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ABSTRACT

In this document I will examine Alexander Siloti’s (1863-1945) fourteen transcriptions for solo piano of works by J. S. Bach (1685-1750) that are currently in print. I will compare all of these transcriptions to Bach’s originals and discuss Siloti’s musical treatment of Bach’s music. When possible and relevant, I will compare certain works to transcriptions of the same pieces by contemporaries of Siloti, including Ferruccio Busoni (1866-1924), Ignaz Friedman (1882-1948), Wilhelm Kempff (1895-1991), Camille Saint-Saëns (1835-1921), and Theodor Szántó (1877-1934). I will also consider other Bach transcriptions made by Siloti in instances where he completed a solo piano transcription and one or more transcriptions of the same work for other instrumental combinations. It is my hope that pianists will become acquainted with a small but excellent body of work by a neglected artist due to this examination of Siloti’s Bach transcriptions. To this end I will give a brief overview of the history of the nineteenth century piano transcription, Bach as a transcriber, and the legacy of Bach’s music as transcribed for the piano. I will also provide important details about Siloti’s biography, and discuss his style and technique as a transcriber of Bach’s music. Lastly, I will examine Siloti’s fourteen Bach transcriptions for solo piano in detail.
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this document is to examine the musical life and work of the neglected Russian-American pianist, pedagogue, impresario, conductor, arranger, and editor, Alexander Siloti (1863-1945). More specifically, I will be focusing on the fourteen transcriptions for solo piano by Siloti of works by J. S. Bach (1685-1750) that are currently in print.

I will begin by discussing Siloti’s background and biography. I will then place his transcriptions into historical context by first discussing Bach as a transcriber, providing a brief history of the nineteenth century piano transcription together with the Lisztian tradition of transcribing Bach’s music. I will then give a brief overview of Siloti’s editions of Bach’s music and of his Bach transcriptions, including works for solo piano, two pianos, piano with other instruments, and works for ensembles without piano. Finally, I will examine fourteen of Siloti’s Bach transcriptions for solo piano.

In this final section, I will start by discussing common characteristics present in Siloti’s approach as a transcriber of Bach’s music. I will then consider each piece individually. I will compare musical elements of each of these pieces to Bach’s originals upon which they are based. Where possible and relevant, I will compare Bach transcriptions by Siloti, to transcriptions of the same works by contemporaries of Siloti including Ferruccio Busoni (1866-1924), Ignaz Friedman (1882-1948), Wilhelm Kempff (1895-1991), Camille Saint-Saëns (1835-1921), and Theodor Szántó (1877-1934). I will also consider other Bach transcriptions made by Siloti in instances where he completed a solo piano transcription and one or more transcriptions of the same work for other instrumental combinations. In these ways, I hope to highlight Siloti’s extraordinary
ability as a transcriber of Bach’s music and his distinctive style of transcribing for the piano.

The first time that I heard Siloti’s Bach piano transcriptions was in 2001 at a piano recital by Joseph Banowetz in South Africa. Mr. Banowetz played the “Prelude in B minor” from the Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann Bach, BWV 855a, and the “Prelude” from Prelude and Fugue in G minor for Organ, BWV 535. At the time both of these transcriptions were out of print. In 2004, I discovered The Alexander Siloti Collection,¹ which is an album comprised of piano transcriptions by Siloti, as well as piano works edited by Siloti. This collection contains all fourteen transcriptions for solo piano of works by J. S. Bach, which are the focus of this document. Amongst these pieces are the two that were played by Mr. Banowetz in 2001. It is here that my exploration of Siloti’s art began.

My earliest desire for my DMA document was to present an examination of as many of Siloti’s Bach transcriptions as I was able to acquire. Since the scope of this enterprise proved to be too broad, I decided to dedicate my examination of Siloti’s abilities as a transcriber to the fourteen Bach transcriptions for solo piano that are currently in print.

The works that will be discussed in detail in my document are listed below:

1. “Adagio” from Sonata for Violin and Keyboard, BWV 1018
2. “Air” from Orchestral Suite No. 3, BWV 1068
3. “Andante” from Violin Sonata No. 2, BWV 1003
4. “Chaconne” from Violin Partita No. 2, BWV 1004

5. “Fantasia” from *Fantasia and Fugue in C minor*, BWV 906
6. *Paraphrase on the Prelude in C sharp major*, BWV 872
7. “Prelude” from *Cantata* No. 29, BWV 29
8. “Prelude” from *Cantata* No. 35, BWV 35
9. “Prelude” from *Prelude and Fugue for Organ in E minor*, BWV 555
10. “Prelude” from *Cello Suite* No. 4, BWV 1010
11. “Prelude in B minor” from the *W. F. Bach Büchlein*, BWV 855a
12. “Prelude” from *Prelude & Fugue for Organ in G minor*, BWV 535
13. “Siciliano” from *Sonata for Flute and Keyboard*, BWV 1031
14. *Toccata & Fugue for Organ in D minor*, BWV 565

As is evident from this list, most of the works are excerpted movements from larger works. Amongst the pieces are works that were originally for solo violin, solo cello, or solo organ, as well as orchestral movements, and chamber works. Several of the transcriptions are actually paraphrases of works that Bach originally composed for solo keyboard: these include the “Fantasia” from BWV 906, the *Paraphrase on the Prelude in C sharp minor*, BWV 849, and the “Prelude in B minor.” (Note that I will discuss the definition of the terms paraphrase, transcription and arrangement in more detail in Chapter 2 of this document).

It is my hope that after I provide important details about Siloti’s biography and illuminate features within several of his transcriptions of works by Bach, pianists would become acquainted with a small but excellent body of work by this neglected musician.
CHAPTER 1
ALEXANDER SILOTI: BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Alexander Ilitch Siloti was a multi-faceted artist and musician. He was first and foremost a world-renowned pianist who became an eminent pedagogue. Siloti was also a music editor and copyist, a transcriber and arranger, and a music impresario and conductor.

Siloti was born in 1863 in the Ukrainian city of Kharkov. He studied in the junior division of the Moscow Conservatory with Nikolai Zverev (1832-1893), and continued on to the conservatory’s higher grades to work with the pianist Nikolai Rubinstein (1835-1881) and the composer Peter Ilyich Tchaikovsky (1840-1893) amongst others. Siloti also briefly studied with Nikolai’s more famous brother Anton Rubinstein (1830-1894) after Nikolai’s death. He graduated from the conservatory in 1881, receiving the gold medal for piano.

Siloti was not only Tchaikovsky’s composition student in Moscow; he was also his copyist for some time. He edited and published several of Tchaikovsky’s works and his version of Tchaikovsky’s Piano Concerto No. 2 in G major, Op. 44, is particularly well known (if not always highly regarded).

Siloti also likely suggested certain

---


3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.


modifications to Tchaikovsky about his Piano Concerto No. 1 in B flat minor, Op. 23, including the famous blocked chords of the opening theme, which were originally conceived as arpeggiated chords. Pianists almost universally favor these over what was originally penned by Tchaikovsky and it is probable that Tchaikovsky accepted and approved of these changes. It is notable in this regard that Tchaikovsky and Siloti, took turns conducting and playing Tchaikovsky’s first and second piano concerti whilst performing in Europe on tour together.

After his studies in Moscow, Siloti moved to Weimar to work with the great Franz Liszt (1811-1886) between 1883 and 1886. Siloti would become a favorite pupil of Liszt’s there and arguably one of his very finest. Liszt apparently used to affectionately refer to Siloti as “Silotissimus” in honor of his pianistic prowess. Siloti was a tireless promoter and supporter of Liszt’s music and revised and published versions of several of Liszt’s works. The most significant of these include his editions

---


13 Ibid., 5.

14 Ibid.

15 Ibid.


17 Ibid., 366.
of Liszt’s *Sonata in B Minor*, \(^{18}\) *Totentanz*\(^ {19}\) (in the version for two pianos based on that of the composer) and the “Bénédiction de Dieu dans la solitude” from *Harmonies poétiques et religieuses*.\(^ {20}\) Siloti’s essay, “My Memories of Liszt,”\(^ {21}\) is a valuable document as it provides insights into Liszt’s personality, his style of teaching, and manner of playing.

In addition to editing the works of Liszt, Tchaikovsky, and J. S. Bach amongst others, Siloti completed over 200 piano transcriptions\(^ {22}\) and several orchestral editions.\(^ {23}\) These include arrangements of compositions by Beethoven, Liszt, Tchaikovsky, Vivaldi, and Bach.\(^ {24}\) Siloti also completed a work entitled, *Complainte*.\(^ {25}\) This is subtitled as a “Nocturne for Piano” and is actually a paraphrase based on two themes from Tchaikovsky’s *Snow Maiden*, Op. 12.\(^ {26}\) It is currently out of print but it has been performed and recorded by Hamish Milne.\(^ {27}\)

---


\(^{24}\) Ibid.

\(^{25}\) Alexander Siloti, and Peter Ilich Tchaikovsky, *Complainte: Nocturne for piano: arranged on two themes from Tschaikowsky’s Schneewittchen* (New York: Edward Schuberth, 1898).

\(^{26}\) Ibid.

Siloti was a champion of the contemporary music and musicians of his time and established an important concert series in Russia known as the “Siloti Concerts.” These concerts were central to the cultural and social life of the city of St. Petersburg between 1903 and 1917. Many new works received their local, national and/or world premiere at these events. They also attracted the cream of the world’s leading instrumental and vocal performers, conductors, composers and other performing artists of the time. Compositions by composers such as Debussy, Elgar, Ravel, and Sibelius were performed and premiered while Siloti championed the works of many contemporary Russian composers of the time, including Medtner, Prokofiev, Rachmaninoff, Scriabin, Stravinsky, and Tcherepnin. It was also at one of these concerts that Stravinsky first met Diagliev. Artists who performed for the series include such luminaries as violinists Leopold Auer, Fritz Kreisler, Jacques Thibaud, and Eugène Ysaïe, the great cellist Pablo Casals, pianists such as Siloti, Rachmaninoff, Josef Hofmann, Wanda Landowska, and Rosina Lhevinne, and conductors including Fauré, Glazunov, Sibelius, Willem Mengelberg, Felix Weingartner, and Siloti himself, to name but a few. Reading through the programs from fifteen seasons worth of these concerts makes for a fascinating course of study in itself.

---

28 Barber, “Introductory Notes,” The Alexander Siloti Collection. 7.
29 Ibid.
30 Barber, Lost in the Stars, 261-337.
31 Ibid.
32 Barber, “Introductory Notes,” The Alexander Siloti Collection, 7.
33 Barber, Lost in the Stars, 261-337.
Siloti also instituted a series of free concerts called the “People’s Free Concerts” during World War I.\(^{34}\) Siloti wished to deliver concerts that were “devoted to public education and the building of wartime morale.”\(^{35}\) Each concert was unapologetically nationalistic and showcased Russian music and Russian artists almost exclusively.\(^{36}\) Preconcert lectures were a regular feature at these events, often given by Siloti, who also served as a frequent performer during the two-year span of the series (1915-1917).\(^{37}\)

Siloti was also a distinguished conductor. He led the Moscow Philharmonic between 1901 and 1903 and was appointed Intendant of the Mariinsky Theatre in 1918.\(^{38}\) Sadly, he only lasted little more than a year at the Mariinsky. Siloti had to flee Soviet Russia; he first went to England and finally to New York, where he settled in 1921.\(^{39}\)

A distinguished teacher throughout most of his adult life, Siloti taught at the Moscow Conservatory early in his career and later at the Julliard School.\(^{40}\) Sergei Rachmaninoff (1873-1943) was not only one of Siloti’s most exceptional piano students in Moscow (if not his finest), he was also Siloti’s first cousin.\(^{41}\) Pianists might recognize Siloti’s name as the dedicatee of works by Rachmaninoff; these include the latter’s Preludes, Op. 23, and his Piano Concerto No. 1, Op. 1. Siloti also conducted the premiere of Rachmaninoff’s Piano Concerto No. 2, Op. 18, with Rachmaninoff at the piano and
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\(^{34}\) Ibid., 339.
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\(^{40}\) Barber, “Introductory Notes,” The Alexander Siloti Collection, 9.

\(^{41}\) Barber, Lost in the Stars, 85-86.
later performed the work at the piano, with Rachmaninoff conducting.\textsuperscript{42} In addition to works by Rachmaninoff, Siloti is the dedicatee of compositions by Arensky, Godowsky, Liszt, Stravinsky, and Tchaikovsky.\textsuperscript{43} He taught dozens more distinguished pianists, including the composer Marc Blitzstein (1905-1964), and the pianists Alexander Goldenweiser (1875-1961),\textsuperscript{44} Bernardo Segáll (1911-1993), Benning Dexter (1915-1996), and Eugene Istomin (1925-2003).\textsuperscript{45}

Above and beyond all of these activities however, Siloti was a pianist of international renown. He toured the globe and was well known for his performances of Romantic repertoire. He is still remembered in Russia as a pianist of formidable technical facility, musical taste and fine musicianship. Pianist and conductor Vladimir Ashkenazy (b. 1936) has said that Siloti’s name is spoken with the utmost of reverence in Russia to this day,\textsuperscript{46} while Vladimir Horowitz (1904-1989) described Siloti as an important pianist.\textsuperscript{47} A critic once made the comment that Siloti had “brains as well as fingers and wrists, and subtle but indisputable [sic] temperament.”\textsuperscript{48} Siloti’s student Bernardo Segáll has said of Siloti’s pianism that “it was very Lisztian...he played from the heart – direct, with great simplicity and nobility and a beautiful singing tone.”\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{42} Barber, “Introductory Notes,” \textit{The Alexander Siloti Collection}, 7.

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{44} Hinson, \textit{The Pianist’s Dictionary} (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), 171.

\textsuperscript{45} Barber, “Introductory Notes,” \textit{The Alexander Siloti Collection}, 9.

\textsuperscript{46} Barber, \textit{Lost in the Stars}, v.


All of these little-known facts belong to an historic figure rich in musical influence and interest; one that has largely been overlooked arguably because he left behind no recorded legacy and due to the fact that most of his arrangements and editions lay out of print for decades before a selection of them was reprinted, with some published for the first time, in 2003.
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50 Barber, “Alexander Siloti Biography,” http://www.siloti.com/biography.php (accessed May 31, 2011). Barber states that Siloti “made 8 piano rolls and 26 minutes of home-cut discs.” Some of Siloti’s piano roll recordings are available on the following compact discs:


CHAPTER 2
THE TRANSCRIPTION AND BACH

Terminology and Definitions

Thus far, I have collectively referred to Siloti’s fourteen solo pieces based on works by Bach simply as transcriptions. The Oxford Dictionary of Music defines a transcription as:

An Arr[angment] of a mus[ical] comp[osition] for a performing medium other than the orig[inal] or for the same medium but in more elaborate style.\(^{51}\)

For the term, arrangement, it provides the following definition:

“Adaptation of a piece of mus[ic] for a medium other than that for which it was orig[inally] comp[osed].”\(^{52}\)

The Oxford Companion of Music expands on this and defines an arrangement as follows:

“The adaptation of music for a medium different from that for which it was originally composed, for example the recasting of a song as a piano piece, or of an orchestral overture as an organ piece.”\(^{53}\)

In the New Grove Dictionary of Music, the word arrangement is provided with the German word, Bearbeitung, and is defined as:

“The reworking of a musical composition, usually for a different medium from that of the original.”\(^{54}\)


In both the *Oxford Companion* and the *Oxford Dictionary of Music*, the terms transcription and arrangement are described as being interchangeable. The *Oxford Dictionary* notes that in the United States there seems to be a “tendency to use ‘Arrangement’ for a free treatment of the material and ‘Transcription’ for a more faithful treatment.”\(^{55}\) The *Harvard Dictionary of Music* seems to concur as it includes the following information in its definition of arrangement: “The terms transcribe and transcription are sometimes used interchangeably with arrange and arrangement. Often, however, the former imply greater fidelity to the original.”\(^{56}\) Evlyn Howard-Jones seems to contradict this sentiment however and distinguishes between an arrangement and a transcription as follows:

Arrangements I would call a playing of the notes in another medium, transcriptions a recreation or making-over with regard to their imaginative and creative content. The first is as though one should play the Bach Flute Sonatas on the Violin or the Grieg Violin Sonatas on the Viola, making the necessary adjustments for the change in medium; the second is exemplified by the Liszt Tristin Liebestod [from Wagner’s *Tristan und Isolde*], a definite re-making of the orchestra and vocal material [of Wagner’s original] into a new piece.\(^{57}\)

So, is there truly a difference between an arrangement and a transcription, and which is the freer and which is the more literal reworking? Are Siloti’s adaptations of Bach’s music, transcriptions, arrangements or both? Furthermore, Siloti provides the term “paraphrase” for one of the pieces under discussion here. Is this a type of transcription or a kind of arrangement or a new entity entirely? Maurice Hinson defines a piano paraphrase as follows:

... freely modifying, excerpting or changing an original work’s musical content for another instrument or instruments: for example, Franz Liszt’s operatic
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paraphrases for piano, where he takes material from an opera (e.g., Bellini’s *Norma* and Verdi’s *Rigoletto*) and uses the themes to create an entirely new composition. A paraphrase can also stay closer to the original form of a piece, as in Liszt’s paraphrases of Schubert’s *Lieder*.\(^\text{58}\)

Alan Walker explains that Liszt coined the terms “paraphrase” and “transcription” (along with the term “Réminiscence”) and that each term is distinct in meaning. He also implies that each is a subtype of the term, arrangement. Walker says that,

> In a paraphrase the arranger is free to vary the original and weave his own fantasy around it. A transcription, on the other hand, must be a faithful recreation of the original.\(^\text{59}\)

The *Oxford Companion* agrees, saying that,

> In the 19\(^{th}\) century the term [paraphrase] was applied to works based on existing melodies or pieces, often used as virtuoso showpieces. The supreme master of this type of recomposition was Liszt, who wrote numerous piano paraphrases of Italian operas, such as *Rigoletto*, and even of Wagner’s operas.\(^\text{60}\)

To differentiate clearly between an arrangement, transcription, and paraphrase, Hinson offers the following explanation,

> 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.\(^\text{61}\)

This all seems somewhat ambiguous; what is clear is that there is little consensus as to the absolute definitions for the terms transcription and arrangement, while it seems somewhat certain that a paraphrase is the freest type of reworking of previously composed material. For this reason I will simply refer to all of Siloti’s works to be
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discussed in this document as both transcriptions and arrangements since they are all adaptations in one form or another, to varying extents. I will reserve the term “paraphrase” for exceptional cases like the “Prelude in B minor” or the Paraphrase on the Prelude in C sharp major, BWV 872, in which Siloti deviates from Bach’s original significantly. In cases where the work is clearly a paraphrase, Siloti’s modifications to Bach’s material include:

1. Reversing the original left hand and right hand parts.
2. Altering the original notes in order to provide a newly conceived “hidden” melody. In the case of the “Prelude in B Minor” this is coupled with a repeat system so that the new melody is only heard on the second play-through.
3. Changing the original key.
4. Utilizing octave displacement and doubling parts at the octave for reinforcement.
5. And in some cases, totally re-conceiving the original piece. In these instances, the basic figuration and harmonic basis are retained while Bach’s original is radically altered and reconceived by Siloti.

Bach the Transcriber

“For his part, Bach has surely shown that transcription is in itself an art.”
(Le Sie D. Paul, “Bach as Transcriber”)

It seems fitting to first discuss Bach’s own practices as a transcriber in a document that will examine the transcriptions of Bach’s music by another. The tradition of transcribing music from one medium to another has taken place for centuries and it is one that Bach inherited. Bach was a prolific transcriber of his own music and of the music of others.
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In the case of Bach’s keyboard concerti (for one, two, and three keyboard instruments), each is actually a transcription of a pre-existing concerto by Bach himself, while the *Concerto for Four Keyboards in A minor*, BWV 1065 is a transcription of Vivaldi’s *Concerto for Four Violins in B minor*, RV 580. For some works, we know exactly which existing piece Bach used as models for specific keyboard concerti. For example, the *Concerto for Violin in A minor*, BWV 1041, was transcribed as the *Concerto for Keyboard in G minor*, BWV 1058. For others, like the *Concerto for Keyboard in E major*, BWV 1053, scholars believe that the original work is now lost. In this case they speculate that the original work was a concerto presumably for oboe (in a different key).  

Bach also transcribed works that he had originally written in one genre to a completely different one. A good example of this is the “Sinfonia” from *Cantata* No. 29, BWV 29. Bach first composed the piece as the “Prelude” from the *Partita in E Major for Solo Violin*, BWV 1006 in 1720. He then arranged this piece for orchestra and it became the opening “Sinfonia” in the *Cantata*, in 1731. Bach also arranged the very same violin *partita*, for lute or harpsichord (BWV 1006a). Parts of the *Christmas Oratorio*, BWV 248, are also re-workings or arrangements of secular cantata movements composed earlier.

The list goes on and on.

Furthermore, Bach not only transcribed Vivaldi’s *Concerto for Four Violins in B minor*, RV 580, he transcribed other works by Vivaldi as well as the works of other

---
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contemporaries. These include sixteen transcriptions for solo keyboard of concerti originally by Vivaldi, Benedetto Marcello, Alessandro Marcello, Giuseppe Torelli, Prince Johann Ernst of Saxe-Weimar, Telemann, and a few for which the original composer is not known. In many of these works, Bach did not merely adapt the works of these composers, but he “added inner parts, and altered rhythms, keys and melodies. He transformed the originals into compositions of his own.” Leslie Paul states that as an arranger: Bach “never accepted it as a principle that the ideas of his originals should be scrupulously respected.” Paul argues that Bach’s own harpsichord transcriptions are the first examples of the “superior art” of “free transcription” and that Bach masterfully reworked the works of others, making them more “pianistic” without changing their character. Busoni says the following about Bach as transcriber and of Bach’s influence on Busoni’s own transcriptions:

> It is only necessary to mention J. S. Bach in order, with one decisive blow, to raise the rank of the transcription to artistic honour in the reader’s estimation. He was one of the most prolific arrangers of his own and other pieces, especially as organist. From him I learnt to recognize the truth that Good and Great Universal Music remains the same through whatever medium it is sounded. But also the second truth, that different mediums each have a different language (their own) in which this music again sounds somewhat differently.

Underpinning Busoni’s words is the fact that the transcription was considered a valid art form during his lifetime. Not only did Busoni transcribe Bach and the music of
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others, so too did many of his contemporaries including Webern and Schoenberg, two of the most important composers of the time.

After Busoni’s death, the transcription lost some validity and arrangements of the music of Bach and others were considered blasphemous in some quarters. It might be hard to imagine why transcriptions of Bach’s music (and of anyone else’s for that matter), went almost completely out of vogue, and why the playing of them became virtually taboo, when the art of transcribing had been an accepted and an acceptable practice for centuries by great composers including Bach. The demise of the transcription could be blamed on the rise of the early-music movement—the importance of so-called historically informed or authentic performance practices and the value placed on urtext editions. The many tasteless and banal arrangements that were made during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries could also not have helped the plight of the transcription in an era that placed increasing importance on authentic performance practice and scholarship.

Up until recently, transcriptions have not been considered to be of the same artistic caliber as “original” compositions by scholars and performers alike; as Kathron Sturrock explains, “The politically correct view is—or has been until recently—that the road to hell is paved with (good) transcriptions.” Artur Schnabel (1882-1851) apparently once commented on the famous transcription by Busoni of Bach’s violin

---


“Chaconne” from Violin Partita in D minor, No. 2, BWV 1004, as follows, “[it has] a kind of sensuousness, impurity or bombast which seems to be absolutely foreign to Bach’s essential qualities.” For those who disagree and consider the transcription to be as equally valid an art form as original compositions, it is encouraging to see that the transcription is making a steady comeback and that arrangements for piano, such as those of Siloti, are re-entering the repertory. Would Bach not have wholeheartedly approved of the piano transcriptions that were made of his music, since he was such an ardent and prolific transcriber himself?

The Piano Transcription in the Nineteenth Century

As a pupil, supporter and disciple of Liszt, Siloti is part of the Lisztian tradition that sought to monumentalize the works of Bach and others through the medium of transcription. Before discussing the transcriptions of Bach in particular, it is important to place the practice of transcribing for the piano into historical context.

There are a number of reasons why the piano transcription of the nineteenth century developed and became such a popular art form. Firstly, the transcription was nothing new. While Bach made arrangements of his own and others’ music, so did Beethoven and Mozart, for example. The nineteenth century piano transcription grew out of these practices. But the rise of the transcription for piano is directly related to the piano’s newfound status in the nineteenth century. The piano became the instrument of choice in the homes of the middle-class. This is partly because it was capable of playing a vast array of music. Evlyn Howard-Jones explains:
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With the nineteenth century the process of arrangement rapidly accelerated. The modern pianoforte became in very truth the household orchestra, capable of a compass, a resonance, a dynamic variety, a rapidity of execution, and (with the pedal) a continuance and collecting of sonorities that made it the ideal instrument for the study and the enjoyment and the bringing of all and every kind of music under the control of one pair of hands.79

There is little doubt that before the advent of recordings the piano transcription played a valuable part in the transmission of music to a mass audience, making previously inaccessible music available to many. Smaller cities and towns did not have a large orchestra or an opera company, and the transcription was a way in which the middle class public could become familiar with large genres such as symphonic music and operas, for example. As a result, a great deal of music was simplified, and two-hand and four-hand arrangements were created for domestic use.

Glenn David Colton provides another reason for the rise of the piano transcription in the nineteenth century—“the transcription as a critical commentary”80—while A. Hyatt King asserts that the transcription was a medium in which the arranger could pay tribute to the original composer.81 I believe that Liszt, and Siloti by extension, were essentially doing both of these things in the vast majority of their transcriptions. To be sure, many of Liszt’s operatic paraphrases were intended as vehicles for showcasing his technical prowess, but when one considers these, his affection for the original composer and composition is also obvious. In the case of Liszt’s piano transcriptions of six of Bach’s preludes and fugues originally for organ, Liszt’s treatment of Bach’s music is both admiring and respectful. As Francis Pott puts it, “The

79 Howard-Jones, “Arrangements and Transcriptions,” 305.


reverence of Liszt’s Bach transcriptions is detectable not least in their restraint.”82 And so it was in this reverential spirit that the Bach piano transcription was born.

The Lisztian Tradition of the Bach Transcription

The performance of Bach’s St. Matthew Passion by the Berliner Sing-Akademie conducted by Felix Mendelssohn in 1829 (exactly a century after that work’s premiere)83 is often cited as the start of the Bach revival of the nineteenth century. This is not entirely true, however, as the revival of Bach’s music took place over several decades, starting in the late eighteenth century,84 but this great event is indicative of the Bach Renaissance that was taking place at the time. In addition to the St. Matthew Passion, the Berliner Sing-Akademie revived several other choral works by Bach during the 1830s including the St. John Passion (1833) and the Mass in B Minor (1835).85 The following decade saw Mendelssohn adding a piano accompaniment to Bach’s violin “Chaconne” and editing several of Bach’s organ works.86 By 1850, the Bach-Gesellschaft was born, marking the hundredth anniversary of Bach’s death, with the intention of creating and
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It was in this artistic spirit that Liszt made his transcriptions of six of Bach’s organ preludes and fugues for the piano between 1842 and 1850.\footnote{R. Larry Todd, "Mendelssohn, Felix," in \textit{Oxford Music Online} (accessed June 22, 2011).} The reason Liszt decided to transcribe Bach’s music for the piano is unclear. Pott suggests that in 1841, Liszt “sensed keenly the spiritual presence and legacy of his distant predecessor at Weimar upon arriving there himself” and therefore embarked on the transcriptions of Bach’s organ preludes and fugues. The choice of piano seems obvious as this was Liszt’s instrument—indeed he was possibly the greatest piano virtuoso of his time—and he had already made numerous transcriptions, including arrangements of Schubert \textit{Lieder} and several operatic paraphrases, by the time that he turned to the music of Bach.\footnote{Alan Walker, et al, "Liszt, Franz," in \textit{Oxford Music Online} (accessed June 21, 2011).}

The Bach transcription continued to thrive throughout the century and beyond. There was something about Bach’s music, more than just a general longing for the past, which so enthralled if not compelled the pianist-composers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to create piano transcriptions of his music. Kathron Sturrock offers the following explanation as to why Bach’s music was such a popular vehicle for transcription:

\begin{quote}
Of all composers, Bach has lent himself most to being transcribed, and on one level it is easy to find the reason. A deep spirituality lies at the heart of all his
\end{quote}

\footnote{87 Nicholas Temperley and Peter Wollny, "Bach Revival," in \textit{Grove Music Online} (accessed June 22, 2011).}
works, and this chimed with the spirit of the late nineteenth century, its romantic, almost naïve idealism as yet unshattered by the harshness of global warfare and its attendant brutal realism. Bach’s loftiness of vision and supreme mastery of contrapuntal form and texture made his works ideal structures from which to build.  

In general, there were two main approaches to the piano transcription of Bach’s music at this time. The first is a more literal approach in which the arranger tried to stay as faithful as possible to Bach’s original. The second is a somewhat freer approach in which Bach’s works are paraphrased, reworked and sometimes transformed into new creations. Many pianist-composers made use of both of these approaches and very few exclusively sought to transcribe Bach’s music in one way versus the other. In the first category, Liszt is certainly at the forefront because he added very little new material to Bach’s original works (aside from some occasional doubling of parts and added notes). In essence, Liszt’s arrangements are almost literal adaptations of Bach’s music from one medium to another. A few of Liszt’s disciples, such as Eugene d’Albert (1864-1932), can be counted among the group that tried to approach the Bach transcription with a similar “Lisztian” reverence. In fact, Evlyn-Jones states that d’Albert was the “genuine successor” to Liszt in this regard since he made “fastidious and economical use of the Piano’s Powers” in his Bach transcriptions versus the “heroic scale” of those by Busoni and Max Reger (1873-1916), for example. Some also categorize Siloti’s Bach transcriptions among this first group of literal adaptations, but I disagree. Siloti
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prescribed to both approaches since he also paraphrased Bach’s music at times. Kenneth Hamilton likens D’Albert’s approach to that of Siloti’s and says the following, however:

They [D’Albert and Siloti, as distinguished pupils of Liszt] adopted the minimally invasive approach of their revered master to the works of Bach. Busoni took a divergent pathway, in which more heed was paid to the actual acoustic effect of organ registration in an echoing cathedral. The former method privileges lucidity over weight, the latter promotes an impressively cyclopean sonority that can risk indistinctness.  

Busoni’s Bach transcriptions might indeed be the best examples of the freer type of approach to transcribing Bach’s music. This group also includes certain works by pianists such as Godowsky (1870–1938), Tausig, and Siloti. The pianist Samuil Feinberg (1890-1962) made some outstanding Bach piano transcriptions and he commented on the merits of the two approaches of transcribing Bach’s music for the piano as follows:

What is fairest in a transcription? To force oneself to preserve the original as precisely as possible—in the prior knowledge that, on the piano, an organ’s work’s expression will be significantly reduced? Or to try to find a maximum of light and shade, to create a sort of pianistic equivalent of the organ’s power, even if that implies an inevitable dose of enrichment and addition to what had originally been written? In each different situation, everything depends on the gifts and the artistic initiative of the contemporary pianist or composer who is preparing a transcription of a work by Bach. In other words, one might preserve the original text of a work almost completely—and, at the same time, smother the charm of the original in such a half-transcription. Or one might rework the original, creating a pianistic equivalent of it—and, despite everything, in so doing reveal the greatness of Bach’s music all the more strongly.

In short, Siloti made use of both approaches of transcribing Bach’s music. In some works, such as Toccata and Fugue in D Minor, Siloti keeps very close to Bach’s original and creates an almost literal transcription. In others, such as the Prelude in B minor, Siloti paraphrases, reconstructs and even transforms Bach’s original into an entirely new work of art.
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CHAPTER THREE
SILOTI’S BACH TRANSCRIPTIONS FOR SOLO PIANO

Overview of Siloti’s Bach Transcriptions and Editions

As has already been expressed, Siloti was a disciple of Liszt and very much part of the Lisztian tradition that sought to pay tribute to the works of Bach and other composers through the medium of transcription. In some instances, Siloti stays extremely close to the original notes of Bach’s original, while in others, Siloti paraphrases Bach’s music.

Siloti’s Bach transcriptions are a product of their time and comparable to Bach transcriptions by his contemporaries and predecessors such as those of d’Albert, Harold Bauer (1873-1951), Feinberg, Ignaz Friedman (1882–1948), Godowsky, Myra Hess (1890-1965), Wilhelm Kempff (1895-1991), Rachmaninoff, Reger, Camille Saint-Saëns (1835-1825), Walter Rummel (1887-1953), and many others. As such, they do not measure up to the standards of the authentic period practices of today. The scores are highly edited, the pages of which are littered with many performance indications including detailed articulations, dynamics, pedaling, tempo indications, and metronome markings.

Scottish pianist, Hamish Milne (b. 1939), who has recorded several of Siloti’s Bach transcriptions, says the following about them:

In all of his pianistic transcriptions his aristocratic pianistic pedigree is evidenced by the fastidious perfectionism of his writing. Nothing is left to chance; the scores, while superficially simple, are replete with meticulous pedal markings and copious fingerings which have little to do with keyboard manipulation but everything to do with achieving a distinctive sonority and phrasing. In general he seems to have been attracted to this music more by its noble melody and flawless harmonic paragraphs than by its intricacy of counterpoint or dramatic power.96
Charles Barber suggests that Siloti was inspired to try his hand at creating piano transcriptions due to the time he spent working with Liszt.\(^{97}\) Like Liszt’s other students from the same period, Siloti studied the transcriptions of his great teacher, including Liszt’s Bach transcriptions.\(^{98}\) Barber believes that Siloti’s transcriptions were conceived both as “a medium of transmission” and as “reimagining[s] of music.”\(^{99}\) Phillip Scott similarly believes that the Bach transcriptions of Siloti and others were created “partly to display their pianistic prowess but also in a genuine attempt to bring their music to the masses,” and that Siloti and others “treated Bach with veneration and respect” in their transcriptions.\(^{100}\)

Unlike Busoni’s and a handful of other well-known Bach transcriptions by some of the afore-mentioned transcribers, Siloti’s transcriptions are largely unknown and rarely heard in concert today. There are also comparatively few recorded performances of his entire output of transcriptions. These are attractive pieces however that effectively and idiomatically make use of the piano. By examining the original works, I will show the ways in which Siloti utilized the piano for each of his Bach transcriptions for solo piano. Siloti pays tribute to Bach in his re-workings and does so without many of the virtuosic excesses found in Busoni’s transcriptions for example. By contrast, Siloti’s arrangements generally stay close to the original texts and while some still demand a high level of virtuosity and pianistic refinement, they are far less overtly
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ostentatious than those of many of his contemporaries. Hamish Milne, describes their character as follows:

... [in his] delicate transcriptions....he [Siloti] eschews grandiloquence and elaboration in favor of intimate meditation.  

In reference to three specific Bach-Siloti transcriptions, Bryce Morrison writes:

And his [Siloti’s] way with the Air from the Orchestra Suite No.3 in D major, the Andante from the Violin Sonata No.2 in A minor and the Siciliano from the Flute Sonata in E flat major is altogether more effortless and transparent, aiming for simplicity rather than elaboration.  

Barber concurs and says the following about Siloti’s Bach transcriptions in general:

Uncommonly for his era, and uniquely for his circle, Siloti was also capable of simply enchanting work in small forms. No better example of this rare gift may be found than in his transcriptions of Bach. He has analyzed the genetic code of Bach’s design, and reduced it to the simplest measure. Then, with exacting requirements as to tempo, dynamic, and pedal, and often with an introduction of near-silence at crucial harmonic moments, he makes of it something wholly new. With such restraint does Siloti speak in a distinct and memorable Romantic voice.  

By and large, Siloti’s transcriptions are refined recreations that showcase the piano, exploiting its sonority, without glorifying the virtuosity of the performer. At times Siloti reproduces the music of Bach almost exactly, and at other times, he enhances, monumentalizes, reconsiders and even re-conceives Bach’s music in his transcriptions. As Barber has stated:

... every transcription [of Siloti] is achingly faithful to the actual notes written by Bach...and every one of them sounds reborn. The Romantic power of these transcriptions lies in this ongoing contradiction, in this fertile tension, in this unyielding sense of certainty and surprise. These traits and contradictions are surely familiar to our own time. In this precise way, Siloti’s transcriptions are the work of one great century looking backward to another, and forward to our own.  
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The most substantial source dedicated to the life and work of Alexander Siloti is Charles Barber’s ground-breaking book published in 2002, *Lost in the Stars: The Forgotten Musical Life of Alexander Siloti*. Barber’s dedicated and thorough research encompasses comprehensive lists of all of Siloti’s musical achievements and contributions, including lists of all of his editions of the music of a number of composers including J. S. Bach.\(^{105}\) Also included, are lists of all of Siloti’s piano transcriptions. Amongst these is a list of transcriptions made by Siloti of works by Bach for various instruments or instrumental combinations including pieces for solo piano, two pianos, piano four hands, piano and other instrument(s), and transcriptions or arrangements for instrumental ensembles which do not include piano, such as string orchestra and string quartet.\(^{106}\) Some of the works that Barber includes as transcriptions are arguably editions, depending on the definition of “edition” and “transcription”; for this reason, I have chosen to include lists of both categories of works in the Appendix of this document.

Siloti edited quite a number of Bach’s works. His editions are very much a product of their time and highly detailed. Some of these works have never been published and all are rather difficult to access. Siloti’s Bach editions are listed in Appendix A, utilizing Barber’s list.\(^{107}\) I have also included additional information in order to provide as much detail as possible with regard to both Bach’s original work in each case, as well as specific publication information pertaining to all of Siloti’s editions.

Siloti completed more transcriptions of Bach’s music than he did of any other composer. In some cases, his transcriptions were left unpublished and aside from the fourteen solo piano transcriptions that are the focus of this document, almost all of his

\(^{105}\) Barber, *Lost in the Stars*, 364.

\(^{106}\) Ibid., 368-370.

\(^{107}\) Ibid., 364.
other Bach transcriptions are currently out of print. There is one Bach transcription by Siloti for cello and piano that is still listed in the Carl Fischer catalogue and available for purchase. In some cases, Siloti completed multiple transcriptions of the same work by Bach for different instruments or instrumental combinations. For example, the “Air” from Bach’s *Orchestral Suite* No. 3, BWV 1068, exists in versions for solo piano, cello and piano, violin and piano, as well as in a version for string quartet. See Appendices B through E for comprehensive lists of all of Siloti’s Bach transcriptions.

**General Elements and Common Characteristics**

In order to examine Siloti’s treatment of Bach thoroughly in his solo piano transcriptions, I will begin by listing common elements employed by Siloti as transcriber of Bach’s music. These elements include:

1. Siloti’s consistent faithfulness to the notes of Bach’s original, except in cases where the transcription is a paraphrase. Siloti does sometimes rework the original pieces by re-voicing chords, redistributing pedal lines in organ pieces, and re-casting melodic lines, for example.

2. Siloti’s preference for transcribing excerpted movements or individual pieces from a larger work rather than transcribing a substantial piece. The exception to this tendency with regard to the solo piano transcriptions of Bach’s works, is Siloti’s transcription of the *Toccata and Fugue in D minor for Organ*, BWV 565.

3. A fondness for transcribing slow movements. The vast majority of Siloti’s Bach transcriptions (when looking at his transcriptions in all mediums, including the works for solo piano) are pieces in a slow tempo. Even in works where the usual performance tempo taken by most performances would be
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quite brisk, Siloti’s tempo indications suggest that he preferred slower and statelier tempi in his transcriptions, as a rule.

4. Siloti’s frequent use of doubling notes at the octave for reinforcement. Siloti does so in a way that suggests organ or harpsichord registration (i.e. as if adding a 16 ft. and/or 4 ft. stop to the original “8 ft.” part by Bach) and in this way he mirrors Liszt’s practices as well as those of Busoni. An example of this is evident in the “Prelude” from Prelude and Fugue for Organ in G minor, BWV 535. Please see Figure 3.1 for an example of Bach’s original score and Figure 3.2 which shows the same passage transcribed by Siloti using the octave doubling as described above.

Figure 3.1: Bach, Prelude & Fugue for Organ in G minor, BWV 535, mm. 14-15.\textsuperscript{110}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure31.png}
\caption{Bach, Prelude & Fugue for Organ in G minor, BWV 535, mm. 14-15.}
\end{figure}

5. Siloti’s detailed editorial use of performance directions, such as phrasing, dynamics, pedaling, articulation, tempo indications (including metronome markings), as well as his written out realizations for Bach’s ornaments.

6. Siloti also provides very specific, if not exacting, fingering throughout his Bach transcriptions. Barber suggests that pianists who ignore Siloti’s exacting fingerings do so “at their peril.” Siloti’s double fingerings are unique and utilized for voicing purposes. Observe Siloti’s indication for the simultaneous use of the fourth and fifth fingers in Figure 3.3. In this example, the highest and lowest notes are to be brought out where indicated, so-to-speak.

---


112 Barber, “Introductory Notes,” The Alexander Siloti Collection, 11.

7. Siloti’s occasional inclination to change the key of Bach’s original for his transcriptions. Although not common to all of the pieces that will be discussed, Siloti changes the key for three of them, namely: the “Prelude in B minor” from the *Klavierbüchlein für W. F. Bach* (changed from E to B minor), the “Andante” from *Violin Sonata* No. 2 (changed from C to D major) and the *Paraphrase on the Prelude in C-sharp major, BWV 872* (changed from C sharp major to F sharp major). Siloti also changes the key of several of his other Bach transcriptions, including two for piano and cello: *Jesu meine Freude* (changed from C to F minor) and *Ich Ruf’ zu Dir, Herr Jesu Christ* (changed from F to A minor).

8. Siloti’s propensity for writing out arpeggiated chords in the left hand. Siloti does so in such a way that the notes of the chord are always begun on the beat and each note is given an actual rhythmic value and placement.

9. Siloti’s fondness for creating a “third-hand” effect in which the thumbs of both hands play a newly conceived counter melody in the middle register of the piano. Barber describes the function of these thumb melodies as “re-imagine[d] counter melodies otherwise given in different stops or on different instruments altogether.”

10. Siloti’s practice of sometimes using someone else’s transcription as a starting point for his own realization of Bach’s music. For instance, the “Chaconne” from *Violin Partita* No. 2, BWV 1004, is based on Busoni’s famous transcription; and the “Prelude” from *Prelude & Fugue for Organ in G minor, BWV 535*, is based on Theodor Szántó’s transcription.

**A Detailed Discussion of the Printed Transcriptions for Solo Piano**

I will now consider each of Siloti’s printed Bach transcriptions for solo piano individually and examine the unique characteristics in every piece.
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1. “Adagio” from Sonata for Violin and Keyboard in F minor, No. 5, BWV 1018

Bach composed his six sonatas for violin and keyboard (BWV 1014-1019) sometime before 1725 during his time in Cöthen, and revised them in Leipzig before 1740.\textsuperscript{116} Anderson describes the texture of these works as that of a trio sonata, with three independent but interwoven melodic lines.\textsuperscript{117} In Bach’s original of this movement, the violin is provided with a part consisting mostly of two-part chordal writing, while the keyboard accompanies with continuous moving notes, alternating between the right and left hands in different registers, that propel the music forward. Siloti replicated this texture in his transcription; in fact, this piece perfectly demonstrates Siloti’s faithfulness to Bach’s original work, as Siloti was able to retain every note of the original parts for violin and keyboard. Almost all of the original chords are filled in however through Siloti’s use of doubling notes at the octave. The texture is greatly thickened as a result. Compare Bach’s original in Figure 3.4 to Siloti’s “enhanced” version of the opening measure of the piece, in which Siloti used fuller chords in Figure 3.5.

\textbf{Figure 3.4. Bach, “Adagio” from Sonata for Violin and Keyboard, BWV 1018, m. 1.}\textsuperscript{118}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{bassadagio.png}
\end{figure}


The thickening of the texture, as is evident in Figure 3.5 above, adds grandeur and weight to the piece, thereby transforming its character. As is also evident from the two examples above, Siloti changed the register of the original right-hand figuration of the keyboard, setting it an octave lower. This change of register is a pragmatic choice: it allows for a more pianistic solution than what would have occurred had Siloti tried to retain the original register of all the moving note figuration together with the violin chords, but without altering Bach’s original significantly.

Siloti attached a dynamic framework to Bach’s original in which the tension and drama of the movement is heightened through the use of long crescendi and diminuendi. Milne states that this “scrupulously plotted dynamic graph would be frowned upon today, yet it captures the inexorable unity of the piece to perfection.” In these ways, Siloti elevated this movement from a simple Baroque texture of chords and alternating figuration, to a more substantial and self-standing “Romantic” piece.

The Romantic character of this transcription is further enhanced by Siloti’s use of carefully indicated voicing within certain chords. Siloti marked specific notes within some of the chords with dynamic accents. In this way he designated the desired voicing
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120 Milne, “Russian Bach Piano Transcriptions,” 3.
for these chords and Bach’s original is transformed through the illumination of hidden melodic phrases within the original chords. It is clear from Siloti’s voicing that he must have had large hands and a fine technique, as some of the voicing is very uncomfortable, if not impossible, for smaller hands. Please see Figure 3.6 which provides an example of Siloti’s indicated voicing and hidden melodic fragments.

Figure 3.6 Bach-Siloti, “Adagio” from Sonata for Violin and Keyboard, BWV 1018, m. 8.121

While this transcription is not exceedingly challenging technically, it demands a high level of refinement, with regard to balance of sound, voicing, phrasing, and attention to the marked dynamics and accents, in order to work effectively in performance. A convincing rendering of this transcription would compliment Arthur Schanz’s remark that it this is “probably the most successful and strongly expressive”122 transcription of this movement by Bach. James Barbagallo, Risto Lauriala, and Hamish Milne have recorded the piece (please refer to Appendix F and the Discography for further details regarding audio recordings).


2. “Air” from *Orchestral Suite* No. 3, BWV 1068

Bach’s *Orchestral Suite* No. 3, BWV 1068 was composed around 1731 for strings and continuo.\(^{123}\) The famous “Air” from this suite is sometimes called the “Air on the G String,” due to a transcription for solo violin, piano and string orchestra by August Wilhelmj (1845–1908),\(^{124}\) in which the violin part is written entirely on its lowest G string. This movement has been transcribed for solo piano by numerous authors resulting in transcriptions that range greatly in quality, from the average wedding-album-type arrangement, to this exquisite transcription by Siloti. Siloti also prepared transcriptions of the “Air” for violin and piano, for cello and piano, and one for string orchestra.

The piano transcription again exemplifies Siloti’s faithfulness to Bach’s original whilst exhibiting copious performance directions and expressive markings. In the foreword, Siloti wrote, “The present Transcription has been prepared in *exact* accordance with the composer’s original orchestra score.” Siloti was so concerned with authenticity yet aware of the limitations of the piano that he followed this first statement in the foreword with the following remark:

> In Bach’s original version the upper f sharp in the first measure is a whole note; as the piano-tone in this particular register is not of sufficient carrying power I was obliged to replace the whole note by two half notes.\(^{125}\)

Siloti edited the score, providing a great deal of performance directions and suggestions. He included detailed phrasing, articulation, dynamics, pedaling, and expressive fingering. Ornamentation is written out and Siloti’s realizations are
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sometimes historically correct by today’s standards and sometimes not. Please see Figure 3.7 for an example of Siloti’s realization of Bach’s original trills in Figure 3.8. Notice that these are arguably correct by today’s standards of historically informed performance practice.

Figure 3.7. Bach-Siloti, “Air” from Orchestral Suite No. 3, BWV 1068, mm. 17.\(^{126}\)

![Figure 3.7](image)

Figure 3.8. Bach, “Air” from Orchestral Suite No. 3, BWV 1068, mm. 15-18.\(^{127}\)

![Figure 3.8](image)

Now compare figures 3.9, 3.10, and 3.11. The first shows Bach’s original melody line with appoggiatura, the second shows Siloti’s incorrect realization thereof and the third indicates a typical realization of the appoggiatura as it would be carried out utilizing today’s standards of historically informed performance practice.


Unfortunately, the transcriptions of the “Air” for string orchestra, and for violin and piano exist only as manuscripts. The version for cello and piano (which I will refer to as CP, shorthand for cello and piano) was published and in the CP edition, the title suggests that this is a transcription for cello and piano made by both Pablo Casals and Siloti. A comparison between this version (CP) and the solo piano transcription (which I will call SP, for solo piano) shows several differences. These include:

1. Different means to denote similar articulation in the left hand of the piano part. See Figures 3.12 and 3.13.
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128 J. S. Bach, Ouverture (suite) no. 3 für Kammerorchester und Basso continuo, D-Dur, 22.


130 Barber, Lost in the Stars, 368.

2. Differing dynamics and expressive markings. In general, SP is far more detailed in this regard. Compare Figures 3.12 and 3.13, for example.

Figure 3.12. Bach-Siloti, “Air” from *Orchestral Suite* No. 3 BWV 1068, for cello and piano, mm. 1-2.\textsuperscript{132}

![Figure 3.12](image)

Figure 3.13. Bach-Siloti, “Air” from *Orchestral Suite* No. 3 BWV 1068, for solo piano, mm. 1-2.\textsuperscript{133}

![Figure 3.13](image)

3. Different metronome markings: in CP the eighth note is equal to 56 while in SP, the eighth is equal to 63-66 (see Figures 3.12 and 3.13 above).

4. Different time signatures: in SP Siloti retains Bach’s original 4/4 but suggests the use of 8/8 in parentheses, while in CP, he and Casals only utilize a signature of 8/8 (see Figures 3.12 and 3.13 above).

\textsuperscript{132} Ibid.

5. Very little ornamentation is written out in CP, while in SP, the ornaments are all exactly realized.

Both transcriptions are beautifully realized and Milne notes the following about the solo piano transcription: “[Siloti’s] imaginative use of the pedal and the extraordinarily expressive fingerings are of a different epoch.” Likewise, Schanz compliments Siloti’s solo piano transcription and implies that Siloti did great justice to this most famous movement of Bach. James Barbagallo, Alessio Bax, Jouni Somero, and Hamish Milne recorded the solo transcription, while Casals recorded the version for cello and piano.

3. “Andante” from Violin Sonata No. 2, BWV 1003

Bach’s six sonatas and partitas for solo violin (BWV 1001-1006) were completed in 1720. In the original Bach-Gesellschaft edition, there is a transcription of the Sonata No. 2, BWV 1003 for keyboard included as the Sonata in D minor, BWV 964. There is some controversy about the authorship of the Sonata in D minor, however, since some have suggested that it is not the work of J. S. Bach but perhaps that of his son, Wilhelm Friedemann Bach. Milne, for instance, describes this transcription as “rather weak.”
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Both Camille Saint-Saëns (1835-1921) and Siloti realized a solo piano transcription of the “Andante” from Bach’s *Violin Sonata* No. 2, while Leopold Godowsky (1870–1938), and Joachim Raff (1822–1882) completed transcriptions of the entire sonata for piano.\[140\] In Siloti’s transcription, he enhanced the original violin part with a full chordal accompaniment. This accompaniment is based on the implied harmonies of the double stops and melodic contour of Bach’s original. Siloti placed this accompaniment in both the left and right hand parts of the piano, while the melody is hardly altered from the original and written as the highest part in the right hand. Milne says the following about this transcription, “…from the moment we hear the sumptuously voiced chords cushioning Bach’s sublime melody we know that we are in the hands of a master romantic pianist.”\[141\]

A brief harmonic analysis of Siloti’s transcription shows his authenticity to Bach’s original harmonic progression, despite adding an accompaniment. Please see Figure 3.14 and 3.15, which include harmonic analyses of the first three measures of the original violin part and of Siloti’s piano transcription respectively. Note that the two are in different keys as Siloti changed the key from C major to D major in his transcription. It is immediately evident that the underlying harmonies are identical between the two throughout.
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Siloti also realized transcriptions of this movement for cello and piano (edited by Casals), and for violin and piano (edited by Kochansky) and these were published together in a single volume in 1927,\textsuperscript{144} while the solo piano version dates from 1924.\textsuperscript{145}

Maurice Hinson describes the solo transcription as “Beautifully realized,”\textsuperscript{146} and it makes for an attractive addition to a solo piano program or it can be used effectively


\textsuperscript{143} Siloti, et al, \textit{The Alexander Siloti Collection}, 50.

\textsuperscript{144} J. S. Bach, and A. Siloti, “Andante” from \textit{Violin Sonata in A minor, BWV 1003}, transcribed for cello and piano, and for violin and piano, ed. P. Casals, and P. Kochansky (New York: Carl Fischer, 1927).

as an encore. Alessio Bax, James Barbagallo, and Hamish Milne have recorded the solo transcription, while Pablo Casals recorded the transcription for cello and piano.

4. “Chaconne” from Violin Partita No. 2, BWV 1004

As is stated above, Bach completed the six sonatas and partitas for solo violin (BWV 1001-1006) in 1720. Many authors have transcribed the “Chaconne” from Violin Partita No. 2, BWV 1004 for the piano. There are solo versions for the left hand alone by Johannes Brahms (1833-1897), Paul Wittgenstein (1887-1961), and Géza Zichy (1849-1924), and two hand versions by Arthur Briskier, Busoni, Joachim Raff (1822-1882), and Siloti, amongst others. Mendelssohn, and Wilhelmj also created piano accompaniments for the “Chaconne” thereby creating versions of it for violin and piano.

The most famous transcription of the “Chaconne” for piano is undoubtedly Busoni’s arrangement, which he completed by 1893. Siloti’s transcription dates from 1924. Busoni’s version was clearly the model for Siloti: the following is stated in Siloti’s edition: “Arranged by Alexander Siloti after Ferruccio Busoni’s Transcription and the Bach-Society edition.” In essence, Siloti’s transcription is therefore an arrangement of a transcription.

While Siloti retains much of Busoni’s realization, there are numerous and sometimes stark differences between the two transcriptions. These include differences
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of harmonic realization, register placement of melodic material, realization of chordal
figuration, octave doubling, dynamics, ornamentation and their realization, articulation,
and pedaling. The biggest difference between the two is a textural one: Siloti’s version is
often simpler– lines are less adorned and more transparent, and there are generally
fewer pianistic embellishments and virtuosic excesses. There are quite a few variations
in which Siloti literally lifted material from Busoni’s arrangement, while at other times,
Siloti chose not to make use of Busoni’s newly composed counter-melodies and other
additional material whatsoever. For example, Busoni provided four extra measures of
newly composed material in his version, which Siloti chose to omit. Similarly Siloti
chose to ignore another added measure of filigree provided by Busoni for one the
climaxes of the piece. In these ways, Siloti’s arrangement stays closer to Bach’s original
than Busoni’s transcription.

Siloti’s version is also decidedly on a smaller scale and not quite as grandiose as
Busoni’s setting. Anderson compares the versions of Siloti and Busoni as follows:

The piano version of Siloti gives great clarity to the melodic line, which is not
always at the top, and is able to give fuller form to the chordal structure, while
avoiding the occasional extravagance of Busoni’s version.\(^{151}\)

Hinson comments on the freeness in approach made by both Busoni and Siloti in
comparison to Briskier’s more literal transcription. Hinson also implies that Busoni’s
transcription is on a larger scale than Siloti’s however. He states:

The Busoni and Siloti transcriptions are more like “free arrangements,” while
Briskier’s version respects more of Bach’s intentions as revealed in the
autograph. But Busoni and Siloti managed by skillful use of the piano’s resources
to give the work a whole new personality without altering its thematic and
rhythmic content. Busoni searched for a grandeur and richness that he felt the
piano sonority could provide and gave us a work of monumental
proportions.\(^{152}\)

\(^{151}\) Anderson, “Cover Notes,” in J. S. Bach, Transcriptions for Piano, 2.

I will now provide several examples detailing differences and similarities between the versions of the “Chaconne” by Siloti and Busoni. At the very outset of the piece, the two set Bach’s original music quite differently. Siloti had gone back to Bach’s original source and sought to place the upper melody of the opening material for the piano in the same register (i.e. at the same octave) as it was set in the original part for violin. Siloti sets the bass line an octave lower. By contrast, Busoni placed all of the opening material down an octave lower from the original violin part of Bach’s original. Siloti also enhanced the texture with octave doubling. Compare Figures 3.16 and 3.17.

Figure 3.16: Bach-Busoni, “Chaconne,” from Violin Partita No. 2, BWV 1004, mm. 0-2.  
![Figure 3.16](image1)

Figure 3.17: Bach-Siloti, “Chaconne,” from Violin Partita No. 2, BWV 1004, mm. 0-2.  
![Figure 3.17](image2)
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Similarly, at the start of the D major section of the piece, Siloti’s setting of the melody is in the same register as Bach’s while Busoni set it an octave lower. See Figures 3.18 and 3.19.

**Figure 3.18: Bach-Busoni, “Chaconne,” mm. 138-139.**

![Figure 3.18: Bach-Busoni, “Chaconne,” mm. 138-139.](image1)

**Figure 3.19: Bach-Siloti, “Chaconne”, mm. 133-134.**

![Figure 3.19: Bach-Siloti, “Chaconne”, mm. 133-134.](image2)

Curiously, when the piece returns to the key of D minor, Siloti replicated Busoni exactly so that both transcribers set Bach’s original an octave lower. The apparent differences here are simply due to the way in which the music has been printed – the actual notes are identical. See Figures 3.20 and 3.21.
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In Bach’s original, there are two well-known places (mm. 89-90 and mm. 201-202) in which he simply wrote chords with the directive, \textit{arpeggio}, and the violinist is expected to realize figuration for an extended passage of music based on one measure of figuration provided by Bach.\footnote{J. S. Bach, and Ferrucio Busoni, “Chaconne,” 16.} As a result, different realizations and interpretations are possible. With this in mind, Busoni and Siloti made use of similar but different figuration in these two places. By and large, Siloti’s figuration is simpler and less virtuosic than Busoni’s. Compare the following examples and notice that in Busoni’s version, the leaps are wider and therefore more difficult to play:

\footnote{Siloti, et al, \textit{The Alexander Siloti Collection}, 42.}

\footnote{J. S. Bach, \textit{6 Sonatas and Partitas for Violin Solo}, 35 & 42.}
Later on in this same section, Siloti’s realization in Figure 3.25 is considerably easier to play than that of Busoni in Figure 3.24 since Siloti spaced the notes of each chord closer together, thereby necessitating fewer hand extensions (or less stretching).
Notice that in the next two examples, the figuration is very similar, but Siloti’s is once again simpler as he made use of fewer notes, and less octave displacement (and thus fewer leaps). As a result, Siloti’s version of this passage is technically easier to play. Siloti altered Busoni’s realization in order to make it more comfortable under the hands but retained the same pianistic effect. See figures 3.26 and 3.27.

---

Figure 3.27: Bach-Siloti, “Chaconne,” mm. 201-202.\textsuperscript{165}

There are numerous other passages in which Siloti simplified Busoni’s writing presumably for technical reasons and for textural clarity. Compare the following examples:

Figure 3.28: Bach-Busoni, “Chaconne,” mm. 166-168.\textsuperscript{166}

Figure 3.29: Bach-Siloti, “Chaconne,” mm. 161-163.\textsuperscript{167}

\textsuperscript{165} Siloti, et al, \textit{The Alexander Siloti Collection}, 41.

\textsuperscript{166} J. S. Bach, and Ferrucio Busoni, “Chaconne,” 14.

Furthermore, notice that in the following passage the left hand part is reduced and simplified in Siloti’s transcription:

**Figure 3.30: Bach-Busoni, “Chaconne,” mm. 190-192.**

![Figure 3.30: Bach-Busoni, “Chaconne,” mm. 190-192.](image)

**Figure 3.31: Bach-Siloti, “Chaconne,” mm. 185-187.**

![Figure 3.31: Bach-Siloti, “Chaconne,” mm. 185-187.](image)

In the next two examples, it is clear that Siloti chose to reduce and lessen some of Busoni’s technical flourishes. Where Busoni utilized many more notes, played in tenths, for his virtuosic passagework in Figure 3.32, Siloti achieved a similar effect with fewer notes spaced an octave apart in Figure 3.33. Busoni also inserts an extra measure here for the sake of virtuosity and to elongate this climactic moment.
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For other passages, Siloti was possibly trying to stay closer to Bach’s original by not including newly conceived counter melodies by Busoni. Notice also that Siloti’s writing is considerably more sparsely textured in Figure 3.35 than Busoni’s in Figure 3.34.


Interestingly, in Busoni’s version it is implied that large chords be broken before the beat (see Figure 3.36), while Siloti chose to realize these on the beat (see Figure 3.37). In this way, Siloti is actually closer to authentic performance practice than Busoni.
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Figure 3.37: Bach-Siloti, “Chaconne,” mm. 126-127.\textsuperscript{175}

![Image of Bach-Siloti, “Chaconne,” mm. 126-127.]

It could be argued that the ending of Busoni’s “Chaconne” is a little excessive; it is both monumental, but also somewhat bombastic. By comparison, Siloti kept the ending more reverential to Bach. Where Busoni made use of tolling bell-like effects and a tierce di Picardi, Siloti did not. Compare figures 3.38 and 3.39.

Figure 3.38: Bach-Busoni, “Chaconne,” mm. 259-262.\textsuperscript{176}

![Image of Bach-Busoni, “Chaconne,” mm. 259-262.]

\textsuperscript{175} Siloti, et al, The Alexander Siloti Collection, 37.

\textsuperscript{176} J. S. Bach, and Ferrucio Busoni, “Chaconne,” 19.
The arrangements by Busoni and Siloti of Bach’s “Chaconne” from *Violin Partita* No. 2 are both exceptional recreations that monumentalize Bach. In general, Siloti’s is the simpler and technically easier of the two. Schanz argues that the lightened texture and technical simplifications of Siloti’s transcription compromise the *Chaconne* in terms of mass of sound, inner voices, and plasticity, but I find that Siloti’s transcription is no less effective in performance than that of Busoni’s. Risto Lauriala, James Barbagallo, and Bernardo Segáll have all made fine recordings of Siloti’s “Chaconne.”

5. “Fantasia in C minor” from *Fantasia and Fugue in C minor*, BWV 906

The “Fantasia” from *Fantasia and Fugue in C minor*, BWV 906 dates from 1704. The “Fugue” was left incomplete and the work is typically performed with the “Fantasia” excerpted. Siloti’s arrangement dates from 1922 and in it, Bach’s original is radically altered through Siloti’s extensive use of octave doubling for reinforcement in
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sections that he marks *forte*. Compare Bach’s original of the opening passage of the piece in Figure 3.40 and Siloti’s version in Figure 3.41.

Figure 3.40: Bach, “Fantasia” from *Fantasia and Fugue in C minor, BWV 906*, m. 1.\(^{181}\)

![Figure 3.40: Bach, “Fantasia” from *Fantasia and Fugue in C minor, BWV 906*, m. 1.](image)

Figure 3.41: Bach-Siloti, “Fantasia” from *Fantasia in C minor, BWV 906*, m. 1.\(^{182}\)

![Figure 3.41: Bach-Siloti, “Fantasia” from *Fantasia in C minor, BWV 906*, m. 1.](image)

Siloti utilized this technique of doubling notes at the octave to imitate harpsichord registration.\(^{183}\) In Siloti’s “editor’s note” to the “Fantasia” he addressed the octave doubling:

> It has been questioned by critically inclined musicians and pedagogues [sic], whether or not I was justified in strengthening the setting of this “Fantasia” with

---


\(^{183}\) Ibid., 52.
octaves, instead of leaving it in its original form, (single notes in each of the hands). My purpose in presenting such a changed version may be briefly explained as follows:

Whenever the music for a cembalo (for which the composition was originally written) was marked “Forte,” the player would press down the pedal, which produced the given note three times as strong (two octaves). Hence, even in strengthening each hand in the octave, I did not achieve the sonority desired by Bach.\textsuperscript{184}

Siloti contrasted the louder forte passages with sections marked piano. In piano sections he made no use of octave doubling, thereby creating a terraced dynamic effect akin to harpsichord registration.

Another example of octave doubling utilized in this way can be found in Busoni’s concert edition of Bach’s Chromatic Fantasia and Fugue, BWV 903\textsuperscript{185} (which is an arrangement of the Bach original). There are sections within the fugue in which Busoni doubles the fugal subject at the octave, sixth, and third possibly to achieve the same “cembalo” type sonority or registration that Siloti attempted to create in the Fantasia in C Minor from BWV 906. Figure 3.42 shows both the original and Busoni’s version of a section of the Chromatic Fantasia and Fugue, BWV 903. Note that Busoni’s enhanced version is printed above Bach’s original with the octave doubling highlighted.

\textsuperscript{184} Ibid.

In Siloti’s arrangement of the *Fantasia in C Minor* from BWV 906, octave doubling significantly alters the tempo and affect of the movement, as the octaves cannot be played as quickly as single notes, thus necessitating a slower tempo. Bach’s original of this movement is typically performed at quite a rapid tempo, but Siloti marks his transcription, *Molto maestoso*, thereby acknowledging the need for a slower and statelier tempo to accommodate the extensive use of octaves. In so doing, Siloti has placed sonority over tempo and affect.

Siloti’s transcription is furnished with dynamics, phrasing, fingering, pedaling and articulation by extension, as well as written-out realizations for all of Bach’s ornamentation. Rhythmic realizations for mordents are in-line with current practices, but instead of realizing the notated *Doppelt-cadence* figures (as Bach labeled these ornaments in the table found in the *Klavierbüchlein für W.F. Bach*), which consist of a
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trill with prefix from above or below and are shown with Bach’s performance explanation in Figure 3.43 below, Siloti simply provides written-out trills for these.

**Figure 3.43: Bach, Excerpt from the “Ornament Table” from the *Klavierbüchlein für W. F. Bach*.**

In the autograph manuscript, it is clear that Bach explicitly wanted a *Doppelt-cadence* (with prefix from above) and not a trill, see Figure 3.44 below, while Siloti’s incorrect realization of the ornament is evident in Figure 3.41 on page 55 above. Note that Siloti has placed the ornament in both hands, as it is doubled at the octave.

**Figure 3.44: Bach, “Fantasia” from *Fantasia & Fugue in C minor, BWV 906* (autograph), mm. 1-2**

---

188 Bach used the word *idem* for this ornament, but *idem* is Latin for “the same” and in this context, it means that this ornament had the same title as the preceding ornament. In other words, both ornaments are a type of *Doppel-cadence*, one in which the prefix starts from above and another in which the prefix begins from below.

To date, this transcription has not been recorded. This is possibly due to the
difficulty of the octaves, as a highly advanced octave technique is essential for an
effective rendering of this arrangement. Curiously, no mention of this transcription is
made in Schanz’s book, *Bach in der Klaviertranskription*, which is the most comprehensive
source on Bach piano transcriptions. It is an effective transcription, however, that merits
further attention.

6. **Paraphrase on the Prelude in C-sharp major, BWV 849**

Bach completed his second book of *Das wohltemperirte Clavier* by c. 1740. Carl
Fischer first published Siloti’s paraphrase on the third prelude from this collection, in
1924. This work by Siloti is a paraphrase of Bach’s original for several reasons:

1. The key is changed from C sharp major to F sharp major
2. Some pitches within the inner parts are altered and a hidden melody emerges
3. The texture of the piece is radically altered
4. Some of the chords are re-voiced

Siloti transposed Bach’s original up by the interval of a perfect fourth. I suspect
that Siloti may have changed the key for the sake of the inner voices. The new key
places the notes of the inner voices into a brighter register on the piano. In this way,
they are able to cut through the texture more clearly. Siloti also changed some of Bach’s
original pitches within these inner voices, such that a hidden melody emerges, whilst he

---

6, 2011).

re-voiced certain chords for the same reason. Siloti marked this inner melody, *melodia cantando espressivo*. This melody alternates between the right and left hand, and is played almost exclusively by the thumbs of each hand. In order for it to permeate the texture even further, Siloti alters the texture of Bach’s original. He retained the sixteenth note figuration of the original right hand part but furnished the left hand with a sparser texture of quarter notes instead of repeated eighth notes. In Figures 3.45 and 3.46, Siloti’s paraphrasing procedure becomes evident when compared to Bach’s original.

**Figure 3.45: Bach, Prelude in C sharp minor, BWV 849, mm. 1-2.**

![Prelude in C sharp minor, BWV 849, mm. 1-2.](image1)

**Figure 3.46: Bach-Siloti, Paraphrase on the Prelude in C-sharp minor, BWV 849, mm. 1-2.**

![Paraphrase on the Prelude in C-sharp minor, BWV 849, mm. 1-2.](image2)

Siloti supplies dynamics, phrasing, articulation, fingering, and pedaling for his paraphrase. While Hinson praises this piece, calling it “very effective,” Schanz is

---


rather more dismissive and refers to it as an “schwelgerischen Dank-Stückchen.” The piece has not been recorded.

7. “Prelude” from Cantata No. 29, BWV 29

In 1731, Bach recycled the “Prelude” from his Partita for Solo Violin, No. 3, BWV 1006, and used it as the opening “Sinfonia” to his Cantata No. 29, “Wir danken dir, Gott, wir danken dir” (“We thank you God, we thank you”). Bach transcribed the original for orchestra and changed the key from E major to D major. The cantata was first performed for the inauguration of the town council in Leipzig, on August 27, 1731.

Various publishing houses, including Breitkopf & Härtel, Gutheil, and Methuen Simpson, published Siloti’s transcription of the “Sinfonia” for piano, while the manuscript is dated, 1909. Curiously, Siloti’s manuscript is apparently in the key of E major, but the piece has only been published in the key of D major. This might indicate that Siloti was considering Bach’s original version of this movement, the “Prelude” from the Partita for Solo Violin, No. 3, when he made his transcription. Similarly, because Siloti chose the title “Prelude” for his transcription and not “Sinfonia,” there may be a possible link to Bach’s first version of this piece, but this is purely speculative. It is also worth noting that Siloti’s piano student and cousin, Rachmaninoff, completed a transcription of the “Prelude” from the Partita for Solo

---

195 Schanz, Johann Sebastian Bach: in der Klaviertranskription, 335.
196 Barber, Lost in the Stars, 369-370.
197 Ibid., 370
198 Ibid.
Violin, No. 3, in E major in 1933. The “Prelude” or “Sinfonia” seems to have been one of Siloti’s favorite pieces of Bach to program and transcribe: in addition to the solo transcription, Jurgenson published a transcription of the “Sinfonia” by Siloti for orchestra in 1930 and both of these transcriptions were performed on numerous occasions at the “Siloti Concerts.”

There are also transcriptions of the “Sinfonia,” by Saint-Saëns and Kempff in addition to the arrangements by Rachmaninoff and Godowsky of the “Prelude” on which it is based. I will not consider the transcriptions by Rachmaninoff and Godowsky here since these are transcriptions of Bach’s violin version and not of his orchestral version of this piece. Kempff’s arrangement was first published in 1931 while it is unclear when Saint-Saëns completed and published his transcription.

When comparing the three transcriptions of this piece in terms of texture, Siloti’s is the most transparent. Siloti’s economic use of material stands in stark contrast to the versions by Saint-Saëns and Kempff. Siloti managed to achieve more clarity and a

---


200 Barber, Lost in the Stars, 369.

201 Ibid., 284, 288, 291, 300, 302 & 310.


203 J. S. Bach, and Wilhelm Kempff, J. S. Bach: 10 Pieces Transcribed for Piano by Wilhelm Kempff (Berlin: Bote & Bock, 1982), 12-17.

204 J. S. Bach, and Sergei Rachmaninoff, Suite from the Partita in E major for Violin (New York City: C. Foley, 1941).

205 J. S. Bach, and Leopold Godowsky, Bach-Godowsky Violin Sonatas and Partitas 1, 2, & 3 (S.l: s. n, 1900).

206 J. S. Bach, and Wilhelm Kempff, J. S. Bach: 10 Pieces Transcribed for Piano by Wilhelm Kempff, 12.
sparser texture by utilizing less octave doubling. As a result, Siloti’s is the least virtuosic of the three transcriptions but no less effective. Consider the opening of the piece in all three versions below, and observe the simplicity of Siloti’s setting.

**Figure 3.47: Bach-Kempff, Prelude to the Ratswahl Cantata, mm. 1-3.**

\[\text{Allegro pomposo Solemnly moving}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\begin{array}{c}
\text{\textbf{Allegro pomposo Solemnly moving}}
\end{array}}
\end{array}
\]

**Figure 3.48: Bach-Saint-Saëns, Ouverture de la 28e [sic] Cantate d’Église, mm. 1-3.**

\[\text{Presto}^{(1)}\]

**Figure 3.49: Bach-Siloti, “Prelude” from Cantata No. 29, mm. 1-3.**

\[\text{sempre legato}\]

---

207 Ibid.

208 J. S. Bach, and Camille Saint-Saëns, Œuvres de J. S. Bach, 1.
In Bach’s original, the movement is marked *Presto* at the outset.\textsuperscript{210} However, none of the three transcriptions make use of this marking (the marking provided in Figure 3.48 above is not Saint-Saëns’ but rather the editor’s). Kempff writes *Allegro pomposo* (Kempff provides the English words “Solemnly moving” alongside his indication, which is a fair translation; one could also translate this as, “fast yet stately”), Saint-Saëns’ is marked *Allegro*, and Siloti indicates, *Moderato maestoso*. As I have previously noted, the choice of a slower tempo by Siloti is a general trend. Most of his Bach transcriptions are of slow movements, while the fast movements that he transcribed are usually marked with a tempo indication and/or metronome marking that is slower than the typical tempo one might usually encounter for these movements in performance. Bernardo Segáll and James Barbagallo have recorded Siloti’s transcription and they both observe Siloti’s indication and play it at a rather stately tempo.

The three transcriptions are all edited with Saint-Saëns employing the fewest editorial markings and Siloti, the most. All three indicate some dynamics, articulation, and pedaling, but Siloti is the most specific with regard to these. Siloti also provides considerably more fingering than his fellow transcribers.

\section*{8. “Prelude” from *Cantata* No. 35, BWV 35}

Bach’s *Cantata* No. 35 is for voice and orchestra and titled, *Geist und Seele wird verwirret*, which translates to “Soul and spirit are thrown into confusion.” It was first performed on the twelfth Sunday after Trinity Sunday in 1726 and is partly based on a


lost oboe concerto, the material of which was recycled for Bach’s *Concerto for Keyboard in D minor*, BWV 1050.\footnote{Christoph Wolff, et al, “Bach, Johann Sebastian,” in *Grove Music Online* (accessed June 6, 2011).}

The “Prelude” from *Cantata* No. 35, as titled by Siloti, is actually the “Sinfonia” to the second part of Bach’s Cantata and this movement was originally scored for organ obilgato and orchestra. Siloti made more than one transcription of this movement: he completed one transcription for solo piano (it is unclear when this was first published)\footnote{Barber, *Lost in the Stars*, 370.} and another for violin and piano (last published in 1924).\footnote{J. S. Bach, “Prelude from Cantata no. 35” from *Works for Violin and Piano Newly Transcribed and Edited by Alexander Siloti* (New York: Carl Fischer, 1924).} A transcription of this cantata movement for solo piano also exists by Saint-Saëns, and it is very similar to the transcription by Siloti.

Since the original scoring of this work was for orchestra including three oboes, strings, continuo and obbligato organ, Siloti’s transcription does not make use of all of the notes of the original. He largely reduces the instrumentation of Bach’s original by retaining the written organ part and by filling it out with notes from the remaining orchestral parts.

It is interesting to note the differences between the two different transcriptions of this piece by Siloti. Firstly, the two transcriptions of this piece have different metronome markings assigned to them by Siloti: the solo piano transcription is marked, quarter note = 208, while the transcription for violin and piano is marked, quarter note = 192. The tempo indication, *Presto*, is Bach’s own. Figure 3.50 and Figure 3.51 below also show differences of articulation, dynamic markings, and pedaling.
In Figure 3.52 and Figure 3.53, note the differences with regard to Siloti’s realization of the trill ornament (marked “tr” in the urtext).\textsuperscript{216}

\textsuperscript{214} J. S. Bach, “Prelude” from Works for Violin and Piano Newly Transcribed and Edited by Alexander Siloti, 2.

\textsuperscript{215} Siloti, The Alexander Siloti Collection, 88.

\textsuperscript{216} J. S. Bach, Kirchencantaten, No. 31-40, BWV 31-20, Bach Gesellschaft Edition (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1947), 206.
Schanz calls Siloti’s version “fully set” and “somewhat romantic.” Since Siloti does not change any of the notes of the original, this designation probably refers to Siloti’s extensive use of pedal indications, dynamics, written out ornaments, and expressive markings. There are recordings of the solo transcription by Hamish Milne, James Barbagallo, and Bernardo Segáll.

---

217 J. S. Bach, “Prelude” from Works for Violin and Piano Newly Transcribed and Edited by Alexander Siloti, 2.


219 Schanz, Johann Sebastian Bach: in der Klaviertranskription, 162.
9. “Prelude” from Little Prelude and Fugue for Organ in E minor, BWV 555

Bach completed several little or short preludes and fugues for the organ. The publication date for the Prelude and Fugue for Organ in E minor, BWV 555 is unknown.\textsuperscript{220} Siloti’s transcription of the prelude dates from 1923\textsuperscript{221} and his realization for the piano, remains more faithful to the acoustical effect of this piece as played on the organ, than to the absolute letter of Bach’s text. Siloti achieves this in part by doubling both the melody and the bass line at the octave so as to imitate organ registration. Similarly, Siloti also repeats many notes rather than retaining Bach’s original ties. In this way, Siloti made allowance for the decay of the piano versus the sustaining capability of the organ: that is to say that every note within every chord can be heard equally well on the piano as would have been the case on the organ.

Siloti supplied fingering, pedaling, dynamics, and other performance directions in his score. He marked the piece \textit{sempre legato}, and since there is much octave playing and sometimes uncomfortably spaced chords, the piece demands a “large hand span.”\textsuperscript{222} Siloti also changed several note lengths of the original pedal part at the very end of the piece: instead of maintaining the written rests, he doubled the length of certain notes from a quarter note to a half note, which allows the entire texture to remain wholly \textit{legato}. Compare Bach’s original in this regard to Siloti’s realization, in Figures 3.54 and 3.55, respectively.


\textsuperscript{221} Siloti, et al, \textit{The Alexander Siloti Collection}, 60.

\textsuperscript{222} Hinson, \textit{The Pianist’s Guide to Transcriptions, Arrangements, and Paraphrases}, 12.
It is curious to observe Siloti’s extensive use of arpeggiated octaves in the left hand part in this piece. Siloti may have chosen to include these as an expressive device; they might even be a type of notation for indicating splitting of hands, so common in the playing of pianists of the Golden Age, as there is no physical or technical need to arpeggiate these octaves. Please see Figure 3.56 below showing Siloti’s use of arpeggiated left-hand octaves.

---


Siloti added a repeat system in the last measure, thus doubling the length of the piece. In certain places, he specified different dynamic markings and performance indications for the first play-through and the second time through the piece.

Salzman describes the piece as “a meditative organ piece that moves rather easily over the piano keyboard” and Schanz describes it as “a gem for the house concert.” James Barbagallo, Bruno-Leonardo Gelber, João Carlos Martins, and Bernardo Segáll have recorded the Prelude in E minor.

10. “Prelude” from Cello Suite No. 4, BWV 1010

Bach’s six suites for solo cello (BWV 1007–1012) date from the same period as his six sonatas and partitas for solo violin, which is some time close to 1720. Siloti’s

\[\text{Ref 228}\]

\[\text{Ref 227}\]

\[\text{Ref 226}\]

\[\text{Ref 225}\]
transcription of the “Prelude” from *Cello Suite* No. 4, BWV 1010 was first published in 1931\textsuperscript{229} but it has never been recorded.

Siloti’s use of octave doubling is very striking in this piece as it transforms the entire character of Bach’s original. It is as though Siloti first made a transcription of the solo cello piece for organ and then transcribed his organ setting for the piano. At the outset, the original single line of the cello is doubled so that it is heard simultaneously at three different octaves (much like using a two foot, a four foot, and an eight foot stop on an organ). This is cleverly fingered however, so that the octaves are divided between the hands and therefore very pianistic and comfortable under the fingers. See Figure 3.57 for example.

**Figure 3.57: Bach-Siloti, “Prelude” from *Cello Suite* No. 4, BWV 1010, mm. 1-2.**\textsuperscript{230}

Towards the end of the piece (in measure 82), the cello line is played in octaves in both the right hand and left hand parts of the piano, and is thus heard at four different octaves. In this way, Siloti adds another organ stop or even signals that the *tutti* stop be pulled for the climax of the piece. In support of this idea, Siloti instructs the pianist to


\textsuperscript{230} Ibid.
“Use the entire arm” when playing octaves in both hands. Siloti is clearly after a very full, massive sound, as the score at this point, is marked \textit{fff} and \textit{pesante al fine}. Hinson notes that the conclusion requires the use of “almost every resource of instrument and performer.”\footnote{Siloti, et al, \textit{The Alexander Siloti Collection}, 79.}

To compliment the thickening of texture towards the end of the piece, Siloti also utilized a general slowing or broadening of tempo throughout the piece. This temporal plan for the “Prelude” is both fascinating and unusual. The piece is first marked \textit{Maestoso}, with a metronome marking of half note equal to 59. Siloti’s tempo markings thereafter indicate a steady \textit{rallentando} throughout the remainder of the \textit{Prelude}. This marked deceleration in tempo throughout the course of the piece is clearly visible in the table provided in Figure 3.58 on page 73. Please note that translations are not literal but convey the sentiment of the terminology. By thickening the texture and expanding the tempo of the piece, Siloti has created a grandiose transcription that romanticizes Bach’s original.

The entire piece is also a study in \textit{legato} octave playing. Siloti makes use of long \textit{legato} slurs from the very beginning of the piece, and later on, he marks the first \textit{Molto tranquillo} section in measure 62, \textit{“legatissimo.”}\footnote{Hinson, \textit{The Pianist’s Guide to Transcriptions, Arrangements, and Paraphrases}, 13.} Perhaps Siloti is challenging the pianist to achieve a \textit{legato} or connected line similar to the way in which a cellist would have to aim to connect the melodic line the piece in detail and discussing Siloti’ whilst negotiating tricky string crossings.

\footnote{Siloti, et al, \textit{The Alexander Siloti Collection}, 73.}

\footnote{Ibid., 77.}
Figure 3.58: Tempo Indications throughout Bach-Siloti, “Prelude” from Cello Suite No. 4, BWV 1010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Numbers</th>
<th>1-48</th>
<th>49&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>49&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;-56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tempo Indication</strong></td>
<td>Maestoso (half = 59), 2/2 time signature</td>
<td>fermata</td>
<td>(Maestoso (half = 59))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation</strong></td>
<td>Majestically / stately pause</td>
<td>Majestically / stately pause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures</strong></td>
<td>57-58</td>
<td>59-61</td>
<td>62-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tempo</strong></td>
<td>più tranquillo</td>
<td>sempre poco più rit.</td>
<td>Molto tranquillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation</strong></td>
<td>more tranquil / calmer</td>
<td>continually getting a little slower</td>
<td>very tranquilly calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures</strong></td>
<td>70-73</td>
<td>74-79</td>
<td>80-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tempo</strong></td>
<td>Molto tranquillo</td>
<td>riten. Al meno mosso</td>
<td>rit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation</strong></td>
<td>Very tranquilly calm</td>
<td>gradually getting slower until a slower tempo</td>
<td>getting gradually slower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures</strong></td>
<td>82-85</td>
<td>86-87</td>
<td>88-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tempo</strong></td>
<td>Meno mosso, trionfante (half = 42)</td>
<td>ritenuto</td>
<td>molto meno mosso sempre più rit. Al Lento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation</strong></td>
<td>Less movement (slower), triumphant</td>
<td>immediately slower / held back</td>
<td>much slower with a continual broadening until an even slower tempo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tempo</strong></td>
<td>Lento, fermata, 6/4 time signature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation</strong></td>
<td>Slowly / sluggish, pause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarly, in places where the original cello part has a chord that would have to be broken or arpeggiated by the player in some way, Siloti imitates this action on the piano, of the cellist playing double stops. Siloti actually denotes a specific rhythm to the various notes in the piano part, similar to the way in which such a chord might be realized on the cello. Compare Bach’s original in Figure 3.59 with Siloti’s reworking for piano in Figure 3.60.

Figure 3.59: Bach, “Prelude” from *Cello Suite No. 4, BWV 1010, mm. 59-60.*

![Figure 3.59](image)

Figure 3.60: Bach-Siloti, “Prelude” from *Cello Suite No. 4, BWV 1010, mm. 59-60.*

![Figure 3.60](image)

For all octaves throughout the piece where “no fingering is indicated,” Siloti calls for the simultaneous use of the fourth and fifth fingers (See Figure 3.57 on page 71

---


for an example of this in the text). This expressive fingering tells the pianist to voice chords to the highest note in the right hand, and to the lowest note in the left hand.

Throughout the piece, Siloti’s pedal changes adhere to Bach’s underlying harmonies. At each harmonic change, the pedal is changed. This means, however, that there are sometimes long sections without a pedal change. This too might imply an organ sonority that Siloti was trying to achieve. The long pedal markings may serve to replicate a cathedral-like acoustic. The pedal indications vary between two measures, one measure and half a measure in length. On the final chord of the piece, Siloti instructs the pianist to raise both the pedal and hands “at the same moment.”

Due to the greatly thickened texture, the use of long pedal effects and the temporal plan for this prelude in which there is a general broadening of tempo, it could be argued that Siloti’s transcription of Bach’s “Prelude” from Cello Suite No. 4, is in fact a paraphrase. The character of the piece is radically different from Bach’s original work yet the modifications made by Siloti have transformed the work into a monumental and Romantic tribute to Bach.

11. “Prelude in B minor” from the Klavierbüchlein für W. F. Bach, BWV 855a

Bach began compiling the collection of pieces that comprise the Klavierbüchlein für W. F. Bach, in Cöthen in 1720. The “Prelude in E minor” BWV 855a is included in this album, and it was revised in 1722 and became the “Prelude” from “Prelude and Fugue in E minor” BWV 855 from Book One of the “Well-tempered Clavier.” The two

---

237 Ibid., 73.
238 Ibid., 79.
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preludes are quite similar, but it is the earlier, unadorned version of this prelude from the *Klavierbüchlein für W. F. Bach* that was used by Siloti for his piano paraphrase.

As a starting point for examining the piece in detail and discussing Siloti’s treatment of Bach’s original, I turned to the analysis of Charles Barber in *Lost in the Stars*. Many of Barber’s points are reiterated here but I have also tried to expand on them.

Consider the first six measures of Bach’s “Prelude” in Figure 3.61:

Figure 3.61: Bach, “Prelude in E minor” from the *Klavierbüchlein für W. F. Bach, BWV 855a, mm. 1-6*.


Compare this to Siloti’s paraphrase shown in Figure 3.62:

Figure 3.62: Bach-Siloti, “Prelude in B minor” from the *Klavierbüchlein für W. F. Bach*, BWV 855a, mm. 1-6.\(^\text{243}\)

Notice, firstly, that in the original version, Bach placed the sixteenth note figuration in the left hand and accompanying chords in the right hand. Siloti reversed the original left hand and right hand parts. Siloti also transposed the “Prelude” from the key of E minor to B minor.

In Bach’s original, there is also no real melody to speak of, simply right hand chords and left hand figuration. However, Siloti found a hidden melody within Bach’s original and it is this hidden melody that gives the piece its magic. The hidden melody...

is observable as whole and half notes, first in the left hand part in measures one through four, and then in the right hand part from measure five, as shown in Figure 3.63.

Figure 3.63: Bach-Siloti, “Prelude in B minor” from the *Klavierbüchlein für W. F. Bach*, BWV 855a, mm. 1-6 (annotated).⁴⁴

Barber describes the effect of this transcription as played by Emil Gilels at a concert in 1973 in Vancouver, Canada, as follows:

---

²⁴⁴ Ibid.
What followed is what amazed. His first encore consisted of a work I had never heard. It seemed to rise from the *Well-Tempered Clavier* but wasn’t the same at all. Some exquisite hand had redrawn it in a way I couldn’t imagine. At encore’s end, the audience offered a greater tribute yet: silence, stillness, a vast sigh, and only then a rolling and tidal ovation. This small encore had stolen the show.\(^{245}\)

In order for the hidden melody to be fully effective, Siloti devised a repeat system for the piece. The penultimate measure of the work goes directly back to the first measure. Siloti did this is to allow for a new voicing to illuminate the hidden melody during the repeat of the piece. On the first play-through, the sixteenth note figuration in the right hand is given special emphasis. On the second, the hidden melody in whole and half notes is given pride of place, and the sixteenth notes serve as an embellishment. According to Barber, it is a traditional nineteenth-century practice for most pianists to play the middle voice with the thumbs following the practices of nineteenth century pianists Francesco Pollini (1762-1846) and Sigismund Thalberg (1812-1871), and the harpist Elias Parish-Alvars (1808-1849).\(^{246}\)

On the word of Kyriena Siloti, Siloti’s daughter and the dedicatee of this piece, it was Siloti’s practice to omit all left-hand arpeggiation on the first play-through and to only arpeggiate the chords during the repetition.\(^{247}\) This helps to bring out certain notes of the hidden melody within the left-hand part. Barber says that this practice has become a Russian tradition\(^{248}\) and I can say that from recorded evidence, Gilels certainly played it this way.\(^{249}\) Curiously, Siloti’s pupil Bernardo Segáll does not play it this way. He arpeggiates the left hand part during both the play-throughs of the piece.

\(^{245}\) Barber, *Lost in the Stars*, xv.

\(^{246}\) Ibid., 257.


\(^{248}\) Ibid.
One last issue with regard to performance practice of this piece concerns the tempo. Listening to any of Gilels’s performances of the work (as well as many other recorded performances of the work), one will notice that Siloti’s metronome marking is a lot faster than the tempo at which Gilels plays this piece. Siloti’s metronome marking is half note = 50! Barber comments that this tempo marking is “rather slower than many performances” but, in fact, it is the opposite. The metronome marking might be a misprint, since it would make the tempo of this piece exceedingly fast and impractical.

In short, the “Prelude in B minor” is representative of Siloti’s mastery of the art of the Bach transcription. It exhibits his faithfulness to Bach whilst paying tribute to him by adding a little extra to the original. It displays all of Siloti’s pianistic devices and Maurice Hinson’s description of this piece could so aptly be applied to all of Siloti’s works in this medium. He writes, “The Siloti version is more elaborate than the original but retains its essence and spirit.”

This is the most recorded Bach-Siloti transcription in any medium. There are at least half a dozen commercially available recorded performances of Gilels playing the piece live, as well as dozens of recordings of the “Prelude in B minor” by a wide range of artists, including Cyprien Katsaris, Dmitry Paperno, Grigory Sokolov, and Alexis Weissenberg. For a more complete list of recordings, please refer to Appendix F and to the Discography.

---

249 This is evident from the commercially available recordings of Gilels’s various live performances. See footnote 135 below.

250 Barber, Lost in the Stars, 256.


252 There are six different recordings from as many different live performances of Gilels playing the “Prelude in B minor” listed on the site: http://www.bach-cantatas.com/NVD/PT-Siloti-Rec.htm, compiled March 2007-April 2011 (accessed June 6, 2011).
12. “Prelude” from Prelude and Fugue for Organ in G minor, BWV 535

An early and incomplete version of the Prelude and Fugue for Organ in G minor, BWV 535 dates to c.1705. Bach revised and completed the work between 1708 and 1717.\(^{254}\)

Siloti’s “Prelude in G minor” is not only a transcription of the “Prelude” from Bach’s Prelude and Fugue for Organ in G minor, BWV 535, it is actually based on the transcription of this work by the Hungarian pianist and composer, Theodor Szántó (1877-1934). Siloti performed Szántó’s transcription of the prelude and fugue on more than one occasion\(^ {255}\) and from there, it seems that Siloti made use of Szántó’s transcription as the starting point for his own piano realization. Siloti’s reworking of Szántó’s transcription is therefore an arrangement of a transcription. While Szántó transcribed both the prelude and fugue of Bach’s original, Siloti only transcribed the prelude.

In Siloti’s arrangement, it is very evident that he was mindful of the fact that this piece was originally conceived for the organ. Siloti utilizes the piano in such a way as to imitate the organ, but it is not only the Baroque organ that he had in mind here but rather, the tradition of nineteenth-century Romantic organ playing as applied to Baroque organ literature. To this end, Siloti made use of clearly marked terraced dynamics and alternating register displacement for specific passages in order to imitate two manuals with contrasting registration on the organ. The use of terraced dynamics is


\(^{255}\)Barber, Lost in the Stars, 284 & 317. This is evident from concert programs from the “Siloti Concerts.” Siloti performed Szántó’s transcription in 1909 and again in 1913.
Siloti’s own original device, as it does not occur in Szántó’s transcription or in Bach’s original. Please see Figure 3.64 below, which indicates Siloti’s use of terraced dynamics and register displacement.

**Figure 3.64: Bach-Siloti, Prelude in G minor, BWV 535, mm. 26-28.**

Furthermore, the use of doubling notes at the octave for reinforcement is particularly striking in this piece, as it too helps to imitate organ registration. Please see Figure 3.65 below which illustrates this point with regard to fast passagework (beginning in measure 14) and see Figure 3.66 in which Siloti has doubled several notes within every chord in the closing section of the piece, thus replicating four foot, eight foot, sixteen foot and thirty-two foot organ stops. Hinson feels that this thickening of the texture helps to dramatize the conclusion, but in so doing, he feels that the work becomes “a reconception, rather than a transcription” of Bach’s original.257

---


Figure 3.65: Bach-Siloti, *Prelude in G minor*, BWV 535, mm. 13-15.\(^{258}\)

Figure 3.66. Bach-Siloti, *Prelude in G minor*, BWV 535, mm. 39-42.\(^{259}\)


\(^{259}\) Ibid., 72.
Siloti also eliminated one measure from Bach’s original in this piece. This was first done by Szántó in his transcription and then implemented by Siloti. By shortening the piece by one measure, the momentum of the piece is propelled forward and a more immediate and arguably more spectacular climax is achieved. Please see Figure 3.67 for Bach’s original, and Figure 3.68 which shows Szántó’s abridged version of the same passage. Notice that Szántó (and therefore Siloti by extension, in Figure 3.69) simply eliminated a couple of repetitions within the passage and thus condensed the material of two measures into one measure.

Figure 3.67: Bach, Prelude & Fugue for Organ in G minor, BWV 535, mm. 31-32.\(^{260}\)

Figure 3.68: Bach-Szántó, Prelude & Fugue in G minor, BWV 535, m. 31.\(^{261}\)

---


A unique indication present in the left-hand part towards the beginning of this piece instructs the pianist to silently depress specific notes in the bass. Siloti’s indication for this device is shown in Figure 3.70.

By depressing certain notes silently, the dampers of these notes are lifted and the strings are free to vibrate sympathetically with notes within the right hand part. This

---


263 Ibid., 66.
helps to provide low bass sonorities that reinforce overtones of the right-hand figuration.

Next to the “Prelude in B minor,” the “Prelude in G minor” is the most recorded Bach-Siloti transcription, possibly because it is considered to be “among his [Siloti’s] finest creations.” The most outstanding recordings include those by Nelson Freire and Guiomar Novaes (a complete list of recordings is available in Appendix F).

13. “Siciliano” from Sonata for Flute and Keyboard in E flat major, BWV 1031

Bach completed the Sonata for Flute and Keyboard in E flat major, BWV 1031 between 1730 and 1734. There are several outstanding transcriptions of the second movement “Siciliano” including one each by Siloti, Ignaz Friedman, and Wilhelm Kempff. Siloti’s transcription was only published for the first time in 2003, while copies of the manuscript have been in circulation for years after Siloti presented a written manuscript of his “Siciliano” (dated c. 1919) as a gift to the son of the Finnish composer Erkki Melartin (1875–1937).

---

264 This is evident from the list of Bach-Siloti recordings posted online at: http://www.bach-cantatas.com/NVD/PT-Siloti-Rec.htm (accessed June 9, 2011).


270 Barber, “Introductory Notes,” The Alexander Siloti Collection, 11.

271 Barber, Lost in the Stars, 182.
Of the three transcriptions mentioned above, Friedman’s is the freest, while Siloti and Kempff stay closer to the notes of the flute and keyboard parts of the original work. Barber remarks that Siloti’s transcription of this work “is a superb example of his [Siloti’s] sometime reductionist and always captivating art.” Hinson characterizes Kempff’s transcription as “A free paraphrase.” This is arguable since Kempff took inconsiderable liberties with the structure of the piece rather than the notes themselves. In fact, the structure of the piece is quite different in all three transcriptions: In his version, Kempff attached a three-measure introduction to the beginning, which is based on the sixteenth-note accompanimental motive throughout Bach’s original (see Figure 3.71).

Figure 3.71: Bach-Kempff, “Siciliano” from Sonata for Flute and Keyboard in E flat major, BWV 1031, mm. 1-3.

Kempff also added a repeat sign at measure 22, signaling to the performer to start the piece a second time (but to omit the three-bar introduction on the second play through), thereby altering the formal design of the movement. I do not feel that this necessarily

---

272 Barber, “Introductory Notes,” The Alexander Siloti Collection, 11.
274 J. S. Bach, and Wilhelm Kempff, J. S. Bach: 10 Pieces Transcribed for Piano by Wilhelm Kempff. 6.
makes the movement a paraphrase, but it certainly alters the proportions of the piece and affords the player an opportunity to interpret the first twenty-two measures quite differently on each play-through.

Like Kempff, Friedman also added some prelude material. Friedman includes a one-measure preamble based on material from measure 8 of the original; Figure 3.72 indicates Friedman’s introduction based upon Bach’s material shown in Figure 3.73.

Figure 3.72: Bach-Friedman, “Siciliano” from Sonata for Flute and Keyboard in E flat major, BWV 1031, mm. 1-2.275

Figure 3.73: Bach, “Siciliano” from Sonata for Flute and Keyboard in E flat major, BWV 1031, mm. 5-8.276

Siloti mirrored Bach and does not add any introductory material or anything else. As a result, Siloti’s transcription is the only one of the three transcriptions that is identical in structure to the original work by Bach.

---

275 J. S. Bach, and Ignaz Friedman, The Friedman Collection, 49.

In terms of texture, Friedman’s is the most enhanced transcription. In places, he inserts inner voices and fills out the harmony. By contrast, Siloti and Kempff add scrupulously little, although both make use of some octave reinforcement in the left hand at times (Kempff more so than Siloti), presumably to imitate harpsichord registration. Siloti also utilized arpeggiated chords in the left hand at times, spanning a tenth from bottom to top in lieu of octaves, thus coloring the harmony in a way that is wholly pianistic and thus divergent from Bach’s original but also distinct from Kempff’s transcription. Compare the single notes of the left hand part of Bach’s original with the arpeggiated chords in the left hand of Siloti’s transcription in figures 3.74 and 3.75 respectively.

Figure 3.74: Bach, “Siciliano” from *Sonata for Flute and Keyboard in E flat major, BWV 1031, mm. 1-2.*

---

Friedman made use of a similar technique, but alters the inversions of some of Bach’s original harmonies (compare figures 3.76 and 3.77).

---

Figure 3.76: Bach, “Siciliano” from Sonata for Flute and Keyboard in E flat major, BWV 1031, mm. 20-21.\(^{279}\)

---


When transcribing a piece of chamber music for solo piano, there are invariably difficult decisions that have to be made by the transcriber. These include how to best retain certain musical effects on a single piano that are really only possible in music for more than one instrument. In Bach’s original “Siciliano”, there are several places where the right hand of the keyboard part imitates the melodic material of the flute part, at the same pitch (see Figure 3.78 for example).

---


In Kempff’s transcription, he chose to reproduce the original pitches of the music exactly, so that the right hand plays the same music twice. See figure 3.79 below.

Figure 3.79: Bach-Kempff, “Siciliano” from Sonata for Flute and Keyboard in E flat major, BWV 1031, mm. 27-28. 282

The unfortunate result is that in his transcription, the imitative effect of the original is lost and the passage simply sounds like a repetition. To try to solve this problem and retain the element of imitation, Kempff makes each imitation/repetition an echo, so that the original flute material is played f or mf while the original keyboard part is heard as p and pp respectively (see Figure 3.79 above).

Siloti and Friedman find a different solution. Instead of utilizing dynamics to try to preserve Bach’s original imitative effect, they do so by changing the register of the original keyboard part. This is achieved by setting the original right hand part an octave lower and giving it to the left hand to play. Figure 3.80 below shows Siloti’s version of this same passage.

---

282 J. S. Bach, and Wilhelm Kempff, J. S. Bach: 10 Pieces Transcribed for Piano by Wilhelm Kempff, 7.

92
There are numerous editorial differences between the three transcriptions since all three are very personal adaptations and were likely created in part, at least, to showcase the interpretive taste of each transcriber/pianist. Dynamics, articulation, phrasing, pedaling, and other expressive markings differ considerably between the pieces, but all are convincing in their own right and give one a glimpse into the musical approach and style of the three individual virtuosi. For example, something as interpretively simple but subjective as tempo choice makes for a fascinating comparison: in Bach’s original, there is no tempo indication, the movement is simply designated with the title, “Siciliano,” which refers to a “moderately slow dance of pastoral character in $6/8$ or $12/8$.” By contrast, each transcription is marked with a similar but different tempo indication: Kempff’s denotes *Andante simplice*, Friedman indicates *Andante con moto*, and Siloti writes, *Andantino* (presumably on the faster side of *Andante*). Kempff and Siloti even supply metronome markings; Kempff’s being the slower of the two with eighth note = 104 and in Siloti’s, the eighth note = 120.

---


The transcriptions of Bach’s “Siciliano” from *Sonata for Flute and Keyboard in E flat major*, BWV 1031 by Kempff, Friedman, and Siloti are all highly effective and beautiful realizations. I agree with Hamish Milne however, who compares Siloti’s transcription to others of the same piece saying that, “Siloti’s [transcription], without attempting anything extraordinary, is in my opinion simply the best.”\textsuperscript{285} Schanz describes Siloti’s arrangement as both “Romantic” and possessing “great warmth.”\textsuperscript{286} Alessio Bax, Bernardo Segáll, James Barbagallo, and Milne have all made attractive recordings of Siloti’s “Siciliano.”

14. *Toccata and Fugue for Organ in D minor, BWV 565*

Bach may have completed the famous *Toccata and Fugue for Organ in D minor*, BWV 565 before 1708.\textsuperscript{287} There is some question as to whether Bach actually composed this work,\textsuperscript{288} but it has remained extremely popular regardless. Due to its popularity, it has been transcribed for various mediums by many transcribers; there are arrangements for full orchestra including the famous version by Leopold Stokowski (1882–1977),\textsuperscript{289} to versions for guitar,\textsuperscript{290} as well as thirty or more transcriptions for solo piano.\textsuperscript{291} Amongst the latter, there are outstanding examples by notable pianists and composers such as

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{285} Milne, “Russian Bach Piano Transcriptions,” 5.
  
  \item \textsuperscript{286} Schanz, Johann Sebastian Bach: in der Klaviertranskription, 250-251.
  
  \item \textsuperscript{287} Christoph Wolff, et al, “Bach, Johann Sebastian,” in Grove Music Online (accessed June 6, 2011).
  
  
  \item \textsuperscript{289} J. S. Bach, and Leopold Stokowski, Toccata and fugue in D minor, BWV 565, transcribed for orchestra (New York: Broude, 1952).
  
  \item \textsuperscript{290} J. S. Bach, and Philip Hii, Toccata & Fugue, BWV 565, transcribed for guitar (San Francisco: Guitar Solo Publications, 1995).
  
  \item \textsuperscript{291} Waugh, “Cover Notes,” in J. S. Bach, Chaconne: Bach Transcribed, 5.
\end{itemize}
Busoni, Alfred Cortot (1877–1962), Friedman, Tatiana Nikolayeva (1924–1993), Isidor Philipp (1863–1958), Reger, who also completed a version for piano four hands, György Sándor (1912–1995), Carl Tausig (1841–1871), and Siloti. Siloti’s transcription of this work holds the unique distinction of being his only Bach transcription for solo piano for which he chose to transcribe the entire original work.

Quite uncharacteristically, there are very few performance directions present in this transcription when compared to all of Siloti’s other Bach transcriptions for solo piano. These include surprisingly few dynamic indications, absolutely no pedal markings until the final two pages of the piece, just occasional fingering suggestions, and merely selected passages marked with specific articulation. Siloti’s signature octave doubling and terraced dynamics are indeed present.

Like the “Prelude” from Prelude and Fugue for Organ in G minor, BWV 535, Siloti makes use of doubling notes at the octave for reinforcement in order to imitate organ registration but it is not as extensive as in many of his other transcriptions. Similarly in certain passages, Siloti utilizes marked terraced dynamics to imitate two manuals with contrasting registration on the organ, but this too is indicated fairly infrequently.

When compared to some of the transcriptions of this work by those of the authors listed above, Siloti’s is rather straightforward and does not deviate very far from Bach’s original. Siloti also avoids any added excesses. Another difference is that the transcriptions by Busoni, Friedman, and especially Tausig are rather more


\[293\] J. S. Bach, and Ferrucio Busoni, Toccata and fugue in D minor for Organ, transcribed for piano (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1915).

\[294\] J. S. Bach, and Ignaz Friedman, Toccata and fugue in D minor for Organ, transcribed for piano (Melbourne: Allan & Co, 1944).
virtuosic and “glamorous” than Siloti’s. Curiously Arthur Schanz does not discuss or even list Siloti’s transcription in his book. Recordings of Siloti’s transcription include one each by Segáll and Barbagallo.

CONCLUSION

While largely forgotten, Alexander Siloti was an important figure in the history of music. His contributions as an editor and copyist in the works of Tchaikovsky and Liszt, in particular, demonstrate that he was an influential and significant figure. He was also an important pianist, teacher, conductor, and impresario, who influenced artists such as Rachmaninoff and many others. As a devout disciple of the great Franz Liszt and in the spirit of Bach himself, Siloti made numerous transcriptions of Bach’s music for solo piano, and for other instrumental combinations. Siloti completed more transcriptions of Bach’s music than of anyone else’s and amongst his solo piano Bach transcriptions are some of the finest works in the entire genre of the piano transcription.

Siloti’s Bach transcriptions pay homage to Bach. They were conceived as mediums for transmitting, and as vehicles for reimagining Bach’s music. As such, they are comparable to Bach transcriptions by Siloti’s contemporaries and predecessors. In general, Siloti chose to honor Bach without virtuosic excess and fanfare. Instead, Siloti’s arrangements are refined recreations that explore the piano, exploiting its sonority, without glorifying the performer. At times Siloti reproduces Bach almost exactly, and at others he enhances and paraphrases Bach in his transcriptions.

Unfortunately, Siloti’s Bach transcriptions are little known when compared to similar pieces for the piano by some other transcribers of Bach’s music. Aside from one or two well-known pieces, they are rarely performed in concert and some have never been recorded. However, his fourteen printed Bach transcriptions for solo piano are superb pieces that effectively and idiomatically make use of the piano. It is my hope that readers will begin to investigate these pieces more thoroughly and explore the possibility of programming and recording them more frequently.
APPENDIX A

LIST OF SILOTI’S BACH EDITIONS

Siloti edited quite a few of Bach’s works. Like his transcriptions, his editions are very much a product of their time: they are highly edited with many performance suggestions. Some of these works have never been published and are not easily accessible. Siloti’s editions of works by J. S. Bach are listed here in Appendix A utilizing Barber’s list. Additional information for these is included in order to provide as much detail as possible with regard to both Bach’s original work in each case, as well as to specific publication information pertaining to every one of Siloti’s editions. The entries are arranged alphabetically by title.


“Aria” from Cantata No. 105, BWV 105, for soprano and orchestra. MS and 12 parts, n.d.

Brandenburg Concerto No. 4, BWV 1049, for piano and orchestra. St. Petersburg: MS 1909.

Brandenburg Concerto No. 5, BWV 1050, for solo flute, violin, piano; strings, full score. Leipzig: Zimmermann, n.d.

“Gigue” from Partita No. 1 in B flat major, BWV 825, for solo piano. New York: Carl Fischer, 1923.


“Widerstehe doch der Sünde” from Cantata No. 54, BWV 54, for mezzo-soprano and orchestra with organ. n.d.

296 Barber, Lost in the Stars, 364.
APPENDIX B

LIST OF BACH–SILOTI TRANSCRIPTIONS FOR SOLO PIANO

Siloti’s Bach transcriptions for solo piano include the works that are currently available in print as well as a few works that are unavailable at present. The fourteen works published by Carl Fischer in 2003 as part of the *The Alexander Siloti Collection* are listed here. All of these works were previously published (by Carl Fischer) except for the “Siciliano” from *Sonata for Flute and Keyboard*, BWV 1031.

“Adagio” from *Sonata for Violin and Keyboard*, BWV 1018
“Air” from *Orchestral Suite No. 3*, BWV 1068
“Andante” from *Violin Sonata No. 2*, BWV 1003
“Chaconne” from *Violin Partita No. 2*, BWV 1004
“Fantasia” from *Fantasia and Fugue in C minor*, BWV 906
*Paraphrase on the Prelude in C sharp major*, BWV 872
“Prelude” from *Cantata No. 29*, BWV 29
“Prelude” from *Cantata No. 35*, BWV 35
“Prelude” from *Prelude and Fugue for Organ in E minor*, BWV 555
“Prelude” from *Cello Suite No. 4*, BWV 1010
“Prelude in B minor” from *W.F. Bach Büchlein*, BWV 855a
“Prelude” from *Prelude & Fugue for Organ in G minor*, BWV 535
“Siciliano” from *Sonata for Flute and Keyboard*, BWV 1031
*Toccata & Fugue for Organ in D minor*, BWV 565

Siloti’s Bach transcriptions for solo piano that have not been reprinted are four pieces included as the second volume of a set entitled, *Transcriptions for the Young*. The

---

transcriptions from this collection are all intermediate in difficulty and taken from Bach’s cello suites no. 1 (BWV 1007) and no. 3 (BWV 1009). Siloti calls them, “Four Etudes from the Cello Suites of Bach.” Hinson describes the texture of these pieces as, “mainly one line, frequently tossed between the hands.”\(^{299}\) He goes on to say that Siloti’s settings are “clever and most effective for the less-advanced student.”\(^{300}\) These works are in the public domain and available for download at the following website:

http://imslp.org/wiki/Category:Siloti,_Alexander

They include:

1. “Prelude” from Suite No. 3
2. “Bourrée” from Suite No. 3
3. “Prelude” from Suite No. 1
4. “Courante” from Suite No. 1

The following Bach-Siloti transcriptions are possibly for solo piano and have not been published or reprinted, and are not easily accessible.


Kleine Stücke: Choral, Variationen, Prélude. Moscow: Gutheil, 1900.

Passacaglia in C minor. MS, n.d.


“Toccata” from Toccata & Fugue in D minor for Organ, BWV 565. MS, n.d.


\(^{300}\) Ibid.
APPENDIX C

LIST OF BACH-SILOTI TRANSCRIPTIONS FOR TWO PIANOS & FOUR HANDS

Siloti completed several arrangements for two pianos, and for one piano, four hands. His two-piano version of the *Italian Concerto*, BWV 971 is exceptional as it was conceived for three pianists: one solo piano and the other four hands, so six hands altogether. Siloti also completed a version of the *Italian Concerto* for one piano, four hands. The full list of works for two pianos, and for one piano, four hands, is provided here with publication information. None of these works is currently in print.

“Andante” from *Brandenburg Concerto* No. 2, BWV 1047, for two pianos. New York: Carl Fischer, c. 1924.

“Andante” from *Concerto for 2 Keyboards* No. 3 BWV 1062, for two pianos. New York: Carl Fischer, c. 1927.

“Andante” from *Italian Concerto*, BWV 971. Four hands. MS, n.d.

*Concerto no. 3 in C minor, from concerto for 2 violins in D minor*, BWV 1043, for two pianos. New York: Carl Fischer, c. 1927.

*Italian Concerto*, BWV 971, for two pianos (three players). New York: Carl Fischer, c. 1924.

*Italian Concerto*, BWV 971, for piano, four hands. New York: Carl Fischer, 1930.

“Toccata” from *Adagio and Fugue for Organ in C major*, BWV 564, for piano, four hands. MS, n.d.
Most notable in this category are several works for cello and piano that Siloti completed for the great Catalan cellist, Pablo Casals (1876–1973), who also edited all of the cello parts. Casals and Siloti probably performed at least some, if not all, of these works together and each of these pieces exhibits similar treatment by Siloti of Bach’s material. There are also arrangements made incorporating violin, with the violin parts edited by Paul Kochanski (1887–1934). Kochanski was a colleague of Siloti’s in St. Petersburg and at the Juilliard School, and like Casals, he too collaborated with Siloti in performance. The first work listed is the only work of those below that is currently available in print. The full list of transcriptions for piano and other instrument(s) is listed below.

“Adagio” from Toccata & Fugue for Organ in C major, BWV 564, for cello and piano, viola and piano and violin and piano. Edited by Pablo Casals, Paul Kochansky and Tertis. New York: Carl Fischer, 1925.


“Air” from Orchestral Suite No. 3, BWV, 1068, for violin and piano. Edited by Paul Kochansky. MS, n.d.

“Andante” from Brandenburg Concerto No. 5, BWV 1050 for violin, viola and piano. Leipzig: Zimmerman, 1921.

“Andante” from Italian Concerto, BWV 971, for cello and piano. Edited by Pablo Casals. MS, n.d.

---

301 This is a likely assumption based on the fact that Casals and Siloti performed on numerous occasions together at the Siloti Concerts and elsewhere. See Barber, Lost in the Stars, 82, 84, 119-121, 177, 272, 278, 281, 286, 291, 301 & 317.

302 Barber, “Introductory Notes,” The Alexander Siloti Collection, 7.

*Brandenburg Concerto* No. 5, BWV 1050 for flute, violin, piano and string orchestra. Full score. Leipzig and Berlin: Zimmermann, n.d.


*Concerto for Violin in E major*, No. 2, BWV 1042, for violin and piano. New York: Carl Fischer, 1924.

*Kom süßer Tod*, for cello and piano. Moscow: Gutheil, 1923.

*Partita in E minor* [sic] (This is actually the *Sonata in E minor for Violin and Continuo*, BWV 1023.) For violin and piano. Edited by Paul Kochansky. New York: Carl Fischer, 1927.

“Prelude” from *Cantata* No. 29, BWV 29, for violin and piano. Score only, n.d.

“Prelude” from *Cantata* No. 35, BWV 35, for violin and piano. New York: Carl Fischer, 1924.

*Sonata in E major*, No. 3, for violin and piano. n.d.

*Sonata for Flute and Piano*. n.d.

*Sonatas for Violin and Piano* [4, in B minor, A major, E major, F minor]. N.d.
APPENDIX E

LIST OF BACH-SILOTI TRANSCRIPTIONS FOR INSTRUMENTAL ENSEMBLE WITHOUT PIANO

The vast majority of Siloti’s Bach transcriptions include piano. The few transcriptions that do not include a piano part are listed here.

“Adagio” from Toccata & Fugue for Organ in C major, BWV 564, for string orchestra. New York: Carl Fischer, c. 1925.

“Air” from Orchestral Suite No. 3, BWV, 1068, for string quartet. MS, n.d.

Brandenburg Concerto No. 4, BWV 1049 for orchestra. MS, score only, n.d.

“Prelude” from Cantata No. 174, BWV 174, for orchestra. MS St. Petersburg, 1913.
APPENDIX F

LIST OF COMMERCIALY RELEASED RECORDINGS OF THE PUBLISHED BACH-SILOTI TRANSCRIPTIONS FOR SOLO PIANO

There are three Bach-Siloti transcriptions for solo piano that are currently in print but have not been recorded. These are the “Fantasia” from Fantasia and Fugue in C minor, BWV 906, the Paraphrase on the Prelude in C sharp major, BWV 872, and the “Prelude” from Cello Suite No. 4, BWV 1010. For the other eleven pieces, I have done my best to assemble as complete a list of recordings as possible below.

“Adagio” from Sonata for Violin and Keyboard, BWV 1018

“Air” from Orchestral Suite No. 3, BWV 1068
   Alessio Bax, Signum, 2009.

“Andante” from Violin Sonata No. 2, BWV 1003
   Alessio Bax, Signum, 2009.

303 For further details regarding these recordings, please refer to the discography. In all incidences, recordings are in the format of a compact disc, unless otherwise noted.
“Chaconne” from *Violin Partita* No. 2, BWV 1004

“Prelude” from *Cantata* No. 29, BWV 29

“Prelude” from *Cantata* No. 35, BWV 35

“Prelude” from *Prelude and Fugue for Organ in E minor*, BWV 555
Giovanni Cultrera, Casa Musicale Eco, 2010. (mp3)
Bruno-Leonardo Gelber, EMI, 1970. (LP)
Clemens Rave, Christoph Schulz, 1999.

“Prelude in B minor” from *W. F. Bach Büchlein*, BWV 855a
David Bismuth, Ameson, 2008.
Michel Block, OM Records, 1991
Susan Chan, MSR Classics, 2008.
Giovanni Cultrera, Casa Musicale Eco, 2010. (mp3)
John Damgaard, Classico, 2010.
David Delucia, David Delucia (private release), 2003.
Maria Gambarian, Melodiya, 1978? (LP)
Julian Lawrence Gargiulo, 2003. (mp3)
Emil Gilels, Bearac Reissues, n.d.
Emil Gilels, Music Bible, 1977. (DVD)
Emil Gilels, Melodiya/ Angel, 1969. (LP)
Emil Gilels, Musical Heritage Society, 1981. (LP)
Tong-il Han, Arcadia, 2000.
Susanne Kessel, Oehms Classics, 2011. (mp3)
Nicola Krog, Classico, 2002.
Elena Kuschnerova, Steinway Japan, 2002.
Vladimir Leyetchkiss, Orion, 1988. (Cassette)
Angelika Nebel, Ars Musici Records, 2009
Caio Pagano, Soundset Recordings, 2008.
Filipe Pinto-Ribeiro, CNM, 2009.
Robert Preston, Spectrum, 1982. (LP)
Anne Queffélec, Mirare, 2009.
Yaroslav Senyshyn, Platon Promotions, 2010. (mp3)
Grigory Sokolov, Naïve, 2002. (DVD)
Elizabeth Sombart, Quantum, 1997.
Jouni Somero, Mils, 1996.
Alexis Weissenberg, Philips, 1974, 1998

“Prelude” from Prelude and Fugue for Organ in G minor, BWV 535
Jeanne Bovet, Turicaphon, 1972. (LP)
Susan Cohen, Elesar, 1981. (LP)
Laszlo Gyimesi, Ex Libris, 1986. (LP)
Caio Pagano, Soundset, 2008.
Daniel Pollack, Columbia, 1974. (LP)
William Schatzkamer, RCA Victor, 1900. (LP)

“Siciliano” from Sonata for Flute and Keyboard, BWV 1031
Alessio Bax, Signum, 2009.
Toccata & Fugue for Organ in D minor, BWV 565
APPENDIX G

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION

CARL FISCHER, LLC.
65 Bleecker Street
New York, NY 10012

November 11, 2011

Stephen Pierce
608 Lucea Drive
Evans, CO 80620

Carl Fischer, LLC (the ‘Owner’), hereby grants to you (the ‘Licensee’) non-exclusive permission to include the excerpts from the copyrighted musical works listed in the attached Schedule A by J.S. Bach, arranged by Alexander Siloti (the ‘Musical Works’) in your dissertation for University of Cincinnati, College Conservatory of Music titled “An Examination of Alexander Siloti’s Printed Solo Piano Transcriptions of J.S. Bach’s Works” (the “Dissertation”). The Dissertation is to be available on the OhioLink online library only, as per the following terms:
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Prelude in B minor (measures 1-6)

Adagio from the Sonata for Violin and Keyboard in F minor (measures 1 and 8)

Air from the Suite for String Orchestra No. 3 in D Major (measures 1-2 and 17)


Andante from the Sonata for Violin Solo in A Minor (measures 1-3)

Fantasia in C Minor (measure 1)

Organ Prelude in E minor (Measures 16-18 and 21-24)

Paraphrase on the Prelude in C sharp Major (measures 1-2)

Organ Prelude in G minor (measures 1-2, 13-15, 26-28, 39-42)

Prelude from the Suite in E flat Major for Cello Solo (measures 1-2, 59-60)

Prelude from Cantata no. 29 (measures 1-3)

Prelude from Cantata no. 35 (measures 1-2, 31-35)

Siciliano from the Sonata for Flute and Keyboard in E flat Major (1-2, 27-28)

Prelude from Cantata no. 35 (measures 1-2, 33-35)
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“Andante” from Brandenburg Concerto no. 2 for Orchestra, BWV 1047. Transcribed for two pianos. New York: Carl Fischer, 1927.


*Concerto no. 2 in E Major*, BWV 1042. Transcribed and arranged for violin and piano. New York: Carl Fischer, 1924.


“Prelude from Cantata no. 35” from *Works for Violin and Piano* Newly Transcribed and Edited by Alexander Siloti. New York: Carl Fischer, 1924.
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