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SUMMARY OF Ph.D. THESIS

The aim of the thesis is to promote understanding of the published concert arrangements of Leopold Godowsky (1870-1938). This may be attained by elucidating them in three ways. The historical approach sets the arrangements in the context of those by Liszt, Rachmaninov, Busoni, and others. The analytical considers technical matters to do with harmony and counterpoint, rhythm, structure, and key. But the latter mode of inquiry is unable to rise to the challenges posed by the wider concept of arrangement; for this reason, the Introduction debates aesthetic matters, and in the process attempts to explicate Godowsky's syncretic commitment to an unfashionable cause.

The broader musical argument is waged not chronologically but in terms of the various post-opera-fantasy 'genres' of arrangement that Godowsky explored. Each Part, though, compares and contrasts Godowsky's earlier and later forays into the various 'genres'. Part One examines the Chopin arrangements. The musical inquiry is here supplemented by accounts of the historical context, genesis, chronology, and critical reception of the fifty-three studies on Chopin's études (1894-1914). Part Two deals with the two collections of Baroque arrangements. The musical inquiry has a dual mission: to indicate the paraphrase qualities of the earlier collection, Renaissance (1906 and 1909), and to judge the extent to which the later 'elaborations' of Bach's solo violin and cello suites (1924) 'realise' and recompose the originals. Part Three scrutinises the 'symphonic metamorphoses' on Johann Strauss (ca. 1905-07 and 1928), the twelve Schubert song arrangements (1926), and the reworkings of Weber, Albéniz, and others.

The Conclusion remarks on the fate of the 'genres' with which Godowsky engaged and briefly charts the trajectory of the arrangement after Godowsky. In highlighting the rigidity of Godowsky's idiom, and in evaluating the merit of the particular arrangements, it isolates various components of Godowsky's musical enginery: for instance, 'discretion' and 'naïveté'. One trend in Godowsky's output, though, is discernible. The earlier arrangements are generally more radical; for they thoroughly rework the details of the original texts. By contrast, the later ones tend to perform only cosmetic surgery on the originals.
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I sometimes have the suspicion that Godowsky is not really interested in other men's music unless he wrote it himself.

(Ernest Newman, 'Arrangements -- By Godowsky and Others')

What fundamentally is a painter? He's a collector who wishes to obtain a collection by making himself the paintings he likes. It's like that and then it becomes something else.

(Picasso, quoted in Michael Ayrton, Introduction to K. E. Maison, Themes and Variations)
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For reasons of economy, I refrain from giving full publication details of books and articles in my endnotes; I give only enough detail to allow the reader to pin-point references in the Bibliography, where full citations are, of course, given. The thesis generally follows the advice dispensed by The Chicago Manual of Style, 13th ed.; but I have adapted its stipulations at my pleasure and have sometimes incorporated into its guide-lines the most compelling features of the Style Book, 4th ed., of the Modern Humanities Research Association (Notes for Authors and Editors).

Bar numbers enclosed in square brackets denote the bar numbers of the works that Godowsky is arranging; bar numbers not enclosed in square brackets denote the bar numbers of Godowsky's arrangements and other works.
ABBREVIATIONS

AMT: After Midnight Thoughts on Leopold Godowsky: Journal of the International Godowsky Society

N.E.: 'Nouvelle Etude'; refers to Chopin's Trois Nouvelles Études, without opus number

NGS: Newsletter of the Godowsky Society

A shorthand denotes individual numbers of Godowsky's Studien über die Etüden von F. Chopin. For instance, the abbreviation '25/2iv (28a)' denotes Godowsky's fourth version of the Etude, Op. 25/2, numbered 28a in Godowsky's set.
As a writer of music, [Godowsky] was less of a composer than what one might call a 'combinator' [Kombinator], in which capacity he showed genius -- if this superlative may be applied to a relatively inferior activity. His original compositions lacked inner compulsion while at the same time reaching the very limit of intellectual calculation. In order to apply his talent, Godowsky always needed an external fulcrum: he very rarely invented his own themes. But his arrangements of Chopin and Bach are veritable masterpieces in that they solve the most intricate problems and exhaust multiple technical possibilities which, to be sure, are of a somewhat mathematical kind -- despite the unquestionable euphony of the finished result. [...] The great and unflagging passion of his life was to 'combine' music for the piano.

(Carl Flesch)

Leopold Godowsky's music, both the original compositions and the 'combined' sort, is growing in popularity. The days of trawling through antiquarian bookshops for out-of-print scores or cadging xerographs of battered but lovingly tended editions seem to be drawing to a close. In the next decade, Godowsky's principal publisher, Carl Fischer, is committed to reissuing the works in its copyright; in the past decade, commercial recordings of Godowsky's work have proliferated. Godowsky's pieces are no longer the fodder for a few elderly pianists' encores but constitute the stuff by which today's younger virtuosos lay bare their mettle. Indeed, London has recently seen its first all-Godowsky recital. The present generation has arguably shown much more enthusiasm for the music than any preceding it.
Why the burgeoning interest? Doubtless it has something to do with the allure of the virtuosic: Godowsky's music (nearly all of which is for the piano) is well known for the extraordinary demands it makes on the pianist. But this alone is not enough to account for its strengthening pull; for such a fascination is perennial. The clue is surely to be found in the arena of performing 'technique', where, to stretch a point, F. A. Hayek's famous economic theory -- in which the esoteric concentration of wealth seems destined in the long term to procure a higher standard of living for the population at large\(^4\) -- finds a musical analogue: that which could be played by few eventually comes to be in the grasp of many. The appeal of virtuosity might be perennial; but performing technique is progressive. Thus today's pianists are better equipped to cope with Godowsky's challenges than their predecessors. For Wilhelm Bachaus, in a piece titled 'The Pianist of To-morrow' (1913), it seemed that 'the borderland of pianistic difficulty had been reached in the compositions and transcriptions of Busoni and Godowsky'.\(^5\) Less awestruck was James Gibbons Huneker, the American critic and arch Godowskyphile, who predicted in 1901 that 'in ten years -- so rapid is the technical standard advancing -- [Godowsky's Chopin arrangements] will be used in the curriculum of students. [...] [Godowsky] is writing for the next generation -- presumably a generation of Rosenthals.'\(^6\) Though temporally optimistic, the prophecy seems recently to have been fulfilled. Writing of the Chopin-Godowsky studies in Gramophone in 1978, Max Harrison asserted that 'in the light of modern virtuosity such music (and one thinks also of Yonty Solomon's recent Sorabji performances) no longer seems overburdened with detail. What Alfred Lockwood [...] called its
"heavy freight of counterpoint" can more fluently be carried. More recently, Wilson Lyle has punningly affirmed that 'the accent is upon "high tech"', remarking on how 'the new generation queues up at Wigmore Hall and recording studios to toss off all three movements [of Ravel's Gaspard de la nuit] with nonchalant ease'. Indeed, in Japan some pupils are encouraged to master Godowsky's versions of Chopin's études before tackling the originals.

But other factors must be considered. The seminal ones are the influence of Jorge Bolet's 1978 recording of a selection of Godowsky's Chopin arrangements and the impact of Jeremy Nicholas's 1989 biography of Godowsky. Bolet's recording remains the most seductive of the portals into Godowsky's art. Not only this; it is also authoritative in that Bolet was a pupil both of Godowsky and of Godowsky's son-in-law, David Saperton. Nicholas's informative biography -- which occasioned a blaze of publicity in the Musical Times -- stimulates and expedites any reappraisal of Godowsky's life and art, and is particularly valuable for the wealth of source material it affords: letters, programmes, and even a fragment of autobiography. Simultaneously, it seems that the aversion from Godowsky's richly chromatic and contrapuntal musical idiom and, in particular, from his brand of arrangement has been spent. The pianist no longer imperils his career by performing the music. In turn, the recording industry has begun to encourage the quarrying of this repertoire. And doubtless the contemporary appetite for complete recorded editions -- why record one of Godowsky's Studien on Chopin's études when there are fifty-two others to commit to disc? -- has furthered Godowsky's cause as much as the pianists' wish to demonstrate
their technical virility by performing the music. (We should not be surprised to learn, then, that a project to record all of Godowsky's piano music is underway.) One factor above all, though, sustains the growing appreciation of Godowsky's music: simply that much of it is worth hearing and performing.

Talk of the burgeoning popularity of Godowsky's works implies that the music was formerly unpopular. And so it was, even within Godowsky's lifetime (1870-1938). It was the arrangements, not the free compositions, which were to blame, simply because it was they which excited the most critical fuss. Indeed, as Paul Bekker posited, Godowsky's name came to suggest only "arrangements" and "adaptations" for the pianist with technical equipment. For though Godowsky's free compositions had been issued as early as 1888, when he was eighteen, it was the arrangements which dominated his output in the ensuing two decades. In this period, Godowsky penned at least fifty-three 'studies' on Chopin's études, two other Chopin paraphrases, some Weber arrangements, a collection of Baroque arrangements entitled Renaissance, and 'symphonic metamorphoses' on waltzes by Johann Strauss II. Among these are the most radical of Godowsky's arrangements, ones that thoroughly rework the details of the original texts. Godowsky shifted his attentions almost entirely to free composition in the decade after 1910; but a second phase of arranging began in the 1920s, during which free compositions and arrangements flowed from his pen in almost equal measure. These arrangements include 'elaborations' of three of Bach's solo violin sonatas and partitas, and three of the solo cello suites; twelve Schubert song arrangements; five concert versions of Chopin's
waltzes; and two Albéniz reworkings. By this time, though, Godowsky's appetite for extensively reworking other composers' works had dulled. Unlike the earlier arrangements, the later ones conserve more of the originals' outlines; the horizons of Godowsky's enterprise become narrower in that the domains in which the reworking occurs exclude that of structure. In a word, the later arrangements tend to perform only cosmetic surgery on the originals.

Godowsky's reputation as a composer never wholly recovered from the battering it took from the critical 'Niagaras of abuse' -- as K. S. Sorabji memorably put it\(^1\) -- occasioned by his arrangements of Chopin's études. Critics considered Godowsky's arranging an excuse for 'improving' the classics or 'modernising' them; his zeal for arranging seemed to indicate a deficiency in his compositional skills; it was as if, apparently short of inspiration of his own, Godowsky was feeding parasitically on other composers' blood. In fact, for many commentators Godowsky the arranger was essentially an extension of Godowsky the pianist, not of Godowsky the composer. Godowsky being one of the great virtuosos of the age, the arrangements were not considered 'works' in their own right, but as fodder for his recitals, serving merely to demonstrate his technical prowess. Indeed, the conservative stance of his later arrangements might in part have been due to Godowsky's calculated avoidance of prompting such strictures: in 1928 he complained that he could not face any more charges of 'sacrilege, self-advertising, conceit, lack of ideas of my own, and what not'.\(^1\)

The free compositions also suffered. 'Will Godowsky the composer
for piano share honors with the instrumentalist?' pondered a critic in 
Musical America in 1928. The Musical Times held that he would not, at least not in the perceptions of the general public. The journal held Godowsky culpable for failing 'to follow the example of the classics and [failing to] write a few fairly easy and attractive things for the domestic performer'. The answer, though, is surely more complex. Godowsky in fact produced much that could be tackled successfully by the amateur pianist, and 'Alt Wien', from his collection of thirty pieces in triple time, Triakontameron (1920), became a minor classic. Godowsky's original compositions surely suffered because the arrangements' infamous reputations preceded them; they unwittingly became the victims of the critical ammunition fired at the arrangements. Even 'Alt Wien' succumbed to the onslaught.

There was another reason for Godowsky's want of prestige in critical circles. It was this: his works and arrangements were essentially reactionary. (In itself, this might not have been so much of an obstacle had the limited sphere of his activities -- he composed almost exclusively for the piano and wrote no orchestral music -- not marginalised him further.) To be sure, the dernier cri of the times was 'neoclassicism'. But this concept has few points of contact with Godowsky's brand of arrangement. For a start, neoclassical works do not necessarily arrange. In fact, collisions between the concepts of neoclassicism and arrangement are relatively few; Stravinsky's Pulcinella (1920) is the one which most immediately comes to mind -- though, significantly, the work was not considered 'neoclassical' at the time of its first performance. Secondly, a central feature of neoclassicism,
especially of Stravinsky's brand, is irony; as Richard Taruskin has argued, Stravinsky's neoclassicism invokes a 'stance of highly self-conscious contemporaneity'.\textsuperscript{24} Ironical estrangement of archaic musical procedures and materials, textural disjunctions, procedural conflicts -- none of these features as such in Godowsky's work. Finally, and most importantly, the neoclassical impulse was a reaction to Romanticism, particularly to the German musical heritage.\textsuperscript{25} It was concerned with rupturing the aesthetic continuum with the immediate past; it sanitised the rich, cloying textures of the nineteenth-century idiom in favour of abstract, simple, architectural constructions -- generally by drawing on the surface gestures or formal designs of eighteenth-century sources. In other words, the neoclassical concept aimed at purging music of precisely the sort of anti-classical textures and procedures that Godowsky promoted -- indeed, gloried in -- to his dying day.\textsuperscript{26} Godowsky was thus irrelevant to the brittle anti-Romantic modernism of the 1920s; moreover, much contemporary music was irrelevant to him. His response to Berg's Wozzeck attests to the point: 'I find [the opera] most abominable, a crime upon civilization. The success it had in America is a stain on the discriminative ability and musical judgement of the music critics and public.'\textsuperscript{27} He damned 'ultra-modernists' 'crazy' and 'dishonest'. This is not to deny Godowsky's own modernist instincts, though: his addiction to arranging was in no small measure encouraged by his belief in 'progress'. But his enthusiasm for the trappings of the modern age -- for cinemas, aeroplanes, contemporary science -- indicates an older, Victorian mindset that was nourished by a mixture of wonderment by, and curiosity in, innovation. He owed allegiance to a world which in Werner Haftmann's
words was characterised by a 'cosmopolitanism fostered by travel and
world fairs, [...] a society which seemed to be within reach of its ideal
-- a life devoted to lofty aims in a world securely subjected to the
control of man, at a time when the prevailing faith in technology,
organisation, and progress seemed to have been justified by
experience'. That world -- that 'ground of reality', to use Haftmann's
term -- had almost certainly expired by 1914. To be sure, Godowsky
grew increasingly disillusioned with the post-1918 world, particularly
after 1930; and no doubt his trust in the 'prevailing faith' evaporated.
But this only entrenched his position as a vanguard of what Dahlhaus
called the 'moderately modern', a sure enemy of the 'new'. In a word,
Godowsky subscribed to the first of what Matei Calinescu has dubbed the
'two modernities', with its emphasis on continuity, progress, and
reason. In terms of music, Godowsky essentially drew the line with
Richard Strauss, Szymanowski (from whom he commissioned a concerto, which
was never written), and early Bartók.

Given the contemporary interest in Godowsky's music, the time is
ripe for a detailed inquiry into it. There is no standard work on
Godowsky's music to date. Nicholas's biography dwells on the man, not
the music. Likewise, character-profiles proliferate. And though there
are brief surveys of Godowsky's music and certain of his arrangements,
most are hagiolatrous. In a word, much of it is propaganda. To date,
there have been few, if any, cool-headed critical responses.

This thesis is concerned only with Godowsky's arrangements. There
is something curiously beguiling about Godowsky's tenacious commitment to
arranging -- a cause he was loath to give up -- at a time when the activity (or, at least, Godowsky's brand of it) became increasingly disparaged. In fact, the arrangements lay at the heart of Godowsky's compositional career. Godowsky nurtured his musical idiom in the arrangements. It was in the studies on Chopin's études that he developed his life-long interest in piano music for the left hand alone. More generally, rewriting other composers' works presented him with a challenge to which he responded, at his best, with inventive, compelling solutions; one sometimes senses that free composition often failed to supply him with an equal stimulus. Finally, it is in the arrangements that some sense of stylistic 'progression' can be felt, something that is difficult to discern in Godowsky's corpus of free compositions. But there is a further incentive for choosing the arrangements over the free compositions. Studying Godowsky's arrangements furnishes an opportunity to discuss the procedure of arranging itself. For while literature on arrangement -- though not legion -- is not hard to come by, most articles lapse into futile arguments about the ethics, not the aesthetics, of the matter. They are scarcely inspired.

My inquiry is, of necessity, limited in scope. In the first place, I examine only the published arrangements. Of the unpublished arrangements, many are lost; others, such as the versions of Mozart's Piano Concerto in A, K. 488 (ca. 1929), or the Concerto for Two Pianos in E flat, K. 365 (1935), both of which 'modernise' the piano part, are in the possession of Leopold Godowsky III. Secondly, I do not consider Godowsky's arrangements of his own free compositions. A brief survey here will suffice. Of his forty-six Miniatures for piano duet (1918),
Godowsky arranged six for two hands between 1918 and 1920. The Twelve Impressions for violin and piano (1916-17) are arrangements of movements from the Sonata (1911) and Walzermasken (1912), as are the Four Impressions for cello and piano (1917). Many of Godowsky's late pieces for the left hand alone (written from 1928) are also arranged for two hands. Thirdly, I do not examine Godowsky's educational adaptations, simple transcriptions which are aimed at the student and which nurture no great aesthetic pretensions. Most were published by the Art Publication Society (St Louis) in 1915; a few more were published in 1936 and 1937 by Simon & Schuster (New York) and G. Schirmer (New York) respectively.

Neither do I appraise Godowsky's cadenzas. This might seem odd, given that the cadenzas -- to Beethoven's Fourth Piano Concerto (1909), and Mozart's concertos, K. 365, K. 488 and K. 491 (published in 1921, 1925, and 1927 but dated 1920, 1905, and 1927 respectively) -- might be considered arrangements subsisting within the precincts of the germinal work. But the aesthetic problems that Godowsky's highly idiosyncratic cadenzas raise fall outside the orbit of this thesis; inquiring readers are directed to my prefaces to Volumes 1 and 2 of Carl Fischer's Godowsky edition for further elucidation. Finally, I do not aim at evaluating the arrangements' contributions to piano technique. Such a line of inquiry would certainly be profitable with regard to the arrangements of Chopin's études (which were, after all, conceived as studies). But though drawing distinctions between musical and technical matters in such pieces is sometimes unpalatable, an investigation which could do justice to the technical aspect deserves more space than this thesis can provide. For this reason, matters to do with technique are discussed only when immediately relevant to the musical inquiry.
The primary object of the thesis is simply to show how the arrangements work, to answer the question: 'What does Godowsky do to the originals?'. In tackling it, I elucidate Godowsky's arrangements in three ways. The historical approach is straightforward enough: it aims at setting Godowsky's arrangements in the context of works by Liszt, Busoni, Rachmaninov, and others. The analytical entails a consideration of harmony and counterpoint, rhythm, structure, and key. It facilitates the historical inquiry and concomitantly indicates Godowsky's strategies for reworking other composers' music. But, in its purest form, the latter mode of inquiry is inadequate fully to grapple with the challenges posed by the wider concept of arrangement. For this reason, the Introduction debates aesthetic matters, and in the process attempts to explicate Godowsky's syncretic commitment to an unfashionable cause.

The rest of the thesis confronts the arrangements directly. Godowsky's arrangements are denizens of the soberer world left behind by the passing of the operatic fantasy. The death-throes of the opera arrangement date from the middle of the nineteenth century; by 1899, Huneker could state that 'a Liszt operatic transcription is almost as obsolete as a Thalberg paraphrase. Bold is the man who plays one in public.' The reasons for its passing are various, and need not be discussed here in detail. The most important was surely the rise of the 'repertory concept', that is, the assembling of a musical canon. This turned the concert world upside-down; for the virtuosic style of the operatic fantasy gave way to 'solider musical stuff'. In 1866, a Viennese journalist noted that 'individual concert-givers scarcely dare
any longer present themselves to the public without Beethoven, Chopin,
and Schumann.41 The 1860s, in fact, saw the first piano recitals
dedicated entirely to Beethoven and Chopin.42 In 1911, the Musical News
asserted that one of Myra Hess's recitals was 'somewhat unusual in that
it contained no Beethoven or Chopin';43 in another issue, it contended:
'In these days a pianist who presents a programme [which ignores]
Beethoven and Chopin, can at least claim unconventionality.'44

The operatic fantasy was succeeded by virtuoso arrangements that
could, at least initially, cohabit with the more 'solid' world of the
canon. Charles R. Suttoni has listed some 'genres' of arrangement that
arose.45 One is the concert study, which could treat music within the
canon -- Chopin's études are the obvious example -- and which could be
programmed with lengthier, more serious works. Another is the waltz
arrangement. Liszt's collection Soirées de Vienne (1852) set a trend in
this direction; the off-shoots of Liszt's work included Strauss waltz
arrangements by Karl Tausig, Eduard Schütz, Isidore Philipp, Alfred
Grunfeld, and others.46 Suttoni pin-points two characteristics of dance
music that commended it to paraphrase treatment: its strong, melodic
themes, which could be readily embellished, and its exoteric disposition,
which permitted virtuoso display without the pianist's (or arranger's)
leaving himself open to the charge that by such a procedure he had
annihilated the original character of the work.47 (Such arrangements
could cohabit with the 'repertory concept' because, in Michel Kozlovsky's
words, 'the broadening of the recital repertoire to include works from
the German classical school allowed the performer to indulge in even
greater displays of their pyrotechnics in the less serious part of their
A further 'genre' is not discussed by Suttoni: the Bach arrangement. The circumstances for its arising are intricate enough for this thesis to devote a chapter to them (Chapter 6).

Godowsky explored all these 'genres' of the post-operatic arrangement. (He made no opera paraphrases: the nearest he came to this was his metamorphosis of Strauss's Die Fledermaus; but this really counts as a waltz arrangement.) Part One of the thesis discusses Godowsky's Chopin arrangements, of which most were conceived as studies. Part Two considers the Baroque, and particularly the Bach, arrangements. Part Three examines the Strauss metamorphoses, the Schubert song arrangements -- a throwback to a mid-nineteenth-century phenomenon, which seemed to have passed on by the end of the century -- and the arrangements of Weber and others. The Conclusion is concerned with isolating various components of Godowsky's musical enginery; in addition, it remarks on the fate of the 'genres' with which Godowsky engaged and briefly charts the trajectory of the arrangement after Godowsky's demise.

Two final points. Each Part aims at contrasting Godowsky's early and late procedures within each arrangement 'genre'. Part One contrasts Godowsky's Studien on Chopin's études (1894-1914) with the later Chopin waltz arrangements, dating from the 1920s. Part Two compares the aesthetics and achievements of the early set of Baroque arrangements, Renaissance (1906 and 1909), with those of the Bach 'elaborations' (1924). Within Part Three, Chapter 10 compares the early and late 'symphonic metamorphoses' on Johann Strauss, and Chapter 12 charts the different treatments afforded to Weber's works throughout Godowsky's
career. The second point is this: the main body of the thesis makes no attempt systematically to submit biographical details; these are offered only when immediately relevant to the musical inquiry. But I realise that a bald outline of Godowsky's career would be useful. To this end, I have taken the liberty of reproducing Godowsky's obituary notice in the New York Musical Courier in Appendix 1. It might be helpful to the reader to peruse this material before proceeding further with the thesis.
Notes


2. The project commemorates the hundredth anniversary of Godowsky's Berlin début of 1900.

3. The recital was given by Carlo Grante at Wigmore Hall, London, on 9 June 1996.
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left hand for Paul Wittgenstein in 1924 (the contract is reproduced in NGS 8, no. 2, pp. 5 and 6); the work was never written. (See also the discussion of the left-hand 'Schatz' Waltz paraphrase in Chapter 10.) It is interesting to note that Godowsky had apparently been reading Cecil Forsyth's Orchestration in 1917, a book which Emerson Whithorne had recommended to him (see Harry Winstanley's comments in NGS 8, no. 2, p. 3). See also p. 245 n. 10.
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INTRODUCTION

Without further ado, we should clarify the term 'arrangement'. Recently, it was contended that the terms 'transcription' and 'arrangement' are 'used interchangeably in so much of the literature that it seems pointless to try to distinguish between them now'. Yet an attempt to discriminate between these and other related terms remains worth while. Without doubt, confusion obtains over the proper usage of the terms 'arrangement' and 'transcription'; this uncertainty stems largely from the fact that, in the course of this century, the terms have switched their meanings. The earlier view, held by, among others, J. A. Fuller Maitland and Eric Blom, considered an arrangement more 'literal' in its treatment of the original work than a transcription; that is, a strict adaptation, involving only a recasting of medium, constituted an arrangement, not a transcription. But the more recent definitions give the converse. Leonard B. Meyer, for instance, understands a transcription to be stricter than an arrangement; a 'transcription' uses means 'different from those of the original work [...] to re-present it as accurately as possible', whereas an 'arrangement' 'generally involves significant additions to, deletions from, or changes of order in the original'. In Meyer's view, a 'paraphrase' differs from both these in that it does not attempt to reproduce the 'character and "tone" of the original' but rather aims at becoming a work in its own right. Alan Walker and the aesthetician Stephen Davies propose a similar usage of
these terms. In the present thesis, 'arrangement' serves as a global term covering all nuances of its implications. A 'transcription' is understood as a strict arrangement that recasts the medium of the original but which otherwise adheres closely to the original musical conception. The terms 'paraphrase', 'metamorphosis', and Nachdichtung are regarded as synonymous with 'recomposition', which arises when an arranger freely reworks the original composition.

Busoni commented at length on the kinship of the arrangement to the inoffensive variation:

For some curious reason variation form is held in great esteem by serious musicians. This is odd, because if the variation form is built up on a borrowed theme, it produces a whole series of transcriptions and the more regardless of the theme they are, the more ingenious is the type of variation. Thus, arrangements are not permitted because they change the original whereas the variation is permitted although it does change the original. [7]

Though Busoni's reasoning is generally secure, his comments controvert the status of the arrangement as a work. In Busoni's estimation, the arrangement constitutes a subsidiary of the original, just as the variation constitutes a subsidiary of the 'theme'. But is it possible for an arrangement to subsist as a work in its own right? The question lies at the core of the dispute between the Platonists Jerrold Levinson and Peter Kivy over the status of strict arrangements -- that is, transcriptions that recast the medium or the instrumental forces of the original. Kivy argues that the medium plays little or no part in defining a work's musical identity, positing that the original and its transcription both constitute instances of the same work. Levinson, on the other hand, maintains that a transcription is best grasped as a
'distinct musical work', but not as a primary one: it 'stands in a subsidiary, derivative relation to its original, a relation that is always properly recalled when perceiving and assessing it'. For Levinson, a transcription is an 'expansion or extension' of the original work, and such transcriptions are as a consequence relatively 'slight' artefacts in terms of the creative effort expended in creating them.  

Neither Kivy nor Levinson grapples with the challenges arising from the broader concept of arrangement: their concerns are with strict transcriptions only; therefore, let us take the inquiry farther afield. One means of shedding light on an arrangement's status as a 'work' is to posit a 'continuum' between strict and free arrangements. In doing this, though, it is imperative to register the fact that Busoni's comparison of the arrangement to the variation misses a crucial point. It is this: the arrangement is usually given without a 'theme'. Now, in variation form much aesthetic enjoyment arises from the listener's relating each variation to the theme and, as with Brahms's 'Handel' Variations, to other variations. On hearing an arrangement, though, the listener may or may not be aware of the relationship obtaining between the arrangement and the original; if he is, he may or may not be familiar with the original work. The listener either knows the 'theme' or he does not; it is not given to him in the arrangement. At the 'strict' extremity, the 'variation' of the original that the arrangement constitutes usually issues from the recasting of medium, not from a reappraisal of the work's conception or, to borrow Platonist terminology, 'sound-structure'. For the listener hearing a strict transcription, prior knowledge of the original is relatively unimportant; for it seems to present an
alternative version of the 'theme' rather than a variation on it; thus an external reference to the original, the 'theme', on the part of the listener is essentially tautologous. At the other extremity, the interest in each of the paraphrases located here depends strongly on its internal integrity; for the music might have traversed such a distance from the original that it becomes unreasonable to expect the uninformed listener to establish aural connexions between the original and the paraphrase. Pushing deeper into this zone, we find that recompositions interblend with works utilising the techniques of quotation and collage (as in Zimmermann, Kagel, or Berio). The arrangements between these extremes rely on the listener's establishing the connexions between the 'variant' and the original for their impact. To give specific examples: at the strict extremity, or close to it, one might locate Liszt's Bach arrangements of 1842-50; at the other, one could place works such as Busoni's Fantasia contrappuntistica (1910-12), which interfuses strict and free procedures, or the Sonatina brevis 'in signo Joannis Sebastiani magni' (1919), which is a far-reaching paraphrase of Bach's spurious Fantasy and Fugue in D minor, BWV 905. The bulk of Godowsky's work sits between these markers. It might be contended, then, that an arrangement constitutes a new work when it can be placed at the 'recomposition' pole of the continuum, where the listener's forging the connexion with the original is less important than his contemplating the internal integrity of the arrangement; but such a contention fails to acknowledge that new light is always cast on a (free) arrangement even through rudimentary knowledge of the original. Such knowledge unwittingly forms an element of the aesthetic experience. For this reason, one need not take recourse to the ideology of post-modernism to see that the free arrangement can
never wholly divorce itself from the original from which it sprang.\textsuperscript{12}

Though useful, this model has drawbacks. For one thing, formulating scientific criteria for measuring the strictness or freedom of an arrangement surely poses an insurmountable challenge. The model breaks down when a distinction is drawn between, on the one hand, an arranger's utilising strict or free procedures in his arrangement and, on the other, his cultivating a strict or free 'sound'.\textsuperscript{13} By adhering to a strict procedure in an arrangement, so that, for instance, the original is shadowed on a bar-by-bar, or even note-for-note, basis, an arranger does not necessarily bring about a sound-structure similar to that of the original. It is difficult categorically to locate such arrangements on the continuum, adaptations which might utilise the technique of Klangfarbenmelodie.\textsuperscript{14} Conversely, there exist arrangements that are relatively free in terms of procedure but 'strict' in their conservation of the salient aural effects of the originals. The piano arrangements by Tausig, Reger, and Busoni of Bach's organ works often fall into this category. The essence of the problem lies, of course, in the simplistic opposition of strict and free that is the premise of the model. One way of remedying this might be to posit several models, each measuring strictness and freedom according to its own terms; but the expedience of the enterprise would depend on the formulation of a methodology that could effectively elucidate their interactions.\textsuperscript{15}

In Levinson's opinion, a 'version' of the work is to be distinguished from a 'transcription': a version is a minor variant of the work, which to all intents and purposes is to be regarded as synonymous
Leo Treitler has shed more light on this stance in a discussion of the ontology of the musical work. In this, he contends that 'to the roles of identifying and instructing that are commonly ascribed to the score vis-a-vis the work and the performance, respectively, we must add the possibility of an exemplifying role'. Performing traditions are relevant here. For Treitler, a score exemplifies a work when the community of practitioners to which it is addressed makes performances from it in a range of different versions -- touching musical parameters that are explicitly specified in the score, not those that the score leaves to the performer's discretion by omission -- that is broader than that lying within the denotation field of the score. [...] The work occupies that entire range, and each score exemplifies the range indirectly by denoting one specific realization of it. [18]

Godowsky's alterations to works in his performing practice (described below) procure such versions, as do Artur Rubinstein's adaptations of numbers from Albéniz's Iberia -- which aimed at thinning the textures of the originals -- and the many adaptations of Chopin's music made in performance at the turn of the century. In short, they exemplify, not arrange, the originals.

Two points arise. First, certain criteria must be met if an altered text is to exemplify the original work. The variant must be represented as the original and the instrumentation or medium of the original must be retained; in addition, the broader conception of the work should remain intact. And secondly, the question arises as to what extent a work must undergo alteration if it is to become an 'arrangement', an artefact that cuts a profile distinct from that of the original. The question is, of course, unanswerable. There can be no mathematical point where
alterations assume such a collective potency that the work becomes 'arranged'. It might further be held that the moment the modified work ceases to be represented as the original -- the moment it is announced as an arrangement -- it becomes an arrangement. (The question in its most rudimentary form would not even have arisen for Busoni, because he contended that the very performance of a work, however faithful to its score, constituted a 'transcription'.)  

A psychologist would doubtless make much of Godowsky's tenacious commitment to arranging. Given the recent interest shown by music theorists in Harold Bloom's Freudian- and intertextual-based literary theory (Joseph N. Straus's and Kevin Korsyn's recent applications of its precepts to music spring to mind), it is particularly tempting to seek the aetiology of Godowsky's 'condition' in Bloom's notion of the 'anxiety of influence'. But though a brief discussion here is ineluctable, I shall not advance this line of argument. Bloom's theory is largely irrelevant to the matter of arrangement, in spite of its being deployed (or, to purloin a Bloomian term, 'misread') by Straus to account for Stravinsky's and Schoenberg's arrangements, and by Korsyn briefly to explore Brahms's renovation of Chopin's Etude, Op. 25/2. Straus justifies his usurpation by contending that the arranger engages in a 'vigorous and self-aggrandizing struggle' with the original composer, to 'assert his priority over his predecessor, to prove himself the stronger'. This has a measure of truth, to be sure. But Bloom's theory is expressly an attempt to gauge creative influence; and applying his precepts to the musical arrangement is highly problematic. An arranger is not necessarily being 'influenced' (not even in one of the
negative senses that Bloom adumbrates) by the composer of the original. 'Misreading' an earlier composer does not necessarily entail being 'influenced' by him. Straus essentially barks up the wrong tree by muddling the concept of intertextuality (which asserts that the meaning of a work of art inheres in the matrix of relationships obtaining between 'texts' rather than within texts)\(^28\) with Bloom's concept of influence (which uses the idea of intertextuality as a means to the end of highlighting influence). To be blunt, a Straus analysis merely shores up the obvious: that in a Bach arrangement, Godowsky is arranging (or 'misreading', if one prefers) Bach. If Bloom's theory of influence must be applied to arrangement, then one should consider not how, say, Godowsky 'misreads' Bach in an arrangement but how he 'misreads' other Bach arrangers, for instance Saint-Saëns or Busoni, and gauge their influence, negative or otherwise, on Godowsky. And, to extend the argument, there is no reason why one should not go on to understand Godowsky's arrangements as 'misreading' 'texts' totally unconnected with the subject-matter at hand. This would open up a boundless intertextual space, though, something that Bloom admittedly avoids. Such a space is, of course, ultimately meaningless.\(^29\)

I prefer to understand Godowsky's arranging as a syncretism. The arrangements reconcile two opposing currents in Godowsky's musical philosophy, his puritanical streak and his compulsion to interfere with other composers' works.

Godowsky issued some remarkably purist edicts. In the 'Personal remarks' on his fifty-three arrangements of Chopin's études, he held that
he would 'strongly condemn any artist for tampering ever so little with such works as those of Chopin'. Elsewhere, he maintained that 'the motive and the result of [arrangement] determine whether or not there is justification for touching the original. When the motive is selfish exploitation, or the result poor art, then the tampering with standard compositions is damnable.' In addition, he made no secret of his low opinion of various arrangements by Liszt, Tausig, Schütz, and Schulz-Evler. Godowsky's purism extended to much of his teaching and performing practices. Abram Chasins noted that Godowsky 'unwittingly inhibited many musicians through his relentless insistence on the letter rather than the spirit of the music', observing that 'if you played for him and disregarded a phrase mark or treated an eighth rest as a sixteenth, your life was not safe'. (Certainly, Godowsky's obsession with precise notation -- a concern which Percy Grainger in particular shared -- is apparent from every page of his music.) Heinrich Neuhaus, a Godowsky pupil, likewise recalled that 'pieces that [Godowsky] had played dozens and perhaps hundreds of times he would again and again check against the score, he compared the different versions of various editions (of Chopin alone he had seventeen editions at the time!)'. His scrupulosity was often remarked on in reviews. One commentator declared that Godowsky played with 'a precision that often seems of an idealized and "transcendental" pedagogy'. For Huneker, Godowsky's observation of the text seemed so conscientious that it seemed he had 'no desire to make any personal comment'. And the New York Tribune declared that Godowsky's playing indicated 'no perceptible thawing of the ice that walls round his hard, faultless art'. Indeed, comments on Godowsky's objectivity in performance are leitmotives of contemporary
criticisms.

Despite this, Godowsky's practice was schizophrenic. Chasins recalled that

once you knew what was in a score, [...] he would delight in showing you dozens of places where changes would make the piece 'sound better' -- altering harmonizations and the disposition of voices, removing parallel fifths or octaves, or especially completing some contrapuntal line that the composer had abandoned. This delighted him. In his philosophy, rewriting was really a service to the composer [...]. [40]

In this regard, Godowsky's recordings offer valuable insights into his performing practice. To give three examples: he embroiders the final bars of Mendelssohn's 'Spinning Song', Op. 67/4; alters sections of Chopin's Waltz, Op. 34/1; and rewrites passages of Liszt's Rigoletto paraphrase. 41 Contemporary accounts indicate that he also took the opportunity to 'improve' on Tausig's reworking of Chopin's First Piano Concerto; he might even have reworked the second concerto in performance. 42 In Treitler's view, of course, such alterations exemplify, not arrange, the originals.

Godowsky's arrangements are syncretisms in that they reconcile the two aspects of his musical mindset. Arranging allowed him to cut the Gordian knot. He could alter texts and yet assert the purity of the originals; for the arrangements clarified their disparity from the originals by virtue of their transformation or change of medium. There is an interesting analogue with painting here. Should a painter decide to rework an artefact, he would be faced with two choices: either to retouch the original or to rework it on another canvas. The former
course of action could indubitably be dubbed as 'vandalism' (unless he was retouching his own picture); but the latter permits the original to live alongside the variant. Of course, the analogue is imprecise: in music, the original survives intact as a 'sound-structure'; but none the less, Godowsky in his arrangements errs on the right side: he opts for the latter course. And that involves, as has been shown, advertising the variant of a work as an 'arrangement'.

Godowsky's purist standpoint warrants closer investigation. It has to be seen in the light of the contemporary debate over the 'ethics' of arrangement. On the surface, at least, the polemic seems clear-cut; the participants routinely divided into two factions, one against arrangement, the other for. But the issues were clouded by value-judgments, which stole into the argument under cover of the pro-arrangement faction. That arrangers and their apologists resorted to debating the merits of individual arrangements indicates their failure to repulse their adversaries' onslaught; for the proposition that an arrangement could be defended only on the grounds of its intrinsic quality conceded that its production was immoral unless the procedure was vindicated by the merit of the resulting artefact. Viewed in the light of the ubiquitous charges of 'irresponsibility' levelled against arrangers by their critics, then, Godowsky's purist comments constitute a manifesto proclaiming his avowed 'responsibility'. By calculatedly adopting the tones and vocabulary of the anti-arrangement camp, Godowsky, and others pleading the case for arrangement, such as Huneker and Sorabji, aimed at endowing 'good' arrangements with respectability and 'good' arrangers with responsibility.
Godowsky's philosophical schizophrenia in fact mirrors the Janus-faced profile of the nineteenth century. As Joseph Kerman has explicated, the liberal production of arrangements in that century coincided with a tendency towards purism. Composers became increasingly adamant that their works were not to be corrupted through unsanctioned alterations. Though Dahlhaus posited that the principle of 'virtuosity' (which gave the performer the freedom to fill out skeletal textures) yielded mid-century to that of 'interpretation' (which made every note of the score intrinsic to the musical argument, any alteration detracting from the work's integrity), a transitional state of affairs in fact subsisted in the second half of the nineteenth century, as contemporary performing practice indicates. For the principle of 'interpretation' failed to neutralise the temptations of the earlier 'improvisation' aesthetic. This is not to deny, though, that arrangements such as Godowsky's increasingly flew against the concept of 'works', a concept which, as Lydia Goehr has demonstrated, invested original compositions with a 'kind of untouchability' and their composers with an odour of sanctity. As far as their critics were concerned, arrangers neither reverenced composers nor recognised the inviolacy of musical works. (In fact, the arrangers' obduracy in the face of this censure provoked near-hysteria in some quarters of the anti-arrangement faction: George Bernard Shaw, for instance, submitted that 'Tausig's early death was, like that of Ananias, the result of supernatural interposition for the extermination of a sacrilegious meddler'. At a deeper level, though, the onslaught against arrangement stemmed from an insecurity about the putative immortality of
great works of art. In this regard, the enormity of such arrangements as
Godowsky's lay in their presumed capacity directly to damage (in some
unspecified way), challenge, or replace the originals in the 'canon'.

The suspicion that the arrangers' agenda was to 'improve the
classics' deeply coloured the anti-arrangement camp's strictures. And
should the 'improvement' entail the 'modernisation' of the original, so
much the worse. Hindemith pronounced that 'for the connoisseur this is
an artistic procedure of about the same value as providing a nice painted
skirt and a jacket for the Venus of Milo, or dolling up the saints of
Reims and Chartres with tuxedos, mustaches, and horn-rimmed
spectacles'. The ground was thus laid for a latter-day Querelle des
anciens et des modernes. Busoni owned that the Bach arrangements --
including his own -- written from the middle of the nineteenth century
aimed at modernising the originals and added that 'the attainments of
modern pianoforte-making, and our command of their wide resources, at
length render it possible for us to give full and perfect expression to
Bach's undoubted intentions.' Similarly, Godowsky, in his Foreword to
his Bach arrangements of 1924, averred:

I have not merely transcribed, but have created new contrapuntal
parts and introduced occasional harmonic modifications, while fully
availing myself of the developments of our modern pianoforte and the
strides we have made in the technique of piano playing. [...] The
enormous advance in the science of interpretation, the considerable
strides [...] made in the art of re-creating the works of our
masters, enable us today to define more clearly, exactly and
minutely the nature, character and aim of each composition, and to
indicate more precisely the most subtle and intricate nuances. [57]

Godowsky and Busoni thus justified their actions by asserting that they
enjoyed an ineluctable advantage over composers of previous generations
whose works they were treating, an advantage which derived, not only from advances in instrument manufacture and performing techniques, but from their ability to mine the collective musical wisdom accumulated since the composition of the originals. In this thesis, the composer was not considered the arbiter of his works. (When Jorge Bolet was challenged to defend his alteration of passages in Chopin, he pointed out that he had known Chopin's music longer than Chopin himself had and, as a consequence, knew what worked and what did not.)

Parenthetically, it should not be assumed that the opponents of arrangement subscribed any less to the 'idea of progress' than, say, Godowsky. On the contrary. They understood arrangement as an outdated, even reactionary, concept that impeded real progress, which was to be procured by one's adhering to composers' original texts. In other words, in defending les anciens, the critics saw themselves as enlightened modernes. While a distinction should be drawn between the anti-arrangement polemic and the authenticity movement -- the latter takes the precepts of the former to conclusions that even the most robust antagonists of arrangement found unpalatable (Hindemith, for example) -- it is no profound insight that the nexus of the anti-arrangement faction with the authenticity movement lay in its exemplifying the tenets of modernism.

At this point, we should turn to the signal accusation that arrangers such as Godowsky 'damaged' original works. It is a grave charge; and before the matter may be adjudged, two thorny questions must be tackled: can a musical work be damaged in any capacity; and is the
cumulation of such damage conducive to its 'death'? To be logical, each iota of damage sustained by an artwork should take it one step closer to its death. Certainly, in the 'autographic' arts (to use Nelson Goodman's useful but contentious term), the relationship of cumulative physical damage to an artefact with its eventual 'death' or destruction is reasonably straightforward. In addition to vandalism, putative causes of damage in painting or sculpture include the ageing process or the effects of climate. For instance, the Henry Moore arch in Kensington Gardens, London, having absorbed fifteen years' worth of rainwater, is apparently close to collapse; it remains standing only on sufferance of scaffolding. It might similarly be posited that an arrangement, if in some capacity it pertinaciously assails the original work, is endowed with the power to destroy the original. To risk some abstract conjectures, I suggest that a musical work is not likely to 'die' (in the qualified sense submitted below) if it is protected by the canon, though it may suffer 'extrinsic' damage if its aesthetic appeal is diminished by, for instance, an arrangement. I further suggest that 'intrinsic' damage, an injury which renders a work susceptible to 'death' can occur only if an arrangement or some other force ousts a work from the repertory or, more rarely, from the canon.

It is instructive first to consider whether musical works can 'die'. The irrevocable, permanent 'death' of a work should be distinguished from its mere disappearance. In terms of 'autographic' art, the former -- irreversible, permanent death -- is akin to destruction wrought by physical damage; whereas the latter is comparable to the mode of existence of an artwork consigned to the basement of a museum. 'Death'
can occur only when a musical tradition, along with its artefacts, is wiped out, leaving no or very few musical records of its existence.\footnote{65} This music becomes as extinct as the dinosaurs. With regard to the latter -- 'dormant' works -- the construction of the musical canon in the nineteenth century is of critical import. Prior to the early part of the century, works did become 'dormant', usually because of the supersedence of the styles that produced them and erosion of the functions that the works originally served. But with the formation of the canon, exhumation and resurrection rather than 'death' in this sense became the current phenomena. J. Peter Burkholder has intimated that from the nineteenth century onwards, the principal problem for composers lay in writing imperishable works, works that would be eternally great, retaining in perpetuity their aesthetic appeal.\footnote{66} It was presumed, of course, that pre-nineteenth-century composers shared this ideal and had grappled with the problem themselves; the fact that composers such as Bach could be successfully resurrected was sufficient to confirm their immortality to the Romantics. Through this, composers of all eras came to acquire a status of contemporaneity with each succeeding generation, their individual styles appreciated, understood, and even more highly valued than those of 'contemporary' composers in the truest sense of the word. Alfred Einstein contended that there is 'a good portion [of music] that is only seemingly dead; and this -- in order to live -- needs only a master's magic words: "Arise and walk!"',\footnote{67} The words were, and are, of course, uttered by historical musicology.\footnote{68} For, owing to the security afforded by the canon, the sophistication of historical musicology, and, in the twentieth century, the impact of the recording industry, 'works' (which might not have been conceived as works) such as those by Bach or
Beethoven cannot simply 'disappear' or become 'dormant'. They were, and are, also less immediately susceptible to the ravages of fashion or reappraisals of value-systems than works excluded from the canon. The anti-Beethoven polemic of the 1920s, for instance, did not engender the 'disappearance' of Beethoven's works, but merely the provisional repositioning of his works within the canon.

In turning to the concept of 'damage', a distinction can be drawn between a work's being damaged for the listener and a work's being damaged intrinsically. The former -- 'extrinsic' damage -- is difficult to discuss; for the concept is tenaciously bound to the estimation of the work's aesthetic value. Successive generations will judge works of art differently from previous ones: owing to the supersedence and the revaluation of value-systems, the aesthetic appeal of artworks can rise or fall. An alteration within the aesthetic relationship between a listener and a musical work, which can be positive (improving the work), negative (damaging it), or neutral (causing some change in the appreciation of an artwork, without a work's necessarily being improved or damaged), may be brought about through diverse means: for instance, a change in the intellectual climate, extra-musical associations, repeated exposure to the work, an interpretation or an analysis of the work, or an arrangement of the work. For a composition to be injured through such factors, though, its aesthetic appeal has to be diminished as a result, though how this would be measured I am unsure; similarly, to be 'improved', its aesthetic appeal augmented.

While the aesthetic appeal of a work might be augmented if its
arrangement sheds light on some of its arcane aspects, 'extrinsic' damage might occur if the arrangement enhances the work's aesthetic appeal in such a way that the arrangement itself is considered an 'improvement' on the original. This in turn could cause 'intrinsic' damage -- an injury which arises if a musical work is expelled from the canon or the repertory by its arrangement. (Of course, no such damage is inflicted by an arrangement that enters the canon or repertory in its own right.) Yet a work will surely resist such damage, especially if it is in the canon. Intrinsic damage to a musical work may be inflicted only by an arrangement that is sufficiently similar in its conception to that of the original, so that it competes with the work for a place in the canon or repertory, not by one that is so close in its conception that it exemplifies the work. The nicely regulated criteria militate against an arrangement's inflicting damage on the original, as does the fact that an arrangement more often than not 'improves' the work 'positively', either by disclosing an arcane facet of the work or by endowing it with an aspect that enhances its appeal.

Let us consider the case of Albéniz's Tango, Op. 165/2. It might be contended that Godowsky's arrangement, which is one of his most popular, has expelled the original from the repertory; but this assertion assumes that the original enjoyed a place in the repertory to begin with; in fact, the Tango entered the repertory only in the garb of the arrangement. It could thus be held that Godowsky rendered a service for Albéniz, by rescuing the Tango from obscurity. On the other hand, it might be argued that the original has sustained damage; for it is now open to unfavourable comparisons with Godowsky's 'improved' version, a
situation that is potentially more harmful for the work than any criticism of it on the grounds of its putative compositional defects. Yet, after repeated exposure to Godowsky's arrangement, the original sounds fresh and economical: it acquires the acoustic status of a restored painting; and, in this sense, its aesthetic appeal is enhanced; but the 'improvement' is entirely dependent on the continuing existence of the arrangement, a state of affairs that conspires against the original's profiting from the 'improvement'.

In the final analysis, because the circumstances in which an arrangement can damage the composition that it treats are contingent on a multitude of interacting factors (criteria that cannot easily be isolated), the fear of an arrangement's damaging the original work was largely unfounded. Godowsky's antagonists surely exaggerated the potential of an arrangement to injure the original work; but the accusation that arrangers damaged works was certainly potent enough significantly to injure Godowsky's cause. Ignorance, and an idle preoccupation with the ethics, rather than the aesthetics, of the matter, prompted this reflex criticism. And nowhere in the history of arrangement is such reflex criticism more evident than in the response to Godowsky's Studien on Chopin's études, the initial subjects of our inquiry. The pieces launched Godowsky's career as an arranger with a resounding bang; the reverberations were not quick to quieten down.
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PART ONE
CHAPTER 1

THE CHOPIN-GODOWSKY STUDIES:
CONTEXT, GENESIS, CHRONOLOGY

Context

The infamy of Godowsky's Studien über die Etüden von F. Chopin (1894-1914) might suggest that they were compositional aberrations. But in fact the pieces merely swelled the bevy of Chopin arrangements masquerading as concert-studies that accumulated from the middle of the nineteenth century. Chopin exerted a strong pull on later nineteenth-century arrangers; for in arranging his music, they could not only pay lip-service to the 'repertory concept' -- by this time Chopin had secured a firm foothold on the canon -- but also work widely known and popular materials, thus ensuring that the character and the scope of the adaptations were made plain to audiences. Chopin's music was peculiarly accessible to arrangers in another sense, one which was to do with the performing order in which the music itself was conceived, and in which it operated. For the arrangements essentially participated in, and extended, this tradition. To grasp the point, it should be understood that Chopin's pieces are not the rock-solid musical artefacts beloved of the Urtext editor. Rather, as Leo Treitler has observed, the music constantly betrays the 'fluidity of its ontological condition'; Chopin
'did not behave as though he believed that the process of composition had a terminal point (e.g., the writing down).\(^2\) This 'fluidity from the processes of composing and inscribing right through to performing' impinged on all aspects of the pieces' transmission history.\(^3\) Thus Chopin's works themselves carried a gene that rendered the late-nineteenth-century adaptations virtually inevitable.

A brief survey should set the scene.\(^4\) One of the earliest studies on Chopin is Brahms's arrangement of Chopin's Etude, Op. 25/2 (1869). Others include Carl Bial's study on Op. 10/2 (1873); Bial's _Clavier-Studie_ (1874), modelled on Op. 25/6; Carlyle Petersilea's technical variant of the étude in sixths, Op. 25/8 (1884); and Rafael Joseffy's arrangements of the posthumous E minor waltz (which Godowsky performed),\(^5\) the 'Minute' Waltz, Op. 64/1, and the Etude, Op. 10/5. Max Reger, in his _Fünf Specialstudien für Pianoforte_ (1899), treated Chopin's Waltzes Op. 42, Op. 64/1, and Op. 64/2, the Impromptu, Op. 29, and the Etude, Op. 25/6. Isidore Philipp, the Parisian pianist-pedagogue, was another who traversed similar avenues to Godowsky. James Huneker puffed five Philipp concert paraphrases:\(^6\) the first two on the 'Minute' Waltz; the third on Op. 25/2, in which Philipp exchanges Chopin's left- and right-hand parts between the hands; the fourth on Op. 10/5, which underpins the original right-hand line with additional thirds, fourths, sixths, octaves, or any other appropriate interval to the harmonic context; and the fifth on Op. 10/2, which transmutes the original into a chord study. Philipp also constructed two studies after Op. 25/6 (1900), one of which again exchanges parts between the hands.
Exercises, which isolated and varied selected passages from Chopin's works, also proliferated. Philipp produced these in abundance; his contributions included the *Exercises d'après Chopin* [...] *pour la main gauche seule* (1895), which assign the right-hand part of selected études strictly (though sometimes doubled in octaves) to the left hand alone. Adolph Henselt hewed thirty exercises (some of which flesh out into full-scale concert-studies) from Chopin's works in his *167 Finishing Studies* (ca. 1895), of which seven adapt the études. Henry Levey, too, amassed a collection, entitled *The Chopin Technic* (1908). And though Joseffy did not publish such exercises, he did, in the words of Edwin Hughes, recommend 'the practise [sic] with the left hand of some of the Chopin Etudes [...] calling attention to the fact that Tausig had followed this proceeding and recommended it to his pupils long before the Godowsky left hand arrangements put in their appearance'.

Chopin's music was occasionally arranged for the left hand alone. From the Whistling and Hofmeister catalogues, one learns of versions of Op. 25/11 by G. Leo (ca. 1886-91); Opp. 10/2 and 10/7 by Aloys Jiranek (ca. 1882-97); and two *Etudes de concert d'après Fr. Chopin* on Op. 10/5, as well as a version of the Prelude, Op. 28/4, by Georges Mathias (a Chopin pupil). There is also an adaptation of the Polonaise, Op. 40/1, by the one-armed Géza Zichy (ca. 1880-85).

Many of these arrangements' strategies contribute to the arsenal of techniques on which Godowsky's fifty-three *Studien* draw. The most conspicuous aspect of Godowsky's studies, the left-hand perspective, is perhaps the least original. Piano music for the left hand alone --
arrangements and original works (often studies) -- had proliferated from about 1840. Hence, in terms of their medium (and indeed their subject-matter, as we saw above), the twenty-two studies for left hand alone in the corpus were well anticipated. One of the favourite gambits of the two-hand arrangements -- to posit the original right-hand part to the left hand while casting the spirit of the left-hand part to the right -- was also no novelty, being the premise of Bial's study on Op. 10/2 and many of Philipp's arrangements. But in other ways Godowsky's Studien diverge from the tradition. They fight shy of cosmetic doubled figurations, such as those that hold rein in Brahms's study, Reger's version of the Impromptu, Op. 29, or the versions of the 'Minute' Waltz by Joseffy (1879), Moriz Rosenthal (1884), Philipp (1886), Guiseppe Ferrata (1902), Moritz Moszkowski (ca. 1919), and Josef Hofmann. Moreover, Godowsky's studies stand aloof, not only by virtue of the unprecedented scale of the project which gave rise to them and the systematic activity by which it was completed, but also owing to their force of personality and vitality, qualities which elude many earlier or contemporary Chopin arrangements. In this regard, the arrangements emulate Chopin's originals in seeking to transcend the strait waistcoat of the study idiom.

Genesis

From the outset, a technical impulse motivated the Studien. Godowsky wanted to 'develop the mechanical, technical and musical possibilities of
pianoforte playing, to expand the peculiarly adapted nature of the instrument to polyphonic, polyrhythmic and polydynamic work, and to widen the range of its [sic] possibilities in tone colouring [...]'. 14 The distinctions between 'mechanical, technical and musical possibilities' regularly came to the fore in Godowsky's explications of the principles of piano playing. The mechanical side included 'all that pertains to that branch of piano study which has to do with the exercises that develop the hand from the machine standpoint'. 15 The technical aspect was more intellectual than physical, and embraced 'Rhythm, Tempo, Accent, Phrasing, Dynamics, Agogics, Touch, etc.' 16 The third facet denoted the 'emotional or artistic phase of piano playing'. 17 As 'technique' was for Godowsky different from 'mechanics' (he asserted: 'I place technic on a higher plane than mechanism'), 18 he declined to take umbrage when critics called him a technician 19 -- even though in such instances Godowsky was doubtless being charged with being 'simply a mechanicus', to borrow Mozart's dismissal of Clementi. 20

In fact, Mozart held that Clementi's strength lay in his dextrous ability to perform passages in thirds with his right hand. 21 The Chopin-Godowsky Studien, though, were the fall-out of an experiment with playing thirds with the left hand. In 1938, forty-four years after the publication of the first study, Godowsky outlined their genesis:

[In 1893] I had been practising [...] the Double-Thirds Etude of Chopin. [...] After numerous experiments, I succeeded in finding an entirely new succession of fingers which appeared to me most practical. I then transposed the Study to the left hand [...] ; to my great surprise I found that the left hand was more amenable than the right to my experiments. Once I realized that fact, I experimented with other Etudes [...]. The more I transcribed, the more I found that the left hand was as adaptable to the mechanical
and technical difficulties as the right hand. [22]

The New York Musical Courier in 1906 gave a similar account: it held that the arrangements had their genesis in Godowsky's attempts to play successive chromatic thirds with the right hand without using the thumb on two consecutive white keys. On finding 'a new and simple way of securing the desired legato effects', Godowsky 'applied this discovery to the Chopin Study in thirds and was so satisfied with the result that he arranged it for the left hand'. [23] A glance at the ten Chopin-Godowsky studies published in 1899 immediately elucidates the left-hand perspective; for whereas the left-hand part is painstakingly fingered, the right-hand part is not. (Godowsky remedied this discrepancy in later editions.) The left-hand bias is also betrayed by the early titles. For instance, in 1894 Godowsky's first Chopin arrangement was misleadingly advertised as a version of Op. 25/6 'arranged for the left hand'. (Actually, the arrangement is scored for both hands; it essentially exchanges Chopin's right- and left-hand parts.) [24]

The studies enjoyed a privileged role in Godowsky's early performing career. By programming a selection in his recitals, Godowsky not only laid bare his technical prowess, but also answered commentators who argued that the studies were unplayable. [25] Moreover, the audiences on the whole seemed to enjoy the works; evidently they did not share the critics' disapproval. [26] The Westminster Gazette, for instance, noted that the Studien 'exhausted all [the] hearers' superlatives'. [27] The New York Tribune in 1914 stated that they elicited 'long and prolonged applause'. [28] And, speaking of Godowsky's celebrated Berlin début of 1900, Louis Bruenberg recalled how Godowsky 'burst on us like a meteor
[...] with his Chopin transcriptions [...]. [...] The audience stood up as one man to gaze in astonishment at the figure on the stage that was performing miracles at a piano. In fact, so spectacular were Godowsky's performances that Rosenthal intimated that, had he written the studies, he would have published them only after having puzzled audiences for many years as to how he played two studies at a time and how he made such 'elaborate combinations'.

Chronology

Constructing a chronology of the composition of the Studien is problematic. Though publication data are easily available, many of the precise dates of composition are obscure. Only two of the studies in the current Schlesinger edition are annotated with the date and place of composition: 10/9ii (18) and 10/6 (13), marked 'Berlin, 27.August 1902' and 'Alt Aussee, 26.-28.Juni 1908' respectively. The original 1914 edition, which is in other respects identical to the current one, includes two more: 25/2iii (28), marked 'Berlin, 10.September 1902', and 10/5i (7), marked 'Alt-Aussee, 1.-4.Juli 1908'. Given that the holographs of ten other studies, deposited in the Library of Congress, bear annotations not printed by Schlesinger, and in view of Godowsky's inveterate habit of inscribing these data onto his manuscripts, it is highly likely that the remainder of the holographs of the studies -- which seem to be lost -- impart the date and place of composition.
Because the dates of composition are largely unknown, publication dates must be taken as the starting-point for the chronology. In this regard Leonard S. Saxe's list of Godowsky's published works is invaluable; for it supplies, not only the dates, but also a lucid exposition of the tangled publication history of the Studien. Godowsky owned that the first was written in 1893; this was published in 1894 by H. Kleber. In 1899, G. Schirmer issued nine more studies and a revision of the 1894 study (see Table 1). According to Saxe, Godowsky suggested assembling a collection of fifty such arrangements to Robert Lienau (Schlesinger) in 1900. The deal concluded, a few more appeared from 1903, being issued jointly by Schlesinger (Berlin), Schirmer (New York), and Haslinger (Vienna). At the same time, the 1899 arrangements were mildly revised and re-engraved for the new enterprise. Released with the 1903 studies was a list imparting details of all fifty arrangements that would make up the final collection. Six new studies joined the programme in 1909, and were denoted with alphabetical suffixes so as not to disrupt the original numerical scheme; the additions raised the projected total to fifty-six. When the set was issued in its definitive form in 1914, it included a further five arrangements which were on neither the 1903 nor 1909 list. (Table 2 shows the list of 1903 and the additions of 1909 and 1914.) But because eight studies on these lists were not published, the final total came to fifty-three.

The dates on which the arrangements were registered at the United States Copyright Office are shown on Table 1. But the case of the left-hand arrangement 10/1ii (2), which transposes the original from C to D flat, gives a salutary lesson in the unreliability of publication data.
as tools for establishing a chronology of composition. For though the study was published in 1909, recital programmes indicate that Godowsky performed a version of Op. 10/1 that met at least some of the specifications of 10/1ii (2) as early as 1898, 1901, and 1903. While the 1903 list does not describe the forthcoming second version of Op. 10/1 as a transcription for the left hand, it does advertise it as a 'chromatic' D flat version complementing the 'diatonic' first version in C. All this gives ample fodder for conjecture. Were the studies performed in 1898, proposed on the 1903 list, and published in 1909 more or less identical? And, if so, why the time-lag between composition and publication? The questions must remain unanswered. It suffices to make the following points. First, all 'versions' transpose the original to D flat. Secondly, the published left-hand study of 1909 is more chromatic than the first version, just as the 1903 list promised; the indication 'for left hand alone' might have been omitted from the list for a reason as simple as lack of space. (However, the 1903 list is not always a trustworthy indicator of the definitive format of the studies it advertises for forthcoming issue; see below.) Finally, if the 1909 version is a derivative of the 1898 version (that is, is not a different arrangement altogether), it is implausible that it radically revised the 1898 music. J. G. Hinderer, the founder and sometime president of The American Guild of Music Teachers, observed: '[Godowsky] was able to make finished drafts of his music with the first manuscript. He rarely re-wrote any of his music. If he wasn't sure of his ideas he would sketch a bit on the side before deciding or try it over in various ways at the piano.' Godowsky was in the habit, though, of spending much time after composing the fabric of the work on finalising his
interpretative directions. As Saxe notes, on their republication in 1903, the 1899 studies included 'additional ossia readings, occasional changes in fingering, a certain amount of new prefatory material and explanatory notes, but [...] very few changes in the basic music'.

The latest possible dates by which certain arrangements were composed can be gleaned from Adolph Brune's critique of the studies, dated February 1900. In this he remarks: 'I have thought [it] better to include in my study the published pieces [of 1899] as well as the eighteen or twenty which still remain in Mss.' In the course of the survey, Brune discusses eleven arrangements then unpublished, studies which were issued for the first time in 1903 and 1904. The earliest-known dates of performance of two of the unpublished arrangements (Nos. 38 and 48) mentioned by Brune indicate that they were written at least one year earlier (see Table 1). In any event, analysis of the data reveals that the bulk of the studies published for the first time in 1903 and 1904 was in fact completed by 1900. The number of studies first published in 1903 and 1904 without known annotations is twenty; that thirteen of these were written by 1900 becomes evident either from Brune's discourse or from the earliest-known dates of performance (Nos. 4, 8, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 24, 34, 38, 42, and 48). To these 10/1ii (2), published in 1909 but probably written by 1898, can be added. Thus a maximum of fourteen out of the eighteen or twenty studies Brune saw in manuscript in 1900 can be accounted for; this leaves four or six that cannot be identified. These might include the arrangements which can be dated to 1901 (Nos. 9, 10, 27, and 32); or some of the studies that were never published. A few other Studien may
be loosely dated to 1903.

The 1903 list suggests that Godowsky had conceived at least the form that a number of studies not yet published by 1903 were to take. The list correctly gives the specifications of some forthcoming arrangements. The arrangement N.E.2i (45), published in 1906, is accurately described as an A flat transposition; the studies 10/5v (11) and 10/12 (22), issued in 1909, are rightly advertised as an inversion on black keys and a version for left hand alone respectively.

Particularly striking is the number of studies for the left hand alone published in 1909 and 1914. All but two of the twenty arrangements issued in these years are crafted for this medium. In fact, there is ample evidence to suggest that Godowsky was increasingly attracted to the left-hand medium as he progressed with his task. The annotations to the holographs of the Studien published in 1914 reveal that they were written in 1913. Certainly, some of the left-hand studies published in 1909 can be dated to an earlier period; these include 10/1ii (2), discussed above, and 10/3 (5) and 10/12 (22), which were conceived as left-hand transcriptions as early as 1903. But the details in the 1903 list argue for a later dating of the remainder of the 1909 left-hand works and suggest that some of the études transcribed in 1913 were not originally singled out for this treatment. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that Godowsky put aside certain unpublished two-hand arrangements that met the specifications of the 1903 list and wrote instead new left-hand versions of the same études for publication in 1909 or 1914.
To consider first the left-hand studies published in 1909: neither 10/5ii (12a) nor 10/9iii (18a) feature on the 1903 list (Table 2). Three other left-hand studies, 10/4 (6), 10/6 (13), and 25/12 (43), were not described in 1903 as transcriptions for the medium. The left-hand study 10/6 (13) can, in fact, be securely dated to 1908. In addition, the 1903 list advertises the forthcoming arrangements 10/10ii (20), 25/3ii (30), and 25/10 (41) as an imitation of Op. 25/9, a 'March', and a 'Funeral March' respectively, implicitly for both hands. But when published in 1914 they were not in these forms; the projected two-hand paraphrases were evidently abandoned in favour of left-hand transcriptions. Neither was N.E.1 (44) described as a left-hand transcription in 1903. And the five pieces issued in 1914 that were on neither the 1903 nor 1909 list are all left-hand transcriptions of études already arranged for both hands (see Table 2).

The threads drawn together, it becomes clear that the production of the Studien divided into three phases. Most of the 'strict transcriptions' (as Godowsky put it), in which the two hands exchange their original parts, were published by 1899; they were the immediate fruit of Godowsky's 1893 experiment with the étude in thirds. The superimpositions of Chopin's études (Nos. 47 and 48) also date from this time. The arrangements written between about 1900 and about 1903 are products of the second phase. They generally comprise more 'cantus-firmus' versions (in which the original étude more or less crystallises into the left-hand part, the right hand playing free elaborations) and metamorphoses than 'strict' adaptations. The arrangements 25/1iii (25) and 25/4ii (32) are especially representative
of the bolder spirit of these studies. The third phase gave rise to the
majority of the strict left-hand transcriptions.

Table 2 shows a number of arrangements that were never published.
Apparently some did exist in manuscript. In 1931, Hinderer wrote:

Godowsky has numerous compositions still in manuscript that were
stored away in Vienna at the outbreak of the [First World] war,
including the following, -- The three Chopin A minor Etudes combined
(for two hands) and played simultaneously; the two A minor Etudes,
Op. 25, Nos. 4 and 11, also for two hands played simultaneously; the
Chopin Etude, Op. 25, No. 8, in sixths turned into thirds, one for
the left hand alone and one for the right hand [not alone,
presumably]; Chopin Etude, Op. 25, No. 6, in thirds (inverted) for
left hand (also for the right hand) [not alone, in either case];
Chopin Etude, Op. 25, No. 7, an Elegie for left hand alone;
arrangements of the Etudes, Op. 10, No. 11 in E flat (another
version); the F minor Etude (the first of the three composed for
Moscheles) in variation form; and the Etude Op. 25, No. 12, in a
version for two hands because the published one is for one hand
alone -- ten altogether. [44]

Why these studies -- some of which feature on the 1903 list -- were not
published, and their location today, if still extant, is a matter for
speculation. As we saw above, two of them, the versions of Op. 25/12 and
N.E.1, both mentioned by the 1903 list, were dropped in favour of
versions for left hand alone. The non-appearance of the triple
superimposition of the A minor studies (given as No. 50 in the 1903 list)
is curiouse.45 In his 1900 essay, Brune mentions the two published
superimpositions and the triple superimposition. But though he proceeds
to discuss the two published combinations in detail, Brune omits from his
exposition an appraisal of the triple superimposition -- a premonition of
its fate, perhaps? Also odd is the fact that Godowsky's arrangement of
Op. 25/7 -- Hinderer says that it is an 'Elegie' for left hand alone --
ever made the publishers' press; it is the only étude that does not
participate in the published set. The large number of unpublished studies seems to suggest that Godowsky intended to add to his collection at a later date. It could be that the outbreak of the First World War, which compelled him to flee Vienna, rudely shattered such projects; it is also not improbable that Godowsky lost interest in this work; after all, the decade after 1910 was largely devoted to original composition. But few concrete facts illuminate this corner of our inquiry; it remains as obscure as the location of the unpublished Studien.
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Godowsky has amused himself with the études of Chopin. These transcriptions are remarkable for being technically transcendent but musically topsy-turvy.

(Albert Lockwood)\(^1\)

General Characteristics

Adolph Brune identified Godowsky's 'discretion' as the chief virtue of the Studien.\(^2\) Certainly, Godowsky scrupulously and methodically absorbs Chopin's details into his textures, even into those of the radical metamorphoses, which sever many aural connexions between the arrangements and their respective originals. Yet his 'discretion' is protean. In the strictest of the left-hand transcriptions, Godowsky's scrupulosity arises more from the care he takes to cultivate Chopin's original sound than from his methods of transcription; conversely, in the two-hand arrangements the 'discretion' owes more to his strict transcriptional processes than to the arrangements' aural effects.

Godowsky's 'discretion' is a corollary of his basic arrangement
technique. It is simply this: to distort the études' vertical, not horizontal, dimensions. Godowsky fights shy of expanding Chopin's texts laterally; his strategies are unlike those guiding the Fantasia contrapuntistica (1910-12) or Sonatina brevis 'in signo Joannis Sebastiani magni' (1919), two of Busoni's most radical revampings of Bach. In other words, Godowsky rarely expands Chopin's études by interpolating into them derivative passages that unfold more fully or digress from a musical argument. Rather, he tends to build onto Chopin's études. The études function as foundations supporting Godowsky's new edifices, and aspects of the originals, though often buried deep in the textures, remain essentially intact. To risk some comparisons, lateral expansion holds an affinity with the way a sixteenth-century parody mass treats the seminal motet, whereas Godowsky's vertically oriented technique compares to the workings of a cyclic mass, in that it calls upon Chopin's études to assume the properties of cantus firmi -- albeit non-monophonic ones.

Perhaps seeking to imbue his procedures with historical legitimacy, Godowsky himself exercised the term 'cantus firmus'. It appears in a table prefacing the arrangements headed 'Description of the various forms employed in the versions of the Chopin Studies'. The table attempts a procedural-technical taxonomy of the fifty-three arrangements, placing them into five classes: 'strict transcriptions'; 'free transcriptions'; 'cantus-firmus versions'; 'versions in the form of variations'; and 'metamorphoses'. Godowsky himself understood only eight of his fifty-three studies as 'cantus-firmus' versions, that is, arrangements 'in which the text of the original study in the right hand is strictly
adhered to in the left hand of the version while the right hand is freely treated in a contrapuntal way'; but in fact the 'cantus-firmus' technique takes the helm in many other arrangements. In four of Godowsky's seven 'strict transcriptions', the 'cantus firmus' conveys Chopin's right-hand materials in the left-hand part, while the new right-hand part projects salient characteristics of Chopin's left-hand music. In some other arrangements, the 'cantus-firmus' technique governs, not the entire arrangement, but only short stretches; examples include 10/10i (19) and 25/11 (42).

That the 'cantus-firmus' technique is one of the guiding principles of the Studien should not surprise, given that the arrangements were the fruit of Godowsky's experiments with assigning Chopin's right-hand figurations to the left hand. It is an attractive strategy; for it can instantly submerge Chopin's surface details in the new textures without rendering them impotent to navigate the course of the arrangement. In a word, it permitted Godowsky at a stroke aurally to distance an arrangement from the original étude.

The physiognomy of Godowsky's 'canti firmi' is simple. Projected by the left hand, they generally comprise the materials of Chopin's right-hand parts. Sometimes the right hand may deputise for the left if the latter has momentarily to articulate a bass note or chord to clarify the harmony, or if it can more easily play the 'cantus-firmus' figuration owing to its register. (The study 10/5iv (10) has examples of both adaptations of the 'rule'.) If necessary, new bass notes may attach to the 'cantus firmus' to clarify the harmony; similarly, harmonically
defining elements of the original left-hand part (if its figuration is not particularly distinctive) may combine with it, as in 25/1iii (25) and, in certain passages, 10/10i (19).

The 'cantus-firmus' principle holds sway in 10/2ii (4). Because Chopin's right-hand line supplies both harmony and figuration, the arrangement can transfer it to the left hand without having to anchor its music to new bass notes (Ex. 2.1). Indeed, so self-sufficient is Godowsky's left-hand part that its music differs from that of the version of the étude for the left hand alone (No. 3) only in that the stronger, not weaker, fingers are directed to play the chromatic scale. Similarly, the left-hand part of the central section of 25/5i (33) would, in isolation, make a convincing left-hand transcription of this portion of the étude. Example 2.2 shows one passage from the section. The wide ambit of Chopin's figuration allows Godowsky, not only to present the melody in a middle register, but also firmly to pin the figuration to bass notes. Because the figuration must begin in a low register, so that it may sound the appropriate bass note, the first melody note, b', cannot be stated until the second beat -- a crotchet beat late. By such melodic syncopation, Godowsky is able both to carve out a wide registral space and to articulate the melody and bass line with one hand. (It thus comes as little surprise that melodic syncopation is a staple feature of Godowsky's Chopin arrangements in general and the left-hand transcriptions in particular.)6 The figuration's swirling around the melody is not only musically felicitous but also technically strenuous; for the difficulty in differentiating the components of the stratified texture, a problem that must be tackled in any contrapuntal work, is
increased here by other, simultaneous technical demands. In addition to juggling different rhythms, the performer must articulate staccato and legato concomitantly, spin out thirds with the right hand, and rapidly shift the position of the left hand. The last manoeuvre exacts particular dexterity from the weaker fingers of the hand.

Opposing the precepts of the 'cantus-firmus' technique is one which reshuffles the constituent strands of Chopin's textures. Both strategies might seem to be simultaneously at work in the arrangements which relocate Chopin's right-hand materials strictly to the left hand and assign -- less strictly -- the original left-hand materials to the right. In these, the 'cantus-firmus' principle clearly operates; for the left-hand part is the line on which all the other parts are pegged. The 'redistribution' technique might also seem to be directing the renovation; for the parts are exchanged between the hands. But true redistribution entails something more than a simple interchange. It involves thoroughly unravelling, and consequently reconstructing, Chopin's texture; it demands dismantling, reshuffling, and sometimes buttressing the textural layers of the music -- the bass line, melody, figuration, inner parts, and so on. It thus aims, not at focusing some elements of the texture into a 'cantus firmus', but at reorganising the very brickwork of Chopin's text. An arrangement may, of course, switch between the 'cantus-firmus' and 'redistribution' modes. For instance, though the former regulates the central section of 25/5i (33), the latter presides in the outer sections. As Ex. 2.4 shows, bb. 9-12 retain Chopin's melody in the right hand but present it in such a way that its notes alternate between two octave levels. The bass generally sounds the
lower part of Chopin's right-hand music. The workings of the technique become even clearer in a passage towards the end of the arrangement (Ex. 2.5). The drone originally lodged in the middle of the texture migrates to the treble; the melody shifts to the drone's former position and sounds on the off-beats; meanwhile, the quaver appoggiaturas of the original right-hand part relocate to the lowest voice, where they now subsist within a triplet framework. (In b. 119 the bass in the second and third beats derives from the third beat of the corresponding bar in the original, b. [118].) A few bars later (bb. 123-24), the original bass line poses as the melody (Ex. 2.6). This relocation furnishes an excuse for new chromatic harmonies; for the arrangement interprets the individual notes' function, not as passing notes, but as essential notes. Conversely, the origin of the asterisked bass notes in Ex. 2.6 lies in Chopin's treble part. The five-beat rest in bb. [124]-[125] is plugged by music deriving from the original's previous two bars, the initial bass line restored to its legitimate position and altered slightly towards the end so that it may come to rest on the requisite B naturals in b. 127.

The opening bars of 25/3i (29) essentially transfer Chopin's right-hand part to the left hand (Ex. 2.7). They reorganise the étude's figuration (without destroying its shape) by transmitting the upper line of the original right-hand part (stems up) in the lower part of the left-hand line and by inverting the direction of the originally rising octaves. They also initiate a rhythmic change; for the arrangement's accented melody, originally heard on the second half of each beat in the right-hand part, now sounds on the beat. This does not obliterate Chopin's syncopated effect, though; for the study is scrupulous in
projecting its right-hand figures -- which roughly imitate and invert the direction of those in the left hand -- off the beat.

In N.E.3 (46), Godowsky sometimes places Chopin's bass in the treble, as in bb. 57-60 and 87-88. Conversely, he switches Chopin's treble to the bass in the left-hand transcription of Op. 10/11 (No. 21). But Godowsky rarely hesitates to adapt the prevailing transformational devices in deference to harmonic or other exigencies. For instance, the final bass note of b. 8 should be G# (because this line charts Chopin's treble); but Godowsky alters it to an E, supplying a root-position chord to lend a stronger harmonic impetus to the following tonic harmony.

Regardless of whether he follows the 'cantus-firmus' principle or the 'redistribution' one, Godowsky always aims at recasting the constituent particles of Chopin's texts. At the opening of Op. 25/11 (Ex. 2.8), Chopin's chromatic line catapults down from the pitch class F; but in the arrangement (No. 42) it plunges down from C, to avoid obfuscating the uppermost e''' by an f''''. Though Godowsky's adaptation seems innocuous, it distorts the harmonic flavour of the original. Godowsky's c''', for instance, is an essential note, whereas Chopin's f''' is an appoggiatura, which serves to precipitate the descent. The arrangement further reconstructs the underlying structure of Chopin's chromatic descent. If the uppermost descending chromatic line of either Chopin's or Godowsky's figuration is stripped away, an outline of the arpeggiated tonic chord emerges. This is shown by Ex. 2.9, which misaligns the two lines to reveal their relationship. The grouping of Godowsky's version is different from that of Chopin's, and the descending
chromatic line slotted into this arpeggiation out of phase. Marshalling Godowsky's outline into four-note units, though, exposes a simpler, symmetrical pattern (Ex. 2.10).8

Structure

Long-range adaptations of Chopin's structures are rare in the Studien. This is a corollary of Godowsky's methods of transcription, which often entail assigning a 'cantus-firmus' role to the original right-hand lines and building on Chopin's études vertically. Though Godowsky frequently reshuffles the linear elements of Chopin's music -- the layers that constitute the études' textures -- he is not disposed to dismembering the music into chunks that can in turn be reassembled in different configurations to redirect the musical argument. Chopin's tripartite forms are thus generally preserved. Radical structural adaptations occur in only four arrangements: N.E.2i (45), N.E.3 (46), 25/4ii (32), and 10/10i (19); but even these conserve Chopin's rounded designs.9 The agent disrupting Chopin's schemes in Nos. 45 and 46 is variation form. In N.E.2i (45), Godowsky drafts three variations of the opening theme before rewriting Chopin's central and final sections. The design is more complex in N.E.3 (46). As Table 3 shows, Godowsky interpolates varied statements of the eight-bar theme (bb. [3]-[10]) -- now adorned with a new countersubject -- into the texture and intercuts the arrangement's variation format with a rondo scheme articulating three tonic 'pillars' of theme A and interjacent episodes. The treatment of Op. 25/4 in 25/4ii
(32), a 'Polonaise', is simpler. The original is arranged twice in the arrangement; the étude officiates as the ground-plan not only of the polonaise but also of the trio. The structural adaptation of 10/10i (19) is discussed later in this section.

Theodore Edel mistakenly declares that all of Godowsky's left-hand transcriptions have the equivalent number of bars as the études that they treat. In fact, four of the twenty-two left-hand studies end up with a different number of bars from their corresponding originals: 10/8ii (16a), 25/4i (31), 25/5iii (35), and 25/10 (41). A much larger proportion of the two-hand Studien consists of arrangements with a different number of bars from their corresponding originals. The reason for the discrepant lengths is simple: the studies do not slavishly follow the études bar for bar. Rather, they effect adjustments which, while having little impact on the études' formal designs, skew their local bar-by-bar progressions. The adjustments divide into three types: compressions, excisions, and expansions.

Compressions, which are the most elaborate of Godowsky's adjustments, arise when a short-cut is established to Chopin's harmonic or melodic ends. Inevitably, laying such a path entails the excision of some bars and the reorganisation of the remaining music. The study 25/3i (29) supplies a particularly elaborate specimen; for the intrinsic complexity of the compression, which occurs in the transition from the final statement of the primary theme to the coda, is amplified by metrical displacements. The initial displacement is due to the half-beat-early return of the theme in the right hand, which is followed
by the 'correct' metrical placing of the melody in the bass half a beat later. Matters are further complicated by the original's own metrical ambiguity in the continuation of the theme from b. [56] onwards, where the three-crotchet groups straddle the bar-lines. As Ex. 2.11 shows, Chopin's continuation breaks down into a two-bar pattern -- the first group of two bars is between bb. [56\textsuperscript{2}] and [58\textsuperscript{1}] -- a pattern which comprises two statements of a three-crotchet figure, the second statement an octave higher. This pattern is repeated from b. [58\textsuperscript{2}], and the second three-crotchet figure is extended. The arrangement, though, omits the first statement of the two-bar pattern but retains the second and its continuation. It also chromatically recasts the internal configuration of the three-crotchet group. This refashioning assumes the utmost importance, because the final crotchet of Godowsky's group assumes a dual function in its second statement. Here, it not only furnishes the third crotchet of the three-crotchet figure but, as the dotted line in Ex. 2.11 indicates, also takes the role of the second-crotchet figure of Chopin's original group. Owing to the double interpretation, Godowsky's music now lags half-a-crotchet beat behind that of the étude. Further complications ensue. As Ex. 2.12 shows, the arrangement strikes out one figure from the harmonic parenthesis of bb. [60]-[62\textsuperscript{1}], that of b. [61\textsuperscript{3}]; this erasure occurs in the face of the harmonic alterations, which extend Chopin's circle of fifths by quickening the harmonic rhythm at selected points, from one change per crotchet beat to two changes. Underpinning the harmonic descent, and lending a contrapuntal framework to the progression, is the rising figure -- repeated in descending sequence -- in the upper strand of the left-hand part. In combination, these features eradicate the symmetrical construction of Chopin's uppermost
line (stems up) and force the music out of joint so that it runs half a
beat ahead of the original. (The progression is actually more elaborate
than Ex. 2.12 suggests, because the asterisked bass notes are struck a
fraction of a beat earlier than denoted, a typically Godowskian
sleight.) However, in b. 62 Godowsky's music reverts to trailing
Chopin's, by half a beat. So that it may metrically align with the
original before the final cadence, the study ingeniously takes advantage
of Chopin's trill in b. [68] to absorb the flux and reflux of metrical
displacements.

By contrast, a simple short-cut to Chopin's ends facilitates the
compression in 10/8i (16), an arrangement in which the left-hand part
inverts Chopin's right-hand part. As with 25/3i (29), the compression
occurs within a transitional passage, which here leads to the restatement
of the opening section. The étude's strategy in bb. [54]-[56] is
rudimentary (Ex. 2.13): b. [54] reinterprets the diminished seventh on C#
of the preceding bars as the diminished seventh on E; and b. [55] alters
this to C dominant seventh (to be strict, the reinterpretation happens on
the final semiquaver of b. [54]), a chord which also prevails in b. [56].
The arrangement replaces this three-bar progression with a one-bar unit.
The short-cut to the original destination has its provenance in the
unit's treble melody, which recycles and sequentially manipulates a motif
to be found in the left-hand part of Chopin's primary theme.
Example 2.14 indicates the harmonic basis of the progression.

Rhythmic diminution, rather than a short-cut, prompts a substantial
compression in the final section of 10/10i (19). In place of the first
theme, A, which initiates this section of Chopin's étude, theme B sounds, in the tonic -- a theme originally immured in the étude's central section. After manipulating theme B to a climax, the arrangement doubles the tempo of the étude's eight-bar continuation of A. It subsequently interpolates a much-needed exposition of A in the four bars that accrue from the diminution of Chopin's music to redress the thematic imbalance in the arrangement. Only then does it see to the coda.

Unlike the compressions, the excisions are by far the most straightforward adjustments. An excision arises when Godowsky elides one or more of Chopin's bars, generally intending to tidy up, that is, to 'rationalise', Chopin's procedures. The results are not always salutary. In 25/4i (31) -- an unusually radical left-hand transcription -- Godowsky's dispensing with Chopin's echo-like extension of the final phrase of the first section not only prunes the original ten-bar unit into a more standard eight-bar segment but also obliterates the tonal inertia that arises from Chopin's alternation of the E minor and A minor chords in b. [16].

More common than excisions are expansions, in which Godowsky either extends the content of one or more bars into additional bars or, more often, reiterates an originally unrepeated section. An expansion arises towards the close of the middle section of 25/5i (33). The passage is organised so that the left hand projects Chopin's lyrical melody and the accompanying arpeggio triplet (later semiquaver) figuration; this ruse frees the right hand to articulate a new triplet-figuration counterpoint. The triplet counterpoint, though, does not close with the final note of
the melody (in the bass, b. 96), but spills into the remainder of b. 96, delaying Chopin's two-bar smorzando by one bar (Ex. 2.15). Accordingly, whereas the étude overlaps the end of the melody and the smorzando retransition, the arrangement dissociates them. A further expansion arises -- on paper at least -- from the precise durational values that the study allocates to the ornamental notes signing off Chopin's étude -- a revision which augments the final bar to five bars. The second version of Op. 25/5 (No. 34), a 'Mazurka', also features such an expansion and incorporates two others: one arising from a reiteration of a four-bar phrase (bb. 73-76) and the other, from the extra bars appended to the central section to smooth the way for the return of the mazurka rhythms and the minor mode of the ensuing reprise.

Simpler expansions occur when an arrangement fully reiterates a block of music where the original states a shortened one. This occurs in the second version of Op. 10/2 (No. 4). Chopin's first section divides into two segments, of eight and ten bars: $A + A'$, where $A$ is harmonically closed and $A'$ modulates. The restatement, from b. [36], comprises only $A''$ and the coda. The arrangement, though, gives $A + A''$ in the reprise and hence supplies a prolonged emphasis on the tonic that offsets the more chromatic musical language. Similar expansions occur in 10/5iii (9), a 'Tarantella', and the mazurka version of Op. 25/5 (No. 34).

Even the more adventurous reworkings scrupulously demarcate the larger sections of Chopin's études. The study 10/7ii (15), for instance, supplements Chopin's own change of key with other indicators to herald the middle section. It introduces a new but derivative figure into the
right-hand part; relieves the pedal-points that dominated the previous section; and returns the 'cantus firmus' to the middle of the texture. Such tactics endow the reworkings with formal clarity.

Harmony and Counterpoint

Godowsky's transformational processes do not generally concern themselves with renovating the harmonic enginery of Chopin's études. Rather, they aim at chromaticising the études' veneers. The technique of altering harmonies neatly facilitates this end. Two types of altered chord are particularly prominent: that which entails, to borrow Ernst Kurth's terminology, the 'chromatic modification of chord tones' and that which relies on 'neighbor-note insertion':

Neighbor-note insertion is not based on creating a leading tone that chromatically modifies a chord tone but rather on creating an (upper or lower) neighbor note that strives toward a chord tone and is forced into the chord as a foreign tone [...]. Neighbor-note insertion is thus the interpolation of foreign tones that strive into the chord, just as the chromatically altered tones of the first variety strive out of the chord. [13]

An altered chord of the first variety both enhances the original triad's propulsion to the ensuing harmony and, if the original chord is dissonant, stimulates its existing appetite for resolution. Thus a sharpened fifth in place of the standard fifth in the dominant-seventh triad will increase the chord's urge to move on. With 'neighbor-note insertion', though, one or more appoggiaturas obfuscate the harmony itself by leaning onto the triad's constituent notes, and the triad
emerges from the appoggiaturas' resolving to essential notes. Such a chord arises if $b\,6$ initially replaces the fifth of the triad; for, unlike $\#5$, $b\,6$ can be resolved within the context of the triad itself; no change of the fundamental is necessary.\footnote{14}

The fifth, especially that of the dominant triad, is especially susceptible to alteration in Godowsky's music. Example 2.16 shows two cadences in which Godowsky adapts Chopin's music to his own harmonic idiom merely by sharpening the fifth of this triad. (The modification gives rise to an altered chord of Kurth's first variety.) Examples of Godowsky's infecting Chopin's music with appoggiaturas leaning onto other degrees are too numerous to be listed here; a systematic classification of such alterations is essayed in the ensuing chapter; it suffices to illustrate the point with the bars preceding the return of the opening music in 25/11 (42) (Ex. 2.17). In this passage, Chopin's and Godowsky's right-hand parts are essentially identical, Godowsky's octave reinforcements being discounted. In both the original and the arrangement, the harmony is the dominant minor ninth, with the emphasis on the diminished-seventh chord dissembled within it. The left-hand part of the arrangement gilds the notes of the diminished seventh with appoggiaturas and recasts the figuration in order to thicken Chopin's line; the inessential notes here strive into the chord and hence give rise to Kurth's second type of altered chord. Such sonorities as the C# minor chord on the third semiquaver of b. 61 are, then, merely by-products of this transformational procedure.

To alter chords is one means by which Godowsky chromaticises the
veneer of Chopin's music. Others include applying dominants to Chopin's harmonies, usually to Chopin's dominants, and enriching chords, again usually dominants, by piling on sevenths, ninths, or both. The dominant ninth, for instance, may shelter Chopin's supertonic harmony, as in b. 4 of 10/5ii (8). The leading-note diminished seventh may be blended with the dominant triad to procure the dominant minor ninth. A dominant seventh, too, might become a dominant ninth. The passage shown in Ex. 2.18 is subtle; for though the ninth, e', in the lower counterpoint of the right hand can be regarded as a passing note to f#', it none the less endows the harmony with dominant-ninth sonority; for its preparation by #8 (d#') bestows on it the status of an essential, rather than a passing, note. It should be added, though, that the previous bar anticipates the embellishment but locates it in the more familiar context of a C major triad (giving rise to the formula #2-3), a preparation which mitigates the mordant aural effect of b. 8.

Chopin's transitional harmonic progressions are especially liable to chromatic elaboration. A particularly elaborate instance from 25/3i (29) was analysed earlier, in 'Structure'. A further example is in 10/10i (19). Near the end of the retransition to the reprise, the original briefly prolongs the dominant (E flat) by treading through a series of dominant-seventh chords, each a semitone lower than the preceding one (bb. 51-53); a voice-leading chord between each of the constituent 'pillars' of the progression guards against consecutive fifths. Example 2.19 indicates one stage in the process. Godowsky's (transposed) version, though, plots a sequence comprising plain triads, not dominant sevenths. It further interpolates two voice-leading chords between the
'pillars' (Ex. 2.20), entailing a change in the harmonic rhythm; the voice-leading chords function as altered dominant ninths of the ensuing 'pillar'. Not all Godowsky's alterations are as elaborate, however. Godowsky's treatment of many of Chopin's sequences, for instance, both 'rationalises' and chromaticises the music, owing, in these cases, to his transmuting Chopin's tonal sequences into real ones. The third version of Op. 25/1 (No. 25) gives an example: the asterisked pitch class $F^b$ in Ex. 2.21 was originally an $F$ natural; another is given by bb. 49-52 of 10/9ii (18). (But there is one sequence which Godowsky 'rationalises' without chromaticising it, however: in bb. 17-20 of 10/6 (13), a transcription for the left hand alone. The arrangement omits to project Chopin's refinements of detail to the passage on its sequential repetition. That is, whereas the étude substitutes a 9-8 suspension at the beginning of the sequential repetition for the original 4-3, the arrangement plots a 4-3 suspension at the beginnings of both statements. The alteration constitutes an instance of the studies' tendency to restate passages literally -- a trait highlighted earlier in 'Structure'.

The cumulative outcome of Godowsky's harmonic adaptations is an increase in the pace of Chopin's surface harmonic rhythm. Godowsky's inclination to harmonise individual notes (especially at the end of phrases) -- notes which Chopin either sets against a background of one prolonged, unshifting harmony or leaves unharmonised -- further accelerates harmonic rhythm. Most often, Godowsky's harmonisations of such notes are referable to his contrapuntal strategies; accordingly, such harmonies tend to be highly chromatic. Consider the end of 25/8
(38) (Ex. 2.22). Chopin's étude closes with a rising chromatic scale in simultaneous sixths against a backdrop of dominant-seventh harmony. The arrangement, which assigns Chopin's rising scale to the left hand (in accordance with its general strategy), elects to dispense with the harmonic surround and instead imposes two more chromatic lines on Chopin's scale in sixths: a parallel chromatic scale in the lower part of the right hand, and, in the upper part, a rising chromatic scale divided into three-note cells, the constituent notes of each stated in retrograde. The resulting harmonies are simply products of the contrapuntal procedure. A similar treatment of Chopin's text is discernible in bb. 83-84 of N.E.3 (46), bars which rework Chopin's bb. [43]-[44].

Other tactics aim at prolonging dissonance. Godowsky's treatment of a routine 4-3 progression within the dominant-seventh chord in bb. [13] and [14] of Chopin's Op. 10/1 (Ex. 2.23) illustrates the point. Chopin's étude achieves the resolution to 3 at the beginning of b. [14]. Though Godowsky's (transposed) version, 10/1ii (2) (in which each bar houses two of Chopin's), retains the V⁷ harmony and the 4-3 suspension, the fourth (Dᵇ) resolves to the third (C) only in the final crotchet of the bar, a beat which aligns with the final crotchet of Chopin's b. [14]. (The c'' in the fifth crotchet beat is an embellishing note that is impotent to resolve the Dᵇ's.) The music can accommodate the suspension of 4, Dᵇ, for so long because the arrangement alloys V of V (Eᵇ) with the background harmony, V (Aᵇ); the Dᵇ thus acquires harmonic legitimacy by virtue of its being the seventh of V of V. The alloy is not difficult to form; for all but one of the notes of V of V can be considered appoggiaturas to the
essential notes of the fundamental harmony, V: the pitch class G functions as #7, rising to 8 (Ab); B^b as 9, leaning onto 8; and D^b as 4, falling to 3; the remaining pitch class, E^b, the root of V of V, is of course a constituent tone of V. Not all of Godowsky's delaying tactics, though, are aimed at prolonging dissonance. Some are of practical necessity. The technicalities of adapting Chopin's music for the left hand, for instance, might prompt an arrangement to delay stating Chopin's figuration so that the left hand can strike a bass note to clarify the harmony before continuing to spin out Chopin's materials. Such adaptations occur in 25/11 (42), for instance in bb. 37, 40, and 45. Alternatively, the bass note may itself be delayed and projected off the beat, as in 10/6 (13). (Sometimes the bass sounds early instead, as at the opening of 10/3 (5), a transcription for the left hand alone; see Ex. 2.43.)

Godowsky provokes some interesting harmonic alterations to Chopin's Op. 10/5 in 10/5iii (9) -- a 'Tarantella' -- by setting Chopin's major-key étude in the minor mode; he transposes Chopin's music from G^b major to A minor. Underframing the arrangement is a 'cantus firmus' projecting Chopin's right-hand line. This melody originally lay on the black keys of the keyboard; it now lies on the white keys, in the 'natural' minor mode on A. The change of mode distorts Chopin's pentatonic melody, which consists of scale degrees 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6, by flattening the third and sixth. As the pentatonic melody does not supply the third of the dominant triad, the arrangement does not have to contend with troublesome suggestions of the minor-dominant triad. But the 'cantus firmus' does yield -- unlike Chopin's original figuration -- the
interval of the tritone, between degrees $\frac{5}{2}$ and $\frac{7}{2}$ (B and F). This has two consequences. First, it invites the frequent participation of the augmented-sixth chord in A minor, a harmony which tends to replace V of V, B major. Secondly, the music more easily slips into C major than into E minor. Thus the arrangement migrates to the relative major for the middle section, not to Chopin's dominant. This modulation is further necessitated by the problems entailed in sustaining the dominant key. The statements of $b\text{6}, F$ natural, in the 'cantus firmus' prove to be intractable obstacles to stating V of V; the earlier solution of giving V of V with a flattened fifth cannot easily be implemented in the dominant surround; for the resulting augmented-sixth sonority would imply not V, but i. However, for the remainder of the middle section, b. 23 onwards, Godowsky's music prolongs V of A minor -- it is here aided by the paucity of F naturals in the 'cantus firmus' -- instead of returning to the tonic through Chopin's circle of fifths. In this way, the arrangement circumvents the taxing harmonic problems that would arise from following Chopin's scheme. 15

The harmonic procedures inevitably have profound contrapuntal implications. For the process of altering chords gives rise to a linear element that is due to the appoggiaturas' or suspensions' moving to their resolutions; hence the security with which Godowsky knits his contrapuntal lines into Chopin's études. Contrapuntal manipulations held a perennial fascination for Godowsky, as his 'Badinage' (No. 47) and the splicing of Opp. 10/11 with 25/3 (No. 48) testify. He maintained that his music had accomplished a 'free musical development along modern polyphonic lines'; 16 indeed, as Chapter 1 indicated, one of the
objectives of the Studien was to 'expand the peculiarly adapted nature of the [piano] to polyphonic' work. It was this contrapuntal aspect which exalted Godowsky's music for his admirers and which convinced them of its worth and durability. Huneker, for instance, contended that Godowsky had 'restored polyphony to its central position, thus bettering in that respect Chopin, Schumann, and Liszt'; he judged Godowsky a Chopin doubled by a contrapuntalist. Bach and Chopin. The spirit of the German cantor and the Polish tone-poet in curious conjunction. And it is the studies' closely packed contrapuntal textures that are responsible for their notorious technical difficulties. The performer must not only negotiate the quicksilver changes in weight, nuance, and articulation, but also in the process guard against choking the listener with the indigestible details. In view of Godowsky's dense figuration and his wealth of agogic, dynamic, and expression markings, Wilhelm Bachaus declared: 'I fail to see how pianoforte technic can go much beyond these [studies], unless one gets more fingers or more hands.'

The technique of elaborating harmonies with inessential notes striving into essential notes enables Godowsky easily to generate a contrapuntal line at the opening of 25/2i (26) (Ex. 2.24): in the first bar, the melody sounds the appoggiaturas (♯)6-7, ♭7-8, and 2-3 in the context of the dominant seventh on C. More intricate instances may be found in 25/1ii (24), an arrangement which amplifies the range and the texture of Chopin's étude to conjure up an impression of a piece for four hands. Though the arrangement initially treats Chopin's text strictly, it soon slips into a more chromatic idiom (Ex. 2.25). This owes much to the contrapuntal lines subsisting within the arpeggio figuration, the
unfolding of which often throws up some exotic harmonies -- the clash of \( \text{f}## \) and \( \text{f} \text{ natural} \) in the outer parts of b. 11\(^3\) is particularly notable. The rhythmic displacement of some of these parts -- the arrangement syncopates the uppermost melody line and some of the appoggiaturas -- has a three-fold function: it highlights the contrapuntal parts; differentiates between the two 'pairs' of hands; and inducts a degree of rubato into the music.

The progression \((3)-#2-3\) within a major triad, an elaboration which aurally transforms Chopin's original triad momentarily into a minor chord, is an important harmonic-contrapuntal trait. Example 2.26 gives some specimens. Particularly intricate is the instance in b. 11 of 10/5ii (8), in which two #2-3 progressions, one in the context of G major harmony, and the other in the context of the ensuing D major harmony, interlock in the fourth and fifth quavers.

Notwithstanding their indebtedness to chord alterations, Godowsky's new lines in an arrangement generally recycle materials from the original étude. For this reason heterophony arises in some studies (for example, 10/2ii (4), 10/5ii (8), 10/9ii (18), 25/2i (26), 25/2ii (27), and 25/11 (42)). Now, though Charles Rosen has identified heterophony as a feature of Chopin's music itself, understanding it as 'a special kind of illusory counterpoint typical of the Romantic period [...] in which both principal and secondary voices outline the same motif, but out of phase with each other',\(^{21}\) such heterophony as Chopin's arises from an attempt to underscore certain contrapuntal progressions; Godowsky's usually comes about for different reasons. Consider the opening bars of 10/9ii (18),
an arrangement which assimilates the figuration of Op. 25/2 into that of Op. 10/9 (Ex. 2.27). On first impressions it might be thought that the arrangement's left-hand part delivers the figuration of Op. 25/2, and that the right hand projects a variation of the melodic part of Op. 10/9, adhering to the character of the original right-hand line in its ascending direction and deployment of rests. Actually, this is not so. Godowsky actually grafts the melody of Op. 10/9 onto the right-hand figuration of Op. 25/2, now in the left hand. This is achieved by the sequential manipulation of fragment \(x\), a motif which derives from the first bar of Op. 25/2; such a treatment is facilitated by the pliability of Op. 25/2's figuration, the character of which owes more to its shape than to its precise intervallic structure. Heterophony arises simply because Godowsky's right-hand part sets forth a variant of Chopin's right-hand part which is at the same time being conveyed by the left hand; this is particularly clear in b. 6, where both hands leap up by an octave and descend by a smaller interval. It is the outcome of an attempt on Godowsky's part to transmit clear aural signals as to the derivation of his study, the outcome of a ploy to remind the informed listener of the study's subject-matter.

Let us consider the way in which 10/9ii (18) more generally cements the quasi-superimposition of Opp. 10/9 and 25/2. At the end of their second bars, both études project a similar motif, \(y\), the most prominent feature of which is the ascending sixth (see Ex. 2.27). This motif enjoys an important role in the reconciliation of the two études' figurations: consider the arrangement's final left-hand triplet figure in b. 2. The underlying structure of the arrangement, though, is governed
by the design of Op. 10/9. Accordingly, the first eight-bar section of Op. 25/2 is compressed into the initial four-bar phrases of Op. 10/9, an abridgment which 10/9ii (18) accomplishes by preserving only the salient features of the eight-bar segment of Op. 25/2, such as motif \( y \) or the diminished-seventh arpeggio towards the close of the segment. (The diminished-seventh arpeggio is supplied by the left-hand part of b. 4; above this, the right hand momentarily causes admirable confusion by announcing the opening figure of Op. 25/2 in a cadential context.) To reinforce the illusion of superimposition, the arrangement stations selective fragments of Op. 25/2 at strategic points. For instance, the oscillating figure signing off the larger units of Op. 25/2 (Ex. 2.28) is called upon to signal the structural demarcations (see b. 8 of the combination in Ex. 2.27). A particularly subtle touch is the way the work consummates the synthesis of the two études by assimilating the oscillating Op. 25/2 figure (Ex. 2.28) into a passage near the end of Op. 10/9 (Ex. 2.29), giving rise to the passage shown in Ex. 2.30.

Godowsky's counterpoint may recycle the original music in other ways. Example 2.31 indicates the opening of 25/1iii (25). The left-hand part throughout the arrangement is a microcosm of Chopin's étude. The new right-hand counterpoint is enmeshed in an arpeggio figuration which preserves the ambience of Chopin's texture. The resulting two-part counterpoint is readily discernible if the arpeggio figurations are expunged (Ex. 2.32); this unveils the subtle relationships between Godowsky's melody and Chopin's. To begin with, Godowsky's motif \( x \) finds a good answering phrase in a fragment from Chopin's bb. [11]-[12], \( y \) (see Exx. 2.32 and 2.33). Motifs \( x \) and \( y \) share some significant intervals, a
fact which becomes clear if \( y \) is stated in retrograde (Ex. 2.34). Motif \( x \) also freely relates to the melody of bb. [3]-[4] (Ex. 2.35). And there are other, more general, kinships. The arrangement establishes the same registral space as the étude: the highest note both of Chopin's first eight bars and of Godowsky's opening section is \( c''' \). In addition, the phrase incorporating Godowsky's highest note in fact freely relates to the upper line of Chopin's bb. [11]-[12] (Ex. 2.36).

In his quest to reuse Chopin's materials in the new counterpoint, Godowsky occasionally superimposes the figuration of one part of Chopin's étude onto another. This occurs most often in the 'cantus-firmus' versions, in which the materials above the 'cantus firmus' may be imported from another province of the étude. This matter may be modified if its harmonic orientation is incompatible with that of the recipient passage. Such internal superimposition is a feature of 10/5ii (8), a 'white-key' version of the 'black-key' étude. In b. 13, for instance, the right hand plays the figuration from Chopin's b. [17] above the current material, located in the 'cantus firmus'. The bars preceding Godowsky's reprise of the opening music implement a similar procedure. The left-hand part here, as in the original, transmits the root and the fifth of the dominant triad; above this sounds Chopin's opening theme, which is tailored to the harmonic context (Ex. 2.37). The statement of Chopin's opening theme, though, does not enervate the authority of the ensuing reprise. This is not only owing to the dominant pedal preceding the reprise, but also because Godowsky's right-hand part beginning the reprise constitutes, as it did at the beginning of the arrangement, a variation on Chopin's melody. The relationship of the variant to
Chopin's theme becomes evident when the themes are misaligned with each other (Ex. 2.38); for the variant rhythmically displaces Chopin's melody -- a typical Godowskian sleight, as the discussion of 25/11 (42) earlier in this chapter indicated. Here, good harmony is procured when the variant sounds with the original melody, owing to the theme's triadic configuration (Ex. 2.39); the simultaneous statement of theme and variant also brings about the arrangement's characteristic parallel motion. One further point: the variant plots new chromatic counterpoint with a salutary economy of means. This relies much on lending a dual interpretation to certain of Chopin's notes to differentiate them into a separate line.

There are other instances of such opportunistic interpolations of Chopin's materials into the textures. Chopin's original melody, hitherto submerged in the 'cantus firmus', unexpectedly breaks surface in the final bars of 25/1iii (25), as if it were the culmination of 'backwards' variation form, the theme being stated after the variation. To different effect is the materialisation of Chopin's original music in 25/2ii (27), a 'Waltz'. The 'cantus firmus' of this piece approximately inverts the original right-hand line. In some places, though, the study projects the original line and its derivative simultaneously: Ex. 2.40 shows one. Such passages help to define the structure of the 'Waltz'; for they generally occur only at the beginning of new sections; the non-inverted line afterwards flows into free figuration. By contrast, the entirety of 10/1i (1) conveys an inversion stated in conjunction with the original line. The study presents Chopin's arpeggios to the left hand (where they function as the 'cantus firmus'), simultaneously inverts them in the
right-hand part, and assigns both hands the task of articulating the original left-hand bass notes, which are now amplified into chorale-like chords. (One interesting point: whereas the étude inverts the direction of motion between bb. [42] and [46], the arrangement opts to maintain the consistency of its configuration; it thus transfers Chopin's line in these bars to the right hand and gives the inversion to the left.)

One final way in which the Studien might recycle Chopin's materials entails imitation. Consider the study 10/11 (21), for the left hand alone. From the outset, the right and left hands articulate a canon, the comes following at the distance of one crotchet (Ex. 2.41). (Later, the comes of the canon imitates fragments of the dux in rhythmic diminution.) The 'new' counterpoint is again invented with some economy of means; this is illustrated by the passage shown in Ex. 2.42. The music here not only syncopates the canon, augmenting the technical difficulties of performance (b. 33ff.), but also splits the right-hand melody into two by differentiating the first right-hand quaver of each of these bars so that an upper counterpoint arises. This upper voice enounces the remainder of the melody from b. 35. Thus two duets arise -- one suggested by the dux and the comes of the canon, and the other, by the two strands of the melody itself. Further instances of imitation may be found in 10/5ii (8), 10/9i (17), 25/1ii (24), and 25/9i (39).
Transpositions

Twenty-one of Godowsky's fifty-three arrangements transpose the études that they treat. The Studien generally aim at setting the left-hand transcriptions in keys in which the tonic and preferably dominant degrees fall on black notes on the keyboard. Eleven, that is half, of the left-hand transcriptions are in a different key from their corresponding originals; of these, nine shift Chopin's music from a white-note key to a black-note one:

10/1ii (2)  C→ D flat
10/3 (5)    E→ D flat
10/7iii (15a) C→ E flat
10/8ii (16a) F→ G flat
10/9iii (18a) f→ f sharp
10/12 (22)  c→ c sharp
25/2iv (28a) f→ f sharp
25/5iii (35) e→ b flat
25/12 (43)  c→ c sharp

All the transpositions up a semitone from a white-note to a black-note key occur in the transcriptions for left hand alone. With the single exception of 10/11 (21), which transposes the original from E flat to A, none of the left-hand transcriptions transposes to a white-note key. Of the half that do not transpose, six retain Chopin's black-note keys, and five, the original white-note keys.

It might be thought that, by transposing certain études to black-note keys, the left-hand Studien attempt to challenge the resources of the medium to the limit. Actually, the converse is generally true; for a transposition to a black key often facilitates performance. This is because, in music for the left hand alone, a key with black-note tonic
and dominant degrees -- and, preferably, other black-note degrees -- assists in hand orientation. In playing such music, the performer must rapidly strike and quit bass notes, since the resources of the hand are divided between supplying the bass line, stating the melody, and articulating accompanying figurations. Black-key bass notes are more convenient for swift location than white-key ones. The opening bars of 10/3 (5), a study which transposes the étude from E to D flat, demonstrate the necessity for locating, striking, and quitting piano-keys efficiently, and the three-fold demand on the hand (Ex. 2.43). Owing to the transposition, all the functional bass notes of Godowsky's first thirteen bars fall on black keys. Now, in relation to this study Edel notes that the key of D flat 'appears with unusual frequency in music for the left hand [alone]'; but he opines no explanations for the phenomenon.25 Let us consider them here. One advantage of D flat is immediately apparent: the dominant and tonic degrees of the keys on its dominant, supertonic, and subdominant degrees are black notes on the keyboard; and the fact this is so prolongs the benefit of the transposition for much of the music. The benefit (which no other key enjoys) is supplementary to another bonus (common to some other black-note keys): the thirds of the dominant and tonic chords, C and F, are white notes on the keyboard. Thus a double advantage accrues. The white notes contribute towards the grip of the hand on the keyboard, because the dominant and tonic chords are not wholly on black notes; the chord of G flat major is invested with less grip than D flat harmony. (Chopin himself recognised that a key comprising a mixture of black and white notes on the keyboard provides for more pianistic comfort -- and, in turn, grip -- than a purely white-note key.)26 And the second
advantage is clearly manifest in 25/12 (43), which transposes Chopin's étude from C minor to C sharp minor (= D flat minor). Owing to the shape of the hand, the thumb is better suited to striking white keys. By transposing the étude, Godowsky ensures that the thumb plays E, not E♭, in the extended arpeggio of the first bar (Ex. 2.44). While not every chord in the arrangement provides this ideal position, the benefits of the transposition none the less persist throughout the study. Even if the thumb has to strike a black note, the hand remains in reasonable position so long as the bass note of the arpeggio itself falls on a black key.

The above factors might explain why Godowsky transposes the 'Revolutionary' Etude from C minor to C sharp minor in 10/12 (22). James McKeever has suggested that the transposition is intended to aggravate the technical difficulties; he argues that the execution becomes awkward, because the thumb is required to play black notes in the transposition. This perhaps holds true of the introduction but is less the case with the main body of the arrangement, where the transposition spares the thumb the task of striking many black notes. In addition, the change of key helps the performer to locate bass notes. Finally, as Op. 10/12 itself tested the dexterity of the left hand, it is surely logical that Godowsky should transpose the music so that the capabilities of the left hand are newly challenged by its different position on the keyboard.

The two-hand arrangements transpose the études they treat less frequently. The transpositions are rarely as obvious as those of 10/5ii (8) or 10/5iv (10), which relocate Chopin's 'black-key' étude to give
respectively a 'study on the white keys', in C, and a 'study on black and white keys', in A. This becomes apparent when we consider the factors that might have prompted the transposition of Op. 10/7 from C to G flat in 10/7ii (15). Key association, though usually notoriously elusive, cannot be discounted as a factor. The arrangement is, after all, subtitled 'Nocturne'; and Chopin did not associate the genre with C major. Opus 10/7 might also have been transposed so that the left hand (which states the 'cantus firmus') is exercised in a different position from that which it had in the first, untransposed, version of the étude, 10/7i (14). With the two-hand arrangements, though, it is difficult to determine whether the transpositions are directed towards facilitating performance or aggravating execution (though, from the technical standpoint, facilitating one aspect of the music often bedevils another). And, in any case, Godowsky could have met the two criteria of key-association and exercising the left hand in a new position simply by shunting the key of Op. 10/7 up a semitone to D flat. Perhaps Godowsky chose G flat to position his music to the centre of the keyboard, so that the general register of the music is neither too high nor too low. Yet this implies that the music was initially conceived in another key or in purely abstract terms, and awkward questions about the relationship between the creative act and choice of key must surely follow. For the two cannot easily be dissociated; the choice of key surely shapes the music as much as the details of the music -- genre, for instance -- determine the key. But whatever the motivations behind the change of key -- and there may be a complex of factors -- it is undeniable that by setting an arrangement in a different key from the étude it treats, Godowsky distances his reworking from the original. This might go some
way towards explaining why 10/7ii (15) is in G flat, not C; why 10/10i (19) is in D, not A flat; and why 25/4ii (32), a 'Polonaise', is in F minor, not A minor. In the final analysis, this factor, albeit in combination with others, might well have been the most decisive in prompting the changes of key in the two-hand Studien.

Three Case-Studies

Its missions having been to isolate and collect musical traits in the Studien, the preceding discussion has, of necessity, darted from one arrangement to another, and has not dwelt for long on any one. This section indulges in a more leisurely analysis. It presents three case-studies, not only to set the isolated traits in context, but also to disclose facets of the arrangements' working that cannot easily be divorced from the context of the whole and which, in turn, do not find a convenient niche in the earlier exposition. Almost any of the studies could be recruited as 'case-studies'; so rich are the textures that most invite a commentary. But the selection here turns on the need to illuminate procedures that have so far escaped detailed scrutiny. The section divides into two. The first comments on 25/4ii (32), which regards the original étude in a polonaise fitting; the second examines 10/5vi (12) and 25/2ii (27), two arrangements which intervallically invert aspects of the originals.
1. A 'Metamorphosis': 25/4ii (32)

Godowsky uses two methods to convert Op. 25/4 into a polonaise. In the first place, he endows the work with the stylistic features of the genre, such as polonaise rhythms, 3/4 metre, and the appropriate form. But, as Jim Samson has pointed out, the 'basic principles' of such abstractions 'flow from actual musical works', and for Godowsky these were Chopin's polonaises, the textural configurations of which mediate between the abstract features of the genre and his arrangement. Thus Godowsky secondly stamps his study with 'authenticity' by alluding to specific passages from Chopin. In this regard, Exx. 2.45 and 2.46 indicate some connexions with Chopin's F sharp minor Polonaise, Op. 44.

The recasting of metre from 4/4 into 3/4 has far-reaching consequences. The metrical change prompts a radical redistribution of the elements constituting Chopin's bars. Triple time cannot accommodate the regular syncopated rhythm of Chopin's étude without the excision of one crotchet beat from each bar. Such an adaptation is possible only in bars such as the first and second, where the étude repeats a second-beat melody note on the third beat; in most bars, though, the arrangement is compelled to redistribute Chopin's melody notes -- a procedure that has significant ramifications for the harmonic rhythm. In order to throw light on its procedure, Ex. 2.47 plots the arrangement's rhythmic dispersion of the melody against a quaver pulse; the numbers denote the crotchet beats in which the original projects its syncopated melody notes. From this, it may be seen that the Polonaise preserves a little
of Chopin's syncopated effect by positioning quaver rests at the beginning of each of the first three bars. It tends to move the melody note that is off Chopin's third beat to the second beat, compressing the melody notes within the first two crotchets of Chopin's bar into the first beat. It frequently retains the melody note off Chopin's fourth beat as the last quaver of the bar. In addition, it reiterates motives or figures to fill the lacunae engendered by the compression of certain of Chopin's crotchets into quavers; hence the solutions of bb. 4 or 7. And by recomposing the rhythm, the arrangement forges new relationships between certain bars and sections: rhythm, for instance, now connects bb. 5 and 22. The upshot of the metrical recasting is this: the Polonaise is more rhythmically flexible than Chopin's étude. Particularly remarkable is the slowing of the melody to crotchet motion to signal the beginning of Chopin's middle section at b. 18 / [19]. As Ex. 2.47 shows, the deceleration of the melody to the crotchet pulse depends on the final melody note of Chopin's bar being sounded simultaneously with the first melody note of the ensuing bar, b. 19 / [20].

The change of metre has wider ramifications. For instance, the arrangement has to expand Chopin's one-bar lead-in to the reprise, b. [38], into a two-bar one in order to retain the features of the original progression without resorting to rhythmic diminution, which would not lend each chord here sufficient stress (Ex. 2.48). It facilitates this, not by inserting a new bar, but by beginning the progression a bar early (b. 34). The expansion provides the study with
two spare beats: the extra space allows the melody to rise to the leading-note, rather than to the original dominant. Concomitantly, the bass line pads out and a new augmented-sixth chord sounds (between bb. 34 and 35).

Apart from recrafting Chopin's harmonic rhythm, the Polonaise generally effects only minor harmonic adaptations. There are two harmonic alterations that earn our consideration, however. In the first place, though the original stresses vi (F minor) towards the end of its central section, the Polonaise -- which transposes the étude from A minor to F minor -- shies away from stating the harmonic equivalent, C sharp minor, preferring instead to suggest $\text{III}$ (A major). It also harmonically reworks Chopin's passage between bb. [35] and [38] (see Ex. 2.48). Whereas the étude alternates V of vi (C) both with the augmented sixth in vi (on D$b$) and with the diminished seventh of V of vi (on B, a chord which facilitates, through enharmonic respelling, the return to i), the Polonaise replaces V of vi with v of vi (spelt G$\#$ minor) and dispenses with the equivalent augmented-sixth chord (which here would have had its root on A); this is partly a corollary of its recasting of metre, a change which hinders it from conveying Chopin's even-handed alternations.

The Trio, in the major mode on D flat, re-treats the entire étude. Its key brings to mind the D flat interlude of Chopin's C sharp minor Polonaise, Op. 26/1, and the flattened submediant relationship of the B major trio to the outer sections in the E flat minor Polonaise, Op. 26/2.
(In fact, this tonal relationship is ubiquitous at all levels in Chopin's music: even in Op. 25/4 the music moves down a major third from A minor to F major at the opening of the middle section, and then down another major third to D flat major, before returning to A minor through ascending major thirds. Thus, in spite of the transposition, Godowsky's Polonaise emphasises the same sonorities as Chopin's étude; for it descends from F minor to D flat major and, subsequently, to A minor.) As its first two bars show (Ex. 2.49), the Trio places the 'cantus firmus' in the middle of the texture. The music is more rhythmically stable than it is in the polonaise section; syncopation is notably absent. Though subtle affiliations with the Polonaise are discernible, the Trio is largely successful in suppressing and dissembling the resemblances that could easily have arisen from its tracking the same ground. In this, it is aided by the change of mode from minor to major, an alteration which has significant harmonic implications. Thus whereas the étude modulates from A minor to F major at the beginning of the central section, the Trio moves from D flat major to B flat minor (b. 79). Because the original melody of bb. 79-80 does not readily assimilate into a minor-mode context, fundamental alterations have to be made. Whereas the étude treats this fragment sequentially, restating it down a major third, the Trio elects to take it down a tone, to A flat; and, in order to evade the harmonic obstacles arising from the change of mode, it plays safe by staying within sight of the dominant, A flat, for the remainder of its central section. Hence it prolongs A flat in the ensuing bars, bb. 83-88, by adjusting the pitch levels of Chopin's two- and, later, one-bar segments; for, whereas in the étude the tonal sequence between
bb. [23]-[24] and [25]-[26] rises by a tone, in the Trio (bb. 83-84 and 85-86) the sequence ascends by a minor third. And whereas Chopin's [27] and [28] are identical and are not treated sequentially, Godowsky's version of these two bars, bb. 87 and 88, are cloven apart by a tone so that the paragraph may end on the dominant of A flat. All this has implications for the way the Trio handles the retransition. As we noted, the étude facilitates the return to the reprise by reinterpreting vii° of (V of vi) as vii° of i (bb. [35]-[38]; see Ex. 2.40). But the Trio at this point is already in V, not vi: thus no reinterpretation of the diminished-seventh chord is required; and the music of Chopin's four-bar retransition is accordingly compressed into two bars (Ex. 2.50).

2 & 3. Two Inversions: 10/5vi (12) and 25/2ii (27)

Godowsky treats Chopin's right-hand figuration to consistent inversion in four arrangements: 10/5v (11), 10/5vi (12), 25/2ii (27), and 10/8i (16). In the last of these, the inversion is a by-product of Godowsky's relocating the materials of Chopin's right-hand line to the left hand; it is more an expedient adaptation than a creative stimulus.

Godowsky's inversion 10/5vi (12) softens the bright, stark outlines of Chopin's Op. 10/5. In the opening bars, for instance (Ex. 2.51), it liquidates the punctuating left-hand chords, reduces the dynamics from forte to pianissimo, and obfuscates Chopin's harmonies through chromatic
alterations. In fact, many of the harmonic adaptations are the outcome of the study's inverting the right-hand line — a procedure which gives rise in the first bar, not to a plain G flat triad, but to a G flat chord with an added sixth. (This is in keeping with Chopin's own colouring of G flat harmony with an $E^b$ in the closing bars of the étude.)

The inversion of the right-hand line is seldom strict; rather, Godowsky's fund of tactics includes strict inversion, free inversion, and retrograde motion. Chopin's line is not often inverted strictly; this would extirpate the original harmonic template; rather, the means seek a compromise aiming, not only at conserving Chopin's underlying harmony, but also at confining the right-hand notes to the black keys and relaying the inversion aurally. Godowsky devises several methods to achieve the compromise.

The first sacrifices strict inversion in favour of preserving Chopin's underlying harmony. Godowsky retains the pitch-class content of certain triplet groups but inverts the direction of movement between their constituent notes; this, of course, disrupts the intervallic structures. The triplet clusters most susceptible to such a treatment are those whose constituent notes articulate intervals of the fourth and the fifth. For instance, in bb. 3 and 4 of the arrangement (Ex. 2.52), Chopin's descending fourths become ascending fifths and so on, alterations which conserve Chopin's harmony. (A curious by-product of the adaptation here is that the right-hand part of bb. 3-4 becomes the precise retrograde of the original line.)
The second strategy permits strict inversion, but only where mild harmonic modifications would result. As strict inversion generally changes the note content of Chopin's triplet cells, Godowsky usually implements it only where the interval between two adjacent notes in the original is smaller than the fourth or greater than the fifth. Preserving the note content but inverting the direction of movement would in such cases be untenable, as it would distort the intervallic structure beyond recognition: the interval of the second, for instance, would become the seventh. Chopin's first bar meets the criteria regulating strict inversion and thus Godowsky inverts it precisely.

Godowsky chooses the first note of his triplet or double-triplet cells with care. To clarify the harmony, he might begin the cell with Chopin's original pitch class and then implement strict or free inversion according to the circumstances. On the other hand, he might select a particular note for its ability to ensure that subsequent ones in the cell remain on track, that is, remain on the black keys and in inversion. In the first bar, the inversion is launched from the pitch class $B^b$, as the strict inversion would stray off the black keys if the first note were $G^b$ or $D^b$. Of course, such a procedure skews the inversion between such cells.

These tactics may be seen operating in conjunction with each other just after the beginning of the second section of the arrangement, from b. 19 (Ex. 2.53). The first triplet cell freely inverts the original: it
recasts the étude's intervallic structure so that it can preserve the pitch-class content. As the original interval between the final note of the first cell and the first note of the second is an ascending second, the arrangement treats it strictly. In the étude the interval between the final two notes of the second cell is a descending fourth, and thus the study abandons strict inversion in favour of preserving the note content; it accordingly plots an ascending fifth. In the second half of b. 19, the arrangement, like the étude, begins the cell with a D♭, both to clarify the harmony and to avoid the articulation of the pitch class F, which would have arisen had it ascended by the interval of the second (inverting Chopin's descent of a second) between the two halves of the bar. This would have derailed the right-hand line off the black notes.

One point of interest in the arrangement is Godowsky's quotation of Ravel's _Jeux d'eau_ (1901) in bb. 64-66, an ingredient adding to the existing cocktail of Godowsky and Chopin (Ex. 2.54). The impetus for the quotation, which is of Ravel's b. 48, is Chopin's black-key descent in b. [65] and the quasi-trill of the immediately preceding bars. Godowsky's trill (b. 64), which assumes almost the same form as Ravel's in his b. 48, having sounded, the arrangement does not initially invert Chopin's black-key descent. Rather, it plots a black-key descent of its own (which, unlike Ravel's descent, is not glissando). This is answered immediately by a black-key ascent (b. 66). Thus for the only time in the arrangement the listener is given a fleeting 'glimpse' of the 'image' that Godowsky is inverting. But it is a brief encounter. The arrangement swiftly reverts to inverting Chopin, toning down the _forte_
dynamics of the descent in favour of the *subito piano* ascent.

Quite different in its procedures is 25/2ii (27), an adaptation which gives an inversion of the original right-hand line in the bass. The arrangement is cast as a waltz, and prevaricates (in the way of Chopin's 'Two-Four' Waltz, Op. 42) between compound duple time and simple triple time. It plots a *via media* between the exigencies of projecting a convincing inversion of the original right-hand line and crafting a strong bass line to support Chopin's harmonies. Consider bb. 1 and 2 (Ex. 2.55). First, while the original right-hand line here grants a pivotal melodic role to the pitch class C, the inverted line of the arrangement takes the pitch class G as its axis in b. 1 and A\textsuperscript{b}, in b. 2. This alteration is due to a simple harmonic constraint: the Waltz aims at retaining the dominant harmony of b. 1 and the tonic of b. 2. While C is common to both chords, it cannot function as the pivotal note in the left hand; for it would both suggest a six-four chord in b. 2 and give rise to other unwanted harmonies. The solution, which gives the rising structural bass notes, G and A\textsuperscript{b}, inducts a degree of heterophony (an effect discussed earlier in 'Harmony and Counterpoint'): for the pivotal bass notes follow the contours of the right-hand part; this is because the arrangement's right-hand line itself shadows that of the étude, as Ex. 2.55 indicates -- a procedure which ensures that the study does not stray too far from the original in its opening aural effects.

The differences between the guiding principles of 10/5vi (12) and those of 25/2ii (27) are due, first, to the fact that the latter is not a
black-key study and, secondly, to the vexations of locating the inversion of Op. 25/2 in the bass. The inversion is always, of course, liable to be compromised by the harmonic constraints. Thus where Chopin stipulates a chord-inversion that is crucial to the harmonic progression but which cannot be incorporated into the inversion, Godowsky volunteers a supplementary bass note, for instance in b. 12. Of course, as with 10/5vi (12), intervals are sometimes adjusted so that the first note of each double-triplet group can support Chopin's harmony. But the first note of these groups is selected with care for other reasons. For example, it is desirable that the pitch class A♭ should be stated in the bass in b. 16, because only by launching the inversion from A♭ can the harmonically crucial F♭ be achieved in the second half of the bar. For this reason, Godowsky momentarily suspends the inversion between bb. 14 and 15.

Conclusion

The Studien über die Etüden von F. Chopin adopt two, largely independent, policies towards Chopin's texts. In the first place, they expand the role of the left hand. And secondly, they select various facets of the originals with a view to amplifying them: their procedures are like distorting mirrors, exaggerating certain of Chopin's musical features and, in the process, obscuring others. Primarily, the Studien enlarge on the études' technical challenges. The arrangement 10/1i (1), for
instance, charges both hands to play adaptations of the original
right-hand arpeggios in contrary motion;\textsuperscript{31} it further attempts to augment
the étude's 'triumphantly grand character';\textsuperscript{32} both by buttressing the
texture and by indicating a slower tempo than the original's. (Many
other studies bear slower tempo markings than those stipulated by the
études, for both aesthetic and technical reasons.)\textsuperscript{33} By consistently
doubling lines and by stitching new counterpoint into the weave, the
studies also expatiate on, and concentrate, the contrapuntal-motivic
working of the originals. They concomitantly boost the tonal thrust of
the études through the various harmonic modifications. Partially as a
result of this, the studies generally amplify climaxes. Brune held that
the climax of the first version of Op. 10/5 was more compelling than that
of the original;\textsuperscript{34} similar intensifications occur in 10/7ii (15) and
10/10i (19).

An examination of N.E.2i (45), a study which revises Chopin's
materials in terms of variation form, grounds these observations in
musical fact. The arrangement immediately begins to alter Chopin's
chords, and thus intensifies the linear make-up of the original music
(Exx. 2.56); the lowest right-hand strand particularly contrasts with the
étude's in its convoluted, chromatic descent. The significance of the
contrapuntal working becomes manifest in the first variation, from b. 9,
where the middle and lowest voices of the arrangement's opening
right-hand part exchange roles (Ex. 2.57). A further contrapuntal
feature of the original is amplified: from b. 2 the left-hand part of the
'theme' elaborates on the étude's own contrapuntal hints in the left hand
(bb. [9] and [11]). Meanwhile, the study does not omit to drive home its tonal allegiance; the opening tonic pedal performs this task. Neither does it neglect rhythm as a parameter for bedevilment: it alters Chopin's juxtaposition of duplets and triplets, first to triplets and quadruplets in the 'theme', secondly to triplets and quintuplets in the first variation, and finally to sextuplets against groups of four and nine in the second. A few other exaggerations: the first bar scales down the dynamics from piano to pianissimo; the study adds new expressive and interpretative directions; and, finally, it makes explicit the articulation surely taken for granted by most pianists, for instance through the slurs conjoining the first two quaver triplets in each triplet figure in b. 1. With regard to notational and interpretative guidance, Godowsky was never inclined to do things by halves.
Notes

1. Lockwood, Notes on the Literature of the Piano, p. 93.


4. Note that Godowsky places some arrangements in more than one category. Godowsky's taxonomy is highly problematic. The illogicalities within the table are due to the confused premises of the categorisation, a confusion which arises from Godowsky's slippery use of the term 'strict'. A 'strict' arrangement may be one of two things: either a version that implements a strict procedure or one that cultivates a strict 'sound-structure' relative to the original's. Godowsky's table makes no allowances for the fact that a 'strict' procedure can lead to a free 'sound-structure' and vice versa; and hence the taxonomy fails.

5. Godowsky, 'Description of the various forms employed in the versions of the Chopin Studies', Studien über die Etüden von F. Chopin, p. viii.

6. The same technique is discernible in the corresponding passage from Godowsky's transcription of Op. 25/5 for left hand alone (Ex. 2.3); however, Godowsky lays out the melody, not in the middle of the accompanying figuration, but on the higher edge, entrusting the tune to the thumb to lend it emphasis -- a common strategy in the left-hand adaptations, as Theodore Edel has observed ('Piano Music for the Left Hand Alone', pp. 89 and 101-2).

7. In some editions of Chopin's études, such as Paderewski's (Warsaw, 1949), the second Nouvelle Etude, in A flat, is given as the third, and the third, in D flat, as the second.

8. Godowsky's intricate notation here results from his efforts to transcribe his thoughts accurately onto paper. The ambivalence between the duple and triple groupings is a corollary of the fact that while the triple grouping is musically appropriate, the duple divisions arise from, and reinforce, Godowsky's fingering.

9. Godowsky's preference for rounded forms above binary or through-composed structures is especially evident in his Bach 'elaborations' and the collection Renaissance (see p. 116).


11. Another example of Godowsky's tendency to give bass notes ahead of time is the opening of the 'Elegie', the fifth number of the collection Renaissance (see p. 175).
12. See Kurth, Ernst Kurth: Selected Writings, pp. 111. Kurth recognised a third type of alteration: the 'chromatic chord progression', which entails 'stringing chords together based on pure chromatic progression of all or of individual tones, and no longer based on tonal relationships' (p. 111).

13. Ibid., pp. 111-12.

14. Throughout this thesis, the figures are taken from the root of the chord, not the bass note; sharps and flats indicate a semitonal movement to the essential note.

15. See also the commentary on the trio section of 25/4ii (32) later in this chapter, a passage in which Godowsky finds a similar solution -- necessitated in this case by the change of mode, not from Chopin's major to minor, but from minor to major.


22. Similarly, the splicings of Opp. 10/5 with 25/9 (No. 47), and Opp. 10/11 with 25/3 (No. 48) each employ one of the études as the ground-plan.


24. Godowsky maintained that his music was not difficult to play, as it was conceived pianistically, conceived to 'fit the hand'. (See John G. Hinderer, letter to Paul Howard, 7 July 1947, printed in AMT, no. 14, pp. 172-74 (p. 173).)


28. An incidental point: Hans von Bülow transposed Chopin's Tarantella, Op. 43, from A flat to B in 1886; he thought that the 'brighter' sound would help to make it more 'popular'. (According to the preface to the arrangement, this was done on the advice of a French music teacher, M. Emile Laurent, of Bordeaux.)


30. Godowsky alters Chopin's duple time to triple time in only one other arrangement, 10/1i (1). None of Godowsky's Chopin arrangements treats a triple-time étude to duple metre.


36. Godowsky prefixes N.E.2i (45) with a short article, 'On the use of the pedals' (Studien über die Etüden von F. Chopin, vol. 5, p. 33); to illustrate his points, he suggests six different patterns of pedalling for the first two bars of the study. (None the less, there is little reason to join issue with Ronald Stevenson's assertion that Godowsky's pedal markings are generally a disappointment and do not match his innovations in fingering (in NGS 3, no. 2, p. 10).) Godowsky in fact prefaces many of the studies with directions and exercises for preliminary study. Preface No. 45 (preluding the article on pedalling, on p. 32) for instance dwells on the rhythmic complexities of N.E.2i (45) and offers suggestions as to how different pulses may be played simultaneously.
CHAPTER 3

THE WALTZES AND RONDO, Op. 16

The 1899 Paraphrases

Owing to its radical cut, the paraphrase of Chopin's Waltz in E flat, Op. 18, holds aloof from Godowsky's other Chopin arrangements and betokens the Renaissance arrangements of the ensuing decade. The 'cantus-firmus' technique is de-emphasised in favour of theme-transformation; bar-by-bar transcription gives way to the dismemberment of Chopin's music into blocks for subsequent reconstitution. This surgery is facilitated by the concatenated design of Op. 18 itself. Taken together, the structural manipulations weave a more through-composed fabric than the original's and allow the music of Chopin's 387 bars (including repeats) to be compressed into 242. But, more significantly, the reconstruction undermines the hierarchy of Chopin's musical elements. This becomes clear from a perusal of Table 4. From it, we see that Op. 18 comprises a sequence of discrete but motivically connected waltzes. Each, save for section G, incorporates a contrasting episode, or 'trio'; the trio may either alternate with the primary 'waltz' (in the way that B alternates with A) or may interpose between two or more statements of the 'waltz' (consider C and D, and E
and F). Thus a pecking-order arises, a hierarchy which elevates C above D, and E above F. The paraphrase, though, divorces E from F and weakens the bonds between A and B, since A and B are no longer inseparable. Its general strategy, in fact, is to reknot the ties between the thematic elements, not to cut them: the links between A and B, and between C and D, for instance, now subsist through the agency of thematic superimposition.

Crucial to the arrangement's sabotaging of Chopin's concatenated ground-plan is the restatement of A from b. 105. At a stroke, it divides the arrangement into three. The first section concludes with the restatement of A in bb. 105-20. The second ends in b. 152. And the third begins in b. 153 with the return of introductory material, which betokens a further statement of A. This design is undergirded by the broader tonal scheme. However, Op. 18's key structure -- which stresses subdominant relations, not the paraphrase's third relations -- and its thematic structure tally more precisely than the arrangement's; for the paraphrase occasionally smudges the divisions within the broader sections by not changing key at thematic junctures. To give an instance, the superimpositions A + B and C + D are soldered together by the agent of C major. This procedure immediately enhances continuity, a major concern of the paraphrase. (To offset the relative tonal stasis of the second and third broad sections, the second section indulges in some rhythmic complication and the varied statement of the introduction, in new chromaticism.) Continuity is further enhanced by the paraphrase's omitting some of Chopin's repeats and its eschewing literal reiterations. Where sections do repeat precisely, it is for a purpose, as with the
return of A from b. 105, which serves to mark a major staging-post.

Some impressive thematic manipulations are in evidence. The superimposition of A and B (Ex. 3.1) experiments with metrically misaligning the themes, a tactic which is later deployed to the full in the Johann Strauss metamorphoses. That is, though A and B initially run in phase, A is shorn of two bars, rendering the reiterations of the themes out of joint, and, as a result, forging new counterpoint between them. (The superimposition incidentally demonstrates the expanded role of the left hand, which is excused the chore of articulating waltz skips -- these surface only when A is restated; it further falls to the left hand to state D from b. 73 (Ex. 3.2), a theme which was earlier anticipated in the left-hand part of bb. 67-69.) Also noteworthy is the treatment of theme E in the Prestissimo section of the coda (Ex. 3.3). (This theme was omitted by the middle section of the paraphrase, which elected instead to transform G and F.) Though the Prestissimo preserves E's phrase structure, melodic contour, and harmonic details -- the inflexion onto the local subdominant is the salient harmonic feature -- it couches the theme in a new rhythm. This rhythm owes a debt to D's hemiola effect (see bb. 223-24 of the paraphrase in Ex. 3.3) and to F's crotchet motion. In this way, the coda synthesises aspects of themes D, E, and F.¹

Synthesis and compression are in fact the guiding principles of the concert-arrangement of Chopin's Rondo, Op. 16. More than in the paraphrase of Op. 18, Godowsky 'motivicises' Chopin's textures to improve their coherence.² He also grants the work a fuller-blooded texture by
fortifying Chopin's right-hand part (which, as in the rondo theme, often comprises a single line), though he occasionally neutralises the reinforcements by horizontalising his left-hand block chords, sometimes at a rate conflicting with the prevailing pulse. There is one other concern: to enhance continuity. This is largely effected by maintaining the motion of the accompanimental parts during Chopin's rests and pauses.

Unlike that of the Op. 18 paraphrase, structure is not revised root-and-branch; the arrangement generally tracks Chopin's sequence of events. It does not craft a new tonal scheme; neither does it subvert the hierarchy of Chopin's elements. None the less, compression and excision play leading roles. The paraphrase does away with the Rondo's fifty-one-bar introduction, severing the threads that obtained between, on the one hand, the introduction and, on the other, the transitions in the main body of the work. But the 'motivicisation' of the texture largely compensates for this loss; for the overriding aim is to weld a unity which had eluded the original, primarily by interrelating the figurative transitions with the two lyrical themes. To this end, the arrangement plots three lines of attack. The first entails infusing elements of one section into another. Two examples: a fragment of the subsidiary theme persists in the left hand in the second transition; the triplet motif that chaperons the subsidiary theme intrudes into the final statement of the rondo theme. The second involves 'motivicising' the expositions of the themes themselves. At the end of the first statement of the subsidiary theme, for instance, the arrangement enlivens Chopin's tonally affirming but thematically redundant blocks of alternating local dominant and tonic harmonies by engraving onto them an outline of the
subsidiary theme (Ex. 3.4). The final strategy demands progressively introducing new cellules into the texture. Although the original's first and third transitions are essentially identical -- both bridge the rondo theme and the subsidiary theme -- the arrangement's are not. Instead, a new dotted-rhythm motif creeps into the third transition (a rhythm which derives from the rondo theme); this gives a sense of continuing organic development from point to point.

The paraphrase effects most of the compressions towards the end, where the original inclines towards prolixity. The fourth and final transition to the rondo theme condenses the materials of Chopin's fifty-six bars into forty; amongst other things, it alters pitch levels, reinterprets harmonic functions, and nudges sequences to their logical conclusions. Likewise, the paraphrase extensively abridges the lexicon of stile-brillante figurations that constitutes Chopin's coda.

The Waltzes of the 1920s

The versions of Chopin's waltzes dating from the 1920s are typical of Godowsky's later arrangements. Unlike the 1899 paraphrase of the Op. 18 Waltz, the arrangements do not recast the structures of the originals, save for the version of the 'Minute' Waltz, but coat them with a chromatic lacquer. Neither do they generally indulge in thematic superimpositions. They further differ significantly from the Studien on Chopin: whereas the Studien often construct a new exterior for the études
(think of the 'cantus-firmus' technique), the later Chopin arrangements build a new interior for the waltzes. The way this is done should become clear from our discussion below.

The chromatic counterpoint of the waltz arrangements arises, of course, from Godowsky's tried-and-tested method of altering chords. We might identify several genera of such chordal modifications: ⁴

1. **Alteration to the fifth**
   
   (a) \( \frac{4}{5} \)  
   (b) \( \frac{6}{5} \)  
   (c) \( \frac{5}{5} \)

2. **Alteration to the third**
   
   (a) \( \frac{4}{3} \)  
   (b) \( \frac{2}{3} \)

3. **Alteration to the root**
   
   \( \frac{7}{8} \)

4. **Hybrids**
   
   (a) \( \frac{4}{5} \)  
   \( \frac{2}{3} \)  

   (b) \( \frac{7}{8} \)  
   \( \frac{2}{3} \)  

   (c) \( \frac{7}{8} \)  
   \( \frac{4}{3} \)

1. Fifth alterations are ubiquitous. The progressions of types (a) and (b) are instances of Ernst Kurth's alteration by 'neighbour-note insertion', because the foreign notes 'strive' into the chord. ⁵ Most of Godowsky's alterations are of this class. The progression of type (c)
differs from the others in that it exemplifies Kurth's 'chromatic modification of chord tones', since the resolution demands a change of the root. Most susceptible to fifth-alterations in Godowsky's music are dominant-seventh or dominant-ninth chords. The bars leading to the da capo of Godowsky's version of the 'Minute' Waltz (Ex. 3.5) supply both types of altered chord and indicate how a contrapuntal line may arise from such rudimentary fifth-alterations within the dominant seventh. Not indicated in these bars is Godowsky's tendency to single out second-inversion triads for fifth-alterations, so that the appoggiatura movement may occur in the bass; Ex. 3.6 gives an instance. Godowsky is particularly tempted to alter a chord in this way if Chopin's melody falls from 6 to 5 above the root (momentarily generating a half-diminished seventh), in which case he will usually synchronise the two resolutions (Ex. 3.7).

2 (a). This alteration is almost as common as 1 (a). Godowsky nearly always introduces the (usually unprepared) appoggiatura in the context of the dominant seventh or the dominant ninth, engendering quartal harmony within the former. The elaboration is often intended to animate a bar in which Chopin gives only one harmony, Godowsky's resolution to 3 usually being achieved at the end of the bar. The 'Minute' Waltz arrangement has many instances; two are shown in Ex. 3.8.

2 (b). This alteration was discussed in the preceding chapter. To add one more fact: Godowsky frequently implements the progression when, above the root, Chopin sounds a sixth that resolves to the fifth (Ex. 3.9). (See also the comments on 4 (a) below.)
3. This is spicier but rarer than the other alterations. The progression, which generally takes place within a five-three chord, usually sounds in conjunction with another elaboration, such as a 9-8 or 6-5 appoggiatura, the latter often supplied by Chopin's melody (Ex. 3.10). If it sounds without another concomitant alteration, the appoggiatura generally occurs within the context of the minor triad, momentarily generating the augmented chord. In contrast to his general practice, Godowsky sometimes plots in the bass the potential resolution with the appoggiatura (Ex. 3.11).

4. Of the hybrids, (b) and (c) are unusual; but (a) is one of Godowsky's favourites. It momentarily sounds a diminished triad on the fundamental (a diminished seventh if Chopin supplies the 'sixth' in the melody), resolving to the major triad built above the same root. The modification is most effective, and thus most often to be found, in the context of the root-position chord (Ex. 3.12). Though Godowsky does not generally sound the potential resolutions with the appoggiaturas, he does sometimes simultaneously state the fifth at a lower octave (Ex. 3.13). The version of Op. 69/1 gives an example of such an alteration within Eb dominant ninth; the dissonance 'resolves' to the dominant seventh over the same root (Ex. 3.14).

In addition to altering chords, the arrangements bring into service pedal-points -- which are not prominent in the originals. A dominant pedal might underpin passages -- usually in the trios -- where tonic and dominant harmonies routinely alternate. Short-term tonic pedals might
also join the argument: in Ex. 3.15 the bass F naturals of b. 21 function
as a tonic 'pedal', a bass which resolves the dominant harmony of the
preceding bar; the harmony above is essentially the diminished-seventh
chord on E (or C dominant seventh), with an A♭ that resolves to G in the
ensuing bar.

As stated earlier, thematic superimpositions are rare; but one does
occur in the 'Minute' Waltz arrangement, which combines the waltz and
trio themes just before the da capo (Ex. 3.16). This is no innovation;
many earlier arrangements of the waltz also combine these themes, usually
within the precincts of the trio. However, Godowsky's version departs
from the tradition in a number of ways. In the first place, its
combination has structural implications; for the passage between bb. [69]
and [76], which transmits a trill on A♭, and the lead-in to the da capo
has to expand its dimensions to accommodate the superimposition. Thus
the bars here become trapped in neutral territory: they are not quite
part of the trio, as the return of the waltz theme in the left-hand part
of the superimposition suggests the beginning of the da capo; but neither
are they part of the da capo, because they initially assert dominant
harmony, not the emphatic tonic harmonising the start of the da capo in
b. 99. The second way in which the superimposition stands apart from the
combinations of the 'tradition' lies in its synthesising three musical
elements, not two. For it not only transmits the waltz and trio themes,
but also hints at the trill on A♭ that portends the da capo of Chopin's
waltz. Each element enjoys its own particular articulation: staccato,
accented notes, and legato respectively. The three components are
assimilated not by way of complex and ambitious counterpoint, which might
have devitrified the texture, but by the fusion of the trill and the trio theme into one line. That is, rather than accompanying the trio theme with an on-going trill (in the way of Beethoven or Liszt), the arrangement requires the two parts to share notes, the lines otherwise pronouncing their disparity by means of their individual articulations. Not only does this procure an economical texture, but it also provides for facility of execution.

Like the Op. 18 paraphrase, the 'Minute' Waltz arrangement attempts to enhance the continuity of the original. This endeavour further distinguishes Godowsky's version from others in the 'tradition'. The da capos of Joseffy, Rosenthal, Philipp, and Ferrata follow Chopin's in being virtually literal restatements of the initial exposition. And while there are some variations in the da capos of Laistner, Reger, and Michael Zadora (1915), the revisions are largely ineffective: Laistner and Reger set a new varied figure into motion and leave it at that, while Zadora contents himself with only a minor rearrangement of the opening materials. Godowsky's da capo, though, provides for an organic development that accelerates momentum towards the final bars. Chords are horizontalised by the dissolution of the waltz-skip figuration. New hemiola effects sound in bb. 103-6, effects which were anticipated in the retransition to the reprise. And, crucially, the arrangement stitches new chromatic counterpoint into the texture, especially from b. 115. This counterpoint is often derivative. To give an example: while the bass line of Chopin's bb. [29]-[32] emphasises rising leading-notes, that of the corresponding bars in the arrangement's da capo projects falling sevenths (Ex. 3.17).
A few closing remarks on melody and counterpoint. First, the arrangements generally decline to revise Chopin's tunes. One notable adaptation is in the Posthumous Waltz, Op. 70/3 (Ex. 3.18); but the alteration is infelicitous; for it not only awkwardly anticipates the $e^b$ on the third beat, but also detracts from the arch of the melody. Secondly, the melody generally enjoys prominence by sounding at the top of the texture. On two occasions, though, it is plotted out in the middle, buried underneath linear counterpoint or rising chords (Ex. 3.19). (It is striking how similar the two passages in Ex. 3.19 are.) Thirdly, the arrangements often signal the end of phrases or sections by thinning the music into two-part chromatic counterpoint (Ex. 3.20); this is a stock punctuation mark in Godowsky's musical language. Fourthly, the arrangements eschew cadenzas, glissandos, and other such decorative devices. Such asceticism contrasts with the extrovert cut of the Op. 18 paraphrase, which notably boasts a 'chromatic' glissando. And finally, the arrangements draft all decorative notes and ornaments in full; this procedure determines whether or not the ornaments in question are to be played on the beat. Likewise, the music accurately mensurates note-durations: the trio of the 'Minute' Waltz arrangement, for example, is careful to allocate the notes of Chopin's quadruplet in b. [44] their precise dotted-quaver values.
Notes

1. According to G. Ackley Brower, assistant editor at Carl Fischer between 1929 and 1931, Godowsky was unhappy with the coda and rewrote it; though the revised version of the paraphrase was announced on the covers of other works, it was never published; and the revision is now lost. (Letter to Paul Howard, 28 February 1940, printed in AMT, no. 10, pp. 112-13 (p. 112).)

2. I borrow the verb 'to motivicise' from Joseph N. Straus, who uses it throughout Remaking the Past; 'to motivicise' a texture is simply to increase its motivic content and, in turn, its motivic density. Because this is one of Godowsky's staple techniques in his arrangements, the term and its derivatives will crop up liberally in the thesis.

3. Gerald Abraham noted that this is a feature of Chopin's rondos in general (Chopin's Musical Style, p. 12). Because of Op. 16's loose, sectionalised design, Huneker judged it 'neat rather than poetical' (Chopin, pp. 309-10).

4. A reminder: all figures are calculated from the root of the chord.

5. See pp. 60-61.

6. Because the fourth above the root of the dominant triad is the tonic degree, Godowsky is often able to blend tonic and dominant sonorities through such means; see also the discussion of 10/1ii (2), pp. 64-65.

7. See p. 68.

8. Such a superimposition occurs, for instance, in the arrangements by Rafael Joseffy, Isidore Philipp, Max Laistner, Giuseppe Ferrata, and Moriz Rosenthal (whose trio is a superimposition from start to finish). Godowsky knew Rosenthal's arrangement; a concert programme of 31 May 1898 (reprinted in Jeremy Nicholas, Godowsky, p. 278) indicates that he performed it.

9. Godowsky stipulates that the glissando should be played with the second finger on the black keys and the fourth finger on the white keys. Tausig's ruse for achieving the effect seems quite primitive by comparison: according to Wendelin Weisheimer, the German conductor and composer, Tausig's Das Geisterschiff included an 'ascending chromatic glissando'. Because Liszt had trouble in performing it, 'Tausig sat down, performed a glissando on the white keys with the middle finger of his right hand, while at the same time making the fingers of his left hand fly so cleverly over the black keys that a chromatic scale could clearly be heard [...].' ('With Liszt at the Altenburg', trans. Adrian Williams, quoted in Derek Watson, Liszt, p. 178.) Godowsky uses Tausig's method for procuring a chromatic glissando in the 'symphonic metamorphosis' of Johann Strauss's Die Fledermaus (b. 156b).
[The studies on Chopin's études] were the cause of my having been labelled a technician who had sold his soul to the devil. I could not have been more misunderstood, nor could my aim and purpose have been more distorted, had I been a radical reformer or a political leader.

(Godowsky)¹

Godowsky's later Chopin arrangements, namely those of the waltzes, received little critical perusal; by this time, Godowsky's power to excite significant comment had faded. It was perhaps just as well. For the earlier Studien on Chopin had ignited a prairie fire of criticisms which charged Godowsky with musical blasphemy. That he had dared to rewrite the études was bad enough; that he had rewritten them with the view to augmenting their technical difficulties was simply beyond the pale.² It was clearly not to Godowsky's advantage that Chopin was taken almost universally at this time to be the 'archetypal romantic composer';³ neither did it help that Chopin's études themselves were generally held in the highest esteem;⁴ it could thus scarcely be said in Godowsky's defence that his Studien 'rescued' obscure works by a minor composer. For this reason, The Standard and the Musical Times considered the arrangements simply 'unnecessary'.⁵ For them and others, all
Godowsky had brought about by 'tampering' with -- 'maltreating' -- the études was a freakish set of 'perversions' and 'derangements' -- terms liberally scattered across the invective.6 The Globe complained that Chopin's works had been 'tortured and twisted about almost beyond recognition' by the Studien;7 the worst offender was often held to be 'Badinage', the combination of Opp. 10/5 with 25/9: not all commentators were as polite as the Morning Post's, who found the combination 'curious and not a little startling': spluttering with rage, The Globe's reviewer, for instance, damned the piece as 'a monstrous perversion', a view more recently expressed by James Methuen-Campbell.8 And, unlike audiences in general, critics tended to disdain the studies for left hand alone. The New York Tribune held that

it would be a feat which would challenge curiosity at least to do a thing with one hand for which two hands had been supposed to be necessary; it is less of a feat to change the thing designed for two hands so as to make it practicable for one [...]. A pugilistic expert probably would say that though it might require an extremely clever man who had one hand tied behind his back to beat a man using both hands, it would not be a proof of so much dexterity if the second man was also handicapped. Perhaps this analogy doesn't quite meet the case of Mr. Godowsky's clever performances with Chopin's studies, but it seems to do so to a considerable extent. [9]

Like this notice, many reviews readily acknowledged Godowsky's 'cleverness'; but the accolade was dubious, to say the least.10 Some critics did concede that the Studien might serve a purpose in the practice room11 -- but otherwise held that they were ill-suited to the concert hall. A few found it convenient simply to downgrade the studies to jokes or experiments.12 Similarly, some refused to take them seriously and urged others not to do so either.13 And one or two were plainly bewildered.14
Amongst all this reflex action, there was, and has been, little constructive criticism. Indubitably, the arrangements are not wholly above reproach. Godowsky's harmonic adaptations are sometimes gauche; various chord alterations, for instance, 'work' on paper but can sound awkward, even harsh, in performance. Similarly, the counterpoint is rough in places. The textures are sometimes unconscionably impenetrable and the music overladen with detail. Finally, one might cavil at Godowsky's zeal for 'rationalising' some of Chopin's subtler touches. None of these strictures, though, should derogate from the stature of Godowsky's achievement. For he assembled a collection of studies of not only technical value but also musical merit; the feat was all the more remarkable given that the Studien treat formidable and highly prestigious artefacts. Wilhelm Bachaus, for one, held: 'One forgets [the arrangements'] technical intricacies in the beauty of the compositions. One cannot say that [the études'] original beauty has been enhanced, but [Godowsky] has made them wonderfully fascinating compositions despite their aggravating complications for the student.'15 And the fecundity of Godowsky's invention must inspire some awe. A cursory glance at the seven versions of Op. 10/5, for instance, is ample to indicate the breadth of Godowsky's imagination.16 In this regard, the Studien bring into service a host of textures and forms. The study 25/1ii (24) conjures up a piano-duet texture. Other studies assume the trappings of genres or dance-forms such as the mazurka, polonaise, waltz, tarantella, nocturne, toccata, and minuet -- incidentally, all, except the toccata and minuet, genres associated with Chopin. As we saw with reference to Godowsky's polonaise version of Op. 25/4, allusions to Chopin's works
abound in such adaptations. Such references are perhaps inevitable, given Chopin's role in stabilising the genres of, say, the mazurka, polonaise, or nocturne. But even when they do not allude to Chopin's works outside of the études, the Studien engineer much in-breeding; that is, they often impregnate attributes of one étude into another. Obvious examples are the hybrids, Nos. 47 and 48, each of which combines two études, and No. 18, in which the figuration of one étude systematically infiltrates another. Other, less comprehensive, 'borrowings' include the suggestion of Op. 10/10's figuration in b. 27 of 10/2ii (4), a study titled 'Ignis Fatuus' ('Will o'the wisp'); the similar reference in the ossia for b. 34 onwards in 'Badinage'; and the hint of Op. 10/11's arpeggiated texture in the first variation of N.E.2i (45) (see Ex. 2.57). 18

The discussion of the Chopin arrangements cannot be closed without a remark on the aesthetic status of the strictest of the Chopin arrangements for left hand alone, a status which is sui generis. The transcriptions' primary function, as has been shown, is to conjure up aural illusions of the corresponding original études. Owing to the recasting of medium but the absence of a concomitant change in instrumentation, these works come close to acquiring the status of what W. E. Kennick understands as 'fraudulent' artworks. 19 This is because the uninformed listener hearing, but not watching, a performance of, say, Godowsky's left-hand version of Chopin's Op. 10/3 might be fooled into thinking that he is hearing the original work. Such artefacts might perhaps be more accurately termed 'fakes', not forgeries or 'fraudulent' works. For, as Kennick writes, 'the kind of deception at issue would be
simply that endemic or natural to a certain kind of theatre and would be as innocent as the deception practiced by a performing magician'.

Isidore Philipp recognised and commended this aspect of Godowsky's Studien. 'It is witchcraft,' he exclaimed, 'a veritable phantasmagoria!'
Notes

1. Godowsky, 'Apropos Transcriptions, Arrangements and Paraphrases'.

2. Such sentiments were expressed in The Athenaeum, 8 June 1901, p. 734, and Musical Times 42 (1901), p. 478. More recently, Robert Collet has averred that 'there is something monstrous and slightly repellent in [Godowsky's] total obsession with technique, something from which Chopin himself was quite free' ('Studies, Preludes and Impromptus', p. 125).

3. See Jim Samson, 'Myth and reality: a biographical introduction', in The Cambridge Companion to Chopin, p. 5. This image was given sustenance by the biographical myths germinated and propagated by, for instance, Liszt and d'Agoult, Maurycy Karasowski, and Stanislaw Tarnowski (see Adam Harasowski, The Skein of Legends Around Chopin, p. 25ff.).

4. Tovey, for instance, pronounced that 'Chopin's Etudes stand alone' (Essays in Musical Analysis: Chamber Music, p. 155) and Huneker deemed them 'Titanic Experiments' (Chopin, p. 139), predicting that 'these studies will endure, will stand for the nineteenth century as Beethoven crystallized the eighteenth, Bach the seventeenth centuries in piano music' (p. 212).

5. The Standard, 13 June 1901, p. 5; Musical Times 42 (1901), p. 478. The large number of performances of Chopin's music doubtless gave added force to this judgment; indeed, in 1911, The Times lamented the lower standards brought about by so many performances of Chopin's works (22 May 1911, p. 12).

6. In for instance The Era, 8 June 1901, p. 7 ('tampering' and 'tinkering'); The Athenaeum, 2 February 1901, p. 153 ('tampering'); The Standard, 1 June 1901, p. 5, and The Athenaeum, 8 June 1901, p. 734 ('maltreatment' and 'maltreated'); Musical News, 30 March 1912, p. 299 ('ill-treatment'); The Standard, 13 June 1901, p. 5 ('perversions'); and The Athenaeum, 15 June 1901, p. 768 ('derangements'). The Era took a nationalistic line: '[Godowsky's] alterations of Chopin [...] will in the long run fail to please English audiences. [...] We may be told that prominent Continental journals have commended this tinkering of the gems of a great musician. But in this country our rule is to leave the works of a man of genius in the form originally produced.'

7. The Globe, 1 June 1901, p. 6. The Globe had a change of heart eleven years later and praised Godowsky's arrangements as 'masterly studies' (20 March 1912, p. 6). In this case, the tergiversation might be referable to a different critic's reviewing Godowsky's recital. But the reviewer of the London Musical Courier did admit to revising his opinion of 7 June 1901 (p. 268) a week later, conceding that the arrangements 'made a much deeper impression' and noting that 'these studies possess undoubted musical value' (14 June 1901, p. 280).

8. Morning Post, 1 June 1901, p. 5; The Globe, 1 June 1901, p. 6; Methuen-Campbell, in Gramophone, February 1988, p. 1215.
With reference to Henry Brougham, Muriel Jaeger has noted: "Clever [...] for reasons of national psychology [...] has come to suggest limitations as well as capacities." (Before Victoria, p. 91.) That such usage was not peculiar to the British shores of the Atlantic is shown by Carl Engel's remarks: 'One of the worst cases [of transcriptural obsessions in musicians] is that of Mr. Leopold Godowsky. He can not [sic] pick up a sheet of music, without wanting to trace over it convolutions of octave runs and double trills, rhomboids of counter-melodies, and all very cleverly at that.' ('Views and Reviews', p. 299.]


12. The Daily News, for instance, pronounced that 'an experiment, or joke, of this sort scarcely bears repetition' (13 June 1901, p. 6).


16. And as if seven versions of Op. 10/5 were not enough, the 1909 list of Godowsky's completed and projected Studien advertised eighth and ninth versions; these never saw publication (see Table 2).


18. Likewise, the second version of Op. 10/10 was originally meant to be an imitation of Op. 25/9: see the 1903 list of the published and projected studies on Chopin (Table 2).

19. Kennick distinguishes a 'forgery' from a 'fraudulent artwork': the forgery entails an attempt on the part of the fabricator to deceive; the fraudulent artwork entails an attempt by a party other than the creator to represent as original a work that was not actually executed with the intent to deceive or to defraud ('Art and Inauthenticity', pp. 5-6). See my article "Improving the Classics" for a detailed investigation into the kinship of arrangements with art forgeries (pp. 73-75).

CHAPTER 5

THE AESTHETICS OF THE BAROQUE ARRANGEMENTS

It will give me real pleasure to send you my Bach elaborations (they are not transcriptions!) [...]. You will notice that [...] I transformed Bach's violin solo and 'cello solo works into musical and pianistic skyscrapers. Bach is merely the foundation upon which I built the structure.

(Godowsky)¹

Reducing to straightforwardness [Bach's] involved, ornate, and baroque lines would be like transforming a gothic cathedral into a skyscraper.

(Wanda Landowska)²

Godowsky did not devote his compositional energies exclusively to the Studien on Chopin in the 1900s. He had other projects on the go. One of the largest was Renaissance (1906 and 1909), a set of 'free transcriptions of old master pieces' which glossed movements by Rameau, Loeillet, Schobert, Corelli, Dandrieu, and Domenico Scarlatti. The venture, though, was never completed; of the twenty-four projected numbers, only sixteen were published. Nearly a decade and a half elapsed before the 'genre' attracted Godowsky's attentions again. This was between 1922 and 1924, when he arranged six of Bach's suites and sonatas for solo violin and solo cello:³ the first two violin sonatas, in G minor
and A minor, the first violin partita, in B minor, and the second, third, and fifth cello suites, in D minor, C major, and C minor respectively. The temporal schism separating the two collections of Baroque arrangements at least partly accounts for the stylistic differences between them. The Renaissance pieces are denizens of the racy, revisional world of the 1899 Chopin paraphrases and the Strauss metamorphoses. They flaunt their allegiance by zealously disrupting the originals' bar-by-bar progressions: they not only effect compressions, expansions, and the like, but also install decorative devices such as small-scale cadenzas and glissandos. The pieces also establish a kinship with the other Chopin arrangements through their rich, chromatic language, that is, through their recourse to inter-dominants, applied diminished sevenths, and chains of various seventh chords. From the structural and harmonic standpoints the Bach 'elaborations' are soberer. Yet there is also much common ground between the two collections. As in the Chopin arrangements, contrapuntal strategies proliferate. In both, the presiding strategy is 'motivicisation'. Rounded forms are always more prized than simple binary designs. And both sets tend to exaggerate generic features. For instance, Godowsky's sarabandes consistently underscore the second beat more heavily than Rameau's or Bach's. Likewise, the arrangement of Rameau's 'Musette en Rondeau' (Renaissance No. 14) transmits almost a glut of open-fifth drones. 

The aesthetic premises of Renaissance are abecedarian. As the title suggests, Godowsky understood these arrangements as attempts to revive stale, elderly artefacts. By comparison, the aesthetic terrain of the Bach 'elaborations' is difficult; in traversing it, it is useful first to
consider why the arrangements were written. The apophthegm attributed to Confucius heading the collection ('I am not concerned at not being known I seek to be worthy to be known') might imply that the 'elaborations' aimed at rendering the solo suites 'worthy to be known'. Whether or not this was the case -- doubtless the proposition would have been strenuously denied -- a more immediate concern actually impelled their composition. This was apparently Godowsky's conviction that 'material available for beginning a piano recital in a manner at once dignified and effective was altogether too limited'. (The example of the Bach-Busoni Chaconne was doubtless an inspiration.) And the material discovered, Godowsky listed his aesthetic objectives: 'To explore [the originals'] inner meanings; to probe hidden beauties; to give utterance to vaguely suggested thoughts; to project undivulged ideas -- inarticulated subconscious impressions.' His endeavour was largely 'to develop the polyphony and the harmony in the spirit of the master and his period'.

Now, Godowsky's statement of intent is highly significant; for it is nourished by the suppositions that the original works are in some sense inchoate and that their musical ideas transcend the capacities of the solo violin or cello to convey them. Such notions were scarcely novel. Though Forkel in his 1802 study of Bach had pronounced that 'so remarkable is Bach's skill that the solo instrument actually produces all the notes required for complete harmony, rendering a second part unnecessary and even impossible', the view to the contrary gained currency in the nineteenth century. Philipp Spitta opined that the violin was likely to 'burst and break' under the strain exacted by the D minor violin Chaconne; earlier, Schumann, inspired by Mendelssohn's treatment of the Chaconne in 1840, had undergirded Bach's solo suites and
sonatas with piano accompaniments (1853). Such views persisted into the twentieth century. Sorabji held that 'these Bach solo-violin and 'cello works are nightmares, grinning, dry, rattling skeletons of compositions, bloodless, fleshless, staring anatomies.' By the same token, H. O. Osgood maintained that 'nothing bores the present reviewer more than listening to any one of the Bach sonatas for violin alone, or the suites for cello alone, no matter how well played. [...] The (for the most part) utterly bare melodic lines cry aloud for sympathetic harmonic support today.' For Sorabji and Osgood, the merit of Godowsky's 'elaborations' lay in their rectifying the posited faults. Sorabji thus contended that

Godowsky clothes [the solo suites] with flesh and blood and makes of them magnificent and indeed tremendous musical organisms having the sweep and grandeur, the profundity, solemnity and richness [...] but of which I can discern little or no trace in the bald bare sketches of the originals. [14]

All this begs the question as to whether the Bach 'elaborations' 'realise' or recompose the originals. The answer must hinge, of course, on whether the solo suites and sonatas are considered aesthetically susceptible of 'realisation'. The matter is undeniably tricky; for the term 'realisation' conveys various shades of meaning. One might for convenience identify three. The first is quickly dispensed with. In this definition, 'realisation' is understood to be the 'completion' of an unfinished art-work in the style of its original creator. However, the solo suites and sonatas are complete; for the works are finished; and if they can be 'realised', it is not because Bach expired in the process of writing them. The second is singular to the aesthetic status of the
solo suites and sonatas and owes a debt to Gerald Abraham's assertion that Bach experiments with 'the solo violin in what is essentially a keyboard style'. In this, all keyboard settings of the solo sonatas might be regarded as 'realisations' of the originals' textural disposition. The third refines this definition and is the one which the ensuing discussion will adopt. It holds that 'realisation' comes about if an arranger draws out and makes explicit the patterns and harmonies that Bach's solo suites and sonatas imply but cannot state explicitly owing to the limitations of their mediums.

The specific question as to whether the 'elaborations' 'realise' or recompose cannot be answered without clarifying the relationship between 'realisation' and 'recomposition'. They are not in fact polar opposites. There is no such thing as a 'pure' realisation; for all realisation entails at least a modicum of recomposition. Though this is not so the other way round -- it is theoretically possible to recompose the solo suites and sonatas without 'realising' them -- in truth most arrangements of Bach's solo suites and sonatas end up doing both, Godowsky's included. Of course, the ratio of 'realisation' to 'recomposition' is variable. If the arrangement keeps the element of recomposition at, or near, the minimum required to trigger the realisation, then a large proportion of the artefact conveys this 'realisation', and a strict transcription arises. If the arranger gives freer rein to the recompositional element, by drawing out or elaborating on Bach's implications beyond a certain (indefinable) point, then a smaller proportion of the artefact conveys 'realisation', and a 'free arrangement' (or, for convenience, a 'recomposition') arises. Godowsky's 'elaborations' vary the mixtures;
but it is safe to posit that most of Godowsky's movements can be placed at the 'free arrangement' end of the spectrum, while admitting that they also 'realise', that is, fulfil the implications of, aspects of the originals.

To sum up: the differences between the properties of the two sets of Baroque arrangements are referable, not only to the temporal schism between them, but also to the aesthetic ideas underlying their formulation. In part, these are shaped by the aesthetics of the pieces they treat; various factors -- some intrinsic to the works, some historical -- have bedevilled those of the Bach solo suites and sonatas. Crucially, at the core of the Bach 'elaborations' lies an aesthetic ambivalence. Though Godowsky admitted his urge to work out the originals in the 'spirit of the master and his period', he could not at the same time resist injecting a strong dose of recomposition into his artefacts and diluting the measure of 'realisation' in the process. To be on the safe side, he termed the resulting arrangements 'elaborations' rather than 'transcriptions' and asserted that the originals constitute 'merely' foundations on which his 'elaborations' rest. However, Godowsky's motivation to 'realise' never deserted him. And it was this which restrained him from treating Bach's music more extravagantly.18
Notes

1. Godowsky, letter to Paul Howard, Cornish, N.H., 4 October 1932, facsimile in AMT, no. 16; also printed in AMT, no. 15, p. 181.


3. Godowsky compiled a third set of Baroque arrangements, Airs of the Eighteenth Century (1937), which consists of seven simple transcriptions of short eighteenth-century pieces, of which five are anonymous; the others are by André-Joseph Exaudet and Pergolesi. One incidental point of interest: the New York Tribune of 1 March 1914 (sec. 3, p. 4) advertises a Godowsky recital in the Aeolian Hall on 3 March that was apparently to open with a Bach organ prelude and fugue in A minor 'transcribed' by Godowsky. There is no other record of such a transcription; possibly the transcription was by Liszt, who made a piano version of BWV 543.

4. In his Foreword to the Bach collection, Godowsky notes that the terms 'sonata' and 'suite' have been used interchangeably in connexion with these works. To be strict, all the cello works are suites; the violin works divide into three sonatas and three suites (or partitas). The Bach Gesellschaft edition alternates the violin sonatas and partitas, so that the first sonata is followed by the first partita, and so on. Because Godowsky designates all the violin works as 'sonatas', his collection labels the first partita 'Sonata No. 2' and the second sonata 'Sonata No. 3'. Throughout the thesis, I stick to Godowsky's terminology.

5. For instance, the glissando in b. 138 of Renaissance No. 3 (Rameau: Menuet). Compare this with those in the introductory section of Godowsky's Johann Strauss Künstlerleben paraphrase.

6. Andrew Cockburn points out in 'The Six Bach-Godowsky Suites and Sonatas' that 'there might be some significance in the choice of this quotation and the fact that a number of the transcriptions were conceived and written either in China (the B minor suite) or in Oriental waters'.

7. Although Bach's solo suites and sonatas were not in Godowsky's day as widely known as they are today (see Joseph Szigeti, Szigeti on the Violin, pp. 123-25), it is ironic that Godowsky's Bach 'elaborations' are, and always have been, much less known than the originals. The 'elaborations' do not even feature in Maurice Hinson's The Pianist's Guide to Transcriptions, Arrangements, and Paraphrases.

8. H. O. Osgood, "Johann Sebastian Godowsky".

9. Godowsky, Foreword to Johann Sebastian Bach: Sonatas & Suites for Violin Solo and Violoncello Solo (unaccompanied). Stung by the hostile reception of the Chopin arrangements, Godowsky drafted the Foreword to anticipate, and to stave off, potential criticisms. In addition, he took pains categorically to state at the head of each of the Bach arrangements that the original is 'very freely transcribed and adapted for the piano';
doubtless, this was a warning to purists not to proceed further if they valued their sensibilities. To demonstrate his 'responsibility' further, Godowsky appended the original texts of the arranged works both to the Bach collection and to Renaissance.

10. Forkel, Johann Sebastian Bach, p. 83. In fact, the idea that the works were intrinsically complete had first been expressed by Johann Philipp Kirnberger (see Alan Lessem, 'Schumann's arrangements of Bach as reception history', p. 37).


13. Osgood, 'Johann Sebastian Godowsky'.


15. The debate as to whether Bach's solo suites and sonatas need 'completion' in some way is analogous to the debate about Turner's 20,000-odd 'sketches' (see Robert S. Winter, 'Of Realizations, Completions, Restorations and Reconstructions', p. 98 n. 5).


17. An 'authentic' 'realisation' is as much of a chimera as an 'authentic' performance; for a discussion of these issues, see Winter, 'Of Realizations'. Britten was careful to assert that his Purcell realisations constituted a 'performing edition for contemporary conditions' (untitled note to Purcell, Orpheus Britannicus) -- a statement which neatly demonstrates how the aesthetic premises of any realisation are bound to the intellectual and musical milieu.

18. A similar conflict subsists within Godowsky's Schubert song arrangements (see Chapter 11).
Although written squarely in the twentieth century, Godowsky's 'elaborations' are in fact the last of the nineteenth-century Bach arrangements.¹ By the time Godowsky tried his hand at the 'genre', the factors which had converged and interacted in the previous century to give rise to it had spent their force. Of these, the most fundamental -- the one on which the others had hinged -- had been the Bach revival. As Friedrich Blume observed, the impact of the phenomenon 'transformed the musical world from the very depths'.² To say that the field of arranging was scarcely immune from this impact would be imprecise; for arguably the concept of arrangement was absolutely fundamental to its anatomy.³ Indeed, one might go further and postulate that arrangement functioned as the very conceptual prop for the revival.

Some background helps to elucidate the point. It was the canon-building generation of Schumann and Mendelssohn which reappraised the received but faded image of Bach as a 'law-giver'.⁴ This they achieved essentially by infiltrating the idea of 'absolute' music into his works.⁵ By disinterring the deity of an unspecified 'golden age', such progressively-minded composers as Schumann hoped to locate a source
for contemporary artistic renewal. Particularly seductive for an era that craved avatars of originality was Bach's strong, personal style. Also revered was the aura of timelessness that haloed Bach's works. Busonni was persuaded that it was this facet which permitted arrangements of Bach to be essayed without their 'degenerating into caricature'; by contrast, he deemed arrangements of Haydn's and Mozart's works to be 'sad blunders', since the originals belonged 'wholly to their period'. Hans Richter's response to Bach was perhaps typical:

We were seated at the piano, Wagner and I, playing a duet version of Bach's preludes and fugues from the Well-Tempered Clavier. My friend! That wasn't the old pedant, the father of fugue and counterpoint! No, that was [...] the work of the greatest composer, the founder of German music. [...] When we got to the C sharp minor Fantasy I could restrain myself no longer, the tears poured from my eyes. Wagner too was quite moved by the power of Bach's sounds. Time and again he called out, 'He is the greatest master.'

That Richter and Wagner were playing an arrangement of Bach is highly significant; for adaptations and, by extension, arrangements of Bach's works spearheaded the revival. As Alan Lessem has noted, 'the nineteenth century could not bring Bach into the domain of absolute music without adaptation of one kind or another'; that is, 'Bach's music became seminal for the nineteenth century only through its being creatively misunderstood.' A case in point is Mendelssohn's resurrection of the St Matthew Passion in 1829. This landmark of the revival was drastically 'arranged'; it was cut, rescored, and laden with new tempo and dynamic markings; in all, it was shorn of one-third of its original length. That said, though, the 'rediscovery' of Bach was attended by the usual nineteenth-century cocktail of paradoxes and contradictions. Two parties in fact regulated the revival: on the one hand, the purists or
historicists and, on the other, a more practically-oriented group. (This division should not surprise, given the Janus-faced profile of the nineteenth century.) The 'purists' ruled out 'all tampering with the substance of the compositions or of the texts, with the expression or the language of Bach'; such a procedure, they feared, might dilute the spiritual purity of Bach's music. But the more powerful opposing camp held that Bach, to speak, should be adapted or modernised to counter the not uncommon opinion that Bach in his original colours was 'unmelodious, dry, and unintelligible'; even as late as the turn of the century, Eugène d'Albert could exclaim without fear of impugning his integrity: 'I know there are people who can listen for hours to [Bach's] cantatas without showing any apparent boredom. These people are either hypocrites or pedants.' Thus, as Joseph Kerman has put it, Bach was often 'made to sound like a premature Romantic. [...] The skeleton may not have been bodied out with authentic flesh and blood, but it was made into a handsome waxwork which was quite real enough for the nineteenth century.'

By later nineteenth-century standards, the earlier adaptations were much more faithful to the original texts. Liszt's piano transcriptions of Bach's organ preludes and fugues (1842-50 and ca. 1872), which aimed at disseminating the works more widely, are remarkably strict; so, too, are Schumann's arrangements, which add piano accompaniments to the solo violin and cello suites without sullying the original parts. After Liszt, though, Bach piano transcriptions became 'mightyier' in tone -- a sound no doubt aided and abetted by technical improvements to the instrument itself. Particularly prized in the arrangements were organ
resonances, particularly those of nineteenth-century German instruments, which Blume termed 'giant orchestras'. Busoni, for one, admitted that his piano arrangement of the violin Chaconne 'treated the tonal effects from the standpoint of organ-tone'; Godowsky, too, had a weakness for such writing, especially in the opening movements of his 'elaborations'. To sum up the reigning philosophy, then: the grander its sound, the more an arrangement could aurally muster up Bach's immense, deified personality.

Consistently overlooked are two capital factors that intersected with the course of the Bach revival (which itself drew on the concept of arrangement) to promote the 'genre' of the Bach arrangement towards the end of the nineteenth century. They are these: the rise of what Charles R. Suttoni has termed the 'repertory concept' and the concomitant demise of the operatic fantasy. After all, the production of piano transcriptions of Bach was largely concentrated within the period ca. 1870-1900, the very decades when the operatic transcription fell out of favour with both the performer and composer -- often the same person. Furthermore, Bach arrangements complied with the precepts of the 'repertory' concept, whereas opera arrangements did not. For Bach's works, such as the organ fantasias, preludes, and fugues, stood diametrically opposed to operatic overtures and arias -- the former imbued with Bach's 'holy' aura, constituting serious, 'absolute' music, the latter extravasated from the secular stage, not constituting absolute music in its original form and sometimes being tainted with the unsubtle adulation of the mass public. The paradox is that this serious, highbrow music was itself sweetened for public consumption through virtuoso
arrangement. As a result, the Bach arrangement became endued with a mixture of both worlds: the exoteric virtuoso tradition of the early nineteenth century and the esoteric 'repertory concept' of the late nineteenth century.

The contemporary work and influence of the Bach Gesellschaft was of decisive import in determining the later course of the Bach revival. But for Blume, writing in 1947, its work had an incidental 'undesirable result'; for it inadvertently made available more materials for the arranger. Having noted that 'Zelter and Mendelssohn, Schelble and Mosevius had already led the way in believing in the necessity of adapting Bach to the needs of their own environment, of modernizing him and painting him over with the colours of their own age', Blume went on: 'The second half of the century cheerfully carried on the "good work". Bach's works [...] became the playground for self-important virtuosos and vain conductors.' He condemned the 'antics of the professional virtuoso' and the 'hair-raising absurdities perpetrated even by such masters as Reger and Busoni', exploits which proved for him 'how intrinsically hollow must have been the conception of Bach which led to such travesties'. And in all these 'excesses' were sown the seeds of the decline of the Bach arrangement. Blume noted that 'only in the last few decades [that is, before 1947] has anything been done to remedy this state of affairs'; he remarks on a 'truly herculean purge'. After the First World War 'a younger generation [...] gathered round Bach with a new sense of responsibility and in a spirit of clear-headed devotion to his work'. For Blume, they attempted to play Bach 'in a style of severe simplicity far removed from all the dazzling virtuosity of the past.
The increasing antipathy to the Romantic Bach transcription can be traced in successive entries of 'Arrangement, or Adaptation' in Grove. The entry in the first edition (1879) comments on, and gives musical examples of, Tausig's piano version of Bach's spurious organ Toccata and Fugue in D minor, BWV 565. The author, C. Hubert H. Parry, contends that this is 'the most remarkable instance of the adaptation of the resources of modern pianoforte-playing to arrangement [...]. Tausig's perfect mastery of his art has carried him through the ordeal unscathed, from the first bar [...] down to the end [...] and the result in the hands of a competent performer is magnificent.' Few in the ensuing generation would have concurred; indeed, Tausig's incorrect realisation of the opening inverted mordent (which Parry seemingly sanctions by making it the subject of a musical example) frequently became the emblem of his putative enormity and sacrilege. It should come as little surprise, then, that the third edition (1927) excises Parry's discussion and musical examples of Tausig's arrangement. And it was at this unpropitious time that Godowsky began to arrange Bach.

It is a measure of Godowsky's artistic isolation that he embarked on such a project in the 1920s, a time when only epigones or hacks arranged Bach -- arrangers who generally aimed at the amateur market. That Godowsky's arrangements, the largest-scale piano arrangements of Bach this century (thirty-seven movements), failed to make any significant impression on the contemporary musical scene is hardly astonishing. As
Blume pointed out, Bach reception came to be thoroughly overhauled after the First World War. Moreover, the broader aesthetics of Godowsky's Bach 'elaborations' ran counter to those informing the Bach revival in the first place, which aimed at using Bach as a springboard for the future. But Godowsky's Bach arrangements look squarely to the past. To parody Paul Griffiths's comments on Mauricio Kagel, Godowsky was writing in the twentieth century in the nineteenth-century manner, recomposing eighteenth-century works. The simple fact that this was so would probably be sufficient for Donald Mitchell to reject, to say 'No' to, Godowsky's Bach arrangements altogether. In a manner of speaking, though, Godowsky's peers went further; they ignored the 'elaborations' altogether.
Notes

1. Contributors to the tradition include Liszt, Tausig, Eugène d'Albert, Saint-Saëns, Busoni, Isidore Philipp, and Reger. See also Albert Schweitzer, *J. S. Bach*, vol. 1, p. 319.

2. Blume, *Two Centuries of Bach*, p. 61. The progress of the revival can be charted in the Whistling and Hofmeister catalogues, which reveal an explosion in the number of Bach scores in print from about 1840. (For the labyrinthine bibliographic details, see Rudolf Elvers and Cecil Hopkinson, 'A Survey of the Music Catalogues of Whistling and Hofmeister'.)


5. See Lessem, 'Schumann's arrangements of Bach', p. 34, and J. Peter Burkholder, 'Museum Pieces', for accounts of the context.


7. See Burkholder, 'Museum Pieces', p. 119.

8. Busoni, *Introduction to The Well-Tempered Clavier*, Book 1, by J. S. Bach. Robert P. Morgan has contended that the 'unforgivable perversions' of the nineteenth century were 'deemed acceptable precisely because Bach's music persisted as part of a flourishing tradition, unbroken and in constant transformation [...]' ('Tradition, Anxiety, and the Current Musical Scene', p. 68). However, Blume argues that the 'selectiveness' (Two Centuries of Bach, p. 34) of the 'younger generation' -- that of Schumann and Mendelssohn -- was due in fact to a break in tradition. ('Bach in the Romantic Era', p. 298). In fact, there is some truth in both viewpoints. R. Larry Todd, discussing the contemporary Parisian indifference to Bach, notes that 'only in a few musical centers' was Bach's music revered and cultivated (Mendelssohn's *Musical Education*, p. 6) -- in other words, only in a few centres did the tradition continue unbroken. One such place was Berlin, where 'the Bach tradition was sustained [...] during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries [...] by theoretical discussion and [...] performance' (p. 11).

9. Richter, letter to Camillo Sitte, November 1867, quoted in Christopher Fifield, *True artist and true friend*, pp. 21-22. Forkel's seminal 1802 biography of Bach, itself a major stimulus to the revival, had emphasised Bach as a German; and this nationalistic slant was not short-lived. Richard Taruskin notes that the Bach of Schoenberg and Webern was a 'national as well as a universal figurehead, asserting one nation's claim to ascendance', citing Schoenberg's 1931 essay 'National Music' as evidence of this ('Back to Whom? Neoclassicism as Ideology', p. 299).


12. Revealingly, Blume was schizophrenic in his assessment of Mendelssohn's contribution to the revival. On the one hand, he argued that Mendelssohn's performing score of the St Matthew Passion was a 'travesty of Bach's intentions [...] a caricature of its true self' (Two Centuries of Bach, p. 51). On the other, he downplayed the extent of the revisions, maintaining: 'Mendelssohn's score unmistakably reveals the new spirit in action, determined to allow Bach's mighty language to ring out in its true tones' ('Bach in the Romantic Era', p. 299).

13. For a discussion of the two-sided nature of the nineteenth century, see p. 12. The two camps were not, of course, mutually exclusive. Alfred Schweitzer, usually considered a purist, nevertheless praised piano transcriptions of Bach's organ works, holding that they helped to 'educate' the public (J. S. Bach, vol. 1, pp. 319-20). Yet understood this way, such transcriptions are necessarily demoted to purely temporary phenomena.


16. D'Albert, quoted in Taruskin, 'The Pastness of the Present and the Presence of the Past', p. 196. Likewise, Derek Watson has reminded us that 'Bülow's inclusion of items from Bach's Das wohltemperierte Klavier was regarded in the late nineteenth century as grim and difficult listening' (Liszt, p. 196). Surely not unconnected with this is the fact that the 'Forty-Eight' entered the 'canon' before it added to the 'repertory' (see Joseph Kerman, 'A Few Canonic Variations', p. 121).


18. Liszt also made plans to transcribe the violin Chaconne for piano in 1880.


21. Godowsky's Foreword to his Bach 'elaborations' is peppered with phrases as the following: 'the mighty genius [of Bach]'; 'the transcendent nature of [Bach's] music'; 'the profundity of [Bach's] ideas'; the 'grandeur of his vision'; 'the mightiness of the organ [...]', the "thunderer of instruments"; Bach as a 'colossus in chains'; and so on.

22. Dahlhaus inadvertently put his finger on the origins of the 'monumentalisation' of Bach when he noted that 'the familiarity of musicians with the Well-Tempered Clavier (1722) combined with the aura of
holiness surrounding the St. Matthew Passion to form the substance of a Bach renaissance [...]" (Nineteenth-Century Music, p. 31). Simply substituting 'monumentality' for 'holiness' here elucidates the point.

23. For an explanation of the 'repertory concept' of the second half of the nineteenth century see pp. xx-xxi and Charles R. Suttoni, 'Piano and Opera', pp. 325-26.

24. Blume, Two Centuries of Bach, p. 70.
25. Ibid., p. 71.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid., p. 78.
28. Parry, 'Arrangement, or Adaptation', pp. 92-93.


30. Parry and Leonard Borwick, 'Arrangement, or Adaptation'.

31. Griffiths understands Kagel's recomposition of Brahms's 'Handel' Variations (Variationen ohne Fuge for orchestra (1971-72)) as a '20th-century gloss on a 19th-century commentary on 18th-century music' (Modern Music: The avant garde since 1945, p. 206). There is a curious resonance with Schoenberg's Cello Concerto (1933), a recomposition of a keyboard concerto by the eighteenth-century composer Georg Matthias Monn. Joseph H. Auner has indicated that Schoenberg's intention was to draw the original 'forward through time almost, but not quite, into the present'; the work updates the 'eighteenth-century original to a style that would be at home at the end of the nineteenth century' ('Schoenberg's Handel Concerto and the Ruins of Tradition', p. 286).

The Bach 'elaborations' were, without a shred of doubt, anachronistic. But the earlier Renaissance set cannot altogether avoid the label either -- though in its case the adhesive is less sticky. For Godowsky's methods of usurping Rameau, Loeillet, and Dandrieu -- the collection has a strong French bias -- were far removed from the ways that French composers around this time were tapping eighteenth-century sources in their quest for a new musical classicism and, in turn, for their musical roots. James Methuen-Campbell touched the nub of the issue when he suggested that the Renaissance arrangements 'ooze decadence': he doubtless had in mind the arrangements' sumptuous altered harmonies, their richly 'motivicised' contrapuntal textures, and -- paradoxically, as the idea of 'decadence' is ostensibly opposed to the concept of 'renaissance' -- the aesthetic premises of the collection. It was precisely to this 'decadent', 'German' texture that contemporary French composers -- Debussy is the obvious example -- were reacting when they attempted to recapture the apparent clarity and elegance of earlier French masters. To wade into the hazardous waters of terminology, we might today term the contemporary French practice 'neoclassical'; ironically, on their first appearance, Godowsky's works would probably
have received the (then pejorative) tag. Though Renaissance nominally comprises four volumes of six pieces each, only the first and second volumes are complete; the third volume contains only three arrangements and the fourth, only one. The unpublished arrangements, numbers 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, are not identified; neither are the provenances of the originals, although the original texts are supplied in an appendix to each volume. I submit the provenances below, together with other relevant details. (Keys are indicated only when Godowsky transposes the original in his arrangement or where they assist in identifying pieces; composers' names and the arrangements' titles are stated as Godowsky gives them, details that may differ from the authentic names and titles.)

Volume 1

1. 'Rameau: Sarabande'. Godowsky's appendix gives two 'original' texts. The first, in E major (the key of the arrangement), is the basis of the arrangement: it comes from Rameau's opera Zoroastre, in which the Sarabande is entitled 'Enchantements'. Godowsky's source seems to be C. Poisot's edition of the opera (Paris, 188-?), where the Sarabande is located in Act III. The second text, which is in A major, is a version of the Sarabande to be found in Rameau's Nouvelles suites de pièces de clavecin (Paris, ca. 1728); it has no direct connexion with Godowsky's arrangement.
2. 'Rameau: Rigaudon'. Transposed from G major / minor to E major / minor. The movement belongs to Act I of the opera Dardanus; Godowsky uses both the premier and deuxième Rigaudons in his arrangement, the second functioning as the trio.

3. 'Rameau: Menuet'. The arrangement is based on two consecutive minuets, in G major and G minor respectively, from Nouvelles suites de pièces de clavecin. Godowsky transposes them to A major and A minor. The minor-key minuet is arranged first; the major-key minuet serves as the trio.

4. 'Rameau: Menuet'. The arrangement amalgamates three minuets: 'L'indifférente' from Nouvelles suites de pièces de clavecin (in G minor), an A minor minuet from the Premier livre de pièces de clavecin (Paris, 1706), and 'Les triolets' from Nouvelles suites (in G major). The key of the paraphrase is G minor / major.

5. 'Rameau: Elegie'. This paraphrases two gigues in E minor and E major respectively, from Pièces de clavecin avec une méthode sur la mécanique les doigts (Paris, 1724; revised 1731 as Pièces de clavecin avec une table pour les agréments). The second gigue supplies the trio of the arrangement.

6. 'Rameau: Tambourin'. From Pièces de clavecin avec une méthode sur la mécanique les doigts.
Volume 2

7. 'Schobert: Menuet'. From Sonata No. 22, in E flat, for keyboard.


9. 'Lully: Sarabande'. The original is actually by Jean-Baptiste Loeillet, not Lully, and is the 'Aire' from Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinet (London, ca. 1712).

10. 'Lully: Courante'. Again, this is by Loeillet and is the 'Corant' from the Lessons.

11. 'Dandrieu: Le Caquet (Capriccio)'. From the fifth suite of the Second livre de pièces de clavécin (Paris, 1728).

12. 'Loeilly: Gigue'. From the first suite of Loeillet's 6 Suits of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinet (London, 1723).

Volume 3

13. 'Rameau: Sarabande'. Based on two consecutive sarabandes from
Premier livre de pièces de clavecin; the second sarabande acts as the trio in both Rameau and Godowsky.

14. 'Rameau: Musette en Rondeau'. From Pièces de clavecin avec une méthode sur la mécanique les doigts.

15. 'Rameau: Gavotte'. From Premier livre de pièces de clavecin.

Volume 4

19. 'Scarlatti: Concert-Allegro'. This treats the Allegro, K. 113.

The arrangements of Renaissance generally paraphrase, rather than transcribe, the originals. This might be expected, of course, from those numbers which synthesise two or more originally discrete pieces. But even the seemingly more straightforward single-piece arrangements impart significant structural revisions. For instance, in treating Schobert's binary-form minuet, No. 7 abandons bar-by-bar transcription after the first four bars of the 'B' section and instead submits a varied reiteration with a new four-bar continuation. The material that is excised (bb. [15]-[20]) is presented to the coda, where it is freely extended. The bar sequence of the trio, too, is significantly disrupted. On its second hearing, its first eight-bar paragraph is made harmonically
closed (for this reason, it actually transcribes the final eight bars of Schobert's trio); the first four bars of its second limb, bb. [47]-[50], are removed; and a six-bar phrase in the middle of its 'B' section is extended by two bars (bb. 81-88).

Phrase extensions are in fact ubiquitous in Renaissance: their job is simply to guard against any lapse into consistent bar-by-bar transcription. (Significantly, such manipulations are virtually absent from the Bach 'elaborations'.) Consider the trio of No. 4, a section which reworks Rameau's minuet 'Les triolets': it repeatedly interpolates a cadential echo of preceding material into the bar sequence both to prolong phrases and to bedevil the original's already flexible phrasing, as shown by bb. 63-64 (Ex. 7.1). Accordingly, the first phrase expands in length from three bars to four, and the second, from four bars to five. To Rameau's third, six-bar, phrase, the trio appends a bar to effect a perfect, rather than the original imperfect, cadence; the ensuing double statement of the echo-like cadential figure strengthens the closure. The following bars, which initiate the second section of the trio (bb. 79-86), elongate Rameau's opening two-bar phrase by repeating two bars; they also reformulate the melodic details of Rameau's final four-bar phrase. A final point: the materials which initiated the trio also launch the coda; but differences obtain. To begin with, the first member is extended by two, reharmonised, statements of the cadential figure. Moreover, the arrangement reinterprets the structure of Rameau's second phrase, which may be considered either two or four bars in length. The position of the interpolated cadential figure in the trio had signalled a four-bar construction; the placing of the
interpolations in the coda, though, suggests two two-bar phrases.

Phrase extensions often operate in league with more general revisions to the musical argument, as in the outer sections of No. 3 (Rameau: Menuet), an arrangement which solders two minuets together by having the minor-key minuet flank the major-key one. Bars 3-34 rework the minor-key minuet;\(^6\) bb. 35-42 repeat a portion of the 'B' section of Rameau's minuet (bb. [17-24]); and bb. 43-54 stretch Rameau's ensuing phrase -- let us call it phrase a -- to give rise to a circle-of-fifths construction.\(^7\) The arrangement sacrifices the remainder of Rameau's 'B' section in favour of a free passage; this prepares the return of the opening 'A' music.

It is within phrase a (bb. [25]-[28]) and its environs that the most extensive revisions occur. Bars 27-30 leave the phrase intact but impose it onto the prevailing staccato figuration (Ex. 7.2). Bars 43-54 remould phrase a into a sequential pattern of two two-bar segments (Ex. 7.3) moving through the circle of fifths. A two-bar extension (bb. 47-48) subsequently swivels the music back to the dominant of A minor through the regions of F and B\(^b\) (the Neapolitan); a further, free, extension ensues, to confirm the dominant (bb. 49-54). And the reprise carries on the reinterpretative process. Whereas phrase a had originally sounded eight bars into the 'B' section, it enters just four bars into the reprise, in bb. 139-46; and although the circle of fifths again directs the argument, the materials are transmitted by a new liquid figuration featuring intervening chromatic notes (Ex. 7.4). A final observation: because the reprise takes the two middle bars of phrase a as the seminal
two-bar unit for the sequential construction, each unit now comprises a
new pair of harmonies.

To extend phrases, then, is a powerful means of disrupting an
original text's bar sequence; to purloin the original materials
selectively is another. The brief discussion of No. 7 (Schobert: Menuet)
above hinted at this; the technique is more discernible in No. 4 (Rameau:
Menuet). Essentially, the arrangement alloys three minuets (we shall
term them 1, 2, and 3) by utilising only selective fragments of the
binary-form minuets: the 'A' section of 1, both the 'A' and 'B' sections
of 2, and the 'A' section of 3. While the synthesis permits the
particles of 1 and 2 to interact, the arrangement immures the thematic
materials of 3 in the major-mode trio. Though motivic connexions between
1 and 2 obtain (a rudimentary instance is the inverted relation of the
opening figure of 2, a descending third, to that of 1), the basis of the
synthesis lies more in the ability of their thematic elements to fuse
contrapuntally.

This technique also operates in No. 5 (Rameau: 'Elegie', based on
two gigues). As with No. 3, the 'Elegie' comprises a minor-mode gigue
flanking a major-mode trio (the second gigue). The opening section is a
synthesis of Rameau's eight-bar 'rondeau' melody, the opening bars of the
ensuing episode, and four free bars. A further episode in Rameau's gigue
(bb. [31]-[43]) does not feature here but secures a role in the reprise
(though with b. [41] excised). The closing bars of the paraphrase freely
rework the 'rondeau' theme, which is now transposed down a third. The
trio is equally, if not more, selective: it initially transcribes
bb. [13]-[20] of the major-mode gigue (bb. 17-20); then, in bb. 21-24, it projects the dominant and ruminates on the opening of the previous phrase. After the return of episodic material, in bb. 25-28, the major-mode gigue's rondeau theme puts in an appearance for the first time.

Owing to its fenestrated texture, the arrangement of Scarlatti's Allegro (No. 19) stands apart from its Renaissance colleagues: it supplies some 'windows' into the original piece by leaving a significant number of bars untransformed. Not only this: its general structural and harmonic fidelity to the original is exemplary; and though the 'Concert Allegro' may recast various figurations -- it aims at plotting fuller harmonies and reinforcing Scarlatti's lines -- it tends to retain their salient features (see Exx. 7.5, 7.6, and 7.7). But it does 'motivicise', usually by massaging a good measure of Scarlatti's opening motifs (shown in Ex. 7.8) into the materials (see Exx. 7.9, 7.10, and 7.11: as Ex. 7.10 indicates, it is not lost upon Godowsky that motif b can easily underframe cadential passages). Finally, the arrangement takes the opportunity to rework the original bass line: to strengthen the harmonic impact, it may supply root positions in place of Scarlatti's inversions (Ex. 7.11), or it may jettison Scarlatti's pedal notes in favour of more contrapuntal constructions (bb. 86-88 and 90-92). The removal of the tonic pedal that ends the original Allegro has a structural motivation: to make parallel the endings of the two halves. To this end, the 'Concert Allegro' also couches the closing materials of the first half in the configuration of those of the second and interpolates two bars, bb. 81 and 82, into the first half's final phrase, extending the cadence.
to match the corresponding bars in the second half, bb. 144 and 145a.

Though the version otherwise tracks the bar sequence of the original, it does interpolate two passages; these are marked vide: that is, they may be omitted in performance. The first, bb. 29-40, which slots in between bb. [28] and [29], 'prolongs' the tonic minor by inflecting onto the flat submediant, F major. The first four bars of the interpolation initially work motif a, in A minor; a circle of fifths, deriving from bb. [44]-[45] ensues; and a statement of figure b brings them to an end. The second lot of four bars follows a similar procedure, but the circle of fifths rotates from a different point so as to supply F major more quickly; the passage again closes with motif b, in F. The final, more chromatic, four bars mix up F major and A minor, though A minor finally prevails. The vide signs off with the cadential deployment of motif b.

The other vide (bb. 101-11), in the second half, is more complex. Its subject-matter is the A minor theme which sounds in the left-hand part of bb. 98-100, a passage which gains a distinct character through the syncopation in b. 99 (Ex. 7.12). The interpolation plots this theme, now in E minor, in the treble (bb. 102-5); meanwhile, the left-hand part sketches free counterpoint (except in b. 103, where it inverts the counterpoint of the corresponding bar in the theme's first presentation). In bb. 106-9 the theme sounds in A minor at an even higher register; and the interpolation thus assumes the hallmarks of a fugato. Further complexity is referable to the music of b. 101: though the bar acts as the first bar of the vide, its content is virtually equivalent to that of
b. [87], the bar that should have been treated at this point; these materials re-sound in b. 112, the bar following the interpolation, albeit in a different configuration; therefore the 'Concert-Allegro' subtly overlaps the entry of the interpolation with the original's bar sequence. Because bb. 109-11 have the equivalent content to that of the cadential sequence of bb. [87]-[89], bars which are dealt with in bb. 112-14 (after the interpolation), this material sounds twice, in immediate succession. But, to differentiate the second statement, the arrangement inserts V of V harmony in place of the original V in the first half of b. 114 (b. [89]). Astonishingly, this is the most radical harmonic reworking in the arrangement of Scarlatti's Allegro; and in this sense, at least, the 'Concert-Allegro' anticipates the stance of the simpler movements of the Bach 'elaborations'. 
Notes

1. For a lucid introduction to the contemporary French turn to classicism, see Scott Messing, 'Neoclassicism in France: 1870-1914', Chapter 1 of Neoclassicism in Music, pp. 1-59.


3. For a discussion of the concept of 'decadence', see Matei Calinescu, 'The Idea of Decadence', in Five Faces of Modernity, pp. 149-221.

4. For an account of the pejorative connotations of 'neoclassical' in France at this time, see Messing, Neoclassicism in Music, pp. 12-17.

5. Lionel Salter points this out in 'Godowsky's "Renaissance"', p. 14.

6. See also the comments on p. 167 n. 7 and p. 162.

7. Similar circle-of-fifths expansions occur in the Studien on Chopin's études, for instance in 25/3i (29), discussed on p. 56.

8. See also the discussion of the version of Schubert's 'Die Forelle' on p. 226.
The Bach 'elaborations' do not overhaul the structures of the works they treat as comprehensively as the Renaissance pieces. The longer movements of the 'elaborations', though, none the less recompose. To expose the enginery of the recomposition, this chapter presents four case-studies: the 'elaborations' of the fugues from the A minor violin sonata, the G minor violin sonata, and the C minor cello suite, and of the Prelude from the D minor cello suite. The aim is not, initially at least, to codify general techniques and traits. Such an endeavour cannot measure the individual, and often elusive, metabolism of a particular structure. Neither can it impart much about Godowsky's unique responses, which defy categorisation, to singular contexts; such responses cannot be labelled traits other than by demoting them to 'miscellanea'; but this depreciates the role that they play in shaping a composer's 'style'. The first case-study, then, examines Godowsky's treatment of the original from 'ground' level; that is, it charts the bar-by-bar course of the arrangement. That done, the other case-studies tend increasingly to spotlight only the most interesting facets of the relevant reworking. The ensuing chapter will then survey the broader scene from a crow's-nest perspective.
1. Violin Sonata No. 3 in A minor: Fugue

Godowsky's exposition (Ex. 8.1) bears little resemblance to the archetypal Bachian exposition. The freedom of the part-writing is particularly notable. This contrapuntal informality owes a large debt to the play of 'multi-dimensional' voices, which are those parts -- there are generally between one and five at any one time in the arrangement -- that comprise two or more strands: one primary, the other or others subsidiary. The subsidiary strands offer textural or harmonic support to the primary one, for instance by doubling it in sixths (b. 3) or octaves (b. 5). Such an approach absolves Godowsky from the task of inventing many more independent contrapuntal parts than in the originals; for it readily procures a full texture. It further by-passes the problem of projecting full harmonies solely through the interplay of pure contrapuntal voices, since the 'multi-dimensional' parts can contribute an additional note or notes should the harmony need reinforcing. Notice how the ossia for b. 35 deletes the right-hand part's auxiliary strand to leave naked the primary line (Ex. 8.2); in a similar vein, Ex. 8.3 purifies the opening bars, expurgating the auxiliary voices to reveal the underlying four-part, as opposed to the original three-part, frame. From the diagram, it becomes apparent that the bass voice never sounds the subject in Godowsky's exposition: when it enters, it carries material originally located in the lower part of Bach's short codetta, a two-bar passage which dissociates the second from the third entry. In practice,
though, the final entry of the answer, in b. 7, which logically belongs to the 'tenor', sounds as if it were in the bass; for this reason there is fair margin for regarding the lowest two lines in b. 8 as two strands of a 'multi-dimensional' bass voice.

There is more to the recasting of the exposition. In the first place, both Godowsky's 'multi-dimensional' voices and the strands within them are untrammeled by traditional contrapuntal 'rules'. Consecutive fifths and octaves are not uncommon. Occasionally, parts transfer, as in the beginning of b. 13, where the tenor picks up the music of the alto voice (see Ex. 8.3) -- a procedure not unknown in Bach. Motif \( Q \) expands into a new countersubject that grafts onto Bach's E - E - D\# progression of b. [4] (see Ex. 8.4). A new right-hand alto entry of the subject, initially doubled in octaves, sounds above Bach's codetta (b. 5) and thus supplies the entry missing from Bach's scheme of subject - answer - codetta - answer. Owing to the initial octave reinforcement, this alto entry and the ensuing statement of the countersubject sound as if they belong to the soprano voice, and as a consequence they further distort the fabric of the exposition by giving the impression that the answer in bb. 3-4 belonged to the alto, not soprano, part. Meanwhile, the redistribution of the entries, which takes advantage of the piano's wider compass, magnifies Bach's own gradual expansion of the registral range. The arrangement transposes the subject down an octave, and states it, not in Bach's middle voice, but in the tenor; while the highest entry in Bach, in b. [7], now relocates to what we have understood as the 'multi-dimensional' bass part. Thus whereas the registral span of Bach's exposition is two octaves, that of Godowsky's is four octaves. Finally,
as the texture thickens, Godowsky's exposition increasingly spotlights each entry of the theme. The subject initially enters unaccompanied; the answer makes its début with supporting sixths; the third entry is in octaves; and the final entry sounds in the bass with forte dynamics.

The technique of 'motivicisation' already begins to flex its muscles in the exposition. In b. 8 the soprano voice superimposes a version of the headmotif, \( a \), both onto the end of the countersubject and onto the 'multi-dimensional' bass entry. By suggesting stretto -- which is not a feature of Bach's fugue -- the adjustments forecast the impending stretto entries in the 'elaboration'. Then, armed with motif \( X \), the arrangement diligently 'motivicises' the opening paragraph of the first episode, bb. [9]-[18] (Ex. 8.5). Whereas Bach sounds his initial \( X \)-constructed imitative entries in the upper two voices, the 'elaboration' distributes the imitative entries over three voices and, as a result, gluts the texture with \( X \).

Godowsky often cannot resist incorporating \( X \) into certain melodic configurations. If two notes repeat, he might sandwich an auxiliary note between them to give rise to the motif (as between bb. 9 and 10). He may supply \( X \) by constructing a 4-3 movement over the root of the dominant in a dominant-tonic progression (bb. 10-11). And the motif may be used to vivify long-duration notes. But Godowsky is not wholly reliant on \( X \) for his 'motivicisation' of this paragraph. In b. 13 he superimposes a variant of \( a \) onto Bach's line. This gives rise to a sequence not found in the original, because Bach himself articulates \( a' \) in b. 14, up a step from Godowsky's new \( a' \) in b. 13. And he 'motivicises' the segment in
another way: by interpolating the varied subject in the lowest part of bb. [15]-[16]. Such thematic interpolations perform much the same task as the strictly motivic ones: they improve the surface coherence of the musical texture. In this case, the new subject entry also does something else: it imperils the episodic status of the passage.

The second phase of the four-paragraph episode, bb. [18]-[24], assumes a ritornello function in both the original and the arrangement. The 'elaboration' preserves its details (Ex. 8.6) but reinforces the texture by doubling the lower part of Bach's two-voice episode in octaves. The arrangement also maintains rhythmic momentum, in two ways: by virtue of the oscillating figure in the right hand -- in which the new alto part enounces harmony notes off the beat; and by means of the syncopated bass notes -- which, as a bonus, facilitate performance and differentiate the line by granting it a distinctive rhythmic profile. These adjustments conspire to smooth out Bach's flow of alternating strong and weak beats into a more homogeneous metrical continuum.

The 'elaboration' distinguishes the third paragraph, bb. 24-29, from the preceding one by adjusting the dynamics and momentarily damming the semiquaver flow (Ex. 8.7). The raison d'être of this section in the original was to demonstrate the invertible counterpoint of the preceding 'ritornello' section; but this is not so in the arrangement. For though Bach's upper part is given to the right hand (its reinforcements were anticipated in the immediately preceding bars), the lower part -- the sliding chromatic line -- is expunged. Consequently, no trace of Bach's inversion remains. In fact, the 'elaboration' throughout repeatedly
de-emphasises the episode's chromatic line. A later statement of the ritornello episode, from b. 232, devises three ways of minimising its impact: it posits the line to the alto (not the bass) voice, entangles it with the X motif, and projects a strong bass line to distract the listener.

Bach expatiates on a, the head-motif of the subject, in the final paragraph of the episode, bb. [30]-[39]. Here, Godowsky seizes the opportunity to convey the materials in a way that Bach can only imply. In the original, a is alternated with a scalar passage, z; the pair is repeated sequentially. As figures a and z are contrapuntally compatible, Godowsky is able to state z under a when a is articulated and to give a under z when z sounds. For Godowsky, this section is the high-point of the episode. Not only does he prescribe fortissimo dynamics, but he also reduces the number of active parts, a time-honoured means of activating a climax.

In b. 38, Godowsky, by converting the melody of Bach's b. [38] into a subject entry, pulls the middle entries forward by a bar (Ex. 8.8). This strategy smudges the divisions between Bach's episodes and the entries; it is a staple technique in Godowsky's reworkings of Bach's solo violin and cello fugues; but the opportunities for implementing it in the present movement are limited, owing to Bach's own increasing recourse to the tactic. Godowsky's music here is far removed in its effect from Bach's, not only because the early subject entry in b. 38 and the new entry in b. 40 procure stretto, but also owing to the sheer concentration of the musical materials. For whereas Bach supplies only one subject
entry in this middle-entry section (which lasts until b. [44]) and gives no false entries, Godowsky suggests five entries, most of them real. (The dense texture, though, disguises the fact that the music here comprises only two or three real voices.) The left-hand subject entry in b. 41 arises from a registral transfer (Ex. 8.9) and, subsequently, an extension. The fifth subject entry, in bb. 44-45 (Ex. 8.10), sits astride the division between the end of Bach's entries and the beginning of the first semiquaver episode in b. [45] and thus weakens -- but does not paralyse -- the A minor cadence signalling the end of the first sector of the fugue.

The 'elaboration' of the episode between bb. [45] and [60] has some subtle touches. The arrangement counterpoints the head-motif, a, with the melodic line of the episode -- a line which belongs to the alto part in b. 45 and which transfers to the soprano in b. 46, and consequently to the tenor from b. 47 (Ex. 8.11). Motif a sounds above this line in b. 45 and under it in b. 46. (By intruding into the first bar of the episode, b. 45, a sounds simultaneously with the second half of the subject, b, which belongs to the entry overlapping this section and the previous one.) From b. 47 the augmented fugue subject steals in in the treble, above Bach's episodic material in the tenor (see Ex. 8.11), and thus controverts the episodic status of Bach's passage. The bass meanwhile projects a new pedal-point on the local tonic, A; this not only magnifies the static ambience of Bach's music here, but also acts as harmonic cement, bonding the disparate musical materials together. (Other episodes underpinned by a pedal-point include the passages of bb. 94-102, 106-24, and 166-88.) The second paragraph of the episode, from b. 53,
shifts to a higher register. After an initial hint of the augmented subject, in bb. 53-54 (above the episodic material), to which a replies underneath (b. 54), the full augmented subject enters over an E pedal.

Stretto dominates the set of entries in Godowsky's bb. 61-73. Whereas the previous stretto group, bb. 38-39, plotted its entries four quavers apart, this one plots them only two quavers apart. A four-bar episode, laden with interjections of X, interrupts the argument; the entries resume in b. 69 (Ex. 8.12). At this point, the original supplies only one entry -- an entry which directs the music towards the structural E minor cadence in b. 73 -- but the 'elaboration' indulges in yet another stretto entry, between the soprano, which sets forth the subject, and the bass; the parts enter at the interval of the major ninth. The inner voices meanwhile drive home motif X. From the last quaver of b. 70, the statements of X in conjunction with each other activate complementary rhythm and unfractured semiquaver motion. The cadence in bb. 72-73 is underpinned in the bass with a variant of the subject's head-motif (Bach hints at this in bb. [145]-[146]).

The following bars aim at synthesising various elements of the fugue. The variant of the 'ritornello' episode, from b. 73, joins forces with an extract from the semiquaver episode of b. [45] onwards (Ex. 8.13). The semiquaver-episode material percolates into the C major subject entry in b. 81. This entry is notable for a rhythmic change: it evens out Bach's melody in bb. 84 and 86 by introducing triplet motion. The subsequent entries, between bb. 87 and 93, are accompanied by material that Bach first announces in b. [89] (Ex. 8.14). The
consecutive octaves between the right and left hands scarcely bother Godowsky; indeed, the doubling of motif X that results serves to underscore the beginning of these entries. The doubling eventually gives way to heterophony.

The high sonorities from b. 53 begin to erode from about b. 84. From this point, the music begins to penetrate deeper into the bass register. The point of arrival is b. 94 -- the launch of an episodic passage which Godowsky undersets with a pedal-point on G. (As with the pedal on B in the episode from b. 165, this pedal also transmits motif X.) The episode eventually melts into two-part semiquaver counterpoint (bb. 100-103), a stock Godowsky punctuation mark (Ex. 8.15).4

Bach signals the half-way point of the fugue by stating the subject in inversion. Godowsky further marks the division by doubling the entry in octaves, thinning the texture, stipulating fortissimo dynamics, and abstaining (for once) from st~etto. This abstention is short-lived, though; for stretto entries, using both prime and inverted forms of the head-motif, steal in from b. 137. Though they intercut at the fourth quaver, not at the second of the previous set, their impact is guaranteed by the sparse texture from b. 137.

Two-part counterpoint initiates the second limb of Bach's 'ritornello' episode. This is set forth by the right hand in Godowsky (b. 149); the left expounds the upper part canonically, trailing by a crotchet. When Bach's fugue volunteers a third voice, in the bass, Godowsky's adds a fourth, also in the bass, which crawls beneath the
canonic tenor. Such an intensification of the counterpoint has, of course, harmonic ramifications. Bar 153 is characteristic (Ex. 8.16). The first half of Bach's bar gives G major harmony and the second half, E minor. Godowsky's delays the move to the E minor harmony until the fourth quaver; this shift enhances the impulse onto the following chord, A minor, in b. 154. The suspension of a'' onto g' (a 9-8 movement in the context of a G major triad or a 4-3 one in terms of E minor) above the canonic tenor line obfuscates the harmony, as does the passing second-quaver c' in the canon. In fact, E minor never sounds satisfactorily; for by the time the root of the chord sounds, the other parts have progressed either to an f' passing note or to a c'' accented passing note.

A feature of the episode from b. 166 is the pedal-point which solders its sections together. Other aspects include the simpler texture from b. 178, which eschews doubling (this sets the passage apart from the weighty, doubled entries that follow from b. 189); the slithering, chromatic counterpoint of bb. 169-71; and the mordant harmonies that accrue from the X motif's being stitched into the B pedal-point.

In his version of Bach's single-line episode from b. 199, Godowsky provides a second part through imitation (from b. 206), a procedure which is facilitated by the chordal bent of Bach's material (Ex. 8.17). In addition, he enriches the texture by constantly projecting motif X; by constructing secondary sevenths (usually by placing a minor third below the root of a simple triad); and by introducing applied dominants.
The final bars of the 'elaboration' rely on grandiose figurations for their effect. These figurations entail reducing the number of parts in play; consequently, the number of octave doublings increases. The doublings are stated either simultaneously or successively; the latter configuration procures rolling octaves, as in bb. 257-58 and bb. 273-74. Generally, Godowsky's structures in his arrangements of Bach's longer movements are more end-weighted than the originals; and the final climax tends to amplify any final climax that Bach's movement may give. In this instance, the original relies, not on stretto or other sophisticated contrapuntal devices to fortify the impending closure, but both on withholding the expected A minor cadence and on the increased surface pulse of the demisemiquavers of bb. 286-87. Godowsky's fugue is more adventurous. It hints at the augmented subject in bb. 280-81, and superimposes this on the original statement of the inverted subject; the procedure serves to recall the episode between bb. 45 and 60. The arrangement also reworks the cadence figure (Ex. 8.18): not only is it now rhythmically augmented and marked molto cresc., but it is also in the guise of a glorified single line, reinforced with octaves and double octaves. (This texture was anticipated in adjacent bars, such as b. 253, and much earlier, in bb. 191 and 193.) Elsewhere in the final pages, two- and three-part writing predominates, as in bb. 269-74 and bb. 283-85. In the latter passage, the writing is animated by the 'multi-dimensional' voices and the oscillating constructions in the left hand. These passages alternate with more complex phrases, for instance that of bb. 263-68. The figuration here not only permits the left hand to articulate another part, but also allows the semiquaver pulse to continue unbroken; the syncopated pedal-point meanwhile adds a dash of
excitement.

2. Violin Sonata No. 1 in G minor: Fugue

Immediately striking is the arrangement's transformation of Bach's texture. In the original, the counterpoint is liberally ventilated by rests; this is because the energetic profile of the fugue subject demands separate bowing-strokes, which prevent the articulation of sustained accompanying voices. By contrast, the 'elaboration' consistently plugs the gaps, making for a weightier and rather glutinous texture. A comparison of Bach's exposition with Godowsky's illustrates the point (Ex. 8.19).

Godowsky's exposition transposes Bach's subject down an octave, establishing space for the music to branch out in both registral directions and permitting the 'elaboration' more sharply to differentiate the successive entries through registral means. It also transforms Bach's three-part exposition into a four-part one. But, again, in terms of its part-writing and its lay-out, the reconstructed exposition is unconventional. The four entries of the theme (subject, answer, answer, subject) are distributed amongst only three voices -- the same three voices, to speak in relative terms, as in the original. The bass voice is cut out of the thematic debate: though it enters as early as b. 2, it never enunciates the subject or the answer in the exposition. One more point: an interesting manipulation occurs in b. 4. A motif sounding in
Bach's second crotchet beat is augmented so that it sounds for a minim, not a crotchet, and as a consequence begins to unfurl within the first beat, not within the second.

Motifs \( a, b, X \) (all elements of the fugue subject) and \( y \) (in b. [6]) are the tools for Godowsky's 'motivicisation' of the movement (Ex. 8.20). The new counterpoint for Bach's single-line episode from b. 8 plots \( X \) and \( b \); later, Godowsky's episode introduces \( y \) to anticipate the original compressed statement of the motif in b. 12. From b. 42, the 'elaboration' weaves the fugue subject into Bach's single-line, arpeggio-constructed episode -- initially underneath Bach's line (which is doubled in sixths, fifths, or fourths, or any other interval providing the requisite harmony) and subsequently above, the parts exchanging between the hands (Ex. 8.21). The simultaneous articulation of the subject and Bach's episodic line subtly draws out the subject-derivation of Bach's episode. Now, each of Bach's bars between bb. [42] and [44] projects \( X \) and hints at \( b \). As Ex. 8.21 indicates, b. 42 (subsequent bars take this bar as the model) filters these motivic traces out of Bach's episodic material, transfers them to the left hand, in the process expands the hint of \( b \) into a full statement, and precedes \( b \) with \( a \) to give rise to the full subject. By remoulding the right-hand material of b. 42 into a simple arpeggio pattern, the arrangement avoids duplicating \( X \) at the octave. The bass notes are placed off the beat, both to prioritise the subject and to facilitate the performance of the left-hand part. (The arrangement's procedure is slightly different when the original alludes to this episode at the end of the fugue (bb. 87 and 88): it elects not to tamper with the hint of \( b \) in the second half of the
bars; rather, it precedes the motif directly with \(a\), in order to give rise to the fugue subject in the right hand; the arpeggio figure in the first half of the bars obligingly migrates to the left hand (Ex. 8.22).

Godowsky's treatment of bb. 47-51, which lie within the same episode, is similarly intricate. In b. 47 -- succeeding bars save b. 51 take this bar as the model -- an inner part supplies Bach's arpeggio material (Ex. 8.23). Above it, the 'elaboration' states a variant of the subject, its two constituent particles, \(\text{a and \(b\)}\) (the statement of \(b\) is not exact) sounding in reverse order. (Rudolph Reti might call this 'interversion'.)\(^5\) The arrangement alters one note of Bach's figuration: a \(d''\) should sound instead of a \(g''\) on the second and fourth beats. The alteration prevents a second-beat \(d''\) from clashing with, and detracting from, the \(\text{e}^{b''}\) of Godowsky's subject-variant and prevents three successive \(d''\)'s from robbing \(a\), in the second half of the bar, of its impact. Accompanying this 'interversion' is motif \(a\), in the bass of the first half of the bar; in b. 51, \(a\) expands into a pedal, which persists into the following bar (Ex. 8.24).

Bach's fugue has no stretto. Godowsky 'remedies' the omission by converting the passage from b. 25, a set of middle entries, into a series of stretto entries, at four quavers' distance (Ex. 8.25). This stretto is procured by the commencement of a new left-hand entry mid-way between Bach's two successive statements of the fugue subject, now located in the right hand of b. 25. The passage works harmonically only because the new entry is in the bass; for the repeated entry note, \(g\), behaves as a local tonic pedal that can support the dominant seventh on D above it. Similar
stretto entries occur in bb. 26 and 55. Also informed by stretto are the entries from b. 52 -- though the effect here is largely due both to a false right-hand entry of a in the second half of b. 52, an entry which is not extended into the full subject, and to the superimposition of b onto motif a (from the initial entry of the subject) in the first half of the bar.

3. Cello Suite No. 5 in C minor: Fugue

None of Bach's movements for cello is texturally as intricate as the more ambitious violin movements (primarily the fugues). Multiple stoppings, for instance, are rarer. Nevertheless, Godowsky's arrangements of the cello suites do not differ substantially in their idiom from the arrangements of the violin sonatas. This is partly due to their inclination to transpose the cello part up one or more octaves. If the cello part is transcribed at pitch, it is most often posited to the bass, where it crawls underneath derivative counterpoints.

The Bach Gesellschaft edition entitles the first movement of the fifth cello suite 'Prélude'. The design of the movement is akin to that of the French overture; it consists of a grave-like section followed immediately by a 3/8-metre fugue. Godowsky, though, designates the movement a 'Prelude and Fugue', and wrests the two sections apart. The break is underscored by the weighty trill and tierce de picardie which signal the close of the first limb, and by the new tempo stipulated for
the fugue -- a tempo change which is understood rather than stated in the
original. Godowsky also explicitly labels the second spur 'Fuga'.

Although Bach's movement boasts no multiple stopping, it is
effectively in two parts. There is a double exposition; a codetta
intervenes between the two pairs of entries. Though four
('multi-dimensional') voices seem to be the norm in Godowsky's version,
the arrangement shuns the obvious solution, which is to dole out Bach's
four expositional entries to each of the four voices. The left hand
having announced the subject in bb. 1-9, the right hand sounds the
answer, in the top voice. The left hand continues with a countersubject
-- the original gives no countersubject -- which comprises a fragment of
the fugue subject stated out of joint with the answer. This procedure
procures healthy counterpoint (Ex. 8.26). In bb. 16-22, the right hand
supplies Bach's codetta; meanwhile, the left, by crossing to-and-fro over
the right, depicts a new, illusive, high treble entry (Ex. 8.27). As
with many of the subsequent statements of Bach's subject, this one
differentiates the two strands inherent within the theme by stating the
'upper' strand in the treble, the left hand crossing over the right, and
the 'lower' in the bass, the left hand returning to its normal position.
But the entry is scarcely conventional. It sounds at the 'wrong' pitch
level and, moreover, freely adjusts the intervals between the two strands
of the subject. And the bass strand of the entry may be interpreted as a
separate voice altogether -- a voice in dialogue with the high treble
entry suggested by the left hand. Concomitantly, another bass part
sounds the countersubject. To be categorical as to how many parts
bb. 16-22 project is thus difficult. The number might be three,
comprising the right-hand (codetta) part, the illusive entry (the treble
incipits and bass continuations counting as one voice), and the bass
voice that carries the countersubject. It is four if the differentiated
strands of the illusive entry are considered to be separate parts.

One point of interest is Godowsky's bb. 102-4, bars which treat
Bach's bb.[128]-[130] (Ex. 8.28). Bach signals the end of an episode
here with a subject entry but dissembles it in semiquaver figuration in
order to keep up the momentum. Godowsky further de-emphasises the entry
by assigning the semiquaver line to an inner voice. Moreover, he
eliminates any sense of a new passage beginning at b. 104 / b. [130] by
pulling the disjunction forward by a bar, to b. 103 / b. [129]. The
fresh start is indebted, not only to the interrupted cadential
progression between bb. 102 and 103, but also to the new dynamic and
expression markings in b. 103 and the concomitant launch of a new melodic
sequence.

A notable rhythmic recomposition occurs in bb. 83-84
(bb. [109]-[110]). Bach achieves a G minor cadence in b. [109].
Godowsky recomposes the cadence by installing into it a hemiola involving
a motif from the subject, c (Ex. 8.29). (The rhythmic ploy is not
gratuitous; for hemiolas feature elsewhere in the original fugue.) By
sounding c in b. 83, Godowsky anticipates Bach's statement of it in
b. [110] / b. 84. But whereas Bach uses c to promulgate the new passage,
Godowsky uses the motif both to extend the cadence and to span the divide
between the adjacent sections.
4. Cello Suite No. 2 in D minor: Prelude

This arrangement enlists the services of pedal-points -- which are absent from the original -- to conjure up a solemn, grave effect. In fact, about half its bars project a pedal. This preoccupation is apparent from the outset: the 'elaboration' prefixes the movement with two new bars which mensurate the beat with the pitch class D (Ex. 8.30). To balance the opening, the closing two bars, which constitute half of Godowsky's expansion of Bach's final bar, similarly hammer out the pitch class -- now tripled in octaves. In this way, the opening and closing bars suggest a platform of on-going activity onto which the main body of the music is raised.⁷

The new pedal-points in the D minor Prelude serve to sectionalise Bach's seamless texture. Yet the effect is partially and paradoxically mitigated by the Prelude's omitting to relieve or resolve such pedal-points satisfactorily. For instance, though a bass D sounds in b. 27 after a stretch of dominant pedal, the D is a local, not structural, phenomenon that does not adequately resolve the dominant. For one thing, the D supports dissonant harmony, the dominant of G minor, not the expected tonic. Moreover, the 'resolution' does not signal the beginning of a new section but occurs midstream. Another instance is in b. 42, where the bass breaks a stretch of dominant pedal by moving down a minor sixth to G♯; the ensuing resolution to D in b. 43 is further weakened by the fact that b. 43 is both the second bar of a new paragraph
and the second bar of a two-bar sequential unit. These strategies conspire to enervate the return of the opening D minor theme in the tenor voice of this bar.

The arrangement manipulates register subtly. Particularly sensitive is the way in which it expands the tessitura from the low sonority of bb. 1-2 to that of b. 15, where the F major version of the opening theme sounds two octaves higher than in the original (that is, at '+2' pitch). In b. 3, the 'elaboration' posits Bach's theme to the top of the texture, though at a register that is low by pianistic norms. From b. 7 it overlays Bach's cello part with a new line. The initial right-hand chords of bb. 7, 9, and 11 sound at a register that prepares the '+2' statement of the theme in b. 15; the other counterpoint of bb. 8-10 has a lower vantage-point. After the sequential continuation, bb. 9-10, a new right-hand figure on the second beats of bb. 11 and 12 -- a motif which imitates a cello figure in the first beats -- pushes up the right-hand register, conflating the two registers set up by the right hand in bb. 7-11. The movement then transposes the cello part up an octave in b. 14 to smooth the transition to the '+2' statement in the ensuing bar. In brief, the '+2' statement is prepared by the notes d'' (b. 7), c'' (b. 9), b'' (b. 11), c'' (b. 12), and d'' and c'' (b. 13).
Concluding Remarks

The four case-studies reveal the extent to which Godowsky recomposes Bach's longer, opening movements. Generally, he dilutes the measure of 'realisation' within his 'elaborations' by administering strong doses of recomposition. Just how strong is made clear from a quick examination of corresponding arrangements by Bach and Joachim Raff.

Tovey condemned Raff's arrangements of the cello suites (1868) as 'really deplorable efforts'. Though their textures sometimes seem simple and unpretentious -- sometimes they verge on pastiche -- more often they seem simply poverty-stricken, largely because the arrangements fail to reformulate the materials according to the needs of the new medium. A large proportion of the arrangements is made up of 'realisation'; the dose of recomposition necessary to trigger the 'realisation' is almost the tiniest possible; but this scarcely serves to make them interesting piano pieces. (Indeed, in places in his version of the Prelude to the D minor cello suite, Raff does not bother even to 'realise' some of Bach's compound melodies, but transfers them strictly to the piano.)

Unlike Raff's arrangements, Bach's transcription of the fugue from the first violin sonata in the organ prelude and fugue, BWV 539, takes much more trouble to rethink the music in terms of the new medium. In fact, it even takes liberties with the original materials which are not to be found in Godowsky's arrangement, the second case-study. For instance, whereas the 'elaboration' follows the original on a bar-by-bar
basis, the organ fugue inserts two bars, each of which accommodates a new entry of the subject in the pedal part. It also embellishes the melody (unlike Godowsky's arrangement), largely to maintain continuity of semiquaver motion. (By contrast, Raff generally fills in such hiatuses with oscillating figures.) None the less, the proportion of 'realisation' in the organ fugue is much greater than it is in Godowsky's 'elaboration'; the original's dry, chordal idiom is preserved; the original treble and bass lines generally retain their polarity; the transcription resists strenuous 'motivicisation'.

Less radical than the organ fugue is BWV 964, a keyboard transcription, possibly by W. F. Bach, of the A minor violin sonata. Unlike the first case-study, the fugue from BWV 964 conserves the basic three-part texture of the original and is thus able to keep the original exposition virtually intact. It might retain the polarity of the treble and bass parts, like BWV 539; alternatively, it might plot a simple bass line under existing parts to flesh out the textures. Melodic embellishment again serves to maintain rhythmic continuity. The transcription does not indulge in the recompositional processes of the 'elaboration'; it does not, for instance, subvert the status and functions of episodes, suppress certain materials in favour of others, forge new motivic connexions, or reinterpret the counterpoint root and branch. Rather, BWV 964 calculates a ratio of 'realisation' to 'recomposition' which enables it to strike a balance between conserving the conception of the original and fashioning from it a keyboard piece which is both interesting and idiomatic.
A final thought. The other arrangements, particularly Raff's, generally dilute the strain and struggle that Philipp Spitta identified with respect to the violin Chaconne (and which characterise most of the solo violin and cello movements). By contrast, Godowsky's 'elaborations' stretch the pianist as much as, if not more than, the originals stretch the violinist or cellist. In this respect they conserve -- even exaggerate -- the virtuosic cast of the original works to good effect. If this were to be the sole test for identifying a worthy arrangement of one of Bach's solo suites, the 'elaborations' would surely pass with flying colours.
Notes

1. I have at the back of my mind Theodor W. Adorno's discussion of 'bottom-up' compositional processes in Mahler ('Mahler', p. 87).

2. Throughout this discussion, motifs denoted by capital letters are not peculiar to the movements under discussion, whereas motifs denoted by lower-case letters are variable. Thus motif A in one movement will not necessarily be identical with motif A in another. However, motif X, for instance, is invariable. In this sense, such standard, invariable motifs are analogous to the so-called Z-cells, Y-cells, and so on that are sometimes isolated in Bartók's music (see The Bartók Companion, ed. Malcolm Gillies, pp. 121 and 123 n. 19).

3. The subject does not enter here in the original because, first, an entry on e" would duplicate the opening entry; secondly, an entry an octave lower would go beyond the violin's range and would clash with the register established by the lowest part in bb. [3]-[4]; and, finally, an entry on e"" would be too high for the voice to maintain a dialogue with the lowest part.

4. This was discussed in Chapter 3, with regard to the Chopin waltz arrangements, p. 104.


6. A note on my bar numbering: the original movement, comprising the prelude and the fugue, is numbered all the way through. I have numbered Godowsky's two movements separately; Godowsky's fugue thus begins with b. 1, which corresponds to b. [27] of the original.

7. Something similar is discernible in Renaissance No. 3 (Rameau: Menuet), where a sustained dominant note sounds alone at the beginning and at the end; it also links the end of the trio to the reprise of the minuet, where the dominant note persists as a pedal for some bars.

8. Tovey, 'Linear Harmony', p. 5. Raff also arranged some movements from the violin sonatas for piano (1865) and the Chaconne for orchestra (1873).

9. Brahms had his own way of ensuring that the 'strain and struggle' arising from the limitations of the medium in Bach's violin Chaconne were transferred to a performance of his piano version (1879): he adapted the music for the left hand alone.
CHAPTER 9

THE BAROQUE ARRANGEMENTS:
A MUSICAL INQUIRY

Counterpoint and 'Motivicisation'

'Motivicisation' (increasing the motivic density of the original) is one of the presiding transformational devices in Renaissance and the Bach 'elaborations'. The raw materials for the endeavour are generally mined from the movement being arranged. Cross-movement links -- other than those forged by the 'itinerant' motifs discussed below -- are rarer: only in the 'elaborations' of the first and third violin sonatas does Godowsky attempt to forge such connexions; he aims particularly at binding the preludes and fugues closer together by impregnating the preludes with statements of the ensuing fugue subject. Busoni showed similar concerns in his Bach arrangements: for instance, he superimposed the D major Prelude and Fugue from Book I of the 'Forty-Eight' in An die Jugend (1909) to demonstrate their motivic connexions; exchanged the E flat and G major fugues between Books I and II on similar grounds;¹ and scattered musical annotations across his otherwise strict transcription of the A minor Fantasia and Fugue, BWV 904 (1917), to highlight a basic germinal cell. But, unlike Busoni, Godowsky concocts links; he does not spotlight existing ones. In the 'elaboration' of the Adagio from the first violin
sonata, for instance, Godowsky implants references to the fugue subject in his new counterpoint, as in bb. 2, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 16, 23, and 24 (with a stretto effect); Ex. 9.1 indicates b. 2. These infixations, as well as 'motivicising', incidentally perform other duties. Sometimes they aim at sealing the perforations in Bach's texture: the precise method depends much on the size of the lacuna: for instance, because the hiatus within the first crotchet of b. 3 is too brief to accommodate the subject in its entirety, the subject doubles onto itself (Ex. 9.2); in other similar circumstances, the subject may either continue simultaneously with the remainder of Bach's counterpoint or be fragmented into the opening repeated notes, a, or the second half, b (the motifs are shown in Ex. 8.20).

The procedures differ in the arrangement of the Grave from the third violin sonata. The interpolated particles of the subject of the ensuing fugue slowly coalesce into a full statement; James Hepokoski might call this 'teleological genesis':\(^2\) though suggestions of the subject abound (in bb. 8, 19, 20, 23-26, and 28-30), it is only in b. 31 that the theme is heard in full (Ex. 9.3). Not only does the subject put in an appearance before the fugue, but it also returns afterwards, in the arrangement of the final movement, Allegro. As Ex. 9.4 shows, the subject easily counterpoints Bach's (now fortified) figuration.

Godowsky's new counterpoint in the Bach 'elaborations' -- less frequently in Renaissance -- often plots abstract, neutral motifs which do not have an internal derivation. Such motifs are 'itinerant': they relocate from one context to another. As we have seen, the most
travelled is $X$, which readily assimilates into a contrapuntal texture; motif $Y$ comes second (Ex. 9.5). To give a few examples: $Y$ intrudes into Dandrieu's 'Le Caquet' (Renaissance No. 11); $X$ and $Y$ counterpoint Bach's line in bb. 7 and 9 of the Allemande from the second cello suite; and $X$ fills the second-bar hiatus in the Prelude to the third cello suite (Ex. 9.6). The high register of $X$ in the last of these signals the motif's importance to the later counterpoint (see bb. 13, 37, and 45ff.). And, as if to complement this treble statement, the movement concludes with a bass utterance of $X$ (Ex. 9.7), a coup de grâce which cheekily epitomises Godowsky's usurpation of the original. (The Allegro (Finale) of the third violin sonata also signs off in this way.) Elsewhere, $X$ might assume an ornamental role: it might, for instance, cling to a pedal-note -- as in the fugue from the third violin sonata, the Allemande from the D minor cello suite, and, in conjunction with another part, the Allemande from the C major cello suite (bb. 12-13) (Ex. 9.8). (The complementary rhythm -- a Godowsky trait -- in this example recalls that in 25/3i (29), one of the Studien on Chopin.)

'Motivicisation' occurs also on the larger scale -- through the agency of thematic superimposition. When arranging one of Bach's binary-form movements, Godowsky will usually see to it that the second half establishes some thematic contact with the opening of the first half. We might take as an example the second half of the arrangement of the Sarabande from the D minor cello suite, which initially quotes the opening theme in the left-hand part (Ex. 9.9). In this instance, the recollection assimilates Bach's current lower musical strand and trill; the remaining material unfolds in the right hand. Superimposition
features more extensively in the Gigue from the C major cello suite. In
the second half of b. 3 (bb. [11] and [12]), the right hand anticipates
Bach's oscillating figure from b. [21] over the left-hand projection of
Bach's current melody. Beneath Bach's oscillations from b. [21] (now in
the right-hand part of b. 6), the left refers to Bach's opening four-bar
theme -- sometimes in Bartókian, 'contrapuntally compressed' versions
(Ex. 9.10). And the opening bar of the second half, b. 13
(bb. [49]-[52]), slots material from b. 9 underneath the original music,
material which was repeated quasi-sequentially in b. 10 (bb. [33]-[36]
and [37]-[40]) (Ex. 9.11). No other dance movement in Godowsky's
collection wields the technique of superimposition so thoroughly.

Occasionally, the counterpoint in the 'elaborations' lapses into
Godowsky's characteristic chromatic idiom. In the present Gigue, this is
discernible in a typical two-part configuration in b. 11; also in the
'chromatically compressed' passage discussed above and in the second beat
of b. 3. Instances in the other 'elaborations' include the opening of
the second half of the Allemande in the C minor cello suite; the Gavotte
from this suite; bb. 25 and 27 of the Double of the Allemande from the
second violin sonata; b. 16 of the Courante from the same sonata;
bb. 19-20 and 34 of the Double of the ensuing Sarabande; and also the
Bourrée. The Double of this Bourrée is especially well endowed with such
writing; Ex. 9.12 shows bb. 42-43.

A few miscellaneous points. Needless to say, the principles of
'multi-dimensional' counterpoint guide all Godowsky's Bach
'elaborations'. Example 9.13 (b. 3 of the Allemande from the C minor
cello suite) shows how Godowsky's 'multi-dimensional' writing may resolve into simple parts. Contrapuntal devices such as imitation and anticipation also direct the arguments: indeed, Godowsky's version of the Gigue from the C major cello suite imparts so many instances of anticipation that at times it seems that Bach is 'imitating' Godowsky. Finally, as in the Chopin arrangements, Godowsky's counterpoint in the Bach 'elaborations' sometimes tends towards heterophony; lines converge and then splinter into discrete parts: an example is in the Courante from the C major cello suite, in bb. 9-11 (Ex. 9.14). The tenor line in b. 9 duplicates, at a lower octave, the treble's quaver melody. In b. 10 the lines briefly diverge on the first beat; but they amalgamate again on the second. The duplication peters out in b. 11, where the tenor assimilates into the treble, though the voice rejuvenates into a separate part at the end of the bar.

Rhythm and Metre

Godowsky's contrapuntal procedures and his treatment of rhythm cannot be dissociated, simply because one of the missions of the new counterpoint is to fill Bach's rhythmic lacunae. All the Bach 'elaborations' have at heart this concern with maintaining the pulse. In that of the Adagio from the first violin sonata, for instance, insertions of the subject of the ensuing fugue fill in the cavities and preserve semiquaver motion. The new wide-arched, quasi-improvisatory, arpeggio constructions -- Godowsky subtitles this Adagio a 'Fantasia' -- also fulfil this role.
(But the opening flourish of Godowsky's arrangement (Ex. 9.15) has a different task: to mimic the violinist's spreading of Bach's first, widely spaced, chord.) Other gaps are plugged by new scalar-semiquaver counterpoint, as in b. 9 (Ex. 9.16), or by quicker scalar flourishes, as in b. 4 -- flourishes which in this bar actually derive from Bach (Ex. 9.17). Some of these tactics combine in b. 11 (Ex. 9.18); notice that the second-beat tenor figure here derives from b. [1].

Imitation comes in handy for filling such textural hiatuses in the arrangement of the Prelude to the Fugue of the C minor cello suite. Not only imitation; anticipation, too, may perform the task: see bb. 8 and 9 of the Gigue from this suite and b. 10 of the Allemande from the second violin sonata (Ex. 9.19). Many of these devices operate in the Grave preceding the Fugue of the third violin sonata. Though, like the Adagio of the first violin sonata, the movement is subtitled 'Fantasia', the counterpoint filling the lacunae in this movement is more often constructed from simpler arpeggio designs (bb. 6, 7, or 9) or repeated notes or chords (bb. 1 and 13) than from quasi-improvisatory flourishes. Such procedures can overwhelmingly recast the character of a movement. To give one example: the stately jerkiness of Bach's Allemande from the C minor cello suite, emphasising the first and third beats of each bar, gives way to a more even continuum. The first beats of bb. 11 and 13 are the only points in the thirty-six-bar 'elaboration' where the semiquaver motion ceases. Godowsky combines rhythmic and harmonic considerations by supplying off-beat bass pendants, as in bb. 1-3 (Ex. 9.20 shows b. 1), which enable the performer to skip quickly from one register to another. Extended arpeggios also fill the pauses in this movement, especially
those at the beginning of bars. This solution endows these points with a distinctive character, an emphasis which was originally brought about by the long-duration values of the notes positioned here.

Godowsky discovers four further methods of enhancing continuity. The first makes use of complementary rhythm (see Ex. 9.8). The second entails quickening the pulse through the agency of syncopation, as in b. 27 of the Adagio from the first violin sonata (Ex. 9.21). The third involves giving originally simultaneous notes successively, as in b. 11 of the Allemande from the D minor cello suite (Ex. 9.22). And the fourth implements rhythmic redistribution. For instance, in b. [9] of this Allemande Bach supplies a quaver followed by twelve demisemiquavers (as the quaver is tied to the first demisemiquaver, there are actually only twelve discrete notes here). To eliminate the pause on the initial quaver, Godowsky redistributes the twelve notes equally, as semiquaver triplets, three notes per quaver beat (Ex. 9.23).

Conversely, and more rarely, Godowsky may redistribute notes, not to regularise the pulse, but to sharpen the differences between discrete rhythmic groupings. This occurs in b. 8 of the Grave of the third violin sonata, a bar which corresponds to the second half of Bach's b. [4]. (As Godowsky's note-values are double those of Bach's, all values in the ensuing discussion are in the context of Godowsky's.) The melody of the first half of b. 8 should have been that shown in Ex. 9.24. Godowsky, though, augments the value of the initial dotted figure -- which should have lasted a quaver -- to the crotchet; and, as a consequence, he emphasises the G major harmony (Ex. 9.25). Likewise, he exaggerates the
ornamental cut of the ensuing figure by diminishing the durational values of the first four notes, as a result equalising the pulse of the scalar figure.

Some numbers explore the possibilities of cross rhythms. The original Presto from the first violin sonata flows in 6/8; this gives ample scope for the arrangement simultaneously to articulate two or more ways of dividing the 6/8 bar (two beats of three quavers each -- the original configuration -- or three beats of two quavers each, or four beats of three semiquavers each). That said, though, metrical displacement is more a concern of Renaissance. In the Corelli paraphrase (No. 8), an interpolated dotted-crotchet value in bb. 73-74 displaces the music from bb. 74 to 80 by half a bar; but, as is usual with Godowsky's metrical displacements, the music later realigns, as in the first arrangement of Chopin's Op. 25/3. There is a similar metrical reworking in the central Musette section of No. 15 (Rameau: Gavotte); again, a phrase extension later makes good the displacement. Harmonic displacements, however, feature both in the Bach 'elaborations' and in Renaissance. To give one instance in the latter: in No. 5 (Rameau: Elegie) harmonically-determining bass notes enter a quaver sooner than they should (Ex. 9.26), lending an iambic stress pattern to the melody; the notation of the reprise particularly illuminates this pattern on paper (Ex. 9.27).
Godowsky generally transcribes the melodies of the violin sonatas at pitch and those of the cello suites up one or more octaves. Notwithstanding this guide-line, though, the 'elaborations' tend to begin in a low register before climbing to higher ones. Take the Grave of the third violin sonata: it commences an octave lower than the original (that is, at level '−1'), and in turn floats up to a higher octave by means analogous to those described in relation to the Prelude from the D minor cello suite, the fourth case-study of Chapter 8. As with the D minor Prelude, the higher register is well prepared: the arpeggios in b. 6, for example, smooth the way for the level '0' statement of b. 7. But though the ascent is carefully gradated here and in the D minor Prelude, a sharper contrast between registers obtains in some of the dance movements. This is because, as a rule, Godowsky repeats the first part of the binary-form dance movement at a higher octave and concomitantly redraws the figuration and dynamics (the earlier piano dynamics usually giving way to forte ones).

Other means of differentiating a repeat from the first exposition is to lend the melody to another part on its reiteration or to couch it in new figuration. The arrangement of the Double of the Allemande from the B minor violin sonata begins with a figuration that simulates octave doubling (Ex. 9.28); it consigns this music to an inner part in the repeat and expunges the octave simulations in the repeat of the second half. A different manipulation of register, one which highlights the binary format of the dance movement, is apparent in the Allemande proper.
of the B minor violin suite. The first half of the piece unfolds at level '0', but the second half obstinately stays put at level '-1'. The eccentric harmonisation in the second section further deepens the schism between the two halves (see 'Harmony' below).

This Allemande supplies some examples of Godowsky's method of distributing the strands of Bach's compound melodies between the treble and the bass of his arrangements. He routinely seizes the opportunity to turn up the contrast between the background and foreground by exaggerating the registral differentiation of the two strands. This is particularly apparent in the Gigue from the C major cello suite. At the opening of b. 1, Godowsky augments the gap between the strands by one octave: the upper part now sounds at level '+1', and the lower, at '0' (Ex. 9.29). Bars 2-5 are treated in a similar way. In bb. 8 and 9 Godowsky opens out the registral gap between the two layers of Bach's oscillating figuration: in b. 8 the upper line sounds at '+2' and the lower, at '+1'; the differentiation is greater still in b. 9, where the upper strand unfurls at level '+1' and the lower, at '-1' (Ex. 9.30). These strategies ensure that the arrangement traverses the full keyboard range.

Some final points. Godowsky often reconfigures Bach's discursive melodies, for instance in his version of the Courante from the B minor violin sonata. In the original, the 'melody' vacillates between linear and arpeggio designs. But the arrangement fashions a melodic line that cuts the path of least resistance through Bach's figuration while remaining pegged to the first note of each of Bach's arpeggio groups
(Ex. 9.31). Taken together, Godowsky's processes stratify Bach's original textures. The opening bar of the arrangement, for instance, implies up to four strands (Ex. 9.32) -- an upward-moving arpeggio, a descending and ascending arpeggio, a single falling arpeggio in the first half of the bar, and the linear melody in the treble.

Harmony

Though Godowsky held that in the Bach 'elaborations' his endeavour had been 'to develop the polyphony and the harmony in the spirit of the master [Bach] and his period', he owned that 'aesthetic considerations' had prompted him to 'deviate slightly from this reverential attitude' and justified his departure by citing Bach's own 'amazing harmonic modernisms'. As Chapter 5 noted, Godowsky's endeavour -- in principle -- to work out the originals largely in the 'spirit' of Bach and 'his period' shielded Bach's solo suites from a revamping as thorough as that afforded to the numbers of Renaissance. But this discrepancy between the collections is in degree, not in kind. In both, one precept is much the same: to fight shy of supplying the most immediately obvious harmonisations. In Renaissance, Godowsky achieves this by spraying on the originals a chromatic lacquer, the ingredients of which include dominant-seventh-related harmonies, strings of diminished sevenths and other seventh complexes, and altered chords. Unlike Renaissance, though, the Bach 'elaborations' handle pieces for which there are often no immediately obvious harmonisations. Tovey appreciated this. In
condemning various attempts concretely to harmonise Bach's solo suites, such as Schumann's and Raff's (the former he damned a 'miserable failure' and the latter, as we saw, as 'really deplorable efforts'), he noted that some 'passages are really impossible to accompany with additional harmonies; not because, like folk-music, they have no harmonic interpretation, but because they are intended to have two or three conflicting meanings, all of them perfectly clear, but leaving it to the event to show how the oracle is infallible'.

The difficulty of concretely harmonising the Bach suites and Godowsky's (checked) urge to recompose taken into account, it should not surprise us that some of Godowsky's harmonisations in the 'elaborations' seem wayward. In the arrangement of the Allemande from the B minor violin sonata, for instance, a bass E, not a C natural, might be expected on the final crotchet of b. 31 (Ex. 9.33). And in b. 27 (Ex. 9.34) one might have predicted a six-three B minor harmony on the third beat and a six-three A minor triad on the fourth. Although Godowsky's progression works -- in the broader harmonic context, though, only by the skin of its teeth -- one might impugn the wisdom of positing Bach's melody to the bass here. It does not help matters that the impact of the first chord of b. 28 is weakened by its being anticipated on the preceding weak beat.

The means by which Godowsky subverts the harmonic implications of the Courante from the C major cello suite shed a strong light on his harmonic practice. In the first place, Bach's sequential passage of bb. [49]-[51] acquires a peculiar harmonic gloss (Ex. 9.35). The arrangement supplies a pedal-point on E, over which triads descend: A
minor and G in b. 49; F and E minor in b. 50; and D minor and C major in b. 51. The progression is complicated by chromatic inflexions in the inner parts, which give rise to various incidental seventh and augmented-sixth chords. A less imaginative 'realisation', though, might have sketched fifth relationships: A minor and E minor in b. 49; F major and C major in b. 50; and D minor and A minor in b. 51. And though b. 53 should impart a six-three A minor harmony, Godowsky's harmonies here collapse onto something resembling an augmented-sixth chord on F (an elusive blend of the French and German varieties), in the key of A minor (Ex. 9.36). Secondly, the music from bb. [65] to [71] is harmonically recomposed (Ex. 9.37). The arrangement could have 'realised' the original passage in a number of ways. Clearly, b. [65] should comprise E dominant-seventh harmony; b. [66] might have commenced with an A minor chord -- moving either to F major then D minor or immediately to D minor; alternatively the bar could have begun with F major, by-passing A minor altogether. The ensuing bars continue this pattern in sequence. The 'elaboration' favours none of these 'realisations', though; rather, it circumvents the problem by underpinning the sequence with a pedal-point on E, thus de-emphasising the surface harmonic progression. In addition, owing to its contrapuntal approach, the reworking avoids having to decide on matters such as whether Bach's final beat of b. [68] should project F major or D minor harmony; its lower counterpoint here does not commit itself. Through such means, the harmonic ambiguity that Tovey identified as a feature of the originals is conserved: for instance, does b. 68 of the arrangement open with a C major chord or an incomplete A minor one? One final point. The pedal on E takes on added structural significance. It recalls the passage from b. 49 and thus establishes a connexion that
did not obtain in the original. It also acts as a harmonic decoy; for the ultimate goal is a pedal-point on G, which eventually sounds from b. 73 until the penultimate bar.

Modal effects occasionally contribute towards the oddity of Godowsky's harmonisations. Consider b. 5 of the Double of the Courante from the second violin sonata (Ex. 9.38): the modal aura of the progression would not have arisen had Bach's implied D major sounded throughout the bar. Likewise, the peculiarity of the progression in bb. 5-6 of the Double of the ensuing Sarabande (Ex. 9.39) is due to the juxtaposition of F sharp minor chords with B minor triads in a B minor context. False relations further coarsen the surface texture. Examples 9.40 and 9.41 show two instances, one in b. 33 of the Double of the Courante from the second violin sonata and the other in b. 39 from the Presto (Finale) of the first violin sonata.

Particularly problematic is the matter of harmonic rhythm in the 'elaborations'; for Bach's implied and ambiguous harmonies procure an implied and ambiguous harmonic rhythm. In any discussion, it is always expedient to differentiate between foreground and background rates of harmonic change; for the alliance of parts moving together often procures a series of passing harmonies incidental to the underlying, prolonged ones. As a rule, Godowsky's foreground harmonic rhythm is quicker than Bach's; but his background rhythm is much the same. The third bar of the Gigue from the C major cello suite (Ex. 9.42) shuns the solution of supplying one harmony over two dotted-crotchet beats, preferring to give up to six harmonic changes in its first half. But, on another level, it
retains Bach's implied harmonic rhythm: essentially, the second, third, and fourth beats project embellished A minor harmony; the first beat states an elaborated secondary seventh on E. To compensate for the faster foreground rhythm, the 'elaborations' often slacken the pace of Bach's background rhythm by plotting pedal-points. Thus, like their treatment of Bach's compound melodies, the arrangements' manipulation of harmonic rhythm serves to set the foreground in sharper relief to the background.

Though pedal-points slow the pace of Bach's underlying harmonic rhythm, they often compensate for this by invigorating the surface harmonies. (And they might well characterise an arrangement, for instance the Prelude to the D minor cello suite or the paraphrase of Corelli's Pastorale in Renaissance.) Accented passing notes further animate harmonies and enhance the contrapuntal basis of the harmonic course. Augmented-sixth chords are called up to chromaticise progressions, as in b. 2 from the Allegro (Finale) from the third violin sonata, and are often required to behave in unorthodox ways -- for instance by serving as altered dominants, not as altered dominants of the dominant (see bb. 7-8 of Renaissance No. 2 (Rameau: Rigaudon)). Other ways of chromaticising the music -- these means are discernible more in Renaissance than in the 'elaborations' -- include concocting secondary sevenths, Godowsky adding a minor third below an implied major triad, or adding sevenths to a succession of fifth-related triads, as in bb. 40-42 of Renaissance No. 15; constructing chains of applied diminished-seventh and other seventh chords, as in Renaissance No. 15, bb. 22 and 35 (Ex. 9.43); focusing diminished and dominant sevenths into
dominant-minor-ninth chords; and planting suspensions and appoggiaturas into the texture. The minor tenth leaning onto the dominant minor ninth (for instance, a $B^b$ onto an $A^b$ over the dominant-seventh chord on $G$) is characteristic (as in b. 29 of the Double of the Courante from the second violin sonata and b. 54 of the Presto (Finale) from the first).

Structure

Godowsky declared in his Foreword to the Bach arrangements that he had been 'tempted' to alter the 'archite[c]tural design' of some of the movements in order to give their 'structural outline[s] a more harmonious form'. Accordingly, he effects structural adjustments to eleven movements (thirteen, if two border-line cases are counted). All but one are dance movements, generally the Sarabande, but never the Allemande or the Courante; most adaptations occur in the 'elaborations' of the cello suites. As noted earlier, the structural refashioning is virtually always directed to one end: to mould rounded forms from essentially through-composed ones. This is usually achieved by interpolating the opening theme, or part of the opening theme, into the music usually eight, but sometimes four, bars from the end of the movement. The adjustment is often made with minimum fuss, as in the Sarabande from the D minor cello suite. The second Menuet from this suite effects the structural alteration with even less disruption: it merely tags the opening eight-bar theme on the end. (And the Allemande from the C minor cello suite achieves a rounded effect without any structural adjustment
at all; it simply lends the final bars the grandiose spirit of the opening.)

In Renaissance, two other structural concerns supplement the aim to create rounded forms. Like the paraphrase of Chopin's Op. 18, the numbers sometimes rearrange the original order of thematic segments. For instance, in No. 15 (Rameau: Gavotte) the internal configuration is not the original \( A - A - B - A - C - A - C - A \) but \( A - A - B - B - A - C - C - A \). And the new repetition and return of such segments in No. 6 cause Rameau's 'Tambourin' significantly to expand in length. The other concern is with compression -- one shared by the contemporary Chopin paraphrases but not by the later Bach 'elaborations'. The analysis of the Elegie (No. 5) in Chapter 7 demonstrated how the arrangement draws only on portions of the original. Another interesting case is that of No. 8 (Corelli: Pastorale), which both compresses and expands the original materials. That is, though bb. 82-86 condense Corelli's middle section of bb. [53]-[70] into a four-bar bridge and bb. 93-94 constitute a two-bar link replacing four of Corelli's bars, by way of compensation bb. 1-31 (which draw on Corelli's bb. [1]-[23] and [32]-[33]) serve to prelude the full exposition of the opening section in bb. 32-82. Unlike the original, the arrangement does not permit the opening theme to affirm the opening of the reprise; rather, it sets the theme aside for the extended coda: the purpose of this relocation is, of course, to round the form.

The two marginal cases of Godowsky's formal alterations, while not affecting the broader structure of the movements concerned, nevertheless
entail interpolations. The first is in the Gigue from the D minor cello suite: the music of the first eight bars of the second half is immediately restated in a varied form. The other is in the second Gavotte from the C minor suite. A two-bar interpolation, inserted two bars before the end, bb. 25-26, sounds the opening theme in the bass -- extending Bach's statement, at the end of b. [24], of the two-beat figure (characteristic of the Gavotte) with which the movement began.

The Bach 'Elaborations' in Context: Busoni, Rachmaninov, and Others

The fact that Busoni was the most significant turn-of-the-century Bach arranger invites an urgent comparison between his and Godowsky's efforts in the 'genre'. One generalisation may immediately be risked. Whereas Godowsky's Bach arrangements are stylistically homogeneous, Busoni's are not. The difference is referable, not only to the fact that, unlike Busoni's, Godowsky's arrangements were conceived as a set, but also to the diversity of Busoni's objectives. For Busoni's Bach arrangements obtain in a continuum ranging from editions and versions of Bach's music that 'exemplify', not arrange, the originals to reworkings stimulated by his odyssey to discover a new means of musical expression. The arrangements which chart the bar-by-bar sequence of Bach's originals -- neither the most transcriptural nor the most radical of Busoni's Bach arrangements -- have perhaps the most points of contact with Godowsky's. Yet even in these, Busoni's idiom differs markedly. It dwells much more on cultivating organ sonorities (suggesting the various manuals, pedals,
and so on, often by subtle and ingenious applications of octave doubling), not only in the arrangements of Bach's organ works, but also in, say, the famous arrangement of the violin Chaconne. And, crucially, the role of 'motivicisation' is much more subdued than in Godowsky's 'elaborations'. The practice of Busoni's more radical Bach arrangements diverges even more sharply from Godowsky's. The original thematic materials develop extensively and the contrapuntal lines often exchange roles. The *Sonatina brevis 'in signo Joannis Sebastiani magni'* (1919), a radical revamping of the D minor Fantasy and Fugue, BWV 905, the *Fantasia nach Bach* (1909), and the *Fantasia contrappuntistica* (1910-12) -- all these depart radically from the nineteenth-century 'genre' of Bach arrangement; for they direct the Baroque idiom to rub shoulders with twentieth-century counterpoint. John C. G. Waterhouse holds that these pieces attempted to resolve the contradiction between Busoni the 'visionary' and Busoni the 'pasticheur'; for by drawing on Bach, Busoni was able to find a 'remarkably effective, albeit makeshift, solution to the problems of Busoni the visionary'. To put it another way: for Busoni Bach's music came to function as a crutch for a certain type of free composition; it offered his 'limited vision' some sort of spiritual resolution. In this analysis, Busoni's later need for reworking Bach was different from Godowsky's. Unlike Busoni, Godowsky was no visionary, no musical prophet; his feet were planted firmly to the ground, his face set resolutely to the past.

Godowsky's idiom has more points of contact with Rachmaninov's; but, again, significant distinctions can be drawn. These become readily apparent on considering Rachmaninov's arrangement of the Prelude,
Gavotte, and Gigue from Bach's third violin partita, in E major (1933). Rachmaninov's version of the Prelude compares particularly well with Godowsky's 'elaboration' of the Prelude from the C major cello suite. In both the original preludes, a memorable incipient phrase is followed by a single-line semiquaver perpetuum mobile in 3/4 metre. Both preludes' first bars conclude with a triadic figure. Furthermore, the two arrangements articulate common motifs: the \( X \) motif opens Rachmaninov's Prelude, as it does Bach's; the motif also sounds in Godowsky's opening phrase — though in this case it is imported into the context.

The most conspicuous differences between Godowsky's and Rachmaninov's arrangements obtain in their textures. Rachmaninov's Prelude quickly sets up the controlling lean but muscular two-part counterpoint that sometimes implies more voices. While one of the two parts may later become 'multi-dimensional', rarely do more than three discrete voices sound, apart from in the final twenty bars or so. The arrangement generally favours high registers, and avoids the bass resonances cultivated by nineteenth-century Bach arrangers. Octave doublings are few and far between; none of the active contrapuntal voices is doubled. And it studiously fights shy of virtuosic nineteenth-century figurations. For though it does stipulate some semiquaver hand alternations, these are inspired by the original violin line and arise from an attempt to facilitate performance; furthermore, by ensuring that the hands alternate at the same register, the arrangement avoids the clichéd blind-octave effect. The relative clarity of the texture perhaps owes most to the abundance of unelaborated triads. Though chromaticisms do creep in, they do not suffocate the music of diatonicism.
Godowsky's texture is denser, owing in part to its unremitting 'motivicisation'. Whereas Rachmaninov's arrangement is content generally to sustain semiquaver motion through the agency of only one part at a time, Godowsky's 'elaboration' is not. The simultaneous semiquaver voices in turn procure coarser, veiled harmonies, and nudge up the dissonance level. Unashamedly nineteenth-century figurations sound, such as in bb. 45-60 (see Ex. 9.44), where the right hand conveys a flamboyant Lisztian -- even Chopinesque -- embellishment which horizontalises the harmony within a two-octave span.

Many minor composers arranged individual movements (generally the galanterien) from the solo violin and solo cello suites in the years between 1870 and 1930. Particularly popular were the Bourrée from the second violin sonata and the two Bourrées from the third cello suite. Saint-Saëns, who published two sets of six Bach arrangements (ca. 1861 and ca. 1872), was emphatically not a minor composer; but his arrangement of the violin Bourrée (which is wrongly entitled 'Gavotte') sums up well the differences between Godowsky's approach to Bach's dance movements and that of contemporary minor arrangers. In a word, Godowsky tends towards contrapuntal solutions, the others strongly towards homophonic ones.
A Concluding Note

Tovey remarked: 'In order to translate from the solo violin or 'cello to an organ and orchestra we need, not the technical skill to fill out harmonies and interpret ambiguities, but the imagination to conceive the whole work as if it had never existed in the earlier medium.' This is surely one of Godowsky's achievements in Renaissance and the Bach 'elaborations', although both collections amount to much more than 'translations'. Certainly, the imagination and boldness of the Renaissance arrangements are their presiding qualities. Their audacity is simply compelling. By contrast, the attractions of the 'elaborations' are subtler. To be sure, there is no short measure of imagination and audacity in the longer, opening movements (such as those which Chapter 8 took as 'case-studies'). Though some of the dance movements (particularly in the 'elaboration' of the B minor violin sonata) seem dull by comparison, such unevenness surely holds within the original sonatas and suites; in any event, the more straightforward movements add variety and set in relief the achievements of the more interesting ones.

For Carl Flesch, it was the 'elaborations' deciphering various 'mathematical' technical possibilities that made them 'veritable masterpieces'. But he might also have pointed out their nice aesthetic balancing act: for the 'elaborations' effect their (sometimes extensive) recomposition without ever abandoning their resolve to 'realise'; that is, though the measure of 'realisation' in the artefacts is sometimes much diluted by the large dose of recomposition, it is there none the less; and it makes its presence felt. The 'elaborations' therefore effect a curious gelling of 'strict' and 'free' procedures. Though this
fusion undeniably characterises much of Godowsky's music (the *Studien über die Etüden von F. Chopin*, for example), nowhere does it hold the stage as much as in the Bach 'elaborations'. It is this quality which compels. For this reason, the 'elaborations' can scarcely be indicted with reducing Bach to Landowska's 'straightforwardness'.
Notes

1. This was also a concern of Schenker in Vienna prior to 1917 (see Larry Sitsky, Busoni and the Piano, p. 195). Wilhelm Werker and Johann Nepomuk David further attempted to highlight such links between the preludes and the fugues of the 'Forty-Eight'; the former's arguments were demolished by Arnold Schering in the Bach-Jahrbuch 1923 (see Hermann Keller, The Well-Tempered Clavier by Johann Sebastian Bach, p. 29; see also Cecil Gray, The Forty-Eight Preludes and Fugues of J. S. Bach, p. 14). A more recent essay in illuminating such connexions is Peter Maxwell Davies's orchestration of the Prelude and Fugue in C sharp major from Book 1 of the 'Forty-Eight' (1974).


3. This figuration is similar to that of the eleventh variation of Brahms's 'Paganini' Variations.


5. Tovey, 'Linear Harmony', p. 5. And Tovey acidly noted: 'Even in 1850 it had not yet occurred to anybody that melody could still have aesthetic qualities irrelevant or contradictory to the use of our classical harmonic system as their accompaniment' (ibid., p. 4). Conversely, for reasons closely bound to his own agenda, Heinrich Schenker found much to praise in Schumann's adaptations. He remarked: 'Schumann's accompaniment may be considered sui generis. Its purpose was clearly to provide Schumann with an account of all aspects of the compositional techniques. It is a reduction as much as an accompaniment -- in short, a work with a didactic purpose. [...] It demonstrates that, for the most part, he understood Bach's voice-leading correctly.' ('The Largo of Bach's Sonata No. 3 for Solo Violin [BWV 1005]', trans. John Rothgeb, in Schenker, The Masterwork in Music: A Yearbook: Volume 1 (1925), pp. 31-53 (p. 36.).)

6. Tovey, 'Linear Harmony', p. 5.

7. The natural sign in front of the C argues against this being a misprint. I have found only two credible misprints in Godowsky's Bach 'elaborations'. The first is in b. 57 of the Fugue from the third violin sonata, where the d''s should be d sharp'; the second is in b. 51 of the Allegro (Finale) from the same sonata, in which the second and third semiquavers in the right hand should be demisemiquavers.

8. I borrow Leo Treitler's useful term here; see p. 6.


10. Busoni wrote a lucid essay explaining his methods: 'On the Transcription of Bach's Organ-works for the Pianoforte'.
11. Busoni admitted that the arrangement of the violin Chaconne 'treated the tonal effects from the standpoint of organ-tone' ('On the Transcription of Bach's Organ-works for the Pianoforte', p. 73).

12. This recalls Godowsky's treatment of Chopin's stratified textures in the Studien über die Etüden von F. Chopin. Because fully fledged contrapuntal lines are at a premium in Bach's solo suites, the technique of 'reshuffling' (see p. 5ff.) does not feature as much in the Bach 'elaborations'. A rare instance is in the passage from b. 21 in the Gavotte from the D minor cello suite.

13. For a discussion, see Marc-André Roberge, 'The Busoni Network and the Art of Creative Transcription', p. 76.


15. Ibid., p. 88.

16. Ibid.

17. Godowsky probably thought otherwise; see Chapter 13, p. 254.

18. In 1970, a Godowsky pupil, Douglas Miller, suggested that Rachmaninov took some piano 'lessons' from Godowsky ('The Godowsky Centenary (born February 13th, 1870)'). His reasons for believing this were expounded in a reply (Musical Opinion 93 (1969-70), p. 468) to a letter from Keith Fagan (ibid., p. 354); further points were raised in ensuing correspondence by Wilson Lyle (ibid., p. 468) and James G. Farrow (ibid., p. 632). See also an excerpt from Paul Roës, Music, the Mystery and the Reality (Maryland, [1980]), printed in NGS 3, no. 1 (unpaginated), which suggests that Rachmaninov consulted Godowsky with the view to improving his left-hand technique. (Rachmaninov once pronounced that 'Godowsky is the only musician of this age who has given a lasting, a real contribution to the development of the piano' (see Jeremy Nicholas, Godowsky, p. 66).)

19. They include Berthold Tours, Alfred Gilbert, Frida Cremer, D. Brocca, Agnes Zimmermann, Henry Geehl, G. F. West, Matthew Prior, Stafford Trego, E. Linde, and Frederick Rivenall.

20. Tovey, 'Linear Harmony', p. 6.

PART THREE
Godowsky, in a letter of 1936: 'I have written five Concert Paraphrases on five Johann Strauss [II] Waltzes; "Wein, Weib und Gesang" is the third of the series; the other two are still unpublished. The fifth of the paraphrases is my most ambitious work for the left hand alone [...].'

Of the five, three were published in 1912 by Cranz of Vienna: the 'symphonic metamorphoses' of Künstlerleben, Die Fledermaus, and Wein, Weib und Gesang. Künstlerleben and Die Fledermaus date from 1905 and 1907 respectively; in all likelihood, Wein, Weib und Gesang was arranged in the same period. These Strauss metamorphoses were thus written in parallel with the later studies on Chopin's études and the Renaissance collection. But their paraphrase outlook affiliates them more to the earlier 1899 Chopin paraphrases (and, to a degree, the Renaissance pieces) than to the contemporary left-hand Studien on Chopin's études.

In fact, the Strauss metamorphoses are by far the most scintillating and outgoing of Godowsky's arrangements to date. Their élan accrues from Godowsky's exaggerating the already exuberant cast of Strauss's originals. In short, the 'symphonic metamorphoses' represent the meridian of Godowsky's 'virtuosic' style.
The fifth paraphrase to which Godowsky referred in his letter is of the 'Schatz-Walzer' themes from Strauss's Der Zigeunerbaron, a left-hand metamorphosis which was composed in Vienna in May 1928 and published posthumously in 1941. The identity of the fourth, unpublished, paraphrase is obscure. From some comments made by G. Ackley Brower, it may be inferred that Godowsky planned a two-hand version of the 'Schatz' Waltz paraphrase. Though this is plausible -- after all, Godowsky arranged most of his late left-hand original compositions for two hands -- no evidence that Godowsky reworked the 'Schatz' Waltz paraphrase in this way obtains. More probably, the paraphrase is of Andrei Schulz-Evler's celebrated 'Arabesques' on the 'Blue Danube' Waltz. In 1920, Godowsky remarked of this setting:

It is purely a virtuoso piece, whose musical values are slight. In a way I am responsible for its vogue since I played it a good deal when it first came out. But even then I omitted all its banal and empty interlude passages -- they are musically impossible -- and I kept on reshaping it each time I played it, until at last -- there was no Schulz-Evler left! Then I threw it away, and had my own transcription. I still have it in Vienna, in ms., and hope to take it up again and make a final revision of it sooner or later. [6]

The arrangement is presumed lost.

Die Fledermaus

Let us launch our discussion with a resumé of Michel Kozlovsky's comments on the paraphrase. In the first place, Kozlovsky makes rudimentary observations on Godowsky's treatment of Strauss's melodies and remarks on
the paraphrase's piano figuration and texture, its 'polyphonic juggling' of Strauss's melodies,\(^8\) the chromatic harmonic language, and the technical problems arising in performance. He also compares the textures of the metamorphosis with those of the original; but the comparison is ultimately futile; for, as he concedes, the paraphrase purloins Strauss's melodies for 'purely pianistic exhibitionism'.\(^9\) More valuable is his tabulation of the themes projected by the metamorphosis and his pin-pointing their provenances in Strauss's full score.\(^10\) These findings are indicated in a table.\(^11\) My Table 5, which numbers the themes in accordance with Kozlovsky's scheme, also indicates the structure of Godowsky's paraphrase; but the table yields more data than Kozlovsky's. To begin with, Table 5 gives bar numbers. This allows the chart to indicate the subdivisions of the metamorphosis more precisely and, in turn, enables it to convey the duration, in terms of bar numbers, of each statement of a theme or combined themes. Secondly, the table denotes the harmony in terms of Roman numerals; this permits it to show up the tonal structure more clearly.

Kozlovsky's most significant remarks pertain to the structure of the paraphrase. With some caveats, he contends that the paraphrase is in sonata form and suggests that 'this is inferred from the tonal relationships within the exposition, development and recapitulation, each of which is preceded by a transition which anticipates the main thematic elements that follow'.\(^12\) The judgment of the transitions is certainly spot-on. Like the introduction, they unfurl warped versions of the immediately ensuing themes; this is a staple technique in all Godowsky's Strauss metamorphoses. But Kozlovsky's division of the work into the
various components of sonata form is specious and indicates little more than Godowsky's aptitude for assembling large-scale structures. This is not to deny that in some respects a sonata-form analogy holds. Arguably, theme 9, from bb. 77 to 108 (Ex. 10.1), functions as a first subject, in the tonic, and theme 4, from bb. 109 (Ex. 10.2), functions as the second, in the dominant\textsuperscript{13} -- an argument not posited by Kozlovsky. And the tonic superimpositions of the themes in bb. 315-27 and bb. 369-85 -- bars which fall within Kozlovsky's 'recapitulation' -- might be understood as harmonic 'resolutions' of theme 4. But in other respects the analogy malfunctions. Though it does trigger a move away from the tonic-dominant field of the 'exposition', Kozlovsky's 'development' (bb. 187-259) is no more tonally adventurous than the section following it. Neither is the posited 'development' thematically developmental. Thematic distortions generally occur only in the introduction and the transitions. It is true that thematic combinations (arguably 'developmental' appurtenances) do feature in Kozlovsky's 'development'; but such superimpositions are legion in the metamorphosis. In fact, owing to Godowsky's wholesale recourse to the technique of superimposition from bb. 260, much of the final section might be considered a 'development'. For Kozlovsky, though, this sector of the metamorphosis constitutes the 'recapitulation'. But the exposition of themes has not been exhausted at this point -- themes 14 and 15 have yet to be stated -- and the re-establishment of the tonic, G flat, is precarious. One might better understand the music up to bb. 315 as the 'exposition' of Godowsky's fifteen themes. In this case, a thematic and tonal 'recapitulation' ('reprise' or 'apotheosis' might be better terms) would begin in bb. 315, where themes 9 and 4 return in tonic superimposition, fulfilling the
expectations whipped up from b. 284. Viewed this way, the metamorphosis would comprise a lengthy exposition followed by a brief reprise, the structure affording intermittent opportunities for local 'development'.

The technique of thematic superimposition holds the stage in the Strauss metamorphoses. This hegemony is the culmination of a trend strongly apparent in the 1899 Chopin and Weber paraphrases. Never again was Godowsky so comprehensively to implement the technique. In the *Fledermaus* metamorphosis, superimpositions loom large from b. 300 and furnish the work with its climactic onward momentum towards the closing bars. (For Godowsky, this procedure solved the problem of how to close the work effectively, a dilemma he articulated to Maurice Aronson: 'You know how long I worry to bring a work like [*Fledermaus*] to a proper climax.').' Most themes in the metamorphosis are initially presented in solo, except five (themes 2, 3, 4, 5, and 10), of which all but theme 10 make their débüt in the introduction or in the first transition. Particularly notable for their intricacy are the superimpositions between bb. 315 and 348 (Ex. 10.3). These bars supply the *mélange* of melodies signalling the climax; they superimpose themes 4 and 9, and 4 and 12, and triply superimpose themes 9, 4, and 11, and subsequently themes 9, 4, and 13. To complicate matters, the superimposed themes are misaligned. Unlike the earlier (brief) combination of themes 4 and 9 in bb. 248-51 (the superimposition in bb. 149-56 need not be considered owing to its thematic distortion of theme 4), that from b. 315 misaligns the four-bar units of the themes, so that the units of theme 9 end a bar before those of theme 4. (This is also the case with the superimposition of bb. 369-85.) Also out of joint with theme 4 is theme 12, which enters in
b. 328. And because the close of theme 4 in b. 332 is reinterpreted as the beginning of theme 9 for the ensuing triple superimposition, theme 9 in the following bars proceeds out of phase with themes 11 and 4. In b. 340, theme 11 is replaced by theme 13; theme 13 might be considered in phase either with theme 4 or with theme 9, a judgment which depends on whether or not the first bar of the theme is taken to have 'upbeat' status. (Another subtle eliding of melodies is discernible in b. 307, where the key shifts to A major from the implied G flat. Theme 15 (right hand) makes a one-bar incursion on the A major section and, as a consequence, overlaps with theme 13 (left hand), which begins in b. 307. Theme 4 subsequently enters in the right hand in b. 308; the theme can be held to be either in alignment with theme 13 or not, a judgment which depends again on one's interpretation of the phrase structure of theme 13.)

Rich, altered harmonies and elaborate pianistic devices imbue Godowsky's Strauss metamorphoses with an almost titillating euphoria. Whole-tone formations are especially rife. Whereas they are daubed quite evenly through the paraphrase of Wein, Weib und Gesang, in the Fledermaus and Künstlerleben paraphrases they generally pigment only introductory and transitional passages. The opening bars of the paraphrases (bars which always lack a key signature) are especially well endowed with such complexes. The beginning of Fledermaus is a case in point (Ex. 10.4). A distortion of theme 1 sounds in a Bartókian, 'chromatically compressed' version, initially harmonised by whole-tone clusters. In Strauss's operetta, the theme quickens in tempo; in the paraphrase, the theme navigates a distinct but parallel course by gradually sloughing off its
distortions. The introduction influences other portions of the paraphrase, for instance the transition from bb. 157 to 186: an incipient 'chromatically compressed' and predominantly whole-tone version of theme 4 (Ex. 10.5) preludes a whole-tone entry of theme 9 in b. 165. (It was surely to this passage that Godowsky was referring when he stated: 'Between the second theme of the first valse and the first theme of the second valse, I introduce a very short parody on Richard Strauss (something like Till Eulenspiegel and a bit of Salomé cacophony). It is rather amusing, not unmusical but queer, stranger than the beginning.').

A salient feature of whole-tone formations is, of course, the tritone, and Godowsky is quick to implement constructions on this interval both to supply harmonic colour and to create tonal ambiguity. In *Fledermaus* the tritone is particularly prominent at the end of the introduction, where C sharp major (= D flat) is prolonged by interjections of G major, though both harmonies are often altered and spelt with enharmonic notes (Ex. 10.6). The harmonic strategies are arguably more conventional in the more tonally stable passages: as ever, Godowsky surfeits their textures with altered triads to achieve both galvanising harmonic effects and a quick surface harmonic rhythm, and engineers striking modulations through pivotal six-four chords.

A resilient and recurring motif in Kozlovsky's commentary on *Fledermaus* is the notion that the metamorphosis is 'humorous'. Kozlovsky avers that 'obviously the musical intention of this paraphrase is not oriented towards musical, dramatic or theatrical unity; it is pure fun and games'. (This is surely in the face of his argument that the work is in sonata form.) But he goes further: 'There is no pretension
to musical seriousness in any part of [this] paraphrase. Every motive, harmony or contrapuntal line in this work is expressive of Godowsky's humor. The place of this transcription in the piano repertoire is comparable to that of the clown among acrobats [...]. Indubitably, Kozlovsky has a point. Yet the work is not all 'fun and games'; for the humorous aspect (which Kozlovsky surely exaggerates) masks the seriousness of Godowsky's intent. In a word, this was to create Strauss paraphrases of better quality than those of his contemporaries and immediate predecessors. Thus Godowsky depreciated, not only Schulz-Evler's arrangement of the 'Blue Danube' Waltz (as we saw above), but also Eduard Schütz's Strauss paraphrases:

[They] seem to me to be just what I disapprove of, shallowly brilliant drawing-room pieces of a virtuoso cast; whereas virtuosity, as such, is the least part of my Metamorphoses, and everything in them is developed out of Strauss's own music in an endeavour to build up a living, pulsing, colourful transformation of the simple original legitimately, by means of theme-inversion and theme development, rich and glorified instrumental counterpoint, imitation and embellishment. [21]

Of course, such statements have to be taken with a grain of salt, geared as they are towards proclaiming the arranger's 'responsibility' and good taste. But it is clear that Godowsky was not exclusively preoccupied with technical 'acrobatics' in his metamorphoses. He was also concerned with creating a unified musical artefact (rather than a loose pot-pourri confection), largely by means of sophisticated contrapuntal strategies that operated within strong tonal and thematic frameworks. To be fair, though, Schütz's paraphrases are often more intricate than Godowsky admitted -- even though they shun contrapuntal pyrotechnics. The concert-paraphrase of Fledermaus (1882) is a case in point. Schütz does
not swathe Strauss's themes in elaborate piano figurations, as one might infer from Godowsky's comments, but distorts and fragments them; the treatment of the themes is consistently developmental. Schütz's harmonies, which both engineer and arise from such a treatment of melody, are often unpredictable. The ground-plan is tonally goal-directed, at times making Neapolitan-biased excursions. If Godowsky's version is superior to Schütz's, it is because of the equilibrium it sets up between open-ended and closed structures. Because Schütz's paraphrase is so concerned with forward motion, full, undistorted statements of themes occur less often than one might like. Too much seems harmonically and thematically open-ended. Godowsky's version, though, indulges the listener's appetite for closed themes without lapsing into a stasis. This is not least accomplished by the thematic superimpositions, which allow the themes to ring out more or less in full but at the same time carry on the argument, and by the more substantial transitions, which permit, on arrival at their goal, fuller-blooded statements of the themes. To risk an operatic comparison, Godowsky's strategy conveniently separates the 'narrative' mode (conveyed by recitatives in opera) from the 'reflective' mode (given by arias). Schütz's paraphrase, by comparison, compares to continuous opera, but does not solve the problem of how satisfactorily to dissolve the two dramatic modes into each other. It is Schütz's unfettered radicalism -- not, as Godowsky implies, his shallow conventionalism -- that lets his arrangements down.
Because the *Fledermaus* paraphrase extracts its themes from an operetta, it would be nonsensical -- and difficult -- to attempt to compare the proportions of the themes in the paraphrase with those of the themes in the original. There is no such problem with the *Künstlerleben* metamorphosis; indeed, such a comparison is fully worth our while. To consider first the anatomy of the original: Strauss supplies an introduction, five waltzes, and a coda; each waltz has two sections, the first and second waltzes outlining the sequence a - b - b - a - b, and the third, fourth, and fifth waltzes projecting a simpler binary format. The longest section of Strauss's work is the coda, which accounts for a quarter of the total number of bars; the most substantial waltz is the second, accounting for one-fifth of the work; the third, fourth, and fifth waltzes are each just over half the length of the second. The shortest section of Strauss's work is the introduction. In Godowsky's metamorphosis, though, the fifth waltz and the introduction are the longest and second-longest sections respectively (see Table 6). And as the paraphrase wends its way towards the fifth waltz, the waltz-sections become shorter and the transitions, longer; this fuels a drive towards the fifth waltz, the materials of which dominate more bars in the paraphrase than those of any other waltz. But the length of the fifth waltz in Godowsky's metamorphosis is scarcely cut-and-dried; for its two interludes, which import 'foreign' materials from the third waltz, may or may not be inputed into the calculations determining its length. Not only this; the metamorphosis grants the performer the option of omitting
bb. 454-502 -- a cut which would severely diminish, but not obliterate, the emphasis on the fifth waltz. Nevertheless, the hegemony of theme 5, particularly theme 5a, is assured by the return of the theme in the reprise, between bb. 606 and 622; the III context here particularly draws attention to it. (By contrast, Strauss's coda devotes only four of its 187 bars to the music of theme 5a.) However, the paraphrase demotes the fourth waltz by imprisoning its thematic materials within the Neapolitan statement from b. 342.

In this way, the Künstlerleben metamorphosis, like the paraphrase of Chopin's Waltz, Op. 18, puts in place a new thematic hierarchy, promoting theme 5, for instance, and degrading theme 4. Observe that theme 4b is never stated by itself but always in combination. Thus whereas the third waltz does not conscript external thematic materials into its ranks -- internal superimposition occurs instead -- the fourth waltz does. Though at first only 2b sounds with 4b, subsequently both 2a and 2b combine with 4b in a triple superimposition. (This is the first superimposition of 2a onto 2b: the feat was not risked in the second waltz.) Likewise, the fifth waltz recalls the third: theme 3a combines with 5b; then both 3a and 3b superimpose onto 5b (bb. 503-18). The reprise tries out new combinations: 2a with 3b; fragments of 3a with 1a; and 1b with 5b. Notably, 5b sounds more often in conjunction with another theme or themes than by itself; it enjoys only one solo turn, in bb. 438-53. Conversely, theme 1a retains its sanctity by never sounding in full with another theme.

The metamorphosis is less subversive in its tonal structure. There
are some significant reinterpretations, though: the paraphrase engineers a more directional tonal design than the original by presenting the fourth waltz in the Neapolitan, not in Strauss's tonic; and, owing to the new tonal drive, it can indulge in a more stable reprise than the original. Strauss's coda submits an assortment of waltz themes to developmental processes; at the same time it journeys from the subdominant through various tonal regions until it arrives at the tonic by way of the relative minor; only from b. 82 of the coda is the tonic securely established. Godowsky's reprise, though, once it has announced the revised materials of the introduction (bb. 519-59), is scarcely 'developmental'. Save for its brief slippage into bIII, the reprise remains unflinchingly in the tonic. The materials fragment only in the final bars, from b. 623, where they freely craft the climactic ending. All this helps to make the reprise the focal point of the metamorphosis; notice that it never allows the music to dip below fortissimo dynamics.

The superimpositions in the main body of the metamorphosis -- between bb. 106 and 518 -- generally interleave the solo presentations of the thematic materials, the various entrances of the themes en grande tenue. A superimposition may furnish the climax of the subdivision in which it occurs or, as with the triple superimposition of bb. 389-405, facilitate a transition. However, some transitions do not bother with a full thematic superimposition; they are content merely to piece together shards of the themes they link. That from the second waltz to the third, for instance, combines particles of theme 2a and 3a; and that between the third and fourth waltzes, bb. 330-41, sounds cellules of theme 3b in conjunction with references to 4a. The three-bar transition from the
first to the second waltz, bb. 188-90, is somewhat different (Ex. 10.7). These bars draw out the second waltz's initial repeated notes so that the performer may 'grop[e]' for the 'correct' chord (the dominant seventh on Ab).

Strauss generally plots embryonic versions of his themes in an introductory duple-metre section. Kunstlerleben is no exception: it begins with wisps of themes 1a, 4b, and 3b. But Godowsky's introduction is much more ambitious thematically and harmonically; and, for this reason, it holds affinities with Strauss's coda. To begin with, it plots two thematic combinations: a hesitant 3a + 5b and a more confident 3b + 5b. These are later consummated in the main body of the paraphrase, 3a + 5b in bb. 454-70, and both superimpositions in the triple combination of 3b + 3a + 5b in bb. 503-18. Moreover, it is harmonically volatile, and chromatic constructions are rife. Whole-tone collections become particularly assertive in the third segment, bb. 52-79. In b. 67, for instance, a right-hand whole-tone flourish streaks over a whole-tone harmony (we might interpret this as an altered German sixth). The music of bars 72-73 (repeated quieter in bb. 74-75) decks out an Ab dominant-ninth harmony so that all pitch classes sound (Ex. 10.8); the resolutions demanded by notes extraneous to this harmony are provided by the piano reiteration. In b. 76, the dominant seventh on Ab supports a white-note glissando in the right hand (Ex. 10.9); though the collection is not a whole-tone one, the trill and the opening notes of the glissando do supply five notes of the whole-tone scale. The following bar transmits an equally colourful effect, which is due to the superimposition of a descending white-note glissando onto a
prolongational harmony a third away from $A^b$ dominant-seventh harmony -- B (or $C^b$) minor.

Wein, Weib und Gesang

Perhaps the most famous of the 'symphonic metamorphoses', the paraphrase of Wein, Weib und Gesang is also the most harmonically daring. As ever, Godowsky's surgery on Strauss's cycle-of-fifths plan aims at animating the forward impulse (Tables 7, 8, and 9). The second waltz now begins a major third, not the original minor third, lower than the tonic and consequently treads through a cycle of thirds to III, E major. The third waltz sounds in $bV$ (D flat), the most remote key, but later swivels to $bVII$ (F), outlining another third relation. A descent through fifths back to $bVI$ (E flat) ensues until the close of the fourth waltz (b. 450). The metamorphosis then takes advantage of the harmonic direction of Strauss's waltz 3a to steer the music from E flat to C major between bb. 465 and 467; the harmonic locus of 3a ensures that the tonal level rises from E flat to G, the dominant of C. From here the return to the tonic is abecedarian. The work does not entirely reject the tonal schemes internal to the original individual waltzes, though. For instance, like Strauss's waltz 2b, Godowsky's 2b opens a major third lower than the key of 2a (b. 224).

The harmonic ambition of the Wein, Weib und Gesang paraphrase saps its will to revamp the original's thematic hierarchy. Notably, unlike
those of the Künstlerleben metamorphosis, the dimensions of the waltzes here are similar to those of the original. Both original and paraphrase transmit a lengthy introduction -- though Godowsky's is more harmonically goal-directed than Strauss's -- and both confer on the third waltz the distinction of being the longest. But differences obtain. Godowsky's transitions, which as usual sketch the theme or themes of the ensuing waltz, are more substantial than Strauss's four-bar prefaces. And Godowsky's lengthy coda, which essentially begins in b. 489, assumes a recapitulatory function, unlike Strauss's eleven-bar coda, which merely drives home the final cadence.

Whole-tone formations and altered chords abound in the introduction and the transitions. In the customary way, the metamorphosis opens ambiguously with regard to harmony and metre (the latter is a nominal 2/4 until b. 8). The initial horizontalised $D^b$ augmented chord rapidly reforms so that it relinquishes its whole-tone aspects. The adjustments give rise to the interval of the perfect fourth (which is off-limits in whole-tone writing), an interval which is characteristic of theme 4a -- of which these bars afford distorted fragments. The two-bar unit repeats in sequence from b. 3; owing to the interval of transposition, a major third, the music here quarries the same whole-tone collection. In bb. 5-6 and 7-8 a compression of these materials sounds in a minor-third sequence, entailing a shift to the complementary whole-tone collection -- though, again, each of these two-bar groups eventually rejects its whole-tone orientation. While more whole-tone configurations sound in bb. 11 and 12 (and in the parallel bars of 37 and 38), the most potent whole-tone writing is in bb. 27-34, which project distortions of the
first two bars of theme 2a (Ex. 10.10). This passage plots a descending sequence of three two-bar units: that of bb. 27-28 plots augmented harmonies on D\(^b\) (b. 27) and A\(^b\) (b. 28); that of bb. 29-30, on C\(^b\) and G\(^b\); and the unit of bb. 31-32, on A and E. The fifth-relationship of each pair of chords underwrites the tonal basis of this passage and prompts the whole-tone group to shift from one collection to the other. Though 'foreign' notes, external to the prevailing whole-tone collection, intrude into this music (for instance the g\(^b\)\(^2\) in b. 27), they tend to 'resolve' to 'essential' notes, that is, notes belonging to the controlling collection.\(^22\) Not only does this process yield colourful, exotic harmonies, but it also affords a means of distorting a given theme; in addition, it brings about harmonic equivocality, though this ambiguity is assuaged here by the assimilation of functional harmonies such as the dominant seventh or ninth into the whole-tone context through chord alteration (as in b. 33). A few more instances of whole-tone harmonisations in the introduction may be listed: the B\(^b\) augmented chords in lieu of B\(^b\) major ones in bb. 43-44; the dominant seventh on C (V of V of B\(^b\)) with a flattened fifth in bb. 47-48; and the elaboration of the dominant seventh on D in bb. 109-12.\(^23\)

The whole-tone writing of bb. 27-34 supports a distortion of theme 2a. The later presentation of this theme, in bb. 255-70 (which casts 2a in much the same figuration), begins tonally but is gradually infected with whole-tone inflexions (Ex. 10.11). The process begins six bars into the first eight-bar segment, in b. 260. The left-hand part here sketches a whole-tone descent, with a passing chromatic chord on b. 261.\(^2\) In b. 262, the phrase comes to rest, not on the expected E major triad, but
on E augmented. Preceding this (in b. 262\textsuperscript{1}) is the dominant ninth on B over an E pedal-point. The ninth is not immune from the whole-tone influence; accordingly, its fifth is sharpened. The opening of the second (parallel) phrase, bb. 263-64, is similar to the distorted statement of 2a in the introduction. Though a gradated return to a strictly tonal idiom occurs between bb. 265 and 266, symptoms of the whole-tone condition persist until b. 266. The harmonic basis of the second phrase -- the way in which E major is restored in b. 267 -- is shown in Ex. 10.12.

But there is a sudden irruption of the whole-tone idiom. Like the first phrase, the second concludes, not with an E major chord, but with an E augmented triad (b. 270). This is reinterpreted as an A\textsuperscript{b} augmented triad in the ensuing transition, facilitating the shift to D flat for theme 3a, which begins in b. 287. Whole-tone complexes abound here: from bb. 281 to 286, a succession of augmented and other whole-tone harmonies sounds over an A\textsuperscript{b} pedal. The next transition section (bb. 391-402) is equally indebted to such constructions; Ex. 10.13 shows bb. 396-98: the whole-tone chords harmonising the chromatic descent in the treble constitute altered dominant ninths; they move through the circle of fifths to the dominant ninth on F (b. 398), which of course prepares the key of the ensuing section, B flat.

Unlike the other Strauss metamorphoses, the Wein, Weib und Gesang paraphrase does not confine whole-tone harmonies to introductory and transitional passages but allows them to percolate into the exposition of the waltzes. The presentation of theme 4b accommodates a passing
augmented triad by means of a melodic alteration (b. 437). A further augmented chord comes about from an attempt to lubricate the harmonic progression with an accented passing note (b. 442). The ensuing superimposition of themes 3a and 4a should culminate in plain G major (b. 465); but a residue of the preceding key, E flat, gives rise to a G augmented chord (which here functions as the dominant of C), spelt with an E♭, not a D♯. In b. 504, prior to the final statement of the themes of the first waltz, a climactic dominant seventh sounds with a sharpened fifth; this chord also triggers the apotheoses of the Künstlerleben metamorphosis and the paraphrase of Weber's Aufforderung zum Tanz. An accented passing note supplies a G augmented chord in b. 514. And whole-tone harmonies are in plentiful supply in the final bars. The first, chromatic, four-bar unit of the coda, which distorts theme 4b, affects a whole-tone dialect in its final bar, b. 522 (Ex. 10.14). The initial whole-tone chord of b. 522 has a subdominant function (the octave F naturals in the bass are passing notes); the second is an altered dominant. The ensuing unit, bb. 523-26, reiterates the first (Ex. 10.15). But now all the harmonies, save for the initial G major, are whole-tone complexes. Though the bass line rises, the progression actually constitutes a string of augmented triads (altered in the final bar) falling by semitones.
Concluding Remark: The 'Schatz' Waltz Metamorphosis

Godowsky was fond of the waltz. The Strauss waltz paraphrases continued a locus initiated by the 1899 paraphrases of Chopin's Op. 18 and Weber's Aufforderung zum Tanz. This line of development was deflected in the 1910s, a period in which Godowsky's interest in the waltz, and in 3/4 time generally, was siphoned off into free composition -- giving rise to the twenty-four Walzermasken (1912) and Triakontameron (1920), a set of thirty 'moods and scenes' in triple time. But the line re-entered the region of concert arrangements in the 1920s, a decade in which Godowsky penned the remainder of his Chopin waltz arrangements and, in 1928, a paraphrase of Strauss's 'Schatz' Waltz for left hand alone.

In spite of its later date of composition, the 'Schatz' Waltz metamorphosis often follows procedures similar to those directing the earlier Strauss metamorphoses: for instance, a new introduction, which anticipates the waltz melodies in chromatic distortion, replaces Strauss's 6/8-metre prelude. But there are also some significant departures from the earlier practice. As with the Wein, Weib und Gesang paraphrase, Strauss's four-bar introductions to each waltz are replaced by harmonic transitions; but each of the transitions in the 'Schatz' Waltz paraphrase extends and harmonically distorts the materials of the section immediately preceding it; that is, unlike those of the earlier Strauss paraphrases, these transitions do not comment on the ensuing materials (Table 10). Moreover, the paraphrase (which does not take Strauss's opera Der Zigeunerbaron as the starting-point but, like Webern's chamber arrangement, follows Strauss's own orchestral concert
setting, Op. 418)\textsuperscript{24} shadows Strauss's ground-plan more precisely than the earlier metamorphoses. (However, the one tonal alteration -- the fourth waltz is in the flat submediant, not the tonic -- does recall the earlier Strauss paraphrases' concern with directional tonal plans.) Other differences in strategy are of course referable to the limitations of the medium, the left hand alone. In this light, it is not surprising that some of the more ambitious devices and textures of the earlier paraphrases are jettisoned. Particularly striking is the omission of full-blooded superimposition. True, one thematic superimposition is discernible -- a combination in which theme 1\textsuperscript{a} sounds with theme 3\textsuperscript{b} (for instance from bb. 259 and from 428) -- but it is Laodicean to say the least; never is the combination taken through to its conclusion. This is odd: themes 3\textsuperscript{b} and 1\textsuperscript{a} are harmonically compatible; and crafting a combination that could be executed by the left hand alone would surely have posed an irresistible challenge for Godowsky: a possible solution is given in Ex. 10.16.\textsuperscript{25} It may be significant that the work was written for Paul Wittgenstein, a pianist not famed for his technical prowess; indeed, Godowsky remarked of his paraphrase: 'It is good music, very likely too good for Wittgenstein';\textsuperscript{26} certainly, Wittgenstein never performed it in public. Disabled in part by the esoterism of its medium, the arrangement -- unlike its more glamorous, fully-formed older siblings -- has languished in obscurity since its conception.
Notes


2. See Jeremy Nicholas, Godowsky, pp. 68-69, 288, and 290. The title 'symphonic metamorphosis' is perhaps meant to suggest that Godowsky was reworking Strauss with the view to tightening the originals' motivic and harmonic frameworks; in all probability it refers also to Godowsky's endeavour to create a 'living, pulsing, colourful transformation of the simple original[s] [through] theme-inversion and theme development, rich and glorified instrumental counterpoint, imitation and embellishment'. Godowsky further remarked: 'Hear Josef Hofmann play the Fledermaus symphonic metamorphosis and you will understand why the term "symphonic" is used in the title of these free fantasies!' (Godowsky, interview in the Musical Observer, May 1920, quoted in Nicholas, Godowsky, pp. 69-70 (p. 70).) Cranz's reprints of Fledermaus, Künstlerleben, and Wein, Weib und Gesang (1965) substitute the term 'concert paraphrase' for 'symphonic metamorphosis'.

3. According to Michel Kozlovsky, Godowsky conceived his paraphrases as a tribute to the Austrian Kaiser and the Viennese public ('The Piano Solo Transcription in the Romantic Period', p. 69). This is unlikely; for it was only in 1909 that Godowsky became Director of the Klaviermeisterschule of the Imperial Royal Academy of Music in Vienna, where he apparently had to take the oath as königliche und kaiserliche Professor in Austria (see Leonard S. Saxe, 'The Published Music of Leopold Godowsky', p. 166).


5. See also pp. xix and 248.


8. Ibid., p. 80.

9. Ibid., p. 78.

10. Godowsky assists identification by superposing onto the music of his metamorphosis the words, if any, that originally accompanied each theme in the operetta.

11. Kozlovsky, 'The Piano Solo Transcription', pp. 71-73. This is Kozlovsky's Table 2.

12. Ibid., pp. 73-74.
13. Both themes are repeated in their expositions. The Cranz reprint accidentally omits the repeat marking that should be found at the beginning of b. 77.

14. By superimposition, I mean the substantial statement of two or more themes together, not the synthesis of thematic particles.


16. Ibid., p. 68.

17. For instance on p. 74.


19. Ibid., pp. 73-76.

20. Ibid., pp. 86-87.


22. This is similar to the posited 'resolution' of notes foreign to the whole-tone or the octatonic collections to 'essential' notes in late Scriabin (see Jay Reise, 'Late Skriabin: Some Principles Behind the Style').

23. In their recordings, both Shura Cherkassky (CD, ASV QS 6096) and Charles Rosen (LP, SAX 5267) misread the left-hand chord of b. 112 as a D augmented triad; it is in fact D major, completing the progression 6 - #5 - 5 over the root D.

24. The members of the Second Viennese School showed much interest in Strauss's waltzes. In 1921 they made arrangements, for piano quintet and harmonium, of a selection for the Society for Private Musical Performances. These include Webern's version of the 'Schatz' Waltz themes and Berg's arrangement of 'Wein, Weib und Gesang'.

25. I have attempted, as far as possible, to imitate Godowsky's left-hand style and fingering; for instance, Godowsky often asks that the interval of the third be played by the third and fourth fingers (see Samuel Randlett, 'A Solution to a Problem in Piano Fingering' for further details).

26. Godowsky, letter to Frieda Godowsky, Vienna, 6 May 1928, quoted in Nicholas, Godowsky, p. 135. The work was eventually dedicated to Simon Barere.
CHAPTER 11

THE SCHUBERT SONG ARRANGEMENTS

Today, when a song recital without Schubert lieder is a rarity, their performance on the piano [...] is about as futile as taking food pills at a banquet. And it is about as attractive.

(César Saerchinger)

Schubert, untouched and untouched-up, is always available for us when we want him; so why not meanwhile spend ten minutes enjoying Godowsky?

(Ernest Newman)

Four months before the composition of the Strauss 'Schatz' Waltz paraphrase, Carl Fischer published Godowsky's monumental Passacaglia on the opening of Schubert's 'Unfinished' Symphony. The Passacaglia was Godowsky's contribution to the centenary of Schubert's death (1928) -- a year which saw a critical reappraisal of Schubert's life and art, and, in turn, a flurry of judgmental causeries, such as Saerchinger's and Newman's above, on the value of Schubert adaptations. By coincidence -- or was it? -- Godowsky's twelve Schubert song arrangements had appeared in August 1927. They thus revived a tradition which was forged above all by Liszt, and which included significant contributions from Czerny and Heller, and, in 1926, a single one from Rachmaninov. Therefore, while
the 'Schatz' Waltz paraphrase engaged with an obsolescent genre, the Schubert song arrangements resurrected one which was, to all intents and purposes, obsolete.

The Schubert song arrangement constituted the only significant new generic venture for Godowsky's later phase of arranging; by contrast, the contemporary Chopin, Bach, and Strauss arrangements cast generic links back to the earlier phase. The song arrangements ostensibly proclaimed Godowsky's 'love and veneration' for Schubert, and in the act intended 'not merely to transplant [the originals] from the voice to the piano' but also 'to create piano compositions out of vocal material, to comment upon and interpret the songs as a composer would treat a theme when writing free variations'. But Godowsky's words surely dissembled a further motive. For the arrangements seem to constitute, if only in part, an effort musically to out-do Liszt and Rachmaninov, if not Schubert as well. Godowsky contended that his versions of 'Wohin?' and 'Das Wandern' were 'a thousand times better and more effective' than Liszt's; the arrangement of 'Wohin?' was also a jestful rejoinder to Rachmaninov's own 1926 setting -- a point which Godowsky drove home by dedicating the piece to his fellow Slav.

In comparing his Bach arrangements (completed two years earlier) with the Schubert ones, Godowsky held that in the latter he had followed an entirely different scheme: 'The melody and the meaning underlying the text I used as fabric to metamorphose the songs into genuinely pianistic works; thus interpreting not only Schubert but the poet of the words as well.' In truth, though, conveying the drifts of the texts is generally
of subsidiary concern. If any poetic sensibilities are transmitted from the song to the arrangement, they are in the process refracted by the medium of Schubert's music; the transfer does not come about through close textual analysis. The arrangements' preoccupation is rather with dressing up well-known melodies. The strophic designs of many of the songs often prompt the arrangements to work within a theme-and-variation format. But the variation technique is rarely applied to Schubert's melodies; rather, it engages with the accompanying figurations. That is, like the music of the Russian nationalists, the arrangements keep the 'foreground' -- the melodies -- static but continually vary the 'background'.

Liszt arranged nine of the twelve songs treated by Godowsky: 'Wohin?', 'Gute Nacht', 'Das Wandern', 'Die junge Nonne', 'Litanei', 'Die Forelle', 'Liebesbotschaft', 'Heidenröslein', and 'Ungeduld'. (The remaining three songs in Godowsky's collection are 'Wiegenlied', 'Morgengrüss', and 'Am Mignon'.) While Liszt transposes only 'Ungeduld', Godowsky transposes five of the nine songs that Liszt arranged and three others -- eight in all. Three move down a tone: 'An Mignon', 'Liebesbotschaft', and 'Wiegenlied'. Two shift up a tone: 'Gute Nacht' and 'Litanei'. One, 'Morgengrüss', climbs up a semitone. 'Das Wandern' is taken down a minor third and 'Die Forelle' elevated by a major third. It is difficult to account for these shifts. We can immediately dispense with the thought that the arrangements transcribe from transposed sources; for the shifts do not concur with the conventional adjustments made for, say, the baritone or mezzo-soprano voice. That the transpositions occur for reasons to do with the textual or poetic
sensibilities of the originals is implausible.\textsuperscript{12} And the minimal
distance of the transpositions invalidates the argument that they attempt
to reposition the pieces to the central sector of the keyboard, as with
some of the \textit{Studien} on Chopin's études. Rather, it is as if the
transposed arrangements are attempting to distance themselves from the
originals and, where applicable, perhaps also from Liszt's
transcriptions. Technical considerations could also impinge on the
decision. For instance, the rustling figuration initiating
'Liebesbotschaft' is more strenuous to play in F major than it is in G.
In this respect the transpositions force the pianist to tackle the music
afresh in those passages which are not significantly renovated.

'Improving' aspects of Schubert's music is a concern that weighs
heavily with the arrangements. The version of 'Morgengrüß', the eighth
number of \textit{Die schöne Müllerin}, enhances continuity by substituting a
harmonically open-ended introduction (serving as a dominant preparation)
for Schubert's closed entity (Ex. 11.1).\textsuperscript{13} The more directional
progression is achieved by pitching the melody up a fourth from the level
at which it should have sounded and by adjusting the music of the third
bar to dock the progression in an imperfect cadence. The $B^{\flat}b - A^b$
appoggiatura in b. 4, which occurs within dominant-seventh harmony, not
only eases the entry of the singer's melody (the resolution of the $B^{\flat}b$ is
given by the first notes of the melody), but also refers to the bass part
in b. [9], where it occurs in an identical harmonic context. Similar in
its construction is the introduction to 'Die Forelle'; the harmonic
adjustments are implemented in conjunction with a compression of the
music from six bars into four to align it with the four-bar interlude
separating the first and second stanzas of Schubert's song.

The opening of 'An Mignon' performs more radical surgery. Schubert's two-bars-and-a-half harmonically closed introduction becomes a four-bar unit in which Schubert's music plays the antecedent phrase to a new consequent. Though the consequent seems to announce new material, it actually projects the singer's dotted-rhythm motif in Schubert's bb. [5] and the (thwarted) cadential melody of b. [13]. As a result of its new distinctive profile, Godowsky's introduction carries more weight than Schubert's and, as a consequence, can fulfil a ritornello role, rendering obsolete Schubert's four-bar postlude -- which merely extended the piano's undulating arpeggios towards the final cadence.

The forward impulse in the 'variation' arrangements owes much to registral manipulations. As in his arrangements of Bach's galanterien, Godowsky initially plots the melody at a low octave. He normally allows the pitch level of the melody to float up as the arrangement progresses, though it might be summoned down in the final strophes.

In its aim to boost forward momentum, Godowsky's use of register differs from Liszt's; the distinction becomes clear if we compare their versions of 'Die Forelle'. Now, the song is not wholly strophic; for though the music of the first two stanzas is identical, the third announces new music and seems 'developmental' owing to the volatile harmony and irregular phrase structure. The stanza does close, though, with a partial reprise. Godowsky's version states the melody first at pitch level '0' and envelops it in the accompanimental figuration. It
subsequently lifts the tune to level '+1' for the second strophe, where it is reinforced at the octave, holds it at that level for the beginning of the third stanza, and finally raises it to level '+2' for the opening of the partial reprise. Liszt's arrangement treats the structure of the song with greater latitude. The music of the first stanza sounds three times, not twice as in the original; and more than in Godowsky's arrangement, Schubert's music acts as a 'theme' to be decked out with increasingly elaborate finery. Liszt's arrangement begins at level '-1'. The melody climbs to '0' for the second stanza; dips to '-1' for the additional, third statement of the 'theme'; and rises to '0' for the final stanza. The arrangement is able to commute between the low registers of '-1' and '0', and is able to plot the music at '-1' in its central sector, without dissipating momentum by pitching the focus of the music onto the brilliant accompanying figuration that sounds in the interpolated strophe and at the beginning of Schubert's third strophe. Thus whereas Godowsky's version relies on registral means to stimulate the forward impulse, Liszt's relies much more on figuration.

Rhythm generates much of the onward motion in Godowsky's version of 'Morgengrüss'. That the underlying pulse of the accompaniment quickens from stanza to stanza in the arrangement (which sets only three of the four stanzas) is in itself unremarkable. But attention might be drawn to the way it preserves Schubert's rhythmic differentiation of the three musical units in each strophe: a, bb. [5]-[11]; b, bb. [12]-[15]; and c, bb. [16]-[21]. The setting of the first stanza casts a in a basic quaver pulse (as opposed to Schubert's dotted minims and, later, crotchets); b in a semiquaver pulse (rather than the original quaver); and c in quaver
triplets, which, unlike Schubert's triplets here, apply the brakes to the preceding pulse. The arrangement of the second stanza quickens the pulse to the quaver triplet in a, to the semiquaver triplet in b, and to the quaver triplet in c. The differentiations of Godowsky's third, and final, stanza are more subtle. The pulse throughout is the semiquaver triplet. Within a, this constitutes an increment on the corresponding pulse of the previous stanza. This, though, is not true of b, which conveys Schubert's effect of quickening pace by elaborating the melody itself with semiquaver triplets. (Such melodic ornamentation is rare in Godowsky's Schubert arrangements.) In turn, units b and c are differentiated, not by the fragmentation of the semiquaver-triplet pulse, but by the regrouping of the semiquaver triplets. Whereas b marshalled them into two groups of three within the crotchet beat, c reconfigures them into three groups of two, provoking the surface retardation that the arrangement (but not the original) cultivated in the earlier strophes.

Similarly, the version of 'An Mignon' -- a strophic song comprising five stanzas -- cements together the additive blocks of the variation form by progressively mutating the accompanying figuration. Not all the adaptations to the 'accompaniment', though, aim at enhancing onward motion. The object of some is to enliven the figurations. The version of 'Litanei' remoulds the original arpeggio backdrop into a chordal pattern (Ex. 11.2); this horizontalises in the third stanza. Likewise, the setting of 'Die junge Nonne' discards Schubert's original oscillating figure in favour of more dramatic repeated notes, like those of Schubert's 'Erlkönig'.

The forward impetus is often regulated by fluctuations in chromatic intensity. Though the arrangement of 'Das Wandern' begins diatonically, the chromatic level rises to a cusp at the middle of the piece (the third stanza) and to another apex towards the end; the rise frequently occurs in conjunction with an increase in the number of contrapuntal parts in play. In the version of 'Ungeduld', too, the degree of chromaticism constantly rises until the final stanza, which tones down the chromaticism. (The refrain of each stanza, 'Dein ist mein Herz und soll es ewig bleiben!', acquires its own pigmentation, owing to its general diatonicism throughout the arrangement.) The version of 'Heidenröslein' assigns the peak of chromatic intensity to the second of the three stanzas, in b. 27. But the arrangement is more interesting for the way in which it progressively fragments Schubert's music. The original stipulates two fermatas for each stanza. In its setting of the first, the arrangement gives none; it prescribes only one in the second; and it gives both in the third. The disjunctions of the third stanza are further underlined by sudden registral shifts in the melody. The fragmentation, though, is balanced by the increasing emphasis on semiquaver motion as the arrangement progresses and by the tendency of the dynamics to amplify towards the end.

Harmonic manipulations are central to Godowsky's endeavour to weave a continuous fabric from the blocks of Schubert's strophic songs. Witness the treatment received by the singer's final phrase in the arrangement of 'An Mignon'. Schubert's music inflects onto the Neapolitan (b. [11]) and then onto the dominant (b. [13]); the cadence on the tonic, initially frustrated by a second burst of Neapolitan harmony
in b. [14], finally occurs in b. [16] (Ex. 11.3). The arrangement's first strophe treats the passage strictly in terms of harmony (the arrangement is in F minor, not in Schubert's G minor; the ensuing discussion is in terms of F minor). Though the corresponding passage in the arrangement's second strophe is not harmonically dissimilar to that of the first, one significant alteration obtains. A diminished-seventh chord incorporating the melody note G\textsubscript{b} displaces the second burst of Neapolitan harmony (G\textsubscript{b} major) in the third bar of the progression, b. 35 / b. [14] (Ex. 11.4). This diminished seventh alters to the German sixth on C\textsubscript{b}, which only then 'resolves' to the first inversion of G\textsubscript{b}, the postponed Neapolitan harmony, which is initially coloured with an E\textsubscript{b} to lubricate the progression. (Schubert occasionally implemented such a resolution of the German sixth; see, for instance, the closing bars of the first movement of the Ninth Symphony.) The tendency to increase harmonic complexity is confirmed by Godowsky's third 'variation'. In addition to concentrating the occurrences of altered chords, the harmonic scheme magnifies certain tendencies of the previous 'variation'. The A diminished-seventh chord, which again momentarily displaces the second burst of Neapolitan harmony (b. 53 / b. [14]), is now emphasised to the detriment of the ensuing German sixth on C\textsubscript{b}, which is downplayed to the point that it is barely suggested (Ex. 11.5). In both the second and third stanzas, the dominant triad (C major) which should have preceded the A diminished seventh is replaced by a diminished-seventh harmony with a bass D\textsubscript{b}. But whereas in the second strophe the D\textsubscript{b} diminished seventh sounds only briefly — for a quaver (b. 34) — in the third it prevails for a dotted crotchet (b. 52), the chord elaborated with suspensions and a passing note. Meanwhile, the contrapuntal orientation of the bass line
comes to the fore; this aspect takes further the contrapuntal proclivity 
of the bass line in previous statements. The fourth 'variation' supplies 
the climax. The harmonic complexity again increases. To take the bar 
immediately before the 'Neapolitan' passage, b. 67 (Ex. 11.6): the first 
half projects a decorated dominant ninth on E♭; the second half should 
give a diminished seventh on E to prepare the F minor tonic chord on the 
end quaver. But an A♭ in the bass and, later, appoggiaturas (such as the 
ff to g) debilitate the E diminished-seventh chord; it nevertheless 
yields to F minor by the end of the bar. In b. 68, the first burst of 
Neapolitan harmony (= b. [11]) is elaborated by a chromatic scale in the 
bass and, in the second half of the bar, by the diminished-seventh chord 
on F (Ex. 11.7). Though the following bar states the original dominant 
of the Neapolitan, it also sounds G♭, the Neapolitan degree, as a short 
pedal-note. As in the corresponding passages in the second and third 
'variations', the six-four tonic chord in the third bar of the 
progression (b. 70 / b. [13]) follows the diminished seventh on E; but 
here it does resolve to V (C major), rather than to the diminished 
seventh on D♭. This is because the music moves directly to the German 
sixth on C♭ in the following bar (b. 71 / b. [14]) without an intervening 
A diminished seventh, a harmony which had featured prominently in the 
preceding strophe. Hence the two harmonies ousting Schubert's original 
Neapolitan chord sound with almost equal weight in Godowsky's version, 
each having been thoroughly explored: the A diminished seventh in the 
third strophe, and the German sixth on C♭ in the fourth. As if to 
promote further the role of the German sixth in the progression, another 
German sixth, this time on G♭, is announced on the final quaver of b. 71 
(see Ex. 11.7). Though this should resolve to the second-inversion chord
of $B^b$ minor / major, it gives way to the second-inversion chord of $F$ minor, in readiness for the impending perfect cadence. The contrapuntal outlook of the bass line becomes even clearer; and in b. 72 the line imitates the thwarted melodic progression of bb. 70-71 / bb. [13]-[14]. The fifth, and final, statement of the passage holds affinities with the second. In contrast to the preceding 'variations', the relatively functional bass line here clarifies the harmonies, as does the more pellucid texture.

A few supplementary remarks on harmony. As ever, Godowsky's harmonic idiom precariously balances contrapuntal and harmonic procedures, as Ex. 11.8 (from 'Ungeduld') shows. Chord inversions are sometimes altered. For instance, whereas Schubert's 'Die Forelle' configures virtually all the chords of the first two strophes in root position, the arrangement, in its quest for a more linear, contrapuntally oriented bass line, plots more six-three triads. Other touches are subtler: for instance, in 'Die junge Nonne' Schubert's structural harmonic side-slipping is epitomised by Godowsky's chromatic treatment of bb. [22]-[25] and corresponding passages (Ex. 11.9).

Of the twelve arrangements, the most densely 'motivicised' are 'Ungeduld' and 'Die junge Nonne'. The incipient flourish of the version of 'Ungeduld' originates from the left-hand triplet figure in Schubert's piano introduction. This figure bears much of the burden of the 'motivicisation'; it is installed into the flow through the agencies of imitation and insertion, though the distinction between the two is often not clear-cut. Sometimes the intervals between the constituent notes
of the figure expand so that it can act in a harmonic, and not merely a
melodic, capacity, as in the bass part of bb. 53 (Ex. 11.10). In keeping
with its contrapuntal orientation, the version of 'Ungeduld' plots a
thematic superimposition: the refrain of the third verse is combined with
the theme of the verse (bb. 69-72). Such superimpositions are otherwise
rare in the Schubert arrangements. (This is surely a measure of
Godowsky's increased 'discretion' in the late 1920s; as we saw earlier,
the contemporary 'Schatz' Waltz paraphrase and the later Chopin waltz
arrangements also avoided thematic combinations.)

Godowsky usually sets all of Schubert's stanzas in his arrangements.
He departs from this 'rule' only in the version of 'Morgengrüss', in
which he sets only three of the original four stanzas. He never inserts
a stanza for the sake of increasing the potential for variation, as Liszt
does in 'Die Forelle'. Other adjustments of the bar-by-bar sequence of
Schubert's songs are minimal. The new postlude in the version of 'Gute
Nacht' is two bars shorter than Schubert's. The content of two bars
squeezes into one (b. 74) in 'Die junge Nonne'. The introduction gains
one bar in 'Liebesbotschaft'; the final bar repeats itself in 'Litanei'.
'Die Forelle' initially loses two bars but later gains two to accommodate
an ascending flourish. The bar sequence of 'An Mignon' is disrupted only
by the arrangement's new ritornello.

In this and other respects, it is interesting to compare Godowsky's,
Liszt's, and Rachmaninov's versions of 'Wohin?'. To facilitate this,
Ex. 11.11 aligns them with Schubert's song. From this, it becomes
immediately obvious that though Godowsky's and Rachmaninov's versions
follow the bar sequence of the original, Liszt's does not. To begin with, it draws out some cadences, a procedure which adds a bar between bb. [34] and [35] and which elongates b. [49] into two bars. It prolongs the climax through repetition (Liszt's bb. 42-43). A new 'antecedent' phrase (bb. 49-52) in the fourth stanza renders its final bars thematically parallel with those of the third. Finally, further bars are added by the more substantial statement of the brooklet figuration to betoken the return of the opening music. In conjunction with the extended postlude, these alterations add sixteen bars to the length of the original song. Yet in spite of its latitude with Schubert's bar-by-bar structure, Liszt's arrangement generally transcribes Schubert's harmony and figuration strictly. Unlike Godowsky's and Rachmaninov's versions, it is not contrapuntally oriented; neither is it as chromatic.

In general, the stylistic distinctions between Godowsky's version and Rachmaninov's are much the same as those which became apparent from our earlier comparison of Godowsky's and Rachmaninov's Bach arrangements. They boil down to this: while Rachmaninov on the whole favours lean, translucent textures, Godowsky prefers denser, more chromatically active ones.

Let us inspect the way Godowsky and Rachmaninov treat the two-bar introduction. Neither wishes to preserve Schubert's harmonic stasis; rather, each aims at stimulating a forward-moving, goal-oriented impulse, geared towards the entry of the melody. The momentum of Rachmaninov's prelude accrues from the falling-crotchet bass line, which sketches third
relations. The momentum in Godowsky's prelude, though, is referable both to the falling-quaver bass line and to the proclivities of the chromatic notes. Though it, too, plots falling thirds, these are located in the treble line, which is syncopated to complicate the working further. From the outset, then, Godowsky's treatment of Schubert's music is both more linear and more chromatic than Rachmaninov's, which supplies only diatonic notes.

The harmonic structures of the two introductions, though, are similar. Each avoids the dominant and lays an emphasis on shading the background G major harmony with the pitch class E (especially Rachmaninov's version). In fact, the added sixth is ubiquitous in both arrangements. It often officiates as an appoggiatura to the fifth. Sometimes it acquires the status of a guest harmony note, as in Rachmaninov's b. 18, where the E itself is preceded with an appoggiatura, D♯. More generally, although both composers synthesise their brand of conjunct, chromatic counterpoint into Schubert's music -- the similarity of their idioms becomes clear when Rachmaninov's closing chromatic flourish is compared with that ending Godowsky's 'Die Forelle' (see Exx. 11.11 and 11.12) -- the points of chromatic high intensity infrequently correspond. Unlike Godowsky's, Rachmaninov's version tends to follow the chromatic contours of the original. But Rachmaninov's version has two harmonic features which are absent from Godowsky's: the movement of b₃ (really #2) to 3 within the tonic chord, as in b. 5; and the simultaneous movement of b₃ to 3 and b₆ to 5, as in the second and third quavers of b. 6. The latter procedure is so conspicuous that it almost becomes a motivic trait in itself.
Rachmaninov is more economical and consistent in his figuration than Godowsky: the opening figuration, for instance, directs the flow of the entire arrangement and is never 'forgotten' or superseded. Godowsky, though, sets more store on developing and transforming figurations; for instance, his reprise, from b. 54, incurs a smaller debt to the opening bars than Rachmaninov's. That said, Godowsky is more scrupulous in transcribing Schubert's melody than Rachmaninov, who tends to simplify its outlines. In b. 11, for instance, Rachmaninov removes Schubert's ornamental appoggiatura. And neither Rachmaninov nor Liszt preserves the semiquaver reiteration of the b'' on the second quaver of b. 23.

Godowsky does feel free to alter the melody rhythmically, though, if the adjustment facilitates performance. Thus melody and accompaniment notes are aligned when duple and triple divisions clash, as in bb. 4, 5, and 27. (Liszt also does this, for instance in bb. 2, 4, and 5.)

It is obviously in terms of texture that Godowsky's and Rachmaninov's versions differ most. Rachmaninov's music generally clarifies into three layers: the melody, the brooklet figuration, and the bass. It may occasionally expand to accommodate four strands, as in bb. 58-59 and 74-78, but the four 'parts' are only suggested in such passages and are not in play simultaneously. The pellucid textures are largely referable to a judicious handling of the bass voice: generally, it enters only when harmonically necessary. For this reason, the keyboard's low register sometimes falls into abeyance, for instance in bb. 18-20, 31-34, and 51-52. The occasional ornamental ascending scales poised above the melody, as in bb. 20 and 51-52, indicate the bias
towards lighter, higher textures. Godowsky's music, on the other hand, is fundamentally in four parts, and the busy disposition of the voices seems to thicken the flow further. The onward-moving 'brooklet' figuration generally sounds in the two inner voices. The bass line is more contrapuntal than Rachmaninov's; the doubling is more frequent.

It is difficult to know what to make of Godowsky's Schubert song arrangements. In many respects they are unsatisfying; for despite their efforts to create through-composed weaves from the strophic songs, their fundamental ruse -- varying the background figurations but leaving the melodies intact -- does not, as far as the listener is concerned, prevent a certain ennui from setting in. The most successful tend to be the arrangements which treat fewer stanzas (the arrangement of 'Das Wandern' is simply too long -- Godowsky should have followed the example of Liszt's version and excised some stanzas) and those which treat more dramatic songs, such as 'Die junge Nonne', allowing Godowsky wider scope for sustaining interest. Otherwise, the complexity of Godowsky's contrapuntal, chromatic idiom too often relates uneasily to the subject matter at hand (that of 'Die Forelle', for example); one sometimes senses the songs are too fragile to carry what Albert Lockwood termed Godowsky's 'heavy freight of counterpoint'. For this reason, Godowsky's mixture of 'strict' and 'free' procedures in the Schubert song arrangements is much less palatable than normal; the conflict within his theory -- on the one hand to interpret 'not only Schubert but the poet of the words as well' and, on the other, to 'metamorphose' the songs -- is not adequately resolved. Jeremy Nicholas has opined that 'the singer is rarely far away in these refined morceaux'; the problem is that the 'singer' is neither sufficiently near nor sufficiently far to guarantee consistent success.
Notes

1. Saerchinger, '"Derangements"'.

2. Newman, 'Arrangements -- By Godowsky and Others'.

3. The fact that 1928 was the Schubert centenary loomed large in the controversy over 'improving the classics' in Musical Times 69 (1928), pp. 142, 425, and 442-43. On p. 425, the writer of the 'Occasional Notes' asserts that 'Schubert has suffered a good deal at the hands of arrangers, and will perhaps have a particularly bad time this year'.

4. Other arrangers include Alfred Cortot and Paul Wittgenstein. Wittgenstein generally treated Liszt's arrangements so that they could be played by the left hand alone.

5. Godowsky, 'Apropos Transcriptions, Arrangements and Paraphrases'.

6. Ibid.


8. Ibid., p. 127.

9. Godowsky, letter to Paul Howard, Cornish, N.H., 4 October 1932, facsimile in AMT, no. 16; as some of the words are obscure here, see also AMT, no. 15, p. 181.

10. Unlike Liszt, Godowsky did not superscribe the text of the songs over his arrangements, though he did preface each arrangement with the melody and the words.

11. For a discussion of this procedure in Russian nationalist music and particularly in Glinka, see Richard Taruskin, 'How the Acorn Took Root'.

12. David Cloutier claims, not convincingly, that Godowsky's choice of key for 'Das Wandern' is 'not haphazard'; for it 'seems to underscore the miller's insouciance' ('A Comparison of the Transcription Techniques of Godowsky and Liszt', p. 13).

13. Susan Youens judges this prelude as a 'preliminary bit of rehearsal' on the miller's part, although he is too impatient to 'rehearse beyond the first words of greeting' (Schubert: Die schöne Müllerin, p. 85).

14. See also my comments on Godowsky's version of Scarlatti's Allegro, K. 113 (Renaissance No. 19) in Chapter 7, p. 141.

15. Imitation is also an important feature of the version of 'Wiegenlied', which is largely canonic, and that of 'Morgengrüss'.

17. The cadential figure following the upwards rush in 'Die Forelle' -- essentially a plagal cadence, the half-diminished seventh on the supertonic with a major ninth standing in place of the subdominant -- was transplanted by Jorge Bolet in performance to the end of Rachmaninov's arrangement of Fritz Kreisler's Liebeslied.

18. Lockwood, Notes on the Literature of the Piano, p. 92.

Let us turn the clock back to 1899. This was the year in which Godowsky's 'contrapuntal paraphrase' of Weber's Aufforderung zum Tanz, Op. 65, replaced Tausig's version as one of the staple concluding agents of Godowsky's recitals. ¹ In some respects, this paraphrase looks ahead to Godowsky's later work. In the first place, it initiates a locus which continued with the Strauss metamorphoses of the next decade and which terminated thirty years later with the 'Schatz' Waltz paraphrase of 1928. Notwithstanding its close links to the Strauss metamorphoses, though, it stands aloof from them, and also from the 1899 Chopin paraphrases, in its relatively sober treatment of Weber's text. As such, it forecasts the attitude of the 1920s arrangements; for it not only shadows Weber's work virtually on a bar-by-bar basis (by contrast, Tausig's version installs a cadenza in the introduction and consistently extends phrases), but also spurns flamboyant devices such as glissando (also unlike Tausig's version). However, it otherwise implements the standard procedures. Unlike the (lost) version of Strauss's 'Blue Danube' Waltz, which apparently remodelled Andrei Schulz-Evler's 'Arabesques', ² the Aufforderung zum Tanz paraphrase refers back to the original; it does not set out to arrange Tausig's setting. Thus it is Weber's, not Tausig's,
textural nooks and crannies which Godowsky fills with imitations, anticipations, or reminiscences of themes and motifs. A new inner part becomes particularly prominent; it acts as a countermelody both for the second section of the first waltz and for the second waltz (Ex. 12.1). Thematic superimpositions -- absent in Tausig -- are the crowning glory of the arrangement; the most ambitious is the triple superimposition from b. 231, which sounds versions of the first waltz theme, its trio, and the controlling melody of the second waltz simultaneously (Ex. 12.2). The amalgamation is facilitated by the distinctive rhythmic profile of the first theme, which allows the arrangement to adjust its constituent notes without impugning its identity; also by the pliable quaver perpetuum mobile of the trio theme, which may be warped at will to suit the circumstances. As a security measure, the passage is ground in a tonic pedal; this can absorb the impact of any conflicting harmonies. (The later Strauss paraphrases, too, often implement this technique.) As we saw with respect to the Fledermaus paraphrase, thematic superimpositions give one means of restating themes without impeding forward motion. To boost the onward impulse further, the Aufforderung zum Tanz paraphrase plots a consistent quaver pulse and, unlike the original and Tausig's version, avoids repeating sections or passages.

There is little new to say about the harmonic idiom. Two points will suffice. First, some phrases are set in a harmonic parenthesis to increase interest, such as in bb. 279-93 (Ex. 12.3). This passage supplies three four-bar phrases. In Weber, the first two phrases are in D flat minor; the third guides the music towards A flat. The arrangement -- which counterpoints Weber's music here with the first waltz's quaver
trio theme -- sets the second phrase in E minor but otherwise leaves the surrounding phrases as they were. (A similar adjustment occurs in bb. 351-66.) Other harmonic adjustments are nearer to surface level. For example, to give off some cheap but effective chromatic colour, the paraphrase often sharpens the fifth of the dominant (and sometimes the tonic) chord.³

While the 1899 version of Aufforderung zum Tanz in some ways forecasts Godowsky's later practice, the version of the paraphrase for two pianos (1922) is backward-looking; obviously, treating Aufforderung zum Tanz turned Godowsky's reigning aesthetics on their head. The two-piano version, which largely follows the 1899 arrangement, recalls Godowsky's earlier practice in two ways. It incorporates a cadenza into the end of the introduction (like Tausig's version); and it supplies glissandos, in bb. 357, 424, and 426 (taking advantage of Weber's C major at these points), and quasi-glissandos, in bb. 413-18.

The wider scope given by a second piano allows Godowsky to flesh out the original paraphrase. Harmonies are fortified; new chromatic inflexions creep in; thematic hints in the 1899 version occasionally inflate into fuller statements; and the quaver pulse is more consistent. The existing contrapuntal lines are distributed between the pianos, often doubled in octaves or couched in new figuration. Some lines gain sinew by being stated at the same register in both piano parts simultaneously: from b. 62, for instance, the new countermelody is routinely doubled in this way (Ex. 12.4). Finally, more 'motivicisation' and superimposition are attempted.
On being told that the two-piano version had probably exploited Weber's material to its limits, Godowsky rose to the challenge and crafted an optional third-piano part. Not surprisingly, much of this music doubles (or triples) selected contrapuntal lines from the other piano parts, often in varied figurations so that an element of heterophony ensues; it also indulges in some more 'motivicising'. The third part is generally leaner in texture than the other two; often it proceeds in single notes. The part assimilates well into the existing construction: it holds a dialogue with the second piano in bb. 102-5; more notably, it adds a fourth line, the tune from the second part of the first waltz, to the existing triple superimposition.

For all its anachronisms, the turn-of-the-century paraphrase of Au 'fforderung zum Tanz affiliates to the Strauss waltz metamorphoses. By contrast, the version of Weber's Momento capriccioso, Op. 12 (1904), joins the ranks of the Studien on Chopin's études and the Renaissance pieces. Its bonds with the Studien are largely generic and harmonic-contrapuntal. The piece, like the original, is of the 'study' type, its forward drive -- apart from in the more relaxed central interlude -- largely governed by a perpetuum mobile. As in the Studien, its highly chromatic counterpoint is much the product of altered chords; as a result, the counterpoint is more linear and abstract, that is, less rhythmically vital, than that of the Au 'fforderung zum Tanz paraphrase. It is not hard to fathom Godowsky's attraction to the original; for, in a manner of speaking, the work's idiom is already half-way to Godowsky's: it itself enlists a legion of inessential chromatic notes, appoggiaturas,
and auxiliary diminished- and other seventh chords; and thus, taken together, Godowsky's additions seem merely to intensify the original musical language. As Weber has already done much of Godowsky's 'work', Godowsky is able to leave a number of bars untransformed. Usually, though, one of Weber's left- and right-hand parts is more active than the other. And it is at this part, which might project a repeated chord, that Godowsky generally directs his fire. Examples 12.5 and 12.6 indicate the typical results. They also raise some subsidiary points. Example 12.5 shows that an anticipation of the left-hand line provides the material for Godowsky's right-hand part in b. 62; Ex. 12.6 indicates that the reconfiguration of the right-hand part serves to obliterate the repeated notes between Weber's four-quaver groups.

It is in its structural freedom that the arrangement allies itself to the Renaissance pieces. In the first place, it interpolates a new episode (bb. 109-36) just before the central interlude. This insertion not only furnishes an opportunity to develop Weber's materials within new tonal regions, but provides more time for converting the tonic, B flat, into V of IV (the key of the central interlude). To be strict, though, there is not one interpolation here, but two. For after inserting a brief transformation of first-episode material (in G major) between bb. 109 and 116, the music backtracks, re-treats the material it had arranged just before this interpolation (in B flat), and then, inspired by the rondo theme, launches into a more substantial digression (bb. 121-36). The harmonic strategy here is indebted to some colourful third relations: the interpolation descends through a cycle of major thirds from B flat to G flat and then D; it then climbs up by minor
thirds, from D to F to A flat to C flat. The C flat harmony functions as
the augmented sixth and thus stimulates the requisite move to E flat for
the central interlude. By way of recompense for these extra bars,
though, the arrangement snips out Weber's retransition (which uses
second-episode material) from the central interlude to the restatement of
the rondo theme. Thus, whereas the original moves swiftly to the
subdominant of the central section and takes its time in returning to the
tonic restatement of the rondo theme, Godowsky's arrangement does the
opposite: it takes a leisurely tonal approach to the interlude and
returns much more quickly. A final point: the structural revisions have
thematic implications. By virtue of its interpolations and excision, the
arrangement de-emphasises the second-episode material in the piece in
favour of first-episode music. At the same time, it strengthens the
impact of the rondo theme by reiterating it between Weber's bb. [8] and
[9].

Less interesting is the arrangement ('Perpetuum mobile') of the
Rondo from Weber's Sonata, Op. 24 (1903). The piece transcribes the
original on a bar-by-bar basis; the right-hand melody remains generally
unchanged, though some of its figurations are reconfigured, often with a
view to making them more chromatic (Ex. 12.7) or to reinforce the part
'multi-dimensionally'.\(^5\) Weber's left-hand part receives more radical
treatment. Its original, static chords give way to a succession of
contrapuntally-oriented chromatic harmonies; this reworking in fact takes
its cue from the occasional chromaticisms in the original left-hand
line.\(^6\) Similar in its aesthetic is the version of Henselt's Etude ('Si
oiseau j'étais'), Op. 2/6 (1899). This arrangement lets slip its date of
composition by its lengthy cadenza -- the only feature that violates the rigorous bar-by-bar transcription of the original. Godowsky magnifies the study aspect of the original, first, by condensing Henselt's music (now an octave higher) into the right-hand part and, secondly, by prescribing a new discursive left-hand part that chromatically embellishes the original harmonies.

Godowsky's selection of the Weber and Henselt pieces for arrangement should raise no eyebrows; the choices seem obvious given his attraction to the waltz and, at least in the earlier years of his floruit, to the study genre. But this is not so with his selection of Albéniz's 'Triana', from Iberia (1922); it is, on first considerations, a most unlikely candidate for arrangement. Its textures are congested enough and scarcely invite Godowsky's standard treatment; Artur Rubinstein for one found the work over-composed and admitted to slimming it down in performance. But though Godowsky does implant new details, he also straightens out some of Albéniz's untidy procedures; that is, he both complicates and facilitates the music. Examples of facilitation include the following. Some of the original's wide left-hand stretches are ironed out and both hands now share in articulating discursive arpeggio designs; as a result, a few awkward hand-crossings are eliminated (see Ex. 12.8). The arrangement changes the key signature at strategic points to clear away obtrusive accidentals; it also enharmonically respells notes in order to clarify their harmonic function. Finally, the version rationalises Albéniz's often erratic, random counterpoint. The insertions include these: flourishes and chromatic passing notes (to promote continuity by filling Albéniz's hiatuses); ornaments, such as
trills, acciaccaturas, and mordents (to enliven the argument -- see Ex. 12.9); and doublings of all kinds (to reinforce voices). The work generally assumes a more contrapuntal profile: for instance, linear counterpoints thread their way through originally repeated chords. Two strategies help to punctuate and variegate the arrangement: one inverts some of Albéniz's pianissimo dynamics to sforzandos; the other entails articulating pungent, percussive interjections. The arrangement more or less follows the bar sequence of the original; the only departures are due to its dovetailing six of Albéniz's bars into two immediately before the reprise and to the new bar -- consisting of a flourish -- interpolated eleven bars before the end.

The other Albéniz arrangement is one of Godowsky's most popular transcriptions: the 'concert-version' of the Tango, Op. 165/2 (1921). Unlike 'Triana', the original is somewhat threadbare. Godowsky richens its textures in several ways: he devises some gently chromatic counterpoint, felicitously respaces chords, and brings into service more of the keyboard range. He also underlays much of the music with pedals. These not only enliven local harmonies but foster a sensation of languid inertia that nicely offsets the direction lent to the surface texture by the new chromatic passing notes.

The remaining arrangements dating from the 1920s are similar in their idiom and are quickly dealt with. The three song arrangements -- of Schumann's 'Du bist wie eine blume', Op. 25/24 (1921), Carl Bohm's 'Still wie die Nacht' (1921), and Richard Strauss's 'Ständchen', Op. 17/2 (1922) -- are strict transcriptions. In the Schumann and Bohm, Godowsky
even superscribes the words onto the music. Unlike Walter Gieseking in his somewhat freer treatment of 'Ständchen' (1897), Godowsky for the most part conserves Strauss's subdued dynamics and fights shy of adding ornamental flourishes and other decorations. In addition to the Schubert song arrangements, Godowsky made versions of the Moment musical, D. 780/3 (1922), and the Ballet Music No. 1 from Rosamunde (1923). Both transpose the originals up a semitone and none too lightly dust the music with a layer of chromaticism. The Rosamunde arrangement handles only the first three sections of the ballet music; its structural strategy is to construct a new pattern of repeats and restatements. The chromaticism is largely underwritten by linear, chromatic bass lines (often replacing an originally static bass), providing for cycles of dominant-family harmonies. The arrangement also tends towards constant semiquaver motion, which is in contrast to the rhythmic diversity of the original. Largely similar in their moulds are the arrangements of Kreisler's Rondino on a Theme by Beethoven (1916); John Stafford Smith's The Star-Spangled Banner (1920) -- like Rachmaninov's version, a tribute to Godowsky's new-found nationality; the Adagietto from Bizet's L'Arlésienne (1927); the 'Canzonetta' from Benjamin Godard's Concerto romantique, Op. 35 (1927); and 'Le Cygne' from Saint-Saëns's Le Carnaval des animaux (1927).

In the last two especially, Godowsky transforms the original accompaniments into a panoply of chromatic counterpoints. But he takes care not to imperil the wider conceptions of the originals. This is, of course, the hallmark of Godowsky's later arrangement style. Sorabji might have posited a related, but more extreme, argument; that in many of
his later arrangements, Godowsky tends, not broadly to preserve, but to fulfil such conceptions. With regard to the Albéniz-Godowsky 'Triana', he held that the arrangement 'sounds much more like "Triana" than it ["Triana"] does itself'.¹¹ For Sorabji, Godowsky identified and externalised the quiddity of the piece more convincingly than Albéniz; it seemed that Godowsky was seeking, not to subvert the conception, but to bring to perfection underlying thoughts, sensibilities which the original composer had not the ability (or the will) to transmit in the most cohesive, polished way.¹² Ernest Newman might have agreed with the thrust of Sorabji's remarks. To take his 1928 observation as the final word:

[Godowsky] has a remarkable facility for drawing out of another man's work something that was not formally expressed by the man but is really latent in the work. Indeed, this faculty shows signs of having come uppermost in Godowsky's mind in recent years, judging from his alertness when he plays his arrangements and his detachment -- sometimes amounting to nonchalance -- when he plays the classics in their original form; I sometimes have the suspicion that Godowsky is not really interested in other men's music unless he wrote it himself. [13]
Notes

1. The Weber-Tausig version was performed in Godowsky's Chicago recitals on 21 January 1897, 30 March 1898, and 9 February 1899 (the programmes are reprinted in Jeremy Nicholas, Godowsky, pp. 274, 277, and 279); the Weber-Godowsky version is announced by a Chicago programme of 1899 (Nicholas, Godowsky, p. 279), and by some programmes for Berlin recitals between 1900 and 1901 (ibid., pp. 280 and 281). For a discussion of Tausig's arrangement, see Wilhelm von Lenz, The Great Piano Virtuosos of Our Time, pp. 81-82. One wonders what George Bernard Shaw would have made of Godowsky's 'contrapuntal arrangement': in 1890 he complained of 'that impertinent paraphrase of Tausig's, which I thought London had outgrown these many years' (in 'A Mozart Controversy', in The World, 11 June 1890, reprinted in Shaw's Music, vol. 2, pp. 84-89 (p. 89)). For Huneker, Godowsky's version seemed 'a much more viable arrangement than Tausig's; also thrice as difficult' (Steeplejack, vol. 2, p. 207).

2. See p. 195 for further details.

3. This procedure brings about whole-tone harmonies, of course, which are a feature of the Johann Strauss paraphrases, particularly that of Wein, Weib und Gesang.

4. See Nicholas, Godowsky, p. 71. Louis Bruenberg recalled that Godowsky subsequently toyed with the idea of adding a fourth piano part ('Tribute to Leopold Godowsky at Memorial Services', p. 98).

5. The term 'multi-dimensional' was defined in Chapter 8, p. 146.

6. Godowsky's version is texturally denser and more chromatic than Brahms's and Tchaikovsky's arrangements (1852 and 1871 respectively), both of which assign Weber's right-hand part to the left hand and stamp the outlines of the left-hand part on the right. Like Godowsky's arrangement, though, both follow the originals on a bar-by-bar basis (to be accurate, Tchaikovsky cuts one bar). But though Brahms's version begins strictly, it soon becomes freer than Tchaikovsky's and even, in some respects, Godowsky's; Brahms occasionally inverts the original right-hand line, for instance, whereas Godowsky fights shy of such blatant melodic alterations. Other composers who made piano arrangements of Weber's works include Alkan, Heller, and Thalberg (for details, see Maurice Hinson, The Pianist's Guide to Transcriptions, Arrangements, and Paraphrases, pp. 150-51).

7. Rubinstein wrote: 'When I finished [playing "Triana"], Señora Albeniz said to Laura [her daughter]: "Isn't it amazing? He plays it exactly as your father used to play it." "Yes, yes," Laura said. "Papa also left out a lot of the nonessential accompaniment."' (My Young Years, p. 471.)

8. This is unlike the procedure in the Schubert song arrangements, of course (see pp. 217-18 and 232 n. 10).
9. Rachmaninov's version of The Star-Spangled Banner, though unpublished, does survive through an Ampico piano recording (available on CD, Decca 425 964-2). It was first performed in Boston in December 1918 in the opening recital of his first American season. The differences between Rachmaninov's arrangement and Godowsky's are similar to those between their Bach and Schubert arrangements (see Chapters 9 and 11).

10. Though Godowsky had become an American citizen in 1891, the impact of his naturalisation was largely delayed until after 1914, when he settled permanently in the United States. In 1920, Godowsky remarked: 'Since I have become an American, and have made America my home, I find my Americanism expressing itself in my compositions. In my "Triakontameron" five of the numbers are of direct American inspiration [...].' (Godowsky in the Musical Observer, May 1920, quoted in Nicholas, Godowsky, pp. 107-8.) And in 1927 the Musical Mirror reported -- not without a touch of amusement -- that 'a recent photograph of Godowsky depicts him on a hotel roof, surrounded by skyscrapers, in the act of composing (at the piano) a new symphony, in which will be recorded the hum and clash of New York traffic. Such a subject should give great scope to his "musical intellectuality".' ('Piacevole', 'Heard in the Interval', Musical Mirror, December 1927, p. 275; the 'symphony' never materialised.)


12. This was doubtless laudatory for Sorabji. But it is also why the later, more circumspect, arrangements might have been more properly liable to the charge that they 'improve the classics' than the earlier ones.

13. Newman, 'Arrangements -- By Godowsky and Others'.
PART FOUR
CHAPTER 13

CONCLUSION

Our clever young (or old enough to know better) contrapuntists who Godowskify* the classics by combining everything with everything else [...]).

* Nevertheless, I get up and snort when anybody else says a word against that great player.

(Sir Donald Tovey)¹

Time for a conspectus of Godowsky's arranging career. In the two decades preceding the outbreak of the First World War, Godowsky made contact with three 'genres' of arrangement: the Chopin arrangement (by means of the Studien and the Opp. 16 and 18 paraphrases); the Baroque arrangement (through Renaissance), and the Strauss waltz metamorphosis. The Weber arrangements formed a sub-set, the versions of the Momento capriccioso, Op. 12, and the Rondo from the Sonata, Op. 24, overlapping with the Chopin constellation (owing to their study textures), and Aufforderung zum Tanz, with the Strauss constellation. The pull of these 'genres' largely governed the later vector of Godowsky's arranging career. The Chopin waltz arrangements, the Bach 'elaborations', the metamorphosis of the Strauss 'Schatz' Waltz themes, and the rearrangement of Weber's Aufforderung zum Tanz -- all these artefacts issued from Godowsky's
re-engagements with the 'genres' in the 1920s. The same decade saw the resurrection of the Schubert song arrangement -- the only new type to be added to Godowsky's repertory of 'genres' -- and a number of arrangements which neither belonged to an established 'genre' nor found a niche in multi-number sets.

The different attributes of the two batches of arrangements have much to do with the way in which they approach original texts and 'genres'. For instance, a later contribution to an established 'genre' might rethink the medium afresh. The rearrangement of Aufforderung zum Tanz for two or three pianos expanded the established medium of the Weber sub-set; conversely, the 'Schatz' Waltz paraphrase, for left hand alone, contracted that of the Strauss metamorphoses. (In fact, Godowsky's interest in left-hand work, which first arose in connexion with the Chopin Studien, was vigorously renewed in the 1920s -- in defiance of the New York Times's admonition that it was 'a futile and Alexandrine form of art'.) More significant, though, is the increased structural conservatism of the later arrangements. Such fidelity in fact had its roots in the early artefacts. Godowsky's very first essay in arranging, the version of Chopin's Etude, Op. 25/6, was 'strict' in its treatment of both the original musical materials and the structure. The entire Chopin enterprise, of course, was tarred with the brush of 'discretion', to adopt Adolph Brune's term. In this sense -- and the 'genres' notwithstanding -- the first phase of arranging gave rise to two broad 'types' of work: the stricter, study arrangements (of Chopin, Henselt, and Weber's Rondo from Op. 24) and the paraphrases (of Chopin's Op. 18, Strauss, and Rameau and others in Renaissance). As the years clocked up,
radical paraphrase treatments lost their appeal, as did study textures. Yet the 'strictness' inherent in the study 'type' persisted as the abstract structural premise of most of the later arrangements. The 1920s, in other words, saw the triumph of Godowsky's innate 'discretion'.

The diminishing appeal of structural surgery constituted, then, the major trend of Godowsky's arranging career. Yoked to this line of development were other changes of emphasis. In the first place, Godowsky grew increasingly averse from virtuosic effects such as glissandos, unmensurated fioraturas, and cadenza-oriented figurations, all of which would disfigure the cosmetic features of the texts being treated. Secondly, he became disinclined to rework melodies; this was in a large part to do with the waning of his interest in studies and study textures and his parallel turn to more lyrical subject-matter. And finally, he seemed slightly to tire of his old stand-by, thematic superimposition. Yet these trends pale beside the broader stability of his style. For, just as the controlling 'genres' of arrangement were largely determined early in his career, so too were the axioms of his musical idiom. The Introduction, we may recall, closed by noting the seismic impact of the Chopin Studien. The vibrations were recorded not only in the columns of the critics but also in the products subsequently issuing from Godowsky's compositional atelier; for, throughout his arranging career, Godowsky arranged works with recourse to tools he first devised for the studies on Chopin: these techniques coalesced to form the bedrock of his arranging style. Its objectives are easily listed. At the most general level, it endeavours to complicate the original music; it aims at making the pianist work harder. At a lower level, its guide-lines are to
'motivicise' and to alter chords. Most of the other salient features of Godowsky's musical language flow from these two principles: thematic superimposition is a consequence of 'motivicisation'; the dense counterpoint is a product of both this and altering chords. Finally, there is a rhythmic concern: to enhance continuity. All the music that Godowsky arranged for concert purposes received more or less the standard dose, regardless of the original idiom. There are no exceptions.

Restraint and rigidity: these, then, are two hallmarks of Godowsky's broader musical style. We may add another: naïvety. The term is slipped into the discussion provocatively, to hint at parallels between Godowsky's art and the work of 'naïve' painters such as Henri Rousseau (1844-1910). Such a comparison is undoubtedly problematic. There is no readily available framework to support a consistently analytical comparison of the qualities of the visual arts and music. Moreover, it would be foolish to assert that Godowsky was a naïve composer: to assert that he was is to argue that he was largely untouched by contemporary culture and conventions, to pronounce that his work slips into a timeless fairy-tale realm, to suggest that he makes a 'skilled use of unskill'. But one need not go so far as to label Godowsky a 'naïve composer' to hold that there are naïve touches in his music or that certain similarities obtain between Godowsky's circumstances and those of the naïve painter. Godowsky, like most naïve artists, was largely an autodidact: apart from the twelve unhappy weeks he spent at the Berlin Hochschule für Musik in 1883, where his composition teachers included Woldemar Bargiel (Clara Schumann's half-brother), he had no formal training. The 'spontaneity' of naïve art is often attributed to such
lack of training. Though 'spontaneous' might not perhaps be the mot juste for Godowsky's art, certainly the younger Godowsky was relatively uninhibited, a condition not far removed from 'spontaneous'; this youthful audacity -- his daring, for instance, to compile a mammoth set of Chopin arrangements -- must have owed something to his not being immured at an early age in a trammel of music-educational orthodoxies. There is a connexion, too, with the circumstances of naïve artists in Godowsky's artistic isolation. For naïve artists tend to stand aloof from contemporary artistic developments: they cling to established routines; their patterns of thought are deeply ingrained.7

Owing to their complexity, Godowsky's textures may not strike us as naïve. But in fact naïve artists, as Roger Cardinal points out, 'frequently [develop] modes of operating that are highly sophisticated'. He adds:

> It is a keynote of naïve painting that it should appear complete in every part, with an even accentuation of each last detail; it is often this studied concern for minutiae at the expense of overall balance, combined with deviations from the naturalistic norm -- awkward contours, incorrect colouring -- that creates its characteristic aesthetic impact. [8]

Adapted, these comments could easily confer a judgment on Godowsky's arrangements. Admittedly, it might seem to dwell on the negative aspects. Yet Godowsky's textures are heavily loaded; they do concern themselves with minutiae (largely by 'motivicising'); the larger balance is sometimes askew as a consequence (especially in the Schubert arrangements); and harmonic awkwardnesses do arise, usually owing to the sophisticated contrapuntal techniques at work.9 Particularly germane is
the notion of 'accentuation'. Werner Haftmann identifies exaggeration as an important component of naive painting, commenting on Andre Bauchant's 'exact definition of things, and emphatic enlargement of selected representative details'. In turn, we might term the tendency of Godowsky's arrangements constantly to magnify selected features of the originals naive (think of how the sarabandes of Renaissance and the Bach 'elaborations' delight in hammering out the second beat). Naive, too, is the arrangements' 'rationalising' original composers' procedures -- by turning tonal sequences into real ones, tidying up phrase lengths, painstakingly rounding the forms, and neatening and regularising other aspects of the structure. So are the compulsions to superimpose themes and to 'motivicise'. In fact, beneath the sophisticated veneer of the arrangements one detects a subterranean innocence; for the reworkings take an almost child-like pleasure in following the drill -- contrapuntally combining themes, stretching a motivic net over the surface, exaggerating certain features. Such familiar, tried-and-tested devices had a comforting security about them; and it is for this reason that the tactics never palled.

Because of the general rigidity of Godowsky's style, the success of a particular arrangement depends much on the compatibility of Godowsky's idiom with that of the original musical materials. Whatever the negative aspects of Godowsky's idiom, they should not blind us to the consistently high standards of the individual arrangements. A whirlwind tour of the corpus demonstrates the achievement. The Johann Strauss arrangements and the paraphrase of Weber's Aufforderung zum Tanz are perhaps the strongest and most cohesive, since the originals respond well to the extrovert,
vibrant cast of Godowsky's idiom. Likewise, the urbane, salonesque cast of Chopin's waltzes is well matched by the more measured 'decadence' of Godowsky's later style. Godowsky's workings are also well received by the more abstract musical textures of Chopin's études and the two early Weber arrangements, particularly that of the *Momento capriccioso*, Op. 12. Finally, the contrapuntal slant of both Chopin's and Bach's music prepares it well for the rigours of Godowsky's processes, though both in the *Studien* and in the 'elaborations' the standard is not altogether even. Only the Schubert song arrangements prompt serious misgivings. As Chapter 12 showed, Godowsky's methods seem sometimes to brutalise the songs, the sensibilities of which do not undergo sufficient transformation for them to withstand the pressures of Godowsky's treatment.

In this sense, one wishes that Godowsky had arranged Schubert earlier in his career; for a radical reinterpretation of Schubert's materials and frames might have worked wonders. After all, the *Renaissance* arrangements are captivating, in spite of the little common ground obtaining between the originals' musical stance and Godowsky's idiom, simply because of the sheer effrontery of the radical treatment. One craves more of this raw audacity in Godowsky's arrangements, particularly in the later ones. In this capacity, then, they are a let-down. Of course, it is easy to proffer advice with hindsight, when one can stand apart from the maelstrom of events, circumstances, and commercial, personal, and other pressures to which an artist inevitably succumbs. But had Godowsky cast his caution to the winds -- had he abandoned his instinctive 'discretion' -- by venturing deeper into the
realms of radical recomposition, then the allure of his arrangements might have been greater. One might protest that the 'Chopin audacities'\textsuperscript{12} landed Godowsky in enough trouble; but he might as well have been hanged for a sheep as for a lamb. It is unlikely that he would have faced further charges of -- to borrow his words -- 'sacrilege, self-advertising, conceit, lack of ideas of my own, and what not':\textsuperscript{13} more probably he would have been met with critical silence; for the critics had, to all intents and purposes, dismissed him relatively early on in his floruit. It is a pity that Godowsky did not make more of the rare artistic freedom this afforded him.

Now, Godowsky considered his musical style, particularly the 'polyphonic, polyrhythmic and polydynamic' textures of the Studien über die Etüden von F. Chopin,\textsuperscript{14} a new departure for composition. He predicted that 'if it is possible to assign to the left hand alone the work done usually by both hands simultaneously, what vistas are opened to future composers were this attainment to be extented [sic] to both hands!'.\textsuperscript{15} This immediately brings to mind Debussy's dismissal of Wagner's art as a sunset that was mistaken for a sunrise. Theodore Edel has put it less poetically: 'Godowsky's dream of a new kind of piano music [...] was not fulfilled and with the current historical perspective, his works appear to be a culmination rather than a beginning.'\textsuperscript{16} In fact, Godowsky's dense, contrapuntal idiom persisted only in the works of peripheral twentieth-century composers such as Sorabji and Ronald Stevenson. (And even these figures are actually the heirs of Busoni, not Godowsky.)\textsuperscript{17} Moreover, Godowsky's arrangements represented more or less a full point for the nineteenth-century
tradition of virtuoso piano arrangement. By the time of Godowsky's death in 1938, the age which had deified the pianist was slipping away. As Chapter 6 declared, Godowsky's Bach 'elaborations' were among the last of their kind. Though Strauss arrangements were made after Godowsky's earlier efforts of ca. 1905-7, the 'genre' was virtually exhausted by the time of Godowsky's death. The Schubert arrangements constitute a special case; for the tradition of arranging Schubert songs was to all intents and purposes obsolete by the 1920s, Godowsky essentially resurrecting it for his own purposes: predictably, the 'genre' crumbled to dust once he had finished with it.

The tradition of Chopin arrangement, though, has taken longer to expire. A number of Chopin arrangements have been made after 1914, though none of them belongs to a collection even approaching the scale of Godowsky's work on the études. The arrangements include Hedwig McEwen's Chopin Through the Looking Glass (1929) -- comprising three numbers; Carlos Chávez's left-hand inversions of five études; James Friskin's arrangement of the Prelude, Op. 28/16, for left hand alone (1936); Joe Furst's arrangement of the 'Minute' Waltz (1949); and Ronald Stevenson's versions of the Waltz, Op. 42, for the left hand; the Waltz, Op. 34/1, for the right; and a 'Double' Waltz, which combines Opp. 42 and 34/1 (1954, 1955, and 1955 respectively). Jorge Bolet apparently arranged Op. 25/5; some younger pianists, too, have contributed to the 'genre'.

But though Godowsky's arrangements marked a full-point for the nineteenth-century tradition of arrangement -- Hans Keller held the fiats...
of the 'authenticity cult' responsible for the demise,\textsuperscript{24} though the rot had actually set in with the rise of the 'work' concept in the nineteenth century -- they constitute scarcely a faint semicolon for the broader process of arranging itself.\textsuperscript{25} The Introduction, we might recall, remarked on Busoni's belief that arrangement was immanent within the compositional process itself. But we need not adopt this stance to elucidate the point. Rummaging in the 'biscuit tin of the past', as Dahlhaus memorably put it,\textsuperscript{26} is one of the inveterate reflexes of the Occidental composer. This habit has scarcely been discouraged by the light increasingly shed on the contents of the tin by musicology.\textsuperscript{27} Of course, perspectives have shifted. The most significant shift was brought about by 'neoclassicism', a concept which did not necessarily entail 'arranging', but which did negotiate an influential new compact with past music. And while 'neoclassicism' itself has sunk into the oblivion awaiting all 'isms', its legacy -- its luring arrangement into the waters of free composition,\textsuperscript{28} its severing the arrangement's associations with virtuoso display and with 'improving the classics' -- remains with us today. In fact, 'arrangement', in the broader sense, seems to have acquired a new relevance in recent years. As Leonard B. Meyer argued some thirty years ago, the demise of teleological concepts and determinism in all spheres of intellectual inquiry has increased the 'psychological accessibility of the past';\textsuperscript{29} besides, the advent of the 'post-modern' condition and, in particular, the rise of 'intertextual' readings, which claim that every work of art is an 'arrangement' (exactly how, is a matter for fruitless debate), seem to have given some intellectual basis to the notion that arrangement is a central player in the creative process.
Obsolescent even in its own time, Godowsky's practice has clearly had its day. But the offsprings of his labour, the arrangements, none the less survive into the present as aesthetic objects. What are we to make of them, in the broader sense? Let us rotate full circle to the subject-matter of the Preface. Godowsky's legacies to us have much profited from the inevitable loosening of their ties with the circumstances, ideologies, and polemics of the world in which they initially operated. Time has begun to cleanse these early-twentieth-century musical lepers. This is not to assert that the after-life of these compositions has been a happy one, but simply to suggest that the neglect (which actually set in during Godowsky's lifetime) has been crucial to this process. I do not mean to suggest that we can better contemplate the arrangements both as aesthetic objects and as historical documents now than at the time of their conception: we shall never of course be equipped with a disinterested lens to train on Godowsky's corpus. Rather, as is so often the case, the more Godowsky's arrangements recede into the historical horizon, the easier it becomes simply to accept -- and marvel at -- the bundle of premises and paradoxes, prejudices and preoccupations that constituted, to adapt Tovey's verb, 'Godowskifying' the classics.
Notes

1. Tovey, 'Tonality in Schubert', p. 145.


4. Nevertheless, Tovey and Carl Flesh pin-pointed thematic combination as the cornerstone of Godowsky's arranging style: see the quotations heading this chapter and the Preface.

5. For an account of the rise of nineteenth-century naïve art (a phenomenon to do with the concomitant decline of folk art owing to industrial expansion), see Roger Cardinal, 'Naive art', and Anatole Jakovsky, Naive Painting, pp. 13-15. This concept of naïveté does not necessarily correspond with Friedrich Schiller's special usage of the term in his famous distinction between 'naive' and 'sentimental' poets. In Schiller's sense of the word, Godowsky is surely not 'naive' but thoroughly 'sentimental'. (For an interesting discussion of this concept of naïveté, see Isaiah Berlin, 'The "Naiveté" of Verdi'.)


7. Godowsky departed significantly from his compositional norms only in the extraordinary Java Suite for piano (1925). In the twelve numbers of the set, he skilfully conjures up the effect of gamelan music, for instance by etching an underlying skeletal melody (in Javanese terminology, the balungan) onto stratified, motoric textures, evoking the sonorities of bronze kettles (bonang) and gongs (pencon), and by conveying pentatonic melodies (suggesting the Javanese slendro scale), albeit with surface 'chromatic' inflexions. (Like Debussy, Godowsky had heard the gamelan at the 1889 Grand Universal Exhibition in Paris; and, like Britten, he had first-hand acquaintance with the musical tradition, having toured Java in 1923.)


9. See also p. 108.


11. For a discussion of exaggeration in Godowsky's Studien, see pp. 88-90.


15. 'Special remarks on the studies for the left hand alone', *Studien über die Etüden von F. Chopin*, p. vii.


17. For a discussion, see Marc-André Roberge, 'The Busoni Network and the Art of Creative Transcription'.


19. These are listed in Daphne Kennard, 'Music for One-Handed Pianists', p. 120. I have been unable to locate them.

20. See Donald M. Garvelmann, *Thirteen Transcriptions for piano solo of Chopin's Minute Waltz*.

21. The Stevenson arrangements are listed in *NGS 3*, no. 2, p. 11.


23. Marc-André Hamelin, for instance (see p. 46 n. 45), or Sergio Daniel Tiempo, who has combined Opp. 25/6 with 10/12 (available on CD, Victor VDC-1411). I am grateful to Jeremy Nicholas for supplying me with details of Tiempo's recording.

24. Keller, 'Arrangement for or against?', p. 23. The increasing antipathy towards the nineteenth-century arrangement can be charted in successive editions of Grove. Edward Dannreuther's article on Tausig in volume 4 (1889) of *A Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. George Grove (hereafter *Grove 1* etc.) argues that 'Tausig's arrangements, transcriptions, and fingered editions of standard works deserve the attention of professional pianists' (p. 65). *Grove 3* (1928), edited by H. C. Colles, strikes out the offending sentence, but otherwise preserves the article (vol. 5, p. 274). And *Grove 5* (1954), edited by Eric Blom, interpolates the following: 'As an arranger Tausig did extremely effective but also at times very tasteless work', adding that the Scarlatti arrangements in particular 'show him deficient in any sense of style' (vol. 8, p. 322).

25. 'Arrangement' for the purposes of this discussion excludes the straightforward transcription of a work for a different instrument or set of instruments.

26. Dahlhaus, 'Tonality: structure or process?', in Schoenberg and the
27. The resurrection of Monteverdi's music is a case in point: see p. 26 n. 68.

28. Quotation and collage are extreme manifestations of this tendency. For a comprehensive list of twentieth-century recompositions, see Glenn Watkins, Soundings, pp. 657-60.

29. See Meyer, Music, the Arts, and Ideas, pp. 185-208.

30. Time has also transformed the arrangements into valuable philosophical-historical documents. For interesting observations on the conflict between the musical work as an aesthetic object and the work as a piece of documentary evidence, and on the after-life and reception history of a work, see Dahlhaus, Foundations of Music History, p. 4; Chapter 2, 'The significance of art: historical or aesthetic?', pp. 19-33; and Chapter 10, 'Problems in reception history', pp. 150-65.
Leopold Godowsky died in the Lenox Hill Hospital, New York, on November 20. The eminent pianist, composer and teacher was in his sixty-ninth year and had been active until recently, although he had ceased appearing in public concerts for about a decade and a half. He had undergone an operation for an intestinal ailment a week previous. With him at the time of his death were his daughter, Mrs. Vanita Saperton, and his son, Leopold, Jr. His other daughter, Dagmar, was en route to this country on the SS. Manhattan but was not notified until her arrival.

Godowsky had long ranked among the foremost performers and toured almost continuously between his debut as a child performer and his retirement from active concert work in 1930, following a slight stroke during a concert visit to London. He was one of the most active master teachers in his profession both in this country and for a time in Europe, and as a composer had made significant contributions to the literature of his instrument.

Born in Vilna, Russia, February 13, 1870, the son of Dr. Mathaeus
and Anna Lewin Godowsky, he first appeared as a pianist at the age of nine following instruction in his native city. He then had lessons with Rudorff at the Berlin Hochschule, but at fourteen began a series of American tours with the sopranos Clara Louise Kellogg and Emma Thursby, later with the violinist Ovide Musin. In 1886 he went back to Europe to study with Liszt, but the death of that master prevented this, and in [sic] 1887 to 1890 he was under the tutelage of Saint-Saëns in Paris.

In 1890 he made his second American tour, was engaged in 1892 as instructor of teachers at the Broad Street Conservatory, Philadelphia, and from 1894 to 1899 as director of the piano department of the Chicago Conservatory. In 1900 he went to Germany, making his Berlin debut and also choosing that city as his home for nearly a decade of concert work and teaching. From 1909 to 1912 he was director of the piano master school at the Vienna Akademie der Tonkunst (succeeding Busoni) and won the title of Royal Professor. Tours of the United States in 1912 and 1913 were followed by his taking up permanent residence here in 1914. After 1918 he conducted piano master classes on the Pacific Coast and elsewhere.

In addition to his playing and teaching, he composed and edited numerous works, serving as editor-in-chief of the Progressive Series of Piano Lessons. His original works for his instrument included a sonata in E minor, 24 Walzermasken, 24 Renaissance Pieces, 53 Studies on Chopin Etudes, concert paraphrases on Weber works, symphonic metamorphoses on Johann Strauss waltzes, a cadenza to Beethoven's fourth concerto, 34 miniatures for four-hand piano performance,
Triakontameron, Java Suite (the last adapting native music to pianistic idiom with success) and numerous other piano pieces and arrangements, as well as twelve impressions for violin and piano, four impressions for cello and piano and other writings.

Godowsky's playing was dubbed by James Huneker "transcendental, a fine equilibrium of intellect and emotion that compels admiration." As a teacher he was highly influential, many of his pupils later attaining eminence in this field.

The funeral was held November 23 at the Campbell mortuary chapel, attended by many more than could be admitted. In lieu of religious services, a musical program was contributed by Dr. Charles Courboin, the Gordon Quartet, Mischa Elman, Josef Hofmann and Harry Kaufman, and eulogies were spoken by Gene Buck (president of ASCAP) and Leonard Liebling. Interment occurred at Mt. Hope Cemetery, Long Island.
Notes

1. Godowsky actually died on 21 November.

2. Although Vilna (or Wilno) was then under Russian control, geographically it lay in Poland; the city also has Lithuanian connexions.

3. Actually in 1891.

4. Only sixteen numbers were published (see Chapter 7).

5. In fact there are forty-six Miniatures.
APPENDIX 2

A CATALOGUE OF GODOWSKY'S PIANO ARRANGEMENTS

Albéniz, Isaac

_España:_ Tango, Op. 165/2, concert version (New York, 1921)

_Iberia:_ Triana, concert arrangement (New York, 1938)

Bach, Johann Sebastian

_Sonatas & Suites for Violin Solo & Violoncello Solo (unaccompanied):_  
Freely transcribed and adapted for the pianoforte (New York, 1924):  
Sonata No. 1 for solo violin, in g, BWV 1001  
Sonata No. 2 for solo violin, in b, BWV 1004  
Sonata No. 3 for solo violin, in a, BWV 1002  
Suite No. 2 for solo cello, in d, BWV 1008  
Suite No. 3 for solo cello, in C, BWV 1009  
Suite No. 5 for solo cello, in c, BWV 1011

Bizet, Georges

_L'Arlesienne:_ Adagietto, transcription (New York, 1927)

Bohm, Carl

'Still wie die Nacht', transcription (New York, 1921)

Chopin, Frédéric François

_Studyen über die Etüden von F. Chopin_ (Berlin, 1914):  
Op. 10/1, in C  
Op. 10/1, in D flat, for left hand alone  
Op. 10/2, in a, for left hand alone
Op. 10/2, in a, 'Ignis Fatuus'
Op. 10/3, in D flat, for left hand alone
Op. 10/4, in c sharp, for left hand alone
Op. 10/5, in G flat
Op. 10/5, in C, 'Study on the white keys'
Op. 10/5, in a, 'Tarantella'
Op. 10/5, in A, 'Capriccio: Study on the black and white keys'
Op. 10/5, in G flat, inversion for left hand
Op. 10/5, in G flat, inversion for right hand
Op. 10/5, in G flat, for left hand alone
Op. 10/6, in e flat, for left hand alone
Op. 10/7, in C, 'Toccata'
Op. 10/7, in G flat, 'Nocturne'
Op. 10/7, in E flat, for left hand alone
Op. 10/8, in F
Op. 10/8, in G flat, for left hand alone
Op. 10/9, in c sharp
Op. 10/9, in f, imitation of Op. 25/2
Op. 10/9, in f sharp, for left hand alone
Op. 10/10, in D
Op. 10/10, in A flat, for left hand alone
Op. 10/11, in A, for left hand alone
Op. 10/12, in c sharp, for left hand alone
Op. 25/1, in A flat, for left hand alone
Op. 25/1, in A flat, a version intended to give the illusion of a piece for four hands
Op. 25/1, in A flat
Op. 25/2, in f
Op. 25/2, in f, 'Valse'
Op. 25/2, in f, two separate versions
Op. 25/2, in f sharp, for left hand alone
Op. 25/3, in F
Op. 25/3, in F
Op. 25/4, in a, for left hand alone
Op. 25/4, in f, 'Polonaise'
Op. 25/5, in e
Op. 25/5, in c sharp, 'Mazurka'
Op. 25/5, in b flat, for left hand alone
Op. 25/6, in g sharp
Op. 25/8, in D flat, 'Study in sixths'
Op. 25/9, in G flat
Op. 25/9, in G flat, for left hand alone
Op. 25/10, in b, for left hand alone
Op. 25/11, in a
Op. 25/12, in c sharp, for left hand alone
Op. 10/5 and Op. 25/9 combined, in G flat, 'Badinage'
Op. 10/11 and Op. 25/3 combined, in F

Trois Nouvelles Études composées pour la Méthode de Moscheles, 4
  No. 1, in f, for left hand alone
  Trois Nouvelles Études, No. 2, in E
  Trois Nouvelles Études, No. 2, in D flat, for left hand alone
  Trois Nouvelles Études, No. 3, in G, 'Menuetto'

Rondo, Op. 16, concert arrangement (Boston, 1899)
Waltz, Op. 18, paraphrase (Boston, 1899)
Waltz, Op. 64/1, concert arrangement (New York, 1923)
Waltz, Op. 64/3, concert arrangement (New York, 1927)
Waltz, Op. 69/1, concert arrangement (New York, 1927)
Waltz, Op. 70/2, concert arrangement (New York, 1927)
Waltz, Op. 70/3, concert version (New York, 1921)

Corelli, Arcangelo
  Concerto grosso, Op. 6/8 ('Christmas Concerto'): Pastorale, free transcription (in Renaissance (Berlin, 1906))

Dandrieu, François
  Second livre de pièces de clavecin: 'Le Caquet', free transcription (in Renaissance (Berlin, 1906))

Exaudet, André-Joseph
  Minuet, transcription (in Airs of the Eighteenth Century (New York, 1937))
Godard, Benjamin
Concerto romantique for violin and orchestra, Op. 35: Canzonetta, free transcription (New York, 1927)

Henselt, Adolf von
Etude, Op. 2/6 ('Si oiseau j'étais') (Boston, 1899; first revision, Leipzig, n.d.; second revision, New York, 1931)

Kreisler, Fritz
Rondino on a theme by Beethoven, transcription (New York, 1916)

Loiellet, Jean-Baptiste
Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinet: Aire; Corant, free transcriptions (in Renaissance (Berlin, 1906))
6 Suits of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinet, First Suite: Gigue, free transcription (in Renaissance (Berlin, 1906))

Pergolesi, Giovanni Battista
'Que ne suis-je la fougère', transcription (in Airs of the Eighteenth Century (New York, 1937))

Rameau, Jean Philippe
Dardanus: Rigaudon, free transcription (in Renaissance (Berlin, 1906))
Nouvelles suites de pièces de clavecin: Minuets in G and g amalgamated into 'Menuet', free transcription (in Renaissance (Berlin, 1906))
Pièces de clavecin avec une méthode sur la mécanique les doigts: Giggues in e and E amalgamated into 'Elegie'; Tambourin (in Renaissance (Berlin, 1906)); Musette en Rondeau, free transcriptions (in Renaissance (Berlin, 1909))
Premier livre de pièces de clavecin: Gavotte; two Sarabandes amalgamated into one, free transcriptions (in Renaissance (Berlin, 1909))
Zoroastre: Sarabande, free transcription (in Renaissance (Berlin, 1906))
'Menuet': an amalgamation of 'L'indifferente', 'Les triolets' (both from Nouvelles suites), and the Minuet in a from Premier livre (in Renaissance (Berlin, 1906))
Saint-Saëns, Camille

Le Carnaval des animaux: 'Le Cygne', free transcription (New York, 1927)

Scarlatti, Domenico

Allegro, K. 113, free transcription (in Renaissance (Berlin, 1909))

Schobert, Johann

Sonata No. 22, in E flat: Menuet, free transcription (in Renaissance (Berlin, 1906))

Schubert, Franz

Twelve Schubert songs, freely transcribed for the piano (New York, 1927):

'Wohin?'; 'Das Wandern'; 'Heidenröslein'; 'Gute Nacht';
'Morgengrüß'; 'Wiegenlied'; 'Die Forelle'; 'Die junge Nonne';
'Litanei'; 'Liebesbotschaft'; 'An Mignon'; 'Ungeduld'

Moment musical, D. 780/3, arrangement (New York, 1922)

Rosamunde: Ballet Music No. 1, concert version (New York, 1923)

Schumann, Robert

'Du bist wie eine blume', Op. 25/24, transcription (New York, 1921)

Smith, John Stafford (attr.)

The Star-Spangled Banner, concert version (New York, 1921)

Strauss, Johann, II

Die Fledermaus, symphonic metamorphosis (Leipzig, 1912)

Künstlerleben, symphonic metamorphosis (Leipzig, 1912)

Wein, Weib und Gesang, symphonic metamorphosis (Leipzig, 1912)

Der Zigeunerbaron: 'Schatz' Waltz themes, symphonic metamorphosis (New York, 1941)
Strauss, Richard
'Ständchen', Op. 17/2, transcription (New York, 1922)

Weber, Carl Maria von
Aufforderung zum Tanz, Op. 65, contrapuntal arrangement (Berlin, 1905)
Aufforderung zum Tanz, Op. 65, arranged for two pianos, with an optional accompaniment of a third piano (New York, 1922)
Momento capriccioso, Op. 12, concert arrangement (Berlin, 1904)
Sonata, Op. 24: Rondo, concert arrangement (Berlin, 1903)

[Anonymous]
Airs of the Eighteenth Century (New York, 1937):
Lisette; La Mère bontemps; Maman, dites-moi; Bergère légère; Venez, agréable printemps, transcriptions
Notes

1. This list excludes the educational adaptations and the cadenzas (see pp. xviii-xix). The dates given are the dates of publication.

2. See p. 121 n. 4 for a discussion of Godowsky's use of the term 'sonata' to cover both the violin sonatas and the violin partitas.

3. For details of the tangled publication history of the Studien über die Etüden von F. Chopin, see pp. 35-42.

4. See p. 91 n. 7 for a remark on the sequence of Chopin's Nouvelles Etudes.
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