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ABSTRACT

Interpreting Schubert Lieder through Transcription: Four Composers’ Techniques in Solo Piano

Transcriptions of Lieder from Die schöne Müllerin

Franz Schubert wrote Lieder familiar to many singers and collaborative pianists that were subsequently transcribed for solo piano by other composers. This paper will give a brief introduction to the art of transcription and delve into compositions of four composers who wrote Schubert Lied transcriptions: Godowsky, Rachmaninoff, Thalberg and Smetana. Two Lieder from Die schöne Müllerin, D. 795 have been chosen in order to unify the content and limit the original texts to compare and contrast how each composer handles the material differently.

The primary purpose of the research is to offer an interpretive analysis of the transcriptions, including the expansion of piano techniques needed to achieve the layout and timbre of the original Schubert Lieder. Transcription that is carefully crafted to suit the essence of the text can improve the musical understanding of the text, draw both pianists and listeners to revisit the original score and allow for a new and effective aesthetic experience of the original material. The evidence in scores, texts, and translations will be collected. An analysis of transcription techniques will be done in order to reach the goal of interpreting these texts.

The secondary purpose of this research is to enrich the repertoire of pianists by discovering Schubert Lieder through the genre of solo piano transcription. While many are familiar with the transcriptions of Schubert Lieder from Franz Liszt, the works offered by other composers for analysis in this paper are lesser known and of enduring value in the genre.
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# LIST OF MUSICAL EXAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Thalberg</td>
<td>mm. 23-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Smetana</td>
<td>mm. 12-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Smetana</td>
<td>mm. 23-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Smetana</td>
<td>mm. 39-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Smetana</td>
<td>m. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Rachmaninoff</td>
<td>mm. 37-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Rachmaninoff</td>
<td>mm. 79-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Godowsky</td>
<td>mm. 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Godowsky</td>
<td>mm. 3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Godowsky</td>
<td>mm. 18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Godowsky</td>
<td>mm. 54-56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION: Franz Schubert and Lied Transcription

Transcription is an age-old compositional technique. “A transcription may be narrowly defined as the transfer of music from one medium to another.”\(^1\) Maurice Hinson writes: “It is impossible to know exactly when the first transcriptions were made; in a sense a prehistoric tune played on a primitive pipe was a transcription from the human voice.”\(^2\) After defining transcription according to the *New Harvard Dictionary of Music* and two other sources, Hinson concludes: “With these definitions we can say that the transcription is the closest to being a literal treatment of the original, the paraphrase is the freest, and the arrangement is somewhere in between.”\(^3\) There are arguments for and against transcription as an art form, and a brief summary of each position is included in the body of this paper. One of the most transcribed composers after Johann Sebastian Bach is Franz Schubert, whose Lieder are well represented in the solo piano transcription repertoire, which include the fifty-six Lied transcriptions of Franz Liszt and fifty-six transcriptions of Stephen Heller, a contemporary of Liszt. Works based on Schubert Lieder by Leopold Godowsky, Sergei Rachmaninoff, Sigismond Thalberg and Bedřich Smetana are less known. This paper will examine these four composers and their approaches to transcribing Schubert Lieder for solo piano. The central thesis of this paper is that pianists can improve their interpretation of Schubert Lied transcriptions for solo piano by comparing the techniques composers used in transcribing Schubert Lieder.


\(^3\) ibid, x.
Liszt transcriptions have not been included in this document by virtue of the sheer volume of material that has already been written concerning Liszt and Schubert. The intention was to find something similarly noteworthy to analyze and interpret. The research process began in locating scores and discovering who transcribed Schubert Lieder in addition to Liszt. In Appendix two, I have included a table of the twelve composers, including Liszt, who have transcribed Schubert’s Lieder that were discovered in researching and gathering evidence for this document.

In an effort to unify content, I have limited the original Schubert material to two Schubert Lieder from *Die schöne Müllerin*. Multiple composers made transcriptions from Schubert’s song cycle, *Die schöne Müllerin*, available for study. There are several transcriptions by the pianist Leopold Godowsky from this cycle. Godowsky and Rachmaninoff set the second Lied in the cycle, “Wohin?”*. Sigismond Thalberg and Bedřich Smetana transcribed the sixth Lied in the cycle, “Der Neugierige”.

Both of the Lieder are similar in the theme of questioning. “Wohin?” is “To Where?” or “Where to?” and “Der Neugierige” is “The Inquisitive One.” Both of these Lieder utilize the cyclical water accompaniment figures. In contrast, “Wohin?” is a moderate tempo, while “Der Neugierige” is a slow tempo. With the idea of presenting material and performing it as well, tempi and theme factored into the narrowing of selections. I then selected the composers who transcribed these Lieder and included all four of them in order to compare and contrast how each composer transcribed the Lieder and what techniques they used to compose their solo piano versions. Thalberg and Smetana transcribed “Der Neugierige”. These are the only two solo piano transcriptions of “Der Neugierige” located and neither are in print publications but are
available in public domain online. There is one recording on a CD of Czech dances by Kathrynn Stott (2007) of the Smetana transcription. There is no recording of Thalberg’s transcription. Both are extremely rare, but now have been added to the IMSLP Petrucci library where pianists can easily access them online. Neither transcription is mentioned in Maurice Hinson’s bibliography, “The Pianists Guide to Transcriptions, Arrangements, and Paraphrases.” “Wohin?” was also transcribed by both Heller and Liszt, but in order to have a more modern interpretation on the original material, Godowsky and Rachmaninoff were selected for this document. Maurice Hinson suggests the following criteria in evaluating what transcriptions to include of worth in a wealth of piano literature:

1. Is this arrangement, transcription, or paraphrase acceptable as a musical entity?
2. Is it a finer composition than the original?
3. Is it pianistic, that is, does it truly suit the piano?
4. Is it in good taste?  

This is not to suggest the other versions are not worth attention and exploration. The Stephen Heller transcriptions are of superior quality, as is the Gerald Moore transcription and that of Alfred Cortot. The scores and sources for the composers mentioned above are included in the bibliography for reference.

Background of *Die schöne Müllerin*

“Schubert’s *Die schöne Müllerin*, composed in 1823, must be considered the first great song cycle of the nineteenth century. It was composed eight years after Beethoven’s *An die ferne Geliebte*, but unlike Beethoven, who had linked songs together to form a continuous work,

---

Schubert structured his cycle so that each song is complete in itself, but also an essential part of the whole.”  

The poetry was written by Wilhelm Müller, who also provided the text of Schubert’s other great cycle, *Die Winterreise*. “Müller’s greatest ‘kindred spirit’, was Schubert, a composer he never knew, who indeed ‘heard the tunes within the words’, and gave them back to the world.”

The main character is the miller apprentice, who is in love with the miller’s daughter from afar. An additional character is the hunter. There are unifying elements of nature and color. “The most important character is not human; it is the all-pervading brook, graphically represented by a variety of music figures throughout the cycle. For the young miller, the millstream is a living entity, a friend and confidant that he addresses as the story unfolds. Only the brook speaks to the miller during the cycle.”

---


7 Kimball, 64.
CHAPTER ONE: Transcriptions

Performance Practice and Reception

Are transcriptions worth the attention of pianists, musicians, composers and audiences? Some music purists argue they are not. "Even when Earl Wild, Jorge Bolet, and Shura Cherkassky were playing in the 1960s and 1970s, their programming of transcriptions rarely sat well with the critics, and they were often not taken seriously as artists." Other writers argue these works are worth discovering and represent a new manifestation of the original musical idea that stands alone. "With the present-day emphasis on authenticity in music, there is a tendency to view nineteenth-century piano transcriptions as a necessary evil, a body of music not worthy of serious study from the era before recordings. Yet some of these pieces hold up to scrutiny even without reference to a model." Many composer-pianists have also spoken about the merit and beauty of the transcription, including Earl Wild, Egon Petri, Leopold Godowsky, Kaikhosru Shapurji Sorabji, Ferruccio Busoni and writers such as Maurice Hinson and Alan Walker. The debate is centuries old and far from over. In the Preface to his book, Maurice Hinson writes:

Transcription is a time-honored art. Its tradition flourished under J.S. Bach, continued with Liszt, Busoni, and Ravel, and even lives today. There was never a recital by a great virtuoso that did not feature some transcriptions, especially of Bach, when this writer was a boy. In fact, earlier in this century, and especially in the nineteenth century, important artists performed transcriptions of all sorts on their programs, and critics and the public unquestioningly accepted the practice. The piano transcription contributed a great deal to the musical life of the Romantic era and has been a significant factor in developing the full potential of the piano. . . . Starting about forty years ago, the purist approach to music

---


gained in popularity, and piano transcriptions, arrangements, and paraphrases gradually disappeared from view. Only in the last few years have they begun to make a comeback.

Transcriptions for solo piano were indeed very common in the 1800s and early 1900s. From the mid twentieth century to until about 1995, transcriptions disappeared from public performances and fell out of fashion. As I was studying as a piano major undergraduate in 1996-2000, it was extremely unusual to program a transcription for any performance. The piano literature text book in common use on many university campuses in 1998, *Five Centuries of Keyboard Music*, didn’t even mention Godowsky as a composer. Rachmaninoff was given brief mention for his compositions and transcriptions. From this text, copyright 1965, John Gillespie writes about Liszt transcriptions: “From this huge mass of transcriptions, it is safe to say that almost none are performed today, except several from Bach. There is no point in playing Schubert’s *Erlking* or Beethoven’s *Fourth Symphony* as piano solos when they can be heard in their original form. Liszt operatic fantasias have suffered a similar fate.”  

Gillespie also wrote of Thalberg: “Thalberg’s compositions have not passed the test of time. Almost thirty of his many piano works are operatic fantasias, a type long since fallen into oblivion.”

Leopold Godowsky is not mentioned in Dr. F.E. Kirby’s reference either, “Music for Piano: A Short History” published much later in 1995. One of the first references to include any mention of Godowsky, again was the Hinson research in the bibliography “Guide to the

---


12 Gillespie, 254.

Pianist’s Repertoire.” Here, mostly solo works are mentioned and of the numerous transcriptions, only three are mentioned and none of the Schubert Lieder transcriptions.

One of the first major writings to defend transcription was published in 1986 by Kaikhosru Shapurji Sorabji (1892-1988). Sorabji was a respected writer, critic, pianist and composer. Two years before his death, he wrote a book chapter entitled: “Leopold Godowsky as Creative Transcriber”. This chapter mentions that in the first two decades of the twentieth century, Godowsky was known only as a pianist, and criticized for his transcriptions before his death in 1938. Since that point, “there were, so far as I am aware, no more than three people in this country who were publicly paying Godowsky’s work its due tribute, three people who knew sufficient of it and about it to express an authoritative opinion.” Sorabji continues on to defend Godowsky’s prowess as a transcriber, even to suggest his transcriptions surpassed his technical skills as a pianist. He further argues for transcription by comparing it to literary commentary.

Transcriptions such as those of Leopold Godowsky are like the work of great commentators, like Scartazzini upon the Divina Commedia, like Conginton upon Virgil, like Montague Summers upon the Restoration Dramatists. To quote Mr. Newman’s own words: “After all, Schubert, untouched and untouched-up is always available for us when we want him, so why not, meanwhile, spend ten minutes enjoying Godowsky?” . . . The great transcriber expounds, enlarges and amplifies matter and thought that it has been left to him to discover and reveal, and as in Godowsky’s case, makes the original a point de départ for a great new creation.


16 Mr. Ernest Newman, in addition to Sorabji and Mr. Clinton Gray Fisk are the three writers Sorabji refers to above as the three people paying Godowsky any tribute in quote above.

After Sorabji’s defense, Maurice Hinson is the next writer to examine transcriptions in a more positive light. Hinson is a respected author of bibliographies of piano music and literature. Hinson provides one of the only references for transcriptions with his book in 1990, *The Pianist’s Guide to Transcriptions, Arrangements, and Paraphrases*. This was reprinted in 2000 and serves as an enduring reference as well as representation of the inaugural centerpieces of research in dealing with this body of piano music.

Transcriptions are gradually coming back into the public sphere. As I was perusing concert programs from the Gina Bachauer International Piano Competition and piano festival in 1989, I found no transcriptions. By 1993, some transcriptions, by the Junior Artist competitors only, and some by faculty artists in 1994. I did not find transcriptions programmed by competitors, and then very rarely, until 1999. In my own anecdotal experience, I was not allowed to study transcriptions studying in the 1980’s as they were not “original music” and not allowed for study by most teachers, competitions repertoire standards, or programmed by concert artists. All of this seems to be a fallout on the larger musical culture from attitudes in scholarship and purism of the mid twentieth century. As transcriptions began making their way back into the concert repertoire in the late 1990’s, most were on the end of a solo program or offered as an encore. They were, in essence, audience pleasers of well-known tunes. This all begins to change in the first decade of the twenty first century. One of the competitions that previously had few transcriptions programmed, the MTNA competition, moved to include more transcriptions in the past couple of years. In 2001, A MTNA teacher (now President), Dr. Rebecca Grooms Johnson, NCTM, Columbus, Ohio wrote:

---

In 1990, Indiana University Press published Hinson's book, The Pianist's Guide to Transcriptions, Arrangements, and Paraphrases. As he notes in the highly informative Preface, transcriptions are a time-honored art and have flourished for centuries. It was during several decades of the twentieth century, when the pendulum of taste swung heavily to the purist approach to performance, that the transcription/arrangement fell into disfavor with many performers, scholars and teachers. Some pianists, however--notably Earl Wild--continued to perform this genre, and as we begin the twenty-first century, this form of music has again returned to the concert hall. . .

Without a doubt, transcriptions, arrangements and paraphrases are coming back into general acceptance as teaching and performance pieces. At the 2001 National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy, several national winners of the piano portion of the MTNA competition were spotlighted in an evening concert. A stunning performance of four transcriptions by the junior high winner brought the audience of piano teachers and pedagogues to their feet in an enthusiastic reception of music that, twenty years ago, might have been questioned as being appropriate to study or perform. Because this type of music has been out of vogue for several decades, many teachers and performers may be unaware of the extensive repertoire available to them, and would find this to be an invaluable resource.  

**Transcription as a Compositional Technique**

Many Western musical giants and composer-pianists were leading advocates of transcription, including Johann Sebastian Bach, Franz Liszt, Leopold Godowsky, and Sergei Rachmaninoff. Johannes Brahms enjoyed transcription and his catalogue includes over forty transcribed works. Brahms enjoyed introducing his music to friends and colleagues in two-piano transcriptions. Sometimes a composer works through their compositional process and transcribes along the way as demonstrated by Brahms’ Piano Concerto No. 2 in B-flat Major. The first version was a two-piano version. Later, he realized the full solo piano version with orchestra. Likewise, Liszt’s *Petrarch Sonnets* took shape over a twenty-three year period in five different transcriptions and mediums. First, the original vocal setting of 1838-39; second, as a solo piano

---

transcription; third, a song for tenor published in 1846; then a new piano version published in 1858 in *Années de pèlerinage*; and last a modified version of the thematic material for low voice in 1861. These examples provide excellent reasons why transcription is inherently a part of the compositional process.

Musical giants like Arnold Schoenberg and Paul Hindemith argued against transcription. Some of the arguments against transcription include twentieth-century purism and nineteenth-century attitudes that transcription was the activity of a lesser composer. “Brahms's concern that the transcription of his own music might injure his reputation as a serious artist led him to publish most of the arrangements anonymously.” Musical purists will further argue no one has the right to tamper with the masterpieces of another composer.

Much of the music of the nineteenth century was made available to audiences through piano transcriptions. Ballet, operatic and orchestral music was disseminated through arrangements transcribed for piano for salon use. While a justified means to that end in the nineteenth century, music purists of the twentieth century argue with the advent of the recording age, all the music in its original form is available to the public and no longer requires transcription.

---


In response to this, the transcriber of today may take refuge in Ferruccio Busoni’s question a century earlier: “Why are variations considered worthy because they change the original, while arrangements are considered unworthy because they also change the original?”\textsuperscript{23} The transcriber, in my opinion, is offering a new musical conception that stands on its own, independent from the original. The original is left intact and a new work emerges that can be realized in new mediums and stands alone.

CHAPTER TWO: Thalberg Transcribing Techniques

An example of literal transcribing techniques can be found in the Thalberg’s transcription of “Der Neugierige”. “Together with Liszt, Thalberg must be ranked as the greatest virtuoso pianist of the mid-19th century, a view endorsed by Mendelssohn in a letter of 30 March 1840. In keeping with the virtuoso tradition he played almost exclusively music of his own composition, which consisted mainly of fantasias on favorite opera arias by Rossini, Meyerbeer, Donizetti, Verdi and sometimes Weber and Mozart. His Fantasia Op.33, on themes from Rossini’s Moïse, brought him wide recognition, and the dazzling technique it demanded aroused admiration.”

The score is found in “Trois Mélodies de F. Schubert,” Op. 79 No. 2, as the piece “La Curieuse”, the French translation of the original German title. The music was composed in 1862 and published by Ricordi in 1864. The composition has none of the virtuosity for which Thalberg was known. These transparent compositions were published just seven years before Thalberg’s death in 1871. In contrast, the Smetana transcription of “Der Neugierige” is a new reinterpretation of the work entirely. Smetana’s “Zvědavý” Op. 10 No. 2 is a virtuosic transcription of “Der Neugierige” published in 1858.

This is an example of a transcription possibly published to disseminate the Schubert Lieder to a larger audience of pianists who might buy the music to perform in small salon performances without a singer available. Transcriptions from this period are not solely available and useful for practical purposes only. Charles Rosen writes: “I do not think that it serves any


useful purpose to classify Liszt’s versions of other composers’ works into the two categories of faithful transcriptions and free paraphrases, as many critics do. . . It is absurd to pretend that many of the arrangements, like those of the Schubert songs, were done only to make the originals more available to the public and to popularize them: there must have been very few of Liszt’s contemporaries who could even have attempted the transcription of Schubert’s “Der Lindenbaum.”

The literal transcriptions may have served both a practical and aesthetic purpose. The transcription may have been a welcome change of style from the freer paraphrase, reminiscences, caprices and fantasies of the nineteenth century. In the London journal, *The Music World*, May 21st, 1864 (the same year Thalberg’s music was published by Ricordi) there is a description of “20 Mélodies de Schubert”, composed by Henri Roubier.

M. Roubier’s ‘Mélodies de Schubert’ are excellent examples of the best way of arranging a Song for the Pianoforte. We have here no amplifications, nor distortions, nor variations, nor impertinent arpeggios; the Melodies with their Accompaniments, being simply woven together, so as to form a piece for the Pianoforte. They cannot be too strongly recommended to amateurs who wish for something new, and at the same time prefer music to noise and vulgar display.  

There are no additions to the Schubert original in the Thalberg transcriptions. Many of the Liszt transcriptions serve the same purpose.

Liszt, following a practice common in the nineteenth century, was primarily concerned with bringing new music into the home of the domestic pianist. The piano transcription was the most widely used and successful medium for accomplishing this. Liszt also frequently transcribed pieces of a particular composer in order to promulgate them by featuring them in his recitals. The Schubert Lieder fall into this category. Liszt did not drastically alter the original in these compositions. Indeed, in the cases of

---


"Liebesbotschaft" and "Das Wandern," very little alteration beyond the incorporation of the melody into the piano accompaniment, occurs.  

Analysis

Thalberg keeps the original high key of B Major, for high voice. The accompaniment is found in small notes and the Schubert melody is incorporated into the pianist’s treble staff in larger notes. Incorporating the melody into the right hand does change the register of the tune. The melody is heard in the original one octave lower as sung by the tenor voice in most performances. The melody is above the accompaniment in the piano transcription. This necessitates the pianist’s redistribution of notes in the accompaniment figure between hands for convenience.

Example 2.1

This occurs in several other places in the score. The original material remains unmodified, except for an additional leap in the melodic line in m. 51 and some harmonic

---

alterations in m. 30. The addition of dynamics is a notable change. The following table summarizes musical elements for comparison with Smetana’s transcription to follow.
## Table 1: Style Comparison of Two Versions of “Der Neugierige”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thalberg (1864)</th>
<th>Smetana (1858)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall stylistic impression</td>
<td>Literal transcription</td>
<td>Virtuoso transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>High key, B Major</td>
<td>High key, B Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Melodic Range</strong></td>
<td>Incorporated into the treble staff. Larger notes, stems up are melody. One added ornament (m. 31)</td>
<td>Shifting range: In the original bass register, then treble, bass, and ending in the treble register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Added leap, m. 51</td>
<td>Added leap, m. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompaniment</td>
<td>Musical question first four bars. Broken chord and blocked chord</td>
<td>Musical Question first four Bars. Broken chord and arpeggiated chord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td>Altered, mm. 30</td>
<td>No harmonic alterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texture</td>
<td>Melody and voice in the same register at moments</td>
<td>Thicker texture, larger chord voicings, doublings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Scheme</td>
<td>B Major, Temporary tonization of F-sharp Major, G Major</td>
<td>B Major, Temporary tonization of F-sharp Major, G Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>2/4 Intro. stanza 1,2 3/4 AA(^1) stanza 3 B stanza 4 A, A(^2) stanza 5</td>
<td>2/4 Intro. stanza 1,2 3/4 AA(^1) stanza 3 B stanza 4 Added cadenza A, A(^2) stanza 5 Extended coda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm</td>
<td>Unchanged from original</td>
<td>Sixteenth-note accompaniments to thirty-second note accompaniments, polyrhythms, unmeasured cadenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry/Text and dynamics</td>
<td>“Like to Hear” m. 11 piano</td>
<td>“Like to Hear” m. 11 forte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert original paints certain words with harmonic, rhythmic devices. No dynamics marked.</td>
<td>“stumm!” m. 25 no mark</td>
<td>“stumm!” m. 25 &lt; &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Love me?” m. 52 decrescendo</td>
<td>“Love me?” m. 52 fortissimo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THREE: Bedřich Smetana

“Zvědavý” was written in 1858 by Smetana. It is included in the complete works of Smetana’s compositions, Volume 5: Virtuoso Songs. “Zvědavý” is the Czech title for the sixth Lied in the Schubert cycle, “Der Neugierige”. Smetana also composed a transcription of Schubert’s “Trockne Blumen” from the same cycle. “Zvědavý” is in the original high key of B Major as in Thalberg’s transcription and the opening statement of the Lied is preceded by an exact reproduction of Schubert’s four-bar piano introduction. The tessitura is for tenor, and the melody is for right hand written in the bass staff. Smetana gives the accompaniment figure to the pianist’s left hand. The right hand plays the melody for the first stanza, complete with Schubert’s ornaments.

Example 3.1
The first two stanzas are a vocal introduction to the main theme in 3/4 meter. This is supported by the text: The narrator speaks to himself in stanza one and two. Harmonically, each phrase of the antecedent phrases end on V7 (m. 15), as does the entire period in the first stanza (m. 20).

The pianist who is aware of the text will use this information to allow the music to breathe between sections. The narrator asks the brook in the final stanza: “Tell me, little brook, does she love me?” in the Schubert original. This is the question with which the music ends and there is no response from the brook. The accompaniment figure in mm. 20 and 21 is followed by silence in m. 23. This may be the answer to the Lied, foreshadowed in the structural break between the 2/4 and 3/4 sections. The answer may be silence from the brook. The pianist, and singer in the case of the original, should be sure to observe the rests for this reason and not begin into the next section too hastily. The pianist may also consult the original score for tempi considerations between the two sections and consider following Smetana’s marking L’istesso tempo and avoid the temptation to rush through the next passage. There is a complete structural break in meter, tempo, text implications, and accompaniment figuration to support that the first two stanzas are simply an introduction to the Lied.

In the third stanza the meter changes from 2/4 to 3/4 meter. In Schubert’s original text, the first stanza is marked langsam. The third stanza is marked Sehr langsam. Smetana writes Zvolna (slowly) and Klidně (Tranquil) L’istesso tempo. Smetana gives the pianist an undulating thirty-second note pattern in the accompaniment that requires extreme velocity. The pianist may take time and proceed in an unhurried manner with this stanza, as Schubert has marked it slower to make the transition seamlessly to a slightly slower tempo in the 3/4 meter at m. 23. The text begins a new thought here with narrator speaking to the brook.
Example 3.2

In both the Schubert and Smetana accompaniments, these running notes depict the brook to which the narrator is speaking. These running sixteenth notes begin again in m. 23. The narrator is now speaking to the brook in the third stanza. Schubert uses word painting in m. 25 with a sudden minor tonic chord when asking the brook: “Why are you so silent today?” Smetana gives the emphasis with a crescendo and accents in the melody. The same passage later is found in m. 46. Here the text is “How strange you are!” Smetana highlights this same minor tonic chord with a sudden pianissimo on the word strange followed by a crescendo to the exclamatory “you are!” Smetana embellishes the passage with trills and scale passage work to give yet still more dramatic emphasis to this text.
The text is an important element for the composer and interpreter to consider for the above reason and others that will follow. For reference, the original German text by Wilhelm Müller and the English translation is reprinted here before analyzing the subsequent stanzas.

Der Neugierige

Ich frage keine Blume,  
Ich frage keinen Stern,  
Sie können mir alle nicht sagen,  
Was ich erfüh’ so gern.

I ask no flower,  
I ask no star;  
None of them can tell me  
What I would so dearly like to hear.

Ich bin ja auch kein Gärtner,  
Die Sterne stehn zu hoch;  
Mein Bächlein will ich fragen,  
Ob mich mein Herz belog.

For I am no gardener,  
And the stars are too high;  
I will ask my little brook  
If my heart has lied to me.

O Bächlein meiner Liebe,  
Wie bist du heut’ so stumm!  
Wil ja nur Eines wissen,  
Ein Wörtchen um und um.

O brook of my love,  
How silent you are today!  
I wish to know just one thing,  
One small word, over and over again.

»Ja«, heißt das eine Wörtchen,  
Das andre heißt »Nein«,  
Die beiden Wörtchen schließen  
Die ganze Welt mir ein.

One word is ‘yes’;  
The other is ‘no’;  
These two words contain for me  
The whole world.

O Bächlein meiner Liebe,  
Was bist du wunderlich!  
Will’s ja nicht weiter sagen  
Sag’, Bächlein, liebt sie mich?

O brook of my love,  
How strange you are!  
I will tell no one else:  
Say, brook, does she love me?  

---

Smetana utilizes large arpeggiated chords marked *fortissimo* in the B section and extreme registers in contrast to the A section. The harmony also modulates to G Major in this section. Schubert’s chords are also thick in texture, but unmarked dynamically. Smetana elaborates on the cadential harmonies Schubert uses to close this section. Schubert has a German augmented 6\(^{th}\) chord leading to a tonic 6/4 chord to modulate back to the key of B Major. Smetana highlights the colorful progression by adding a bravura G Major arpeggio and broken chord two-against-three figure in the right hand.

Example 3.3
At the arrival of the original tonality of B Major, again there is extended passage work in Smetana’s transcription that will allow the listener to settle in to the B Major harmony and give the pianist a moment of virtuosity not present in the original accompaniment. This cadenza is new material and not in the original. The passage utilizes the upper register of the piano and descends downward, all the while marked as a continuous crescendo. The effect is much like one of a cascading waterfall. Beginning at the top, the pianist is instructed to play soft and leggierissime. The pianist may interpret this as brook rushing over some embankment. To create such an effect, one may begin slowly and accelerate as the passage moves downwards. At the bottom, the low f-sharp in both clefs is marked Sforzando. After reaching this goal, a turn of direction in the scales brings the harmony to a closing fermata on the F sharp dominant-seventh chord in transition back to the theme. The pianist may again play a piacere, and return to the previous slower tempo. The passage would not be played in strict measure, and there are no bar lines in the score. Instead, a fast-slow-fast interpretation would offer meaning as an emulation of the brook, not just sheer passagework and scales.
Smetana’s transcription supplies a poetic interpretation of the Schubert original. The entire passage is one of the brook speaking, surging and a mighty cadenza of water figures and virtuosity. This is the commentary Smetana makes on the Schubert original.

With the return of the A section, there is no deviation from the original Schubert Lied. Smetana does add a different arpeggiated pattern in the pianist’s left hand and a trill in the middle texture played by the pianist’s right hand all the way to m. 53. This section is marked tranquilla and the additions are for effect and not to disturb the quality of tone. The pianist shouldn’t allow the trill to overshadow the melody or be mistaken for virtuosity for virtuosity’s sake. The melodic line should still stand in the foreground, prominently voiced in this texture.
The postlude is only four bars in Schubert’s original. Smetana uses the same harmonies and extends the postlude an additional ten bars, again giving the pianist some virtuosic arpeggios to settle on the B Major harmony and stay a little longer in the brook’s running accompaniment. There is a soft-loud-soft pattern to the postlude, then a declamatory *forte* final chord.

Smetana’s transcription adheres to the original key and tessitura in the opening stanza. In the second stanza, the brook is highlighted even further in thirty-second notes, rather than Schubert’s sixteenth notes. This tempo should take into account Schubert’s original marking to make the transition smooth. There are moments when Smetana takes Schubert’s crucial harmonies at cadential points and modulatory passages and elaborates on these harmonies, extending the music, but not changing the underlying structure of the original. The dynamics Smetana marks are used to reinforce the text in most cases, with an exception being the final chord. The final chord seems to establish that the brook has the last say. In the 1830 Diabelli edition of the Lied, the final lyric is marked with an exclamation point and not a question mark as in subsequent editions.  

Smetana concludes his transcription with the finality of this exclamatory punctuation.

---

Sergei Rachmaninoff and Leopold Godowsky both wrote transcriptions of the second Lied in *Die schöne Müllerin* “Wohin?”.

In “Wohin?” we follow the thoughts of a young miller who finds himself following a rushing brook down from the mountains toward a valley. In later songs in *Die Schöne Müllerin*, this stream leads the young man to a mill, where he falls in love with a pretty young girl working at that mill. The affair has a sad end, with the young miller finding a final resting place in the deep waters of this very brook. Thus, while "Wohin" seems bright and jolly, it carries poignancy and menace because we know how the story will end.\(^\text{31}\)

First, a look at the text and form will help in discussing the work further. First, consider the text alterations. The following translation by Tom Potter is straightforward and shows the many modifications to each strophe Schubert made. For a strict translation by Richard Wigmore of the original Müller text, see Appendix One.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
  \text{“Wohin?”} & \text{To Where?} \\
  \text{Wilhelm Müller} & \text{Wilhelm Müller} \\
  \text{(Schubert’s version)} & \text{Translated by Tom Porter} \\
  1 & 1 \\
  \text{Ich hört’ ein Bächlein rauschen} & \text{I heard a brooklet rushing,} \\
  \text{Ich weiß nicht, wie mire wurde} & \text{Ich weiß nicht, wie mire wurde} \\
  \text{Wohl aus dem Felsenquell,} & \text{down from its mountain source,} \\
  \text{Ich müßte auch hinunter,} & \text{Ich müßte auch hinunter,} \\
  \text{Nicht, wer den Rat mir gab,} & \text{Ich müßte auch hinunter,} \\
  \text{Hinab zum Tale rauschen} & \text{It was rushing to the valley,} \\
  \text{Ich mußte auch hinunter,} & \text{so fresh and bright its course.} \\
  \text{So Frisch und wunderhell.} & \text{So Frisch und wunderhell.} \\
\end{array}
\]

Mit meinem Wanderstab,
Ich mußte auch hinunter,
Mit meinem Wanderstab.

3 Hinunter und immer weiter
Und immer dem Bache nach,
Und immer frischer rauschte
Und immer heller der Bach,
Und immer frischer rauschte
Und immer heller der Bach.

Yes downward and always onward,
with ever the brook ahead;
The brook ran ever fresher,
and brighter as it sped,
The brook ran ever fresher,
and brighter as it sped.

4 Ist das den meine Straße?
O Bächlein, sprich, wohin?
Wohin? Sag, wohin?
Du hast mit deinem Rauschen
Mir ganz berauscht den Sinn,
Du hast mit deinem Rauschen
Mir ganz berauscht den Sinn.

Is this the road I’m taking?
Oh Brook, please speak, to where?
To where? Say, to where?
Your tumult and your rushing
my senses overbear,
Your tumult and your rushing
my senses overbear.

5 Was sag’ ich den vom Rauschen?
Das kann kein Rauschen sein:
Es singen wohl die Nixen
Tief unten ihren Reihn,
Es singen wohl die Nixen
Tief unten ihren Reihn.

What say I then of rushing?
That can no rushing be:
Deep down, perhaps the mermaids
are singing songs for me,
Deep down, perhaps the mermaids
are singing songs for me.

6 Laß singen, Gesell, laß rauschen,
Und wander fröhlich nach!
Es gehn ja Mühlenräder
In jedem klaren Bach,
Es gehn ja Mühlenräder
In jedem klaren Bach.

Keep singing, My Friend, keep rushing,
and wander merrily,
In each clear stream I follow,
there millers wheels will be,
In each clear stream I follow,
there millers wheels will be.

7 Laß singen, Gesell, laß rauschen,
Und wander fröhlich nach,
fröhlich nach, fröhlich nach.

Keep singing, My Friend, keep rushing,
and wander merrily,
Merrily, merrily.

The poetry in “Wohin?” is strophic. “Some commentators have pointed to the fact that

Die schöne Müllerin is framed on either side by strophic songs and includes six others as

evidence of the miller’s naïveté and innocence.”

“Wohin?” is the second Lied in the cycle. There are similarities between the first Lied, “Das Wandern” including accompaniment figuration representing the brook, 2/4 meter, similar rhythmic durations and broken triadic folk-like melodies. “Das Wandern” fits easily into a simple strophic form. However, the musical form of “Wohin?” is more challenging to fit into any established strophic or modified strophic forms.

In her book on Die schöne Müllerin, Susan Youens suggests there is a B section in an E minor tonality. Consider the following analysis for future reference in this document for discussion of a possible form for “Wohin?” I have analyzed this in a Sonata-Allegro Form. There are two themes in the exposition, a development, retransition, recapitulation and coda. There are new thematic ideas in the musical material in the coda, however both Beethoven and Schubert writing in this period would often introduce new themes in the coda. I would suggest it is the modulation to the key of D Major that would imply that the ternary form is not sufficient enough to capture such a harmonic structure and one could make a case for Sonata-Allegro form as such.

Schubert was certainly a composer familiar with instrumental forms. Schubert is also known to adjust the poetry to fit the music regularly in his Lieder, and “Wohin?” is no exception. Here, Schubert adjusts every single stanza but the first to fit his instrumental form. Consider Schubert had an affinity to make the poetry fit the musical form, not the other way around. Even in a simple strophic Lied, like “Das Wandern”, the poetry is subservient to the music concerning structure. Each stanza repeats the first line of text in order to form a complete music antecedent and consequent phrase. The last line is repeated to make an even four bar musical phrase and balanced period.

This table may help bridge the gap between the strophic poetry and Sonata-Allegro musical form and assist singers, students, and performers in understanding the structure further.

**Table 2: Proposed Sonata-Allegro Form For Schubert’s “Wohin?”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Mm</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>mm 1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>mm 3-10</td>
<td>Theme 1 (T1), Broken-chord melodic motion, G Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mm 11-14</td>
<td>New melodic material, descending stepwise figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mm 15-22</td>
<td>Theme 1 (T1) continues with embellishment. Stanza 2 concludes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mm. 23-34</td>
<td>Theme 2 (T2) melodic material descending stepwise figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>foreshadowed in mm. 11-14 becomes theme 2. T2 is sequenced to begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>modulation into the second key relationship, D Major, the dominant key.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End of stanza 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>mm. 35-53</td>
<td>Inverted T1; unstable in key (A minor, B Major, E minor); T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stanza four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retransition to key of G Major (beginning of stanza 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>mm. 54-73</td>
<td>T1, T2 (stanza 5 concludes); stanza 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>mm. 74-81</td>
<td>Schubert’s added two lines, repetition and postlude; stanza 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation in “Wohin?”

Rachmaninoff composed his transcription in 1925, and it was published in 1926. This was composed during the first few months after Rachmaninoff came to America. The melody is set in the pianist’s right hand in the soprano register in the original key of G Major. “Wohin?” is the only Schubert transcription by Rachmaninoff. The accompaniment rhythmically follows Schubert’s original compound duple meter. The harmony in this broken-chord accompaniment figure is modified in Rachmaninoff’s setting. Rachmaninoff adds many passing tones, creating many harmonies with suspended sixth, seventh, ninth and eleventh chords. Schubert used predominantly tonic and dominant triadic harmonies with modulatory passages. This transcription already creates a more modern tonality in the first few bars. By the second phrase, Rachmaninoff begins adding chromatic passing tones to the accompaniment, creating a more complex contrapuntal texture. To allow the melody to speak above this texture, the pianist should carefully follow Rachmaninoff’s articulation on eighth notes in the melodic line. Schubert made no such specifications.

The beginning of the second stanza is measure eleven in Rachmaninoff’s transcription, which he marks dolce. The harmonies depict the text’s vagueness in this stanza. The narrator does not know how he got here (to the brook) and Schubert places a progression of chords here that has no relationship to the key of G Major. Rachmaninoff keeps these Schubert chords intact as they depict the text well. The performer would be free to interpret this dramatically with more intense dynamics in the original Lieder. Rachmaninoff, however, chooses instead to set this text in a more delicate fashion and give the performance direction dolce with no dynamic change from the previously marked pianissimo. The slurs in the Schubert original bass staff do indicate a change as well in this stanza from the previously unmarked bass staff in the first stanza.
In the fourth stanza, the poem asks “Is this then my path?” Rachmaninoff cleverly gives the pianist a choice of what to play here. The first choice is to allow the counterpoint to cross the melodic line and continue above the melody. The ossia keeps the counterpoint below the melody. Here, Rachmaninoff allows the text to speak in a new revelation that is supported musically and allows the performer into the creative process. Both parts are equally difficult. Rachmaninoff did record his transcription in 1925 and it is digitally re-mastered in 1998 on the CD “A Window in Time”, reproduced from the original piano roll Rachmaninoff recorded on. Rachmaninoff did not take the ossia and allows the brook to surge in this passage.

In the song cycle, the narrator eventually succumbs to his lost love, the fair maid of the mill, and drowns himself in the brooke. Is this brook a friend or foe of the narrator? Rachmaninoff gives the pianist a choice to keep the rushing and babbling brook below the melody, a musical counterpart. Or, one may choose to allow the brook to surge here and overcome the melodic line. Again, this technique is used in the final coda of Rachmaninoff’s transcription. Here, he makes the choice for the performer. Eight measures from the end, the pianist’s left hand leaps over the melody all the way to the end of Schubert’s reinforced strophe. This is the brook’s moment to keep merrily singing. As in Schubert’s postlude, the brook finishes the Lied, but with an added two-bar chromatic flourish that seems to suggest the brook has the final word in this Rachmaninoff’s transcription.
In the next chapter, “Wohin?” will be discussed with Leopold Godowsky’s free transcription. Table 3 gives a preview of the comparison and contrast in elements of style between the two composers. In summary, “Wohin?” contains the following elements:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements largely similar include:</th>
<th>Contrast significantly in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Harmonic language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rachmaninoff: Chromatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Godowsky: Diatonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic material and form</td>
<td>Melodic register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rachmaninoff consistent register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Godowsky freely altered register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text set with musical meaning</td>
<td>Rhythmic components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tempo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhythmic complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dynamics &amp; articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texture</td>
<td>Rachmaninoff: melody with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>counterpoint in the accompaniment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Godowsky: contrapuntal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Style Comparison of Two Versions of “Wohin?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall stylistic impression</th>
<th>Rachmaninoff (1925)</th>
<th>Godowsky (1927)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>High key, G Major</td>
<td>High key, G Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Range</td>
<td>Incorporated into the treble staff.</td>
<td>Melody shifts register freely throughout the composition from soprano to alto, tenor and bass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Register</td>
<td>Delineated by articulation</td>
<td>8va higher: mm. 19-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always in the same range, except on “echo” 8va higher</td>
<td>mm. 26-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mm. 31-34</td>
<td>mm. 66-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8va lower</td>
<td>mm. 42-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In several registers mm. 23-26</td>
<td>mm. 62-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>m. 30 from imperfect cadence to perfect cadence</td>
<td>Leaves imperfect cadence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompaniment</td>
<td>Countermelody, split between hands</td>
<td>Countermelody, split between hands,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td>Highly chromatic altered chords</td>
<td>More diatonic harmonies (2nds, 6ths and 9ths)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texture</td>
<td>Three-part polyphony</td>
<td>Four-part polyphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Scheme</td>
<td>G Major, D Major a minor, B Major tonicization e minor</td>
<td>G Major, D Major a minor, B Major tonicization e minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retransition</td>
<td>Retransition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G Major</td>
<td>G Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Sonata-Allegro (modified)</td>
<td>Sonata-Allegro (modified) with extended optional ending mm. 81-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm</td>
<td>Compound Duple Meter Polyrhythms between melody and accompaniment</td>
<td>Compound Duple Meter Polyrhythm between melody and accompaniment In addition, there are many polyrhythms within the accompaniment figures alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry/Text and dynamics</td>
<td>Schubert original paints certain words with harmonic, rhythmic devices. No dynamics marked.</td>
<td>Non-stop 16th throughout signify the brook mm. 11-14 dolce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-stop 16th throughout signify the brook m. 11-14 molto espressivo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE: Leopold Godowsky

Leopold Godowsky wrote his first version of the *Twelve Schubert Songs* in 1927. This collection included “Wohin?” as the first in the collection and was dedicated to Rachmaninoff whose transcription was published the year prior. Godowsky later revisited these transcriptions in 1937. He had a stroke in 1930 and “during his enforced retirement from the concert platform. . . Godowsky busied himself by revisiting and revising his published music. The Schubert song arrangements came under particular scrutiny. Godowsky emended errors, revised tempo and metronome markings, inserted or altered notes, offered new or alternative pedallings, suggested alternative or revised fingerings, and added a host of articulation, dynamic, and expressive markings.”

This new edition was dedicated to Joseph Hoffman. The score referred to for this analysis is the 1937 edition. In a letter to Frieda Godowsky on 22 July 1926, Godowsky claimed his versions of “Wohin?” and “Das Wandern” were a “thousand times better and more effective” than Liszt’s versions.

Godowsky begins with a two bar introduction and descending chromatic bass line. Already, a new harmonic language is in place and will continue being developed in the accompaniment triplet sixteenth notes in the verse. The opening phrase in essence picks up where Rachmaninoff left off. Schubert’s diatonic harmony and basso ostinato have been replaced with harmonic progression and chromaticism. Godowsky even goes further to introduce a contrapuntal melody in the soprano voice to the bass movement and inner workings of the water accompaniment figures, shared between hands in a third voice. See Example 5.1

---


Example 5.1

In the first verse Godowsky uses four-part writing. This added polyphonic texture is new and not in the Rachmaninoff transcription. The accompaniment figure is more sophisticated and is shared between hands and the tenor and alto voices are in polyrhythms throughout the piece. There is a bass line, tenor, countermelody to the original Schubert melody (soprano), and alto that is the accompaniment figure and alternates between the pianist’s left and right hand. Multiple textures are a hallmark of Godowsky’s style. Sachania explains: “these stylistic traits include altered chords, to which Godowsky’s distinctive chromatic and contrapuntal idiom owes a large debt; motivically concentrated textures; and a predilection, in arrangements, for vertically combining sections of the originals.”

When the first melody appears after the introduction, Godowsky alters the rhythm from the Schubert original. This gives a lilting folk-like quality to the music. Godowsky may be commenting on the poetry, narrator and nature themes in Die schöne Müllerin. The dotted eighth and sixteenth note rhythms become triplet rhythms and this alternation continues throughout the piece.

---

The second stanza in Godowsky’s transcription begins in measure eleven, as in Rachmaninoff’s. Rachmaninoff wrote *dolce* and Godowsky writes *molto espressivo*. These performance directions give more expression to the text here. Schubert’s original score doesn’t have any expressive markings, but these transcriptions add it here to capture the quality of the lyrics.

An added component to the texture in Godowsky’s arrangement is that the simple-duple meter melody is accompanied by a compound-duple meter alto. The tenor countermelody is also in simple-duple meter. This results in many two-against-three polyrhythms, further complicated by the distribution of notes between the hands. In measure nineteen, the melody is hidden between the alto and tenor inner voice and shared between both hands. Now the tenor is in compound meter and the alto in duple meter. The pianist must work to voice this hidden melody and all four parts are now in the treble staff. This added challenge of delineating voices all within the same upper register is a difficult technical challenge for the pianist. Finally, this
melody is in imitative counterpoint with a legato articulation following the soprano lead voice in a staccato articulation (see Example 5.3). Godowsky ends this texture and begins the third stanza by returning the rhythms to the voices assigned in the first stanza.

Example 5.3

The fourth stanza is a more bravura passage for the pianist. The texture also foreshadows fragments of an upcoming melody in the bass part. The pianist must play the four-part texture with a dramatic crescendo in all voices toward the middle of the stanza and then keep all the notes and voicing in place while coming to a *pianissimo* at the conclusion of the stanza.

In the fifth stanza, the texture is distributed rhythmically in a combination of techniques from the first and second stanza. Here, the difficulty is in the tenor stemmed notes in the pianist’s left hand. This is a cross duple countermelody interwoven in the alto compound triplet accompaniment figure.
The sixth stanza is marked *pianissimo* in Schubert’s original score. Godowsky writes *ppp* in his transcription (*pianississimo*) and this extreme range is an example of Romantic extreme dynamics. Godowsky adds an optional coda that brings the work full circle. He incorporates the introduction, which was modified from the original, and weaves it with the opening melodic theme, still in four parts, but now with more of a chorale-like texture. The accompaniment from the first note and throughout has resembled the running water of the babbling brook except in Godowsky’s extended optional ending. Godowsky brings back the Miller apprentice vocal theme with no rippling water figures in this optional ending. This optional ending seems to suggest it is the miller, not the brook, who would have the final say.

Godowsky was diligent in marking tempo indications in his 1937 version of the score. There are many marks to let the performer know that the interpretation should imitate the movement of water, with plenty of ebb and flow. The following Table 4 summarizes the many tempi changes in the score.
Table 4: Tempo Markings in Godowsky

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Markings</th>
<th>M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Introductory bars</td>
<td>Allegretto mormorando</td>
<td>m. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rallentando</td>
<td>m. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A tempo</td>
<td>m. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition: theme 1</td>
<td>Rallentando</td>
<td>m. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2, D Major</td>
<td>A tempo</td>
<td>m. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poco rallentando</td>
<td>m. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A tempo</td>
<td>m. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development, a minor</td>
<td>Accelerando</td>
<td>m. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2, e minor</td>
<td>A tempo</td>
<td>m. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rallentando, sostenuto</td>
<td>m. 45-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A tempo</td>
<td>m. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retransition</td>
<td>Rallentando</td>
<td>m. 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A tempo</td>
<td>m. 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>Rallentando</td>
<td>m. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A tempo</td>
<td>m. 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>Morendo</td>
<td>m. 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poco a poco accelerando</td>
<td>m. 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A tempo</td>
<td>m. 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended optional ending</td>
<td>Poco rallentando</td>
<td>m. 82-85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Godowsky’s transcriptions were not well received in his time. Many critics abhorred Godowsky’s sacrilege. Godowsky himself wrote a preface responding to criticism to the 1927 edition explaining his motives. There is also a comparison of transcription to literature he uses to make his case. Godowsky states: “Essays are written on all kinds of subjects. Histories and biographies deal with events and people that are as immutably established as any masterpiece in music. Novels are dramatized and dramas are novelized. Why should musicians be denied the privileges of comment, criticism, dissertation, discussion, and display of imaginative faculties when transcribing, arranging, or paraphrasing a standard work! Why should the literary man alone enjoy all the prerogatives! Shakespeare builds his plays upon borrowed themes, and
Molière said: “Je prends mon bien où je le trouve.” (i.e. “I take my materials where I can find them). Godowsky has taken Schubert’s original score and greatly changed it with respect to texture, contrapuntal techniques, articulation and harmonic structure. This is an example of a free transcription and Godowsky does write in the score, “freely transcribed by Leopold Godowsky”.

---


CHAPTER SIX: Conclusion

Thalberg, Smetana, Rachmaninoff, and Godowsky took four different approaches to transcribing Schubert’s Lieder. The transcriptions remain authentic in key, form, textual meaning, and melody. The transcriptions differ in texture, dynamics, tempo, harmony, and articulation. The pianist is left to interpret these elements. After comparing and contrasting the techniques in transcribing these four pieces, the pianist can confidently make choices regarding the interpretation of each transcription.

A pianist’s interpretation of these pieces should consider both the original Lied and transcribed texts to best communicate the essential elements of the piece. The text was a critical component in the musical settings for two composers. Smetana and Rachmaninoff both highlighted moments in the poetry and expressed them dynamically and formally in the structure. Godowsky’s contrapuntal techniques are more the focus of his writing and leave the listener a more general impression of the brook, rather than the narrative text. Thalberg’s transparent texture keeps Schubert’s original textual setting intact and brings it to the forefront.

Comparing Thalberg and Smetana enlightens the pianist to the purpose of the transcription. Thalberg’s transcription is conceptually one of transparency, delicacy and ease. It is a poetic, sensitive and eloquent approach that will best suit the structure Thalberg has designed in his straightforward instrumental version of “Der Neugierige”. Word painting is not highlighted explicitly. In Smetana, a more virtuosic and narrative commentary is in order. The meaning of rests, of pacing and of dynamic levels change when comparing the two. Word painting is decidedly marked in Smetana’s transcription. Passagework is not only virtuosic, but a
comment on the poetry if not the entire cycle. Original text and punctuation inform the performance nuances of touch, tempo, pedalling and dynamics.

Rachmaninoff and Godowsky seek through harmonic implications to create new conceptions of the original source material. In view of radically different textures, the tempo of each piece is subject to interpretation. The optional endings and ossia do constitute a choice for the performer’s own interpretation of the text and thoughts regarding the miller, the brook and context of “Wohin?” in the complete cycle. These are not purely technical choices, but rather deal in text, poetry, and narrative so that the pianist must return to the original source material to make an informed determination. All of these choices inform the performer and greatly improve the interpretation in mood, style, understanding as well as provide for a more musical and confident performance.

Busoni’s description of the compositional value of the transcriber applies to each of the compositions analyzed. The thematic material is left intact and gives authenticity to the works. The transcriptions are nevertheless new works that could stand on their own as legitimate new compositions of the transcriber.

These four settings could make a complete set of variations on the Schubert themes. Thalberg could provide the thematic material. Smetana then adds a virtuosic variation followed by Rachmaninoff’s harmonic innovations on the theme. Finally, a contrapuntal conclusion and musical development of many elements in stretto, with the Godowsky discourse on this theme. Transcription has the capacity to pay such homage to Schubert, and doesn’t take away from the original material or text in any of the settings.
Transcription as a body of music is not widely recorded and the discography is limited. Further research and recording of this repertoire seem open to possibility in today’s landscape and market. The solo artist can program such a set and pay tribute to the Lieder. The audience may experience this instrumental version as a new work and listening experience, while still having original Schubert Lied and singers’ renditions available to them in other concerts and recordings. All of these incarnations can be desirable to the listener, differ in contrasting compositional strategy, serve a practical function to the solo pianist in terms of expanding repertoire, and provide unique insight into the original Schubert setting and score.
APPENDIX ONE: Translations

_Wohin?_  
Ich hört’ ein Bächlein rauschen  
Wohl aus dem Felsenquell,  
Hinab zum Tale rauschen  
So Frisch und wunderhell.

Ich weiß nicht, wie mire wurde  
Nicht, wer den Rat mir gab,  
Ich mußte auch hinunter  
Mit meinem Wanderstab.

Hinunter und immer weiter  
Und immer dem Bache nach,  
Und immer heller rauschte,  
Und immer heller der Bach.

Ist das den meine Straße?  
O Bächlein, sprich, wohin?  
Du hast mit deinem Rauschen  
Mir ganz berauscht den Sinn.

Was sag’ ich den vom Rauschen?  
Das kann kein Rauschen sein:  
Es singen wohl die Nixen  
Tief unten ihren Reihn.

Laß singen, Gesell, laß  
rauschen,  
Und wander fröhlich nach!  
Es gehn ja Mühlenräder  
In jedem klaren Bach.

_Laß singen, Gesell, laß  
rauschen,  
Und wander fröhlich nach,  
fröhlich nach,  
fröhlich nach!_  

_Where to?_  
I heard a little brook babbling  
From its rocky source,  
Babbling down to the valley,  
So bright, so wondrously clear.

I know not what came over me,  
Nor who prompted me;  
But I too had to go down  
With my wanderer’s staff.

Down and ever onwards,  
Always following the brook,  
As it babbled ever brighter  
And ever clearer.

Is this, then, my path?  
O brook, say where it leads.  
With your babbling  
You have quite befuddled my mind.

Why do I speak of babbling?  
That is no babbling,  
It is the water nymphs singing  
As they dance their round far below.

Let them sing, my friend, let the brook babble,  
And follow it cheerfully.  
For mill-wheels turn  
In every clear brook.

Let them sing, my friend, let the brook babble,  
And follow it cheerfully,  
cheerfully,  
cheerfully!\(^{39}\)

---

**Der Neugierige**

Ich frage keine Blume,
I ask no flower,
Ich frage keinen Stern,
I ask no star;
Sie können mir alle nicht sagen,
None of them can tell me
Was ich erfüh’ so gern.
What I would so dearly like to hear.

Ich bin ja auch kein Gärtner,
For I am no gardener,
Die Sterne stehn zu hoch;
And the stars are too high;
Mein Bächlein will ich fragen,
I will ask my little brook
Ob mich mein Herz belog.
If my heart has lied to me.

O Bächlein meiner Liebe,
O brook of my love,
Wie bist du heut’ so stumm!
How silent you are today!
Wil ja nur Eines wissen,
I wish to know just one thing,
Ein Wörtchen um und um.
One small word, over and over again.

»Ja«, heißt das eine Wörtchen,
One word is ‘yes’;
Das andre heißt »Nein«,
The other is ‘no’;
Die beiden Wörtchen schließen
These two words contain for me
Die ganze Welt mir ein.
The whole world.

O Bächlein meiner Liebe,
O brook of my love,
Was bist du wunderlich!
How strange you are!
Will’s ja nicht weiter sagen
I will tell no one else:
Sag’, Bächlein, liebt sie mich?
Say, brook, does she love me?\(^{40}\)

---

APPENDIX TWO: Schubert Lied Transcriptions Available

I have included the composers I found along the way in researching this paper. This list may be useful for pianists looking for composers who have transcribed Schubert Lied to study and perform. The list is the result of researching electronic data bases, local library reference resources, and professional journals and recording reviews. This list does not include arrangements, paraphrases, or fantasies and is limited to specifically the genre of transcription.

In the case there are multiple transcriptions from one composer, the most readily available are included as title entries. The list of composers is alphabetical.
Table 5: Published Schubert Piano Transcriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Cortot</td>
<td>“Heiden-Roslein”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopold Godowsky</td>
<td>Twelve Schubert Songs, including songs from <em>Die schöne Müllerin</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Heller</td>
<td>56 Schubert Song Transcriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Des Mädchens Klage” a transcription of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Nähe des Geliebten” D. 162, “The Beloved Nearby”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz Liszt</td>
<td>56 Schubert Song Transcriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Series I: “Ave Maria”, “Erlkonig”, and ten others including</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Auf dem Wasser zu singen”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Series II: The Complete <em>Winterreise</em> and Seven Other Great Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Series III: Complete <em>Schwanengesang</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Moore</td>
<td>“An die Musik”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Rolfe</td>
<td>“Ave Maria” arranged from Heller transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergei Rachmaninoff</td>
<td>“Wohin?” from <em>Die schöne Müllerin</em> (only Schubert Lied transcribed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schultze-Biesantz</td>
<td>“Serenade”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedřich Smetana</td>
<td>“Der Neugierige” from <em>Die schöne Müllerin</em>, No. 6 “Zvédavy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Trockne Blumen” from <em>Die schöne Müllerin</em>, No. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigismond Thalberg</td>
<td>“The Miller and the Torrent” (based on simplified version, Carl Czerny)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Wittgenstein</td>
<td>“Meeresstille” left hand transcription of the Liszt Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Die bist die Ruh” from the <em>School for the Left Hand</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gèza Zichy</td>
<td>“Erlkonig” for left hand alone (Count Vasony-Keo Gèza)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EPILOGUE

Heuristic Information

In the presentation for this paper, I was asked why I became interested in song transcription. My first musical experiences were coming home from pre-school and church singing the songs I learned there. There was a piano in my home, and I would try to pick out these melodies intuitively by ear. In a very real sense, these first musical encounters were song transcriptions. When my formal musical education began a few years later, I continued in ear training with the Suzuki school of piano. There was heated discussion in the 1980’s whether transcriptions were worthy of study in pedagogy, as well as music criticism and performance programming. The Suzuki school was essentially a string method that came to this country in the 1970s as a piano method of study. The repertoire was adapted from the String method and eventually the philosophy used in training students on a variety of musical instruments. One of the pieces in Suzuki Piano School Volume Three was a transcription of the *Eroica* symphony of Beethoven, fourth movement. That piece was contested and many teachers objected to teaching an arrangement, mine included. Today, the piece is still included in the Suzuki volume three. New scholarship in pedagogy and transcriptions may have influenced that decision.

The disconnect between what I naturally experienced with song transcription, and then in formal experiences with music training and concert attendance led me to the topic of exploring transcription for my research. Why aren’t transcriptions acceptable? From there, many other questions followed. As I began to see changes in scholarship and performers programming transcriptions in the first decade of 2000, I wanted to explore the topic in depth and found a great body of literature that has certainly piqued my interest. It is my hope, others will follow.
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