ANTONÍN DVOŘÁK’S PIANO CONCERTO IN G MINOR, OPUS 33: A DISCUSSION
OF MUSICAL INTENT AND PIANISTIC EFFECTIVENESS IN VILÉM KURZ’S
VERSION OF THE SOLO PIANO PART

Wen-Chien Tang, B.M., M.M.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF MUSICAL ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

August 2010

APPROVED:

Adam Wodnicki, Major Professor
Elvia Puccinelli, Minor Professor
Joseph Banowetz, Committee Member
Jesse Eschbach, Chair of the Division of Keyboard Studies
Graham Phipps, Director of Graduate Studies in the College of Music
James Scott, Dean of College of Music
James D. Meernik, Acting Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse School of Graduate Studies

Since its premiere in 1878, Antonín Dvořák’s Piano Concerto in G Minor has been underrated and held in low regard by musicologists, critics, performers and audiences alike. Vilém Kurz (1872-1945), a Czech pianist and pedagogue, revised and reworked the piano solo part to incorporate what he considered to be added brilliance and pianistic effectiveness. However, the revised version has not increased the popularity of the work. In recent decades, this concerto has begun to appear more often in the programs and recordings are currently available, utilizing either the original piano part or Kurz’s revision or a combination of both. In order to gain a broader analytical perspective and achieve a more authentic interpretation of the piece, a thorough understanding of the relation between Dvořák’s work and Kurz’s revisions is indispensable. This study examines these adaptations and compares them with Dvořák’s scoring in order to gain further insight to Kurz’s musical intent and pianistic aims. Examples from all movements are evaluated vis-à-vis the original to determine their purpose and musical validity.
Copyright 2010

by

Wen-Chien Tang
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF MUSICAL EXAMPLES

Chapters

I. INTRODUCTION

II. COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ORIGINAL AND REVISED VERSION

III. ANALYSIS OF SELECTED EXAMPLES OF KURZ’S ALTERATIONS

   Simplification of Texture/Material
   Rhythmic Changes
   Harmonic and Sonorous Enrichment

IV. CONCLUSION

APPENDIX: ALTERATIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHY
MUSICAL EXAMPLES

Example 1: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.70-72
Example 2: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.268-272
Example 3: Grieg: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.69-71
Example 4: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.546-550
Example 5: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.393-395
Example 6: Brahms: Piano Concerto No.2, 3rd movement, m.41
Example 7: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.426-431
Example 8: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.492-493
Example 9: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.135-138
Example 10: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.295-298
Example 11: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.299-304
Example 12: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.212-214
Example 13: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.486-490
Example 14: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.21-25
Example 15: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.243-252
Example 16: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.362-364
Example 17: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.537-539
Example 18: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.323-324
Example 19: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.365-366
Example 20: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.93-95
Example 21: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.191-193 ......................24
Example 22: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.494-495 ......................25
Example 23: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 2nd movement, mm.68-70 ......................26
Example 24: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.178-181 ......................26
Example 25: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.383-385 ......................27
Example 26: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.516-519 ......................28
Example 27: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.73-74 ......................29
Example 28: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.532-533 ....................30
Example 29: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm. 77-79 ......................31
Example 30: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.93-94 ......................31
Example 31: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.508-515 ......................32
Example 32: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.118-121 ....................33
Example 33: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 2nd movement, mm.16-20 ......................34
Example 34: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 2nd movement, mm.25-30 ......................35
Example 35: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 2nd movement, mm.37-40 ......................36
Example 36: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.211-215 ....................37
Example 37: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.461-470 ....................38
Example 38: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.480-482 ....................39
Example 39: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.523-525 ....................39
Example 40: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm.125-127 ....................40
Example 41: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 2nd movement, mm.59-60 ......................41
Example 42: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 3rd movement, mm.128-132 ....................41
Example 43: Dvořák: Piano Concerto, 1st movement, mm. 96-98 ............................. 42
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in G minor, op.33, the first of three concertos that Dvořák composed, was written between late August and mid September of 1876. Dvořák wrote this three-movement work for the outstanding Czech pianist Karel Slavkovský (1849-1919), a performer and advocate of Dvořák’s piano pieces and chamber music. Slavkovský premiered the Piano Concerto in 1878 with the orchestra of the Czech Interim Theatre in the Prague Žofín Hall under the baton of Adolf Čech.¹ In contrast to the success Dvořák would experience years later with the premieres of his violin and cello concerti, the Piano Concerto was not well received.

The piece as a whole portrays characteristic compositional traits, like Dvořák’s vivid use of color and a flair for writing appealing melodies. However, the piano solo part has long been considered clumsy and unpianistic. John Clapham described the layout of the solo part as being often ineffective, further stating that “at times the work appears to have been conceived for a player with two right hands.”² Harold Schonberg stated that Dvořák composed “an attractive Piano Concerto in G minor with a rather ineffective piano part, a beautiful Violin Concerto in A minor and a supreme Cello Concerto in B

minor.”³ Russian virtuoso pianist Sviatoslav Richter⁴ in sharing his opinion on the work, “What a shame, so much fine music, so many successful details, but, all in all, it’s not a success.”⁵

Some decades after the concerto was composed, Czech pianist and pedagogue Vilém Kurz (1872-1945) responded to criticism by revising the piano solo part and, in his opinion, improving it through changes designed to add both pianistic brilliance and technical refinement.⁶ In 1919, the Kurz version of Dvořák’s Piano Concerto was premiered by the arranger’s daughter, Czech pianist Ilona Kurzová (1899-1975), under the baton of Václav Talich. At first, this reworking did not attract much public attention either. Since 1955, however, both Dvořák’s original and Kurz’s revised version have been printed together, one under the other, as in Otakar Šourek’s critical edition, published by Artia (1955).⁷

Dvořák’s major compositions have been discussed and performed in many types of media, resulting in copious information regarding his symphonic works, chamber music, and songs. However, in regard to this particular work, most of the few available sources focus on mentioning the various weaknesses of the concerto and substantiating the already extant negative criticism. Additionally, not many of these resources approach the piece in a detailed manner, which disappointingly results in disregard of the attractive

---

⁷ Clapham, 97.
qualities found in Dvořák’s musical idiom.

Despite a series of generalized disapproving remarks, there are several sources providing historical information which argue in favor of the work. David Hurwitz, in his book, *Dvořák: Romantic Music’s Most Versatile Genius*, states that this piece is an outstanding example of a work modeled on the classical concerto style, and finds the original version of the composition to be a “shapely, attractive, lyrical piece with no dead spots whatsoever.” The book titled *Dvorák Symphonies and Concertos*, by Robert Layton, provides a positive overview of the work and discusses some relevant topics regarding the concerto, such as the piano writing. Both Hurwitz and Layton state that in response to criticism, Dvořák considered revising the piano part. However, he opted for not changing any notes after hearing the piece again in performance. “He knew he had done well, and beyond that, the piece was by no means a failure in his own lifetime, achieving success on several occasions both at home and abroad. So rather than complain about what the music is not, it pays to consider what in fact it is.” In the article “Some Remarks Concerning the Autograph Score of Dvořák’s G-Minor Piano Concerto,” Jan Dehner provides a fascinating and much deeper insight into Dvorak’s compositional procedures by examining the solo part in the composer’s manuscript.

The autograph shows numerous adjustments in the piano solo part made by Dvořák with the aim to “achieve a more effective and virtuoso-sounding texture.”

---

9 Layton, 57-59.
10 Hurwitz, 56-57.
11 Ibid, 57.
Notwithstanding multiple criticisms to the concerto, Dehner maintains that this work “is a convincing and significant musical masterpiece.”\footnote{Ibid.} Czech pianist Radoslav Kvapil, who is widely regarded as the leading contemporary authority on Czech piano music,\footnote{Alena Němcová. "Kvapil, Radoslav." In Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/15723 (accessed November 30, 2009).} also commented on the concerto, stating that Dvořák “made every note so very important. So he wrote things that can be incredibly awkward and difficult but sound fresh and new.”\footnote{John C. Tibbetts, Dvořák in America (Portland: Amadeus Press, 1993), 275.}

There are at least eleven recordings of this Piano Concerto. Some pianists, notably František Maxián (a pupil of Vilém Kurz) and Ivan Moravec, recorded the revised version of the concerto; Rudolf Firkušný, also a pupil of Vilém Kurz, recorded first the revised version and later rerecorded the work this time performing Dvořák’s original. The original score was recorded by such major artists as Sviatoslav Richter, Radoslav Kvapil and András Schiff. Still others, Garrick Ohlsson among them, combine elements from both versions. These artists, committed to bringing Dvořák’s Piano Concerto to the public in performance and on records, have well proven that this neglected work is of outstanding artistic and instrumental merit, and their championing of the work has contributed to the much increased interest in the concerto as part of the canon in the genre. (See appendix for the listing of the recordings).

The goal of this study is to examine the revisions Kurz made to Dvořák’s original and to further explore their musical intent and pianistic aims. It is the author’s hope that...
this treatise will provide a foundation for making educated decisions regarding textual choices and contribute to a more informed approach to the work.
CHAPTER II

COMPARISION BETWEEN THE ORIGINAL AND THE REVISED VERSION

In Dvořák’s autograph, many corrections can be found in the piano solo part. This is indicative of the struggles the composer went through to create a piece for virtuosi.\textsuperscript{16}

To achieve this purpose, Dvořák constantly increased the level of technical difficulty. For instance, he expanded the tonal space by using large leaps or increased the technical demand on the left hand figurations, which resulted in unusual hand motions and placements.

In general, the harmonic texture of the piano solo part is thin, while the orchestral fabric is rich. This factor leads to a generalized perception that it is the orchestra and not the piano solo part which has the leading role throughout the piece. These reasons could have contributed to judgments that deemed Dvořák’s original as being both ineffective and pianistically awkward.

To resolve the issue of thin harmonic textures, as found in the original, Kurz enriched sonorities by adding notes, doubling notes, changing notation, and rearranging notes in different registers. The intention of these changes was to facilitate technical execution while providing a more robust texture. In regard to pianistic ineffectiveness, Kurz focuses on reducing technical demands and awkward hand placements by deleting, rearranging, and rewriting notes, as well as changing articulation markings. The

purpose of these adaptations is to simplify the music and make it more manageable from both a technical and interpretative standpoints. In some cases, for example, these rearrangements account for the production of a fuller sound while requiring less physical effort from the performer.

Overall, the changes Kurz made in the revised version are based on established technical premises that simply aim to make the piece more brilliant and yet manageable. Moreover, the approach he uses is reflective of pianistic writing styles and performance practices exhibited primarily in the the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. For instance, similar ideas can be found in Percy Grainger’s edition/arrangement of Grieg’s Piano Concerto, as well as in Busoni’s transcription of Liszt’s Spanish Rhapsody (Folies d'Espagne and Jota aragonesa). Both of these examples illustrate a synthesis of compositional approaches and pianistic elements reminiscent of the aesthetic principles found in Kurz’s reworking of Dvořák’s concerto.

---

19 Franz Liszt, Folies d'Espagne and Jota aragonesa, arranged as a concert piece for piano and orchestra by Ferruccio Busoni (New York : G. Schirmer, 1894).
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF SELECTED EXAMPLES FROM KURZ’S VERSION

Simplification of Textures /Materials

In order to have a better understanding of the changes made by Kurz, his revisions will be divided into three major categories with several subcategories: 1) simplification of textures and/or materials, 2) rhythmic changes and 3) harmonic and sonorous enrichment. A number of musical examples of each type and from each movement are provided and discussed in detail to further clarify these distinctions.

1. Examples of Simplification of Texture/Material
   - Alternating hands:

   Examples 1 and 2 illustrate the fact that Dvořák’s original rendition often makes considerable technical demands on the performer; in these cases due to the use of double-thirds figurations. Kurz’s version simplifies this by rearranging the passage to make use of the alternation of the hands. In both cases, the sound can be projected effectively and with relative ease. This is an illustration of one of many pianistic devices in nineteenth century virtuoso piano writing, as seen in example from Percy Grainger’s rearrangement in Grieg’s Piano Concerto (Example 3). Similar arrangement can also be seen in Example 4.
Example 1. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 70-72.

Example 2. Dvořák : Piano Concerto, movement 3, mm. 268-272.
Example 3. Grieg: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 69-71.

In Example 5, Dvořák’s writing makes it difficult to bring out the top voice despite the fact that the way the passage is originally conceived leads it to naturally have a more sustained sound. Kurz simply replaces the original sixteenth notes with a block-chord alternating figure, allowing the pianist to effortlessly project the indicated ff ending. Kurz’s solution follows countless examples from the piano works by Johannes Brahms. See Example 6.

Example 5. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 393-395.

In order to create a more forceful sound, Kurz rewrites the last two beats of m.428 (Example 7) with a figure that allows hands to alternate, and adds the indication *martellato*. His version has more penetrating power while Dvořák’s original is more vivid and, with articulation as indicated by the composer, fits better with the rhythmic characteristics of the theme being played by orchestra. A similar device can also be found in mm. 492-493 (Example 8).
Example 7. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 426-431.

Example 8. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 492-493.
Dealing notes

Kurz redistributes some of the left hand notes to the right hand, and eliminates others to create octaves in the right hand (Example 9). This, however, does not affect the pianist’s ability to project with a fair amount of volume. In fact, this type of pianistic writing accounts for the production of a fuller sound in an effortless manner.


In Example 10, fuller chords in the second and last beats are deleted (m. 301) with the rapid alternation of octaves, which is similar to the original sound. This writing is used throughout the measure 302, increasing the power of the passage without changing the intended rhythm or the musical gesture.
Example 10. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 299-304.
In Example 11, Kurz deletes some notes of the third beat from the original, and rearranges the last beat with a sixteenth-note blocked chord figure that projects effective sound easily (m.213). The main purpose of this rearrangement is to make the left hand part less busy and provide more time so it can properly prepare for the last beat as well as for the leap to the first beat of measure 214.

Example 11. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 212-214.

As shown in Example 12, this passage in Dvořák’s original is composed mainly of four-note chords. However, they are difficult to play in tempo, especially for pianists who have small hands. Kurz’s revision resolves this issue by simply deleting what he considers to be non-essential notes, and also changes the articulation to a “non legato” touch in the left hand.

- Rearranging notes

  In Example 13, the notes from the original are rearranged in a way that the triplet figures are played with either the right hand or left hand (m. 297), which produce the effective sound with ease.

Example 13. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 295-298.
The original version of the passage shown in Example 14 is comprised of large intervals that make it technically challenging for the pianist. Kurz rearranges notes in both hands within the same span of the tenth, avoiding difficult reaches of the sixth and the seventh as in the original, without affecting the harmonic texture.


Another instance where the harmony remains unaffected is shown in Example 15. Kurz removes the accent markings and rearranges the sixteenth-note figures so that their range is within an octave. This reworking makes the passage fairly easy for the performer and avoids the unpianistic jumps found in Dvořák’s original. Nonetheless, Dvořák’s writing is more effective in terms of sound and once again fits better with the rhythmic elements of the theme played by the orchestra.
Example 15. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 3, mm. 243-252.

The sixteenth-note triplet figurations shown in Example 16 require leaps, awkward for the smaller hand, as the hand moves from one group to another. To avoid this, Kurz rearranges the patterns by placing the entire figuration in high register and having it move in stepwise motion. This completely eliminates the jumps and gives the passage an easily attainable brilliance.
Example 16. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 3, mm. 362-364

In Example 17, Kurz replaces the double-thirds with octaves. This writing reduces the technical demands without changing the harmony. The texture, however, is thin compared to the original presentation, since the rearrangement in sixteenth does not allow to achieve the “compressed” and intense sound of the double thirds.

Example 17. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 3, mm. 536-539.
Articulation/Touch Changes

An example of this type of adjustment can be seen in measures 323-324 of Example 18, where Kurz does not make any note changes in the left hand part, but rather deletes the original tie. Without the tie, the passage is easier to play. The two-note slurs are removed in the right hand, although the revision will probably produce the effect of a slur naturally. The main objection one might have to this particular arrangement is that different notes of the chord fall on each beat than the original.

Example 18. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 323-324.
A similar approach can be seen in Example 19 (mm.365-366), where the sound can be projected more effectively without holding notes. This rewriting, with a proper use of pedal should produce an effect very close to the one intended by Dvořák, although the pedaling options will be limited if the tied notes of the original are not held. The Kurz’s version is clearly less difficult but it also eliminates brilliance and strength of the sixteenth note upbeats, particularly in the right hand.

Rhythmic Changes

2. Examples of Rhythmic Changes

In measure 95, the first movement, Kurz replaces the rhythm on the second and the last beat of the right hand part with grace notes and trills. This change makes the passage easier to play but the effect is much less rhythmically sophisticated than the original.

Example 20. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 93-95
Example 21 illustrates a modification in the structure through a reversal of the rhythmic components in the last two beats of m. 193. The purpose of this change is to have a smoother flow in the musical discourse, as notes progress from slower ones (four sixteenth notes) to faster ones (sixteenth note quintuplet).

Example 21. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 91-193.

Example 22 illustrates the fact that technical demands in Dvořák’s original are on occasions not only extremely taxing, but rather unnatural as well. In this particular instance, the composer requires the performer to play a tremolo figure and simultaneously bring out an accented tenor notes. In the revision, Kurz replaces the tremolo part with sixteenth-note arpeggio sextuplets, which considerably decreases the level of difficulty.
Example 22. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 494-495.

Another instance of this type of reworking can be seen in measure 68 of the second movement (Example 23), where the pulse of the second beat is based on eighth-notes. Kurz changes it into a rhythmic figure that is based on triplets. In other words, Dvořák divides the beat into two while Kurz divides it into three. The writing in the original is nonetheless much more rhythmically sophisticated; this type of rhythmic pattern appears often in Dvořák’s works and is one of the characteristic elements of his musical language.
Example 23. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 2, mm. 68-70.

In measures 178-180 of the third movement (Example 24), Kurz rewrites the rhythm with a sequence of triplet figures which extends from the previous measures. Unlike the rhythm found in the original, Kurz’s version is more manageable due to the resulting rhythmic consistency and the increased number of notes provides for more easily attained projection.

The rhythmic pattern and note arrangement found in the third movement, measures 384-385 (Example 25), is complicated and not easy to master, therefore making it difficult to coordinate. Kurz simplifies it by changing the rhythm of the left hand part from triplet figures to sixteenth notes descending in an arpeggio pattern (mm.384-385). This same procedure can also be found in the right hand part, where Kurz simply repeats the identical notes of the first beat, and then arranges them in descending motion. All these alternate solutions prove to be essential in making the passage easier to play from a technical perspective.

In Example 26, the rhythmic pattern of Dvořák’s original consists of a five note grouping against two eighth notes. Kurz rewrites it by changing the grouping from five notes into two sixteenth note figures and deletes the doubling and accent markings, which enhance the hands’ ability to coordinate the passage successfully.

Harmonic and Sonorous Enrichment

3. Examples of Harmonic and Sonorous Enrichment

- Adding/rearranging notes

The writing in Dvořák’s original score makes frequent use of unison writing, which results in a thin harmonic texture of the piano part. An instance of this can be seen in Example 27, where Kurz rearranges notes in both hands in a way that provides more range and tone color than the original. This process can also be observed in measures 532-533 of the first movement, where Kurz reorganizes the right hand part and adds notes to the left hand part (Example 28). This thicker texture, however, deprives the music of the melodic contour intended by Dvořák.

Example 27. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 73-74.
Example 28. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 532-533.

The passage in Example 29 also illustrates Kurz’s interest in enriching the sonority. Instead of leaving single notes in the right hand melody, like in the original, Kurz decides to score them as chords instead. He also rearranges the notes in the left hand and places them in a lower register. The apparent purpose of these changes is to create a fuller, orchestra-like sound. This example can also serve to illustrate redistribution, which in no way affects the composer’s text, as is the case with accented notes in the tenor. Taking some of them with the right hand greatly facilitates performance.
In measures 93-94 and 512-513 of the first movement, Kurz adds notes to the arpeggiated chords. Although these modifications appear not to be substantial, the resulting sonority differs highly from the original, becoming much more expansive, particularly in mm.512-513. See Examples 30 and 31.
Example 31. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 508-515.
In Example 32, Kurz changes the thin texture found in the original. This is accomplished through the addition of notes by using intervals of sixths in mm.118 and 120. While this particular reworking enriches the sound, the legato touch becomes harder to achieve, and the simplicity of the original is no longer apparent.

Example 32. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 118-121.
Kurz occasionally also adds ornamentation to the melodic line, as shown in Example 33, changing Dvořák’s more vocal quality to the instrumental approach.

Example 33. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 2, mm. 16-20.
In Example 34, Kurz adds notes in both the right hand and left hand parts and then places them (m.26) in a higher register, in addition to rearranging them. In mm.27-28, in addition to the extra notes, Kurz modifies the left hand triplet figure to facilitate performance without changing the harmony. This is achieved through a redistribution of the notes in order to avoid the leaps. The sonority becomes richer and the touch is more legato than in Dvořák’s original, but the original feeling of pulse diminishes.

Example 34. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 2, mm. 25-30.
Kurz enriches harmonies and sonorities through the addition of notes to thicken the pianistic texture which can be already seen in Example 29. In Example 35, he replaces the original single octaves of the right hand part with chords. He also adds notes to the left hand part, and changes the quintuplet rhythm in the last three beats of measure 38 with a sequence of sixteenths, which smoothes the flow and facilitates execution to finish an eighth lighter. In mm.40, Kurz practically doubles the number of notes in the scale passage and expands its range. Kurz’s intent seems to be yet again enhancing the otherwise thin harmonic texture that appears in the original.

Example 35. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 2, mm. 37-40.
In mm. 211-212 of the third movement, Kurz’s reworking consists of changing single notes into chords in the right hand part. Despite the fact that this increases the technical demands of the passage, Kurz seems more interested in both the quantity and quality of the sound being produced. Additionally, staccato markings are added to the left hand chords. This facilitates the execution and creates a more effective sound, although a change of character from the original can also be perceived. See Example 36.


Apart from adding chords to the right hand part (mm.461-464), Kurz takes notes away from the right hand and rewrites it as chromatic broken sixths (mm.465-467). He also simplifies the left hand part (mm.465-467), making it more brilliant. Kurz rearranges the notes of the left hand part and adds accents, making the passage less awkward (mm.461-464). With these changes, the notes can be played with ease, allowing the performer to focus on reaching the climax. See Example 37.
Example 37. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 3, mm. 461-470.
Besides enriching sonorities, the additional notes occasionally create a complete change in atmosphere. An instance of this can be found in Example 38, where Kurz considerably extends the arpeggiated figures for both right and left hand parts.

Example 38. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 3, mm. 480-482.

Instead of leaving untouched a rather spare sound of the original in mm.522-525 or the third movement, Kurz polishes it by adding notes and having both hands play in unison. This strengthens the sonority and creates a powerful effect. See Example 39.

Example 39. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 3, mm. 523-525.
Doublings

An example of this can be found in measures 126-127 of the first movement, where Kurz doubles the notes of the left hand part and places them in different registers. This is done in order to improve yet again the thin texture found in the Dvořák’s original (Example 40). This process is used in the right hand part as well. The harmony does not change at all, but the quality of sound is more sonorous. However, the original texture achieves a very different, more articulated effect.

Example 40. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 125-127.

In Example 41, Kurz doubles the melodic line in the right hand part in order to amplify the sonorous range. However, this change prevents the lyrical contour found in the original from being easily projected. Kurz seems to apply the same reasoning in parts of the third movement, for instance measures 130-132 of the third movement. See Example 42.
Example 41. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 2, mm. 59-60.

Example 42. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 3, mm. 128-132.
• Changing notation

An example of this can be seen in measures 97-98 of the first movement, where chords are originally written in parallel descending motion. Kurz changes the notation by placing these chords in different registers. Instead of rolling the chords simultaneously, he changes the arpeggio marks, requesting the performer to perform continuous rolls. The sonority Kurz creates here is richer and more sustained, with somewhat changed harmonies. However, compared to the original, this revision loses one of the effects characteristic of Dvořák, often found in the piano part of his chamber works (e.g. Piano Trio, opus 90, “Dumky”).

Example 43. Dvořák: Piano Concerto, movement 1, mm. 96-98.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

Compared to his other major works, Dvořák’s Piano Concerto has remained in the shadows, facing indifference from the musical world for many years. However, the work had been greeted with enthusiasm by some critics after its premiere in 1876. For example, the newspaper *Pokrok* stated that “Antonín Dvořák has again presented himself in a new genre of musical composition… and proved that he is fully conversant with it. His composition is distinguished by many a spirited idea and by clear and well-considered workmanship. Although it places greater weight on the orchestra than on the piano, it demands an extremely adroit performer in the solo part.”\(^{20}\) Another review in *Národní listy* complemented the work by mentioning that “this three-movement concerto…is one of the very first of our works to be written in sonata form, and it is beyond question the most mature and profound composition by Dvořák the symphonist.”\(^{21}\)

In response to criticism and prejudice, Vilém Kurz rewrote the piano solo part with the hope that his version could bring this concerto back to the performance stage. His primary goal was to enrich sonorities and reduce the level of technical demands. Although, like Dvořák’s original, his revision did not gain much acceptance with the public, both of their versions have been utilized by different pianists throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Some pianists, like Sviatoslav Richter and

\(^{20}\) *Pokrok*, 78 (March 1878):4.

\(^{21}\) *Národní listy*, 84(March 1878):5.
Radoslav Kvapil, follow Dvořák’s original faithfully while others, like Ivan Moravec, preferred Kurz’s revised version. American pianist Garrick Ohlsson performed a version which combined both the original and Kurz’s adaptation. These artists, as well as other leading pianists, have been committed to bringing Dvořák’s Piano Concerto to the public both through performances and recordings. They have proven without a doubt that this neglected work is of outstanding artistic and musical merit.

Moreover, due to their efforts and those of numerous other pianists, it is quite clear that the work has started to make a comeback, gradually increasing in popularity with both performers and audiences alike. It should be noted that Kurz’s reworking of the piece is consistent with late nineteenth century piano writing -the time when the work was composed- and is to an extent reminiscent of efforts like that of Busoni in Liszt’s Spanish Rhapsody(Folies d'Espagne and Jota aragonesa)\textsuperscript{22} and Grainger in Grieg’s Piano Concerto\textsuperscript{23}, as mentioned earlier. These modifications did not aim to simply change the original, but rather reflected the mindset of an accomplished musician working in a particular period in music history. In regard to Dvořák’s concerto, David Hurwitz states that “If it will never be as popular as the more famous works of its era, this doesn’t mean that the music is a failure.”\textsuperscript{24} It is imperative to remember, as Clapham mentioned: “Dvořák’s work should not be allowed to drop completely out of the repertoire, for, even if it is not on the same level as his following concertos, it contains much of the genuine Dvořák, and consequently when performed by sympathetic musicians has much to

\textsuperscript{22} Franz Liszt, Folies d'Espagne and Jota aragonesa, arranged as a concert piece for piano and orchestra by Ferruccio Busoni (New York : G. Schirmer, 1894).
\textsuperscript{24} Hurwitz, 59.
commend it.”

The concept of Kurz’s revision aimed to make the piano solo part more brilliant and pianistic. In some cases, Dvořák’s original is superior to the revised version based on the musical reasons, while occasionally; Kurz’s revision should be used particularly regarding technical facilitation.

This study is intended to provide a foundation for making informed decisions regarding textual choices; some rewritings are considered an improvement, but some changes are in opposition to the composer’s intent. It is hoped that this study will ideally provide a primary and valuable source for pianists to appreciate and further understand Dvořák’s Piano Concerto in a more positive light, and lead to more frequent performances.

---

25 Clapham, 99.
APPENDIX

ALTERATIONS
The following alterations are used by the author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement III</th>
<th>Reasons why choose the alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm.387 and 389</td>
<td>Simplify the rhythmic pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 486-493</td>
<td>Reduce the technical demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 510-517</td>
<td>Reduce the technical demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 541-549</td>
<td>Reduce the technical demands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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