed his mind. The stem direction does not reveal with any certainty which hand should execute the scale. Particularly noteworthy are the tempo marking, the key signature and the length of the slur, which covers the whole of the figuration. Beethoven’s observational comment concerning the difficulties in achieving a legato touch, strongly suggests that it was an initial experiment with this technique:

The difficulty here is to play this whole passage legato so that one cannot hear the fingers being placed on the keys, but rather, it must sound as if it were being played with the bow.

---

269 Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, pp. 201, 205 and 215.
270 Skowroneck, Beethoven the Pianist, pp. 309-10; and Rosenblum, Performance Practices, p. 152.
272 Nottebohm, Zweite Beethoveniana, p. 346.
273 The range of Viennese-action pianos in the 1790s was F- F". 
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The tempo appears to have been chosen to maximise the efficiency of the figuration since slow and deliberate pressing of the keys is an effective way to practise legato. Beethoven’s acknowledgment that it is ‘difficult’ to achieve legato throughout the whole passage is extraordinary considering this became such a renowned element of his pianism and so further strengthens the suggestion that Sc. 2 was an initial experiment.

Prior to 1790, the solo piano works use predominantly two-note slurs that aid declamatory articulation. Where slurs cover more than two notes, they are written over rapid runs and tend to indicate a lack of separate articulation, since they often either precede or follow a heavily articulated passage (Ex. 4.5).

Ex. 4.5: ‘Kurfurstsonaten’ WoO 47/2/ii/56-58.

Longer slurs do appear in the ‘Righini’ Variations WoO 65 (c.1790-91), and although their frequency has also increased, they are still predominantly written over runs. It is not until the Thirteen Variations on ‘Es war einmal ein alter Mann’ from Dittersdorf’s Das rote Käppchen, WoO 66 (1792), that a singing touch is implied with ‘sempre ligato’ and ‘sempre dolce’ (Ex. 4.6). Thereafter longer legato lines become more frequent: in Op. 2/1/ii/59 ‘sempre piano e dolce’ is instructed; in Op. 2/2/i/59 ‘espressivo’ is indicated and in Op. 2/2/i/80 the term ‘ligato’ first appears. The frequency of the word dolce alongside longer legato lines also suggests that Beethoven may have felt a connection between the two. The delayed use of this technique in his published works, therefore, further supports the suggestion that Sc. 2 represents an early experiment with it.
Beethoven’s comment on Sc. 2 is also similar to a definition of legato published in London in 1829 and thus emphasises that he was at the forefront of legato production:

The fingers seem all strung upon one wire, and one is not taken up till the other is fairly set down, so that instead of each note telling separately upon the ear, they seem rather to flow into one another, each note being dependent on, and mingled with, the one next to it; yet not so much as to render it confused or indistinct.274

Aside from the solo piano works, Beethoven’s interest in legato is evident in a comment above the piano part for the song Klage WoO 113, also thought to have been written c.1790: ‘Throughout, the notes must be smooth, sustained as much as possible, and slurred together’.275 He composed two versions of Klage and it is only the second that contains longer slurs and the request for legato. In this version, Beethoven also inserted tempo indications of ‘Langsam und sanft’ and ‘Sehr langsam und traurig’. The settings were most likely to have been written a few months apart and it may be no coincidence that Sc. 2 is written in the same key, a similar tempo and dated to the same period as Klage. Given their similarities and chronological proximity, it is likely that Sc. 2 could have been sketched in the period between the two versions, forming part of Beethoven’s experiments for the revised second version. Sc. 2 is noteworthy, therefore, for demonstrating from the outset that, in some cases, there is no clear boundary between what can be classed as an exercise and what could have been used as an experimental idea.


275 ‘Durchaus müssen die Töne geschliffen und so sehr als möglich ausgehalten und zusammengebunden werden’. The sketches for Klage are found on the same leaves as the Cantata for the death of Joseph II WoO 87, which was composed between March and June 1790. See: Kinsky, Das Werke Beethovens, pp. 542 and 575.
Both Sc. 2 and Klage have been discussed by Rosenblum, Skowroneck and Mark Kroll in their respective examinations of legato. They have not, however, made this connection between the two. In addition, Rosenblum was not able to quote the exact location of Sc. 2, taking her reference from Frimmel and describing it as ‘an autograph inscription on an undated sketch of a keyboard composition’. Sc. 2 is sketched on a folio containing numerous small keyboard figurations. It is located on the last two staves at the end of the folio and thus appears to be an independent idea rather than forming part of a composition as Rosenblum implies. Kroll seems to have sourced his information directly from Rosenblum and essentially reiterates her comments. In contrast, Skowroneck accurately gives the location of Sc. 2 but erroneously describes it as ‘an ascending A major scale in sixteenth notes [written] across the entire keyboard’. The relationship between Sc. 2 and Klage, therefore, has previously been overlooked, its location has been taken out of context by Rosenblum and it has been inaccurately described by Skowroneck.

Sc. 5 (SV 75, f. 1v, 1790-92) reveals Beethoven juxtaposing staccato and legato onto a chromatic scale. Although Sc. 5 has been dated 1790-92, making it contemporary with Sc. 2, the combination of the two touches suggests that this figuration may have been written after Sc. 2 (if Sc. 2 is deemed as an early experiment with legato). This idea is strengthened by the ‘prestissimo’ marking compared to the ‘adagio’ of Sc. 2. Whereas Sc. 2 can be linked to Klage, it is likely that Sc. 5 was used as an exercise: Sc. 5 is located on the twelfth stave of SV 75. On the stave directly above it is Fi. 2 (Chapter 4.3) in which Beethoven is experimenting with different fingerings. These two figurations suggest that he was occupied with technical considerations when writing on this folio and therefore it is possible to suggest that Sc. 5 and Fi. 2 were exercises. Chiantore shares this view, perceiving Sc. 5 as an example of Beethoven’s interest in sonority ‘in its most elementary state’ through articulation and emphasising its visionary nature by drawing comparisons with Liszt’s Ballade No. 2.

Lisz’s Ballade does begin with chromatically ascending and descending scales in a similar register, but they are legato throughout. The main feature of Sc. 5 is the contrast between legato and staccato, which

---

278 Kroll, ‘As if Stroked with a Bow’, p. 130.
distinguishes it from standard chromatic scales and demonstrates Beethoven using a scale to practise contrasts in articulation.

Sc. 7 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 53r, 1793) comprises two ascending A-minor scales that begin on their seventh degree. Beethoven has written both the harmonic and melodic forms before noting that the idea is to be continued in all keys. It is arguable that he would have been better acquainted with his melodic minor scales, since this was the most common form found in the tutor books of this period. Sc. 7 could, therefore, show Beethoven familiarising himself with this tonality. Considering there are no other indications, such as tempo markings or articulation marks, the aim of the figuration seems to have been to observe the different tonal qualities between the two and, therefore, could be regarded as more of a compositional tool than a pianistic exercise. Beethoven’s exploration of tonalities can also be seen in Ar. 9 (Chapter 4.2) where he has written a series of root position and first inversion ascending arpeggios.

Sc. 9 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 52r, 1793) is the sole single-stave scale figuration for which Beethoven has indicated which hand should play and, moreover, that the left hand should execute it ‘alone’. His isolation of the left hand in this way suggests that he may have been trying to strengthen it and, by indicating that the passage should be played at the bottom of the piano, may also have been exploiting the inherent qualities of his instrument: the thicker sound in the bass makes it more difficult to achieve clarity and the bigger hammer heads used for bass notes result in a marginally heavier touch. These two features require the fingers to work harder in order to produce clear and rapid runs, and thus it is likely that Sc. 9 was designed as an exercise to strengthen the left hand.

Sc. 13-16 (Meyer Collection, SV 361, c.1794) are a group of sequentially ascending and descending scale passages and, with the exception of Sc. 15, all are written in C major. The lack of consistent beaming throughout the figurations is noteworthy and makes them resemble cadenza sketches. Sc. 13-15 do, however, contain some semiquaver beamings, implying that this movement was envisaged throughout but was not notated fully. Like Sc. 7 the oscillation point of Sc. 13, Sc. 15 and 16 is at the ninth (sixteenth for Sc. 16), which creates a sequentially ascending pattern. Sc. 15 is essentially a figurative repetition of Sc. 13 with one important difference: the tonality varies between C major and C minor (harmonic and melodic), making it

---

281 ‘linke Hand allein’.
282 The oscillation point of Sc. 13 begins at the ninth and then expands to the tenth as the sequences progresses.
akin to the exploration of tonality discussed in Sc. 7. Two further C-major figurations are found in the Wielhorsky sketchbook (Sc. 23 and 24). Both are written in the bass clef and comprise respectively sequentially ascending and descending patterns.

Although Sc. 13-16 and Sc. 23 and 24 are all presentations of scales in C, each is subtly different, whether in tonality (Sc. 15), the range of the scale (Sc. 16) or the direction of movement (Sc. 14). The sketch leaf SV 361 also contains C major scales in double thirds (Dt. 13, Chapter 6.4) and a broken third pattern (Fs. 42, Chapter 4.4) strongly suggesting that this leaf was used by Beethoven when generating such patterns. Furthermore, with the exception of Sc. 14, the remaining figurations are all written in the bass clef. This is also true for Dt. 13 and Fs. 42, which strengthens the notion that Beethoven was preoccupied with trying to increase the dexterity and strength of his left hand; a feature already noted with Sc. 9 and, although not as definitive, with Sc. 2, 5 and 7. It is noteworthy, then, that out of the single-stave figurations examined, Sc. 14 is the sole figuration written in the treble clef.

4.1.2 Two-Stave Figurations

4.1.2.1 Parallel-Motion Scales
Three out of the thirty-two figurations are parallel motion scales (see Tab. 4.2) and they are isolated to the years 1793 and 1803-04. Sc. 26 and 27 belong to the collection of scale exercises found in Landsberg 6. Sc. 26 is an ascending and descending C major scale in tenths, whereas Sc. 27 is essentially the same idea but is descending. Significantly, all the figurations on p. 107 of Landsberg 6 (Sc. 26-29) begin a tenth apart and, owing to the fact they are in C major, do not require any skill in overcoming the disparate occurrence of black notes that would occur between the hands if written in other keys. Sc. 26 is also similar to one of Czerny’s exercises (Ex. 4.7), although Czerny’s scale is in unison as opposed to the tenths of Beethoven’s.
It is possible, therefore, that Czerny’s exercise derived from his lessons with Beethoven. Interestingly both figurations share pivot points at the ninth and not the octave. This necessitates extra practice of crossing over the fingers and by using an ascending sequence, Beethoven ensures that a single finger does not initiate the change of direction on consecutive occasions and thus promotes greater independence.

In contrast, Sc. 6 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 46r, 1793) is an unusual descending and ascending figuration in tenths, which is based on a deviated chromatic scale (no obviously discernible pattern exists). For this reason, Sc. 6 could also have been categorised as figuration that promotes equalisation of the hands (Chapter 4.5).

The conspicuously small number of figurations of this type implies that Beethoven either did not feel it necessary to notate parallel-motion scales or that he tried to be more inventive in his approach—hence the reason why they are written at the tenth. This point is strengthened by the comparatively large number of contrary-motion scales that have been discovered (see below) and could reflect his dislike of the mundane, along with a constant search for new and inventive figurations.

### 4.1.2.2 Contrary-Motion Scales

Contrary-motion scales are numerous (see Tab. 4.2), cover the years c.1790-1815/16 and often incorporate extra figurative ideas. With these figurations, Beethoven incorporates small changes of direction within the overall design of the movement. For example, Sc. 1 (Wegeler Collection, SV, 329, c.1790) is essentially a D-major contrary-motion scale, but two semiquavers in each bar disrupt the movement and produce a small oscillation whereas Sc. 25
(Landsberg 6, p. 96, 1803-04) begins with a repetition of the first two notes of each run. Many of the figurations also do not start in unison: Sc. 1 is the sole figuration where both hands begin on the same note, albeit four octaves apart (the majority of contrary motion scales begin at the tenth). These extra features not only increase the difficulty of the figuration, but also provide a musical rather than purely technical dimension. Significantly, Sc. 1—the only figuration that begins in unison—dates from c.1790 and is therefore the earliest contrary-motion figuration that has been found.

Sc. 1 is notable for its similarity to the opening figuration of the twenty-third ‘Diabelli’ Variation, Op. 120 (Ex. 4.8). The central difference between the two is the key and the oscillations: in Variation 23 they have been inverted so that they incorporate the opening motif from Diabelli’s theme (Ex. 4.9). The period between Sc. 1 (c.1790) and the conception of Variation 23 (1823) is remarkable and strongly implies that Beethoven may have reviewed his earlier sketches.  

William Kinderman has suggested that Variation 23 is a parody of Johann Baptist Cramer’s first piano exercise; the existence of Sc. 1, however, poses an alternative origin for this variation.

Ex. 4.8: ‘Diabelli’ Variations Op. 120/XXIII/1-4 (Diabelli, 1823).

Allegro assai.

---


284 Kinderman, Beethoven’s Diabelli Variations, p. 104.
Ex. 4.9: ‘Diabelli’ Variations Op. 120/Theme/1 (Diabelli, 1823).

\[ \text{Vivace.} \]

In later sketches Beethoven appears to have been more exploratory and imaginative in his approach. This is seen in the held minim notes of the fifth finger in Sc. 10 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 1793), which do bear a passing resemblance to a Cramer exercise (Ex. 4.10) as both share inner-part contrary-motion movement whilst the fifth fingers hold minims and semibreves.\(^{285}\)

Ex. 4.10: Cramer, \textit{Fifty Selected Pianoforte Studies}, No. 2/1-4 (Schirmer, 1899).

Chiantore perceives Sc. 10 to be a forerunner to Ligeti and, although Beethoven does not supply any fingerings, draws comparisons with the second set of fingering indications in Fi. 5 (Chapter 4.3), deducing that Sc. 10 should also be executed with finger slides.\(^{286}\) The difference in Beethoven’s two sets of fingerings in Fi. 5, however, and significantly where he has indicated the finger slides, is the addition of slurs. Sc. 10 lacks any slurs and so the suggestion that the chromatic scales should be executed in this manner is questionable, especially since the first set of fingerings in Fi. 5, where no slur exists, does not use this technique.

\(^{285}\) This Cramer exercise is not one that was supposedly annotated by Beethoven. See discussion in Chapter 3.6.

\(^{286}\) Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, pp. 204-5.
The largest concentration of contrary motion scales is found in Landsberg 6 (Sc. 25, 28 and 29) and appears just before sketches for the ‘Waldstein’ Sonata Op. 53. Initially appearing simplistic in design, they are, however, quite complex. With Sc. 25, 28 and 29, one hand initiates the change of direction ahead of the other: in Sc. 25, before descending, the two-note alternating semiquavers in the left hand are continued for one more quaver beat than the right hand, whereas in Sc. 28 and 29 the change in direction occurs one semiquaver apart and alternates between the left and right hands. The movement in Sc. 28 also bears a close resemblance to part of an exercise in Clementi’s *School of Scales*\(^{287}\) (Ex. 4.11), although Clementi’s exercise is written a sixth apart instead of the tenth; again, however, Beethoven’s figuration pre-dates Clementi’s by eight years.

**Ex. 4.11:** Clementi, *Preludes and Exercises (School of Scales)*, Exercise in G major bars 10-12 (Schirmer, 1896).

Nottebohm, Cooper and Rosenblum\(^{288}\) have all noted the proximity of the Landsberg 6 scales to the sketches for the ‘Waldstein’ Sonata, with Cooper observing:

> Such exercises are common in Beethoven’s sketchbooks, and the ones here … may be of no significance. But as they are in 4/4 time and mostly in C major, with one in E minor, they could be interpreted as evidence that Beethoven was working towards some kind of piano piece in C major in 4/4 time with E as an important subsidiary key.

If, as Cooper believes, the scales may have acted as preparatory material for the ‘Waldstein’ Sonata, a connection between the figurations in the sonata and those of Sc. 25, 28 and 29 may be discernible. It is apparent that scale figurations have a prominent role in the figurative design of both the first and third movements but, surprisingly, there are only two occasions where both hands play scale runs at the same time: the contrary motion scales in the first movement at bars 154-56 (Ex. 4.12) and at bars 299-300 (Ex. 4.13). Both scales, however, are

\(^{287}\) Clementi’s *School of Scales* appeared in 1811 and was appended to the 5th edition of his *Introduction to the Art of Playing on the Piano Forte*.

used at key points: the first leads into the recapitulation whereas the second acts as the final flourish of the movement before the closing cadence. Therefore, although the sonata does not contain the exact figurations found in Landsberg 6, it does seem likely that they played a formative role in its conception and so again the line between what can be classed as an exercise and what has acted as an experimental figuration has been blurred.


Sc. 3, 17 and 18 show remarkable ingenuity: in each case Beethoven has displaced or altered the movement so that although each hand is still playing a contrary motion scale, they are not in unison with one another. With Sc. 3 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 50v, c.1790) and Sc. 18 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 25r, late 1794/early 1795), the rhythms between the two hands are varied: in Sc. 3 the right hand plays quavers against crotchets in the left and in Sc. 18 the left hand plays quavers whilst the right incorporates a dotted crotchet at the start of each bar. Sc. 3 also utilises the held-voice idea already discussed in Sc. 10. This time, however, the held notes are used as an inner voice and at bar 5 the hands reverse so that the right plays the crotchets and the left plays quavers. With Sc. 17 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 47v, 1794) Beethoven has overlapped the voices so that the right hand enters two beats after the left and thus may have been used as an experiment in two-part counterpoint. In all three cases, the complexity of the contrary-motion figuration has been increased by the inclusion of extra features. Interestingly, Sc. 30 (Landsberg 5, S. 52, 1809) and Sc. 31 (Landsberg 5, S. 62, 1809) are the least complex of
the contrary-motion scales and, given that their date of conception was 1809, they suggest no progression of technical difficulty (compare with Sc. 1).

With Sc. 32 (Scheide, S. 93, 1815-16), Beethoven has labelled the sketch as ‘Scales for learners’ and instructs that the scales should be played ascending and descending. The style of notation is similar to that found in Sc. 26 and 27, where a line is used to indicate the direction of the scale. For variation, he also increases the interval between the starting notes each time by descending in the bass whilst remaining on C with the right hand (as indicated by ‘siml’).

In Chapter 3 Beethoven’s teaching was discussed. He may have devised this figuration in preparation for one of his pupils: the appearance of the notation used in Sc. 32 (i.e. notes without stems) complements the description offered by Blahetka of the material prepared for his daughter (‘dots on the stave’). Sc. 32 is found amongst the sketches for the unfinished Piano Trio in F minor, which date from c. May 1816 and imply that Sc. 32 was also written at this time. During 1816, Beethoven began his struggle for the guardianship of Karl, and it is possible, therefore, that he may have been thinking about Karl’s piano instruction at this time, and thus Sc. 32 may represent one of these thoughts.

4.1.2.3 Scale Runs
A number of scale figurations suggest that Beethoven was concerned with increasing the velocity of the fingers. Two figurations (Sc. 4 and 8) lean towards the brilliance and rapid flourishes required for cadenza passages. Sc. 4 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 88v Oct. 1790) consists of prestissimo ascending runs in D major. When the hand is not executing the runs, it plays the tonic in crotchets to maintain a steady beat and slurs are written over a number of the runs implying legato. Sc. 8 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 1793), also in D major, is the opposite of Sc. 4: rapid ascending and descending runs in the right hand cover a two-octave compass range, with the left hand maintaining the beat with repeating chords.

Rosenblum shares a similar view of Sc. 4, regarding it as ‘a brilliant cadenza-like’ passage and relating its date (Oct. 1790) to Beethoven’s years in Bonn. She deduces that it
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289 ‘Scalen für Lernende’.
290 See Chapter 3.5.
291 The sketches for the Trio are found on S. 86-105 of the Scheide sketchbook (Sc. 30 is located on S. 93). See Schmidt ‘Skizzenverzeichnis’, p. 11, and for a detailed examination see Marston, ‘“In the Twilight Zone”: Beethoven’s Unfinished Piano Trio in F Minor’. 
must have been devised at the time when he was developing the ‘great execution’ noted by
Junker in 1791.²⁹² In contrast, Chiantore perceives scales to have been fertile ground for
experimentation and surmises that Sc. 4 would have caused an ‘instant chill’ to those who
heard it on account of the ‘feline velocity’ with which the pianist is required to move around
the keyboard.²⁹³ His description of its effect upon listeners implies that this type of figuration
would have been performed in public and thus suggests that he may regard Sc. 4 as an
improvisational idea rather than a personal exercise. The ‘da Capo’ marking at the end of the
figuration, however, seems to justify its categorisation as an exercise, since the ‘instant chill’
would be somewhat diluted on subsequent repetitions.

Chiantore also offers an alternative view of Sc. 8. Rather than perceiving it to be an
investigation into velocity, he regards it as an experiment with dynamics. Prefacing his
argument with the explanation that Beethoven does not always indicate dynamics, Chiantore
suggests that the multiple harmonisations of the different D’s in Sc. 8 command different
dynamic levels.²⁹⁴ The different registral colours that were produced on Viennese pianos,
however, in addition to the different harmonisations used, would have ensured numerous
colours were produced. This point is further strengthened by the presence of figurations where
Beethoven has indicated extreme dynamic variation (See Chapter 7).

4.2 Arpeggios and Broken Chords (See Vol. II pp. 299-302)

Fourteen figurations have been classified as either arpeggios or broken chords and they span
the years 1790-1803/04. Owing to the small number of such figurations, it is difficult to
establish if a concentration exists in a particular year. Again, however, the year 1793 does
contain more figurations than others (see Tab. 4.3). These figurations have been further
divided into the following categories: arpeggios, diminished and dominant sevenths and
broken chords (see Tab. 4.4).

²⁹² Rosenblum, Performance Practices, pp. 204-5 and Junker’s statement: ‘nach der Fertigkeit, mit welcher er spielt’,
Kopitz, Beethoven aus der Sicht, p. 499.
²⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 201.
Tab. 4.3: Distribution of Arpeggios and Broken Chords.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1790</td>
<td>Ar. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Ar. 2-5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794-95</td>
<td>Ar. 6-7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Ar. 8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797-98</td>
<td>Ar. 9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799-1800</td>
<td>Ar. 10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802-03</td>
<td>Ar. 11-13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803-04</td>
<td>Ar. 14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 4.4: Sub-Categories of Arpeggios and Broken Chords.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arpeggios</td>
<td>Ar. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diminished and Dominant Sevenths</td>
<td>Ar. 1, 10, 12, 13, 14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Chords</td>
<td>Ar. 6, 11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared with their extensive coverage of scales, the contemporary tutor books devoted little space to this area. C. P. E. Bach's discussion of broken chords is particularly brief but noteworthy for his reference to the use of the thumb for such passages. His examples provide major and minor arpeggios and two diminished sevenths, but again focus on fingering and so his examples are not embellished (Ex. 4.14).

Ex. 4.14: C. P. E. Bach, Versuch, Fig. 57.

![Image of musical notation]
Marpurg’s examples are similarly brief and again focus on fingering (Ex. 4.15). In contrast, Türk regards arpeggios as ‘Essential Ornaments’ and concentrates his discussion on the realisation of arpeggiated chords.²⁹⁵

Ex. 4.15: Marpurg, Anleitung, Tab. IX (33) and (34).

Compared with the examples presented above, it is apparent that again Beethoven’s figurations differ on account of their extended application and their inherently musical qualities. Moreover, C. P. E. Bach’s and Marpurg’s concentration on correct fingering is at odds with Türk’s perception of them as ornamented chords.

4.2.1 Arpeggios

Out of the forty-six figurations that have been categorised as scales, arpeggios and broken chords, only two (Ar. 5 and 8) could be classed as being similar to one another: there has been an extraordinary amount of variation amongst the figurations. It is remarkable, therefore, that Ar. 5 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 41v, 1793) and Ar. 8 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 71r, 1796) share similarities when they are dated only three years apart. Both figurations share the same time signature and alternating arpeggio figuration where each hand plays an ascending arpeggio whilst the other plays a minim followed by a crotchet. The difference between the two figurations appears to be limited to their respective key signatures. Although initially appearing trivial, this difference is quite significant: Ar. 5 comprises arpeggios incorporating different patterns of white and black keys whereas Ar. 8 is restricted to white keys only. Ar. 5 and Ar. 8 could, therefore, demonstrate Beethoven writing figurations that utilise multiple arpeggio patterns and so may have acted as exercises.

²⁹⁵ Türk, School of Clavier Playing, pp. 282-85.
The idea of alternating arpeggios between the hands is also found in Ar. 2 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 53v, 1793), where Beethoven has written a series of root-position arpeggios. In contrast, Ar. 7 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 68r, 1795) displaces the third note of each arpeggio so, rather than being the fifth, it is the octave, and the middle note of each triplet alters between the third and fifth. The alteration of the pattern, and the distribution of the arpeggios between the hands, implies that these figurations were not exercises per se but rather experiments with texture. It is noteworthy, however, that the two latest-dated figurations of this type (Ar. 7 and 8) are the only figurations which incorporate all white-key arpeggio patterns. Arpeggio patterns of this type are arguably more difficult to play accurately than combinations which incorporate black notes and so it may be plausible to view Ar. 7 and 8 as a technical progression from Ar. 2 and 5.

Ar. 9 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 67r, 1797/98) stands alone as it consists entirely of crotchets and thus, unlike the other figurations, is not figurative. Ar. 9 comprises various arpeggios and seventh chords in root position and first inversion, which lack any tempo, articulation or phrasing indications, and for this reason it appears to be a similar tonal exploration to that found in Sc. 7 (Chapter 4.1).

4.2.2 Diminished and Dominant Sevenths

In her introduction to Clementi’s Introduction, Rosenblum has implied that he was first to use diminished sevenths as technical exercises:

Another interesting innovation is the use of the arpeggiated diminished-seventh chord. This has since played an important role in many “schools” of technique that stress independence and equality of the fingers.296

This statement is not entirely true. C. P. E. Bach’s presentation of arpeggios (Ex. 4.13) includes diminished sevenths and even if his examples cannot be classified as exercises per se, the fingering indications were designed to be practised. Beethoven’s first diminished seventh figuration is Ar. 1 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 88v, 1790), which was written over ten years before Clementi’s publication appeared. If Ar. 1 is regarded as an exercise, its presence suggests that Beethoven may have recognised the potential of using diminished sevenths as a means of developing finger independence and, given there were as yet no comprehensive technical

296 Clementi, Introduction, p. xv.
exercises available, was forced to write his own. Ar. 1 combines a diminished seventh starting on $e''$-flat with a G-major arpeggio, creating two different finger patterns. Rhythmic variety is added with alternating sextuplets and quintuplets. The figuration, however, is not purely technical: Beethoven has added musical interest and also increased the technical difficulty by writing a two-part left-hand accompaniment. The lower voice plays repeated $G$, ’s that maintain the beat whilst the upper voice plays a descending and ascending run starting on $E$-flat which needs, rather cleverly, the indicated repetition to resolve onto the tonic.

This tactic is also employed in Ar. 14 (Landsberg 6, p. 165, 1803-04), which also has no sense of resolution if not repeated. Although Ar. 14 is written after the sketches for the ‘Waldstein’ Sonata, it may have been inspired by a similar idea used at bars 54-55 of the ‘Waldstein’ and subsequently throughout the first movement (Ex. 4.16).297 Beethoven uses an arpeggio rather than a diminished seventh in the sonata, but may have decided to experiment with this idea by incorporating diminished sevenths. Tyson and Cooper have noted that Beethoven often used the top line of his manuscript paper to record fresh ideas that came to him whilst working on different or related projects:298 Ar. 14 is written at the top of p. 165 whereas the sketches for Op. 53 end on p. 145. If Beethoven did employ this practice here, Ar. 14 could be derived from the figurations in the sonata and thus judging whether it is a figuration, exercise or both is again problematic.


Ar. 13 (Wielhorsky, p. 86, 1802-03) is the sole figuration which presents a diminished seventh as a broken chord. The figuration also incorporates contrary-motion movement between the hands, which significantly increases its technical complexity. Ar. 13 is found on the same page of the Wielhorsky sketchbook as Ar. 11 and 12 and thus demonstrates Beethoven experimenting with broken-chord figurations for major, minor and diminished

---

297 See bars 113-41 and 215-18 where the idea is in triplets and bar 188 where the idea is in semiquavers.
sevenths. Alongside Ar. 11, he wrote the instruction ‘per omnibus [sic] tonos’ (‘through all keys’). Considering that this comment is written next to the first figuration on this page, it is highly likely that Beethoven also intended the same treatment to be applied to Ar. 12 and 13. This comment also mirrors the description of Beethoven’s exercises given by Blahetka (Chapter 3.5) and so these figurations also may represent some of the patterns that Beethoven used when teaching.

4.2.3 Broken Chords

Four figurations have been classified as broken chords (Ar. 3, 6, 11 and 12). Ar. 3 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 1793) utilises contrasting patterns of white with black or all white keys. It also seems likely that Beethoven intended the right hand to play the triplet figurations until bar 5 and hence the justification for his indication that the left hand takes the triplets in this bar. If the right hand was intended to play the triplets until bar 5, the left would then be required to cross over the right in bar 2 and 4. The technique is also employed in Ar. 5. By reversing the role of the hands at bar 5, Beethoven appears to be ensuring both hands are equally adept at executing the figuration, which implies that it may have been used as an exercise.

The exercise-nature of Ar. 6 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 134r, 1794/95), however, is more apparent, since it is another figuration in which Beethoven appears to have been concerned with improving the strength and dexterity of the left hand. This is also true of Ar. 11 (Wielhorsky, p. 86, 1802-03) and Ar. 12 (Wielhorsky, p. 86, 1802-03) discussed above.

Summary

The scale and arpeggio figurations have demonstrated Beethoven’s creativity: his ideas differ from those presented in the contemporary tutor books as he does not write conventional scales. The figurations either have been embellished, such as the additional oscillations in the contrary motion scales, or their range has been expanded by either starting on a non-tonic note or progressing further than an octave. Although the figurations are based on scale and arpeggio patterns, it is often difficult to categorise them definitely as exercises or experimental figurations due to these embellishments.
The lack of repetition amongst the examples is striking: in the twenty-six year time-span of these figurations, only Ar. 5 and Ar. 8 share a resemblance. This either shows that Beethoven’s creativity and musical imagination were endless or that he perhaps revisited or had even memorised his earlier figurations. The latter idea seems more plausible, given that he advised the Archduke Rudolph to write ideas down immediately so that they would not be forgotten:

When sitting at the pianoforte you should jot down your ideas in the form of sketches … In this way not only is one’s imagination stimulated but one learns also to pin down immediately the most remote ideas.\(^{299}\)

The structure and contents of the figurations also seem to have been carefully considered. This is particularly evident in the differing arpeggio patterns discussed above and the variation amongst the C-major scales. Additionally the scales in tenths, found in Landsberg 6, are made slightly easier by the C-major key signature. The less complex and less figurative scales are those in the minor key (Sc. 7 and Ar. 9) where Beethoven seems to be exploring the tonality rather than creating a figuration.

A wide range of tempi is also explored: the ‘adagio molto’ of Sc. 2, the ‘andante’ of Sc. 11 and the ‘prestissimo’ semihemidemisemiquavers of Sc. 4. The accompaniments to the figurations are often simple, usually maintaining a steady beat and when figurations switch between hands the vacant hand takes over the accompaniment in order to maintain the momentum. Nothing seems superfluous.

Beethoven’s ideas also frequently appear to be in advance of their time and at the forefront of piano technique. This is evident with the diminished sevenths occurring over ten years before Clementi had published his and the similarity of Sc. 24 and Sc. 26 with figurations found in later publications by Clementi and Czerny. Even his written comments, such as the comment concerning the execution of legato in Sc. 2, appear to be visionary.

Whether these figurations can be classed entirely as exercises or figurations cannot definitively be established. This is particularly true of Sc. 1 with its similarities to the twenty-third ‘Diabelli’ Variation, of Sc. 2 with its relationship to Klage, and of the Landsberg 6 figurations’ relationship to the ‘Waldstein’ Sonata. Sc. 32 stands alone as being the only

\(^{299}\) Letter dated 1 July 1823. A-1203, B-1686.
figuration where a definite intention can be expressed and thus demonstrates that Beethoven did use some of the figurations as teaching material.

These figurations also have revealed Beethoven’s apparent concern with strengthening the left hand: out of the forty-six figurations Sc. 2, 5, 9, 13, 15, 16, 23, 24 and Ar. 6, 11 and 12 all appear to have been devised for the left hand alone.
4.3 Fingerings (See Vol. II pp. 303-08)

Figurations included in this category could have been included in any one of the other categories discussed in this thesis. The relatively small number of sketches in which Beethoven actually indicates fingering (twenty-three in total) has been deemed significant enough to provide them with their own category. In addition, the figurations included here are not present in Beethoven’s published works. They appear to have been experiments in the truest sense.

These figurations span the years c.1790-c.1808 (see Tab. 4.5) with a concentration in the year c.1808, which is largely due to the sketch-gathering Grasnick 32 (see below for further discussion). The indications are predominantly for the right or left hand alone: only one figuration (Fi. 11) contains figurations for both hands simultaneously. Distribution between the hands is marginally in favour of the right which has thirteen (Fi. 1-5, 7, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 22 and 23) whereas the left has nine (Fi. 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 16, 19, 20 and 21). The figurations appear to fall easily into several categories: slides, articulation and sequences. Figurations found in the sketch-gathering Grasnick 32 and loose leaf BH 124 are an exception to this system: since they contain only fingering figurations, they have been given their own category (see Tab. 4.6).

Tab. 4.5: Distribution of Fingerings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1790-92</td>
<td>Fi. 1-2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Fi. 3-6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Fi. 7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795-98</td>
<td>Fi. 8-10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-01</td>
<td>Fi. 11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1808</td>
<td>Fi. 12-23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 4.6: Sub-Categories of Fingerings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slides</td>
<td>Fi. 1, 4, 5, 16(^{300})</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>Fi. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequences</td>
<td>Fi. 9, 10, 11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasnick 32 and BH 124</td>
<td>Fi. 12-23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{300}\) Fi. 16 has been classified as a finger slide but also belongs to the collection of figurations in Grasnick 32.
Fingering was one of the central topics covered by the contemporary tutor books. C. P. E. Bach devoted a whole chapter to this area, with the justification that ‘the correct use of the fingers has an inseparable relationship with the whole art of performance’. Marpurg, Türk, Milchmeyer and Clementi also devote considerable time to prescribing fingering for passages such as scales, double thirds, broken chords and repeated notes. Owing to the very specific nature of Beethoven’s figurations, in the cases where the contemporary tutor books cover a similar technique, the corresponding examples will be discussed at the appropriate times.

Beethoven’s fingering indications have proven a similarly popular area with scholars and have attracted more attention than any of the other categories covered in this thesis. For this reason, a considerable number of these figurations do appear in several texts. Nottebohm was first to include Fi. 5, which has subsequently been discussed by Newman and Chiantore. Of the remaining figurations, Nottebohm drew attention to Fi. 2-6 and 8. Newman has included Fi. 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, and 11, and Rosenblum Fi. 3, 4, and 6. Meanwhile, Grundmann and Mies have discussed Fi. 2, 3, 11 and 22, and Kann transcribed Fi. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 11.

These discussions focus on performance-practice issues with the figurations being used to reveal Beethoven’s intentions, sometimes on a global scale, for phrasing and articulation. In these arguments, the fingering indications cited most often, however, are found neither in his published works nor in his sketches. Instead, the indications are located in a letter written to Carl Czerny in 1817 in which Beethoven discusses his nephew Karl’s piano lessons. Although he does not indicate specific fingerings, Beethoven does include musical figurations and

---

309 Kann, Etüden für Klavier, pp. xi-xv.
describes his intentions for these examples through a narrative commentary (see Chapter 4.4.3).

The figurations examined in this chapter demonstrate that Beethoven was experimenting with and evaluating different types of fingering. This methodological approach is apparent in the number of figurations that contain not only fingering indications but also written commentaries (9 out the 23). These annotations include assessments on the feasibility of the given fingerings (Fi. 2), instructive comments explaining how the passage should be executed to achieve the desired effect (Fi. 3, 4, 5, 6, 13 and 23), and alternative fingerings for the same passage (Fi. 2, 5 and 12). Where comments are not provided, the fingering indications alone are usually sufficient to reveal Beethoven’s thoughts.

4.3.1 Slides

Beethoven’s use of finger slides fall into two categories: the first is sliding from one finger to another whilst remaining on the same note, and the second is a slide from one note to the next using the same finger. Fi. 1 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 18v, c.1790) requires finger slides on the same note and acts as an early example of this technique, which was employed by Beethoven in his later published works and has provoked much discussion amongst scholars. This style of fingering appears in the Piano Sonatas Op. 106/iii/165 and Op. 110/iii/5 and 125; the Grosse Fuge for piano duet Op. 134/27-38; and frequently in the piano part to the Cello Sonata Op. 69/ii.311 Fi. 1, however, has never featured in these discussions, which strongly implies that its existence previously has been unknown. Opinion is primarily concerned, and divided, over whether the second tied note should be sounded when the finger is changed. Paul Badura-Skoda and Jeanne Bamberger share the opinion that the second note should not sound, whereas Jonathan Del Mar and Malcolm Bilson are of the opposite opinion. The execution of Fi. 1 is similarly unclear and it cannot be used to prove conclusively either theory but its existence does raise some interesting questions. Firstly, the works in which Beethoven used this technique all date from after 1807 (Op. 69 was written 1807-08, Op. 106 in 1817-18, Op.
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310 A-878, B-912. Bamberger (pp. 263-64); Newman (p. 285 from Beethoven on Beethoven and pp. 174-75 from ‘Beethoven’s Fingerings as Interpretive Clues’); Rosenblum (p. 211); and Grundmann and Mies (p. 123) all have included this letter and the examples in their discussions.

311 See in particular: Badura-Skoda, ‘A Tie is a Tie is a Tie. Reflections of Beethoven’s Pairs of Tied Notes’; Del Mar, ‘Once again: Reflections on Beethoven’s Tied-Note Notation’; Bilson, ‘Beethoven’s Tied-Note Notation’; and Bamberger, ‘The Musical Significance of Beethoven’s Fingerings in the Piano Sonatas’, pp. 246-49.
110 in 1821-22 and Op. 134 in 1826). Fi. 1 dates from c.1790, preceding Op. 69 by approximately seventeen years. One of the most frequently occurring arguments is that this style of notation alludes to the ‘Bebung’ technique of the clavichord. Badura-Skoda, however, argues against this point:

Even the ‘Bebung’ of the Clavichord has been quoted in order to justify the (slight) separation of the tied notes, as if Beethoven had tried to imitate a peculiarity of a virtually extinct instrument … it is difficult to see a reason why Beethoven should have developed a nostalgia for an instrument that meant little or nothing to him.312

The existence of Fi. 1 possibly serves to contradict Badura-Skoda’s argument that Beethoven had developed a ‘nostalgia for an instrument that meant little or nothing to him’, since in 1790 Beethoven would still have been living in his family home in Bonn. In Chapter 2.4, it was noted that it was highly likely the Beethoven household possessed a clavichord as its smaller dynamic capabilities would have enabled him to practise late at night. The existence of Fi. 1, therefore, and especially the date in which it was written, contradicts Badura-Skoda’s argument that Beethoven would have needed to have developed a nostalgia for the clavichord, since it seems likely that he would have had access to one at the time Fi. 1 was written.

Fi. 1 is also noteworthy for the change of fingerings that Beethoven prescribes. In his published works Beethoven employs a 4-3 fingering throughout, but in Fi. 1 he reserves a 4-3 fingering for black notes and seems to prefer a 3-2 fingering for white notes. This is especially evident in the third beat of bar 1, where a 4-3 fingering would have been possible and would have allowed the hand to remain static when reaching for the b’’s. Beethoven, however, does not choose this option. He maintains the 3-2 fingering instead. The omission of the slurs in beats 2, 3, and 4 of bar 1, appears to have been an oversight rather than revealing any difference in execution, since the dash above the notes implies they are to be executed the same as the first beat. Türk’s discussion of ‘Bebung’ is noticeable for the addition dots over the notes (Ex. 4.17) whereas Beethoven’s markings do not contain these dots, which might imply that he was not alluding to this technique after all.

Ex. 4.17: Türk, School of Clavier Playing, p. 281.

---

312 Badura-Skoda, ‘A Tie is a Tie is a Tie’, p. 88.
Türk’s description of the technique, nonetheless, might suggest otherwise:

The finger is allowed to remain on the key for as long as is required by the duration of the given note and attempts to reinforce the tone with a repeated and gentle pressure. I scarcely have need of mentioning that after each pressure there is a lessening, but that the finger should not be completely lifted off the key. Besides, everyone knows that this ornament can be achieved only on the clavichord, indeed, only on a very good clavichord.\(^{313}\)

Türk’s description demonstrates that the technique was executed using one finger only and so the dots were used to signify movement with the same finger. His acknowledgement that ‘everyone knows that this ornament can be achieved only on the clavichord’ might have provoked Beethoven’s change in notation and addition of different fingerings in order to realise a similar idea on the fortepiano, since one finger would not be able to produce the same effect. Rather than being able to solve the mystery of Beethoven’s tied-note fingering, therefore, Fi. 1 acts as the earliest known example of this style of fingering, which can be used as evidence that Beethoven may have been alluding to earlier keyboard techniques.

Fi. 5 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 1793) has been one of the most frequently presented fingering figurations. Here, Beethoven has written three repetitions of the same chromatically ascending scale with three different fingerings. In the first instance, he prescribes fingerings which utilise all five fingers and then, in the second, incorporates finger slides from white to black notes with the third and fourth fingers. Newman uses Fi. 5 as an example that reveals Beethoven’s intention for a legato touch by stating ‘the finger slides are the surest clues’.\(^{314}\) Slides from black notes to white notes were not uncommon, however, being advocated by both C. P. E. Bach and Türk (Ex. 4.18) with the latter stating that they could be used ‘for detached as well as legato passages’.

Ex. 4.18: C. P. E. Bach, *Versuch*, Fig. 61.

\[^{313}\] Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, p. 281.
Newman’s statement that the slides denote legato, therefore, is not a safe assumption and the whole figuration must be evaluated. Ex. 4.18 demonstrates that slides onto adjacent notes were not uncommon, yet Beethoven’s commentary and articulation markings in Fi. 5 suggest that he intended the figuration to be used for a more complex purpose. The addition of the slurs on the second and third repetitions of the chromatic scale, in conjunction with the instruction that the last repetition should be the ‘softest’, imply that he may have intended a gradual diminuendo to take place with each repetition. This could suggest that he was using the finger slide to aid a legato diminuendo. The legato execution of Fi. 5, however, already could have been established by the fingering in the original version and so the repetitions of the scale serve to demonstrate Beethoven’s desire to experiment with different fingering effects, and possibly to find alternative or more effective ways of executing the same passage. The reduced dynamic may also have been employed as a means of increasing the difficulty of the figuration: the instruction that the dynamic should be softest on the last repetition requires complete control to prevent an accent occurring when sliding from one note to the next. Similarly, by executing the figuration first with what is essentially legato fingering, Beethoven is setting a precedent as to how the scale should sound so that when the figuration is repeated with the slides, any perceivable lack of control is even more pronounced. It is almost as if he is establishing how the figuration should sound with legato fingering before trying to achieve the same effect with finger slides. The addition of the slur above the second and third repetitions seems to reinforce the notion that a controlled legato is desired. Chiantore has concluded that Fi. 5 is the ‘most frequently quoted in the history of these exercises’ and presents seven different transcriptions of it that have previously been published to demonstrate the difficulties in transcribing these figurations.315

The location of Fi. 5 on folio 39v of the Kafka Miscellany directly precedes Sc. 10, a series of descending chromatic scales which was discussed in Chapter 4.1 (Fi. 5 appears on stave 15 whereas Sc. 10 is written on staves 14 and 15). The positioning of Sc. 10 directly after

---

Fi. 5 suggests that Sc. 10 may be a development or continuation of Fi. 5. This idea is substantiated by the ink colouration and thickness of the strokes, which confirm that they were written with the same pen. Chiantore has surmised that, owing to their close proximity, finger slides were also intended in the execution of Sc. 10. This interpretation, however, is questionable since the finger slides are only indicated when slurs are marked in Fi. 5 and Sc. 10 contains no such slurs (See also Chapter 4.1.2).

The first type of finger slide (changing fingers on the same note) is also employed by Beethoven in Fi. 16 (Grasnick 32, f. 3v, c.1808). Here, the penultimate semiquaver is marked with two fingering indications above it: a 2 and a 1. The two indications could possibly be alternative fingerings for the same note. The placement of the 1, however, is diagonally above the 2, which suggests a finger slide. If the two fingers were written as alternatives, it is likely that they would have been written directly above one other or with a stroke between them. The placement of the 2, however, suggests that this should be played first and then be followed by the 1. The positioning of the numbers on the page also mirrors the movement of the hand as the thumb replaces the second finger and thus makes the reading of a finger slide most likely. This slide also appears to have been written to promote a legato touch: the silent exchange of the thumb and second finger increases the span of the hand and thus makes it easier to reach the lower without forcing a break in the line that might otherwise occur.

Although the execution of the finger slides in Fi. 5 and 16 appear to have been designed to promote legato, the motive for their conception is markedly different. The finger slide in Fi. 16 seems to have been devised for logistical purposes: to maintain a legato line through a potentially awkward stretch. This technique follows the principle advocated by C. P. E. Bach, although he does not cite explicitly the use of finger slides to achieve this:

Those passages which, without the thumb, must be pounced upon with stiff, tensed muscles, can be played roundly, clearly, with a natural extension, and a consequent facility when it lends its assistance.

The finger slide employed in Fi. 16 seems to have been designed to make use of the thumb, avoiding a potentially awkward stretch, and thus appears to show Beethoven’s imaginative interpretation of the advice given by C. P. E. Bach.

---

316 Ink type G according to Cooper, ‘The Ink in Beethoven’s “Kafka”’, p. 329.
317 Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, pp. 204-5.
Fi. 4 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 1793) is another example of the first type of finger slide and, like Fi. 5, is also found on f. 39v of the Kafka Miscellany. Fi. 4 contains the written instruction ‘here the third finger must lie over the fourth until the latter withdraws and the third takes its place’. Newman uses this figuration as an example to reinforce his argument that Beethoven employs finger substitution to maintain legato and ensure the surrounding notes belong to the same melodic line. Rosenblum however, in addition to articulation, regards the finger slide of Fi. 4 as a means of generating dynamics:

Perhaps he reasoned that the fourth finger would play a quiet D more naturally than would the stronger middle finger; further transferring to a 3 silently would allow the player to restrike D with the same finger, assuring a clear separation and with it a more pronounced sforzando attack than might result from playing the two D’s with 4 and 3.

Her statement implies that the fourth finger is playing d’’ alone before being replaced by the third. Beethoven’s explanation, however, seems to suggest that by ‘lying over it’ the third finger is acting as a brace for the fourth, which implies they are depressing the key simultaneously. This action arguably provides the fourth finger with more control to achieve a singing sound at the piano dynamic indicated. The subsequent change of fingers to repeat the d’’ in bar 2 and the e’’ in bar 5, in conjunction with the sforzando, could imply a non-legato touch, whilst the lack of fingering indications on the crotchet d’’ in bar 4 is equally problematic, since it would presumably be played with either the third or the fourth finger; again implying non-legato. Newman’s claim, therefore, that the fingering is designed to maintain legato, along with Rosenblum’s suggestion that the third and fourth finger are acting alone, is questionable.

The suggestion that Beethoven’s double fingering could have been used as a supportive technique, however, is touched upon by Türk:

The habit some beginners have of putting two fingers on one key at the same time is completely in error, not to speak of allowing both to rest on the key until after the duration of the given note. Perhaps the weakness of their fingers leads them into making use of this incorrect fingering.

In spite of Türk’s dismissal that the technique is used by ‘some beginners’, he does concede that it could be employed to strengthen the fingers. Fi. 4, therefore, not only shows a disregard
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319 ‘Hierbei muss der 3te Finger über den 4ten solange kreuzweiss liegen, bis dieser wegzicht und alsdann der 3te an seine Stelle kommt’.
320 Newman, Beethoven on Beethoven, pp. 293-94.
322 Türk, School of Clavier Playing, p. 142.
for conventional fingering practices but also demonstrates Beethoven’s willingness to experiment with different techniques in the quest to find an effective way of realising his objectives.

With the finger slides, then, he appears to have been investigating different possibilities in order to achieve multiple styles of articulation. As a result, Fi. 1, 4, 5 and 16 do appear to be experiments, on account of the fact that the techniques used deviate slightly from those prescribed in the tutor books.

4.3.2 Articulation

The belief that Beethoven’s fingering indications reveal his wishes for articulation is widespread. Alfreda Hiebert states that Beethoven’s ‘choices are determined by the eloquence of his ideas in articulation … He treats fingering like bowing and breathing’,\(^\text{323}\) whilst Newman declares that he ‘introduced innovational techniques and suggested interpretive readings in his piano writing’.\(^\text{324}\) These two statements are applicable to both the figurations discussed above and those that follow, as they also demonstrate Beethoven introducing ‘innovational techniques’ in order to create the desired articulation.

The practice of using the third and fourth fingers simultaneously, as seen in Fi. 4 above, also appears at the end of Fi. 6 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 139v, 1793). Here, Beethoven indicates that the notes in the left hand should be played with the third and fourth fingers together. The placement of the ‘fortissimo’ marking at the beginning of the sketch is ambiguous, as it may have been intended for the left hand alone (Ex. 4.19). It does seem to be located closer to the bass stave, but this may have been out of necessity so that the quavers in the right hand were still distinguishable. If Beethoven did intend the indication for the left hand alone, the subsequent fingering indications pose an interesting contrast to Fi. 4: the combination of the third and fourth fingers in Fi. 4 appear to have been employed to provide greater control at a softer dynamic. The same combination at the end of Fi. 6, however, could have been intended to provide increased security in order to produce a weightier sound. The fundamental idea behind Beethoven’s combined use of the third and fourth fingers, therefore,

is essentially the same in both Fi. 4 and 6: it seems that he saw the third finger as a support to the fourth.

**Ex. 4.19: Kafka Miscellany, f. 139v, 7 & 8.**

The idea of using a combination of two fingers is not discussed by C. P. E. Bach, and Türk’s dismissal of it strongly implies that Beethoven may have developed this technique himself. This point is supported further by Czerny who describes this method in his Op. 500 Piano School:

> Cases occur in which a particular key must be struck with such unusual force, that a single finger would run the risk of not being sufficiently strong for the purpose, or of hurting itself in the attempt. In such cases we must strike the key with two fingers at once, almost pressed upon and held over each other. In general this occurs only on the lowest bass notes, as there the keys go down with some difficulty, and the thick strings are better able to endure such a blow.  

Czerny’s example of this technique also prescribes the same combination of third and fourth fingers on the bass notes as Fi. 6 (Ex. 4.20).


Considering the similarity between Beethoven’s and Czerny’s use of this technique, in combination with the fact that it is advocated neither by C. P. E. Bach nor Türk, it is likely that
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326 The fingering has been altered from the original English system to enable a direct comparison with Fi. 6.
Czerny’s awareness of it derived directly from Beethoven. Czerny did recall that he devoted much time to teaching the correct use of the fingers, which strongly suggests that he also may have taught this technique to Czerny. It is possible, therefore, to perceive Fi. 6 as an experiment with technique, which was subsequently divulged through Beethoven’s teaching.

Thus far, only the fingering indications at the end of Fi. 6 have been discussed. The indications at the beginning are also noteworthy. Under the first note in the left hand, Beethoven has written the figure three and then stated that ‘all notes throughout, with the third finger’. This request is invariably designed to add weight to the notes, helping to achieve the fortissimo, but also to produce a rather pronounced and detached sound as opposed to a legato effect which theoretically could be achieved by using all of the fingers. In this example, Beethoven’s fingering indication is used to reinforce his wishes for articulation: he could have easily written his intention instead; by prescribing the fingering, however, his intentions are much more explicit, and it renders the desired effect infallible.

Türk’s vilification of combining two fingers on one note is repeated for using one finger on successive notes:

The habit of playing almost everything with one finger is just as incorrect, especially in the left hand … That someone should accustom himself to this fingering—as unbelievable as it may seem to many—has come to my attention again and again. I regard a detailed explanation of why this is incorrect as superfluous.

Beethoven’s prescribed fingering throughout Fi. 6 appears, therefore, to be entirely unconventional and of his own design. Türk implies that this style of fingering derives from a lack of proper technique, whereas Beethoven has devised this fingering to realise his intentions for articulation and rather than being perceived as poor technique, Fi. 6 actually demonstrates an advanced approach to fingering.

Both Nottebohm and Rosenblum have quoted extracts from Fi. 6. Their omission of the middle section of the figuration, however, falsely gives the impression that the beginning and end are two separate ideas. When the middle section of Fi. 6 is included, allowing a comparison of the differences in notation and fingering, Beethoven’s objective becomes clear. Rosenblum believes ‘the coupling of 4 and 3 … helps the pianist maintain the maximum
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327 Kopitz, *Beethoven aus der Sicht*, p. 204.
328 ‘alle Noten durchaus mit dem 3ten Finger’.
329 Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, p. 142.
possible *fortissimo* along with a dollop of action noise on any instrument of the 1790s'.

The sole dynamic marking of *fortissimo*, however, appears at the beginning of the figuration. No further dynamics are indicated, which suggests that Beethoven’s addition of the fourth finger was not for the dynamic effect Rosenblum implies. Dynamically, both sections of Fi. 6 appear to be the same. If Beethoven wanted more volume on the later notes, he would most likely have indicated this. The difference between the two sections, and the key to understanding Beethoven’s intentions, lies in the movement of the hand: the first section consists of an ascending and descending arpeggio sequence, whereas the second section involves two-octave leaps. This gesture is similar to that described in Fi. 3: a throwing movement (see below), and thus further strengthens the notion that Beethoven used the third and fourth fingers simultaneously to ensure stability.

The fingering prescribed at the end of Fi. 6 could, therefore, be used to execute similar passages for the right hand in Op. 7/i/51-54, where no fingering indications are provided but the same effect appears to have been desired (Ex. 4.2). Fi. 6 precedes Op. 7 by approximately four years and so, if Beethoven did desire the technique to be employed here, it strengthens the notion that Fi. 6 was an initial experiment with this style of fingering.

**Ex. 4.21: Piano Sonata Op. 7/i/51-54.**

Fi. 8 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 45r, c.1795), is a more ambiguous case. Newman has said that the figure 3 written under each bass note could be either fingering indications or a form of shorthand notation which indicates that the bass should be played in thirds. The latter seems highly unlikely for several reasons: firstly, Beethoven’s usual way of writing thirds is to write the number followed by a line. This style of notation is used on f. 43r of the Kafka Miscellany (Ex. 4.22). Secondly, if the passage is to be played in thirds, writing a number three on each
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332 This style of leap also occurs at bars 209 and 231-33, and to a lesser extent at bars 221-23.

333 Op. 7 was written 1796-97.

individual note would arguably be as time-consuming as writing out the actual note and thirdly, in this particular case, executing the passage in thirds would not make harmonic sense. Considering his explicit indications in Fi. 6, it is almost certain that he intended this style of execution in Fi. 8 also. Given that Fi. 6 is dated 1793 and Fi. 8 dates from c.1795, is it possible that Fi. 6 could represent one of Beethoven’s first attempts at utilising this style of fingering, hence the explanation, but by 1795 he was now familiar with this practice and so did not feel the need to write further explanatory notes. Thus, Fi. 8 demonstrates again that Beethoven used the third finger alone to reinforce his desire for a non-legato touch.

Ex. 4.22: Kafka Miscellany, f. 43r, 12(7).

Fi. 3 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 1793) represents a further example of Beethoven using fingering to produce a non-legato touch. Here, he has indicated that the octave leaps should be fingered alternately 2-4. By prescribing this fingering, instead of the more conventional 1-5, he is increasing the movement the hand is required to make by decreasing its span. Additionally, his comment that the hand is to ‘be thrown’, creates a sense of freedom in the wrist, enabling the hand to land with greater force. This technique appears to have been employed in the ‘Righini’ Variations WoO 65 where the figuration is progressively expanded (Ex. 4.23).

Ex. 4.23: ‘Righini’ Variations WoO 65/X/1-8 (Henle, 1961).

Rosenblum has compared Fi. 3 with Beethoven’s physical style of playing, suggesting that this movement creates a ‘bounce and liveliness’ that would not be achieved by conventional staccato markings with 1-5 fingering.335 Fi. 3 demonstrates Beethoven’s exploration of fingerings that would achieve, without misunderstanding, the desired effect. This point is also

evident in Fig. 7 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 147r, c.1794) where he writes that the fingering 4-3-2 produces a ‘good effect’ as it clearly helps distinguish the rhythmic grouping of the quaver-semiquaver pattern.

4.3.3 Sequences

Beethoven’s discussion of fingering in his letter to Carl Czerny provides examples of sequences (Ex. 4.24) and states:

In certain passages, such as [Ex. 4.24a] I would also like all the fingers to be used occasionally, and also with [Ex. 4.24b], so that one may slide one finger over another. Certainly such passages sound, as one says, as if they were “played like pearls” (i.e. with fewer fingers) or like a pearl, but occasionally one wishes for a different kind of jewellery.336

Newman and also Grundmann and Mies interpret these examples as confirmation that Beethoven desired a legato touch in such passages. Newman even suggests a possible fingering whereas Grundmann and Mies point out the differences between this style of fingering and C. P. E. Bach’s.337 Bamberger also includes the examples in her discussion of legato but does not comment on the content of the letter or the possible implications it may have.338 Rosenblum, however, also translates the letter as an expression of Beethoven’s desire for legato and notes that one of the examples is identical to Clementi’s Sonata Op. 36/6/i/43 in which he has provided the non-legato fingering: 1-3, 1-3, 1-3. Rosenblum justifies this difference by stating that ‘Beethoven may have felt in a teaching context it would take more than the slurs to

336 ‘Bei gewissen Passagen wie [Ex.4.24a] wünsche ich auch zuweilen alle Finger zu gebrauchen, wie auch bei d.g., damit man d.g. schleifen können; freilich klingt d.g., wie man sagt, „geperlt gespielt“ (mit weniger Fingern) oder wie eine Perle, allein man wünscht auch einmal ein anderes Geschmeide’. A-878, B-912.
overcome what appears to have been common practice”. This point has been verified with the fingering indications thus far provided in this chapter: Beethoven indicated fingerings to solidify his intentions on articulation. The pedagogical motivation behind the examples given above is obvious, but whether the figurations discussed in this chapter were also entirely pedagogically orientated is doubtful.

Fi. 9 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 30r, 1795/98) and Fi. 10 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 138r, 1795/96) specify the style of fingering advocated by Beethoven in his letter to Czerny. Rosenblum’s assertion implies that at the time he wrote the letter (1817), this style of fingering was not widely accepted. It is noteworthy, then, that with Fi. 9 and Fi. 10, Beethoven was experimenting with this style of fingering over twenty years prior to writing the letter. Johnson and Kerman have classified both Fi. 9 and Fi. 10 as cadenza sketches for the First Piano Concerto Op. 15. The confusion surrounding the dates of the two folios derives from the fact that Beethoven is thought to have completed Op. 15 in 1795 but gave a later performance in 1798 when he could have written further sketches for the cadenza. Their inclusion in the present study is based on the existence of their fingering indications, since this implies that they were not compositionally orientated, but served a practical purpose instead. Fi. 9 and 10 represent one of the rare occasions where duplication amongst the figurations occurs. There are, however, still subtle differences that prevent them from being exact repetitions: firstly the figurations are written in different clefs although they both are fingered for the left hand. Secondly, the fourth group of semiquavers is given a different fingering: Fi. 9 decrees that the thumb should be placed on the f-sharp whereas Fi. 10 indicates this should be the second finger. Using the thumb on black keys was a practice that was discouraged by C. P. E. Bach and Türk. C. P. E. Bach states that ‘the thumb is never put on black keys’, whereas Türk is more cautious, advising ‘One is only rarely permitted to put the little fingers and the thumbs of both hands on a raised key, unless the passage in question is such that no other way of playing is possible’. Fi. 9 and 10, therefore, seem to revolve around Beethoven’s indecision whether to use the thumb on the f-sharp. Despite the confusion over their dating, it seems likely that

343 Türk, School of Clavier Playing, p. 131.
344 Newman, Beethoven on Beethoven, p. 288, also argues Fi. 9 and 10 show Beethoven’s ‘indecision’ over whether to use the thumb.
Fi. 10 was written after Fi. 9, since Fi. 9 is written on paper-type I-M16 whereas Fi. 10 is written on paper-type III-C16. Moreover, the fingering in Fi. 10 is more fluid, which suggests that it was a development from Fi. 9. The fingerings in Fi. 9 are also more comprehensive than those of Fi. 10 (the first two and last two semiquaver groups contain only the first fingers for each group). It is only where Fi. 10 differs from Fi. 9 that full fingerings are provided. This implies that the fingerings omitted in Fi. 10 were the same as in Fi. 9 and were not indicated as they were already understood. Fi. 9 and Fi. 10, therefore, demonstrate Beethoven’s systematic approach to experimenting with different styles of fingerings and implies that these sketches were written when Beethoven was practising for a performance of the concerto (alternative fingerings for the same passage are also found in Fi. 12 (Grasnick 32, f. 1v, c.1808), discussed below).

Fi. 11 (Landsberg 7, S. 55, 1800-01), provides fingerings for a sequentially descending C-major scale pattern, which is similar to many of the scale patterns discussed in Chapter 4.1. The use of roman numerals for the thumb only at the start of semiquaver groupings is notable and could suggest that Beethoven may have intended this to denote an accent on the beat. On account of its similarity to the scale patterns in Chapter 4.1, it may be used as an example of the fingering Beethoven envisaged for these figurations too. This is also true of Fi. 20 and 21 from Grasnick 32 discussed below.

Fi. 2 (SV 75, f. 1v, 1790-92) contains two elements: the first is an appraisal of different fingerings for a double trill and the second is a sequence of double sixths. The first element has received attention from scholars, whereas the double sixths do not appear to have been discussed before. Although it appears to be two separate ideas, the lack of a double barline, or even a single, between the two has governed its classification as a single figuration here. The double trill fingerings show Beethoven testing different ideas based on the combination of white and black notes and are very similar in layout, if not in content, to Türk’s presentation of double trills (Ex. 4.25).

**Ex. 4.25:** Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, p. 258.

---

345 Johnson, *Beethoven’s Early Sketches*, pp. 149-50 and 179-80.
He explains:

For a two-voiced trill in one hand—a matter which is not and should not be of concern to beginners—one must make use of the thumb or the little finger according to the context.\(^{346}\)

Whilst Türk’s trills also combine white and black notes, Beethoven’s are in sixths as opposed to thirds, and thus show an increase in technical complexity. Along with the second part of Fi. 2, the use of sixths suggests that Beethoven was exploring technical possibilities for this interval. Newman regards Fi. 2 as an example in which Beethoven was exploring ‘new expressive and technical possibilities’.\(^{347}\) The implications this figuration have for the execution of Beethoven’s trills will be discussed in ‘Chapter 6.2’. Here, Fi. 2 is presented as a further example of Beethoven trialling alternative fingerings in order to find the most effective. His evaluation that the first fingering ‘is difficult’ and that the second trill is ‘not possible to make with the fingering’\(^{348}\) confirm that Fi. 2 was designed as an experiment. Significantly, in the second part of this figuration where Beethoven writes fingerings for double sixths, he has indicated that the passage is ‘zur übung’ (‘for practice’) and thus represents one of only two occasions in this entire study where the word ‘Übung’ appears next to a figuration.

4.3.4 Grasnick 32 and BH 124

Grasnick 32 is a loose gathering located in Berlin, and BH 124 is a single leaf located in Bonn. Their inclusion under one category stems from two shared features. Firstly, they once belonged to the same gathering, a fact that appears previously to have gone unnoticed: both gatherings are 8-stave manuscript paper with the same staff ruling, with the same style of handwriting (most notably dots over the number 1) and what appears to be the same ink-type. Secondly they contain fingered passages from the Fourth Piano Concerto Op. 58. The passages in Grasnick 32 have already been linked to the concerto, but the passages in BH 124 appear to have gone unnoticed: Schmidt describes BH 124 as ‘chord passages for piano with fingerings and a long memo relevant to this’\(^{349}\) and the Beethovenhaus appears to be similarly unaware, describing the leaf only as an example of ‘two scales with exercises, which have

\(^{346}\) Türk, School of Clavier Playing, p. 256.

\(^{347}\) Newman, Beethoven on Beethoven, p. 194.

\(^{348}\) ‘Triller ist schwer’ and ‘Triller ist nicht möglich mit dem Fingersatz zu machen’.

fingerings’. The table below shows how the figurations in Grasnick 32 and BH 124 relate to the concerto (Tab. 4.7).

Tab. 4.7: Figurations from Grasnick 32 and BH 124, and their Corresponding Passages in the Fourth Piano Concerto Op. 58.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURATION</th>
<th>PASSAGE FROM OP. 58</th>
<th>SKETCH COLLECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 12</td>
<td>iii/134-36</td>
<td>Grasnick 32, f. 1v, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 13</td>
<td>iii/45-48</td>
<td>Grasnick 32, f. 1v, 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 14</td>
<td>i/155</td>
<td>Grasnick 32, f. 2r, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 15</td>
<td>i/361-69</td>
<td>Grasnick 32, f. 2r, 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 23</td>
<td>i/223</td>
<td>BH 124r, 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although these fingerings belong to the Fourth Piano Concerto, their inclusion in the present study is based on the premise that they do not appear to have served a compositional purpose: the passages are virtually identical to the published version. The fingering indications are particularly noteworthy for the ‘oder’ in Fi. 12 and the ‘N.b’ comments for Fi. 13 and Fi. 23. This suggests that the fingerings may have been devised for someone else and that Beethoven provided alternatives to cater for different hands. Moreover, the ‘N.b’ comment written for Fi. 13, has an instructional tone. Newman and Shedlock have quoted this passage but have mistakenly transcribed the final word as ‘wird’ rather than ‘werde’, which changes subtly the meaning of the sentence (see Ex. 4.26 for original). If using ‘wird’, the sentence reads ‘it must be noted that the thumb or first finger is passed under at once’ whereas ‘werde’ translates as ‘should [if possible] be passed under’. This use of the subjunctive changes the tone of the text from observational to instructional and further implies that the passages were written for another, since Beethoven’s previous comments have taken the form of observations. The same tone is used for the comment written at the bottom of BH 124: ‘N.b. with long or extended passages as much as possible the same fingering’. The use of ‘möglich’ in BH 124 matches the tone of ‘werde’ in Grasnick 32, further emphasising their connection.

351 The last note of Fi. 13 is the only difference.
353 ‘Nb: ist zu bemerken daß der Daumen oder erster Finger sogleich untergesetzt werde’.
354 ‘Nb bei großen weitausgehenden oder gedehnten Passagen so viel als möglich einerley Fingersatz’.
Beethoven’s exploration of the use of the thumb in Fi. 13 complements Czerny’s recollections of his lessons with him in which he focused specifically on this technique:

[Beethoven] showed me, |: to most players then still unknown :| the only correct position of the hands, fingers and especially the thumb – rules whose benefits I only fully appreciated later in time.355

The comparatively late date of these sketches (c.1808) further implies that the comments were not for Beethoven’s use, since by this time he already knew how to use the thumb and, as demonstrated by Czerny, had been teaching his pupils the correct use of it too. This suggests that Beethoven may have created Grasnick 32 and BH 124 for someone who was not one of his regular pupils; hence the reason for explaining explicitly the use of the thumb and the remarkably neat handwriting when compared to his other sketches. This neatness, in conjunction with the fingerings, is comparable to the autograph copy of the Piano Trio WoO 39, which Beethoven prepared for Maximiliane Brentano in 1812 ‘to encourage her with her piano playing’356 (Ex. 4.27).

Ex. 4.27: Autograph Copy of WoO 39, p. 3.

---

356 ‘zu ihrer Aufmunterung im Klawierspielen’.
The remaining figurations in Grasnick 32 (Fi. 16-21) provide further fingerings for passages and show a preference for fingerings in the left hand (Fi. 16, 19, 20, and 21). This is a feature that also has been noted in Chapter 4.1 and Chapter 4.3. In addition, the scale patterns used in Fi. 20 and 21 are similar to those from the Wielhorsky sketchbook discussed in Chapter 4.1. Fi. 20 uses the same pattern as Sc. 23 from bar 2 onwards and Fi. 21 is essentially the same pattern as Sc. 24 from bar 2 onwards. Comparisons also can be drawn with Fi. 22 and Ar. 12 (also from the Wielhorsky sketchbook): both use the same sequentially ascending broken-chord passage. The sole difference is that Fi. 22 is written in C major and Ar. 12 is in C minor. The fingerings presented here, therefore, can be used to demonstrate how Beethoven also could have executed Sc. 23, 24 and Ar. 12.

Summary

Beethoven’s fingering indications seem to have served a largely practical purpose: he appears to have been experimenting with different styles, particularly for articulation, in order to devise fingerings that would render his intentions unmistakable. This explains the ‘guten effect’ comment written next to Fi. 7, the explanation of how to throw the hand in Fi. 3 and the use of a combination of the third and fourth fingers in Fi. 6 and 8. In addition, the fingering indications for the First and Fourth Piano Concertos would have been derived from Beethoven’s personal experiences of performing them. It is perhaps significant, then, that no
fingering indications have been found after c.1808, which corresponds approximately with the period when he made his last public performance as solo pianist.\textsuperscript{357}

\textsuperscript{357} Beethoven’s last public performance as a soloist was at his Akademie in December 1808. He did, however, accompany the violinist Giovanni Battista Polledro and improvise on 6 August 1812, and then played the piano in the ‘Archduke’ Piano Trio on 11 April 1814 and also in May of that year.
4.4 Finger Speed (See Vol. II pp. 309-20)

The figurations included here require agile fingers at fast tempi. This movement is more intricate than scale runs, requiring greater finger strength and independence. To emphasise the notion of speed, the majority of these figurations are written in semiquavers or smaller rhythmic values. There are a few exceptions (Fs. 16, 41, 43, 44, 49, 50 and 51), but three of these (Fs. 16, 41 and 44) are written in triplets, whilst the notation of the remaining figurations implies either that they could have been intended as semiquavers and Beethoven merely missed off the extra beam (Fs. 39 and 50) or that the movement itself implies speed (compare Fs. 43 with Fs. 1). Out of the fifty-nine figurations, six contain fast tempo markings: ‘prestissimo’ is written on Fs. 1, 3 and 17, ‘presto’ is used for Fs. 25 and 38, whilst a more conservative ‘gemässiger tempo’ appears alongside Fs. 37. Another distinguishable feature is their relatively simple accompaniments; when the finger-speed movement is located in one hand, the other hand is either absent or accompanies with single notes or repetitive chords. This implies that they were designed specifically to improve finger agility, since where accompaniments are provided their simplicity either allows full concentration on the figuration or provides a steady beat. Given the large number of figurations included in this category, only those that are particularly noteworthy will be discussed in detail.

The fifty-nine figurations span the years c.1790-1809, with a concentration in the years 1790-95 (see Tab. 4.8) and are dominated by figurations for the right hand: forty-two figurations contain semiquaver movement for the right hand either alone or with a simple left-hand accompaniment (Fs. 1-4, 7-15, 17, 20, 23, 25-28, 30-32, 34, 38-40, 41, 44-55, 57 and 58). Thirteen are written for the left hand alone or with a simple right-hand accompaniment (Fs. 5, 6, 16, 18, 19, 22, 24, 29, 36, 37, 42, 43 and 59) and four are written for both (Fs. 21, 33, 35 and 56).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1790-92</td>
<td>Fs. 1-15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Fs. 16-34</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794-95</td>
<td>Fs. 35-45</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796-98</td>
<td>Fs. 46-51</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799-1800</td>
<td>Fs. 52-56</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Fs. 57-59</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 4.8: Distribution of Finger Speed.
Owing to their large number, the finger-speed figurations are diverse in nature and thus have been difficult to group together. In many cases a figuration did not easily fall into one category or could have fitted into multiple categories. There are certain characteristics, however, which have enabled a number of the figurations to be categorised: broken thirds, broken octaves, wrist rotation and increased finger movement, repetitive or basic accompaniments and inner- or outer-part movement (see Tab. 4.9). Owing to the extent of this diversity, a comparison with contemporary tutor books is also problematic as they do not contain chapters on comparable aspects. There are, however, a few instances where Beethoven’s figurations share similarities with those that appear in the tutor books. This is true of the broken-third figuration Fs. 42 (Meyer collection SV 361, c.1794) and the broken-octave figurations. Where such similarities occur, they will be highlighted in the following discussion.

Tab. 4.9: Sub-Categories of Finger Speed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broken thirds and Derivatives</td>
<td>Fs. 1, 12, 16, 18, 24, 25, 35, 36, 42, 43, 49, 50, 54</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Octaves</td>
<td>Fs. 10, 11, 14, 19, 20, 46, 48, 59</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Finger Movement and Wrist Rotation</td>
<td>Fs. 3, 4, 8, 13, 21, 22, 26, 27, 31, 34, 39, 41, 44, 47, 56, 58</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetitive Accompaniments</td>
<td>Fs. 15, 28-30, 32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner or Outer-part Movement</td>
<td>Fs. 17, 40, 45, 53, 57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Speed</td>
<td>Fs. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 23, 33, 37, 38, 51, 52, 55</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some figurations have received attention from scholars. Rosenblum has discussed Fs. 3,\(^{358}\) which also has been appraised by Chiantore along with Fs. 1, 12, 29, 31, 43, 46, and 58.\(^{359}\)


4.4.1 Broken Thirds

Thirteen figurations incorporate broken-third movement (see Tab. 4.8). Beethoven’s use of this idea is varied and extensive; spanning the years c.1790–c.1799. Figurations incorporating broken thirds are one of the few sub-categories that do appear in contemporary tutor books: Marpurg focuses on appropriate fingering systems (Ex. 4.28) and C. P. E. Bach also concentrates on fingering choices and incorporates held notes in outer voices whilst the broken-third movement continues inside (Ex. 4.29). He also explains differences in fingering styles when the broken thirds are played at rapid tempi:

Several successive broken thirds in rapid tempos are played with a pair of repeated fingers, 1/3 or 2/4, so long as black keys do not intervene (Fig. 43, Ex. a). When they do, the finger is changed, the thumb being withheld from them (b). 5/3 or 2/1 are employed in passages containing a sustained or interpolated tone (Ex. c). When necessary, the thumb may play the black keys in such spans.\(^{360}\)

In both Marpurg and C. P. E. Bach’s examples, the multiple fingering systems demonstrate that the figurations were to be executed by both hands, either individually or simultaneously.

Ex. 4.28: Marpurg, *Anleitung*, Tab. IX, Fig. 22 and 23.

Ex. 4.29: C. P. E. Bach, *Versuch*, Fig. 43.

In contrast, Türk’s examples provide fingering only for the right hand (Ex. 4.30). He does advise, however, that in similar passages ‘in rapid motion with no raised keys, all of these thirds are generally played with the first and third fingers, or even more commonly with the second and fourth’.\footnote{Türk, School of Clavier Playing, p. 161.} This advice mirrors C. P. E. Bach’s presented above.

Ex. 4.30: Türk, School of Clavier Playing, p. 161.

Milchmeyer incorporates fingering for each hand into one figuration (Ex. 4.31) and uses the same triplet idea that is seen in Fs. 42, although his is based around a diminished seventh chord instead of the standard arpeggio pattern of Fs. 42. In contrast, Clementi also focuses on fingering but provides separate examples for the left and right hands (Ex. 4.32). Although these examples use standard semiquaver patterns, he does include a Giga by Corelli in one of his lessons at the end of the book, which incorporates broken thirds in triplets (Ex. 4.33).

Ex. 4.31: Milchmeyer, Die wahre Art, p. 22.

Ex. 4.32: Clementi, Introduction, pp. 18 and 19.\footnote{Clementi uses the old English system of fingering where ‘+$’ denotes the thumb and ‘1’ the index finger.}

\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{Türk, School of Clavier Playing, p. 161.}
\item \footnote{Clementi uses the old English system of fingering where ‘+$’ denotes the thumb and ‘1’ the index finger.}
\end{itemize}
Beethoven’s broken-third figurations differ from those presented above in several aspects. Firstly, they display endless variation and deviation from standard patterns: Marpurg, C. P. E. Bach, Türk, Milchmeyer and Clementi all base their broken-third examples on ascending and descending scales and arpeggios. Only four of Beethoven’s figurations use standard scale patterns: Fs. 35 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 97v, c.1794) is based on an ascending and descending scale; Fs. 42 (Meyer Collection SV 361, c.1794) and Fs. 49 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 67r, 1797/1798) are based on ascending and descending arpeggios; and Fs. 43 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 132v, 1794/1795) is an ascending scale. The nine remaining figurations are modified forms of this pattern: Beethoven alternates the intervals in Fs. 1, 12 and 54, incorporating fourths, fifths and octaves; he displaces the accents in Fs. 9, 16, 24, and 36 so that the interval is placed on the off-beat; juxtaposes ascending and descending broken thirds in Fs. 18; and disguises the interval by incorporating passing notes (Fs. 9 and 36). In addition, he varies the rhythm between quavers (Fs. 43, 49, 50), semiquavers (Fs. 1, 9, 18, 35, 54), demisemiquavers (Fs. 12) and triplets (Fs. 16, 24, 42), and switches the direction of the interval to incorporate rising and falling broken thirds.

Secondly, the almost total absence of any fingering indications is particularly noticeable, as this appears to have been the overriding concern of his contemporaries. There are two occasions where his fingering intentions have been revealed. The first is the letter to Czerny regarding his nephew Karl’s instruction discussed in Chapter 4.3.3 above, and the second is found in Fi. 14, which is one of the passages taken from the Fourth Piano Concerto Op. 58, also discussed in Chapter 4.3. A comparison of these fingering indications reveals that Milchmeyer’s approach was unusual: the others choose an alternate-finger system instead of the successive-finger pattern adopted by Milchmeyer.

Broken-third ideas can be found in Beethoven’s published works, and therefore the figurations cannot be viewed entirely as exercises. Variation XV of the ‘Righini’ Variations WoO 65 (c.1790-91) uses a triplet pattern similar to Fs. 42, although the sequence is based on a
descending scale rather than an arpeggio (Ex. 4.34). Fs. 42 could, therefore, be seen as a
development of the ‘Righini’ figuration since the movement has been changed from scales to
arpeggios. Scale patterns formed the basis of the examples provided in the contemporary tutor
books and so it is noteworthy that this early example also follows this procedure.

Ex. 4.34 ‘Righini’ Variations WoO 65/XV/1-4 (Henle, 1961).

A more complex example, found in Variation XXIX of WoO 80 (1806) (Ex. 4.35), is
also based upon arpeggio patterns. Here, both hands are employed in contrary-motion
sequences that incorporate broken thirds and fourths, which represents a development from
the simpler, single-hand descending scale used in WoO 65.

Ex. 4.35: 32 Variations WoO 80/XXIX/1-4 (Bureau des Arts et d’Industrie, 1807).

The extended runs of Fs. 35 are found in the Piano Sonata Op. 31/1/ii/10 and 12 (Ex.
4.36). Significantly, both Fs. 35 and Op. 31/1/ii are in the same key. With Op. 31/1, however,
Beethoven uses only the ascending form of this pattern, preferring to incorporate a scale as the
descending movement. This example provides one of the rare instances in which Beethoven
provided fingering in his published works, and is notable for following Türk’s and C. P. E.
Bach’s guidance that, in rapid broken-third passages, only the first and third finger are
generally used (see above).
Fs. 18 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 53r, 1793) resembles Fi. 9 and 10 (Chapter 4.3) and pre-dates them by approximately two years.\textsuperscript{363} Fi. 9 and 10 are based on a descending scale whereas Fs. 18 descends in thirds. Both ideas are used in the ‘Waldstein’ Sonata Op. 53/ii: Fs. 18 is used at bars 29-30 (Ex. 4.37) and Fi. 9 and 10 are used at bars 53-54 (Ex. 4.38).

Fs. 1 (Wegeler Collection SV 329, f. 1r, c.1790) and Fs. 43 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 132v, (1794/1795) are constructed from broken thirds and resemble cadenza-like flourishes. It is possible that Beethoven may have made a mistake with the key signature in Fs. 1 and added an extra sharp: if he intended D major, the figuration would be a dominant seventh of D instead of the tonic seventh it appears to be. Chiantore perceives Fs. 43 as an example that demonstrates Beethoven’s interest in the challenge of ‘unprecedented velocity’ and argues that this challenge was one of his principal aims.\textsuperscript{364} Considering the similarity between Fs. 1, which is marked ‘prestissimo’ and Fs. 43, it is highly likely that Beethoven also intended Fs. 43 to be executed at speed, which makes Chiantore’s view a fair assessment. Particularly noteworthy,

\textsuperscript{363} See Chapter 4.3.3 for discussion over the dating of Fi. 9 and 10.
\textsuperscript{364} Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, p. 163.
however, is that Fs. 1, written for the right hand, and Fs. 43, written specifically for the left hand, are dated approximately four years apart. It was noted in Chapters 4.1 and 4.2 that Beethoven appears to have been keen to develop the strength and agility of the left hand. The four-year gap between Fs. 1 and Fs. 43 demonstrates that after Beethoven had moved to Vienna he began experimenting with flourishes in the left hand that had previously been reserved for the right. Only two of the fifteen figurations dated prior to 1793 are written for the left hand. In comparison, seven left-hand figurations appear in 1793 alone, and in subsequent years they feature consistently. This evidence strongly supports the notion that Beethoven developed a preoccupation with improving his left hand once he had moved to Vienna.

Fs. 12 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 2r, 1790-92) alternates demisemiquaver broken thirds or fourths with broken octaves. In addition to finger speed, this figuration also requires a degree of wrist rotation\textsuperscript{365} and so draws comparisons with Fs. 39 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 47r, 1794), where the rocking interval gradually decreases; Fs. 46 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 73v, 1796), which comprises rocking octaves; and Fs. 56 (Autograph 19e, f. 1r, 1800), which incorporates rocking sixths. Likewise, St. 2 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 19r, c.1790) (see Chapter 5.1) also shares this gesture. The similarities between these five figurations are even greater as the rocking gesture is preceded by an arpeggiated sequence in each case.

Fs. 25 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 52r, 1793), although incorporating broken thirds, is a figuration whose classification is problematic. Fs. 25 could be an unused idea for a work: the indication ‘presto thema’ implies that is it more than a figuration and the full time signature and key signature markings also support this interpretation. Likewise, the lack of a barline, repeat mark or ‘usw.’ indication at the end of the figuration implies that it may have been intended as an idea for a work. Its rapid semiquavers and broken-third design do, however, justify its inclusion here.

The variety and experimentation with which Beethoven has treated broken-third figurations, therefore, in conjunction with their appearance in published works, strongly implies that he viewed them as experimental figurations and not purely finger exercises. The broken-third figurations also reveal Beethoven’s determination to develop his left hand after moving to Vienna.

\textsuperscript{365} This point is also noted by Chiantore, ibid., p. 179.
4.4.2 Broken Octaves

Broken-octave figurations (see Tab. 4.9) share one feature; they are predominantly written as semiquaver triplets. Only three (Fs. 14, 46 and 55) do not use this rhythmic grouping. Given the simplicity of a broken-octave triplet figuration it is extraordinary that in the six figurations of this type no repetition occurs. Beethoven treats the figuration sequentially in scales (Fs. 10, 48 and 59), arpeggios (Fs. 11) and alternating intervals (Fs. 19 and 20). He also alternates the movement within the triplet so that the middle note is higher (Fs. 10, 19 and 20), lower (Fs. 48) and alternating (Fs. 11 and 59).

Kris Worsley has noted the presence of this figuration in the third movement of Neefe’s Piano Concerto in G (bars 168-170), where it is written in demisemiquavers, and has remarked that ‘the broken octave figuration in Neefe’s work (which is surely unplayable at the prescribed Allegretto tempo…) is unusual’.\(^{365}\) Owing to its unusual nature (it has not been found in the tutor books), it is possible to surmise that Beethoven might have encountered it through his association with Neefe. The concerto was published in 1782, the same year that Neefe helped Beethoven publish his ‘Dressler’ Variations WoO 63, and thus it is highly likely that Beethoven was familiar with it.\(^{367}\) Variation V from the ‘Righini’ Variations WoO 65 is constructed entirely around this figuration (Ex. 4.39) and the Piano Sonata Op. 2/2 also includes it (Ex. 4.40).


![Ex. 4.39: ‘Righini’ Variations WoO 65/V/1-4 (Henle, 1961).]


![Ex. 4.40: Piano Sonata Op. 2/2/i/84-85.]


\(^{367}\) See Schiedermair, Der Junge Beethoven, pp. 155 and 169.
Notably, the most technically-demanding form of this figuration i.e. the alternating triplets written for the left hand in Fs. 59 (Landsberg 5, S. 110, 1809), is chronologically the last variation of this figuration and thus demonstrates a progression in technical difficulty: Beethoven’s first two presentations of this figuration are a sequentially-descending scale in Fs. 10 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 125r, 1790-91) and a sequentially-descending arpeggio in Fs. 11 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 100r, c.1790-91), both of which are written for the right hand. The time difference between Fs. 10 and Fs. 59, therefore, mirrors the pattern discussed above with Fs. 1 and Fs. 43: a significant delay before an idea presented in the right hand is tried in the left. Folio 125r of the Kafka Miscellany also contains sketches for WoO 65 and so it may be no coincidence that this figuration also appears on this leaf. The direction of the triplets is reversed from those used in Variation V of WoO 65 (sketched on f. 123v), although it is highly likely that Fs. 10 may have been connected to Beethoven’s sketching for the variations. The paper-type for both folios is III-B; the ink used on each folio, however, is different (ink C for f. 123v and ink A for f. 125r).368

Broken-octave triplets also appear in Czerny’s study for the left hand Op. 399/7 (Ex. 4.41). It is likely that he became acquainted with the figuration through Beethoven, especially considering that he discusses the ‘Righini’ Variations and describes them as showing ‘what an original and genial direction [Beethoven’s] mind had already taken, both in the treatment of the theme, as well as in the invention of new melodies and brilliant passages’.369

Ex. 4.41: Czerny Piano Studies for the Left Hand Op. 399/7/41-44 (Cocks & Co., 1839).

The broken-octave figurations that do not incorporate this triplet idea are Fs. 14 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 2v, 1790-92) and Fs. 46 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 73v, 1796). Fs. 46 was discussed above as being characterised by a rocking gesture. Fs. 14 is also comparable to Le. 12 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 1793) (Chapter 5.2). Its inclusion as a finger speed figuration, as opposed to a leap, has been governed by the lack of two-note slurs that were present in Le. 12:

368 Cooper, ‘The Ink in Beethoven’s “Kafka”’, p. 327.
without slurs, Fs. 14 is arguably quicker, since it does not require extra weight to be placed on the upper note; it is largely propelled by the fingers. The figurative pattern between the two, however, is similar. The only differences really are their respective keys and the movement of the sequence.

4.4.3 Increased Finger Movement and Rotation of the Wrist

This category encompasses two areas of technique and, as far as possible, will be discussed individually.

4.4.3.1 Increased Finger Movement

A number of the figurations require increased finger movement by incorporating numerous accidentals and thus require the fingers to extend forward in order to reach the black keys. Figurations of this type are Fs. 3, 4, 21, 22, 31, 41, 44, 47 and 58.

Fs. 3 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 88r, 1790) is notable for both its repeat markings and the written instruction ‘vielmal’ (‘many times’). Rosenblum suggests that Fs. 3 ‘could be practised “many times” with several different fingerings, [and] would aid in developing finger strength, equality, and speed, all necessary for brilliant cadenza-like passages’. She observes that Fs. 3 is written on the same leaf as Sc. 4 (Chapter 4.1), which also is marked ‘prestissimo’ and consists of rapid ascending-scale runs. Chiantore highlights the change in finger position from white to black notes and suggests that Beethoven was well aware of the need to prepare the muscles of the hand properly in order to execute such movements at speed. He concludes that, with Fs. 3, Beethoven demonstrates sensitivity to the need for extending and contracting the finger from the second joint, which is a technique sometimes forgotten, but is necessary for tonalities with many accidentals. It is evident that both scholars view Fs. 3 as an exercise. Rosenblum’s idea that Fs. 3 could be practised with multiple fingerings is appropriate for a number of figurations. There are numerous examples where Beethoven has indicated that the figurations should be practised in a variety of keys (Sc. 7, Ar. 11, and Oc. 3) and thus a similarly flexible approach also could apply to their fingering. Fi. 2, 5, and 12 (Chapter 4.4) are specific examples where Beethoven has experimented with different fingerling styles within the

---

same figuration. It is also possible that he may have done this for figurations where no fingering has been indicated: Fs. 3 lends itself particularly well to adaptable fingering, as does Fs. 4 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 88v, 1790).

Fs. 4 is essentially an inversion of Fs. 3: it appears on the verso of the same folio, is an ascending three-note pattern instead of descending and contains the French marking ‘beaucoup’ as opposed to the German ‘vielmal’. In addition, the ‘pianissimo’ marking on Fs. 4 necessitates greater finger strength in order to execute the passage with control. Interestingly, both Rosenblum and Chiantore identify Fs. 3 and yet fail to mention Fs. 4. Rosenblum’s observation that Fs. 3 is linked to Sc. 7, which like Fs. 4 is on folio 88v, makes this omission even more surprising.

Fs. 31 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 18v, 1793) has also been discussed by Chiantore. He observes that it is similar in appearance to Fs. 43 although admits that they differ regarding their respective realisations.\(^{372}\) Fs. 43, however, does not incorporate any black notes and thus does not require the increased finger-movement that characterises Fs. 31. In addition, a comparison of Fs. 31 with Fs. 58 (Landsberg 5, S. 86, 1809) reveals one of the very few cases where repetition of a figuration occurs: the chromatic sequence of Fs. 31 is repeated at the same pitch sixteen years later with Fs. 58. The only perceivable difference is that Beethoven has written ‘und so weiter’ at the end of Fs. 31, implying that it should continue, whereas with Fs. 58 he has written the sequence out in full and added a descending form. By including this descending form, it could be argued that Fs. 58 is a development, and not a repetition, of Fs. 31. Beethoven’s ‘und so weiter’ comment, however, might have covered its descent also. It is impossible to suggest why this figuration may have been repeated, and so one can only emphasise that the repetition between Fs. 31 and 58 is rare. Beethoven has used a similar type of figurative flourish in the piano sonata Op. 2/3, where the same movement is used, but is based around an ascending broken chord instead (Ex. 4.42).

\(^{372}\) Ibid., p. 163.
Of the remaining figurations, Fs. 21 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 1793) is noteworthy for its use of alternating hands in quick succession. This novel effect is confirmed by Beethoven's need to clarify its execution, marking ‘zwei Hände’ (‘two hands’) at the start. Previously he had used a similar demisemiquaver alternating hands idea in Variation V of the ‘Dressler’ Piano Variations WoO 62 (Ex. 4.43), where the figuration is written as a contrary-motion passage. The later form presented in Fs. 21 is, however, technically more complex, as the hands are in close proximity to one another, and it is therefore visually more impressive.

4.4.3.2 Rotation of the Wrist

Figurations that require lateral rotation of the wrist are Fs. 8, 13, 26, 27, 34, 39 and 56. The first four comprise semiquaver patterns that require freedom in the wrist, since they appear to use both the thumb and fifth finger at the beginning and end of each semiquaver grouping.

Fs. 34 (Fischhof Miscellany, f.55r, 1793) is interesting for two reasons. Firstly, Beethoven switches the accents so that the thumb and fifth finger alternately lead the movement. Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, the pitch of the right-hand part ascends to g’’, which goes beyond the standard compass available on Viennese pianos at this time (Ex. 4.44).³⁷³ Beethoven’s sole published work prior to 1800 that extends beyond f’’’ is the Piano Sonata Op. 14/1/i/41, written 1798, which incorporates a single f’’’-sharp. It is not until the ‘Waldstein’ Sonata Op. 53 (1803-04) that a further extension is recorded. The existence of the

³⁷³ The standard Viennese compass was F, f’’’.
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f”’-sharp in Op. 14/1, has provoked the suggestion that he may have owned a piano with an extended compass range before.\textsuperscript{374} Fs. 34, however, strongly suggests that Beethoven may have had access to a piano with an extended compass much earlier than was previously thought. Although very little information is known about the pianos Beethoven owned, rented or borrowed in the 1790s, two makers are regularly associated with him: Anton Walter\textsuperscript{375} and the Stein/Streicher family. Richard Maunder has located a Walter piano c.1785 which has an extended compass to g’”, two pianos by Stein/Streicher dated c.1795 which have a compass range F, - g’” and a Schantz piano c.1795 that possesses a compass up to g’”.\textsuperscript{376} These discoveries have helped Maunder conclude that ‘by about 1790, F, - g’” must have been quite common on all types of keyboard instrument’.\textsuperscript{377} The existence of Fs. 34, which appears to have been previously unknown, now becomes Beethoven’s earliest-known use of g’”.

Ex. 4.44: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 55r, 3 & 4.

4.4.4 Repetitive Accompaniments

The main characteristic that distinguishes this category is the use of simple repetitive accompaniments (see Tab. 4.9). Although supporting the harmonic structure, these simple accompaniments also may serve another more practical purpose: their simplistic nature may have been employed to maintain a steady beat whilst the other hand was engaged in rapid execution. This point is apparent especially where chords are repeated throughout the figuration, such as Fs. 15 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 130v, 1792?), Fs. 30 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 4r, 1793) and Fs. 32 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 51r, 1793). In other figurations, where the chords are placed on weak beats, as in Fs. 22 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 40r, 1793) and in the second half of Fs.


\textsuperscript{375} Czerny remembered seeing a Walter piano in Beethoven’s room when he went for his piano lessons in 1801. Kopitz, \textit{Beethoven aus der Sicht}, p. 203.

\textsuperscript{376} Maunder, \textit{Keyboard Instruments}, pp. 70-71 and 76-77.

\textsuperscript{377} Ibid., p. 115.
44 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 25v, c.1794), the placement of the chords provides a greater sense of musical interest but still helps to maintain a steady beat. Such precautionary additions suggest that Beethoven was using these figurations as exercises to develop strength and independence of the fingers in addition to possible ideas for improvisations and works.

4.4.5 Inner- and Outer-Part Movement

C. P. E. Bach’s inclusion of inner- and outer-part held notes in his examples for broken thirds (Ex. 4.29) is also a technique that Beethoven employs in Fs. 17, 40, 45, 53 and 57.

Most notable are Fs. 17, 40 and 45. Fs. 17 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 52r, 1793) incorporates prestissimo semiquaver sextuplets underneath a simple melodic line whereas Fs. 40 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 47v, 1794) switches the parts so that demisemiquavers play above an inner melodic line. In both cases the semiquavers and demisemiquavers are based around a turn-like figuration. This idea is continued with Fs. 45 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 131r, 1794/95) where the same turn-like figuration is used inside held crotchets in octaves before switching to outer-voice and then subsequently inner-voice crotchets. With Fs. 45, therefore, Beethoven has not only incorporated both ideas from Fs. 17 and 40, but also has added a new variant in the form of the octaves. The use of inner-held crotchets is adventurous for such an early date (c.1794). The texture, simple accompaniment and in particular the sextuplet-turn figuration, also bear a remarkable resemblance to one of Czerny’s piano exercises (Ex. 4.45).


These figurations, however, seem extraordinary since nothing similar appears in Beethoven’s published works. The closest example is the inner-part movement employed in the Pathétique Sonata Op. 13,378 which incorporates broken thirds and fourths. Owing to the lack of similar
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378 See for example Movt. I/253-56 and Movt. II/9-16.
figurations in his published works, it is highly likely that such ideas were reserved for improvisations.

4.4.6 Miscellaneous Speed

The figurations included here do not easily fit into one of the preceding categories and, whilst initially being problematical, clearly demonstrate Beethoven’s varied approach and seemingly endless wealth of ideas.

Out of the twelve figurations in this category (see Tab 4.9), Fs. 2, 5, and 52 are noteworthy for their dotted semiquaver rhythm. Fs. 2 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 88r, 1790) and Fs. 52 (Grasnick 2, S. 9, 1799-1800) are written for the right hand and comprise largely scale runs and stepwise movement whereas Fs. 5 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 50r, c.1790) is written for the left, making it one of only two left-hand finger-speed figurations dated prior to 1793. These figurations may have formed rhythmic experiments but dotted rhythms are also notable for developing finger strength and so may have served this purpose also.

Beethoven’s awareness that rhythmic stresses can improve finger strength and agility is evident in the comment he has written alongside Fs. 6 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 19v, c.1790). He notes that the triplet figurations are a good exercise for the left hand.379 Fs. 6, therefore, is notable as an early example of Beethoven’s intent on developing his left hand and also as a figuration which has been firmly classed as an exercise.

The remaining figurations of this type incorporate semiquaver movement in various patterns: descending sequences are used for the right hand in Fs. 7 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 125r, 1790-91); Fs. 9 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 125r, 1790-91); and Fs. 38 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 99r, c.1794) and an ascending sequence for the left hand is found in Fs. 37 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 97, c.1794). Interestingly, four finger-speed figurations (Fs. 7, 8, 9 and 10) are found on folio 125r of the Kafka Miscellany, which strongly suggests that, at times, Beethoven did actively work at generating complementary ideas.

379 ‘diese Art Triolen sind gut zur Übung in der linken Hand’.
Summary

The finger-speed figurations develop finger agility, and a number also require a flexible wrist. Given that a number of derivatives from the figurations have been found in Beethoven’s published works, it is impossible to conclude that all of them function as exercises. The existence of Fs. 6, however, has proven conclusively that some may have served this purpose initially. Moreover, the large number of left-hand figurations has demonstrated that Beethoven was actively trying to improve the independence of this hand, and the increase in such figurations after 1793 strongly suggests this was motivated by his desire to impress and compete with the Viennese Klaviermeister.

Fs. 31, 34 and 58 are particularly notable as Fs. 31 and 58 represent one of the very few occurrences of direct repetition amongst the figurations, and Fs. 34 becomes Beethoven’s earliest-known use of g''. The broken-octave triplet ideas are also notable for the level of variation that Beethoven was able to create within this pattern.
4.5 Equalisation of the Hands (See Vol. II pp. 321-26)

Figurations of this type give equal importance to both hands. Neither hand appears to take prominence over the other: sometimes the hands play simultaneously whereas on other occasions they alternately share the material, producing an imitative effect. Twenty-four figurations have been found which display these characteristics and they date from the years c.1790-1809 (see Tab. 4.10).

Tab. 4.10: Distribution of Equalisation of the Hands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1790-92</td>
<td>Eq. 1-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Eq. 4-10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794-95</td>
<td>Eq. 11-18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799-1800</td>
<td>Eq. 19, 20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802-04</td>
<td>Eq. 21, 22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Eq. 23, 24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figurations can be subdivided into two categories: simultaneous motion and imitation. Distribution between the two sub-categories is not equal: sixteen figurations have been classified as simultaneous motion and eight as imitation (see Tab. 4.11). The chronological distribution of sub-categories, however, is fairly even and demonstrates that Beethoven was consistently writing both techniques. Only two of the figurations (Eq. 1 and 7) contain dynamic markings. This is also true of tempo indications: only two (Eq. 3 and 7) have been provided with tempo markings, although the largely semiquaver movement for the remaining figurations does imply speed. This distinct lack of musical indications could imply that Beethoven's main concern when writing figurations of this type was their figurative, as opposed to musical, features.

Tab. 4.11: Sub-Categories of Equalisation of the Hands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous Motion</td>
<td>Eq. 1, 3, 5-8, 11, 10, 15-18, 20-23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td>Eq. 2, 4, 9, 12-14, 19, 24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The lack of discussion of this theme in contemporary tutor books is revealing: neither C. P. E. Bach nor Marpurg include any musical examples that either bear a resemblance to Beethoven’s figurations or demonstrate equality of movement in the hands. The two-hand figurations that Marpurg includes consist of small pieces at the end of his *Anleitung*, the first of which briefly uses similar motion triplets in both hands (Ex. 4.46).


![Image of Ex. 4.46: Marpurg, *Anleitung*, Tab. XVII, bars 1-8.](image)

Türk does include a limited number of passages in his discussion of cadenzas and the examples provided are used to demonstrate ‘how the left hand may be used in simple cadenzas’ ⁵³⁰ (Ex. 4.47). Türk’s description reveals that such passages were used for displays of bravura and were not regarded as the norm. The example below demonstrates that, even when playing in simultaneous motion, the left hand still takes an accompanying role; it is only in the imitation passages that the hands can be considered equal.

Ex. 4.47: Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, p 305.

![Image of Ex. 4.47: Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, p 305.](image)

Milchmeyer’s book also is notable for the absence of such figurations. He provides only one example (Ex. 4.48), describing it as a conversation (‘Gespräche’), which bears some resemblance to the characteristics seen in Beethoven’s. Likewise, Clementi does not provide any two-hand examples. His comment that ‘Most of the passages fingered for the right hand,

⁵³⁰ Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, p. 304.
may, by the ingenuity and industry of the pupil, become models for the left’, \(^{381}\) could be interpreted as a suggestion to play the passages simultaneously with both hands or to play the examples with each hand individually. Their execution seems to lie with Clementi’s direction that it is up to the ‘industry and ingenuity’ of the pupil to use the material as they desire. It initially appears then, that Beethoven’s figurations might have been born out of his desire to develop the left hand (see Chapter 4.4) by measuring it against the right.

Ex. 4.48: Milchmeyer, *Die wahre Art*, p. 49.

Beethoven’s figurations of this type have received scant coverage from scholars. Chiantore appears to have been the only scholar to have referred to them, commenting upon Eq. 1, 5, and 15.\(^ {382}\) Newman, Rosenblum and Skowroneck do not include any figurations of this type in their respective discussions, and the figurations were not discussed by Nottebohm either. Kann, however, has included Eq. 21 and 22.\(^ {383}\)

4.5.1 Simultaneous Movement

The figurations that utilise simultaneous movement either involve both hands playing in unison (Eq. 1, 3, 5, 7 and 10) or intervals of thirds, sixths and tenths (Eq. 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 and 23). Figurations of this type can be further divided into classifications of parallel motion and contrary motion.

Eq. 1 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 50v, c.1790), the first of the parallel-motion figurations and one of only two figurations with dynamic markings, seems to show that Beethoven was
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\(^{382}\) Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, pp. 162, 171 and 199.

\(^{383}\) Kann, *Etüden für Klavier*, pp. xiv and xvi.
striving for equality and lightness of touch by writing demisemiquavers at a ‘piano’ dynamic. The initial ‘forte’ marking produces the attack needed to ensure the held a’s sound for the desired length. Chiantore concludes that this figuration demonstrates Beethoven’s interest in the juxtaposition of different attacks to generate unusual sonorities and sees it as a precursor for the Piano Sonatas Op. 13 and Op. 27/2. He considers the figuration to be an experiment in creating two different depths with the same hand but does not comment on the fact that both hands are playing the same figuration and therefore also need to be balanced. His comparison to Op. 27/2 would be more appropriate if Eq. 1 were written for one hand only. The movement in Eq. 1 would then allude to the two different layers in the right hand of the first movement. Considering that Eq. 1 is written for both hands, this feature strongly implies that it was balance between the hands, in addition to sonority, that Beethoven was experimenting with. Chiantore’s allusion to Op. 13, therefore, is more appropriate, as the opening fp chord followed by a succession of chords in both hands does mirror the gesture presented in Eq. 1. If Beethoven did use his experiments in Eq. 1 as a precursor for Op. 13, there is approximately an eight-year gap between the conception of Eq. 1 and its application in a published work—a feature that has been seen with a large number of figurations presented in this study.

Eq. 3 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 61v, 1792), Eq. 7 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 52r, 1793) and Eq. 10 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 52v, 1793), appear to be the most exercise-like: they contain simple ideas with no real sense of development or progression.

Eq. 5 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 54r, 1793) is noteworthy largely due to the variety of possibilities that exist for its interpretation. Eq. 5 is written on one stave only, but the addition of octave lines above and below the stave implies that both hands are to be used in its execution. The octave lines suggest that the first section of the passage, until the second double bar, should be played in unison with the left hand playing an octave lower. After the second double bar, there follow two passages where the right hand plays a bar alone before being joined again by the left hand (this time Beethoven has written the lower part and indicated that the second part is an octave above). The change in placement of the octave line, from below the stave to above it, strongly suggests that the execution is also different, and there appear to be two possible interpretations. Firstly, Beethoven may have intended the left hand to continue the passage as written and wrote the octave line above to indicate that the
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right should return to its original position and thus repeat the previous sequence. Owing to the fact that Beethoven did not write the original right-hand positioning of the sequence (with an octave line underneath) as he had done previously, another reading is suggested: the octave line above the semiquavers could indicate that he wanted the left hand to play above the right i.e. with the hands crossed. This would account for the passage being written an octave below, as it would continue to indicate the placement of the right hand. This interpretation implies that all written notation is played by the right hand and the octave lines indicate where the left hand joins. Either interpretation is possible, making it difficult to determine which, if either, Beethoven intended. It does seem that the change in placement of the octave lines was an interpretative decision and not logistically required, since adding the line above actually causes it to clash with the octave line from the stave above (Ex. 4.49). Moreover, the succeeding bar (written at the upper octave) also clashes with the octave line and so further implies that they were not written in this way due to a lack of space. The second interpretation, therefore, appears to be more likely.

Ex. 4.49: Kafka Miscellany, f. 54r, 7 & 8.

At the end of this specific passage, Beethoven has written an s-type double bar (see Ex. 4.49), implying that the subsequent passage is a different idea. This second idea, written in the bass clef, appears to be a study for the left hand, comprising ascending scales that are preceded by small trill-like ideas. Owing to the s-type double bar and the change in construction of the figuration (going from two hands to one), this part of the figuration could have been included in the previous category, ‘Finger Speed’. Its inclusion here is justified by the fact that an examination of the handwriting suggests both sections of Eq. 5 were written at the same time, which implies that Beethoven also envisaged them as a set. Either interpretation, however, is equally applicable and thus represents one of the many cases where multiple classifications exist for a single figuration.

385 See Cooper, ‘Beethoven and the Double Bar’.
In his transcription of the Kafka Miscellany, Kerman has labelled Eq. 5 ‘[piano studies?]’ but provides no further discussion.\(^{386}\) Kerman’s choice of terminology, however, is apt due to the extended length of Eq. 5: the term exercise tends to imply something shorter in length. In contrast, Chiantore’s transcription of Eq. 5 omits the middle part of the figuration (from after the first double barline until the bass-clef passage immediately following the s-type double barline) without acknowledgement.\(^{387}\) This section, however, is arguably the most interesting on account of its ambiguous nature and thus, depending on which interpretation is used, alters significantly the execution of the figuration. Chiantore points to similarities with C. P. E. Bach’s exercises, and although his inclusion of Eq. 5 under the heading ‘The Action of the Finger’ is appropriate, the comparison with C. P. E. Bach is questionable, since it has already been observed that C. P. E. Bach does not include two-hand exercises of this type in his *Versuch*. The general consensus amongst scholars, however, is that Eq. 5 is a piano study.

Eq. 8 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 160v, 1793) is a simple sequential idea in triplets. The use of the accidentals could mirror the technique discussed previously (Chapter 4.4) of introducing accidentals to increase finger movement and promote independence. These features seem to suggest that the figuration could be an exercise, and yet it has parallels with Op. 2/3 (Ex. 4.50). Eq. 8 was written two years prior to Op. 2/3, again implying that the figuration may have had some bearing on the later work. Both Eq. 8 and the passage in Op. 2/3 comprise a sequential passage of unison triplets. The movement in Op. 2/3, however, is inverted.

\[\text{Ex. 4.50: Piano Sonata Op. 2/3/iv/45-54.}\]

\[\text{Ex. 4.50: Piano Sonata Op. 2/3/iv/45-54.}\]


\(^{387}\) Chiantore, “Los ejercicios técnicos”, p. 162.
It seems, therefore, that although a large number of the parallel-motion figurations initially appear to be exercises, Beethoven’s incorporation of the textures, patterns or figurations into some of his later works strongly suggests that he also regarded them figuratively. Although none of the figurations have been inserted directly into a work, there appears to be a definite relationship between ideas trialled in the figurations and those that appear in later works.

The remaining figurations of this type employ contrary-motion movement. (Eq. 6, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 and 23). Out of these, Eq. 15 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 68r, 1795) and Eq. 18 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 128r, 1795) both use triplet semiquavers in a descending (and ascending for Eq. 15) C-major scale sequence. Their difference lies in the construction of their respective triplets: Eq. 15 is based on arpeggios whereas Eq. 18 uses scale-runs. Both of these figurations initially appear to be exercises due to the sequential construction and relatively simplistic nature. Chiantore is in agreement, also drawing attention to Eq. 15’s internal development (the movement changes from single notes to octaves and back to single notes again). He also draws parallels with Chopin’s Etudes Op. 10/10 and Op. 25/5. Chiantore perceives Eq. 15 to be proof of Beethoven’s incredible pianistic instinct, comparing it to the sophisticated approach of Chopin. The comparison with Chopin’s Etudes emphasises the exercise qualities of Eq. 15 and Eq. 18, and so it is surprising to find that derivatives from both figurations are found in a large number of Beethoven’s published piano works. Similar figurations are used sequentially with varying left-hand accompaniments in Op. 2/1 (1793-95) (Ex. 4.51); are the central feature of Variation VII in WoO 71 (1795) (Ex. 4.52) where both a scale sequence and a sequence with leaps is used; are inverted and used in parallel motion in Op. 7 (1796-97) (Ex. 4.53); are treated as a descending, partially chromatic sequence in Op. 37 (1800-03) (Ex. 4.54); are used in both original and inverted variants in Op. 33/5 (1802) and with a melody above (Ex. 4.55); are found in Op. 53 (1803-04) (Ex. 4.56); have been changed to semiquavers in Op. 57 (1804-06) (Ex. 4.57) and returned to triplets in Op. 58 in an ascending scale (Ex. 4.58).

---

388 Chiantore, “Los ejercicios técnicos”, p. 171.

Ex. 4.52: 12 Piano Variations WoO 71/VII/3-5 (Artaria, 1797).


Ex. 4.54: Third Piano Concerto Op. 37/iii/290-95 (Bureau des Arts et d'Industrie, 1804).
The variety of treatments that Beethoven uses to transform Eq. 15 and 18 into material for his published works is astonishing. None of the published examples are an exact copy in either key or design of Eq. 15, Eq. 18 or one another: each has been slightly transformed whether it be the sequence of triplets, the intervals between the triplets, the note-values or the direction of movement; Beethoven has varied each application, displaying great ingenuity and again blurring the line between what is deemed an exercise or an experimental figuration. Eq. 15 and 18 initially appear to have been technical exercises, but Beethoven has used them as the basis
for a figurative pattern that was subsequently used for approximately fifteen years. Again, however, as in other cases, the original idea contains some more radical elements that were not transferred into his published works, namely the incorporation of octaves (Eq. 15) and the duration for which the figuration is continued.

The idea of adding extra voices to double-handed simultaneous-motion figurations seems to be something that Beethoven was experimenting with for some time. It is arguably first seen in Eq. 1 with the held $a's$ in the outer parts of the figuration and then reappears in Eq. 6 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 54r, 1793) where simple crotchets are placed in the outer parts of both hands. This time there is movement and repetition in these outer parts instead of the single held-notes found in Eq. 1. The final figuration that uses additional voices is Eq. 11 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 47r, 1794) where there are again crotchets placed in the outer part of the right hand. Derivatives of this type of texture can be seen in the Piano Sonatas Op. 13 (1796-99) and Op. 28 (1801) (Exx. 4.59 and 4.60).


Ex. 4.60: Piano Sonata Op. 28/i/351-60.
Eq. 21 (Wielhorsky, p. 46, 1802-03) and Eq. 22 (Landsberg 6, p. 107, 1803-04) are remarkably similar, comprising a juxtaposition of contrary- and similar-motion movement. Each also contains similar repeat marks and consists of semiquaver movement with small oscillations. Eq. 22 appears on the same page as the scale figurations Sc. 26-29 (Chapter 4.1), and thus can be associated with the ‘Waldstein’ Sonata Op. 53 also. It is noteworthy that Eq. 21 largely consists of similar motion with a few contrary-motion semiquaver groups, whereas Eq. 22 comprises mainly contrary-motion movement with only a few similar motion groups.

Again it seems that Beethoven’s ideas in the figurations have taken some time to filter through to his published works, which implies that the figurations presented here were experimental ideas. Given the large number of examples that have been taken from his published works, it must be stressed that this type of rushing semiquaver movement in both hands is particularly innovative: it is rarely seen in Mozart, and on the occasions it does appear, the movement is usually quite brief, the tempo is relatively slow or the left hand is merely playing an Alberti-bass figuration (sometimes a combination of these features is seen).

4.5.2 Imitation

Beethoven’s characteristic trait of passing small motifs through different registers is also shared by a number of the figurations (Eq. 2, 4, 9, 12, 13, 14, 19 and 24). In these, imitation occurs from exchanging ideas between the hands. This imitation takes two different forms: overlapping and direct repetition. In both cases, figurations of this type have been included in this chapter, since switching ideas between hands requires each hand to execute the idea similarly, with the same accentuation and articulation.

Direct repetition is seen in Eq. 2, 12, 13, 14 and 24. In all of these figurations, excepting Eq. 13, the idea is presented in the right hand first before being passed to the left, and it is only in Eq. 14 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 45v, c.1795) that the movement reverts back to the right hand, whereas the remaining figurations end once the material has been presented in the left. In Eq. 14, Beethoven has clarified his intention to pass the idea between hands by indicating left and right hands alternately. This seems to have been necessary as the material is presented on the same stave and the parts are otherwise only discernible from the stem direction. In all other figurations of this type, the repetition is written on the stave corresponding to which hand is playing it. Eq. 14 is also the only figuration where exact
repetition occurs at the octave: two out of the remaining three figurations (Eq. 2 and 12) present the material with a direct transposition either a fourth or fifth below. Eq. 13 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 55v, c.1795) and Eq. 24 (Landsberg 5, S. 74, 1809), start their repetition a twelfth and a fourth higher. Eq. 24 also changes the direction of the repetition to contrary motion: instead of ascending in a C-major arpeggio sequence, the passage descends in an F-major arpeggio sequence. The pattern for each cell of semiquavers, however, remains the same. Eq. 13 also could be classified as a leaping figuration owing to the extreme nature of the quavers in the left hand which gradually increase until the hand is required to leap two octaves. Its inclusion in this chapter results from the predominant semiquaver movement.

Both forms of exact and transposed repetition are used in Op. 31/3 (Exxs. 4.61 and 4.62), and it is possible that Beethoven’s experimentation with this type of figuration could have influenced his decision to incorporate similar ideas into this work. Again there is a significant delay between comparable ideas being found in the sketches and their subsequent employment in a work: the first sketches of this type date from 1790 (Eq. 2), but Op. 31/3 was not written until 1802.

Ex. 4.61: Piano Sonata Op. 31/3/i/246-49.

Eq. 12 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 25r, 1794/95) also shares parallels with published works. The figurative pattern of Eq. 12 is used in a slightly altered form in the final movement of the Third Piano Concerto Op. 37, but rather than employing the imitation gesture of Eq. 12, Beethoven exploits the parallel technique of simultaneous movement discussed above (Ex. 4.63). The ascending form of the pattern is also slightly altered as it is based on a scale run as opposed to the arpeggios found in Eq. 12. In spite of these small differences, the two passages do share distinct parallels and these similarities are too striking to be ignored. It is also interesting to note that Beethoven has changed the initial technique used in Eq. 12 into the associated technique discussed above, which supports the idea that he saw a relationship between the two. Once again the line has been blurred as to whether Eq. 12 can be regarded as an exercise or an experimental figuration.


Perhaps the most overt case of this type of repetition is seen in the Piano Variations WoO 80 (Exx. 4.64 and 4.65) where Beethoven uses right-hand repetition of the left to create two consecutive variations. In these variations, Beethoven has reversed his preference for using the right hand first and has taken his initial idea of alternating ideas between hands to the extreme by extending it and turning it into two independent but at the same time analogous variations.
The remaining figurations in this chapter (Eq. 4, 9 and 19) comprise varying degrees of overlapping imitation. Again it is the right hand that begins the figuration, but the three figurations each employ different treatments of this technique. Eq. 4 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 1793) makes use of exact repetition an octave lower with the left and right hands alternately holding minims whilst the idea is passed between the hands. At bar 4, Beethoven has cleverly changed the interval of repetition in order to modulate smoothly into F major and then develops the idea into a double-octave pattern.

With Eq. 9 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 161r, 1793), dated to the same year as Eq. 4, Beethoven follows the same pattern of repetition an octave below but has changed the rhythmic value so that the repetitions are occurring more frequently (every two, instead of every three, notes). This slight change speeds up the movement and is arguably technically more challenging than Eq. 4. The use of semiquavers and quavers instead of crotchets and quavers also promotes the feeling of increased speed. Although the two figurations have been
dated to the same year, they are written on different paper types: Eq. 4 is written on I-A16 whereas Eq. 9 is written on I-C16. From the paper-type analysis presented by Johnson, in conjunction with Cooper's ink analysis,\textsuperscript{389} it appears that Beethoven used the majority of I-A16 before I-C16, which supports the suggestion that Eq. 9 is potentially a development from Eq. 4.

A further increase in technical complexity is seen in Eq. 19 (Grasnick 2, S. 13, 1799-1800) where the repetitions have been contracted even more so that there is considerable overlapping between ideas, along with the addition of a third voice. The sense of progression seen across the three figurations (Eq. 4, 9, and 19) suggests that Beethoven was aware of his previous attempts, and that he was striving for ways to make each idea more complex. Whether this was on account of him using them as technical exercises instead of figurative ideas cannot be verified with any certainty. This is especially true owing to his use of this technique in his published works also. The most basic type of imitation is seen in the Rondo a capriccio Op. 129, written 1795 (Ex. 4.66), which corresponds to Eq. 4 and comes barely two years after Eq. 4 was conceived. Although the repetition of intervals and direction of movement is not the same, the premise behind the texture is. These parallels, in terms of style and dating, therefore, further strengthen the association between the two.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Ex. 4.66: Rondo a capriccio Op. 129/158-164 (Diabelli, 1828).}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Ex.4.66.png}
\end{center}

Summary

Figurations of this type have been highly varied and innovative. The boundary between an experimental figuration and an exercise was blurred considerably with the variety of different ways in which Beethoven incorporated Eq. 15 and 18 into his published works. Whilst initially
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appearing to represent exercises, they were utilised as the basis for innovative new textures and figurations. It is possible, therefore, that when Beethoven was trying to develop the equality of his hands, he saw the potential to use similar ideas as virtuosic figurations. This point is noteworthy considering that only Türk provided vaguely comparable examples under the heading of cadenza figurations. As a result, the rushing semiquaver movement seen in the examples presented above and, for example, throughout the Piano Sonatas Op. 26/iv, Op. 27/1/i, Op. 53/i and Op. 57/iii could have arisen from these figurations.
5  Keyboard Geography

This chapter discusses figurations that feature movement around the keyboard, which goes beyond that of typical scale, arpeggio or broken-chord patterns. Figurations of this type fall into two distinct areas. The first is stretches and finger extensions (Chapter 5.1) and is characterised by figurations that contain large intervals that can be reached by expanding the hand, extending the fingers or rotating the wrist. Figurations in this category allow the hand to remain rooted to the keyboard and do not require it to be lifted. In contrast, the second category is leaps (Chapter 5.2) and involves ideas that cannot be reached by extending the fingers alone: they require the hand to be lifted and moved laterally around the keyboard. Again grey areas exist where a stretch may be viewed as a leap and vice versa (a factor that is also dependent on hand size). Le. 31 (Kessler, f. 23v, 1801-02) is one such example. This figuration has been classed as a leap but also could be perceived as a stretch. Its present categorisation has been based on the definition presented above: the figuration incorporates intervals of two octaves, which cannot be reached by extending the finger alone.

5.1  Stretches and Finger Extensions (See Vol. II pp. 327-32)

Twenty-six figurations have been classified as stretches and finger extensions and they span the years c.1790-98. Again there is a concentration in 1793: thirteen date from this year (see Tab. 5.1). Those written prior to 1793 fall into two categories: chords (St. 1) and fifth-finger extensions (St. 2-7). In 1793 Beethoven appears to have begun varying the technique, experimenting with extensions of the thumb and later wrist rotation (see Tab. 5.2). Similarly, it is not until c.1792 (St. 6) that figurations appear which require both hands to execute the same technique simultaneously. Before this date, the stretch or expansion was limited to one hand only. Distribution between the hands, however, is approximately even, with the right and left hands taking eleven and ten figurations respectively; the remaining five necessitate movement in both hands. The expansion, development and increase in number of ideas during 1793, therefore, mirrors the trend found in previous categories and thus further strengthens the idea that this year was particularly productive.
Tab. 5.1: Distribution of Stretches and Finger Extensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1790-91</td>
<td>St. 1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>St. 6-7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>St. 8-20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794-95</td>
<td>St. 21-25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>St. 26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 5.2: Sub-Categories of Stretches and Finger Extensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chords</td>
<td>St. 1, 9, 11, 18, 19, 21, 22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions of the Fifth Finger and Thumb</td>
<td>St. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 23, 24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotation of the Wrist</td>
<td>St. 8, 16, 25, 27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contemporary tutor books of C. P. E. Bach, Marpurg, Milchmeyer and Clementi do not provide exercises or any advice on executing stretches: musical examples either stay within the range of an octave when motion is static or, if movement travels beyond an octave, it is a gradual process that does not necessitate leaps or stretches. It is only Türk who allocates any space to stretches of this kind in his chapter on fingering. He states:

Ninths and tenths, which are not at all frequently to be found and are not everybody's affair, are naturally to be played with the thumb and the little finger, without consideration for raised and lower keys, for example:

Whoever has very long fingers can probably reach ninths with 4/1 or 3/1. It would be superfluous to give additional rules for this since for such intervals everything depends on the stretches.₃⁹⁰

₃⁹⁰ Türk, School of Clavier Playing, pp. 167-68.
It is noteworthy that Türk states this type of stretch is not common and not to everybody’s taste, intimating an association between the perception of stretches and the frequency of their occurrence. Türk’s second example, where the interval is gradually expanding, rarely progresses beyond a tenth, which again suggests that intervals larger than tenths were rare. Considering that Türk includes this discussion in his chapter on fingering, it is striking that none of the fingering indications written by Beethoven are for stretches. The closest is Fi. 3, where Beethoven indicates a 2-4 fingering for octaves. Fi. 4 cannot be considered as a stretch, however, since his comment dictates that the hand should be thrown (Chapter 4.3.2). Beethoven’s omission of fingerings for figurations of this type, therefore, implies that he thought they were unnecessary.

Scholarly interest in these figurations is negligible. Out of the twenty-six, only six have received any attention: Rosenblum has highlighted St. 12 whilst Chiantore has provided a discussion of St. 2, 10, 12, 14, 17 and 20.\footnote{Rosenblum, \textit{Performance Practices}, pp. 207-9, and Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, pp. 166, 169, 179 and 180.}

5.1.1 Chords
Seven out of the twenty-six figurations involve stretches in the form of large chords (see Tab. 5.2). Sometimes these chords are sustained, at other times they are repeated; frequently, however, they are treated as part of an underlying harmonic sequence. These figurations include stretches for the right hand (St. 1 and 19), for the left hand (St. 9, 18 and 22) and for both hands simultaneously (St. 11 and 21). As with other figurations it appears that Beethoven has tried to make them musically meaningful: he does not write mere ascending and descending scales in tenths.

With one exception (St. 9) none of these stretches exceeds a tenth. This is significant considering Czerny noted that Beethoven’s span was barely a tenth,\footnote{‘Er selbe spannte kaum eine Decime’, Kopitz, \textit{Beethoven aus der Sicht}, p. 232.} as it could be used to corroborate the idea that he was writing the figurations for personal use. A larger interval such as an eleventh could have been employed if harmonised correctly, although a hand span larger than an eleventh is not particularly common. If Czerny’s observation was correct, if Beethoven were using the figurations as practical exercises or ideas for improvisations and compositions, writing chords larger than a tenth would preclude himself from executing them without
arpeggiation. Czerny’s observation also implies that the interval may have been uncomfortable for him to play repeatedly. This may account for the relative lack of prolonged repetitions of tenth chords.

In St. 1 (SV 329, f. 1r, c.1790) the right hand plays two inversions per bar of the same chord in a chromatically-ascending sequence. The first requires a stretch of a tenth and alternates between first inversion and root position chords whilst the second uses a sixth and alternates between second and first inversions. The harmonic structure of the figuration, and the inversions used, demand an opening and closing gesture from the hand which, when repeated, develops the familiarity of the hand with this interval. St. 1 was written c.1790 when Beethoven would have been approximately nineteen years old. By this age, his hands would have grown to their full size and so St. 1 could be viewed as a stretching exercise designed to increase the span of his hand. It also could have been written to practise accuracy and ensure muscular familiarity with the interval. The simplicity of the left hand (repeated semiquaver broken-octaves) enables full concentration to be given to the right hand and further strengthens this suggestion.

St. 19 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 4v, 1793) is also written for the right hand. This time, however, Beethoven has written a sequence that alternately requires the fifth finger and thumb to move a step down the keyboard. This movement repeatedly changes the interval between a tenth and a ninth. Interestingly, the left hand only accompanies the figuration when the interval in the right is a ninth: when the interval is a tenth the left hand remains silent. This implies that Beethoven was allowing full attention to be devoted to the stretch. Although the repetition of tenths in St. 19 is a prolongation, and therefore a development, from the single chords in St. 1, the recurrent reduction to a ninth provides a period of relaxation for the hand before repeating the stretch.

Although the stem direction in St. 22 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 47v, 1794) is ambiguous, it is most likely that the stretches are to be played by the left hand since, owing to their spacing, four-note chords in the right hand would be highly unlikely. St. 22 uses a common chord sequence, but Beethoven’s incorporation of tenths into this sequence demonstrates his constant search for new approaches: he has taken an established chord progression and has tried either to make it more complex by adding the tenths or to colour it differently.

393 This chord sequence is also used for the main theme and subsequent variations of Handel’s Organ Concerto Op. 7/5/ii; in the Minuet from Haydn’s String Quartet Op. 50/2; and in Pachelbel’s Canon in D major.
Beethoven’s usual treatment of this harmonic sequence, as seen in the piano sonatas Op. 79 and Op. 109 (Ex. 5.1), is to alternate first inversions on the second, fourth and sixth chords of the sequence, whereas in St. 22 he uses root position chords throughout. St. 22 is, therefore, noteworthy for Beethoven’s uncharacteristic handling of this chord sequence. If he had followed his usual method and written alternate first inversion chords, retaining a similar spacing in the upper voices, the intervals between the bass notes would have been reduced to octaves throughout. This change of inversions, therefore, implies that he deliberately wrote the root-position chords in order to incorporate tenths into the sequence. It seems highly likely, then, that St. 22 was devised specifically to make use of the interval and so further implies that it was designed as an experiment or an exercise. Since St. 22 was written in 1794, whereas the sonatas were written in 1809 and 1820, it appears that Beethoven may have perceived the stretch of a tenth to be impractical for a published work (Türk already had written that such intervals were uncommon and were not particularly popular).

Ex. 5.1: Piano Sonata Op. 79/iii/1-4.


St. 11 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 54v, 1793) is the earliest figuration of this type to incorporate a stretch in both hands. Since this figuration is dated 1793, there does not seem to have been a progression from writing chord stretches for the hands individually before moving onto simultaneous stretches: out of the seven chord figurations, four date from 1793, of which two are left-hand stretches (St. 9 and 18), one is for the right hand (St. 19) and one is for both hands (St. 11). The sole chord-stretch figuration that appears before 1793 (St. 1) is for the right
hand, whilst the chord stretches that appear in 1794 are for the left hand (St. 22) and both hands (St. 21). With St. 11, the left hand plays a repeated accompaniment in tenths until bar 7, where it switches to octaves. Meanwhile, the right hand incorporates a melodic line in the upper part that stretches out to a tenth before returning to a ninth. The key of St. 11 is also noteworthy as it is D minor: the majority of figurations are written in major keys.

St. 21 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 98r, c.1794) also incorporates stretches for both hands and is the sole chord figuration in this category that contains repeat marks. Combined with the simplicity of its rhythm and harmony (alternating tonic dominant with a tonic pedal throughout), these features strongly imply that it was devised as an exercise.

Remarkably, chord stretches of the kind seen in the figurations do not appear frequently in Beethoven’s published works. There are a few isolated tenth chords in the Piano Sonatas Op. 2/2/i/3; Op. 2/3/i/3 and 135; Op. 7/i/60 and 62; and Op. 90/i/17 and 21, but it is not until Op. 106 that they are found with any regularity. Since this sonata was written in 1817-18, there appears to have been a lengthy period in which Beethoven was experimenting with such ideas before they were incorporated into his works. Owing to the fact that the piano sonatas would largely have been played by women, who typically have a smaller hand span than men, Beethoven may have deliberately omitted such large stretches. This suggestion is plausible, given that he was experimenting with stretches of a tenth from as early as c.1790 (St. 1) and yet they do not appear in his published works until Op. 2/2 (1795) and not with any regularity until Op. 106.

Donald Francis Tovey has taken the presence of broken-octave figurations and tenth chords in the sonatas as evidence that Beethoven ‘could easily stretch 10ths’, which contrasts with Czerny’s comment presented earlier that he could ‘barely’ stretch this interval. If Beethoven could have indeed easily stretched a tenth, he might have been inspired to write stretching exercises incorporating elevenths in order to increase his stretch further. St. 9 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 1793) may be an example of this. The division between the hands of the repeated chord in bar 2 is ambiguous as the stem direction of the notes is not always clear (Ex. 5.2). The shape of the noteheads suggest that all of the dotted minims in bar 2 are to be played by the left hand, since there is a discernible tail marked down the right-hand side of each of these notes. This would involve a stretch of over two octaves from b’ to A-natural, which is

394 For a discussion of the social history of the piano see: Loesser, Men, Women and Pianos. Chiantore has also alluded to this point. See: ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, pp. 178-79.
impossible. If the chord is divided as in bar 1, however, a stretch of an eleventh is required between the $d'$ and the $A$-natural. The addition of the wavy vertical line could either be used as a bracket indicating which notes the left hand should play or to indicate that Beethoven intended this chord to be arpeggiated. With this second interpretation, it is not certain whether he would have held the notes when spreading the chord or lifted each individually. If he did want the chord to be arpeggiated with the notes held, given Beethoven's frequent commentary assessing the feasibility of other figurations, it would be highly unlikely for him to have written a figuration which he could not execute, or one that he found particularly difficult to execute, without making an observation next to it. It seems, then, that if interpreted as a single chord or as an arpeggiated chord (with the notes held), Beethoven was able to execute this figuration or possibly that he was trying to stretch this interval. Although the interpretation of St. 9 cannot be confirmed with any certainty, St. 9 becomes noteworthy as it can possibly be used to cast doubt upon Czerny's claim. The inconsistency in the number of beats in a bar is likely to be the outcome of Beethoven’s intention to clarify the execution of the repeated notes: he included the dots to show that the repeated chords are to be executed as sextuplet semiquavers.

Ex. 5.2: Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 5 & 6.

The dating of St. 9 (1793) also is significant: not only is this the year when a large number of figurations were written but, in 1793, Beethoven also appears to have been experimenting with a number of particularly new and innovative figurations.

The most likely purpose of these figurations, therefore, appears to have been for personal use since, excepting St. 9, they do not exceed the interval believed to have been Beethoven’s maximum span and are hardly found within works that are contemporaneous

---

396 See for example Fi. 2 (Chapter 4.4).
397 See for example Tr. 7-10.
with their dates. This proposal does not necessarily imply that they were intended purely as exercises. Such ideas could have been used as a basis for his improvisations as they would have created the audibly impressive effect he seems to have been searching for. The fact that many are built upon simple chord progressions does, however, lend more naturally to their interpretation as exercises.

5.1.2 Extensions of the Fifth Finger and Thumb

Extensions of this type total fifteen out of the twenty-six figurations (see Tab. 5.2) and are defined as figurations where the main core of notes is located in either the lower or upper half of the hand but one, or perhaps two, notes are then displaced away from this core, requiring a stretch with the fifth finger or thumb. Disposition between the hands is as follows: eight figurations for the right, four for the left and three for both hands. Although the distribution is not equal, it appears that Beethoven was again ensuring adequate training for both hands, since the occurrence of figurations for a specific hand is not limited to a particular date. With this type of stretch, the potential for the extension to go beyond that of a tenth is possible as the hand is not rooted to the keyboard in the same way as it is with chords. If an extension goes beyond that of a tenth, however, it has been classed as a leap. One exception is St. 10, which requires the fifth finger of the left hand to extend beyond this interval in the last bar. Its categorisation as a stretch has been based on the movement of the preceding bars where the fifth finger is gradually extending and contracting with each triplet.

With fifth-finger extensions in the left hand (St. 2 and St. 10), the extensions switch from movement by step in St. 2 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 19r, c.1790), which alternates between a broken octave and a broken tenth, to extended broken arpeggio movement in St. 10 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 54v, 1793). St. 10 could, therefore, be viewed as technically more advanced than St. 2, given that the extensions require independent movement: the distance at which they move away from the main core of the figuration varies from a third to a thirteenth; it is not always the same.

St. 2 is similar to a prominent theme found in the Piano Sonata Op. 2/3/i (Ex. 5.3). The sonata incorporates the same type of figuration, although the tenth that characterises St. 2 has been reduced to an octave. This idea is first heard in Op. 2/3 in the key of C major at bar 13 and appears again at bar 195 in the recapitulation. Beethoven’s treatment of the figuration
in Op. 2/3 is notable for its transformation: St. 2 is written in the bass clef, which suggests that he may originally have conceived the figuration as an accompaniment figure i.e. that of a modified Alberti bass. In Op. 2/3 the figuration has been transferred to the right hand with a different accompaniment underneath. Its prominence within the movement transforms the idea into a theme and thus elevates its position from what appears to have been an accompaniment idea into a secondary theme in a sonata. Moreover, St. 2 was written c.1790 whilst Op. 2/3 was written in 1795, demonstrating Beethoven’s transformation and incorporation of an idea written in Bonn into his first published piano sonatas written in Vienna.


A similar figuration also appears in the Piano Sonata Op. 54 (Ex. 5.4). Here, the broken tenth in St. 2 has been reduced further to a broken sixth. The figuration is again treated sequentially and, unlike Op. 2/3, Op. 54 uses the basic cell of St. 2 in its original key and register. Although the similarities between St. 2, Op. 2/3 and Op. 54 are clear, the reduction of the broken tenth in St. 2 to a broken octave in Op. 2/3 and then to a sixth in Op. 54 precludes them from being viewed as exact repetitions and thus mirrors the trend found previously where few repetitions of a figuration can be found: some form of revision or modification is usually present. Broken tenths can, however, be found in the Piano Sonatas Op. 2/2/i/183-99 and Op. 90/i/55-64.
One further difference between St. 2, Op. 2/3 and Op. 54 is worth noting. Op. 54, which incorporates the smallest intervalllic use of St. 2, is also the only presentation of the figuration marked with a slur. The smaller interval would have enabled this slur to be added and a legato effect to be achieved. The inclusion of a legato slur in Beethoven’s latter use of the figuration may also illustrate the increase in frequency of this technique.

Notably, the most extreme version of this particular figuration (the broken tenths of St. 2) is reserved for Beethoven’s sketches. When incorporated into works that would be performed by the public, the interval is reduced even when used fourteen years after its initial conception. The evidence seems to suggest, therefore, that he could have written St. 2 as an experimental idea, realised that its execution was problematic on account of its dependency on hand size, and subsequently modified it for use in the sonatas. Alternatively, he could have reserved St. 2 in its original form for inclusion in his improvisations. If so, the re-workings of St. 2 in the sonatas further demonstrate Beethoven’s appraisal of initial ideas in terms of their effect and feasibility.

Chiantore has surmised that St. 2 demonstrates Beethoven’s interest in wrist rotation and concludes that this type of figuration does not appear frequently in his published works. As a result, he suggests that St. 2 was most likely to have been devised as a personal challenge by Beethoven to experiment with new resources.\(^\text{398}\) The second part of the figuration does require wrist rotation, although this alone would not achieve the stretch: the fifth finger must be extended too. In addition to Examples 5.3 and 5.4, a similar movement to bar 2 of St. 2 also

can be found in the First Piano Concerto Op. 15 (Ex. 5.5), where it is used in a chromatically ascending and descending sequence.

Ex. 5.5: First Piano Concerto Op. 15/i/147-52 (Breitkopf & Härtel, 1862).

Chiantore also suggests that St. 10 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 54v, 1793) was designed with velocity in mind, as it favours higher speeds of attack. He states that it obviously requires finger articulation, but also recommends that arm movement is needed to give greater support to the larger intervals. He does concede, however, that this was not a technique used on pianos at this time,\(^\text{399}\) which makes the point somewhat redundant in a discussion concerning the intention behind its conception. The extent to which the intervals are contracted and then expanded again does, however, require equality of touch to prevent an accent being heard on the notes following the stretch and so, in addition to promoting extensions of the fifth finger, this passage also encourages equality of touch. The choice of triplet figuration also could be significant as the second and third notes of each triplet (where the accents would occur if the extension is not controlled) actually fall on the weaker beats. This encourages weight to be focused on the fifth finger (created by the extension and slight accent occurring on the starting note of the triplet) in order to counteract possible accents on the second and third notes. Chiantore’s assessment that St. 10 was designed with velocity in mind cannot be verified from the notation alone, owing to the fact that the triplets themselves do not signify speed (compare

\(^{399}\) Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, pp. 168-69. Chiantore also incorrectly labels the figuration as being located on f. 54r instead of f. 54v of the Kafka Miscellany.
with Op. 27/2/i, which is in the same metre) and there is no tempo indication to corroborate the idea either.

The tonality of St. 10 is interesting as the key signature indicates D major whilst the figuration itself implies A major (all G’s are sharpened and the underlying harmony is I, V7, I, V7, I). This may suggest that it could have been conceived as part of another idea, or a composition, that was originally written in D major rather than an independent exercise. The remaining sketches on folio 54v of the Kafka Miscellany consist of small unrelated figurations, which do not help to support this view and thus imply that if related material exists, it is located elsewhere.

St. 7 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 61v, 1792) is the sole figuration in this sub-category with a tempo indication. Its ‘Presto’ marking may add weight to Chiantore’s suggestion that Beethoven was experimenting with finger extensions at high speeds in St. 10. Here, Beethoven has transformed a simple ascending arpeggio by displacing the third note of each repetition up an octave. This figuration has been included as a stretch rather than a leap, owing to the possible fingerings as presented in Ex. 5.6, Var. 1, 2 and 3, which either require a stretch between the first and second fingers or the second and fifth.

**Ex. 5.6: St. 7 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 61v, 11(12) & 12(8)).**

Similarly, in St. 13 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 1793) a stretch of an octave between the second and fifth finger is also required if fingered according to Ex. 5.7. The alternative possibility, that the fourth and first notes of each semiquaver group could be executed with a thumb hop is less likely given the difficult move from e’’ – b’-flat and f’ – e’-flat that would result from this style of fingering. Beethoven has used this style of fingering in the Piano Sonata Op. 2/2/i (Ex. 5.9 discussed below) and thus supports the interpretation presented here.
An extension between the second and fifth fingers is also required in the second half of St. 17 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 161v, 1793) if each semiquaver group is fingered 1, 3, 2, 5 instead of 1, 3, 1, 5. St. 17 also can be viewed as a less extreme example of the displaced arpeggio idea already seen in St. 7.

The occurrence of stretches between the second and fifth finger in Beethoven’s sonatas has provoked Tovey to surmise that such stretches provide ‘interesting evidence of the size and shape of his hand’.\(^{400}\) Tovey was referring to a passage in the Piano Sonata Op. 2/3/i/129 (Ex. 5.8), but further evidence exists in Beethoven’s fingering for the broken octaves in Op. 2/2/i/84-85 and 88-89 (Ex. 5.9), which also implies that he could stretch an octave between his index and fifth fingers.

as experiments in different types of attack.\textsuperscript{401} The notion that both figurations were being used as technical experiments and exercises is highly likely and although this type of technique does appear in Beethoven’s published works, the examples presented here have not been found, which further suggests that they were either used for practice or for experimental purposes.

The remaining right-hand figurations in this category (St. 3, 4, 5 and 12) all employ sequences involving extensions of the fifth finger. Rosenblum regards St. 12 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 1793) as one of the ‘sampling of exercises in which Beethoven concentrated on the challenges of … patterns that utilise alternately the fingers on each side of the hand’\textsuperscript{402} but makes no references to the finger extensions that this figuration also requires. Its construction with two repeat markings, however, renders this interpretation likely. This is also true of St. 3 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 154r, c.1790-91).

The remaining figurations in this sub-category all require finger extensions to be executed in both hands, either simultaneously as in St. 6 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 153r, c.1792), in quick succession as in St. 24 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 120r, 1794) or occupying two separate halves of the same figuration as in St. 15 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 42r, 1793). St. 24 makes use of registral shifts that incorporate extensions in a descending sequence. St. 6, however, is notable for its similarity to Variation VIII of WoO 72 (Ex. 5.10): each share similar-motion semiquaver movement based on broken chords. WoO 72, however, displays a diluted form of St. 6 as the figuration does not employ finger extensions in the last semiquaver of each group. Instead the figure remains within the range of an octave despite being written approximately four years after St. 6. The comparison of St. 6 with WoO 72, therefore, again reveals a modicum of restraint by Beethoven when writing works for publication.

\textbf{Ex. 5.10: Piano Variations WoO 72/viii/83-86 (Traeg, 1798).}

Figurations that require an extension of the thumb are also treated in a variety of different ways. St. 14 and 20 both date from 1793 and require this movement, although

\textsuperscript{401} Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, p. 166.
distribution is split between the right and left hand: neither requires simultaneous extensions of the thumb. St. 14 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 40v, 1793) employs a rising arpeggio sequence whereas St. 20 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 52v, 1793) incorporates stepwise movement. Chiantore groups St. 20 with the figurations that he perceives promote velocity and wrist rotation whilst commenting that the progressive widening of intervals, as seen in St. 20, is the best way to learn the opening position of the hand.\footnote{Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, p. 180.} This statement strongly suggests that he views St. 20 as a technical exercise in spite of the existence of similar figurations in Beethoven’s published works. For example the Piano Sonata WoO 47/3 incorporates both stepwise and arpeggio movements simultaneously into a sequence (Ex. 5.11). This example also includes a broken tenth (bars 32 and 34), which was discussed previously as being a rare feature. It is notable, therefore, that WoO 47/3 was written c.1783 when it is probable that Beethoven would have been more concerned with trying to exhibit his own skill at the keyboard than if others would have been able to play his music and thus it is remarkable that, at such an early age,\footnote{Beethoven was born in December 1770.} he appears to have been comfortable with executing this stretch.

Ex. 5.11: Piano Sonata WoO 47/3/i/31-34.

Beethoven’s exploration of extensions with the thumb and fifth finger is, as in previous cases, varied and non-repetitive. He covers figurations with broken chords, stepwise movement, arpeggios and sequences whilst constantly changing the interval the thumb and fifth finger is required to extend.
5.1.3 Rotation of the Wrist

Chiantore has identified St. 20 as a figuration that requires rotation of the wrist. More overt examples, however, have been found in St. 8, 16, 25 and 26. With the exception of St. 26 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 34r, 1798), the figurations are written for the left hand. St. 26 is not provided with a clef but when Beethoven omitted a clef he usually intended a treble clef and this is confirmed in the second part of the figuration, where a progression from e-sharp to f would occur if read as bass clef. The remaining figurations all appear to have been devised as accompaniment ideas: St. 16 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 47r, 1793) and St. 25 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 131r, 1794/95) have only basic treble parts. St. 8 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 51r, 1793) is slightly different as Beethoven has indicated specifically that the idea is to be played with the left hand and it is based on a modified sequence of broken chords. The two-note chords on the second, fourth and sixth quaver beats of each bar act as pivots that enable rotation of the wrist and allow the thumb and fifth finger to extend.
5.2 Leaps (See Vol. II pp. 333-40)

Figurations of this type total thirty-three and span the years c.1790-c.1802. Out of the thirty-three figurations, twenty have been dated to the year 1793 (See Tab. 5.3). Considering that only three figurations have been dated 1790-91, it seems that prior to 1793, Beethoven does not appear to have had a pronounced interest in this technique. Moreover, the figurations written before 1793 all involve hand crossings whereas, in addition to this category, subsequent figurations incorporate throwing or Alberti-Bass extensions (see Tab. 5.4).

Tab. 5.3: Distribution of Leaps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1790-91</td>
<td>Le. 1-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Le. 4-23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794-95</td>
<td>Le. 24-29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Le. 30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-02</td>
<td>Le. 31-33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 5.4: Sub-Categories of Leaps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hand Crossing</td>
<td>Le. 1-3, 6, 14-17, 25, 32, 33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throwing</td>
<td>Le. 4, 7, 9-13, 18-24, 26-28, 30, 31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberti-Bass Extensions</td>
<td>Le. 5, 8, 29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No reference to this technique can be found in the contemporary tutor books of C. P. E. Bach, Marpurg or Clementi. Türk and Milchmeyer do, however, discuss crossing hands. Milchmeyer advises that each hand should be indicated and that the aim should be to create a continuous passage as if being played by one hand.\(^{405}\) In contrast, Türk’s discussion of the crossing of the hands is quite interesting:

The crossing of the hands … was formerly regarded as quite a trick. One would have doubted the skill of those keyboard players who were not able to play a Menuett with crossing of the hands or a Bataille with thundering cannon in the same manner. At present one also finds compositions by good composers in which this kind of playing takes place, but it is used less often and it is not likely

\(^{405}\) Milchmeyer, *Die wahre Art*, p. 33.
to be found unless it is necessary to bring out a particular musical idea. There are, of course, some modern composers who merely as a whim require the crossing of hands. Türk’s comments reveal two points: firstly, that this technique was regarded as ‘quite a trick’, which suggests that Beethoven’s experiments with it may have been motivated by the desire to impress. Secondly, Türk implies that it was becoming less fashionable and that its application was regarded as somewhat whimsical. He does, however, provide a number of examples that are found in the works of J. S. Bach, C. P. E. Bach, Kirnberger and Haydn.407 If Türk’s opinion was widely shared, Beethoven’s use of the technique may have been at odds with accepted practice and thus demonstrates further proof of his disregard for convention. Alternatively, since there are examples of this technique in works that Beethoven may have known (J. S Bach, C. P. E. Bach and Haydn in particular. See also Ex. 5.12), his figurations of this type may have been designed as exercises to perfect the technique.

Ex. 5.12: Bach: ‘Goldberg’ Variations BWV 988/V/1-3 (Breitkopf & Härtel, 1853).

Scarlatti: Essercizi per Gravicembalo, Sonata No. 27/50-53 (Thomas Roseingrave, 1739).

Scholarly interest in these figurations again has been minimal: Nottebohm, Rosenblum, Kann and Chiantore have presented Le. 13 whilst Rosenblum also has discussed Le. 31.408 Additionally, Chiantore has highlighted Le. 1, 9, 12, 23 and 28.409 In these cases, however, the comments usually consist of one sentence and often lack depth (they will be presented when discussing the appropriate figurations below).

406 Türk, School of Clavier Playing, p. 182.
407 Ibid., pp. 184-88.
409 Ibid., pp. 181, 182, 185 and 186.
5.2.1  Hand Crossing

This sub-category contains chronologically the earliest leaping figurations and spans the years c.1790-1801/02 (see Tab. 5.4). In theory, Le. 22 also could be classified in this category but, owing to the fact that only the thumbs cross, has not been included since the crossings do not involve the entire hand. Figurations where the left hand crosses over the right total seven out of the eleven and where the right crosses over the left total four. Some of the figurations indicate explicitly that the hands are to be crossed by the use of corresponding clefs (Le. 2, 6, 14, 15, 16 and 32) and written comments (Le. 25). With others (Le. 1, 3, 17 and 33), however, the gesture is implied by the musical content and, in the case of Le. 3, the stem direction of the notes. This practice mirrors Türk’s observation:

In most cases, one can judge from the context with which hand one must cross over … However, if there is reason to fear that perhaps one person or another might play the notes for the left hand with the right, or those for the right hand with the left, then more painstaking composers are accustomed to change the clef for one hand … or they specify the right hand … by appending an R. dect. or d, and the left hand by an L. sin. or s.410

If Beethoven were adhering to this practice, the figurations where he has indicated clefs or hands may have been exercises for his pupils or ideas for works, since he would not necessarily have needed to write such indications for himself. Considering that some of the figurations are quite novel, however, the indications also could have been used to reinforce Beethoven’s intentions.

With Le. 1, 6, 15 and 17, the non-crossing hand plays a simple repetitive accompanying figure that provides harmonic interest: the main feature of the figurations is the hand crossing. This idea is simplified further in Le. 32 (Kessler, f. 62r, 1801-02), where the right hand holds one continuous chord whilst the left hand executes octave leaps over the top. With Le. 1 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 50v c.1790), the hand crossing is implied on account of consistently using the right hand to maintain the repetitive accompanying triplets. This enables the left to execute a series of descending scales with each downward step being interrupted by a two-octave leap up to the top note of the keyboard. The lack of melodic interest within this figuration, combined with the descending chromatic scale in the left hand (producing a gradual increase in arm movement with each leap), strongly suggests that Le. 1 was designed as a technical exercise. Chiantore has grouped Le. 1 with Le. 9 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 139r, 1793) and regards

410 Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, pp. 182-83.
them as figurations in which Beethoven was experimenting with muscular, acoustic and mental challenges by writing ideas that could disorientate the performer.\textsuperscript{411} Chiantore’s interpretation does not confirm whether he regards them as personal exercises, since his conclusion implies a third party. He also perceives them to be an extension of Beethoven’s interest in the ‘radical improvement of finger technique’.\textsuperscript{412} Chiantore’s assessment suggests that Le. 1 and 9 were designed with technical mastery in mind and thus could be perceived as exercises but the visually-impressive hand crossing also implies that the figurations, and those of a similar nature, could have been used in Beethoven’s improvisations.

Le. 15 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 47v, 1793) is similar in design to Le. 1. With this figuration, however, the implied tempo is quicker owing to the semiquaver accompaniment and the smaller leaps in the left hand. Although hand crossing appears in Beethoven’s published works, such extreme leaps as those found in Le. 1 are not found until Op. 2/1/ii/17, 19 and 21 (1793-95) and the Trio of Op. 10/3 (Ex. 5.13) written during 1797-98. The texture of the Trio is similar to that of Le. 1: both use repeating triplets in the right hand. The leaps of the left, however, have been given a melodic nature in the Trio by the use of a dominant-tonic two-note motif that expands into a five-note motif. This two-note leaping motif also characterises the leaps in Le. 3 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 123r, ε.1791).

\textbf{Ex. 5.13: Piano Sonata Op. 10/3/iii/54-58.}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Ex513}
\end{center}

Beethoven’s experimentation with this technique several years before including it in a published work may suggest that initially he was using the figurations as ideas for improvisations. Hand crossing has already been acknowledged as a visually impressive technique and, as such, could have proved popular amongst his audiences in a public setting. Beethoven’s ability to execute accurately such leaps was noted in a review of 1798 in the \textit{Patriotisches Journal für die k.k. Staaten} where the reviewer applauded his ‘dexterity, his arduous

\textsuperscript{411} Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, p. 185.

\textsuperscript{412} ‘radical superación de técnica digital’, ibid., p. 185.
jumps and figurations’. Given that the date of this review is five years after the proliferation of these figurations appears, it could be used as evidence to support the notion that he had been practising this technique.

The figurations presented above all require the left hand to cross over the right. Le. 6 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 53v, 1793) and Le. 17 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 51r, 1793) require the right to cross over the left, and employ antiphonal hand crossings that not only exploit contrasts in register but also the distinct tonal colouration of each octave register, which was a recognised characteristic of Viennese fortepianos of the eighteenth century. Beethoven exploited this device in the Rondo Op. 51/1, written c.1796-97 (Ex. 5.14), which also is in the same key as Le. 6 and similarly necessitates that the right hand crosses over the left. In Exx. 5.13 and 5.14, where ideas from sketches have been incorporated into published works, the figurations again precede the published works by several years.

Ex. 5.14: Rondo Op. 51/1/120-24 (Artaria, 1802).

The two remaining figurations involving hand crossing (Le. 16 and 25) use different types of gestures and are accompanied by written comments. Beethoven has written ‘not carried out far’ at the end of Le. 16 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 47v, 1793), which suggests that it may have been an unused idea for a work. It is possible that he intended to write ‘weiter’ (‘further’) instead of ‘weit’ (‘far’) although again this cannot be confirmed. Owing to this comment, however, it is perhaps significant that this type of figuration, involving a syncopated accompaniment with cross-hand trills, has not been found in his piano works.

414 John Broadwood had invented a divided bridge in 1788 which created uniformity in tone colour throughout the keyboard compass, whereas Viennese makers continued to use a single bridge well into the nineteenth century. For a further discussion see: Bilson, ‘Keyboards’, in: Performance Practice Music After 1600, p. 76.
415 ‘nicht weit ausgeführt’.
Le. 25 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 120r, 1794) also appears to have been a textural experiment as there is minimal melodic interest and it is not ostensibly technically demanding. Beethoven has labelled the left and right hands to reinforce his intention to cross them. This may be on account of the left hand uncharacteristically playing a more active role than the right. It is most likely, however, that Beethoven was making a note for himself in case he overlooked this feature when reviewing the sketch at a later date. This implies that the figuration was experimental since Beethoven felt the need to write down such clear indications. Le. 25 is dated 1794, which makes this point remarkable given that he had been experimenting with hand crossing since c.1790 at the latest (Le. 1). Le. 25, however, is the first hand-crossing figuration where he appears to have felt that the roles of the hands were not immediately apparent.

The hand-crossing figurations discussed thus far, although musically diverse, all share one feature: they necessitate physical arm movement and, in cases where the movement switches constantly between the lower and upper halves of the keyboard (Le. 1, 3, 6, 14, 15, 17 and 25), an athletic rotary movement. The larger leaps, therefore, may be examples of Beethoven pushing this technique to the extreme in order to encourage a sense of freedom in the arm. This suggestion may account for the fact that such excessive leaps as those found in Le. 1 are isolated in the sketch figurations and do not appear in his works until several years later. Similarly, the large number of figurations where the left hand crosses over the right is at odds with its usually static position and may have been designed to be visually impressive, which suggests that they could have been devised as ideas for improvisations. Türk’s comment that hand crossing was regarded as somewhat whimsical implies that it was less favoured in published works but it still could have been employed in improvisations.

By pushing this technique to the extreme in private, Beethoven may have felt more comfortable executing it in a public setting, such as in his improvisations or when performing his written works. If this suggestion is correct, it demonstrates a rather sophisticated approach to the practising of technique. The most significant point, however, is that Beethoven has taken a pre-existing technique and literally pushed it to the limits of the keyboard.\footnote{An extreme example of this idea is seen in Op. 111/i/115 where the right hand leaps from $F_\flat$ to $c'''$, which covers virtually the complete range available on Viennese pianos in the 1820s.}
5.2.2 Throwing

Figurations of this type span the years 1793-96. Chronologically, the first figuration is Le. 4 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 1793). Le. 4 is remarkably similar to Fi. 3 (Chapter 4.3.2): both figurations are written on folio 89v of the Kafka Miscellany, use the same ink⁴¹⁷ and are written on subsequent staves (Le. 4 is situated diagonally above Fi. 3). Owing to their close proximity, it is highly likely that Beethoven’s instruction ‘to throw the hand’,⁴¹⁸ written on Fi. 3, is the same technique he intended for Le. 4. Moreover, the figurations appear on a leaf that is occupied with sketches for the Second Piano Concerto Op. 19, specifically its cadenza,⁴¹⁹ which implies that Beethoven may have been exploring innovative piano techniques at this time.

Given Le. 4 is the first figuration of this type, in conjunction with its relationship to Fi. 3, it is likely that, when he wrote subsequent figurations requiring a similar movement, Beethoven also intended the hand to be used in the same way. It is possible, therefore, to suggest that the execution of the remaining throwing figurations (see Tab. 5.4) is similar. This suggestion is particularly evident in the slur markings indicated in Le. 24 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 140v, c.1794) and also is applicable to the left-hand movement of Le. 9 (Kafka Miscellany f. 139r, 1793). With Le. 9, the right and left hands are rhythmically similar but are leaping different intervals and thus, although moving in parallel motion, they need to cover different distances by moving at different speeds. As such, this gesture not only requires accuracy in executing the leaps but also promotes independence of the hands. The different note values between the left and right hands is also particularly interesting: the left is written entirely in quavers, which contrasts with the alternate crotchet quaver indications in bars 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 of the right. This style of writing is possible only in the right since the resulting stretch does not exceed a ninth.

Le. 20 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 5v, 1793) also employs a similar idea. Initially, the figuration appears to be in similar motion with both hands executing the same technique. The notation in the left hand, however, differs subtly from the right in order to allow the execution of the leaps. The shorter quaver, as opposed to the crotchet in the right hand, facilitates the execution of the following semiquavers: if the left hand were written as a crotchet, this would

---

⁴¹⁷ Ink F according to Cooper, ‘The Ink in Beethoven’s “Kafka”’, p. 328.
⁴¹⁸ ‘mit der Hand geworfen’.
⁴¹⁹ The sketches for the cadenza occupy all of f. 89r and the first four staves, along with the first bar of staves 5 and 6, of the verso. Le. 4 is written directly after, in bar 2 of stave 5.
necessitate a fingering of 2 and 1 on the semiquavers, which would be uncomfortable for all
but the largest of hands in the first five bars and impossible in bar 6. The subtle differences in
notation between the right and left hands of Le. 9 and 20, therefore, demonstrate that
Beethoven was acutely aware of the physiology of the hand.

Le. 11, 12 and 13 are somewhat problematical since the style of fingering used
influences the technique needed to execute the passages. Theoretically, all three figurations
could be executed by stretching the hand and using a degree of wrist rotation. Their inclusion
as leaps has been made for a number of reasons. Firstly, the semiquaver triplets of Le. 11
(Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 1793) could be fingered 4,5,4, 1,2,1, but this style of fingering
requires strong fourth and fifth fingers. The notation suggests that the tempo of Le. 11 is
quick, which further increases the difficulty of executing the lower triplets with a 4,5,4,
fingering, making an alternate fingering, and therefore a leap, highly likely. Secondly, the first
half of Le. 13 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 40r, 1793) also could be executed using a 5,2,5,2,1,2,
fingering. The stretch of a tenth in the second half, however, implies a small displacement of
the hand in order to facilitate the movement at speed and thus has justified its present
classification.

Beethoven has labelled both Le. 11 and 13 with the specific hands (left in Le. 11 and
left and right hands separately in Le. 13). The change in figurative pattern for the right hand at
bar 3 alters the weight of the arm movement so that, rather than leading with the fifth finger
and falling onto the thumb, the action is reversed and the thumb now leads. By alternating the
gesture like this, Beethoven appears to be ensuring that both an inner (towards the body) and
outer (away from the body) arm movement is practised. With Le. 4, 9, 11 and 12, there is a
tendency for the leaps to move into the body i.e. the left hand leaping up the keyboard and the
right hand leaping down the keyboard. For Le. 13, however, Beethoven begins the figuration
with this pattern but then switches the oscillation point at the beginning of the last bar in the
right hand to ensure that the opposite direction is practised also. The intervals, both within and
between the triplets, of Le. 13 are also varied which, in combination with the variations in arm
movement, makes it highly likely that Le. 11, 12, and 13 were written as exercises.

The triplet figurations used in Le. 11 and 13, however, are found in the ‘Wranitzky’
Variations WoO 71, written 1796-97 (Ex. 5.15). Bars 10-14 use Le. 11 in the right hand instead
of the left and bars 15-18 use a developed and modified form of Le. 13: essentially the hand
movement is the same but the intervals used in the triplets have been expanded and contracted alternately to create melodic interest.

Ex. 5.15: ‘Wranitzky’ Variations WoO 71/X/5-19 (Artaria, 1797).

The close proximity of Le. 11, 12 and 13 in the Kafka Miscellany again implies that Beethoven may have been experimenting with a variety of possibilities for using this gesture (Le. 11 and 12 are both located on f. 39v and Le. 13 can be found on f. 40r). Folios 39 and 40 belong to the same gathering, have been dated to 1793 and use the same the ink-type, which strongly suggests they were written at a similar time and thus strengthens the idea that, at times, he systematically explored a variety of possibilities for specific techniques.

Chiantore has suggested that Le. 12 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 1793) is one of a number of exercises in which Beethoven was practising the execution of broken octaves and, in
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420 For an analysis of the gathering see Johnson, *Beethoven’s Early Sketches*, p. 94. The ink is ‘ink G’ according to Cooper, ‘The Ink in Beethoven’s “Kafka” ’, p. 329.
particular, focussing his concern on the inherent weakness of the fifth finger. This is a valid point: Le. 12 is a sequence of descending arpeggios in broken octaves that begins each time with the upper note. These characteristics require the fifth finger to lead the movement of the hand and to pick out the descending arpeggio sequence, possibly with accents as indicated by the two-note slurs, and thus demands strength and accuracy. The semiquavers also imply that this movement should be executed with some speed, which increases the technical difficulty of the figuration further. The broken octaves featured in Le. 12 cannot be regarded purely as a technical exercise, however, since this type of figuration also appears in a number of Beethoven’s published works. In these published works its form is usually inverted so that the thumb leads the movement (Op. 53/i/32-33 is one exception), which implies that Beethoven may have reserved the more difficult fifth-finger movement in Le. 12 for personal use.

Out of the leaping figurations, Le. 13 has been most frequently quoted amongst scholars. It was first presented by Nottebohm and has subsequently been discussed by Rosenblum and Chiantore. Nottebohm and Rosenblum have reproduced only the right hand figurations of Le. 13, however, completely omitting the left-hand figurations that directly precede them. Their identical omission of this left-hand section, in conjunction with the similarly misleading omission of the middle section to Fi. 6, strongly implies that Rosenblum took these examples directly from Nottebohm. Nottebohm and Rosenblum’s omission of the left-hand figurations crucially fails to reveal the systematic process employed by Beethoven: he was experimenting with a gesture and was writing figurations that incorporate it in both hands. The left- and right-hand sections of Le. 13, therefore, have been classed as one single figuration as their stylistic similarity and adjacent positioning on the sketch leaf strongly suggest that Beethoven saw them as a pair of complementary figurations. This point is further strengthened by the fact that the movement in each hand, although in contrary motion with one another, is designed so that both hands move into the body.

Rosenblum believes that Le. 13 is part of ‘a sampling of exercises’ in which Beethoven concentrated on patterns ‘that utilise alternately the fingers on each side of the hand’.
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statement is dependent on the choice of fingering as discussed above, but Beethoven’s use of
the figurations in their original form in WoO 71 (Ex. 5.15) demonstrates that they were not
reserved solely as exercises.

Grouping Le. 13 with Le. 11, Chiantore equates the change in preference from
harpsichord and clavichord to the fortepiano as the motivating factor behind their conception.
He argues that the fortepiano enables changes in accentuation by varying the speeds of attack
and consequently regards Le. 11 and 13 as examples of Beethoven trying to improve the
manual dexterity required to produce such variations at speed. It is clear that Chiantore also
perceives Le. 11 and 13 as exercises but the incorporation of these patterns into his published
works again suggests that they were not used exclusively for that purpose. Moreover,
clavichords also were able to reproduce changes in accentuation, although to a lesser degree
than fortepianos. It is likely, therefore, that Beethoven may have developed them initially as
exercises and then subsequently saw their potential as figurations that could be incorporated
into his works. This would explain the three-year gap between the conception of Le. 11 and 13
and the appearance of similar figurations in WoO 71.

With Le. 21, 22, 23 and 25, Beethoven enlarges the leaps, forcing the hand to cover a
greater area of the keyboard. All four figurations are written with leaps in the left hand and
display a sense of development from Le. 4, 11, 12 and 13 since, in addition to increasing the
intervals of the leaps, the gesture is no longer isolated to purely technical or figurative
experiments. It is now incorporated into musically-interesting settings. This sense of
development continues with leaps onto chords instead of single notes in Le. 26 (Fischhof
Miscellany, f. 47v, 1794) and contrary-motion leaps with both hands in Le. 28 (Kafka
Miscellany, f. 134r, 1794/95). Le. 28, however, does revert back to the characteristic sequential
writing of earlier figurations. Nonetheless, the throwing gesture of the hands moves away from
the body, which is atypical of the other figurations—excepting the end of Le. 13 discussed
previously—and thus is noteworthy as it demonstrates a departure from earlier preferences.

Le. 31 (Kessler, f. 23v, 1801-02) is a highly original fan-shaped broken-chord sequence,
which requires leaps of up to two octaves. Rosenblum has noted similarities between the
patterns used in Le. 31 and Dt. 10 (Chapter 6.4.1), commenting that they both make use of
outward thrusts of the hand to the weaker fingers and that the finale of the Piano Trio Op.
1/1 (Ex. 5.16) ‘opens with three solo leaps of a tenth in the right hand which becomes an
increasingly important feature of the movement'. These solo leaps are more akin to Le. 4 however, which was previously related to Fi. 3 and Beethoven’s comment that the hand should be ‘thrown’. The connection between Le. 4, Fi. 3 and Op. 1/1 is even stronger owing to their date of conception: Le. 4 and Fi. 3 were both written shortly before Op. 1/1, which suggests that the figuration used in Op. 1/1 could have been derived from Le. 4 and Fi. 3.

Ex. 5.16: Piano Trio Op. 1/1/iv/1-11 (Artaria, 1795).

In summary, Beethoven appears to have discovered a new technique of throwing the arm (Fi. 3), extended its application with Le. 4 and Le. 9; tried out new figurations for both hands (Le. 11, 12, and 13); incorporated the idea into more musical settings (Le. 18 and 23) and also changed the direction of the movement (Le. 29); a thoroughly systematic and methodical exploration of a new technique.

5.2.3 Alberti-Bass Extensions

In some respects this sub-category is an extension of the previous one. Rather than using single notes or small motifs, these figurations are accompaniment ideas; namely Alberti bass, which have been extended across the keyboard (Alberti-bass figurations typically remained within the range of a fifth or sixth). The first figuration of this kind occurs in 1793 and is Le. 5 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v). Here, the right hand plays a descending scale whilst the left is executing an Alberti-bass accompaniment that contains sequentially decreasing leaps in the first to the second note of each semiquaver group. This type of extended Alberti-bass accompaniment is employed in the Piano Variations Op. 34 written in 1802 (Ex. 5.17), nine
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years after Le. 5. Beethoven had previously employed slightly enlarged Alberti-bass figurations in earlier works such as Variation III of the Twelve Variations on ‘Menuett à la Vigano’ from Haibel’s ballet Le nozze disturbate, WoO 68 (1795). These extensions, nonetheless, were no larger than an octave.

Ex. 5.17: Piano Variations Op. 34/VI/22-25 (Breitkopf & Härtel, 1803).

Le. 8 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 54r, 1793) is a deceptive figuration. The interval of a tenth between the lower and upper notes of the Alberti figuration does not appear large initially. The addition of a third on the first note of each group, however, closes the hand, reduces its span and thus necessitates a leap in order to reach the second note of the semiquaver group. Tovey has previously commented that Beethoven had an unusually large span between his index and fifth finger (see Chapter 5.1). This figuration could be used as further evidence to support this claim.

Summary

The figurations that incorporate stretches and leaps have revealed a number of interesting details. Firstly, they demonstrate Beethoven’s varied and inventive approach to the technique, suggesting that he was thoroughly exploring all of its potential. The sub-headings provided in this chapter only give the basic differences in approach that Beethoven has used. It is the variety within each category that is particularly noteworthy. Moreover, it is significant that, across the twenty-two year time span when figurations of this type have been found, no repetition occurs.

Like Chapter 4, the concentration of figurations in 1793 implies that this was a particularly productive time for Beethoven when he was actively experimenting with a wealth of ideas, although it is the relationship between the figurations and his published works that is remarkable. Ideas from the figurations are often used in published works but their
incorporation is frequently delayed by a number of years. Moreover the more radical ideas, particularly the frequency of tenth chords that appear in the sketches and the extreme nature of the leaps, are often diluted for published works. This suggests that Beethoven was aware of the demands of his music on the public, specifically the need to reduce intervals in order to cater for smaller hands, and took this into account when using ideas from his figurations. This is evident in the frequency of broken tenths found in WoO 47, which was written when Beethoven would most likely have been little concerned with whether they would have been playable for other pianists. It seems, therefore, that a large proportion of these figurations were devised initially either as exercises for Beethoven or ideas for improvisations. Considering many of the figurations appear to fit his hand physiology, this idea is highly likely, although the presence of St. 9 with its stretches of elevenths could present a challenge to the long-established belief that he could only just span a tenth. Additionally, the figurations have provided further evidence that supports Tovey’s claim that Beethoven’s span between his index and fifth finger was quite large.
6 Extended Techniques

This chapter covers techniques that progress beyond basic keyboard skills and examines ‘Trills and Oscillations’ (6.1), ‘Note Repetitions’ (6.2), ‘Double Octaves’ (6.3) and ‘Double Thirds’ (6.4).

6.1 Trills and Oscillations (See Vol. II pp. 341-45)

There are twenty figurations that fall into this category and they span the years c.1790-1809. Again there is an abundance of figurations dating from the year 1793 (seven out of the twenty) (see Tab. 6.1) and a significant proportion also date from 1794-95 (six out of twenty).

Although there is often a fine line in differentiating between an oscillation and a slow written-out trill, the figurations have been divided into the following categories: standard trills (including oscillations); double trills in either individual hands or both hands simultaneously; mordents; and the so-called ‘Beethoven trills’, where trills are incorporated into a texture within the same hand as a melodic line either above or underneath. These will be further divided according to whether their movement occurs in the inner or outer voice in the subsequent analysis (see Tab. 6.2).

Tab. 6.1: Distribution of Trills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1790-92</td>
<td>Tr. 1-4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Tr. 5-11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794-95</td>
<td>Tr. 12-17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Tr. 18-19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Tr. 20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 6.2: Sub-Categories of Trills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Trills</td>
<td>Tr. 1, 6, 15, 19, 20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Trills</td>
<td>Tr. 4, 9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordents</td>
<td>Tr. 2, 10, 13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Beethoven Trills’</td>
<td>Tr. 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contemporary tutor books focus on the execution and realisation of trills: C. P. E. Bach explains ‘Trills are the most difficult embellishments, and not all performers are successful with them. They must be practiced industriously from the start’. Türk’s concentration is also on the correct realisation of the trill. He does, however, provide some interesting points. He refers to the trill as being ‘without doubt the most difficult ornament, and for this reason … should be practiced immediately in the first lessons’. He also relates that there are ‘four main classes of trills’:

i. The common or proper trill (with and without a termination)
ii. The trill from below
iii. The trill from above
iv. The short half trill or Pralltriller

Türk provides an example of a two-voice trill (Ex. 6.1), which resembles the early ‘Beethoven trill’ (see discussion below) and it is noteworthy that both he and C. P. E. Bach regard trills as the most difficult ornament and both recommend extensive practice.

Ex. 6.1: Türk, School of Clavier Playing, p. 249.

Clementi also concentrates on the realisation of trills and notably does not include a discussion of fingering. He briefly remarks that ‘composers trust chiefly to the taste and judgement of the performer, whether it shall be long, short, transient, or turned’. Milchmeyer similarly focuses on the execution of trills but, like Türk, provides examples of two-voice trills with both inner- and outer-part movement and a double two-voice trill (Ex. 6.2).

---

428 Türk, School of Clavier Playing, p. 247.
429 Ibid., p. 248.
430 Clementi, Introduction, p. 11.
The subject of Beethoven’s trills has provoked much fruitful discussion amongst scholars. Particularly noteworthy was the exchange of opinions between Newman and Robert Winter, printed during the years 1976-79 in the *Journal of the American Musicological Society* and *The Musical Quarterly*, and most recently Skowroneck’s discussion concerning their execution. The key areas of interest have revolved around starting notes and whether they should start on the main or upper note; the main body and exit of the trill; and, in the rare instances where Beethoven has supplied fingering, whether the fingering was included because the trill represented a move away from the norm or merely reinforced it. Questions concerning whether Beethoven’s preference for the starting note of his trills changed in later years and whether the trills he wrote out in full provide concrete evidence of his intentions for the execution of all of his trills also have been raised.

Considering this level of scholarly interest, the figurations again have received comparatively little attention. Tr. 15, however, has been much discussed amongst scholars and was referred to in the aforementioned exchange of words between Newman and Winter. Fi. 2

---

431 See: Newman, ‘The Performance of Beethoven’s Trills’ and ‘Second and One-half Thoughts on the Performance of Beethoven’s Trills’; and Winter, ‘Second Thoughts on the Performance of Beethoven’s Trills’ and ‘And Even More Thoughts on the Beethoven Trill…’.

(Chapter 4.3) has also been discussed by Skowroneck,\(^3\) Newman,\(^4\) and Rosenblum,\(^5\) and will be deliberated again in this chapter with focus on its features as a trill as opposed to an example of Beethoven’s fingering indications. In addition, Skowroneck appears to be the sole scholar to have noted the presence of Tr. 2, 3 and 4,\(^6\) whilst Chiantore is alone in highlighting Tr. 6.\(^7\) The remaining figurations do not appear to have been discussed.

6.1.1 Standard Trills

Relatively few figurations can be classified as standard trills. Only Tr. 6, 15, 19 and 20 really fit this type. Newman included Tr. 15 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 132v, 1794/95) in his aforementioned discussion and cited it as an example of a main note start,\(^8\) which was subsequently disputed by Winter who claimed that it lacks any harmonic context to enable it to be regarded as either a main or dissonant note start.\(^9\) Significantly, Beethoven has not indicated a trill sign for Tr. 15: the only implication that it was to be executed as a trill derives from the 4-3 fingering and the suffixes. The placement of the figures, however, does little to support either Newman’s or Winter’s theory as their positioning is unclear: it is not definite whether it is the figure 4 or 3 that is positioned directly above the G, and thus whether it is a main note start: if the figure 4 were positioned above the G, the fingering would suggest a main note start, whereas if it was the figure 3 instead, this could suggest a lower note start. The positioning of these figures in the sketch is particularly unclear: Beethoven has written the first figure 3 directly over the stem of the minim G, whilst the first figure 4 is placed before the minim. The second figure 3 is written marginally to the right of the stem of the minim F, whilst the second figure 4 remains in front of the minim (Ex. 6.3).

\(^{33}\) Skowroneck, ‘Beethoven the Pianist’, p. 368.
\(^{34}\) Newman, Beethoven on Beethoven, p. 194.
\(^{35}\) Rosenblum, Performance Practices, p. 250.
\(^{36}\) Skowroneck, ‘Beethoven the Pianist’, pp. 382 and 379 respectively.
Neither C. P. E. Bach nor Türk discuss a 3-4 fingering for left-hand trills: C. P. E. Bach states that the left hand should finger trills with the thumb and second, or second and third fingers, and continues to explain that ‘it is because of this normal fingering of trills that the left thumb grows so agile and along with the second finger becomes about the most active of the left hand’.

Türk declares that ‘even the left hand should not be exempted from this exercise [the practising of trill figurations]; in this case the second and third fingers should first be practiced and then the first and second’. Their omission of 3-4 fingering for left-hand trills suggests that Beethoven’s direction to use the third and fourth fingers appears to have been unprecedented and that it may have been designed to strengthen the left hand.

Discerning the execution of Tr. 19 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 71r, 1796) is similarly problematical whereas Tr. 20 (Landsberg 5, S. 38, 1809) is written out, and therefore explicitly reveals its dissonant starts. Tr. 20 is not an ordinary trill, since it is an under trill for which there was no shorthand symbol and so has necessitated its writing out in full. There is a gap of thirteen years between Tr. 19 and 20, and given the argument adopted by Skowroneck, that Beethoven preferred a normal trill to begin on the upper note until his latest works for piano, neither of these examples appear to support this theory: the execution of Tr. 19 remains ambiguous whereas Tr. 20 clearly starts on a lower dissonant note. Tr. 19, however, is similar in construction to that found in the ‘Righini’ Variations WoO 65 (Ex. 6.4) written c.1790-91, approximately six years prior to Tr. 19. The variation also does not indicate whether the trills are main notes starts, which could have clarified the execution of Tr. 19.
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If Tr. 6 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 47r, 1793) had been known to Newman, he also might have suggested a main note start and, unlike Tr. 15, Tr. 6 contains the harmonic context desired by Winter. Again, however, no definitive execution of Tr. 6 can be determined. Chaintore has argued that Tr. 6 is an example of Beethoven’s interest in cells of ‘peculiar sounds’ that are detached from any context and points to the seventh chord as being unusual in the lower register whilst the trill is executed on the leading note. Tr. 6 appears to be a simple V\(^7\)–I progression. Beethoven has not indicated any unusual fingering and the spacing between the notes is also conventional. It appears, therefore, that he may have simply liked the effect that this particular arrangement produced and noted it down.

Tr. 9 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 1793) initially follows the same format as Tr. 6 with a trill indication and a two-note suffix. This figuration, however, is a triple trill with no further comments provided on its execution. The suggestion that this figuration may have been devised for other instruments was discussed in Chapter 1. The other sketches on f. 51v, however, consist of various piano fragments, making it likely that Tr. 9 was also written for piano. Moreover, Tr. 8 and Oc. 6 (discussed in Chapter 6.3) also contain trills and are found on this leaf, along with more peculiar figurations such as the already discussed St. 9 (Chapter 5.2). The presence of these related figurations for piano on the same sketch leaf as Tr. 9 strongly implies that Beethoven was using the leaf to experiment with unusual figurations and the existence of three different trill figurations on the same leaf (Tr. 9, St. 9 and Oc. 6) confirms that he was taking special interest in this particular technique. Tr. 9, therefore, is almost certainly written for piano. The uniform stem direction does not reveal how the trill should be divided between the hands and the lack of any commentary or fingering also leaves its realisation somewhat ambiguous. If the right hand takes the double trill, it would play a

\[ \text{Ex. 6.4: ‘Righini’ Variations WoO 65/IV/9-16 (Henle, 1961).} \]

---


\(^{444}\) See p. 39.
single trill in sixths whilst the left hand trills a third below. Conversely, if the left hand takes the double trill in thirds, the right hand would play the single trill a sixth above. At this stage, the execution of Tr. 9 remains uncertain but what it does clearly demonstrate is Beethoven’s apparent interest in, and experimentation with, trill figurations including double trills for one hand.

Tr. 4 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 61v, 1792) is a written-out double trill in fourths for the right hand, but if the semiquaver movement in the left hand is also counted as part of the trill, the figuration can also be considered a triple trill. Consequently, Tr. 9 could be considered as a progression of Tr. 4, especially if the double trill in Tr. 9 is executed by the right hand. Although Tr. 4 is written on two staves and Tr. 9 is on one, the suggestion that Tr. 9 is a piano figuration has been further strengthened by the existence of Tr. 4. Beethoven wrote triple trills in the Piano Sonatas Op. 2/3 (1795) and Op. 111 (1821-22) (Ex. 6.5). Both of these examples necessitate the right hand to play a double trill and the left a single, which makes this distribution even more likely for Tr. 9. Tr. 4 and 9, therefore, can again be regarded as preliminary experiments with this type of trill. The fingering Beethoven has provided for the double trill in Op. 111 is also the same fingering he used in the first set of fingerings for the double trills in Fi. 2 and also involves the same placement of white and black notes.

Tr. 1 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 125r, 1790-91) includes a written-out trill that gradually speeds up, moving from quavers to semiquavers with the unusual instruction ‘immerhin geschwinder’ before a full trill indication is notated in the last bar. Skowroneck has discussed the fine line between a trill and an oscillation and has concluded that ‘most of Beethoven’s written-out oscillating textures are not trills’. He does, however, use Tr. 1 as an exception to this rule by explaining that ‘Occasionally, Beethoven did write out ordinary trills … One reason for writing out part of a trill was to indicate an accelerando.’ This type of written-out accelerando prior to a full trill indication is also used in Variation VI of Op. 109, where the trill is used as an accompaniment to the main theme. In Op. 109, however, there is no explicit statement of an accelerando: the accelerando is shown through a speeding up of the notation (Ex. 6.6). An accelerando was almost unknown in 1790 and there are none in Beethoven’s published works until the Piano Sonata Op. 57/iii/304 where he includes the instruction ‘sempre più allegro’. Another example of an early accelerando, which dates from c.1794, was presented in Chapter 1 (Ex. 1.3). Yet again, the timespan between an idea appearing in the figurations and a derivative being used in a work is considerable: in this case there is a gap of thirty years.
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6.1.2 Mordents and *Schneller*

The term *Schneller* gradually replaced the term *Pralltriller* from the mid-eighteenth century onwards and is used here to describe an upper mordent. Newman has concluded that Beethoven intended his *Schneller* to be executed as a triplet and not two short notes followed by a longer one.\(^{447}\) Out of the three figurations classified as this type, two are written-out *Schneller* which follow the rhythm advocated by Newman (Tr. 2 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 2v, 1790-92) and Tr. 13 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 120r, 1794). The third, Tr. 11 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 56v, 1793), includes only the indication for a *Schneller* to be used: it is not written out. Skowroneck, however, has challenged Newman’s assertion that Beethoven’s use of the sign had ‘one, unequivocal sense’ as a substitute for a main note—auxiliary note—main note shake by stating that Beethoven eventually did restrict the use of the sign to limited musical contexts but ‘neither the history of its interpretation in the 18\(^{th}\) century nor Beethoven’s early use of the sign are straightforward enough to justify a decision about its indisputable meaning’.\(^{448}\) The figurations are unable to add further to this argument, but the written-out examples (Tr. 2 and 13) do support Newman’s theory. It is noteworthy, however, that no example of a *Mordent* (lower mordent) has been found amongst the figurations.

Arguably the most adventurous figuration in this category is Tr. 10 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 54v, 1793). This triple idea reinforces the notion that 1793 was a year in which Beethoven experimented with technically impressive ideas. The fluidity of the movement suggests that a *Schneller* would be an appropriate realisation as anything longer would hinder the speed of the progression. Along with Tr. 4 and 9, Tr. 10 demonstrates that c.1792-93, Beethoven appears to have developed an interest in triple ornament figures and their associated textures. Although Tr. 2 and 13 are not as complicated technically, they also demonstrate Beethoven’s interest in experimenting with different textures as both incorporate *Schneller* in inner voices. Tr. 13 also switches between individual hands and both hands simultaneously.

Beethoven’s treatment of Tr. 2 and 13 is also akin to his development of the ‘Beethoven trill’ discussed below, since both are used as inner-part textures. In this sense Tr. 13 is a technical progression from Tr. 2 as the outer part is more melodic when compared to the simple repeating two-note idea used in Tr. 2.

---


6.1.3 Beethoven Trills

The largest number of figurations in this chapter is of the so-called ‘Beethoven trills’. Ten out of the twenty figurations fall into this category (see Tab. 6.2) with nine being written in the years 1792-96. By examining the figurations in these years it is possible to trace the development of the ‘Beethoven trill’ from simple two-part textures with written-out oscillations before the movement accelerated into written-out trills and then finally was indicated only by a trill sign. An early sketch, dating from c.1790, which is technically an oscillation and appears to have been an unused idea for a work, does show the start of the inner/outer movement idea that distinguishes the ‘Beethoven trill’ (Ex. 6.7).

Ex. 6.7: Kafka Miscellany, f. 50v, 6(3) & 7(3).

In Tr. 3 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 61v, 1792), this oscillating movement has accelerated to semiquavers and is beginning to resemble a trill. It is not until 1793, with Tr. 5 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 46r, 1793), however, that the first ‘Beethoven trill’ proper appears. Winter has said that a ‘Beethoven trill’ was used for the first time in the Prometheus Variations Op. 35 (1802). The coda to the Variations for Piano and Violin WoO 40, also incorporates them, however, and was written in 1792-93. The dating of Tr. 3, therefore, initially appears to correspond with the incorporation of these trills into Beethoven’s published works and

---

appears to precede WoO 40 by a few months since Tr. 3 is written on Bonn paper (VII-B), whereas the coda to WoO 40 is written on Vienna paper (I-A). 450

Beethoven’s explanation of the execution of these trills in WoO 40 (Ex. 6.8), given to Eleonore von Breuning, reveals why he had included such difficult passages:

The variations will be rather difficult to play, and particularly the trills in the coda. But this must not intimidate and discourage you. For the composition is so arranged that you need only play the trill and can leave out the other notes, since these appear in the violin part as well. I should never have written down this kind of piece, had I not already noticed fairly often how some people in Vienna after hearing me extemporise of an evening would note down on the following day several peculiarities of my style and palm them off with pride as their own. Well, as I foresaw that their pieces would soon be published, I resolved to forestall those people. But there was another reason, namely my desire to embarrass those Viennese pianists, some of whom are my sworn enemies. I wanted to revenge myself on them in this way, because I knew beforehand that my variations would here and there be put before the said gentlemen and that they would cut a sorry figure with them. 451

It appears then, that the ‘Beethoven trill’ initially may have been generated for or by ideas for improvisations. Moreover, their technical complexity appears to have been driven by Beethoven’s desire to overshadow his Viennese counterparts.

Ex. 6.8: Variations for Piano and Violin WoO 40/Coda/29-40 (Artaria, 1793).

The sketches for the coda of WoO 40 are found on f. 6r of the Fischhof Miscellany and are described by Johnson as being ‘complete except for the first eight measures and in near final form’. 452 The important omission from these sketches is the ‘Beethoven trills’ in the right

---

450 Johnson, Beethoven’s Early Sketches, pp. 280 and 415.
451 Trans. is Anderson’s: A-9, B-4 and B-11.
452 Johnson, Beethoven’s Early Sketches, p. 415.
hand. This omission may have been an oversight as they are present in the left hand and the right hand texture is otherwise complete. Significantly, however, Johnson believes that f. 6r ‘may well have been the last sketch for WoO 40 prior to the autograph itself’. As described above, the sketches are written on Viennese paper, and so must have been written after November 1792 when Beethoven moved to Vienna. Considering Beethoven explained to Eleonore von Breuning that the trills were included because they had become a trademark of his improvisations and that he needed to notate their style in order to prevent others copying him, a date towards the middle of 1793 seems likely: he would have needed this time to improvise at a number of venues in order to note how certain Viennese musicians were trying to pass off his ideas as their own.

The trills in WoO 40, however, consist of outer-part movement and for this reason are more akin to Tr. 7 and 8 discussed below than Tr. 3. These figurations were written in 1793 and mark the first outer-part trills. They are also written on the same paper-type as WoO 40 (I-A16).

Inner-Part Movement

Of the ten ‘Beethoven trills’, five incorporate inner trills only (Tr. 3, 5, 11, 14, and 18). Out of these, Tr. 11 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 56v, 1793) is particularly noteworthy as the sketch appears to show Beethoven’s indecision over its execution. The sketch reveals how he had written individual trill markings in bars 9-15 before deleting these with one continuous trill line over the top. Each individual trill also displays crossed out two-note suffixes. Only the suffix in bar 13 remains, probably as an oversight, considering the suffixes in the subsequent two bars have also been cancelled. It seems that Beethoven initially intended a series of independent trills with two-note suffixes before revising the notation to create one ascending chromatic line of trills without suffixes. This reading of revision, as opposed to complete cancellation, is most likely since Beethoven has left the initial trill sign intact: the longer line appears to be a continuation of this initial trill marking rather than a deletion of it (Ex. 6.9).

---

453 Ibid.
454 Ibid., p. 86.
Tr. 5 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 46r, 1793) is the earliest figuration that can be classified as a double ‘Beethoven trill’: the inner parts in both the left and right hands execute trills. The outer parts of this figuration are notably simple and are in contrary motion with one another, and so each hand performs the same movement. The relative simplicity of the figuration, coupled with its early date, strongly suggest that it was an initial experiment with the technique (a more advanced figuration may have incorporated independent movement in the outer parts). Tr. 5 also is the sole figuration of this type where both hands play a ‘Beethoven trill’ simultaneously.

Tr. 14 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 131r, 1794/95) incorporates an under trill and, as stated previously, no symbol exists for this execution, which has forced Beethoven to write out his intentions. Oscillations of this kind are also found in the written-out trills of Op/109/iii/VI/160 presented above (Ex. 6.6).

Outer-Part Movement

Three figurations (Tr. 7, 16 and 17) have been classified as outer Beethoven trills. Two of these figurations (Tr. 7 and 16), incorporate double-third textures inside the trill. Tr. 7 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 51r, 1793) incorporates an ascending and descending chromatic scale in double thirds in the right hand whilst the sketch shows the left hand playing a held b-flat. It is possible that Beethoven may also have wished for the left hand to play a trill in order to mirror the right hand, but forgot to add the trill indication. Tr. 16 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 126v, 1795) incorporates a repeating sequence in thirds that has been devised specifically for the left hand and thus provides another example of Beethoven’s experiments with figurations that develop the strength of this hand.

The ratio of inner trills to outer trills in the figurations (5:3) also appears to mirror Beethoven’s practice in his published works: there is a majority of inner ‘Beethoven trills’

Ex. 6.9: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 56v 7 & 8.
compared with outer trills, which suggests a preference for this for this type of texture.\textsuperscript{455} Considering this apparent preference for inner trills, Tr. 8 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 1793) is noteworthy as Beethoven has provided an ‘oder’ at the end of the figuration that reveals his indecision over whether to employ an outer or inner trill. The outer-trill variant is the continuous part of the stave suggesting that this was written first. The inner-trill variant is written underneath, which strongly implies that this may have been a secondary choice and that he may have had some reservations about using his initial version. The context of the figuration strongly suggests that its purpose was as an idea for a work instead of an experiment or exercise. Beethoven’s note that the accompaniment is ‘very pleasant in that register’, and that ‘the Eingänge here are always with the bass pp’, also implies that the work was in its initial stages. The ‘No. 90’ indicates a connection to another passage on the same folio (Ex. 6.10), further implying that the figuration was intended to be part of a work, whilst the ‘usw. zum Schluß’ at the end of Ex. 6.10 connects it to a further passage on the stave below.\textsuperscript{456}

\textbf{Ex. 6.10: Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 13(8) & 14(7).}

Two figurations (Tr. 12 and 18) incorporate multiple styles of trills. Tr. 12 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 98r, c.1794) contains inner and outer ‘Beethoven trills’ in addition to double trills whereas Tr. 18 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 57v, 1796) incorporates both inner ‘Beethoven trills’ and double trills and also involves hand crossing. These two figurations demonstrate Beethoven experimenting with multiple trill textures within the same figuration and are considerably longer in length than other figurations of this type (owing to the multiple trill textures contained within them). This extended length represents a move away from the contemporary tutor books’ view of trills as embellishments and has turned them into independent musical ideas.

\textsuperscript{455} A written-out outer ‘Beethoven trill’ can be found in Op. 26/V/197-203.

\textsuperscript{456} The passage begins on staves 15(4) & 16(4) of f. 51v.
Summary

The trill figurations have not been able to contribute to the debate over the starting notes of Beethoven’s trills. Instead, however, they have revealed how the ‘Beethoven trill’ developed out of simple two-part textures and that he appears to have preferred inner as opposed to outer-trill movement. Again there have been figurations devoted to the left hand (Tr. 15 and 16) which further demonstrate his desire to strengthen it, whereas the more complex trill textures such as the triple trills of Tr. 9 and the double ‘Beethoven trills’ of Tr. 5 were written in 1793, when many of the more inventive and complex figurations across all categories seem to appear. Tr. 14 necessitated that Beethoven write out the precise notes of the trill movement, since their construction could not be revealed by a simple trill symbol and thus further demonstrates his inventive approach. The figurations reveal that Beethoven envisaged trills not as mere embellishments but as an integral part of the texture and melodic design of an idea. They also display a gradual elongating of the trill patterns so that by c.1794, with Tr. 12, Beethoven writes a twenty-five bar figuration with almost continuous trills and thus paves the way for the extended trill passages in Op. 109/iii/VI, which are used for virtually the entire variation.
6.2 Note Repetitions (See Vol. II pp. 346-50)

The figurations included in the following discussion are characterised by note repetitions, which can be single notes, octaves or chords. The number of repetitions varies, ranging from two to six. Twenty-one figurations fall into this category and they cover the years c.1790-1809 (see Tab. 6.3). Again a preponderance of figurations date from 1793: 7 out of the 21 figurations have been dated to this year, although figurations continue to appear steadily until 1800. Hand distribution favours right-hand figurations: thirteen are written for the right hand (Nr. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 18 and 20). Repetitions involving both hands total five (Nr. 8, 11, 16, 17 and 21) whilst repetitions involving the left hand are limited to just three (Nr. 3, 14 and 19). The figurations have been divided into the following categories: scales and sequences, and chords or accompanying textures (see Tab. 6.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1790-92</td>
<td>Nr. 1-4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Nr. 5-11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794-95</td>
<td>Nr. 12-17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796/97</td>
<td>Nr. 18-19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799-1800</td>
<td>Nr. 20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Nr. 21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scales and Sequences</td>
<td>Nr. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chords or Accompanying Textures</td>
<td>Nr. 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note repetitions did receive some attention in contemporary tutor books. The main focus appears to have been on advising appropriate fingering styles or to demonstrate how different fingering styles could produce different effects. As a result, the actual examples provided are often quite basic and, with the exception of Milchmeyer, do not place repeated notes into musical contexts.
C. P. E. Bach’s sole reference to the technique covers ‘broken seconds’ (Ex. 6.11). He advises that it is best to use alternate fingers in these types of passages, which are often slurred, as repetition of the same finger can cause excessive detaching of the notes. He also remarks on the increased frequency in use of the thumb and second finger of the left hand, usually in places where the right would use the second and third, but does not provide any further comments.\footnote{C. P. E. Bach, \textit{Essay on the True Art}, p. 60. For original see \textit{Versuch}, Vol. I, p. 36.}

\textbf{Ex. 6.11: C. P. E. Bach, \textit{Versuch}, Fig. 41.}

Marpurg provides slightly more information by offering two different uses of repeated notes. The first involves extended repetitions of the same note whereas the second uses the two-note repetition discussed by C. P. E. Bach. The slurs found in C. P. E. Bach’s examples, however, are not present in Marpurg’s but the fingering is the same (Ex. 6.12). Whilst providing detailed fingering for these examples, Marpurg’s written commentary again is very brief. He advises that using all five fingers for extended repeated notes is bad (‘male’) and that the preferred fingering for two-note sequences is with the second and third fingers.\footnote{Marpurg, \textit{Anleitung}, p. 66.} As in C. P. E. Bach’s treatise, however, the fingering examples do provide suggestions for both hands.

\textbf{Ex. 6.12: Marpurg, \textit{Anleitung}, Tab. VII.}

Clementi continues the pattern seen thus far in providing extensive fingering but very little commentary. His examples, however, do include more applications of the technique: he includes the broken seconds and extended repeated notes seen in Marpurg and C. P. E. Bach, but also incorporates sequences and broken-chord ideas (Ex. 6.13).
Unlike C. P. E. Bach, Clementi advises that finger changes are required for passages where the repetitions are too quick to be executed by one finger, rather than where a legato, as opposed to a detached, touch is required. His concentration appears, therefore, to be on speed as opposed to articulation. Türk’s discussion is similarly brief. His sole reference to repeated notes emphasises appropriate fingering and, like Clementi, advises using alternate fingers.\footnote{Türk, \textit{School of Clavier Playing}, p. 140.}

Milchmeyer’s discussion of the technique and the examples he provides is by far the most comprehensive. Although providing examples of two-note slurred repetitions and extended repetitions (Ex. 6.14), he also includes small pieces that incorporate the technique, essentially using them as exercises in pedal control.\footnote{Milchmeyer, \textit{Die wahre Art}, pp. 62-63.}
With the exception of Milchmeyer, therefore, the contemporary piano tutors provide limited examples and advice on how to execute this technique. They do not put their examples into musical contexts, since they use mainly small, sequential or scalic ideas. Moreover, it is only Milchmeyer who incorporates demisemiquavers into this movement: all other examples restrict themselves to quavers or semiquavers and thus imply slower tempi.

The central difference between Beethoven's figurations and those discussed above is the complete lack of fingering indications: not one of Beethoven’s repeated-note figurations includes fingering and thus he provides no clues as to how he intended them to be executed. This may be a result of Beethoven already being familiar with appropriate fingering styles and thus rendering its inclusion unnecessary, but also could imply that he was more interested in experimenting with different applications of the technique and how it could be incorporated into different musical settings. If correct, this suggestion implies that these figurations are not exercises. Out of the twenty-one figurations, only four (Nr. 1, 5, 6, and 9) make use of the ‘broken seconds’ idea that featured heavily in the contemporary piano tutor books. Nr. 6 (Fischhof Miscellany, f.3v, 1793) is also the sole figuration that does not include an accompaniment. Instead Beethoven varies the rhythm by using a dotted quaver/semiquaver pattern.

Modern scholarly interest in these figurations is rather meagre. Chiantore’s only inclusion is Nr. 17.\textsuperscript{461} There appears to have been no further discussion of these figurations.

6.2.1 Scales and Sequences

Twelve figurations can be categorised as scales and sequences (see Tab. 6.4). Out of these, the ‘broken seconds’ figurations are isolated to the years c.1790 and 1793. The first of this type is Nr. 1 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 154r, c.1790-91). Here, Beethoven has taken the ‘broken second’ idea, has extended it over three octaves and has introduced a tremolando accompaniment in the left hand. Although the slurs are missing, C. P. E. Bach’s earlier comment that this style of figuration is often written in this way strongly implies that this was its most common treatment, and therefore it is likely that Beethoven neglected to include them on account of their execution already being understood. The slurs, however, do appear in the first half of Nr. 5 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 3r, 1793). Their subsequent omission in the second half also implies

\textsuperscript{461} Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, p. 192.
that their presence was intended rather than marking a change in the actual style of execution. It is notable that both of these figurations are written in the key of E-flat major. This technique was used by Beethoven in the Rondo in C major Op. 51/1 (c.1796-97) (Ex. 6.15) and perhaps most famously in the ‘Tempest’ Piano Sonata Op. 31/2 (Ex. 6.16).

Ex. 6.15: Rondo in C Op. 51/1/53-54 (Artaria, 1797).

Ex. 6.16: ‘Tempest’ Sonata, Op. 31/2/1/2-5.

The passage is written in quavers, but the alla breve time signature in conjunction with the Allegro tempo indication in the ‘Tempest’ Sonata imply speed. This is a feature clearly evident in Nr. 17 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 128r, 1795). In this figuration, Beethoven has taken a repeated-note descending scale and significantly increased its complexity by incorporating double thirds into the texture. The decision to notate demisemiquavers implies immense speed and thus further increases its technical difficulty. With Nr. 17, Beethoven has taken several ideas (descending scale, repeated notes and double thirds) and incorporated them together into one complex idea demonstrating in two bars his desire to push the boundaries of piano technique and technical complexity. Nr. 17 is also the sole repeated-note figuration to have been discussed by Chiantore. He describes the passage as being electrifying and incorporates it into his discussion of double thirds stating it is the most striking example of the technique, that it accelerates the traditional movement of double thirds, and that it necessitates weight in the first note followed by extreme lightness in the arm.\footnote{Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, p. 192.} These observations are valid, but the difference between Nr. 17 and the repeated-note figurations presented in the contemporary
tutor books is tremendous: no examples of this type, with this level of complexity and implied speed exist. Milchmeyer’s demisemiquaver example is the closest comparison but does not incorporate the double thirds and note shifts that Nr. 17 does: each four-note grouping remains the same. Nr. 17 is dated 1795, which is comparatively late to his other highly original figurations that tend to appear in the year 1793. It does, however, belong with this group of complex figurations.

Nr. 12 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 52v, 1793) comprises an ascending and descending arpeggio sequence with minimal accompaniment in the left hand. Whilst bearing no resemblance to the figurations provided in the contemporary tutor books, Nr. 12 is, however, remarkably similar to one of Czerny’s published exercises (Ex. 6.17) and thus could perhaps reveal Beethoven’s influence on his former student. The movement of three repeated notes followed by a fall in an ascending and descending sequence is the same for both. Beethoven’s sequence rises in arpeggios, however, whereas Czerny’s is an ascending and descending scale. Czerny’s is also slightly more complex owing to the addition of a contrary-motion left hand. The two figurations also draw comparisons with Milchmeyer’s second example (Ex. 6.14) excepting the falling interval.


Nr. 12 could also be considered as a development from Nr. 2 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 61v, 1792) since Nr. 2 uses the same ascending repeated-note arpeggio idea but its movement, comprising quavers at an Allegretto tempo marking, is slower than Nr. 12’s. Nr. 12 has been incorporated into the Piano Sonata Op. 10/2 where the figuration is used as the opening motif of the third movement. The semiquavers have been altered to quavers but the ‘Presto’ tempo marking
qualifies this and thus also indicates velocity (Ex. 6.18). Op. 10/2 was written 1797-98 and so again presents an example of a figuration being incorporated into a later published work.


Nr. 16 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 55v, c.1795) also utilises an ascending arpeggio idea but the contrasts of notation in Nr. 16 are the significant feature and differentiate it from other figurations of this type. Initially, Nr. 16 appears to be a repeated-note ascending arpeggio in tenths. The contrasting notation in alternate bars, however, suggests a difference in execution: the tremolos not only increase the number of repetitions, they also could imply a difference in articulation and, therefore, fingering. Bars 1 and 3 use a style of notation referred to by Bart van Oort as ‘counter-resonance notation’,\(^{463}\) which was used by pianists of the London pianoforte school when trying to emulate the precise cut-off of Viennese dampers. This notation calls for precisely articulated semiquavers to make the semiquaver rests perceptible. Clementi advised that a change of fingering was necessary for note repetitions that were too quick for the same finger.\(^{464}\) This comment suggests that using the same finger might produce a detached effect as it is unable to repeat as quickly. C. P. E. Bach also commented that quick repetitions are better suited to alternate fingers since repetitions using the same finger ‘causes an excessive detaching of the notes’.\(^ {465}\) The semiquaver rests in bars 1 and 3 appear to require such an effect and thus may have been executed using repetitions with the same finger. The notation in bars 2 and 4, where no rests are present, necessitates much quicker repetitions and, therefore, would be easier to achieve with finger changes, which do not cause excessive detaching. Consequently, it is possible to interpret Nr. 16 as a figuration that employs both

\(^{463}\) Bart van Oort, ‘Haydn and the English Classical Piano Style’, pp. 80-81.
\(^{464}\) Clementi, Introduction, p. 18.
types of fingering and thus could be viewed as an experiment in observing two different fingering styles for note repetitions and the different effects they produce.

Nr. 15 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 47v, 1794) comprises a descending arpeggio sequence in the right hand with an indication for the left hand to play an octave below. Whilst the descending arpeggio sequence is clearly apparent the repetitions themselves also produce an independent descending arpeggio sequence.

The first three variations of WoO 80 also incorporate semiquaver note repetitions: the first in the right hand, the second in the left and the third with both hands in contrary motion. Although none are of the type presented in the figurations, as each is preceded by a rising arpeggio, they are noteworthy nevertheless for their similar semiquaver movement and their contemporary dating: the variations were written in 1806, placing them towards the end of the figurations presented here (Ex. 6.19).

Ex. 6.19: 32 Variations WoO 80/1/1-4 (Bureau des Arts et d’Industrie, 1807).

Of the remaining figurations, it is highly likely that Nr. 7 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 4v, 1793) was an unused idea for a work. The note repetitions occur only in bars 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6. The rest of the figuration does not contain any repetitions and owing to its full time signature, tempo indication, key signature and internal repeat marks, the notion that Nr. 7 was an idea for a work is most probable. It is notable that Beethoven had initially written a 6/8 time signature and then replaced it with a 2/4 signature but maintained a predominantly triplet quaver movement in the right hand.

Nr. 6 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 3v, 1793) is important less for the dotted repeated notes, and more for the unusual use of a soprano clef and the placement of a staccato mark over the dotted quavers. Clive Brown has observed this practice in the autograph of the Violin Sonata
Op. 30/3/ii, written 1801-02, where it is seen in both the violin and piano part (Ex. 6.20) and it can also be found in the Violin Concerto WoO 5 (e.g. bars 3 and 7), written 1790-92. Brown, however, was not aware of the existence of Nr. 6 and thus it becomes a new example of this practice.


Brown links this staccato mark to a comment made by C. P. E. Bach where he explains that such indications were used to create a detached sound: ‘it is possible to indicate a desired detaching of the final note of a turn … by playing a vertical stroke to the right of the symbol and just above the second added dot [Ex. 6.21]. Although this new indication looks strange, it is necessary, for all means which lead to correct performance should be adopted, even though they seem excessive’. Brown suggests that ‘Beethoven may possibly have derived this notation directly from … C. P. E. Bach’s Versuch, where he suggests precisely this relationship of staccato mark and dot of prolongation to signify a rest in such a figure’. Although C. P. E. Bach includes an extra dot with the staccato mark over the top, which is not present in either Nr. 6 or Op. 30/3/ii, Brown’s suggestion appears valid and thus the soprano clef used by Beethoven in Nr. 6 becomes more significant since C. P. E. Bach’s original examples were also written in this clef.

Ex. 6.21: C. P. E. Bach, Versuch, Fig. 129.

---

466 This has been established through personal correspondence. See also Brown, Classical and Romantic Performing Practice, pp. 208-10.


6.2.2 Repeated Chords and Accompaniments

This sub-category includes repeated-note figurations that act as an accompaniment (see Tab. 6.4). They are written either in an inner voice in the right hand or as a left-hand accompaniment. Sometimes repetitions of the same chord are used in a progression without a melodic line. Figurations that fit into this sub-category span the years 1793-1809. Nr. 3 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 89r, 1793) is the first of this type and consists of repeated chords alternating between sixths and thirds which are used to accompany a sequence of alternating ninths and octaves in the right hand. Nr. 3 stands out as being one of only three repeated-note figurations written for the left hand (the others are Nr. 14 and 19). Moreover, Nr. 3 is the sole repeated-note figuration that is purely a left-hand accompaniment: Beethoven’s predominant treatment of figurations of this type is to incorporate the repetitions into an inner voice texture as seen in Nr. 4, 10, 11, 13 and 14. This type of accompaniment used in Nr. 3, however, is seen extensively in the Piano Sonata Op. 110 (Ex. 6.22), whilst repeated chords characterise the opening of the ‘Waldstein’ Piano Sonata Op. 53/i and are also seen in the Piano Sonata Op. 54/i/102 and 148-49.


Nr. 4 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 39r, 1793), Nr. 10 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 51r, 1793), Nr. 13 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 54v, 1793) and Nr. 14 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 120r, 1794) all appear to use repeated notes and chords as a textural effect, which strongly suggests that these figurations were either unused ideas for works or improvisations and not exercises.

Summary

Skowroneck has suggested that the arrival of Beethoven’s Érard piano, and its heavier action, provoked him to avoid quickly repeated notes in his works and that they only reappear...
gradually in later works, concluding that ‘Perhaps Beethoven also became less and less content with the sacrifices to his usual brilliant playing technique he apparently had to make on account of the Érard.’ The frequency in figurations of this type is noticeably less between the years 1799/1800 and 1809. This reduction, however, starts three years prior to the arrival of the Érard and so cannot support Skowroneck’s theory that the arrival of this instrument provoked Beethoven to cease writing figurations of this kind. In addition, WoO 80 (Ex. 6.19) and Nr. 21 (Landsberg 5, S. 57, 1809) were both written after the arrival of the Érard and do not appear to display a slowing down of speed when compared to earlier figurations. They do, however, fit into the period in which Skowroneck claims Beethoven had grown dissatisfied with the Érard.

The predominant feature of these figurations is their implied speed. Demisemiquavers are used in Nr. 17, discussed above, but the notation of the remaining figurations also implies that they were to be performed at speed, which would have been easier to execute on Viennese pianos on account of their shallow key-dip and lighter action. The only figurations that are given tempo markings (Nr. 2, 7, 14) are marked ‘Andante’ (Nr. 7 and 14) and ‘Allegretto’ (Nr. 2). This may suggest that these slower tempi were indicated on account of their unusually slow speed when compared to the other figurations.

Whilst Nr. 12 resembles exercises by Milchmeyer and Czerny, the use of similar repeated patterns in Beethoven’s published works again has blurred its categorisation as an exercise. Most noteworthy, however, has been the discovery of Nr. 6 as it appears to be a new example of Beethoven using staccato marks over dots.

---

470 Sébastian Érard sent Beethoven this piano on 6 August 1803, ibid.
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6.3 Octaves (See Vol. II pp. 351-56)

Twenty-three figurations have been classed as octaves and they span the years c.1790-1809 (see Tab. 6.5). A concentration of figurations appears in the years 1793-95 and distribution between the hands is dominated by right-hand figurations with seventeen out of the twenty-three (Oc. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 23). The left hand has three (Oc. 3, 9, and 13) and both hands play octaves in Oc. 14, 21 and 22, but only two figurations (Oc. 3 and 18) are actually written for one hand alone: the others require the non-octave playing hand to accompany the figuration.

Tab. 6.5: Distribution of Octaves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1790-92</td>
<td>Oc. 1-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Oc. 4-10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794-95</td>
<td>Oc. 11-17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799-1800</td>
<td>Oc. 18-20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802-03</td>
<td>Oc. 21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Oc. 22-23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figurations have been divided into three categories: scale runs, leaps and multi-directional movement (see Tab. 6.6). A number of the figurations could fit into more than one of these categories. This is particularly true for the multi-directional figurations which often incorporate leaps when the change in direction occurs. Similarly, the scale figurations sometimes include small oscillations that change the direction of the movement momentarily. In such cases, the predominant movement of the figuration has been used to classify the figurations and where other possibilities exist, they will be discussed in the ensuing analysis.

Tab. 6.6: Sub-Categories of Octaves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale runs</td>
<td>Oc. 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 20, 21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaps</td>
<td>Oc. 5, 8, 9, 10, 17, 22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-directional Movement</td>
<td>Oc. 6, 7, 14, 15, 19, 23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The contemporary tutor books devote little attention to this area: C. P. E. Bach’s sole reference to figurations of this kind is to advise that ‘those who are not sufficiently trained to execute the octave doublings of thorough bass can practice by playing any given bass first with the thumb and then with the little finger’.⁴⁷¹ Marpurg does not provide examples of this type whereas Türk also devotes little time to this topic. He does, however, provide an example with fingering and explains that ‘those who have long fingers may reach octaves with 4/1 and probably even with 3/1. With this, the execution of the following examples in slow tempo indisputably gains very much’.⁴⁷² It is notable that Türk’s example is written in quavers and thus implies a moderate tempo (Ex. 6.23).

Ex. 6.23: Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, p. 166.

Milchmeyer, however, provides an abundance of octave figurations, which have been taken from Clementi’s works, and includes scale runs, multi-directional figurations and leaps (a selection is given in Ex. 6.24). He advises that they all should be played with the thumb and fifth finger and that they should be practised in all twenty-four keys, initially with the hands separately and then simultaneously. He also recommends practising octaves in arpeggios. The contrast between C. P. E. Bach’s, Marpurg’s and Türk’s discussions of this subject, when compared to Milchmeyer’s, is striking and strongly suggests that this technique increased in popularity during the 1790s. Moreover, Milchmeyer’s examples are given a ‘Presto’ tempo marking.⁴⁷³


⁴⁷² Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, p. 166.
⁴⁷³ For all the figurations see Milchmeyer, *Die wahre Art*, p. 30.
Clementi only provides a very brief example of octaves, describing them as ‘one of the best exercises for opening the hand’ and providing two fingerings for detached and legato octave runs (Ex. 6.25). It is noteworthy that such a brief discussion is given since octaves became a renowned feature of his style and his Piano Sonata Op. 2/2 is often referred to as the ‘celebrated octave lesson’. This may be on account of his Introduction being aimed at beginners whereas octave passages were regarded as an advanced skill.


With the exception of Milchmeyer, who has taken his examples from Clementi’s works, octave figurations in the contemporary tutor books, therefore, predominantly consisted of short scale runs with advice provided on how to achieve a legato effect for successive passages.

Modern scholarly interest in Beethoven’s octave figurations has been fair. Nottebohm was first to present Oc. 3 and Oc. 17, which have also been discussed by Rosenblum and presented by Kann. The precise location of Oc. 3, however, remains unknown: Rosenblum was unable to locate it and the present study also has not been able to identify its location (Kann, like Nottebohm, does not provide locations for the examples). Kann also includes Oc. 21 whilst Chiantore has discussed three figurations: Oc. 7, 12 and 17.

6.3.1 Scale Runs

Scale runs can be divided into two groups: chromatic and diatonic. Surprisingly there are only two chromatic scales in the collection. Oc. 1 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 88r, 1790) is an ascending...
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476 Clementi uses the English system of fingering where ‘+’ indicates the thumb and ‘4’ indicates the fifth finger.
479 Kann, Etüden für Klavier, p. xi.
480 Ibid., p. xiv.
481 Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, pp. 174, 189 and 211.
chromatic scale with an Alberti-bass accompaniment. Again, as found in the scale and arpeggio
figurations, Beethoven does not write a conventional scale: after starting on an F-sharp, he
ascends only until E-flat before beginning a partial descent that is intersected with quaver rests.
Oc. 20 (Grasnick 2, S. 80, 1799-1800) shows an immediate sense of progression with the
semiquavers in Oc. 1 transforming into demisemiquavers. Like Oc. 1, Oc. 20 comprises a
three-flat key signature but starts on an F-sharp and it is likely that the two-note slur indicated
in bar 1 also was intended for the subsequent bars and thus requires a legato fingering similar
to that advocated by Türk in Ex. 6.23. The speed of the figuration, however, prevents the
finger slides that Clementi prescribes. Given the opening bars that precede the octaves in Oc.
20, it is likely that this figuration was intended as an idea for a work. Beethoven does
incorporate an ascending chromatic octave scale into the Pathétique Sonata Op. 13 (Ex. 6.26),
written 1796-99, which places it between Oc. 1 and Oc. 20. It is noteworthy that Op. 13 is also
written in a three-flat key signature although the rhythm of Op. 13 has been transformed into a
melodic gesture instead of the figurative idea used in Oc. 1 and 20.

Ex. 6.26: Pathétique Sonata Op. 13/i/7-8.

The first diatonic scale run is Oc. 3 (Miscellaneous leaf, 1790-92), which comprises an
ascending C-major scale marked staccato throughout. Beethoven has indicated that it should
be played in all keys, minor and major, descending and ascending and as fast as possible.482 Oc.
3 is, therefore, one of the very few figurations whose classification as an exercise can be firmly
established. Oc. 3 reveals Beethoven’s desire to improve his octave playing by practising the
figuration in all keys, but also his desire to impress by executing it as fast as possible. Oc. 3 is
also noteworthy as it partially fits the description Blahetka gave of the exercises Beethoven
prepared when teaching his daughter (See Chapter 3.6). Considering Beethoven dictates that
the figurations should be executed descending and ascending, it is highly likely that he also
would have used both hands independently and perhaps simultaneously. This treatment of Oc.

482 ‘durch alle Tonarten moll und dur sowohl herauf als herunter in so geschwindem Zeitmasse als möglich’.
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3, therefore, mirrors the advice given by Milchmeyer in 1797 (see above), who also implied that speed was the aim for octave passages and thus suggests that Beethoven’s thinking was advanced, given that C. P. E. Bach, Türk and Marpurg do not appear to share this ideal, and yet Oc. 3 is dated approximately five years before Milchmeyer’s publication. Given Oc. 3’s overt technical purpose, it is therefore noteworthy that it also represents one of the rare occasions when Beethoven writes a scale that starts and ends on its tonic (See discussion in Chapter 4.1).

A concentration of scale runs appears in the years 1794-95. The first of these (Oc. 11 and 12) are both written on f. 140r of the Kafka Miscellany. Both figurations appear to be in the key of B-flat major, although neither starts on their tonic, and both are accompanied a third below by the left hand. The first three notes of Oc. 11 seem to have been a mistake by Beethoven rather than part of the actual figuration as he switches to the octave above thereafter. Additionally, these three notes appear to be a lighter shade of ink than the subsequent ones, which suggests that he may have tried to delete them (Ex. 6.27).

Ex. 6.27: Oc. 12, Kafka Miscellany, f. 140r, 1(2) and 2(2).

The descending runs in Oc. 11 also incorporate a small oscillation and thus could be considered as a multi-directional figuration. Initially, it appears that Oc. 11 and 12 may have acted as exercises (Chiantore perceives Oc. 12 to be an exercise for legato octaves)\(^{483}\) and yet the patterns for both of these figurations are similar to ideas found in the ‘Righini’ Variations WoO 65 (Ex. 6.28). This passage also contains an ascending chromatic run in octaves and indicates a mixture of staccato and two-note slurs. The ‘Righini’ Variations were written before Oc. 11 and 12 and so present a reverse to the normal pattern found throughout this study. It is possible, however, that Beethoven may have used Oc. 11 and 12 as technical exercises since they do follow a stereotypical exercise pattern. Oc. 4 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 1793) also uses

\(^{483}\) Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, p. 189.
this pattern and whilst the octaves are not fully notated after bar 6, the implication that they were intended to be executed this way is strong. Beethoven uses this pattern again in the piano Sonata Op. 7 (1796-97) (Ex. 6.29) and thus Oc. 4, 11 and 12 are placed in between his uses of these ideas in his published works, which again blurs the boundary between what can be classed as an exercise and what was an idea for a work.


Oc. 13 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 133v, 1794/95) presents a reverse of Oc. 11 and 12: the hands are switched so that the left plays a descending scale in octaves whilst the right accompanies with a descending sequence.

Oc. 18 (Grasnick 2, S. 8, 1799-1800) is similar in design to Oc. 3 as it also comprises an ascending scale. The repeat marks suggest that it was likely to have been an exercise and the ‘Presto’ tempo indication mirrors Beethoven’s comment in Oc. 3 to execute the figuration as fast as possible. The rests prior to the repeat marks appear to have been devised to allow adequate time for the hand to re-take its position since the tempo would not allow sufficient
time otherwise, which further strengthens the suggestion that Oc. 18 might have been an exercise.

Oc. 16 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 48r, 1794/95) incorporates an ascending and descending scale that is prolonged by the use of tied notes and alternates with the left hand so that when one hand is playing, the other is holding a tied note. Beethoven uses this texture in the arpeggio figurations Ar. 5 and 8 (Chapter 4.2), and since it is not overtly technical, it is likely that this figuration may have been a textural experiment. A similar texture is found in the ‘Righini’ Variations WoO 65 (Ex. 6.30).

Ex. 6.30: ‘Righini’ Variations WoO 65/XXIX/1-5 (Henle, 1961).

The final scale-run figuration is Oc. 21 (Wielhorsky, p. 15, 1802-03), which is a simple ascending and descending C-major scale in octaves that adds a third interval in each hand. The rhythm used (quaver used to mark the ascent and descent of the scale followed by semiquavers) is the same pattern used in Fi. 11 (Chapter 4.3) and thus implies that this rhythm was used by Beethoven when practising his scales. The addition of the third increases the technical difficulty of the figuration and so also marks a technical progression from Oc. 3.

6.3.2 Leaps

These figurations are primarily based on arpeggio patterns and span the years 1793-1809 (see Tab. 6.6). Oc. 5 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 1793) is the first of this type and is based around a D-major arpeggio with a triplet figuration underneath that produces a cross-rhythm (two’s against three’s).

Oc. 8 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 4r, 1793), Oc. 9 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 52r, 1793) and Oc. 22 (Landsberg 5, S. 54, 1809) incorporate leaps with multi-directional movement. These figurations are characterised by their relatively simple accompaniments whilst the octave
repetitions incorporated into Oc. 9 are used to create further interest. Oc. 17 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 68v, 1795) has actually been labelled by Beethoven as ‘Octave leaps’ and comprises an ascending G-major arpeggio, which echoes Milchmeyer’s advice to practise octaves in arpeggios. Nottebohm was the first scholar to reveal the existence of Oc. 17 but incorrectly transcribed Beethoven’s ‘Sven Sprünge’ indication as ‘viele Sprünge’. Beethoven also instructs that the figure should be played from A-flat to A (‘aus as ins a’) and by using these two keys, he has incorporated arpeggios with a multitude of white and black-note patterns. This idea was also seen with Ar. 5 and 8 (Chapter 4.2) and strongly implies that Oc. 17 was used as an exercise.

Rosenblum has suggested that Beethoven’s direction to play Oc. 17 in A-flat and A should also be ‘presumably continued’. This suggestion is questionable, however, since Beethoven has indicated explicitly his wish for figurations to be executed in all keys on a number of occasions (Oc. 3, Sc. 7 and Ar. 11). It is likely then, that if he had intended Oc. 17 also to be practised in all keys, he would have indicated this rather than the three he has specified. Arpeggio patterns are repetitive (C major is the same as G major and D major is the same as A major etc.) and thus the three keys he has chosen provide an all-white arpeggio (G), one with a black note in the middle (A) and one with a white note in the middle (A-flat), which cover the most commonly-occurring arpeggio patterns; if he had wanted to ensure complete coverage, the remaining major keys that needed to be included are B-flat, B and F-sharp. Beethoven’s choice to indicate Oc. 17 in G, A-flat and A, therefore, represents a shrewd judgement.

Rosenblum highlights Oc. 17 as a figuration ‘in which Beethoven concentrated on the challenges of rapid octave passages’. The notion of speed is confirmed with the ‘Presto’ indication and thus complements Oc. 3, discussed above, where Beethoven declared his intention for the figuration to be played as quick as possible. Oc. 10 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 42v, 1793) and Oc. 18 (Grasnick 2, S. 8, 1799-1800) also share a ‘Presto’ marking whilst Oc. 22 (Landsberg 5, S, 54, 1809) is ‘Allegro’ and Oc. 7 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 54v, 1793) is ‘Allegretto’, and thus further supports this view. Furthermore, eight of the figurations include octave
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passages in semiquavers and Oc. 20 is written in demisemiquavers, which further implies that speed was desired.

Oc. 10 is an extended passage in B-flat major that comprises a mixture of leaps, multidirectional movement and chromatic passages. On account of its full key and time signature, its construction, and the extension that Beethoven added with the ‘No. 100’ indication, it is likely that this figuration may have been an idea for a work or improvisation.

6.3.3 Multidirectional Octaves

Six figurations incorporate multi-directional movement (see Tab. 6.6). Oc. 7 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 54, 1793) begins, essentially, with written-out slow trills in octaves. This use of alternating white and black notes is also seen in Oc. 14 and 15, both located on f. 134v of the Kafka Miscellany. Oc. 14 incorporates multi-directional movement in an ascending sequence whereas Oc. 15 is a descending sequence. Oc. 14 is also notable for being one of only three figurations where both hands are playing octaves simultaneously (the others are Oc. 21 and 22).

The patterns used in these figurations are found in the extended octave passage of the ‘Andante favori’ WoO 57 (Ex. 6.31) and so their use in a published work again blurs the line over what can be counted as an exercise and what is an idea for a work. Beethoven was writing some of the figurations used in WoO 57 nearly ten years earlier with Oc. 14 and 15, but demisemiquaver notation is not used in the figurations until Oc. 20 written 1799-1800. The extended octave passage in WoO 57, therefore, could be considered a culmination of Beethoven’s continued experiments with such figurations (WoO 57 also incorporates the broken-third idea used in Oc. 8) and a realisation of his preoccupation with speed.
Oc. 14 and 15 already have been noted as being located on the same folio. Oc. 13, written on the preceding folio and dated to the same period, actually appears to have been written concurrently with Oc. 14 and 15 since folios 133v and 134r share similar ink-blot patterns: the darker ink blots appear on f. 134r, which suggests that f. 133v might have been underneath f. 134 and the ink blots were transferred onto f. 133v when Beethoven turned f. 134r over to work on the verso. Concentrations of similar ideas have also been seen with Oc. 11 and Oc. 12 located on f. 140r of the Kafka Miscellany and the scale figurations on SV 361, in the Wielhorsky sketchbook, and in Landsberg 6 (see Chapters 4.1 and 4.2). The close proximity in conception of Oc. 11-15, therefore, further supports the notion that Beethoven created similar figurations concurrently. Four of the figurations also incorporate the same oscillation: this can be found in bar 4 of Oc. 6 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 1793); bar 4 of Oc. 7; throughout Oc. 14; the first four semiquavers of Oc. 15; and bar 3 of Oc. 22, where the rhythm is altered slightly. This oscillation is also found in WoO 57 (Ex. 6.31), suggesting that it
was a popular figuration for octaves since it facilitates legato-style fingering by enabling the fourth finger to be used on the black notes.

The multi-directional figurations discussed thus far have primarily involved movement by step or a third. Oc. 23 (Landsberg 5, S. 55, 1809) is the last figuration of this type and, given its later date, it is perhaps no coincidence that it is the most technically complex. Oc. 23 comprises two sections: the first is a repeated idea based on the dominant seventh of G with the left hand accompanying in similar motion a third below. The second part, however, consists of an ascending sequence based on upward leaps of a fourth followed by downward leaps of a third with the left hand again accompanying a third below. This figuration, therefore, marks a significant progression as the hand and wrist are required to make frequent changes of direction whilst incorporating larger leaps.

Rosenblum has concluded that ‘technical demands increased considerably in the larger works of Clementi and Beethoven’, and has highlighted rapid octaves as one of these technical demands. Beethoven’s intention to impress with his octaves was observed in Oc. 3 with his desire to play them as fast as possible and appears to have culminated in the demisemiquavers used in Oc. 20 along with quick changes of direction in Oc. 23.

Summary

A successful octave-exercise book written during the nineteenth century was by Theodor Kullak, who studied with Czerny. In it, he arranges the exercises into seven headings that include:

(1) All the scales, including the chromatic.
(2) Octaves in progressive intervals.
(3) Passages in broken chords…
(7) Exercises on the Tremolo, Trill, Appoggiatura and Glissato.

These headings could easily apply to Beethoven’s figurations, reinforcing their thoroughness and suggesting that initially he may have used a number of them as exercises. Only Oc. 3 can definitely be classed as an exercise and, with less certainty, Oc. 8 also appears to have served
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489 Kullak, *The School of Octave Playing*, unpaginated, comments occur at the beginning of ‘Section II’ in ‘Preliminary Remarks’.
this purpose. The remaining figurations are less easy to categorise especially since derivatives of them appear in published works.

A number of figurations are written in flat key signatures, and in particular B-flat and E-flat: nine out of the twenty figurations are written for these keys. In addition, Milchmeyer’s example (Ex. 6.24) also is written with a three-flat key signature, which suggests that such keys might have been used to facilitate rapid legato playing on account of their black notes being easier to reach with the fourth finger. A concentration of these figurations appears in the years 1793-95 and in particular 1794/95. In the Piano Sonata Op. 2/2, which is in D major, a B-flat major octave scale is incorporated into the second movement (Ex. 6.32) and further examples can be found in Op. 2/1/iv/34-49, Op. 7/iv/161-66 and Op. 10/1/iii/26-27. The figurations Oc. 11, 12, and 14 which were written in 1794/95, therefore, may have played a similar role in the conception of these passages as the Landsberg 6 scales did with the ‘Waldstein’ Sonata (see Chapter 4.1).

**Ex. 6.32: Piano Sonata Op. 2/2/ii/60-63.**

![Ex. 6.32](image)

No fingerings have been found for octave figurations and so it is impossible to determine which style of fingering Beethoven adopted. Similarly, no glissandi figurations have been found either. This technique is implied in the ‘Waldstein’ Sonata Op. 53/iii/465-75 and the First Piano Concerto Op. 15/i/344-46 although Beethoven does not use the term explicitly. He does, however, provide a 5-1 fingering in the ‘Waldstein’. Owing to the fact that he does not provide fingering for the figurations and only two are C-major octave scales (the only key in which octave glissandi are possible), it appears that this technique may have been reserved either for Opp. 15 and 53 or for his improvisations that were not notated. The octave figurations, therefore, reveal Beethoven’s concern with executing such ideas at speed and Oc. 3 demonstrates clearly that he was using some of the figurations as exercises.
6.4 Double Thirds (See Vol. II pp. 357-62)

Twenty-two figurations contain movement that is written in double thirds and they span the years c.1790-1809 (see Tab. 6.7). A concentration of figurations again appears in 1793 (seven out of twenty-two), which is followed by five in c.1790-91. Distribution between the hands favours the right, which has twelve figurations (Dt. 1, 3-5, 7, 9, 14, 17 and 19-22); the left has four (Dt. 2, 11, 13 and 18) and there are six figurations that require both hands to play double thirds either simultaneously or alternately (Dt. 6, 8, 10, 12, 15 and 16). These figurations have been divided into three categories: scale movement, repetitive patterns and alternating notes, with each category sharing a fairly even distribution of figurations (see Tab. 6.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1790-91</td>
<td>Dt. 1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Dt. 6-12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794-95</td>
<td>Dt. 13-16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Dt. 17-18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797/98</td>
<td>Dt. 19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802-03</td>
<td>Dt. 20-21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Dt. 22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale Movement</td>
<td>Dt. 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetitive Patterns</td>
<td>Dt. 4, 5, 12, 15, 20, 21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternating Notes</td>
<td>Dt. 3, 6, 7, 11, 16, 18, 19, 22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This technique proved a popular subject amongst the contemporary tutor books. C. P. E. Bach, Marpurg, Milchmeyer, Türk and Clementi all devote some space to it, with each emphasising the importance of appropriate fingering. The degree to which each author investigates the technique, however, is diverse. Marpurg’s contribution is basic, with brief examples being provided to demonstrate two different fingering styles: repeated and
consecutive (Ex. 6.33). Marpurg explains that successive fingers should be used in quick passages without semitones.\footnote{Marpurg, Anleitung, Tab. VII, Fig. 37-41.}

Ex. 6.33: Marpurg, Anleitung, Tab. VII, Fig. 37-41.

C. P. E. Bach also concentrates on fingering and provides examples of repeated and consecutive fingering. Only one example, however, contains any rhythmic value: all other examples consist of note-heads only (Ex. 6.34). C. P. E. Bach also advocates that the same fingers should be used for repeated notes and for successive notes at fast tempi as ‘a change of fingers is more difficult’ in these passages (Ex. 6.35).\footnote{‘das Abwechseln schwerer fällt.’ C. P. E. Bach, Versuch, Vol. I, p. 37. For English version see Essay on the True Art, pp. 60-61.} This ethos mirrors Marpurg’s fingering of the semiquaver runs in Ex. 6.31. Unlike Marpurg, however, C. P. E. Bach also provides examples that contain multidirectional movement and small leaps (see again Ex. 6.34).

Ex. 6.34: C. P. E. Bach, Versuch, Fig. 42.

Ex. 6.35: C. P. E. Bach, Versuch, Fig. 42 g.

Türk provides a variety of different fingering examples and suggests that ‘if several thirds directly follow each other, some of them can be played with the first and second finger in order to avoid crossing of fingers and putting under of the thumb [Ex. 6.36a], or to make the notes of a so-called slur [Schleifung] more cohesive [Ex. 6.36b]’. Türk, therefore, is the first author to explain how slurs can be achieved in double thirds through fingering. He also
provides examples of fingering for alternating thirds (Ex. 6.37) and similarly explains that ‘a large number of consecutive thirds moving in stepwise motion on lower keys only, particularly in rapid motion can be played without alternation by the second and fourth fingers (also possibly with the first and third)’, which emulates the advice given by Marpurg and C. P. E. Bach (Ex. 6.38).  

Ex. 6.36: Türk, School of Clavier Playing, p. 159.

Ex. 6.37: Türk, School of Clavier Playing, p. 160.

Ex. 6.38: Türk, School of Clavier Playing, p. 160.

Milchmeyer also provides numerous examples of passages in double thirds. In contrast to Marpurg, C. P. E. Bach and Türk, Milchmeyer’s examples show repeated fingerings of scales at an andante tempo whilst consecutive fingerings are used for passages marked ‘Presto’ (Ex. 6.39). Türk’s and Milchmeyer’s examples are by far the most comprehensive of the piano method books as Clementi provides only short examples of exercises using double thirds incorporating both repeated and consecutive fingering. He does, however, include multi-directional movement (Ex. 6.40).

492 Türk, School of Clavier Playing, pp. 158-60.
The contemporary tutor books, therefore, focus on fingering above rhythmic, melodic or textural ideas, which is the apparent reverse of Beethoven’s figurations. Out of the twenty-two figurations, he has supplied a partial fingering for only one (Dt. 2), which is dated c.1790. The omission of further fingering indications in later figurations implies that Beethoven already was familiar with appropriate fingering styles and thus it is likely that he was concerned only with exploring the possibilities for using double thirds and the variety of ways in which the technique could be employed. Notably, all the tutor books provide two fingering styles that essentially can be classed as ‘legato’ and ‘non-legato’ and yet it is only Türk who includes a description of how legato can be achieved through fingering whilst only he and Milchmeyer include slurs in their examples.

Scholarly interest in Beethoven’s double-third figurations has been relatively substantial. Nottebohm first transcribed Dt. 10 and 17, which have also been discussed by
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494 Clementi uses the English fingering system where ‘+’ represents the thumb and ‘1-4’ the index-fifth fingers.
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6.4.1 Scale Movement

Scale movement formed the basis of most of the examples provided in the contemporary tutor books and Beethoven’s figurations also continue this pattern. Seven figurations (see. Tab. 6.8) have been classified in this category and they are located in the years c.1790-96.

The first figuration of this type is Dt. 2 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 50r, c. 1790), discussed above as being the sole double-third figuration for which Beethoven supplied fingering. He specifically indicates the left hand at the end of the figuration rather than at the beginning, which is unlike other figurations that have been designed for the left hand (See for example Sc. 9, Fi. 13, Fi. 20, Fi. 21 and Fs. 24). Dt. 2 stands apart from the examples given in the tutor books as it is a chromatic rather than diatonic scale: Marpurg, C. P. E. Bach, Türk, Milchmeyer and Clementi provide only diatonic examples. It is not until Clementi’s *Gradus ad Parnassum*, first published in 1817,⁴⁹⁹ that a chromatic double-third scale is provided.⁵⁰⁰ It is interesting, therefore, that one of Beethoven’s earliest double-third figurations includes a chromatic scale and that the fingering provided for Dt. 2 covers the diatonic part of the scale, not the chromatic section where it is seemingly needed most. The layout of Dt. 2 on folio 50r of the Kafka Miscellany is also problematic when trying to discern how Beethoven intended the figuration to be executed. Dt. 2 is spread over three staves and incorporates Beethoven’s s-type concluding double barlines in conjunction with his normal separating double barlines (Ex. 6.41).⁵⁰¹ Kerman has transcribed this figuration as one continuous single-line stave⁵⁰² whereas Chiantore has separated the idea into three sections that do not correspond to the original division on the three staves, and does not differentiate between s-type and separating double barlines (Ex. 6.42).

---

⁴⁹⁷ Kann, *Etüden für Klavier*, pp. xi, xii and xiv.
⁴⁹⁹ *Gradus ad Parnassum* was published in three volumes in 1817, 1819, and 1826, and was then reissued in a single volume in 1829 by Clementi, Collard & Collard.
⁵⁰¹ For further discussion see Chapter 1 and Cooper’s article ‘Beethoven and the Double Bar’.
Beethoven’s use of the s-type double barlines, however, suggests another reading. He uses two s-type double barlines in the figuration: one at the end of the second stave and one mid-way through the third. These two barlines are written at the end of identical chromatic passages (an octave apart and almost directly above one another). It is possible therefore that, owing to the uniform s-type double barlines at the end of the chromatic passages and their similar alignment, Beethoven intended these staves to be played concurrently by the right and left hands. Instead of one continuous passage as indicated by Kerman, therefore, Dt. 2 could be two separate ideas: the first stave is played alone by the left hand and then possibly by the right after the treble clef, the second and third staves are played concurrently by the right and left hands, and then the final passage at the end of the third stave is played alone by the left hand again: hence Beethoven’s ‘linke Hand’ indication at the end of this stave. Although a long s-type double barline can be seen in Ex. 6.41, which is used to conclude the previous sketch, this form of extended ‘s’ is rare: Beethoven’s usual practice was to write s-type double barlines independently on each stave as seen at the end of the chromatic scales in Dt. 2.503 The idea that the left hand duplicates the right, therefore, does seem highly likely and thus provides a new interpretation of this figuration, which becomes particularly significant when examining the ‘Righini’ Variations WoO 65.

---

One of Beethoven’s first uses of a chromatic scale in double thirds appears in Variation IX of the ‘Righini’ Variations. Given that both Dt. 2 and the ‘Righini’ Variations are dated to the same period (c.1790-91) it is likely that Dt. 2 may have acted as preparatory sketches for Variation IX, or that the variation was inspired by Beethoven’s experiments with chromatic double thirds. The final statement of the chromatic scale in Variation IX (Ex. 6.43) is virtually identical to the newly interpreted double-hand section of Dt. 2, and thus further supports this reading of the sketch. Similarly, the slur written over the passage also complements the consecutive (legato-style) fingering Beethoven indicated at the start of Dt. 2, making the relationship between the two even stronger. Dt. 17 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 71r, 1796) also includes an ascending chromatic scale in double thirds and it is highly likely that this figuration also functioned as an unused idea for a work owing to its ‘adagio mit doppelgriffen’ label and the full key and time signature.


Dt. 8 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 1793) and Dt. 13 (Meyer Collection, SV 361, c.1794) both employ double-third scales in C major. Dt. 8 is written for both hands whereas Dt. 13 is written for the left hand alone. Dt. 13 uses similar ascending and descending patterns to Beethoven’s other C-major scale figurations written on SV 361 (Sc. 13-16), where the turning point varies with each repetition. The C-major figurations written on SV 361, therefore, demonstrate Beethoven experimenting with different scale patterns and applications. Moreover, Sc. 13, 15 and 16 also seem to have been written for the left hand and thus represent a set of figurations where Beethoven appears to have been working on developing the strength in this hand. It is highly likely, therefore, that Dt. 8 and 13, along with Sc. 13-16, initially were used as exercises for this purpose.

Dt. 8 represents a technical progression from the examples provided in the tutor books, since it is written for both hands simultaneously whereas their examples appear to be for each hand individually: Clementi’s statement that ‘most of the passages fingered for the
right hand, may, by the ingenuity and industry of the pupil, become models for the left’, implies that his examples are to be practised by the hands separately rather than simultaneously. The slurs marked in Dt. 8 also imply that Beethoven intended a legato fingering and touch, which, owing to its semiquaver notation is also innovative, considering that, with the exception of Milchmeyer, contemporary tutors recommended that rapid double thirds should be executed with repeated fingers, since it was easier to achieve the desired speed (see above). With Dt. 8, therefore, Beethoven appears to have been trying to increase the complexity of a standard C-major scale by not only writing it in double thirds, but by writing it legato in both hands. Chiantore has grouped Dt. 8 with Dt. 2 and 12 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 140r, 1793) and describes them as passages that, taken out of context, look like authentic warming-up exercises. This observation is valid, although Dt. 2 also seems to have served another purpose.

Dt. 10 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 40v, 1793) is also highly original and technically complex. Beethoven has taken a descending and ascending scale and significantly increased its difficulty by incorporating octave finger extensions and leaps into the movement. The movement given in the contemporary tutor books was primarily stepwise with the occasional leap of a third (Exx. 6.34 and 6.40). Only Türk provided examples with finger extensions (Ex. 6.37). Chiantore describes Dt. 10 as ‘one of the great challenges in the manuscripts of the young Beethoven’, whilst Rosenblum draws attention to the development of patterns within the figuration:

A degree of thought in the writing of these exercises is shown by the progressive change ... only after the pattern has been practiced in two increasingly difficult forms, using just the fifth finger for the outwards thrusts (mm. 1, 3-4), is the exercise made more demanding with the addition of thirds in the outward thrust to the short, weaker fingers (mm. 7-8).

All interpretations assume that the semiquaver extensions are played by one hand rather than being divided between the two. The uniform beaming and lack of any written comments by Beethoven that suggest otherwise do seem to support this theory. It is possible, however, that he intended the right hand to play the first eight bars and then at bar 9, where the figuration begins again with a repetition of the opening bar, for the left to repeat the sequence. The ‘und

---

504 Clementi, *Introduction to the Art*, p. 19.
506 ‘como uno de los grandes retos de los manuscritos juveniles de Beethoven’, ibid., p. 184.
so weiter’ instruction could then be interpreted as indicating a repetition of the preceding bars rather than a continuation. A small section of Dt. 10 can be found in the ‘Diabelli’ Variations Op. 120, where it is written for the right hand whilst the left hand accompanies underneath (Ex. 6.44) and thus supports the interpretation that the semiquaver extensions in Dt. 10 also are played with the right hand alone.

Ex. 6.44: ‘Diabelli’ Variations Op. 120/XVII/8-9 (Diabelli, 1823).

Rosenblum’s ‘degree of thought’ is particularly appropriate considering that the opening of Dt. 10 appears to have grown out of Dt. 1 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 19r, c.1790), which is essentially a shorter version with a smaller compass range. The only significant difference between the two figurations is the addition of a semitone flourish to Dt. 10 in bars 1, 5 and 9, which adds a melodic element to the figuration. In addition, further developments from Dt. 10 can be seen with Dt. 14 (NE 105, f. 1r, c.1794) where Beethoven has taken the two-bar octave jumps idea in Dt. 10 and has extended it into a full ascending and descending scale. This may imply that as Beethoven became more accomplished at executing the technique he decided to extend it into the form seen in Dt. 14.

Chiantore has linked Dt. 14 and Dt. 1 to Beethoven’s concern with broken octave figurations. He suggests that the introduction of double thirds into these figurations helps balance the weight of the hand and gives it a stability which would not be there otherwise. It appears that Chiantore conceives Dt. 1 and 14 as an extension of broken octaves rather than double-third figurations in their own right. Given that Beethoven has introduced double thirds into broken octave figurations, it seems that he was keen to experiment with and implement

---

508 There is some uncertainty over the origins and dating of NE 105. The paper type used (I-C) is one which Beethoven used exclusively between the years 1792-96. The lack of barlines on the folio, however, strongly suggests that the date should be c.1794 (See Johnson, Beethoven’s Early Sketches, pp. 45-46). The origins of NE 105 are less clear. The leaf was said to have been acquired by the Beethovenhaus from Dr Hirsch in 1977 (Helms and Staehelin, ‘Bewegungen von Beethoven – Quellen 1973-1979’, p. 342) but Johnson does not list NE 105 in Beethoven’s Early Sketches. He does include a leaf called the Stargardit leaf, however, and it is possible that this leaf became NE 105: they share identical characteristics (p. 45).

509 Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, p. 182.
double thirds into numerous different applications. This point was already noted with the similarities between Dt. 13 and Sc. 13-16 (see above). Rather than perceiving Dt. 1 and 14 to be an extension of broken octaves, therefore, they could be regarded as examples of Beethoven’s varied treatment of double thirds, which suggests that he may have been experimenting with numerous applications in order to create a bank of ideas that could possibly be used at a later date either in his improvisations or in his compositions.

Dt. 9 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 39r, 1793) continues this trend by incorporating a D-major scale into a complex texture which involves, presumably, crossing hands. The incorporation of double thirds into a melodic idea that was hinted at in Dt. 10 is clearly evident here, and thus represents a significant progression from the purely figurative ideas that were seen both in Beethoven’s earlier figurations and in the contemporary tutor books. Although Dt. 9 is numbered here before Dt. 10, both figurations are dated to 1793 and both are written on the same paper type (I-A16) which contains a mixture of the same ink types (F and G). This evidence confirms that the two figurations were written within close proximity of one another. Although it cannot be verified with any certainty, it is logical to presume that Dt. 10 was written before Dt. 9 and thus the melodic elements found in Dt. 9 can be considered as a true development from Dt. 10. What is certain, however, is that during 1793 Beethoven was experimenting with the idea of incorporating double thirds into melodic textures. In his discussion of Dt. 9, Chiantore draws attention to the complex contrapuntal textures and hand-crossing but does not comment on the introduction of a melodic element.

The execution of the first bar of Dt. 9 is slightly ambiguous, since the final quaver beat is impossible to play as written. It is likely that Beethoven initially wrote the high $d''$ thinking that he was going to continue the left-hand idea in the treble register and then decided to delay it for one bar and so continued writing the left-hand part in the bass clef. In the sketch (Ex. 6.45) the $d''$ has been left, which is more likely to have been an oversight than intentional.

---

511 Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, p. 192.
512 Chiantore, ibid., has not included this $d''$ in his transcription of the figuration whilst Kerman, *Autograph Miscellany*, Vol. II, p. 186, does not comment on the superfluous note.
The Piano Sonata Op. 2/3 incorporates double thirds into its opening melodic motif (Ex. 6.46) and thus, considering it was written in 1795, may have developed from Beethoven’s melodic interest in double thirds that appears to have emerged in 1793.

Allegro con brio

6.4.2 Repetitive Patterns

Six figurations have been included in this category (see Tab. 6.8). Dt. 4 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 125v, 1790-91) and Dt. 5 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 100r, c.1790-91) both contain double-third movement in the right hand and also have the instructions ‘ter’ and ‘bis’ indicating that these passages should be repeated (three times in Dt. 4 and twice in Dt. 5). It is likely that Dt. 4 may have been an exercise or experimental figuration whereas Dt. 5 appears to have been an initial idea for a work.

Dt. 12 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 140r, 1793) and Dt. 15 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 25v, 1794/95) both use contrary-motion double thirds. Dt. 12 comprises a repeating four-note pattern whereas Dt. 15 is more complex, incorporating changes in the direction of the four-note patterns and movement up and down the keyboard. The addition of an upper voice in the right hand adds further complexity, although the repetitive nature of both suggest they were figurative experiments as opposed to ideas for works. Whether Beethoven also intended both bars of the left hand to play double thirds is unclear. It might be significant, however, that
when the left hand is written in double thirds, the held notes in the right are omitted and thus could represent a change in texture. Chiantore has included Dt. 12 in his discussion of the double-third figurations that look like ‘warming-up exercises’. This assessment is plausible since Beethoven’s use of double thirds in his published works is largely of a scalic nature, as opposed to the repetitive sequences seen in Dt. 12 and 15. The contrary-motion movement, however, is significant: the contemporary tutor books did not provide examples of contrary-motion double thirds, which implies that these figurations were possibly experiments with this technique. Beethoven used contrary-motion movement of this kind over twenty years later in the ‘Diabelli’ Variations (Ex. 6.47) where he has altered the movement to triplet semiquavers and included slurs to indicate a legato touch but, rather than being repetitive, is based on scale runs.

The patterns used in Dt. 12 and 15 are similar to those found in the scale figurations (Chapter 4.1), particularly the idea of small oscillations within the overall movement and could, therefore, act as further evidence of Beethoven’s desire to incorporate double-third movement into standard techniques. This was seen already with the broken-octave ideas and, as discussed previously, increasing the technical complexity of standard techniques could have been driven by his desire to compete against the Viennese Klaviermeister.

Dt. 20 (Wielhorsky, p. 86, 1802-03) and Dt. 21 (Wielhorsky, p. 87, 1802-03) both use double thirds in triplets. Dt. 20 is a repeating pattern that alternates the accent with each triplet so that, depending on the fingering used, both sides of the hand are required to initiate the movement and thus transfer weight from the outside of the hand to the inside. Dt. 21 is a repeating sequence that builds on each repetition so that it starts with single notes, progresses

---

to double thirds and then onto three-note chords. The repetitive nature of both Dt. 20 and 21 suggest they also may have been experimental ideas with different uses for double thirds.

6.4.3 Alternating Notes

Figurations of this type can be classified into three groups: the first involves movement that alternates between an octave and a third (Dt. 3, 7 and 11); the second alternates between a third and a single note (Dt. 16 and 19); and the third contains movement with a mixture of intervals (Dt. 6, 18 and 22). Dt. 10, discussed above, also could be included in the second classification as its movement begins and ends with alternating double thirds and single notes.

Where movement switches between double thirds and octaves, Beethoven appears to have been using this pattern as a textural effect: Dt. 3 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 50v, c.1790) contains only scale runs in the left hand whilst the left hand in Dt. 7 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 89r, 1793) comprises merely two-octave leaps. With Dt. 11 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 41r, 1793), however, the situation is reversed so that it is the left hand playing the alternating thirds and octaves whilst the right plays single notes preceded by grace notes. The movement in these figurations tends to remain static; it does not move around the keyboard in the same way the double-third scale figurations do. This lack of movement is clearly evident in the number of short-hand repeat indications that Beethoven has used. Dt. 3, 7 and 11 contain a significant number of these markings, which could imply that their function was harmonic rather than figurative and, therefore, that Beethoven was experimenting with this pattern as an accompaniment texture. He has, however, used this idea figuratively in the Piano Variations WoO 80 (Ex. 6.48) and the ‘Prometheus’ Variations Op. 35 (Ex. 6.49). In both examples the double thirds are sometimes altered to fourths for harmonic purposes. They do, however, demonstrate that he adapted the figuration to serve both purposes. This latter figurative use in published works, compared with the earlier textural use in the sketches, implies that he may have started experimenting with the figuration as a textural idea first before seeing its potential as a figuration. It is noteworthy, then, that WoO 80/VII uses alternating double thirds and octaves as an accompaniment texture before they are used figuratively in Variation VIII.
Ex. 6.48: Piano Variations WoO 80/VIII/1-2 (Bureau des Arts et d'Industrie, 1807).


When the thirds alternate with single notes, the movement around the keyboard is more comparable to the double-third scale figurations. Dt. 1 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 19r, c.1790), already discussed above, is a relatively simple descending and ascending idea whereas Dt. 16 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 44v, 1795?) also includes a left-hand accompaniment in double thirds. In bars 7-9 Beethoven has used one of the broken-third patterns discussed in Chapter 4.4 and thus again demonstrates him using existing patterns and making them technically more complex by incorporating double-thirds. He had used alternating double thirds and single notes previously in his Piano Sonatas WoO 47/2 and WoO 47/3 (Ex. 6.50) and so Dt. 1 and 16 are unlikely to have functioned as exercises: they appear to have been experimental figurations.

Ex. 6.50: Piano Sonata WoO 47/2/i/78-81.
Dt. 6 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 54r, 1793) and Dt. 18 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 48v, 1796) comprise a mixture of double thirds and sixths. With these figurations, it appears that Beethoven wanted to incorporate a variety of intervals into the figurations with neither alternating strictly between double thirds and sixths. In Dt. 6, after the first quaver, the pattern is two double sixths followed by two double thirds, whereas in Dt. 18 the sixths appear on the sixth and seventh semiquaver beats. Dt. 6 comprises two bars for the left hand followed by two bars for the right and thus resembles the imitative figurations discussed in Chapter 4.5.2 where imitation was used to encourage equality of the hands. Dt. 18, however, is more unusual and appears highly experimental owing to the number of revisions that Beethoven has made to it. Dt. 18 appears on the same leaf as sketches for the Quintet for Piano and Wind Op. 16 and is it likely that it may have been an unused idea for this work also.

Summary

The double-third figurations again show immense variety and demonstrate Beethoven’s desire to impose the technique on pre-existing figurations such as scales, broken octaves and the broken-third patterns discussed in Chapter 4.4. The number of figurations that have been incorporated into his published works demonstrates that a clear division between an exercise and an experimental idea cannot be made, even in such simple cases as the chromatic scale of Dt. 2. Similarly, the figurative and accompanimental use of the alternating thirds and octaves found in Dt. 3, 7 and 11 demonstrates that a clear distinction between ideas that could be used as accompaniments or figurations cannot be made either: every idea was ripe for variation and multiple uses.
7 Experimental Sonorities

(See Vol. II pp. 363-66)

This chapter includes figurations whose main characteristics are associated with sound. There are fourteen figurations that fall into this category and they span the years c.1790-1809 (see Tab. 7.1). These figurations can be grouped into four categories: articulation, contrasts in dynamics, sonority and instrumental characteristics (see Tab. 7.2) and, unlike the other figurations examined in this study, none are written on one stave only: the figurations are all written on two staves.

Tab 7.1: Distribution of Experimental Sonorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1790-91</td>
<td>So. 1-4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>So. 5-11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795-96</td>
<td>So. 12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>St. 13-14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab 7.2: Sub-Categories of Experimental Sonorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FIGURATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL (OUT OF 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>So. 1, 8, 10, 14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrasting Dynamics</td>
<td>So. 6, 11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonority</td>
<td>So. 4, 5, 7, 9, 12, 13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Characteristics</td>
<td>So. 2, 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly interest in these figurations has been moderate. Nottebohm was first to transcribe So. 3, 6, 7 and 10,\(^514\) which, excepting So. 7, have also been discussed by Chiantore, who additionally has examined So. 2 and 11.\(^515\) Rosenblum has included only So. 10,\(^516\) whereas Newman has deliberated over So. 1, 3 and 10.\(^517\) In his examination of pedalling, David Rowland has also discussed So. 2\(^518\) and Kann included So. 3.\(^519\)

\(^514\) Nottebohm, ‘Clavierspiel’, pp. 359, 361 and 362.
\(^515\) Chiantore, ‘Los ejercicios técnicos’, pp. 197, 198, 204, 207 and 208.
\(^519\) Kann, *Etüden für Klavier*, p. xi.
7.1 Articulation

Four figurations cover areas of articulation (see Tab. 7.2), which are primarily legato and staccato. So. 1 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 88v, 1790) is the first of these and is a simple four-bar figuration, with tonic-dominant harmony and the instruction ‘all staccato’.

So. 1 is noteworthy for the uniform staccato strokes that Beethoven has written (Ex. 7.1). ‘Ganz staccato’ serves to reinforce that the staccato should continue until the end of the figuration (particularly where no marks exist in bars 3 and 4; only the wavy line).

Ex. 7.1: Kafka Miscellany, f. 88v, 11(5) & 12(7).

So. 10 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 4r, 1793) is a simple melody with simple repetitive chords underneath. Beethoven has indicated that the hand should be held together as much as possible and that the figuration should be in the ‘strictest legato’.

In Chapter 4.1, Sc. 2 was identified as being an early investigation into legato. The long slur is a feature shared by both figurations. Newman refers to So. 10 as an exercise and concludes that through examples such as this, ‘it becomes apparent that this evidence of Beethoven’s emphasis on legato playing and a singing effect link closely with tone projection, the drawing out of a melodic line, and the shaping of incises and phrases’.

Rosenblum focuses on Beethoven’s ‘unusual direction’ concerning holding the hand together as much as possible. Newman has translated this instruction as ‘The hands must keep together as much as possible’, but the omission of an umlaut on the ‘a’ and an ‘e’ at the end of the word strongly implies Beethoven was referring to the singular and not plural, which corresponds to Rosenblum’s translation. She concludes:

The contracting of the hand after each melodic skip provides more technical solidity and security than a continuously extended hand and allows a better choice of fingering. Breuning’s observation

---

520 ‘ganz staccato’.
521 ‘auf das strengste ligato’.
of 1826 also suggests a compact hand position. When Beethoven played a run, “he held his fingers very curved ...; he appeared really to have the so-called older hand position rather than that presently used, with more flattened [less curved] fingers”.

Contracting the hand as described by Rosenblum would allow more weight to be given to the notes and also would enable the wrist more freedom to ensure the ‘strictest legato’ could be achieved. So. 10, therefore, can be used to demonstrate how Beethoven produced legato and to confirm that he did have the supreme understanding of it for which he was renowned. Newman’s classification of So. 10 as an exercise, however, is questionable, since it contains a melodic line and simple accompaniment that could also have been an unused idea for a work.

Newman’s assertion that Beethoven associated legato with a singing touch is partially evident in So. 14 (Landsberg 5, S. 52, 1809) where Beethoven has written ‘The most dexterity into the left hand damages the song in the right’. The noticeable omission, however, is the slurs for the song in the right hand. This figuration is particularly noteworthy for the striking dischords in the first three bars and in bar 5. The clarity of the dischords in the sketch is so striking that one wonders if Beethoven really did intend them (Ex. 7.2); a point which is supported by his use of the word ‘verletzt’ (‘damages’). It seems that with So. 14, he was experimenting with extreme contrasts in part-writing: dischordant harmony and a singing right hand against rushing semiquavers in the left. Owing to its structure and design, the probability that So. 14 was an unused idea for a work is high. This is also applies to So. 8 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 53v, 1793), where Beethoven has written a sequence of two-note slurred quavers. It is highly likely that he intended the two-note slurs to continue in bar 2 also.

Ex. 7.2: Landsberg 5, S. 52, 8 & 9.

523 Rosenblum, Performance Practices, p. 204.
524 Die Meiste Fertigkeit in die Linke Hand verletzt gesang in der Rechten.
7.2 Contrasting Dynamics

Two figurations (So. 6 and 11) display contrasts of dynamics. So. 6 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 51r, 1793) appears to be a study in the gradation of sound: the musical notation is a repeating five-finger pattern, which switches from the right hand to the left in bar 8, enabling both hands to practise the crescendo and diminuendo. The dynamics range from *ppp* to *ff* and suggest that in addition to practising control, Beethoven may also have been experimenting with the level of dynamic gradation that was achievable on the new fortepianos. Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven tended to stay within the dynamic range of *pp*-ff, using the outer extremes only occasionally. So. 6, therefore, indicates a progression from standard practice. It is noteworthy, then, that So. 6 dates from 1793 and thus can be added to the collection of figurations written in this year where Beethoven was experimenting with new techniques and ideas. A *ppp* dynamic marking is rare in Beethoven's piano music. An early indication appears in the Piano Sonata Op. 7/iii/146 written 1796-97; this suggests that So. 6 also may have been one of Beethoven’s earliest uses of it. An earlier figuration, which crescendos to *fff* before a diminuendo to *ppp*, is found on folio 88r of the Kafka Miscellany (10(9) and 11(9)). This figuration has been dated October 1790 but has not been included in this study as it is labelled ‘Schluss’, implying that it was to be the end of an unused work. It noteworthy, then, Beethoven does not also progress the crescendo up to *fff* in So. 6. Both figurations show remarkable ingenuity, since a large dynamic range was something that only could be fully explored with a fortepiano. Chiantore concludes that, on account of the homogeneous writing, an even greater technical challenge is posed that requires ‘impeccable control over the rate of the descent of the key’. The control required to produce the gradual increase and decrease in dynamics, along with the early use of *ppp* denotes that So. 6 served as both an exercise and an experiment into gradation of sound.

So. 11 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 4r, 1793) also shows Beethoven experimenting with quick and extreme contrasts in dynamics; a feature that occurs frequently in his published works. The shock of the fortissimo markings is further increased by the use of minor ninths that resolve quietly before being repeated again. C. P. E. Bach observed that ‘in general it can

---

be said that dissonances are played loudly and consonances softly, since the former rouse our emotions and the latter quiet them. Türk also agrees, stating:

Good taste has made it a rule that dissonance or dissonant chords must generally be struck with more force than consonant ones, for the reason that the passions should be especially aroused by dissonances. If one considers this rule particularly with relation to the degree of the dissonance, it then follows that the sharper the dissonance or the more dissonances contained in a chord, the louder must the harmony be played.

Beethoven’s use of the $ff$ on the minor 9th chord, followed by $p$ on the resolution, therefore adheres to this practice. It is noteworthy that Beethoven introduces the dissonant note first before harmonising it to accentuate this contrast further and thus demonstrates an inventive approach to an established custom. It is also likely that So. 11 may have been an idea for an ending of a movement or work.

7.3 Sonority

Six figurations have been classed as experiments with sonority (see Tab. 7.1). The six figurations can be divided into two groups: the first includes So. 4, 5, and 9, and covers remote keys and unusual sonorities. The second includes So. 7, 12 and 13, and concentrates on sustained notes.

So. 4 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 125v, 1790-91) is a figuration that focuses on Beethoven’s intent to surprise the listener following a cadential trill. He comments that ‘In order to effect a surprise here for the listener, the closing trill must appear right after a few bars and with the same to be modulated into a somewhat remote key and after this … not to be developed’. This comment realises Beethoven’s intentions to surprise with a remote modulation and a dissonance, and strongly implies that the figuration was for a cadenza. Considering that Beethoven has expressed his desire to shock the ‘listener’, So. 4 provides evidence that Beethoven considered carefully how he could surprise his audiences.

---

530 ‘um hier überraschung bejm Zuhörer zu bewirken muss gleich nach einigen Täckten der schluss Triller vorkommen und mit demselben in einen etwas entfernten Ton modulirt werden und nach diesem … nicht ausgeführt werden.’
So. 5 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 1793) is an unusual figuration that alternates between G major and G minor with an inner-voice dominant pedal. The E-flat on the weak beat clashes with the dominant pedal to create a dissonance that is resolved on the final quaver beat of each bar. The repetitive nature of the figuration implies that it was an experiment rather than an unused idea for a work.

So. 9 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 139v, 1793) is also an experiment with unusual key relationships. From the outset, its resemblance to the ‘Moonlight’ Sonata Op. 27/2 (1801) is clear (Ex. 7.3). So. 9 is written in a different key (B minor instead of C-sharp minor), but remarkably Beethoven has superimposed the harmonies of So. 9 into Op. 27/2, by the use of a modulatory passage in the preceding bars. He also switches the harmony between B minor (vii) and B major (using it as the dominant of III/iii) within this context. In addition, the treble part has been altered slightly so that the second and fourth bars of So. 9 have been changed from four crotchets (b' and a'-sharp) to a dotted minim on c''-natural followed by a crotchet a'-sharp. The c''-natural creates more tension, since it produces an interval of a ninth with the bass. The relationship between So. 9 and Op. 27/2, therefore, mirrors the pattern seen in previous chapters whereby an unusual figuration has taken several years to filter into Beethoven’s published works. A significant difference between So. 9 and other figurations, however, is that when used in Op. 27/2, the idea has not been diluted but rather made more unusual with the addition of the dissonant c''-naturals and its insertion into a work in C-sharp minor.

Ex. 7.3: Piano Sonata Op. 27/2/i/15-19.
A central question running throughout this study has been whether the figurations were used by Beethoven as ideas for improvisations. This question is particularly significant here: the subtitle of the Op. 27 Sonatas is ‘quasi una fantasia’ and the origins of fantasias lie in improvisations. C. P. E. Bach observed that ‘the undamped register of the pianoforte is the most pleasing and, once the performer learns to observe the necessary precautions in the face of its reverberations, the most delightful for improvisation’.\textsuperscript{531} Beethoven’s ‘senza sordino’ direction, therefore, further emphasises a link between Op. 27/2 and improvisations, and so the likelihood that So. 9 originally could have been an idea for an improvisation is high and may also have been the reason why this particular figuration was inserted, virtually unabridged, into the sonata with its ‘quasi una fantasia’ subtitle.

So. 7, 12, and 13 all comprise sustained notes: either semibreves or minims. So. 7 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 1793) was first transcribed by Nottebohm who observed:

\begin{quote}
One can see how Beethoven speculated about sound effects and made experiments with lingering tones and that the pleasing effect used by others was known to him where one finger releases one note after another from the bottom to the top of the keys, which causes a gradual fading of the notes.\textsuperscript{532}
\end{quote}

Nottebohm observes that this technique was not new and that Beethoven may have heard it elsewhere. It is possible, therefore, that So. 9 may represent Beethoven’s own experimentation with this technique after hearing it being used by other pianists. It is significant that Beethoven does not appear to have used this technique in his published works and might be due to the fact that it was already common.

So. 12 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 138v, 1795/96) comprises a series of pianissimo semibreve chords. This figuration appears to reveal Beethoven experimenting with chord progressions by alternating major and minor chords. Instead of using this figuration in a later published work for piano, he incorporates it into the String Quartet Op. 18/6 (Ex. 7.4). Op. 18 was written between 1798-1800 and demonstrates once again a delay in using an idea that appears in the sketches. The unusual occurrence of a figuration being used for an instrumental work is largely derived from the fact that So. 12 is based on sonority and not figuration. Richard Kramer has

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
noticed the striking similarity between So. 12 and a sketch for Op. 18/6 that is found on folio 14r of the sketchbook Autograph 19e. Apart from being written a semitone lower, So. 12 is virtually identical to this sketch with its semibreve barless notation and has resulted in Kramer calling it ‘an uncanny Doppelgänger’.533

Ex. 7.4: String Quartet Op. 18/6/iv/14-21 (Breitkopf & Härtel, 1862).

So. 13 (Landsberg 5, S. 54, 1809) is based on two descending seventh chords in the right hand with tied minims in the left and is notable for its use of imitation and change of interval: the left hand imitates the right a fifth below in the first sequence and in the second changes to a third below. The last chord of the figuration, and the omission of a barline, suggests that the ascending sequence of seventh chords is to be continued. Again So. 13 appears to have been an experiment with harmony as opposed to an exercise.

7.4 Instrumental Characteristics

Two figurations (So. 2 and 3) demonstrate Beethoven writing figurations that utilised the physical characteristics of the piano. So. 2 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 96r, c.1791) belongs to the sketches that Beethoven made to accompany the plainsong *Lamentations of Jeremiah*, which would have been performed in Bonn during Holy Week. Its inclusion in this study is derived from the pedal indication, which marks the only time he wrote an indication specifically for the knee levers and also is his first pedal indication of any type. So. 2 is chronologically the second

---

533 Kramer, ‘Ambiguities in *La Malinconia*: What the Sketches Say’. See footnote 56 on p. 35 regarding the reconstruction of Autograph 19e.
documented pedal indication for any composer and, therefore, demonstrates again that Beethoven was at the forefront of pianistic thinking. The direction has been indicated to help sustain the bass notes whilst reaching for the subsequent repeated chords and thus exhibits an early and sophisticated knowledge of how the pedal could be used to produce legato where otherwise it would be impossible. It also draws distinct parallels with Beethoven’s similar use of the technique in the opening to the ‘Hammerklavier’ Piano Sonata Op. 106 (1817-18) (Ex. 7.5).

Ex. 7.5: ‘Hammerklavier’ Sonata Op. 106/i/1-4.

So. 3 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 123r, c.1791) is a series of ascending scale runs and descending arpeggios with tied minim bass notes underneath. Beethoven’s observation that ‘the held notes in the bass create a good effect because the bass lasts longer than in such higher notes’, demonstrates an astute awareness of the capabilities of his instrument and that he wrote figurations that would manipulate such characteristics. Chiantore regards So. 3 as a visionary ‘study in sonority’ and that it has an ‘almost Debussian concept to it’. Beethoven’s comment appears to have been observational rather than designing the figuration specifically as an exercise in sonority, which suggests that he did experiment at the piano and then, on occasion, noted down his reactions to the effectiveness of what he had created. This practice has been seen previously in Fi. 7 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 147r, c.1794), where he remarked that the fingering produced a ‘good effect’ (Chapter 4.3). The probability that So. 3 originated from an improvisation, then, is quite high and it was only after observing the effectiveness of the bass notes that he wrote the figuration down as a reminder.

534 Rowland, *A History of Pianoforte Pedalling*, p. 53. The first (‘con sordini’) can be found in the first sonata dedicated to ‘Madame Victoire de France’ by Louis Jadin c.1787.
535 ‘die haltende Noten im Bass verursachen guten Effect weil der bass länger anhält, als in der bej solchen Noten’.
Viennese-action pianos were known to have a stronger bass than their English-action counterparts: in 1768, Jacob Adlung had urged piano builders to increase the number of strings in the treble in order to compensate for this, but in 1796 Walter’s pianos were still described as having a strong, resonant bass. Milchmeyer also complained about this feature:

In the grand pianofortes I have also noticed that the two top octaves, by comparison, rarely had a beautiful, clear and penetrating tone, whereas the basses were in general extremely strong and the top notes languishing, so that such an instrument resembles a gentleman in unfitting apparel who is accompanied by a splendidly dressed servant, or a seven-foot tall man whose voice resembles the voice of a child.537

Rather than perceiving this quality to be a disadvantage, Beethoven’s observation written on So. 3 reveals that he exploited this characteristic by writing figurations that would benefit from it, and thus substantiates the notion that his writing was rooted in his practical experiences. Newman has used So. 3 as an example to demonstrate Beethoven’s concern with sustaining the bass by use of the damper pedal.538 The characteristics of the Viennese piano given above in conjunction with the observational tone of Beethoven’s comment, however, might suggest otherwise. He has, however, used the pedal to hold the bass note in a similar figuration found in the Prometheus Variations Op. 35 (1802) (Ex. 7.6). The autograph copy reveals that Beethoven had originally written the ‘senza sordino’ mark at the start of the variation and then changed it to the first complete bar. This move appears to have been made in order to catch the bass E in the pedal. The greater sustaining power of the bass notes, therefore, would have ensured that the E lingered until the dampers were replaced. This effect is also seen in the ‘Waldstein’ Sonata Op. 53 (1803-04) (Ex. 7.7). Both works were written a considerable time after So. 3 and thus provide further examples of ideas from a figuration being incorporated into later works.

---

537 Trans. is Oort’s: ‘Haydn and the English classic piano style’, pp. 76-77. For original see Milchmeyer, Die wahre Art, p. 57. Details of Adlung’s comment and Walter’s pianos can also be found on p. 76.
538 Newman, Beethoven on Beethoven, p. 237.
Summary

The figurations presented in this chapter all appear to have originated from Beethoven’s experiments at the piano, with some perhaps originating in improvisations. Each appears to have been rooted in his personal experiences: the use of the pedal in So. 2 to join the bass notes, the realisation in So. 3 that he could use the unequal balance in sound to produce pleasing effects and the explanation in So. 10 of how to produce the ‘strictest legato’. So. 12 appears to stand alone as a figuration that was used later in a string quartet but also appears to have originated from an experiment at the piano: it was not originally designed for a quartet as there are only three voices. These figurations, therefore, reveal that Beethoven was actively exploring his instrument for new ideas.
8 Conclusion

The aim of this study has been to ascertain the function of Beethoven’s piano figurations, to determine if the common classification of them as piano exercises was valid and if they could be easily categorised as piano exercises. In pursuit of this goal, this study has encountered many grey areas when trying to classify the figurations and determine if they were used as an exercise, an experiment for a work, ideas for improvisations, or teaching material. Although these grey areas have often been viewed as troublesome, they perhaps demonstrate best what function the figurations served Beethoven. Their inherent characteristics, the fact that so many figurations were used in later works and the ambiguous nature of many of them proves that Beethoven did not separate technical exercises from figurations for composition or improvisations; everything had potential to be used in a variety of ways. The trills in WoO 40 were initially one of his trademarks when improvising but were written down and published in order to prevent others from passing them off as their own. The scale figurations in Landsberg 6 appear to have informed the figurative design of the ‘Waldstein’ Sonata Op. 53, his experiments with alternating major and minor chord progressions in So. 12 were used in the ‘Malinconia’ of the String Quartet Op. 18/6, and So. 9 was used in the ‘Moonlight’ Sonata Op. 27/2. There is no clear distinction between what can be classed as an exercise, what is an unused idea for a work or a figuration for a cadenza. Similarly, there is also no clear divide between what appears to have been a figurative idea and what could have become a theme for a work. This point was demonstrated with St. 2 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 19r, c.1790), which initially was thought to have been a figurative idea, but was found to have performed a prominent role in the Piano Sonata Op. 2/3/i (Chapter 5.1.2).

Except in three cases where Beethoven has expressly described the figuration as ‘Übung’ or ‘Scales for Learners’ (Fi. 2, Fs. 6 and Sc. 32), no specific or single function can be identified. There is a distinct overlap between figurations that may have been exercises, those that were used in works and those that were not. These findings, therefore, contradict the claim by Nottebohm and Chiantore that there is a collection of figurations which were exclusively technical exercises.
In Chapter 3, it was noted that the term *technische Übung* (technical exercise) in German pedagogical literature did not exist and that *Passagenübung* (passage exercise) was used instead.\(^{539}\) The figurations reflect this ethos: very few can be classified as solely technical exercises, many have a figurative or sequential nature but the fact that derivatives of many of them do appear in Beethoven’s published works verifies the potential they had as musical figurations. The term *Passagenübung*, however, suggests such figurations were devised to practise passages that occur frequently in works. In view of the fact that Beethoven noted Fs. 6 was good for exercising the left hand, this figuration demonstrates that he was, in some cases, moving away from the existing ideology and starting to think in terms of their capabilities for developing independence and strength too, which is remarkable and progressive.

The fingering passages for the First Piano Concerto (Fi. 9 and 10) and for the Fourth Piano Concerto (Fi. 12, 13, 14, 15 and 23), and most importantly the omission of these fingering indications from the published versions, clearly demonstrates that once Beethoven had written a passage, he then set about working on its execution for performance.\(^ {540}\) The suggestion that the passages for the Fourth Piano Concerto in Grasnick 32 and BH 124 were written for another pianist strengthens the notion that some of the figurations could have been used for teaching purposes. Ultimately, however, they appear to have been derived from Beethoven’s practical experiences.

Considering that many of the more innovative and radical figurations took several years to appear in an often less-extreme form in his published works, this delay and dilution strongly imply that they may have been used in improvisations first and, therefore, demonstrate clearly why his improvisations caused the amazement and astonishment that has been frequently documented. Beethoven is known to have considered the structure of his improvisations, due to a comment written on leaf 3v of the gathering HCB Mh 75 (c.1808) located in Bonn:

Variations on a Lied, a fugue at the end and finishing pianissimo. Model every improvisation on this and perform it afterwards in the theatre.\(^ {541}\)


\(^{540}\) Beethoven performed the First Piano Concerto in 1795 and 1798, and the Fourth Piano Concerto at his *Akademie* in 1808. See Thayer-Forbes, pp. 173, 207 and 446.

The Beethovenhaus appear to regard this comment as reflections for himself:

However, as is the case with all specialists he did not just play like that but prepared himself very conscientiously. The sketch leaves shown here, on which Beethoven not only made sketches but also notes for improvisation, bear witness to this.542

The tone of Beethoven’s comment, however, reflects the instructional manner seen in both Grasnick 32 and BH 124. Their relationship, which does not appear to have been noticed by previous scholars, is even more apparent since all three sources are of the same paper type (8 staves, which have been identified as matching through a rastrological examination). The probability that this comment was also written for another is, therefore, quite high. Regardless of who the comment was written for, however, it demonstrates that Beethoven thought conceptually and structurally about improvisation and so there is no reason to suggest that he also did not think figuratively.

The labelling of the figurations as exercises, therefore, whilst not being entirely inaccurate, is only partially true, and the preference by previous scholars, Chiantore excepting, for repeatedly highlighting a select few has enabled this view to continue for a considerable length of time. The catalogue of figurations enables a broad cross-section to be viewed simultaneously. As a result, it is hoped that the figurations will become more widely known, which in turn will lead to a deeper understanding of their use.

When deciding which figurations and exercises were written for piano, excepting Ex. 1.4 discussed in Chapter 1, there were very few figurations that appear to have been written for other instruments. This reinforces the present conclusion that the figurations were for practical use and, more specifically, for the piano. Beethoven was a proficient violinist: he took lessons with Franz Rovantini (1757-81), Franz Ries (1755-1846), Ignaz Schuppanzigh (1776-1830) and Wenzel Krumpholz (c.1750-1817),543 and yet there appear to be hardly any figurations for the violin or other instruments.

Lack of Repetition and Comprehensive Coverage

The wealth of ideas that Beethoven was able to produce is remarkable. The grey areas encountered when categorising the figurations have been discussed frequently, but they

542 Ibid.
543 Thayer-Forbes, pp. 61, 82 and 146; and Wegeler and Ries, Remembering Beethoven, p. 184.
actually demonstrate Beethoven’s versatility: he often writes figurations that do not serve one specific function. In cases where figurations have initially appeared to be an exercise, they have been adapted later in published works. This confirms that he did not distinguish between an exercise and a compositional idea: everything had potential. The abundance of C-major scale figurations, and their lack of repetition, demonstrates this point: one would think that there are only a limited number of variations for a C-major scale, and yet nearly every time he produces a new figuration that is slightly different from previous ideas. This is achieved by alternating the oscillation point, starting on a different note, playing in tenths or octaves, combining similar motion or contrary motion, starting ascending or descending, and extending past the standard octave ranges. Beethoven appears to be constantly creating new and challenging ideas that are both pianistically and musically inventive.

The subdivision of the figurations into thematic categories has accentuated how Beethoven was multifaceted in his approach: he does not appear to concentrate on any one category over another. The comprehensiveness of the categories (they cover a multitude of ideas) suggests that the figurations were a carefully considered and systematic approach to devising new techniques and figurations and experimenting with sonorities. As seen from the sub-headings used in Chapters 4 to 7, there are very few noticeable areas that have not been addressed.

Moreover, the lack of duplication suggests that if Beethoven were using these figurations to improve his technique, he would be playing them on a regular basis, perhaps even committing them to memory, and thus would be less likely to repeat an idea. This observation strongly implies they served some practical purpose.

The analytical nature with which Beethoven approached the figurations is evident in the comments he noted down. Out of the figurations examined in this study, approximately 38% include written annotations and it is possible to divide these remarks into different types that reveal how he often had a specific intention in mind:

i) Performance-related directions: tempo indications, articulation and musical characteristics.

ii) Physical directions for execution: indication of hands and how to move the hand to achieve the desired effect.

iii) Ideas for expansion and development: directions to play in different keys and directions to repeat the figuration many times.
iv) Assessments on the difficulty and feasibility of the figuration.

v) Assessments on the effectiveness of the figurations such as the sonority produced by the piano or the success of a particular fingering.

vi) A limited number of specific labels that explain the intended use of the figuration: for learners or as a specific exercise (particularly for the left hand).

These different categories demonstrate that Beethoven either was devising figurations for specific purposes or was experimenting with ideas and then noting their effectiveness. In both cases, he was evidently evaluating the success of the figurations and experimenting with the potential to manipulate the inherent characteristics of his instrument. His correspondence and relationship with Streicher has demonstrated that he took an active interest in the technical development of the piano. The evidence presented in these letters and Beethoven’s comments next to the figurations demonstrate that they were often devised with a specific function in mind or were the result of an experiment at the piano. For example So. 3, where Beethoven has commented upon the effectiveness of the long bass notes, appears to have been the outcome of his experience with the unequal balance between the bass and treble in Viennese pianos.

The French theorist and teacher Anton Bemetzrieder (1739-1808) made a relevant comment in his *Abstract of a New Method of Teaching the Principles of Music* (1782):

There are, without doubt, many artists who are excellent teachers; but how to find them out? It is easy to distinguish the reader, the virtuoso, and the composer, by the eyes and ears; by hearing the virtuosos we can judge of his ability; the composer is best known by his works; and the reader performing rapidly at first sight; but no visible sign indicates the professor. He is a philosophical being, who reflects, reasons, meditates and analyses his art.

Much of what Bemetzrieder says is applicable to Beethoven: he was an excellent sight-reader, composer and performer, but it is the characteristics Bemetzrieder notes that distinguish an excellent teacher and professor that are significant to this study. The idea of reflecting, reasoning and meditating is exactly what Beethoven has done with the figurations with his written comments: he reflects on the sonority produced by the bass notes in So. 3 and reasons with the effectiveness of the fingering for double trills in Fi. 2. Whether these comments were purely for instructive purposes as Bemetzrieder implies is not possible to ascertain and in all

544 See in particular letters A-17, B-23; A-18, B-22; and A-257, B-440.

545 Bemetzrieder, *Abstract of a New Method of Teaching the Principles of Music*, pp. 7 and 9.
probability is highly unlikely. The detail in the figurations, however, suggests that Beethoven was also considering the effect from a performance point of view and moreover from a personal point of view. The experiments in fingering for the double trills (Fi. 2) and the comments concerning their level of difficulty would have been personal to Beethoven’s own experiences and the individual physiology of his hand. Rather than merely showing an excellent teacher and professor at work, Beethoven’s comments also show an intelligent pianist who was trying to develop the potential in himself, his music and the ability to exploit his instrument.

Sense of Technical Progression

The figurations often do not display the level of technical progression where basic ideas gradually increase in technical difficulty. This is largely due to the fact that Beethoven was already an accomplished pianist by the time the figurations appear\(^5\). One of the most interesting discoveries, however, is that the figurations can be used to document the gradual development of the ‘Beethoven trill’ (Chapter 6.1), demonstrating how it appears to have evolved from a simpler two-voice texture with basic written-out trills that become quicker before finally being notated solely with a trill sign. Variation, more often than technical progression, is the feature which appears to characterise the figurations: where technical progression is found, however, it is often the result of figurative development.

The Year 1793

1793 has consistently proven to be the year in which the most figurations of each type have been found. The figures presented in the chronological tables verify Skowroneck’s and Chiantore’s claims that a concentration exists in the 1790s and also to some extent in the early 1800s\(^6\), but have revealed this to be even more specific to the year 1793, which does not appear to have been identified before.

\(^5\) The earliest figurations date from c.1790 when Beethoven would have been approximately nineteen years old.

In his article on the years 1794-95, Johnson noted that ‘for reasons not yet fully explained, no substantial new works were written in 1793’,\(^{548}\) whilst Cooper, in his biography on Beethoven, revealed:

For the rest of 1793 he was evidently composing, practising and improvising on his own, and performing at private or semi-public musical events (most often extemporizing rather than playing set pieces) … Evidence for his private improvisations comes from numerous manuscripts that can be dated to 1793 on the basis of paper type and handwriting. Many of these show the same kind of written down fragments … short, disconnected ideas for piano, usually with some striking texture or figuration that was worth recording for possible future use in a composition, or in an improvisation before an audience.\(^{549}\)

This study has now provided irrefutable evidence to support Cooper’s theory that a large quantity of figurations appear in this year, that they are ‘striking’ and that sometimes they were used in his later works.

The increased presence of the figurations in 1793 suggests that they were motivated by Beethoven’s desire to outclass the Viennese Klaviermeister. It is clear from his letter written to Eleonore von Breuning that the competition amongst pianists was fierce and that he was determined to outclass his rivals.\(^{550}\) This level of competition was something that he had not encountered in Bonn, and so the existence of the more adventurous and technically complex figurations which appear in this year could have been a direct result of this competition and of his desire to make an impact.\(^{551}\)

Similarly, Beethoven’s determination to develop the strength of his left hand may also have been born out of the desire to impress. Although a small number of such figurations exist prior to 1793, this year marks the start of a noticeable effort to improve its independence and elevate it from the traditional accompanying role it had been accustomed to.

Beethoven moved to Vienna with the aim of studying intensely with Haydn in order to improve his compositional skills. The extant sketches that exist from these studies, and those with Albrechtsberger, demonstrate that he had adopted a back-to-basics approach in the study of harmony and counterpoint.\(^{552}\) It is probable, therefore, that undertaking such a disciplined and systematic attitude in his compositional studies would have encouraged him to adopt the


\(^{549}\) Cooper, Beethoven, p. 48.

\(^{550}\) A-9, B-4 and B-11.

\(^{551}\) See for example Fs. 21, Tr. 9 and St. 9.

same attitude towards his instrumental studies. The years following 1793 do not show the
same level of intensity, but consistently throughout the 1790s, the number of figurations that
have been found is high.\footnote{Beethoven did, however, produce a vast number of counterpoint studies for Albrechtsberger.}

Practical Orientation

Two patterns have emerged from this study, which support the notion that the figurations
predominantly served a practical purpose. Firstly, the survey of five pocket sketchbooks has
unearthed not one single figuration. This implies that they were developed with the aid of a
keyboard. Whether they were improvised first and then written down or devised whilst
Beethoven was sitting next to the piano cannot be determined. The clear absence of any
figurations in the pocket sketchbooks, however, is significant.

Secondly, there is a conspicuous decline in the number of figurations appearing in the
later sketchbooks. Although the writing of the figurations does not cease entirely, there is a
marked reduction in their frequency which corresponds approximately to Beethoven’s waning
public performances. Given that he did not stop composing when his performing career did,
the gradual decline in the figurations at this time strengthens the suggestion that their value
was principally of a practical nature.

The abundance of figurations in the 1790s and early 1800s also correlates with
Skowroneck’s assessment that, up until 1800, the reviews of Beethoven’s performances were
favourable.\footnote{Skowroneck, ‘Beethoven the Pianist’, pp. 235-56.} It appears, therefore, that during the period when the majority of the figurations
were written, Beethoven was at the height of his pianistic capabilities and was seemingly on a
mission to outclass the Viennese Klaviermeister. This evidence further suggests that the
figurations served a practical purpose: Beethoven may have devised them not only to hone his
pianistic skills but also to develop innovative ideas and textures that would impress his
audiences.

The premise that Beethoven had intended to write his own keyboard tutor and his
aptitude for teaching was discussed in Chapter 3. Whereas early reports of Beethoven trying to
avoid his teaching duties were recorded by Ries and Wegeler,\footnote{Wegeler and Ries, Remembering Beethoven, p. 24.} his later concerns with the
progress of one of Streicher’s pupils\textsuperscript{556} and Gerhard von Breuning’s keyboard lessons\textsuperscript{557} demonstrate that he did maintain a pedagogical interest. Significantly, Blahetka’s description of the exercises Beethoven prepared when teaching his daughter does correspond to a small number of the figurations,\textsuperscript{558} in particular the scale figurations Sc. 13, 15, 16 and 32 with their lack of complete rhythmic notation. Sc. 7 along with the octave figuration Oc. 3 contains the instructions to be played through all keys, which also was one of the features of Blahetka’s exercises.

Although it is particularly difficult to verify whether Beethoven used these figurations as teaching material, there is enough evidence to suggest at least some of the exercises encompassed a didactic element. The most obvious example is Sc. 32 (Scheide, S. 93, 1815-16) with its label ‘Scalen für Lernende’ and corresponding date to the custody battle for Karl.\textsuperscript{559} Klöber recalled that Beethoven took an active interest in his nephew’s progress despite having entrusted his lessons to Czerny and, as such, Sc. 32 could be a direct result of this concern.\textsuperscript{560} In addition, the similarities between a number of the figurations and those of Czerny also help support this view.\textsuperscript{561} Even if Czerny was not taught them directly by Beethoven, the similarity in style of his own published exercises with Beethoven’s figurations strongly suggests that he was acquainted with a number of them.

The cases presented above, therefore, demonstrate that Beethoven had a continued interest in the development of students but the distinct lack of figurations in later years suggest that, when he was not in need of them, he did not write them with the same level of frequency. The picture that emerges, therefore, is that they were largely devised for personal use.

The comparison with contemporary tutor books has served a useful purpose, mainly in demonstrating how different Beethoven’s figurations were to those previously published by C. P. E. Bach, Marpurg and Türk. Even Clementi’s piano method which, according to

\textsuperscript{556} A-18, B-8. The pupil is thought to have been Fräulein von Kissow (1783-\textendash c.1864). Beethoven asked of Streicher: ‘I trust you will not take it amiss … if I too take a little interest in her training? – or, rather, if I am anxious about her progress?’

\textsuperscript{557} A-1532, B-2203.

\textsuperscript{558} Kopitz, \textit{Beethoven aus der Sicht}, pp. 74-75.

\textsuperscript{559} Beethoven began his fight for Karl after his brother died on November 15 1815, and eventually won custody of him when he was appointed sole guardian on January 19 1816. See Cooper, \textit{Beethoven Compendium}, p. 25.

\textsuperscript{560} See letter dating from 1817: A-878, B-912, and Nohl, \textit{Beethoven Depicted by his Contemporaries}, p. 164 where an account is provided by Klöber who recalls Beethoven telling Karl to practise at the piano and correcting ‘every fault’ and ‘making the boy repeat certain passages’.

\textsuperscript{561} See similarities between Sc. 26 and Czerny’s Op. 261, No. 100 in Chapter 4.1.2 and also the broken octave triplet figurations and Czerny’s Op. 399, No. 7 in Chapter 4.4.2
Rosenblum, ‘achieved the greatest popularity and use’,\textsuperscript{562} does not contain the type of figurations that Beethoven was writing almost a decade earlier. In this respect, the study has revealed that the figurations were often in advance of contemporary ideas.

One of the aims of this study was to ascertain if any correlation existed between the presence of the figurations and the piano duels in which Beethoven competed. He duelled with Gelinek in 1793, Wölffl in 1799 and Steibelt in 1800.\textsuperscript{563} Excepting 1793, there is no clear increase in the frequency of figurations for the years 1799 and 1800. Instead, there are a consistently large number throughout the 1790s, which suggests that these duels did not significantly impact upon their frequency. In light of the information presented above in Beethoven’s letter to Eleonore von Breuning, his daily life in Vienna seems to have been a constant battle against the Viennese Klaviermeister. The piano duels, although presenting definite occasions when his abilities were tested, were not exceptions and as such they do not appear to have had an impact upon the frequency of the figurations.

New Discoveries

Quite unexpectedly this study has also presented a number of new theories and unearthed previously unknown relationships.

In recent years, with the work of Skowroneck and Chiantore, the area of Beethoven as a pianist has been revisited in depth. The evidence presented in Chapters 2 and 3 along with the subsequent analysis of the figurations has shown Beethoven to be a conscientious, methodical and discerning individual. The figurations highlight the humanity and competitive spirit of a man who needed to practise his technique so that he could compete with the leading pianists in Vienna, who was not ashamed of going back to basics and practising C-major scales when he was in his thirties, and whose inventiveness and originality shine through in the wealth of ideas that he was able to produce and, in conjunction with his observations, the figurations were often many years in advance of his contemporaries. The notion that he was musically gifted but, on occasions, susceptible to technical lapses has never before been examined in the

\textsuperscript{562}Clementi, \textit{Introduction}, p. v.
\textsuperscript{563}Thayer-Forbes, pp. 139-41, 205-7 and 257. See also DeNora, ‘The Beethoven-Wölffl Piano Duel: Aesthetic Debates and Social Boundaries’ in: \textit{Beethoven and the Construction of Genius}, pp. 147-69.
way presented in Chapter 3 and has hopefully provided an alternative assessment of Beethoven's abilities as a pianist.

The analysis of the figurations has also resulted in a number of new discoveries. A new reading of the double third figuration Dt. 2 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 50r, c.1790), differing in layout from Kerman's transcription,\(^{564}\) has enabled a direct association to be made with the 'Righini' Variations WoO 65/IX/13-15. It has also been possible to relate Sc. 2 (Wegeler Collection, SV 329, c.1790) to the experiments for the song Klage WoO 113.

In addition, the figurations have created a series of earliest-known examples. The finger-speed figuration Fs. 34 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 55r, 1793) becomes the earliest known use of a g''' in Beethoven's piano writing. Similarly, the fingering figuration Fi. 1 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 18v, c.1790) appears to be Beethoven’s earliest-known experiment with the controversial ‘Bebung’ technique, whereby a change of fingering is indicated for two identical notes that are joined together by a slur. The unused example from the Kafka Miscellany, f. 60r, c.1794 (Ex. 1.3) and Tr. 1 (1790-91) document what are perhaps Beethoven’s earliest uses of accelerando. The repeated-note figuration Nr. 6 (Fischhof Miscellany, f. 3v, 1793) becomes a new example of Beethoven using staccato dashes over dotted rhythms. Whilst So. 6 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 51r, 1793) and the unused sketch in the Kafka Miscellany (f. 88r, 10(9) and 11(9) ), which dates from October 1790, become Beethoven’s earliest-known uses of ppp and fff.

Czerny’s statement that Beethoven ‘could barely span a tenth’\(^{565}\) and the lack of any chord larger than a tenth in Beethoven's published works have resulted in this suggestion being widely accepted. The existence of St. 9 (Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 1793), where a stretch of an eleventh is possibly implied, now challenges this claim.

Significantly, this study has discovered that the loose leaf BH 124 once belonged with the gathering Grasnick 32 and that it too contains a fingered passage for the Fourth Piano Concerto. A further exploration of these sources, along with HCB Mh 75, is needed in order to understand fully their relationship and the reasons behind their existence.


Implications for Further Research

This study has demonstrated that an examination of Beethoven’s sketches which does not concentrate on his published or unfinished works is a worthwhile endeavour that ultimately can lead to new discoveries. It has become clear, however, that a comparison with the exercises and figurations of other contemporary composer-pianists would be beneficial. This is especially true of Hummel, whose Ausführliche theoretisch-praktische Anweisung zum Piano-Forte-Spiel, first published in 1828, consisted of the exercises he had invented over the course of his career, which began in the late 1780s. This comparison would reveal whether Beethoven’s figurations, and their multifaceted characteristics, differed from those of his contemporaries, and if they do, to what extent and in what ways. Such a comparison would be extremely beneficial and would help place the figurations much more firmly in the context of contemporary thought than the tutor books since they would trace the thinking and experimentation at the exact time of conception, as opposed to the delay that occurs with a publication. The catalogue of figurations presented as Volume II, therefore, will now enable a direct comparison to be made with the sketches and figurations of other composer-pianists without the necessity to rely on the select few that were transcribed by Nottebohm.

The Fischhof Miscellany has been identified as containing many smaller figurations and unidentified sketches that are particularly difficult to transcribe. Owing to the fact that this miscellany dates from precisely the time when the abundance of these figurations were written, a more rigorous modern transcription including a colour facsimile of the complete miscellany could reap untold rewards.

It was beyond the limits of this study to examine all of Beethoven’s piano music, whether for solo piano or voice and instrument with piano accompaniment. In order to comprehend fully the extent to which Beethoven used the figurations in his works, such an investigation would be deeply beneficial. Similarly, although the examination of the sketches was designed to cover a broad timespan and multiple formats, an extension of the study covering the sketch collections not examined here, particularly the later sketchbooks, would be beneficial. From the findings of the present study, it is fairly clear that a decrease in frequency exists, but such a study would help to prove conclusively how far this decline corresponded to

---

566 See Chapter 3.
Beethoven’s activities as a pianist and whether there are figurations in any of the pocket sketchbooks not examined here.

Beethoven withdrew from public performances on account of his increasing deafness, and so any study that concentrates on the later sketches must also take this into consideration. If experiments with sonority can be found to exist when Beethoven’s deafness was almost profound, their existence would suggest that they were compositionally orientated. Similarly, if the figurations served a compositional purpose, there is no reason why the particularly figurative ones should also have declined since he would not have lost the tactile point of reference that the keyboard offered. Such a study would either substantiate further the findings presented here—that the figurations predominantly were for personal and practical use—or, conversely, that they had a compositional purpose. A brief examination of the sketchbook Artaria 197 (March-December 1821) has shown that such figurations tend to be more thematic in design and not overtly figurative, which suggests that they may have been more compositionally orientated. Firm conclusions, however, cannot be made without a more thorough examination.

In all cases, further study of the figurations can only serve to deepen an understanding into the reasons for their existence.
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Fundamental Skills

Scales (See Vol. I Chapter 4.1)

Sc. 1: Wegeler Collection, Koblenz, SV 329, f. 1r, 5 & 6 (c.1790).

Sc. 2: Wegeler Collection, Koblenz, SV 329, f. 1r,11(8) & 12(8) (c.1790).

Sc. 3: Kafka Miscellany, f. 50v, 12(3) & 13(3) (c.1790).

Sc. 4: Kafka Miscellany, f. 88v, 7(9) & 8(9) (Oct. 1790).

Sc. 5: H. C. Bodmer Collection SV 75, f. 1v, 12 (1790-1792).
Sc. 6: Kafka Miscellany, f. 46r, 5(4) & 6(4) (1793).

Sc. 7: Kafka Miscellany, f. 53r, 1 (1793).

Sc. 8: Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 3 & 4 (1793).

Sc. 9: Kafka Miscellany, f. 52r, 5 (1793).

Sc. 10: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 14 & 15(3) (1793).
Sc. 11: Kafka Miscellany, f. 160r, 14(2) & 15(2) (1793).

Sc. 12: Kafka Miscellany, f. 160v, 1 & 2 (1793).

Sc. 13: Meyer Collection, Paris, SV 361, 1 (c.1794).

Sc. 14: Meyer Collection, Paris, SV 361, 2 (c.1794).

Sc. 15: Meyer Collection, Paris, SV 361, 3 (c.1794).
Sc. 16: Meyer Collection, Paris, SV 361, 7 (c.1794).

Sc. 17: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 47v, 11(9) & 12(9) (1794).

Sc. 18: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 25r, 11(7) & 12(7) (late 1794/early 1795).

Sc. 19: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 25v, 5 & 6 (late 1794/early 1795).
Sc. 20: Kafka Miscellany, f. 140v, 3(5) & 4(5) (c.1794).

Sc. 21: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 26v, 9 & 10 (late 1794/early 1795).


Sc. 25: Landsberg 6, p. 96, 4 & 5 (1803-1804).

Sc. 26: Landsberg 6, p. 107, 1 & 2 (1803-1804).

Sc. 27: Landsberg 6, p. 107, 3 & 4 (1803-1804).

Sc. 28: Landsberg 6, p. 107, 6 & 7 (1803-1804).

Sc. 29: Landsberg 6, p. 107, 9 & 10 (1803-1804).
Sc. 30: Landsberg 5, S. 52 12(2) & 13(2) (1809).

Sc. 31: Landsberg 5, S. 62, 6 & 7 (1809).

Sc. 32: Scheide, S. 93, 1 & 2 (March 1815–May 1816).

Scalen für Lernende

Hand eben so hinauf u. hinunter wie die linke
Arpeggios and Broken Chords (See Vol. I Chapter 4.2)

Ar. 1: Kafka Miscellany, f. 88v, 9 & 10 (Oct. 1790).

Ar. 2: Kafka Miscellany, f. 53v, 11 & 12 (1793).

Ar. 3: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 2(3) & 3(3) (1793).
Ar. 4: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 12 & 13 (1793).

Ar. 5: Kafka Miscellany, f. 41v, 13 & 14 (1793).

Ar. 6: Kafka Miscellany, f. 134r, 3(3) & 4(3) (late 1794/early 1795).

Ar. 7: Kafka Miscellany, f. 68r, 5(5) & 6(5) (early 1795).
Ar. 8: Kafka Miscellany, f. 71r, 3(5) & 4(5) (1796).

Ar. 9: Kafka Miscellany, f. 67r, 4(7) (late 1797/early 1798).

Ar. 10: Grasnick 2, S. 8, 9 & 10 (1799-1800).

Ar. 11: Wielhorsky, p. 86, 1 (autumn 1802-May 1803).

Ar. 12: Wielhorsky, p. 86, 2 (autumn 1802-May 1803).

Ar. 14: Landsberg 6, p. 165, 1 & 2 (1803-1804).
Fingering (See Vol. I Chapter 4.3)

Fi. 1: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 18v, 3 & 4 (c.1790).

Fi. 2: H. C. Bodmer Collection SV 75, f. 1v, 11(3) (1790-1792).

Fi. 3: Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 7(4) (1793).

Fi. 4: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 1(3) (1793).

Fi. 5: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 15 (1793).
Fi. 6: Kafka Miscellany, f. 139v 7 & 8 (1793).

Fi. 7: Kafka Miscellany, f. 147r, 7 (c.1794).

Fi. 8: Kafka Miscellany, f. 45r, 3(3) & 4(3) (c.1795).

~ 304 ~
Fi. 9: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 30r, 11 (1795 or 1798).

Fi. 10: Kafka Miscellany, f. 138r, 11 (late 1795/early 1796?).

Fi. 11: Landsberg 7, S. 55, 1 & 2 (1800-01).

Fi. 12: Grasnick 32, f. 1v, 1 (c.1808).

~ 305 ~
Fi. 13: Grasnick 32, f. 1v, 3 & 4 (c.1808).

Fi. 14: Grasnick 32, f. 2r, 1 (c.1808).

Fi. 15: Grasnick 32, f. 2r, 3 & 4 (c.1808).

Nb: ist zu bemerken daß der Daumen oder erster Finger sogleich untergesetzt werde.
Fi. 16: Grasnick 32, f. 3v, 1 (c.1808).

Fi. 17: Grasnick 32, f. 3v, 4 (c.1808).

Fi. 18: Grasnick 32, f. 3v, 5 (c.1808).

Fi. 19: Grasnick 32, f. 3v, 7 (c.1808).

Fi. 20: Grasnick 32, f. 4r, 1 (c.1808).
Fi. 21: Grasnick 32, f. 4r, 3 (c.1808).

Fi. 22: Beethovenhaus Bonn, BH 124, SV 98, 1 & 2 (c.1808).

Fi. 23: Beethovenhaus Bonn, BH 124, SV 98, 5 (c.1808).

N b: b e i g r ö ß e n we i t a u s g e h e n d e n o d e r g e d e h n t e n P a s s a g e n s o v i e l a l s m ö g l i c h e i n e r l e y F i n g e r s a z t
Finger Speed (See Vol. I Chapter 4.4)

Fs. 1: Wegeler Collection SV 329, f. 1r, 5(11) (c.1790).

Fs. 2: Kafka Miscellany, f. 88r, 14 (Oct. 1790).

Fs. 3: Kafka Miscellany, f. 88r, 14(13) (Oct. 1790).

Fs. 4: Kafka Miscellany, f. 88v, 15 (Oct. 1790).

Fs. 5: Kafka Miscellany, f. 50r, 15(5) & 16 (5) (c.1790).
Fs. 6: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 19v, 1 (c.1790).

Fs. 7: Kafka Miscellany, f. 125r, 1(5) & 2(5) (1790-early 1791).

Fs. 8: Kafka Miscellany, f. 125r, 1(7) (1790-early 1791).

Fs. 9: Kafka Miscellany, f. 125r, 7(18) (1790-early 1791).

Fs. 10: Kafka Miscellany, f. 125r, 7(19) (1790-early 1791).

Fs. 11: Kafka Miscellany, f. 100r, 10(5) & 11(5) (c.1790-1791).

Fs. 12: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 2r, 8(17) (1790-1792).
Fs. 13: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 2r, 14 (1790-1792).

Fs. 14: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 2v, 2(4) & 3(4) (1790-1792).

Fs. 15: Kafka Miscellany, f. 130v, 3(5) & 4(5) (1792?).

Fs. 16: Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 7 & 8 (1793).

Fs. 17: Kafka Miscellany, f. 52r, 6 & 7 (1793).

Fs. 18: Kafka Miscellany, f. 53r, 2 (1793).
Fs. 19: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 9(2) & 10(2) (1793).

Fs. 20: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 12(4) & 13(4) (1793).

Fs. 21: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v 18, 10 & 12 (1793).

Fs. 22: Kafka Miscellany, f. 40r, 3 & 4 (1793).
Fs. 23: Kafka Miscellany, f. 40r, 3(4) & 4(4) (1793).

Fs. 24: Kafka Miscellany, f. 40r, 5(6) (1793).

Fs. 25: Kafka Miscellany, f. 52r, 3 & 4 (1793).

Fs. 26: Kafka Miscellany, f. 150r, 13 & 14 (1793).
Fs. 27: Kafka Miscellany, f. 161r, 15(14) (1793).

Fs. 28: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 3r, 13(5) & 14(5) (1793).

Fs. 29: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 3v, 15(4) & 16(4) (1793).

Fs. 30: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 4r, 3(3) & 4(3) (1793).
Fs. 31: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 18v, 12(4) (1793).

Fs. 32: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 51r, 7(4) & 8(4) (1793).

Fs. 33: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 51r, 15 (1793).

Fs. 34: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 55r, 3 & 4 (1793).

Fs. 35: Kafka Miscellany, f. 97v, 9(2) & 10(2) (c.1794).
Fs. 36: Kafka Miscellany, f. 97v, 13 & 14 (c.1794).

Fs. 37: Kafka Miscellany, f. 97v, 15 & 16 (c.1794).

Fs. 38: Kafka Miscellany, f. 99r, 16 (c.1794).

Fs. 39: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 47r, 2(2) (1794).

Fs. 40: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 47v, 3 & 4 (1794).

Fs. 41: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 47v, 9(5) (1794).
Fs. 42: Meyer Collection SV 361, 5 (c.1794).

Fs. 43: Kafka Miscellany, f. 132v, 7(1) (late 1794/early 1795).

Fs. 44: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 25v, 7(2) & 8(2) (late 1794/early 1795).

Fs. 45: Kafka Miscellany, f. 131r, 5(4) & 6(4) (late 1794/early 1795).
Fs. 46: Kafka Miscellany, f. 73v, 6 (early 1796).

Fs. 47: Kafka Miscellany, f. 71r, 5 (1796).

Fs. 48: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 27r, 1 (7) (1796/early 1797).

Fs. 49: Kafka Miscellany, f. 67r, 13(5) (late 1797/early 1798).

Fs. 50: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 41r, 10(3) (1797/1798).

Fs. 51: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 45r, 9(9) (late 1797/early 1798).

Fs. 52: Grasnick 2, S. 9, 5 & 6 (1799-1800).

\textit{alegretto}
Fs. 53: Grasnick 2, S. 13, 2 & 3 (1799-1800).

Fs. 54: Grasnick 2, S. 74, 11 (1799-1800).


Fs. 56: Autograph 19e, f. 1r, 2 & 3 (May-August 1800).

Fs. 57: Landsberg 5, S. 68, 1 & 2 (1809).
Fs. 58: Landsberg 5, S. 86, 2 (1809).

Fs. 59: Landsberg 5, S. 110, 12 & 13 (1809).
Equalisation of the Hands (See Vol. I Chapter 4.5)

Eq. 1: Kafka Miscellany, f. 50v, 14 & 15 (c.1790).

Eq. 2: Kafka Miscellany, f. 125r, 7(13) & 8(13) (1790-early 1791).

Eq. 3: Kafka Miscellany, f. 61v, 7(3) & 8(3) (1792).

Eq. 4: Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 15(9) & 16(9) (1793).
Eq. 5: Kafka Miscellany, f. 54r, 7 (1793).

Eq. 6: Kafka Miscellany, f. 54r, 14(3) & 15(3) (1793).

Eq. 7: Kafka Miscellany, f. 52r, 1 & 2 (1793).
Eq. 8: Kafka Miscellany, f. 160v, 15 & 16 (1793).

Eq. 9: Kafka Miscellany, f. 161r, 3 & 4 (1793).

Eq. 10: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 52v, 1 & 2 (1793).

Eq. 11: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 47r, 3 & 4 (1794).

Eq. 12: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 25r, 13 & 14 (late 1794/early 1795).
Eq. 13: Kafka Miscellany, f. 55v, 12 & 13 (c.1795).

Eq. 14: Kafka Miscellany, f. 45v, 10 & 11 (c.1795).

Eq. 15: Kafka Miscellany, f. 68r, 9 & 10 (early 1795).

Eq. 16: Kafka Miscellany, f. 68r, 11(3) & 12(3) (early 1795).
Eq. 17: Kafka Miscellany, f. 128r, 4(9) (1795).

Eq. 18: Kafka Miscellany, f. 128r, 5 & 6 (1795).

Eq. 19: Grasnick 2, S. 13, 7(11) & 8(11) (1799-1800).

Eq. 20: Autograph 19e, f. 9r, 2 & 3 (May-August 1800).
Eq. 21: Wielhorsky, p. 46, 4 & 5 (autumn 1802-May 1803).

Eq. 22: Landsberg 6, p. 107, 11 & 12 (1803-1804).

Eq. 23: Landsberg 5, S. 74, 1 & 2 (1809).

Eq. 24: Landsberg 5, S. 74, 5 & 6 (1809).
Keyboard Geography

Stretches and Finger Extensions (See Vol. I Chapter 5.1)

St. 1: Koblenz Wegeler Collection SV 329, f. 1r, 3(4) & 4(4) (c.1790).

St. 2: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 19r, 14(10) (c.1790).

St. 3: Kafka Miscellany, f. 154r, 10(2) & 11(2) c.1790-1791.

St. 4: Kafka Miscellany, f. 125r, 11(12) & 12(12) (1790-early 1791).

St. 5: Kafka Miscellany, f. 125v, 7(5) (1790-early 1791).
St. 6: Kafka Miscellany, f. 153r, 3(10) & 4(10) (c.1792).

St. 7: Kafka Miscellany, f. 61v, 11(12) & 12(8) (1792).

Presto

St. 8: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 51r, 9 & 10 (1793).

St. 9: Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 5 & 6 (1793).

St. 10: Kafka Miscellany, f. 54v, 5 & 6 (1793).
St. 11: Kafka Miscellany, f. 54v, 9(5) & 10(5) (1793).

St. 12: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 1 (1793).

St. 13: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 16(4) (1793).

St. 14: Kafka Miscellany, f. 40v, 2(4) (1793).

St. 15: Kafka Miscellany, f. 42r, 1 & 2 (1793).
St. 16: Kafka Miscellany, f. 47r, 15(3) & 16(3) (1793).

St. 17: Kafka Miscellany, f. 161r, 7 (1793).

St. 18: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 4r, 9(2) & 10(2) (1793).

St. 19: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 4v, 3 & 4 (1793).
St. 20: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 52v, 14(5) & 15(5) (1793).

St. 21: Kafka Miscellany, f. 98r, 9 & 10 (c. 1794).


St. 23: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 47v, 9 & 10 (1794).

St. 24: Kafka Miscellany, f. 120r, 11(5) & 12(5) (1794).
St. 25: Kafka Miscellany, f. 131r, 9 & 10 (late 1794/early 1795).

St. 26: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 34r, 2 (first half 1798).
Leaps (See Vol. I Chapter 5.2)

Le. 1: Kafka Miscellany, f. 50v, 8(7) & 9(7) (c.1790).

Le. 2: Kafka Miscellany, f. 88v, 12 & 13 (Oct. 1790).

Le. 3: Kafka Miscellany, f. 123r, 5 & 6 (c. early 1791).

Le. 4: Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 5(2) (1793).
Le. 5: Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 9(7) & 10(7) (1793).

Le. 6: Kafka Miscellany, f. 53v, 13(7) & 14(7) (1793).

Le. 7: Kafka Miscellany, f. 54r, 10 & 11 (1793).

Le. 8: Kafka Miscellany, f. 54r, 12 & 13 (1793).
Le. 9: Kafka Miscellany, f. 139r, 7 & 8 (1793).

Le. 10: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39r, 10(7) & 11(7) (1793).

Le. 11: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 11(end) (1793).

Le. 12: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39v, 16 (1793).

Le. 13: Kafka Miscellany, f. 40r, 6(6) (1793).

Le. 14: Kafka Miscellany, f. 47r, 15(6) & 16(6) (1793).
Le. 15: Kafka Miscellany, f. 47v, 7(5) & 8(5) (1793).

Le. 16: Kafka Miscellany, f. 47v, 9 & 10 (1793).

Le. 17: Kafka Miscellany, f. 51r, 3(9) & 4(9) (1793).

Le. 18: Kafka Miscellany, f. 161r, 8 & 9 (1793).

Le. 19: Kafka Miscellany, f. 161r, 15(14) & 16(14) (1793).
Le. 20: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 5v, 15(3) & 16(3) (1793).

Le. 21: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 51v, 7(3) & 8(3) (1793).

Le. 22: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 53r, 5(3) & 6(3) (1793).
Le. 23: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 53r, 11 & 12 (1793).

Le. 24: Kafka Miscellany, f. 140v, 15(5) & 16(5) (c.1794).

Le. 25: Kafka Miscellany, f. 120r, 9 & 10 (1794).

Le. 26: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 47v, 7 & 8 (1794).
Le. 27: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 25v, 15 & 16 (late 1794/early 1795).

Le. 28: Kafka Miscellany, f. 134r, 3(2) & 4(2) (late 1794/early 1795).

Le. 29: Kafka Miscellany, f. 55v, 14 & 15 (c.1795).

Le. 30: Kafka Miscellany, f. 73r, 5 & 6 (Early 1796).

Le. 31: Kessler, f. 23v, 1 & 2 (1801-1802).
Le. 32: Kessler, f. 62r, 7 & 8 (1801-1802).

Le. 33: Kessler, f. 90r, 14 & 15 (1801-1802).
Extended Techniques

Trills and Oscillations (See Vol. I Chapter 6.1)

Tr. 1: Kafka Miscellany, f. 125r, 9 & 10 (1790-early 1791).

Tr. 2: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 2v, 2(1) & 3(1) (1790-1792).

Tr. 3: Kafka Miscellany, f. 61v, 5(4) & 6(4) (1792).

Tr. 4: Kafka Miscellany, f. 61v, 15(5) & 16(5) (1792).

Tr. 5: Kafka Miscellany, f. 46r, 7(4) & 8(4) (1793).
Tr. 6: Kafka Miscellany, f. 47r, 15 & 16 (1793).

Tr. 7: Kafka Miscellany, f. 51r, 1(6) & 2(5) (1793).

Tr. 8: Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 9(7) & 10(7) (1793).

Tr. 9: Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 13(3) (1793).

Tr. 10: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 54v, 3 & 4 (1793).
Tr. 11: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 56v, 7 & 8 (1793).

Tr. 12: Kafka Miscellany, f. 98r, 9 & 10 (c. 1794)
Tr. 13: Kafka Miscellany, f. 120r, 1 & 2 (1794).

Tr. 14: Kafka Miscellany, f. 131r, 5 & 6 (late 1794/early 1795).

Tr. 15: Kafka Miscellany, f. 132v, 7(2) (late 1794/early 1795).

Tr. 16: Kafka Miscellany, f. 126v, 16 (1795).

Tr. 17: Kafka Miscellany, f. 128r, 3(4) (1795).
Tr. 18: Kafka Miscellany, f. 57v, 3 & 4 (1796).

Tr. 19: Kafka Miscellany, f. 71r, 8 & 9 (1796).

Tr. 20: Landsberg 5, S. 38, 13 & 14 (1809).
Note Repetitions (See Vol. I Chapter 6.2)

Nr. 1: Kafka Miscellany, f. 154r, 8(7) & 6(6) (c.1790-1791).

Nr. 2: Kafka Miscellany, f. 61v, 3(5) & 4(5) (1792).

Nr. 3: Kafka Miscellany, f. 89r, 11(5) & 12(5) (1793).

Nr. 4: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39r, 10 & 11 (1793).
Nr. 5: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 3r, 15 & 16 (1793).

Nr. 6: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 3v, 7(3) & 8(3) (1793).

Nr. 7: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 4v, 11 & 12 (1793).

Nr. 8: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 5r, 3 & 4 (1793).
Nr. 9: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 5v, 13(2) & 14(2) (1793).

Nr. 10: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 51r, 5(6) & 6(6) (1793).

Nr. 11: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 51v, 7(7) & 8(7) (1793).

Nr. 12: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 52v, 12(7) & 13(7) (1793).
Nr. 13: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 54v, 13 & 14 (1793).

Nr. 14: Kafka Miscellany, f. 120r, 11 & 12 (1794).

Nr. 15: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 47v, 1 & 2 (1794).

Nr. 16: Kafka Miscellany, f. 55v, 6(8) & 7(8) (c.1795).

Nr. 17: Kafka Miscellany, f. 128r, 1(10) & 2(10) (1795).
Nr. 18: Kafka Miscellany, f. 48v, 5 & 6 (mid 1796).

Nr. 19: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 9v, 7 & 8 (late 1796/early 1797).

Nr. 20: Grasnick 2, S. 74, 14 (1799-1800).

Nr. 21: Landsberg 5, S. 57, 1(6) & 2(6) (1809).
Octave Passages (See Vol. I Chapter 6.3)

Oc. 1: Kafka Miscellany, f. 88r, 8 & 9 (Oct. 1790).

Oc. 2: Kafka Miscellany, f. 100r, 10(8) & 11(6) (c.1790-1791).

Oc. 3 Miscellaneous leaf (1790-1792), taken from Nottebohm, *Zweite Beethoveniana*, p. 360.

Oc. 4: Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 7(5) & 8(5) (1793).
Oc. 5: Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 11(2) & 12(2) (1793).

Oc. 6: Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 9 & 10 (1793).

Oc. 7: Kafka Miscellany, f. 54v, 9 & 10 (1793).

Oc. 8: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 4r, 7(10) & 8(10) (1793).

Oc. 9: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 52r, 15 & 16 (1793).
Oc. 10: Kafka Miscellany, f. 42v, 14 & 15 (1793).

Oc. 11: Kafka Miscellany, f. 140r, 1(2) & 2(2) (c.1794).

Oc. 12: Kafka Miscellany, f. 140r, 5 & 6 (c.1794).

Oc. 13: Kafka Miscellany, f. 133v, 11 & 12 (late 1794/early 1795).
Oc. 14: Kafka Miscellany, f. 134v, 1(6) & 2(6) (late 1794/early 1795).

Oc. 15: Kafka Miscellany, f. 134v, 3(3) (late 1794/early 1795).

Oc. 16: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 48r, 1 & 2 (late 1794/early 1795).

Oc. 17: Kafka Miscellany, f. 68v, 5 & 6 (Early 1795).

Oc. 18: Grasnick 2, S. 8, 1 & 2 (1799-1800).
Oc. 19: Grasnick 2, S. 64, 6 & 7 (1799-1800).

Oc. 20: Grasnick 2, S. 80, 12(11) & 13(11) (1799-1800).

Oc. 21: Wielhorsky, p. 15, 6 & 7 (1802-1803).


\textit{allegro}:
Oc. 23: Landsberg 5, S. 55, 4(1) & 5 (1809).
Double Thirds (See Vol. I Chapter 6.4)

Dt. 1: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 19r, 7(7) (c.1790).

Dt. 2: Kafka Miscellany, f. 50r, 1(10) (c.1790).

Dt. 3: Kafka Miscellany, f. 50v, 10(5) & 11(5) (c.1790).

Dt. 4: Kafka Miscellany, f. 125v, 7(7) (1790-early 1791).
Dt. 5: Kafka Miscellany, f. 100r, 1 & 2 (c.1790-1791).

Dt. 6: Kafka Miscellany, f. 54r, 5 & 6 (1793).

Dt. 7: Kafka Miscellany, f. 89r, 1(5) & 2(5) (1793).

Dt. 8: Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 5(3) & 6(3) (1793).
Dt. 9: Kafka Miscellany, f. 39r, 12 & 13 (1793).

Dt. 10: Kafka Miscellany, f. 40v, 5 & 6 (1793).

Dt. 11: Kafka Miscellany, f. 41r, 12(3) & 13(3) (1793).
Dt. 12: Kafka Miscellany, f. 140r, 3 & 4 (1793).

Dt. 13: Meyer Collection Paris, SV 361, 8(2) (c.1794).

Dt. 14: Beethoven Haus, NE 105, 1r, 7(2) (c.1794).

Dt. 15: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 25v, 2 & 3 (late 1794/early 1795).

Dt. 16: Kafka Miscellany, f. 44v, 1 & 2 (1795?).
Dt. 17: Kafka Miscellany, f. 71r, 1 & 2 (1796).

\[\text{adagio mit doppelp Griffen}\]

Dt. 18: Kafka Miscellany, f. 48v, 9(7) & 10(7) (mid 1796).

\[\text{ms: g" flat}\]

Dt. 19: Kafka Miscellany, f. 66v, 15 & 16 (late 1797/early 1798).

Dt. 20: Wielhorsky, p. 86, 10 (1802-1803).

Dt. 21: Wielhorsky, p. 87, 1 & 2 (1802-1803).
Dt. 22: Landsberg 5, S. 81, 13 & 14 (1809).
Experimental Sonorities

(See Vol. I Chapter 7)


Allegro con brio

So. 2: Kafka Miscellany, f. 96r, 9(4) & 10(14) (c.1791).

So. 3: Kafka Miscellany, f. 123r, 5 & 6 (c. Early 1791).
So. 4: Kafka Miscellany, f. 125v, 15(10) & 16(10) (1790-early 1791).

So. 5: Kafka Miscellany, f. 89v, 15(6) & 16(6) (1793).

So. 6: Kafka Miscellany, f. 51r, 5 & 6 (1793).

So. 7: Kafka Miscellany, f. 51v, 1(7) & 2(7) (1793).

Transcription is Kerman’s, Autograph Miscellany, Vol. ii, p. 248. The lower half of the last line of text has been cut off in the facsimile.
So. 8: Kafka Miscellany, f. 53v, 9(7) & 10(7) (1793).

So. 9: Kafka Miscellany, f. 139v, 13(4) & 14(4) (1793).

So. 10: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 4r, 13(5) & 14(5) (1793).

So. 11: Fischhof Miscellany, f. 4r, 15(12) & 16(12) (1793).

So. 12: Kafka Miscellany, f. 138v, 11 & 12 (late 1795/early 1796?).
So. 13: Landsberg 5, S. 54, 15 & 16 (1809).

So. 14: Landsberg 5, S. 52, 8 & 9 (1809).
Index of Figurations

Arpeggios and Broken Chords

Ar. 1........................................................................................................... 108, 110, 299
Ar. 2........................................................................................................... 108, 110, 299
Ar. 3........................................................................................................... 108, 112, 299
Ar. 4............................................................................................................... 108, 300
Ar. 5........................................................................................................... 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 231, 232, 300
Ar. 6........................................................................................................... 108, 112, 114, 300
Ar. 7........................................................................................................... 108, 110, 300
Ar. 8........................................................................................................... 108, 109, 113, 231, 232, 301
Ar. 9............................................................................................................... 99, 108, 110, 113, 301
Ar. 10........................................................................................................... 108, 301
Ar. 11........................................................................................................... 108, 111, 112, 114, 146, 232, 234, 301
Ar. 12........................................................................................................... 108, 111, 112, 114, 134, 234, 301
Ar. 13........................................................................................................... 108, 111, 112, 234, 301
Ar. 14........................................................................................................... 108, 111, 302

Double Thirds

Dt. 1........................................................................................................... 237, 241, 245, 246, 250, 357
Dt. 2........................................................................................................... 237, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 251, 273, 357
Dt. 3........................................................................................................... 237, 249, 251, 357
Dt. 4........................................................................................................... 237, 247, 357
Dt. 5........................................................................................................... 237, 247, 358
Dt. 6........................................................................................................... 237, 249, 251, 358
Dt. 7........................................................................................................... 237, 249, 251, 358
Dt. 8........................................................................................................... 237, 241, 243, 244, 358
Dt. 9........................................................................................................... 237, 241, 246, 359
Dt. 10........................................................................................................... 32, 195, 237, 240, 241, 244, 245, 246, 249, 359
Dt. 11........................................................................................................... 237, 249, 251, 359
Dt. 12........................................................................................................... 237, 241, 244, 247, 248, 360
Dt. 13........................................................................................................... 100, 237, 243, 246, 360
Dt. 14........................................................................................................... 237, 241, 245, 246, 360
Dt. 15........................................................................................................... 237, 247, 248, 360
Dt. 16........................................................................................................... 237, 249, 250, 360
Dt. 17........................................................................................................... 32, 237, 240, 243, 361
Dt. 18........................................................................................................... 237, 241, 249, 251, 361
Dt. 19........................................................................................................... 237, 249, 361
Dt. 20........................................................................................................... 237, 248, 249, 361
Dt. 21........................................................................................................... 237, 241, 248, 249, 361
Dt. 22........................................................................................................... 237, 249, 362

Equalisation of the Hands

Eq. 1........................................................................................................... 153, 155, 156, 162, 321
Eq. 2........................................................................................................... 153, 163, 164, 321
Eq. 3........................................................................................................... 153, 155, 156, 321
Eq. 4........................................................................................................... 153, 163, 166, 167, 321
Eq. 5........................................................................................................... 40, 153, 155, 156, 157, 158, 322
Eq. 6........................................................................................................... 153, 159, 162, 322
Eq. 7........................................................................................................... 153, 155, 156, 322
Eq. 8........................................................................................................... 153, 158, 323
Eq. 9........................................................................................................... 153, 163, 166, 167, 323
Eq. 10......................................................................................................... 153, 163, 156, 323
Eq. 11......................................................................................................... 153, 162, 323
Eq. 12......................................................................................................... 153, 163, 164, 165, 323
Eq. 13......................................................................................................... 153, 163, 164, 324
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fingering</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 1</td>
<td>32, 98, 115, 116, 117, 130, 131, 146, 175, 201, 205, 263, 267, 268, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 2</td>
<td>32, 115, 116, 117, 126, 127, 134, 171, 191, 196, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 3</td>
<td>31, 115, 116, 117, 122, 123, 124, 171, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 4</td>
<td>31, 103, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 146, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 5</td>
<td>31, 115, 117, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 134, 194, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 7</td>
<td>32, 115, 128, 134, 260, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 8</td>
<td>32, 115, 116, 126, 127, 134, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 9</td>
<td>115, 116, 129, 142, 264, 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 10</td>
<td>115, 116, 129, 142, 264, 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 11</td>
<td>115, 116, 130, 231, 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 12</td>
<td>115, 117, 130, 132, 146, 264, 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 13</td>
<td>115, 117, 132, 133, 241, 264, 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 14</td>
<td>115, 132, 240, 264, 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 15</td>
<td>115, 132, 264, 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 16</td>
<td>115, 121, 123, 134, 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 17</td>
<td>115, 134, 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 18</td>
<td>115, 142, 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 19</td>
<td>115, 134, 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 20</td>
<td>115, 130, 134, 241, 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 21</td>
<td>115, 130, 134, 241, 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 22</td>
<td>115, 130, 134, 241, 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi. 23</td>
<td>115, 117, 132, 264, 308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finger Speed</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 1</td>
<td>136, 137, 140, 142, 143, 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 2</td>
<td>136, 137, 151, 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 3</td>
<td>136, 137, 146, 147, 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 4</td>
<td>137, 146, 147, 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 5</td>
<td>136, 137, 151, 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 6</td>
<td>136, 137, 151, 152, 262, 264, 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 7</td>
<td>136, 137, 151, 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 8</td>
<td>136, 148, 151, 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 9</td>
<td>136, 137, 140, 151, 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 10</td>
<td>136, 137, 144, 145, 151, 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 11</td>
<td>136, 137, 144, 145, 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 12</td>
<td>136, 137, 140, 143, 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 13</td>
<td>136, 137, 148, 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 14</td>
<td>136, 137, 144, 145, 146, 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 15</td>
<td>136, 137, 149, 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 16</td>
<td>136, 137, 140, 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 17</td>
<td>136, 137, 150, 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 18</td>
<td>136, 137, 140, 142, 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs. 19</td>
<td>136, 137, 144, 312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fs. 20 ............................................................. 136, 137, 144, 312
Fs. 21 ............................................................. 136, 146, 148, 269, 312
Fs. 22 ............................................................. 136, 137, 146, 149, 312
Fs. 25 ............................................................. 136, 137, 313
Fs. 24 ............................................................. 136, 137, 140, 241, 313
Fs. 25 ............................................................. 136, 137, 143, 313
Fs. 26 ............................................................. 136, 137, 148, 313
Fs. 27 ............................................................. 136, 137, 148, 314
Fs. 28 ............................................................. 136, 137, 314
Fs. 29 ............................................................. 136, 137, 314
Fs. 30 ............................................................. 136, 137, 149, 314
Fs. 31 ............................................................. 136, 137, 146, 147, 152, 315
Fs. 32 ............................................................. 136, 137, 149, 315
Fs. 33 ............................................................. 136, 137, 315
Fs. 34 ............................................................. 136, 137, 148, 149, 273, 315
Fs. 35 ............................................................. 136, 137, 140, 141, 315
Fs. 36 ............................................................. 136, 137, 140, 316
Fs. 37 ............................................................. 136, 137, 151, 316
Fs. 38 ............................................................. 136, 137, 151, 316
Fs. 39 ............................................................. 136, 137, 148, 148, 316
Fs. 40 ............................................................. 136, 137, 150, 316
Fs. 41 ............................................................. 136, 137, 146, 316
Fs. 42 ............................................................. 100, 136, 137, 139, 140, 317
Fs. 43 ............................................................. 136, 137, 140, 142, 143, 145, 147, 317
Fs. 44 ............................................................. 136, 137, 146, 150, 317
Fs. 45 ............................................................. 136, 137, 150, 317
Fs. 46 ............................................................. 136, 137, 143, 144, 318
Fs. 47 ............................................................. 136, 137, 146, 318
Fs. 48 ............................................................. 136, 137, 144, 318
Fs. 49 ............................................................. 136, 137, 140, 318
Fs. 50 ............................................................. 136, 137, 140, 318
Fs. 51 ............................................................. 136, 137, 318
Fs. 52 ............................................................. 136, 137, 151, 318
Fs. 53 ............................................................. 136, 137, 150, 319
Fs. 54 ............................................................. 136, 137, 140, 319
Fs. 55 ............................................................. 136, 137, 144, 319
Fs. 56 ............................................................. 136, 137, 143, 148, 319
Fs. 57 ............................................................. 136, 137, 150, 319
Fs. 58 ............................................................. 136, 137, 146, 147, 152, 320
Fs. 59 ............................................................. 136, 137, 144, 145, 320

Leaps

Le. 1 ............................................................. 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 333
Le. 2 ............................................................. 185, 187, 333
Le. 3 ............................................................. 185, 187, 188, 190, 333
Le. 4 ............................................................. 185, 191, 192, 195, 196
Le. 5 ............................................................. 185, 196, 197, 334
Le. 6 ............................................................. 185, 187, 189, 190, 334
Le. 7 ............................................................. 185, 334
Le. 8 ............................................................. 185, 197, 334
Le. 9 ............................................................. 185, 186, 187, 188, 191, 192, 196, 335
Le. 10 ............................................................. 185, 335
Le. 11 ............................................................. 185, 192, 193, 195, 196, 335
Le. 12 ............................................................. 145, 185, 186, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 335
Le. 13 ............................................................. 31, 185, 186, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 335
Le. 14 ............................................................. 185, 187, 190, 335
Le. 15 ............................................................. 185, 187, 188, 190, 336
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Le. 16...........................................................................................................185, 187, 189, 336
Le. 17...........................................................................................................185, 187, 189, 190, 336
Le. 18.........................................................................................................185, 196, 336
Le. 19.........................................................................................................185, 336
Le. 20.........................................................................................................185, 191, 192, 337
Le. 21.........................................................................................................185, 195, 337
Le. 22.........................................................................................................185, 187, 195, 337
Le. 23.........................................................................................................185, 186, 195, 196, 338
Le. 24.........................................................................................................185, 191, 338
Le. 25.........................................................................................................185, 187, 189, 190, 195, 338
Le. 26.........................................................................................................185, 195, 338
Le. 27.........................................................................................................185, 339
Le. 28.........................................................................................................185, 186, 195, 339
Le. 29.........................................................................................................185, 196, 339
Le. 30.........................................................................................................185, 339
Le. 31.........................................................................................................169, 185, 186, 195, 339
Le. 32.........................................................................................................185, 187, 340
Le. 33.........................................................................................................185, 187, 340

**Note Repetitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Repetitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>214, 217, 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>214, 219, 224, 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>214, 223, 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>214, 223, 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>214, 217, 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>214, 217, 221, 222, 224, 273, 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>214, 221, 224, 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>214, 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>214, 217, 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>214, 223, 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>214, 223, 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>214, 219, 224, 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>214, 223, 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>214, 223, 224, 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>214, 221, 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>214, 220, 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>214, 217, 218, 219, 224, 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>214, 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>214, 223, 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>214, 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>214, 224, 350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Octaves**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oc. 1</th>
<th>Repetitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>225, 227, 228, 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32, 146, 225, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 235, 236, 271, 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>225, 229, 230, 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>225, 231, 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>204, 225, 234, 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>225, 227, 232, 233, 234, 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>225, 231, 233, 235, 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>225, 231, 232, 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>225, 231, 232, 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>225, 229, 230, 234, 236, 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>225, 227, 229, 230, 234, 236, 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>225, 230, 234, 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>225, 233, 234, 236, 354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scales

Sc. 1.......................................................................................................................... 91, 92, 101, 102, 106, 113, 292
Sc. 2.......................................................................................................................... 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 113, 114, 253, 273, 292
Sc. 3.......................................................................................................................... 92, 105, 292
Sc. 4.......................................................................................................................... 32, 92, 95, 106, 107, 113, 146, 292
Sc. 5.......................................................................................................................... 91, 92, 95, 98, 100, 114, 292
Sc. 6.......................................................................................................................... 91, 92, 101, 293
Sc. 7.......................................................................................................................... 92, 99, 100, 110, 113, 146, 147, 232, 271, 293
Sc. 8.......................................................................................................................... 92, 106, 107, 293
Sc. 9.......................................................................................................................... 92, 95, 99, 100, 114, 241, 293
Sc. 10......................................................................................................................... 92, 95, 103, 105, 120, 121, 293
Sc. 11........................................................................................................................ 92, 95, 113, 294
Sc. 12........................................................................................................................ 91, 92, 294
Sc. 13........................................................................................................................ 91, 92, 99, 100, 114, 234, 243, 246, 271, 294
Sc. 14........................................................................................................................ 92, 99, 100, 234, 243, 246, 294
Sc. 15........................................................................................................................ 92, 99, 100, 114, 234, 243, 246, 271, 294
Sc. 16........................................................................................................................ 91, 92, 99, 100, 114, 234, 243, 246, 271, 295
Sc. 17........................................................................................................................ 92, 105, 295
Sc. 18........................................................................................................................ 92, 105, 295
Sc. 19........................................................................................................................ 92, 295
Sc. 20........................................................................................................................ 92, 296
Sc. 21........................................................................................................................ 91, 92, 296
Sc. 22........................................................................................................................ 91, 92, 296
Sc. 23........................................................................................................................ 91, 92, 100, 114, 134, 234, 296
Sc. 24........................................................................................................................ 91, 92, 100, 113, 114, 134, 234, 296
Sc. 25........................................................................................................................ 91, 92, 101, 104, 234, 297
Sc. 26........................................................................................................................ 91, 92, 95, 100, 106, 113, 163, 234, 236, 271, 297
Sc. 27........................................................................................................................ 92, 100, 106, 163, 234, 236, 297
Sc. 28........................................................................................................................ 92, 100, 104, 163, 234, 236, 297
Sc. 29........................................................................................................................ 91, 92, 100, 104, 163, 234, 236, 297
Sc. 30........................................................................................................................ 91, 92, 105, 298
Sc. 31........................................................................................................................ 91, 92, 105, 298
Sc. 32........................................................................................................................ 91, 92, 94, 95, 106, 113, 263, 271, 298

Experimental Sonorities

So. 1.......................................................................................................................... 252, 253, 363
So. 2.......................................................................................................................... 252, 259, 262, 363
So. 3.......................................................................................................................... 32, 252, 259, 260, 261, 262, 267, 363
So. 4.......................................................................................................................... 252, 256, 364
So. 5.......................................................................................................................... 252, 256, 257, 364
So. 6.......................................................................................................................... 32, 252, 255, 273, 364
So. 7.......................................................................................................................... 32, 252, 256, 258, 364
So. 8.......................................................................................................................... 252, 254, 365
So. 9.......................................................................................................................... 252, 256, 257, 258, 263, 365
So. 10......................................................................................................................... 32, 252, 253, 254, 262, 365
So. 11........................................................................................................................ 252, 255, 365
So. 12........................................................................................................................ 252, 256, 258, 259, 262, 263, 365
So. 13........................................................................................................................................252, 256, 258, 259, 366
So. 14........................................................................................................................................252, 254, 366

Stretches and Finger Extensions

St. 1 ........................................................................................................................................169, 170, 171, 172, 174, 327
St. 2 ........................................................................................................................................143, 169, 170, 171, 176, 177, 178, 179, 263, 327
St. 3 ........................................................................................................................................169, 170, 182, 327
St. 4 ........................................................................................................................................169, 170, 182, 327
St. 5 ........................................................................................................................................169, 170, 182, 327
St. 6 ........................................................................................................................................169, 170, 182, 328
St. 7 ........................................................................................................................................169, 170, 180, 181, 328
St. 8 ........................................................................................................................................170, 184, 328
St. 9 ........................................................................................................................................170, 171, 173, 174, 175, 198, 204, 269, 273, 328
St. 10 .....................................................................................................................................170, 171, 176, 179, 180, 328
St. 11 .....................................................................................................................................170, 171, 173, 174, 329
St. 12 .....................................................................................................................................170, 171, 181, 182, 329
St. 13 .....................................................................................................................................170, 180, 181, 252, 329
St. 14 .....................................................................................................................................170, 171, 182, 183, 329
St. 15 .....................................................................................................................................170, 182, 329
St. 16 .....................................................................................................................................170, 184, 330
St. 17 .....................................................................................................................................170, 171, 181, 330
St. 18 .....................................................................................................................................170, 171, 173, 330
St. 19 .....................................................................................................................................170, 171, 172, 173, 330
St. 20 .....................................................................................................................................170, 171, 182, 183, 184, 331
St. 21 .....................................................................................................................................170, 171, 174, 331
St. 22 .....................................................................................................................................170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 331
St. 23 .....................................................................................................................................170, 331
St. 24 .....................................................................................................................................170, 182, 331
St. 25 .....................................................................................................................................170, 184, 332
St. 26 .....................................................................................................................................170, 184, 332

Trills

Tr. 1 ........................................................................................................................................38, 199, 206, 273, 341
Tr. 2 ........................................................................................................................................199, 202, 207, 341
Tr. 3 ........................................................................................................................................199, 202, 208, 209, 210, 341
Tr. 4 ........................................................................................................................................199, 202, 205, 207, 341
Tr. 5 ........................................................................................................................................199, 208, 210, 211, 213, 341
Tr. 6 ........................................................................................................................................199, 202, 204, 342
Tr. 7 ........................................................................................................................................175, 199, 210, 211, 342
Tr. 8 ........................................................................................................................................175, 199, 204, 210, 212, 342
Tr. 9 ........................................................................................................................................175, 199, 204, 205, 207, 213, 269, 342
Tr. 10 .....................................................................................................................................175, 199, 207, 342
Tr. 11 .....................................................................................................................................199, 207, 210, 343
Tr. 12 .....................................................................................................................................199, 212, 213, 343
Tr. 13 .....................................................................................................................................199, 207, 344
Tr. 14 .....................................................................................................................................199, 210, 211, 213, 344
Tr. 15 .....................................................................................................................................199, 201, 202, 203, 204, 213, 344
Tr. 16 .....................................................................................................................................199, 211, 213, 344
Tr. 17 .....................................................................................................................................199, 211, 344
Tr. 18 .....................................................................................................................................199, 210, 212, 345
Tr. 19 .....................................................................................................................................199, 202, 203, 345
Tr. 20 .....................................................................................................................................199, 202, 203, 345