

Lively Experiences of the Orchestral Performance at Home without an Orchestra through Arrangements: Analytical Observations on the Arrangements of Beethoven's Symphonies¹

MARUYAMA Yoko

Today, we can enjoy music without attending concerts. Wherever we are, whether en route to work, sitting in waiting rooms or, as is most often the case, at home, we can consume music through CDs, DVDs, podcasts and other online streaming services. If concert-goers find appealing a certain work performed at a live show, they can listen to the piece again at home from a recording; however, before this technology was available, favourite works could not be accessed at just any time or in any place. Likewise, opportunities to be entertained by the original performance of a musical work were limited to repeat performances (which were rarer than today) or to those who could afford to buy tickets or who had connections to the concert organisers (particularly for private concerts). How, then, did people satisfy their desire to integrate music into their everyday lives, especially in their homes? Perhaps they played music themselves or hired musicians for private performances, but this did not necessarily give them access to the music they most appreciated. For example, pianists may have been unable to play string instruments, and not everyone was able to hire house orchestras. Even aristocrats gradually disbanded their *Kapellen* around the turn of the nineteenth century.² Thus, what could music lovers do to bring the sounds of their favourite works into their homes? Moreover, how did they know works at all, aside from at concerts?

In these situations, arrangements were immensely significant to domestic music consumption, that is works becomes accessible in an arranged form (e.g. an arrangement designed for a piano solo from a string quartet becomes enjoyable for a keyboard player). Despite many arrangements types, such as those for enlarged performing forces (piano music for chamber works, for example) or for more popular instruments than the original, arrangements for small performing forces, especially those of original orchestral works, provided alternatives for domestic music making, as suggested in previous studies,³ because

such orchestral works were usually only performed at public/semi-public concerts; even when performed in private, the presentation would be limited to select social classes, such as aristocrats, many of whom could hire orchestras for their private concerts.⁴

Recently, Nancy November (2020: 225) referred to the functions of arrangements as the 'repeated performance and close study' of a work. In her research, November explored the qualities demanded of arrangements based on contemporary reviews of various adaptations of *Eroica*. Based on November's observations, we can understand the nineteenth century view regarding the requirements for arrangements as follows.⁵

First, ideal arrangements should be faithful to the original composition. In terms of the appreciation of originality, which began to increase at the end of the eighteenth century (Leopold 2000b: 8–9), this notion may perhaps be surprising in that it emphasises maintaining the original nature of the music. Indeed, remaining faithful to the original encompasses more than simply retaining the original melodic line or harmonic progression. Second, the original instrumentation should be captured by the arrangement, and third, the original texture and timbre, including the contrast between them, should be perceivable.

In considering arrangements played in small private venues, it is important to understand that orchestral music differs from that composed for small performing forces in terms of sonorous quality. In this respect, one may wonder whether adapting arrangements for small ensembles impairs the original composition's power to the point of diminishing its appeal, resulting in an unsuccessful representation of the original.

Skilful arrangers can provide listeners with living musical experiences. Such elaborate arrangements make it possible to not only auditorily experience (and then enjoy) quasi-symphonic sonority but also grasp the essence of the work, that is its formal structure and the motivic relationship or musical nature of a certain phrase, through self-performance at home. Arrangements' function for a better understanding of a work has often been discussed since Beethoven's lifetime. As Ladenburger (2008: 20–21) suggested, citing *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* (vol. 8, col. 8–9, 1806), understanding would be apparently enhanced by the physical experience through self-playing.⁶

Concentrated listening also helps deepen this understanding, and it is undeniable that the extent to which arrangements contribute to comprehension depends on how works are arranged (see below). Self-playing, however, involves various senses: not only hearing, but also seeing the score and touching the instruments by moving one's own body. Such multitudinous physical senses could imprint the music. The impression could become perhaps stronger than by only listening, at least occasionally.

Moreover, from a retrospective viewpoint, arrangements can help us ascertain how the work was understood by the arrangers (in this paper, by Beethoven's contemporaries). If the arrangers' comprehension was to the point and they successfully make this perceivable in their arrangement, consumers will come closer to work's essence through the arrangers' view. Moreover, the arranging method can occasionally imply compositional standards in general.

This paper aims to clarify these points persuasively with a detailed analysis, taking arrangements from Beethoven's symphonies, for example. Among the various performing forces for arrangements, the focus here is on chamber music to examine arrangements performed in small-scale private venues. Indeed, piano arrangements may come to mind as a form of convenience media for working on musical pieces in small-scale venues.⁷ However, in considering that the aim of arrangements is to reproduce orchestral works faithfully and the physical experience of performance, piano arrangements seem better discussed separately from other arrangements in small performing forces: there are numerous arrangements in a piano/vocal score, or *Klavierauszug*, and they have many functions, including study or practical use for singers as an alternative to orchestral accompaniment. There are even *Klavierauszüge*, which are too difficult to play. In the case of arrangements only for piano (not with ad-libitum instruments), their categorisation (medium for enjoying works instead of orchestra or *Klavierauszug* for study/practice) seems difficult; some of them perhaps cannot be categorised into only one type. Further research on piano arrangements should highlight one aspect of the *raison d'être* of arrangements, but it goes beyond the scope of this article. Here, instead, we take chamber arrangements of the composer's contemporaries who are familiar with his compositions, namely Johann Nepomuk Hummel and Ferdinand Ries, along with several other arrangements that contain less remarkable changes.

Hummel arranged Beethoven's symphonies up to no. 7, playable either as piano solo or piano quartets with ad-libitum parts.⁸ From these, nos. 1 and 2 (for a relatively compact orchestra among Beethoven's symphonies), as well as no. 5 (for an expanded orchestra) are closely examined here. Meanwhile, Ries produced various arrangements of his teacher, Beethoven's works.⁹ Among these, one of Beethoven's *Eroica* for a piano quartet (published posthumously in 1857 [November 2019: xiv]) is exemplified here because observations of previous studies also help readers' consideration.

In addition, Zulehner's string quartet version of Symphony no. 1 (published in 1828) and the piano trio version of Symphony no. 2 (published in 1806, attributed to Beethoven but supposedly by Ries [Raab 1994: 168f.; November 2019: xiv]), are consulted for a better

overview of the general trend in arrangement techniques.

On the whole, the composers made no drastic changes to the original works, such as adding newly invented unique motifs or melodies, except for the additional measures by Ries (see below). In this sense, they meet the contemporary demand for the faithful translation of originals and therefore enrich domestic music-making with a symphonic repertoire; however, they (especially Hummel) did not literally transcribe the original musical text.¹⁰ Remarkably, changes to the original dynamics, rhythms, registers and harmonies are often found.

To avoid passing partial judgment in favour of arrangements (as the author never mean to say arrangements are better than originals), it should be noted that changes to arrangements can sometimes abandon the fundamental aspects of the original. In Hummel's arrangement, for example, the initial motive and its variation in the theme of Symphony no. 1 are contrasted by the slur and staccato in the original, but Hummel spoiled this contrast (ex. 1, Symphony no. 1-1, mm. 19-20 and 21¹¹). On the other hand, some articulations appear written arbitrarily or inconsistently (ex. 2, no. 1-1, mm. 248ff., compare the broken accord of the flute and the pianoforte in the arrangement to the same in the original).

Ex. 1. Symphony no. 1-1

Piano part, mm. 19ff.



(This paper cites only Hummel's arrangements. The instruments are notated in the following order: flute, violin, cello, and piano forte. In this paper, staccatos are consistently represented either as dots or a wedge in each example; Notation is tacitly modernized.)

Ex. 2. Symphony no. 1-1, mm. 248ff

Similarly, some changes in Ries' arrangement distort or negate the original structure: in no. 3-2, the rhythmically impressive motive in bass continues from m. 200 but drops off from m. 204. From m. 226, the harmonically important c is originally intensified by the repeated note, though it is weakened through the omission of the high note of the flute in the arrangement. The contrasting sound is not always enriched but sometimes dismissed, as the arrangement abandons the original increase in number of the instruments in no. 3-4, from m. 412ff.¹²

Some alternations from the originals like these seem unable to be explained in light of the shortness of the parts. Nevertheless, it is still noteworthy that many deviations from the original have led to the realisation of a lively orchestral dynamism or a clear-cut version of the original's essential structure. A discussion of the full array of arrangement techniques goes beyond the scope of this article, so several select examples are illustrated.

Contrast

In downsized arrangements, reducing the number of instruments limits the change in texture between massive and thin, as well as the variety in timbre and total ambitus. Consequently, arrangements cannot always establish contrasts in the same way as in the originals; however, contemporary arrangers effectuate these contrasts by modifying the original.

Hummel achieves this by changing or adding instruments and increasing or decreasing tones. In addition, altering the register contributes to the ability to represent the original contrast in texture and timbre. In no. 2-1, Hummel maintains the cello register before m. 47, where the cello finally descends to the original double-bass register, which is doubled by the piano's left hand by adding a lower octave, except for sixteenth-note motives (the original first violin does it only in m. 47). What originally happens in m. 47 is strengthening of the melody line by the entering bassoons, but in the cello line, and expanding the whole ensemble, thereby changing the sonority with the additional instruments. This sonorous change and highlight of bass melody are realised differently in the arrangement. In prior studies, skilfully created contrasts in Hummel's arrangement have been observed and deemed more elaborate compared to the works of his contemporaries.¹³

In Ries' arrangement, contrast and the essential outline of phrases are largely maintained. November suggested that he changes the original register to take in the important materials, while holding the original ambitus (see no. 3-2, piano and double-bass [November 2019: xiv-xv]). He mobilises registral change for contrast, as well. Comparing

the corresponding four-bar phrases before and after m. 113 in the closing section of the exposition in no. 3-1, for example, the string and winds exchange the melody and subordinate parts in m. 113, but the highest pitches of melody and subordinate parts both remain the same (see the first violin and flute). Conversely, Ries cuts the original highest *f*'' in the flute (mm. 109–112), consequently restricting the high tones of the original winds' accord (now following the oboe part). In the next four bars from m. 113, not only the melody (now in the violin), but also the accompanying accords (in the piano) takes over the highest pitch in the original. The original contrast between these two four-bar phrases—apart from dynamics and rhythmic alternation—through instrumental change via the exchange of melody and accompaniment is now supported by a registral structure in the arrangement. Before and after m. 93 (lower register, recapitulation from mm. 351) in no. 3-3, a similar restriction and expansion of the register is found.

Many original nuances in sonority are reproduced, as Hummel translates the original massive texture through a thicker accord. Ries' version also reveals his concern for nuance, including the original registral settings of the musical materials. In no. 3-1, mm. 655ff., for example, the original lowest range remains the same as the previous phrase (see double-bass, mm. 647ff.). Conversely, Ries transposes it an octave higher (namely, cutting double-bass) before m. 655 and then shifts it to the original register from m. 655. This seemingly contradictory change could represent the registral distribution among the whole orchestra. From m. 655, bass range becomes gradually thicker: timpani begin continuous rolling and, subsequently, the horns and trumpets shift to lower tones and repeat them without rest (previously trumpets with punctuation) until the end of the phrase (m. 663). The lower part is also strengthened in that now four instruments (bassons, viola, cello and double-bass) produce one melody together, while only the low strings are coupled up to m. 654. That Ries seems to place great importance on tone colour is supported by the fact that he reserves the original *pizzicato* almost entirely in the arrangement, giving such parts played by *pizzicatos* to string instruments, not the piano.

Registral adjustment is found in the arrangement by Zulehner as well. In no. 1-1, from m. 198, the violins' melody is transposed an octave higher (violins, *g*²-*g*³ with *sf* in m. 198), so the original uppermost pitches of the flute are maintained in the arrangement, though the original accords in the woodwinds are abandoned. In the arrangement of no. 2-4 issued under Beethoven's name, the highest note of the opening unison motive (woodwinds) is transposed an octave lower after jumping down. As a result, the registral contrast

between the off-beat ascending and lower trill motive is sharpened. Registral adjustments like these also imply the high consciousness of the contemporaries of tone colour and how to imitate the original sonorous nuance with a small ensemble.

Ex. 3. Symphony no. 2-1

The musical score for Ex. 3 consists of three systems. The first system shows a violin part (top staff) and a piano part (bottom staff). The violin part has a dynamic marking of *f* at the end. The piano part has dynamic markings of *p* and *f*. The second system continues the violin and piano parts, with the piano part having a dynamic marking of *ff* at the end. The third system shows the piano part with a dynamic marking of *ff* at the end.

Repetition, mm. 81ff.

The musical score for Ex. 3, showing the repetition from mm. 81ff., consists of three systems. The first system shows a violin part (top staff) and a piano part (bottom staff). The violin part has a dynamic marking of *p* at the beginning. The piano part has a dynamic marking of *p* at the beginning. The second system continues the violin and piano parts. The third system shows the piano part with a dynamic marking of *f* at the end.

Ex. 4. Symphony no. 1-1, mm. 110ff.

The musical score for Ex. 4 consists of three systems. The first system shows a violin part (top staff) and a piano part (bottom staff). The violin part has dynamic markings of *fz*, *p*, and *sf*. The piano part has dynamic markings of *fz*, *p*, and *pp*. The second system continues the violin and piano parts. The third system shows the violin and piano parts with dynamic markings of *fz*, *p*, and *sf*. A black box highlights a specific passage in the piano part of the second system.

The contrasts highlighted in an arrangement are not restricted to tone colour. Hummel, for instance, also enhanced the contrasting character of each phrase—lyrical, rhythmic and so on. In the secondary theme of no. 2 (ex. 3), the additional suspended notes of the piano enhance the legato character, which is endowed by a sixteenth-note trill. Consequently, this phrase progresses more smoothly than the foregoing phrase (mm. 73ff.). In the other example (ex. 4), an additional ‘pp’, which was originally ‘p’, emphasises the

accents that follow.¹⁴

Orchestral Dynamism

The sonorous powerfulness, as well as the dynamism it produces are perhaps considered appealing points of orchestral music. A dramatic climax reinforced by a large performing force, however, cannot emanate from a chamber ensemble. Nevertheless, symphonic motion can be generated in a way that suits them, even with chamber ensembles. Changing rhythm, articulation and dynamics in contemporary arrangements typically contributes to this effect. In Hummel's arrangement (ex. 5), the additional crescendo and diminuendo, the newly created contrast between forte and piano and the alternation of articulation serve to enhance the liveliness, even though it is against the Original.

Simultaneously, a sonorous climax is also created by expanding the overall ambitus, which the contemporaries often introduce near the phrase ending, as in Hummel's version of no. 2-2, mm. 135ff. (ex. 6). In this phrase, the original maintains the same register until the phrase ends, while in the arrangement, the lower register expands. As this example, such expansions are often achieved by avoiding the lowest or highest pitches in the earlier phase of the passage. In the arrangement of no. 2-1, attributed to Beethoven, from m. 197, the bass range, which originally remains the same as previous measures (His-his), expands (His¹-His in piano). Theoretically, the bass range could remain an octave higher, aligning it with the original (cello,

Ex. 5. Symphony no. 1-4, 86ff.

Contrast between articulations newly created dynamic wave.

Ex. 6. Symphony no. 2-2, mm. 135ff.

double-bass, bassoons). Considering that m. 197 is just the place where the fortissimo and the diminished seventh prepare for the formal and harmonic caesura in m. 198, however, the registral change in the arrangement seems intended for the climax at the end of the phrase. Ries' version of *Eroica* shows many examples of this procedure to create a climax, one of which is the registral expansion in the closing section of no. 3-1, discussed above. Similarly, in the development, he avoids the highest range of winds in the imitation from m. 244 until the fortissimo outburst from m. 248, where the piano covers the original flute's uppermost note. Remarkably, the violin in the arrangement, which previously followed the winds, takes the original violin part at this point. It seems the aim is to give accords to the piano to effectuate the use of the damper pedal, which helps to enhance sonorous richness.

As in this example, the damper pedal is another typical device used to create dynamism through its enrichment of the whole sound: unique to arrangements and decidedly different from the original orchestra without piano. The arrangements including piano by Hummel and Ries often indicate this with fortissimo (see above-mentioned examples). Ries appears to make full use of the pedal, apparently to mark the climax point (see also no. 3-1, mm. 37ff., 218ff., 561ff. in no. 3-2, mm. 76ff, 98ff. and so on), and this frequent usage suggests the development of the piano's construction and, accordingly, Ries' stylistic change. In comparing the piano trio arrangements of Beethoven's string trios op. 9 by Ries (published in 1806 as op. 61 by Simrock in Bonn) with this piano quartet version, it is important to note that during the approximately fifty-year gap between the trio and the quartet versions, the piano developed significantly. The limited use of pedal indication in the trio version compared to its richness in the quartet version indicates that the mechanical development of the piano induced Ries to introduce it more actively.¹⁵

Clarification of the Structure

Changes in arrangements sometimes function as indicators of the musical structure, and several remarkable techniques from among these adjustments are presented next.

Frequently, the formal structure is defined by the control of the register. In the first theme of no. 1-1, the fall to the lowest C of the cello every two measures marks the formal unit of a two-measure phrase (ex.7). The constant alternation of the register also articulates the phrase structure (ex. 8). In the arrangement of no. 2-1 (attributed to Beethoven), from m. 202, the dotted motive is doubled by the right hand of the piano. This originally lacking sonorous change can be identified at the beginning of the repetition of the previous passage.

Ex. 7. Symphony no. 1-1, mm. 33ff.

The musical score for Ex. 7 consists of three staves. The top staff is Violin I, the middle is Violin II, and the bottom is Cello/Double Bass. The Cello/Double Bass staff has a box around the first two measures, highlighting the register change to the lowest C.

Ex. 8. Symphony no. 2-4, mm. 98ff.

The musical score for Ex. 8 consists of three staves. The top staff is Violin I, the middle is Violin II, and the bottom is Piano. The Piano staff has a box around the first two measures, highlighting the articulation and rhythmic shift.

New articulations or a rhythmic shift contribute to structural clarity as well: the additional slur over each three measures in Hummel's no. 2-1, mm. 34ff., for instance, clarifies the changing point of the material and rhythm in a four-measure phrase unit.

Similar examples can be found as well.

Changing the instrumentation or the number of parts can signify a structural unit as well. In no. 3-3, for example, the opening theme is repeated from m. 14. The difference in the instrumentation originally consisted of the additional double bass alone, which signals the new beginning of the theme. Ries, in addition to the lower octave according to the double bass, transposes the accords in the piano's right hand to the strings, so the structural caesura becomes more clearly audible than when adding octave notes alone. From m. 266 in no. 3-4, originally, the sixteenth motive remained in the first violin throughout the imitation, while Ries changed the instrument every phrase, a sonorous change highlighting one phrase unit. At the end of the movement, the structure of the four measures from m. 457, consisting of four one-measure segments, is marked by changing instrumentation every bar: an additional octave in the second violin, the shift from descending to ascending motive and the increase in tones of the ascending scale. In the arrangement, the change to the number of parts for descending and ascending octaves every measure functions as a structural indicator. The alternation between with and without pedal also clarifies the formal unit (see no. 3-1 of Ries' version, mm. 186ff.).

Sometimes, harmonic changes are accentuated in arrangements, as sufficiently exemplified by no. 5-1, m. 34–37 in Hummel's version. Here, the flute follows the upper voice of the piano, while the original flute rests during these four measures, and there are no other wind-note changes in each two-measure unit. Why Hummel makes such a change may possibly be explained in terms of harmony: this piano part follows the original violin part, the descending step of which determines the harmonic transformation. The doubling by the flute in the arrangement underlines this harmonically crucial step to clarify the harmonic shift.

Notably, though in rare cases, Hummel employs techniques to clarify the motivic relationship. In no. 5-1 (mm. 158ff), he divides the beams of the original low strings (now in piano) consistently, whereas they are inconsistent in both Beethoven's autograph and the other authentic sources.¹⁶ Although this change initially appears arbitrary, upon closer examination, it could be conceived as an intentional approach to enable the listener to distinguish clearly that the ascending four notes and descending four notes are paired.¹⁷ As seen in these examples, the musical structure becomes easily perceived through Hummel's changes.¹⁸

Interpretation

Moreover, arrangements can promote a better understanding of the function or nature

intrinsic to a certain formal section in a specific musical form, such as the sonata form, as exemplified by the transition to the secondary theme in no. 5-1 (m. 36ff.). In a sonata form, the transition typically progresses energetically.¹⁹ Here, Hummel shifts the flute to an upbeat with *sforzato* to intensify the momentum of the phrase (from m. 38). Similarly, in the first thematic complex, Hummel emphasises the momentum towards the cadence by gradually decreasing the spacing between part-entries (see below). If the original lacks changes, such as a gradual increase in instruments or growing total ambitus, the growing energy towards the phrase could be only assumed, if ever it is intended: To contemplate how to perform the phrase and to decide whether to add *crescendo* and accents are left to the players, as is certainly always done at live performances; however, in Hummel's versions, the nature of each formal section in the score becomes apparent through his modifications, such as the additional dynamics and newly created instrumental accumulation.

A certain musical character, which, seemingly, contemporary composers commonly admitted to be endowed, becomes perceivable through arrangements, as well. Generally, composers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries tended to increase momentum and volume near the close of the passage. The examples of the original symphonies cited reflect such a tendency and technique for it (expanding ambitus, rhythmic acceleration and forceful dynamics; see also Lodes 2004; Maruyama 2017: 185–208). The changes in the arrangement confirm this tendency as firmly visible through a comparison with their originals.²⁰ The examples can likely illustrate this sufficiently, so only a few other techniques are described.

One is changing the original rhythm, which Zulehner introduces frequently: see the closing section of the exposition in no. 1-1. While tremolo in sixteenth notes is originally given only to violins up to the closing cadence in m. 100, Zulehner adds viola to the arrangement (at the first mm. 92–94). The viola momentarily slows down (in mm. 95f.) and speeds up again at the end of the section, producing the *accelerando* towards the end. At the end of the first section in the development, the original sustaining note of the flute in mm. 134f. is changed to syncopation, which also increases momentum. This kind of rhythmic change is found in other places in his arrangement.

Remarkably, liveliness is sometimes intensified even by the radical addition of musical materials²¹ or of performing indications opposite the original. In the first thematic complex of no. 5-4, mm. 22ff., for example, the intervals between the entrances of each instrument become progressively shorter in the arrangement by Hummel: the piano, violin and cello enter at intervals of one measure, whereas the flute and the lowest voice of the piano's

left hand join in at intervals of a half measure. This pattern differs from that employed in the original, where the interval of each part-entrance is one measure only in m. 23. In this way, Hummel's modifications create the effect of the whole sound expanding with speed up, resulting in music that is driven strongly to the phrase-ending.

Studying a Work with an Arrangement

Arrangements have traditionally served as learning tools for composers. To master the styles or techniques of others, a composer often creates arrangements of other composers' works (Rapp 2000: 74), such as when Beethoven transcribed fugues from J. S. Bach's *Wohltemperierte Klavier* into five or four voices (from BWV 867 and 869, respectively; see Dorfmueller, Gertsch and Ronge [2014: vol. 2, 639–640]). At the same time, arrangements play a pedagogical role for music consumers as well, allowing them to grasp the outline of the work (see the first section of this paper). Indeed, Lott (2015: 46–47) suggested that arrangements in the nineteenth century provided a context in which to study works closely.²²

As noted, changes in the arrangements express the original musical structure—formal, harmonic or motivic—in various ways. Sometimes, even the instrumentation, dynamics or articulation deviate from the original, if, theoretically, those of the original can be imitated. However, this results in clarification of the structure or contrast. Contrasts in the original and its arrangement are difficult to rank, as the sonority of both performing forces is quite different in nature. In arrangements, however, suggestions by professional composers are given in the form of changes from the original. These changes can at least help understanding the musical pieces. Changes which function as reference points are sometimes made by a highly respected composer, such as Hummel. His additional accents, for example, indicate which note should be accented strongly, and the new dynamics he adds imply how to differentiate between the two phrases that follow each other; his articulation suggests which melody should be performed more lyrically or more rhythmically, while the original text is somewhat vague in providing such direction. In arrangements by one connected closely with the original composer, like Ries, the arranger's changes possibly offer an interpretation close to the intention of the original composer: which formal marking should be highlighted, where to initiate intense momentum, etc.

Changes to the original score represent arrangers' interpretations of works, as November also observed. Ries' particular drastic change exemplifies this, as he inserts two measures into the first movement of *Eroica* at the last of the exposition. This

repetition of the previous two measures produces gradual thickening by adding the viola, and emphasises the dominant before the repeat of the exposition (November 2019: xix). Whether to evaluate Ries' insertion as good or bad is difficult considering faithfulness, but listening and playing arrangements indeed allow us to notice the function of this section to return to the tonic impressively.

In this sense, arrangements guide players to study the quintessence of a work through the interpretation of the arranger, who is sometimes a prominent composer of the time. With their interpretation, players learn where orchestral dynamism is necessarily required and how to create various contrast between phrases, even in chamber music form. As such, arrangements allow for the close study and effective performance of the works.

Conclusion

As illustrated, the arrangements analysed in this paper are relatively faithful as a whole; however, they do not simply follow the original note by note, especially those by Hummel and Ries. Rather, numerous modifications sharply represent the original outline. The function of an easy understanding of the original outline is indeed perceived by the contemporary reviewer in a welcome tone (Ladenburger, *ibid.*).

However, the changes do not simply outline the composition; they highlight the original outline by creating contrast, motion and lyricism. The orchestral force cannot be realised in the same way as the original, but dynamism certainly emerges in a form suitable for a chamber ensemble. If some of these musical characters are not obviously suggested in the original score, they should be realised through the player's musical sense in a live performance. Arrangements also indicate the unwritten nature of the original to guide players' deliberations.

Considering the arrangement techniques illustrated in this paper, clearly, domestic musicmaking with elaborate arrangements does not offer alternatives of a lesser quality than the original orchestra. Rather, arrangements provide the opportunity to experience orchestral works without losing the powerful dynamism in suitable ways for a chamber ensemble.

The merit of playing prominent arrangements is not limited to enjoying orchestral works outside the concert hall. There are other advantages of learning with a first-hand impression. Playing the arrangements by oneself can allow the musical dynamism to be felt directly, perhaps occasionally more strongly than at the concert hall, because one experiences the work not merely with their ears (hearing) but also with their eyes (reading the scores) and physical motions (playing instruments). The quintessence of

original works also come to light by reading changes in the score that stem from the arranger's interpretation with their own eyes. Thus, the physical experience and close reading during self-playing at home can develop familiarity with the original work. While the author does not posit that all arrangements are better tools for understanding than their originals, it is also true that listening at a concert sometimes becomes a passive experience to distract one's attention—as is certainly known from experience—whereas active self-playing keeps one's concentration on the music. In case that one can focus in considering a musical piece harder by playing than only by listening, arrangement could lead to an effective and close understanding of the work.

Finally, it may be reasonable to argue the merits of arrangements from a historical, as well as a modern viewpoint. As mentioned repeatedly in this paper, changes in arrangements may reflect the interpretations of the arrangers. In a narrow sense, this suggests how the arrangers interpreted Beethoven's work. More generally, it can provide us with insight into the musical conceptions of the times: the composers in general conceive momentum and energy as an important characteristic of the end of a section in the musical flow. The changes also function as an indication of the compositional technique of the individual composer (such as changing the usage of the pedal by Ries) and perhaps the nineteenth century overall (how to mark the formal unit). In this respect, arrangements can contribute to developing our modern scholarship and performance when we retrospectively consider a certain composer's thinking or the musical conventions of the period of the birth of the arrangements. Studying arrangements therefore has not lost its significance to modern receivers.

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 21K12868.

Notes

- 1 This paper is based on the author's presentation at the virtual symposium *Music in the Home* (June 2–5, 2020) hosted by Northumbria Music Research Group. The musical analysis is partly described in Maruyama (PTNA).
- 2 DeNora (1995: 40–44) discussed the decline of *Kapelle* in detail.
- 3 Suggestive studies about arrangements can be found in the collection of essays (Leopold 2000a). For the relation between the disband of *Kapelle* and the arrangements, see also November (2019: ix).
- 4 Consider, for example, patrons of Beethoven, Prince Lobkowitz or of Joseph Haydn, Prince

Esterhazy.

- 5 She wrote, “the best arrangements bore in mind the instrumentation of their originals, and attempted to capture something of its nature in translation.” (November 2020: 227).
- 6 A similar observation is given by November (2019: viii) as well, with reference to the study of Hans Größ (1978).
- 7 Insightful studies about piano arrangements, as discussed in this section, see especially Christensen (1999), Loos (1983), Edler (2016) and Bandur (2016). The various types of piano arrangements and their functions, including terminology and prominent observations from previous studies, are discussed in Maruyama (PTNA).
- 8 Concerning the relation between Beethoven and Hummel, see Hust (2018). Regarding the latter’s arrangements, see Dorf Müller, Gertsch and Ronge (2014: vol 2, 716–718).
- 9 Some of Ries’ arrangements were Beethoven-supervised (Wegeler, Ries 1838: 93–94) and published under Beethoven’s name. Even among those issued under Ries’ name as arranger, many arrangements for various chamber ensembles were published. For full details of the published arrangements by Ries, see the comprehensive arrangement list by Maruyama (2021: 300–322).
- 10 Among other scholars, November (2020: 229–230) also noticed Hummel’s faithfulness yet non-literal transcriptional approach. See also her comments on the arrangements not only by Hummel, but also by Ries and Zulehner (November 2019: xi–xx).
- 11 Hereafter, a movement is signified as follows. Symphony no. 1, the first movement: no. 1-1. The counting of measures follows the orchestral version. Because of space, examples are minimised, mainly to Hummel’s nos. 1 and 2, whose modern scores seem unpublished and made by the author. For other works, readers can consult the published scores cited in the bibliography.
- 12 Zulehner’s version shows many examples that do not realise the original effects, though seemingly possible: the secondary theme in no. 1-1, the melodic instrument does not change in the phrase-repetition (from m. 61) as opposed to the original (see also mm. 42ff. in no. 1-2, mm. 275ff. in no. 1-4, etc.).
- 13 November (2020: 227–230) compared Hummel’s arrangement of *Eroica* to those created by Ferdinand Ries and an anonymous arranger in 1807.
- 14 The London first score published by Cianchettini & Sperati (1808) lacks this dynamic.
- 15 The trio version of Beethoven’s Symphony no. 2, supposedly made by Ries, has only one pedal marking (no. 2-4, m. 366). If Ries is the true arranger, this lack of pedal marking supports the author’s argumentation.
- 16 The first part scores from Breitkopf und Härtel, as well as the first full score published in

Lively Experiences of the Orchestral Performance at Home without an Orchestra through Arrangements

1826 (Dufner 2013: 245).

17 Considering the consistent beams, the inconsistency of additional articulations seems somewhat strange. Possibly, the failure could have introduced when engraving the plate, while Hummel would have written them consistently; however, this question remains unanswered.

18 November (2019: xx) suggests that Hummel's changes to the dynamics and articulation "bring out different voices within the texture." She also perceives the changes in the arrangement as the interpretations of the arrangers and their performance practice in their lifetime.

19 See, for example, Hepokoski and Darcy (2006: passim, especially 25).

20 The changes may result from the smaller corpus of the performing force: the orchestra could easily yield sufficient energy, while a chamber ensemble may need additional devices.

21 The additional material cannot be specified here because it varies in individual cases: it can be new notes, performance indication, articulation and so on.

22 November's observation of the arrangements of *Eroica* (see above) supports this.

Bibliography

Abbreviation (if used) is indicated after each work in parenthesis ().

Musical Scores

Beethoven, Ludwig van. *Symphonie Nr. 1 C-Dur Opus 21*, edited by Armin Raab, Munich: G. Henle, 1995.

———. *Symphonie Nr. 2 D-Dur Opus 36*, edited by Armin Raab, Munich: G. Henle, 1995.

———. *Beethoven Werke*. Series IV, vol. 2, *Klaviertrios*, vol. 2, edited by Friedhelm Klugmann. Munich: G. Henle, 1965.

———. *Symphonie Nr. 5 c-moll Opus 67*, edited by Jens Dufner Munich: G. Henle, 2015.

Hummel, Johann Nepomuk. *Beethoven's Grand Symphonies, Arranged for the Piano Forte, with Accompaniments of Flute, Violin & Violoncello, BY J. N. HUMMEL. Maitre de Chapelle to the Duke of Saxe Weimar*. London: Chappel & Co., No. 1, 1825; No. 2, 1826; No. 5, 1827.

(Of these part scores, piano part of no. 5 (London: Chappel & Co. 1827) is in the possession of the author; the other parts of no. 5, as well as no. 1 (1825) and no. 2 (1826) are the holdings of the British Library, shelf number H03/6856. No. 5 is issued in November 2019 too.)

November, Nancy ed. *Chamber Arrangements of Beethoven's Symphonies*. Part 1, *Symphonies Nos. 1, 3, and 5 arranged for Quartet Ensembles*. Middleton, Wisconsin: A-R Editions, 2019.

Secondary Sources

- Hust, Christoph 2018. Art. "Hummel, Johann Nepomuk," In: MGG Online, edited by Laurenz Lütteken. Bärenreiter, Metzler. Accessed October 22, 2022. <https://www.mgg-online.com/mgg/stable/51798>
- Bandur, Markus 2016. "Die Entstehung des professionellen Klavierauszugs. Carl Maria von Weber, Gottfried Weber und die Nachbildungen des vollständigen Werkes in verkleinertem Masstabe," in *Schumann Forschungen*, vol. 15, *Klavierbearbeitung im 19. Jahrhundert. Bericht über das Symposium am 25. November 2012 in Köln*, edited by Birgit Spörl, Mainz et al.: Schott.
- Christensen, Thomas 1999. "Four-hand piano transcription and geographies of nineteenth-century musical reception." *Journal of the American Musicological Society*. 52, no. 2: 255–298.
- Edler, Arnfried 2016. "Das Orchesterale Klavier," in *Schumann Forschungen*, vol. 15, *Klavierbearbeitung im 19. Jahrhundert. Bericht über das Symposium am 25. November 2012 in Köln*, edited by Birgit Spörl, Mainz et al.: Schott.
- DeNora, Tia 1995. *Beethoven and Construction of Genius: Musical Politics in Vienna, 1792–1803*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dorf Müller, Kurt, Nobert Gertsch and Julia Ronge 2014. *Ludwig van Beethoven – thematisch-bibliographisches Werkverzeichnis*, 2 vols., Munich: G. Henle.
- Dufner, Jens 2013. "Kritischer Bericht." In: *Beethoven Werke*, series i, vol. 3, *Symphonien*, Munich: G. Henle.
- Grüß, Hans 1978. "Bearbeitung—Arrangement—Instrumentation als Form der Aneignung musikalischer Werke von Beethoven bis Schönberg." In: *Bericht über den Internationalen Beethoven-Kongreß 20. Bis 23. März 1977 in Berlin*, edited by Harry Goldschmidt, Kahl-Heinz Köhler, and Konrad Niemann. Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik.
- Hepokoski, James and Warren Darcy 2006. *Elements of Sonata Theory. Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leopold, Silke ed. 2000a. *Musikalische Metamorphosen: Formen und Geschichte der Bearbeitung*, 2nd. ed., Kassel: Bärenreiter (Bärenreiter-Studienbücher Musik 2).
- 2000b. "Einleitung." In: Leopold 2000a, pp. 7–10.
- Lodes, Birgit 2004. "Verweigertes Laut. Beethovens Idee und ihre Realisation durch Interpret und Hörer." In: *Dem Ohr voraus. Erwartung und Vorurteil in der Musik*, edited by Andreas Dorschel, Wien, London, New York: Universal Edition: 79–111 (Studien zur Wertungsforschung, Bd. 44).
- Loos, Helmut. 1983. *Zur Klavierübertragung von Werken für und mit Orchester des 19. und 20.*

- Lively Experiences of the Orchestral Performance at Home without an Orchestra through Arrangements
Jahrhunderts. Munich: Musikverlag Emil Katzbichler.
- Lott, Marie Sumner 2015. *The Social Worlds of Nineteenth-Century Chamber Music Composers, Consumers, Communities*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Ladenburger, Michael 2008. "Aus der Not eine Tugend? Beethovens Symphonien in Übertragungen für kleinere Besetzungen." In: *Von der Ersten bis zur Neunten. Beethovens Symphonien im Konzert und im Museum*, 17–29. Bonn: Beethoven-Haus Bonn.
- Maruyama, Yoko 2017. "Beethovens Streichquartette Opus 59 im Kontext der Wiener Streichquartette des früheren 19. Jahrhunderts. Komposition und Bedeutung." PhD. diss. University of Vienna.
- 2017-2023. "Arrangements in Music and their History." The PTNA Piano Encyclopedia. <https://research.piano.or.jp/series/arange/index.html> (PTNA)
- 2021. "What do arrangements tell us?: a case study of the arrangements of Beethoven's compositions." *The Hiyoshi Review of Humanities*, no. 36: 273–323.
- November, Nancy 2019. General Preface and Introduction to *Chamber Arrangements of Beethoven's Symphonies*. Part 1, *Symphonies Nos. 1, 3, and 5 arranged for Quartet Ensembles*, edited by Nancy November, Middleton, Wisconsin: A-R Editions.
- 2020. "Performing, Arranging, and Rearranging the *Eroica*: Then and Now." In: *The Cambridge Companion to the Eroica Symphony*, edited by Nancy November, pp. 221–238. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raab, Armin 1995. Preface to Ludwig van Beethoven, *Symphonie Nr. 2 D-Dur Opus 36*, edited by Armin Raab, pp. III–VI. Munich: G. Henle.
- Rapp, Regula 2000. "„Nicht etwa aus Leichtsinnigkeit..., sondern aus Antrieb verhoffentlich eines Besseren Geistes "Lernen durch Bearbeiten." In: Leopold 2000a, pp. 74–85.
- Wegeler, Franz Gerhard, Ferdinand Ries 1838. *Biographische Notizen über Ludwig van Beethoven*. Koblenz: K. Bädcker.

オーケストラなしのオーケストラ体験
——ベートーヴェンの交響曲の室内楽編曲に関する楽曲分析的考察——

丸山 瑠子

音楽史学において、大規模な管弦楽作品の小編成への編曲は、特に「原典版」重視の時代などには、オリジナルの複製物として低評価を受けることもあった。しかし、この半世紀ほどそうした編曲の評価は見直され、徐々に編曲研究の様々な意義が認められてきている。

編曲が担う役割の中で、管弦楽作品の代替としての機能は重要である。18世紀から19世紀には、他の小編成のオリジナル楽曲と共に、編曲も家庭での音楽レパートリーにおいて重要な位置を占め、楽譜市場には多くの編曲が流通していた。こうした編曲は録音技術誕生以前に大規模な管弦楽作品の普及を可能にした。またGrüb (1978)の指摘にもあるように、編曲者の手腕が優れていれば、単なる聴取ではなく自ら編曲を演奏する実体験を通じて、受容者は作品の理解へ近づくこともできる。また編曲の際に行われた原曲からの変更は、編曲者による原曲の解釈でもある。従って、編曲は原曲がどのように解釈されていたのかという作品受容の研究にも役立つ (November 2019)。

ここで小編成への編曲が、編成の異なる管弦楽作品の理解をどのように助けるのかという点で、編曲手法が問題になってくる。単純に考えれば、管弦楽作品の小編成編曲では、原曲が有する力強さが失われ、オリジナルの持つ魅力が半減してしまうと思われるかもしれない。しかしながら、一例としてベートーヴェンの交響曲の室内楽編曲を分析すると、編曲では新たな素材の追加、強弱法、リズム、和声の変更を通して、小編成であっても管弦楽に近づきうる躍動的な音楽が作り出されている。また変更の結果、原曲の音楽内容が強調され、楽曲の構造や響きの特徴が先鋭化しているところが随所に見られる。

本論文では数ある編曲の中でもヨハン・ネポムク・フンメル、フェルディナント・リースといった作曲家による編曲に焦点を当て、彼らが編曲で用いた、原曲の音楽を「先鋭化」する手法を明らかにし、作品理解のツールとして編曲に求められた在り方を編曲手法の面から論じる。またこうした編曲手法は、オリジナルとして書かれた室内楽作品の作曲様式研究において、各作曲家が当該の室内楽編成に適すると考えた作曲法を考察する際に、有用な参照項になるはずである。