Two Pieces for Piano were written early in Glenn Gould's exploration of the music of Arnold Schoenberg and his contemporaries and followers. Around 1948/49 Gould's teacher, Alberto Guerrero, had introduced him to the music of Schoenberg – Gould was about sixteen years old – and he immediately became engrossed in music based on serial technique. The precise date of composition of *Two Pieces for Piano* is ambiguous. At the head of the manuscript for the first piece, he wrote *2 Pieces 1951–52*, and dated the first piece at the end November 1951. The second piece appears first to have been dated September 1952, but the "2" is heavily inked over so as make the date 1951.

The *Two Pieces* are built on applications of a single twelve-note series. In the second work the row is revolved so as to begin at different points but in the same basic order as in the first piece. In copying out the *Two Pieces* Gould frequently neglected to cancel accidentals in a bar although he is inconsistent in this matter; i. e. sometimes an accidental has value for the repetition of a pitch within a bar, sometimes it applies only to the note to which it is attached. Because the application of the pitch series is so regular, it is possible in almost every case of uncertainty in the manuscript to determine the accurate pitch from its position in the series.

More problematic are pitches that appear to be incorrect in the manuscript because of their inconsistency with the application of the series, not because Gould forgot to cancel an accidental. However, these *Two Pieces* are so obviously essays in strict serial technique, and because the ordering of pitches is so consistently regular, there can be little doubt that an error was made simply in the copying of the music from a prior source, such as sketches or a work copy, that must surely have existed but which has not apparently survived.

Changes from the manuscript have been made directly in the musical text and indicated in the following notes.

In this edition, in accordance with general practice, an accidental applies to all repetitions of a pitch in the same octave until cancelled or changed.

Carl Morey
Institute for Canadian Music
University of Toronto
August 1994

I

bar 6: LH beat 2: G♮ – the MS lacks the natural sign.
bar 10: RH beat 3: C♮ – the MS lacks the natural sign.
bar 15: LH beat 2: A♭ – the lower note is unclear in the MS and could be interpreted as G♭, but A♭ is consistent with the series at this point.
bar 18: RH beat 2: D♮; beat 3: A♮ – the MS lacks the natural signs.
bar 20: LH beat 3: C♮ – the MS lacks the natural sign.
bar 23: LH beat 3: To be consistent in the serial application, the chord should have C♯ in the middle, not D. However, D has a musical logic in the context of the spacing of the four LH chords in bars 23–25, and the MS is clear in the notation of D.
bar 28: RH beat 2: In the MS, D was originally D♭, but the flat sign was erased. D♭ would be possible, but apparently Gould decided on D♮.
bar 29: RH lower voice: sequence should be C♯ D♯ C♯ F♮ D♮ C♮ B in order to conform to the series; the MS lacks natural signs for the F and the final C.
bar 32: RH beat 3: F♮ – the MS lacks the natural sign.
bar 34: LH beat 2: B♮ – the MS lacks the natural sign.
bar 41: LH beat 3: D♮ – the MS lacks the natural sign.
bar 45: RH last chord: C♮/D♮; the MS has one natural sign but it is unclear to which pitch it was intended to apply. To conform to the series, both pitches should be natural.
bar 46: RH: despite change of voice notation, B♭ throughout the bar.
bar 48: LH: reading upwards, chord should be F♯ C♮ F♮ (same as preceding chord, which is fully notated); the MS lacks accidentals.
bar 54: RH: the rests are missing in the MS.
bar 57: LH beat 2: D♮ – the MS lacks the natural sign.

II

bar 2: RH last note: C♮ – the MS lacks the natural sign.
bar 6: LH beat 3: B♮ – the MS lacks the natural sign.
bar 7: LH beat 3/4: G♮, F♮ – the MS lacks the natural signs.
bar 11: RH beat 2: G♯ – the MS lacks the sharp sign, but G♮ is inconsistent with the strict presentation of the series at this point.
bar 16: RH beat 3: F♮ – the MS lacks the natural sign.
bar 20: RH last note: A♮; LH beat 2: E♮ – the MS lacks the natural signs.
bar 28: RH beat 1: D♯–D♯–G; the D♯ is carried over from bar 27 but the sharp sign is missing in bar 28 in the MS.
bar 31: RH beat 3: D♮, F♮ – the MS lacks the natural signs.
bar 32: RH beat 2: D♯; beat 3: D♮ – there is no accidental in the MS for either D, but D♯ and D♮ are consistent with the presentation of the series.
LH beat 3: G♮ / A♮ / F♮ – the MS lacks the natural signs.
bar 33: RH lower voice: G♯ C♯ F♯ E – the MS lacks accidentals for C and F, but C♯ and F♯ are required for consistency in the presentation of the series.

Two pieces

I

rit.

21

3

28

32

(7)

37

3

44

3 3 3

rit.

49 *a tempo*

55

II

5

9

3

13

19

23

8

28

31