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Number 21, October 1957
CONFUSION AND ERROR

 Norman Del Mar

I have always been intrigued by mistakes and inconsistencies in editions of orchestral works, and already some 15 years ago, while still a horn-player, I began noting down, more or less casually, textual problems that arose during rehearsals. It would turn out, for instance, that the figure —which I had been playing as 2nd Horn in the finale of Beethoven’s 7th Symphony—appeared an extra time 2 and 3 bars after M in some scores and parts but not in others, or that the note in the 1st Horn near the beginning of the slow movement of Dvořák’s Cello Concerto (Ex. 1)1 must surely be for Horn in E, although no evidence to that effect was to be found in either score or part!

Before very long I found that practically every work I encountered contained more or less material for what, if assembled properly, would eventually become nothing less than a novel kind of encyclopedia. I have been collecting data ever since and am still eagerly doing so, since these are matters not merely for the musicologist, but which arise in the course of normal professional activity. Moreover, after accumulating copious notes on well over 200 works I regard myself as no more than on the fringe of a vast uncharted territory.

It would be as well to enumerate at once some of the different kinds of errors and incongruities which I have been noting down in this way. Simple misprints in their crudest form can be too numerous and uninteresting to be worth listing; yet some can have far-reaching consequences, especially over a period of time. In the slow movement of the Jupiter Symphony, the lower strings eleven bars before the end have a sudden f (Ex. 2). This is a simple yet devastating misprint seldom, if ever, corrected in modern performances. Yet it is easy to see how it arose in early editions in view of the phrase (Ex. 3) which follows immediately after.

Sometimes misprints can by their sheer quantity obscure the true reading of a work such as Debussy’s Nocturnes or the Dvořák Serenade for Strings, though the composer himself may have been partly responsible! Or there may have been several faulty editions which in the course of time gave rise to quite different versions of the same work, as with the Overture to the Secret Marriage of Cimarosa, let alone the,

1 See examples on pages 15 and 16.
many such Overtures of Rossini. The appalling situation over the two versions of the Overture to the Barber of Seville is notorious.

The composer can be to blame in a number of different ways. Even Wagner, otherwise so scrupulous, laid himself open to the charge of carelessness when he allowed such a serious clash in the Prelude to Tristan as shown in Ex. 4. Perhaps he meant it; but some printed editions make the apparently necessary alteration. Composer’s revisions can account for many of the worst confusions, as in the case of Hansel and Gretel, which abounds in serious differences of text between the parts, the full score, and the miniature score, all in the same edition. Nor does reference to the manuscript always clear up the trouble, as the controversy over the Barber of Seville Overture proved! The late Dr. Kleiber stirred up a hornet’s nest when he discovered that it appeared to be an alien hand which prescribed the arco for the violins four bars from the end of the slow movement of Beethoven’s 7th Symphony; and he raised a similar issue in the last movement of the New World Symphony, since he was firmly convinced that the trumpets should be in C instead of E in the passage quoted in Ex. 5. Oddly enough, the miniature score falls into the same trap, though the original is clear enough and makes excellent sense! In many cases, however, doubt arises from a suspicion that the composer himself has blundered. Perhaps the most famous example of all is the flute solo at the beginning of the 2nd Mvt. of Tchaikovsky’s 1st Piano Concerto. Opinions are sharply divided as to whether the opening bar is correct as printed in the original score (Ex. 6), or whether the F should be a B flat, in accordance with every subsequent entry of this melody. Scores exist with the correction made, but it is more than probable that the autograph itself is responsible for the confusion.

These are just a few outstanding examples of the problems which arise in the course of every-day work with an orchestra. Only recently in rehearsal on Brahms’s Violin Concerto, a piece I have hitherto regarded as free from trouble of this kind, a few violinists insisted on holding the note C (Ex. 7) long after all the others had left off. On my pressing the point it transpired that the orchestral parts were a mixed set, and that the players concerned were using the original Simrock while the remainder, including myself, were working from Breitkopf. In the former the passage appears as in Ex. 7a, in the latter, as in Ex. 7b. In the 4th Symphony of Brahms a similar matter equally vital arose, and so on with every work. Of course, it stands to reason that textual worries arise also in all other branches of music; but works for solo instruments, or for small combinations, are mostly published in editions in which the editor has put the stamp of his scholarship upon the text. This is extremely rare with orchestral music, except in Collected Editions of the works of a single composer or occasionally in some editions of miniature scores, such as Eulenburg. Even then, however, the work is rarely so completely covered that one can rely on obtaining an authoritative decision on every major problem of textual interpretation. It is obviously impossible to be certain at any given time of assembling all the necessary data. The difficulties experienced by the recent Haydn Society give gloomy evidence of this. The task is by definition never-ending even when applied to a single work, let alone to the thousands that will, I hope, be dealt with in the encyclopedia I envisage!
Hence the volume can never make a single complete appearance; countless sections will always need revision in the light of ever-changing knowledge and scholarship; editions come and go, sometimes solving old problems, sometimes posing new. I have no illusions that my researches will ever be complete. Nevertheless the stock of material is already so astonishing that I think it high time to begin laying out a few representative items in the present form.

HAYDN—SYMPHONY NO. 101 IN D (CLOCK)

1. The Preface to the Breitkopf octavo score protests, as in the case of many of the other high-numbered Symphonies, that it is 'revised according to the original manuscript'. But the relevant word is of course 'revised': and the Eulenburg miniature, published in 1934, throws a good deal of light on some of the more important corruptions covered by it. Yet in one striking instance, as will be seen (note 9), the editor of the Eul. goes too far and commits what I am convinced is a serious error.

2. I. Bars 7/8: The hairpins in Breitkopf are gratuitous editing such as is to be found throughout the edition. Eul., however, shows that the ties over the barline in 2nd Ob, Fag, and middle strings are also spurious. Since on the other hand the equivalent ties over the next barline are preserved, and the two passages are directly sequential, this editing seems pedantic. Apparently also the pp just before the Allegro is not to be found in the autograph, and certainly this can be granted to be open to taste.

3. I. Bar 57: The Br. parts slur the first half of this bar, no doubt in sympathy with the surrounding bars of similar passage-work. The Br. score does not give this, and neither does Eul. Hence, we now have three sources for comparison. Naturally, this forms only a small fraction of the additional and substantial re-editing to which the Br. string parts are always subjected in classical works, including elaborate bowings, phrasings, dynamics and the like. In this instance, however, a good case can be made for the reading in the parts as against the score!

4. I.—2nd time bar: All hairpins and phrasings here are mere editing until bar 148, as is also the cresc. in bar 186. In fact, there is a considerable difference in the approach to the climax between the two versions and it is even debatable whether the Br. is not after all more satisfactory and practical, as claimed in the Preface. This also applies to the pp at letter E (bar 197). Close scrutiny will find continual instances of this kind of deviation which cannot all be listed here.

5. II. Bar 28: The &gt; G in Eul. is a most odd reading. The lack of a preceding double dot to the F# suggests a misprint, but this reading is preserved (with double dot intact!) at the return in bar 90, so it is presumably authoritative, however unsatisfactory. Eul. produces a further discrepancy in bar 87 with its 7', which does not appear on any other occasion. It seems probable that Br. did rightly in choosing the first logical statement of the melody as correct throughout.

6. II. Bar 42: The tie in the flute linking the held top F to the 'clock' figure is removed in Eul., possibly an important correction, though the missing staccato on the first note of bar 43 is a little sinister. The altered phrasings in oboes and strings in the subsequent bars are rather inconsistent and in fact the string phrasings need attention in many places between here and the end of the movement. In particular, the Br. slur in bar 133 is apparently not original but has something to be said for it as an interpretation.
7. II. Bar 46: Eul. changes the trumpet C to a minim as opposed to the Breitkopf crotchet, presumably in sympathy with the horns. But whereas the horns, being in G, are quite harmless, the trumpets are pitched in C and form very curious harmony with the rest of the orchestra if they sustain into the second half of the bar! It is a pity that Dr. Praetorius makes no reference to this passage in his Revisionsbericht. Perhaps it was an oversight?

8. III. Bars 14-17 et seq.: Here Breitkopf by altering the phrasing removes an important feature of the movement, i.e. the splendid bias on the second beat of the bar in the upper instruments. Eul. restores this and other phrasings in the Minuet, notably in bars 26/7 and 36.

9. III. Trio, bars 6-8: Here is the salient point of dispute in the whole Symphony, and one of the chief bones of contention in all music! The Preface to the Breitkopf octavo score makes it absolutely clear that Haydn preserved the tonic D Major chord under the entire flute solo, viz.

![Musical notation]

even to the use of some such abbreviation as above and to numbering the bars scrupulously in the repetitions to avoid any misunderstanding! Professor Tovey in Vol. 1 of his essays (p. 163) also cites the autograph as authority.

Nevertheless, Dr. Praetorius, the Eul. editor, refers in his preface to the passage as ‘der alte Druckfehler’ and actually changes the offending bars to correspond with bars 102/3 in the written-out repeat! As a result this very repeat becomes virtually redundant since now only a minute revision of the trumpet parts in the last three bars remains as difference, and it is unlikely (to say the least) that Haydn would have written out the repeat in full for so minor a variant. The whole matter could be dismissed as an editorial blunder were it not for the curiously wide divergence of opinion on the matter. Indeed, no less a figure than Toscanini played and recorded the Symphony in this altered form! Thus to remove all trace of one of Haydn’s most typical jokes (I cannot accept Tovey’s suggestion that ‘perhaps it is a bad one’) is sad indeed.

10. III. Bars 123-135: Eul. reveals some most interesting cross-phrasings in the string parts which are well worth restoring. In bars 151-155 the suggestion is also made, with a most reasonable discussion in the Revisionsbericht, that the bassoon should remain silent during these bars preceding its solo.

11. IV. As before, there are many differences of phrasing to be found between the editions. While the majority of these are too small to enumerate individually here, bar 19 (and naturally all subsequent returns of this bar) might stand as an example. Here it seems to me that the phrasing has been spoilt by Breitkopf, the original 2-note groups being far more convincing.

![Musical notation]

12. IV. Bar 52: All scores and parts give the 1st Clar.
more likely reading would change the note marked x to E, thus bringing the part into line with the flute and violins. Bearing in mind that the clarinet parts are not in the manuscript at all, but have been added from old parts (though contemporary with Haydn and probably authentic), a slip of this kind is by no means inconceivable. Certainly there is no point in keeping what can only sound, if it is heard at all, like a wrong note.

13. IV. Bar 188: The fermata in Eul. is an unexpected apparition and disturbs the flow and continuity so characteristic of Haydn’s best finales. Dr. Praetorius makes no mention of it in his Revisionsbericht and one is left in hopeful doubt as to its authenticity.

HINDEMITH—SYMPHONY: MATHIS DER MALER

1. I. 4 bars after 17: The ‘tr———’ for cymbals is a misprint which occurs in full score, miniature and orchestral part alike. The score of the complete opera shows clearly that a single clash is intended.

2. II. 4 bars after Fig. 3: The note A on the last beat of the bar in tuba and 2nd Fag. is very odd, clashing with the G in Vc/Cb. As before, it is given so in all scores and parts, and again the full score of the opera shows that it is an error though a curious one. The score of the Symphony has a second misprint in the tuba in the following bar, but this is corrected in both part and miniature score.

3. II. 6 before Fig. 4: There is no specific statement as to how the cymbals are to be played. The normal procedure in this case is to clash the pair and this is the manner adopted habitually by Hindemith. Nevertheless performances frequently take place in which, in the absence of instructions to the contrary, a drumstick is used.

4. II. Fig. 4, bars 3/4: A footnote of the composer’s exists here which has failed to get into print. This supplies the sign to each of the three phrases in the lower strings and the remark, ‘Same bow throughout!’

5. III. Bar 1 and Fig. 1: Yet another indication by the composer, entered into the score after publication, shows the correct phrasing of the rubato passage to be as follows:

6. III. 7 after Fig. 1: The question sometimes arises as to whether the A in violins should not still be governed by the # to the upper A in the preceding phrase. Fortunately this can be established as wrong by the composer’s own readings.

7. III. 7 bars after Fig. 12: The 8va sign in 1st Vls should certainly start from the B in this bar, exactly as in flute.

8. III. 2/3 bars before the end: The slur in the trumpets from their Eb to D# is an error peculiar to the miniature score.

MAHLER—SYMPHONY NO. 6 IN A MINOR

1. The alterations made by Mahler in this Symphony after publication are possibly the most substantial and far-reaching in all his works. The Symphony was so completely re-orchestrated that scarcely a page remains in its original form. Needless to say, there is no possibility of listing all the revisions here, but it must be stressed at once that the later octavo score published by Kahnt with the order of the middle movements reversed does not include any of this changed
orchestration. It is thus identical with its predecessor in all respects except for the adjustment of the rehearsal figures! Only the full score, and fortunately the parts, were re-engraved, the original plate number 4526 being retained to add to the confusion, and since this is extremely rare the Symphony is virtually unknown in its final form.

2. The list of instruments in the full score cites ‘1 und 2 Harfe’, yet all scores have the indication ‘4 Harfen’ at Fig. 96 (Orig. Fig. 79) of the Scherzo!

3. It is not clear what Mahler meant by adding beneath the Celeste: ‘(in F)’. There is no question of transposition, of course, and it may perhaps have referred to the compass of an extended keyboard belonging to some giant Celeste once seen or used by Mahler. At all events, the indication has disappeared from the later printing of the full score.

4. I. 3 bars after 33: The original marking for the *pizzicato* strings, *ppp*, is altered to *p* in the revised version. But oddly enough the marking *sempre ppp* remains four bars later! This seems to have no sense and must surely be an oversight.

5. I. 7 and 8 bars after 42:

![Staff notation image]

In the identical passage 4/5 after 43 the violins have slurs at the beginning of each phrase, in keeping with interpretation of the figure when it comes as part of the 2nd Subject (cf. Fig. 8, etc.). There seems little point in the isolated change here and perhaps the slurs should be restored.

6. II (Andante). Bar 7: It is curious to find that the clash between the horn and the clarinets on the last beat of the bar was originally averted through the simultaneous movement of the two instruments. This does not, however, seem an adequate reason for doubting the validity of the later text, especially since several such points of composition, as opposed to orchestration, were revised in this movement as for example the horn solo 3 bars after 48 (89).

7. II (Andante). Fig. 54 (95): The 1st Vls appear all to be playing, yet as the page of the score is turned it transpires that only the first half are in action! The parts have reproduced this situation exactly as it stands, but it seems probable that only half the section should play throughout the passage, the lay-out of the pages being at fault.

8. II (Andante). 2 after 60 (101): In the original score all the instruments playing the melody moved to an A♭ in this bar. In the revised version this is changed to A♯, a far more likely reading.

9. IV: The outstanding problem of this movement, indeed of the Symphony, is unquestionably that of the Hammer. Moreover the problem arises not only as to what this should be, but what it should hit and even how many times it should hit it!

   Firstly, as to what it should be: in the revised score Mahler adds to his familiar note on its non-metallic character by describing it as ‘the blow of an axe’ (‘wie ein Axthieb’), but while it is clear that some heavy wooden mallet or even a sledge-hammer would answer the purpose it is extraordinarily hard to find a satisfactory recipient for the blow. It would be valuable to establish once and for all how exactly the effect should be achieved, especially since both Schoenberg and Alban Berg borrowed the device, in *Die glückliche Hand* and the 3 Orchesterstücke, Op. 6 respectively. But each of these composers entirely avoids any indication of *modus operandi*! Obviously there can be no categorical answer to the problem, which would have to be tackled anew on every occasion.
having regard to both the materials and equipment available and to the acoustical situation.

Secondly, the number of hammer blows is very seriously in question since the revised score omits altogether the ‘death stroke’, as Mahler used to call the third blow, which originally fell at the 11th bar of Fig. 164. Scholars debate, with increasing fervour, Mahler’s final wish with regard to the omission of this focal point of the entire eighty-minute structure and once again no final verdict of unquestionable authenticity can be delivered. For even the revised score cannot be regarded as the last word on the subject and the restoration of the crucial third stroke, regarded by many as essential, is no act of vandalism! Mahler is known to have included it himself in performances as late as 1910 in New York, by which time the reprinting of the material had already been carried out.

10. IV. Fig. 104: Although Mahler, in his pursuit of clarity, changed the dots into rests in this theme throughout the movement, he seems to have overlooked this section. A similar omission occurs in the lower WW 8 bars after 131 where a mistake must certainly have been made since the lower strings who play in unison have duly been altered.

11. IV. Page 152 of the score: The ‘Tiefes Glockengel’ is marked in all scores with an asterisk implying, as always, a footnote. But there is no footnote even in the full revised score, and the one on page 149 must presumably do service for both places.

12. IV. 6 bars after 118: The timpani stroke in this bar was altered in revision to a cymbal clash. This revision was only partially observed by the engravers of the new parts as a result of which the stroke appears in neither instrument!

13. IV. 3 bars after 119: Here there was originally a very confusing misprint:

![Musical notation](image)

By good fortune Mahler’s attention was drawn to this passage which might have been interpreted in two ways, and in the all too rare revised full score a footnote appears stating that the figure marked x above ‘ist kein Triole’.

14. IV. Fig. 140: In the revised full score Mahler adds a footnote which gives a most doubtful option as to the use of the tam-tam and cymbals with the second hammer blow. The suggestion seems to be that these additional instruments should reinforce the hammer if necessary, but in actual practice they obscure it.

**MOZART—SYMPHONY NO. 38 IN D MAJOR (PRAGUE) K.504**

1. As in the case of Mozart’s three last symphonies, the Kroyer edition published by Eulenburg is of the utmost importance here in establishing the correct text. Moreover, if not entirely reliable, it is unusually far-reaching in its restoration and the changes from the hitherto normally accepted text are of outstanding interest.

2. I. Bar 1: The opening fp is shown in the manuscript to last for half the bar, the drop to p coming only at the third crotchet. A further point revealed by
Eul. is that the violins should have tails up and down to their D’s—i.e., double stopping with the open string.

3. I. Bar 14: The ascending passage \[ \text{music} \] should be only in 1st Vls, the 2nds resting for the whole bar. On the other hand, the trumpets should play in unison with the horns in bar 15.

4. I. Bar 25: The first turn in 1st Vls should start on E\(_5\), according to Kroyer. In view of the G minor harmony it is easy to see how the corruption arose, yet the original is far the more interesting reading. Unfortunately this is only the first of many such tamperings. In bars 32/33 the 2nd Vl. parts give B\(_7\) though the score has no such indication. No doubt this was done by the Breitkopf editor to make them correspond with the 1sts, just as these had their G’s altered to G\# (this time in score and parts alike) to correspond with the 2nds! In fact, the correct reading is:

\[ \text{music} \]

the changes arising out of the harmonic resolution in the second halves of the bars.

5. I. Bars 92/93: The lower strings should read \[ \text{music} \] not \[ \text{music} \]. The same applies naturally to the violas in bar 133. Still more important, in bar 96 the 2nd Vls should move from A to D, not E.

6. I. 170/7: A number of smaller matters arising out of flute slurs are shown by Kroyer to be incorrect. Also the bassoon should rest in bar 176 instead of joining the cellos as in the earlier steps of the sequence.

7. I. 189: As at the opening of the Symphony, the \( fp \) should be a half-bar stress.

8. I. Bars 200 \( et \ seq. \): Mozart wrote here a series of most expressive false relations, some of which (1) were removed by the copyists of early editions. In bar 200 the 2nd Vls should have C\#\#, in 202 the 1st Vls F\#\# and in 204 the 2nd Vls F\#\#, \textit{viz.}

\[ \text{music} \]

The basses should also tie to the last crotchet A at the same octave at which they have been sustaining, instead of jumping up to meet the cellos.

9. I. 240: The manuscript gives the horns \( à 2 \) up to and including the D\( 4 \). This is a splendid discovery.

10. I. 258 \( et \ seq. \): The bassoons should have a single slur over each of their phrases, exactly like the oboe phrase which follows.

11. II. Bars 14-17: In Breitkopf the phrasing of the basses differs considerably in these bars from the return in bars 99/102. The MS proves both wrong, the
correct reading being:

12. II. Bar 17 and all similar instances: Kroyer acts very wrongly in printing the acciacaturas as \( \uparrow \). It is true that many scholars believe this to be the correct interpretation but it is by no means universally accepted. As the Eulenburg score reads, there is no possibility for the conductor to see the original text in order to reach a decision for himself. It is strange to find such a flaw in an otherwise scholarly edition, but Kroyer is sometimes capable of the most presumptuous editing as his score of the Haffner Symphony shows, with its repeat of the exposition to the 1st mvt!

13. II. 1st time bar: The MS has both bassoons on D, giving a cleaner sound.

14. II. Bar 83: The horns should read: \( f \). This is far more satisfactory than the very odd G given by Breitkopf to the 2nd Hrn at the note marked x above. In the following bar (84) Mozart himself apparently changed the Vc/Cb first note to C\(_5\), a much better reading.

15. II. Bar 89: Kroyer rearranges the \( fps \) here and in bars 107 and 111; in general this is right, the \( p \) coming at the half bar in each case. In bar 89, however, it seems unusual for the 2nd Vls and Vlas to hold their notes \( f \) while the 1st Vls, oboes and basses are already \( p \).

16. II. Bar 94: The oboes should have a crotchet, not a quaver as in Breitkopf. Similarly, the 2nd flute should end the phrase in bar 117 with a quaver, to correspond with the oboes.

17. III. Bar 251: Here is a maddening situation, since Kroyer despite his access to the manuscript does not solve one of the outstanding queries of the work. The Breitkopf parts give the 1st Vls:

This is the obvious climax to the phrase and corresponds with the equivalent top C in bar 54. The score, however, gives only a \( \uparrow \) D, a very disappointing note and inexplicable since the high F was by no means out of the range of Mozart’s violins (they reach G in the 1st mvt!). Kroyer merely gives the D without comment.

18. III. Bar 291: The 2nd Hrn should resolve to the tonic (here a written C) as in bar 94. In bar 295 the Vls should end on a crotchet as in bar 98.

19. III. Bars 322/323: The timpani should of course continue the figure \( \uparrow \) for these two extra bars.

PROKOFIEV—SYMPHONIE CLASSIQUE OP. 25

1. I. Beginning: The metronome mark of \( \downarrow = 100 \) is fantastic and must surely be a misprint for exactly twice this speed (i.e. \( \downarrow = 100 \)). This is indeed the tempo at which the movement is habitually taken, and were it not for the fact that Prokofiev used to grumble at the excessive speed of most performances nothing more would be thought of the matter. But moreover he himself used to play the
piece quite extraordinarily slowly, and thus the metronome mark may just possibly *not* be a misprint! All scores and parts agree with the slow marking, although this seems scarcely practicable and in any case wholly out of keeping with the $\frac{4}{4}$ time signature.

2. I. One bar before Fig. 19: The F$\sharp$'s in this bar are extremely doubtful. The original Gutheil score gave F$\sharp$ throughout, though corrected in most copies by a later hand in ink. A still later hand has systematically scratched out the sharps right down the page in many scores! The miniature prints F$\sharp$'s. Kussevitsky (who knew the composer intimately but was not always a purist!) played and recorded F$\sharp$'s and this reading is at least in keeping with the nearest parallel places at Figs. 11 & 29.

3. II. 2 before Fig. 36: The Boosey and Hawkes miniature differs from Gutheil in the last note of the 1st Vls. Gutheil follows the unison with the 2nd Vls down to the D, *viz*:\[\text{\begin{music}\ac[centering]{\trill{\schedule{\no\flat}\natural\natural\natural\natural}}\end{music}}\]. B & H rises on the last note (x) to an F following in this respect the flute and clarinet. Either reading is possible and as in the last instance only taste can decide.

**SCHUBERT—SYMPHONY NO. 4 IN C MINOR (TRAGIC)**

1. I. Bar 1: As in the B flat Symphony (No. 5), the Great C major, the *Unfinished* and so many other works of Schubert, it is hard to differentiate between a hairpin *diminuendo* and an accent. This is due, as can be seen from reproductions of Schubert's manuscripts, to his habit of writing them in a similar manner. Some extraordinary readings have resulted from this and it is scarcely possible always to make a definite decision. The general practice is to treat this bar and bar 10 as long *diminuendos*, but the smaller hairpin-accents in bars 3, 7, 30, etc., as stresses. Bars 39 and 41 and the countless similar places throughout the movement are borderline cases which can be interpreted according to taste, bearing in mind the long, heavy stress characteristic of the Viennese style of the period.

2. I. Bar 10: Oddly enough the horn note in this bar is missing from both the 3rd and 4th horn parts.

3. I. Bar 76: The strings' *mf* should surely begin only at the second crotchet of the bar. All scores and parts agree in placing it at the barline both here and in the recapitulation (bar 223), so that the error probably originates from Schubert's manuscript.

4. I. Bars 85-88: It is curious to find the violas phrasing differently from the Ve/Cb in a passage in which they move so exactly together. Moreover, in the two subsequent passages they fall back into line and this at least makes the development of the figure agree with its first statement as part of the 2nd subject, bars 71 *et seq.* Yet there is no question here of misprints, since not only do all editions agree but the discrepancy returns even more often in the recapitulation (bars 232 *et seq.*) where the cellos and basses eventually come to agree with the violas! I am of the opinion that the correct prototype for all these passages is to be found in bars 232/235, for the reason that where the minim and the crotchet are different notes they are slurred, but when the same, the crotchet is slurred forward across the barline. If this reading is to be adopted, however, each of the other three passages has to be corrected to a considerable extent, since they are fantastically inconsistent.

5. I. Bars 116 & 124: The F$\sharp$'s for horns and trumpets, omitted by Schubert but generally supplied in brackets, are plainly essential.

6. I. Bar 277: The timpani C comes on the last crotchet of this bar in all scores and parts, but should surely read $\text{\begin{music}\tt{C}\end{music}}$ as 6 bars earlier. A similar
7. II. The horns, pitched in A♭, could be *alto* or *basso*. This is a problem which one meets also in Haydn. If the horns are *alto* the first player soars to the top of his compass, if *basso* the second goes to unheard-of depths! One solution may lie in the great rarity of A or A♭ *basso* crooks at so early a date and in any case the 1st Hrn at no time goes higher than top C for Horn in F. It is my opinion that the choice of the lower crook produces a turgid effect quite foreign to Schubert's style of wind writing.

8. III. The score merely specifies 'Horns in E♭'. The parts give the movement to the 3rd and 4th players, who remain in this crook throughout the Symphony.

9. IV. Bars 82-84: No score or part gives the *decresc.* to the 1st Vls but it should certainly be added.

**STRAINSKYNY**—4 ETUDES FOR ORCHESTRA

1. The first three of these *Etudes* are taken directly from the *Three Pieces for String Quartet* of 1914, published—like the *Etudes*—by Edition Russe de Musique. Consequently the texts can be compared, often with valuable and revealing results. The fourth *Etude* is taken from an isolated sketch for pianola entitled *Madrid*, which was never printed in ordinary notation. A recent arrangement for two pianos made by the composer's son has been published by Boosey and Hawkes, but though useful up to a point it is naturally less authoritative.

2. II. *Excentrique*: 3 bars after Fig. 2: The *a tempo* is of course $\frac{3}{4}$ = 76, as at the beginning of the piece.

3. II. 3/4 bars after Fig. 3: Stravinsky seems to have got tied up here in his own notation. If these bars are to be felt as in a 6/8, then the rests at the *fermata* need to be made uniformly $\frac{3}{4}$ (so also the horn note 2 before 4 which should presumably tie as before). This seems to be Stravinsky's intention but the change of time signature to $\frac{2}{4}$ has no meaning that I can see! A further misprint needs clarifying: the brass notes

![image]

have slipped up a stave and should apply to the two trumpets.

4. II. Fig. 5: There is some doubt as to the horn parts here. The orchestral material gives the low B to the 3rd player and changes the minim D in 1st horn to an E, this tieing accordingly to the quaver E in the next bar. It seems likely that preference can be given to the parts as against the very untrustworthy score.

5. II. 3 bars before 8: The piccolo solo is most troublesome: $\frac{3}{4}$

—though the extension of the piccolo's compass down to C is at least in keeping with the low A for oboe to be found in the next piece, *Cantique*! Nevertheless, even if it could be obtained it would be a strange sound and the fact that in the string quartet version the phrase is played at concert pitch (for the piccolo it would of course sound an octave higher) leads me hopefully to suggest that a *misprint* lies in the indication 'Pic.' and that the passage should be played on a flute. On this instrument it would be perfectly possible and effective. The bar
is in any case full of misprints: the last rest in the phrase just under consideration should be \( \text{\textacuten} \); the celli lack their rest \( \text{\textbar} \); and the dynamic marks between 6 and 8 are woefully inadequate.

6. II. Penultimate bar:

The viola B\( \flat \) marked \( \times \) above appears as a second C\( \flat \) in the quartet version. The change may be in the nature of a correction but one cannot be sure of this, especially in view of the large number of misprints in the orchestral score. A logical case could be made for either reading.

7. III. Clartique: The tempo is a very serious problem in this movement. The indication \( \text{j}=40 \) is derived from the quartet score. But in orchestrating the piece Stravinsky has changed the notation, writing out the opening triplet \( \text{j}\text{j}\text{j} \) in notes of longer value. Although adopted no doubt for practical reasons, this device has the effect of making the opening figure considerably slower and it is doubtful whether this was the intention. The signature 3/2 in the silent WW shows amusingly how the original notation was still in Stravinsky’s mind. The problem recurs with even severer consequences at Fig. 4, where the original went into 2/2, with the crotchets appearing as triplets and so on to the end of the movement. (Incidentally, the original quartet score indicates how the cello harmonics are to be obtained).

The solution, if it be thought desirable to restore the shape of the original, is to play \( \text{j}=40 \) for the first 3 bars, changing to \( \text{j}=40 \) at the 5/4 but returning to \( \text{j}=40 \) at Fig. 4 and remaining so to the end. This has the additional virtue of restoring to their proper length the 9/4 bars which are given as 3/2 in the original.

8. III. 4 bars after Fig. 4: 1st Fl. should have \( \text{\textbar} \) not \( \text{\textacuten} \); 2 bars after Fig. 5 the 3 flutes have too many beats to the bar—the dots are of course wrong—and 4 bars after 5 a real problem arises which may or may not involve a misprint. The 3 flutes read:

3 Fl.

\[ \text{\textbar} \text{\textbar} \text{\textbar} \text{\textbar} \text{\textbar} \text{\textbar} \text{\textbar} \text{\textbar} \]
while the equivalent place for string quartet appeared as follows:

Now, direct transcription would have involved a low B♭ for the 3rd Fl. Since Stravinsky writes for the other woodwind below their normal compass it is curious to find him using an elaborate expedient to avoid this. Mahler uses the low B♭ for flute on several occasions. However, even granting this there seems no need for him to have changed the earlier B♯ to C♯ (both notes marked x in the quotations above!)

9. IV. Madrid: This first bar contains a number of extremely doubtful points. The thematic line seems clearly to lie in the 3rd oboe, 1st trumpet, ‘A’ clarinets and 2nd violins. These, then, should surely correspond! To bring this about it is necessary to establish first of all what the correct line should be, a far from simple matter. By taking a majority vote one arrives at:

in which case the 2nd Vls need a ♯ to their G and an F♯ at the end of the bar, and the 1st Tr. must have his F♯ at the beginning of the bar changed. But Soulima Stravinsky in his transcription favours the trumpet F♯ against all the others and it would be interesting to know whether he consulted his father in making the decision. There is no inconsistency between the 2nd and 3rd oboes since they are each engaged on different parts, as the transcription shows very clearly. On the other hand the cellos’ D ♭ at the end of the bar is a very doubtful note!

10. IV. Bar 6: The WW and Tr. figures should be slurred, though to what extent is never made plain. Possibly the triplet should be separated from the quaver, but cf. 2 bars after Fig. 4! The passage is given in every conceivable form during the movement.

11. IV. 2 bars before 4: The 2nd Clar. should continue the figure unaltered, with G the last note as shown. The faulty E appears in score and part alike.

12. IV. Fig. 5: The strings and oboe are presumably p, though nothing is ever said. Nor is it clear how loud the E♭ Clar. and Hrn solos should be before Fig. 6. The remarkable accumulation of errors in this passage has caused great confusion in the parts. In particular the alternation of bar rhythms has been omitted in many cases.

13. IV. Fig. 8: The 1st Tr. part here seems to me to prove the point of the misprint in 1st Tr. at the beginning of the piece. The sudden appearance of a 4th Tr. is in direct contradiction to all previous lists of instruments but is clearly neces-
sary. Less so, however, is the 4th trombone which makes a brief entry at Fig. 9! The parts transfer this naturally enough to the tuba.

14. IV. Figs. 8-12: The clarinet accidentals are full of inconsistencies in this section. Between 8 and 10 all B's for 'A' Clars should be B♭, but in the second bar of 11 the 1st Clar should have B♭ and the 2nd B♮, with the 1st changing to B♭ in the following bar. Since these errors correspond in score and parts they are not always readily apparent.

15. IV. Fig. 13: It is very far from clear whether the violins should play pizz. or arco. The new indication, pizz., at Fig. 15 suggests a change to arco here as does the very faint slur in 2nd Vls, but though probable this evidence is not really conclusive.

16. IV. One bar before Fig. 15: The oboe ties have got inverted in this figure. Naturally it is just the 2nd Ob. who should tie the two A's.

WALTON—OVERTURE : PORTSMOUTH POINT

1. Bars 3/4: The percussion notation is very unclear here. The indication 'with Bass Drum stick' for cymbal comes only at bar 4. There is, however, a cymbal stroke in the previous bar and the question rises as to whether this too should be struck or clashed. Comparison with the parallel passage after Fig. 10 shows that the first stroke is there clearly marked 'nat.', while for the second a 'soft stick' is specified! The problem is solved only when the distribution of percussion players is worked out, and one discovers that the list of instruments on Page 1 of the score is both incomplete and misleading: incomplete because it omits the castanets, and misleading because it shows only 'cymbals', whereas the work requires a pair of clashed cymbals executed by one player, in addition to a suspended cymbal played by the bass drum player and even to a very large extent with the bass drum stick. The extremely rapid change from clashed to struck cymbal now contains no problem and the two passages can be brought satisfactorily into line.

2. One bar before Fig. 7: The composer has clearly shown in a pencilled revision to certain scores that this bar should appear as an 8/8 and not, as printed, a 4/4. This is admirable in that it corroborates the internal evidence of the music, but it makes the existing rests in the clarinets and 1st violins very confusing as the parts still stand.

3. Fig. 10: The strings should certainly have hairpins up, to correspond with WW. These are omitted from all printed material.

4. 2 bars before 12: The percussion parts need to be closely compared with bars 4/6 of the Overture for dynamic and expression marks. Each passage omits something, but between the two a complete reading can easily be constructed!

5. 4 after 26: Here is the outstanding query of the work. The isolated bar of treble clef in violas is clearly marked in all scores and parts but makes nonsense with the surrounding harmony. Had the line remained in the alto clef it would have fitted beautifully. In the next bar the change back to alto clef produces the reverse situation: the chord would now have fitted harmonically in treble but is useless as it stands!