



美国 CARL FISCHER® 音乐出版公司提供版权

戈多夫斯基 钢琴改编曲

53首以肖邦练习曲为素材改编的练习曲
及其他肖邦作品改编曲

上

严逸澄 译

Godowsky

53 STUDIES ON ÉTUDES OF FRÉDÉRIC CHOPIN
AND OTHER CHOPIN ARRANGEMENTS I



 **SMPH**
上海音乐出版社
WWW.SMPH.SH.CN

美国 CARL FISCHER® 音乐出版公司提供版权

Godowsky

戈多夫斯基 钢琴改编曲

53首以肖邦练习曲为素材改编的练习曲
及其他肖邦作品改编曲

上

萨哈尼亚博士编辑并作序

严逸澄 译

上海音乐出版社

Introductory Essay

In 1928 Ernest Newman, the British music critic, remarked that 'Godowsky is not really interested in other men's music unless he wrote it himself'.¹ In the same year, Sir Donald Tovey coined the phrase 'to Godowskify the classics'.² Each had in mind Godowsky the arranger. For then, as now, the arrangements virtually eclipsed Godowsky's corpus of original compositions; as Paul Bekker commented, Godowsky's name had come to suggest only "'arrangements" and "adaptations" for the pianist with technical equipment'.³ True enough, the early free compositions, issued from 1888 (when Godowsky was eighteen), had given way to a spate of radical, audacious arrangements: fifty-three 'studies' on Chopin's études (1894–1914), two other Chopin paraphrases (1899), some Weber arrangements (1903–5), a collection of Baroque arrangements entitled *Renaissance* (1906 and 1909), and 'symphonic metamorphoses' on waltzes by Johann Strauss II (1912). The evidence suggests that Godowsky wanted his compositional skills to mature in these years,⁴ and one might wonder to what extent Godowsky conceived of the arranging process as a means of compositional improvement. (The only formal 'lessons' he had had were during his twelve unhappy weeks at the Berlin Hochschule für Musik in 1883, where his composition teachers included Clara Schumann's half-brother Woldemar Bargiel.) If indeed arranging served — even if only in part — as a form of self-instruction, then 1911 marked the end of Godowsky's compositional 'apprenticeship' with the publication of the Sonata (which was begun in 1896). This monumental *opus* was followed by sets such as *Walzermasken* (1912), *Triakontameron* (1919), and, for piano duet, *Miniatures* (1918). Meanwhile, the production of arrangements slowed considerably until Godowsky's interest revived in the 1920s. Generally more conservative than the earlier batch, these later arrangements include 'elaborations' of three of Bach's solo violin sonatas and partitas, and three of the solo cello suites (1924), five concert versions of Chopin's waltzes (1921–27), and two Albéniz reworkings (1921 and 1928). The flow of free compositions from Godowsky's atelier continued, however, and the 1920s saw the publication of the 'Java' Suite (1925),

the Passacaglia on Schubert's 'Unfinished' (1928), some 'Waltz Poems' (1929–30), and a selection of works for the left hand alone, a medium which Godowsky had first explored in his 'studies' on Chopin's études.

Godowsky's reputation as a composer never wholly recovered from the critical 'Niagaras of abuse' — as K. S. Sorabji memorably put it⁵ — which buffeted his 'studies' on Chopin's études. 'Godowsky the arranger' being understood as an extension of 'Godowsky the pianist', not of 'Godowsky the composer', such arrangements were generally judged as sinful aberrations in the service of Godowsky's recitals rather than as potentially valuable entities in their own right. The broad critical consensus was that the arrangements aimed at 'improving' the classics, 'modernizing' them, or amplifying their technical difficulties. Accordingly, Godowsky was indicted with 'damaging' the works he treated, with threatening the originals' standing in the repertory, with irreverence, and with compositional deficiency.⁶ It was as if Godowsky were compensating for his lack of inspiration by feeding parasitically on other composers' blood. Indeed, the conservatism of the later arrangements might well have been due, in part, to Godowsky's desire to escape such strictures: he complained that he could not face any more charges of 'sacrilege, self-advertising, conceit, lack of ideas of my own, and what not'.⁷ Not that critical opinion was much more positive about the free compositions. 'Will Godowsky the composer for piano share honors with the instrumentalist?' pondered a critic in *Musical America* in 1928.⁸ The *Musical Times* thought not, at least not in the perception of the general public.⁹ The journal held Godowsky culpable for failing 'to follow the example of the classics [by not writing] a few fairly easy and attractive things for the domestic performer', adding that 'it was a fatal omission on the part of Godowsky and Busoni to give us no Consolation in E, no Minuet in G, no Prelude in C sharp minor'. But Godowsky in fact produced much that could be tackled successfully by the amateur pianist; indeed, 'Alt Wien', from *Triakontameron*, became a minor classic. The free compositions surely suffered because they unwittingly became the victims of the criti-

¹ 'Arrangements — by Godowsky and Others', *Sunday Times* (London), 22 April 1928, p. 7.

² 'Tonality in Schubert', in *Essays in Musical Analysis: Chamber Music* (London, 1944), p. 145.

³ 'A Note', in Leopold Godowsky, *Operatic Masterpieces* (New York, 1936).

⁴ See my comments on the origins of Godowsky's E minor Sonata in my Introductory Essay for *The Godowsky Collection*, Vol. 1 (New York: Carl Fischer, 2001), p. v.

⁵ 'Leopold Godowsky as Creative Transcriber', in *Mi Contra Fa: The Immoralisings of a Machiavellian Musician* (London, 1947), pp. 62–70 (p. 68).

⁶ For a discussion of these issues, see my "'Improving the Classics": Some Thoughts on the "Ethics" and Aesthetics of musical Arrangement', *Music Review* 55 (1994): 58–75.

⁷ Godowsky quoted in Clarence Lucas, 'A Chat with Godowsky', *Musical Courier* (New York), 9 August 1928, p. 14.

⁸ Sydney Dalton, 'From Virtuoso to Composer: Godowsky Featured in New Publications', *Musical America*, 2 June 1928, p. 32.

⁹ 'Feste', 'Ad Libitum', *Musical Times* 81 (1940), p. 204.

序

1928年,英国音乐评论家欧内斯特·纽曼写道:“戈多夫斯基对别人的作品都不真正感兴趣,除非他自己在上面动刀子”。^①同年,唐纳德·托维爵士创造了一种说法——“把古典音乐‘戈多夫斯基’一下”。^②两人都将戈氏视为音乐作品改编家。后来,戈多夫斯基的改编曲最终掩盖了他原创作品光芒,就像现在这样。保罗·贝克尔评价道:“‘戈多夫斯基’成了为技巧出众的钢琴家写的改编作的代名词”。^③诚然,自1888年(戈多夫斯基18岁)起,戈多夫斯基陆续出版的早年自由创作的作品很快就被一堆大胆激进的改编曲所取代:《53首以肖邦练习曲为素材改编的练习曲》(1894—1914)、两首肖邦其他作品的释义曲(1899)、若干韦伯作品改编曲(1903—1905)、一本名为《复兴》的巴洛克作品改编曲集(1906及1909),以及一些针对小约翰·施特劳斯的华尔兹的“交响变形曲”(1912)。有证据表明,戈多夫斯基希望他的作曲技巧能在那几年中达到成熟。^④至于戈氏有多相信改编作品是一种完善技术的途径,则是一个疑问(1883年,他在柏林高等音乐学院度过了并不愉快的12周,仅在那里接受了正规的音乐“课程”,他的作曲老师包括克拉拉·舒曼的异父兄弟沃德马尔·巴吉尔)。随着1911年一首奏鸣曲的问世(该曲从1896年开始创作),他的这种“学习生涯”便告结束。这部里程碑式的作品之后,接踵而至的是《面具圆舞曲》(1912)、《三十曲》(1919),以及钢琴二重奏《小曲》(1918)。同时,戈氏改编作品的创作量明显减少,直到1920年代他才对该领域重燃兴趣。总体来说,这些晚期改编作品比早年的更保守,包括巴赫的3首无伴奏小提琴奏鸣曲和帕蒂塔,以及3首大提琴无伴奏组曲的“润饰曲”(1924)、5首肖邦圆舞曲的音乐会版本改编曲

(1921—1927),和对两首阿尔贝尼斯作品的再创作(1921和1928)。然而,戈多夫斯基的自由创作仍在继续:1920年代陆续出版了《“爪哇”组曲》(1925)、根据舒伯特《未完成交响曲》而作的“帕萨卡里亚”、若干首“圆舞曲之诗”(1929—1930),以及一些单为左手而写的作品集萃。这里所用的手法,是戈氏在他的《以肖邦练习曲为素材改编的练习曲》中初次探索过的。

K. S. 索拉布吉曾用“泛滥的尼亚加拉大瀑布”来抨击这些练习曲,令人记忆深刻。戈多夫斯基作为一个作曲家的声誉始终没能从这一批评中完全恢复过来。^⑤“改编家戈多夫斯基”是对他身为钢琴家,而不是作曲家的补充。其改编曲的潜在价值往往被忽略,相反被视作是他为了准备自己的独奏音乐会曲目而不惜歪曲原著的大逆不道之作。改编曲欲将经典作品进行现代化“改进”、并加大技巧难度的做法成了广大舆论的众矢之的。于是,戈氏被冠以“损毁”原作之名,认为他因态度轻率、作曲水平不佳而威胁到作品原本的地位^⑥,仿佛他是一条为了弥补自身灵感的不足而依附于其他作曲家的寄生虫。诚然,他后期改编曲的保守倾向很可能部分出于想避开各种苛评的愿望:他抱怨过,自己再也无法面对诸如“亵渎、自我包装、自负、缺乏主见”这样的非议。^⑦但关于他原创作品的评论也没好到哪里去。“钢琴音乐作曲家戈多夫斯基能和演奏家戈多夫斯基平起平坐吗?”——1928年的《美国音乐》期刊作了这样的考量。^⑧《音乐时报》的观点至少和主流舆论有所不同。该期刊认为,戈氏“没能超出仅仅为国内演奏家写作简单动听小曲的改编目标”是要批评的,并补充道,“戈多夫斯基和布索尼并没给我们带来E小调安慰曲、G大调小步舞曲和升C小调前奏曲的改编,这是两人极为严重的疏漏”。^⑨但期刊

① 《改编作品——由戈多夫斯基和其他人创作》,载于《周日时代》(伦敦),1928年4月22日,第7页。

② 《舒伯特的调性》,载于《音乐分析论文:室内乐》(伦敦,1944年),第145页。

③ 利奥波德·戈多夫斯基:《一份笔记》,载于《歌剧名篇》(纽约,1936年)。

④ 参见我为《戈多夫斯基作品集》(第1卷)所作的序中对戈多夫斯基E小调奏鸣曲原稿的评论,第V页(纽约,卡尔·菲舍尔出版社,2001年)。

⑤ 《富有创造力的改编家利奥波德·戈多夫斯基》,载于 *Mi Contra Fa: The Immoralising of a Machiavellian Musician* (伦敦,1947年),第62—70页(所引内容位于第68页)。

⑥ 关于这些话题的讨论,参见我的论文《“改造经典”:对改编曲“道德”和美学方面的若干思考》,载于《音乐评论》(1994年),第55期,第58—75页。

⑦ 戈多夫斯基引自克拉伦斯·卢卡斯写的《与戈多夫斯基对话》一文,《音乐信使报》(纽约),1928年8月9日,第14页。

⑧ 西德尼·达尔顿:《从炫技家到作曲家:戈多夫斯基在公众眼里的形象》,载于《美国音乐》,1928年6月2日,第32页。

⑨ 《任意》,载于《音乐时报》,第81期(1940年),第204页。

cal ammunition fired at the arrangements. Even 'Alt Wien' eventually succumbed to the onslaught.

Much of the critical censure was, needless to say, ill founded and prejudiced. Carl Engel's comments of 1923 give but one example. (By a strange turn of events, Engel — later the Editor of the *Musical Quarterly* and President of G. Schirmer — became a member of the Godowsky circle and the dedicatee of the left-hand Waltz Poems (1930).) Complaining of 'transcriptural obsessions in some musicians', he declared that 'one of the worst cases, undoubtedly, 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 [...], and all very cleverly, at that.'¹⁰ Such uninformed thinking — octave runs and double trills are actually rare in Godowsky's music — distracted attention from the broader issue at stake: Godowsky's reactionary musical language. To be sure, the *dernier cri* of the time was 'neoclassicism'. But this — actually highly elusive concept — had few points of contact with Godowsky's brand of arrangement: neoclassicism aimed at purging music of precisely the sort of anti-classical textures and procedures in which Godowsky gloried to his dying day. Godowsky was thus irrelevant to the brittle anti-Romantic modernism of the 1920s; moreover, much contemporary music was irrelevant to him. He had little time for 'ultra-modernists' (Berg's *Wozzeck* he found a 'crime upon civilization');¹¹ his horizons did not extend much beyond Richard Strauss, Szymanowski (from whom he commissioned a concerto, which was never written), and early Bartók. Yet this is not to deny Godowsky's own modernist instincts; his addiction to arranging was in no small measure a symptom of his confidence in 'progress'. But his enthusiasm for the trappings of the 'modern' age — for cinemas, aeroplanes, science — reflected a 'rationalist' modernity that balanced confidence in innovation and progress with a respect for tradition. Godowsky owed allegiance to a world which, as the art historian Werner Haftmann put it, was characterized by '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'.¹² That world, as Godowsky later came to realize, was in its death throes during his adult life.

The general stability of Godowsky's musical style is remarkable. Sure enough, there are changes of emphasis: within his arrangements, major trends include the di-

minishing appeal of structural surgery, a disinclination to rework melodies, and an increasing aversion from virtuosic effects such as glissandos, unmeasured flourishes, and cadenza figurations — devices not uncommon in the earlier music (the paraphrase of Chopin's Waltz Op. 18 even boasts a 'chromatic' glissando).¹³ None the less, the axioms of his musical idiom were set early in his career. 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 (or even superimposing two or more different pieces, as in Nos. 47 and 48 of the 'studies' on Chopin).

One hallmark of Godowsky's idiom is particularly evident in the arrangements: a certain restraint of approach, which the critic Adolph Brune termed 'discretion'.¹⁴ As seen above, the later arrangements are generally conservative in their treatment of the original texts. Such fidelity in fact had its roots in the early artefacts. Godowsky's very first essay in arranging, the version of Chopin's Étude Op. 25, No. 6 was 'strict' in its approach to the original musical materials and structure. The entire Chopin enterprise, in fact, bears the stamp of Godowsky's 'discretion'. In this sense, two broad types of work resulted from the first phase of arranging: the stricter, study arrangements (of Chopin's études, Henselt's 'Si oiseau j'étais', and Weber's Rondo from Op. 24) and the paraphrases (of Chopin's Opp. 16 and 18, Johann Strauss's waltzes, and Rameau and others in *Renaissance*). As the years clocked up, the radical paraphrase treatments lost their appeal, as did the study textures. Yet the 'strictness' inherent in the study 'type' persisted and became the structural premise of most of the later arrangements. The 1920s, in other words, saw the triumph of Godowsky's innate 'discretion'.

Stability and 'discretion': these, then, are two features of Godowsky's musical style. We may add another: *naïveté*. Admittedly, drawing parallels between Godowsky's art and the *opera* of 'naïve' painters such as Henri 'le Douanier' Rousseau (1844–1910) is problematic. To begin with, there is no readily available framework to sustain a rigorous, analytical comparison of the aesthetic qualities of the visual arts and music. Moreover, it would be misguided to argue that Godowsky was a naïve *composer*: this would suggest that he was largely untouched by contemporary culture and conventions, to posit that his work slips into a fairy-tale realm, to imply that he makes what Harold Rosenberg called a 'skilled use of

¹⁰ 'Views and Reviews', *Musical Quarterly* 9 (1923): 287–302 (p. 299).

¹¹ Godowsky, letter to Maurice Aronson, Vienna, 28 May 1931, quoted in Jeremy Nicholas, *Godowsky: The Pianists' Pianist* (Hexham, Northumberland, 1989), p. 147.

¹² *Painting in the Twentieth Century*, trans. Ralph Manheim and Janet Seligman (New York and Washington, 1965), vol. 1, p. 17.

¹³ See *infra*, note 93.

¹⁴ 'Godowsky's Chopin Studies: Technically and Aesthetically Considered', *Music* (Chicago) 17, no. 5 (February 1900).

同时指出,戈多夫斯基确实写出了很多业余弹琴者能够胜任的作品,《三十曲》中的《古老的维也纳》俨然是一首二线的经典之作。原创作品待遇不佳,因为它们不知不觉中成了评论界向改编曲开火的受害者,连《古老的维也纳》也没能最终幸免。

毋庸置疑的是,许多批评是恶意、有失公正的。卡尔·恩格尔于1923年的评论就是个例子(一次奇怪的转变后,这位未来的《音乐季刊》编辑、古斯塔夫·希尔默出版公司的总裁却成了戈多夫斯基朋友圈子中的一员,后者还将自己于1930年为左手写的《圆舞曲之诗》题献给他)。他曾指责“有些音乐家改编成癖”,并称“毫无疑问,其中最糟糕的当属利奥波德·戈多夫斯基先生。他无法克制用一连串的八度和双音颤音去处理作品,除此之外别无他法……那全都是些小聪明。”^⑩其实,八度连奏和双音颤音在戈氏作品中并不常见。他这种不严谨的说法在紧要关头分散了公众对一个更大问题——“戈氏反潮流音乐语言”的关注。确实,那个时代最时髦的是“新古典主义”。但这一事实上非常模糊的概念和戈多夫斯基改编曲的风格几乎没有共同点:新古典主义的目标是,通过去掉反古典主义的语汇来净化音乐,而戈氏一生都以运用这类语汇见长。因此他和1920年代尖锐的“反浪漫主义”现代观念并无瓜葛。而且,许多同时代的音乐都和他无关,他对“激进的现代作曲家”也鲜有兴趣(他觉得贝尔格的《沃采克》“文明中蕴含犯罪”^⑪)。他的视野差不多就到里夏德·施特劳斯、希曼诺夫斯基(戈氏曾受他委托写一部协奏曲,但从未兑现)以及巴托克早期为止。然而,这并非否认戈氏个人作为现代人的天性。他痴迷于改编作品,在很大程度上表明他有足够信心能够“与时俱进”。但他对电影院、飞机、科学这些“摩登”时代特有标志所持的热情反映出他的一种“理性”特质,使他能以一颗对传统的敬畏之心平衡创新和前进道路中的自信。戈多夫斯基深深忠诚于一个世界。如艺术史学家威尔纳·哈夫特曼所说,那个世界是“一个看上去即将达到理想境界的社会——它由人牢牢掌控着,人们一生为各种远大抱负而奋斗,对科学、组织和进步的普遍信仰通过经验得到证实。”^⑫日后戈氏逐渐意识

到,这个世界在他的成年岁月中正处于濒死前的剧痛。

戈多夫斯基的音乐风格总体上有显著的稳定性。但可以肯定的是,也存在一些重要变化:他的改编曲中,主要的变化倾向包括减少了结构上和旋律上的改动,并逐渐摒弃诸如滑音、不计时装饰音以及华彩音型等他早期作品中并不罕见的炫技手法(《肖邦〈华尔兹 Op. 18〉的释义曲》中甚至出现了一串“半音阶”滑音)^⑬。不管怎么说,戈氏的音乐语汇定势在他职业生涯的早期就已经成型了。这些风格特征包括变和弦——戈氏独特的变音以及对位风格在很大程度上依赖于此,动机凝练的织体,以及改编曲中对原作段落进行纵向拼贴的嗜好(甚至将两个或两个以上不同作品的段落叠合在一起,见《以肖邦练习曲为素材改编的练习曲》的第47和48首)。

戈氏音乐语汇的一个标志在他的改编曲中尤为明显:对原作的某种保留,批评家阿道夫·布伦纳称之为“谨慎”。^⑭如前所述,戈氏晚期改编曲在处理原作织体时总体来说较为保守。事实上,这种精确性已植根于早期一些作品中,戈氏很早的改编作——《肖邦练习曲》Op. 25, No. 6中,在处理原作的素材和结构方面非常“严谨”。其实,戈多夫斯基的“谨慎”深深融于整个肖邦王国中。从这个角度讲,戈氏第一阶段的改编曲能延伸出两种大的类型——较严谨的练习曲一类(肖邦练习曲、亨泽尔特的*Si oiseau j'étais*,以及韦伯 Op. 24 中的回旋曲)和较激进的释义曲一类(肖邦 Op. 16 和 Op. 18, 约翰·施特劳斯的圆舞曲,以及《复兴》中若干拉莫等作曲家的作品)。随着年岁的增长,释义曲中较为肆意的处理手法逐渐失欢,而练习曲中循规蹈矩的织体也是如此。但练习曲一类中的“严谨”风格仍被继承下来,成为大多数后期改编曲的构架原则。换句话说,1920年代见证了戈多夫斯基那与生俱来的“谨慎”大放异彩。

稳定和“谨慎”,这就是戈多夫斯基音乐风格的两大特征。我们或许可以加上另一个特征:“纯真”。不可否认的是,将戈氏的艺术同“纯真型”画家(诸如亨利·卢梭,1844—1910)的作品相提并论是有问题的。首先,在视觉艺术和音乐艺术的美学性质探究领域,两者间精确的分析比较并没有一个唾手可得的框架能予以支撑;其次,把戈

⑩ 《观察与评论》,载于《音乐季刊》,第9期(1923年),第287—302页(所引内容位于第299页)。

⑪ 戈多夫斯基致毛莱斯·阿伦松的信(维也纳,1931年5月),转引自杰里米·尼古拉斯:《戈多夫斯基:钢琴家中的钢琴家》(海克斯海姆,诺森伯兰郡,1989年),第147页。

⑫ 拉尔夫·曼海姆、珍内特·塞里希曼著:《二十世纪绘画》。

⑬ 参见下文第93条注释。

⑭ 《戈多夫斯基的肖邦练习曲:从技巧和美学上考虑》,载于《音乐》(芝加哥),第17期, no. 5(1900年2月)。

unskill'.¹⁵ But one can reasonably argue that there *are* naïve touches in his music, and that affinities do hold between Godowsky's circumstances and those of the naïve painter. As mentioned above, Godowsky was largely self-taught as a composer, and the 'spontaneity' of naïve art is often attributed to such a lack of formal instruction. Though 'spontaneous' might not perhaps be the *mot juste* for Godowsky's art, certainly the young Godowsky was relatively uninhibited, a condition which is not far removed from that of 'spontaneity'. This youthful audacity — patent in 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 the trammels of musical orthodoxy. There are connexions, too, with the circumstances of naïve artists in Godowsky's artistic isolation and in the stability of his musical idiom. Naïve artists, after all, tend to stand aloof from contemporary artistic developments, drawing instead upon deeply ingrained patterns of thought, following established, trusted routines.

Haftmann identifies exaggeration, or accentuation, as a key component of naïve painting.¹⁶ The naïve artist is fascinated by minutiae, with the exact definition of things, with selected representative details. In Godowsky this tendency is most apparent in the arrangements, which constantly magnify selected features of the originals: for instance, the sarabandes of *Renaissance* and the Bach 'elaborations' delight in projecting the second beat. Naïve, too, is the way Godowsky's alchemy rationalizes the originals — turning tonal sequences into real ones, tidying up phrase lengths, painstakingly rounding the forms, neatening the structural features. So is the compulsion to superimpose themes, as is the preoccupation with increasing the original textures' motivic density. In fact, for all the sophisticated veneer of Godowsky's works, one detects in them a subterranean *innocence*, Godowsky taking a pleasure in following a certain compositional drill. It is almost as if the familiar, tried-and-tested devices came to offer a comforting security; and it is perhaps for this reason that the tactics never palled.¹⁷

[The *Studien* 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.

— GODOWSKY¹⁸

Godowsky has amused himself with the études of Chopin. These transcriptions are remarkable for being technically transcendent but musically topsy-turvy.

— ALBERT LOCKWOOD¹⁹

If one considers nothing beyond this immense technical skill, the ingenuity and accomplishment of musicianship involved in these fifty or more prodigious 'glosses' upon the Chopin *Études*, they are manifestly an outstanding achievement; [...] only blind bigotry or insensate obscurantism can deny, it seems to me, that these *Studies* are a contribution to the literature of the piano not only of the highest, but of an unique order.

— SORABJI²⁰

In their time, Leopold Godowsky's *Studien über die Étüden von F. Chopin*, published between 1894 and 1914, ignited a prairie fire of comment. They acquired an infamy unprecedented in the history of piano literature, a notoriety which tarnished the composer's name for much of his career and which later obscured his considerable corpus of 'free' compositions. More significantly, they stoked the on-going debate over the 'ethics' of transcription, a debate which exposed the ambiguities, contradictions, and tensions within the broader musical ideology at the turn of the twentieth century.²¹ Certainly, Godowsky's collection was nothing if not daring. Assembled over this twenty-year period, it finally comprised fifty-three *Studien* on twenty-six Chopin études: on the twelve numbers of the Op. 10 set, on all but one from the Op. 25 set, and on the three posthumous études. Twenty-two of the *Studien* are for left hand alone, of which most aim at conjuring up in performance an aural 'illusion' of the original two-hand étude. The thirty-one two-hand *Studien*, on the other hand, engineer far-reaching transformations of Chopin's texts, amplifying their technical difficulties and re-interpreting their textures through layers of intricate, chromatic counterpoint. Little wonder that Godowsky's enterprise shocked.

¹⁵ Review of *The Flowering of American Folk Art, 1776–1876*, exhibition catalogue by J. Lipman and A. Winchester, *New Yorker*, 25 March 1974, pp. 128–32, quoted in Roger Cardinal, 'Naïve Art', vol. 22 of *The Dictionary of Art*, ed. Jane Turner (London, 1996), pp. 439–42 (p. 440).

¹⁶ *Painting in the Twentieth Century*, vol. 1, p. 173.

¹⁷ Godowsky's compositional style in relation to his arrangements is fully discussed in my *The Arrangements of Leopold Godowsky: An Aesthetic, Historical, and Analytical Study*, Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, England, 1997 (RILM 1998–07340–dd; BLDSC Microform no. D197866).

¹⁸ 'Apropos Transcriptions, Arrangements and Paraphrases', dated 11 March 1927, in *Schubert Songs: Freely Transcribed for the Piano* (New York, 1925); reprinted in *The Godowsky Collection*, Vol. 2 (New York: Carl Fischer, 2001), pp. 2–3.

¹⁹ *Notes on the Literature of the Piano* (Ann Arbor and London, 1940), p. 93.

²⁰ 'Leopold Godowsky as Creative Transcriber', p. 69.

²¹ For more details, see my 'Improving the Classics'.

多夫斯基算作“纯真型”作曲家也会引来误导:因为这也意味着他与当代文化和艺术手法风马牛不相及,假设他的作品滑落到了一种童话境地,暗示他在使用哈罗德·罗森伯格所说的“无技巧之技巧”。^⑮但有人还是能理直气壮地说,戈氏的音乐中确实有“纯真”的笔触,而且戈氏的音乐确实和那些“纯真型”画家感觉很像。如上所述,戈多夫斯基是一个自学成分很重的作曲家,那些纯真的“肺腑之声”往往被视为缺乏正规指导的产物。虽然用“肺腑之声”来形容戈氏的艺术也许并不贴切,但戈氏早年所受的约束肯定相对较少,这一点就离“肺腑之声”不远了。这种初生牛犊不怕虎的勇气——比如年纪轻轻就汇编了数量庞大的肖邦作品改编曲——一定和他早年未受到正统音乐教育的束缚有关。戈氏艺术的与世隔绝和音乐风格的稳定性也确实与那些纯真型艺术家有所联系。毕竟,纯真型艺术家倾向立足于当代艺术发展之外,而借用根深蒂固的思想,遵循约定俗成、值得信赖的手法惯例。

哈夫特曼将纯真派绘画最重要的画风定义为夸张,或者说极尽渲染。^⑯纯真派画家对细节着迷,挑选典型的细部使其纤毫毕见。到了戈多夫斯基那儿,这种趋势在改编曲中格外明显,他经常挑选原作的细节进行放大:比如《复兴》中的萨拉班德舞曲以及巴赫改编曲中乐此不疲地突出每小节第二拍。“纯真”也是戈氏组织原作的一大法宝——他将调性进行完全模进,将乐句进行整合,孜孜不倦地完善曲式,并有条不紊地组织结构。此外,不由自主地叠加主题、加厚原作织体动机的密度,也是他常用的技法。其实,在戈氏作品缜密的外表下,我们能发现有一种内在的“纯真”。戈多夫斯基热衷于使用已定型的作曲技法,仿佛这些熟悉的、经过实践和考验的手法提供了一种令人欣慰的安全感。也许由于这个原因,这种策略从未被戈氏抛弃。^⑰

因为编创了《肖邦练习曲之“练习曲”》,我就被说成是“出卖灵魂的艺匠”。即使我是个激进的改革家或政治领袖,我也不不会被这样极大地误解,我的理想

和目的也不会被这样极大地歪曲。

——戈多夫斯基^⑱

戈多夫斯基用肖邦练习曲来自娱自乐,这些改编曲从技术角度来说是卓越的,但从音乐角度来说却混乱不堪。

——艾尔伯特·洛克伍德^⑲

有人觉得这些曲子除了大量技术把戏外一无是处,但这五十多条庞大的肖邦练习曲“注释”中所含的独创性和造诣,显然是卓越的艺术成就……只有出于盲目的偏执或愚钝蒙昧的人才会否认这一点。在我看来,这些《练习曲》为丰富钢琴文献所作的贡献不仅是最大的,也是独一无二的。

——索拉布吉^⑳

在那个时代,利奥波德·戈多夫斯基于1894年到1914年间出版的《以肖邦练习曲为素材改编的练习曲》在评论界一石激起千层浪。它被冠以钢琴文献中史无前例的恶名,这恶名几乎给作曲家整个职业生涯都蒙上了阴影,日后还牵连了他的大量原创作品。更重要的是,这些作品使已经存在的关于改编曲“道德”问题的争论愈演愈烈,这场争论在19、20世纪之交,暴露了在更广泛的音乐创作思想意识中模棱两可、自相矛盾,以及一触即发的某些问题。^㉑毋庸置疑,戈氏的这个集子极为大胆。经过这20年的汇集,集子最终包含了基于肖邦26首练习曲的53首《练习曲》:改编了Op. 10的全部12首和Op. 25的11首(仅一首未改编),还有肖邦死后出版的3首。《练习曲》中有22首单为左手而作,多半为了追求原作中两只手演奏那样的音响错觉。另一方面,31首为左右手而写的《练习曲》在肖邦原作的基础上作了深入的挖掘和改动:通过错综复杂、充满变音的对位来加大原作的技术难度,并重新编排织体。无怪乎戈氏的音乐王国要被闹个天翻地覆了。

⑮ 《1776—1876年美国民间艺术的涌现》的书评,载于J. 李普曼和A. 温切斯特展览目录,《纽约人》,1974年3月25日,第128—132页,转引自罗格·加迪纳尔:《纯真派艺术》,载于简·特纳编辑:《艺术辞典》,第22卷(伦敦,1996年),第439—442页(所引用内容位于第440页)。

⑯ 《二十世纪绘画》,第1卷,第173页。

⑰ 戈多夫斯基改编曲的作曲风格在我的博士论文《利奥波德·戈多夫斯基的改编曲:美学、历史学、分析学研究》中有详细阐述(剑桥大学,英国,1997年,RILM 1998-07340-dd, BLDS Microform no. D197866)。

⑱ 《恰当的配乐曲、改编曲和释义曲》,写作日期为1927年3月11日,载于《舒伯特艺术歌曲:为钢琴作的自由改编》(纽约,1925年);再版于《戈多夫斯基作品集》第2卷(纽约,卡尔·菲舍尔出版社,2001年),第2—3页。

⑲ 《钢琴文献笔记》(安阿尔伯市和伦敦,1940年),第93页。

⑳ 《富有创造力的改编家利奥波德·戈多夫斯基》,第69页。

㉑ 更详细的内容请参见我的文章《“改造经典”》第69页。

The 'Niagaras of abuse'²² that rained on Godowsky's head for composing the *Studien* essentially accused him of committing musical blasphemy. The critics' three recurring allegations were: first, that Godowsky had rewritten Chopin's études in order to augment their technical difficulties; secondly, that in the process he had attempted to 'improve' the originals;²³ and, finally, that he had exploited Chopin in order to further his own performing career.

It did not help Godowsky that at the beginning of the twentieth century Chopin was widely taken to be the 'archetypal romantic composer'.²⁴ Neither did it help that the études themselves were generally held in the highest esteem;²⁵ it could thus scarcely be said in Godowsky's defence that his *Studien* 'rescued' obscure works by a minor composer. Accordingly, the *London Standard* and the *Musical Times* considered the arrangements simply 'unnecessary':²⁶ 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.²⁷ *The Globe* (London) complained that Godowsky's *Studien* 'tortured and twisted about almost beyond recognition' Chopin's études;²⁸ the worst offender was generally identified as the 'Badinage', a piece which combines the études Op. 10, No. 5 and Op. 25, No. 9, so that it seems that the pianist is playing both études at once. Not all commentators were as restrained as the *Morning Post*'s, who found this combination 'curious and not a little startling'; *The Globe*'s reviewer,

for instance, damned the piece as a 'monstrous perversion' — a view more recently expressed by James Methuen-Campbell.²⁹ And, unlike audiences in general, the critics were unmoved by the *Studien* which arranged the études 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.³⁰

Like this notice, many reviews readily acknowledged Godowsky's 'cleverness'; but the accolade was dubious, to say the least.³¹ Some critics conceded that though the *Studien* might serve a purpose in the practice room,³² they were ill-suited to the concert hall. A few found it convenient simply to dismiss the studies as 'jokes' or 'experiments'.³³ Similarly, some refused to take them seriously and urged others not to do so either.³⁴ Still others were plainly bewildered.³⁵

This hostility to Godowsky's *Studien* might suggest that they were compositional aberrations, that Chopin's music had never before been the subject of such attentions. Yet Godowsky's *Studien* merely contributed

²² Sorabji, 'Leopold Godowsky as Creative Transcriber', p. 68.

²³ I discuss this matter in detail in my 'Improving the Classics'.

²⁴ See Jim Samson, 'Myth and reality: a biographical introduction', in *The Cambridge Companion to Chopin*, ed. Samson (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 1–8 (p. 5), and Adam Harasowski, *The Skein of Legends Around Chopin* (Glasgow, 1967), p. 25 ff.).

²⁵ Sir Donald Francis Tovey, for instance, pronounced that 'Chopin's Etudes stand alone' (*Essays in Musical Analysis: Chamber Music* (London, 1944), p. 155) and James Gibbons Huneker deemed them 'Titanic Experiments' (*Chopin: The Man and His Music* (London, 1901), 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).

²⁶ *The Standard*, 13 June 1901, p. 5; *Musical Times* 42 (1901), p. 478. The large number of performances of Chopin's music doubtless added weight 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).

²⁷ 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.'

²⁸ *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 was probably due to a different critic's reviewing a Godowsky 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).

²⁹ *Morning Post*, 1 June 1901, p. 5; *The Globe*, 1 June 1901, p. 6; Methuen-Campbell, in *Gramophone*, February 1988, p. 1215.

³⁰ 'H. E. K.', *New York Tribune*, 13 December 1916, p. 11.

³¹ *The Athenaeum*, 15 June 1901, p. 768, and 23 March 1912, p. 347; *Daily Chronicle*, 20 March 1912, p. 7; *Daily News*, 13 June 1901, p. 6. See also Carl Engel's remarks on Godowsky's music cited earlier in this essay.

³² *Musical News*, 30 March 1912, p. 299; also implied by *The Athenaeum*, 15 June 1901, p. 768.

³³ *The Daily News*, for instance, pronounced that 'an experiment, or joke, of this sort scarcely bears repetition' (13 June 1901, p. 6).

³⁴ *The Musical News*, for instance, on 30 March 1912, p. 299. A few days earlier, *The Athenaeum* had asserted that 'such feats [as entailed in performing the studies] merely cause astonishment' (23 March 1912, p. 347).

³⁵ See the *Musical News*, 4 February 1911, pp. 107–8, and the review of Huneker's *Chopin* in the *Musical Times* 42 (1901), p. 176. Similarly, the *New York Times* remarked on the 'bewildering flux' of Godowsky's *Die Fledermaus* metamorphosis (28 November 1912, p. 10), and the *New York Tribune*, on the 'bewildering metamorphosis of the Strauss waltz "Künstlerleben"' (18 October 1915, p. 7).

因《练习曲》而“泛滥的尼亚加拉大瀑布”^②将戈多夫斯基浇个透湿。其主要矛头是认为他亵渎了肖邦的音乐。批评再三强调了以下三点：第一，戈多夫斯基改编肖邦练习曲是为了夸大其技术难度；第二，在此过程中他试图擅自“改进”原作；^③第三，他利用肖邦来拓展自己的演奏事业。

20 世纪初，肖邦被视为“浪漫主义作曲家的原型”^④对戈氏并无好处，肖邦练习曲本身至高无上的地位也对他不利。^⑤因为这样一来我们就不能为戈氏辩护，说这些《练习曲》“拯救”了一个被忽视的作曲家的作品。由此，伦敦 *The Standard* 和《音乐时报》认为这些改编曲完全“不必要”^⑥；所有戈多夫斯基以“篡改”和“糟蹋”原作所写出的东西都是些怪异的“黑白颠倒”之作——这些词充斥了整篇评论。^⑦伦敦《环球报》抱怨道，戈氏的《练习曲》将肖邦练习曲“折腾和扭曲得几乎认不出来了”；^⑧最令人气恼、一般被称为“玩笑”的，是一首将肖邦练习曲 Op. 10, No. 5, 以及 Op. 25, No. 9 拼贴起来的作品，听上去像同时在弹两首作品。不是所有的评论都像《早报》那样有所保留，说这种拼贴“很古怪，而且一点儿也不令人吃惊”。比如，《环球报》将这首曲子说成是“骇人听闻的曲解”——这是近来詹姆斯·马图恩·坎贝尔发表的观点。^⑨此外，和一般观众

不同的是，有些评论对《练习曲》中那些改编成左手练习曲的作品也同样无动于衷，《纽约论坛报》就刊登了如下文字：

用一只手去做本来必须要两只手做的事情会是一项壮举，起码能激发好奇心；但如果硬将为两只手设计的东西改成单手去做，就不能算是有什么壮举了……拳击专家可能会说，虽然将一只手绑在背后只用另一只手打败一个双手出拳的对手，需要极大的才能，但如果对手是个残疾，就不能说有多高明了。这个类比可能不大适用于戈多夫斯基先生巧妙的肖邦练习曲的演奏，但似乎可以是一个不错的参照。^⑩

和这则报道一样，许多评论很快承认了戈多夫斯基的“巧妙”之处，但这种称赞怎么说都显得闪烁其辞。^⑪一些批评虽然承认《练习曲》的创作是出于学习目的，^⑫却又说它们对于音乐厅演奏很不合适。一些人觉得干脆用“音乐玩笑”或“作曲试验”来打发这些练习曲比较省事。^⑬同理，有些人拒绝严肃看待这些作品，并怂恿别人也这么做。^⑭此外，仍有些人明显感到困惑。^⑮

对戈氏《练习曲》的这种敌意可能暗示了这些作品在创作上偏离常规，肖邦的作品之前也从未受过这般关注。但戈氏的《练习曲》只是为填补 19 世纪后半叶歌剧热潮消

② 索拉布吉：《富有创造力的改编家利奥波德·戈多夫斯基》第 68 页。

③ 更详细的讨论参见我的文章“改造经典”。

④ 参见吉姆·萨姆逊：《虚幻和真实：生平引言》，载于《剑桥肖邦指南》，萨姆逊编辑（剑桥，1992 年），第 1—8 页（所引内容位于第 5 页）；以及亚当·哈拉索夫斯基：《围绕肖邦的诸多传奇》（格拉斯哥，1967 年），第 25 页。

⑤ 譬如唐纳德·弗朗西斯·托维爵士就称：“肖邦练习曲是独立存在的”（《音乐分析论文：室内乐》，伦敦，1944 年，第 155 页）；詹姆斯·吉本斯·休内克则认为它们是“巨大的试验”（《肖邦：其人与其音乐》，伦敦，1901 年，第 139 页）；他预言说：“这些练习曲会经久不衰，会成为 19 世纪钢琴音乐的代表，就像贝多芬凝结了 18 世纪、巴赫凝结了 17 世纪的钢琴音乐”（第 212 页）。

⑥ 1901 年 6 月 13 日的 *The Standard*，第 5 页；《音乐时报》第 42 期（1901 年），第 478 页。肖邦音乐的大量演出无疑为这一评价增添了砝码；1911 年的《泰晤士报》为低水平的肖邦作品演出如此之多而感到痛惜（1911 年 5 月 22 日，第 12 页）。

⑦ 比如 1901 年 6 月 8 日的《时代报》第 7 页（“篡改”和“胡搞”）；1901 年 2 月 2 日 *The Athenaeum* 第 153 页（“胡搞”）；1901 年 6 月 1 日 *The Standard* 第 5 页和 1901 年 6 月 8 日 *The Athenaeum* 第 734 页（“糟蹋”和“被糟蹋”）；1912 年 3 月 30 日《音乐新闻》第 299 页（“坏处理”）；1901 年 6 月 13 日 *The Standard* 第 5 页（“曲解”）；1901 年 6 月 15 日 *The Athenaeum* 第 768 页（“扰乱”）。《时代报》走了民族路线：“（戈多夫斯基的）肖邦改编曲会很久都得不到英国观众的喜爱。我们可能听说，一些著名的（欧洲）大陆学报大力赞赏这些对伟大作曲家珍品的拙劣篡改，但在这个国家，我们的宗旨是让天才之作保持它原本的模样。”

⑧ 1901 年 6 月 1 日《环球报》第 6 页。11 年后，《环球报》来了个 180 度大转变，称赞戈多夫斯基的改编曲为“伟大的练习曲”（1912 年 3 月 20 日，第 6 页）。这种立场的转变可能是因为另一个评论家对戈多夫斯基某场独奏会作了不同的评价。但《伦敦音乐信使报》的评论家在一星期之后，也更正了他在 1901 年 6 月 7 日发表的看法，说这些改编曲“令人印象深刻”，还说“这些练习曲毫无疑问有很大的音乐价值”（1901 年 6 月 14 日，第 280 页）。

⑨ 见 1901 年 6 月 1 日《早报》第 5 页；1901 年 6 月 1 日《环球报》第 6 页；1988 年 2 月《留声机》第 1215 页马修恩·坎贝尔的文章。

⑩ “H. E. K.”，载于《纽约论坛报》，1916 年 12 月 13 日，第 11 页。

⑪ *The Athenaeum*，1901 年 6 月 15 日第 768 页、1912 年 3 月 23 日第 347 页；《每日历史》1912 年 3 月 20 日第 7 页；《每日新闻》1901 年 6 月 13 日第 6 页。亦可参见这篇文章前部分卡尔·恩格尔对戈多夫斯基音乐的评论。

⑫ 1912 年 3 月 30 日《音乐新闻》第 299 页；1901 年 6 月 15 日 *The Athenaeum* 第 768 页也有类似内容。

⑬ 譬如《每日新闻》称：“这种试验，或说是一种玩笑，经不起一再推敲”（1901 年 6 月 13 日，第 6 页）。

⑭ 譬如 1912 年 3 月 30 日的《音乐新闻》第 299 页。几天之前，*The Athenaeum* 声称：“这样的技艺（演奏改编练习曲所要具备的素质）只能引起惊异”（1912 年 3 月 23 日，第 347 页）。

⑮ 参见《音乐新闻》（1911 年 2 月 4 日）第 107—108 页，及对休内克撰写《肖邦》的书评，载于《音乐时报》第 42 期（1901 年），第 176 页。同样的，《纽约时报》谈到了对戈多夫斯基《蝙蝠》变形曲的“不解”（1912 年 11 月 28 日，第 10 页）；而《纽约论坛报》则对“施特劳斯圆舞曲‘维也纳森林故事’的变形曲难以理解”（1915 年 10 月 18 日，第 7 页）。

to a genre that had helped to fill the vacuum left by the demise of the operatic fantasy in the second half of the nineteenth century. This was the concert-study arrangement.³⁶ For this reason, the *Studien* had a number of precursors. Chopin's music in particular proved attractive to later nineteenth-century arrangers; by arranging his music, they could not only pay lip-service to the 'repertory concept' — by this time Chopin had secured a prestigious place in the canon³⁷ — 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 originally operated. Chopin's pieces are not the rock-solid musical artefacts prized by 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)'.³⁸ This 'fluidity from the processes of composing and inscribing right through to performing' impinged on all aspects of the pieces' transmission history.³⁹ In a rhetorical sense at least, Chopin's works themselves carried a gene that rendered the late-nineteenth-century adaptations virtually inevitable.

A brief survey should set the scene.⁴⁰ One of the earliest studies on Chopin is Brahms's arrangement of Chopin's Étude Op. 25, No. 2 (1869). There is Carl Bial's study on Op. 10, No. 2 (1873); Bial's *Clavier-Studie* (1874), modelled on Op. 25, No. 6; Bendel's study in sixths on the same étude;⁴¹ Carlyle Petersilyea's technical variant of the étude in sixths, Op. 25, No. 8 (1884);⁴² and Rafael Joseffy's arrangements of the posthumous E minor waltz (which Godowsky performed),⁴³ the Waltzes Op. 64, Nos. 1 and 2, and the Étude Op. 10, No. 5. Max Reger, in his *Fünf*

Specialstudien für Pianoforte (1899), treated Chopin's Waltzes Op. 42, Op. 64, No. 1, and Op. 64, No. 2, the Impromptu Op. 29, and the Étude Op. 25, No. 6. Isidore Philipp, the Parisian pianist-pedagogue, was another who traversed similar avenues to Godowsky. James Huneker puffed five Philipp concert paraphrases:⁴⁴ the first two on the 'Minute' Waltz; the third on Op. 25, No. 2, in which Philipp exchanges Chopin's left- and right-hand parts; the fourth on Op. 10, No. 5, which doubles the original right-hand line with additional thirds, fourths, sixths, octaves, or any other appropriate interval; and the fifth on Op. 10, No. 2, which transmutes the original into a chord study. Philipp also constructed two studies after Op. 25, No. 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 *Exercices 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 crafted 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, suggest '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'.⁴⁵

Chopin's music was occasionally arranged for the left hand alone. From the Whistling and Hofmeister catalogues,⁴⁶ one learns of versions of Op. 25, No. 11 by G. Leo (ca. 1886–91); Op. 10, No. 2 and Op. 10, No. 7 by Aloys

³⁶ See Charles R. Suttoni, *Piano and Opera: A Study of the Piano Fantasies Written on Opera Themes in the Romantic Era*, Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1973, p. 324 ff., for an account of the reasons for the passing of the operatic fantasy. One of the most important was surely the rise of the 'repertory concept', the formation of a musical canon. The 'concert-study' arrangement was the ideal successor to the opera fantasy, since it could both treat music within the canon (works such as Chopin's études) and be programmed with lengthier, more serious works.

³⁷ In 1866, a Viennese journalist noted that 'individual concert-givers scarcely dare any longer to present themselves to the public without Beethoven, Chopin, and Schumann' (*Dwight's Journal of Music*, 19 (1866), p. 112, reprinted from the Viennese magazine *Recensionen*, quoted in William Weber, *Music and the Middle Class: The Social Structure of Concert Life in London, Paris and Vienna* (London, 1975), pp. 51 and 146 n. 93). In fact, the 1860s had seen the first piano recitals which were dedicated entirely to Chopin. In 1911, the *Musical News* asserted that one of Myra Hess's recitals was 'somewhat unusual in that it contained no Beethoven or Chopin' (6 May 1911, p. 427); in another issue, it contended: 'In these days a pianist who presents a programme [which ignores] Beethoven and Chopin, can at least claim unconventionality' (16 December 1911, p. 564). For an interesting account of the 'canonization' of Chopin, see Samson, 'Chopin reception: theory, history, analysis', in *Chopin Studies 2*, ed. John Rink and Jim Samson (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 1–17, especially pp. 5–8.

³⁸ 'History and the Ontology of the Musical Work', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 51 (1992–93): 483–97 (p. 493).

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 495.

⁴⁰ A more general survey of piano, vocal, orchestral, and jazz arrangements of Chopin through the ages was undertaken by Jeremy Nicholas in his broadcasts 'Chopin by Arrangement', BBC Radio Three, 29 December 1996, 30 December 1996, 3 January 1997, and 5 January 1997.

⁴¹ This is mentioned by Huneker in *Mezzotints in Modern Music: Brahms, Tchaikowsky, Chopin, Richard Strauss, Liszt and Wagner*, 3d ed. (London, 1899), p. 270.

⁴² Also mentioned in Huneker, *Mezzotints in Modern Music*, p. 282.

⁴³ Charles Hopkins has pointed this out; see *Newsletter of the Godowsky Society*, ed. by Harry Winstanley, 3, no. 2, p. 2.

⁴⁴ *Mezzotints in Modern Music*, p. 278.

⁴⁵ 'Rafael Joseffy's Contribution to Piano Technic', *Musical Quarterly* 2 (1916): 349–64 (p. 355).

⁴⁶ For a lucid account of the labyrinthine history of the Whistling and Hofmeister catalogues, see Rudolf Elvers and Cecil Hopkinson, 'A Survey of the Music Catalogues of Whistling and Hofmeister', *Fontes Artis Musicae* 19 (1972): 1–7.

退后的空白而添砖加瓦。这些作品都是音乐会练习曲形式的改编曲。^③出于同种原因,《练习曲》有为数不少的“前辈”。肖邦的作品对 19 世纪的改编作曲家来说尤具吸引力,通过改编他的作品,不但能应付个人音乐会(当时肖邦的作品已在经典音乐文献中占有稳固地位^④),还能运用广为人知的音乐素材,这确保了能将改编曲的音乐形象和旋律清楚地呈现给观众。肖邦的音乐特别能被接受的另一个原因,关系到音乐怎样被传达,以及音乐存在本源的演奏问题。肖邦的作品不是“Urtext”公司编辑所评价的那样是硬邦邦的音乐人工制品;而应是列奥·特莱德勒尔观察到的那样:肖邦的音乐经常背离“它本应呈现的流动性”;“肖邦虽然相信创作活动的过程要有一个终点(即写在纸上),但他并不这么做”。^⑤这种“流动性来自于创作过程,并直接在演奏活动上留下烙印”,它笼罩了历来改编作的各个方面。^⑥说得花哨点,肖邦作品自身带有一种基因,使 19 世纪晚期改编曲的大量涌现成为必然之势。

应该拿一份简短的统计来交代一下肖邦作品改编曲的情况。^⑦勃拉姆斯基于肖邦练习曲 Op. 25, No. 2 的改编曲(1869)是关于肖邦音乐最早的研究之一;卡尔·拜厄 1873 年写过作品 Op. 10, No. 2 的改编练习曲;他的《钢琴练习曲》(1874)则以作品 Op. 25, No. 6 为蓝本,布伦德尔的六度练习曲也基于这首作品;^⑧此外还有卡尔利勒·彼得希尔耶根据 Op. 25, No. 8 写的技巧性改编曲(1884);^⑨拉斐尔·约瑟费对肖邦死后出版的 E 小调圆舞曲进行的改编(戈多夫斯基曾演奏过);^⑩马克思·里格的《为钢琴

写的特殊练习曲》(1899)中的圆舞曲(Op. 64, No. 1 和 No. 2)以及练习曲(Op. 10, No. 5),是基于肖邦的圆舞曲 Op. 42、Op. 64, No. 1、Op. 64, No. 2, 即兴曲 Op. 29, 以及练习曲 Op. 25, No. 6。巴黎钢琴家、教师伊斯多尔·菲利普也走过与戈氏相类似的路。詹姆斯·休内克帮菲利普的 5 首音乐会《释义曲》作过广告^⑪:前两首基于“小狗”圆舞曲;第 3 首基于 Op. 25, No. 2, 其中菲利普将肖邦的左右手声部对换了一下;第 4 首基于 Op. 10, No. 5, 右手声部在原作叠加了三度、四度、六度、八度或其他任何合适的音程;第 5 首基于 Op. 10, No. 2, 将原作改编成一首和弦织体的练习曲。菲利普还根据 Op. 25, No. 6 写了两首练习曲(1990), 其中一首再次对换了两只手的声部。

单独地、多种多样地从肖邦作品段落挑选几段进行改编的练习曲也层出不穷。菲利普就写了很多, 包括《关于肖邦作品的练习曲——只为左手而作》(1895), 其中将所选段落的右手部分严谨地编排为左手的单声部(虽然有时使用八度叠加)。阿道夫·亨泽尔特的 167 首《最后的练习曲》(约 1895)中根据肖邦音乐写的有 30 部(其中一些被扩充成音乐会练习曲)。亨利·莱维也积累了一个作品集, 名叫《肖邦的手法》(1908)。约瑟费虽然没有将他的练习曲出版, 但用爱德温·胡格斯的话说, 他暗示了“某些肖邦练习曲中的左手练习提醒我们注意这样一个事实, 即陶西格很早就将这些练习推荐给他的学生了, 比戈多夫斯基的左手改编练习曲的问世要早很多。”^⑫

肖邦的音乐还偶尔被改编成左手单手作品。根据威斯林和霍夫迈斯特目录,^⑬ 我们知道约有 G. 列奥改编的

③ 参见查尔斯·R·苏托尼:《钢琴和歌剧:浪漫主义时期基于歌剧主题而作的钢琴幻想曲研究》(博士论文, 纽约大学, 1973 年), 第 324 页, 对歌剧主题幻想曲作了回溯。最重要的一点当然是“个人音乐会”的兴起, 它是“个人作品集”的重要形成因素。“音乐会练习曲”的改编曲是歌剧幻想曲的理想继承者, 因为它既能与经典作品为伍(如肖邦练习曲), 又能处理更大、更严肃的作品。

④ 1866 年, 一个维也纳记者说道:“开个人音乐会的演奏家大多再也不敢呈现给大家一场没有贝多芬、肖邦和舒曼的演出”(《德怀特音乐学报》第 19 期, 1866 年, 第 112 页, 转载于维也纳《评论》杂志, 引自威廉姆·韦伯:《音乐和中产阶级:伦敦、巴黎、维也纳音乐会生活的社会结构》, 伦敦, 1975 年, 第 51 页, 第 146 页 n. 93)。事实上, 19 世纪 60 年代见证了第一次曲目全部是肖邦的钢琴独奏会。1911 年, 《音乐新闻》称米拉·赫斯的独奏会“因为没有贝多芬和肖邦的作品而显得有点不寻常”(1911 年 5 月 6 日, 第 427 页);在另一期中, 有这样的话:“近来, 一个在曲目单中忽略贝多芬和肖邦的钢琴家, 至少可以说是不守常规的”(1911 年 12 月 6 日, 第 564 页)。一个关于肖邦“经典作品”的有趣阐释, 请参见萨姆逊:《论肖邦音乐的接受:理论、历史及分析》, 载于《肖邦研究二》, 约翰·林克与吉姆·萨姆逊编(剑桥, 1994 年), 第 1—17 页, 尤其是第 5—8 页。

⑤ 《音乐作品的历史和本体》, 载于《美学与艺术批评学报》, 第 51 期(1992—1993 年), 第 483—497 页(所引内容位于第 493 页)。

⑥ 同上, 第 495 页。

⑦ 一份更普及的关于肖邦钢琴、声乐、管弦乐和爵士改编曲的统计在杰里米·尼古拉斯的广播节目“改编曲中的肖邦”播出过, BBC 电台 3, 1996 年 12 月 29 日、1996 年 12 月 30 日、1997 年 1 月 3 日和 1997 年 1 月 5 日。

⑧ 休内克在《现代音乐人物志:勃拉姆斯、柴科夫斯基、肖邦、里夏德·施特劳斯、李斯特和瓦格纳》第 3 版(伦敦, 1899 年)中提到(第 270 页)。

⑨ 同上, 第 282 页。

⑩ 查尔斯·霍普金斯指出了这点。见《戈多夫斯基的书信集》, 哈里·温斯坦利编辑, 3, no. 2, 第 2 页。

⑪ 《现代音乐人物志》, 第 278 页。

⑫ 《拉斐尔·约瑟费对钢琴技术所作的贡献》, 载于《音乐季刊》第 2 期(1916 年), 第 349—364 页(所引内容位于第 355 页)。

⑬ 想要了解威斯林和霍夫迈斯特目录错综复杂的历史, 可参见鲁道夫·埃尔维斯和塞西尔·霍普金森:《一份威斯林和霍夫迈斯特音乐目录的调查》, 载于 *Fontes Artis Musicae*, 第 19 期(1972 年), 第 1—7 页。

Jiraneck (ca. 1882–97); and two *Etudes de concert d'après Fr. Chopin* on Op. 10, No. 5, as well as a version of the Prelude Op. 28, No. 4, by Georges Mathias (a Chopin pupil). There is also an adaptation of the Polonaise Op. 40, No. 1, by the one-armed Géza Zichy (ca. 1880–85).⁴⁷

Godowsky's fifty-three *Studien* borrow many of these arrangements' strategies. The most conspicuous aspect of Godowsky's *Studien*, 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 1840.⁴⁸ Hence, in terms of their medium and indeed their subject-matter, the twenty-two *Studien* for left hand alone were well anticipated. One of the favourite tactics of the two-hand arrangements — to give the original right-hand part to the left hand while transferring the spirit of the left-hand part to the right — was also no novelty, being the premise of Bial's study on Op. 10, No. 2 and many of Philipp's arrangements.⁴⁹ But in other ways, Godowsky's *Studien* diverge from the tradition. They fight shy of superficial doubled figurations, such as those that hold rein in Brahms's study,⁵⁰ Reger's version of the Impromptu Op. 29, or the versions of the 'Minute' Waltz by Joseffy (1879), Moriz Rosenthal (1884), Philipp (1886), Giuseppe Ferrata (1902), Moritz Moszkowski (ca. 1919), and Josef Hofmann.⁵¹ Moreover, Godowsky's *Studien* 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 by virtue of their personality and vitality, qualities which elude many earlier or contemporary Chopin arrangements. In this regard, the *Studien* emulate Chopin's originals in seeking to transcend the strait waistcoat of the study idiom.

Godowsky did own that his reworkings intended 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 it's [*sic*] possibilities in tone colouring [...].'⁵² 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'.⁵³ The technical aspect was more intellectual than physical, and embraced 'Rhythm, Tempo, Accent, Phrasing, Dynamics, Agogics, Touch, etc.'. ⁵⁴ The third facet denoted the 'emotional or artistic phase of piano playing'.⁵⁵ Since 'technique' was for Godowsky different from 'mechanics' (he asserted: 'I place technic [*sic*] on a higher plane than mechanism'),⁵⁶ he declined to take umbrage when critics labelled him as a technician⁵⁷ — even though in such instances Godowsky was doubtless being charged with being 'simply a *mechanicus*', to borrow Mozart's put-down of Clementi.⁵⁸

Mozart held that Clementi's strength lay in his dextrous ability to perform passages in thirds with his right hand.⁵⁹ The Chopin-Godowsky *Studien*, though, were the product of an experiment with playing thirds with the *left* hand. In 1893, Godowsky explained, his brother-in-law and his wife were among the hundred or so people who perished in 'the most terrible railroad accident in the history of America, happening near Battle Creek, Michigan'.⁶⁰ Godowsky went on:

⁴⁷ In addition to Mathias's version of Op. 28, No. 4, there is James Friskin's study version for left hand of the Prelude in B flat minor, Op. 28, No. 16 (1936). Otherwise, Chopin's preludes, polonaises, and mazurkas generally escaped such treatments. It is difficult to determine the reason for this. With regard to the preludes, Nicholas has suggested that it might be due to their deeply personal idiom (in 'Chopin by Arrangement', BBC Radio Three broadcast, 5 January 1997). And doubtless the 'national' idiom of the polonaises and mazurkas afforded them a degree of 'protection'.

⁴⁸ See Theodore Edel, *Piano Music for the Left Hand Alone*, D.M.A. diss., Manhattan School of Music (New York), 1980, p. 1, for an account of the rise of music for this medium; for a comprehensive list of works, see Edel's Chapter 4, pp. 120–40.

⁴⁹ This procedure also directs the versions of the Rondo from Weber's Sonata, Op. 24, by Brahms (1852) and Tchaikovsky (1871). Godowsky, too, arranged this movement (Berlin, 1903).

⁵⁰ But consider Kevin Korsyn's reading of Brahms's arrangement in 'Towards a New Poetics of Musical Influence', *Music Analysis* 10 (1991): 3–72 (pp. 17–18), where he contends that Brahms's 'transcription has a covert purpose, in addition to its obvious function as a virtuoso technical exercise: it is also a compositional study, a study in phrase expansions' (p. 17).

⁵¹ Hofmann's version is unpublished. A recording of Hofmann performing it in April 1938 at the Curtis Institute of Music, Philadelphia, was broadcast by Nicholas in 'Chopin by Arrangement', BBC Radio Three, 30 December 1996.

⁵² 'Introductory remarks', *Studien über die Etüden von F. Chopin*, p. iii.

⁵³ Godowsky, 'The Real Significance of Technic', in *Great Pianists on Piano Playing*, by James Francis Cooke (1913; reprinted Philadelphia, 1976), pp. 133–42 (p. 133).

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

⁵⁶ In Harriette Brower, *Piano Playing — Second Series* (New York, 1917), extract printed in *Newsletter of the Godowsky Society*, ed. Winstanley, 6, no. 1, pp. 13–19 (p. 17).

⁵⁷ See John G. Hinderer, 'Listening in at a Godowsky Master Class', *Musician* (New York), July 1933, reprinted in *After Midnight Thoughts*, ed. Paul Howard, no. 14, pp. 176–79 (p. 177).

⁵⁸ Letter to his father, Vienna, 12 January 1782, printed in *The Letters of Mozart and His Family*, ed. and trans. Emily Anderson, rev. Stanley Sadie and Fiona Smart, 3d ed. (Basingstoke, 1985), pp. 791–92 (p. 792).

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ Pedagogic Experiments at the Two Extremes of Pianism', *Overtures* (Curtis Institute of Music, Philadelphia) 8 (1938): 37–40 (p. 38).

Op. 25, No. 11(约 1886—1891),阿洛伊斯·伊拉内克的 Op. 10, No. 2 和 Op. 10, No. 7(约 1882—1897),乔吉斯·马提亚斯(肖邦的学生)根据 Op. 10, No. 5 写的两首《弗雷德里克·肖邦音乐会练习曲》,以及一首《前奏曲》Op. 28, No. 4 的改编曲。此外,还有独臂作曲家盖扎·季奇改编的《波洛奈兹》Op. 40, No. 1(约 1880—1885)。^{④⑦}

戈多夫斯基的《练习曲》借鉴了这些作品很多创作手法。《练习曲》最引人注目的地方——对左手的处理也许最缺乏原创性。单为左手写的钢琴作品——包括改编曲和原创作品(通常是练习曲)——在约 1840 年就开始大量涌现。^{④⑧}因此,就它们的处理手法和内容而言,这 22 首左手练习曲不足为奇。其他常规改编曲最主要的特征之一——将原作左右手声部对换——也并无新意,早有拜厄基于 Op. 10, No. 2 写的练习曲以及菲利普的许多改编作为先导。^{④⑨}但戈氏的《练习曲》在其他方面背离了传统。他尽量避免使用肤浅的双音音型,这些音型在他的勃拉姆斯练习曲中大量出现,^{⑤⑩}里格改编的《即兴曲》Op. 29、约瑟费(1879)、莫利兹·罗森塔尔(1884)、菲利普(1886)、朱赛培·费拉塔(1902)、莫利兹·莫什科夫斯基(约 1919),以及约瑟夫·霍夫曼改编的《“小狗”圆舞曲》等也是如此。^{⑤⑪}而且,戈氏的《练习曲》显得鹤立鸡群,不仅是因为那史无前例的规模和富有条理的创作,更因为它们自身的特点、活力和质量好过许多同时代及之前的肖邦改编曲。就这一点而言,《练习曲》向肖邦原作

靠拢时也在不断寻求一种超越狭隘的练习曲风格的表现手法。

戈多夫斯基确实承认这些改编曲意在“拓展钢琴演奏技术、技巧以及音乐上存有的可能性;意在将这门乐器最适宜的特有属性向复调、复节奏、复重音的方向发展;意在扩展它在音色表现范围上的可能性……”^{⑤⑫}“技术、技巧和音乐可能性”各自间的区别,经常成为戈氏对钢琴演奏原则的最佳阐释。技术方面包括“钢琴学习中一切与提高手指技术有关的练习的分支”。^{⑤⑬}所谓技巧则比生理机能层面更高明一点,包括“节奏、速度、重音、分句、力度、缓急、触键等等”。^{⑤⑭}“音乐可能性”则包含“钢琴演奏时艺术化或情感化的分句”。^{⑤⑮}因为“技术”和“技巧”对戈氏来说不是一回事(他声称:“我将技巧置于一个比技术更高的位置”),^{⑤⑯}故他被评论界视为“技巧家”时并不动怒^{⑤⑰}——尽管同时,他因借鉴莫扎特所不屑的克莱门蒂的某一手法^{⑤⑱}而毫无疑问地也被视为一个“单纯的技术专家”。

莫扎特认为,克莱门蒂的本事无非是能用右手敏捷地连续弹三度双音。^{⑤⑲}戈氏的这些肖邦《练习曲》却尝试用左手弹奏三度。1893 年,戈氏解释说,他的小舅子和妻子是百来位“发生于密歇根州巴特尔克里克市,美国史上最恐怖的铁路事故”遇难者的一分子。^{⑥⑰}他接着说:

“那段时间我一直在弹肖邦练习曲的三度双音作品。为了分散注意力以不至于沉陷在这个悲剧中,我一门心思地为这首练习曲开发一套更可行的

④⑦ 除了马提亚斯改编的 Op. 28, No. 4, 还有詹姆斯·弗里斯金改编的降 B 小调前奏曲(Op. 28, No. 16)的左手练习曲版本(1936 年)。除此之外,肖邦的前奏曲、波洛奈兹和玛祖卡则较少被改编,很难确定其中的原因。关于前奏曲,尼古拉斯认为这可能和它们强烈的个体风格有关(BBC 广播节目“改编曲中的肖邦”,1997 年 1 月 5 日)。毫无疑问,波洛奈兹和玛祖卡的“民族”风格为它们提供了某种“保护”。

④⑧ 要了解这一音乐类型是怎样兴起的,参见希奥多勒·艾德尔:《左手单手钢琴音乐》(硕士论文,纽约,曼哈顿音乐学校,1980 年),第 1 页。要具体作品的清单,参见第 4 章,第 120—140 页。

④⑨ 这种手法在勃拉姆斯(1852 年)和柴科夫斯基(1871 年)对韦伯奏鸣曲(Op. 24)回旋曲乐章的改编曲中亦占主导地位。戈多夫斯基也改编过这一乐章(柏林,1903 年)。

⑤⑩ 但要考虑到凯文·柯辛对勃拉姆斯改编曲的解读——*Towards a New Poetics of Musical Influence* 一文中(载于《音乐分析》,第 10 期,1991 年,第 3—72 页,所引内容位于第 17—18 页),称勃拉姆斯的改编曲“除了明显的技巧训练功能外,有个隐藏的目的:这是一部作曲习作,一部训练乐句扩展的习作”(第 17 页)。

⑤⑪ 霍夫曼的版本没有出版,1938 年 4 月他在费城柯蒂斯音乐学院的一份演出录音,曾在尼古拉斯的广播节目“改编曲中的肖邦”播出过(BBC 广播三台,1996 年 12 月 30 日)。

⑤⑫ “序评”,载自《肖邦练习曲研究》,第 iii 页。

⑤⑬ 戈多夫斯基:《技巧的真正重要性》,载于《伟大钢琴家》,詹姆斯·弗朗西斯·库克著(1913 年,1976 年于费城再版),第 133—142 页(所引内容位于第 133 页)。

⑤⑭ 同上,第 134 页。

⑤⑮ 同上,第 135 页。

⑤⑯ 见哈丽特·布劳尔:《钢琴演奏——系列二》(纽约,1917 年),摘要刊载于《戈多夫斯基书信集》,温斯坦利编,6, no. 1, 第 13—19 页(所引内容位于第 17 页)。

⑤⑰ 参见约翰·G. 辛德勒:《在戈多夫斯基大师班聆听》,载于《音乐家》(纽约,1933 年 7 月),再刊于保罗·霍华德编:《午夜后的思考》,no. 14, 第 176—179 页(所引内容位于第 177 页)。

⑤⑱ 见“给父亲的信”(维也纳,1782 年 1 月 12 日),载于《莫扎特书信集》第 3 版,艾米莉·安德森编辑并翻译,斯坦利·萨迪及菲欧娜·斯马特修订,(巴辛斯托克,1985 年),第 791—792 页(所引内容位于 792 页)。

⑤⑲ 同上。

⑥⑰ 《钢琴教学法的两极试验》,载于《泛音》,第 8 期(柯蒂斯音乐学院,费城,1938 年),第 37—40 页(所引内容位于第 38 页)。

I had been practising at that time the Double-Thirds Etude of Chopin. In trying to divert my thoughts so that I would not brood over this tragic event, I concentrated on evolving a more practical fingering for the double-notes of this Etude. 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 see whether the same fingering could be applied to it; 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 which had special mechanical problems as their object. Thus I transcribed the Black-Key Study, the Study in Sixths, the Study in Wide Arpeggios (Op. 10, No. 1), etc., etc. 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.⁶¹

The New York *Musical Courier* in 1906 sketched 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'.⁶² A glance at the ten Chopin-Godowsky *Studien* 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 indicated by the early titles. For instance, in 1894 Godowsky's first Chopin arrangement was misleadingly advertised as a version of Op. 25, No. 6 'arranged for the left hand'. Actually, the arrangement is scored for both hands; it essentially exchanges Chopin's right-hand and left-hand figurations.⁶³

There is some truth, too, in the suggestion that the *Studien* contributed to Godowsky's prestige as a concert

pianist, though the extent to which they were primarily crafted to this end is debatable. Certainly, the *Studien* 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 gave excellent exposure to his compositional gifts and the *Studien* themselves. In addition, he was able to answer commentators who argued that the *Studien* were unplayable.⁶⁴ The audiences on the whole were electrified; evidently they did not share the critics' distaste. The *Westminster Gazette*, for instance, noted that the *Studien* 'exhausted all [the] hearers' superlatives'.⁶⁵ The *New York Tribune* in 1914 stated that they elicited 'long and prolonged applause'.⁶⁶ 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, noting how 'the audience stood up as one man to gaze in astonishment at the figure on the stage that was performing miracles at a piano'.⁶⁷ In fact, so spectacular were Godowsky's performances that Rosenthal intimated that, had he written the *Studien*, he would have published them only after having puzzled audiences for many years as to how he played two études at a time and how he made such 'elaborate combinations'.⁶⁸

For Godowsky, though, the *Studien* had an additional, more serious purpose. For he believed that the *Studien* heralded a new era in the history of piano literature, by virtue of their demands on the left hand. Godowsky mused, '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 extended [sic] to both hands!'⁶⁹ Whilst acknowledging his predecessors in left-hand composition, he complained that their pieces, unlike his left-hand *Studien*, intended mostly to 'develop the left hand in the direction of mere virtuosity'.⁷⁰ His left-hand music,

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² *Musical Courier* 12 (1906), reprinted in *Newsletter of the Godowsky Society*, ed. Winstanley, 8, no. 1, pp. 5–6 (p. 6).

⁶³ The ten arrangements that Godowsky published in 1899 and many of his concert programmes bear this ambiguous locution, as do a number of contemporary accounts of similar arrangements (see also Huneke, *Mezzotints in Modern Music*, p. 277). This ambiguity prompted the *Musical Courier* (see preceding note) mistakenly to claim that the arrangement of Op. 25, No. 6 was for the 'left hand alone'.

⁶⁴ Carl Flesch recalled that 'on one occasion, I saw Theodor Leschetizky, Josef Hofmann and Wladimir von Pachmann crowd round him in the profoundest admiration while he played one of his Chopin arrangements, whose difficulties seemed wellnigh inconceivable even to these sovereign exponents of the instrument' (*The Memoirs of Carl Flesch*, trans. Hans Keller, and ed. by him in collaboration by C. F. Flesch (London, 1957), p. 201). Edel, too, has expressed his doubts as to whether some of the *Studien* for the left hand alone are playable, arrangements such as that of Op. 25, No. 12 (*Piano Music for the Left Hand Alone*, p. 112) — though pianists such as Carlo Grante and Marc-André Hamelin have risen to the challenge with aplomb in their recent recordings (Altarus AIR-CD-9092, Altarus AIR-CD-9093 (1993, 1995); Hyperion CDA674411/2 (1998, 1999) respectively).

⁶⁵ 14 June 1901, p. 2. In the same month, Arthur Friedheim performed Godowsky's version of Chopin's Op. 25, No. 6 in London as part of his Chopin selection. The *London Musical Courier* remarked that the performance 'evoked great enthusiasm' (21 June 1901, p. 304).

⁶⁶ 4 March 1914, p. 7.

⁶⁷ 'Tribute to Leopold Godowsky at Memorial Services', delivered in Los Angeles, 28 November 1938, printed in *After Midnight Thoughts*, ed. Howard, no. 9, pp. 97–98 (p. 98). Leonard Liebling, the editor of the *New York Musical Courier*, confirmed this: 'It was particularly these left hand studies that swept Berlin by storm.' ('Godowsky's Berlin Debut', *Musical Courier* (New York), May 1934, reprinted in *After Midnight Thoughts*, ed. Howard, no. 18, p. 235.)

⁶⁸ Godowsky, letter to Maurice Aronson, Berlin, 15 July 1901, quoted in Nicholas, *Godowsky*, p. 58.

⁶⁹ 'Special remarks on the studies for the left hand alone', *Studien über die Etüden von F. Chopin*, p. vii.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

双音指法。经过无数次试验,我成功地找到了一种全新的、在我看来最为有效的指法。随后,我将相同的指法移植到左手上,看看是否行得通。让我大吃一惊的是,我发现这个试验的结果是左手弹起来比右手更顺。

一旦意识到了这点,我就又试了其他几首以特殊技术问题为其训练目的的练习曲,由此改编了《黑键练习曲》、六度练习曲、Op. 10, No. 1 等琶音练习曲等等。我改编得越多,越是发现左手能和右手同样应付技术难点。”^{⑥1}

1906 年纽约《音乐信使报》做了篇类似的报道,认为这些改编曲的诞生源于戈氏试图在大拇指不连弹两次白键的情况下,能用右手连续弹奏带变音三度的愿望。为了寻求一种全新、简便的能保证连奏效果的方法,戈多夫斯基将目光投向了肖邦三度练习曲。他对结果如此满意,以至将其改编成“左手作品”。^{⑥2}只消瞥一眼 1899 年出版的 10 首肖邦-戈多夫斯基《练习曲》,就能马上说出左手声部的写作情况:凡是左手被精心配上指法的地方,右手都没有(戈氏在后来的版本中弥补了这点差异)。对左手的这种偏袒同样体现于早期作品的标题中。比如,1894 年戈氏第 1 首肖邦改编曲,被错误地宣传为 Op. 25, No. 6 的“左手改编版”。其实,作品是为两只手同时谱曲的,将肖邦的左右手声部音型对换才是其精髓。^{⑥3}

《练习曲》对戈氏成为一名音乐会钢琴家有帮助这一说法,是有一定道理的,虽然这些作品在创作之初在多大程度上指向这个目的具有争议。可以肯定的是,《练习

曲》在戈氏早期演奏生涯中曾享有特殊地位。通过在音乐会上挑选若干作品演奏,戈多夫斯基不仅展示了他的技巧才能,也使他的作曲天赋和《练习曲》自身大放异彩。此外,他还能回击那些说《练习曲》无法弹奏的评论家。^{⑥4}观众从总体上来说是被震撼了,显然他们没受负面批评的影响。如《威斯敏斯特公报》提到,《练习曲》“使最好的听众都感到酣畅淋漓”。^{⑥5}《纽约论坛报》于 1914 年称,《练习曲》赢得了“经久不息的掌声”。^{⑥6}当谈到戈氏 1900 年在柏林成功举行的首演时,路易斯·布伦贝格回忆了他怎样“凭借肖邦的改编曲像颗流星似的在我们头顶上呼啸而过”,观众怎样“站起身诧异万分地盯着台上那个在钢琴上创造奇迹的人”。^{⑥7}的确,戈氏的演出如此精彩,惹得罗森塔尔明确表示,如果《练习曲》是他写的,他会通过展示他怎样同时弹两首练习曲,怎样做到这种“精巧的结合”而把观众唬得眼花缭乱很多年,卖足关子以后才会出版。^{⑥8}

尽管如此,对戈多夫斯基来说,这些《练习曲》有个额外的、更为严肃的目的。因为他相信,《练习曲》凭借它们对左手声部的要求,会在钢琴文献史上预示一个新时代的到来。戈氏若有所思地说:“如果能将通常要求双手同时弹奏的作品改为仅用左手弹,一旦这种做法分别扩展到两只手,那对未来的作曲家来说是打开了怎样的前景啊!”^{⑥9}在谈到前辈们的左手作品时他并不服气,说他们的作品和他的左手《练习曲》不同,几乎都是“将左手朝着仅仅是炫技的方向发展。”^{⑦0}而戈氏的左手音乐创作,则定位成“单为左手设定的一项与现代发展要求相契合的任务,通过音

⑥1 同上。

⑥2 《音乐信使报》,第 12 期(1906 年),再刊于《戈多夫斯基书信集》,温斯坦利编,8, no. 1, 第 5—6 页(所引内容位于第 6 页)。

⑥3 戈多夫斯基 1899 年出版的 10 首改编曲和众多音乐会曲目中有许多指示都含混不清,当代很多改编曲也是这样(参见休内克:《现代音乐人物志》,第 277 页)。这种含混使得《音乐信使报》(见前注)错误地以为 Op. 25, No. 6 的改编曲是“单为左手而作的”。

⑥4 卡尔·弗莱什回忆道:“有一回,我见到西奥多·莱谢蒂茨基、约瑟夫·霍夫曼和弗拉基米尔·德·帕赫曼怀着最深的仰慕之情围在他身边,看他弹一首肖邦的改编曲,曲子的难度甚至连那些造诣最高的演奏家也难以驾驭”(《卡尔·弗莱什回忆录》,汉斯·凯勒译,与 C. F. 弗莱什一同编订,伦敦,1957 年,第 201 页)。艾德尔也对某些左手单手练习曲是否可以弹表示怀疑,如 Op. 25, No. 12 的改编曲(《单为左手而作的钢琴音乐》,第 112 页)——尽管卡罗·格兰特和马克·安德烈·汉梅林这样的钢琴家在最近的录音中从容地成功应付了它们(分别是 Altarus AIR-CD-9092, Altarus AIR-CD-9093, 1993, 1995; Hyperion CDA674411/2, 1998, 1999)。

⑥5 1901 年 6 月 14 日,第 2 页。同月,阿图尔·弗里德海姆在伦敦演奏了戈多夫斯基的肖邦 Op. 25, No. 6 的改编曲,将其作为他的肖邦系列演出中的一首。《伦敦音乐信使报》评价这场演出“引起了巨大的热情”(1901 年 6 月 21 日,第 304 页)。

⑥6 1914 年 3 月 4 日,第 7 页。

⑥7 《回忆利奥波德·戈多夫斯基》,1938 年 11 月 28 日于洛杉矶出版,刊于《午夜后的思考》,霍华德编, no. 9, 第 97—98 页(所引内容位于第 98 页)。纽约《音乐信使报》的编辑莱奥纳德·利伯林说:“这些左首练习曲太特别了,它们在柏林掀起了一场风暴”(《戈多夫斯基的柏林首演》,载于《音乐信使报》,纽约,1934 年 5 月);再刊于《午夜后的思考》,霍华德编, no. 18, 第 235 页)。

⑥8 戈多夫斯基给毛瑞斯·阿伦松的信(柏林,1901 年 7 月 15 日),转引自《戈多夫斯基》,尼古拉斯著,第 58 页。

⑥9 《左手单手练习曲的特别注释》,载于《以肖邦练习曲为素材改编的练习曲》,第 vii 页。

⑦0 同上。

though, assigned 'to the left hand alone a task commensurate with the demands made by the modern evolution in the means of musical expression'.⁷¹ In a word, the *Studien* consciously attempted to lift both piano technique and musical expression onto a new level on the pianistic Parnassus. A staunch modernist, Godowsky set much store by the concept of 'progress', and the *Studien* were his contribution to the 'strides which modern composition and instrumentation have made in the direction of polyphony, harmony, tone colouring and the use of a vastly extended range in modern counterpoint'.⁷²

More light can be shed on Godowsky's project by constructing the chronology of composition. This task is problematic, however; for though publication data are readily available, many of the precise dates of composition are obscure. Only two of the *Studien* in the current 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.⁷³ 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'.⁷⁴ Given that the holographs of ten other *Studien*, deposited in the Library of Congress, Washington D.C., bear annotations not printed by Lienau,⁷⁵ 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 *Studien* — 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*.⁷⁶ Godowsky

owned that the first was written in 1893;⁷⁷ this was published in 1894 by H. Kleber. In 1899, G. Schirmer issued nine more *Studien* and a revision of the 1894 study. 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, issued jointly by Lienau (Berlin), Schirmer (New York), and Haslinger (Vienna). At the same time, the 1899 arrangements were lightly revised and re-engraved for the new enterprise. Released with the 1903 *Studien* was a list imparting details of all fifty arrangements that would make up the final collection. Six new *Studien* joined the programme in 1909, their numbers bearing 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. But because eight *Studien* on these lists were not published, the final total came to fifty-three.

It is possible to draw some conclusions about the chronology of the *Studien*'s composition by analysing the available documentary evidence other than the publication dates. This includes, of course, Godowsky's annotations mentioned above; Adolph Brune's essay on the *Studien*, dated February 1900;⁷⁸ other early references to the *Studien*, for instance by Huneke;⁷⁹ Godowsky's recital programmes, which supply dates of performances; and the 1903 and 1909 lists, which give some descriptions of the forthcoming, as yet unpublished *Studien*. From these sources, it is possible to surmise that the production of the *Studien* divided into three phases. Most of the 'strict transcriptions' (to use Godowsky's term), in which the two hands exchange their original parts, were published by 1899; they were the immediate fruit of Godowsky's 1893

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ I use the abbreviation 10/9ii (18) to denote Godowsky's second arrangement of Chopin's Étude Op. 10, No. 9, numbered 18 in Godowsky's set. 'N.E.' refers to Chopin's *Trois Nouvelles Études*, without opus number.

⁷⁴ I am indebted to Dr Christhard Frese of Robert Lienau Musikverlag for this information. The second annotation, dated 1908, is questionable. The study 10/5i (7) was first published in 1899 and revised and re-engraved in 1903. Leonard S. Saxe, in his account of the publication history of the *Studien* ('The Published Music of Leopold Godowsky', *Notes* (Music Library Association, Second Series) 14 (1956-57): 165-83 (pp. 173-76)), does not mention any 1908 revisions; there is no evidence to suggest that any of the 1899 *Studien* were re-engraved after 1905. In view of Lienau's inconsistency in printing these annotations, it is possible that this annotation belongs elsewhere.

⁷⁵ I am indebted to the Music Section of the Library of Congress for forwarding me copies of these holographs.

⁷⁶ Saxe, 'The Published Music of Leopold Godowsky', pp. 173-76.

⁷⁷ 'Pedagogic Experiments at the Two Extremes of Pianism', pp. 37-38.

⁷⁸ 'Godowsky's Chopin Studies: Technically and Aesthetically Considered', *Music* (Chicago) 17, no. 5 (February 1900), reprinted in *Newsletter of the Godowsky Society*, ed. Winstanley, 8, no. 1, pp. 11-17 (p. 11). Brune 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'. Five months after the publication of Brune's article, another piece in *Music* appeared (July 1900), by an unknown writer. This refers to the '30' Chopin *Studien* composed since the publication of the 1899 batch and states: 'During [Godowsky's] summer at Wilmette, in 1899, he wrote some 15 paraphrases of the Chopin Studies, and later added 15 more, intending to finish more during the voyage — i.e. to add fingerings and pedal marks.' (Reprinted in *Newsletter of the Godowsky Society*, ed. Winstanley, 9, no. 2, pp. 11-13 (p. 12).) Unfortunately, the author reveals little of these unpublished *Studien*'s identities that cannot be gleaned from Brune's piece. It is plausible, though, that the 'eighteen or twenty' *Studien* in manuscript to which Brune refers are essentially the '19' delivered to the publisher mentioned in the July 1900 article.

⁷⁹ Huneke writes in his *Chopin*: 'In 1894 I saw in manuscript some remarkable versions of the Chopin Studies by Leopold Godowsky' (p. 208). He proceeds to discuss all the arrangements published in 1899. But it is unclear from the discussion which of these he actually saw in manuscript in 1894.