

**SERVING TWO MASTERS: HUMMEL'S ARRANGEMENT OF MOZART'S PIANO
CONCERTO IN C MAJOR, K. 503 (ca. 1828)**

by

Irene Margarete Setiawan

B.Mus, National University of Singapore, 2009

M.Mus, University of British Columbia, 2012

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF MUSICAL ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

(Vancouver)

April 2019

© Irene Margarete Setiawan, 2019

The following individuals certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies for acceptance, the dissertation entitled:

Serving Two Masters: Hummel's Arrangement of Mozart's Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503 (ca. 1828)

submitted by Irene Margarete Setiawan in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

the degree of Doctor of Musical Arts

in Piano

Examining Committee:

Prof. Corey Hamm, Music

Co-supervisor

Prof. Hedy Law, Music

Co-supervisor

Prof. Mark Anderson, Music

Supervisory Committee Member

Prof. Eric Wilson, Music

University Examiner

Prof. Robert Gardiner, Theatre and Film

University Examiner

Additional Supervisory Committee Members:

Supervisory Committee Member

Supervisory Committee Member

Abstract

Johann Nepomuk Hummel (1778-1837), once a pupil of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756-1791), made seven arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos. Most studies of Hummel's arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos have focused on their reception history and Mozart's performance practice. However, few have studied Hummel's approach to piano arrangement, particularly his arrangement of Mozart's Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503 (ca. 1828). To better understand Hummel's approach to arrangement, I borrow concepts from translation theories. In this thesis, I adopt the concept "to serve two masters" from philosopher Franz Rosenzweig's theory of translation. Similar to a translator who serves two masters (i.e., the original author and readers in the target language), an arranger who serves two masters pays equal attention to the composer of the original and the target audience of the arrangement. Using K. 503 as a case study, I investigate in this thesis how Hummel mediated between Mozart and the early nineteenth-century audience. I discover that Hummel added ornamentation to select themes and reinforced select closing passages. While he made the original more virtuosic in his arrangement, his ornamentation and modifications stay close to Mozart's original thematic materials. As he used these techniques to satisfy the nineteenth-century audience's need for piano virtuosity while adhering closely to Mozart's intent, I argue that he served two masters. The implication of this thesis is that performers can take Hummel's arrangement as a model that seeks not only to serve the composer but also to serve the target audience.

Lay Summary

Johann Nepomuk Hummel (1778-1837), once a pupil of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756-1791), made seven arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos. This study focuses on Hummel's arrangement of Mozart's Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503. I borrow concepts from language translation theories, including the concept "to serve two masters" from philosopher Franz Rosenzweig. Similar to a translator who serves two masters (i.e., the original author and readers in the target language), an arranger who serves two masters pays equal attention to the composer of the original and the target audience of the arrangement. I investigate how Hummel mediated between Mozart and the early nineteenth-century audience. Using K. 503 as a case study, I discover that Hummel modified only select passages. In addition, his modifications reveal his sensitivity to a demand for keyboard virtuosity in the early nineteenth century and his respect for Mozart's original musical ideas. Hence, he served two masters.

Preface

This thesis, written under the guidance of Dr. Corey Hamm, Dr. Hedy Law, and Professor Mark Anderson is an original, unpublished work which stands as intellectual property of its author, Irene Margarete Setiawan. Musical examples from W. A. Mozart's Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503 are reprinted with kind permission from Bärenreiter-Verlag.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Lay Summary.....	iv
Preface	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
List of Figures	viii
List of Musical Examples	ix
Acknowledgements	xi
Dedication.....	xiii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Terminology: Arrangement or Transcription	2
1.2 Historical Background.....	3
1.2.1 Historical Overview of Arrangements.....	3
1.2.2 The Piano: From Mozart to Hummel	5
1.2.3 Overview of Hummel’s Arrangement of Mozart’s Piano Concerto.....	6
1.3 Editions and Studies of Hummel’s Arrangements of Mozart’s Piano Concertos	10
Chapter 2: To Arrange is to Serve Two Masters.....	15
2.1 Arrangements as Musical Translations	16
2.2 How Translators Serve Two Masters	18
2.3 How Arrangers Serve Two Masters	20
Chapter 3: Hummel’s Arrangement of Mozart’s Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503:	
Serving Composer and Audience	26

3.1	Ornamentation of Select Themes	28
3.1.1	First Movement	32
3.1.2	Second Movement	35
3.1.3	Third Movement	42
3.2	Reinforcement of Select Closing Passagework	48
3.2.1	First Movement	48
3.2.2	Second Movement	59
3.2.3	Third movement	62
	Chapter 4: Conclusion	69
	Bibliography	71
	Appendices	80
	Appendix A	80

List of Figures

Figure 3.1.1. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement.	37
Figure 3.1.2. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement.	43
Figure 3.2.1. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement.	51
Figure 3.2.2. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement.	60

List of Musical Examples

Example 3.1.1. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 89-102.....	33
Example 3.1.2. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 91-102.	34
Example 3.1.3. Mozart/Kalkbrenner, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 90-102. Bibliothèque nationale de France. Used by permission.	35
Example 3.1.4. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement; two variants of principal theme.	37
Example 3.1.5. Mozart/Hoffmann, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement; two variants of principal theme. <i>Copyright © Edition Peters. Used by permission of C. F. Peters Corporation. All rights reserved.</i>	38
Example 3.1.6. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement; two variants of principal theme.	38
Example 3.1.7. A Comparison of Ornamentation by Kalkbrenner (Ka.), Hoffmann (Ho.), Hummel (Hu.), Badura-Skoda (Ba.), and Levin (Le.) of Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement, m. 59-62.....	41
Example 3.1.8. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement; four variants of principal theme.	43
Example 3.1.9. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement; four variants of principal theme.	45
Example 3.2.1. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 111-112.....	50

Example 3.2.2. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 111-112.	50
Example 3.2.3. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 207-215.....	54
Example 3.2.4. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 208-214.	55
Example 3.2.5. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 139-148.....	57
Example 3.2.6. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 139-145.	58
Example 3.2.7. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement, mm. 94-102. ...	60
Example 3.2.8. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement, mm. 97-102.....	61
Example 3.2.9. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement, mm. 64-80.....	64
Example 3.2.10. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement, 65-76.	64
Example 3.2.11. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement, mm. 106-115....	66
Example 3.2.12. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement, mm. 109-113.....	67

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the immense help and mentoring from my supervisors Dr. Corey Hamm and Dr. Hedy Law. I am deeply grateful for Dr. Hamm who shares a similar fascination with arrangements, as well as for his kind guidance and support. I benefit much from his contagious curiosity and ideas. My sincere gratitude goes to Dr. Law for her generous advice, dedication, and patience. I have been extremely fortunate to have an academic supervisor who is willing to go to the extra mile to help and to motivate me to improve my research and writing skills.

I am also really grateful for my thesis committee Professor Mark Anderson for his substantial suggestions, constructive comments, and positive words of encouragement.

To other professors who have supported me since my arrival at UBC, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Sara Buechner, who has graced me with inspiring lessons, contagious passion, and exceptional kindness from 2010 until 2016 at UBC as well as with continuous love and care of a mentor until today; Prof. Rena Sharon, who has shown me the beauty, the meaning, and the honor of music making beyond what I had imagined before; Dr. John Roeder, whose thought-provoking questions about arrangement have stretched my train of thought; Dr. Terence Dawson, who has always been ready to offer words of encouragement and regularly checked in with my progress; previous graduate advisor Dr. Alex Fisher and current graduate advisor Dr. Michael Tenzer, who have always responded quickly to various questions and needs.

This thesis is also indebted to the music librarians of the British Library who sent me a copy of Hummel's autograph manuscript of his arrangement, of the *Bibliomediateca*

dell'Accademia di Santa Cecilia di Roma who sent me a copy of the first edition of Hummel's score published by Chappell, of the *Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin* who provided me a copy of the first edition by Schott, and of the *Bibliothèque nationale de France* who allowed me to examine a copy of Kalkbrenner's arrangement of Mozart's Piano Concerto, K. 503.

My special thanks go to the staff of UBC Centre for Writing and Scholarly Communication and of UBC Music, Art and Architecture Library who have provided an invaluable writing and research support. I am grateful for Harini, Erin, Kylie, Catherine, Kevin, Tayo, Shanleigh, and Sue for their helpful feedback.

To my colleagues and friends of the UBC School of Music, St. John's College, House for All Nations, and Tenth Church, I thank you for our stimulating conversations and our shared experience of music making, as well as for your mental and spiritual support. A special shout-out to Felicia Angeline who gave critical pointers to help me improve the slides of my lecture recital.

Last but not least, my utmost gratitude goes to God who has blessed me with numerous people and resources that have shaped my being and becoming, thinking and doing; to my parents, who have given all they can give to support me throughout my years of education, both morally and financially; as well as to my relatives who have given me their moral and material support.

To my parents, Junanto Setiawan and Hunitasari Sutjandra

Chapter 1: Introduction

Johann Nepomuk Hummel (1778-1837), once a pupil of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756-1791), made seven arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos. While scholars have discussed most of these arrangements from the perspectives of their reception history and Mozart's performance practice, few have investigated Hummel's approach to piano arrangement, particularly his arrangement of Mozart's Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503.¹ Therefore, this thesis focuses on Hummel's approach to making an arrangement of Mozart's K. 503. To begin the discussion, I will give an overview of the term "arrangement," followed by a brief historical background and discussions of Hummel's arrangements. The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature and to establish that the concept of an arrangement exists not solely to interpret the original but also to bring the original to a different audience.

¹ See Claudia Macdonald, "Mozart's Piano Concertos and the Romantic Generation," in *Historical Musicology: Sources, Methods, Interpretations*, eds. Stephen A. Crist and Roberta Montemorra Marvin (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2004), 302-329; David Grayson, "Whose Authenticity? Ornaments by Hummel and Cramer for Mozart's Piano Concertos," in *Mozart's Piano Concertos*, ed. Neal Zaslaw (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 373-391; Leonardo Miucci, "Mozart after Mozart: Editorial Lessons in the Process of Publishing J. N. Hummel's Arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos," *Music and Practice* 2 (2015), <http://www.musicandpractice.org/volume-2/arrangements-of-mozarts-piano-concertos/> (accessed September 30, 2018); Leonardo Miucci, "I Concerti per Fortepiano e Orchestra di W. A. Mozart: Le Trascrizioni di J. N. Hummel," *Rivista Italiana di Musicologia* 43/45 (2008/2010): 81-128; Gerhard Bachleitner, "Mozart-Metamorphosen: Zu Johann Nepomuk Hummels Bearbeitungen Mozartscher Klavierkonzerte," *Acta Mozartiana* 44, no. 1-2 (June 1997): 17-28; Gerhard Bachleitner, "Mozart-Metamorphosen 2: Zu Johann Nepomuk Hummels Bearbeitungen Mozartscher Klavierkonzerte," *Acta Mozartiana* 54, no. 1-2 (June 2007): 55-70; Frederick Neumann, *Ornamentation and Improvisation in Mozart* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 248-250; Eva and Paul Badura-Skoda, *Interpreting Mozart: The Performance of His Piano Pieces and Other Compositions*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2008), 244-247.

1.1 Terminology: Arrangement or Transcription

The term “transcription” or “arrangement” is often used interchangeably to indicate an adaptation of a work that is recreated in a context different from its original. Malcolm Boyd says that the results of arrangement “vary from a straightforward, almost literal, transcription to a paraphrase which is more the work of the arranger than of the original composer.”² Although he claims that “transcription” adheres more closely to the original than an “arrangement” does, he adds that there is no universal acceptance of the conceptual difference between them. Another scholar Ter Ellingson says that the word “transcription” may refer to an “arrangement.”³ Musicians have also used these two terms interchangeably. Ferruccio Busoni (1866-1924), for example, wrote in his essay *Von der Einheit der Musik* (1922) that “it is only necessary to mention J. S. Bach in order, with one decisive blow, to raise the rank of the *transcription* to artistic honor in the reader’s estimation. He was one of the most prolific *arrangers* of his own and other pieces.”⁴ However, Franz Liszt, approximately half of whose outputs are adaptations of other composers’ works, used these terms differently. He categorized his adaptations of Paganini Violin Etudes (LW A170) and Bach’s organ Preludes and Fugues (LW A92) for piano as *Bearbeitung* (arrangement) and categorized his adaptations of Schubert’s lieder for piano under a heading *Transkriptionen von Gesängen und Liedern* (Transcriptions for Songs).⁵ Liszt might

² Malcolm Boyd, “Arrangement,” *Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online*, Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.

³ Ter Ellingson, “Transcription (i),” *Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online*, Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>. Maurice Hinson and Millan Sachania have also mentioned other scholars who have used the term “arrangement” and “transcription” interchangeably. See Maurice Hinson, *The Pianist’s Guide to Transcriptions, Arrangements, and Paraphrases* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), ix-x and Millan Sachania, “‘Improving the Classics’: Some Thoughts on the ‘Ethics’ and Aesthetics of Musical Arrangement,” *Music Review* 55 (1994): 61-63.

⁴ Ferruccio Busoni, *The Essence of Music and Other Papers*, trans. Rosamond Ley (London: Rockliff, 1957), 87. (my emphasis)

⁵ Jonathan Kregor, *Liszt as Transcriber* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 101-102.

have used these two terms to demonstrate different degrees of adherence to the original. His adaptations of Bach's Preludes and Fugues adhere more closely to Bach's originals than his adaptations of Schubert's songs do. Regardless, an "arrangement" or a "transcription" refers to a work of re-creation, to be performed in a context different from its original.

1.2 Historical Background

1.2.1 Historical Overview of Arrangements

The new context for which a musician made an arrangement played a significant part in shaping *how* he or she adapted the original music. In the eighteenth century, Johann Sebastian Bach arranged music by others as compositional exercises and practices. By adapting sixteen Violin concertos by Antonio Vivaldi (1678-1741) for Clavier, Bach practiced basic compositional techniques such as musical structure, modulation, melodic and motivic development.⁶ Mozart wrote his seven early keyboard concertos by arranging keyboard sonatas written by his contemporaries, including those by C. P. E. Bach, Johann Schobert, and J. C. Bach. He performed these concerto arrangements during his early performance tours as a child prodigy.⁷ In addition, Mozart arranged oratorio works written by Baroque composers George

⁶ Johann Nikolaus Forkel, *Johann Sebastian Bach: His Life, Art, and Work*, trans. and ed. Charles Sanford Terry (London: Constable, 1920), 70-72.

⁷ Neal Zaslaw, "Contexts for Mozart's Piano Concertos," in *Mozart's Piano Concertos*, 8-10; David Humphreys, "Arrangements and Additions; Transcriptions of Works by Other Composers," in *The Mozart Compendium: A Guide to Mozart's Life and Music*, ed. Robbins Landon (London: Thames and Hudson, 1990), 336-339. Mozart wrote seven early piano concertos K. 37, 39-41, 107 No. 1-3 based on sonatas by C. P. E. Bach (1714-1788), Hermann Raupach (1728-1778), Johann Schobert (c. 1735-1767), J. C. Bach (1735-1782), Johann Eckard (1735-1809), Leontzi Honauer (1737-1790), and one unidentified composer. He wrote the first four arrangements when he was eleven years old (1767) and the other three of K. 107 five years later. In these arrangements, he added orchestral accompaniments, composed ritornelli, and added cadenzas (perhaps with the help from his father Leopold Mozart). It can be argued that he wrote these arrangements as compositional lessons by his father Leopold and as repertoires to be played in his performance.

Frideric Handel for Baron Gottfried van Swieten's concert society called *Gesellschaft der Associierten Cavaliers* in Vienna. His arrangements including Handel's *Acis and Galatea* (1788) and *Messiah* (1789) contributed to the revival and dissemination of Baroque works in his time.⁸ In general, the purposes for which arrangements were created played an important part in shaping how an arranger adapted the original, whether arrangements were for compositional practices, expanding performance repertoires, or bringing older repertoires to contemporary audiences.

With the development of the piano and piano technique in the nineteenth century, the piano transcription became a means of virtuoso display and a means to bring orchestral repertory to the domestic market.⁹ Liszt, Leopold Godowsky, and Busoni were well known for their virtuosic piano transcriptions. They include Liszt's transcriptions of Beethoven's nine symphonies, Liszt's opera fantasies (e.g., Mozart's *Don Giovanni* (1841), Bellini's *Norma* (1841), Verdi's *Rigoletto* (1855?)), Godowsky's *53 Studies on Chopin Etudes* (1894-1914), and Busoni's arrangement of J. S. Bach's *Chaconne* (1897). In addition to providing a means of virtuoso display, piano transcriptions played a major role in disseminating musical works. Scholar Thomas Christensen has noted the importance of four-hand piano transcriptions in bringing orchestral concert repertoires to the nineteenth-century domestic market.¹⁰ Other scholars David Grayson, Claudia Macdonald, and Leonardo Miucci have explained the contribution of the virtuosic arrangements by Hummel, Johann Baptist Cramer, Ignaz Moscheles, and Frédéric Kalkbrenner to the nineteenth-century musical world, arrangements that brought Mozart's Piano Concertos to the

⁸ Humphreys, "Arrangements and Additions," 339.

⁹ Boyd, "Arrangement," <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.

¹⁰ Thomas Christensen, "Four-Hand Piano Transcription and Geographies of Nineteenth-Century Musical Reception," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 52, no. 2 (Summer 1999): 256.

nineteenth-century public.¹¹ Scholar Jonathan Kregor has discussed Liszt's arrangements of Schubert's lieder and Berlioz's *Symphonie Fantastique* (1833-1876) that introduced the works of Schubert and Berlioz to Liszt's audiences.¹² These examples are by no means exhaustive. But they demonstrate that piano arrangement was a widespread phenomenon, which was a by-product of the development of the piano in the nineteenth century. For this reason, it is important to take a brief overview of the development of the piano from Mozart to Hummel.

1.2.2 The Piano: From Mozart to Hummel

To understand Hummel's piano arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos, we need to understand the expansion of the range of the piano since Mozart's time. Mozart wrote most of his Viennese piano concertos (1784-1786) for the Walter grand piano. He purchased one in Vienna sometime around 1782-84, when he was quite well-to-do.¹³ It consists of a range of five octaves (F¹ to f⁵).¹⁴ Since its upper registers from a¹ to f³ were triple strung and its remaining lower registers were double strung, Walter pianos were able to produce a bigger volume of sound compared to the double-strung Stein pianos of which Mozart had spoken highly.¹⁵ Scholar Eva Badura-Skoda mentions that Mozart chose Walter's piano for his public performances due to its louder dynamic.¹⁶ In the year of Mozart's death in 1791, Broadwood, a piano maker in London with whom Hummel, Jan Ladislav Dussek, and Muzio Clementi were associated, made the first

¹¹ Grayson, "Whose Authenticity," 373-391; Macdonald, "Mozart's Piano Concertos," 302-329; Miucci, "I Concerti per Fortepiano e Orchestra," 81-128; Miucci, "Mozart after Mozart," <http://www.musicandpractice.org/volume-2/arrangements-of-mozarts-piano-concertos/>.

¹² Kregor, *Liszt as Transcriber*, 41-111.

¹³ Richard Maunder, "Mozart's Keyboard Instruments," *Early Music* 20, no. 2 (May 1992): 216.

¹⁴ The octave designation is based on the following system: C¹, C, c, c¹, c², c³, c⁴ with middle c as c¹.

¹⁵ Maunder, "Mozart's Keyboard Instruments," 216.

¹⁶ Eva Badura-Skoda, *The Eighteenth-Century Fortepiano Grand and Its Patrons: From Scarlatti to Beethoven* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017), 404.

five-and-a-half-octave grands ranging from F¹ to c⁴; other makers, including Longman & Broderip, Southwell, and Clementi soon followed suit.¹⁷ A few years later, makers also started to make the piano with a six-octave range.¹⁸ Naturally, composers began to write piano music using the extended range of the piano. As early as 1793, Dussek wrote Concerto in B-flat major, Op. 22 and Sonata in B-flat major, Op. 24 for pianos with five-and-a-half octave range ranging up to c⁴.¹⁹ Publishers such as Corri & Co. and Longman & Broderip even published Dussek's Concertos Op. 22 and Op. 27 (1794) and Clementi's Sonatas, Op. 33 (1794) in two formats, i.e., one for five-octave piano and another for five-and-a-half octave piano.²⁰ In 1822, Franz Schubert already composed Fantasy in C major, Op. 15, D. 760 'Wanderer' ranging up to f⁴. Evidently, by the time Hummel arranged Mozart's piano concertos in 1827, he wrote them for pianos that had a range more extended than that of Mozart's piano.

1.2.3 Overview of Hummel's Arrangement of Mozart's Piano Concerto

Although Hummel composed music throughout his life, he wrote piano arrangements only in the last phase of his career from 1819 to his death in 1837. He wrote arrangements of songs and orchestral works that met the growing demands for piano arrangements.²¹ In addition, as a *Kapellmeister* in Weimar at this period, Hummel had a reputation as a composer, conductor, and pianist, a reputation that made him an obvious choice for publishers to request him to write

¹⁷ Michael Cole, *The Pianoforte in the Classical Era* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 133-134.

¹⁸ David Rowland, *The Cambridge Companion to the Piano* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 33.

¹⁹ David Rowland, "Piano Music and Keyboard Compass in the 1790s," *Early Music* 27, no. 2 (May 1999): 288.

²⁰ Rowland, "Piano Music," 288.

²¹ Joel Sachs and Mark Kroll, "Hummel, Johann Nepomuk," *Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online*, Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://oxfordmusiconline.com>; Joel Sachs, *Kapellmeister Hummel in England and France* (Detroit: Information Coordinators, 1977).

insightful arrangements. According to Joel Sachs, a leading Hummel scholar, Hummel made approximately seventy arrangements during this period.²² These include twenty arrangements of Scottish songs and fifty arrangements of orchestral works such as overtures and symphonies by Mozart and Beethoven. Hummel wrote these fifty arrangements as a response to a series of commission requests by J. R. Schultz, who was a German or Austrian agent who commissioned composers in continental Europe to arrange music for publication in London.²³ To fulfill Schultz's commission requests, Hummel wrote arrangements of twenty-four opera overtures (including Mozart's *Le nozze di Figaro*, *Don Giovanni*, and *Die Zauberflöte*, Beethoven's *Fidelio*, Weber's *Der Freischütz*, Rossini's *Il barbiere di Siviglia*), four symphonies by Haydn (i.e., No. 44, 100, 102, and 103), six symphonies by Mozart (i.e., K. 385, K. 425, K. 504, K. 543, K. 550, K. 551), seven piano concertos by Mozart (i.e., K. 365 (316a), K. 456, K. 466, K. 482, K. 491, K. 503, and K. 537), Beethoven's first seven symphonies, and Beethoven's Septet. Hummel wrote most of them for piano with optional accompaniment played by flute, violin, and cello.

In his arrangements of seven Mozart's Piano Concertos, Hummel altered some passages, added ornamentation and, with the exceptions of K. 365 and K. 537, composed cadenzas. There is strong evidence that he made these changes in response to Schultz's request. In a letter dated 15 April 1823, Schultz commissioned Hummel to write twelve arrangements of Mozart's Piano

²² Joel Sachs, "A Checklist of the Works of Johann Nepomuk Hummel," *Notes* 30, no. 4 (June 1974): 750-752. See also Mark Kroll, ed., *Johann Nepomuk Hummel, Mozart's Haffner and Linz Symphonies: Arranged for Pianoforte, Flute, Violin, and Violoncello* (Madison: A-R Editions, 2000), xi-xii.

²³ Joel Sachs, "Authentic English and French Editions of J. N. Hummel," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 25, no. 2 (Summer 1972): 205.

Concertos. He also commissioned Kalkbrenner and Moscheles to write two arrangements each.²⁴ In this letter, Schultz explained why he chose Hummel to arrange these concertos. He stated that Hummel was once Mozart's pupil. He believed Hummel was therefore familiar with "the secrets of his [Mozart's] art," and had heard Mozart play "these concertos more often [than Kalkbrenner and Moscheles did]."²⁵ Since Hummel lived and studied with Mozart for about two years from sometime in 1786 until December 1788, Schultz valued Hummel's personal relationship with Mozart and his insight into Mozart's music. His commissions were grounded in his belief that Hummel had access to Mozart's authorial intention. However, he also requested Hummel to "change the antiquated passages according to [his] tasteful judgment."²⁶

How should Hummel change Mozart's music? In the same letter from Schultz to Hummel, Hummel's friend Ignaz Moscheles (1794-1870) offered suggestions for arranging Mozart's original:

Herr Schultz's project: To bring out a selection of Mozart's concertos with enriched solo, reinforcement, [especially in the] closing passagework, seems of special interest to me. If you undertake this enterprise, you cannot fail to succeed. Would you kindly just explain the following points further: 1) if in the *tuttis* and the *obbligato* parts the accompaniment ought not to be written out for the piano in small notes (as in your concerto). 2) If occasionally due to the increased brilliance, a few measures could not be added to the principal passages. 3) If it would not be better to retain the designation concerto (not sonata). 4) Would you please indicate which concertos you will arrange, because Herr Kalkbrenner and I would gladly attach ourselves to this work and then choose.

²⁴ The letter is printed in Karl Benyovsky, *J. N. Hummel: Der Mensch und Künstler* (Bratislava: Eos-Verlag, 1934), 231-233. Hummel only wrote seven out of the twelve arrangements starting in 1827 until his death in 1837.

Leonardo Miucci states that this was perhaps due to Hummel's incidental death in 1837. See Miucci, "Mozart after Mozart," <http://www.musicandpractice.org/volume-2/arrangements-of-mozarts-piano-concertos/>.

²⁵ Translated and adapted from Grayson, "Whose Authenticity?," 373. See Benyovsky, *J. N. Hummel*, 231-232.

"...sind Sie als mehrjähriger Zögling Mozarts in die Kunstgeheimnisse des Unsterblichen eingeweiht... Dann haben Sie endlich Mozart selbst diese Concerte öfter vortragen hören."

²⁶ Cited in and translated by Grayson, 373. See Benyovsky, 232. "...verändern Sie veraltete Stellen nach Ihrem geschmackvollen Urteil."

Ignaz Moscheles to Johann Nepomuk Hummel, 15 April 1823.²⁷

Among other techniques, Moscheles mentions “enriched solo,” “reinforcement in the closing passagework,” and “increased brilliance.” Using Moscheles’s suggestions as guidelines, I will explain in Chapter Three the ways Hummel stayed close to Mozart’s authorial intention while asserting his “tasteful judgment” in his arrangement of Mozart’s Piano Concerto, K. 503.

As shown in the passage above, Ignaz Moscheles predicted the success of the piano arrangement of Mozart’s Piano Concertos by Johann Nepomuk Hummel. Hummel wrote seven arrangements of Mozart’s Piano Concertos between 1827 and 1837. The reviewer of Hummel’s first arrangement of Mozart’s Piano Concerto in D minor, K. 466 (ca. 1827) praised it as follows: “Genuine melody of the sweetest kind, simple, clear, and perfect in its rhythm, abounds every where [sic]. The ‘Romanza,’ for instance – what softness, what intensity of musical feeling! And all this is achieved at the least possible expense of notes. As Mozart himself said once, there is not one too many!”²⁸ Moreover, the renowned pedagogue Carl Czerny also spoke highly of Hummel’s arrangements. In the fourth part of Czerny’s *Pianoforte-Schule*, Op. 500, he said “[Mozart’s] Concertos No. 1 [K. 467], 3 [K. 503], and 5 [K. 466] were arranged and provided with excellent cadenzas for the modern fortepiano of greater range by Hummel.”²⁹ Not

²⁷ Cited in and translated by Macdonald, “Mozart’s Piano Concertos,” 306. The German original of this passage is printed in Benyovsky, *J. N. Hummel*, 312-313. “Herr Schulzes Projekt: eine Auswahl der Mozart’schen Concerte mit Bereicherung der Hauptstimme, Verstärkung, Schluß-Passage, heraus zu geben, scheint mir von besonderem Interesse. Wenn Sie diese Unternehmen beginnen, kann der gute Erfolg nicht ermangeln. Wollten Sie nur folgende Punkte gütigst näher erklären: 1.) ob die Tuttis u. Obligaten Stellen der Begl. Nicht mit kleinen Noten fürs Klavier ausgeschrieben werden müssen (wie in Ihrem Concert). 2.) Ob nicht zuweilen zur Vermehrung der Brillance einige Takte in den Haupt-Passagen zugesetzt werden könnten. 3.) Ob es nicht besser sei den Nahmen Concert bey zu behalten, (nicht Sonate). 4.) Wollten Sie gefälligst anzeigen welche Concerte Sie bearbeiten würden, denn H. Kalkbrenner u. Ich wollen uns mit vergnügen zu dieser Arbeit anschließen u. dann wählen.”

²⁸ Cited in Grayson, “Whose Authenticity?,” 379. The review is from *Repository of Arts, Literature, Commerce, Manufactures, Fashions and Politics*, 3rd ser., 10 (October 1827): 237.

²⁹ Cited in Miucci, “I Concerti per Fortepiano e Orchestra,” 101. See Carl Czerny, *Pianoforte-Schule*, Op. 500 (Wien: A. Diabelli & Comp., 1839), 4:164-165. “Die Concerte No. 1 [K. 467], 3 [K. 503], und 5 [K. 466] wurden

surprisingly, publisher Litolff republished them in 1874 and reprinted them in 1890, indicating that they were much in demand from the public.³⁰ These arrangements have rekindled interest recently; between 2014 to 2017, Edition HH published K. 456, K. 466, K. 491, and K. 503 in modern editions with critical commentaries.³¹ The past and recent interest in Hummel's arrangements of these concertos, then, invites scholarly investigation.

1.3 Editions and Studies of Hummel's Arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos

Of all editions of Hummel's arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos, the most up-to-date and reliable one for performers is Edition HH. Edition HH, founded over twenty years ago in the UK, publishes performing editions of lesser-known works by composers from the Renaissance to the twenty-first century.³² Thus far, it has published four of Hummel's seven arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos: K. 466 (No. 1) and K. 456 (No. 7) in 2014, K. 503 (No. 2) in 2015, and K. 491 (No. 4) in 2017, all of which were edited by Leonardo Miucci.³³ The sources of these four arrangements are Hummel's autograph manuscripts and two first editions (see Appendix A for detailed information including publication dates and locations). The

von Hummel für die jetzigen Fortepiano von grösser'm [sic] Umfange arrangirt [sic] und mit trefflichen Cadenzen versehen." (my translation)

³⁰ Grayson, "Whose Authenticity?," 382.

³¹ From 2003 to 2006, the recordings of seven of them were released by BIS played by Fumiko Shiraga (piano), Henrik Wiese (flute), Peter Clemente (violin), Tibor Bényi (cello). See *Mozart Arranged by Hummel: 7 Piano Concertos and Symphony No. 40*, with Fumiko Shiraga (piano), Henrik Wiese (flute), Peter Clemente (violin), Tibor Bényi (cello), recorded at the Bavaria Music Studios in Munich, Germany, June 2003 (Disc 1: Nos. 20 and 25), June 2004 (Disc 2: Nos. 10 and 24), May 2005 (Disc 3: Nos. 22 and 26), June 2006 (Disc 4: No. 18 and Symphony No. 40), BIS Records Abe, BIS-CD-9043, 2013, 4 compact discs.

³² For a catalogue of these works as of Summer 2018, please consult http://www.editionhh.co.uk/catalogues/EditionHH_catalogue_1806.pdf

³³ According to <http://www.hkb-interpretation.ch/personen/mitarbeitende/miucci-leonardo.html>, Miucci is an Italian pianist and musicologist who specializes in the performance practice between eighteenth- to nineteenth-century. Currently he is a researcher at Bern Hochschule der Künste, an institution that has supported the publication of these concerto arrangements.

autographs were in Hummel's library and are currently preserved in the British Library. Augustus Hughes-Hughes (1857-1942), an English musicologist and staff member at the Department of Manuscripts at the British Museum, states in the *Catalogue of Manuscript Music* that these autographs were "by, and in the hand of Hummel."³⁴ Of the two first editions for these arrangements, one was published by Chappell for the English market and the other was published by Schott for the French and German market.³⁵ These two first editions are different from the autographs in that they give more detailed dynamic markings and articulations. Their layouts are different but are otherwise identical. The autographs are in full score but the first editions published separate instrumental parts. Edition HH, however, published them both in full score as well as separate instrumental parts. It also provides textual notes detailing the discrepancies between these three sources. For these reasons, I will use Edition HH as the principal score for this thesis.

A number of scholars have discussed six of Hummel's arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos, but K. 503 has received little scholarly attention. Using K. 491 and K. 537 as examples, David Grayson focuses on Hummel's and Cramer's ornamentation. He presents the critics' mixed reactions and discusses the idea of authenticity. To his mind, these nineteenth-century arrangements documented the reception history of Mozart's piano concertos and help us to reevaluate our current performance practice of Mozart's piano concertos. Claudia Macdonald discusses the posthumous performances, editions, and reception of Mozart's Piano Concertos.

³⁴ Augustus Hughes-Hughes, *Catalogue of Manuscript Music in the British Museum*, 3 vols. (London: Longman and Co., 1909), 3:265. Six autographs (K. 482, K. 491, K. 456, K. 466, K. 503, and K. 537) are available in the Volume III of a Collection of Arrangements by Johann Nepomuk Hummel, Add MS 32234, Music Collections, British Library.

³⁵ See Joel Sachs, "Authentic English and French Editions," 209. Based on an advertisement in the supplement to *Cäcilia*, Vol. 5 (1826) Schott published Hummel's arrangements in Paris to be distributed in France and Germany.

She examines the repertoire's growth, decline, and rediscovery from the beginning until the end of the nineteenth century. In particular, she studies the modifications that Hummel, Cramer, Moscheles, and Kalkbrenner made in their arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos in the first movements.³⁶ Leonardo Miucci provides historical contexts in which the arrangements were published. These contexts include the genesis and reception of Mozart's Piano Concertos, the establishment of piano concerto genre, the growing demands of arrangements in the early nineteenth century, and the relationship between Mozart and Hummel. He discusses the arrangements of K. 466, K. 482, and K. 537 and, in his article "Mozart after Mozart" (2015), further explains Hummel's approach of embellishing Mozart's melody of K. 456 and K. 466. Gerhard Bachleitner, however, acknowledges that Hummel modified Mozart's original beyond surface-level melody embellishment. He discusses Hummel's virtuosity relative to early nineteenth-century pianism and Hummel's alterations of Mozart's Piano Concertos K. 365, K. 482, and K. 537. In his second article, he discusses the aesthetic changes from Mozart's to Hummel's time and the critics' objections and approvals of Hummel's arrangements. Since no one has discussed Hummel's arrangement of Mozart's Piano Concerto K. 503, I will investigate this arrangement in this dissertation.³⁷

While the scholars mentioned above present the value of Hummel's arrangements, scholars on Mozart's keyboard music such as Frederick Neumann and Eva and Paul Badura-Skoda show

³⁶ Macdonald, "Mozart's Piano Concertos," 305. According to Macdonald, Cramer arranged K. 450, K. 459, K. 466, K. 467, K. 482, K. 491 in 1825-1835. Kalkbrenner arranged K. 503 around 1828 and was published by Probst around 1829, and Moscheles's arrangement of K. 365 was published in 1861 by Breitkopf and Härtel.

³⁷ Grayson, "Whose Authenticity," 373-391; Macdonald, "Mozart's Piano Concertos," 302-329; Miucci, "I Concerti per Fortepiano e Orchestra," 81-128; Miucci, "Mozart after Mozart," <http://www.musicandpractice.org/volume-2/arrangements-of-mozarts-piano-concertos/>; Bachleitner, "Mozart-Metamorphosen," 17-28; Bachleitner, "Mozart-Metamorphosen 2," 55-70.

objections to Hummel's arrangements.³⁸ Neumann and Badura-Skoda criticize Hummel's embellishments for being too lavish. Badura-Skoda claims that "Hummel embellished Mozart's works much too elaborately," and that Hummel's embellishments are "not in the style of Mozart."³⁹ Similarly, Neumann criticizes that Hummel "corrupts the deeply moving, tender epilogue of the slow movement [of K. 491], converting it into a passage of flashy technical display."⁴⁰ Their objections are understandable since Badura-Skoda and Neumann aim to inform readers about *Mozart's* style. They state that Hummel's embellishments do not follow Mozart's style, but their point does not do justice to nineteenth-century pianism and therefore was unfair to Hummel. What they have deemed as "too elaborate" or "flashy" for Mozart is different from what Hummel and his contemporaries considered appropriate. Hummel arranged Mozart's Piano Concertos for the early nineteenth-century public and for pianos different from those of Mozart's time. Therefore, one should not look at Hummel's arrangements in order to deduce Mozart's style of embellishment. Rather, one should understand Hummel's arrangement within the context of the early nineteenth-century pianism.

In sum, the term "arrangement" denotes a re-creation of an original work in a different context. The context in which arrangements are written plays a significant part in shaping how an arranger re-creates the original. The development of the piano and piano technique in the nineteenth century gave rise to demands for piano arrangements as a means of virtuosic display and a means of making orchestral repertoires accessible to the domestic market. Accordingly, the

³⁸ Frederick Neumann, *Ornamentation and Improvisation in Mozart* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 248-250; Eva and Paul Badura-Skoda, *Interpreting Mozart: The Performance of His Piano Pieces and Other Compositions*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2008), 244-247.

³⁹ Badura-Skoda and Badura-Skoda, *Interpreting Mozart*, 244-245.

⁴⁰ Neumann, *Ornamentation and Improvisation*, 250.

publisher Schultz commissioned Hummel to write arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos that met these demands. While scholars have discussed six of Hummel's seven arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos, K. 503 has received little attention. In addition, the discussions of these arrangements have revolved around *Mozart's* performance practice and reception history. In this thesis, however, I investigate *Hummel's* approach to making an arrangement of Mozart's K. 503 for the early nineteenth-century public and how his arrangement fits in the historical context of arrangements by other arrangers such as Mozart and Kalkbrenner. I ask the following research questions: What kind of arranger was Hummel? What approach did he take to arrange K. 503? How did he modify Mozart's passages while staying faithful to Mozart? Could there be musical reasons that account for his approach? To understand Hummel's arrangement of Mozart's K. 503, I borrow concepts from theories of translation to explain his approach in the following chapter.

Chapter 2: To Arrange is to Serve Two Masters

To better understand Hummel's approach to arranging Mozart's Piano Concerto, K. 503, I borrow the expression "to serve two masters" from Franz Rosenzweig's theory of translation.⁴¹ To begin the discussion, I will show how one can draw a connection between musical arrangements and linguistic translations. Then I will discuss what Rosenzweig meant when he claimed that "to translate means to serve two masters," i.e., the author and the target reader. Similarly, arrangers write arrangements that mediate between the composer and the target audience. Since Mozart himself also made musical arrangements, I will discuss how Mozart attempted to be faithful to the original works while making modifications to make them accessible to the new target audience. Having established that an arranger's task is to serve the original composer and the new target audience, I propose that the value of an arrangement is not only based on its fidelity to the intention of its original composer but also based on its accessibility to the new audience. Therefore, one should not necessarily expect an arrangement to be a duplicated copy of the original. Instead, one should expect some degree of alterations made by the arranger in completing his task "to serve two masters."

⁴¹ Franz Rosenzweig, "Luther and Scripture," in *Scripture and Translation*, trans. Lawrence Alan Rosenwald and Everett Fox (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 47-48, quoted in Franz Rosenzweig, "The Impossibility and Necessity of Translation," in *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*, ed. André Lefevere (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1977), 110 and Paul Ricoeur, *On Translation* (London: Routledge, 2006), 22-23.

2.1 Arrangements as Musical Translations

Similar to an “arrangement” or a “transcription” that adapts an original musical piece for a different context, a translation renders a work in a foreign language for a different reader. In *Liszt as Transcriber* (2010), Kregor mentions that musical arrangements are closely related to works of literary translations.⁴² He surveys different approaches to translations, including reader-oriented ones and author-oriented ones. Reader-oriented translations prioritize the target language over the source language. According to Kregor, they are equivalent to performer-oriented arrangements that prioritize idiomatic writing. Examples include Czerny’s arrangement of Mozart’s “Lacrimosa” and François-Joseph Fétis’s *Traité de l’accompagnement de la partition sur le piano ou l’orgue* (Treatise on the Accompaniment from Score by Piano or Organ) (1829). Similar to a translator who strives to make a translation accessible to the target reader, Czerny and Fétis wrote idiomatic arrangements that were accessible to contemporary pianists. In contrast, author-oriented translations preserve the peculiar components of the source text in the translation. They are analogous to composer-oriented arrangements that seek to adhere as closely to the originals as possible. Liszt’s arrangements of Beethoven’s nine Symphonies and Hector Berlioz’s *Symphonie fantastique* for solo piano serve as examples. Through his composer-oriented approach, Liszt strove to re-create the composers’ orchestration at the piano so meticulously that he made the piano arrangements technically challenging. His arrangements became so virtuosic that few contemporary pianists could play them. The similarities between reader-oriented translations and performer-oriented arrangements as well as between author-

⁴² Jonathan Kregor, *Liszt as Transcriber* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 9-40.

oriented translations and composer-oriented arrangements illustrate that one can adopt concepts from translation theories to help explain different approaches to musical arrangements.

Pianist and scholar Rian de Waal also connects transcription with translation theory in his *Metamorphoses: The Art of the Virtuoso Piano Transcription* (2013).⁴³ He borrows ideas from linguist Roman Jakobson who categorizes translations into intralinguistic, interlinguistic, and intersemiotic ones. Intralinguistic translation or rewording denotes a synonym, which is a translation from one word to another word within the same language. According to de Waal, an intralinguistic arrangement refers to an arrangement for the same instrument, such as Liszt's arrangements of Schubert's Impromptus, Op. 90 No. 2 and No. 3 and Godowsky's 53 arrangements of Chopin's Etudes, both of which were written originally for piano and were arranged for piano. Interlinguistic translation, which seeks to translate from one language to another language, is equivalent to a musical adaptation for instruments different from the original (e.g., from orchestra to piano, or vice versa). Intersemiotic translation is a type of translation that works across different systems such as from a text to a sign language. In music, intersemiotic translations are similar to arrangements of operatic arias as opera fantasies (e.g., Liszt's arrangements of Mozart's *Don Giovanni*, Bellini's *Norma*, Verdi's *Rigoletto*) and song transcriptions (e.g., Liszt's arrangements of Schubert's and Chopin's songs).⁴⁴ Because one can draw a parallel between translations and arrangements, one can borrow theories of translations to understand "arrangements" or "transcriptions."

⁴³ Rian de Waal, *Metamorphoses: The Art of the Virtuoso Piano Transcription* (Delft: Eburon Academic Publishers, 2013), 63-65.

⁴⁴ Waal, *Metamorphoses*, 63-65.

Similar to a translator who aims at introducing a work by the original author to the target reader, I propose that an arranger seeks to present a composition by the original composer to the target audience. At a time when there was no recording technology, the target audience may have included the target performer, who played the arrangement for himself or herself. In the case of Hummel's arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos, Schultz commissioned Hummel to arrange them for the nineteenth-century public while also staying faithful to Mozart. Therefore, as one could argue that Hummel's objective as an arranger was "to translate," I investigate how Hummel used his creativity to serve both the composer and the target audience.

2.2 How Translators Serve Two Masters

One can understand translation in two ways. From a narrow perspective, when a reader desires to read a text written in a foreign language, the reader needs a translator. In this case, a translator needs to have a strong command of the language used by the author and the language of the target reader. A translator acts as a mediator so that the reader will understand the author's intention. From a broader perspective, according to Rosenzweig, whenever one speaks, one translates. A speaker translates the ideas in his or her mind into the language that the target audience understands. The awareness of different types of audiences helps one speak differently to different groups of people even though one wants to deliver the same ideas in the same language. Similarly, whenever one hears words, one translates. One translates the original words one hears into one's own language.⁴⁵ Whether one introduces the work of a foreign author to a

⁴⁵ Ibid.

reader, or facilitates mutual understanding, translation is the work required to help people understand one another, bridging the cultural-linguistic gap.

According to Rosenzweig, a translation is not a copy of the original and it should not be viewed as such. After all, the work of translation exists because of the reader. Philosopher Paul Ricoeur also agrees with this idea. He says that one should “give up the ideal of the perfect translation.”⁴⁶ According to Ricoeur, a perfect translation does not exist. He labels one’s expectation of a translation to be a duplicated original as a “banal dream” or a “fantasy.”⁴⁷ If one nourishes this fantasy, a translation would always be a bad translation by default since it would never amount to the original. Instead, one can view a translation as a means to understand the original. Therefore, instead of expecting a translation to be identical with the original, one should expect some degree of difference between the original and the translation.

The kind of difference between the original and the translation depends on the translator’s approach to translation. The following paragraph presents three perspectives: 1) a reader-oriented approach; 2) an author-oriented approach; 3) a reader- and author-oriented approach. As an example of the first approach, Cicero says that “I translate the ideas, their forms, as one might say, their shapes; however, I translate them into a language that is in tune with our conventions of usage. Therefore, I did not have to make a word-for-word translation but rather a translation that reflects the general stylistic features and the meaning of the foreign words.”⁴⁸ Cicero’s approach is reader-oriented since he is more concerned with making the text approachable for the

⁴⁶ Paul Ricoeur, *On Translation* (London: Routledge, 2006), 8.

⁴⁷ Ricoeur, *On Translation*, 5.

⁴⁸ Cited in Hugo Frederich, “On the Art of Translation,” in *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 11-16, at 12.

readers rather than staying close to the author's original language. On the other hand, one can privilege the author rather than the reader. Friedrich Schleiermacher proposes that translators should "comprehend the spirit of the language that was native to the author, and they must be able to behold his unique nature and manner of thinking."⁴⁹ Schleiermacher's approach is author-oriented since he prioritizes the foreign language more than the target language. The third approach pays equal attention to the reader and the author. Rosenzweig, for example, views this kind of translation as a work that "serves two masters."⁵⁰ Rosenzweig finds this type of translation nearly impossible since one tends to serve only one master. Despite its theoretical challenge, this type of translation is conceivable when the translator is adept at communicating in the foreign and the target language. The effectiveness of this approach depends on the translator's understanding of the original text, the degree of fidelity towards the original, as well as the translator's writing skills in imparting the original's content in the target language.

2.3 How Arrangers Serve Two Masters

The work of translation has implications for musical arrangements. Arrangers who are expert at understanding the original score and are performers who understand their new audience could be arrangers who can "serve two masters." While one may argue that it is inappropriate to alter Mozart's music to suit a different audience and that performers should perform Mozart's compositions exclusively in the style of Mozart, Mozart himself arranged works by other

⁴⁹ Cited in and translated by Kregor, *Liszt as Transcriber*, 15. The German original of this passage is printed in Friedrich Schleiermacher, "Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens," in *Kritische Gesamtausgabe: Akademievorträge*, ed. Martin Rössler and Lars Emersleben (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002), I/11:65-93, at 72-73. "Wenn seine Leser verstehen sollen, so müssen sie den Geist der Sprache auffassen, die dem Schriftsteller einheimisch war, sie müssen dessen eigenthümliche Denkweise und Sinnesart anschauen können."

⁵⁰ Rosenzweig, "Luther and Scripture," 47-48.

composers that suited his contemporary audience.⁵¹ It is noteworthy that during Hummel's stay with Mozart from 1786 to 1788, Mozart became the director of the concert society *Gesellschaft der Associierten Cavaliers* in 1787. As the director of this society, Mozart was in charge of making arrangements of Handel's oratorios.⁵² Therefore, it was highly possible that Hummel witnessed Mozart making arrangements of works by composers of the past. Remarkably, Mozart and Hummel shared a similar approach to writing arrangements. Both of them wrote arrangements of earlier works that suited their contemporary audience. While Mozart arranged Handel's oratorios for his contemporary what one might call the Classical audience, Hummel arranged Mozart's Piano Concertos for the early Romantic audience. They also strove for idiomatic writing in their arrangements. Their arrangements were accessible to the performer while preserving the original's effect. Hence, as arrangers, both Mozart and Hummel "served two masters," by paying close attention to the original while addressing their target audience.

In his letters, Mozart revealed that idiomatic writing was one of his priorities in his approach to arrangements. When he wrote keyboard arrangements of ballet music by Kapellmeister Christian Cannabich (1731-1798), he wrote to his father on 6 December 1777, "He [Cannabich] has to produce selections of all [his ballet music], but these must be arranged for [the clavier]. He is quite unable to *transcribe them in such a way as to render them effective and at the same time easy*. So he finds me very handy, as he did on one occasion already when I

⁵¹ Frederick Neumann, *Ornamentation and Improvisation in Mozart* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 248-250; Eva and Paul Badura-Skoda, *Interpreting Mozart: The Performance of His Piano Pieces and Other Compositions*, 2nd edn. (New York: Routledge, 2008), 244-247.

⁵² Christoph Wolff, "Mozart's *Messiah*: "The Spirit of Handel" from Van Swieten's Hands," in *Music and Civilization: Essays in Honor of Paul Henry Lang*, ed. Edmond Strainschamps and Maria Rika Maniates (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1984), 1-5.

arranged a *contredanse* for him.”⁵³ This quote indicates that Mozart had the expertise to arrange music in an “easy” and “effective” way, an expertise that was recognized by the Mannheim Kapellmeister and one that indicates idiomatic writing for the keyboard. In another letter written after the first two performances of Mozart’s opera *Die Entführung aus dem Serail* on 16 and 19 July 1782, Mozart told his father about his attempt to arrange the opera for wind band. On 20 July 1782, he wrote: “You can’t imagine how difficult it is to arrange such a thing for wind band – so that it suits the wind instruments and yet loses none of its effectiveness.”⁵⁴ This letter shows that Mozart viewed the task of arranging as a challenge because he aimed at achieving two agendas in mind, namely, to preserve the original musical ideas and to transfer them through idiomatic writing for the target instrument or ensemble.

Around the 1780s, Mozart arranged several fugues by Johann Sebastian Bach and oratorios by George Frideric Handel and contributed to the dissemination of Baroque works for audience of his time.⁵⁵ He arranged them for Baron Gottfried van Swieten (1733-1803), who was fond of the music of the Baroque composers. In his letter to his father on 10 April 1782, Mozart said, “At noon every Sunday I visit Baron van Swieten – here nothing is played but Handel and Bach.”⁵⁶ In that year, Mozart wrote five arrangements for string quartet (K. 405) from keyboard fugues by

⁵³ Wolfgang A. Mozart. *The Letters of Mozart and His Family*, ed. Emily Anderson, 3rd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1985), 408. (my emphasis)

⁵⁴ Wolfgang A. Mozart, *Mozart: A Life in Letters*, ed. Cliff Eisen and Stewart Spencer (New York: Penguin Book, 2006), 451. According to Eisen and Spencer, Mozart did not complete this arrangement for the wind band.

⁵⁵ David Humphreys, “Arrangements and Additions; Transcriptions of Works by Other Composers,” in *The Mozart Compendium: A Guide to Mozart’s Life and Music*, ed. Robbins Landon (London: Thames and Hudson, 1990), 336-339; Stanley Sadie, “Handel, George Frideric,” *The Cambridge Mozart Encyclopedia*, ed. Cliff Eisen and Simon P. Keefe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 207-209.

⁵⁶ Wolfgang A. Mozart, *Mozart: A Life in Letters*, ed. Cliff Eisen and Stewart Spencer (New York: Penguin Book, 2006), 448.

J. S. Bach (BWV 871, 874, 876-878).⁵⁷ Afterward, van Swieten commissioned Mozart to arrange oratorios such as C. P. E. Bach's *Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu* (1788), Handel's *Acis and Galatea* (1788), *Messiah* (1789), *Alexander's Feast* (1790), and *Ode for St. Cecilia's Day* (1790). As requested by van Swieten, Mozart supplied the continuo realization and changed the instrumentation by adding wind parts because the original orchestration was sparse and inadequate for contemporary musicians. Most of the added wind parts serve primarily as accompaniments or double parts of the orchestra. Therefore, Mozart's alterations did not make substantial structural changes that would betray Handel's original.⁵⁸ Thus, Mozart arranged older works in a way that better fit his contemporary context while respecting the original's content.

Similarly, Hummel arranged Mozart's Piano Concertos in order to serve Mozart as well as the nineteenth-century public. In London, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Mozart's piano concertos were not as popular as those by Cramer, Dussek, Moscheles, and Hummel.⁵⁹ Scholar Claudia Macdonald cites a review in the *Haude- und Spenersche Zeitung* of Mozart's D-Minor Concerto performed by Wenzeslaw Hauck in Berlin on 27 January 1830: "It was extremely interesting, for once to hear finally one of Mozart's pianoforte concertos, which are still completely alien to our modern virtuoso, because there is not enough passagework in them."⁶⁰ The review indicates that the performances of Mozart's Piano Concertos were rare and

⁵⁷ Mozart may also have written other arrangements of J. S. Bach's works for string trio (K. 404a from BWV 527, BWV 853, BWV 882, BWV 883), string quartet (K. deest from BWV 548, BWV 874, BWV 876, BWV 877, BWV 878, BWV 891), and string quintet (K. deest from BWV 849, BWV 867, BWV 878) though their authenticity is still in question. See Ulrich Konrad, *Mozart, Catalogue of His Works: Compositions, Fragments, Sketches, Arrangements, Manuscript Copies, Texts* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2006), 164.

⁵⁸ Wolff, "Mozart's *Messiah*," 1-5.

⁵⁹ Therese Marie Ellsworth, "The Piano Concerto in London Concert Life Between 1801 and 1850" (PhD diss., University of Cincinnati, 1991), 244-277.

⁶⁰ Cited in and translated by Macdonald, "Mozart's Piano Concertos," 305 from *Haude- und Spenersche Zeitung*, 1 March 1830, printed in Klaus Kropfinger, "Klassik-Rezeption in Berlin (1810-1830)," in *Studien zur Musikgeschichte Berlins im frühen 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Carl Dahlhaus, Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19.

that their technical demand failed to satisfy early nineteenth-century audiences. This review also indicates that although Mozart's Piano Concertos were not popular, interest in reviving earlier music also grew since 1820.⁶¹ This growing interest provided a favorable context for Hummel to arrange Mozart's piano concertos to suit his contemporary public.

To sum up, theories of translation help explain various approaches to arrangements. Similar to a translator who aims at serving both the original author and the target reader, Schultz requested Hummel to make arrangements that would serve both Mozart and the nineteenth-century public. When one considers Hummel's arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos as translations, one should expect some degree of difference between Mozart's style and the arrangements. Therefore, it is understandable that Mozart scholars such as Eva and Paul Badura-Skoda and Frederick Neumann regard Hummel's arrangements as un-Mozartean.⁶² Yet, borrowing Ricoeur's words, I propose that we "give up the ideal" that the arrangements are the "perfect translations" of Mozart.⁶³ The value of an arrangement is not only based on its fidelity to its original composer but also based on its accessibility to the new audience. Similar to Mozart who "translated" Handel's oratorios for Mozart's contemporaries, Hummel "translated" Mozart's piano concertos for the early nineteenth-century public. Using Hummel's arrangement of Mozart's Piano Concerto K. 503 as a case study, I will show in the following chapter how

Jahrhunderts, 56 (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1980), 375. "Höchst interessant war es, wieder endlich einmal eines der Mozartschen Pianoforte-Concerte zu hören, welche unsern modernen Virtuosen ganz fremd bleiben, weil es nicht Passagen-Werk genug darin giebt."

⁶¹ Macdonald, "Mozart's Piano Concertos," 303.

⁶² Frederick Neumann, *Ornamentation and Improvisation in Mozart* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 248-250; Eva and Paul Badura-Skoda, *Interpreting Mozart: The Performance of His Piano Pieces and Other Compositions*, 2nd edn. (New York: Routledge, 2008), 244-247.

⁶³ Paul Ricoeur, *On Translation*, 8.

Hummel “served two masters,” catering to his contemporary audiences without downplaying the intention of the original composer.

Chapter 3: Hummel's Arrangement of Mozart's Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503: Serving Composer and Audience

According to Moscheles's letter to Hummel quoted in the first chapter, Schultz requested Hummel to add enrichment (*Bereicherung*) to the solo passages of the concerto and to add reinforcement (*Verstärkung*) to the closing passagework (*Schluß-Passage*).⁶⁴ Which passages did Hummel modify? In K. 503, Hummel added ornamentation to select themes in the second and third movements and highlighted select closing passagework in all movements. Unlike what Badura-Skoda and Tovey have claimed, Hummel did not alter *all* Mozart's passages.⁶⁵ Rather, Hummel only altered *select* passages. I will show in this chapter that Hummel's alteration of select closing passagework highlights the structure of Mozart's concerto while making them more virtuosic than the original ones for the nineteenth-century audiences. He enhanced Mozart's themes through his ornamentation and offered practical guidelines for the nineteenth-century pianists. The evidence presented below will show that though Hummel refashioned Mozart's Concerto K. 503 for the early nineteenth-century audience, he still attempted to stay as close to Mozart's materials as possible. Therefore, I argue that Hummel served two masters, i.e., Mozart and the early nineteenth-century public.

⁶⁴ Cited in and translated by Macdonald, "Mozart's Piano Concertos," 306. The German original of this passage is printed in Benyovsky, *J. N. Hummel*, 312. "Herr Schulzes Projekt: eine Auswahl der Mozart'schen Concerte mit Bereicherung der Hauptstimme, Verstärkung, Schluß-Passage, heraus zu geben, scheint mir von besonderem Interesse.

⁶⁵ Badura-Skoda writes, "When Hummel embellished Mozart's concertos, he did not hesitate to alter practically every passage, even in allegro movements." See Eva and Paul Badura-Skoda, *Interpreting Mozart: The Performance of His Piano Pieces and Other Compositions*, 2nd edn. (New York: Routledge, 2008), 244. Likewise, Tovey writes, "he [Hummel], rewrote almost every bar of the pianoforte passages and brought them up to date." See Donald Francis Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis*, Vol. III (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), 45.

I will divide this chapter into two sections: ornamentation of select themes and reinforcement of select closing passagework. In the first section, I will discuss Hummel's ornamentation of Mozart's themes with examples from each movement. I will also compare some of Hummel's ornamentation with those of his contemporaries and the twentieth-century Mozart scholars. Using this comparative method, I demonstrate how Hummel respected Mozart's original while adding ornamentation.

In the second section, I will examine Hummel's modifications of Mozart's closing passagework using examples from each movement. To better understand the meaning of what Macdonald translates as "closing passagework," I begin with Moscheles's original German for this term, which is *Schluß-Passage*. The first part of the term is *Schluß*. According to the entry "Cadence" in Grove Music Online, the word *Schluß* can also be translated as "cadence."⁶⁶ Scholar Charles Rosen states the connection between cadence and closure: "The basis of all Western musical form starting with Gregorian chant is the cadence, which implies that the forms are 'closed,' set within a frame and isolated."⁶⁷ Music theorist William Caplin also asserts that "cadence creates musical closure."⁶⁸ Likewise, musicologist James Webster mentions that "the sense of closure is arguably the most essential structural attribute of tonal music."⁶⁹ From these three claims, I gather the interconnection between "cadence," "closure," and "structure." The second part of the term is *Passage*. Macdonald translates the term specifically as "passagework,"

⁶⁶ William Rockstro, George Dyson, William Drabkin, Harold Powers, Julian Rushton, "Cadence," *Grove Music Online*, *Oxford Music Online*, Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.

⁶⁷ Charles Rosen, *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997), 26.

⁶⁸ William Caplin, "The Classical Cadence: Conceptions and Misconceptions," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57, no.1 (Spring 2004): 56.

⁶⁹ James Webster, *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991): 145. Cited in Mark Richards, "Closure in Classical Themes: The Role of Melody and Texture in Cadences, Closural Function, and the Separated Cadence," *Intersections* 31, no. 1 (2010): 25.

which, according to Grove Music Online, denotes “transitional sections consisting brilliant figuration or virtuoso display.”⁷⁰ I agree with Macdonald’s interpretation because Mozart himself shows some degree of virtuosity in his original closing sections. Therefore, in this second section, I shall demonstrate how Hummel makes select closing passagework more virtuosic than the original while making Mozart’s structure more lucid for the nineteenth-century audience.

3.1 Ornamentation of Select Themes

Hummel’s addition of ornamentation to Mozart’s music followed the conventions Mozart himself introduced to his own performances. Until the eighteenth century, performers including singers and instrumentalists often added embellishments or ornamentation to original compositions.⁷¹ They embellished a melody by adding ornaments (e.g., trills, turns, grace notes) and by applying running figuration patterns to a melody.⁷² They might have used embellishments prepared by the composer or themselves before the performance or they might added them spontaneously during the performance. The treatises by Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach (1753), Leopold Mozart (1756), and Daniel Gottlob Türk (1789) testify to this widespread performance

⁷⁰ Michael Tilmouth, “Passage,” *Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online*, Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.

⁷¹ Robert Levin, “Improvisation. 4. The Classical Period,” *Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online*, Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>; Andrew Jones and Will Crutchfield, “Ornamentation (ii),” *Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online*, Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.

⁷² Kenneth Kreitner, “Ornaments,” *Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online*, Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.

practice.⁷³ C. P. E. Bach mentions that “no one disputes the need for embellishments.”⁷⁴ Türk shares the same opinion and asserts the consequences of playing musical compositions without ornamentation:

I regard any attempt to prove the necessity of ornamentation at greater length as superfluous, since the need is so evident that none can fail to recognize it. Especially in the light of present taste, ornaments have become a very necessary requirement. For one knows by experience that many excellent compositions lose much and perhaps have only half the effect when they are played without ornamentation (appoggiaturas are included); on the contrary a very mediocre work can be extraordinarily improved by well-chosen ornaments.⁷⁵

According to Türk, ornamentation might improve or weaken a composition. The three authors C. P. E. Bach, Mozart, and Türk agreed that embellishments were indispensable for the following reasons: they “connect and enliven tones,” “impart stress and accent,” “make music pleasing and awaken our close attention,” “strengthen the expression,” and “[create] variety in often-repeated and similar passages.”⁷⁶ Thus, it is reasonable to suppose that Mozart would add ornamentation to his compositions when he performed.

Adding ornamentation to a musical composition was such a common practice in the eighteenth century that composers and teachers cautioned performers against abuse. Bach,

⁷³ Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments*, trans. and ed. William John Mitchell, 2nd ed. (London: Cassell, 1951). It was first published in German as *Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen*, 2 vols. (Berlin: In Verlegung des Auctoris, 1753, 1762). Leopold Mozart, *Treatise on the Fundamental Principles of Violin Playing*, trans. Editha Knocker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985). It was first published in German as *Versuch einer gründlichen Violinschule* (Augsburg: Johann Jacob Lotter, 1756). Daniel Gottlob Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, trans. Raymond H. Hagg (Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 1982). It was first published in German as *Klavierschule* (Leipzig and Halle: Schwickert, 1789). See also Elizabeth Loretta Hays, “F. W. Marpurg’s ‘Anleitung zum Clavierspielen’ (Berlin, 1755) and ‘Principes du Clavecin’ (Berlin, 1756): Translation and Commentary” (PhD diss., Stanford University, 1976). Johann Joachim Quantz, *On Playing the Flute*, trans. Edward R. Reilly, 2nd ed. (New York: Schirmer Books, 1985). It was first published in German as *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen* (Berlin, 1752).

⁷⁴ Bach, *Essay*, 79.

⁷⁵ Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, 229.

⁷⁶ Bach, *Essay*, 79; Mozart, *Treatise*, 214; Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, 229.

Marpurg, Türk, and Mozart often complained about performers who introduced ornamentation too ostentatious for a composition. Such abuse did not add anything substantive to the compositions in question. According to Leopold Mozart, although performers usually played the *allegro* section of a concerto well, they played the *adagio* section poorly because their ornamentation was “too overloaded.”⁷⁷ His remark indicates that though most performers at his time had the technical capability, they could not ornament melodies with taste. On the overuse of ornamentation, Türk writes, “How disgusting! But nevertheless, the most touching compositions are all too often played in this tasteless manner.”⁷⁸ It came as no surprise that C. P. E. Bach recommended composers to prescribe their own ornamentation rather than allowing performers with bad taste to ruin their compositions. However, he also encouraged accomplished performers to insert ornamentation as long as they added them prudently at the correct places and enhanced expression.⁷⁹ The constant complaints indicate that introducing ornamentation was the standard of performance practice at Mozart’s time, though some keyboard players were ill-equipped to do so tastefully.

Similarly, Hummel was aware of the potential problem of abuse. In his treatise *Ausführliche theoretisch-practische Anweisung zum Pianoforte Spiel* (A Complete Theoretical and Practical Course of Instructions on the Art of Playing the Piano Forte) (1828), he warned performers against “an overloaded decoration of the passages of melody,” because it could deprive a passage of “beauty, sweetness, and grace.”⁸⁰ As a renowned teacher and pianist of his

⁷⁷ Leopold Mozart, *Treatise*, 215-216.

⁷⁸ Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, 230.

⁷⁹ Bach, *Essay*, 79-80.

⁸⁰ Johann Nepomuk Hummel, *A Complete Theoretical and Practical Course of Instructions on the Art of Playing the Piano Forte* (London: T. Boosey, 1828), 3:40. It was first published in German as *Ausführliche theoretisch-*

time, he urged other performers to introduce embellishments “with moderation and in the proper place.”⁸¹ If Hummel cautioned other pianists to be prudent in their ornamentation, he would most likely exercise restraint in ornamenting Mozart’s music. Moreover, known as a pupil of Mozart and a well-known pianist in his time, Hummel was considered by Schultz to be the most suitable person to ornament Mozart’s compositions. That said, as mentioned in the first chapter, Mozart’s scholars such as Eva and Paul Badura-Skoda and Frederick Neumann criticize Hummel’s embellishments for their “excesses,” and assert that the embellishments “should be emphatically rejected.”⁸² These objections lead me ask this question: Under what circumstances do embellishments amount to “excess”?

Instead of judging Hummel’s embellishments by late eighteenth-century standard, one should judge them by early nineteenth-century standard. To consider how much ornamentation qualified as excessive in Hummel’s time, we need to adopt a comparative method, which would show how “excessive” Hummel’s embellishments were relative to those by his contemporaries. To this end, I examine Hummel’s style of ornamentation in relation to his contemporaries Friedrich Kalkbrenner (1785-1849) and Philipp Karl Hoffmann (1769-1842), both of whom made arrangements of the same concerto (K. 503). In addition, I will compare Hummel’s ornamentation of Mozart’s “sketch-like” melody—to borrow Robert Levin’s term—in the second movement with ornamentation by Hoffmann, Kalkbrenner, Badura-Skoda, and Levin.⁸³ I

practische Anweisung zum Pianoforte Spiel (Vienna: T. Haslinger, 1828) and later in French as *Méthode complète théorique et pratique pour le pianoforte* (Paris: A. Farrenc, 1829).

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Frederick Neumann, *Ornamentation and Improvisation in Mozart* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 248-250; Badura-Skoda, *Interpreting Mozart*, 244-247.

⁸³ Robert Levin, “Improvisation and Embellishment in Mozart Piano Concertos,” *Musical Newsletter* 5, no. 2 (1975): 10.

shall demonstrate in these comparisons that Hummel's ornamentation was not "excessive" by early nineteenth-century standard. Rather, Hummel enhanced Mozart's themes and served nineteenth-century audiences.

3.1.1 First Movement

In the first movement, Hummel kept Mozart's themes intact, unlike his contemporary Kalkbrenner, who added ornamentation to Mozart's themes. To demonstrate this point, I will compare parts of Mozart's original solo entry in mm. 91-102 (Example 3.1.1) with Hummel's and Kalkbrenner's arrangements (Example 3.1.2 and 3.1.3). The difference between Hummel's approach and Kalkbrenner's is evident. While Hummel's modification is limited to a few changes of articulation (e.g., in m. 97, Hummel changed Mozart's short slurs highlighting appoggiaturas to a longer slur), Kalkbrenner added ornamentation to mm. 94, 99-100, 102. He added accented passing notes to Mozart's original, such as f-sharp³ on the second beat of m. 94, e³ on the third beat of m. 100, and a² on the second beat of m. 102 (marked by boxes in Example 3.1.3). In addition, while Hummel preserved Mozart's suspensions in mm. 99-100, Kalkbrenner rewrote these two measures, introducing passing tones and rewriting Mozart's original eighth-notes to sixteenth-notes. Therefore, while Kalkbrenner preserved Mozart's harmony and general contour of the melody, he added his own ornamentation. Kalkbrenner also added ornamentation to other passages, such as the Episodes (mm. 146-161, 331-347) and statements of the Second Theme (mm. 170-186, mm. 357-363). In contrast, Hummel preserved Mozart's themes while introducing but minor changes such as articulations and dynamic markings.

Example 3.1.1. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 89-102.

The image displays a musical score for the first movement of Mozart's Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, specifically measures 89 through 102. The score is presented in three systems. The first system (measures 89-95) features a piano introduction with a steady eighth-note accompaniment in the bass and a melodic line in the treble. Dynamic markings include *f* and *p*, and there are trill ornaments in the right hand. The second system (measures 96-101) shows the piano's melodic entry with a more active bass line. The third system (measure 102) shows the final measure of the piano's entry. The score includes various musical notations such as slurs, trills, and dynamic markings.

Example 3.1.2. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 91-102.

The image displays a musical score for the first movement of Mozart/Hummel's Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, specifically measures 91 through 102. The score is written for piano and is divided into three systems, each with a treble and bass clef staff. The first system (measures 91-94) features a 'Solo' marking above the treble staff. The right hand plays a melodic line with trills and slurs, while the left hand provides harmonic support with chords and rests. The second system (measures 95-98) continues the melodic development with more complex rhythmic patterns and triplets. The third system (measures 99-102) concludes the passage with a final melodic flourish and a fermata. The score includes various musical notations such as trills, slurs, triplets, and dynamic markings like 'p' (piano).

Example 3.1.3. Mozart/Kalkbrenner, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 90-102. Bibliothèque nationale de France. Used by permission.

The image displays three staves of handwritten musical notation for a piano solo. The first staff, starting at measure 90, shows a treble clef with a piano (p) dynamic and a bass clef with a piano solo (Piano Solo.) marking. It features a triplet of sixteenth notes in measure 91. The second staff, starting at measure 97, shows a treble clef with a piano solo marking and a bass clef. It features a sixteenth-note run in measure 97. The third staff, starting at measure 100, shows a treble clef with a piano solo marking and a bass clef. It features a sixteenth-note run in measure 100. The notation includes various rhythmic values, accidentals, and dynamic markings.

3.1.2 Second Movement

In the second movement, Hummel often added ornamentation but his ornamentation is not as elaborate as that prepared by pianist Philipp Karl Hoffmann (1803). Example 3.1.4 (a) and (b) show Mozart's original theme in the Exposition (mm. 23-26) and the Recapitulation (mm. 74-77) (see Figure 3.1.1 for a diagram of this movement). In Example 3.1.5 (a), Hoffmann's version shows an ascending scale in F major that connects e^1 in m. 24 to c^3 in m. 25 with chromatic

passing note b-natural² in m. 24. Then, he used an arpeggio from e² to e³ in m. 25, followed by a descending line that returns to c³ in m. 26. Hummel, by contrast, added a triplet in m. 24 that prolongs the note e¹ (Example 3.1.6 (a)). He preserved Mozart's descending line in m. 25 and the leap from e² to c³ in m. 26. In other words, Hummel's version stays closer to the original than Hoffmann's.

Similarly, in the Recapitulation (mm. 74-77), Hummel's ornamentation is more faithful to Mozart than Hoffmann's. As Example 3.1.5 (b) shows, Hoffmann used combinations of broken chords and scales in m. 75 and a chromatic line with an inverted pedal point c³ followed by a sextuplet in m. 76 consisting of three appoggiaturas (i.e., b²-c³, f²-e², d³-c³). In contrast, though Hummel also added ornamentation, he still retained the general contour of Mozart's theme. He added a turn that prolongs the e¹ of m. 75 (Example 3.1.6 (b)). Then he added florid ornamentation consisting of a written-out turn on c¹, played below e¹ of the original melody, followed by an ascending rapid F-major scale with chromatic passing note b-natural² to c³. The rapid scale decorates the dominant seventh in F major, the chord that Mozart used in his original version. This rapid scale in m. 75 and mordents in m. 76 highlight the notes c³, a², and f², notes that bring out the broken F-major chord that marks the beginning of the phrase in mm. 1, 23, and 74. Hummel's ornamentation brings out the F-major chord that underlies the melody of m. 74 and m. 76 in Mozart's version. In addition, Hummel's grace notes in m. 77 emphasize the note c³ as the melodic peak of the phrase. These examples show that Hummel added ornamentation to Mozart's music in order to enhance the melody by prolonging notes that have harmonic significance, connecting notes of structural significance more smoothly, stressing the peak of the melody, and creating a variety of figurations that enhances musical interest in a repeated passage. My findings demonstrate that Hummel did not decorate Mozart's melody in order to make it

more technically challenging for virtuosos. Rather, he decorated Mozart's version for musical reasons.

Figure 3.1.1. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement.⁸⁴

Section	Ritornello				Exposition					Dev/Retransition	Recapitulation				Coda	
Music	1	2	4	6	1	2	C	4'	E	"E" "2"	1	2	4'	E	6	6
Key	I				I		V	V		V-pedal	I				I	
Measure	1	9	13	19	23	31	35	43	51	59	74	82	86	94	102	105

Example 3.1.4. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement; two variants of principal theme.

(a) mm. 23-26 (Exposition)

(b) mm. 74-77 (Recapitulation)

⁸⁴ The analysis is taken from Grayson, *Mozart: Piano Concertos*, 65.

Example 3.1.5. Mozart/Hoffmann, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement; two variants of principal theme. *Copyright © Edition Peters. Used by permission of C. F. Peters Corporation. All rights reserved.*

(a) mm. 23-26 (Exposition)

Musical score for measures 23-26 (Exposition). The score is in C major, 3/4 time. The right hand (treble clef) features a melodic line with a slur over measures 23-24, followed by a triplet of eighth notes in measure 25 and another triplet in measure 26. The left hand (bass clef) provides harmonic support with chords and a single eighth note in measure 25.

(b) mm. 74-77 (Recapitulation)

Musical score for measures 74-77 (Recapitulation). The score is in C major, 3/4 time. The right hand (treble clef) features a melodic line with a slur over measures 74-75, followed by a sextuplet of eighth notes in measure 76 and a triplet in measure 77. The left hand (bass clef) provides harmonic support with chords and a single eighth note in measure 76.

Example 3.1.6. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement; two variants of principal theme.

(a) mm. 23-26 (Exposition)

Musical score for measures 23-26 (Exposition). The score is in C major, 3/4 time. The right hand (treble clef) features a melodic line with a slur over measures 23-24, followed by a triplet of eighth notes in measure 25 and another triplet in measure 26. The left hand (bass clef) provides harmonic support with chords and a single eighth note in measure 25. A dynamic marking of *fz* (forzando) is present in measure 24.

(b) mm. 74-77 (Recapitulation)

The image shows a musical score for two systems, measures 74-77. The first system (measures 74-75) features a treble clef with a key signature of one flat. The right hand plays a melodic line starting with a *dolce* marking, followed by a *leggiero* section with a rapid ascending scale. The left hand provides harmonic support with a *fz* (forzando) marking. The second system (measures 76-77) continues the melodic line in the right hand with a *fz* marking and a triplet of eighth notes. The left hand continues with a simple harmonic accompaniment.

In several parts of the second movement, Hummel added elaborate ornamentation prudently. To illustrate, I will compare Hummel’s ornamentation with ornamentation by early nineteenth-century pianists Kalkbrenner and Hoffmann as well as ornamentation by modern Mozart scholars Badura-Skoda and Levin in mm. 59-62 of the second movement (Example 3.1.7). Both Levin and Badura-Skoda agree that this passage needs embellishments. Levin calls this passage a “sketch-like passage” and Badura-Skoda calls it an “abbreviation.”⁸⁵ Compared with ornamentation by Kalkbrenner and Hoffmann, Hummel’s ornamentation is less virtuosic. Kalkbrenner enriched Mozart’s texture with rapid octave doublings, though Mozart usually treated a melodic line as a vocal line. Hence, Kalkbrenner conceived this movement pianistically rather than vocally. Moreover, he wrote an ascending scale in octaves played in sixty-fourth

⁸⁵ Eva and Paul Badura-Skoda, *Interpreting Mozart*, 241; Robert Levin, “Improvisation and Embellishment in Mozart Piano Concertos,” *Musical Newsletter* 5, no. 2 (1975): 10.

notes that is highly virtuosic. Hoffmann's version, although written as melodic sequences, introduces rapid scalar passages. In addition, his version is the most elaborate of all of those compared here. Thus, Kalkbrenner and Hoffmann prioritized pianistic virtuosity.

By contrast, Hummel, Badura-Skoda, and Levin introduced less virtuosic ornamentation. Furthermore, as shown in Example 3.1.7, they used various figurations such as scalar passages, broken chords, and arpeggios in contrast with Kalkbrenner and Hoffmann who mainly used scalar passages. In Levin's version, although his ornamentation is not as florid as others, he highlighted Mozart's syncopation on the second beat using grace note e^1 in m. 61 and offered a rhythmic diminution of this syncopation in m. 62 (see the boxed pitches of mm. 61-62 in Example 3.1.7). This way, Levin kept hold of the simplicity of Mozart's "sketch-like passage" rather than making it too florid. A comparison between Hummel's and Badura-Skoda's versions show that they chose similar kinds of figurations. They similarly used upward arpeggios, scalar passages, and broken scales in mm. 59, 61, and 62. The only difference occurs in m. 60 when Badura-Skoda used a more virtuosic broken-chord figuration that followed a zig-zag course while Hummel used a more straightforward arpeggio. In this case, even by Badura-Skoda's standard, Hummel's embellishments are not too lavish. By comparing Hummel's embellishments with his contemporaries (Kalkbrenner and Hoffmann) and modern Mozart scholars (Badura-Skoda and Levin), Hummel's embellishments are clearly not excessively virtuosic.

Example 3.1.7. A Comparison of Ornamentation by Kalkbrenner (Ka.), Hoffmann (Ho.), Hummel (Hu.), Badura-Skoda (Ba.), and Levin (Le.) of Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement, m. 59-62.

59

Ka.

Ho.

Hu.

Ba.

Le.

Mo.

Robert Levin's example of embellishments has been removed due to copyright restrictions. Original source: Robert Levin, "Improvisation and Embellishment in Mozart Piano Concertos," *Musical Newsletter* 5, no. 2 (1975): 10.

61

Ka.

Ho.

Hu.

Ba.

Le.

Mo.

3.1.3 Third Movement

Throughout the third movement of K. 503, Hummel added ornamentation to statements of the Refrain (part “a” in Figure 3.1.2) to create melodic or textural variants incrementally. Hummel probably followed Mozart, who also usually avoided literal repetition of his rondo refrain.⁸⁶ In this concerto, Mozart created varied repetition consists of rescoring and adding grace notes. He wrote Refrain 1 for the strings and Refrains 2, 3, 4 for the solo piano. He added grace note e^2 to m. 229 of Refrain 3 and grace note c^2 to m. 307 of Refrain 4 (see Example 3.1.8). In keeping with Mozart’s idea of avoiding literal repetition, Hummel used what I call an “additive” approach in varying the refrain. In Refrain 1 (mm. 1-8, Example 3.1.9), scored for piano, violin, and cello, Hummel added a trill to the end of m. 7. In Refrain 2 (mm. 113-121), he kept the trill of Refrain 1 (now in m. 120) and added a melodic turn to m. 119. In Refrain 3 (mm. 229-237), he also kept the trill of Refrain 1 (now in m. 236) and the melodic turn of Refrain 2 (now in m. 235) and added another melodic turn to m. 234. In the last refrain (mm. 307-315), while he only kept the trill of Refrain 1 and removed the melodic turn of Refrain 2 and 3, he took advantage of the augmented compass of the piano and used octave doubling in mm. 311-315. Thus, he created a climactic moment and a textural variety by employing the higher register in the last refrain. By adding ornaments *progressively* from Refrain 1 through Refrain 3 and using the higher register in Refrain 4, Hummel made the statements of the refrain theme increasingly more dramatic. One could say that Mozart’s original already offers an *idea* of varied repetition but I assert that Hummel introduced an additive approach to his arrangement, making Mozart’s idea more pronounced.

⁸⁶ John Irving, *Mozart’s Piano Concertos* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003), 73.

Figure 3.1.2. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement.⁸⁷

Sonata	Exposition						Development						Recapitulation														
Section	Refrain 1						Episode 1		Refrain 2				Episode 2		Refrain 3				Episode 3		Refrain 4		Coda				
Music	A						B		A				C		A				B		A						
	a	ba	ab'	c	<u>d</u>	<u>e</u>			<u>a</u>	a	ba	ab'	<u>d'</u>		<u>a</u>	a	<u>e</u>					<u>a</u>	ba'	ab'			
Key	C		c	C		mod	V/G	G	V/C		C		mod	a	F		V/C	C		V/C	C						
Measure	1	8	16	24	32	48	66	75	91	113	121	129	137	145	163	206	229	237	245	257	269			307	315	331	374

Example 3.1.8. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement; four variants of principal theme.

(a) mm. 1-8 (Refrain 1)

⁸⁷ The figure is adapted from the model of a rondo form by J. Peter Burkholder and Claude V. Palisca, *Norton Anthology of Western Music* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2014), 2:138. Letters in bold (e.g., **a**) indicate the orchestral sections whereas the underlined letters (e.g., a) indicate the solo passages. The numbering of the Refrains (1-4) and Episodes (1-3) is adapted from William E. Caplin, "Rondo Forms," in *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 231-241.

(b) mm. 113-121 (Refrain 2)

Musical score for measures 111-121. The score is in 3/4 time and features a complex melodic line in the right hand with many accidentals and a steady eighth-note accompaniment in the left hand. The tempo marking *ad libitum* is present above measures 113-115, and *a tempo* is marked above measure 116.

Musical score for measures 116-121. This section continues the melodic and accompanimental patterns from the previous system, ending with a final chord in measure 121.

(c) mm. 229-237 (Refrain 3)

Musical score for measures 226-230. The right hand features a melodic line with a trill in measure 229, while the left hand provides a consistent eighth-note accompaniment.

Musical score for measures 231-236. This system continues the melodic and accompanimental patterns, with a trill in measure 231 and a final melodic phrase in measure 236.

Musical score for measure 237, showing the final notes of the piece in both the right and left hands.

(d) mm. 307-315 (Refrain 4)

Musical score for measures 306-310. The score is in treble and bass clefs. Measure 306 starts with a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 307 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 308 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 309 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 310 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs.

Musical score for measures 311-315. The score is in treble and bass clefs. Measure 311 starts with a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 312 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 313 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 314 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 315 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs.

Example 3.1.9. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement; four variants of principal theme.

(a) mm. 1-8 (Refrain 1)

Musical score for measures 1-8. The score is in treble and bass clefs. Measure 1 starts with a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 2 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 3 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 4 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 5 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 6 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 7 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. Measure 8 has a treble clef and a bass clef. The treble staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs. The bass staff has a series of eighth notes with slurs.

(b) mm. 113-121 (Refrain 2)

Musical score for measures 112-121. Measure 112 features a complex melodic line in the treble clef with a piano (*p*) dynamic. The bass clef has a whole rest. A slur covers measures 112-121. Performance markings include *ritard: e dim:* and *pp* in measure 113, and *p a tempo* in measure 121.

Musical score for measures 113-120. The treble clef has a melodic line with slurs. The bass clef has a steady eighth-note accompaniment. The dynamic is *p*.

Musical score for measures 117-121. Measure 117 has a dynamic of *p*. Measure 118 has a first ending bracket with a '2' above it. Measure 119 has a first ending bracket with a 'tr' above it. Measure 120 has a dynamic of *f*. Measure 121 is marked *Tutti* and *f*.

(c) mm. 229-237 (Refrain 3)

Musical score for measures 229-232. Measure 229 has a dynamic of *p*. Measure 230 has a dynamic of *p*. Measures 231-232 have a dynamic of *p*.

Musical score for measures 233-237. Measure 233 has a dynamic of *p*. Measure 234 has a first ending bracket with a '2' above it. Measure 235 has a first ending bracket with a '2' above it. Measure 236 has a first ending bracket with a 'tr' above it. Measure 237 is marked *Tutti* and *ff*.

(d) mm. 307-315 (Refrain 4)

The image displays two systems of musical notation for a piano piece. The first system, starting at measure 307, shows a treble clef with a melodic line and a bass clef with a rhythmic accompaniment. The melody features eighth-note patterns with slurs and accents. A dynamic marking of *p* (piano) is placed below the bass line. The second system, starting at measure 311, continues the piece. It includes a *8va* (octave) marking above the treble staff, a trill (*tr*) in the treble staff, and a *loco* marking above the bass staff. The dynamic marking *p* is also present at the end of the system.

To sum up, Hummel added ornamentation, not to all, but to *select* parts in his re-working of Mozart's K. 503. Unlike Kalkbrenner who added ornamentation to most of Mozart's materials, Hummel preserved Mozart's themes in the first movement. He restrained his ornamentation to some passages in the second movement and the rondo refrain of the third movement. In the second movement, Hummel's ornamentation enhances Mozart's original melody and translates Mozart's "sketch-like" passages, giving practical guidance to nineteenth-century pianists. In the third movement, Hummel added ornamentation to the rondo refrain progressively, making Mozart's avoidance of literal repetition more obvious. Yet, though Hummel elaborated on Mozart's melodies, his ornamentation is not as florid as those by Kalkbrenner and Hoffmann. Hummel usually reserved virtuosic ornamentation for the last appearance of often-repeated melodies such as the rapid scale in the second movement and the octave doubling in the high register in the third movement. For these reasons, one can say that

Hummel showed a balance approach in serving nineteenth-century audiences through his ornamentation while respecting Mozart's originals.

3.2 Reinforcement of Select Closing Passagework

As Hummel was selective in adding ornamentation to Mozart's themes, he was also selective in modifying the closing passagework in Mozart's K. 503. In the first movement, Hummel highlighted the closing passagework connecting solo with *tutti* sections, bringing out the timbral contrast of the performing forces. In the second movement, he enriched the closing measures of the exposition and the recapitulation, reinforcing the structural ending of the exposition in the dominant key and the ending of the recapitulation in the tonic key. Similarly, Hummel emphasized tonal contrasts between the dominant key and the tonic key in the third movement, intensifying the closing passagework of the first refrain in the dominant key and the closing passagework of the first episode in the tonic key. Hummel's reinforcement of select closing passagework highlights Mozart's structure while enhancing virtuosity for the nineteenth-century public. Therefore, I argue that Hummel did not update Mozart's passages by making them technically more demanding for virtuosity's sake. Rather, he featured strategic passagework as he strove to mediate between Mozart and the early nineteenth-century public, the "two masters" metaphorically speaking.

3.2.1 First Movement

As requested by Schultz and suggested by Moscheles, Hummel reinforced some of Mozart's closing passagework. Using this strategy, Hummel did not violate Mozart's main thematic content but rather, he reinforced the sense of sectional arrival in Mozart's original. For

example, in the first movement, Hummel added an arpeggio to the last measure of the first solo entrance (m. 111 of Example 3.2.2), before the arrival of the first theme played by the full orchestra. Compared with Mozart's version (Example 3.2.1), Hummel's arpeggio emphasizes Mozart's second inversion of the tonic chord (i.e. I^{6/4}). Tellingly, as shown in his autograph manuscript, Hummel did not write *forte* but this dynamic marking appears in both versions of the first editions, suggesting that he kept thinking about this passage after he finished the autograph.⁸⁸ The arpeggio as a link between the soloist and the *tutti* passages increases the difficulty level of the piano part since the pianist needs to make a speedy leap from c¹ to G. While Hummel modified the left-hand part, he kept Mozart's inner voice by transferring the tenor voice of the left-hand part (c¹ and b) to the alto voice of the right-hand part (c² and b¹). Then he added the note f¹ to the fourth beat played by the left hand, which creates a stronger cadential punctuation (V₇ – I) than Mozart's version. In other words, the arpeggio played by the soloist gives a stronger cadential 6/4 and V₇ that in turn create a stronger perfect cadence, and hence, a more fulfilling sense of arrival of the exposition's first theme in m. 112, played by the orchestra. Thus Hummel kept Mozart's thematic content and harmony intact while making the passage more virtuosic and reinforcing the sense of *tutti* arrival.

⁸⁸ I make this point by comparing the autograph Add MS 32234, f. 140r with Johann Nepomuk Hummel, *Mozart's Twelve Grand Concertos, Arranged for the Piano Forte, and Accompaniments of Flute, Violin & Violoncello, including Cadences and Ornaments, Expressly Written for Them by the Celebrated J. N. Hummel, of Vienna* (London: S. Chappell, ca. 1828), 4, and Johann Nepomuk Hummel, *No 2. en Ut majeure des Douze Grands Concerts de W. A. Mozart, arrangés pour piano seul ou avec accompagnement de Flute, Violon, et Violoncelle* (Paris: Schott, ca. 1828).

Example 3.2.1. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 111-112.

Musical score for Example 3.2.1, showing measures 111 and 112. The score is in 4/4 time. The first staff (treble clef) is marked 'Solo' and the second staff (bass clef) is marked 'Tutti'. The music consists of eighth and quarter notes in measure 111, followed by a whole note in measure 112.

Example 3.2.2. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 111-112.

Musical score for Example 3.2.2, showing measures 111 and 112. The score is in 4/4 time. The first staff (treble clef) is marked 'Solo' and the second staff (bass clef) is marked 'Tutti'. The music consists of eighth and quarter notes in measure 111, followed by a whole note in measure 112. A box highlights the bass line in measure 112, labeled with 'f', 'V7', and 'I'.

Figure 3.2.1. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement.⁸⁹

Section	1. Opening Ritornello								Solo entry	2. Solo Exposition						3. Middle Ritornello		
	Primary Group			Secondary Group						Primary Group			Secondary Group					
	first theme	forte move to V	cadence on V	second theme	concl I: forte	concl II: piano	flourish	new material	first theme	cadence on V	Episode	cadence on V	second theme	coda				
Music	1A	1B	2	3	4	5	6	7	I/a	1A	1B	B	C	BB	D	E	2	3
Key	C	c	C	V/C	c-C	C				c	V/C	Eb	V/G	G				
Measure	1	18	26	44	50	66	70	82	91	112	129	143	146	162	170	187	214	222

(cont.)

Section	4. Development			5. Recapitulation						6. Ritornello to Cadenza		Cadenza	7. Final Ritornello					
				Primary Group			Secondary Group											
Music	4			1A	1B	B	C	BB	D	4	E	2				5	6	7
Key	mod		V/C	C	c	V/C	Eb	V/C	C									
Measure	228		282	290	307	321	324	341	345	364	372	399		410		411	415	423

⁸⁹ The analysis follows the model provided by Daniel Leeson and Robert Levin, “On the Authenticity of K. Anh. C14.01 (297b), a Symphonia Concertante for Four Winds and Orchestra,” *Mozart-Jahrbuch 1976/77*, 70-96. To authenticate Mozart’s authorship of K. 297b, Leeson and Levin studied the first movements of Mozart’s thirty-nine concertos and other concertos and *Symphonia Concertantes* by Mozart’s contemporaries (e.g., J. C. Bach, Joseph Haydn, Karl Stamitz). Their study results in a model of the first movement that is “unique to Mozart.”

In the next closing passagework from mm. 207 to mm. 213 leading to what Daniel Leeson and Robert Levin call “the middle ritornello” in m. 214 (see Figure 3.2.1), Hummel also increased the virtuosity of the piano passages and augmented the expressive effect of this transitional moment. In mm. 208-210 (Example 3.2.3), Mozart used metric displacement as he repeated a motive that consists of seven eighth notes, a motive that outlines a diminished fifth interval and an ascending chromatic line (i.e., c^3 - f -sharp²- g^2 - g -sharp²- a^2 - b -flat²- b^2 , marked x in Example 3.2.3) before the cadential trill in m. 211. This metric displacement may not be obvious to the listener since it does not have dynamic and durational accents. Moreover, the harmony remains constant throughout these two measures.⁹⁰ In comparison, as shown in Example 3.2.4, Hummel amplified Mozart’s metric dissonance by creating off-beat accents in its first repetition (compare Mozart’s x^1 of Example 3.2.3 and Hummel’s x^1 of Example 3.2.4), making the metric dissonance and the beginning of this repetition more conspicuous. Then, in the second repetition (i.e., x^2), he discontinued the off-beat accents and thickened the textures by adding repeated notes d^2 and d^3 as inverted dominant pedals that emphasize the dominant pedal played by the left hand. These inverted pedals played by the right hand increases the level of virtuosity by creating a tremolo effect. Thus, Hummel highlighted the metric displacement hinted in Mozart’s original through off-beat accents and a thicker texture with heightened virtuosity.

These modifications lead to the cadential trill in mm. 211-213, which would finally lead to the arrival of the middle ritornello in m. 214. For this cadential trill, Hummel highlighted the upper and lower chromatic neighbor notes (i.e., e -flat¹ and c -sharp¹) to the dominant pedal (i.e.,

⁹⁰ My analysis is based on Harald Krebs, *Fantasy Pieces: Metrical Dissonance in the Music of Robert Schumann* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 22-61. According to Krebs, the motive that consists of seven eighth-notes over the period of eight eighth-notes can be labelled as G8/7.

d¹), in the piano part played by the left hand, inserted a *crescendo* in m. 212, and transposed the last trill played by the right hand an octave higher, allowing a nineteenth-century pianist to showcase the augmented compass of the piano beyond the compass of Mozart's piano (m. 213). Similar to Example 3.2.2 mentioned above, Hummel kept Mozart's thematic materials, but he added more detailed performance directions that *highlight* Mozart's intent. Hummel's modifications in mm. 208-213 do not only increase the difficulty of the piano part but also serve to create a stronger sense of anticipation for the structural arrival of the "middle ritornello" in m. 214. Thus, instead of violating Mozart's thematic content, Hummel reinforced it by highlighting the structural cadential moment.

Example 3.2.3. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 207-215.

The image displays a page of musical notation for Mozart's Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, measures 207-215. The score is arranged in two systems, each with five staves. The top system (measures 207-211) features a piano part with a melodic line in the right hand and a bass line in the left hand. The piano part includes a trill in measure 207 and a series of sixteenth-note figures in measures 208-211. The bottom system (measures 212-215) continues the piano part with a trill in measure 212 and a series of sixteenth-note figures in measures 213-215. The score includes dynamic markings such as *cresc.*, *f*, and *p*, and articulation markings like *tr.* and *a2*. The notation is in C major and 4/4 time.

Example 3.2.4. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 208-214.

Did Hummel modify all of the closing passagework in the first movement? In this first movement, he did not modify the closing passagework from the Episode to the solo Second Theme (mm. 166-170). Rather, Hummel paid more attention to the transitions from solo to *tutti*, and hence, he highlighted the contrasts of performing forces. Indeed, in concerto form, the timbral contrasts between the orchestra and the soloist are significant.⁹¹ As discussed in the two examples above, Hummel enriched the transition from the first “solo entry” (mm. 91-111) to the *tutti* arrival in m. 112 (Example 3.2.2) and the transition from the Solo Exposition to the *tutti* arrival in m. 214 (Example 3.2.4). Similarly, in the next example, Hummel rewrote the passage

⁹¹ Scholars have pursued several approaches to understand the relationship between the soloist and the orchestra in Mozart’s Piano Concertos. David Grayson has given an overview of these scholarships in his book *Mozart: Piano Concertos No. 20 in D minor, K. 466, and No. 21 in C major, K. 467* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 4-8.

in mm. 141-142 at the end of the Primary Groups of the Solo Exposition. He increased the drama towards the *tutti* arrival in m. 143. In mm. 139-142 of the original (and the corresponding passage in mm. 317-320), Mozart repeated the harmonic progression V-i^{6/4} in C minor. He outlined this progression with the broken chord figurations in the right hand accompanied by the Alberti bass in the left hand but thickens the orchestral part with oboes (Example 3.2.5). In Hummel's arrangement, he retained the harmonic progression of V-i^{6/4} and the broken chord figuration in mm. 139-140 but he modified mm. 141-142. In addition to thickening the texture with the flute in mm. 141-142 (a device that recalls the oboe parts in Mozart's original), Hummel rewrote the passage using chromatic harmony V₇ – V^{b9} – i^{6/4} – vii^{o7} of V (Example 3.2.6). As a result, he made the harmonic rhythm of mm. 141-142 twice as fast as that of Mozart's original. He also used arpeggios that reach the upper register beyond the compass of Mozart's instrument whose highest pitch was f³ (see the boxed pitches of mm. 141-142 in Example 3.2.6). The chromatic harmony, the faster harmonic rhythm, and the arpeggios reaching a high register altogether generate a more intense transition from the solo to the *tutti* beginning in mm. 143, a transition based clearly on Mozart's original and tailor-made for early nineteenth-century audience.

Example 3.2.5. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 139-148.

139

p

V i 6/4 V i 6/4

143

f

f

f

Example 3.2.6. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, first movement, mm. 139-145.

139

p

p

cresc.

V i 6/4 V₇ V_{b9}

142

f

f

f

ff

ff

ff

loco

Tutti

i 6/4 vii^o7

3.2.2 Second Movement

In the second movement, Hummel made the last measures of the exposition and the recapitulation more virtuosic (boxed and marked “E” in Figure 3.2.2). He reinforced the sense of closure of the Exposition in the dominant and the closure of the Recapitulation in the tonic of F major. In m. 100 of the Recapitulation, Hummel even employed the note f^4 , an octave higher than the highest note of the pianos available at Mozart’s time. Mozart used the highest register f^3 of the piano in m. 97, 99, and 100 (Example 3.2.7). In addition, Mozart’s original piano part already showed some degree of virtuosity through thirty-second and sixty-fourth running notes. In comparison, Hummel increased this degree of virtuosity through rhythmic diminution at the end of mm. 97 and 98. Then, he transformed Mozart’s diminished seventh chord from sixteenth-note arpeggios to thirty-second note broken chords in m. 99, hence increasing its difficulty while going up to $a\text{-flat}^3$, a minor third above Mozart’s f^3 . Finally, he extended Mozart’s appoggiatura pattern through rhythmic diminution in m. 100, reaching f^4 before going down in a chromatic scale to cadential trill on G in m. 101 (see boxed portions of Example 3.2.8 that highlight Hummel’s modifications that reinforce Mozart’s ideas). At the cadential trill, Hummel added the C dominant-seventh chord in the left hand on the third beat, a chord absent in Mozart’s. This chord reinforced the sense of upbeat to m. 102 and thus emphasized this cadence as structurally significant. It should be noted that though Hummel rewrote some of Mozart’s passages in this example, he still observed Mozart’s figurations by providing rhythmic diminutions of them. Hummel reinforced the closing passagework of the Recapitulation by increasing the momentum of harmonic progressions, building up the anticipation to the cadential trill in m. 101 and finally to its cadential arrival at m. 102. These pieces of evidence demonstrate that Hummel updated

rather than superseded Mozart's passages because he made a concerted effort to build upon Mozart's original harmonies and figurations.

Figure 3.2.2. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement.⁹²

Section	Ritornello				Exposition					Dev/Retransition	Recapitulation				Coda	
	1	2	4	6	1	2	C	4'	E	"E" "2"	1	2	4'	E	6	6
Music	1	2	4	6	1	2	C	4'	E	"E" "2"	1	2	4'	E	6	6
Key	I				I		V	V		V-pedal	I				I	
Measure	1	9	13	19	23	31	35	43	51	59	74	82	86	94	102	105

Example 3.2.7. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement, mm. 94-102.

⁹² The analysis is taken from Grayson, *Mozart: Piano Concertos*, 65.

Example 3.2.8. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, second movement, mm.

97-102.

The image displays a musical score for measures 97 through 102 of the second movement of Mozart's Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, as arranged by Hummel. The score is written for piano and consists of five systems of music, each with a treble and bass clef staff. Measure 97 begins with a treble staff containing a series of eighth-note chords and a bass staff with a simple accompaniment. Measure 98 continues this pattern with more complex chordal textures. Measure 99 features a long, sweeping melodic line in the treble staff, with a 'p' dynamic marking. Measure 100 shows a continuation of the melodic line, with a 'p' dynamic and a 'loco' marking above the treble staff. Measure 101 is marked 'loco' and 'p', with a 'cresc.' marking below the treble staff. Measure 102 concludes with a 'Tutti' marking and a 'f' dynamic marking, with a 'cresc.' marking below the treble staff. The score includes various musical notations such as slurs, ties, and dynamic markings.

3.2.3 Third movement

In the third movement, Hummel enriched the cadences that take place at the end of Refrain 1 and at the end of Episode 1 in the Exposition (see Figure 3.1.2 under the section 3.1.3). Hummel selected these structural cadences in mm. 66-76 and mm. 91-113 of the third movement in order to generate a heightened sense of expectation of the dominant in G major (m. 76) and the return to the tonic in C major (m. 113). Hummel did not modify Mozart's materials in other structural cadences (e.g., at the end of Episode 2, Refrain 3, and Episode 3), except for adding dynamic markings and articulations. This fact indicates that Hummel attempts to preserve Mozart's original writing as much as possible. Again, while he elaborated on Mozart's original, Hummel still paid close attention to Mozart's figuration. In the following section, I will discuss how Hummel increased the virtuosity of those two passages while staying close to Mozart's writing.

The first passage that Hummel highlighted is the closing passagework of Refrain 1. Hummel reinforced this passage on the dominant pedal (D) of mm. 66-75 before the entrance of the first episode in m. 76 in G major, which is the dominant of C major. In mm. 66-69 of the original, Mozart composed a double melody for the right-hand part, writing a descending scalar figuration for each measure while outlining an ascending line f-sharp²-g²-a²-b²-c³ with the first note of each measure (Example 3.2.9). After reaching c³ in m. 70 and rearticulating it multiple times until m. 72, Mozart stopped using the running sixteenth-note figuration in m. 73. Instead, he repeated the last three notes g-sharp²-a²-c³ of m. 72 twice in m. 73, followed by repeating the note c³ in mm. 74-75. Thus, the reduction of the sixteenth note runs to a single note leads smoothly to the first Episode on the second beat of m. 75.

In comparison, Hummel made the reduction of figuration more striking. In mm. 66-69, Hummel wrote an ascending rather than a descending scalar figuration. Notably, he made use of the augmented range of the piano up to c^4 (Example 3.2.10). In addition, he added eighth-note upbeats on the left hand that highlight the dotted rhythm and create stronger downbeats in mm. 67-70. By changing the direction of the sixteenth-note triplets, adding upbeats that create stronger downbeats, and using the augmented range of the piano, Hummel increased the forward momentum and made this passage more climactic than the original. As a result, Hummel made the reduction of figuration more noticeable and thus more dramatic than Mozart's original in m. 73. Beside dynamic markings, Hummel added articulation signs as performance guidelines. When the notes $g\text{-sharp}^2\text{-a}^2\text{-c}^3$ resumes its original register at the end of m. 73, Hummel marked the pitch c^3 in mm. 74-75 with *staccato*.⁹³ Then he marked the single note c^3 on the second beat of m. 74 *pianissimo*, as if he were creating a "fade-out" effect. This example shows that Hummel rearranged the closing passage of the first Episode and added detailed performance markings that heighten a dramatic effect. The contrast between the climactic passage (mm. 66-73) and the "fade-out" (mm. 73-75) creates a greater sense of anticipation of the first Episode, which begins on the second beat of m. 75. Although Hummel made the closing passagework more virtuosic for the nineteenth-century public, he nevertheless adhered closely to Mozart's entrance of the first Episode. Hence, his arrangement once again provides evidence of him serving both Mozart and the nineteenth-century public as his two masters.

⁹³ Hummel labelled both the dots and the strokes as *staccato*. See his treatise *A Complete Theoretical and Practical Course*, 1:65.

Example 3.2.9. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement, mm. 64-80.

Musical score for Example 3.2.9, Mozart's Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement, measures 64-80. The score is in treble and bass clefs, showing a complex rhythmic pattern with eighth and sixteenth notes. The key signature is one sharp (F#), and the time signature is 3/8. The score is divided into three systems, with measures 64-68, 69-73, and 74-80 respectively. The first system (measures 64-68) features a melodic line in the right hand and a rhythmic accompaniment in the left hand. The second system (measures 69-73) continues the melodic line with some triplet figures. The third system (measures 74-80) shows a more active right hand with sixteenth-note runs and a steady left hand accompaniment.

Example 3.2.10. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement, 65-76.

Musical score for Example 3.2.10, Mozart/Hummel's Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement, measures 65-76. The score is in treble and bass clefs, featuring a prominent sixteenth-note figure in the right hand and a bass line with chords and single notes. The key signature is one sharp (F#), and the time signature is 3/8. The score is divided into three systems, with measures 66-68, 69-71, and 72-76 respectively. The first system (measures 66-68) shows a continuous sixteenth-note figure in the right hand and a bass line with chords. The second system (measures 69-71) continues the sixteenth-note figure, with a *8va* marking above the first measure. The third system (measures 72-76) features a *loco* marking above the first measure, followed by dynamic markings *p*, *pp*, and *dolce*. The right hand continues with sixteenth-note figures, while the left hand plays chords and single notes.

The second passage that Hummel modified is the *Eingang* (lead-in) in mm. 110-113 of the last movement. In the rondo movement, a composer or a performer typically writes or plays an *Eingang* to delay the return of the refrain. A typical *Eingang* consists of a short improvisatory passage over a dominant triad or seventh chord that leads into the refrain in the tonic.⁹⁴ Sometimes Mozart provided his own written-out *Eingänge* (e.g., third movements of Piano Concertos K. 271, K. 414, K. 450, K. 595, Piano Sonata in D, K. 311), but sometimes he allowed the performers to use their own versions (e.g., third movement of Piano Concerto K. 467).⁹⁵ In K. 503, Mozart provided his written-out *Eingang* (mm. 110-113) and also notated a fermata marked *ad libitum* in m. 112. This combination indicates that Mozart allowed a performer to choose between playing his notated *Eingang* or playing others' *Eingang*. Therefore, Hummel's *Eingang* serves as an example and an option for performers.

While Hummel made Mozart's *Eingang* more virtuosic, Hummel still showed respect to Mozart's original. Mozart's notated *Eingang* in the third movement of K. 503 (mm. 110-113) consists of scalar triplets that outline the dominant seventh of C major (i.e., G, B, D, F, marked "x" in Example 3.2.11), followed by a chromatic scale descending from f³ to c-sharp² (marked "y") and another chromatic scale ascending from c-sharp² to c³ (marked "z"). Hummel kept most of Mozart's figurations, but he expanded them. He kept the original pattern of the scalar triplets. While Mozart reached his piano's uppermost note of f³ in the middle of m. 111, Hummel extended Mozart's pattern until the end of m. 111 (marked "x" in Example 3.2.12), reaching the note a³ that was beyond the compass of Mozart's piano. After this point, Hummel retained

⁹⁴ For further explanation, see April Nash Greenan, "Eingang," *Grove Music Online*, *Oxford Music Online*, Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.

⁹⁵ Irving, *Mozart's Piano Concertos*, 162.

Mozart's descending scale. However, instead of keeping Mozart's chromatic line that spans approximately an octave, Hummel expanded Mozart's idea by writing a descending C major scale from a^3 to b , spanning two and a half octaves (marked "y"). Next, he used a new figuration combining chromatic scales with the ascending C major scale (marked "z") which is more virtuosic than Mozart's original. In short, Hummel rewrote Mozart's *Eingang* by expanding the original and prolonging the V^7 chord, yet he did so by keeping the general melodic contour and Mozart's original figurations. While Hummel made the *Eingang* more virtuosic for the nineteenth-century public, Hummel did not disregard Mozart's intention. On the contrary, he used techniques of dramatization to highlight the return of Mozart's refrain. Thus, he strategically mediated between the composer and his contemporary public.

Example 3.2.11. Mozart, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement, mm. 106-115.

The image displays two systems of musical notation for the third movement of Mozart's Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, measures 106-115. The first system (measures 106-110) shows the original score with a descending chromatic scale in the right hand and a sustained V^7 chord in the left hand. The second system (measures 111-115) shows Hummel's expansion, featuring a descending chromatic scale from a^3 to b in the right hand, marked "y", and a new virtuosic figuration combining chromatic scales with the ascending C major scale, marked "z". The left hand continues with the V^7 chord, marked "ad libitum" and "a tempo".

Example 3.2.12. Mozart/Hummel, Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503, third movement, mm. 109-113.

In sum, Hummel's strategic treatment of the closing passagework was meticulously thought out. When Moscheles suggested Hummel to add reinforcement (*Verstärkung*) to the closing passagework (*Schluß-Passage*), Hummel did not randomly select any passages. Rather, he selected major closing passagework that highlight Mozart's structure. In the first movement of this Concerto, K. 503, Hummel reinforced the closing passagework leading the solo part to the *tutti* part, passages that highlight the virtuosity of the pianist and build anticipation towards the *tutti* section. Thus, he emphasized the contrasts of the performing forces. In the second movement, he enriched the closing passagework of the exposition and the recapitulation, thus highlighting Mozart's structure. In the last movement, he intensified the tonal contrasts between

the episode in the dominant key and the refrain in the tonic key. While he modified the select sections, he still prioritized Mozart's thematic materials. His virtuosic writing comes from Mozart's original figurations. In doing so, he served the nineteenth-century public by making the solo part more virtuosic and he also served Mozart by keeping his structure intact.

Chapter 4: Conclusion

Similar to a translator whose task is to serve two masters (i.e., author and target reader), Schultz requested Hummel to be an arranger that served the composer Mozart and the early nineteenth-century audiences. Hummel's task is not solely to interpret Mozart, but also to make Mozart's music accessible to his contemporary audience. Therefore, one should not expect Hummel's arrangement to be a copy of Mozart's original performance. Having said that, Hummel's arrangement of Mozart's Piano Concerto K. 503, stays closer to Mozart than arrangements by other pianists of his time, such as Kalkbrenner and Hoffmann. As the third chapter illustrates, Hummel only changed *select* passages of Mozart's original. When Hummel elaborated on Mozart's originals, his modifications still show respect for Mozart's melodic contour, figuration, and thematic materials. In doing so, he served the nineteenth-century public by making select solo passages more virtuosic while preserving Mozart's materials as much as possible.

The roles of performers are similar to the roles of arrangers and translators, for performers mediate between the composer and the audience we are playing for. Therefore, one can consider different translation approaches to arrangements and performances. The second chapter of this thesis offers three approaches to translation: 1) a reader-oriented approach; 2) an author-oriented approach; 3) a reader- and author-oriented approach. In the case of Mozart's Piano Concertos, a reader-oriented approach is similar to an audience-oriented approach, such as Kalkbrenner's and Hoffmann's arrangements written in the early nineteenth century. An author-oriented approach is similar to a composer-oriented approach. For example, Mozart scholars such as Badura-Skoda, Neumann, and Levin seek to understand and inform performers about how to perform Mozart's

music. As Grayson mentions, the principle of this type of approach is to play Mozart's music in Mozart's style, i.e., to find out how to embellish Mozart's compositions based on Mozart's own ornamentation.⁹⁶ Hummel's arrangement of Mozart's K. 503 is similar to a reader- and author-oriented approach since he created a balance between preserving Mozart's intention and making select passages more virtuosic for his audience.

Hummel's arrangement, then, raises the importance of balancing the need between interpreting the composer's intention as faithfully as possible while meeting the audience's expectations and needs at the same time. Similar to a translation, an arrangement is a re-creation of a composition for a *particular* audience. What was accessible and acceptable for one audience may not be accessible and acceptable for another. For pianists, Hummel's arrangement can serve as an example that mediates between Mozart and a new audience in a balanced way.

⁹⁶ Grayson, "Whose Authenticity?," 385.

Bibliography

1. Scores

Hoffmann, Philipp Karl. *Cadenzas to Mozart's Piano Concertos and Elaborations of their Slow Movements*. London: Peters, 1959.

Hummel, Johann Nepomuk. A Collection of Arrangements by Johann Nepomuk Hummel. Vol. 3. Music Collections. British Library. Add MS 32234, ff. 137-170v.

———. *Mozart's Twelve Grand Concertos, Arranged for the Piano Forte, and Accompaniments of Flute, Violin & Violoncello, including Cadences and Ornaments, Expressly Written for Them by the Celebrated J. N. Hummel, of Vienna, No. 2*. London: S. Chappell, ca. 1828.

———. *No 2. en Ut majeure des Douze Grands Concerts de W. A. Mozart, arrangés pour piano seul ou avec accompagnement de Flute, Violon, et Violoncelle*. Paris: Schott, ca. 1828.

Kalkbrenner, Frédéric. *Grand Concerto (posthume) pour le Piano-Forté, avec accompagnement d'Orchestre ad libitum par Mozart, arrangé pour les Pianos à 6 octaves avec un Point d'Orgue et exécuté à Paris au Concert de l'Ecole R.le de musique*. Paris: Pleyel, n. d.

Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. *Konzerte für ein oder mehrere Klaviere und Orchester mit Kadenzen. Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke, series 5, workgroup 15, vol. 7*. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1959.

———. *Piano Concerto in C major, K. 503*. Arranged for Solo Piano and Three Accompanying Instruments by Johann Nepomuk Hummel. Edited by Leonardo Miucci. Launton, Oxon, England: Edition HH, 2015.

Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, Joseph Kerman, and Hermann Beck. *Piano Concerto in C Major, K. 503: The Score of the New Mozart Edition, Historical and Analytical Essays*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1970.

2. Primary Sources

Bach, Carl Philipp Emanuel. *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments*. Translated and edited by William J. Mitchell. 2nd ed. London: Cassell and Company, 1951. Originally published as *Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen*. Berlin, 1753 (Part I); 1762 (Part II).

- Busoni, Ferruccio. *The Essence of Music and Other Papers*. Translated by Rosamond Ley. London: Rockliff, 1957.
- Czerny, Carl. *Pianoforte-Schule, Op. 500*. Vol. 4. Wien: A. Diabelli & Comp., 1839.
- Czerny, Carl, and Ernest Sanders. "Recollections from My Life." *The Musical Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (July 1956): 302-317.
- Hays, Elizabeth Loretta. "F. W. Marpurg's 'Anleitung zum Clavierspielen' (Berlin, 1755) and 'Principes du Clavecin' (Berlin, 1756): Translation and Commentary." PhD diss., Stanford University, 1976.
- Hummel, Johann N. *A Complete Theoretical and Practical Course of Instructions on the Art of Playing the Piano Forte*. London: T. Boosey, 1828. Originally published in German as *Ausführliche theoretisch-practische Anweisung zum Pianoforte Spiel*. Vienna: T. Haslinger, 1828, and later in French as *Méthode complète théorique et pratique pour le pianoforte*. Paris: A. Farrenc, 1829.
- Mozart, Leopold. *A Treatise on the Fundamental Principles of Violin Playing*. Translated by Editha Knocker. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985. Originally published as *Versuch einer gründlichen Violinschule*. Augsburg: Johann Jacob Lotter, 1756.
- Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. *The Letters of Mozart and His Family*, edited by Emily Anderson. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan, 1985.
- . *Mozart's Letters, Mozart's Life: Selected Letters*. Edited by Robert Spaethling. New York: Norton, 2000.
- , and Leopold Mozart. *Mozart: A Life in Letters*, edited by Cliff Eisen and Stewart Spencer. New York: Penguin Book, 2006.
- Quantz, Johann Joachim. *On Playing the Flute*. Translated by Edward R. Reilly. 2nd ed. New York: Schirmer Books, 1985. Originally published as *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen*. Berlin, 1752.
- Türk, Daniel G. *School of Clavier Playing, or, Instructions in Playing the Clavier for Teachers and Students*. Translated and edited by Raymond H. Hagg. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982. Originally published as *Klavierschule, oder, Anweisung zum Klavierspielen für Lehrer und Lernende, mit kritischen Anmerkungen*. Leipzig and Halle: Schwickert; Hemmerde und Schwetschke, 1789.

3. Secondary Sources

- Abert, Hermann, Stewart Spencer, and Cliff Eisen. *W. A. Mozart*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Bachleitner, Gerhard. "Mozart-Metamorphosen: Zu Johann Nepomuk Hummels Bearbeitungen Mozartscher Klavierkonzerte." *Acta Mozartiana* 44, no. 1-2 (June 1997): 17-28.
- . "Mozart-Metamorphosen 2: Zu Johann Nepomuk Hummels Bearbeitungen Mozartscher Klavierkonzerte." *Acta Mozartiana* 54, no. 1-2 (June 2007): 55-70.
- Badura-Skoda, Eva. *The Eighteenth-Century Fortepiano Grand and Its Patrons: From Scarlatti to Beethoven*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017.
- , and Paul Badura-Skoda. *Interpreting Mozart: The Performance of His Piano Pieces and Other Compositions*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Benyovszky, Karl. *J. N. Hummel, der Mensch und Künstler*. Bratislava: Eos-Verlag, 1934.
- Boyd, Malcolm. "Arrangement." *Grove Music Online*. Oxford Music Online. Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.
- Brock, David. "The Instrumental Music of Johann Nepomuk Hummel." PhD diss., University of Sheffield, 1976.
- Broer, Fred. *Johann Nepomuk Hummel: Innovator of His Time*. Gloucester, 2010.
- Burkholder, J. Peter, and Claude V. Palisca. *Norton Anthology of Western Music*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2014.
- Caplin, William. "The Classical Cadence: Conceptions and Misconceptions." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 51-118.
- . *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Carew, Derek. *The Mechanical Muse: The Piano, Pianism, and Piano Music, c. 1760-1850*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.
- Christensen, Thomas. "Four-Hand Piano Transcription and Geographies of Nineteenth-Century Musical Reception." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 52, no. 2 (Summer 1999): 255-298.
- Cole, Michael. *The Pianoforte in the Classical Era*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

- Dale, Kathleen. *Nineteenth Century Piano Music*. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Eisen, Cliff, and Simon P. Keefe. *The Cambridge Mozart Encyclopedia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Ellingson, Ter. "Transcription (i)." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.
- Ellsworth, Therese Marie. "The Piano Concerto in London Concert Life Between 1801 and 1850." PhD diss., University of Cincinnati, 1991.
- Forkel, Johann Nikolaus. *Johann Sebastian Bach: His Life, Art, and Work*. Translated by Charles Sanford Terry. London: Constable, 1920.
- Frederich, Hugo. "On the Art of Translation." In *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet, 11-16. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Goehring, Edmund Joseph. *Coming to Terms with Our Musical Past: An Essay on Mozart and Modernist Aesthetics*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2018.
- Grayson, David. *Mozart: Piano Concertos No. 20 in D minor, K. 466, and No. 21 in C major, K. 467*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Greenan, April Nash. "Eingang." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.
- Heartz, Daniel. *Mozart, Haydn and Early Beethoven 1781-1802*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2009.
- Hinson, Maurice. *The Pianist's Guide to Transcriptions, Arrangement, and Paraphrase*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Howard-Jones, Evlyn. "Arrangements and Transcriptions." *Music and Letters* 16, no. 4 (October 1935): 305-11.
- Hughes-Hughes, Augustus. *Catalogue of Manuscript Music in the British Museum*. Vol. 3. London: Longman and Co., 1909.
- Irving, John. *Mozart's Piano Concertos*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003.
- Jones, Andrew, and Will Crutchfield. "Ornamentation (ii)." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.

- Humphreys, David. "Arrangements and Additions; Transcriptions of Works by Other Composers." In *The Mozart Compendium: A Guide to Mozart's Life and Music*, edited by Robbins Landon, 336-339. London: Thames and Hudson, 1990.
- Keefe, Simon P. "'Greatest Effects with the Least Effort': Strategies of Wind Writing in Mozart's Viennese Piano Concertos." In *Mozart Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- . *Mozart's Piano Concertos: Dramatic Dialogue in the Age of Enlightenment*. Rochester, NY: Boydell, 2001.
- . "'We Hardly Knew What We Should Pay Attention to First': Mozart the Performer-Composer at Work on the Viennese Piano Concertos," *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 134 (2009): 185-242.
- Kim, Aram. "Johann Nepomuk Hummel's Transcriptions of Beethoven's Symphony No. 2, Op. 36: A Comparison of the Solo Piano and the Piano Quartet Versions". DMA diss., University of North Texas, 2012.
- Konrad, Ulrich. *Mozart, Catalogue of His Works: Compositions, Fragments, Sketches, Arrangements, Manuscript Copies, Texts*. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2006.
- Krebs, Harald. *Fantasy Pieces: Metrical Dissonance in the Music of Robert Schumann*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Kregor, Jonathan. Introduction to *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: Arrangements of Orchestral Works II*. Los Altos, California: The Packard Humanities Institute, 2005.
- . *Liszt as Transcriber*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Kreitner, Kenneth. "Ornaments." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.
- Kroll, Mark, ed. *Johann Nepomuk Hummel, Mozart's Haffner and Linz Symphonies: Arranged for Pianoforte, Flute, Violin, and Violoncello*. Vol. 29 of *Recent Researches in the Music of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century*. Madison: A-R Editions, 2000.
- . *Johann Nepomuk Hummel: A Musician's Life and World*. Lanham, Md: Scarecrow Press, 2007.
- . "On a Pedestal and Under the Microscope: The Arrangements of Beethoven Symphonies by Liszt and Hummel." In *Franz Liszt und seine Bedeutung in der europäischen Musikkultur [Franz Liszt and His Position in the European Musical Culture]*, edited by Markéta Stefková, 123-144. Bratislava, Ustav hudobnej vedy SAV: 2012.

- , ed. *Twelve Select Overtures: Arranged for Pianoforte, Flute, Violin, and Violoncello*. Vol. 35 of *Recent Researches in the Music of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*. Madison: A-R Editions, 2003.
- Landon, H. C. Robbins, ed. *The Mozart Compendium: A Guide to Mozart's Life and Music*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1990.
- Lawson, Colin, and Robin Stowell. *The Cambridge History of Musical Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Leeson, Daniel, and Robert Levin, "On the Authenticity of K. Anh. C14.01 (297b), a Symphonia Concertante for Four Winds and Orchestra." In *Mozart-Jahrbuch 1976/77*, 70-96. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1978.
- Levin, Robert D. "Improvisation [§II, 4 (i)]." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.
- . "Improvisation and Embellishment in Mozart Piano Concertos." *Musical Newsletter* 5, no. 2 (1975): 3-14.
- . "Improvised Embellishments in Mozart's Keyboard Music." *Early Music* 20, no. 2 (May 1992): 221-233.
- . "Instrumental Ornamentation, Improvisation and Cadenzas." In *Performance Practice*, edited by H. Mayer Brown and S. Sadie, 267-291. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1989.
- Loesser, Arthur. *Men, Women and Pianos: A Social History*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954.
- Macdonald, Claudia. "Mozart's Piano Concertos and the Romantic Generation." In *Historical Musicology: Sources, Methods, Interpretations*, edited by Stephen A. Crist and Roberta Montemorra Marvin, 302-329. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2004.
- Maunder, Richard. "Mozart's Keyboard Instruments." *Early Music* 20, no. 2 (May 1992): 207-220.
- Miucci, Leonardo. "I Concerti per Fortepiano e Orchestra di W. A. Mozart: Le Trascrizioni di J. N. Hummel." *Rivista Italiana di Musicologia* 43/45 (2008/2010): 81-128.
- . "Mozart after Mozart: Editorial Lessons in the Process of Publishing J. N. Hummel's Arrangements of Mozart's Piano Concertos." *Music and Practice* 2 (2015). <http://www.musicandpractice.org/volume-2/arrangements-of-mozarts-piano-concertos/> (accessed September 30, 2018).

- Moscheles, Charlotte. *Recent Music and Musicians: As Described in the Diaries and Correspondence of Ignatz Moscheles*. Translated by A. D. Coleridge. New York: Da Capo Press, 1970.
- Neumann, Frederick. *Ornamentation and Improvisation in Mozart*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Rawlins, Joseph T. "The Arrangement and Its Role in the Performer's Repertoire." *American Music Teacher* 33, no. 4 (February-March 1984): 26-28, 30.
- Richards, Mark. "Closure in Classical Themes: The Role of Melody and Texture in Cadences, Closures, and the Separated Cadence." *Intersections* 31, no. 1 (2010): 25-45.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *On Translation*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Roberge, Marc-André. "From Orchestra to Piano: Major Composers as Authors of Piano Reductions of Other Composers' Works." *Notes - Quarterly Journal of the Music Library Association* 49, no. 3 (1993): 925-936.
- Rockstro, William, George Dyson, William Drabkin, Harold Powers, and Julian Rushton. "Cadence." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.
- Rosen, Charles. *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven*. Expanded ed. New York: W. W. Norton, 1997.
- Rosenzweig, Franz. "The Impossibility and Necessity of Translation." In *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*, edited by André Lefevere, 110-111. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1977.
- . "Luther and Scripture." In *Scripture and Translation*. Translated by Lawrence Alan Rosenwald and Everett Fox, 47-69. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Rowland, David. *The Cambridge Companion to the Piano*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . "Piano Music and Keyboard Compass in the 1790s." *Early Music* 27, no. 2 (May 1999): 283-288, 290-293.
- Sachania, Millan. "'Improving the Classics': Some Thoughts on the 'Ethics' and Aesthetics of Musical Arrangement." *Music Review* 55 (1994): 58-75.
- Sachs, Joel. "Authentic English and French Editions of J. N. Hummel." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 25, no. 2 (Summer 1972): 203-229.

- . “A Checklist of the Works of Johann Nepomuk Hummel.” *Notes* 30, no. 4 (June 1974): 732-754.
- . “Hummel and George Thomson of Edinburgh.” *The Musical Quarterly* 56, no. 2 (April 1970): 270-287.
- . “Hummel Catalogued.” *The Musical Times* 114, no. 1567 (September 1973): 898-899.
- . “Hummel and the Pirates: The Struggle for Musical Copyright.” *Musical Quarterly* 59, no. 1 (January 1973): 31-60.
- . *Kapellmeister Hummel in England and France*. Detroit: Information Coordinators, 1977.
- and Mark Kroll. "Hummel, Johann Nepomuk." *Grove Music Online*. Oxford Music Online. Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.
- Seidel, Max. *Biographische Notizen aus dem Leben des am 17ten October 1837 verstorbenen Grossherzoglich-Sachse-Weimarischen Kapellmeister und Ritter mehrerer Orden: Johann Nepomuk Hummel, ersten Klavierspieler ner Zeit*. Manuscript, 1837.
- Tilmouth, Michael. “Passage.” *Grove Music Online*. Oxford Music Online. Oxford University Press, accessed September 30, 2018, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.
- Tovey, Donald Francis. *Essays in Musical Analysis*. Vol. 3. London: Oxford University Press, 1935.
- Waal, Rian de. *Metamorphoses: The Art of the Virtuoso Piano Transcription*. Delft: Eburon Academic Publishers, 2013.
- Wolff, Christoph. “Mozart’s *Messiah*: “The Spirit of Handel” from Van Swieten’s Hands.” In *Music and Civilization: Essays in Honor of Paul Henry Lang*, edited by Edmond Strainschamps and Maria Rika Maniates, 1-14. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1984.
- Zaslaw, Neal, ed. *Mozart’s Piano Concertos: Text, Context, Interpretation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Zaslaw, Neal, and William Cowdery, eds. *The Compleat Mozart: A Guide to the Musical Works of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1990.
- Zimmerschied, Dieter. *Thematisches Verzeichnis der Werke von Johann Nepomuk Hummel*. Hofheim am Taunus: F. Hofmeister, 1971.

4. Audio Recording

Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, and Johann Nepomuk Hummel. *Mozart Arranged by Hummel: 7 Piano Concertos and Symphony No. 40*. With Fumiko Shiraga (piano), Henrik Wiese (flute), Peter Clemente (violin), Tibor Bényi (cello). Recorded at the Bavaria Music Studios in Munich, Germany, June 2003 (Disc 1: Nos. 20 and 25), June 2004 (Disc 2: Nos. 10 and 24), May 2005 (Disc 3: Nos. 22 and 26), June 2006 (Disc 4: No. 18 and Symphony No. 40). BIS Records Abe, BIS-CD-9043, 2013, 4 compact discs.

———. *Mozart after Mozart: J. N. Hummel Arrangements of KV 456 and 466 Fortepiano Concertos*. With Leonardo Miucci (fortepiano), Martin Skamletz (flute), Johannes Gebauer (violin), Bruno Hurtado Gosálvez (cello). Recorded at Westvest90-kerk in Schiedam (The Netherlands), June 2014. Dynamic, CDS 7723, 2015, compact disc.

Appendices

Appendix A

Mozart's Piano Concertos	Chronological Order of Hummel's Arrangements	Publication Order of Hummel's Arrangements	First Edition		Dates ⁹⁷	HH Edition	Range ⁹⁸
			England	France			
No. 20, K. 466 (1785)	1	1	Chappell	Schott	Deposit Date in France on August 27, 1828; review in Ackermann's <i>Repository of Arts</i> published in October 1827.	2014	F ¹ -c ⁴
No. 25, K. 503 (1786)	2	2			Deposit Date listed in <i>Bibliographie de la France</i> on January 10, 1829; review in <i>Harmonicon</i> published in February 1829.	2015	F ¹ -f ⁴
No. 10, K. 365 / 316a (ca. 1779)	3	3			The manuscript dated in August 1829; announced for publication on February 1, 1830; review in <i>Harmonicon</i> published in May 1830.	Not yet published	F ¹ -f ⁴
No. 24, K. 491 (1786)	5	4			The manuscript dated in 1830; review in <i>Harmonicon</i> published in October 1831.	2017	F ¹ -f ⁴
No. 26, K. 537 (1788)	6	5			The manuscript dated in March 1835, Deposit Date in Stationers' Hall on December 1, 1835.	Not yet published	F ¹ -f ⁴
No. 22, K. 482 (1785)	7	6			The manuscript dated in January 1836.	Not yet published	F ¹ -f ⁴
No. 18, K. 456 (1784)	4	7			The manuscript dated in January 1830, review in <i>Leipzig Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung</i> published on March 23, 1842.	2014	F ¹ -f ⁴

⁹⁷ No primary sources mention the publication dates. Hence, scholars have turned to secondary sources, such as manuscripts, deposit dates, and reviews, to estimate the dates of publication. See Joel Sachs, "Authentic English and French Editions of J. N. Hummel," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 25, no. 2 (Summer 1972): 226-227; David Grayson, "Whose Authenticity? Ornaments by Hummel and Cramer for Mozart's Piano Concertos," in *Mozart's Piano Concertos*, ed. Neal Zaslaw (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 387.

⁹⁸ The octave designation is based on the following system: C¹, C, c, c¹, c², c³, c⁴ with middle c as c¹.