

Ornamentation in the Piano Music of Beethoven

Daniel Herscovitch, *University of Sydney*

This paper investigates how Beethoven most probably intended his ornaments to be played. It relies less on the writings of CPE Bach, Leopold Mozart and others, which have questionable validity in Beethoven, and more on the evidence of Beethoven's own music, especially his autographs and the first editions. The extensive writings of his student and protégé Carl Czerny are also consulted as well as the investigations of contemporary musicologists

In 1822 Beethoven wrote this reply in one of his conversation books: “we have no Botany Bay, where criminals can be sent”.¹ So Beethoven had a dim awareness of Australia's existence. Even so he would have been astonished had he been told that almost two centuries later we would be gathered here for a learned discussion concerning arcane questions of ornamentation. No doubt he would have been amused by the absurdity of it and broken out into his characteristic boisterous laughter.

Be that as it may, here we are indeed 185 years later to do exactly that. It is interesting to speculate on the reasons why. My own interest in these questions was sparked by two or three passages in the Sonata in D minor Op.31 No.2, a work I have played and thought about for almost forty years, and where I have come to conclusions at odds with nearly every performance I have heard. I will come to these later. But it must be said that Beethoven's music presents far more acute problems to its interpreters than whether a trill begins from above or not, for example. And until relatively recently musicologists apparently felt the same. Whereas there have been several notable books and a veritable flood of papers on ornamentation in Bach and Mozart, particularly since the Second World War, the corresponding literature on Beethoven has until recently been relatively sparse. Of course this has practical reasons too: as soon becomes apparent to anyone immersing themselves in this problem Beethoven could be both old-fashioned and progressive in his treatment of ornamentation, often within the same work, occasionally even within the same bar. Very often it is not possible or even desirable to lay down the law: our contemporary quest for certainty in these matters is reflected in our obsession with Urtext editions. We modern musicians find it difficult to live with ambiguity and therefore demand a text that has the unquestioned authority and pristine purity of a High Court ruling or even a papal proclamation. But this was not how the text of a musical work was perceived two hundred years ago. As Brian Jeffery writes in his preface to the reprints of the first editions of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas: “...the early editions belonged to a time when the concepts of precision, logicity and consistency which we have today had not yet taken the form they now have...the early editions incorporate an approach to detail which is not the same as ours, and which can appear merely inconsistent whereas in fact it is more open and less restrictive. It is legitimate to speak even in terms of deliberate ambiguity”.²

¹ My thanks to Dr Peter McCallum for drawing my attention to this remark.

² L.v.Beethoven: *The 32 Piano Sonatas in reprints of the first and early editions With preface by Dr. Brian Jeffery* London, 1989

As far as I am aware the first musician to devote time and effort to this question was Franz Kullak (1844-1913), who incidentally was one of the first to attempt to publish editions faithful to composers' written intentions. Kullak's editions of the five Piano Concertos, now reprinted by Schirmer are almost on a level with the very recently published Henle Editions and in some respects even surpass these. They were originally published by Steingraber in 1881 and the First Concerto in that edition included a lengthy preface by Kullak, unfortunately not included in the Schirmer reprint, discussing Beethoven's own playing and his treatment of ornamentation, particularly trills. This essay was republished as a book in which Kullak prefaces a lengthy discussion by resignedly stating that "we cannot give our readers much positive information regarding Beethoven".³ The reason generally given for this inherent ambiguity is that he was composing at a time when the melodic/expressive function of ornamentation was giving way to one emphasising harmonic progression. In fact ornamentation had always been ambiguous, and indeed the origin of ornamentation having been in improvisation, it could scarcely have been otherwise. But even today we still find writers asserting that all Bach's trills begin on the upper note, when all one has to do is glance for instance at the adagio of his D major harpsichord Toccata to see several successive written out trills beginning on the main note.

Similarly the writings of CPE Bach, Leopold Mozart and their contemporaries, although very interesting and often thought-provoking, are quite prescriptive, telling their readers what ought to be done, not what actually was done and often railing against many aspects of the actual performance practice of the time. For this reason I prefer to base this discussion firstly on Beethoven's music itself, and wherever possible on the texts of surviving autographs, and secondly on the testimony of Carl Czerny, in particular the fourth chapter of Czerny's *School for Piano Op.500* which is entitled "Über den richtigen Vortrag der sämtlichen Beethoven'schen Klavierwerke", published in 1842 not only in Vienna, but also in Paris, Milan and London⁴. In this work Czerny discusses mostly briefly but always pointedly almost every work by Beethoven that features the piano, that is solo works, chamber music, Lieder and the Concertos. It is true that occasionally Czerny's reliability has been questioned, but he had known Beethoven for the last 26 years of his life. He had studied piano and composition under him, had heard him play numerous times and had himself performed many works by Beethoven after preparing them under his supervision. There seems no reason to doubt his veracity, although one can quibble of course about details.

One of Beethoven's autograph manuscripts which in particular has been scandalously ignored and undervalued is that of his Three Quartets for Piano, Violin, Viola and Cello WoO 36 which were composed before he was 15. These were not published in Beethoven's lifetime but he must have valued them highly for he always retained these autographs and they are a treasure trove in regard to questions of ornamentation.

³ Franz Kullak: *Beethoven's Piano-Playing With an Essay on the Execution of the Trill* (trans. Dr. Theodore Baker) New York, 1970

⁴ Carl Czerny: *On the Proper Performance of all Beethoven's Works for the Piano, With a Commentary by Paul Badura-Skoda* Vienna, 1963

Fortunately Beethoven uses only four signs for ornamentation: grace notes, mordents, turns and trills. Unfortunately they are all used in contradictory ways and therefore have often given rise to heated discussion as to what the composer really intended. This difficulty is exacerbated by the absence of many autograph manuscripts and by a number of somewhat unreliable first editions.

This presentation concerns itself mainly with the question of what Beethoven's specific intentions were when writing ornaments. However there is another potentially more interesting and more important question: whether Beethoven's intended execution is always necessarily the best. This is not a musicological problem, but a musical or even philosophical problem which I will touch on towards the end of this presentation.

We turn now to the first of our ornaments, the grace note. To simplify the discussion I will refer to short grace notes as *acciaccaturas* and longer grace notes *appoggiaturas*. Already in the Menuetto of the first Piano Sonata Op.2 No.1 at bars 11-13 we find an open question (Ex.1). All editions I have consulted advise playing these as *acciaccaturas*, stating that they are differently notated from the surrounding normal quavers, because Beethoven wanted the contrast with the normal pairs of quavers in the rest of the movement. The same editors however, confronted with similar grace notes at bars 53-55 in the first movement of the Sonata in D major Op.10 No.3 (Ex.2) advise playing these as quaver *appoggiaturas*, presumably because here he did not want the contrast with the surrounding quavers. When one casually glances through the early sonatas one can find numerous other inconsistencies of this kind. I am not suggesting these editors are wrong, in fact in these two examples I believe they are correct. In Ex.1 one can see that the typesetter has gone out of his way to put the grace note as close as practicable to the main note on both occasions, probably reflecting the manuscript he was working from. In this regard Dr Jeffery writes: "The early printed editions...have sometimes had an excessively bad press. Yet they were on the whole done with a very high standard of craftsmanship...Those early engravers were men and women who worked to standards which would be the envy of many music originators today..."³ This is doubly so in the case of Beethoven, the chaotic nature of whose manuscripts is notorious. In this and many other passages the early engravers are superior to both of the best modern Urtext editions, Henle and Universal.

In regard to Ex.2 the long *appoggiatura* is recommended by Czerny who frequently heard Beethoven play, and there is no reason to doubt his evidence here. Of the approximately fifteen interpretations I have heard Sviatoslav Richter is the only pianist who plays short grace notes here, to my ears a strangely unconvincing interpretation. This is possibly however merely the stultifying effect of habit, even in listening.

But *acciaccaturas* are definitely intended in the third movement of the Piano Trio Op.1 No.1 in bars 17, 19 and 21 etc (Ex.3). This is conclusively proven by bars 68, 72 etc (Ex.4) where the *sf* on both first beats precludes the use of a long grace note and

³ The musical examples from the piano sonatas are taken wherever possible from Dr. Jeffery's reprint of the original editions. The quotations from Dr. Jeffery are from the unpaginated preface.

where otherwise ugly parallel sevenths between violin and piano would make musical nonsense. And even in earlier works written in Bonn we find the teenage Beethoven using acciaccaturas, e.g. in bar 35 of the first Piano Quartet in C (Ex.5). Numerous further Examples can be found in works from his Bonn period.

Paul Mies, in his otherwise very fine book discussing problems associated with establishing a critically correct text in Beethoven, which unfortunately has never appeared in English as far as I am aware, quite amazingly suggests that long appoggiaturas are to be found in Beethoven only in the early works, and that all later grace notes should be played short.⁶ It is true that in his middle and late periods the majority of his grace notes are short but it is still relatively easy to find examples of long grace notes. Ex. 6 shows how the soloist in the Violin Concerto Op.61 plays the first subject. Now Beethoven later wrote a transcription of this work for piano and orchestra, and for this version he even wrote a cadenza. Example 7 shows how Beethoven wrote this theme in his autograph of the cadenza, obviously intending a long appoggiatura.

There are two further very revealing cases. In bar 27 of the third movement of the Violin Sonata in A Op.30 No.1 the piano part is notated as in Ex.8. The violin has exactly the same notation eight bars previously. As they both appear thus in Beethoven's autograph there can be no doubt of the composer's intentions here. Similarly in Beethoven's autograph of the Arietta "Der Kuss" Op.128, composed in 1822, we again find both acciaccaturas and appoggiaturas in extremely close proximity, here even within the same bar (see Ex.9). Elsewhere in this work there are grace notes where one cannot be entirely sure what the composer intended. A further interesting example of appoggiaturas in a late work can be found in bars 15 and 16 of the cello part in the slow movement of the String Quartet in E flat op.127 (Ex.10). Here it is patently absurd to play acciaccaturas, but what makes these appoggiaturas particularly interesting are the discussions they have provoked about their appropriate length. Robert Donington even prescribes dotted crotchets here.⁷ To my mind these discussions are beside the point. Beethoven's purpose in writing grace notes here is precisely that both their length and intensity are not defined. They depend on the context and could change from one performance to another.

A lesser problem in regard to acciaccaturas is when they are to be played. There is ample evidence to suggest that playing them either before the beat or on the beat accords with the composer's intentions, although occasionally, as in the first movement of the Violin Sonata Op.12 No.1 before the beat is the most probable: compare the exposition and recapitulation in (Exx.11 and 12). Often in actual performance the difference is scarcely audible as the main note always receives the emphasis.

When we turn to our attention to Beethoven's mordents, there appears to be less ambiguity. By this time they always consist of three notes and begin on the main note. The only element of doubt is whether they begin before or on the beat. Czerny remarks that all the mordents in the third movement of the Sonata in D minor Op.31

⁶ Paul Mies: *Textkritische Untersuchungen bei Beethoven* (Munich 1957) p.167

⁷ *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* ed. Stanley Sadie London, 1980. See the article Ornaments Vol 13 p.833

No.2 should be played before the beat and with a marked accent on the main note (see Ex.13).⁸ Czerny had studied this sonata with Beethoven and seems also to have heard Beethoven perform it several times. William Newman, obviously disagreeing, describes Czerny's prescription for this ornament as "astonishing"⁹. It is true that in the overwhelming majority of examples Newman appears to be correct in his assertion that Beethoven's mordents should be played as triplets spread across the beat. If we look at Ex.14 from the early "Kurfürsten" Sonata in F minor WoO47 it is obvious these mordents can only be played on the beat. Numerous other examples can be found, not only in the Piano Quartets but also in works from all periods of Beethoven's life. When one then turns back to Ex.13 from the D minor Sonata, the even triplet spread across the beat seems a logical and musical solution and indeed this is how almost every pianist on record plays it. So did I before becoming acquainted with Czerny's book. A habit once engrained can be difficult to change, but I am now convinced that Czerny was right, mainly because of the context. Tension has been accumulating from the start of this movement, and here Czerny's recommendation sharpens the dramatic impact of the cross rhythms. If this were the only example of mordents before the beat one could still harbour doubts, but there are similar examples, thus in bars 70-71 of the first movement of the late Cello Sonata Op.102 No.2 (Ex.15) where Beethoven's *sf* marking demands a similar execution. There is another interesting example in the trio of the second of his Three Marches for Piano Duet Op.45 (Ex.16). Note that because these are lower mordents Beethoven has to write them out in grace notes, and thus there is no doubt they must be played before the beat.

Newman draws attention to a particularly revealing passage at bars 155-159 of the song cycle "An die ferne Geliebte" Op.98 (Ex.17) where possibly in response to the text ("these clouds in the sky, this merry flock of birds") Beethoven switches from mordents to trills in the middle of a phrase.¹⁰ The only practical way to execute this differently is to play the mordents before the beat. Both these examples lead one to the conclusion that in many other cases playing the mordent before the beat in Czerny's manner is at least admissible.

On the other hand in the Piano Trio in B flat Op.97 we find the interesting contrast of numerous mordents in the first movement (Ex.18) which for technical reasons can scarcely be played other than on the beat, and the fourth movement where he writes the mordents out as grace notes (Ex.19) in order to be absolutely certain that they are played before the beat. And this figure occurs many times throughout this movement, the mordents being written out in all three instruments. Finally of course there are numerous examples where either execution is possible: one is reminded again of Dr. Jeffery's deliberate ambiguity.

When we turn to trills the ambiguities increase and multiply for there is often no certainty as to a trill's beginning or ending. In regard to the beginning of trills, it is a curious fact that from his earliest and even unpublished works we find Beethoven often almost pedantically writing out beginnings and endings of trills. Thus of the

⁸ Czerny p.48

⁹ William Newman: *The Performance of Beethoven's Trills: The Journal of the American Musicological Society* 3/1976 p.446ff

¹⁰ *ibid.* p.448

twenty-four trills in the first movement of the Sonata in C Op.2 No.3, eighteen have a written initial upper auxiliary as well as a concluding suffix as in bars 91-95 (see Ex.20). One is thus forced to conclude that the remaining six trills begin on the main note, especially as they also have the suffix. If we now turn our attention to the Piano Quartet in C WoO36 No.3 we find in bars 1 and 2 (Ex.21) the suffix again in large note-heads but the upper auxiliary at the beginning of the trills absent. One must again conclude that the 15 year old Beethoven was already beginning many trills on the main note, especially as there are several identical situations throughout these quartets. The conclusion seems inescapable that from his earliest days the trill beginning on the main note was the norm, the upper note beginning being the exception. Numerous other examples can be found in works from his early, middle and late periods.

There is a very interesting publication, now long out of print, by the then renowned French pianist and pedagogue Isidore Philipp¹¹ (1863-1958) which simply collates dozens of examples of Beethoven's trills from diverse works, with scarcely any additional text. This conclusively demonstrates that where Beethoven wished an upper-note start he wrote it, not only in early works such as the Sonata Op.2 No.3 but also in later works such as the Sonatas Opp.53 and 57. The upper note start, already not often used in the early and middle period works, is almost non-existent in the later music.

A further indication that Beethoven preferred the main note start occurs in bar 23 of the slow movement of the Piano Sonata in E flat Op.27 No.1 where, contrary to all musicological orthodoxy, the main note start is prescribed even though it entails immediate repetition of this note (Ex. 22).

Yet again it has to be admitted that Beethoven, in accordance with contemporary custom was no doubt flexible in certain contexts. Thus in the composer's autograph bar 147 of the Piano Concerto Op.37 is notated as in Ex.23, but Czerny writes it as in Ex.24, possibly in accordance with how he remembered Beethoven playing it, as Paul Badura-Skoda suggests.¹² He had studied this work under Beethoven and was definitely present at the first performance. Badura-Skoda also points out that in Czerny's edition of the Sonatas, published by Simrock in 1850, his fingerings of the trills in nearly all cases imply a start on the main note.

It must also be said however that even an intimate as close to Beethoven as Czerny was is not always reliable and that his practice regarding trills evolved. Thus Kullak points out that in Czerny's arrangement of the second movement of the "Kreutzer" Sonata for piano duet, published by Diabelli around 1821, all his trill fingerings imply a start on the upper auxiliary. But in his edition of this work in its original guise for piano and violin his fingerings prescribe a main note start throughout.¹³

So how did the often prevailing upper note start originate? Unfortunately, both musicology and performance are as much subject to the whims of fashion as haute cuisine and haute couture. No doubt this is why Rudolf Serkin's otherwise

¹¹ *The Trill in the Works of Beethoven* Boston, 1910

¹² Commentary to Czerny p.10

¹³ Kullak p.56 *ff*

tremendous recording of the “Hammerklavier” Sonata Op.106 is disfigured by his absurdly beginning the trills in the fourth movement fugue on the upper note, thus almost completely destroying the effect of the progression from the leading note to the tonic at each and every repetition of the fugue subject.

A similar situation prevails in regard to the closing turn or suffix at the end of the trill. Already in bars 1 and 2 and all corresponding passages of the first movement of the C major Piano Quartet we find the suffix written out in large note-heads (Ex.21), just as in the Sonata Op.2 No.3 (Ex.20). Later he always notated the suffix in grace notes, and again he was quite pedantic in writing them even when they were obvious due to multiple repetitions of a motif. Nevertheless there are contradictions aplenty here. For example the Diabelli Variations Op.120 contains numerous trills, nearly all of which are painstakingly notated with suffixes. However a notable exception is Variation 6, where in the first half all trills are notated without suffixes, but in the second half they all have suffixes, except in the last few bars where again they are missing. It is difficult to find any convincing reason for this contradiction, perhaps another example of Dr. Jeffery’s creative ambiguity.

Another example is the closing bars of the slow movement of Op.31 No.2 (Ex.25) where to my ears the trills need the suffix but where the composer seems to have deliberately omitted them (they are not present in either of the two first editions). This is an instance where I have almost regretfully come to the conclusion that Beethoven’s more or less clearly expressed preference is not the optimal solution.

To return to the first movement of the Trio in B flat Op.97, here nearly all trills have suffixes. Thus in bars 147-151 (Ex.26) one may conclude that the trills notated without suffixes are exactly what the composer wanted.

Finally the Violin Sonata in G Op.96, obviously composed around the same time as Op.97, presents a particularly interesting contrast to the latter work. Its first movement begins with a motivic trill in bars 1 and 2 (Ex.27). All in all there are 63 trills in this movement and not one of them has a notated upper-note beginning or a suffix, a unique situation in Beethoven. It is clear that Beethoven means exactly what he writes, every trill beginning on the main note and without a suffix.¹⁴

The fourth ornament to be discussed is the turn, which again is to be found in early, middle and late works, although interestingly in the late works Beethoven tends to write out the turns in definite note values. An interesting exception to this is in the theme of the third movement of the Sonata in E Op.109 (Ex.28). Here Beethoven seems to want a freely expressive rendition as evidenced by the differing note values within the ornament. In general Beethoven right from the start preferred the turn to be played as late as possible within the note value. There are several confirmations of this. For example the opening theme from the Piano Trio in C minor Op.1 No.3 is notated as in Ex.29. Compare this with Czerny’s notation of the same theme, shown in Ex.30. Another instance is from the beginning of the second movement of the Sonata in F minor Op.2 No.1 (Ex.31). Beethoven used a very similar theme in the

¹⁴ For an exhaustive study of the trill in this movement see Newman: *The Opening Trill in Beethoven’s Sonata for Piano and Violin Op.96 in Musik Edition Interpretation Gedenkschrift Günter Henle* (Munich 1980) pp. 384-397

slow movement of his Piano Quartet in C major (Ex.32) which makes the desired execution of Ex.31 on the last semiquaver of the beat obvious. On the relatively rare occasions when Beethoven wanted the turn spread across the beat in the manner recommended by CPE Bach he wrote it out in normal notes, as in this example from the second movement of the Violin Sonata in F Op.24 (Ex.33).

This brings me to a more controversial example, this time in the slow movement of the Sonata in D minor Op.31 No.2. When first published by Nägeli in Zurich, bars 10, 12 and 14 were printed as in Ex.34. Note the placement of the turn in bar 10. Everywhere else in the movement the turn was placed as shown here in bars 12 and 14 with the turn placed directly on top of the dotted semiquaver. Beethoven was very upset about the many misprints in this edition: this was after all the same publisher who added four bars to the first movement of the G major Sonata Op.31 No.1 published in the same volume. When the superior corrected edition by Simrock was published every single turn had been shifted to the right (see Ex.35). In spite of this clear indication of Beethoven's intention, in all performances that I have heard the turn is played before the quaver. No doubt it is for this reason that when Beethoven wrote an identical turn in the slow movement of his D major Cello Sonata Op.102 No.2 he wrote the turn out each time in well-defined note values, in both cello and piano parts, always coming after the tied quaver (see Ex.36). This is surely how the turns in the D minor Sonata should also be played.

There is another form of the turn which is not often discussed in the literature, this is the turn placed directly over the note as in bar 61 of the Sonata in C minor Op.10 No.1 (Ex.37). One often hears this and similar turns commencing incorrectly with the main note and thus consisting of five notes, but if one compares the notated versions of the first bar of the slow movement of the C major Piano Quartet with the first bar of the slow movement of the first Piano Sonata, which begin with an identical statement, it is easy to see that a four note figure beginning from above was intended (see again Exx.31 and 32).

Finally, in two middle period works, the Piano Sonatas Opp.54 and 78, Beethoven also asks for the so-called trilled turn, which is not to be found anywhere else in his mature music. This ornament is symbolised by a turn placed above a mordent, as shown in bars 18-20 of the first movement of Op.54 (Ex.38). Fortunately we find this otherwise rare ornament several times in the early Piano Quartets. If we look at bar 14 of the E flat Quartet (Ex.39) it is obvious that the accidentals added to the ornament prescribe a five-note turn beginning on the main note. Several further examples can be found in the violin part of the C major Quartet where there is scarcely time for more than five notes. In the two mature piano sonatas mentioned above, the realisation of this ornament is surely once again five notes spread across the beat. This then further demonstrates that the simple turn is not spread across the beat as we still sometimes still hear it.

Even though Beethoven was probably the most prescriptive composer the world had seen up to that time, he still retained much of the flexibility of earlier composers. An instructive example of this is to be found in the Septet Op.20 where in the finale the beginning of the violin cadenza is written as in Ex.40 in Beethoven's manuscript. When the popularity of this work induced the composer to transcribe it for clarinet, cello and piano Op.38, the same cadenza now played by the piano appears in his

autograph as in Ex.41. There is no particularly discernible reason for this change: it is not easier to play, in fact it is a little less pianistic, nor does it sound superior to the original, just different.

Finally, the question can be asked, are we as performers always bound to execute Beethoven's ornamentation as he consciously intended when we believe that there is a more convincing possibility. This is a subject to which a whole conference could be devoted, as it involves aesthetic, philosophical and even moral dilemmas. My own short answer is yes. There are certain works where it is obvious that a convincing manner of execution took decades to discover, Beethoven's Ninth Symphony being a classic example. On a smaller scale, we performers and teachers do not hesitate to modify composer's clearly expressed wishes for fingering, pedalling, even dynamics whenever we feel it appropriate. The work of composers is to compose, the work of performers is to find a viable way of communicating the composer's vision to the public.

About the Author

Daniel Herscovitch is a Senior Lecturer in piano, chamber music and piano pedagogy at The University of Sydney Conservatorium of Music. In addition to a busy performing career which includes concerto, solo and chamber music performances, he has published papers on ornamentation in the music of Bach as well as on efficient practice methods. His CDs have been released on Tall Poppies, CSM, Continuum and ABC Classics labels.

Contact Details

Daniel Herscovitch, Senior Lecturer, The University of Sydney Conservatorium of Music,
C41, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia
Tel. 61 2 9351 1229 email d.herscovitch@usyd.edu.au

Appendix A – Music Examples

Ex. 1

Op. 2 No. 1

Ex. 2

Op. 10 No. 3

Ex. 3

Op. 1 No. 1

Ex. 4

Op. 1 No. 1

Ex. 5

Wo O 36 No. 3

Ex. 6

Op. 61 (violin)

Ex. 7

Op. 61 (piano)

Ex. 8 Op. 30 No. 1

Ex. 9

Op. 128

Ex. 10

Ex. 11
Op. 12 No. 1

Ex. 12
Op. 12 No. 1

Ex. 13

Op. 31 No. 2

Ex. 14
W. 047

Ex. 15 Op. 102 No. 2

Ex. 16
Op. 45 No. 2

Ex. 17

Op. 98

153

Ex. 18

Op. 97

Ex. 19

Op. 97

Allegro moderato

Ex. 20 Op. 2 No. 3

Ex. 22 Op. 27 No. 1

Ex. 21 Wo O 36 No. 3

Allegro vivace

Ex. 23 Op. 37

Ex. 24 Op. 37

Ex. 25 Op. 31 No. 2

Ex. 26 Op. 97

Ex. 27 Op. 96

Allegro moderato

Allegro moderato

Ex. 28 Op. 109

Ex. 29 Op. 1 No. 3

Allegro con brio

Ex. 30 Op. 1 No. 3

Ex. 31 Op. 2 No. 1

Ex. 32 Wo O 36 No. 3

Ex. 33 Op. 24

Ex. 34 Op. 31 No. 2

Ex. 35 Op. 31 No. 2

Ex. 36 Op. 102 No. 2

Ex. 37 Op. 10 No. 1

Ex. 38 Op. 54

Ex. 39

Wo O 36 No. 1

Ex. 40
Op. 20

Ex. 41
Op. 38