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I. Introduction

Pianists frequently grapple with balancing brilliant pianism and close adherence to the composer’s intentions in their attempts to perform convincing musical interpretations. Discussions of such matters, philosophical and practical, are universal and have been going on for as long as the profession has existed. One figure who made long-lasting contributions to these discussions is Hans von Bülow (1830-94). Today, Bülow is remembered mainly as a nineteenth-century conductor and music critic, as well as the husband of Liszt’s daughter Francesa Cosima, who left Bülow for Richard Wagner the Futurist. In the Norton textbook *Romantic Music*, Bülow is twice introduced as a conductor—first regarding his association with Wagner and the New German School, second as “the conductor of the famed Meiningen Court Orchestra.” Contemporary music history classes and various standard biographical accounts often overlook Bülow’s lasting influence as a pianist. This paper will examine Bülow’s various pianistic contributions, emphasizing his influence on modern performance practice.

Bülow was one of the first to perform the complete thirty-two piano sonatas by Beethoven. His performance and scrupulous editions of these works established his reputation among his contemporaries as the “greatest living authority on Beethoven.” Accounts by his students and musical examples from his editions of the Beethoven sonatas demonstrate the close relationship that tied his teaching, performing, and editing.

---

1 Wagner and Liszt were both associated with the movement Music of The Future, also known as the New German School.
Countless aphorisms taken from his teaching as well as his anti-virtuosic attitudes as a performer are expressed in these editions. The specific suggestions on practice methods, execution, and interpretation in these edited works are not comprehensible without an understanding of Bülow’s unique pianism. In short, his performance practice, teaching philosophy, and editorial style shaped the content of the modern piano canon, pointed performers toward deeper interpretation, and influenced a developing ideal of the concert pianist as serious scholar. Before discussing Bülow’s legacy and his relevance to pianists today, however, we provide a short biography.

**Biographical Background**

Born in 1830, Bülow began his musical studies with Friedrich Wieck at the age of nine and continued through his school years, even during the two years (1848-50) he spent as a law student at the University of Leipzig and the University of Berlin. The year 1850 was a turning point for Bülow. Witnessing Wagner conduct in Dresden and Liszt premier Wagner’s *Lohengrin* in Weimar had such an effect on him that he abandoned law and went to Zurich to work as a conductor in close proximity to Wagner. A year later, he went to Weimar to study piano with Liszt. From Weimar in 1853, he launched his first concert tour as a pianist, performing in Germany and Austria.

Although Bülow primarily made his reputation as a conductor, throughout his career his activities as a pianist often overlapped with his conducting. In addition to his many conducting positions—he was principal conductor at the Royal Opera in Munich and *Hofmusikintendant* at the court of Meiningen, where he famously transformed the orchestra into one of the finest ensembles in Europe—Bülow taught piano at the Stern Conservatory in Berlin in 1855; concertized between 1855 and 1864, notably premiering
Liszt’s B Minor Sonata in 1857; and actively began touring again as a pianist starting in 1872, three years after his traumatic divorce from Cosima. Between 1873 and 1876, he gave 139 concerts in America, including the premiere of Tchaikovsky’s First Piano Concerto in Boston. As the music director of the Meiningnen Orchestra, he caused a sensation conducting Brahms’ First Piano Concerto from the keyboard in 1885. From that year until his death, he taught at Hoch Conservatory in Frankfurt and Klindworth’s Klavier-Schule in Berlin and played recitals throughout Europe. He gave his final tour in America in 1889-90 while guest conducting with opera houses in Hamburg, Berlin, and St. Petersburg.
II. Bülow the Performer

“Those who heard Hans von Bülow in recital during his American tour, in 1876, listened to piano playing that was at once learned and convincing. He was a deep thinker, analyzer; as he played one saw, as though reflected in a mirror, each note, phrase and dynamic mark of expression to be found in the work.”

-Harriett Brower

“I am too good, too honest, to be a Virtuoso.”

-Hans von Bülow

The nineteenth century witnessed a transformative period for concert performance in general as a result of the rise of the middle class and changing cultural influences in Europe and America. Due to their association with the leading figures of the Romantic movement in art and literature, performers or so-called virtuosos were expected to be heroic figures and to exhibit a dramatic concert presence. According to contemporary accounts, phenomenal pianists such as Theresa Carreño and Eugen d’Albert dazzled the public with flashy technique; these were the expectations that greeted Bülow when he first toured the United States in the 1870s. The term “virtuosity”, according to the critic Eduard Hanslick, was “an oversaturated indulgence in sensuality and enthusiasm that exhausted audiences and thereby produced in them the desire for its antithesis—noble and serious music.” The era of virtuosity (1830-48) was also described by Hanslick as a

6 Ibid., 94, 132.  
kind of Dark Age during which performers sacrificed musical expression in pursuit of astonishment. Among the many virtuosos of the 19th century, Bülow stood out for his unique artistic philosophy and pianism, which remain deeply relevant today. In addition to being a virtuoso, he was also a thoughtful musician who paid close attention to details in the scores and found deep expression as an interpreter. His preference for substance over flash, his emphasis on musical integrity, and his thoughtful attitude toward concert programming helped ground concert performance in unprecedented new levels of depth and remain important guidelines for concert performance. As the critic Henry Krehbiel said about Bülow’s performances, “those who wish to add intellectual enjoyment to the pleasures of the imagination derive a happiness from Bülow’s playing which no other pianist can give to the same degree.”

On Concert Programs

Bülow’s unique musical outlook is also reflected in his selective approach to repertoire, which elevated the thoughtful construction of a program to the level of an art. With an uncompromising attitude, Bülow believed that the choice of musical program was just as important as the performance itself. Aesthetically, he was interested in bridging the gap between the two distinct Romantic schools: the conservative camp of Brahms and critic Hanslick and the New German School of Liszt and Wagner. Despite his reputation for association with non-traditional forms and programmatic works of the New German School, Bülow became increasingly interested, in his later years, in performing works by Brahms. His life-long admiration for Wagner’s music remained

---

even though Cosima left him for Wagner, which in itself demonstrates his unbiased attitude in choosing music.

Bülow’s American tours proved uncompromising in their integrity. Before his first American tour in the mid-1870s, he was advertised to the American public as the “disciple of the new and liberal school” of Liszt and Wagner.9 Despite the media sensation surrounding that tour and the fact that Brahms was a relatively new name to the public, Bülow fearlessly performed much of Brahms’ music in these programs. He was also one of a few in the United States to devote entire recitals to one or two composers’ piano works, concentrating on Beethoven, Schumann, Mendelssohn, Liszt, and Chopin. On many occasions, he collaborated with singers and instrumentalists to present chamber music recitals. In short, Bülow was among the first performers to give homogenous concerts, breaking away from the “potpourri” concert program of the past.10

These American tours are one of many examples that show Bülow’s genuine independence and eclecticism as a musician. While the American public expected a dazzling, virtuosic pianist, they encountered a conscientious and deep-thinking musician who used his technical skill toward a high musical end. While audiences expected a radical Wagnerian and an advocate of “music of the future,” they encountered a historicist who performed works by Bach, Beethoven, and Brahms. His choice of repertoire shows that he was open-minded, selecting music that he deemed important, regardless of the school to which it belonged. Critics in America wrote, “Other players tell their audiences: This is my idea of Beethoven, or Schumann, or Mozart. The doctor

9 Susan, “Hans von Bülow as Music Critic,”’134.
10 Susan, “Hans von Bülow as Music Critic,”’133.
[Bülow] tells his hearer: This is what *Beethoven, or Schumann, or Mozart* says … He is at once the servant and benefactor of art."11 Critics often emphasized his faithfulness to the intent of the composer rather than his pianistic skill. Bülow’s ideas about virtuosity and concert programs helped shape and redefine conceptions of concert performance and made him as much an educator as an artist.

---

III. Bülow the Teacher

Bülow was one of the greatest successful pedagogues of the nineteenth century; his philosophies and attitudes left an indelible impression upon many students. Many aspects of his teaching, such as the structure of his master classes, his repertoire choices, his demanding teaching style, and his distinctive personality all contributed to making his lessons valuable. His legacy helped elevate the standards of piano performance and contributed in many ways to today’s conservatory training. Among the many master classes Bülow taught in the 1880s, the Frankfurt master classes were especially well documented by two of their participants: the German pianist Theodor Pfeiffer (1853-1929) and the Portuguese pianist Vianna da Motta (1868-1948), also an eminent pupil of Liszt. These accounts on Bülow’s teaching preserve his performance practice and provide insights on a specific repertoire.

The Frankfurt Masterclasses

Bülow’s Frankfurt summer master classes (1884–86) have influenced the organization and atmosphere of the modern master class. In a large room holding about one hundred and twenty auditors, he gave lessons daily from eight until eleven in the morning. Pianists, conductors, and composers from all over the world assembled to draw from the great master’s wealth of musical knowledge. Performing artists had to audition for Bülow the day before the class in order to be considered; only a few were selected to participate. Memorization was an important part of Bülow’s practice in these master classes, as he believed that “memory is not a special gift; it may be trained and
exceedingly strengthened.”12 Sitting at another piano, Bülow would often demonstrate from memory passages that needed improvement, even individual voices from Bach’s fugues.13 He believed that no pianist could be considered an artist unless he or she could play at least two hundred pieces by heart.

In the interest of unity and style, Bülow dedicated each day to one composer—a day on Bach, the next day on Beethoven, the next on Brahms, and so on. Bülow was fond of saying, “We want to learn very much from a small amount; that is, multum, non multa [much, not many].”14 He placed strict limits on the composers to he was willing to hear; while Liszt welcomed students’ own compositions and even preferred transcriptions of Bach’s works to the originals,15 Bülow refused to work with students on rhapsodies or transcriptions by Liszt, except for “possibly the Soiree de Vienne, and Rhapsody No. 6.” When referring to a Bach-Liszt organ transcription, Bülow once said, “Arrangement, c’est derangement [Arrangement, this is derangement].”16

In comparison to Bülow, Liszt had a less specific set of requirements for his students’ repertoire choices. Liszt taught works by fifty-nine composers in classes between 1884 and 1886, while only nine composers—Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, Chopin,

---

Handel, Liszt, Mendelssohn, Mozart, and Raff—were heard in Bülow’s classes between 1884 and 1887, a longer period. When Bülow gave a master class in the Klindworth’s Klavier-Schule in Berlin in 1885, only four composers were played: Bach, Brahms, Beethoven, and Liszt. Examining these choices, it is clear that Bülow’s repertoire was modeled on—and may have partially influenced—a developing nineteenth-century canon. His preferences were strikingly historicist in nature. In fact, he called Bach the “most necessary” in the preface to Motta’s *Supplement* to Pfeiffer’s book. He warned students against neglecting Handel, Mozart, and Mendelssohn. With artistic vision, he also predicted that “the time will come (and perhaps very soon) when a Mozart sonata will be preferred to Liszt’s *Rigoletto Fantasy* in the concert hall.”

Bülow often used descriptive extra-musical ideas to explain to students how to bring out the expression intended by the composer. Bülow did not trouble himself too much with technique during the master classes, since he expected students who came to him to be technically prepared. His main focus was on the clarity of musical content and its interpretation. For example, in reaction to a student playing the opening sixteenth-note outburst of “The Return” movement from Beethoven Sonata Op. 81a, Bülow stopped the student and said, “In the joy of reunion you bolt out, get entangled in the train of your dress, fall headlong, and overturn all the flowerpots in the garden.” On another occasion after a student played Brahms’ Ballade Op. 10, No. 1, he demanded that the chords in the beginning sound like a “muffled but throbbing heartbeat.” He compared the descending chords and octaves in the middle section to “ghostly footsteps” and the broken triplets in

---

17 Ibid., 29.
the left hand accompaniment to “drops of blood.” When a student tried to turn the page very quickly during a transition, Bülow stopped him and said, “We have been in the deepest dungeon, and on the other side of that page comes a ray of sunshine; you must make a pause there, between the dark and light, it is very effective.” These examples illustrate Bülow’s concern with his students’ developing images for connecting with the emotional contents of the music.

Once, overhearing a student practicing Liszt’s *Au bord d’une source*, Bülow spoke to her of the various shades of water that Liszt had depicted in the music. He said, “Here is blue, then it becomes silver, and here the sunlight dances across the surface,” after which he sat down and played the piece himself with much “clarity and transparency.” Similarly, after each movement of Schumann’s *Kreisleriana*, Bülow would deliver interpretative ideas by drawing connections between the music and the stories that had inspired the piece. His use of poetic analogy and literary reference shows both his imaginative and intellectual side as an artist. Bülow also reached out to the public through program notes. Once, in a performance of Beethoven’s *Diabelli Variations*, he provided each of the variations with a title—variations III was “Duet,” XVIII was “Idyll,” XVIII was “Explosion,” and XXVI was “Butterflies.” Such use of extra-musical analogies shows Bülow’s willingness to incorporate programmatic elements as teaching tools.

---

23 Ibid., 344.
In addition to his insistence on the highest musical interpretation, Bülow’s famously explosive personality left his classes open to a wide range of emotional climates ranging from the humorous, witty, and sarcastic to the tense, abrasive, and insulting. An example of his sense of humor was recorded by a student in 1887: when teaching Brahms’ Ballade Op. 10 No. 1., Bülow read aloud the story of the old Scottish ballad that had inspired the piece, in which Edward kills his father. He began, “Edward committed a great crime. He…”, and continued, expressively, after a long pause, “murdered his wife’s father-in-law.”

Though Bülow’s sense of humor often filled the class with laughter, he also created tense situations by making rather racist, sexist, and chauvinistic comments, which were somewhat more socially acceptable in the nineteenth century. Once, after an Italian man played a variation from Handel’s Suite in E major, Bülow scolded him for not practicing the left hand alone, and commented that “The Italians have a lot of talent, but no perseverance.” In the same lesson, he made a sexist remark on the incompetence of Liszt’s female students, saying, “Liszt had eleven thousand female students, each of whom was his favorite student; and there the main thing was to play the Second Rhapsody as fast and as loud as possible. I have established a different watchword here…” This example seems to show that a circular association between women and bad musicianship was a part of Bülow’s dialogue in the master classes. Similarly, in another class, Bülow disparagingly compared Liszt’s females student to those of Chopin. He said, “I know a number of female students of Chopin who are distinguished from

26 Ibid., 30.
Liszt’s in this way—they are much older and have not had a lesson with Chopin. However, they learn more.”

Despite such insulting comments, these accounts from his master classes show his high expectation as a teacher. While Liszt had many students who could play well, Bülow would rather cultivate a few to play at a very high level.

Bülow’s attempts to distinguish between his teaching style and that of Liszt often leaned on sexism. For example, once when subbing for Liszt’s master classes in Weimar, he was especially discouraging and harsh with female students whom he thought had taken advantage of Liszt’s kindness. He said, “in the best pianist’s house one could hear the worst pianists playing.” To the female students, he said, “…you ladies in particular: most of you, I assure you, are destined for the myrtle rather than the laurel” (myrtle being a flower used in wedding ceremonies). Such comments could be seen as expressing Bülow’s impatience with less dedicated, non-professional pianists, but they also show that Bülow often walked a fine line between being highly demanding and being too harsh.

After a Liszt student named Dori Peterson played Mazeppa poorly, Bülow said, “You have but one qualification for playing this piece—the nature of a horse.” When she played it for him the second time, he lost his patience entirely and said, “I hope never to see you here again… you should be swept out of here—not with the broom, but with the handle!”

Once the seventeen-year-old pianist Frederic Lamond, who was a famous student of Liszt, insisted on playing Beethoven’s Hammerklavier Sonata for him. At first, Bülow said, “Impudent boy! Wait years before you attempt such a work.” On Lamond’s second

---

29 Ibid., 348.
insistence, Bülow stamped his foot and terrified everyone. But on the third attempt, Bülow gave in, agreeing to listen to the Scherzo only, and was surprised and pleased enough that he agreed to listen to the first movement. This incident is a great example of Bülow’s high musical ideal: a monumental work like the *Hammerklavier* was not to be touched by just any pianist; if played at all, it should be played at the highest possible level. It also shows an admirable willingness to be proven wrong by students.

Although his personality was tough, Bülow was without doubt a great pedagogue whose musical visions and ideals inspired many students. Richard Strauss, who attended the Frankfurt classes, wrote that, “…I’m rapidly coming to the conclusion that Bülow is not only our greatest piano teacher but also the greatest executant musician in the world.” At the conclusion of the above observations, the pianist Theodor Pfeiffer wrote, “All of us who took part knew what these lessons were for us… The remembrance of them will always remind us to pay sincere thanks to the illustrious artist, the peerless, the divine inspired, our blessed teacher and master – Hans von Bülow.”

---

32 Ibid., 352.
IV. Bülow the Editor

“These late sonatas are enormously difficult; I have set myself the task of helping you recognize the difficulties and then, after you have recognized them, to show you how to conquer them.”

-Hans von Bülow

The nineteenth century witnessed a developing schism between two types of editions: critical editions by scholars and pedagogical ones by famous pianists such as Bülow, Moscheles, Lebert, Liszt, and Klindworth. Generally, scholarly critical editions such as the Urtext aimed at discerning and explicating the composer’s intentions as objectively and as closely to the original as possible, while pedagogical editions were based on the pianists’ rendition as performers. Even though most conservatory pianists today regard scholarly editions such as the Urtext as the most reliable, it is important to know that until about the 1960s these scholarly editions did not enjoy the same popularity as interpretation editions. Bülow’s approach to editing, which now may be perceived as obsolete and insufficiently objective, enjoyed tremendous success and exerted monumental influence on several generations of performers.

Bülow’s edition of the Beethoven Sonatas contains sound pedagogical and interpretative suggestions that aim to help pianists bring out the artistic intentions of the composer. Some of these observations may seem redundant or pedantic now, but one must remember that Bülow’s editorial works were done before the emergence of a solid performing tradition. Nevertheless, his edition offers some practical advice on how to

---

33 Pfeiffer, The Piano Master Classes of Hans von Bülow, 40.
execute challenging passages (such as fingerings and practice method) in order to bring out specific musical expressions. The incorporation of aphorisms is particularly reflective of his style as a teacher, and they echo attitudes embraced by many teachers today, as evidenced by a selective examination of Bülow’s edition of Beethoven sonatas (e.g., Op. 13, 26, 27, 31 (No. 3), and from Op. 53 to Op. 81a).

Editorial Style

Aimed at players who might need technical and musical guidance, Bülow’s edition offers very specific practical and artistic suggestions based on his own understanding of the works as teacher and performer. Many of his editorial suggestions, such as pedal marks, dynamics, articulations, and musical commentaries are often explained at length in the prefaces and footnotes. In general, Bülow favors long phrases, lyrical expression, and dramatic effects, which are achieved through fingering suggestions or by the addition or deletion of original slur marks and dynamics. Bülow’s prose footnotes explain how to execute certain passages in order to effectively bring out the appropriate expressions such as singing quality, humor, or drama—suggestions whose poetic and aphoristic style was also an important characteristic of his teaching. Because Bülow’s pedagogical and interpretative elements often overlap, the following examples are chosen to clarify the various aspects of his musical ideas as illustrated by salient features of his editing.
Examples

In the beginning was rhythm.

An example of Bülow’s emphasis on rhythmic exactness appears in the Scherzo of Op. 31 No. 3. Bülow’s footnote tells us that “rhythmic precision is an equally important requisite [to pitch],” and that “the unaccented 32nd notes in the left hand must follow in strict time the last note of each group of the 16th notes in the right hand.”

Example 1. Op. 31, No. 3, II, mm. 43–48

“Rhythmic precision”, a concept much emphasized in today’s training, is, of course, dependent on the context of the music. Sometimes rubato is needed even when it is not indicated in the score, and Bülow’s commentary reflects this practicality. For example, upon the first return of the Grave in Op. 13, I, Bülow suggests delaying the B in the left hand in order to bring out the enharmonic change from G Minor to E Minor. The addition of a slight diminuendo at the fully diminished chord to the second inversion of

---

35 The followed italicized aphorisms that precede the musical examples are found collectively on pg. 341–42 of Walker, Hans von Bülow: a Life and Times, and the musical examples, unless otherwise indicated, are taken from Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonatas for the Piano, Book I and II, revised and fingered by Hans von Bülow and Sigmund Lebert, translated by Theodore Baker, (New York: G Schirmer, 1894).

36 Beethoven, Sonatas for the Piano, Book II, 353.
the E minor chord and the added “lunga” over the fermata help to enhance his suggested “full dreamy freedom” in the footnote.37

Example 2. Op. 13, I, mm. 135–36

The phrase “full dreamy freedom” is an example of the kind of poetic expressiveness that Bülow also used in his masterclasses. Another example of his descriptive expressiveness is in Op. 26, I, variation V. The coda which begins in m. 204 is footnoted as follows:

“This charming Coda must end dreamily, as if lost in reverie, but not begin so; therefore, no perceptible change in the Tempo should be made, letting the calando, both as regards tone-power and movement, creep on very gradually.”38 This vividly expressive footnote aimed to poetically convey a sense of the fading expression appropriate to the coda of the movement.

Music is a language. We must punctuate, phrase, divide. We must speak at the piano, not babble at it.

Bülow often gave specific direction to the players to create appropriate punctuation in the music context. In Op. 26, I, variation II, m. 84, he suggested “a slight

---

37 Beethoven, Sonatas for the Piano, Book I, 142.
38 Beethoven, Sonatas for the Piano, Book I, 223.
delay on the second eight—a momentary pause, as if at a semicolon—is needful to introduce the remote key (F Major) in which the middle section begins.” 39

Example 3. Op. 26, I, variation II, m. 84

Generally, Bülow taught players how to create musical “sentences” according to harmonic context, which usually consists of surprising modulation or pitches that are to be emphasized. Here, the addition of an accent on A natural after the tenuto A flat, showing the distant modulation from A-flat major home key to F Major, creates this kind of punctuated “delay”.

*Whoever cannot sing (whether the voice be beautiful or unbeautiful) should not play the piano.*

Even though the idea of singing is self-evident to us, it is important to realize that this is part of the voluminous legacy Bülow imparted for us. This aphorism, from one of Bülow’s masterclasses, is indirectly suggestive of his anti-virtuosoic attitude. Bülow turns to the idea of “singing” on the piano in his footnote on the expression of the slow movement in Op. 13: “The player’s task to ‘make his fingers sing,’ may perhaps necessitate a more frequent use of the pedal than we have indicated, which must of course

be controlled by a most watchful ear.”40 Interestingly, vocal musicianship is evoked here as an antidote to virtuosity, with singing used to indicate a sort of natural, unaffected, genuine substance.

In addition to recommending the use of such “singing” tones, Bülow was attentive to humorous effects, especially prominent in Beethoven’s earlier sonatas. In the scherzo middle movement of Op. 26, upon the return of the Scherzo after the trio, Bülow proposes a brief pause before the reentry in order to “bring out the humor, surprise,” advising the performer to play “in a graceful, bantering style.”41

Example 4. Op. 26, II, mm. 94–97

Bülow provides similar directions on how to achieve a humorous effect in Op. 31 No. 3, II. Upon the sudden return of the primary theme in F Major, he suggests “a slight delay i.e., a pause equivalent to about an eight-note, will render the reprise of the theme more piquant, fresh, and humorous in effect.”42

Example 5. Op. 31, No. 3, II, mm. 63–64

These two examples of the use of time — “a brief pause” versus “a pause equivalent to about an eight-note” show that Bülow is not always absolutely specific in his directions; sometimes he leaves leeway to the discretion of the player.

The concept of drama is also an important category throughout Bülow’s editorial suggestions. For example, in the finale of Op. 27 No. 2, Bülow discusses in a footnote the correct execution of the eighth notes for the purpose of bringing out the drama, saying that the “hammering-out of these passionate eighth-notes in strict time would be incorrect in an aesthetic sense.” He suggests playing the first half of the bar with strong regularity and accelerating to the second half of the measure, thus creating a sense of “physical agitation.”

Example 6. Op. 27, No. 2, III, mm. 50–51

---

As his teaching, described in the previous chapter, demonstrated, Bülow often used vivid words and phrases to ensure that players understand the musical meaning beneath the surface. This practice also carried into his editorial work. For example, in the masterclasses, Bülow explained theoretically the first inversion dominant seventh chord in B-flat major that opens the first movement of Op. 31 No. 3, and how it implies a certain “longing.” Similarly, in the footnote, he describes this opening as a “flower,” and goes on to suggest that it could be played in a variety of ways: “For example, it may be interpreted as question, or may be sung with yearning expression.”

Example 7. Op. 31, No. 3, I, m. 1

In the second movement of the *Appassionata Sonata*, we find another example of how his editorial remarks were very similar to remarks he made in his teaching. Regarding the last chord before the finale, Bülow said in the masterclass, “the first diminished seventh chord (in m. 96) must be pianissimo and arpeggiated dreamily so that it sends a chill down our spine; a veil of clouds descends.” In the edition, he says of this same

---

penultimate chord, “the last chord but one may be arpeggio’d very slowly and dreamily, the last must sound, above all things, energetic.”

Example 8. Op. 57, II, m. 96-97

With Bach we must always be aware that whenever he composes keyboard music, it is the organ that strikes the imagination. With Beethoven it was the orchestral and with Brahms it is both.

One of the many ideas there are common today, this kind of orchestral thinking is mentioned frequently in Bülow’s editions. In the trio of the third movement of Op. 31, a footnote refers specifically to orchestral color: “think of a pizzicato on the stringed instruments when playing the staccato quarter-notes of the weak beat, and let the following half-notes sound as if breathed by the soft-tone woodwind.”

Example 9. Op. 31, No. 3, III, mm. 16–17

Another example of orchestral thinking is in the finale of Op. 57. Starting in m. 142, Bülow refers to the idea of solo and in m. 146 tutti when it is doubled in octave.

Example 10. Op. 57, III, mm. 142–49

Bülow’s background as a conductor adds another dimension to his pianism, for he naturally thinks in terms of instrumentation and colors. Pianist Amy Fay said this about Bülow: “With him you forget all about the piano...”

Bülow’s choice of fingering may also be interpreted in line with his orchestral thinking. For example, in the third movement of Op. 26, his fingering in a tremolo section brings out a specifically “orchestral” sense of drama. The footnote explains the change of fingering from 4-1 to 5-1 in the right hand, and how it “facilitates the crescendo in the tremolo, which must keep strictly to the given number of notes and strive after the effect of a military roll on the drums; in fact, this whole movement is conceived in a distinctly orchestral spirit.”

49 Fifield, “Bülow, Hans Freiherr von.”
Think of the instruments of the orchestra and their different qualities of tone, and try to imitate them on the piano. Think of every octave on the piano as having a different color; then shade and color your playing.

Bülow’s frequent mentions of tone color and timbre are another attribute to his experience as an orchestral conductor. In Op. 26, I, variation IV, Bülow inserted many dynamic markings within small phrases (every two bars) to give each register a different shade of color, like an echo effect.

The following footnote points out the thick, yet varied texture that suggests orchestration by a number of different instruments: “The dialogue-form characteristic of this variations (…more especially the alternation between different registers), requires, in our opinion, a corresponding characteristic shading…. In short, one should attempt to ‘color,” but
without interfering with the requirement of fluent execution.”51 Another example of this emphasis on color is in the first movement of Op. 27, No. 2. In one of the master classes, Bülow talked about a distinct voice in mm. 28–29, saying that it must be played with a different touch, giving it a different tone color. In his edition, he brings out the color by putting *una corda* in that measure, and in the next bar, where the bass has a melody, “*il basso sempre [tenuto]*.”52

Example 13. Op. 27, No. 2, I, mm. 28–29

Not only does Bülow’s choice of fingering create orchestral effects, it also reflects his awareness of the capability and limitations of the instrument his time. The mentioning of “our modern grand pianos” in the second movement of Op. 31, No. 3 proves that. Here, he suggests a difficult fingering for the *staccato* dyads in the left hand, saying “This fingering is inconvenient, but the only one practicable on our modern grand pianos for insuring a distinct repetition of the note by both finger and key.”53

---

51 Beethoven, *Sonatas for the Piano, Book I*, 221.
Example 14. Op. 31, No. 3, II, mm. 49–50

This sense of historical and technical concern for the action of the instrument is also apparent in the famous glissando passage starting in the coda of Op. 53, III. Here, Bülow points out that the glissandi in octaves in both hands, in combination with pianissimo, are “impracticable on our modern grands with English actions. The Editor alters these passages as follows, and finds the effect not at variance with the composer’s intention.”

By suggesting the change of the glissandi in one hand to be played by two, Bülow took into consideration performers’ execution based on the instrument’s capability and the challenge of the passage. He was willing to take out the octaves in the bass and make it a single line, as long as it did not interfere with the desired sonic effect.


A final, although less obvious example of Bülow’s idiosyncratic fingering is in the finale of Op. 53, where he suggests a possible alternative fingering in the Prestissimo coda. His goal was to “evade the difficulty of playing legato octaves”, since the speed of the movement allowed no time for a change of fingers. By having the left hand play the second and third notes in the right hand, a fingering which will demand some practice, it can create a better legato. This comment shows multiple layers of Bülow’s pianistic thought at work: as a performer, he was aware that certain fingering choices depend on tempo; as a teacher, he wanted to create alternatives, allowing students to have options when learning the music.

55 Beethoven, *Sonatas for the Piano, Book II*, 419
There are three grades of musical performance. One can play correctly, beautifully, and interestingly. But one must not play so interestingly that it ceases to be beautiful; and not so beautifully that it ceases to be correct.

Bülow’s use of the term “interesting” in this aphorism resonates with his idea, demonstrated throughout the editions, of creating variety through repetitions. When the same musical passage occurs twice, Bülow emphasizes the importance of making them different from each other especially in the suggestion of various dynamic shades. In one of the masterclasses, regarding the slow movement of Op. 81a, he amusingly spoke of playing the second bar louder than the first, for “the abandoned one sighs, and with even more longing the second time. If you play the second bar exactly like the first, the public will say: ‘Good God, he is practicing!’”56 This idea is captured in the edition, in which Bülow’s adds dynamic markings to this same passage—*mf* for the first measure and *p* for the second.

*Calm is the pianist’s first requirement.*

In teaching and editing alike, Bülow often emphasized a slow, calm tempo, in the interest of clarity of sound and convincing affects. In the first movement of Op. 26, he

---

said in the one of the masterclasses, “You may not make a brilliant etude out of the second variation; it is to be played calmly; it is usually greatly mistreated by bad virtuosos and dilettantes.”\textsuperscript{57} His suggested metronome markings in general, and particularly in fast movements, are a little slower than the execution of many mainstream virtuosic pianists today. For example, regarding Op. 27, No. 2, II, Bülow explains that the Allegretto needs to be played in a slower tempo: “This anti-Scherzo is, indeed, a lyrical Intermezzo between two tragical Nocturnes. Franz Liszt’s clever mot: ‘\textit{une fleur entre deux abîmes}’ (a flower between two abysses) gives the key to the true interpretation.”\textsuperscript{58}

Here, his suggested metronome marking for dotted half-note at 56 beats per minute is a moderately slow tempo.

Besides suggesting alternate metronome markings, Bülow sometimes even takes the liberty of changing the meter. For the first movement of Op. 27, No. 2, in addition to adding the metronome marking of quarter note equals 52 beats per minute to create a slow atmosphere, he changes the time from cut time to 4/4, to indicate a slower sense of pulse.

Example 17a. Op. 27, No. 2, I, m. 1 from Henle Edition\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{57} Pfeiffer, \textit{The Piano Master Classes of Hans von Bülow}, 28.

\textsuperscript{58} Beethoven, \textit{Sonatas for the Piano, Book I}, 258. This footnote resembles recollection from his masterclass as well.

\textsuperscript{59} Ludwig van Beethoven, \textit{Klaviersonaten, Band I}, edited by Bertha Antonio Wallne, Urtext Editions (München: G. Henle, 1980), 249. For further discussion of Bülow’s elimination of pedal marking, see below, pg. 42.
In addition to addressing ideas taken from aphorisms, a number of expressive and technical considerations also characterize Bülow’s editorial style. Some of the expressive elements include the use of extra-musical associations, voicing, architectural approach, and pedaling. The extra-musical ideas that were an important aspect of his teaching also appear in Bülow’s editorial commentary; they also show his interest in the programmatic elements which characterized the New German School. Bülow’s footnote on the Return movement in Op. 81a reads, “Even a player with the most deeply rooted antipathy to programs cannot help seeing, that in the falling pairs of thirds for the left hand (at m. 5) the gesture of beckoning with a handkerchief—the tone-picture of a sign—is illustrated, a sign apprising the coming one of the waiting one’s presence.”

A similar analogy is found in one of Bülow’s masterclasses commenting on the second movement, where he describes a thirty-second notes melisma as "fragile" and "flower pollen."61

Bülow’s suggestions on voicing also reflects a pedagogical purpose, namely to warn students against certain tendencies. For example, in the following footnotes he is very specific about voicing: in Op. 26, I, he seeks to bring out the left hand notes that fall on off-beats (whose role in the melody might otherwise be lost by being played too softly), by using tenuto markings. To achieve a seamless long phrase in the internal line, Bülow says, “the melody contained in the after-striking sixteenth-notes, must be played no louder than the anticipating bass notes alternating with them.”62


In the first measure, he also inserts a crescendo marking to give the phrase a continuous sound which might otherwise sound faded off. This voicing suggestion shows caution against pianists’ natural tendency to play the offbeat softer.

---

In the first movement of Op. 27, No. 2, Bülow provides options for performers by lengthening some of the harmonic moving eighth notes into quarter notes in mm. 3-4.

Example 20. Op. 27, No. 2, I, mm. 3–4

Although his choice of notes to lengthen seem subjective, it is clear that in the second measure he is emphasizing the moving internal line based on the harmonic and melodic interest. They offer pianists an additional aesthetic perspective by providing an option on how to voice these triplets.

Bülow sometimes plays the role of musical architect by bringing out various levels of “shape,” ranging from the larger shape of an ”entire-movement” level of structure as well as smaller shape within a certain section of a movement. For example, Bülow creates an overall emotional shape of the entire first movement of Op. 26 (a theme and variations) by commenting on the pacing, “the player should strive to attain flowing continuity, and to render the transitions as imperceptible as possible.” With the exception of the last variation, he provides both metronome and tempo marking to each variation throughout, giving the work a very specific progression. For example, variation I, un poco piu mosso; variation II, piu animato, ma non troppo; variation 3, piu sostenuto; variation 4, con moto; and variation 5, (untitled). The coda in the finale of Op. 27, No. 2 shows a more local level of architectural shape within a section of a movement.

63 Beethoven, Sonatas for the Piano, Book I, 216.
First, he places waves of crescendo and accent on the end note of each of the broken arpeggio group, and inserts “ff in tempo, ma strepitoso” [ff in time, but boisterously] in m. 163. Four bars later, probably because students are inclined to play a passage like this too agitatedly in m. 167, he writes in “expressivo, ma non troppo appassionato” to keep the pacing gradual and reserved. Only ten bars later in m. 177 does he writes in “vigoroso” to create the effect of a gradual build up until a flourishing cadenza before the end.
Bülow is a musical architect who shapes the music structurally whether in a bigger or smaller scale, and suggests to players a calculated pacing of events, to achieve an emotional goal more effectively.

Another practical aspect of Bülow’s editions—the pedal markings—shows his consideration for the instrument’s mechanical capabilities, and what is required to effectively bring out the ideal sound intended by Beethoven on a modern instrument. In the Op. 27, No. 2, for example, Bülow deletes the marking from the Henle edition “Si deve suonare tutto questo pezzo delicatissimamente e senza sordino,” which means to play delicately and with pedal, and simply inserted “sempre pp e con sordini” and “una corda.” While the original score is mostly bare of markings, Bülow gives suggestions for pedal marks throughout his edition of the movement. He was obviously aware of the pedalling issue he was raising, and wrote in an explanatory footnote that “a more frequent use of the pedal than is marked by the editor… is allowable.” He warns against taking the “original direction sempre senza sordini [without dampers] too literally.”

Bülow’s multiple indications of una corda throughout the first movement emphasize places that demand a special color, as, for example, in the sudden change from E major to E minor in mm. 9–10, and from B major to fully diminished harmony in m. 19.

Example 23a. Op. 27, No. 2, I, mm. 9-10

---

The fact that Bülow does not indicate when to execute *tre corde* is not unusual, as he leaves discretion to the players.

Depending on the musical context, sometimes Bülow prefers blurred pedaling, and at other times not. In the finale of Op. 27, No. 2, he marks in bracket “*sempre Pedales*” in the chromatic cadenza-like passage in the coda in mm. 185-86. This blurred effect is executed by some artists and rejected by others. Here for Bülow, it adds to the “quasi una fantasia” quality of the movement.

On the other hand, Bülow’s changes to pedal markings often went in the opposite direction, subtracting markings rather than adding them. In the famous opening of Op. 53, III, mm. 1-2, while the Henle edition has the pedal held from the beginning until measure eight, Bülow inserts a pedal release after the second measure, right before the “outside”
note D in m. 3. Thus, a non-harmonic tone is eliminated from the blurred sonority created by the use of pedal. Such “cleaner” pedalling in Bülow’s editions was often harmonically based.

Example 25. Op. 53, III, mm. 1-3

Besides a ceaseless flow of his ideas on musical expression, Bülow’s edition also embodies many aspects of technical execution and considerations in an effort to clear confusion that some pianists may have or to enhance more efficient learning process. These include the visual presentation of the score, the spelling-out of ornamentation, practice strategies, and tricks to facilitate execution—particularly in consideration of small hands, which Bülow was known to have.

In an effort to improve visual presentation, for example, sometimes Bülow even modifies the key signature from the typical treble versus bass clefs to two bass clefs in his edition. Unlike the Henle edition where players have to figure out which hand plays which notes, Bülow clarifies which hand is playing in Op. 13, II, mm. 1-4 by rewriting the passages so that they fall into their respective staves (Top stave to be played by right hand and bottom stave by left hand).
Another example of visual clarity is in the third variation of Op. 26, I, where Bülow changes from the original seven-flat key signature to four flats. Instead of presenting a key signature with seven flats, he denotes the change to the parallel A-flat minor by inserting C-flat in the score. Essentially, A-flat minor becomes A-flat major, with accidentals emphasizing the minor mode. His footnote explains that “A signature of seven flats is unnecessary, and confuses the pupils’ eye.”

---


For visual clarity, Bülow sometimes also writes out ornaments to help players achieve more precise execution. In mm. 21–22 in the finale of Op. 27 No. 2, the footnote explains that his insertions are written “in conformity with its undeviating mode of execution,” assuring players that he viewed his notation of the ornaments are not merely subjective interpretations, but as objectively based in tradition.

67 Beethoven, Klaviersonaten, Band I, (Urtext Editions), 220.
68 Note that Bülow pointed out the key change by adding in “Minore” in the m. 103
69 Beethoven, Sonatas for the Piano, Book I, 261.

Example 28b. Op. 27, No. 2, III, mm. 21–22 from Bülow’s Edition

Bülow (who was known to have small hands, himself) aims many of his alternative fingerings towards players with small hands. In mm. 159–60 of the finale of Op. 31, No. 3, he provides an alternative fingering, explaining that “for hands unable to stretch far—a drawback commonly outweighed by the advantage of greater mobility—the following fingering of the higher part may be tried.”

Example 29a. Op. 31, No. 3, IV, mm. 159–60

Another example is in the finale of Op. 53, where the footnote reads, “the following facilitated reading will perhaps be welcome to small hands tired by the preceding trills.” Here, Bülow shifts one of the notes in each pair of the triplets on the lower staff into the upper hand, thereby allowing the line to be split between the hands.\footnote{Beethoven, \textit{Sonatas for the Piano, Book II}, 407.}
Bülow’s editorial comments offering specific advice and strategies regarding student’s practice method show a pedagogical interest in the learning process of his students. His demanding nature as a teacher is reflected in the practice methods he suggests in the edition. In a masterclass, regarding an awkward passage in first movement of Op. 31 No. 3, Bülow stressed a specific approach to practicing, by saying that these alternating chords in the left-hand “must be studied; no one plays that without study; everything must be learned; do not always practice the whole passage, but just the weak points, slowly and strong.” Bülow demands that players study and practice “painstakingly” in order to understand and execute the work. Similarly, in the corresponding place in his edition, he offers specific practicing method, writing that “the execution of this passage calls for nearly perfect technical finish. In practicing, extend it by adding an octave, phrasing throughout in groups of two quarter notes.”

Example 31. Op. 31, No. 3, I, mm. 71–72

Bülow’s edition thus shows not only concerns for the end-result of learning, the accomplished performer, but also for the learning process through which a student might approach the work.

74 Beethoven, Sonatas for the Piano, Book II, 345.
Concluding Remarks

We might look to the commentary in Bülow’s Beethoven edition for insights into how Bülow himself defined the scope of his career as a pianist. Here we see Bülow reinforcing the importance of three separate roles—he consistently refers to himself both as “the Performer” and as “the Editor,” while he addresses players as “Pupils.” Thus Bülow’s insightful pedagogic and interpretive editions may be seen to mirror his roles as a performer and teacher. His exceptional ability to explain musical concepts and to predict learners’ problems would not have been possible without his own studies of the score as a performer; his experience as a teacher, moreover, gave him the ability to point out many potential “dangers” in his editions and to advise players on how to avoid them. While a full examination of Bülow’s musicianship and pedagogy is beyond the scope of this brief paper, the selected examples presented here offer a glimpse into some of Bülow’s contributions to modern pianism that are often overlooked in modern scholarship. As a performer, teacher, and editor, Hans von Bülow contributed to the codification of the modern piano repertoire and helped to elevate the role of the performer to that of thoughtful interpreter—an image that, to the present day, remains crucial to modern ideals of the concert pianist.
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