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Abstract

Ludwig van Beethoven’s music from the first decade of the nineteenth century has been described by musicologists as “heroic.” How is this heroic style conveyed in performance? Three of the most highly regarded twentieth-century interpreters of Beethoven’s music were the German music theorist, Heinrich Schenker (1868-1935), and two Austrian pianists, Artur Schnabel (1882-1951) and Alfred Brendel (b. 1931). While Schenker produced an edition of the sonatas and Brendel made a recording, Schnabel released both. This thesis focuses on how Schenker, Schnabel, and Brendel sought to convey the heroism in two of Beethoven’s middle-period sonatas, the “Waldstein,” Op.53 (1804) and the “Appassionata,” Op. 57 (1805). I focus on the development section in the first movement of each sonata.

I will argue that Schnabel’s approach, in both his printed edition and recordings, is the most pronounced of the three in realizing Beethoven’s heroic style. In his 1910 printed edition, Schenker faithfully copied the markings found in Beethoven’s original manuscript, arguing that “only Beethoven’s notation shows us the meaning of his contents.” In contrast, Schnabel’s 1935 edition enhances the source of heroic struggle by adding his own specific tempos, expressive markings, and pedal markings. Similarly, Schnabel’s recordings reveal great freedom in tempo, adding to his expressive style. Brendel’s 1964 recording, on the other hand, conveys less variation in tempo and, in general, a more restrained interpretation of the composer.

While there is no single, correct way to approach Beethoven’s works, the changing approaches over the years have had a significant impact.
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Introduction:  
Realization of Beethoven’s Heroic Style in Performance

“[…] it was only my art that held me back.”¹

This oft-quoted sentence from the Heiligenstadt Testament by Ludwig van Beethoven (1770-1827), dated October 6 and 10, 1802, has long been held as a clear statement on Beethoven’s determination to overcome personal struggles through his art and an important moment that marks a significant change in Beethoven’s compositional style. Beethoven’s psychological renewal, as one of his most influential biographers, Maynard Solomon, has shown, may be the reason for a change in his artistic expression:

What can be said is that the Heiligenstadt Testament is a leavetaking—which is to say, a fresh start. Beethoven here metaphorically enacted his own death in order that he might live again. He recreated himself in a new guise, self-sufficient and heroic.²

With the Heiligenstadt Testament, Beethoven was not only explaining who he was before and who he had become, but who he was resolved to become. Beethoven’s hope that his “determination will please the inexorable Parcae to break the thread,”³ as he puts it in the Testament (a reference to the three Roman goddesses who “determine the destiny of human

lives”), can be interpreted as Beethoven’s desire to take control of his own destiny. Numerous critics have characterized Beethoven’s music at the beginning of the nineteenth-century, his so-called “middle period,” as reflecting a personal struggle and his effort to overcome it, including William Kinderman in his 1995 biography *Beethoven*, Scott Burnham in *Beethoven Hero*, Carl Dahlhaus in *Ludwig van Beethoven: Approaches to His Music*, and Maynard Solomon in his 1998 biography *Beethoven.*

Beethoven’s output after he penned the *Heiligenstadt Testament* was larger than at any other point in his career. From the end of the year 1802 to 1816, Beethoven composed, among other works, three piano concertos; the so-called “Triple Concerto” for Piano, Violin, and Cello, Op. 56 (pub. 1808); three collections of string quartets; six symphonies; the two piano trios Op. 70 (pub. 1809); and eleven piano sonatas. In these works, Beethoven developed a new musical style. Beginning around 1804, with the publication of such works as the Symphony No. 3 (“Eroica”) in E-flat Major, Op. 55 and the “Waldstein” Sonata, Beethoven created a new set of “musical values,” as Burnham put it, which composers and listeners of the generation following Beethoven held in high regard.

These include thematic development as a way of making ever-greater stretches of music coherent and plastic (often resulting in action-reaction cycles), the captivating presence of

---

5 The nineteenth-century music critics Julius von Schlosser (1828), Francois-Joseph Fétis (1837), and Wilhelm Lenz (1852) have each divided Beethoven’s music into three periods. As Douglas Johnson observes, “Though each of these critics grouped Beethoven’s works differently, the three-period schema took hold and settled into something like a consensus: a first formative period ending around 1802, a second period lasting until around 1812 and the third period from 1813 to 1827.” (From Johnson, “Beethoven, Ludwig van,” *Grove Music Online* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.proxy-wcupa.klnpa.org/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000040026, accessed: August 10, 2018.
6 Opp. 37, 58, and 73.
7 Opp. 59 (“Razumovsky”), 74, and 95.
8 Opp. 55 (“Eroica”), 60, 67, 68, 92, and 93.
9 Opp. 28 (“Pastoral”), 31/1, 31/2 (“Tempest”), 31/3, 53 (“Waldstein”), 54, 57 (“Appassionata”), 78, 79, 81a (“Das Lebewohl”), and 90.
nonregular periodic structures, monolithic treatment of harmony, overall teleological motion, extreme and underdetermined closure, and the monumentalization of underlying formal articulations.\textsuperscript{10}

In short, Beethoven began to conceive his music on a larger scale, to create psychological reactions in the listener. He experimented with new approaches to standard compositional processes, challenging the light galant style of the late eighteenth-century with his own daring innovations that emphasized drama rather than elegance.

In this way, Beethoven’s music gives expression to the “heroic struggle.” Burnham interprets Beethoven’s “Eroica” Symphony in the context of the composer’s early admiration of Napoleon Bonaparte as a heroic figure. Burnham describes a dilemma created in the opening of the Eroica Symphony when an unexpected C-sharp appears in bar 7. He cites earlier critics A.B. Marx, one of the first scholars to map out the heroic elements in the Eroica Symphony, and Alexander Oulibicheff as offering “a neat solution to this dilemma in their Napoleon-oriented programs, both dating from the 1850s.”\textsuperscript{11} According to Burnham:

\begin{quote}

elements that impede the forward progress of the music or undermine its tonality are seen as external to the hero Napoleon and do not signify any weakness or vacillation on the part of the great general. Napoleon himself is stuck in forward gear, and the concept of the heroic implied in these interpretations is that of a singularly obsessed hero fighting against a recalcitrant external world.\textsuperscript{12}
\end{quote}

Thus, according to Marx, our understanding of the historical background of this symphony is what influences our conception of the work as heroic, rather than the symphony itself. This background provides the listener with extramusical ideas to associate with the music.

Chromaticism or repeated rhythmic figures stall the music’s progress toward its final goal – the

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 5  
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
cadence. The delay in the cadence’s arrival causes the music to continue moving forward, signifying a hero resolved to complete his journey.

On the other hand, some scholars argue that musical heroism is derived, not chiefly from external associations, but from how the music itself embodies and communicates the idea of heroism. In contrast with Marx, Kinderman argues that heroism is created in Beethoven through the music of the “Eroica” Symphony itself:

This work is neither simply a homage to Bonaparte nor a “programmatic” symphony in the conventional manner, whereby the music follows a literal narrative sequence. The continuity between movements in the Eroica is sufficiently compelling to force us to give it critical recognition. But what really counts here is not the imposition of associations from outside the work, but rather the recognition that the music itself embodies these associations in its structure, rhythmic movement, orchestration, and character. For want of a better formulation, we may refer to this phenomenon as an intrinsically musical narrative.13

The particular elements within the music create a psychological comparison to the human conception of heroism. For instance, Richard Freed argues that the horn calls in the Trio play a “hunting figure” that is “raised to a level consonant with the work’s title.”14 The recognition of such associations within the Eroica Symphony may be inferred from the fact that Beethoven erased Bonaparte’s name from the dedication page of the symphony. Beethoven once looked upon Bonaparte as a hero himself; but when Bonaparte crowned himself emperor, Beethoven sought out a new hero, which he embodied in his music. This “intrinsically musical narrative,” whereby the music creates heroic associations, is generated by a single germinal cell found at the beginning of the movement. Kinderman identifies this as being characteristic of Beethoven’s

---

compositional style from the first decade of the nineteenth-century and cites another work, the “Kreutzer” Sonata as using a similar technique:

The first movement begins with a weighty slow introduction, marked Adagio Sostenuto, protean in character and tonally unstable after its first four bars for unaccompanied violin in A major. This modulatory introduction gradually isolates the germinal motif of a rising second, which becomes a crucial element in all the themes in the ensuing Presto, in A minor. The relentless rhythmic drive of the Presto abates momentarily at the chorale-like second theme, marked dolce, a passage linked thematically to the introduction. Beethoven briefly recalls the Adagio, furthermore, in his coda.¹⁵

Thus, continuity from one musical idea to the next is what generates the musical narrative that defines Beethoven’s heroic style. It creates a seamless transition from one stage of the hero’s journey to the next using elements such as thematic connections, tonal instability, and rhythmic drive—the last two instilling in the listener a desire for the music to move forward to the next musical event. In addition to these musical elements, other, more heroic elements exist that can be associated with this style. For instance, the horn calls in the opening of the first movement sound like the horn calls used in depictions of war. These elements had been associated with heroism even before Beethoven incorporated them.

Two of Beethoven’s piano sonatas stand out as representatives of the heroic style: No. 21 in C Major, Op. 53, “Waldstein,” and No. 23 in F Minor, Op. 57, “Appassionata.” The “Waldstein” and “Appassionata” Sonatas were conceived at the heart of Beethoven’s middle period, in 1804 and 1805 respectively, when his experimentations had become more practiced and his heroic style was coming into focus.¹⁶ These two sonatas also reflect the advancements in piano construction in the early-nineteenth-century. Developments and improvements of the piano

---

¹⁶ See Charles Rosen, *Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas: A Short Companion* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), 192. Rosen states, “For musicians and public alike, this sonata (Waldstein) has remained, with the C minor Symphony, the archetypal example of Beethoven’s heroic style.”
pursued by piano builders in 1804, such as the French piano builder Sebastian Erard, contributed to Beethoven’s new compositional choices.

The “Waldstein” was written specifically for the new Erard piano and dedicated to Beethoven’s friend and patron Count Ferdinand Waldstein. The Erard piano had an expanded keyboard range of six-and-a-half octaves (compared to the four-octave range of Viennese pianos built around that time; see Figure 1 and Figure 2), and a wider dynamic range. More importantly, however, the Erard had a heavier and faster hammer-action than that found in Viennese pianos. This allowed Beethoven to play more expressively, placing greater weight on the keys in louder passages, in particular, since the piano could better withstand his forceful playing style. He was greatly influenced by the instrument’s capabilities, and as Tilman Skowroneck claims, the “Waldstein” Sonata was certainly directly inspired by the new, yet unchanged Erard. It is probably one of a very few of Beethoven’s works that draw on the resources of this particular type of piano in a positive and direct way.17

17 Tilman Skowroneck, Beethoven the Pianist (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 112.
18 Ibid., 103.

Figure 1: French Erard-style Pianoforte

Figure 2: Viennese Stein Pianoforte
Solomon remarks on how the “Waldstein” stretched the boundaries of eighteenth-century dynamics, technique, and sonority:

[Beethoven] no longer reined in the technical difficulties of his sonatas to permit performance by competent amateurs, but instead stretched the potentialities of both instrument and performers to their outer limits. The dynamics are greatly extended; colors are fantastic and luxuriant, approaching quasi-orchestral sonorities. For this reason, the critic Wilhelm von Lenz called the “Waldstein” “a heroic symphony for the piano.”

By “quasi-orchestral sonorities,” Solomon might mean volume and range. A careful examination of the score indicates that volume and range are significant in the “Waldstein.” Beethoven’s fortepiano dynamic markings at moments when the hands move far apart (such as at the end of the re-transition of the first movement, measures 152-155) exploit both the range and the expressive power of the Erard piano. It is for this reason that the “Waldstein” is deserving of the nickname given by Lenz (1809-1883), “heroic symphony for the piano.” These “quasi-orchestral,” “heroic,” and symphonic characters described by Solomon and Lenz may be a guide for the pianist as to how to interpret the Waldstein Sonata.

It is important to note that, despite the new, expanded range of the Erard, it is clear that Beethoven wished to expand the capabilities of the instrument even further, as evidenced in the “Waldstein.” Thus, the Erard, while certainly a larger instrument than any previous keyboard, was still not big enough for Beethoven’s ambitions. In the years following Beethoven’s death, piano builders redesigned the instrument to withstand a performer’s physical strength. As Emmanuel Ax claimed, Beethoven “was instrumental in the piano becoming a bigger, more powerful, and more flexible instrument because he was always writing to the piano makers to

---

20 William Kinderman provides a different translation of Lenz’s quote, “Klavierheldenthaten” as “heroic pianistic deeds.” Kinderman also states how Lenz described this sonata as having a “symphonistischen Wesen,” or “symphonic essence.” Kinderman and Solomon use different sources in citing this quote, and therefore developed two different translations. Kinderman, *Beethoven*, 97.
make the pianos bigger, stronger, louder.”21 Thus, his demands would come to influence the next generation of piano construction.

The “Appassionata” was also composed for the Erard, and dedicated to his patron and friend, Count Franz von Brunswick.22 The years 1806 and 1807 were a time of great personal conflict for Beethoven. He took on a post in Vienna offered him by the Count in which he taught the Count’s sisters, Countesses Therese von Brunswick and Josephine von Deym. Given the nature of what Eric Blom describes as Beethoven’s “infinite longing for feminine companionship,” it is perhaps not so surprising that his close work with the two sisters stirred in him a desire to be with them both.23 This desire was so strong that it distracted him from his music and he was forced to make a choice, not between one woman or the other, but between feminine companionship and his art. As Blom notes:

No doubt he felt, deep down that for one absorbed in music to the point of utter indifference to the world, indeed often to the normal decencies of life, a final choice had inevitably to be made between art and a wife. Beethoven never knew the meaning of compromise. There could be room enough in his life for one of the two things he most cared for: music and love. And, being the most purposeful of composers and the most vacillating of lovers, he decided in favour of his art.24

Blom postulates that Beethoven’s need to choose between his music and marriage must have stirred in him conflicting feelings. In the end, he chose his music, but even the personal conflict he felt in choosing between one or the other Countess certainly caused him inner turmoil, for as Blom claims:

---

22 According to Charles Rosen, Beethoven did not like the nickname from the publisher. “He was proud of the work, but he did not like the popular nickname it was given by the publisher, and which has remained attached. The term “appassionata” does not render the tragic character of the work, evident at once with the opening page.” Rosen, Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas, 192.
24 Ibid., 192.
The fact that the Brunswick sisters captivated him at almost, if not actually, the same time, made him suspicious of himself, as well as it might. How was he to trust to his heart, a heart so much at the mercy of nature on the one hand and ideals on the other? It may be that he found the choice between senses and sentiments to be as hard to make as that between music and marriage, and that he quailed before that also.  

This inner turmoil described by Blom was no doubt apparent to Beethoven’s contemporaries. Even people like Czerny described the sonata as a desperate “cry for help”:

If Beethoven, who was so fond of portraying scenes from nature, was perhaps thinking of ocean waves on a stormy night when from a distance a cry for help is heard, then such a picture will give the pianist a guide to the correct playing of this great tonal painting.

As Czerny observed, the “Appassionata” Sonata is a “stormy” piece expressing a moment of grave danger. The listener is reminded of someone facing a personal struggle. Thus, the “Appassionata” may just as well be called “an heroic symphony for the piano,” Lenz’s description of the “Waldstein.” These descriptions by Czerny and Lenz indicate how important it is to recognize how performers can communicate these emotional scenes to the listener.

In this thesis, I will examine how the heroism of the “Waldstein” and “Appassionata” was expressed in twentieth-century performance. Rather than attempt a comprehensive study of all performances of these works, I have chosen to focus on the work of three prominent twentieth-century interpreters of Beethoven’s middle period piano sonatas: Heinrich Schenker (1868-1935), Artur Schnabel (1882-1951), and Alfred Brendel (b. 1931). I will demonstrate that, of the three, Schnabel’s approach is most pronounced in realizing Beethoven’s heroic style.

Schenker and Schnabel published printed editions of the sonatas, while Schnabel and Brendel were the first two pianists to produce audio recordings of all of Beethoven’s piano sonatas. Editions and recordings are two different methods of performance interpretation. While

25 Ibid.
the editor of printed music instructs the performer on how to interpret the music, the recording presents the audience with the performer’s final interpretation. The performer and editor indirectly collaborate with one another to prepare the music for a performance. I will show in depth how important it is to examine editions, in order to understand the tradition of interpreting these sonatas. Print editions, including those by Schenker and Schnabel, as well as recordings by Schnabel and Brendel, each present different approaches toward realizing Beethoven’s heroic struggle. In order to examine the effect of recordings and editions on heroic struggle, one must understand the impact of each medium on performance in general.

With regard to recordings, in particular, it is important to recognize that, just as advances in the technology of piano construction influenced Beethoven’s composition, the advent of mechanical recording also influenced how Beethoven’s music was performed. One of the most important sources in the scholarship of recording and technology is Mark Katz’s article, “Beethoven in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction.” In this fascinating study, Katz compares recordings of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto (1806) across the twentieth- and into the twenty-first centuries. While Katz’s focus is on violin and orchestral performance, many of his methods apply usefully to other musical genres and broader musical ideas. Katz’s topic required “as large a sample as possible” in order to identify stylistic trends, and he studied aspects of string performance such as portamento and vibrato. He concluded that, over the years, tempos have slowed and portamento has “disappeared from performances.” Although some of these elements are irrelevant to my own study on piano performance, Katz’s discovery of the changes

---

29 Ibid., 53.
in tempo, duration, and articulation can be usefully applied to my own analysis of the piano sonatas.

Similarly, Robert Philip, in his essay “Traditional Habits of Performance in Early-Twentieth Century Recordings of Beethoven” discusses how over the twentieth century, we have gained a great deal of knowledge about performance practice in Beethoven’s day, regarding both the instruments he played and the approaches he took toward performance execution (tempos, articulations, etc.). However, Philip asks, “have we also lost something?” Philip’s article covers a wide range of instrumentations and genres (for example, the Violin Concerto in D major, Op. 61 and the String Quartet in C# minor, Op. 131), providing a broad overview of Beethoven’s music in general, including some of his piano sonatas (Piano Sonata in C# minor, Op. 27, No. 2 (“Moonlight”); Piano Sonata in C minor, Op. 13 (“Pathetique”)). His analysis of rhythmic details (such as over-dotting, accelerations in groups of semi-quavers) and tempo rubato, and how these elements are approached from one decade to another are some of the most revealing aspects of his study. Through his assessment of recordings like Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, conducted by Roger Norrington, and the “Kreutzer” Violin Sonata recordings by Jacques Thibaud on violin and Alfred Denis Cortot on piano, Philip concludes that much of the basic performance practice of the late twentieth century, which we take entirely for granted, is of very recent development. If this is true, then in order to get back to earlier traditions of performance, back to Beethoven, we would do well to take as our starting point the period before these modern practices developed—that is, the period of early recordings.\(^{30}\)

Thus, Philip’s comparison of tempos and rhythmic details, and how these are expressed in performance from one generation to the next, will be equally helpful in assessing performance interpretations of the “Waldstein” and “Appassionata” Sonatas.

---

By studying the changing attitudes toward the performance practice of Beethoven’s middle period piano sonatas between the early- to mid-twentieth-century in the critical editions and earliest recordings of the complete sonatas, we can arrive at a better understanding of how performance practice of Beethoven piano sonatas from his heroic style changed during the twentieth-century, and perhaps learn how today’s performances have been affected.

In chapter 1, I will discuss Beethoven’s compositional styles in each of these sonatas. Chapter 2 will provide short biographies of Schenker, Schnabel and Brendel. In chapter 3, I will discuss Schenker’s and Schnabel’s printed editions of the development section in the first movements of the “Waldstein” and “Appassionata” Sonatas, assessing their editorial markings to show how Schnabel, in particular, sought to enhance the heroic conflict in the first movement. Chapter 4 will compare the audio recordings of the sonatas by Schnabel and Brendel to show how recording technology has influenced performance interpretations since Schnabel’s day, and how the technology has impacted the way we understand the idea of heroic conflict in Beethoven’s music. Considering editions and early recordings as critical sources of interpretation, today’s pianists can present better informed performances of Beethoven’s middle period sonatas.
Chapter 1

The Heroic Style in the “Waldstein” and the “Appassionata”

The “Waldstein” and “Appassionata” Sonatas each represent one of two different facets in Beethoven’s heroic style. Solomon describes the character of the Waldstein as one of “joyous transcendence,” and that of the Appassionata as one that “maintains an unusually tragic mood throughout.”\(^{31}\) As noted in the introduction, Lenz called the “Waldstein” “a heroic symphony for the piano”\(^ {32}\) and Rosen has labelled the “Appassionata” “the archetypal example of Beethoven’s heroic style.”\(^ {33}\) Despite being composed so closely to one another—the “Waldstein” in 1804, the “Appassionata” in 1805—virtually every element in the climactic moments of their opening movements represents Beethoven’s different approaches to depicting heroism.\(^ {34}\) In this chapter, I will provide a formal analysis of the development section of the first movement in each sonata, as well as an explanation of the compositional techniques Beethoven uses in the development sections to depict heroism.

Background of the “Waldstein” Sonata, Op. 53: (“A heroic symphony for the piano”)

Lenz’s description of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata No. 21 in C Major speaks to its enormous scale, as if it is a work much bigger than any one instrument can produce. Burnham describes how Lenz “made frequent reference to Beethoven’s ‘chimera,’ meaning those passages where the composer goes beyond the dictates of musical taste into something monstrous and
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\(^{32}\) Ibid, 255.


\(^{34}\) The analysis that follows will focus on Beethoven’s compositional process. In accordance with this, musical examples used in this chapter will be taken from the Wallner edition of the sonatas. (Germany: G. Henle Verlag, 1953; revised, 1975-76).
willfully transgressive.”

According to Burnham, Lenz’s criticism, and the criticism by Beethoven’s contemporaries such as Friedrich Rochlitz, point to the difficulties in Beethoven’s music as things that “add to his stature as an uncompromising artist: the struggles of the embattled, heroic artist are more sublime than euphonious.” The musical elements within the “Waldstein” Sonata delay the listeners’ expectations through successive dissonances and repeated rhythmic figures that undercut the time signature, creating a sound that enhances the listeners’ apprehension. They are thus sublime, rather than elements that quickly resolve to consonances, or easily fit within the measure, which are more euphonious. It is the scale on which Beethoven’s music is produced, its association with the large-scale genre of the symphony, and the reflection of this heroic freedom, that make the “Waldstein” something far grander, more “sublime,” than a typical Classical sonata.

The “Waldstein” Sonata has three movements: 1) Allegro con brio in sonata form in C major, 2) a short Introduzione: Molto Adagio in rounded binary form in F major, and 3) Rondo Allegretto in rondo form in C major. In the first movement, Beethoven creates a work in which, according to Rosen, “all the parts fit together convincingly.” All the themes in this movement move stepwise, “alternating harmonies of perfect triads with dominant seventh chords,” according to Rosen, and these dominant sevenths maintain a “constant presence” that “makes for a certain neutral harshness, which admirably complements the driving rhythms.” In fact, says Rosen, “No previous sonata by Beethoven had a first movement with so powerful and so unremitting a drive.” The first theme is characterized by pulsating blocked chords which are

36 Ibid.
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voiced in such a way that each pitch moves in stepwise motion from one chord to the next. The melody of this theme (played in the right hand) moves up by step (E, F-sharp, G), while the top left hand note first moves in the same direction (G to A), then back down by step to G. The bottom right hand voice moves up by step from C to D, while the bottom left hand moves down from C to B. Thus, the chords created by this progression are C major, D major-minor-seventh, G major-sixth. In the second half of the phrase, the right hand plays individual notes, descending by step (B, A, and G), and then expands the figure to D, C, B, A, and G, two octaves higher, again with the implication of tonic, secondary-dominant, dominant (Figure 1.1):

Figure 1.1: Wallner, Op. 53, I, 1-4

This stepwise motion in combination with the constant alternation between tonic and dominant becomes a defining element of the movement.⁴⁰

The development section of this first movement brings this tonic-dominant polarity to its heights. Beethoven begins by restating the opening theme in a new key, and then fragmenting it in measure 93, as shown in Figure 1.2:

Figure 1.2: Wallner, Op. 53, I, 93-96

⁴⁰Ibid., 181.
He then transitions into a development of the triplet theme, creating a series of arpeggio flourishes. These arpeggios have been viewed by Rosen as a virtuosic element, comparing them to the improvisational passages in concertos. According to Rosen, Beethoven “works them into a virtuoso sequence of 29 bars. The influence of the concerto form becomes even more evident. A long sequence of arpeggios was almost obligatory in the ‘second solo’ (or development section) of a concerto at that time. Beethoven never failed to write one in his concertos.”

Rosen goes on to say that these arpeggios imply “a certain freedom of execution reminiscent of improvisation, and the style demands that we avoid the impression of mechanical virtuosity and recapture some of that sense of improvisation in the arpeggios of bars 112 to 124.” These arpeggios eventually descend to the lowest register of Beethoven’s piano to begin the retransition in measure 142. This retransition consists merely of a descending four-note sequence in the left hand (C, B, A, G) and a rising stepwise figure in the right that “gradually outlines a G major chord and rises with a crescendo to F, the highest note of the keyboard” (Beethoven’s keyboard). Once the F is reached, the C in the left hand rises to C# and finally to D, at which point the two hands move in sixteenth-note, contrary motion scales until finally arriving on an implied C major chord (C in the left hand, E in the right hand) to begin the recapitulation. Thus, the more the cadence into C major is prolonged, the more the musical tension builds. Such prolonged harmonic stasis exemplifies how the music itself “goes beyond the dictates of music taste,” as Burnham describes it.

Of course, the tessitura of many of Beethoven’s themes themselves imply a transcendence of the musical tastes of the period for the simple reason that the require a larger

---
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keyboard in order to be played at all. The “Waldstein” Sonata includes such an implication. Skowreneck points out that while the keyboard range of the Erard “does not in fact completely match the ‘Waldstein’ Sonata,” it “does match several slightly later works, such as the ‘Appassionata’ Op. 57.”44 He cites moments in the first movement of Op. 53 in which Beethoven was forced to alter themes in the recapitulation to accommodate the Erard’s register, such as in bars 73 and 234 (Figures 1.3, 1.4):

Figure 1.3: Wallner, Op. 53, I, 73 [Exposition]

![Figure 1.3: Wallner, Op. 53, I, 73 [Exposition]](image)

Figure 1.4: Wallner, Op. 53, I, 234 [Recapitulation]

![Figure 1.4: Wallner, Op. 53, I, 234 [Recapitulation]](image)

In order to imitate measure 73, Beethoven would have needed to include a d\textasciitilde\textasciitilde\textasciitilde\textasciitilde, a fifth above the top G marked in this measure. However, the range of Beethoven’s piano did not expand far enough to accommodate a repeat of measure 73 a perfect fifth higher. As Skowreneck explains, Beethoven would create “subjects or motifs in the recapitulation of a sonata movement that were changed or compromised in comparison with the exposition in order to stay within a defined upper range.”45 Thus, while the Erard piano had a wider range than any previous piano, it is
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44 Tilman Skowroneck, Beethoven The Pianist (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 104.
evident in his compositions that Beethoven wanted the capabilities of the instrument to extend even further. In the generations following Beethoven, the piano’s range expanded to over eight octaves, which is the range of today’s piano.\footnote{“Ranges of Orchestral Instruments,” \textit{Symphony Orchestra Library Center}, orchestrallibrary.com/tables/rang.html, accessed: January 25, 2019.} In this sense, the “Waldstein” Sonata pointed toward the future of piano construction.

Finally, the “Waldstein” exploits the stronger bass register of the Erard in the first movement. Skowroneck claims that \textit{fortissimo} passages in the first movement where the pianist’s hands have been moved far apart from each other have formal significance in the “Waldstein” Sonata, claiming that the movement uses the technique “freely and at important structural points,”\footnote{Skowroneck, \textit{Beethoven The Pianist}, 113.} typically in a transitional passage. Thus, when the hands move far apart, it is a signal to the listener that an important theme is approaching. He argues that this is a characteristic that Beethoven established in his middle period and would become an important element in his late period.\footnote{Ibid.} On the Erard, this technique allowed Beethoven to exploit the power this instrument was capable of generating. Perhaps the most apparent exploitation of the bass in the first movement of the “Waldstein” Sonata comes at the end of the returning passage, when Beethoven asks the pianist to play a low G at a \textit{forte} dynamic marking, then at a \textit{sforzando}, and finally \textit{fortissimo}:  

\texttt{fortissimo}:
Again, this “pushing” of the instrument occurs in tandem with the persistence of the dominant sevenths, the pulsating chords and arpeggios, and the gradual, stepwise ascent of each theme, producing a powerful, forward driving work that recalls Burnham’s idea of “a singularly obsessed hero fighting against a recalcitrant external world.”

**Background of the “Appassionata” Sonata, Op. 57**

The title “Appassionata” was given to the F minor Sonata by his publisher in Hamburg; however, according to Blom, “Beethoven, thinking only of the first and last movements, might well have called it a *sonata appassionata* himself.”

“Appassionata” (Italian for “impassioned”) is certainly a fitting title for a work meant to reflect the composer’s conflicting emotions—desire for a companion versus love for his art. Donald Francis Tovey stated about Op. 57:

> The title *Appassionata* was given by the publisher without waiting for Beethoven’s consent. It is justified by the eminently tragic tone of the whole work. No other work by Beethoven maintains a tragic solemnity throughout all its movements.
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50 Blom, *Beethoven’s Pianoforte Sonatas Discussed*, 163.
52 Donald Francis Tovey, *A Companion to Beethoven’s Pianoforte Sonatas* (London: The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music, 1931, revised 1998), 169.
Similarly, in a 2017 recording of the sonatas by the pianist Martin Rasch, the author of the liner notes, Jorg Handstein, said about Op. 57:

in terms of emotions, this is Beethoven’s most extreme work to date, full of impassioned outbursts and driven desperately forward in frantic despair. And yet precisely here, Beethoven maintains the (sonata) form, as if he were striving to keep this inner storm under control.\(^{53}\)

Thus, according to both Tovey and Handstein, the “Appassionata” Sonata can be characterized as both “tragic” and emotionally “extreme.” I would argue that the ability to produce these characters is essential to any performance of the “Appassionata” Sonata.

Like the Waldstein, the “Appassionata” Sonata contains three movements: Allegro assai in sonata form, Andante con moto theme and variations, and Allegro ma non troppo in sonata form. Philip Radcliffe claims that the “Appassionata” Sonata contains, “many violent climaxes” and that the first movement ends in a “mood of exhaustion.”\(^{54}\) The sheer length of the development in the first movements of Op. 57 is due to these climaxes that explore range (both registral and dynamic), as well as harmony (constantly alternating between major and minor, and sometimes even between different dominant-function chords, namely, the V\(^7\) chord and the vii\(^07\) chord). Rosen even claims that “All sections—exposition, development, recapitulation and coda—take up the themes in the same order—and all four sections are approximately the same length, which gives the form a rigid symmetry that only enhances the violence of the passion.”\(^{55}\) If we refer back to Handstein’s description of the “Appassionata,” Beethoven’s use of the sonata form is meant “to keep this inner storm under control.” Rosen, however, suggests that the use of


\(^{55}\) Rosen, Beethoven’s Pianoforte Sonatas: A Short Companion, 195.
sonata form makes the movement more passionate, even more violent. Tallis Barker notes that “Starting with Beethoven, development sections became increasingly lengthy and, likewise serving to maximize dramatic tension, the overall climax of movements tended to occur as late as possible, in order to avoid an anti-climactic recapitulation.” Thus, the length of the development section serves to prolong the climax, maximizing the dramatic tension. Perhaps, then, Beethoven’s use of sonata form in the “Appassionata” is not meant to “keep this inner storm under control,” but is meant, rather, to strengthen the storm, i.e., heighten the drama. The dynamic, harmonic, and formal extremes to which Beethoven brings the music may allow us to characterize the “Appassionata” as another “heroic symphony for the piano.”

The development in the first movement of Op. 57 begins with opening theme and incorporates an interesting alternation of tonal relationships. The character of these measures is vague, and even deceptive, with its alternating of major and minor modes. The exposition ends in the tonic minor and immediately progresses from an A-flat-minor chord to its enharmonic, G-sharp-minor in first inversion, and finally to an E-major chord, as Beethoven develops the opening theme:
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This E major tonality serves as the enharmonic substitute for F-flat major. Beethoven remains in E major for the following two measures, repeating the motive an octave higher and ending on this motive’s typical half cadence with a B-dominant-seventh chord. Throughout this introduction, Beethoven maintains a soft dynamic with occasional crescendos and sforzandos on the second chord of the second measure in each motive, mostly within a major tonality. From measure 73 through 78, Beethoven seems to bring a glimmer of hope within the tragedy; but very suddenly in measure 79, the tragic element has returned with the opening melody in E minor at a forte dynamic marking in its original register:
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Beethoven repeats the two-measure fragment of the opening melody five times, accompanied by a descending arpeggio and alternating accompaniment and melody between hands after each fragment:

Figure 1.8: Wallner, Op. 57, I, 80-81

The left hand in this passage plays a significant role in the drama. When the right hand reaches the top note in its fragmentation of the theme, that pitch is used as the beginning of the descending arpeggio since it is the common tone between the secondary dominant chord and its resolution. For example, in measure 82, Beethoven writes a G-dominant-seventh chord which he resolves to C minor in measure 83, repeating the common tone in the right hand as it changes from melody to accompaniment:

Figure 1.9: Wallner, Op. 57, I, 82-83

However, at the end of the next fragment, Beethoven ascends a half-step to play an E-flat dominant-seventh arpeggio:
This arpeggio is resolved to A-flat major, which is interrupted by an A fully-diminished-seventh chord. This pattern is brought to a sudden halt in measure 91, when the left hand reaches an A-flat dominant-seventh chord and indecisively alternates with an A-fually-diminished-seventh chord for two full measures before finally settling on A-flat octaves in the left hand and a G-flat in the right:

From the beginning of the development to the end of this dramatic passage, Beethoven introduces moments of resolution, only to be violently undercut by sudden shifts in modality and tonality. The half-step rises in the left hand from the melody to the descending arpeggios creates that desperate forward drive. Much like the octaves before the chordal theme in the “Waldstein,” Beethoven has compressed the arpeggio flourishes into one repeating arpeggio in the right hand, and the low melody and arpeggio flourish into two alternating arpeggios in the left, creating yet another “violent climax.”
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58 Radcliffe, “Piano Music: Middle Period Beethoven,” 344.
With the A-flat pedal point in the left hand, Beethoven brings the music to a development of the transition theme which then proceeds to a development of the second theme. The second theme then evolves into the next idea in much same way that the exposition does, by fragmenting the last octaves in the melody, gradually ascending by half-step, and then finally reaching a series of diminished-seventh arpeggios which compress from a span of three full octaves over two beats each:

Figure 1.12: Wallner, Op. 57, I, 122-123

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{to a span of a seventh over one and a half beats:} \\
\text{Figure 1.13: Wallner, Op. 57, I, 126-127}
\end{align*}
\]

This brings the development into yet another violent climax in the return, as the half-step motive from the beginning of the first theme is played at a fortissimo dynamic, alternating registers as the left hand crosses over the right, while the right hand plays a diminished triad as an arpeggio in sixteenth-notes:
With the beginning of the recapitulation, Beethoven leaves the listener strangely unsettled, as the dominant pedal continues into the first phrase:

Conclusions

Every aspect of intense conflict within the development section of the “Appassionata” deserves our attention when discussing the “heroic” style. Given the frequent reference to violence apparent in this movement, it is easy to see how Handstein could refer to this sonata as emotionally “extreme.” Tovey identifies how the opening theme in the first movement and its recurrences are characterized by frequent “tonic closes,” as well as how their application differs from those of Beethoven’s earlier works:

In earlier works he has been witty in showing how many dominant closes can be tolerated in succession (the slow movement of Op. 1, No. 3, and Op. 14, No. 2). But in Op. 57 the
tonic closes are no more witty than the similar monotony in the lines of melody. The conception is sublime, and can be taken as the ultimate faith underlying the tragic emotion.\textsuperscript{59}

These repeated tonic closes—often in succession—bring us back to the debate between Handstein and Rosen: do these tonic closes keep the storm under control? Or do they enhance the violent passions? Tovey suggests the latter, claiming that they create a “sublime” conception. Particularly in the development section, where the tonal regions change virtually every other measure, there is no sense of “control”—rather, they are mysterious, undiscernible, perhaps even extreme.

The heroic elements apparent in both the “Waldstein” and “Appassionata” Sonatas make for formally and harmonically interesting works. The enormous registral and dynamic ranges in these two sonatas create a level of heroic intensity that Beethoven had never produced before. How to maintain this intensity would be a major challenge for editors and performers of his work after his death. Schenker, Schnabel and Brendel all embraced this challenge so that future generations might experience the “Waldstein” and “Appassionata” as, indeed, “heroic symphonies for the piano.”

\footnote{Tovey, \textit{A Companion to Beethoven’s Pianoforte Sonatas}, 169-170.}
Chapter 2
Three Important Twentieth-Century Interpreters of Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas: Schenker, Schnabel, and Brendel

Heinrich Schenker (1868-1935), Artur Schnabel (1882-1951), and Alfred Brendel (b. 1931) are often cited as authorities on Beethoven’s musical style. In the case of Schenker, Ian Bent and William Drabkin claim that “Beethoven, as man and artist, was a central preoccupation of Schenker’s throughout his career,” and in Schenker’s Harmonielehre (1906), “the number of music examples drawn from Beethoven far exceeds that from any other composer.”60 Schnabel is viewed as a Beethoven authority due to his recital performances of the complete Beethoven sonata cycle in the 1930s and 1940s across Europe, his publication of a performance edition of the sonatas in 1935, the 1938 recordings of the sonatas, as well as two complete recordings of Beethoven’s Piano Concertos.61 Brendel’s authority stems from his recordings of Beethoven’s complete works for the Vox label, which one critic called “some of the finest Beethoven ever recorded.”62 Before we proceed to a discussion of each editor’s and performers’ techniques, it would be beneficial to understand who these men were and why they are important to a discussion of Beethoven performance interpretations.
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Heinrich Schenker

Heinrich Schenker (1868-1935) was a prominent Austrian music theorist and pianist in the early twentieth-century. Best known for his analytical technique, referred to today as “Schenkerian Analysis,” Schenker engaged in music editing and performance as well. While growing up in Wisniowczyk, Galicia in Ukraine, Schenker studied piano with Karol Mikuli, a pupil of Chopin. His father, a physician, encouraged Schenker to pursue a career in law, and in 1884, he enrolled at the University of Vienna, receiving his doctorate in law in 1890. While working on his law degree, Schenker enrolled at the university’s conservatory, studying piano with Ernst Ludwig and harmony with Anton Bruckner, from 1887 to 1889, and composition with Johann Nepomuk Fuchs until 1890. After his father died in 1887, Schenker took time off from his studies to support his family by teaching private piano lessons in his home, and publishing criticism of music by Johannes Brahms and Anton Bruckner in newspapers and journals in Vienna, Leipzig, and Berlin from 1891 to 1901. Schenker’s criticism was, according to Kevin Karnes, a “hermeneutic” approach, in which he “sought to account for what he found disagreeable as a listener by dividing the mind of the artist from the musical materials themselves.” Schenker based his interpretations on an objective
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analysis of the original musical texts. Schenker’s publications of both criticism and musical editions following the turn of the century were frequently consulted by musicians and students alike.\footnote{Robert Snarrenberg, “Schenker, Heinrich.” Schenker’s editions included \textit{Carl Philipp Emmanuel Bach: Klavierwerke} (Vienna, 1902-2), \textit{Georg Frideric Handel: Sechs Orgelkonzerte} (Vienna, 1904), \textit{Johann Sebastian Bach: Chromatische Phantasie und Fuge: kritische Ausgabe mit Anhang} (Vienna, 1910), \textit{Ludwig van Beethoven: Die letzten [fünf] Sonaten von Beethoven: kritische Ausgabe mit Einführung und Erläuterung} (Vienna, 1913-1921).}


\begin{quote}
Working much of the time under wartime conditions, Schenker consulted autograph and printed sources, and notes by Nottebohm, available in Vienna, and obtained photographs of sources from libraries and collectors in Germany and elsewhere, meticulously collating
\end{quote}
his sources to determine Beethoven’s ultimate intentions. Schenker’s antagonism toward what he dubs “hermeneuticist” analysts is at its strongest in these texts, as is his campaign against misguided editors.  

Robert Snarrenberg notes that Schenker’s determination to realize these intentions was fundamental to his theory:

In his analytical writings he illustrated how his theory of musical cognition operated in the perception of musical artworks. The cognition Schenker described is the superior competence of a skilled practitioner, not the ordinary competence of average musicians or listeners. He was convinced, in fact, that his theory accurately described the mind and intentions of master composers.

By 1934, Schenker published the first complete set of Beethoven Piano Sonatas in four volumes with the Universal Edition, despite not having access to the original manuscript of Op. 106, citing original editions of this work instead. These editions are still in print today, each sonata being available as individual publications.

Schenker’s edition of Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas was later dubbed an Urtext by Karl Heinz Fussl and Hans-Christian Muller for the Wiener Urtext Ausgabe, an edition based on composer manuscripts and original editions. Thus regarded as a faithful representation of Beethoven’s original manuscript, Schenker’s edition would influence later editors of musical works, such as Artur Schnabel in his edition of the Beethoven Sonatas.
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Artur Schnabel

Artur Schnabel (1882-1951) was another Austrian pianist known for his performance interpretations of Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert. He was born in Lipnik, Moravia and his natural musical talent was recognized at an early age. At the age of seven, Schnabel moved with his family to Vienna where he studied piano with the Polish pianist Theodor Hermann Leschetizky—himself a student of Carl Cerny, who was in turn a student of Beethoven. Under Leschetizky’s tutelage, Schnabel studied the Schubert Piano Sonatas which, according to William Glock, “at that time were completely neglected.”

With all this repertoire under his fingers, Schnabel began to tour the German provinces beginning around the year 1900. In 1921, Schnabel made his debut in the United States and began touring the country regularly in 1936. In early 1927, Schnabel returned to Germany to perform a series of concerts at the Volksbühne (“People’s Theater”) in Berlin over seven evenings to celebrate the centenary of Beethoven’s death. The concerts took place over the course of two months (January and February), and featured Schnabel’s recitals of all 32 piano sonatas by Beethoven, a task never before completed by a professional pianist. Six years later in
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In 1933, Schnabel achieved this feat again at the Philharmonie in Berlin over the course of four months.⁸⁰

In addition to his career as a performer, Schnabel considered teaching to be an important task of any musician. He served as a professor at the Universität der Künste Berlin (Berlin University of the Arts) from 1925 to 1933. Following his tenure at the university, Schnabel briefly moved to Lake Como, Italy, where he gave summer master classes in piano performance. His teachings laid the groundwork for his own writings on music, such as Reflections on Music (1934) and Music and the Line of Most Resistance (1942). In the latter, Schnabel describes his understanding of art:

> Art is not convenience, is not just one feature of some structure; it is an independent organism and each single representation of it is independent as well. It is intrinsic nature to be released by the noblest aspiration of man and addressed to the noblest aspiration of man, to be released by man’s profoundest demands on himself, by his conscious desire for contact with invisible reality and unequivocal truth—in a region that is above the egotistical, the utilitarian and the mechanical.⁸¹

To Schnabel, art had a psychological function, in that the performer sought to express the emotional content of the music in such a way that his performance would touch upon the emotions of the audience, without the need for concrete description. This spiritual, transcendent view of art and its independence explains his ambivalence about mechanical recordings:

> Since the invention of machines for the reproduction of music, the number of serious amateurs has decreased depressingly. I hope that the phonograph and the radio, which have stopped so many amateurs, have now begun to attract new converts to music...Inactivity, at all events in this connection, is undoubtedly inferior to activity. There is no substitute for activity. The intimacy created by listening to a piece of music (even repeatedly) is superficial compared with the result of repeated playing or even reading of the music. The aptitude for reading music as one reads words should be cultivated by everybody who is fond of music.⁸²

⁸² Ibid., 27-28.
Schnabel believed that engaging with the music through playing and reading is key to understanding the art, and teaching allowed more and more people to participate in the active production of music. Schnabel feared that recordings encouraged people who had the potential to be great musicians to merely listen to rather than study the music.  

His dislike of both recording technology and critics notwithstanding, in 1932, Schnabel entered contract negotiations with the recording company “His Master’s Voice” (HMV). His recording of all 32 Beethoven piano sonatas was, according to his biographers William Glock and Stephen Plaistow, “the first such undertaking in the history of the gramophone.” These recordings took six years to complete and were finally released to the public in 1938. Concurrently with the sonatas, Schnabel also recorded Beethoven’s five piano concertos under the baton of the English conductor, Sir Harold Malcom Watts Sargent with the London Philharmonic and London Symphony Orchestras. Schnabel would continue to perform the complete cycle of sonatas in public during the period in which he recorded them. According to Glock and Plaistow, his Berlin and London performances of the sonatas in 1932 and 1934 “marked the climax of his career.”

In 1935, Schnabel published his complete performance edition with the New York City-based firm Simon and Schuster in two volumes. The Publisher’s Preface states that “[Schnabel] has gone to the original manuscripts and early editions, as well as later editions of the sonatas, and makes entirely clear to the pianist the reasons for Beethoven’s preferences in the
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performance of the sonatas.” Unlike Schenker, however, Schnabel added his own pedal markings, fingerings, and occasional slurs and accents. As Schnabel explains,

The slurs as well as the accents and indications relative to touch were noted by the composer in such an obvious and confusing flightiness and carelessness—especially in his early works—that the Editor felt himself not only musically justified, but duty bound to change them occasionally according to his best judgement, sense and taste: to abbreviate, to lengthen, to supplement, to interpret.

The amendments Schnabel chose to make were merely intended to clarify aspects of the music about which Beethoven’s manuscripts were unclear. He considered this to be a “duty” of an editor. According to Marienne Uszler, pianist and editor of The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher:

Schnabel’s great role was to bring back the primacy of the composer, to recognize that the composer really is far greater than us performers. Part of our obligation is to go back to the text, the original text, the urtext, and discover, as far as we can, what the composer’s intentions were—to make that our framework. And within the framework, to use whatever talents, insight, and awareness we have to bring forth the music.

In this way, however, Schnabel has incorporated his own distinctive touch to the sonatas. This certainly does not take away from Schnabel’s well regarded mastery of Beethoven’s music.

Schnabel’s interpretations of Beethoven’s Sonatas were highly regarded in the 1930s and continue to be today, especially those captured in his recordings. Glock and Plaistow state that “On his recordings the beauty of sound immediately draws the listener in; and yet he so often seems to transcend the instrument. In his lifetime he changed people’s perceptions of Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert, and the best of his recordings still have the capacity to do that for each new generation.” However, it was with his recordings of Beethoven that Schnabel made the biggest mark on history. The chief music critic of the New York Times, Harold C. Schonberg,}
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referred to Schnabel as “the man who invented Beethoven.”\(^9^0\) His edition continues to receive acclaim from professional pianists, and his recording of the complete cycle of the sonatas became a feat which many other pianists—such as Alfred Brendel in the 1960s—would attempt themselves over the next several decades.

**Alfred Brendel**

Alfred Brendel (b. 1931) is an Austrian pianist who has received acclaim for his interpretations of a wide variety of composers, including Mozart, Schubert, Busoni, and Schoenberg; but, his Vox recordings of Beethoven’s piano music, produced between 1958 and 1964, established him as an interpreter of late-18th- and early-19th-century Austro-German music.\(^9^1\)

Brendel never received sustained formal training at the piano. During his early life, his family moved frequently to various towns in Austria and Hungary to escape the conflict in World War II. As a result, he could study only briefly with many different teachers, most of whom are unknown.\(^9^2\) After the war, his family moved back to a town near Graz, and Brendel enrolled in the Graz Conservatory to study piano with Ludovika von Kaan (herself a student of Bernhard Stavenhagen, who was a pupil of Franz Liszt), and composition with the organist and
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composer Artur Michl, but these lessons were not extensive. After the age of sixteen, his formal training came to an end, except for attending a few master classes. But what others might consider a limitation, Brendel regarded as an advantage: “A teacher can be too influential. Being self-taught, I learned to distrust anything I hadn’t figured out myself.” His musical knowledge came from listening to other pianists, conductors and singers. He even found it advantageous to learn from his own playing. As a child, he received a Revox tape-recorder which he used to record himself, study his own methods, and identify what needed to be fixed or what was good. To Brendel, this method was “a very good way to get on, and it makes some of the functions of a teacher obsolete.”

In the late 1940s and 1950s, however, Brendel began to participate in masterclasses led by Paul Baumgartner, Edward Steuermann, and Edwin Fischer. Brendel admired Fischer particularly, claiming that he “led two generations of young pianists ‘away from the piano, and to themselves.’” Fischer performed and conducted music by a range of composers, including Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, as well as Schubert and Liszt. Fischer’s wide repertoire may have influenced Brendel’s own, given that Brendel played music by many of the same composers. These masterclasses would prove to be influential on Brendel’s whole career. As Stephen Plaistow put it, “In all these composers his (Brendel’s) playing is bonded to the music’s expressive life. It has never been his style to push back boundaries arbitrarily. Rather his aim is to ‘put life into the music without doing damage to it’ (one of Edwin Fischer’s precepts) and to

---

93 Ibid.  
94 Ibid.  
95 Ibid.  
96 Plaistow, “Brendel, Alfred.”  
97 Ibid.
avoid false sentiment.” This approach is reflected in Brendel’s performance of Beethoven’s music, described by Nicholas Kenyon in the *New York Times*.

One of Mr. Brendel’s aims, he says, is to place Beethoven in a historical context, ‘to be aware of what was different and new about Beethoven and what he wrote. This is really one of the most difficult things, to return to the surprises that he made.’ But to recover the freshness of Beethoven’s music for audiences whose ears and minds are saturated with Wagner and Mahler is clearly a difficult feat to achieve. ‘Ah, this is what the performer must do,’ Mr. Brendel says. ‘He can make you aware of what the context was for a special harmonic stroke. Take the diminished seventh: Beethoven’s use of this chord was very different from the later 18th century, and I think it is possible to reproduce its startling quality even though out habits of listening to it have changed completely. Beethoven uses it very sparingly and it leads away from the stable tonal universe toward a feeling of mystery and awe, even terror. And someone who cannot feel that at the end of the slow movement of the Appassionata, for instance, has missed the point of the entire piece. Even in the late works Beethoven’s attitude changes slightly: the performer must show all that.’

Thus, Brendel’s aim in performance is to reveal Beethovenian expression as best he can, much in the same way that Schenker did in his edition, and Schnabel did in his edition and recordings. To “put life into the music,” as Fischer stated, and to “avoid false sentiment,” as Plaistow claimed, meant that Brendel wanted to engage with the music, and not subject it to superficial qualities.

By the end of the 1950s, Brendel began recording for the Vox and Vanguard recording companies. His recordings of the Beethoven sonatas from 1958 and 1964 provided what Plaistow called “the spur for his first public cycle of all the Beethoven sonatas, given at the Wigmore Hall in London in 1962.” Like Schnabel, the recording project went hand-in-hand with the public performances of the Beethoven sonatas. They were part of an endeavor to record the complete piano works of Beethoven, which he achieved by the end of the decade. While Schnabel had recorded all the piano sonatas and concertos, Brendel went further, recording all of Beethoven’s

---

98 Ibid.
100 Plaistow, “Brendel, Alfred.”
bagatelles, piano variations, and Beethoven’s complete works for piano and cello, becoming the first pianist ever to accomplish that feat. Following the release of these recordings, Brendel held various concert cycles over the next several decades in which he would recite all 32 Beethoven piano sonatas. Interestingly, his recitals at Carnegie Hall in 1983—which including seven concerts between May 8th and 31st of that year—were the first recitals of the complete Beethoven sonatas at that venue since Artur Schnabel’s performances in the early 1940s.

Conclusions

Through their recordings and editions, these three pianists have been recognized as respected interpreters of the music of Beethoven. Schenker was the first editor to attempt an edition of Beethoven’s Sonatas that was thoroughly researched in manuscript sources and taking into account Beethoven’s constant dissatisfaction with his publishers. Schnabel was not only the first to record the complete cycle of the sonatas but was also the first to record all five concertos and perform the sonata cycle throughout Western Europe and America. Additionally, his edition, like Schenker’s, was seeped in manuscript study and is highly regarded by pianists today. Brendel’s complete recordings and numerous concert cycles of the Beethoven sonatas indicate that his performance career—despite his very diverse repertoire—has been principally defined by his interpretations of Beethoven, which have, in turn, deeply influenced how Beethoven is performed and heard even to the present day.

Between Schenker’s attempt to realize the “true” intentions of Beethoven, and Schnabel’s and Brendel’s devotion to fulfilling the demands of the music without adding superficialities,
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these three performers/editors make for ideal subjects in a discussion of early-twentieth-century performance practices of Beethoven’s middle period sonatas.

As “the man who invented Beethoven,” and someone whose devotion to Beethoven is exhibited in both forms of media discussed in this thesis (recordings and editions), Artur Schnabel takes center stage in the pages that follow. By comparing his approach to musical editing with that of Schenker and comparing his approaches in his recordings to the those taken by Brendel, we may come to understand what makes Schnabel’s interpretations of Beethoven’s middle period sonatas so highly regarded by performers and musicologists alike.
Chapter 3
Schenker’s and Schnabel’s Editions of the “Waldstein” and “Appassionata”

Two of the most highly regarded editions of the Beethoven sonatas are those of Schenker (1910) and Schnabel (1935). These editions are both considered authoritative by their respective publishers as they seek to print a score that realizes the composer’s intentions as closely as possible. However, each takes a slightly different editorial approach. In his Preface, Schenker argues that “only Beethoven’s notation shows us the meaning of his contents,” and that any alteration, be it made with the best intention, especially in order to make both contents and style accessible to the masses, the usual standardizing of the text; the attempt to explain the contents by means of so-called phrasing slurs and other aids intended to facilitate the playing—all rather tend to obstruct the way to Beethoven’s contents and even render the technique of playing more difficult.

Schenker includes hardly any footnotes or indications regarding performance instruction. According to William Rothstein, Schenker believed that “most (musical) nuances are unwritten, yet nonetheless mandatory,” and that these nuances are implied by the musical context and cannot be represented in general rules. On the first page of the “Waldstein” Sonata, he has a footnote claiming, “The fingerings and pedals are the composer’s,” and on the first page of the “Appassionata,” he makes the same claim, but beyond that, there are no significant editorial markings. Rothstein claimed that according to Schenker, the composer’s notation “indicates only
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the effects that the composer desires; it does not specify the means by which the performer is to obtain those effects.”\textsuperscript{108} Such means, Schenker believed, should be interpreted freely by the performer. In fact, he maintained that only with the performer’s “utmost freedom” could the music be played correctly.

Unlike Schenker, Schnabel inserted his own pedalings, slurs, accents, and “indications relative to touch.”\textsuperscript{109} He believed that these were virtually illegible in the manuscript and it was the editor’s job to make them clear:

The slurs as well as the accents and indications relative to touch were noted by the composer in such an obvious and confusing flightiness and carelessness—especially in his early works—that the Editor felt himself not only musically justified, but in duty bound to change them occasionally according to his best judgement, sense and taste: to abbreviate, to lengthen, to supplement, to interpret.\textsuperscript{110}

Whereas Schenker did not believe it was the editor’s responsibility to specify how a performer would achieve the composer’s intentions, Schnabel argued that the purpose of a print edition was to do just that.

James Grier discusses how no musical edition can possibly reproduce the composer’s manuscript exactly. He acknowledges that “Individual sources preserve texts that are faithful to the circumstances in which they were created and used. Consequently, for many works, each source is a viable record of one form of the work and can be treated as a ‘best text’.”\textsuperscript{111} On the other hand, he also claims that

All sources…may contain errors, readings that are impossible within the stylistic conventions of the repertory. These can be identified and adjusted only through the editor’s knowledge of style, the transmission processes and the history of the work. No

\begin{footnotes}
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single theory, then, provides a fully self-contained method for editing, but within the historical approach each contributes valuable concepts and procedures.\textsuperscript{112}

Thus, it is virtually impossible to claim definitively whether Schenker or Schnabel created the more authentic edition. However, it may be possible to determine how each editor’s markings—in particular, pedals, slurs, dynamics, tempos, and fingerings (or lack thereof, in the case of Schenker)—create the sense of conflict and struggle that is so central to Beethoven’s heroic style.

\textit{Waldstein} Sonata in Schenker’s and Schnabel’s Printed Editions

The following discussion will focus on Schenker’s and Schnabel’s editorial approaches to the development section of the first movement of the \textit{Waldstein}, the section of the piece that I analyzed for “heroic” features in chapter 1. As noted there, the development section in the first movement of the \textit{Waldstein} Sonata exhibits its greatest moments of tension in two areas: the triplet variation of theme two (measures 112-141) and the retransition (measures 142-156). These passages from the Allegro con brio incorporate modal mixture, as well as delayed and/or interrupted harmonic resolutions which performers consider when interpreting the music. Such aspects are supported by rhythmically and harmonically driven phrases that use triplets and sixteenth-notes, as well as consecutive dissonances and repeated, unresolved chords, all of which creates the sense of a hero fighting against “a recalcitrant external world,” as Burnham put it.\textsuperscript{113} I will show below how the markings provided by each editor ensure that the heroic energy fundamental to this movement is realized.

\textsuperscript{112} Grier, “Editing: 5. Procedures.”
\textsuperscript{113} Burnham, \textit{Beethoven Hero}, 5.
Schnabel’s indications in the development of the opening theme from the first movement deserve some attention before our discussion of the more dramatic moments in the work. At the beginning of the development in the first movement, Beethoven fragments the motif at the end of the first phrase of the opening theme in such a way that the right hand creates a kind of dialogue between the middle and upper registers of the piano:

Figure 3.1: Schnabel, Op. 53, I, 96-97

The right hand simply continues to alternate registers until measure 103, when Beethoven repeats the higher descending motive, beginning on a higher pitch each time until he finally turns the eighth-two-sixteenth-quarter motif into its own theme:

Figure 3.2: Schnabel, Op. 53, I, 102-105
In measure 104, Schnabel inserts a comment “tranquillo, egualmente, ma in tempo” beneath the right hand, and “non troppo legato” under the left hand: “quiet, also, but in time,” and “not too much legato.” These two indications aid the performer in realizing Beethoven’s heroic style.

Beethoven’s resolutions on beat three in measures 104 and 105 to inverted arpeggios create a sense of uneasiness in the music because under typical period construction, the final tonic cadence occurs on the last beat of one measure and the first beat of the following measure and tends to use the dominant chord in root position, resolving to the tonic chord also in root position. The arpeggios Beethoven writes in these measures includes none of these features. Schnabel’s indications to keep these measures soft, in time, and “not too much legato,” highlight the tension in this portion of the development, indicating to the performer that in measure 104, the music must maintain its character despite its mode change from minor to major.

Throughout the development section of the “Waldstein,” Schenker provides no additional indications to those in the manuscript, save for his own fingerings. He thus adopts a conservative approach to editing, allowing Beethoven’s markings to speak for themselves and giving the performer the ability to aid in the expression of the work. By studying Schenker’s edition of the “Waldstein” development, the effects of Schnabel’s expressive markings come into focus.

Schenker’s restrictive use of slurs versus Schnabel’s more liberal use is revealing of how Schnabel conceived particular passages in Beethoven’s music. In the development of the opening theme, for example, there are no slurs in the left hand between measures 104 and 111 in Schenker’s edition; on the other hand, Schnabel includes slurs that span seven full beats in the left hand for a majority of this theme:
Schenker does not include a slur here because it was not found in the manuscript. As he spells out in his written preface to his edition of the Sonatas, “the attempt to explain the contents by means of so-called phrasing slurs and other aids intended to facilitate the playing—all rather tend to obstruct the way to Beethoven’s contents and even render the technique of playing more difficult.”

However, Schenker does indicate slurs over the triplets of the second theme:
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Such indications in Schenker’s edition implies that they are Beethoven’s own markings, given Schenker’s dislike of the “phrasing slur.” According to Geoffrey Chew, Hugo Riemann (German music theorist and composer, 1849-1919) developed the phrasing slur to indicate “Motive and their multiples and submultiples: these are defined in his *Musikalische Dynamik und Agogik* (1884) as basic rhythmic units of phrasing, each normally comprising a growth phase and a decay phase and each implying a subtle use of dynamics and agogics.”\(^\text{115}\) However, Schenker argued that editors should “return to the Urtext” and use “the ‘non-phrasing’ slur, connoting only legato.”\(^\text{116}\) It is thus the legato slur that is indicated in measures 112-114 in Schenker’s edition of the “Waldstein” Sonata.

Schnabel maintains the original slurs in the developed triplet theme in his edition as well, but also includes his own expressive markings:

Figure 3.6: Schnabel, Op. 53, I, 113-115


\(^{116}\) Ibid.
In measure 114—and each subsequent measure in which the left hand arpeggio becomes a full chord—Schnabel inserts a crescendo at the beginning of the arpeggio, followed by a pedal marking on the full chord. Schenker, on the other hand, provides no indication that this chord, or the arpeggio flourish played over it, is to be distinguished from the previous arpeggios. Thus, Schenker’s interpretation of measure 114 allows the pianist some leeway to express these arpeggios, whereas Schnabel’s edition is more explicit regarding how the performer should express these measures.

In addition, Schnabel marks the triplet theme in measure 112 “marcato e con fuoco” (accented and with fire) after a crescendo from pp, and “sempre f e marcato” (always forte and accented) in measure 114. These markings indicate that the performer must distinguish the drama in the triplets from that of the fragmented opening theme, which Schnabel marks sempre pp and, as mentioned earlier, tranquillo, egualmente, ma in tempo and non troppo legato. It is not enough simply to play louder, according to Schnabel; rather, one must also accentuate and push the music forward.

However, Schnabel is not entirely clear as to how one is to accentuate, or how one is to push forward. Does he mean to accelerate the tempo? Probably not, since Schnabel typically included metronome markings in places he wanted the tempo to change (such as the 160 beats per minute marking in measure 50, and the 168 beats per minute in measure 54). Does he mean to crescendo through these measures? This is also doubtful due to the fact that he already indicated a crescendo into this theme in measures 110-111, and marks measure 114 “sempre forte” (always forceful). Given that the marcato is indicated at the beginning of the arpeggio flourish on beat 2 of measure 114, my assessment is that Schnabel must intend for the flourish to be somewhat distinct from the alternating arpeggios that precede it. The flourish, by which I
mean, to paraphrase Michael Tilmouth, a series of arpeggios used to “(decorate) a common chord”\textsuperscript{117} (through such means as an emphasis on off-beats or a change of inversion) disrupts the eighth-note pattern, which is principally where the drama of this passage comes from. Thus, the accentuation and drive that Schnabel is indicating must mean that the performer is to highlight the rhythmic disruption of meter, and the suspension of the dominant-seventh, inverted minor chords, and the modal mixture from arpeggio to arpeggio, such as from E-flat minor in measures 124-125, to F\# major in measures 126-127, to B minor in measures 128-129, to G major in measures 130-131, and to C minor in measures 132-133.

In the retransition, Schenker’s notation includes fingerings and dynamics, but no other interpretive markings. A gradual crescendo is marked beginning in measure 146 and lasting until the forte in measure 152:

Figure 3.7: Schenker, Op. 53, I, 146-148
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Figure 3.8: Schenker, Op. 53, I, 152-154
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Schenker’s edition of the retransition in the “Waldstein” lays out the musical context of this theme, with the crescendos, the forte in measure 152, and the sforzandos in measure 154. Add to this the lower register gradually building to a higher register and the chromatic bass line in 152, and the context that Schenker implies is one of gradual growth in which the music grows ever higher and ever louder. In this way, Schenker’s edition sets the groundwork for the performance to become more expressive as the tension builds. It is here that the performer must seek additional means by which he or she can attain this effect.

Beginning in measure 142, Schnabel decreases the metronome marking from 176 bpm to 168 bpm. He also includes two Italian expressive markings, “non troppo legato” and “non agitato”:

Figure 3.9: Schnabel, Op. 53, I, 140-142

The slight decrease in tempo and the indication not to connect each sixteenth-note after the series of long, slurred, legato arpeggio flourishes, creates a stark contrast in articulation at the start of the retransition. Coupled with the pianissimo dynamic, the slight detachment between each sixteenth-note that Schnabel indicates in the return heightens the sense of instability and heroic conflict. In measure 153, when the right hand has reached its peak on the high F, and repeats every off beat, Schnabel indicates both the original metronome marking and the original expressive marking, con brio:
With the final contrary motion scales, Schnabel accelerates the tempo again to its fastest marking yet, before bringing the piece back to the original tempo at the beginning of the recapitulation:

Together with the pedal marking and Beethoven's fortissimo dynamic marking, Schnabel’s acceleration into the recapitulation heightens the sense of urgency at the end of the development, as if the hero pushes forward with all his energy.

The examples cited above provide ample evidence that Schnabel’s additional markings enable the performer to more authentically represent the heroic conflict in the “Waldstein.”

**Appassionata Sonata in Schenker’s and Schnabel’s Print Editions**

The sheer length of the development in the first movement of the “Appassionata” Sonata provides the analyst with a wealth of material to assess under a heroic or tragic lens. Just as in
the “Waldstein,” Schnabel provides many expressive markings in his edition, while Schenker keeps very much to the manuscript, inserting only his own fingerings. The development of the Allegro assai of the “Appassionata” exhibits its greatest moments of tragic tension between measures 79 and 92 when the opening theme is accompanied by descending sixteenth-note-quintuplets and sextuplets; measures 119 to 134, when the opening theme is fragmented once more, leading into a series of fully-diminished arpeggios; and finally, in measures 135 to 151, with the ominous and unresolved recapitulation. These passages exhibit the struggle in which the hero must engage in order to defeat his foes. By comparing Schnabel’s edits to Schenker’s strict reading of the manuscript, we can assess how Schnabel enhances the heroic struggle.

Schnabel emphasizes the contrasts between different themes in the “Appassionata” in the same way he did so in the “Waldstein,” mainly through the use of metronome markings. In measure 65 of the closing theme of the exposition, Schnabel inserts a metronome marking of dotted-quarter-note equals 112. On the final A-flats of the exposition in measure 65, he reduces the tempo to 112 beats per minute, and then returns to his original metronome marking from the beginning of the piece (dotted-quarter equals 120) once he begins developing the arpeggios of the opening theme:

Figure 3.12: Schnabel, Op. 57, I, 65-68
The final tempo reduction of the exposition in measure 65 allows for both a smooth transition into the development and a smooth return of the pianissimo dynamic marking.

The significance of the pianissimo at the end of the exposition in measure 65 is comparable to Beethoven’s use of that dynamic at the end of the movement. In a discussion of the final measures of this movement, Kinderman argues that “The mysterious ending connects more effectively with the ensuing slow movement, implying the unresolved character of the dramatic tensions exposed in the Allegro assai—tensions that must carry over into the remaining movements.” In fact, the “mysterious ending” of the exposition serves a similar purpose connecting it with the development. It is here that Schnabel’s reduction in tempo in measure 65 is significant. As was mentioned in the “Waldstein,” twentieth-century performers typically played transitions at a faster tempo. However, since this is a transition from the entire exposition to the development, rather than from one theme to the next, Schnabel uses this tempo to set up a new large section. The slower tempo also delays the resolution of the D-sharp in measure 66 to the E in measure 67. Thus, Schnabel’s metronome markings enhance the “unresolved character” in this transition.

On this point we see how Schnabel’s markings may have been influenced by early twentieth-century performance practices. Philip describes how performers at this time approached thematic transitions. In his analysis of five different recordings of the “Kreutzer” Sonata, Philip concludes that each performer emphasizes the beginning of the second theme “by a drop in tempo, followed by a recovery to the end of the exposition. In all cases, these changes of tempo suggest not a lack of control, but a deliberate strategy for underlining the changing
Schnabel takes this same approach toward the transition into the development. The chromatic-median relation between A-flat minor and E-major (enharmonically F-flat) is a very sudden change in character to the listener’s ear. By inserting a slower tempo marking, Schnabel enhances the transitional character of these two measures, while also delaying the entrance of the development slightly. As a result, the listener’s anticipation of both a cadential arrival and a new statement of the opening theme is prolonged, further heightening the dramatic tension.

With the forte statement of the opening theme in the pick-up to measure 79, Schnabel brings the music to its fastest tempo thus far, at 138 beats per minute:

Figure 3.13: Schnabel, Op. 57, I, 77-79

He also inserts two markings in measure 79: *energico* and *marcato* (“with energy”, and “marked” or “accented”). Philip argues that in early-twentieth-century recordings, “[g]roups of semi-quavers in fast movements were often played rather fast and lightly.” In the case of the “Appassionata” development, this technique further emphasizes the dramatic tension. According to Kinderman, by immediately progressing into this violent theme from the lighter character of the E major opening of the development, Beethoven “exploits a relationship between serene
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lyricism” and a “tempestuous idiom.” Through Schnabel’s acceleration of the theme with a semi-quavered accompaniment, this relationship is further enhanced. The acceleration itself in measure 79 is yet another example of what Philip described above as a “deliberate strategy for underlining the changing character of the piece.”

Schnabel’s tempo and expressive markings contrast with Schenker’s edition, which is so restricted to the original manuscripts that he provides no noticeable strategy for emphasizing the new character:

Figure 3.14: Schenker, Op. 57, I, 76-79

Contrary to Schnabel’s edition, Schenker provides no new tempo marking for the forte statement of the opening theme, nor does he include any additional articulation, like Schnabel’s *energico* or *marcato*. In this way, Schenker seems to break away from early twentieth-century performance or editorial techniques, in favor of a more conservative, purist approach. Schenker asserted that “the performer may not take the composer’s notation at face value and simply play everything exactly as written; neither, on the other hand, may he assume that the structure of the work will express itself adequately without his help.”

Thus, where Schnabel has indicated particular means of expression, Schenker believed it was necessary for the performer to find those articulations on his own based solely on what the composer indicated in the score.
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One method of expression used by Schnabel, aside from metronome markings, was pedal markings. The pedals throughout Schnabel’s edition are predominantly his; however, in many passages, Schnabel will indicate Beethoven’s pedals, which Schnabel believes will add even more weight to the drama created by his own tempo and dynamic markings. The tempo remains the same from the end of the developed lyrical theme to the first arpeggios (138 bpm); but when the arpeggios begin to shorten from a two-octave span to a one-octave span, Schnabel again accelerates the tempo in measure 125 to 144 beats per minute:

Figure 3.15: Schnabel, Op. 57, 125-126

His indication “sempre Ped.” (always pedal) retains Beethoven’s pedal marking, and it is there to ensure that these arpeggios create a flurry of sound and to push the passion, as Tovey put it, “beyond articulate utterance.”[123] Schnabel also adds “sempre ff.” The pedal indication is critical to the drama created by the delayed resolution of these arpeggios. Schnabel even uses the pedal to connect this transition to the repeated statement of the “fate motif”—three eighth notes followed by a quarter note—beginning in measure 130:
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Here the tempo changes to 132 beats per minute in measure 130 from 144. Schnabel also adds “marcatissimo” and suggests repeated use of the same finger to articulate the “fate theme.” This theme marks the beginning of the retransition to the recapitulation—a transitional passage in itself. As mentioned earlier, Katz argued that in early performances, “an increased tempo highlights the instability of transitions and a relaxed tempo signals stability.”\textsuperscript{124} However, when Katz compares the tempos in certain passages in Beethoven’s Violin Concerto, he claims that some are “thematically stable areas” while others are “transitional or more rhythmically active.”\textsuperscript{125} The “fate motif” that appears in measure 130 returns the music to a sense of thematic stability in the left hand. The arpeggios from measures 125 to 129 have no thematic, or even formal, coherence, serving a transitional role. Thus, Schnabel’s reduction in tempo in measure 130 serves to re-establish this coherence for the listener.

Schnabel’s markings in these passages contrast greatly with those found in Schenker’s edition. The arpeggios in Schenker’s edition retain the same pedal markings from Beethoven, as Schnabel did, though he provides no additional tempo markings:

\textsuperscript{124} Katz, “Beethoven in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction: The Violin Concerto on Record,” \textit{Beethoven Forum} Vol. 10, No. 1, 43.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid.
The lack of a tempo indication in measure 125, however, does not necessarily mean that Schenker would have condemned such an acceleration. According to Sandra Rosenblum, the late eighteenth-century theorist and composer Heinrich Christoph Koch wrote out descriptions of what the music should convey under each of the Italian performance tempos. For example in Koch’s description of the Adagio, he remarks that “It is difficult to set down general rules for the performance of every kind of piece, because performance is more an affair of feeling than of description, more of talent than of instruction.” This statement could apply to any Italian tempo marking, and in Schenker’s case, the performance edition still requires the performer to express the structure of the work adequately. Thus, if we were to consider Schnabel’s tempo changes in measures 125 and 130 and compare them to Schenker’s edition which has no additional marking, are we to say that these edits contradict each other? Or did Schnabel merely indicate what Schenker meant to leave up to interpretation? The purpose of Schnabel’s editorial markings in the “Appassionata” Sonata are to give the performer the resources he or she needs to bring out the heroic tragedy. Schenker’s edition, on the other hand, does not include many editorial markings, so that he allows the performer to have some freedom to aid in expressing the structure of the sonata.

Conclusions

Schenker and Schnabel’s print editions of the “Waldstein” and “Appassionata” sonatas offer the performer two different approaches to realize Beethoven’s heroic tension. A close comparison of Schenker’s edition with Beethoven’s manuscripts will show that the only additions Schenker made were his own fingerings. Schnabel, on the other hand, included not only fingerings, but pedal markings, and even “phrasing slurs,” as Schenker calls them, which he very much disliked. Schenker, by supplying only original markings, afforded the performer freedom to decide how best to express the structure of each sonata. Schnabel’s editorial markings are meant to provide the performer with resources for achieving Beethoven’s original intentions. Furthermore, it appears that Schnabel’s editorial approach was based, at least in part, on performance practice of the early twentieth-century. For both these reasons, Schnabel’s print edition “invented” Beethoven for the twentieth-century.

Schnabel’s influence, however, is not limited to his editorial markings in print. The technology of audio recording would also alter how the world heard Beethoven, if for no other reason than that his music could be played on a record in the privacy of one’s own home. As the first performer to record all of Beethoven’s piano sonatas, Schnabel exerted great influence on how Beethoven’s heroic style would be expressed through this medium.

In the next chapter, I will compare Schnabel’s recordings of the “Waldstein” and “Appassionata” sonatas with those of Brendel, who, in contrast with Schnabel’s highly expressive style, favored a more restrained approach to interpreting Beethoven’s music.
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Chapter 4

Schnabel’s and Brendel’s Recordings of the “Waldstein” and “Appassionata” Sonatas

The recording analyses in this thesis are not without precedent. Earlier, I referenced Katz’s 2003 assessment of a large sample of twentieth-century recordings of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto in D Minor, Op. 61. His goal was to “come to a fuller and more nuanced understanding of the Concerto and at the same time reveal how both the reception of the piece and violin performance practice in general changed over the course of the twentieth century.” This chapter will focus on the two recordings of the “Waldstein” and “Appassionata” Sonatas made by Schnabel (Beethoven: The Complete Piano Sonatas, 1935) and Brendel (Beethoven: Complete Piano Sonatas, 1964) in order to identify different approaches to performing Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas in the twentieth-century. As I will show in my comparative analysis of their recordings, Schnabel employs a wider range of his tempos in order to delineate those passages where the music becomes more intense, whereas Brendel keeps to more consistent tempo choices.

Katz’s guidelines for comparison focused on characteristics of both the music itself and the instrument—in his case, the violin. The factors of his analysis were duration of a movement, tempo, vibrato, portamento, articulation and timbre. Since vibrato and portamento are issues primarily associated with stringed instruments, these will be of no use in our analysis on Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas. Likewise, timbre is generally used in comparing the sound of particular instruments; however, in the present study, the effects of recording technology on piano performance is the subject. Since the technologies themselves create such a different sound
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in production, it is difficult to judge how Schnabel’s or Brendel’s piano affected the performance. I will focus mainly on tempo and timing, both of which can be fairly assessed in a comparison of recordings of vastly different sound quality (but which may be subtly influenced by advances in sound technology, as will become apparent).

Effects of Technology on Heroic Conflict in Beethoven

Admittedly, a comparison of a recording from the 1930s with one form the 1960s presents particular challenges. First, Schnabel and Brendel recorded on two different types of discs. While Schnabel recorded on a series of 78-rpm (revolutions per minute) discs, Brendel recorded on a series of 33 1/3-rpm, “long-playing” discs (LPs). The 78-rpm and the 33 1/3-rpm were each about 10 to 12 inches in diameter; however, the difference in rotation speeds meant that there was a significant difference in the amount of time allotted to one side of the disc.

While the 78-rpm disc could only hold about three minutes on each side, the 33 1/3-rpm could hold twenty-three minutes per side. Thus, by developing a way to reduce the speed of the disc’s rotation while still being able to record sound in real time, performers were allowed to fit more music onto a single side and reduce their overall playing speed to one they found more manageable. Unlike 78s, LPs allowed for one continuous performance without the necessity of changing discs every-so-often. This allowed the audience to hear the drama within the music build without interruption.

Second, long-playing discs offered vastly improved sound quality. Samuel Lipman describes the limitations of earlier technologies such as 78-rpm discs:

Thick passages are often covered by a buzz of distortion; in very quiet passages the surface noise created by the cutting of the original wax with a mechanical stylus is all too
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often conscious of the engineer ‘riding gain’ on the volume, making soft passages softer so that they will not cause the blasting distortion for which early electrical 78-RPM discs were known.\textsuperscript{131}

In 1948 Columbia Records introduced the LP, which was more durable than the 78 rpms and capable of holding more musical information.\textsuperscript{132} Distortion levels were greatly reduced, including “blasting distortion,” where the sound level is so strong that the needle comes off of the record momentarily. This was considered especially problematic for listeners of classical music. Other record companies such as RCA developed other classical music recording technologies to rival Columbia’s LP, but according to David Buckley these technologies could not match the sound capabilities of the LP, especially when it came to classical music.\textsuperscript{133}

Also, the studio microphone invented in 1925 improved greatly in quality in the time between Schnabel’s and Brendel’s recordings. As electronic amplification technology itself became more advanced, so too did the ability of microphones to produce a life-like sound.\textsuperscript{134} Rothstein discusses how, over time, the capabilities of the recording technology were stressed more than the performance itself:

The musical goals were in fact subordinate to technological ambitions. During the late ’60s and ’70s overly miked orchestral recordings were regularly produced in which the engineer tinkered with balance and frequency response, thus taking over what should have been the conductor’s role. Splicing was also used to create the technically perfect—

\textsuperscript{133} Buckley, “LP [long-player; long playing record].” Buckley states, “RCA responded with the seven-inch 45 r.p.m. disc, but in 1952 the rival companies ensured that the LP became the format predominantly for classical music, while the single was used for popular music. From its outset the LP was thus associated with what were considered more serious listening habits, and a burgeoning market developed around its superior reproduction. This market was overwhelmingly male, and for some included an appreciation of faithful sound reproduction \emph{per se}.” By “faithful reproduction,” Buckley means the recording technology’s ability to portray the sound of the piano itself, as it would sound in a live performance. Thus, the “superior” and “faithful” reproduction of sound that came with the LP in the early 1950s demanded an attentive audience, much in the same way that recording technology was used in the home in the early decades of the century as an in-home performance, rather than as background.
\textsuperscript{134} Mumma, et al., “Recording: I. Technological Developments.”
if musically mediocre—performance that alone could hold its own in an increasingly crowded marketplace.\textsuperscript{135}

As these recordings became more widely circulated, they became the basis on which a performer modelled his performance: “The goal of the live performance was to sound as much like a spliced recording as possible.”\textsuperscript{136}

The change in sound reproduction between recordings from the 1930s and those from the 1960s makes the depiction of drama important in an assessment of performances of Beethoven’s Sonatas. The sound quality of the recording technology and the tempos chosen by Schnabel and Brendel work in tandem to depict heroic conflict in each of their recordings of the “Waldstein.”

Not all scholars agree with how the technology effects the performance. Lipman discusses the benefits of newer recording technology of the CD-era, in that it can record more music:

Whole movements and entire compositions can be taped in long stretches and, if so desired, in one continuous performance. Any errors or passages felt to require improvement can be cut out and inaudibly replaced by corrected versions called splices or inserts in a process made even easier by the new digital techniques.\textsuperscript{137}

However, Lipman goes on to point out that “It is because of this ability to make corrections, not because of any improvement in performing standards, that new recordings are note-perfect, while old one’s are often technically sloppy, slapdash, and therefore irremediably flawed.”\textsuperscript{138} Despite this concession, Lipman also states that although newer technologies create an “artificial” sound, “it is exhilarating to listen to the Beethoven sonatas played with every detail in place, and without the assorted messes so characteristic of the recordings of older artists (and without the messes characteristic of much live playing by today’s artists in concert).”\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{136} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{137} Lipman, “Beethoven & the Pianists,” 47.
\textsuperscript{138} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{139} Ibid.
Yet, this praise for technology’s ability to produce a “note-perfect” sound “without the messes” of live performance is exactly the reason why early performers such as Schnabel and Brendel disliked the technology. Arved Ashby argues that Schnabel’s dislike of technology stems from a debate between two different approaches to music performance, individualism and collectivism: “Schnabel believed in individualism rather than collectivism and thought recording an instrument of the second. He liked to repeat Goethe’s questions: ‘What is universal? The single case! What is the particular? Millions of cases!’ The undisputed aspects of a culture, in other words, originated from the individual and not the consensus.”

Brendel believed that recording technology led to, what Ashby calls, “emotional alienation and dislocation”:

The image of the machine in its impassive efficiency gained power over many minds. It became an obsession to strive for perfection. In mistrusting their own nature, artists denied themselves access to the nature of music. The usual symptoms of this are that emotions become either completely dried up or willfully superimposed. Often, both extremes are to be found in the same person, the vital area between them remains largely unfrequented.

Thus, recording technology prevented music from conveying raw emotion, since it demanded a perfection that was impossible to create in a real-life performance, which reduced the emotional impact. As technology improved, so too did the ability to realize such perfection, but with it came a reduced ability to communicate emotion.

In terms of heroic conflict in Beethoven’s music, such perfection is contradictory to the aesthetics of the work. Burnham describes the heroic elements in Beethoven’s middle period by citing the German musicologist Paul Bekker, claiming that, “For Bekker, the hero vacillates in his own mind between vorwärtsdragende Tatkraft (“forward-driving energy”) and klangend
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resignierendes Besinnen (“plaintive resigning deliberation”).” With a greater emphasis on perfection that reduces the conveyance of raw emotion—with the use of even and reduced tempos, as well as clarified voicings—Bekker’s “forward-driving energy” is undoubtedly diminished as a result of this technology. This energy is held in check by the consistent tempo; and the clear voicings reflect a desire to express the details of the work, rather than overall affect. Nevertheless, the clarity of sound may very well highlight aspects of musical conflict in ways that recording technology in the 1930s could not due to its sound quality. A discussion of particular moments in the development sections in the first movements of the “Waldstein” and “Appassionata” Sonatas as performed by Schnabel and Brendel will show the difference in tone quality and the effect on heroic conflict. Additionally, timing, articulations, and tempos are important in assessing the interpretations of recordings, and this is especially true in the heroic conflict of Beethoven.

**Recordings of the First Movement of the “Waldstein” Sonata**

The timings and tempos taken by Schnabel and Brendel influence our perception of heroic conflict. A comparison between the two reveals that Schnabel was more successful in conveying the “forward driving energy” and “plaintive resigning deliberation” found in these movements.

As shown in figure 4.2, Schnabel plays the first movement of the “Waldstein” faster than Brendel by 1 minute. This is due to Schnabel’s faster tempo than Brendel overall, in particular the triplets of the development (Figure 4.1):
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Schnabel accelerates slightly once he begins playing the triplets in measure 112 (at the 5:05 mark); he speeds up a bit more in measure 124 when the four-bar phrase of the arpeggios becomes a two-bar phrase (5:22). This does not seem to be intentional: in his edition, Schnabel does not indicate a new metronome marking from that found at the beginning of the development (quarter = 176) until the returning passage in measure 142 (quarter = 168). There is no reason to assume that this is a mistake, however: Schnabel does occasionally indicate accelerations of tempos in the exposition of Op. 53 in his edition when the piece becomes more energetic (such as the acceleration from 160 beats per minute to 168 beats per minute between measures 49 and 50). In the triplet theme in the development, the instability discussed in an earlier chapter warrants this acceleration.

**Overview of Recordings**

The timings in this chart are to be distinguished from the timings notated in parentheses in the following discussion as well as the discussion of the “Appassionata” recordings in Chapter 6, in that “m” and “s” indicates the total time of the recording (for example, “10m 07s”), whereas a time with a colon indicates the time within the recording in which a particular musical event takes place (for example, “5:05”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Schnabel (1935-1938)</th>
<th>Brendel (1964)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Movement: Allegro con brio</td>
<td>10 minutes 07 seconds</td>
<td>11 minutes 10 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Movement: Introduzione: Adagio molto</td>
<td>5m 07s</td>
<td>3m 43s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Movement: Rondo: Allegretto moderato</td>
<td>9m 00s</td>
<td>9m 44s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

144 The timings in this chart are to be distinguished from the timings notated in parentheses in the following discussion as well as the discussion of the “Appassionata” recordings in Chapter 6, in that “m” and “s” indicates the total time of the recording (for example, “10m 07s”), whereas a time with a colon indicates the time within the recording in which a particular musical event takes place (for example, “5:05”).
Brendel takes the triplets at a very consistent tempo—not even accelerating from the previous theme—at about half-note equals 75 (5:32). The more advanced recording technology also leads to more clarity in the recording than Schnabel’s recording. For example, pedalling is much easier to identify, since there is no static fuzz, and the sound quality is closer to that heard in everyday life. When the sustain pedal is held down, the tone of the pitch played is sustained for as long as the pedal is held; if the pedal is released, on the other hand, the pitch is suddenly stopped. Sounds from Brendel’s arpeggios are clearly sustained and judging by how long the tone of the sustained notes last, they are not merely echoing in the studio, but are rather sustained through the use of pedal. He gradually crescendos during the triplet flourishes, beginning around the 6-minute mark, but still maintains a consistent tempo. This crescendo occurs in measure 124, when Beethoven shortens the phrase from four bars to two, enhancing the drama.
Katz discusses a similar instance in his analysis of recordings made of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto in D Major, Op. 61, specifically in the first movement. He identifies six significant passages from this movement, and claims that the different tempos taken are derived from the thematic stability of each passage: “The difference between these passages is revealing: the former are thematically stable areas, and the latter are transitional or more rhythmically active (as in the final measures of the movement).”

since during measures 124-135, the harmonic progression is so unstable: E-flat minor-six-four to F-sharp-major-minor-six-five to B-minor to G-major-six to C-minor to D-flat major to F-sharp-fully-diminished-seventh. Brendel enhances the drama of this harmonically unstable section of the development through gradual crescendo, rather than an accelerando.

Figure 4.2 indicates that Brendel plays the whole development of Op. 53 from 4:47 to 6:40, for a total of 1 minute, 53 seconds. Schnabel’s development takes place between 4:27 and 6:06, for a total of 1 minute, 39 seconds. In his discussion of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto, Katz argues that performance timings reflect societal attitudes: “I believe that the longer performance times reflect a change in attitude toward the Concerto…The Concerto became more stately and serene in the hands of performers over the course of the twentieth-century.”\textsuperscript{146} Thus, the character of the piece is understood differently from one generation of musicians to the next, and as a result, performers approach the piece with different tempos.

Schnabel’s accelerandos in measures 112 and 124—two measures in which the music itself intensifies—seem to also reflect an attitude held by other musicians of his time. In his 1925 recording of Violin Concerto, the conductor Leopold Auer claimed that an accelerando is “natural and obvious, even though it is not indicated.” In 1930, the conductor Carl Flesch called the accelerando “absolutely justified”; and in 1934, the violinist Huberman accelerated the tempo so much that the rest of the Vienna Philharmonic was forced to keep up with him.\textsuperscript{147} Indeed, Katz argued that “elasticity” in tempo was “considered essential to any expressive performance, regardless of genre.”\textsuperscript{148} Later generations of performers from the late-twentieth- and early-twenty-first-centuries made recordings of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto in which “the pace has

\textsuperscript{146} Katz, “Beethoven in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction: The Violin Concerto on Record., 41.
\textsuperscript{147} Ibid., 44.
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., 49.
slowed, the tempo contours have been smoothed out, and timbre has been more consistent, all lending a sense of balance and composure.”

Thus musical expression was emphasized over technical and temporal precision in Schnabel’s time, while the reverse was the case in Brendel’s age.

Furthermore, Schnabel’s performance of the retransition (mm. 142-156) is characterized by a series of gradual accelerations, corresponding to Katz’s study of early twentieth-century performers’ tendency to accelerate the tempo when the music became harmonically unstable. This passage begins with an eerie calm, resolving the F-sharp fully-diminished-seventh arpeggio with a blocked G major chord at a pianissimo dynamic (measure 142, 5:46, see Figure 4.4), but the left hand continues with a descending sixteenth-note pattern in the low register of the piano:

Figure 4.5: Wallner, Op. 53, I, 142-144

Thus, although the blocked chord has resolved the triplets, a new rhythmic drive is created from below. Schnabel reduces his tempo here to 160 beats per minute. As the right hand ascends again, moving farther and farther apart from the left hand, Schnabel accelerates the tempo to 176 beats per minute in measure 148 (5:55). When the music crescendos to forte in measure 152, Schnabel increases the tempo to 176 beats per minute. This creates greater tension in measures 153 and 154 where Beethoven has created a passage of “raw sound,” as described by Kenneth
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Drake and finally, when he reaches the contrary motion scales at the end of the returning passage, he plays them rapidly at nearly 200 beats per minute (measure 155, 6:05). Finally, in the contrary motion scales that bring the music back to the opening theme, Schnabel indicates a tempo of quarter equals 184. The returning passage thus begins as an unstable resolution, and as the right hand ascends, the passage itself becomes increasingly unstable, to the point where the hands are nearly six octaves apart, emphasizing a low G and a high F. Here, just as in the triplet theme, a modern listener can identify the relation between Schnabel’s tempos and early twentieth-century aesthetics, namely that the areas of tonal or rhythmic instability called for an accelerating tempo.

Brendel takes the return at a consistent tempo of about 150 beats per minute (6:18-6:40). However, when compared to the other themes within the development, Brendel plays the return faster. He brings the development to its slowest tempo between mm. 136 and 141, beginning with a tempo of about 140 beats per minute (6:16). But with the beginning of the return in measure 142, Brendel immediately speeds the tempo to 150 beats per minute (6:18), which he maintains all the way into the downbeat of the recapitulation in measure 156 (6:40). Brendel resists adding any accelerations. Such a “polished” tempo, to use Katz’s term, is reflective of mid- and late-twentieth-century performance practice, as well as the longer recording time and modified recording technology of the 1960s, as compared to that of the 1930s.

While Brendel’s tempos only range from about 140 beats per minute to 160 beats per minute, Schnabel’s tempos reflect a wider range from 160 to 200. In addition to the general sound quality afforded by their differing recording technologies, the particular tempos they
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151 After measuring the tempo of bar 155 three times: I first measured 184 bpm, then the second and third time each came out to be about 200 bpm. A sixteen beat difference is very small, and both tempos seem to realize the intended effect of accelerating into the recapitulation.
choose and the degree to which they vary those tempos are primarily what sets their interpretations of the development section of the Allegro con brio apart. Each performer presents a different meaning of the movement, in much the same way that Katz argues the meaning of the Violin Concerto changed from generation to generation: a 1930s expressive performance in Schnabel versus a 1960s precise performance in Brendel.

Overall, Schnabel’s recording of the “Waldstein” presents a more “heroic” interpretation. With the wider range of his tempos, especially in his use *accelerandos* when the music becomes more intense, Schnabel’s performance better embodies Bekker’s “forward driving energy” than does Brendel’s strict interpretation.

**Recordings of the First Movement of the “Appassionata” Sonata**

The factors that influence heroic conflict in the “Waldstein” recordings also influence the tragic conflict in the “Appassionata” recordings. While both Schnabel and Brendel take the first movement of the “Appassionata” at similar speeds (Schnabel plays the movement at dotted-quarter = 120, while Brendel plays at dotted-quarter = 110), they each push and pull the tempo constantly and in different places. This free approach to performance effects the duration specifically. However, the different recording technologies and the general approaches to performance also play a role in how the conflict in this tragic sonata is portrayed.

The different recording technologies and the liberties taken by Schnabel and Brendel in their recordings impact the timings of each theme and movement of the “Appassionata” Sonata, as seen in the tables below:


Overview of Recordings

Figure 4.6: Duration of Each Movement, Piano Sonata in F minor, Op. 57, “Appassionata”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Schnabel (1935-1938)</th>
<th>Brendel (1964)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Movement: Allegro assai</td>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>9:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Movement: Andante con moto</td>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>6:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Movement: Allegro ma non troppo - Presto</td>
<td>7:12</td>
<td>8:02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7: Timing of the First Movement: Allegro assai, “Appassionata”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Schnabel (1935-1938)</th>
<th>Brendel (1964)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>0:00-2:25</td>
<td>0:00-2:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>4:35-6:59</td>
<td>4:51-7:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>6:59-9:00</td>
<td>7:21-9:41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schnabel’s performance of the development is fourteen seconds faster than Brendel’s. Schnabel accelerates the tempo significantly as the music becomes more agitated. When developing the soft, octave position arpeggios and the trill motive (measures 65-78, 2:27-2:54), Schnabel maintains the tempo he took in the exposition, at about dotted-quarter = 120 (refer to Figures 3.14 and 3.15 on pages xx-xx). When he reaches the sudden forte statement (measure 79, 2:54), his tempo gradually—and quickly—accelerates. By measure 90 (3:13), Schnabel has reached a tempo of dotted-quarter = 150. In the A-fully-diminished-seventh- A-flat-dominant-seventh chord alternation in measure 92 (3:16), Schnabel seems to rush through these arpeggios even more, accelerating to 155 beats per minute, as if trying desperately to reach the A-flat pedal point in measure 93 (3:18).
Schnabel slows down the D-flat major theme beginning in measure 94 significantly to about 135 beats per minute, but when he comes to the succession of diminished arpeggios (mm. 123-129). Schnabel rapidly accelerates once again to 150 beats per minute (even very briefly reaching 155 beats per minute at measure 128), banishing any sense of calm brought about by the A-flat major theme. Such “thematically (un)stable” and more “rhythmically active” measures, to borrow Katz’s terminology, are comparable to the musico-cultural conclusion that Katz makes in his discussion of recordings of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto, as we found in our discussion of the “Waldstein.” Here, like in his recording of the “Waldstein,” Schnabel has adopted a performance technique that is simply a reflection of his time: accelerating the tempo to enhance the drama.

The tempo fluctuations incorporated by Schnabel differ significantly from Brendel’s approach. Brendel takes the beginning of the development at a tempo of about 115 beats per minute (2:28). His tempos also increase as the music becomes louder, as it becomes more dissonant, and as rhythmic drive builds, though not as much as Schnabel’s. By measure 79, Brendel speeds up to about 120 beats per minute (2:58). His tempo remains consistent all the
way through this agitated section of the development, until the very end, when he slows down the mid-range octave position arpeggios in measure 92 (3:24), the opposite approach taken by Schnabel who, as we said, accelerates here. However, like Schnabel, Brendel slows down the second developed theme in D major starting in measure 94 (3:29), but only to about 110 beats per minute—a difference of ten beats per minute, as opposed to twenty beats per minute. When he reaches the diminished arpeggios in measure 123 (4:27), Brendel again accelerates to about 125 beats per minute, and by beat 3 of measure 125 (4:32), he speeds up a bit more to 130 beats per minute. Finally, in measure 130 (4:40), at the beginning of the “fate motive,” he reduces the tempo back to 115, which he continues into the beginning of the recapitulation (pick-up to measure 136, 4:51). One could argue that the rhythmic activity in a passage such as can be found in measures 125-129 in Op. 57, justifies Brendel’s tempo acceleration, as it justified Schnabel’s. In this way, Brendel’s accelerations are, in fact, reflective of Schnabel’s approach, and therefore, Brendel’s combination of tempo acceleration and rhythmic activity enhances the tragic conflict in these measures. However, Brendel’s more restricted accelerations reflect the changing approaches to performance tempos between the 1930s and the 1960s.

The different approaches to the end of the development in Op. 57 have implications for the tragic conflict in the beginning of the recapitulation, particularly in Schnabel’s recording. Beethoven continues the rhythmic activity at the end of the development into the recapitulation by maintaining the dominant pedal, beginning in measure 134. By doing so, the sense of arrival is delayed, and the rhythmic drive intensifies the drama in the recap when compared to the exposition. Schnabel’s tempo in this theme relates to Katz’s idea discussed earlier that

152 As discussed regarding the development of the Waldstein, Katz describes how violinists from this time period—such as Leopold Auer, Carl Flesch, and Bronislaw Huberman—believed that rhythmic activity in Beethoven’s Violin Concerto justifies tempo acceleration. Katz, “Beethoven in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction: The Violin Concerto on Record,” 44.
performers from the early-twentieth-century “used tempo to delineate structure, where an increased tempo highlights the instability of transitions and a relaxed tempo signals stability.”

When Brendel reaches the recapitulation (measure 135), he takes his original tempo at 115 beats per minute (4:59). Schnabel’s original tempo at the beginning of the movement is about 120 beats per minute, but with the beginning of the recapitulation, he plays the first theme at about 125 beats per minute (4:35). Ordinarily, five beats per minute is such a small difference that it would be hardly noticeable, but with the dominant pedal pulsating beneath the theme, an acceleration is apparent. What is also interesting to note about the recapitulation in both recordings is how the presentation of the opening theme itself changes from that in the exposition. In the exposition, both Schnabel and Brendel pull the tempo a bit during the trills and even during the pick-up to each phrase with the descending arpeggios; in the recapitulation, however, tempos are hardly pulled at all, and the dominant pedal almost makes the theme sound faster than in the exposition. In reality, though, it is simply played more consistently, creating the illusion of acceleration.

Overall, however, Schnabel’s small accelerations in the development and Brendel’s consistency each enhance the “eminently tragic tone of the whole work,” as Tovey describes it. Brendel allows Beethoven’s dynamic markings and written ranges, such as those found in measures 123-134, to create the drama themselves (4:27-4:48). According to Drake, Beethoven often created, “raw sound” “where the harmonic movement is static and only dynamic contrast holds the listener’s attention.” This technique was used to “produce a psychological response
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154 Donald Francis Tovey, A Companion to Beethoven’s Pianoforte Sonatas (London: The Associated Board for the Royal Schools of Music, 1998), 69
which enables the listener to accept these passages as points of reorientation.” These measures consist of a series of E fully-diminished-seventh chords in various inversions. The seventh (D-flat) finally resolves to C in measure 132, though the rawness is not lost, since this resolution is repeated 4 times, and the D-flat remains prominent. Brendel’s consistent tempo allows this raw sound to essentially speak for itself, without the aid of expressive touch by the performer, but it also reflects, again, a more precise, controlled approach to performance common by the mid-twentieth-century. Schnabel’s slight acceleration around measure 119 (4:06) (when the development of the second theme is fragmented) intensifies the diminished arpeggios starting in measure 123 (Schnabel, 4:13). By measure 130, the raw sound created by the E-fully-diminished-seventh-chord (4:25), and then the C-dominant-seventh-chord (4:28), has reached a climax in rhythm (with its persistent sixteenths between the low and high registers of the melody), tempo, and dynamic. Schnabel’s acceleration enhances this incredibly dramatic moment and, again, highlights the instability of this transition, reflecting an early-twentieth-century aesthetic, in which the tempo served as a primary way for the performer to bring out the emotional content of the music. A performer would increase or decrease the tempo depending on whether the musical character intensifies or relaxes. Katz explains that

From today’s perspective it is easy to hear the flexibility of the older recordings as sloppy or capricious. What we are hearing, however, stems from an earlier aesthetic. For example, in 1913 Frederick Niecks wrote of ‘the propriety, even the desirability—nay, the necessity—of tempo modifications; that is, slackenings here, and hastenings there,’ and the violinist Achille Rivarde explained in 1921 that ‘elasticity of movement should be felt in every bar.’ This elasticity was considered essential to any expressive performance, regardless of genre.¹⁵⁷

Katz cites a 1910 review by an unknown author, describing a performance by “the great nineteenth-century champion of the Concerto,”158 Joseph Joachim, of Beethoven’s Violin Concerto and a Hungarian dance: “naturally a Hungarian dance gave him more scope for rhythmical license than the Beethoven concerto, but in neither one nor the other was there any undue anxiety about the exact equalization of the beats.”159 Katz argues that this practice is “hardly haphazard,” and that it “conformed to an ideal of musical performance in which tempo fluctuations conveyed changing emotional intensity or signaled important structural events.”160 Katz notes, however, that over time, balance became the first priority in transmitting the emotional content of the music:

In the earlier recordings the greater extremes and flexibility of tempo highlight the changing stability of the music, the more prominent portamento intensifies and dramatizes certain notes and passages over others, and the broader timbral palette suggests that the character of the music could change from one measure to the next. By contrast, in recent recordings the pace has slowed, the tempo contours have been smoothed out, and timbre has become more consistent, all lending a sense of balance and composure.161

Thus, Brendel’s “balanced” performance in measures 123-134 compared to Schnabel’s more “flexible” performance of these measures shows a change in the performer’s understanding of the sonata between the 1930s and 1960s.

In tandem with the performer’s chosen tempos, rhythms were treated with some flexibility in early recordings as well. Philip explains that early twentieth-century performers tended to over-dot dotted rhythms, reflecting “a more flexible and, to modern taste, more casual attitude to rhythmic detail.”162 Schnabel takes this approach in his performance of the

158 Katz, “Beethoven in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” 46
159 Ibid.
160 Ibid., 53-54.
161 Ibid., 54.
162 Philip, “Traditional Habits of Performance in Early-Twentieth-Century Recordings of Beethoven,” 198.
“Appassionata.” Beginning with the forte statement of the opening theme in measure 78, Schnabel extends the quarter-sixteenth-tie in each statement of the developed opening theme, and plays the subsequent sixteenth-note shorter:

Figure 4.9: Wallner, Op. 57, I, 76-81

Additionally, when Schnabel reaches the quintuplets in measure 81 (2:58), he accelerates the tempo slightly. Philip explains that in early-twentieth-century recordings, “Groups of semiquavers in fast movements were often played rather fast and lightly. This is one of the features of Schnabel’s playing which now seems particularly characteristic of him.”163 What distinguishes measure 81 from measure 80 compositionally is that the sixteenth-note accompaniment is no longer used merely for effect, like it is in measures 79 and 80; rather it has become a full G-dominant-seventh-arpeggio, and the descending outline apparent on every beat in measure 81 (F, D, B, G) draws the listener’s attention, especially in the measures that follow when Beethoven exploits the range of his instrument.

---

163 Philip, “Traditional Habits of Performance Practice in Early-Twentieth-Century Recordings of Beethoven,” 199.
A closer attention to rhythmic detail became more important to “basic musical rhetoric”\textsuperscript{164} in the latter half of the twentieth-century, according to Philip. This is certainly exemplified in Brendel’s recording of the same passage. Brendel plays the tied-syncopated rhythm (like that in the left hand on beat 4 in measure 78) very much in time at about 120 beats per minute. In fact, Brendel maintains this tempo through measure 91. A crucial difference between Schnabel and Brendel’s recordings—and an excellent example of the difference in each performer’s attention to rhythmic detail—occurs in measure 92, when Beethoven seems to bring the arpeggio flourishes to a grinding halt (see figure 4.8). Schnabel and Brendel take opposite approaches to these rhythms: while Schnabel accelerates from about 152 bpm to 160 bpm, Brendel actually slows the tempo from 120 bpm to 115 bpm. Philip may point toward the reason for this:

In modern performance, a limited relaxation of tempo is still considered acceptable, but acceleration is particularly discouraged. Hurrying is now regarded as an elementary fault which should be stamped out during training, rather than, as in earlier times, a natural expression of musical tension which can be exploited for the shaping of a movement.\textsuperscript{165}

He also points out where the modern approach can be problematic in terms of how the listener hears the shape of the movement:

One of the consequences of this is that, when relaxation does occur in modern performance, recovery to the original tempo is often less immediate, and more reluctant,

\textsuperscript{164} Philip, “Traditional Habits of Performance Practice in Early-Twentieth-Century Recordings of Beethoven,” 199.
\textsuperscript{165} Ibid., 197
than in old performances; and because fast tempos are generally less fast than they used to be, the recovery to tempo is less extreme.\textsuperscript{166}

Thus, the \textit{decelerando} used by Brendel allows for a smooth transition from the development of the first theme to the development of the second theme; and, in fact, Brendel does take one measure to return to the original tempo at the beginning of the second theme. He accelerates immediately in measure 93 with the A-flat pedal, but quickly relaxes in measure 94 when the theme enters in the right hand:

Figure 4.11: Wallner, Op. 57, I, 94-97

The contrasts between the example above and the example on the previous page further highlight Katz’s claim about early recordings: “an increase in tempo highlights the instability of transitions while a relaxed tempo signals stability.”\textsuperscript{167} This all goes back to the idea that later recordings wanted to clarify detail, whereas early recordings sought to communicate the overall affect.

Following the lyrical A-flat major theme comes perhaps the biggest moment of heroic conflict in the whole movement. The arpeggios beginning in bar 123 represent a change in performance style from the time of Schnabel to that of Brendel. Brendel takes a rhythmically strict approach to these arpeggios, in that the sixteenth-notes sound clear and even, almost to the point where the listener can count these notes in rhythm:

\textsuperscript{166} Philip, “Traditional Habits of Performance Practice in Early-Twentieth-Century Recordings of Beethoven,” 199.

\textsuperscript{167} Katz, “Beethoven in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” 43.
Schnabel, however, plays these arpeggios at such a fast tempo that they sound almost like rolled-chords and the sixteenth-note rhythms sound less apparent to the listener. These differing approaches further exemplify the change in performance practice between the 1930s and the 1960s. Robert Philip even points out that Schnabel was part of a school of performers in the early twentieth-century who played with a “lightness of rhythmic detail”:

overdotting of dotted rhythms, flurries of semiquaver (sixteenth-note) groups instead of the deliberate articulation we expect today, the tendency to accelerate when there is a lot of activity—is simply the pianist’s version of what can be heard in recordings of chamber ensembles and orchestras.\(^{168}\)

Schnabel, it seems, is more concerned with creating a flurry of sound than articulating the rhythms. We can recognize the significance of Schnabel’s approach when we consider how scholars have discussed this passage. Tovey even remarks that these diminished-sevenths create a sense that “The passion is beyond articulate utterance.”\(^{169}\) Brendel’s even tempo and precise rhythms make these arpeggios articulate; Schnabel’s light rhythmic detail, where his speed makes the rhythms virtually un-countable, make these arpeggios less articulate. While Tovey’s *Companion to Beethoven’s Pianoforte Sonatas* was re-issued in 2015, it was originally published in 1931, the year before Schnabel began recording the sonatas. One could argue, then, that the emphasis on a “passion” that is “beyond articulate utterance,” as Tovey puts it, is an aspect of


\(^{169}\) Tovey, *A Companion to Beethoven’s Pianoforte Sonatas*, 172.
this sonata that was emphasized more in early-twentieth-century performance practice than it was later in the century. In any case, the more rhythmically active passage is approached by Schnabel in such a way that highlights the tension and emphasizes the heroic conflict.

Articulation is the key difference between each performer’s presentation of the retransition as well. An example of these approaches to articulation occurs in the retransition measures 130 and 133. Schnabel uses the sustain pedal through these measures (4:24-4:32):

![Figure 4.13: Wallner, Op. 57, I, 130-133](image)

It is possible that he changes pedal on the low C in measure 132, but this is difficult to tell with the limited clarity allowed by his 78 rpm recording technology. Nevertheless, Schnabel’s performance of these measures connects each note in the left hand, emphasizing the total effect over the particular notes and details. Brendel uses pedal as well, but he also lifts on the lower pitches starting on beat 4 in measure 131 (4:43), detaching each note from the next. The articulations chosen by each performer in measures 130-133 contribute to the tragic conflict in separate ways. Schnabel’s approach once again contributes to a flurry of sound, like what he created in the arpeggios leading up to this passage. Brendel’s approach is once again more articulate; his restrictive use of pedal is designed to bring out each pitch in the left hand motive,
as well as further dramatize the arrival of the low C in measure 132 (4:44). Thus, Schnabel’s connected approach enhances the forward-driving energy, while Brendel’s detached approach highlights the individual aspects of the work—its structure, rhythmic movement, and character, as described by Kinderman—to create a psychological conception of a hero.

Conclusions

The approaches taken by both Brendel and Schnabel can be differentiated by one key feature: where to focus the listener’s attention. Schnabel’s use of pedal, accelerations, and rushed upbeats (like those found in measures 78 and 92) focus the listener’s attention on the sonata movement as a whole. Brendel’s more articulate approach—with use of ritardando and rhythmic precision—focuses the listener’s attention on the theme currently being presented. Thus, in Brendel’s performance, it is almost as if the heroic conflict occurs as a series of different events, whereas Schnabel’s performance presents the heroic conflict as one, uninterrupted storyline, emphasizing the relationships between every element of the work. As his student Eunice Norton later claimed, Schnabel believed that “Without relationships, there isn’t any music because relationships and shapes make the structure.”

These two recordings represent a change in our understanding of Beethoven’s heroic style, from a focus on the overall forward-driving energy to one on individual characteristics. Since the whole piece is itself characterized as being part of Beethoven’s “heroic style,” Schnabel’s approach is more heroic.

---

Conclusion: Bringing Forth All of Beethoven

Beethoven’s words from the Heiligenstadt Testament that opened this thesis indicate the composer’s determination to use his art as an expressive outlet. His desire to “(bring) forth all that was within me” is reflected in the “Waldstein” and the “Appassionata” sonatas that express a constant movement of pushing forward, projecting the emotional contents to their fullest extent.\textsuperscript{171} How does a performer approach and realize the composer’s intentions?

In this thesis, I have shown how Schenker’s strict adherence to the original score does not specify the means by which the performer is to obtain the effects desired by the composer. While Schnabel shares Schenker’s viewpoint that the performer’s job is to express the structure and effect of the work as indicated by the composer’s notation, he provided additional markings to aid the performer in that effort. A comparison of Schenker and Schnabel’s editions of the first movements of the “Waldstein” and “Appassionata” Sonatas leads me to conclude that Schnabel’s generous editorial markings better represent Beethoven’s heroic style than Schenker’s more conservative approach.

Likewise, Schnabel’s audio recordings of these pieces successfully captured Beethoven’s heroism, despite the technological limitations of the time. Tempo is perhaps the most easily identifiable aspect of performance interpretation upon a first hearing of any recording. As the preceding discussion regarding the tempos taken by Schnabel and Brendel reveal, performance tempos have very little—if anything—to do with the limited capabilities of early recording technology. Early metronome markings from the nineteenth-century are very similar to the performance tempos taken by early-twentieth-century performers such as Schnabel. As recording

technology improved, evenness of tempo and clarity became important to both performing musicians and listeners of classical music. Schnabel’s wide variations of tempo make evenness and clarity very difficult to achieve, but his playing style was meant to clarify the effect of the music, and not merely the particular details.

This, of course, contrasts greatly with later recordings of the mid-twentieth century by Brendel. The clarity of voicings, the slower tempos with limited rubato, even the more advanced microphone that produces a sound similar to that which one might hear in a live performance, all highlight even the subtlest details of the work in Brendel’s performances and focus the listeners’ attention on them. In Brendel’s recordings of the sonatas, notes and voicings are much more audible than in Schnabel’s recordings; every detail of the work is brought to the attention of the listener. A comparison of Schnabel’s and Brendel’s recordings provide evidence that from the early- to the mid-twentieth-century, performance practice shifted from emphasis on overall affect to significance of details.

How does all of this relate to Beethoven’s heroic and tragic conflict? What we see in comparing Schenker’s and Schnabel’s approaches to performance with that of Brendel’s is that in the early-twentieth-century, performers viewed this conflict in a more holistic way, focusing on the overall affect of the work; but by the middle of the century, as recording technology improved, the details took precedence in performance interpretations of heroic and tragic conflict in Beethoven.

As Schenker claimed, the performer “must seek those means that will communicate the structure and the affect of the work as clearly as possible.”172 For Schnabel, the “masterworks” require an approach to performance in which the audience can hear the shifting characters, the

---

modulations, the evolutions from the lyrical to the dramatic themes without getting consumed in any one particular detail. The performer’s focus on precision and technique, which Schnabel argues is the purpose of the “virtuoso pieces,” places the listener’s attention on the skill of the performer, rather than the drama of the music. That drama—the heroic and tragic conflict of the “Waldstein” and “Appassionata” Sonatas—is the chief subject of communication on the part of the performer.

Perhaps we may summarize Schnabel’s approach to Beethoven’s heroic conflict in this way: first, we must understand the overall character through Beethoven’s markings; and second, we must not allow an obsession with these markings to force us to “neglect the creative task.”173 From this standpoint, it would seem that the precision in the recordings of Brendel, and even generations that followed him, has allowed this obsession to overtake performance creation. What Schnabel, and to a lesser extent Schenker, reveal to us is this: the heroic conflict in Beethoven’s middle period sonatas is present within the structure of the composition itself and is what most arrests our attention as listeners; but this conflict is indiscernible if the performer approaches the music in a fashion that is too exact, too precise. Though it is impossible to know for certain exactly how Beethoven wanted his music to sound, we can at least insist that performers not force audiences’ attention into too many particularities, but rather provide an atmosphere where Beethoven’s heroic conflict can be ever present in the minds of listeners.

Appendix 1:
Editions of Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas


Appendix 2:

Discography 1: Artur Schnabel’s Recordings of Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas

Sonata No. 1 in F Minor, Op. 2, No. 1
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
23-24 April 1934

Sonata No. 2 in A, Op. 2, No. 2
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
9 April 1933

Sonata No. 3 in C, Op. 2, No. 3
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
26-27 April 1934

Sonata No. 4 in E flat, Op. 7
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
11 Nov. 1935 & 15 Jan. 1937

Sonata No. 5 in C Minor, Op. 10, No. 1
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
19 April 1933 & 6 Nov. 1935

Sonata No. 6 in F, Op. 10, No. 2
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
10 April 1933

Sonata No. 7 in D, Op. 10, No. 3
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
12 Nov. 1935

Sonata No. 8 in C Minor, Op. 13, “Pathetique”
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
2 Oct. 1933 & 23 April 1934
Sonata No. 9 in E, Op. 14, No. 1
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
25 March 1932

Sonata No. 10 in G, Op. 14, No. 2
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
23 April 1934

Sonata No. 11 in B flat, Op. 22
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
12-13 April 1933

Sonata No. 12 in A flat, Op. 26
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
25-27 April, 7 May 1934

Sonata No. 13 in E flat, Op. 27, No. 1
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
1 Nov. 1932

Sonata No. 14 in C sharp Minor, Op. 27, No. 2, “Moonlight”
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
10-11 April 1933

HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
6 June 1947 – Not issued on record

Sonata No. 15 in D, Op. 28, “Pastoral”
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
3 Feb. 1932 & 3, 17 Feb. 1933

Sonata No. 16 in G, Op. 31, No. 1
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
5-6 Nov. 1935 & 15 Jan. 1937
Sonata No. 17 in D Minor, Op. 31, No. 2, “Tempest”
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
27-28 April 1934

Sonata No. 18 in E flat, Op. 31, No. 3
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
25 March 1932

Sonata No. 19 in G Minor, Op. 49, No. 1
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
19 Nov. 1932

Sonata No. 20 in G, Op. 49, No. 2
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
12 April 1933

HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
25 April, 7 May 1934

Sonata No. 22 in F, Op. 54
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
11 April 1933

Sonata No. 23 in F Minor, Op. 57, “Appassionata”
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
11 April 1933

Sonata No. 24 in F-Sharp, Op. 78
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
21 March 1932

Sonata No. 25 in G, Op. 79
HMV recording
Abbey Road Studios, London
15 Nov. 1935
Sonata No. 26 in E flat, Op. 81a, “Lebewohl”  
HMV recording  
Abbey Road Studios, London  
13 April 1933

Sonata No. 27 in E Minor, Op. 90  
HMV recording  
Abbey Road Studios, London  
21 Jan., 3 Feb. 1932

Sonata No. 28 in A, Op. 101  
HMV recording  
Abbey Road Studios, London  
24 April 1934

Sonata No. 29 in B flat, Op. 106, “Hammerklavier”  
HMV recording  
Abbey Road Studios, London  
3-4 Nov. 1935

Sonata No. 30 in E, Op. 109  
HMV recording  
Abbey Road Studios, London  
22 March 1932

Sonata No. 30 in E, Op. 109  
RCA recording  
RCA Victor Studios, NYC  
18, 23 June 1942

Sonata No. 31 in A flat, Op. 110  
HMV recording  
Abbey Road Studios, London  
21 Jan. 1932

Sonata No. 32 in C Minor, Op. 111  
HMV recording  
Abbey Road Studios, London  
21 Jan., 21-22 March, 7 May 1932

Sonata No. 32 in C Minor, Op. 111  
RCA recording  
RCA Victor Studios, NYC  
16-17 June 1942
Appendix 3:

Discography 2: Alfred Brendel’s Recordings of Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas

Beethoven: Piano Sonatas & Concertos
Decca Music Group
London, U.K.
10 January 2011

Beethoven: The Complete Piano Sonatas – Samtliche Klaviersonaten
Decca Music Group
London, U.K.
07 December 2014

Beethoven: Piano Sonatas – Moonlight, Appassionata, Pathetique, Les Adieux
Musical Concepts
2007

Beethoven: Favourite Piano Sonatas
Decca Classic Production
Germany
18 January 1994

Beethoven: The Last Piano Sonatas
Decca Music Group
London, U.K.
10 May 1993

Decca: Philips
London, U.K.
29 March 2014

Decca: Philips
London, U.K.
08 July 1999

Beethoven: Piano Sonatas: Klaviersonten: Op. 109, 110, 111
Decca Music Group
London, U.K.
20 July 1999
Tuxedo Music
Switzerland
1957, 1991

Alfred Brendel Plays Beethoven: Piano Sonatas, Vols. 1, 2, 3, 4
Vox Recording Studios
Los Angeles, CA
1991

Decca Music Group
London, U.K.
16 August 1999

Decca Music Group
London, U.K.
06 September 1999

Beethoven: The Late Piano Sonatas
Decca Music Group
London, U.K.
June 1993

Op. 49, No. 1
Philips
London, U.K.
1994

Favourite Piano Sonatas: Beethoven
Brilliant Classics
Netherlands
01 August 2011
Beethoven: Piano Sonata Nos. 21, 30, 32; Bagatelles, Op. 126; Piano Concerto No. 4
Decca: Artist’s Choice
London, U.K.
23 January 2006
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