Mission Statement

The College Orchestra Directors Association is dedicated to the promotion and advancement of college and university orchestra programs through the collaborative assistance, insights, knowledge, creativity, resources and shared vision of its members.

CODA champions the art of teaching and performing orchestral music and strives to encourage and support the artistic, professional and personal growth of college orchestra directors and their students.

The association serves as an advocate for the crucial dual roles of the orchestra in the higher education community; namely, providing an essential component in the development of educated students of all majors, and refining the vocational and personal skills required of those preparing for various careers in music and other disciplines.
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Messages

President’s Message

Dear colleagues,

It is my pleasure to announce the Vol. VII of our CODA Journal. I would like to express our gratitude to the editorial board and all contributors for making it possible to reaffirm our commitment to the scholarly advancement of our profession. Let's continue to celebrate our joint accomplishments in our constant pursuit of all the facets of the orchestra conducting art.

Ricardo Averbach, President, CODA
The CODA Journal is publishing research articles that are of quality regarding the writing, and of pertinent issue regarding the subjects. This allows for articles that are of particular interest to University-College conductors and have been recognized as academic research papers by their college/university peers and committees.

While many might consider conducting texts as being acceptable for the promotion sequence, there are many topics that should be accepted and articles such as that by Luis Viquez should lead one to a corpus of compositions that deserve to be performed.

We hope that if you are thinking of writing a paper, please clear the idea with your appropriate committee. I can assure you that you will be assisted along the way by those on CODA’s committees and we look for interesting and thoughtful writing on a variety of subjects germane to the work of a College/University Orchestra.

Leonard Atherton
Dear fellow CODA members,

It is a joy to bring you Vol. VII of the CODA Journal. So much has happened in CODA during this past year and the articles within reflect this.

Joel Neves’ article on selecting appropriate repertoire—something with which we all struggle—presents available resources, including those that are free as well as those available through subscription. At the heart of the article is a report on the data collected from the 2005-2011 CODA member survey. The first part focuses not only on repertoire programmed the most frequently (can we all guess which symphony tops the list?), but also on composers that are the most neglected. This is followed up by a section on programming philosophies, including thematic programming.

Early on, the author states “College orchestra directors lack the industry-wide tools that band directors commonly utilize, such as core repertoire lists, music difficulty grading scales, and voluminous research on literature selection criteria…” Perhaps this is something for CODA to consider.

The CODA Ibermúsicas initiative is already having a very positive effect on our organization. Luis Viquez’ article on Costa Rican romantic symphonic music opens up a wealth of information about music and composers from a country of which most of us know very little. The article presents a history of symphonic music in Costa Rica and then focuses on a single work, Julio Mata’s El Libertador.
Finally, Clinton Niewig, librarian of the Philadelphia Orchestra has given his personal errata list to be published on the CODA website. This will be of great value to our membership. There are, of course, myriad other works and CODA members are invited to mold their own errata lists into articles of scholarly research for the Journal. My own article on score and parts errata for Anton Rubinstein’s 3rd and 4th is, hopefully, the first of many such articles from our members.

Looking forward to seeing everybody in the City of Seven Hills—Rome, er Cincinnati!

Sincerely,

Jon

Jon Ceander Mitchell
Conductor, Chamber Orchestra and Professor of Music
University of Massachusetts Boston

**Da Capo** and the **CODA Journal** are sister publications of the College Orchestra Directors Association. **Da Capo** is our newsletter while the **CODA Journal** contains scholarly research. Both are vital to our membership. In general, shorter, non-scholarly articles appear in **Da Capo** while longer, more scholarly ones appear in the **Journal**. Submissions to either publication are always greatly encouraged. While some crossover is possible, on occasion the editors may recommend members to resubmit their articles to the other publication. This is our CODA, a very giving and sharing organization; let us continue with our strong written record of our accomplishments.
Selecting Appropriate Literature for College Orchestra: A Study of Repertoire and Programming Choices of CODA Conductors

Joel Neves
Michigan Technological University
Houghton, Michigan

Selecting appropriate repertoire is among the principal tasks of an orchestra conductor. Choosing appropriate music is essential for developing individual musicianship, achieving peak ensemble performance, and inspiring a loyal patronage. Playing ill-suited repertoire, however, can misdirect the talents of the musicians, create unpolished performances, and diminish audience engagement. A conductor’s critical task, therefore, is to judiciously select the type of repertoire that best showcases the orchestra and its unique skillsets.

There are numerous print and online resources that aid the college orchestra conductor in this important process. This is especially true of online music score and audio/video streaming sites, which seem heaven-sent for music professionals. If ten years ago one needed to contact a music publisher for a perusal score, wait for it to arrive in the mail, and then try to locate a CD recording, today’s conductor—for a majority of the orchestral repertoire—needs only to search online for the score and parts and multiple professional audio and video recordings, usually without spending a dime. This allows for an in-depth examination of multiple scores in a short amount of time, thus making it easier than ever to evaluate music for one’s orchestra.

The central challenge then becomes sorting out the playable from the unplayable, the practical from the pipe dream, and finding those hidden gems that are uniquely cut for your orchestra. This process of selecting suitable repertoire is much more of a science in the wind band world. College orchestra directors lack the industry-wide tools\(^1\) that band directors commonly utilize, such as core repertoire lists, music difficulty grading scales, and voluminous research on literature selection criteria, along with a vast peer network, CBDNA, formed in the 1940s. There is no

---

\(^1\) JW Pepper, Lucks Music, and Alfred offer “educational” arrangements of orchestral literature that are suitable for middle school, high school, and smaller college orchestras. Each arrangement is listed on the publisher’s website along with snippets of the score, streaming audio of the entire piece, and a grading scale—certainly an impressive array of helpful tools for selecting educational literature. Sadly, none of these options are available for the original compositions.
equivalent of the American Band College Music Grading Chart, the National Band Association’s tiered rankings list (www.nationalbandassociation.org) or the Wind Repertory Project (www.windrep.org) in the college orchestra sphere.

This presents a unique opportunity for the College Orchestra Directors Association to address this deficiency. More research can be encouraged on the topic of repertoire selection for the college orchestra. A collaborative project can be initiated that creates a playability grading chart for orchestral music. Core repertoire lists could be suggested. CODA members’ submissions of concert programs (a current initiative) can be expanded. Such useful tools and resources could greatly assist CODA members in the vital task of repertoire selection.

With that in mind, this paper is intended to give guidance to college orchestra conductors in selecting standard orchestral literature, with a central focus on data derived from a repertoire survey of CODA members administered in 2011. The article is organized as follows: 1) current online and print resources, 2) summary of repertoire data from CODA member survey, 3) programming philosophies, 4) selected concert themes and repertoire, and 5) conclusion.

**Current Online and Print Resources**

**Free Online Scores**

The most comprehensive free online collection of orchestra music is the International Music Score Library Project (www.imslp.org), a user-submitted wiki of orchestra, band, and choral scores—and usually the parts, too—that are in the public domain, or pre-1924, in the United States. (Some living composers allow their recent music to be listed as public domain works.) IMSLP has revolutionized how orchestra conductors, in particular, locate and evaluate music scores: it is free, all files are downloadable and printable (potentially saving orchestras thousands of dollars), and its collection of almost 75,000 compositions embodies the largest repository of Baroque, Classical, and Romantic orchestral scores and parts on the Internet. For those seeking choral or choral-orchestral scores and parts not available on IMSLP, the Choral Public Domain Library (www.cpdl.org) is an excellent companion resource.

---

2The websites of the major music publishers, like Schirmer or Boosey & Hawkes, are excellent resources for repertoire planning, but since these portals lack comprehensive online score examination and audio streaming, they will not be discussed in this article.
Another essential free online resource is the New York Philharmonic’s Digital Archives (archives.nyphil.org), which currently houses the orchestra’s entire collection of marked scores and parts performed during its “International Period”: 1943 to 1970. (When completed, the Archives will contain all documents from 1842 through 1970.) These documents open a rare window into the artistic choices made by individual musicians, such as the principal bassoonist’s phrase markings at the beginning of *Rite of Spring*, Leonard Bernstein’s tempo and dynamic alterations to Beethoven symphonies, or the string bowings used by Andre Kostelanetz. The bowed parts alone—numbering in the tens of thousands—are an invaluable time-saving and educational resource for conductors and concertmasters. Also, since it lacks a public domain or country-specific restriction, the Digital Archives offers access to many 20th century or otherwise hard-to-find compositions not available on IMSLP. For example, a cursory search produces the marked scores and parts to Shostakovich’s Symphony Nos. 1, 5, 7, and 9 and Copland’s *Appalachian Spring Suite* and *Lincoln Portrait*.

**Free Online Audio/Video Streaming**

Two online streaming services are vital companions for score study: YouTube and Spotify. YouTube, a user-generated video sharing website, contains the most extensive library of free classical video and audio content on the Internet. Its usefulness to conductors can hardly be overstated: the bulk of the standard orchestral repertoire is located on the site, often with numerous audio and video renditions of each piece. A search for “Beethoven Symphony 5,” for example, produces the following video results:

- 1,450,000 unique hits
- Toscanini, Stokowski, Munch, Szell, Karajan, Giulini, Bernstein, Harnoncourt, Kleiber, Abbado, Muti, Thielemann, and Dudamel conducting the piece
- hundreds of audio recordings (in video format)
- multiple alternative interpretations, including graphic video music animations, pop remixes, solo instrument arrangements, sketch comedies by Sid Caesar and Rowan Atkinson, and a three-year-old maestro conducting it in his living room

YouTube also includes thousands of performances by college, community, and regional professional orchestras playing the standard repertoire, which can prove uniquely useful to college conductors. The Chicago Symphony playing Shostakovich 5 is one thing, but witnessing a performance of the piece by a university orchestra (especially one with similar skill sets as your own) can provide more realistic clues as to its playability.
Spotify is a “freemium” audio streaming site that offers digital rights management-restricted content from major record labels. Known mostly for its pop music anthologies, Spotify’s art music collection is surprisingly broad and extensive, making it an essential portal for accessing classical music on the Internet. No other online service, whether free or subscription, can boast the complete classical catalogues of Naxos, EMI, Deutsche Grammophone, Decca, Sony, and BBC among its offerings. And unlike automated music recommendation services like Pandora Radio, Spotify offers an individualized experience that allows users to select their own song tracks. (But it does not allow MP3 downloads of these tracks.) Spotify is an excellent second option if a YouTube search comes up empty – Berlioz’s four *Prix de Rome* cantatas, for example, are available on Spotify but not YouTube.

**Subscription Online Scores and Audio/Video Streaming**

Alexander Street Press (www.alexanderstreet.com), an academic database publisher, offers the definitive subscription collection of classical music scores, streamed video and audio on the Internet. It is the only online portal that combines all three elements in one place; it’s as if IMSLP, YouTube, and Spotify were incorporated into the same cross-functional platform. Alexander’s three-volume Classical Scores Library includes 25,000 in-copyright editions from major publishers (thus no public domain restriction) with scores from Medieval through twenty-first century numbering over one million pages. Its audio database contains over 50,000 audio recordings from EMI. And its extensive Classical Music in Video collection offers exclusive copyrighted content from opera, orchestra, chamber, and solo performances; full orchestra rehearsals; and masterclasses, interviews, and documentaries.

The Berlin Philharmonic offers a subscription video streaming service that is unique among professional orchestras. Since 1990 many of the orchestra’s concert performances, and almost all from recent years, have been filmed live in high-definition video and audio. Subscribers can watch these live broadcasts, along with the complete catalogue of 230+ archived performances, via the orchestra’s Digital Concert Hall (www.digitalconcerthall.com). With a variety of camera angles and superb audio mix—along with excellent interpretations of the orchestral repertoire by a world-class orchestra and its conductors—no other professional orchestra
succeeds better at vividly sharing its live performances online. These videos can be valuable tools for evaluating orchestra literature performed at a very high level.³

Subscription Print and Online Dictionary

The definitive print encyclopedia of orchestral literature is David Daniels’ “Orchestral Music: A Handbook,” which catalogues both famous and lesser-known orchestral composers from the Renaissance to the 2000s. It lists the major—but not all—in-print orchestral works by each composer, with associated instrumentations, durations, editions, and publishers of the music. (A grading scale for determining difficulty or playability is not suggested.) The book’s appendices organize these compositions in a helpful way for those crafting concert programs, including by ensemble type, instrumentation, and duration; and thematically by youth concert repertoire, composer anniversaries, and ethnic groups. The online version of Daniels’ book is found at www.orchestralmusic.com, a subscription website that touts “monthly updates with new composers, new works, … [and] more than 1,000 changes since publication of the 4th print edition.”⁴

Summary of Repertoire Data from CODA Member Survey

These online and print resources are remarkable tools for evaluating and selecting orchestral literature—they have made the process more user-friendly, more convenient, more efficient. But the one issue these sources do not address is the question of appropriateness: after thorough score examination and listening to multiple recordings, can and should my orchestra actually play a given piece? This is obviously a personal decision that takes into account many factors, and no outside source can adequately compensate for one’s intimate knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of their ensemble/s. Nevertheless, industry-wide tools could be created that in particular, guide and assist college orchestra conductors with their literature selection process (much like those used in the band world). Unfortunately, such resources are not widely circulated or utilized.

To address this issue, a repertoire survey of CODA members was administered in 2011 with the dual purpose of 1) creating a database of standard orchestral literature

³ A similar service but with a broader scope is medici.tv (www.medici.tv), an online classical music subscription portal with live and archived video performances by multiple professional orchestras. Like Alexander Street, its video collection also includes documentaries, masterclasses, and educational films.

that CODA orchestras performed during a six-year period (2005-2011) and 2) summarizing the programming philosophies that informed that literature. It is hoped that this data, which reflects the repertoire choices of college conductors over multiple concert seasons, could serve as a tool for guiding others in selecting repertoire. The ensuing discussion summarizes the survey’s key findings.

Methodology

Respondents were asked two questions\(^5\): “What repertoire did your group perform from 2005-2011?” and “What is your guiding philosophy for programming concerts?” Repertoire data was gathered from 61 of the 117 CODA members who were active in Fall, 2011 (a 52% sampling rate); 35 individuals responded to the programming philosophy question. Each composition was entered into a master list and coded for frequency of performance by a CODA orchestra.

From this master list, only those pieces that matched the definition of “classical literature for symphony orchestra, 1750-1970” were included in the final project database. This means that Baroque and contemporary\(^6\) were excluded, as well as pops, chamber, and most choral-orchestral music. This distinction was built upon a basic premise: that the “standard repertoire for college orchestra” probably revolves around symphonic literature from the classical, romantic, and twentieth-century (pre-contemporary) periods. And, indeed, the repertoire data verified this assumption, showing that the large majority of music programmed by CODA orchestras from ca. 2005-2011 spans early Haydn symphonies to music of the 1960s, while composers as diverse as J.S. Bach\(^7\), John Williams, and Jennifer Higdon were infrequently performed. The exclusion of Baroque, film, and contemporary music from consideration in this project does not imply, however, that these styles should not play an important role in orchestra literature selection, only that college

\(^5\) The initial survey included questions related to type of music institution (college, school, or department), number of music degrees offered, number of music majors, and types of ensemble (all-student vs. hybrid college-community). The idea was to associate each piece with the skill level of the ensemble that performed it. This proved too daunting and subjective, so the survey was pared down to two questions only.


\(^7\) “[In surveying] subscription concert programming changes of ten major orchestras for fifty years, from 1942 to 1992, [it was found that] music of the Baroque period, which once constituted a major portion of large orchestra programming, had all but disappeared from the concert repertoire of these orchestras. The researcher [attributes] this phenomenon to the rise of specialized ensembles dedicated solely to the performance of early music, as well as to the appearance of chamber orchestra ensembles that programmed works by Baroque composers.” Jeffrey Thuerauf, “A Survey of American Symphony Orchestra Programming for the 2003-2004 Season,” Musiké: Revista del Conservatorio de Música de Puerto Rico, http://musike.cmpr.edu/v001/thuerauf.pdf (April 22, 2014), 2.
conductors prioritized the more traditional classical symphonic literature in their programs.

In terms of compositions for choir and orchestra (notably those where the choir plays a continuous musico-dramatic role), Jonathan Green’s exhaustive multi-volume “A Conductor’s Guide to Choral-Orchestral Works” already analyzes major and obscure choral-orchestral works from the Baroque through twentieth-century periods. Each volume contains a “Performance Issues” section that covers what performers might encounter in a particular piece: vocal/instrumental ranges, contrapuntal complexity, balance challenges between choir and orchestra, difficulty of orchestral parts, suggested ensemble skill levels, investment of rehearsal time, and a playability grading system (i.e. “medium difficult”). Green’s rigorous and systematic method for decoding performance and playability issues in choral-orchestral literature provides an excellent blueprint for future (CODA?) projects that might well benefit from applying this method to the symphonic literature.

The Data and What It Means

The final project database in its current form represents an emerging picture of the types of repertoire college conductors have deemed appropriate for their ensembles. Certain of these pieces were programmed so frequently that, if compiled into one collection, they might constitute an inaugural definition of “standard repertoire for college orchestra.” (These most oft-performed pieces are listed below.) And herein lies a key takeaway: if numerous college orchestras of vastly differing sizes and abilities have performed the same pieces over and over, it could mean that 1) these works are accessible, playable, or artistically meritorious and 2) perhaps my orchestra might consider performing them, too. On the other hand, those pieces or composers largely neglected by college ensembles could open up exciting new repertoire possibilities for the inquisitive conductor.

Most Oft-Performed Works

The most frequently performed composers and compositions from ca. 2005-2011 are listed below. Because of their popularity, these works might embody a broadly acceptable standard of playability by the typical college ensemble. (Note that

---

8 There is insufficient space in this article to include the entire database, but it could be incorporated into www.codaweb.org as an editable Google Doc (or other web-based utility) so CODA members can add to it.
numerals in parentheses equal number of times performed by a CODA orchestra, with the highest number of performances appearing at the top of each list):

Composers

1. Mozart (47)
2. Beethoven (25)
3. Haydn (18)
4. Tchaikovsky (17)
5. Mendelssohn (15)
6. Saint-Saens (14)
7. Copland; Ravel (13)
8. Brahms; Dvorak; Sibelius; Wagner (12)

Compositions (All)

1. Beethoven, Symphony No. 5 (24)
2. Stravinsky, Firebird Suite (20)
3. Dvorak, Symphony No. 8 (17)
4. Dvorak, Symphony No. 9 (15)
   Mussorgsky, Pictures at an Exhibition
5. Sibelius, Symphony No. 2 (14)
   Brahms, Academic Festival Overture
6. Copland, Four Dance Episodes from Rodeo (13)
   Gershwin, American in Paris
   Mendelssohn, The Hebrides/Fingal’s Cave
   Mussorgsky, Night on Bald Mountain
   Schubert, Symphony No. 8

Symphonies

1. Beethoven, Symphony No. 5 (24)
2. Dvorak, Symphony No. 8 (17)
3. Dvorak, Symphony No. 9 (15)
4. Sibelius, Symphony No. 2 (14)
5. Schubert, Symphony No. 8 (13)
6. Beethoven, Symphony No. 6 (11)
   Mozart, Symphony No. 40
   Tchaikovsky, Symphony No. 5
7. Brahms, Symphony No. 1 (10)
Brahms, Symphony No. 2

**Overtures/Tone Poems**

1. Brahms, Academic Festival Overture (14)
2. Gershwin, American in Paris (13)
   - Mendelssohn, The Hebrides/Fingal’s Cave
   - Mussorgsky, Night on Bald Mountain
3. Beethoven, Egmont Overture (12)
4. Respighi, Pines of Rome (11)
5. Bernstein, Candide Overture (10)
6. Debussy, Prelude to the Afternoon of a Faun (9)
   - Rossini, William Tell Overture
   - Smetana, Ma Vlast: The Moldau
   - Tchaikovsky, Romeo and Juliet Fantasy-Overture

**Suites/Dances/Multi-Movement Works**

1. Stravinsky, Firebird Suite (20)
2. Mussorgsky, Pictures at an Exhibition (15)
3. Copland, Four Dance Episodes from Rodeo (13)
4. Elgar, Enigma Variations (10)
   - Prokofiev, Lieutenant Kije Suite
   - Ravel, Mother Goose Suite
5. Bizet, L’arlesienne Suite No. 2 (9)
   - Copland, Appalachian Spring Suite
   - Dvorak, Slavonic Dances, Op. 46
   - Rimsky-Korsakov, Scheherazade

**Neglected Works and Composers**

Identified next were underrepresented major composers and standard symphonic literature _not_ programmed by CODA orchestras from ca. 2005-2011. A few factors might account for this omission: 1) a certain piece or types of compositions—even the idiosyncratic styles of particular composers—were not accessible, playable, or artistically satisfying for orchestras at the college level or 2) such works and composers have untapped potential waiting to be discovered and enjoyed. Therefore, highlighting neglected works could prove just as valuable to the college conductor as the most frequently programmed ones.
The following categories (same as above) list selected pieces not performed by any CODA orchestra over a six-year period⁹:

**Symphonies (including choral-orchestral where the choir does not play a continuous musico-dramatic role)**

- Bernstein: 2
- Bruckner: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
- Copland: 1, 2, 3 (all)
- Dvorak: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- Glazunov: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 (all)
- Harris: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12
- Haydn: 95, 96, 97, 98, 102
- Liszt: Faust
- Mahler: 3, 6, 7, 9
- Nielsen: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6
- Prokofiev: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
- Rachmaninoff: 1, 2, 3 (all)
- Schubert: 1, 7, 9
- Schumann: 2
- Shostakovich: 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15
- Sibelius: 4, 6, 7
- Tchaikovsky: 1, 3
- Vaughan Williams: 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9

**Overtures/Tone Poems**

- Berlioz: Le corsaire, Waverley, Le roi Lear, Rob Roy
- Liszt: Orpheus, Prometheus, Tasso, Mazeppa
- Massenet: Le Cid, Phedre
- Offenbach: Orpheus in the Underworld
- Sibelius: Luonnotar, En Saga, Pohjola’s Daughter, Tapiola
- Strauss: Don Quixote, Also Sprach Zarathustra, Ein Heldenleben
- Tchaikovsky: Tempest, Hamlet, Francesca da Rimini
- Verdi: I Vespri Siciliani, Luisa Miller

---

⁹ Again, this includes only the 52% of CODA orchestras whose six-year repertoire could be gathered for this project in Fall 2011.
Von Suppe: Ein Morgen, ein Mittag…, Pique Dame, Die schone Galathee
Weber: Euryanthe
Wagner: Siegfried’s Funeral March (Ring), Prelude and Liebestod (Tristan)
Prelude to Act III (Tristan, arr. Stokowski), Prelude to Act I (Lohengrin), Faust

Suites/Dances/Multi-Movement Works

Berlioz: Dance of the Sylphs, Minuet of the Will-o’-the-Wisps
Brahms: Hungarian Dances (#1-21, except for No. 5)
Copland: The Red Pony
Debussy: Images pour orchestre: Gigues, Rondes de printemps
Grieg: Peer Gynt, Suite No. 2
Janacek: Sinfonietta
Poulenc: Sinfonietta
Ravel: Daphnis et Chloe, Suite No. 1
Rimsky-Korsakov: The Golden Cockerel
Sibelius: Lemminkainen
Tchaikovsky: Sleeping Beauty

Programming Philosophies

The second part of the survey focused on fundamental principles of concert programming, which are broadly applicable to orchestras of any size or ability. The question asked of CODA members—“What is your guiding philosophy for programming concerts?”—elicited many thoughtful responses (35 total) ranging from the practical to the pedagogical to the philosophical. From these responses, 10 distinct categories emerged; each category summarizes its central philosophies, followed by a direct quote from a CODA member:

Playability

- Crafting repertoire that highlights strengths, softens weaknesses, and matches the instrumentation of the orchestra.
- Choosing easier music for the first concert of the year. It is the beginning of the concert season and musicians are still getting to know each other.
Key question: Can the music chosen be prepared at a high level of excellence within the allotted rehearsal time?\(^{10}\)

“We have a fairly large paying audience and need to perform at a high level, so we are careful to stay within our abilities any given season.” (Daniel Dominick, Austin College)

Themes

- Creating concert-specific themes (“Tales from the Dark Side”) as well as overarching season themes (“The Symphonies of Beethoven”).

“For me, curating a program is most important: these works must have a logical cohesion with one another that is intelligible for audiences and players alike.” (Andrew Koehler, Kalamazoo College)

Balance

- Blending the familiar with the unfamiliar, the old with the new, the challenging with the easily playable.

“I aim to provide a balanced diet and work to include some repertoire each year a) from a living composer, b) that is somewhat off the beaten path, c) that is standard and deserves even more airtime, in my perception, and d) that helps pedagogically.” (Brian Casey, Texas A&M University-Kingsville)

Personal Taste

- Selecting repertoire based on conductor preference.
- A conductor’s enthusiasm for a particular piece or composer is critical to its success.

\(^{10}\) “There is a danger in having multiple pieces beyond the ability level of the students. When this happens, … ‘You end up chasing notes the entire rehearsal sequence and there is no time for making music.’” (emphasis added) Aaron J. Backes, “A Multiple Case Study of Six Exemplary Band Directors’ Repertoire Selection Processes,” MA thesis, (Bowling Green State University, 2010), 27.
“I have at times ended up over-programming a single composer’s works, in part because I like them, and in part because I think the students are served by more exposure to that particular composer (examples: Sibelius, Mendelssohn, Stravinsky, Vaughan Williams).” (Brian Casey, Texas A&M University-Kingsville)

**Contemporary Music**

- Performing the music of our day, which also includes the twenty-first century.

“Orchestral music should reflect the music of our times and not just music from the past. [I program] at least one modern or contemporary piece on every program.” (Chris Kim, Cornell University)

**Pedagogy**

- Selecting repertoire that advances a technical, musical, or pedagogical goal for particular individuals, or for the ensemble as a whole.
- Challenging advanced players artistically and musically.\(^{11}\)
- Exposing students to certain music solely because of its intrinsic merit.

“[I prepare repertoire] always with an eye to developing the skills and capacities of the individual musicians.” (Michael Shasberger, Westmont College)

“I try to challenge the best players while making sure that the least capable players will be able to learn a way to play a part that will contribute and in which they will learn something.” (David Hagy, Wake Forest University)

“I try to select compositions that students need to perform. Occasionally, I use music that calls for a larger orchestra (not instrumentation but size of strings) than ours but we perform the music because our students need to have the experience of performing it.” (J. Robert Gaddis, Campbellsville University)

**Collaboration**

- The repertoire selection process as a cooperative effort.

---

\(^{11}\) “[E]ach individual program … has what he calls a ‘project piece.’ This is the most difficult piece on the program and challenges the students technically and musically. ‘I like to have one piece that is almost sight-readable, one project piece, and then pieces of varying degrees of difficulty.’ Aaron J. Backes, “A Multiple Case Study of Six Exemplary Band Directors’ Repertoire Selection Processes,” MA thesis, (Bowling Green State University, 2010), 27.
“Repertoire is selected via a collaborative process that involves input from the applied faculty and students, and is ultimately worked out in consultation between the conductor and the director of the string program.” (Michael Shasberger, Westmont College)

**Beethoven and the Symphony**

- The symphony as the pillar of orchestral repertoire.
- Beethoven’s symphonies deserve special priority and consideration in comparison to all other composers.
- One conductor suggested programming at least one symphony *per semester* and another suggested programming one Beethoven symphony *per year*.

**The Four-Year Plan**

- Music from many style periods, genres, nationalities, and geographic areas.
- Planning out repertoire based on a four-year rotation.

“Mozart or Haydn each year (every year, usually at the beginning of the year); in the course of four years, one Brahms symphony, one or two Beethoven symphonies, other Romantic symphonies (Dvorak, Schumann), later Romantic works (Wagner, Tchaikovsky, Strauss, Mahler), important 20th century works (Stravinsky, Debussy, Prokofiev, Shostakovich, etc.), American works of the neo-romantic school (Copland, Hansen, Hovhaness, etc.)…. I try to make sure we cover various national styles and geographic areas--British, Russian, Spanish, French, Scandinavian, Slavic, etc.” (Dan Sommerville, Wheaton College)

**The Large Picture**

- Selecting sublime music that is artistically satisfying and inspiring.
- Instilling in students an understanding of the profound human value of great music.

“Focusing on performing great music at the highest artistic level possible has always been the mission of the orchestra…. Despite all of the challenges of people, places, and things, it is the inspirational power of great music that makes it all possible.” (Elisa Koehler, Goucher College)

“I want to leave my students with an understanding of the value and truth imbedded in great music that they will carry with them into their careers, their families and
their communities for the rest of their lives.” (Kory Katseanes, Brigham Young University)

### Selected Concert Themes and Repertoire

These programming philosophies, along with the lists of most oft-performed and neglected music, were a key catalyst and inspiration for the themes and repertoire performed by the Keweenaw Symphony Orchestra. Selected examples from the past three concert seasons are listed below – these illustrate how one college orchestra utilized the data from this project to retool its approach to repertoire:

**Theme:** “Tales from the Dark Side”

**Repertoire:**
- Dance of the Seven Veils (Strauss)
- Threnody to the Victims of Hiroshima (Penderecki)
- Night on Bald Mountain (Mussorgsky)
- Noon Witch (Dvorak)
- Firebird Suite [selections] (Stravinsky)

**Commentary:** Darkness, exotic fantasy, and death serve as a continuous thematic thread, lending dramatic coherence to the program. Noon Witch—a piece that matches the “off the beaten path” definition—was synced to an English translation (via surtitles) of the *Polednice* poem from which Dvorak drew inspiration for the work. The performance made young children cry in the audience.

**Theme:** “Synthetic Symphony”

**Repertoire:**
- Symphony No. 38, First Movement (Mozart)
- Faust Symphony, Second Movement (Liszt)
- Symphony No. 4, Third Movement (Tchaikovsky)
- Symphony No. 9, Fourth Movement (Dvorak)

**Commentary:** With no actual symphony programmed for the season—and wanting to follow the principle of “one symphony per year”—this performance featured an artificially constructed “symphony” built upon individual movements from different
symphonies. There was no attempt to find a thematic corollary from movement to movement. Selection from various symphonies was made so that the ‘general’ character, tempo, and style of a typical first, second, third, and fourth movement (played in sequence) was demonstrated.

**Theme:** “Beethoven’s Eroica”

**Repertoire:**
Symphony No. 88 (Haydn)
Symphony No. 3 (Beethoven)

**Commentary:** Thematically, this program traced the evolution of the symphony from quintessential classicism (Haydn) to radical reinvention (Beethoven). By direct comparison to the Haydn, audiences could more fully appreciate the revolutionary character of Beethoven’s symphony. The concert also fulfilled the orchestra’s essential role of championing the symphonic form.

**Theme:** “1863-2013: Lincoln and Gettysburg”

**Repertoire:**
Civil War Fantasy (Bilik)
Symphony No. 6 “Gettysburg” (Harris)
the CIVIL warS: Interlude #2 (Glass)
Afro-American Symphony (Still)
Lincoln Portrait (Copland)

**Commentary:** 2013 was the 150th commemorative year of key Civil War events: the Emancipation Proclamation and Battle of Gettysburg/Gettysburg Address. This concert highlighted music inspired by these events and the Afro-American Symphony is symbolic of the racial progress initiated by Lincoln’s Proclamation. The program featured living composers (Glass, Bilik), 20th century composers (Harris, Still, Copland), thematic cohesion (Civil War), and balancing the well-known (Lincoln Portrait) with the underappreciated gem (Gettysburg Symphony).

**Theme:** “From Russia with Love”
Repertoire:
Sleeping Beauty Suite (Tchaikovsky)
Antar Symphony, First Movement (Rimsky-Korsakov)
Symphony No. 9 (Shostakovich)

Commentary: Googling the search term “from russia with love orchestra” reveals the immense popularity of this particular concert theme. This program intentionally featured one of the pieces from the “neglected works” list (Sleeping Beauty Suite), and highlighted another underutilized jewel, Antar Symphony. The choice of Shostakovich was both pedagogical and practical: our musicians needed to experience Shostakovich and his Ninth Symphony is easily the most playable and technically approachable of the fifteen.

Theme: “Night at the Ballet and Opera”

Repertoire:
Amahl and the Night Visitors (Menotti)
Swan Lake [abridged] (Tchaikovsky)

Commentary: Performing an opera and a fully-choreographed ballet on the same evening required a strong collaborative effort between music, theatre, sound, and dance divisions. This also presented an important pedagogical opportunity for the orchestra musicians, most of whom had never accompanied an opera or a ballet. The dual task of flexibly accompanying singers in the first half, and then setting and maintaining precise tempi for dancers in the second, stretched and developed their musicianship.

Conclusion

These thematic programs suggest specific ways conductors might incorporate concepts from this article into their concert seasons. The online and print resources previously mentioned, as well as the repertoire data and programming philosophies from the CODA survey, could serve as tools that reinforce already-successful methods of repertoire planning. They also embody a multifaceted approach to literature selection that could be expanded upon and modeled industry-wide.
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ABSTRACT

The beginning of the second half of the twentieth Century reflects a period of drastic changes in music history and aesthetics, in which a more experimental language favored new sound combinations. At that time, the Costa Rican musical environment was significantly different: the foundation of the National Symphony Orchestra was not consolidated until the decade of the 1940s. In addition the National Conservatory of Music began to offer formal instruction for young musicians at the same time. Prior to 1940, music instruction and music development was in an incipient stage, which caused several musicians in need of finding superior education to go outside of the country. Among them, Julio Mata Oreamuno (1899-1969) stands out as a prolific composer of symphonic music which will be studied as an example of the development of the Romantic orchestral repertoire in this country. An analysis of music/program relationships in his symphonic poem El Libertador will be provided in order to understand the musical style of this composer. Also, a discussion of the orchestral repertoire between 1914 and 1980 aims to frame the epoch of the Symphonic Romanticism in Costa Rica.

The beginning of the second half of the 20th Century reflects a period of drastic changes in music history and aesthetics, in which a more experimental language favored new sound combinations. This being the period of total Serialism, combinatorial settings and exploration of electronic and computerized instrument, the overall music development in Europe and in the United States showed the struggle between vanguard compositional language and a style based in the former musical periods. At that time, the Costa Rican musical environment was significantly different: the foundation of the National Symphony Orchestra was not consolidated until 1940. In addition the National Conservatory of Music began to offer formal instruction for young musicians at the same time. Prior to the 40s, music instruction
and music development was in an incipient stage, which caused several musicians to look outside the country for superior education. Among them, Julio Mata Oreamuno (1899-1969), who realized most of his musical training in the United States, stands out as a prolific author of symphonic music which will be studied as an example of the development of the Romantic orchestral repertoire in Costa Rica. An analysis of music/program relationships in his symphonic poem *El Libertador* will be provided in order to understand the musical style of this composer.

**Costa Rican Romantic Symphonic Music in the First Half of the 20th Century**

It is crucial to discuss briefly the status of Costa Rican music in order to contextualize the Romantic period in the music historiography of this country. Up to today, well respected scholars (Flores 1978, Vargas 2004, Vicente 2013, Chatski 2013) have done extensive research in order to rediscover the musical heritage of a country whose beginnings in music have been recent in comparison to the evolution of Western music. By the time of Costa Rican independence in 1821, small military fanfares and musicians from church chapels feature the main musical developments and the role of music was entirely functional, either for the religious or civil service (Vargas 41). Afterwards, coffee being the main exportation product that positioned Costa Rica in the international market, business trips from several citizens to Europe and the United States made the importation of new instruments, music scores and instructional methods possible (Vargas 47). In 1897, a new tax imposed on coffee production allowed for the construction of the National Theater in San José. International opera companies and recognized soloists then came from different parts of the world, mostly Spain, Germany, France and Belgium. Some of them established temporary academies of music (Vargas 51-53). The influence of those foreigners caused a preference in the music environment for Romantic repertory, especially opera and zarzuela tunes, waltzes and a vast quantity of piano pieces. Bernal Flores stated:

During the XIX century Central America was not in a condition to be an adequate place for the germination of “musical geniuses”. Its musical life is austere and poor. Costa Rica, one of the smallest countries of America just reached a population of 300,000 inhabitants. The few talented musicians endeavored with the most struggling circumstances during their career, without the help of competent mentors and without any kind of music environment that could nourish their talents. Since there were no radio programs or recordings that could encourage their musical taste, the contemporary production from other regions was totally unknown in Costa
Rica, which made it impossible to keep the country updated with the music creation from different parts of the world (59).

By 1890, the music development showed a monotonous repetition of the same repertory and a lack of knowledge about symphonic or chamber music repertory, with the exception of band or piano transcriptions. However, the environment was improved by several Costa Ricans traveling around the world in order to get music instruction (Vargas 165). Even though musicians had the opportunity to study abroad and enrich their musical taste, light and operatic repertory was still the audience’s preference. Thus, composers from the early 20th century opted to write still in a tonal language and with predilection to songs and small musical forms. It is important to notice that it was not until the first decade of the 20th Century that a more wide variety of classical repertory appeared in scattered performances as well as the appearance of the first string quartets and trios with piano (Vargas 177).

The rise of large-scale compositions for orchestra by Costa Rican composers during the period between 1914 and 1980 delimits the Romantic Symphonic period in Costa Rican music history which featured three stylistic trends. This classification considers the development of larger forms like overtures, symphonic poems, concertos, suites and symphonies. The first trend from 1914 to 1940 features the works of Alejandro Monestel (1865-1950), Julio Fonseca (1885-1950) and Ismael Cardona (1887-1969). These composers from this first school had musical instruction outside of Costa Rica – Fonseca and Monestel in Belgium, Cardona in New York. Their music style consists of a strict emphasis in a delightful melodic shaping and harmonic progressions from the common-practice period as well as the incorporation of elements from the Costa Rican folk music heritage, as seen in Monestel’s two Rapsodias Costarricenses and the Gran Fantasia Sinfónica and Suite Tropical by Fonseca. On the other hand, Cardona stands out as being the first Costa Rican that wrote a composition for string orchestra and Fonseca’s Obertura Ujarrás (1914) was the first large-scale orchestral piece ever written by a national composer.

The second school of Costa Rican composers of Romantic symphonic music traces the period between 1940 to 1960 and is represented by the composers Julio Mata (1899-1969), Alcides Prado (1900-1984), Mariano Herrera (1902-1969), Jesús Bonilla (1911-1998), Carlos Enrique Vargas (1918-1988) and Félix Mata (1930-1980). This period contains the first symphony and the first concerto ever composed in Costa Rica, both by Carlos Enrique Vargas (Chatski 77). Mariano Herrera wrote three symphonies at the end of his career between 1961 and 1963. The last two of them have not yet been premiered (Herrera, paragraph 6). From this period, the
symphonic poem and the orchestral suite stand out as the most preferred musical forms, as seen in the compositions by Julio and Félix Mata, Bonilla and Prado. Vargas’ symphonic compositions, especially his *Symphony* (1945) experiments with Neoclassical influences such as expanded harmonies, use of chromaticism, and parallel voice-leading, as seen in the music by Paul Hindemith, Sergei Prokofiev and Darius Milhaud (Chatski 64-66).

The third and last period in Costa Rican Symphonic Romanticism dates from 1960 to 1980 and is represented by the music of Ricardo Ulloa Barrenechea (b. 1928), Rocío Sanz (1934-1993), Benjamín Gutiérrez, and Bernal Flores (both born in 1937). Their music was written in a Neo-Romantic style with the combination of dodecaphonic sonorities. Besides the use of contemporary intervalic combinations, the melodic shaping in the orchestral music of these three composers aims for lyricism and expression. It is important to recall that Rocío Sanz was the first Costa Rican woman that developed a professional career in composition (Chatski 89).

The following rubric explains the chronological development of Costa Rican Romantic Symphonic music from 1914 to 1980. It is important to mention that several of these composers have written small miscellaneous pieces like waltzes, polkas, intermezzos, marches, or solo songs with orchestral accompaniment. However, only large-scale compositions classified as overtures, programmatic/descriptive pieces, suites, and symphonies were considered here.

**LARGE-SCALE ROMANTIC ORCHESTRAL WORKS BY COSTA RICAN COMPOSERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>COMPOSER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Obertura Húngara</em></td>
<td>Julio Fonseca</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Leda” Vals Intermezzo</td>
<td>Julio Fonseca</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aires Ticos</em></td>
<td>Julio Fonseca</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Programmatic/Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Suite Tropical</em></td>
<td>Julio Fonseca</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Orchestral Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Suite de Serenata</em></td>
<td>Ismael Cardona</td>
<td>ca. 1933</td>
<td>Suite for String Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Suite Ballet No. 2</em></td>
<td>Ismael Cardona</td>
<td>ca. 1933</td>
<td>Orchestral Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fantasia sobre “La Guaria Morada”</em></td>
<td>Julio Mata</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Programmatic/Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piece</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gran Fantasía Sinfónica</td>
<td>Julio Fonseca</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Programmatic/Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Una Fiesta en Liberia</td>
<td>Jesús Bonilla</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Programmatic/Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obertura &quot;Las Ruinas de Ujarrás&quot;</td>
<td>Julio Fonseca</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite Abstracta</td>
<td>Julio Mata</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Orchestral Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapsodia Costarricense No. 1</td>
<td>Alejandro Monestel</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Programmatic/Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapsodia Costarricense No. 2</td>
<td>Alejandro Monestel</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Programmatic/Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concierto para Piano</td>
<td>Carlos Enrique Vargas</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Concerto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinfonia</td>
<td>Carlos Enrique Vargas</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite Latina</td>
<td>Julio Mata</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Orchestral Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite Piedras Preciosas</td>
<td>Julio Mata</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Orchestral Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinfonietta para Cuerdas</td>
<td>Ricardo Ulloa Barrenechea</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Symphony for Strings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escenas Guanacastecas</td>
<td>Jesús Bonilla</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Programmatic/Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overture Lempira</td>
<td>Julio Mata</td>
<td>ca. 1953</td>
<td>Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Sabanero</td>
<td>Jesús Bonilla</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Programmatic/Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto for Clarinet and Orchestra</td>
<td>Benjamín Gutiérrez</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Concerto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite de Ballet</td>
<td>Rocío Sanz</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Orchestral Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinfonías No. 1, 2 y 3</td>
<td>Mariano Herrera</td>
<td>1961-63</td>
<td>Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite “Dulce Hogar”</td>
<td>Alcides Prado</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Orchestral Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concierto para Violín</td>
<td>Benjamín Gutiérrez</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Concerto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite para Orquesta de Cuerdas</td>
<td>Félix Mata</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Suite for String Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinfonía No. 1</td>
<td>Bernal Flores</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinfonía No. 2</td>
<td>Bernal Flores</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homenaje a Juan Santamaria</td>
<td>Benjamín Gutiérrez</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Programmatic/Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poema Sinfónico “El Libertador”</td>
<td>Julio Mata</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Programmatic/Descriptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concierto Pentafónico para clarinete  |  Bernal Flores  |  1968  |  Concerto

*Suite “Tamira”*  |  Alcides Prado  |  1969  |  Orchestral Suite

*Variaciones Concertantes para piano*  |  Benjamín Gutiérrez  |  1969  |  Concerto

*Preludio Sinfónico*  |  Benjamín Gutiérrez  |  1970  |  Programmatic/Descriptive

*Remembranza*  |  Alcides Prado  |  1971  |  Programmatic/Descriptive

*Concierto para piano, percusión, orquesta*  |  Bernal Flores  |  1973  |  Concerto

*Sinfonía Coral*  |  Benjamín Gutiérrez  |  1979  |  Symphony (with choir)

*Primera Sinfonía*  |  Benjamín Gutiérrez  |  1980  |  Symphony

*Sinfonía Coral*  |  Jesús Bonilla  |  1982  |  Symphony (with choir)

**Julio Mata and his Music**

After understanding the overall development of Romantic symphonic music in Costa Rica, it is crucial to understand the life and work of one of the most representative composers from this historical period: Julio Mata. Mata was born in Cartago on December 9th, 1899 in an environment full of music since both his parents were musicians and trained their eight children in this field. This gave Mata a strong musical background before traveling to the Brooklyn Academy of Music in New York, where he studied violoncello, harmony, and composition between 1927 and 1932. Mata returned to Costa Rica and worked as teacher in the School of Music of the Military Band of San José, an ensemble in which he was latter appointed as the principal conductor in 1941. Additionally, from 1942 to 1953 he worked as professor of violoncello and music theory in the recently founded National Conservatory of Music (Cordero 14). Mata developed a brilliant career as the most outstanding Costa Rican violoncellist of his time. Mata was one of the founding members of the National Symphony Orchestra of Costa Rica and the Symphony Orchestra of Heredia, established in 1965, and also developed a busy career as a chamber musician, performing regularly as member of the Ars Nova String Quartet (Vicente 74). In 1953 Julio Mata moved to Honduras to work as General Inspector of Governmental Schools. In that country, he published his music appreciation book “Música Hablada”, a compendium of general concepts of history, theory and short
biographies of composers. Mata died in his home country on March 4, 1969 in San José (Cordero 16).

The musical catalog of Julio Mata features a lieder cycle with fifteen pieces for voice and piano accompaniment, some of them orchestrated by the composer. Also, religious music, school hymns, and popular songs made up part of his prolific vocal music production. Mata stands out as one of the first opera composers from Costa Rica with his two operas Rosas de Nogaria (1937) and Toyupán (1938). Mata wrote four incidental compositions especially for children’s theater and a Folk Ballet, including mythical characters from Costa Rican popular culture. Julio Mata’s symphonic legacy comprises eight works for full orchestra, including three large scale suites, a symphonic poem, an overture, an orchestral fantasy, and two marches. According to the registers of the Music History Archive of the University of Costa Rica, Marcha Bolívar (1937) is Mata’s earliest symphonic composition. His suites were written in the decade of the 40s: Suite Abstracta (1941), Suite Latina (1945), and Suite Piedras Preciosas (1945). Circa 1953, Mata wrote Lempira Overture under the commission of Julio Palacios, Minister of Education of the Republic of Honduras. As a prize-winner piece, this work was recorded by the label Columbia (Cordero 14). Mata’s Fantasia on “La Guaria Morada” (1937) is a rhapsodic composition based on the piece with the same name, originally written by Roberto Gutiérrez and Carlos López. The symphonic poem El Libertador is Mata’s last orchestral composition, premiered in 1967 by the National Symphony Orchestra of Costa Rica. Recently, in 2013, Julio Mata’s family made an important donation of manuscripts and miscellaneous documents from the composer to the Music History Archive at the University of Costa Rica.

Regarding Mata’s compositional language in his orchestral compositions, Ekaterina Chatski observes that his music follows the traditional trends in harmony, orchestration and form from Romanticism, combined with the extra-musical elements suggested by the literary synopsis that the composer provided for each symphonic piece he wrote (5). Cordero considers that the music by Mata has a peculiar style that oscillates between the popular music genre, the romantic inspiration, and also the school-song style (15). Considering both points of view, it is possible to determine that the musical style by Julio Mata is framed within the characteristics of the music of the middle of the 19th century, even though his music career was developed at the time when modern music was in vogue in Europe and North America.

Programmatic Aesthetics in Mata’s Symphonic Poem El Libertador
As seen in the previous rubric, the preference for descriptive music has been the main feature over seven decades of Romantic repertoire in Costa Rica. The predilection to compose ‘program music’ reflects the musical taste of the audiences in this long period of music history, where the aesthetic acceptance of descriptive music was seen in the first compositions that were awarded with the *Aquileo Echeverría National Prize in Music*, established in 1962. Mata’s *El Libertador* was awarded with this prize in 1967. According to Cordero, the critics who attended the first rehearsals of the composition stated that this symphonic poem was the deepest revelation of the musical style of Julio Mata (23).

*El Libertador* was premiered on September 26, 1967 at the National Theater of Costa Rica with the National Symphony Orchestra under the direction of Carlos Enrique Vargas. A brief newspaper article published that day stated that Mata’s musical style stands out in the first generation of Costa Rican composers due to his refined inspiration and vast knowledge of instrumentation techniques (*La Nación*, September 26, 1967). Also, in the same issue, an advertisement of the performance shows that Mata’s piece was performed along with Mendelssohn’s *Ruy Blas Overture*, Britten’s *Simple Symphony*, and Rodrigo’s *Aranjuez Concerto*, featuring Argentinean guitarist Guillermo Fierens (*La Nación*, 26 Sept 1966, 45-46).

In the manuscripts of the composition, which currently reside in the Music History Archive at the University of Costa Rica (Series AHM 0286), two handwritten full scores, individual parts, program of the premiere, and program notes are available, along with the first drafts of the composition in a piano score with instrumentation indications. These drafts are dated January 4, 1954, when the composer resided in Tegucigalpa, Honduras. An interesting feature in the manuscripts is that the program notes were written in both Spanish and English by Mata himself.

In order to understand the approach of symphonic programmatic music by Mata in *El Libertador*, it is important to underline the essence and purpose of the symphonic poem genre. R.W.S Mendl states:

> It is an orchestral composition inspired by a literary, historical, or pictorial subject – or indeed by anything which exists also outside music (a natural scene, for instance) – and deriving its structure rather from the events or incidents or objects which it seeks to portray than from the inherited forms of the art of music itself. Whereas the motions and adventures of the themes in a symphony or a sonata are governed largely by the traditional structure
(however much an independent genius such as Beethoven or his successors may modify or expand the form to suit the needs of the case), it is the order of events in the story that mainly prescribes the way in which the music of a symphonic poem is to go (443).

Musical depiction being one of the main roles of a symphonic poem and programmatic music, Mata’s *El Libertador* is a musical summary of the life and legacy of one of the most important heroic figures in the emancipation processes of Latin America: Simón Bolívar (1783-1830). Bolívar was crucial to the foundation of the first union of Hispanic-American independent nations, called The Gran Colombia, a result of the first independence processes of the Hispanic colonies from the Spanish kingdom. As appears in the front page of one of the orchestral full scores, Mata employed the pseudonym “Cantor de los Andes” (singer of the Andes), as a metaphor since Bolívar had been a beloved son of the Andean region.

**Words and Music**

Mata’s program notes to *El Libertador* – translated by himself as “*The Liberator*” – initially talk about Caracas, the city of birth of Simón Bolívar. Mata states:

> The ecclesiastic and solemn mood to which the author refers is represented by a choral melody in the brass section, joined afterwards by the woodwinds. The overall tone quality of the wind instruments is an allusion to the sonority of an organ, reflecting the religious environment in which Bolivar was grown.

Mata’s narrative outline continues:

> Fate, however, inexorably truncates the life of his loving mother, bringing upon the child the first sorrow of his life. Descriptively, the orchestra observes a pause of eloquent silence and the mournful event is recorded by the tolling of bells (1).

The cradle melody is interrupted by a Gran Pausa (G.P.), followed by a brief solo of the chimes playing D minor and E diminished chords, representing the funeral of Bolívar’s mother. The music continues with a mood of lamentation. Bolivar is growing up along with the ideals of the Latin American emancipation. The
trumpets are used to represent patriotic calls that remind Bolívar’s promise to serve his land. Mata mentions:

A clarion call gives the “Alert”, and an orchestral exaltation stirs with ideas of renovation and decisions. The young patriot, defying the world, seeks the light and directs his steps towards Spain (1).

Bolívar’s travel to Spain in a ship is musically depicted as Bolivar describes:

Sea and sky were the panorama; the cellos and double basses imitate the ceaseless stirring of the seas. As a presage of forthcoming events, the oboe executes a Spanish theme which is taken up by two oboes, and the harp joins in, accompanying like the Spanish guitar. The whole orchestra then takes up the theme denoting the reality of a celebrated arrival: Bolívar has trodden upon Spanish soil (2).

The music keeps centering around important events in the life of Bolívar: his wedding, represented by a “nuptial serenade” in the middle of the piece. Reminiscences from his homeland are exemplified by Mata’s quotation of popular song Alma Llanera as a big climax.

Mata represented the death of Bolívar’s wife, María Teresa Rodríguez del Toro y Alaysa, by a melody in the style the Gregorian Dies Irae, as seen in the trombone part. Particularly evident is Mata’s preference for assigning this chant to the trombone, an instrument with a crucial role in sacred music, as seen in the solos of Mozart’s Requiem. The sorrowful loss of Bolívar’s wife leads into serenity, which is interrupted by the calls to the independence wars. Bolívar was convinced to go back to his homeland and take an important part in the emancipation processes in Boayacá in 1819. Julio Mata comments:

An Allegro makes its appearance, and the freedom caravan begins. The grave instruments indicate characteristically the steps of the march as a warlike theme. The allegro become more and more agitated, and the clamor of battle is increased by the percussion instruments. Such positions as are gained or lost are announced by fragments of the various national anthems and the plaintive result of the battle is heard in the orchestra which has maintained the prevailing movement (2).

For depicting this, Mata employed diminished triads to generate tension and the employment of the timpani and bass drum to emulate the sound of cannons. A
march-like musical interlude emphasizes the victorious figure of Bolívar as one of the heroes of the Latin American independence. The lively melody is played as a tutti, with musical elements that represent heroism like the fanfare triplets in the cornets and the clarinets and an ad libitum toll of the tubular bells. The closing section of *El Libertador* features the musical depiction of the disease and death of Simon Bolívar. Mata described that what was a warlike theme in the bass instruments is now heard as a funeral melody, followed by the sound of the bells when the chords die out (4). The death of Bolívar is represented by the dynamic *morendo*, which expands a D minor chord that closes the piece. When depicting the death of Bolívar’s mother, the tubular bells are used one more time as a funeral sonority.

In an overall view, the programmatic style by Julio Mata features musical depiction enhanced by harmonic contrasts, tempo changes, sudden caesuras, deceptive cadences, and use of specific instrumental colors in order to reflect the word painting of his own program notes. It is noticeable that he did not employ specific leitmotivs and recurrent rhythmic patterns since the programmatic description is achieved by the emotional content of the melody and the contrasting colors provided by the harmonic progressions. The instrumentation assigns diverse roles to specific instruments. For example, the oboes represent the bagpipes and the harp the Spanish guitar, describing Bolívar’s initial trip to the Iberian Peninsula. The trumpet is used throughout as the instrument that announces the battles, while the timpani and bass drum represent the sound of the cannons. In addition to this, the bells give funereal tones while depicting the death of Bolívar’s mother and himself. It is clear that the choice of those instruments falls more under musical expression than recurrent motive elaborations. Mata’s programmatic ideas are framed within the emotional expressive program music aesthetics that Calvocoressi describes:

> Music expresses emotion through the mediums of sound and of rhythm. Any of the material starting-points of imitative or descriptive music suggest musical elements that are good in proportion as they are themselves intrinsically beautiful and apt to convey emotion (Calvocoressi 440).

Thus, the descriptive programmatic notes provided by Julio Mata are a crucial reference to performers and conductors who want to understand in depth this outstanding masterpiece. Due to its long duration (a regular performance of the piece might last around 25 minutes), it is important for the performers to underline each of the programmatic elements that Julio Mata described. It is of interest to add that Mata’s *El Libertador* is a true tribute to one of the greatest heroes of America since for a long time Mata was involved in the research and promotion of the thoughts and ideals of Simon Bolívar, as member of the Executive Board of the Bolivarian
Association of Costa Rica (Cordero 22). Along with the *Overture Lempira*, these two compositions reflect the interest of Mata to immortalize heroic characters from the conquest and emancipation of Latin America.

**Conclusions**

The rediscovery of Costa Rican music history is an ongoing process that requires a detailed historiography moving forward from the general evolution of the art itself to the understanding of the socio-political environment in which the development of music exists. As Dalhaus stated, the essential problem of music historiography relies in the relations between the art and the historic processes around it (19). The pioneer works of Costa Rican musicologists as Bernal Flores, Enrique Cordero, María Clara Vargas, Tania Vicente, and Ekaternina Chatksi are important cornerstones that have brought attention to the need for a deeper study to be made of the context of the evolution of music history in this country. With the present paper, three points are in need of reflection: the evolution of Costa Rican symphonic repertory during the time period of 1914 – 1980, considered by the author as the period of the rise and development of Romantic orchestral repertoire; the predilection of the programmatic genre by the majority of the composers of Romantic symphonic music in this country, and a final statement that calls attention to the current state of the repertoire mentioned in this research in relation to the actual promotion of Costa Rican symphonic music.

The two main musical events in the decade of the 1940s – the consolidation of the National Symphony Orchestra of Costa Rica and the foundation of the National Conservatory of Music – launched the rise of orchestral compositions that followed a period in which the available repertory was mostly for piano, small ensembles and transcriptions for bands. Crucial importance should be given to the conformation of wind ensembles in the beginning of the 20th Century, since this type of ensemble allowed the audiences to explore Romantic repertory, especially that which was arranged from opera and favorite symphonic pieces. Since Tonal music was the audience’s preference at the time due to a lack of access to further musical appreciation studies, the Romantic style was prevalent in the musical taste of the people even before the consolidation of formal institutions like the National Symphony and National Conservatory of Music.

The prominence of programmatic music is an important feature in the orchestral repertory between 1914 and 1980. Forms like fantasies, programmatic overtures, symphonic poems, and rhapsodies and suites that included folkloric
themes or rhythms represented the preference of the audiences to this specific genre. Through the development of the technical and aural capacities of the musicians of symphonic ensembles in Costa Rica, second and third generation composers of symphonic music – especially Carlos Enrique Vargas, Mariano Herrera, Rocío Sanz, Bernal Flores and Benjamín Gutiérrez – explored with more advanced musical materials and featured large-scale compositions like symphonies, suites, and concertos. It is important to acknowledge the importance of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Symphony Orchestra of Heredia, the Chamber Orchestra of the University of Costa Rica and the student orchestra of the Castella Conservatory as promoters of the symphonic repertoire written between 1940 and 1980.

Sadly, most of the orchestral music by Costa Rican symphonic repertoire has been forgotten, having not yet been programmed. For example, the *Sinfonía Coral* by Jesús Bonilla is still awaiting its world premiere. The orchestral music by Julio Mata has been scarcely performed. It is possible that several of the compositions included in the rubric on pages 7 and 8 either have not been premiered or only performed once. Moreover, it is clear that the promotion of Costa Rican repertoire is still in an incipient stage. Costa Rican oboist and musical philosopher José Manuel Rojas reflects:

Costa Rican composers are still unable to make their livelihoods by writing music, they have to complement this practice with other activities within the musical field. Most of the time, composers write their compositions for a symbolic remuneration. Some of them are economically recognized overseas. However, the most common acknowledgment that they are able to receive is the actual performance of their music. In the last 20 years, the production of Costa Rican composers has featured chamber music works, since it is easier to get their music performed by a chamber ensemble rather than all the bureaucratic procedures that they have to do in order to get a piece performed by an orchestra. As it has been seen, the National Symphony Orchestra has minimum opportunities available for readings of Costa Rican pieces, and from my perception, foreign conductors do not show any particular interest for the works of local composers. Being this the current situation, the cultural politics have not developed a clear project that supports the national musical heritage (Rojas 295-296).

Without any doubt, the appreciation, study, and promotion of Costa Rican symphonic music, especially the cornerstone compositions, need urgent attention from Latin American conductors, musicians, and scholars. It would be sorrowful for
the great masterpieces that conform the national musical heritage to become forgotten by the passing of time.

Image 1: Newspaper shortcut announcing the premiere of the piece, as appeared in “La Nación” 26 September 1967, page 45.
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ANALYSIS:

ANTON RUBINSTEIN:
Piano Concerto No. 3 in G, Op. 45 and
Piano Concerto No. 4 in D Minor, Op. 70

Jon Ceander Mitchell
University of Massachusetts Boston

Anton Grigoryevich Rubinstein (1829-1894) was the premier Russian pianist of his generation. Born into a Jewish family November 28, 1829 in Vikhvatinsi in the Podalsk district northwest of Odessa, he had the advantages afforded him from his family’s conversion to Christian Orthodoxy when he was less than five. This meant significant travel for all members of the family and, particularly for Anton and his brother Nikolay, early exposure to some of the greatest musicians of his time. At the age of eleven, after studying at the Paris Conservatoire, Anton played for Chopin and Liszt. At the age of fourteen, during his family’s two-year stay in Berlin, he met Mendelssohn, Meyerbeer, and Schumann. In 1848, with so much revolutionary activity going on in Europe, he more-or-less permanently settled into St. Petersburg, where he quickly became one of Russia’s most influential musicians.

In 1854, Rubinstein embarked on a four-year concert tour of Europe. Shortly after his return, in 1859, with help from members of the Imperial Royal Family, he founded the Russian Musical Society. This in turn led to the founding of the St. Petersburg Conservatory, which he headed from its inception in 1862 through 1867 and again from 1887 to 1891. Rubinstein’s professional western-leaning approach to music and music education were in direct contrast to that of the Russian nationalist Mily Balakirev and his circle, known as The Mighty Five; in response, this group established the rival Free School of Music in St. Petersburg. For the remainder of his life, Rubinstein’s music and the music of many of those that he had taught (including Tchaikovsky) would be dismissed by the Balakirev circle as being not sufficiently Russian.

At the time of his death in 1894 Rubinstein was revered both as a great keyboard artist (his skills were often compared to Liszt’s) and as a great composer.
It is remarkable that today, over a century later, his own music is almost entirely forgotten. As a pianist, he died too soon to have had any of his actual performances recorded. As a composer, in the generations following his death, his international romantic style was derided by the Soviets and his music banned by the Nazis throughout much of Europe. Rubinstein wrote a large quantity of music in a hurried fashion and perhaps his fault as a composer lies in the fact that in many cases he did not exercise sufficient scrutiny in the revision and dissemination of his works. This is manifested in the myriad errors and inconsistencies found in the available full score and parts to the Piano Concerto No. 3 in G, Op. 45. Unfortunately, many of his finest works—including the opera Demon, the concerti, symphonies, and symphonic poems—have been buried by the popularity of the more timbre-oriented works of his contemporaries. It is indeed unfortunate that even today he is represented in many catalogs only by the dozens of arrangements of his undemanding yet instantly gratifying Melody in F, Op. 3, No. 1.

Rubinstein’s piano concerti span a quarter of a century. All are in the standard three movement format. Two early concerti, in C and in F, appear to have been lost. A third attempt, actually performed as the Piano Concerto in D minor, was withdrawn by the composer and revamped as the Octet for Piano, Violin, Viola, Cello, Contrabass, Flute, Clarinet, and Horn, Op. 9. After these three early attempts, Rubinstein settled into a more consistent pattern. The first three numbered piano concerti date from 1850-1854. The Piano Concerto No. 1 in E Minor, Op. 25 (1850) and Piano Concerto No. 2 in F (1851) are somewhat Beethovenian in that they retain separate orchestral expositions in their first movements.ii At the same time, however, they look forward to Rubinstein’s more mature works through their expansive harmonic structure.

The under-appreciated Piano Concerto No. 3 in G, Op. 45 (1853-54) represents a radical departure from the first two. This very lyrical work, composed just prior to Rubinstein’s highly successful European tour, must be considered an experiment in form. The first movement has no separate orchestral exposition. Instead, within the first twenty measures, there are two cadenzas of a similar nature for the solo instrument. What follows is a truncated sonata form, with the main theme absent in the recapitulation. The E minor second movement is in a relatively brief ABA form, with its contrasting middle section in the parallel major. It is highly contemplative in nature. The third movement, nearly as long as the other two movements combined, is cast into a full sonata-rondo form followed by an orchestral section reintroducing themes used in the first two movements. The concerto is wrapped up by a furious prestissimo coda played in unison by the soloist and orchestra. This unusual cyclical structure was not something that the composer
constructed on the spur of the moment. From the very start, the concerto was intended to be programmatic in nature, as Rubinstein explained during his 1872-1873 American tour:

In the first movement, the piano repeatedly requests admittance into the temple of the orchestra. The orchestra takes the matter into consideration and decides to test the capabilities of the piano. After frequent consultations and trials, the orchestra concludes that the piano is not worthy to enter into its sanctuary. In the second movement, the piano bemoans its fate, but soon recovers its equanimity and asserts its dignity. The beginning of the last movement represents the piano as repeating its request to be admitted. Again consultations are held, during which single instruments express their opinions. The decision of the orchestra is again adverse to the appeals of the piano. Now the piano loses its temper and challenges the orchestra to imitate what the piano can do, and in the tumult of this attempt the Concerto closes. iii

In spite of its programmatic content, the work may still be enjoyed as an abstract composition. After all, Rubinstein did not place any hint of the work’s programmatic nature into its title nor, it can be assumed, did the original publishers print any accompanying program note.

The Piano Concerto No. 4 in D minor, Op. 70 (1864), considered Rubinstein’s masterpiece in the form, was composed a full decade after Op. 45. It displays the benefits of having had a relatively lengthy gestation period. Unlike its immediate predecessor, there is no underlying program. The first movement begins with the briefest of orchestral introductions before the piano enters with a blaze of glory. The remainder of the movement is in sonata allegro form, with the exception that, as in the case of Op. 45, the recapitulation doesn’t start with the main theme. Rubinstein knew that he had a great first theme, however, and waited to bring it back in a bravura section at precisely the right moment, just before the coda. The second movement, in a surprising rondo form, features some of the composer’s most beautiful music. However, it is the third movement that has the most striking main theme, beginning with a syncopated Neapolitan sixth chord. In true “Russian” style, the movement seems to pick up the pace as it moves toward its stirring conclusion.

Of the five numbered concerti, Op. 70 is the only one which has retained a position (though a rather tenuous one) in the core piano concerto repertoire. Rubinstein’s final work in the form, the Piano Concerto No. 5 in E flat, Op. 94 (1874) was composed another decade later; its length (close to fifty minutes) and extreme difficulty have kept it from achieving a toehold in the core repertoire.
Though he lived for another twenty years, Rubinstein was finished with the genre, ironically ceasing to compose any more piano concerti in the same year that Tchaikovsky began to produce his. While Rubinstein’s piano concerti enjoyed tremendous success throughout the nineteenth century, they all but disappeared from the concert hall in the twentieth. Fortunately the early performance practices of these concerti were not lost to posterity, for there was at least one authentic link to Rubinstein’s own interpretations. The well-known and respected pianist Joseph Hofmann (1876-1957), who studied with Rubinstein from 1892 to 1894, recorded Opp. 45 and 70 well into the electronic era. Still, it was not until a half century later, with the release of Joseph Banowetz’ recordings of all five, that the music world’s interest in these concerti was rekindled.\textsuperscript{iv}

\textit{Piano Concerto No. 3 in G, Op. 45}

\textbf{Score:}

Though obtained from Luck’s Music Library as #00136, the score itself has the name Edwin F. Kalmus & Co., Inc. printed on its cover and at the bottom of the first page. This is a reprint of the edition published by the Berlin firm of Ed. Bote & G. Bock as the \textit{3ième concerto pour le piano avec accompagnement d’orchestre ou d’un second piano, op. 45 composé par Antoine Rubinstein}. The full score of this edition, from about 1876, was newly revised by the composer.\textsuperscript{v} Bote & Bock had earlier published a version for solo piano, incorporating the orchestral part within. The composer, while not having the best of relationships with individual publishers, nevertheless experienced an overall high degree of success in working with them; he was able to get his works published by twenty-one different houses in eight locations.\textsuperscript{vi}

The score is approximately 10” X 13” and fairly clear. This Kalmus reprint has no title page and the first page does not mention the work’s dedicatee, Czech pianist and composer Ignaz Moscheles. At the top of the page the work is labeled in German, \textit{Drittes Concert}, providing a paradox since all of the individual parts bear the title in French, \textit{Troisième Concerto}. The parts themselves are labeled in Italian in the score:

Flauti
Oboi
Clarinetti in A
Fagotti
Corni in F  
Trombe in G  
Timpani in G.D.  
Violino I  
Violino II  
Viola  
Pianoforte  
Violoncello  
Basso  

With the exception of a piccolo added to the last movement of the Piano Concerto No. 4 in D Minor, Op. 70, this is the orchestration used by Rubinstein for all of his piano concerti; it was the standard concerto complement used during the first half of the nineteenth century. Here, at least, Rubinstein was quite conservative, being more influenced by the expedient Germanic orchestrations of Mendelssohn and Schumann, rather than by the radical Liszt, who had already used a much larger orchestra for his first concerto.

The horn parts of Op. 45 are for natural horn which, upon occasion, requires hand horn technique. It can be assumed that the parts for the trumpets were intended to be played on natural trumpets pitched in high G (a relative rarity); their parts do not venture above third space C and are restricted entirely to tonic and dominant. Rubinstein was playing it safe here; the newer valved brass instruments had been around for decades, yet in the 1850’s many orchestras still did not have them. The timpani, also confined to tonic and dominant, are not used in the second movement.

I.

m. 2 Violoncello: The stem is missing for the dotted half note. It probably was there originally.
m. 7 Oboe I: The second and third notes (B) and (C ) should not be a part of any slur.
m. 11 Bassoon I: The first note should be a high “B” instead of the printed “A.”
m. 16 Oboe I, Clarinet I, and Bassoon I: The second and third notes should not be a part of any slur. Also m. 18 (here for Flute I as well).
m. 51 Violin I: There should probably be a reminder natural sign for the first note, since the viola part has one for the same line played one octave lower.
m. 73 Clarinet I: There should probably be a cresc. marking for the entire measure since all other parts have one. This is a solo line, marked con espressione, so Rubinstein may have thought it unnecessary. Also m. 77.
m. 85 Clarinets: *mf* is missing.
m. 105 Bassoon I: *mf* is missing.
m. 114 Clarinets: Dynamic marking (probably *mf*) is missing.
mm. 117-118 Clarinet I: Pairs of notes should be slurred, but not across the barline.
m. 129 Flute, Clarinet: *mf* is missing.
m. 161 Basso: *arco* is missing.
m. 165 Clarinet II: Slur should start with the second note.
m. 165 Bassoons: First note should have a double stem.
m. 167 Oboe II: 2nd D should be tied into the dotted half note E of the next measure.
m. 169 (D) Flutes: Note should have a double stem.
mm. 173-175 Violin I: Bowing is inconsistent with what was at the beginning of the piece. Also mm. 181-182 and mm. 529-534 of the third movement.
m. 181 Violin I, Viola, Bassi: *mp* is missing.
m. 201 Horn I: *p* is missing.
m. 203 Oboe I: *p* is missing.
m. 205 Clarinets: *p* is missing.
m. 213 Timpani has an atonal “D” here and in m. 217. This is at the conductor’s discretion. The note can be played as is, tuned up one-half step to E flat, or simply eliminated.
m. 243 Bassoon I: *mf* is missing.
m. 257 Bassoons: Dynamic marking should be the same as for the clarinets in this woodwind quartet passage: *mf*, not *p*.
m. 274 Oboes: *mf* is missing.
m. 293 Oboes: *mf* is missing.
m. 305 Bassi: *mf* is missing.
m. 342 Violin II and Viola: *dim.* is missing.

II.

Beginning Basso: *con sordini* is missing.
mm. 1-2 Bassi: *decresc.* is missing.
m. 6 Violin I, Viola, and Bassi: *p* is missing.
m. 39 Bassi: *p* is missing.
m. 43 Horns: *mf* is missing.
m. 45 Horns: *f* is missing.
m. 53 Bassi: The G marked on the 4th beat in the score is an octave lower than that marked in the parts. As it stands, the note’s placement on the 4th beat is non-harmonic to the D sharp first inversion diminished chord above it. It may have been intentional on the composer’s part to anticipate the E minor chord on the next beat while maintaining the gate of the rather ghostly walking bass line. It is also possible that this is an error and that the note should be either a D sharp (as in the preceding measure) or an F sharp. Another possibility is that the G should fall on the 5th beat instead
of the 4th.

m. 65  Oboes: $p$ is missing.

III.

Beginning  Strings: *senza sordino* is missing.
m. 9    Trumpets: $f$ is missing.
m. 11   Horns: $mf$ is missing.
m. 41   Flutes: Note should have a double stem.
m. 41   Bassoons do not complete the woodwind cadence with the others. This may be the result of a copyist’s error. Completion of this is left up to the discretion of the conductor. Also in m. 321.
m. 57   Questionable Trumpet dynamic: $ff$ while all others parts have $f$.
m. 117  Clarinet I: Last note should be an E natural.
m. 123  Oboe II: Dynamic marking (probably $mp$) is missing.
m. 141  Oboe I: Dynamic marking (probably $p$) is missing.
m. 147  Woodwinds: $f$ is missing.
m. 177  Flute I, Clarinet I, and Violin I: $mp$ is missing.
m. 218  Timpani: On the second beat the Timpani has an atonal “D” that is actually part of a bass line pedal. The fact that it does not continue with the bassi on this pedal over the next two measures makes it rather suspect. Taken as a pedal, the D can work, though a G (the seventh of the dominant seventh chord), or lack of a timpani note may also work here. This is at the conductor’s discretion.
m. 233  Questionable Bassoon I dynamic: $mf$, when all other background parts have $p$.
m. 234  Violin II: $p$ is missing.
m. 237  Bassoons: $mf$ is missing.
m. 235-240 Violin II should have a cresc. here, matching that of the other strings.
m. 241  Horns: $ff$ is missing.
m. 247  Flute I part, marked *Io*., should also be marked *Solo*.
m. 257  Bassoon I: $f$ is missing.
m. 281 (E) Bassoons, Horns, and Trumpets: $f$ is missing.
m. 291  Horns: Dynamic (probably $mf$) is missing.
m. 305  Solo Pianoforte: R.H.: Natural sign missing for the high F.
m. 324  Violin II: $mf$ is missing.
m. 373  Strings: $f$ is missing.
m. 377  Flute I and Clarinet I: $f$ is missing.
m. 420  Basso: $p$ is missing.
m. 421  Flute I: $mf$ is missing.
m. 437  Violin II: *pizz*.
m. 438  Bassi: $mf$ is missing.
m. 469  Bassi: $p$ is missing.
m. 471  Violin II: *arco*.
m. 478  Violins, Bassi: $p$ begins on the second beat of this measure.
m. 485  Flutes: Notes should have double stems.
m. 490  Bassi: *mp* is missing.
m. 509  Bassi: *mf* is missing.
mm. 509-512 Clarinets: Dynamic should be *mf*, to match the flutes in this woodwind quartet section.
m. 513  Violin I and Bassi: *p* is missing.
m. 527  Flute I: *p* is missing.
m. 533  Oboes: *f* is missing.
m. 536  Bassoons, Bassi: *cresc.* should be extended through this measure.
m. 538  Solo Pianoforte: R.H.: The last note of the cadenza should be a D, not a B.
m. 547  Timpani has an atonal “D” here. This is at the conductor’s discretion. The note can be played as is, tuned up a whole step to E, or simply eliminated.
m. 563  Bassi: *mf* is missing; also m. 587.
m. 590  Violin I: First triplet note should be an E flat, not a D, according to the part. There is a certain amount of ambiguity here. Four measures later, with the same musical material presented, the note in question is a D. This creates a major 7th with the viola. This combined Viola-Violin I countermelody is a compression of solo pianoforte material from the second movement, where seven 16th notes are played in succession. The resulting major 7th dissonance in m. 594 may have been intentional, as it appears to have been in mm. 566 and 570.
mm. 600-602 Bassoon staff should be in bass clef.
m. 615  Horns: *p* is missing.
mm. 615-616 Horns: *cresc.* is missing.
m. 661  All winds: *a2* is missing.

**Parts:**

All parts are reproduced on 10” X 13” paper and are quite faint. All accidentals need to be darkened as sharp signs are often difficult to distinguish from naturals. Woodwind, horn, and trumpet parts are printed with both parts together, generally written on two connected staves.

There are discrepancies concerning tempo markings between the score and all parts. These may reflect revisions considered and then ignored, changes made to the score (or parts) without time to fix the other, or the existence of two different editions now published as one. Discrepancies marked with an asterisk (*) indicate those occurring during unaccompanied solo measures, resulting in a limited impact on the orchestral performance. Likewise, those occurring within solo cadenzas have no immediate impact on the orchestral performance and are therefore not listed:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td><em>Moderato assai</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 6</td>
<td><em>Moderato con moto</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 137</td>
<td><em>animato</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 153</td>
<td><em>Tempo I.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 305</td>
<td><em>Tempo I.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td><em>Moderato</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 23</td>
<td><em>Andante</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Adagio</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Adagio</em>, but without the dotted quarter note tempo beat indication given in the score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td><em>Allegro non troppo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 337</td>
<td><em>Allegro</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 437</td>
<td><em>stringendo</em>, though marked one measure later in the strings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 483</td>
<td><em>animato</em>, though occurring one measure earlier in the Violin I part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 501</td>
<td><em>ritard.</em>, though marked one beat late in the Violin I part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 509</td>
<td><em>Andante</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 513</td>
<td><em>Moderato assai</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 539</td>
<td><em>Moderato con moto</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Allegro</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Allegro molto vivace</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The available parts are from Luck’s Music Library, also #00136. As is, these are nearly unusable. There are a number of serious errors in these parts, namely the disappearance of eight measures of notation in Violin II and Viola, one measure left out in the timpani, and wrong notes in the oboe and bassoon. And that is just the beginning; nearly every part has misprinted rhythms and incorrect numbers of measures of rests.

I.

m. 7      Oboe I: The second and third notes (B and C) should not be a part of any slur. Both should be tongued. This is in keeping with the Bassoon I line which doubles this part an octave lower, the solo Clarinet and solo Bassoon parts in m. 16, and the Violin I bowing
established in the second measure.

m. 16  Oboe I: The second and third notes (G and A) should not be a part of any slur. Both should be tongued.

m. 18  Flute I, Oboe I, Clarinet I: the same as for m. 16. [Bassoon I part is correct].

mm. 62-63 Violin II: The dotted half should not be slurred into the others.

m. 81  Bassoons: p is missing.

m. 105 Clarinets: The correct number of measures of rests before the flute cue should be 8, not 7.

m. 105 Bassoon I: con espressione is missing.

mm. 114, 116Clarinet: Notes within these measures should be slurred.

mm. 117-118 Clarinet I: Notes within these measures should be slurred.

mm. 119-120 Clarinet: These two measures should be slurred.

m. 120 Clarinet: Note value should be a dotted quarter note, followed by a dotted quarter rest.

m. 137 (C) Trumpets and Timpani: The first indication of 32 measures of rest is superfluous. There are only 32 measures of rest between C and D, not 64.

mm. 173-175 Violin I: Bowing is inconsistent with what was at the beginning of the piece. Also mm. 181-182 and mm. 529-534 of the third movement.

m. 177 Violin I: Dynamic marking should be ff.

m. 181 Violin I, Bassi: mp is missing.

m. 201 Horn I: p is missing.

m. 236 Viola: Dynamic marking should be mp.

m. 243 Bassoon I: mf is missing.

m. 265 Bassoon I: Dynamic marking should be mf.

m. 267 Oboe II: mf is missing.

m. 276 Flute I: There are seven beats printed in this measure. The quarter note should not be dotted.

m. 305 Bassi: mf is missing.

mm. 323-324 Violins: decresc. is missing. Also mm. 327-328.

m. 325 Strings: f is missing.

m. 329 Horn I: Dynamic should be mf.

m. 353+ Violin II: The measure containing a whole rest does not exist.

m. 354+ Violins: There is an extra penultimate measure printed.

II.

mm. 1 and 2 Bassi: decresc. is missing.

m. 6 Violin I, Viola, and Bassi: p is missing.

mm. 43-44 Bassoon II: Notes should be an octave lower.

mm. 43-44 Horn II: Notes should be an octave lower.

mm. 43-45 Bassi: Notes should be dotted half notes.

m. 47 Oboe I: Note should be a G natural.
III.

Beginning Strings: *Senza sordino* is missing.

Beginning Bassi: *pizz.*

m. 9 Violins: Dynamic marking should be *f*.

m. 68 Timpani: This measure, with the same rhythm as the previous three, is missing.

mm. 106-107 Violin II: Slur should extend across the barline.

m. 147 Woodwinds: *f* is missing.

mm. 161-164vi Flutes: According to the score Flute I should have tied C# two ledger lines above the staff; Flute II should have tied G sharps one space above the staff.

mm. 161-164 Oboes: According to the score Oboe I should have a tied third space C#. Oboe II is tacet.

mm. 161-164 Clarinets: According to the score Clarinet I should have tied third space B naturals, with Clarinet II an octave lower.

mm. 161-164 Bassoons: According to the score Bassoon I should have tied middle C#; Bassoon II should have tied 3rd space E sharps.

mm. 169-180 Violin II and Viola: Twelve measures of notation (actually four measures of notation, followed by four measures of rest, plus four more measures of notation) that are in the score are left out of the parts. The measures line up alright, but instead of notes, the parts have eight measures of rest plus four measures of Violin I cues.

mm. 187-188 Violin II, Viola: Slur should extend over the barline.

m. 193 Flutes: 2nd flute staff *f* is missing.

mm. 193-194 Violin II, Viola: This should be slurred.

Mm. 213-214 Violin II: The rhythm should be quarter rest, quarter note in each of these two measures.

m. 225 Clarinets: The correct number of measures of rest printed here (at D) before the page turn, should be 10, not 16.

mm. 235-236 Bassoons: *cresc.* should appear in these two measures, not in measure 237.

m. 237 Bassoons: *mf* is missing.

m. 244 Violas: This measure is missing. It should be either a repeat of the previous measure (following the composer’s descending octaves), as printed in the score, or a measure of rest (and therefore not intruding on the bass line).

m. 293 Horns: *f* is missing.

m. 313 Oboe I: *f* and *con espressione* are missing.

m. 373 Strings: *f* is missing.

m. 377 Flute I, Clarinet I: *f* is missing.

m. 385 Clarinet I: *mf* is missing.

m. 413 Violin II: Dynamic marking should be *f*.

m. 420 Basso: *p* is missing.

m. 437 Violin I: *Stringendo* should be marked for this measure, rather than one measure later.
m. 437 Violin II: *pizz.*
m. 459 Clarinet I: *cresc.* is missing. Also mm. 466-467.
m. 460 Clarinet I: *decresc.* is missing. Also m. 468
mm. 466-467 Bassoon I: *cresc.* is missing.
m. 468 Bassoon I: *decresc.* is missing.
m. 469 Bassi: *p* is missing.
m. 471 Violin II: *arco.*
m. 493 Oboes: This measure (consisting of a whole rest) is missing.
m. 501-504 Violin I: *cresc.* is missing.
m. 505 Flute II, Bassoons, Horns: Fermata is missing.
m. 509 Flute II: D’s should be tied.
m. 509 Violin I, Bassi: *mf* is missing.
m. 513 Violin I: Time signature should be 6/8, not 6/4.
m. 513 Violoncello: *p* is missing.
m. 518 Violin II: *decresc.*, not the 2nd measure of a cresc.
m. 521 Oboe I: *p* and *espressivo* are missing.
m. 524-525 Bassoons: These measures should not be slurred together.
m. 529 Violin I: *mf* is missing
m. 537 Horn II: Fermata is missing.
m. 555 Violoncello and Basso: No printed distinction is made between the parts.
Basso plays only the low G, not the triple stop.
m. 563 Bassi: *mf* is missing; also m. 587.
m. 603 Bassoons: *Prestissimo* is missing.
m. 615 Horns: *p* is missing.
mm. 615-616 Horns: *cresc.* is missing.
m. 621 Viola: Dynamic marking should be *ff.*
m. 643 Timpani: *f* is missing.

Piano Concerto No. 4 in D Minor, Op. 70

Originally composed in 1864, the *Piano Concerto No. 4 in D minor* was arranged by the composer for two pianos in 1866, revised by the composer in 1869, and the full score published in its definitive form in 1872. Tchaikovsky and Rachmaninov, among others, were heavily influenced by this work and, one might say, by its predecessors as well.

In working with the score and parts to this concerto, one gets the impression of it being a flawed masterpiece—not from a compositional standpoint (it is a tremendous manifestation of solid musicianship), but from the *modus operandi* involved. Reasons for this stem from Rubinstein’s own sense of orchestration (which was quite Germanic) as well as copyist errors. By the time of the work’s composition, Rubinstein was no novice in orchestration; in addition to the piano concerti, he had already composed three symphonies, a violin concerto and his first
cello concerto. The state of the orchestra available to him, however, was still the same as what he had to work with a decade earlier: the brass were still valveless (or the existence ofvalved brass could not counted upon) and it appears that Rubinstein had resigned himself to dealing with rather weak oboes. As in the case of Op, 45, the flutes, clarinets, and bassoons are used far more regularly for solo and ensemble passages than the oboes. There are also certain passages where instruments simply fade out before logical phrase endings occur. These may have been the fault of a copyists or typesetters.

**Score:**

The score used for this study is from Dover Publications, Inc., #0-486-42438-3. In this 8 ½ X 11 paperbound edition *Piano Concerto No. 4 in D Minor*, Op. 70 is paired with Alexander Scriabin’s *Piano Concerto in F-sharp Minor*, Op. 20 and has an introduction by Joseph Banowetz. The Rubinstein work has 147 pages and is a reprint of the original 1872 publication of the full score by Bartholf Senff, of Leipzig, Germany. The printing of the full score is quite faint, but usable. Neither the title page nor the first page mention the work’s dedicatee, German violinist and conductor Ferdinand David.

The work is scored for the following:

- Piccolo
- 2 Flutes
- 2 Oboes
- 2 Clarinets in B flat
- 2 Bassoons
- 2 Trumpets in D
- 2 Horns in F
- Timpani in D and A
- Violin I
- Violin II
- Viola
- Pianoforte Solo
- Cello
- Bass

The piccolo is used only in the third movement. It occupies its own staff located above the flutes. The rather sparse part for this instrument is intended to be played by an additional performer, not as a doubling part for the second flautist.
Once again the brass parts are intended for the natural instruments or, in the case of the horns, natural instruments employing hand horn technique. There is one exception, a solitary D above middle C for Trumpet I in the last movement. This may have been wishful thinking on Rubinstein’s part. The timpani also cling to tradition and are written for tonic and dominant. Though there are indications at the beginning of the second movement for timpani “in F et C,” only a solo drum, pitched in F, is used, and very sparingly at that.

There are two problems posed by the score order. The first is somewhat of a rarity: the trumpets are placed where they would be in a concert band score, above the horns. With the horns and trumpets pitched in two different keys, the visual result can offer an element of surprise at certain page turns. The second problem, a far lesser one, is that once again the solo pianoforte is placed in the middle of the string section, between the viola and the cello, rather than in its customary position above the entire section.

Throughout the score “Solo” is often used in place of “1.” or “2.” in the winds. This marking does not necessarily imply a solo melodic line, but that only the first player should play. Also sub. p is not written. In a number of places, such as m. 297 of the first movement, the dynamic drops suddenly to a p. Both score and parts would benefit from a marking of sub. p in these places.

I.

m. 12 Horn II: mf is missing.
m. 24 Flutes: cresc. is missing.
m. 66 (B) Violin I has no Soli marking, while the Violoncello does. Subsequent moving string parts in this passage do not have this marked.
m. 110 Questionable dynamics, with Violin I marked mf, while all other orchestral instruments have a p and the solo pianoforte a p.
m. 131 Oboe I: mf is missing.
m. 142, 146 Clarinet Solo. This may be the result of a copyist’s error, substituting clarinet for “Clarino,” the natural trumpet. The pairing of the clarinet here with the timpani is inconsistent with the standard classical scoring practice used by Rubinstein in mm. 8, 12, 16-24, 46, and 54.
m. 185 Solo pianoforte, R.H.: Top note (F sharp dotted half) should have a stem pointing up; it is not entirely visible.
m. 198 Violin I and Viola: Questionable dynamics, with Violin I (the melody part)
marked $p$ and Viola marked $mf$. Both parts should be at equal strength.

m. 212 Solo pianoforte, L. H.: The half rest should not be dotted.

m. 225 Basso: missing $f$.

mm. 226-227 Violin I and Violoncello: questionable phrasing. To be consistent with the previous measures, there should be no slur between the notes, but there should be a slur from the quarter note on the 4th beat into the following measure.

m. 237 Flutes: all notes should have double stems in this measure. This may exist, but the faded print negates those on the the 2nd and 3rd beat.

m. 238 Viola: $arco$ is missing.

mm. 254-272 Solo Pianoforte, L.H.: all sustained tones should be accented, to agree with the bassoon part.

mm. 284-296 Strings: The running eighth note passages should be marked *sempre staccato* to be in line with the earlier passage at mm. 67-79.

mm. 295-296 Oboe I: Half note F’s should be slurred; Clarinet II: Half note G’s should be slurred.

m. 336 Questionable dynamics, with Violin I marked $mf$, while all other orchestral instruments have a $p$ and the solo pianoforte a $mp$.

m. 354 The timpani note here is an atonal D occurring in a G flat major chord. Conductors will have to decide for themselves whether to have the timpanist play the tone as is, eliminate it, or ask the timpanist to retune the drum to a D flat for this one note.

m. 474 Flute I: $mf$ is missing.

II.

m. 8 Oboe II: $mf$ is missing; also m. 169.

m. 76 Flute II: *cresc.* is missing.

m. 77 Flutes and Oboe: *decresc.* is missing

m. 78 Flutes: *Solo* (likely) or *a2* (less likely) is missing.

m. 106 (C ) Bassi: $mf$ is missing.

m. 137 Flute I: initial dynamic $mf$ is missing.

m. 180 Clarinet I: Staccato dots are missing for the last two notes,

m. 190 Bassoon II: Note on the 3rd beat is ambiguous. The score has a faint second line B flat (which would agree with what occurs before), while the Bassoon II part itself has a first line G. Both are chord tones and there exists a good argument for the G, in regard to the motion that happens in the following measure. This is a choice for the conductor and either possibility works.

m. 194 Clarinet II: $mf$ is missing.

III.

m. 41 Timpani: Dynamic marking should be $ff$, not $f$. 
m. 43  Timpani: \( f \) is missing. Also at mm. 187 and 451.

m. 73  Violin I and Viola: Questionable dynamics. Violin I, with melody has \( p \), Viola, with supportive harmony has \( mf \), solo pianoforte, with right hand embellishments over an Alberti bass, has \( mp \).

m. 89  Flutes: \( a2 \) is missing.

m. 345  Violin I and Viola: \( mf \) is missing.

m. 583 (I)  Violoncello and Basso: missing dynamics. This is a conductor’s choice. To agree with the solo pianoforte (the only other instrument playing here) the dynamic should be \( f \). However, to agree with Violin I and Viola, both of which come in 4mm later, the dynamic should be \( p \).

m. 663  Viola: Slur connecting the fourth and fifth notes is missing. Also m. 665.

m. 743  Timpani: \( f \) is missing.

m. 762  Bassoons: The staff should be tenor clef, not alto, although the notes, which are on the correct lines, appear as if they were in tenor clef.

m. 781  Flutes.: \( f \) is missing.

### Parts:

The parts are from Luck’s Music Library, #00068. The wind, percussion and viola parts are printed on 10 X 13 paper, while the other strings are on 9 X 12 paper. With the exception of the violas, all string parts are very faint; some stems and accidentals need to be darkened. Wind parts are all printed individually, not as pairs.

As in the case of Piano Concerto No. 3 in \( G \), there are discrepancies between the score and all parts concerning tempo markings. These may reflect revisions considered and then ignored, or reconsidered for either score or parts without time to fix the other. Whatever the case, the discrepancy occurring at m. 289 of the first movement and the exclusion of the second \( \text{allargando} \) toward the end of the third offer serious challenges that need to be worked out by all parties. Those discrepancies marked with an asterisk (*) indicate those occurring during unaccompanied solo measures and have limited effect on the orchestral performers. Likewise, those occurring within the first movement solo cadenza (mm. 355-431) have no impact on the orchestral performers and are therefore not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Moderato assai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 37*</td>
<td>( \text{ritard.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 39 (A)</td>
<td>( a \text{ tempo} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 113*</td>
<td>( \text{ritard.} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
m. 134  ritard.  [none]
m. 135  Tempo Primo  tranquillo
m. 167 (D)  Tempo Primo  tranquillo
m. 175*  animato  [none]
m. 264  calmando  [none]
m. 266*  ritard.  [none]
m. 272  a tempo  [none]
m. 289  poco a poco sempre animato  animato assai
m. 297  piú mosso  [none]
m. 312*  ritard.  [none]
m. 335*  ritard.  [none]
m. 337  animato  [none]
m. 464  animato  [none]

II.

Beginning  Andante  Moderato assai
m. 42*  un poco animato  [none]
m. 62  ritard.  [none]

III.

Beginning  Allegro  Allegro assai
m. 57*  Un poco animato  animato
m. 201  animato assai  animato
m. 287  piú animato  [none]
m. 401  ritard.  ritard.  [Bassoons in m. 401, Flutes in m. 405, all others in m. 403.]
m. 503  piú animato  [none]
m. 549*  piú animato  [none]
m. 781  a tempo  [none]
m. 784  allargando  [none]
m. 789  a tempo  [none]

Parts

In general, it appears that more care was taken with the initial preparation of the published parts for this work than for Op. 45. The egregious errors found in the former, such as wrong notes or entire measures being left out, are not to be found here.

I.

m. 84  Flute I: Staccato marking for the quarter note D is missing.
m. 167  Oboe I: con espressione is missing.
m. 238 Viola, Basso: *arco* is missing.

mm. 284-296 Strings: This passage should be marked *sempre staccato* in all parts to keep in line with the earlier passage at mm. 67-79.

m. 478 Oboe I: There is a break in the phrasing between the two F’s. It also appears this way in the Oboe I cue that is printed in the Oboe II part.

II.

m. 106 Bassi: *mf* is missing.

m. 182 Horns: *f* is missing

mm. 192-193 Clarinet II: *cresc.* is missing.

m. 193 Clarinet I: Dynamic marking should be *f*, not *mf*.

III.

mm. 13-17 Violins, Viola, Violoncello: *cresc.* into the low G# eighth notes are missing. Also mm. 691-694 (Bassi).

m. 74 Violin I: While there is no actual error here, there is a major problem in the spacing of the printed notes in measures containing an eighth note followed by a dotted half. This has resulted in a number of recordings (and performances) where these measures are played incorrectly.

m. 169 Bassoon I: Dynamic marking should be *f*, not *mf*.

m. 177 Clarinet I: Dynamic marking should be *f*, not *mf*.

m. 345 Violin I: *mf* is missing.

mm. 377-379 Bassoons: Accents on the downbeats are missing. Also mm. 385-389.

m. 378 Viola: Accent on the downbeat is missing. Also mm. 381, 386, and 389.

mm. 380-382 Clarinets: Accents on the downbeats are missing. Also mm. 389-390.

m. 382 Oboes: Accent on the downbeat is missing. Also m. 390.

m. 385 Bassi: Accent on the downbeat is missing.

m. 467 Violin I, Viola: Dynamic marking should be *pp*.

m. 483 Viola: Staccato markings missing on the first three notes.

m. 541 Violoncello: Natural sign is missing for the B.

---

i Philip S. Taylor, *Anton Rubinstein: A Life in Music* (Bloomington, IN and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press, 2007), p. 22. The C major concerto was performed at the Mikhaylovsky Theatre on March 1, 1849 under Vieuxtemps’ direction, with Rubinstein as soloist.

ii This idea was anything but dead, as Brahms would continue on with this tradition.

iv. Joseph Banowetz’ recordings feature different conductors. In 2014, Grigorios Zamparas and Jon Ceander Mitchell became the first pianist-conductor team to record all five of the Anton Rubinstein piano concerti, for Centaur Records, Inc.

v. There is room for confusion here as there also exists an edition imprinted by E. Gerard of Paris in 1870 with the indication “Nouvelle ed./revue et modifié par l’auteur.” This may be a reflection the limitations of publication rights for different countries.


vii. Mm. 161-164 of the third movement of Op. 45 are problematical. The score has a C# major chord structure that can be described as semi-open, with the third (E#) appearing only in the bass. The parts feature a juxtaposition with the third (E sharp) on top and elsewhere. Both work, though to different effect. The choice of using one over the other is essentially the conductor’s call.
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