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Abstract

Ambiguous and Fragmentary Notation in Mozart's Piano Concerto in C minor, K. 491: A Survey of Possible Solutions for Interpretation and Completion

by

Dariusz Pawlas

Numerous problems for the performer of Mozart's Piano Concerto in C minor have been encountered through the examination of the manuscript autograph, editions, and recordings. Although the autograph and various editions have been studied before, this is the first discussion to include over sixty recordings of this concerto as well.

Legibility of text and other editorial issues constitute one category of problems. Examples presented in Chapter 1 suggest that generally accepted readings of ambiguous passages found in different editions should not be considered as the only possible options for pianists.

Shorthand methods and incomplete notation are discussed in Chapter 2. The fragments appearing sketchy and requiring or allowing for completion are examined. The particular cases of octave leaps (measures 142-45, 155-57, 159-63 of the third movement) and unreasonable interruption of sixteenth-note flow (first movement, measures 261-62 and 467-70) are presented in Chapters 3, 4, and 5 respectively, along with many ideas for elaboration in these places.
Fermata embellishments are not discussed in this study; however, comprehensive lists of available cadenzas and Eingänge are provided in Appendix A. Two original cadenzas to the first movement by this author are included in Appendix B.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fl.</td>
<td>Flauto, Flauti [flute(s)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob.</td>
<td>Oboe, Oboi [oboe(s)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl.</td>
<td>Clarinetto, Clarinetti [clarinet(s)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fg.</td>
<td>Fagotto, Fagotti [bassoon(s)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor.</td>
<td>Corno, Corni [horn(s)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>Tromba, Trombe [trumpet(s)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timp.</td>
<td>Timpani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pf.</td>
<td>Pianoforte [piano]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vl.</td>
<td>Violino, Violini [violin(s)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va., Ve.</td>
<td>Viola, Viole [viola(s)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vc.</td>
<td>Violoncello, Violoncelli [cello(s)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Basso, Bassi [double-bass(es)]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bibliographical abbreviations

Editions of Mozart’s Piano Concerto No. 24 in C minor, K. 491:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMA</td>
<td>Alte Mozart-Ausgabe, series XVI, No. 24 (Leipzig: Breitkopf &amp; Härtel, 1879); see also B&amp;H (AMA), Kalmus or Dover below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>André (ca. 1800)</td>
<td>First edition of the concerto (Offenbach s/M, Germany: André, [1800]).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSU ML

“Concert pour le Pianoforte composé par W. A. Mozart, No 7,” a handwritten copy of unknown manuscript or edition [19th century] in the possession of Music Library (M 1010 M952 C6), California State University, Fresno, CA.
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Eulenburg (ed. Blume)

Concerto [in] C minor for Pianoforte and Orchestra: Köchel No. 491, composed 1786, edited from the original M.S. by Friedrich Blume (London: Ernst Eulenburg, [1935]).

Heugel & Cie.


Heugel (ed. Philipp)


Kalmus


Litolf (ed. Hummel)


MS


or

«Muzyka» (ed. Bashkirov)  

NMA  

NMA (1959)  
See Bärenreiter (ed. Beck), 1959 above.

NMA (1964)  
See Bärenreiter (ed. Beck), 1964 above.

NMA (1986)  

Peters (ed. Ruthardt)  

Peters (ed. Fischer/Soldan)  

Peters (ed. Wolff/Zacharias)  

Richault (ed. Roubier)  

Schirmer (ed. Bischoff)  
*Concertos for the Piano: in C minor (Köchel 491)*, critically revised, fingered, and the orchestral accompaniments arranged for a second piano by Hans Bischoff (New York: G. Schirmer, 1901, 1953).

Steingräber (ed. Rehberg)  

Wiener Phil. Verlag  
Music is not the score; music is sound, swirling and floating...

Jos van Immerseel
Introduction

A considerable number of writings has been devoted to Mozart's piano concerti in recent years. This may be an indication of both the attractiveness of these works to pianists and audiences of present times and the existence of numerous problems encountered by writers, editors, and performers.

Most of these problems are of a performance practice nature. Questions that arise refer to dynamics and articulation markings, realization of ornaments and *basso continuo*, the use of modern or historical instruments, fermata embellishments, cadenzas (the most frequent subject of study), elaborations of repeated or partially-written themes of slow movements, and finally, passages which appear fragmentary in manuscripts. In addition there are other problems most performers are unaware of, since editors often do not provide enough information as to how they have approached their final decisions.

The case of the Piano Concerto in C minor is an excellent example of all these problems. A detailed examination of Mozart's autograph, numerous editions\(^1\) and recordings\(^2\) of this concerto, undertaken with a desire to find better solutions, has resulted in a very large collection of material. Only part of this material will be used in this treatise. Some problematic passages open to more

---

\(^1\) See *Bibliography II (music sources)*, pp. 123-27.

\(^2\) See *Discography and other sound sources*, pp. 128-35.
than one editorial interpretation will be listed and briefly discussed in Chapter 1. The subsequent chapters of this study will focus only on the specific problem of incomplete notation.

Contrary to other studies dealing with similar issues, the author does not limit himself exclusively to printed sources. Sound recordings, also taken into consideration here, are as valuable as texts and editions of music. In fact, solutions offered by performers and found solely in recordings constitute the majority of musical examples.\(^3\) The large number of them makes a solid basis for a comparison and further studies.

---

\(^{3}\) Musical examples taken from the sound recordings were transcribed by the author; appropriate annotations were made whenever doubts occurred.
Chapter 1

Selected problems in Mozart's Piano Concerto in C minor related to readings and interpretations of the manuscript

Mozart completed his Piano Concerto in C minor (listed later in the Köchel catalogue under number 491) on March 24, 1786.\(^4\) Shortly afterwards he premiered this work in Wiener Burgtheater (the Town Theater of Vienna) during one of his subscription concerts for the Lent season. Some sources give April 7, 1786 as the date of the first performance;\(^5\) others suggest two performances in short succession, on April 3 and April 9 of the same year, the latter being a part of the subscription series.\(^6\) There is no evidence of further performances of this concerto given by the composer and it was not published during Mozart's lifetime.

The manuscript, in the possession of the Royal College of Music in London since 1894 (on indefinite loan to the British Museum), has been available to

---


scholars and editors for most of this time. Moreover, facsimile editions of the autograph were published in 1964 and in 1979. They are accessible through a number of libraries in Europe and the United States.

There are indications this autograph was consulted before the preparation of several editions. Prefaces to some of them include the following:

To the present owner of the Autograph, Mr. Otto Goldschmidt, of London, I owe special gratitude for his kindness in sending it to me. The autograph is in the ownership of the Royal College of Music in London who where (sic) kind enough to lend me a photostat. I herewith wish to express my thanks to the Institute.

The following sources were available for the present edition:
A. The autograph belonging to the manuscript collection of the Royal College of Music, London (…)

The present edition has been revised on the basis of the autograph score located in the British Library in London and published in facsimile.

---

7 Unlike Mozart's other manuscripts (including many of his piano concerti), this autograph has never been a part of the collection of the former Prussian State Library of Berlin, which disappeared after World War II for over three decades and became available to scholars again just recently. Its history of ownership can be found in the foreword written by Watkins Shaw to Piano Concerto in C minor, K. 491: reproduction of the autograph manuscript by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (Kilkenny, Ireland: Boethius Press Limited, 1979). According to Shaw, it was purchased from Mozart's widow by the first publisher, J. André of Offenbach around 1799 and subsequently passed to his son-in-law J. B. Streicher of Vienna. In 1856 it had been acquired by Mr. Otto Goldschmidt (1829 - 1907), who brought it to England and sold it later between 1887 and 1894 at public auction to Sir George Donaldson (1845 - 1925). In 1894 Donaldson donated it to the Royal College of Music, where it remains under the signature R. C. M. MS 402 in the Party Room Library.


A photographic copy of the autograph which is in the possession of the Royal College of Music, London, was very kindly submitted by this College. This has served as a basis for the revision of this pianoforte concerto. It has, consequently, been possible to restore the original version and to cancel numerous alterations and emendations (…) The pianoforte solo-part is now an exact replica of the autograph and additions of any type or form have been rigorously excluded.¹⁴

One may wonder why these editions based on the manuscript (as indicated above) differ so much one from the other (as we will see on following pages); why we do have so many different Urtext versions of the piano part? Are they really true “replicas of the autograph”?

The answer is no. They are not, because (with the exception of facsimile reproduction) they cannot be. Besides being a reflection of the composer’s intentions, the manuscript is, at the same time, a source of doubts and questions concerning these intentions. After its examination it is easy to get an impression quite similar to what some editors have put in words:

Adherents to the “mood” hypothesis might infer from the manuscript that Mozart wrote this concerto under the acute influence of mental anguish: it is full of corrections, rewritings, and therewith stands in marked contrast to the autographs of the other piano con-

certos. (...) It is indeed the only autograph among Mozart’s piano concertos which is inexact and inconsequent in places. (...) this autograph not only conveys Mozart’s so frequent hurry, but decided haste and unrest.¹⁵

Unfortunately, [the autograph] is not calculated to settle all doubts as to the correctness of the text. It gives the impression that Mozart, in writing out the score, gave all desirable care to the notation of the orchestral parts, but only hastily sketched the piano-part in certain passages. Various sections of the piano-part were, perhaps, not written out until later, and some passages at first merely indicated, and more or less exactly executed afterwards. Again, the notation of other figures is so hasty as to render it uncommonly difficult to decipher them. Entire groups of passages were subsequently touched up with the pen. In many places, extreme inexactitude prevails in the notation of the accidentals.¹⁶

Selected editorial issues of various nature (some of which are related to difficulties in the manuscript’s appearance and others to its content) will be presented in this chapter. Input from performers will be taken into consideration only if it contributes to the overall understanding of the particular problem or offers a solution.

Some of the editorial questions relate to the fact that the manuscript includes a number of additions either not in Mozart’s hand (tempo indications, for instance) or made not with ink, but with pencil or a brownish-red crayon. The color is not shown in the reproduction; however, we know from annotations in various sources that, for instance, a flat sign before d” in measure 319 of

---

¹⁵ Blume, preface (1935), pp. ii-iii.
¹⁶ Bischoff, preface (1887), n.p.
the first movement in the second oboe part is written with the crayon. We do not know if it was Mozart himself or somebody else who made these revisions.

Example 1  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 319-21, SECOND OBOE PART, MS, FOLIO 1IV, BARS 1-3, STAVE 6

Additions made with a pencil, as the one in the next example, are much easier to distinguish. Usually they are not included in printed music in any form, but there may be exceptions.

Here is a fragment of a solo section taken from the third variation of the Finale.

Example 2  K 491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURES 69-72, PIANO PART WITH ADDITIONAL SKETCH, MS, FOLIO 27R, BARS 8-11, STAVES 14-16

The piano part is written, as is usual in outer movements, on staves 14-15, while stave 16 (normally reserved for string basses) contains a pencilled sketch. Some

17 Other instances of using the brownish-red crayon can be found on folios 2r, 3r, 3v, and these are markings of certain important points of the score in the ritornello section.
editors believe this sketch deserves inclusion in the printed score as an alternative version of the left-hand part, since it is not crossed out. Both the Bärenreiter\textsuperscript{18} and the newest Peters\textsuperscript{19} editions suggest the following:

Although, in the opinion of the author of critical notes to the facsimile edition, “the alternative l.h. figuration on the lower stave provides attractive sonority and technical relief for the pianist,”\textsuperscript{20} only one performer among those listed


\textsuperscript{19} Peters (ed. Wolff/Zacharias), p. 57.

in the Discography uses this version, and it appears in slightly modified fashion (the first half of measure 72 is transposed one octave higher):

Example 4  
K 491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURES 69-72, LEFT-HAND PART, 
TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF JOS VAN IMMERSEEL

The sketch in the lower right corner of folio 27r is carried only through two and a half measures. If the one who wrote it (presumably Mozart) meant to continue to the end of the phrase in similar manner, still another alternative can be an option. It might look like this:

Example 5  
K 491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURES 69-72, ALTERNATIVE LEFT-HAND PART, 
HYPOTHETICAL VERSION

Whether or not it is appropriate to modify this fragment to that extent is another question. Some may argue it is not, because we do have a regular completed version of the left-hand part of measures 69-72 and there is no need for an alternative. Those in favor of the sketchy version, however, may prefer to remain consistent in modifying this passage until its end.
The solo fragment of section B of the same variation (measures 85-86) also contains a pencilled sketch on the last stave. Since the problem is similar, it does not have to be discussed here in detail.

Legibility of text constitutes probably the most difficult editorial issue. If the notation is not clear, the editors must solve the problem and provide specific suggestions. These suggestions, of course, will differ, unless earlier editions are taken into consideration (which is quite common).

Let us see some examples. Here are two measures from the first movement as they appear in the autograph:

Example 6

If they are taken out of context, it seems almost impossible to decipher them. Most editions suggest the type of figuration similar to what is found in the subsequent section, resulting in the most prevalent version:

Example 7

However, there are different interpretations. The Breitkopf & Härtel edition of 1802 (as we learn from the footnote in the Schirmer edition\(^\text{21}\)) and Hummel's

---

arrangement\textsuperscript{22} omits the entire measure 435 (the whole bar is practically crossed out). Some French editions give only the first $G$ as a quarter note,\textsuperscript{23} while Lebert suggests different figuration.\textsuperscript{24}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Example 8} \textit{K. 491, First Movement, Measures 435-36, Left-hand Part, Richault (ed. Roubier), and Heugel (ed. Philipp)}
\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example8}
\end{center}

\item \textbf{Example 9} \textit{K. 491, First Movement, Measures 435-36, Left-hand Part, Lebert}
\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example9}
\end{center}
\end{itemize}

Another example of illegible notation, this time on a much larger scale, can be found in the second variation of the last movement. Here the composer apparently has been experiencing difficulties trying to determine the final version of the right-hand figuration. The excerpt from the manuscript (section A of this variation) found on the next page is an example.

\textsuperscript{22} Litolf (ed. Hummel), p. 11 (93).


\textsuperscript{24} After Schirmer (ed. Bischoff), p. 20, n. 19.
Example 10

K 491,
THIRD MOVEMENT,
MEASURES 41-48,
Piano part,
Ms,
Folio 26r,
Bars 5-12,
Staves 10-16
The many variants and deletions present a severe editorial problem. It is not only that the staves typically reserved for other instruments have been used for corrections of the right-hand part, but all of these variants in bars 43-47 are either crossed out or incomplete. Therefore "no final form [of this fragment] can be said to exist;" it is written "without revealing a really definite intention."

The standard version, as most of us know it and perform it, "carries through the first...entry for five bars [41-45 on stave 13] and then folds back [to bar 43] to the uppermost stave [11]—as indicated [in the manuscript] by a line."
Only a few editions make the performer aware of possible alternatives. The NMA and Peters (1993) suggest the *ossia* second version for bars 45-47 (which is taken from staves 12 and 13 of the manuscript).
Bischoff, in his Preface, quotes "earlier readings" of certain passages, which "were afterwards remodelled by Mozart" and "are still legible in the autograph."\textsuperscript{29} Measures 45-46 of his alternative version are identical to those in the example above, however the beginning of bar 47 is deciphered as four sixteenth notes $b''', d''', e''', b''$. The remaining part of this measure is not given in a musical example, since "the continuation of the scale last commenced is not wholly legible."\textsuperscript{30} One may assume that figuration based on Bischoff's description in this measure would look somewhat like this:

\textsuperscript{29} Bischoff, preface (1887), n.p.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid.
Wolff and Zacharias have made an interesting decision regarding bar 42 in their edition. They have incorporated into the main text the last four sixteenth notes from stave 12 instead stave 13 as others have done (also there is no $B^\flat$ in the left hand).\footnote{Peters (ed. Wolff/Zacharias), p. 54.} In fact, this measure appears in editions in three different versions, since Roubier\footnote{Richault (ed. Roubier), p. 66.} and Ruthardt\footnote{Peters (ed. Ruthardt), p. 163.} take the natural sign before $a^\flat$ as a flat (the latter even prints an extra flat sign as a reminder).

\textbf{Example 14}  
\textit{K 491, Third Movement, Measure 42, Piano Part, Peters (ed. Wolff/Zacharias)}

\textbf{Example 15}  
\textit{K 491, Third Movement, Measure 42, Piano Part, Most Editions}

\textbf{Example 16}  
\textit{K 491, Third Movement, Measure 42, Piano Part, Richault (ed. Roubier), and Peters (ed. Ruthardt)}
Another misreading or inexactness regarding accidentals takes place in the AMA edition. This is not a problem with legibility. Contrary to what can still be read from the manuscript, the descending scale in the second half of bar 44 appears in its “melodic mode” with $f^\#$ and $e^b$ instead of $f^\#$ and $e^b$. This has been followed in numerous editions and, consequently, many performances. Yet another reading, the “harmonic mode” ($f^\#$ and $e^b$), has been suggested by Roubier.

Example 17
K 491, third movement, measure 44, piano part, MS, NMA, and others

Example 18
K 491, third movement, measure 44, piano part, AMA and others

---


36 Ashkenazy, Barenboim / BP, de Larrocha, Kolessa, Kwok, Uchida, among others; also the current writer’s previous performances.

*) The natural signs in parenthesis were added by the current writer. They do not appear in the Richault edition; however, it can be said without any doubt they were meant by the editor (a strange practice, by modern standards, of applying accidentals only once per measure for notes in different registers is commonly used throughout this edition).

Section B of this variation is also written on several staves, however its interpretation seems to be less ambiguous than in case of section A (the content of stave II should be considered a final version, since it is not crossed out). The next three examples show its appearance in the manuscript and its generally accepted reading in most editions.
Example 20  K.491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURES 57-61, PIANO PART, MS, FOLIO 26V, BARS 9-13, STAVES 10-16

Example 21  K.491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURES 62-64, PIANO PART, MS, FOLIO 27R, BARS 1-3, STAVES 10-16
Sketched material from other staves appears in print in only a few sources.

Hans Bischoff includes several examples in his preface.

Mozart wrote out the following eight-measure passage in various forms. As parallel (or earlier) readings, the following variants are decipherable.  

38 Bischoff, preface (1887), n.p.
Example 24
K 491, Third movement, Measure 60, Piano part,
Schirmer (ed. Bischoff), preface

Example 25
K 491, Third movement, Measure 61, Right-hand part,
Schirmer (ed. Bischoff), preface

Example 26
K 491, Third movement, another reading of Measure 61, Right-hand part,
Schirmer (ed. Bischoff), preface

Example 27
K 491, Third movement, Measure 62, Piano part,
Schirmer (ed. Bischoff), preface

Example 28
K 491, Third movement, Measure 63, Right-hand part,
Schirmer (ed. Bischoff), preface

Peters (1993) suggest alternative versions only for bars 60-62.39

Example 29
K. 491, third movement, measures 60-62, piano part, Peters (ed. Wolff/Zacharias), ossia version

*) The g' in parenthesis in measure 63 is added by the current writer. It seems to be a natural consequence of the ascending chromatic scale.

The NMA's suggestion is almost identical; however, there is an exception. In measure 60 of the alternative version "it overlooks a treble clef in the left hand, and therefore rewrites the notes, seriously distorting the text." 

Example 30
K. 491, third movement, measure 60, piano part, NMA, ossia version

There is also a different problem in this variation. It is again in measure 60, this time regarding the main text of the right-hand part. Two different versions

---


41 Levin, "Devil's in the Details," p. 41.
of the last group appear in various editions. One is a C-minor descending arpeggio, another is an A-flat-major arpeggio.

Example 31  
K 491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURE 60, PIANO PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE MS

Example 32  
K 491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURE 60, PIANO PART, ALTERED VERSION

It is very clear that Mozart wrote $g^\$" in the manuscript (cf. Ex. 20 on page 19). But did he really mean it? Here is what Robert D. Levin writes about this passage:

The last beat of the measure contains an A-flat-major triad in the orchestra but a C-minor triad in the solo part. Mozart's revision, substituting alternating one-beat arpeggios in both hands, uses a C-minor triad throughout the entire measure, which further conflicts with the E-natural in the first violin on the first beat. (...) Some editions—for example, the two-piano scores of Breitkopf & Härtel, Peters, and Steingräber/Schirmer—address the inconsistency: they correct the clashing $g^\$" in the piano to a-flat$. The NMA gives $g^\$", preserving the clash.

---


Editorial interventions of this kind are quite common. They discredit the convictions of less experienced (or more radical) interpreters of Mozart’s music that an answer to every doubt can be found in the composer’s autograph and that everything discovered there has to be followed. Actual examination of the manuscript of this concerto, while helping to solve some problems, causes other questions to arise.

Here are some other problematic spots where the editors have decided to alter the original. Whether or not their decisions are right must be left to the individual judgment of performers, who (contrary to editors enabled to suggest several options) can make only one choice at a time.

For instance, the left-hand Alberti bass figures in the second half of measure 205 of the last movement have been changed in some editions.\textsuperscript{45} Although quite distinguishable in the manuscript, $a^b$ has been substituted with $b^b$.

\begin{example}
K 491, Third Movement, Measures 205-6, Piano Part,
MS, folio 348, bars 3-4, staves 14-15
\end{example}

\textsuperscript{44} Levin, “Devil’s in the Details,” pp.40-41.

The shape of the parallel passage, which appears eight bars later, may be a possible reason for this change.

Another example occurs in measure 510 of the first movement where a succession of descending broken figures takes an unexpected turn, since $g'$ and $c''$ (unlike other groups) are repeated twice. Bischoff calls it “a slip of the pen”\textsuperscript{46} and, along with others,\textsuperscript{47} changes the figuration according to bars 512, 514, and

\textsuperscript{46} Schirmer (ed. Bischoff), p. 27, n. 23.

516 (see next examples). Nevertheless the original version is preserved in some other editions, including the AMA and the NMA.⁴⁸

Example 37
K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 509-14, PIANO PART,
MS, FOLIO 17R, BARS 7-12, STAVES 14-15

Example 38
K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 509-17, PIANO PART,
TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE MS

---

Almost all editions (except Lebert and Philipp\textsuperscript{49}) give the following reading of measures 325-30 of the first movement:

The right-hand figuration in bar 327 is surprising in the light of the analogous passage two measures earlier. Is this another "slip of the pen"? Should the eighth sixteenth-note be read as $g'$ or as $f''$? The manuscript, in the current writer's opinion, does not give a definite answer. While at first glance it confirms the editors' usual choice, one may also notice that the note in question is positioned somehow lower than surrounding $g$'s (the fifth and the tenth notes of the same mea-

\textsuperscript{49} Heugel (ed. Philipp), p. 12.
sure). Thus the f" heard in many performances\textsuperscript{50} should probably not be totally disfavored, although some may call it “conjectural reading.”\textsuperscript{51}

\textbf{Example 41} \hspace{1em} K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURE 327, RIGHT-HAND PART, MS, FOLIO 11V, BAR 9, STAVE 14

\textbf{Example 42} \hspace{1em} K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURE 327, RIGHT-HAND PART, UNALTERED VERSION

\textbf{Example 43} \hspace{1em} K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURE 327, RIGHT-HAND PART, ALTERED VERSION

A noteworthy editorial solution to this problem is offered by Wolff and Zacharias. The main text does not differ from other editions, however it is footnoted with the following comment: “The editor plays here f" instead of g', according to measure 325.”\textsuperscript{52}

While the last few examples reflect various degrees of skepticism regarding the manuscript content in some places, there are other passages that, we may be absolutely certain, appear in the autograph with errors. No fewer than thirty-five instances of overlooked accidentals have been found.\textsuperscript{53} Here is just one:

\textsuperscript{50} By Casadesus, Han, and Schiff, among others.


It is difficult to believe Mozart intended an $a^b$ at the beginning of measure 310 in the right-hand part. No performers and only three editors\(^{54}\) (actually two, since Kalmus duplicates the AMA) take Mozart's text literally and copy the error. There are several different ways other editors handle this problem. Most of them just insert a natural sign before this note. Philipp annotates it in addition with a footnote,\(^{55}\) Bischoff places the natural sign in parenthesis below the note and

\(^{53}\) In the first movement, bars: 187-88 (viola), 227, 228-31, 310, 318 (piano), 322 (first oboe and piano), 334, 337, 341, 354, 355, 360, 377, 438 (piano); in the second movement, bars: 35-36, 57 (piano); in the third movement, bars: 20, 26 (piano), 47 (piano ossia), 48, 58 (piano), 59 (piano and viola), 68, 83, 124, 126, 146, 156, 158, 161, 180 (piano), 210-11 (second violin and piano), 213, 222, 224 (piano).

\(^{54}\) B&H (AMA); Kalmus, p.18 (138); Peters (ed. Fischer/Soldan), p.16; Dover, p.72.

\(^{55}\) "Le la$^b$ n'existe que dans quelques éditions, mais semble logique" [Heugel (ed. Philipp), p. 11, n.a].
also comments in the form of footnote, Beck puts the natural sign in square brackets, Wolff and Zacharias use the small print.

The overlooking of accidentals is not the only mistakes found in the manuscript of Mozart's Piano Concerto in C minor. There are other issues, of which the appearance of measure 40 of the slow movement comprises perhaps the most serious problem. Here is this measure in its context of preceding and subsequent bars:

---

56 "In the autograph the 4 before a' is omitted" [Schirmer (ed. Bischoff), p. 13, n. 11].
EXAMPLE 47  K. 491, SECOND MOVEMENT, MEASURES 39-42, WOODWINDS AND PIANO PART,
MS., FOLIO 218, BARS 3-6, STAVES 5-14
The harmonic content of the second and the third chords of the measure in question, as shown below, is incompatible. There are two triads, E-flat major and C minor sounding at the same time, and this looks inconceivable in Mozart.

The two-piano score published by Peters in 1993 is the first and the only edition up to now which addresses this problem. Christian Zacharias writes in "Notes on Performance:"

[Bar 40 of the Larghetto requires a solution on the part of the executor (sic!). Mozart seems to have overlooked the incompatibility of the piano part with that of the wind instruments. A suggested adjustment is included in our edition.] ⁵⁹

Other remarks dealing with this fragment can be found. All of them are written by practicing musicians, pianists whose repertoire includes this concerto. James Friskin in his short annotation to this concerto gives an advice:

(…) when the principal theme of the slow movement recurs after the first episode, the harmonization of the piano part is inconsistent with that of the orchestra and should be corrected accordingly. ⁶⁰

Géza Anda takes an opportunity to comment on this in his collection of cadenzas to Mozart’s piano concerti:

Although it does not necessarily belong here, I would like to say a few words about the 40th measure of the 2nd movement: it always surprises me that all pianists faithfully play the text printed by Breitkopf — which by the way has been taken over into all other and even most recent editions — although it is quite clear that something is wrong there. I have taken over the orchestral harmonics into the piano part in the conviction that more concentration is required to write out the oboe, clarinet and bassoon parts that to write down the piano theme at its third appearance, especially when one knows how hastily Mozart often worked. ⁶¹


Denis Matthews, an English pianist and author of the cadenza, annotates this fragment in his introduction to the reproduction of the autograph manuscript with the following:

A controversial place where the piano bass conflicts with the bassoon, an understandable slip of the pen that should surely be corrected in favour of the woodwind harmony. 62

The famous expert on Mozart, Robert D. Levin, comments about such passages in general:

The existence of passages in which the harmonic or melodic content of the solo part conflicts with those in the orchestra confirms that Mozart notated different layers of the score at different times. The strange thing about conflicts of this kind is that they are glaringly apparent to the ear, yet they are generally ignored in printed editions and even in many performances. 63

He then writes specifically about the case of bar 40 in the second movement of this concerto:

The most bizarre of these conflicts is caused by the appearance of two superimposed but mutually incompatible harmonizations of the principal theme (...). It is astonishing that the NMA offers no annotation to this passage, in the score or in the critical report. 64

Some reflections of another Mozart expert, Alfred Brendel, are found in his book:

Even a composer like Mozart could make a mistake. Artur Schnabel’s precept that the performer must accept the whims of great composers though he may be quite unable to fathom them must not be allowed to go so far that errors remain unrectified. Schnabel himself provided some examples of reverential blindness, as when, for example, in the middle movement of the Concerto in C minor K.491, he played a bar, with wind accompaniment, precisely as

---

64 Ibid.
Mozart inadvertently let it stand. Here, as in one bar of the finale of K.503, Mozart apparently wrote the piano part first and then, when writing in the orchestral parts, changed his mind about the harmony. In doing so he forgot to adjust the piano part to the new harmonic situation. The result is cacophony and a divergence in the leading of the bass line that is unthinkable in Mozart. If the player, in rare instances, plus Mozart's text right, it does not mean that he promises himself to be equal, or indeed superior, to Mozart.

Artur Schnabel, mentioned above, is obviously not the only pianist adhering firmly to what is found in the manuscript and printed text. Conflicting harmonies can be heard in approximately one half of all examined recordings.

As already indicated by some writers, the solution to this problem lies in adapting the orchestral part by the soloist. This is apparent in most of the remaining recordings (those where performers have decided to alter Mozart's text) as well as in two slightly different recommendations found in print, one by Anda, another one by Zacharias in the form of a suggested alternative version in the 1993 Peters edition.

---

65 Measure 60 of the last movement of Mozart's Piano Concerto in C major, K.503.
67 Bachauer, Badridze, Badura-Skoda / VSO / Prohaska, Barenboim / ECO, Biro, Ciccarelli, de Lara-rocha, Firkusny, Fischer (both recordings), Gieseking, Gould (both recordings), Han, Haskil, Immerseel, Kempff, Kolessa, Kraus, Kwok, Mamou, Moravec, Osetinskaya, Schilhawsky, Schnabel (both recordings), Peter Serkin, Tabe, Then-Bergh, Tepperzger, Zacharias (recording of 1986), among others.
68 Anda, Ashkenazy, Badura-Skoda / SdNR / Boettcher, Barenboim / BP, Bilson, Brendel (both recordings), Casadesus (both recordings), Curzon, Frank, Goode, Istomin, Jandó, Long, Matthews, Naoumoff, O'Connor, Perahia, Rubinstein, Schiff, Rudolf Serkin, Shelley, Uchida, among others.
69 Anda, Kadenzen, p. 39.
70 Peters (ed. Wolff/Zacharias), p. 44.
There may be some other solutions. Since the solo part, as it appears in the autograph, conflicts only with the bassoon, and is fully compatible with the oboe and both clarinets, adjustments to the bassoon part should remain as suitable as changes to the piano part. Only in two recordings have the pianists played the original text while the bassoonists substituted their part with the lowest voice of the piano.\textsuperscript{71} Another alternative suggestion, providing rests for the soloist in bars 40 and 42, is offered in the most recent edition of Peters:

\begin{quote}
Noch besser scheint allerdings, in Takt 40 und 42 die Bläser alleine spielen zu lassen, so ergibt sich echter Dialog.
\end{quote}

[Perhaps a better solution would be to have the winds play alone in measures 40 und (sic!) 42, thereby producing a genuine dialogue].\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{71} Bashkirov / USSR SRO / Gauk, and Previn / LSO / Boult.

\textsuperscript{72} Zacharias, Notes on Performance, pp.85-86.
This solution is also adopted in one recording,\textsuperscript{73} which dates two years prior to the Peters edition.

Selected fragments of Mozart's Piano Concerto in C minor discussed in this chapter do not by any means constitute a complete list of problematic spots encountered throughout the course of examining the manuscript. They are intended to illustrate the circumstances under which some editorial decisions have been made. This may help pianists to realize their options when performing this concerto.

\textsuperscript{73} Pletnev / DK.
Chapter 2

Shorthand methods and incomplete notation
in the Mozart Piano Concerto in C minor

Besides the editorial issues similar to those selected and discussed in the previous chapter, the Piano Concerto in C minor is not free of troubles related to shorthand methods and incomplete notation. These types of problems in Mozart’s concerti have been commonly acknowledged in recent years. In its broadest spectrum “incompleteness” may refer to the lack of arpeggio signs, ornament realizations, articulation markings, dynamic indications, and the like. But the problems become more serious when “the very notes to be played” are not found in the score. And this is not limited just to missing cadenzas.

Before concentrating on the cases where additional notes are demanded, let us begin with examples of Mozart’s shorthand which do not cause such difficulties for editors or performers. The composer, in order not to waste time when writing identical material more than once, made use of abbreviation and symbol systems. For instance, the annotation inf. appearing in his autograph on the second stave indicates that the second violins should double the firsts. The colB sign (which stands for col Basso), written either in the pianoforte’s left-hand part or in the bassoon parts, means these instruments double the string basses.
The use of other symbols made it possible for Mozart to avoid rewriting the nineteen-measure orchestral fragment which appears first at the end of the ritornello section and later is inserted in exactly the same shape between cadenza and coda.

Mozart, like other composers, also uses the abridging method indicated by a double-slash sign (\(\ll\)), or a single- or double-slash with dots on both sides (\(\ll\)), \(\ll\)) when the same material is subsequently employed several times in a row. Repeated Alberti bass figures in measures 32-33 of the second movement are a good example.

---

74 Because of the annotation colB in the pianoforte's left hand part most editors in recent years feel under obligation to copy the entire string bass part into the pianist's left hand whenever its stave is empty. In some editions a copied basso continuo appears in small print to make a distinction between the left-hand notes actually written and the ones taken from the bass line.

75 First movement, measures 82-98.

76 First movement, measures 492-508.
Such abbreviations are usually noncontroversial. They leave no doubt regarding the composer’s intentions, at least when only rhythm and pitches are taken into consideration.

One may think of ornamentation symbols, such as trills and turns, as another form of the shorthand commonly used. Although pitches are exactly determined (doubts may occasionally refer to accidentals only), performers may quite often have more freedom with respect to the rhythm. To exemplify this let us present various performance versions of measure 25 of the second movement. Careful listeners may find no fewer than eleven different realizations of the turn. Examples are given on the next page.

77 The meaning of the *basso continuo* and its implication for the performer is the only exception.
Example 56

K 491, SECOND MOVEMENT, MEASURE 25, RIGHT-HAND PART,
TRANSCRIPTIONS FROM VARIOUS RECORDINGS *

(A) Han, Peter Serkin; (B) Naoumoff, Osetinskaya, Pletnev, Rudolf Serkin;
(C) Shelley; (D) Rubinstein; (E) Previn; (F) Ashkenazy, Casadesus (both recordings);
(G) Badura-Skoda / SdNR / Boettcher, de Larrocha, Goode (between G and H); Kempff, Mamou, Moravec, Perahia;
(H) Barenboim / ECO, Brendel (both recordings), Curzon, Firkusny, Haskil, Jandó,
Kwok, Long, Schiff, Tabe, Topperzcer, Uchida;
(I) Badridze, Badura-Skoda / VSO / Prohaska, Bachauer, Bilson, Ciccarelli, Fischer / LPO / Collingwood, Gieseking, Gould (both recordings), Istomin, Kolessa, Kraus,
O’Connor, Schnabel (both recordings), Then-Bergh, Zacharias;
(J) Fischer / RDO; (K) Immerseel, Schilhawsky.
It must be said that two different readings of the manuscript found in editions have contributed to this enormously large number of performance versions. Some editions\textsuperscript{78} print a dotted eighth note and two thirty seconds on the first beat, while others\textsuperscript{79} suggest a regular eighth note and two sixteenths. The manuscript does not give a definite answer. Also the placement of the turn sign in various editions, over the first or between the first two melodic notes, is noteworthy.

\textbf{Example 57}  
\textbf{K 491, SECOND MOVEMENT, MEASURE 25, PIANO PART, MS, FOLIO 20R, BAR 3, STAVES 13-14}

\textbf{Example 58}  
\textbf{K 491, SECOND MOVEMENT, MEASURE 25, PIANO PART, NMA AND OTHER EDITIONS}


\textsuperscript{79} André; Lebert; B&H (AMA); Broude Bros., p. 37; Kalmus, p. 37 (157); Wiener Phil. Verlag, p. 77; Dover, p. 91.
While the realization of ornaments allowing for more than one rhythmic solution may cause some questions to arise, cases in which the notated text seems to be incomplete constitute a bigger problem. Such cases have been found in the C minor concerto and will be discussed next.

"Incompleteness" manifests itself in various ways and several writers have made an attempt to develop what may be called a "classification system." Alfred Brendel offers this to say:

Mozart’s notation is not complete. (…) the very notes to be played - at any rate in the later works that were not made ready for the engraver - require piecing out at times: by filling (when Mozart’s manuscript is limited to sketchy indications); by variants (when relatively simple themes return several times without Mozart varying them himself); by embellishments (when the player is entrusted with a melodic outline to decorate); by re-entry fermatas (which are on the dominant and must be connected to the subsequent tonic); and by cadenzas (which lead from the six-four chord in quasi-improvisational fashion to the concluding tutti).80

Eva Badura-Skoda writes of additional notes in Mozart’s piano concerti:

We may distinguish three kinds of added notes or embellishments: Those which are necessary, those which are permissible and a matter of taste, and those which are wrong musically and stylistically.81

---

The most common understanding among performers of this concerto is that not only the cadenza on the six-four chord in bar 486 of the first movement must be supplemented, but also "re-entry fermatas" (Eingänge) in bars 15 and 73 of the slow movement and in bars 219-220 of the Finale. Neither long cadenzas nor shorter fermata embellishments will be discussed in this study; however, comprehensive lists of available cadenzas and Eingänge, both in print and in record, are provided in Appendix A (see Tables 5, 6, and 7, pages 140-50). Also, two original cadenzas to the first movement by the current writer appear in Appendix B (see pages 151-61).

Sketchy indications can be considered either in the "necessary" category or in the "permissible" category. Such incomplete fragments, "necessary" in the opinion of this author, will be discussed in detail later in Chapters 3, 4, and 5.

Chapter 3 deals with the fragment for which most editors offer a solution: the left-hand part in the fifth variation of the third movement. This is perhaps the least controversial of cases, and differs from others in that there seem to be only a few suitable solutions. On the other hand, leaps found in the right-hand part of measures 261-62 and measures 467-70, first movement, treated in Chapters 4 and 5, were not recognized earlier by editors as places to be filled in. Probably this occurred because the solutions were not as obvious as in Chapter 3.

---


82 No cadenza by Mozart is known for this concerto.
When recent editors offered solutions, they made them in the form of suggestions (*ossia* measures or footnotes).

Other presumably sketchy fragments which are less frequently acknowledged as well as different variants of recurring themes and embellishments of simpler melodic lines (particularly in the second movement) should fall into the “permissible but not necessary” category. They will be presented in the remaining part of this chapter.

There are some passages in the third movement which may suggest sketchy notation: measures 191, 198 (both concerning broken octaves in the right-hand part), and measures 245-47 (concerning broken thirds in the left-hand part). Here is bar 191 in the context of surrounding measures:

![Example 60](image)

In Robert Levin’s opinion Mozart “must have broken the octaves in performance.”83 It seems highly unlikely that he “desired to move abruptly from a single filigreed line to a measure of slower octaves followed by a resumption of the single line.”84 Thus those who believe that the sixteenth-note motion should be continued will play broken octaves, as illustrated in the next example.

---

84 Ibid.
Example 61  K 491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURE 191, RIGHT-HAND PART, BROKEN OCTAVES SUGGESTED BY LEVIN

There is a similar situation in bar 198 and, according to Levin, this time the octaves can be broken from both directions.85

Example 62  K 491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURES 197-200, PIANO PART, ALL EDITIONS

Example 63  K 491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURE 198, RIGHT-HAND PART, BROKEN OCTAVES SUGGESTED BY LEVIN (2 VERSIONS)

Finally, there follow examples (on the next pages) and a quotation concerning whether or not the thirds in the left hand in measures 245-47 should be broken (the same passage is repeated in measures 262-64). Levin has this to say:

85 Ibid., pp. 42, 46.
The bass line of the piano part doubles the bassi, but the bassi have a repeated g (quarter-eighth) at the end of 245/262 whereas the piano has a dotted quarter; at 246/263 the left hand has a quarter whereas the bassi have two eighths (...). The broken thirds in the left hand immediately preceding this passage (241-44; 258-61) are notated. The figure on the downbeat of 242 and 244 (259, 261) cannot be rendered in shorthand. The thirds are no longer broken from 245/262—where notation no longer impedes the use of shorthand. Furthermore, Mozart resorts to shorthand for the notation of the right-hand octaves at this very spot. I submit that the left-hand thirds should be broken until the downbeat of 248/265 (...). No edition takes these problems into account.  

86 Ibid., pp.42-43.
Example 64

K 491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURES 241-49 (238-66), PIANO AND STRINGS,
ALL EDITIONS

241

Pf.

Vi. I

Vi. II

Ve.

Vc. e B.

245
Example 65  K 491. THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURES 241-49 (258-66), PIANO PART,
BROKEN THIRDS SUGGESTED BY LEVIN

241

244

247
Chapter 3

The case of the left-hand part in the fifth variation, third movement

Examples of sketchy notation can be found in the fifth variation of the last movement. In most editions the left-hand part in measures 142-44, 155-56, and 159-62 differs significantly from the manuscript. Bars 145, 157, and 163, on the other hand, appear exactly as Mozart has written them in all editions, but not all performers and editors believe this is the final performance version either.

First we will examine the left-hand part content of bars 142-44 and 145. Because surrounding measures may give a clue regarding composer's intentions, here is a larger fragment (the whole repeated section A of the fifth variation) of what Mozart wrote:

Example 66  K 491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURES 137-39, PIANO AND STRING BASSES
MS, FOLIO 30V, BARS 4-6, STAVES 14-16
Example 67  
K 491, Third Movement, Measures 140-41, Piano and String Basses  
MS, Folio 30v, Bars 7-8, Staves 14-16

Example 68  
K 491, Third Movement, Measures 142-46, Piano and String Basses  
MS, Folio 31r, Bars 1-5, Staves 14-16
The left-hand part (the middle stave of the previous example) appears in its original shape, faithful to the manuscript, only in the first edition of this concerto published around 1800 by J. André of Offenbach.\textsuperscript{87}

\textsuperscript{87} References in Schirmer (ed. Bischoff), p. 45, n. 19, and in Redlich (see the next note and quotations later in this chapter).
Example 70  K 491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURES 141-46, LEFT-HAND PART, André, ca. 1800

Starting with the Breitkopf & Härtel edition of 1802, all subsequent editors (with one exception\textsuperscript{88}) believe the left-hand passage in bars 142-44 represents only a sketch and as such requires completion. Some of them—in addition to filling these leaps with ascending scales in sixteenth notes as Mozart has done in the preceding measure (see examples on next pages)—make the reader aware of these changes and discuss the issue further either in footnotes or prefaces.

Hans Bischoff annotates bar 144 with the following comment:

The last three measures of the bass passage are merely sketched in the original MS:

\[\text{\textcopyright} \] etc.

This notation is evidently an abbreviation for the scales; it is copied literally only in the old André edition of the piano-part.\textsuperscript{89}

Fischer and Soldan write in bar 142:

Die nächsten drei Takte, sowie Takt 155/156 und 159/162 hat Mozart die Läufe der linken Hand nur durch die äußeren Oktaven skizziert, sodass zum Teil andere Versetzungszeichen auch denkbar wären.\textsuperscript{90} [In the next three measures, as well as in bars 155/156 and 159/162]

\textsuperscript{88} Edition of Hans F. Redlich prepared for Boosey & Hawkes; see also note 101 on page 60.


\textsuperscript{90} Peters (ed. Fischer/Soldan), p. 44, n.*.
Mozart sketched the runs of the left hand using only the outer notes of the octaves, thus different accidentals were also possible in this section.\(^91\)

Bar 141 in the Russian edition prepared by Dmitri Bashkirov has the following annotation:

\[\text{Zdes' v nekatoryh gammah avtorom vypisana lish' pervaya i poslednaya noty.}^{92}\]

[Here the composer wrote just the first and the last notes of some scales.]\(^93\)

Hermann Beck, the editor of the NMA, refers in a footnote to his preface:

\[\text{Zur abgekürztten Schreibform des Originals für die linke Hand Takt 142-144, 155-156, 159-162 vgl. Vorwort.}^{94}\]

[On the abbreviated form of the left hand part of the original at bars 142-144, 155-156 and 159-162 cf. Preface.]

There are actually two different prefaces. The one in the full score edition of 1959 includes the following:

\[\text{Here (...) the left hand is merely sketched in crocet leaps. It is obvious however that Mozart did not fill this out because the preceding bars make it clear in each case that the rising scales must be continued. It was therefore unnecessary to give this in small print.}^{95}\]

A portion from the other one (two-piano score of 1964) expresses with different words a similar degree of certainty regarding a need for fill-ins in this spot:

---

\(^{91}\) Translation by the author.


\(^{93}\) Translation by the author.


\(^{95}\) Bärenreiter (ed. Beck), 1959, p. vi.
At bars 142-144, 155-156/i, 2 and 159-162 of the last movement which Mozart left in sketch form (though there can be absolutely no doubt how these octave quaver (sic!)\textsuperscript{96} leaps \[E^\flat-e^\flat, F-f, \text{etc.}\] are to be performed) rising semiquaver scale figures have been tacitly supplied.\textsuperscript{97}

Words of Denis Matthews in his “Critical Introduction” preceding the pages of the autograph facsimile edition seem to be more careful:

The l.h. crotchets in the solo part are presumably shorthand for the scale-pattern of the previous bar.\textsuperscript{98}

However neither he nor any other pianist whose recordings are taken into account here dares to play those quarter notes unaltered. Continuation of the ascending scale-pattern seems to be the obvious solution for almost everybody.

Here are two examples of filling these measures with scales:

\begin{verbatim}
\textbf{Example 71} K 491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURES 141-46, LEFT-HAND PART
\textbf{B&H (AMA) *}

\textbf{141}
\[\text{\ldots}\]

\textbf{143 cont'd}
\[\text{\ldots}\]
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{*)} This version is strictly followed in the Blume edition published by Eulenberg, not to mention the editions of Wiener Philharmoniker Verlag, Broude Brothers, Kalmus, and Dover, always closely related to the AMA.

\textsuperscript{96} Should be \textit{crotchet} instead of \textit{quaver}; an error in English translation. The original German text refers to \textit{Vierteloktaußprünge}.

\textsuperscript{97} Bärenreiter (ed. Beck), 1964, pp.v-vi.

\textsuperscript{98} Matthews, Introduction (1977), n.p.
Example 72

K. 491. THIRD MOVEMENT. MEASURES 141-46, LEFT-HAND PART
SCHIRMER (ed. BISCHOFF) **

**  This is followed by most subsequent editions including Rehberg's, Puchel's, both published by Peters, and the NMA. Accidental not found in the MS appear in brackets (NMA) or in small print (Wolff/Zacharias).

Differences between these two examples rely on various usages of harmonic, melodic, Dorian or Aeolian modes of the g-minor scale. This applies not only to newly generated figures in the second half of bar 143 and in the whole bar 144 (the first three additional scales beginning with $E_b$, $F$ and $G$ do not constitute any problem in that respect), but also to passages already written out by Mozart in unabbreviated form. Both editors assume there are missing accidentals (as many as three of them) in measure 146 in the scale spelled out by the composer. While we may be almost sure about the $A^\#$ (the Phrygian scale could not have been intended by Mozart), the $f^\#$ and particularly the $e^\#$, overwhelmingly present in editions and recordings\(^{99}\) and reflecting preference for the Dorian over the Aeolian or harmonic modes, are perhaps not as certain as usual choices would suggest. On the other hand accidental inserted in bar 141 (3 of them in the AMA, 4 in the Bischoff's edition) serve as reminders (the G major scale in the preceding measure includes as many as four chromatically altered notes: $f^\#$,

\(^{99}\) The later recording of Badura-Skoda is an exception here.
$e^b$, $B^b$, and $A^b$) and do not need to be discussed here since their presence or their lack make no difference to actual pitches.

This fragment in the Bashkirov edition is based on the AMA; however, additional accidentals in parenthesis appear above the first two notes of the last group in measure 143: a natural sign over the $e$ and a sharp sign over the $f$. While the correction of the second note should be most welcomed (lack of a sharp sign before the $f$ is a clear error on the side of the AMA editors because of its harmonic implications), a suggestion for $e^b$ rather surprises because of its harmonic incompatibility. The harmony is based on the diminished chord: $f^\#$, $a$, $c$, and $e^b$, so the scale with one-and-a-half tones between $e^b$ and $f^\#$ is desired. Such a g-minor harmonic scale appears in Bischoff’s and most of the subsequent editions and seems to be the only acceptable option.

The next two scales—starting with $B^b$ and $c$—in the following measure allow for more freedom. If we agree that three notes have the potential for being chromatically altered, there may be as many as eight different versions of bar 144. Bischoff points out two of them:

The scale beginning on $c$ is usually given as in our text, but the variants $f^\#$ for $f$, and $b$ for $b^b$ are also occur. They are not wrong. The autograph permits no final decision.\textsuperscript{100}

The $e^b$ of this scale cannot be raised due to the c-minor harmony of the right-hand part and strings. However the $e$ in the preceding scale running from $B^b$ to $b^b$ qualifies for being lowered (while the fifth note $f^\#$ as a leading tone for

\textsuperscript{100} Schirmer (ed. Bischoff), p.45, n.19.
g minor probably should not be changed to $f$). The following example and table will show different possible variants of this measure:

**Example 73**

K 491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURE 144.
LEFT-HAND PART FILLED WITH SCALES (NOTES WITH ASTERISK CAN BE ALTERED)

---

*) $e^\sharp$ or $e^b$

**) $f^\sharp$ or $f^4$

***) $b^\sharp$ or $b^4$

---

**Table 1. Different variants of measure 144, third movement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant #:</th>
<th>4th note:</th>
<th>12th note:</th>
<th>15th note:</th>
<th>Editions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$e_4$</td>
<td>$f_4$</td>
<td>$b_5$</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$e_5$</td>
<td>$f_5$</td>
<td>$b_5$</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$e_6$</td>
<td>$f_6$</td>
<td>$b_5$</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$e_7$</td>
<td>$f_7$</td>
<td>$b_5$</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.         | $e_8$     | $f_8$      | $b_5$      | Schirmer (ed. Bischoff)
               |            |            |            | Steingräber (ed. Rehberg) |
               |            |            |            | Peters (ed. Fischer/Soldan) |
               |            |            |            | Bärenreiter (ed. Beck) |
               |            |            |            | B&C & H (ed. Puchelt) |
               |            |            |            | Peters (ed. Wolff/Zacharias) |
| 6.         | $e_9$     | $f_9$      | $b_5$      | —         |
| 7.         | $e_10$    | $f_10$     | $b_5$      | B&C & H (AMA) |
               |            |            |            | Wiener Phil. Verlag |
               |            |            |            | Eulenburg (ed. Blume) |
               |            |            |            | Broude Bros. |
               |            |            |            | Kalmus |
               |            |            |            | Dover |
               |            |            |            | «Muzyka» (ed. Bashkirov) |
| 8.         | $e_11$    | $f_11$     | $b_5$      | —         |

Despite many possibilities for different variants of scales in measure 144 (quite contrary when compared with the limitations of the two preceding bars) only
variants #5 and #7 are adapted in editions. Most performers—some of them probably unaware of the nature of the problem—follow one of the printed sources.

Filling with scales does not necessary have to be the only solution to the problem of sketchy octave leaps in measures 142-44. Fortepianist Jos van Immerseel presents a quite exceptional concept of filling the left-hand part with arpeggios instead of scales. His eighth-note figuration, without doubt technically much less difficult for the performer, corresponds well with the eighth-note octaves of unchanged measure 145; however, the preceding scales (measures 140-41) originally spelled out in sixteenths by Mozart are also altered.

Example 74  
K 491, third movement, measures 140-46, left-hand part  
transcription from the recording of Jos van Immerseel

*) The second note from the end of measure 144 can be the g or the a (g is more likely). The recording is not very clear.

While Immerseel’s version may be controversial because it involves changes of what seems to be completed in Mozart’s autograph, Hans F. Redlich’s opinion in favor of leaving the discussed fragment unaltered (presumably not only in editions, but also in performances) should absolutely be rejected on grounds of lack of both logic and good musical taste. In the preface to his edition of this concerto, where—in the editor’s own strong words—restoration of “original text
after more than 140 years of deliberately garbled versions"¹⁰² was his main task, he writes:

It is the only faithful reprint of Mozart's score (...), the only extant edition (...) printing the unadulterated solo part in Movement III, bars 142/45 and 155/62. The very next edition of K.491, by Breitkopf and Härtel, Leipzig, No. 7, 1802, contains already a great number of falsifications of the original text. (...) The garbled passages in Movement III, indicated above, appear here for the first and, unfortunately, not the last time. From now on André's faithful edition seems to sink into oblivion and Breitkopf and Härtel's anonymous editors rule the field.¹⁰³

In the footnote further accusations are targeted against other editors:

H. Bischoff and others with him believed that Mozart's notation of these bars represented only a mere sketch and that his real intention had been to fill in the left hand stave with runs. But the MS. belies these assumptions. Mozart uses as abridgements exclusively the sign ' or "col Basso". Solo passages are never sketched, but always meticulously written out. Not a single case of a deliberately abridged solo passage can be traced in this work, therefore no editor has the right to substitute runs for octave leaps, as in the case of bars 142/45 and 155/62 of Movement III. The fact that the crotchet octave leaps close organically into quaver leaps in bar 145, left hand stave, is their best certification.¹⁰⁴

To say that the manuscript discredits the assumptions of sketchy notation reflects the false view that all the composer's intentions are always to be found in written completed form in the autograph. Further statements—for instance that

¹⁰¹ His preface and critical annotations to a new and completely revised edition, based on the original manuscript, were published in The Music Review (9/1948: pp. 87-96). However the edition itself, prepared for Boosey & Hawkes, was not available for examination despite of numerous attempts to trace a copy. The only proof of its existence could be found in the book of Eva and Paul Badura-Skoda Interpreting Mozart on the Keyboard.


¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 89.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.
Mozart's solo passages "are never sketched"—are simply not true. The "quaver leaps in bar 145" will be discussed later in this chapter.

Redlich's extensive critical annotations carry further on this topic:

Bars 142/144, and later on bars 155/62, represent in current editions perhaps the most flagrant violation of Mozart's original intentions quite unmistakably expressed in the MS. and faithfully reproduced in this edition. H. Bischoff—op. cit., page 39, footnote 19—believes that the bass passage

\[\text{music notation}\] etc.

is only a sketch and an abridgement for elaborate scale passages which he works out thus:

\[\text{music notation}\]

But he himself admits that the piano part of André's first edition of 1800 has remained faithful to the MS. It appears that only since Breitkopf and Härtel's edition of 1802 has the version, championed by him and widely reprinted in current editions, become the generally accepted one. The condition of Mozart's MS. does not justify in the least Bischoff's theory. The thematic authenticity of the original bass figure

\[\text{music notation}\]

of bars 142 ff. (left hand stave) can best be proved by its logical thematic diminution in bar 145

\[\text{music notation}\]

which not even Bischoff has dared to convert into a scale passage.\(^{105}\)

We certainly may say that the condition of the manuscript does not justify Redlich's point of view either. (Mozart has left no instructions requiring that measures 142-44 be literally followed.) The current writer's disagreement with

\(^{105}\) Ibid., p. 94.
the opinions quoted above does not have much to do with the manuscript con-
tent itself, certainly not with the editor’s praiseworthy wishes to stay closely to 
the original source. Rather, it is that discussing this problem extensively without 
the context of at least one preceding measure (the one with running scales, 
found in the very same manuscript) must be treated as a clear misunderstanding 
and, yes, a total misreading of the composer’s intentions. The fact that this mea-
ure, constituting the integrated part of the same phrase, is written on another 
leaf should not prevent anybody from taking it into consideration. Also it is not 
very clear what this editor has in mind when writing of “thematic authenticity” 
of the quarter-note leaps. No significant relations with any of the themes of 
either movement have been found.

While the quarter-note octave leaps in bars 142-44 (and in corresponding 
measures) are an obvious indication of Mozart’s shorthand for everyone but 
Redlich, similar octave figures—this time in eighth notes—in bar 145 (and com-
parable bars 157 and 163 as well) have remained unchanged in all editions of the 
nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century. For the last four decades, 
however, some editors\textsuperscript{106} and also some pianists\textsuperscript{107} have questioned the text in 
this measure too. They have doubted it appears in the manuscript and previous 
editions in its final form.

\textsuperscript{106} Beck, Puchelt, Wolff/Zacharias.

\textsuperscript{107} Badura-Skoda (in his second recording), Bilson, and Rudolf Serkin.
Perhaps Mozart wished to avoid giving the impression of consecutive fifths (which however is also present in bars 67/68) and therefore left the player to decide whether to elaborate the passage or not. Be this as it may, the editor has given, in small print, an alternative version in broken semiquaver chords.  

It is (...) by no means clear whether the left hand octave leaps in quavers at bars 145, 157 and 163 of the last movement (which the editor has completed as broken chords in semiquavers by analogy with neighbouring bars and indicated with small type and on a separate stave) were also meant by Mozart to remain only a sketch.

Similarly the quaver octaves in the l.h. may be considered as shorthand for arpeggios or other semiquaver figures. See also 32r bar 3.

Rather than scales, some other figuration would be appropriate in order to fill in these octaves. A continuation of sixteenth-note motion is the most desired (thirty-seconds are obviously out of question), thus there is no space for more than four notes in each group. Broken chords—such as the ones suggested in small print as Ausführungsvorschlag in the following editions—may be an acceptable option.

Example 75  

K 491, third movement, measures 145-46, left-hand part, Bärenreiter (ed. Beck)
Beck (and Puchelt who has copied the NMA version in his edition) successfully avoids the impression of parallel fifths, contrary to the Wolff/Zacharias suggestion; however, this passage is somehow pianistically awkward. Perhaps a better solution—illustrated in the next two examples—is to play what may be called a combination of broken octaves with mordents. This type of figuration, used also by Mozart in the first movement, measures 435-43, can be found in the later stereophonic recording of Paul Badura-Skoda (dating approximately from the same time as the Beck's edition of this concerto) as well as in the recording of Malcolm Bilson.
Both artists play identical notes in measure 145 (bar 146 is given here to illustrate chromatic alterations discussed earlier) and one may wonder if Bilson had known Badura-Skoda’s performance before he made his own recording. Getting the same result does not necessary have to mean that what comes later is always based on its earlier source. Identical outcome achieved independently is quite possible.

A further option for figuring this passage in sixteenth notes may be various combinations of the broken-octave/mordent groups with the broken chords, such as in this example taken from the recording of Rudolf Serkin.

*Example 80*  
K 491, Third Movement, Measures 145-46, Left-Hand Part,  
Transcription from the Recording of Rudolf Serkin

*) Due to the quality of this recording it is unclear if the last group in measure 145 should be as written here or if it is the same as the first group.

Up to this point our presentation of the issue of sketchy notation in the fifth variation—with a few exceptions regarding quotations—has been focused on section A of this variation, which includes measures 141-46. Very similar problems may be found in section B as well. Again the manuscript and its transcription into printed notation will be a starting point for this presentation.
EXAMPLE 81
K.491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURES 155-57, PIANO AND STRING BASSES,
MS, FOLIO 31v, BARS 4-6, STAVES 14-16

EXAMPLE 82
K.491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURES 158-60, PIANO AND STRING BASSES,
MS, FOLIO 31v, BARS 7-9, STAVES 14-16

EXAMPLE 83
K.491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURES 161-64, PIANO AND STRING BASSES,
MS, FOLIO 32r, BARS 1-4, STAVES 14-16
The problem of sketchy quarter notes in the left-hand part is evident in bars 155, the first half of 156, and 159-62. Again the first edition of André will be the only one (besides Redlich's attempts to "purify" this text) which literally follows the manuscript.
Roubier\textsuperscript{113} and Ruthardt\textsuperscript{114} fill in with scales in measures 159-62, but bars 155-56 are left unchanged.

Other editions suggest alterations with scales for both quarter-note sketchy segments. They rarely make annotations regarding these changes. In bars 155 and 159 the NMA directs the reader to corresponding parts in measures 142-44, and consequently to the Preface (see quotations on page 54-55). Bashkirov annotates only measure 159 and refers to his footnote on a preceding page. Bischoff is more detailed in his explanation and also touches on the problem of presumed accidentals:

\textsuperscript{113} Richault (ed. Roubier), p. 79.
\textsuperscript{114} Peters (ed. Ruthardt), pp. 166-67.
In this section, too, nearly all the half-measure scales were indicated by the composer in the manner explained in Note 19. Many editions take this abbreviation literally in some or all passages. As to the chromatic signs in these scales, nothing can be ascertained from the autograph. At the place marked by this Note (24) one might also read $e^b f$, which certainly weakens the expression; some editors carry the scale beginning on $f$ through $e^f$ instead of $e^b$; other deviations are not worthy of mention.

Here are some examples of elaborating bars 155-56 and 159-62 with scales:

---

115 See quotation on page 53.
116 Measure 156, beginning.
Again they differ between each other mainly in various applications of accidentals, which are either used as reminders or submitted based on the assumption that Mozart has overlooked them.\(^{118}\) (Other differences relate to articulation marks, not found in the manuscript, beaming of eighth notes in bar 157, and usage of different clefs in bar 163.) Only measures 156 and 162 vary with respect to their pitches. The scale beginning with G in bar 156 may be a regular g-major scale with e\(^{b}\) and f\(^{b}\) (as suggested by Bischoff, Rehberg, Beck, Puchelt, and Wolff/Zacharias) or a c-minor Dorian with e\(^{b}\) and f\(^{b}\) (as preferred by AMA editor(s), Blume, Fischer/Soldan, and Bashkirov). In bar 162 not only the second note from the end (e\(^{b}\) in some editions\(^{119}\) or e\(^{b}\) in the others\(^{120}\)) has a potential

---

\(^{118}\) As many as five accidentals are missing in the autograph: a natural sign before b (the second note) in bar 155, naturals before F and f of the last group in bar 156, a natural before the last B in bar 157, and again a natural before B in the following measure; both editions make appropriate adjustments.


of being chromatically altered. Despite Bischoff’s opinion quoted above\textsuperscript{121} these possibilities are worth exploring. As in measure 144, discussed in detail earlier (see Ex. 73 on page 58), there may be eight different variants of this measure as well. And again only two are used in editions (#5 and #6 from the table).

Example 89

\textbf{K 491, THIRD MOVEMENT, MEASURE 162,}

\textbf{LEFT-HAND PART FILLED WITH SCALES (NOTES WITH ASTERISKS CAN BE ALTERED)}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\hline
162 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

*) $a^5$ or $a^b$

**) $b^5$ or $b^b$

***) $c^*$ or $c^*$

\textbf{Table 2. Different variants of measure 162, third movement}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant #</th>
<th>4th note</th>
<th>12th note</th>
<th>15th note</th>
<th>Editions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$a_5$</td>
<td>$b_5$</td>
<td>$e_5$</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$a_5$</td>
<td>$b_5$</td>
<td>$e_5$</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$a_5$</td>
<td>$b_5$</td>
<td>$e_5$</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$a_5$</td>
<td>$b_5$</td>
<td>$e_5$</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>$a_5$</td>
<td>$b_5$</td>
<td>$e_5$</td>
<td>Schirmer (ed. Bischoff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steingraber (ed. Rehberg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bärenreiter (ed. Beck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B&amp;H (ed. Puchelt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peters (ed. Wolff/Zacharias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>$a_5$</td>
<td>$b_5$</td>
<td>$e_5$</td>
<td>B&amp;H (AMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wiener Phil. Verlag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eulenburg (ed. Blume)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peters (ed. Fischer/Soldan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broude Bros.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kalmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>«Muzyka» (ed. Bashkirtov)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{121} See page 69.
Table 2. Different variants of measure 162, third movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant #</th>
<th>4th note:</th>
<th>12th note:</th>
<th>15th note:</th>
<th>Editions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>$a_1$</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>$e_2$</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>$a_2$</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>$e_2'$</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Immerseel's concept of filling in these measures is again unusual. This time he plays the sixteenth-note scales in bars 155-56, but goes back to his unique way of treating these leaps in measures 159-162. Actually this type of figuration based on broken chords in eighths starts half a measure earlier and again involves some alterations of Mozart's "completed" text. Also the very last measure of this variation is changed: while the idea of an ascending and a descending c minor arpeggio remains the same, the compass from $c$ to $e_7^b$ is extended upwards to $c''$ and sixteenth notes are in groups of sixths instead of fourths.

Example 90  
K 491, Third movement, measures 155-64, left-hand part, transcription from the recording of Jos van Immerseel

There are two measures (157 and 163) similar to bar 145, where the eighth-note leaps presumably can be altered. Bar 157 appears with the small print suggestions in the same editions.\textsuperscript{122}

Badura-Skoda's and Bilson's versions are only slightly different than the one suggested by the Wolff/Zacharias edition. This time the figuration is based on broken arpeggios probably because of the last group of the preceding measure, specifically indicated and spelled out by the composer (in bar 163 they return to what may be called a broken-octave/mordent figuration). Serkin, on the other hand, consistently uses a combination of both.
The elaborated version of bar 163 is found only in Beck’s and Puchelt’s editions.123

Wolff and Zacharias annotate this measure with a footnote ("Ausführung analog Takt 157/Execution analog measure 157")124. We may assume they intended something similar to the following example:

---

Badura-Skoda, Bilson and Serkin elaborate in the same manner as in measure 145.

**Example 99**  
*K 491, Third Movement, measures 163-64, left-hand part.  
transcription from the later stereophonic recording of Paul Badura-Skoda and the recording of Malcolm Bilson*

**Example 100**  
*K 491, Third Movement, measures 163-64, left-hand part.  
transcription from the recording of Rudolf Serkin*

*) The second note may be g' (as written here) or d'. Single notes cannot be distinguished in this recording.
Chapter 4

Solutions for completion of the right-hand part
in measures 261-62, first movement

There are two places in the first movement where the right-hand part is believed to be sketchy by many pianists and some editors. Both fragments must be considered in conjunction with the preceding measures, since the sixteenth-note figuration present there may again give us some clue. What is interesting is that both occurrences of (presumably) unreasonable interruption of the sixteenth-note flow in the right-hand part happen to appear just before the cadential trill concluding larger sections: the solo exposition in the first instance, and the recapitulation in the second.

The next two pages contain a portion of the manuscript including both measures in question as well as its transcription to a printed notation:
Example 101
K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 257-65, FULL SCORE
MS, FOLIO 9V, BARS 5-13, STAVES 1-16
Example 102  
K. 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 257-65, FULL SCORE, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE MS

Cor. I, II

Pf.

VI. I

VI. II

Ve.

Vc. e B.

257

260
One might get an impression that a decision about the final shape of bars 261-62 has not been made and might wonder why. There can be several reasons. In the opinion of the editor of the NMA "in (...) transitions from solo to tutti—first movement bars 261, 262 and 467-470—Mozart has not elaborated his sketch of the solo part at all, in order to leave himself an entirely free hand"\textsuperscript{125} (to improvise during his performances). A desire for improvisation in such passages is only one of several possible reasons the composer has written two dotted half notes; examination of the autograph may give another explanation.

It is a good observation that "there was hardly room to continue the scale-passages in these two bars."\textsuperscript{126} We clearly see that the distance between bar lines, apparently drawn earlier, is smaller, when compared with the surrounding measures. In addition, the last sixteenth note of the previous bar takes some extra room at the beginning of bar 261, limiting the available space even more. Also rewriting of the right-hand part of the preceding four measures on stave 13 and crossing out of what has previously been written one stave lower give us an impression that this is still not a completed version, and that this "sketch" allows for further modifications.

Other arguments in favor of elaboration, not related to what is found in the manuscript, may be of either purely musical or more speculative nature. It is not as much an interruption of the sixteenth-note motion, what sounds "suspi-

\textsuperscript{125} Bärentreiter (ed. Beck), 1959, p. VI.
\textsuperscript{126} Matthews, Introduction (1977), n.p.
cious to musical ear,” as a large leap between $b^\flat$ and $e^\natural^\flat$ combined with this kind of rhythmic reduction in the soloist part and, at the same time, increased rhythmic activity in the orchestra. If, as some interpreters prefer, there are only two long notes to be played here so the listener’s attention can focus on the horn parts,\(^{127}\) probably the second note should not be $e^\natural^\flat$, but $g^\flat$ or $b^n^\flat$. A preference for $g^\natural$ (or any $g$, including $g''$, if it is a part of the figuration and if the range of the instrument allows it) is based on a corresponding passage at the end of recapitulation (cf. Ex. 138, pages 98-99). This can be better understood in conjunction with selected “structural notes” of surrounding measures whose reduction may look like this:

Another question which arises immediately (as well as another possible reason for sketchy notation in this fragment) relates to the upper limit of the eighteenth-century keyboard instruments. Is it possible that the limitation of the keyboard compass prevented the composer (who presumably could have $g'''$ as a “structural” note and a part of the figuration in his mind) from completing this passage? Certainly this point of view, not more speculative than the one pre-

\(^{127}\)“Another view is that the solo dotted minims focus attention on the new and revised figure in the horns” [Matthews, Introduction (1977), n.p.].
sented in the NMA and with a great potential for further implications, cannot be excluded. Mozart may have expected, not without reason, that the keyboard range would expand during his lifetime. In the past he made revisions of some of his piano music due to the expansion of keyboard compass. (For instance, there are passages in K 175\textsuperscript{128} originally written for an instrument with a d'' as the highest note, which were later revised in order to make use of additional three notes available on most of the newer Viennese instruments of that time.)

While there may be several different explanations for the sketchy appearance of bars 261-62 in the manuscript, one may wonder how they have made their way into most editions of the past in an unaltered version. Perhaps some editors have believed that their role is limited to the faithful reproduction of the autograph or that this must be a final version (due to the horn parts). Others, even if they have thought this fragment may be incomplete, have not felt under obligation to supplement missing notes, since the solution is not as obvious as in case of missing scales of the Finale discussed in the previous chapter.

All of the nineteenth-century editions\textsuperscript{129} known to the author, with the exception of Hummel's arrangement published by Litolff as well as the twentieth-century reprints and close followers of the AMA,\textsuperscript{130} offer no suggestion for completing the right-hand part of these two measures. Even Bischoff, who discusses various editorial aspects in great detail and supplements his edition with

\textsuperscript{128} First movement, measures 84, 86.
\textsuperscript{129} Richault (ed. Roubier), B\&H (AMA), and «Muzyka» (ed. Bashkirov).
\textsuperscript{130} Wiener Phil. Verlag, Broude Bros., Kalmus, and Dover.
numerous comments in the form of footnotes, does not recognize that there may be a problem for a performer here. Lack of any comment in this spot in his edition leads the author to the conclusion that it is very unlikely for any nineteenth-century edition examined by Bischoff (and it seems he reviewed all available sources of his time) to include either recognition of the problem in measures 261-62 or—even less likely—suggested solutions. Also in the twentieth century the editions of Blume (Eulenburg), of Fischer and Soldan (Peters), and of Bashkirov (Muzyka) do not suggest anything more than what may already be found in the manuscript and the earlier editions, namely two dotted half notes.

The first indication—as far as could be ascertained—that these two measures may be somehow incomplete, and the call to the soloist for elaboration can be found in the Steingräber edition of this concerto published over thirty years before the NMA. The title page gives the names of two editors, Hans Bischoff and Willy Rehberg; however, after checking the dates and reading the preface, it is clear these two people did not work together. This is Rehberg’s revision partially based on Bischoff’s edition published several decades earlier. The otherwise excellent edition of Bischoff alone, reprinted later by Schirmer and very popular, does not include, as mentioned earlier, any suggestions for fill-ins in these measures. Thus a credit for supplementing the first documented printed performance version of measure 261-62 should probably go to Rehberg. It is noteworthy that this edition “has for its main object the desire to be instruc-
tive,”131 so Rehberg’s suggestion is addressed to a student or less experienced
performer. It appears in the form of a footnote with text in three languages, which reads as follows:

Diese beiden Takte sind etwa folgendermaßen zu ergänzen:
These two measures are to be completed somewhat after the following manner:
Ces deux mesures sont à compléter ainsi ou d'une façon analogue.\footnote{Steinräuber (ed. Rehberg), p. 11.}

Here is the suggestion itself:

Example 104  \( K 491, \text{First Movement, Measures 261-62, Right-Hand Part,}
\text{Steinräuber (ed. Rehberg)} \)

Some thirty years later the editor of the NMA suggests in small print on an \textit{ossia} type stave an elaborated version “which may be followed if desired.”\footnote{Willy Rehberg, preface to \textit{Konzert in c-moll für Klavier mit Begleitung des Orchesters (Köchel-Verzeichnis Nr. 491)} by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, ed. Dr. Hans Bichoff and Willy Rehberg (Leipzig: Steinräuber, 1928), p. 2.} This is also a continuation of sixteenth-note motion, but (as one would expect from so-called “scholarly” edition) within the limits of the Mozartean piano.

Example 105  \( K 491, \text{First Movement, Measures 261-62, Right-Hand Part,}
\text{Bärenreiter (ed. Beck)} \)

The Bärenreiter version is also followed in recordings of John O’Conor and Kyoko Tabé.

\footnote{Bärenreiter (ed. Beck), 1959, p. VI.}
The new Breitkopf & Härtel edition, published some two decades later, acknowledges the fragmentary character of these two bars, among others, in its short preface.\textsuperscript{134} It gives (in small print on the same stave) an identical suggestion to the one found in the NMA to fill in the first measure. The unique solution offered for the second measure, however, will probably be of questionable value for those who strictly adhere to limits of the eighteenth-century keyboard compass (although this time there is only one note beyond the range: $g’$).

\textbf{Example 106} \hspace{1cm} K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 261-62, RIGHT-HAND PART, B&H (ed. Puchelt)

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example106.png}
\end{figure}

The most recent Peters edition offers here something completely different. Neither is the rhythm a continuation of sixteenth notes, nor is the figuration based on scales. (Various approaches towards treatment of rhythm, types of figuration, emphases on various notes, shapes of melodic line, are also evident in examples taken from sound recordings.)

\textbf{Example 107} \hspace{1cm} K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 261-62, RIGHT-HAND PART, Peters (ed. Wolff/Zacharias)

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example107.png}
\end{figure}

As demonstrated above, only four editions of Mozart's Piano Concerto in C minor provide the concrete solutions to solve the problem of sketchy notation in measures 261-62. However, they are not the only printed sources that offer suggestions to complete these two bars. There are three additional examples: one printed together with cadenzas, one in a book, and another one in an article. Marius Flothuis\textsuperscript{135} gives us the following suggestion, which is published together with his cadenzas to this concerto:

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{example108.png}
\caption{Example 108, First Movement, Measures 261-62, Right-Hand Part. Flothuis' Suggestion.}
\end{figure}

Flothuis' suggestion is followed in the recording of Lili Kraus.

The Badura-Skodas discuss this fragment in their famous book:

\begin{quote}
The notation of bars 261-2 and 467-70 (...) is very reminiscent of the first example quoted above from the E flat Concerto.\textsuperscript{136} Although one could conceivably fill out these bars in some such way as this—[see the next example] we feel that in the first of these two passages the original text is somehow more powerful and heroic.\textsuperscript{137}
\end{quote}

This remark, made no doubt in conjunction with the horn parts, is rather surprising in the light of the Paul Badura-Skoda recordings (in both of them this fragment is elaborated).\textsuperscript{138} These recordings are, in fact, among the very first


\textsuperscript{136} K.482, first movement.


\textsuperscript{138} This may reflect a slight disagreement between two authors.
ones where pianists have dared to alter the scores and “supply missing notes” in such cases. The example printed in the book, but—as we may conclude—not recommended to be followed, is identical to what we hear in the earlier monophonic recording with the Vienna Symphony Orchestra under Felix Prohaska.

Example 109

\begin{music}
\begin{dorithink}
\begin{musicnot}
\begin{music}
\begin{dorithink}
\begin{musicnot}
\end{music}
\end{musicnot}
\end{music}
\end{dorithink}
\end{music}
\end{musicnot}
\end{music}
This is very similar to what has been offered by the NMA (cf. Ex. 105), however the recording was made approximately one decade earlier.\textsuperscript{139} The pianist could not possibly have known the Bärenreiter edition at that time. On the other hand it is very likely that the recording or other performances and, almost certainly, the book, of which the German original was issued in 1957, were known to the editor of the NMA and could possibly have influenced him. The fourth note of the second measure is the only difference. The \textit{b}\textsuperscript{\textordmasculine} in Badura-Skoda’s recording seems to be less convincing than the \textit{b}\textsuperscript{\textsc{sh}} in Beck’s edition, perhaps because it puts too much emphasis on \textit{c}\textsuperscript{\textsc{sh}}, the note which obviously does not belong to the E-flat-major harmony.

Yet another printed suggestion for filling out this passage appeared in Robert D. Levin’s article to illustrate his view on where embellishments added by the performer may be appropriate. He writes:

\textsuperscript{139}It was published in 1951.
Apart from principal themes, certain generic passages invite filling out:
1. Whenever melodic and rhythmic activity suddenly slacken without obvious dramatic or expressive motivation. Two such cases are:
   a. sequences in slow movements (...);
   b. passages whose top and bottom notes are delineated without the necessary connective arpeggios required to give them their intended shape.¹⁴⁰

The case of bars 261-62 will apparently fall under category 1b. An additional sign for the identification of this type of passage is the fact “the orchestra’s rhythmic activity suddenly eclipses that of the soloist.”¹⁴¹ To illustrate this, Levin gives a full-score example in broader context (measures 257-64). Since this has already been presented earlier (see Ex.102, page 78), here is only the elaborated version of the two measures in question:

Example 110  
K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 261-62, RIGHT-HAND PART, LEVIN’S SUGGESTION

Examination of sound recordings will provide us with more possible solutions to solve the problem of sketchy notation in bars 261-62. Although most pianists, especially those active in recent decades, elaborate these measures one way or another, it probably was not always the case. All of recordings from the 1930’s¹⁴² and 1940’s,¹⁴³ and most of those made in 1950’s¹⁴⁴ and 1960’s¹⁴⁵ fol-

¹⁴¹ Ibid., p.232.
¹⁴² Kolessa, Fischer/LPO.
low literally the printed text. In fact, the 1951 recording of Badura-Skoda discussed earlier is the first among those listed in the Discography which include the embellished version in this spot. Over approximately a decade the pianist changed his mind. He now links the two long notes with a rapid ascending scale, which presumably helps to expose the “heroic horns.”

Example iii  
K 491, first movement, measures 261-62, right-hand part.  
transcription from the later stereophonic recording of Paul Badura-Skoda

*) The scale is played somehow faster (or it starts earlier) than one may assume from the transcribed example, and there is much space between $d''$ and $e''$, helping to emphasize the top note.

Further examples from recordings will be listed in alphabetical order according to pianists’ names.

Example ii  
K 491, first movement, measures 261-62, right-hand part.  
transcription from the recording of Vladimir Ashkenazy

143 Both recordings of Artur Schnabel.
144 Johannesen, Biro, Gieseking, Fischer/RDO (horns particularly exposed), Then-Bergh, Rubinstein, Bachauer, Bashkirov.
145 Haskil, Kempff, Casadesus / CO / Szell, Anda, Curzon.
Example 113  K 491. FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 261-62, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM RECORDINGS OF DANIEL BARENBOIM (BOTH ARE IDENTICAL)*

*) The articulation is somewhere between staccato and non-legato, particularly in the recording with the English Chamber Orchestra.

Example 114  K 491. FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 261-62, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF MALCOLM BILSON

Example 115  K 491. FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 261-62, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM RECORDINGS OF ALFRED BRENDEL (BOTH ARE IDENTICAL)

*) The lightly touched e’’’ can be heard in the middle of measure 262 in the recording with the Scottish Chamber Orchestra (together with d’’’ — the seventh sixteenth note), but it can hardly be considered intentional. The other recording is clear and there remains no doubt about the pianist’s intentions in this fragment.

Example 116  K 491. FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 261-62, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF ALICIA DE LARROCHA

*) The first beats of both measures are distinctly marked. All triplets are articulated with great clarity. The only exception is the scarcely audible fourth b’ in measure 261.
Example 117  
K. 491, first movement, measures 261-62, right-hand part,  
transcription from the recording of Justus Frantz

*) The author has some doubts about the intentions of the pianist. The second sixteenth note of the second measure is not audible at all. Thus the first group of this measure can alternatively be transcribed as \( \frac{3}{4} \), although it is not very likely the soloist intended to interrupt the flow of sixteenth notes.

Example 118  
K. 491, first movement, measures 261-62, right-hand part,  
transcription from the recording of Richard Goode

Example 119  
K. 491, first movement, measures 261-62, right-hand part,  
transcription from the 1958 recording of Glenn Gould  
(with the Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra)

Example 120  
K. 491, first movement, measures 261-62, right-hand part,  
transcription from the 1961 recording of Glenn Gould  
(with the CBC Symphony Orchestra)

Gould's elaboration of the left-hand part in the surrounding measures also deserves inclusion here.
Example 121  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 257-65, PIANO PART,
TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE 1961 RECORDING OF GLENN GOULD
(with CBC Symphony Orchestra)

Example 122  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 261-62, RIGHT-HAND PART,
TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF DEREK HAN *

*) Triplets are played *legato*.

Example 123  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 261-62, RIGHT-HAND PART,
TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF JOS VAN IMMERSEEL

Example 124  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 261-62, RIGHT-HAND PART,
TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF EUGENE ISTOMIN *

*) Triplets are played *legato*. 
Example 125

K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 251-62, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF Jenő Jandó

*) Triplets are played legato.

Example 126

K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 251-62, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF Roberte Mamou *

Example 127

K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 261-62, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF Denis Matthews

Example 128

K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 261-62, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF Ivan Moravec *

*) Triplets are played legato.

Example 129

K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 261-62, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF Émile Naoumoff *

*) The arpeggio notes are played legato.
*) The sixth sixteenth note in measure 261 is scarcely audible, however it is unlikely that the pianist intended to play the on the second beat.
The current writer plays the following:

Example 135  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 261-62, RIGHT-HAND PART, AS PERFORMED BY THE AUTHOR *

*) The first measure is identical to the NMA suggestion, the second is exactly the same as in suggestion made by Flothuis; however, this author has performed his version before getting acquainted with these sources.
Chapter 5

Solutions for completion of the right-hand part in measures 467-70, first movement

Similarly to bars 261-62 discussed in previous chapter, another unreasonable interruption of sixteenth-note flow in the right-hand part occurs in measures 467-70 of the first movement. Examples found on the next pages will illustrate this case.

This time there are four measures to be filled. Instead of scales, the piano plays broken arpeggios in the preceding bars. Also, there is no characteristic horn part which prevented some performers from elaborating measures 261-62; therefore, more pianists are likely to continue the sixteenth-note figuration in measures 467-70.
Example 136  K. 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 463-69, FULL SCORE
MS, FOLIO 16r, BARS 12-18, STAVES 1-16
Example 137
K.491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 470-73, FULL SCORE
MS, FOLIO 16v, BARS 1-4, STAVES 1-16
The same editions as those mentioned in Chapter 4 as well as a few additional printed sources make suggestions for fill-ins. Rehberg,\textsuperscript{146} Beck (NMA),\textsuperscript{147} Puchelt,\textsuperscript{148} and Wolff/Zacharias\textsuperscript{149} suggest the following as alternative versions:

\textsuperscript{146}Steingräber (ed. Rehberg), p. 20.
\textsuperscript{148}B&H (ed. Puchelt), p. 28.
\textsuperscript{149}Peters (ed. Wolff/Zacharias), p. 35.
*) The Steingräber score gives b" instead of a" in the ascending diminished arpeggio (bar 467), but this must be an engraving error not worthy to duplicate it here.
The Bärenreiter’s version is followed in recordings of Derek Han, Jos van Immerseel, and Kyoko Tabe.

Other printed suggestions of how to embellish measures 467-70 can be found in collections of cadenzas by Marius Flothuis,\textsuperscript{150} Géza Anda,\textsuperscript{151} and Eric Heidsieck.\textsuperscript{152}

\textsuperscript{150} Flothuis, \textit{Cadensen}, p.7.

\textsuperscript{151} Anda, \textit{Kadenzen}, p.38.

Example 143  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-70, PIANO PART, FLOTHUIS, PERFORMANCE SUGGESTION

Example 144  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-70, PIANO PART, ANDA, PERFORMANCE SUGGESTION

*) The above example is taken from the printed version and it probably contains a misprint. In his recording Anda does not move the left-hand part of the last measure one octave lower as his score suggests. Here is the left hand of measures 469-70 in its unchanged version as Anda plays it:
The figuration offered by Marius Flothuis is played by Lili Kraus.

The Badura-Skodas write the following regarding this passage in their book. They also give some suggestions:

The second of the passages mentioned above [measures 467-70] is remarkable, since in all probability the first of the enormous leaps is to be filled out, and not the second.

[...] For the completely regular accompaniment in the first six bars [463-68] (sighing motives on the woodwind, sustained notes for the left hand, crotchets on the strings) suggests that the sequence is also to be continued in the right-hand figurations, perhaps like this.  

The altered accompaniment in bars 7 and 8 [469-70] suggests that the leap is to have pathos, to be played possibly unembellished, giving a rise in the emotional level through its contrast with the foregoing passage-work.  

Another possibility would be.

---

There is another similar suggestion with the last measure modified:156

Performance versions found in the recordings of Paul Badura-Skoda will differ slightly from those suggested in the book:

154 Ibid., p. 195.
155 Ibid.
156 Ibid.
The solution offered for the last two measures in the previous example is similar to what Badura-Skoda does in bars 261-62 in the same recording (cf. Ex. III, page 88). The rapid raising diatonic scale fills in the gap between two written “structural” notes and the right-hand part of the last measure remains unembellished.

Paul Badura-Skoda belonged to a group of pioneers who dared to change the original text in measures 467-70 as early as the 1950's. Other names in this group include Edwin Fischer, Walter Gieseking, Glenn Gould, and Denis Matthews. Matthews wrote that “it would seem nonsensical not to continue the semiquaver pattern up to the trill on the following page [in the manuscript].”

His strong conviction is not shared by everybody. There are still a number of pianists who leave this passage unembellished. Others, however, elaborate it one way or the other.

158 Bachauer, Badridze, Bashkirov, Biro, Casadesus (both recordings), Fischer / LPO / Collingwood, Frank, Johannesen, Kempff, Kolessa, Long, Osetinskaya, Previn, Rubinstein, Schilhawsky, Schnabel (both recordings), Peter Serkin, Then-Bergh.
Enrica Ciccarelli, Rudolf Firkusny, Edwin Fischer, Clara Haskil, Mikhail Pletnev, and András Schiff play additional figuration only in the first two bars.

**Example 151**

K 491, First Movement, Measures 467-70, Right-Hand Part,
Transcription from Recordings of Enrica Ciccarelli, Rudolf Firkusny, and Clara Haskil

*) Cicarelli does not play $g'$ in measure 469.

**Example 152**

K 491, First Movement, Measures 467-70, Right-Hand Part,
Transcription from the 1954 Recording of Edwin Fischer

**Example 153**

K 491, First Movement, Measures 467-70, Right-Hand Part,
Transcription from the Recording of Mikhail Pletnev

**Example 154**

K 491, First Movement, Measures 467-70, Right-Hand Part,
Transcription from the Recording of András Schiff

Further examples taken from recordings, with elaborations in all four bars, will be presented in alphabetical order according to pianists’ names.
Both recordings of Daniel Barenboim are based on the same idea and are rhythmically identical. The only difference can be found in the first measure where the arpeggio on a diminished chord starts and ends with different notes. One may wonder if the change is a result of a conscious decision or rather reflects the performer's quasi-improvisational approach. If the latter is true, the ascending arpeggio could probably begin with $e^\flat$, or $f^\sharp$, or even $a'$ as well. In fact this would narrow the distance between the last note of measure 467 and the first note of the next measure, which seems to be too large in both cases.

*) The eight notes and a triplet in the first two measures are played legato.
Example 158  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-73, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF MALCOLM BILSON

Example 159  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-70, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE EARLIER RECORDING OF ALFRED BRENDEL (WITH THE SCOTTISH CHAMBER ORCHESTRA)

Example 160  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-70, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE LATER RECORDING OF ALFRED BRENDEL (WITH THE ACADEMY OF ST MARTIN IN THE FIELDS)

Example 161  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-70, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF CLIFFORD CURZON
Example 162  
K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-70, RIGHT-HAND PART,  
TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF ALICIA DE LARROCHA

Example 163  
K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-70, RIGHT-HAND PART,  
TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF JUSTUS FRANTZ

Example 164  
K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-70, RIGHT-HAND PART,  
AN ATTEMPT OF TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF WALTER GIESEKING

*) The first two measures of the above example should not be taken literally as what Gieseking intended to play here. Due to poor quality of the recording and lack of good articulation in this fragment we can be sure only about the general shape and the fact this figuration is based on a diminished arpeggio. An easily distinctive c" is heard on the first and the second beat of the second measure, but there can be no certainty about the rhythm whatsoever. The only doubt in the third measure regards the note g, which is not audible.
The alternate transcription from the recording of Walter Gieseking, with rhythmic irregularities in the first two measures and without g in the third, may look somewhat like this:

Example 165  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-70, RIGHT-HAND PART, ANOTHER ATTEMPT OF TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF WALTER GIESEKING

Example 166  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-70, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF RICHARD GOODE
Example 167  K 491, first movement, measures 463-73, piano part, transcription from the 1961 recording of Glenn Gould (with the CBC Symphony Orchestra)*

*) The above example is taken from the later recording of Gould, but measures 467-73 seem to be almost the same in his earlier recording with the Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra. There is an additional b in the left-hand part repeated on the second beat in bar 472. Figuration in measure 468 in its current shape could only be reconstructed after listening to both performances. The beginning of this measure is not clear in the recording with the CBC Symphony (one may assume another version of figuration based on diminished chord is possible here), while the last group on the third beat is imprecise in the 1958 live performance from Stockholm. This may be due either to certain degree of technical difficulty (obviously not exceeding Gould's abilities by any means) or—most likely—the fact the pianist used to play these arpeggios differently and made his final decision on the spot.
*) Note the difference of articulation in the first two measures.
*) The rhythm of the last group in measure 469 of the above example (two thirty seconds at the end) refers to bar 359 towards the end of the development. One may wonder the reason Peraiah decides not to play in even sixteenth notes (as Mozart does in bar 358), though the number of notes to fill diatonically the distance between \( g' \) and \( e'' \) equals exactly twelve (four sixteenths for each beat). There may be two possible answers: because he wants to emphasize the first \( g' \) through prolongation or—more importantly—he tries to avoid having \( a'' \) and \( b'' \) as the first two notes on the third beat (the most important one after the first), since none of them belongs to the c-minor harmony. Mozart in measure 358 is filling the gap between the same notes in even sixteenths, however G-major harmony allows to treat \( a'' \) and \( b'' \) on the third beat as an appoggiatura.
Example 179  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-70, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF PETER TOPORKER

Example 180  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-70, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF MITSUKO UCHIDA

Example 181  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-70, RIGHT-HAND PART, TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE RECORDING OF CHRISTIAN ZACHARIS

This author plays here the following:

Example 182  K 491, FIRST MOVEMENT, MEASURES 467-70, PIANO PART, AS PERFORMED BY THE AUTHOR
Conclusions

One may conclude that the manuscript autograph of Mozart's Piano Concerto No. 24, in C minor, available to editors and (in the form of facsimile edition) to a wider audience, remains the most important source of information related to this piece. However, its examination, while helping to solve some but not all doubts the performer of this concerto may have encountered, causes other questions to arise.

An unexpectedly high number of problems of various kinds has been discovered. One category relates to legibility of text, or rather its lack, in numerous spots. This is quite striking for Mozart, since his other autographs are usually pedantically exact. Haste and the fact that the composer wrote this concerto for his own use, without other performers or an engraver in his mind, are the most likely explanations. Generally accepted readings of ambiguous passages found in different editions should not by any means be considered as the only possible options for the performers.

Another type of problem relates to those passages of this concerto which appear clearly in the autograph, but for various reasons are believed to misrepresent Mozart's intentions. This includes fragmentary notation, frequently left by editors for the performer to resolve. Pianists, particularly those active in the last few decades, are less reluctant to fill in empty spots and elaborate the original
text. A great number of examples in this document reveal many different approaches towards solving this problem.

Information regarding the most suitable solutions may be obtained from various sources. It seems necessary for a pianist to consult more than one edition (which has been done in this study). In fact, the pianist is expected to combine artistry with research and act somewhat like a musicologist. Editors, on the other hand, should make decisions based not only on written sources, but also on good musical taste. It is no surprise that the same names appear in the discography as pianists and in the bibliography as authors, editors, and composers of cadenzas.
Lists of References

Bibliography I (text sources)


Kraus, Lilli. Foreword to *The Complete Original Cadenzas by W. A. Mozart for his Solo Piano Concertos with Supplementary Cadenzas by Beethoven and Kraus*. Miami, Florida: Belwin Mills, c/o CPP/Belwin, Inc. (EL2302), 1972.


Robbins, Mary Lauren. “Mozart’s cadenzas for the first movements of his piano concertos: the influence of harmonic symmetry on their function and structure.” D.M.A. diss., The University of Texas at Austin, 1992.


Tovey, Donald F. *Essays in Musical Analysis*. vol. 3, Concertos. London: Oxford University Press, 1944.


Bibliography II (music sources)


Kraus, Lili, ed. *The complete original cadenzas by W. A. Mozart for his solo piano concertos with supplementary cadenzas by Beethoven and Kraus*. Edited, with fingerings by Lili Kraus. Includes cadenzas by Beethoven for K. 466 and cadenzas by Kraus for K. 37, 39, 41, 238, 467, 482, 491, 503, and 537. Miami, Florida: Belwin Mills, c/o CPP/Belwin, Inc. (EL2302), 1972.


“Concert pour le Pianoforte composé par W. A. Mozart, No 7.” A handwritten copy of unknown manuscript or edition [19th century]. Music Library (M 1010 M952 C6), California State University, Fresno, CA.


Discography and other sound sources

Brahms, Johannes

“Cadenzas for Piano Concertos by [J. S.] Bach (D Minor), Mozart (K. 453, K. 466 & K. 491) and Beethoven (Nos. 3 & 4)” in The complete works for piano solo and the two piano concertos, disc 10.


Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus

Concerto for Piano and Orchestra No. 24 in C minor, K 491:


Badridze, Ketevan (piano), Tbilisi Symphony Orchestra, Jansug Kakhidze (cond.). In Mozart, Beethoven. Germany: Mazur Media GmbH (INF 43), n.d. [CD-HDCD]

Badura-Skoda, Paul (piano), Das Symphonieorchester des Norddeutschen Rundfunks [North German Radio Symphony Orchestra], Wilfried Boettcher (cond.). In W. A. Mozart: Klavierkonzert c-moll, KV 491. With cadenzas by the soloist. Hamburg: Miller International Schallplatten GmbH (Europa 303), [1960].159 [LP]


Biro, Sari (piano), Austrian Symphony Orchestra, Wilhelm Loibner (cond.). In Mozart: Concerto no. 24 for piano and orchestra in C minor (K491); Overture to the opera “The marriage of Figaro.” With cadenzas by Johann Nepomuk Hummel. New York: Remington, 1951. [LP-mono]


159 In or after 1953 (notes in artist's biography); most likely after 1957 (publication of the German version of Interpreting Mozart on the Keyboard).

[CD-ADD]

[LP] [CD-AAD]

[CD-DDD]

[LP] [CD-ADD]

de Larrocha, Alicia (see Larrocha, Alicia de).

[CD-DDD]

[CD-ADD]

[LP] [CD-AAD]

[LP]


Han, Derek (piano), Philharmonia Orchestra, Paul Freeman (cond.). Part of *The Complete Mozart Piano Concertos*, vol. 1. Recorded in London (St. Augustine Church, Kilburn), Roswell, Georgia: Pro Arte, 1992. [CD-DDD]

Haskil, Clara (piano), Orchestre des Concerts Lamoureux [Lamoureux Concerts Association Orchestra], Igor Markevitch (cond.). With cadenzas by the soloist (first movement) and Nikita Magaloff (third movement). Recorded on Steinway & Sons piano in Paris (Salle de la Chimie) in November 1960. Originally released on a long-playing disc (Epic, 1961); also part of a 9-disc collection *L'art de Clara Haskil* (Philips, 1962, 1982) and a 4-disc set *Hommage à Clara Haskil* (Philips, 1970); reissued on a compact disc as a part of *Clara Haskil I*. Great Pianists of the 20th Century, vol. 43. Philips Classics (456 827-2), 1998. [LP] [CD]


Kolessa, Lubka (piano), Berlin Radio Symphony Orchestra, Max Fiedler (cond.). In Lubka Kolessa Legacy, "Legendary Treasures" series (CD1). With cadenzas by Johann Nepomuk Hummel. Recorded and broadcast by Berlin Radio on April 28, 1936. Issued on a compact disc (transfers by Ward Marston; research, production, restoration [editing, processing and all side joints] and remastering by Jacob Harnoy). Canada: Doremi (DHR-7743), 1999. [CD-ADD]


---

161 In or before 1960 [Otto Ackermann (1909-1960)].

Matthews, Denis (piano), Vienna State Opera Orchestra, Hans Swarowsky (cond.). In *Mozart: Concerto for Piano and Orchestra, in C minor, K. 491; Piano Sonata in B flat major, K.333*. Vanguard recordings for the connoisseur. With cadenzas by the soloist. New York: Vanguard Recording Society (VSD 2025), 1959. [LP]


Pawlas, Dariusz (piano), Orkiestra Symfoniczna Filharmonii Sileskiej [The Silesian Philharmonic Orchestra], Jerzy Salwarowski (cond.). With cadenza by Johann Nepomuk Hummel. Live performances in Katowice, Poland (Concert Hall of the Silesian Philharmonics) on February 11 and 12, 1982.


Pawlas, Dariusz (piano), Campanile Orchestra, Gerardo Edelstein (cond.). With cadenza by Johann Nepomuk Hummel. Live performance in Houston, Texas (Stude Concert Hall, Rice University) on April 17, 1994.


Serkin, Peter (piano), Cincinnati Symphony, Jesús Lopez-Cobos (cond.). Live performance on January 19, 1996.
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#### Tables

**Table 3. Score layout in the manuscript (stave/instrument arrangement)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stave</th>
<th>Movements I &amp; III</th>
<th>Movement II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>violini I</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>violini II</td>
<td>violini I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>viola</td>
<td>violini II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>flauto</td>
<td>viola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>oboe I</td>
<td>flauto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>oboe II</td>
<td>oboe I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>clarinetto I in B (B♭)</td>
<td>oboe II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>clarinetto II in B (B♭)</td>
<td>clarinetto I in B (B♭)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 corni in E♭</td>
<td>clarinetto II in B (B♭)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>fagotto I</td>
<td>2 corni in E♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>fagotto II</td>
<td>fagotto I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 clarini in C</td>
<td>fagotto II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>timpany [sic!]</td>
<td>cembalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>cembalo</td>
<td>cembalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>cembalo</td>
<td>Bäṣi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bäṣi</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. List of pianists with indications for elaboration in measures 261-62 and 467-70 (first movement), measures 15 and 73 (second movement), and measures 219-20 (third movement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pianist/Ensemble</th>
<th>i 261-62</th>
<th>i 467-70</th>
<th>ii 15</th>
<th>ii 73</th>
<th>iii 219-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashkenazy</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachauer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badřidze</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badura-Skoda / VSO / Prohaska</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badura-Skoda / SdNR / Boettcher</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barenboim / ECO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barenboim / BP</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bashkirov</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilson</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biro</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendel / ASMF / Marriner</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendel / SCO / Mackerras</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casadesus / VPO / Mitropoulos</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casadesus / CO / Szell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciccarelli</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curzon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Larrocha</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finkusny</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer / LPO / Collingwood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer / RDO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frantz</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gieseking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goode</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gould / SRSO / Jochum</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gould / CBC SO / Susskind</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>261-62</td>
<td>467-70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>219-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immerseel</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istomin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jandó</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannesen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolassa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krainev</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwok</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamou</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravec</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naoumoff</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Conor</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osetinskaya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawlas / OSFS / Salwarowski</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawlas / OSPFL / Przybyszki</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawlas / CO / Edelstein</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pidhia</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietnev</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubinstein</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schilhawsky</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schnabel / PO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schnabel / SSO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serkin, Peter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serkin, Rudolf</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabe</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. List of pianists with indications for elaboration in measures 261-62 and 467-70 (first movement), measures 15 and 73 (second movement), and measures 219-20 (third movement)  
["+" stands for elaboration; "−" indicates adherence to the original text]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>i</th>
<th>ii</th>
<th>ii</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>261-62</td>
<td>467-70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>219-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then-Bergh</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toperczer</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uchida</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacharias</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Music sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(several versions*)</td>
<td><em>Kadenzen, Eingänge und Aus-zierrungen zu Klavierkonzerten von Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart</em> (Bärenreiter, 1967 and 1975), p. 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Victor Fenigstein</td>
<td><em>Kadenzen zu den Klavierkonzerten KV 482, 491, 466, 467, und 557 [i.e. 537] von W. A. Mozart</em> (Künzelmann, 1980), p. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In editions of the concerto:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Litolff (ed. Hummel), pp. 16, 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schirmer (ed. Bischoff), pp. 28, 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heugel (ed. Philipp), pp. 19, 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seingräber (ed. Rehberg), pp. 25, 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Music sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Franco Mannino</td>
<td>Cadenze per il concerto in do min. K.491 per pianoforte ed orchestra di</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, op.258 (Boccaccini &amp; Spada, 1986), p.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. *Eingang* by Hummel and Edwin Fischer’s performance version are included as well.

b. Only the 1964 two-piano score edition of the NMA includes suggestions for *Eingänge*.
Table 6. List of fermata embellishments and cadenzas for measures 219-20, third movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Music sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Victor Fenigstein</td>
<td><em>Kadenzen zu den Klavierkonzerten KV 482, 491, 466, 467, und 557 [i.e. 537] von W. A. Mozart</em> (Kunzelmann, 1980), p.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Leopold Godowsky</td>
<td><em>Two cadenzas to W. A. Mozart's Piano Concerto in C minor</em> (C. Fischer, 1925), pp.9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lili Kraus</td>
<td><em>The complete original cadenzas by W. A. Mozart for his solo piano concertos with supplementary cadenzas by Beethoven and Kraus</em> (Belwin Mills, c/o CPP/Belwin, Inc., 1972), p.106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6. List of Fermata Embellishments and Cadenzas for Measures 219-20, Third Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Music sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Franco Mannino</td>
<td><em>Cadenze per il concerto in do min. K.491 per pianoforte ed orchestra di Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, op.258</em> (Boccaccini &amp; Spada, 1986), p.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Friedrich Wührer</td>
<td><em>Kadenzen zum Klavierkonzert in c-moll, KV. 491 von W. A. Mozart</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Doblinger, 1959), p.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Modified version of Hummel's *Eingang.*  

b. Only the 1964 two-piano score edition of the NMA includes suggestion for *Eingang.*  

c. Based on *Eingang* by Flothuis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Cadenzas available in written form</th>
<th>Cadenzas found in sound recordings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Vladimir Ashkenazy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ashkenazy / PO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Daniel Barenboim</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Barenboim / ECO Barenboim / BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Malcolm Bilsonc</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Bilson / EBS / Gardiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Cadenzas available in written form</td>
<td>Cadenzas found in sound recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Rudolf Breithaupt</td>
<td>Kadenzen zu dem Klavierkonzert c moll von W. A. Mozart (Braunschweig: Henry Litolf, 1933)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Alfred Brendel</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Brendel / ASMF / Martiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kadenzen zu Klavierkonzerten Wolfgang Amadeus Mozarts, rev. and enl. ed. in 3 vol., ed. Rainer Weber, with preface by Frank Reinisch (Breitkopf &amp; Härtel, 1992), pp.10-14</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Enrica Ciccarelli</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ciccarelli / SCO / Pál</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Gabriel Fauré</td>
<td>Cadence pour le concerto en ut mineur (Köchel no. 491) de W. A. Mozart (Pierre Schneider, 1927), pp.2-5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Victor Fenigstein</td>
<td>Kadenzen zu den Klavierkonzerten KV 482, 491, 466, 467, und 557 [i.e. 537] von W. A. Mozart (Künzelmann, 1980), pp.13-15</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Edwin Fischer</td>
<td>Kadenzen zu sieben Klavierkonzerten von Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (B. Schott’s Sohne, 1958), pp.24-27</td>
<td>Fischer / LPO / Collingwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fischer / RDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moravec / ASMF / Martiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Cadenzas available in written form</td>
<td>Cadenzas found in sound recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Marius Flothuis</td>
<td><em>Cadensen voor de pianoconcerten in d kl.t. (K.V. 466) en c kl.t. (K.V. 491) van W. A. Mozart</em> (Uitgave Broekmans &amp; Van Poppel, 1959), pp. 6-7</td>
<td>Curzon / LSO / Kertész</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. [Claude Frank]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Frank / NECO / Fleisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Leopold Godowsky</td>
<td><em>Two cadenzas to W. A. Mozart's Piano Concerto in C minor</em> (C. Fischer, 1925), pp. 2-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Richard T. Gore</td>
<td>“Cadenza to the first movement of Mozart's concerto in C minor, K.491,” photolithograph of composer's manuscript</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. [Derek Han]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Han / PO / Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Clara Haskil</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Haskil / OdCL / Markevitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Eric Heidsieck</td>
<td><em>Cadences et points d'orgue pour les concertos de piano de W. A. Mozart</em> (Éditions françaises de musique Technisonor, 1974), pp. 79-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(first cadenza)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(second cadenza)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Philipp Karl Hoffmann</td>
<td><em>Kadenzen und Durcharbeitung der langsamten Sätze von Mozarts Zeitgenossen Philipp Karl Hoffmann</em>, ed. A. Hyatt King (Hinrichsen, 1959), pp. 69-75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Cadenzas available in written form</td>
<td>Cadenzas found in sound recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. [Jos van Immerseel]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Immerseel / OAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Eugene Istomin</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Istomin / SSO / Schwarz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Wilhelm Kempff</td>
<td><em>Kadenzen zu Klavierkonzerten von Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart</em> (Bote &amp; Bock, 1974), pp.21-23</td>
<td>Kempff / BS / Leitner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Lili Kraus</td>
<td><em>The complete original cadenzas by W. A. Mozart for his solo piano concerts with supplementary cadenzas by Beethoven and Kraus</em> (Belwin Mills, c/o CPP/Belwin, Inc., 1972), pp.103-106</td>
<td>Kraus / VFO / Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. [May-Ling Kwok]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Kwok / CNSO / Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Nikita Magaloff</td>
<td><em>Cadenze per 6 concerti di Mozart K.451, 466, 467, 482, 491, 503 per Pianoforte e Orchestra</em> (Curci, 1960)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. [Roberte Mamou]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Mamou / BS / Oskamp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. List of cadenzas to the first movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Cadenzas available in written form</th>
<th>Cadenzas found in sound recordings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38. Franco Mannino</td>
<td><em>Cadenze per il concerto in do min. K.491 per pianoforte ed orchestra di Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart.</em> op.258 (Boccaccini &amp; Spada, 1986), pp.1-4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Denis Matthews</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Bachauer / LO / Sherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. [Emile Naoumoff]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Naoumoff / ONBA / Lombard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. [John O'Connor]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>O'Connor / SCO / Mackettas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Tean-Hwa P'ng</td>
<td>“First-movement Cadenzas for Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart’s Piano Concertos K.466, 467, 482, 491, 503, and 537,” D.M.A. diss. (West Virginia University, 1997), pp.76-78</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Dariusz Pawlas</td>
<td>see pp.151-56</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(first cadenza)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Dariusz Pawlas</td>
<td>see pp.157-61</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(second cadenza)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Murray Perahia</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Perahia / ECO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Mikhail Pletnev</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Pletnev / DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7. List of cadenzas to the first movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Cadenzas available in written form</th>
<th>Cadenzas found in sound recordings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Cadenza to the Mozart concerto no. 24, in C minor (Küchel, 491): op. 87, no. 20</em>, ed. Edwin Hughes (G. Schirmer, 1920), pp. 2-7</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Ruth Rendleman (second cadenza)</td>
<td>Ibid., pp. 247-49</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Camille Saint-Saëns</td>
<td><em>Cadence pour le concerto en ut mineur de Mozart: cat. Küchel No. 491</em> (Durand, 1911), pp. 1-3</td>
<td>Casadesus / VPO / Mitropoulos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Casadesus / CO / Szell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Franz / BS / Flor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Johannesen / NPO / Ackermann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. András Schiff</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Schiff / CAdSM / Végh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. [Paul von Schilhawsky]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Schilhawsky / ORB / Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Artur Schnabel</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Schnabel / SSO / Wallenstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schnabel / PO / Susskind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. [Peter Serkin]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Peter Serkin / CS / Lopez-Cobos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Rudolf Serkin</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Rudolf Serkin / LSO / Abbado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Cadenzas available in written form</td>
<td>Cadenzas found in sound recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Kyoko Tabe</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Tabe / OdCdL / Lopez-Cobos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. [Erik Then-Bergh]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Then-Bergh / RSB / Abendroth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. [Peter Toperzcer]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Toperzcer / SPO / Slovak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Mitsuko Uchida</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Uchida / ECO / Tate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Friedrich Wührer</td>
<td>Kadenzen zum Klavierkonzert in c-moll, K.V. 491 von W.A. Mozart (Doblinger, 1959), pp.2-6</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Christian Zacharias (first cadenza)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Zacharias / SdNR / Wand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

a. Brackets indicate the authorship is established on assumption the soloists play their own cadenzas (unless specified otherwise).
b. Only the 1964 two-piano score edition of the NMA includes this cadenza.
c. With elements from the cadenza by Hummel.
d. Based on motives by Claude Frank and Leopold Mannes.
e. Based on cadenza by Flotius.
f. Controversial modernistic cadenza.
Appendix B

Two Cadenzas to the First Movement of Mozart’s Piano Concerto in C minor, K.491

I.

\[\text{Dariusz Pawlas}\]