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ABSTRACT

This submission for the degree of Master of Philosophy at the Elder Conservatorium of Music, University of Adelaide, comprises a portfolio of compositions and transcriptions supported by sound recordings and an explanatory exegesis. The submission comes from a composer who is also an experienced conductor and pianist, with a background of an orchestral musician (french hornist and bass trombonist). These multiple musical identities have had a significant bearing on the approach to the five submitted works.

The focus of the portfolio is on approaches to orchestration. The centrepiece (Bagatelles) is a work of several movements that is presented in two parallel versions: one for symphony orchestra (which includes strings), the other for symphonic wind orchestra (which does not include strings). The juxtaposition of these two versions is intended to provoke consideration of a viable alternative to the conventional orchestra.

With the exception of the recorded première performance of the wind orchestral version of Bagatelles, the portfolio of scores is supported by digital performances, demonstrating the potential for such realizations. The increasingly sophisticated digital sound samples that are now widely available, but often used without expertise, have the potential to offer another viable alternative to orchestral performance when none is forthcoming or practical.
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INTRODUCTION

Although I remain active as a performer, my main musical occupation is now one of composition. I have always enjoyed writing for the large instrumental forces of a symphony orchestra or wind orchestra. This portfolio presents works that, within the restrictions of content demanded by the submission, demonstrate my range as a composer. The orchestration of these works seeks to make a contribution to the discipline in a number of ways: an original work that makes a comparison between two different ensembles; an orchestral transcription of a neglected major work for solo piano; an original orchestral work in conventional style that seeks to demonstrate good principles of orchestration; and a short transcription for strings that shows the potential for flexibility and musicality possible with digital realizations.

While my works for wind orchestra have had considerable success in a number of countries (including Australia) I have found it difficult to receive performances of my works for symphony orchestra. Yet I consider each genre to have equal merit. Thus the prime reason for submitting this project is to expand this concept of equality by writing a major work (Bagatelles) that can be performed by either ensemble, each having its separately-tailored version. The exegesis includes discussion of the necessary differences of approach to both orchestrations, with the CD performances demonstrating the viability of the symphonic wind orchestra as an alternative to the symphony orchestra.

The composer and supreme pianist, Leopold Godowsky, considered his Passacaglia as amongst his very best compositions. Although it was completed in 1927, it is still little-known today. Despite the enthusiasm of Godowsky advocates and a slowly-growing handful of pianists willing to tackle its enormous difficulties, few performances of the work have ever been given. It is hoped that my orchestration of this work may lead to wider exposure.

---

1 With some exceptions, such as several compositions and arrangements for the Sydney Olympics of 2000 and Asian Games (Qatar) of 2006 (opening and closing ceremonies for both events).
2 Including, apparently, in academic circles. A search in Répertoire International de Littérature Musicale (RILM) produces no results for “Godowsky Passacaglia”.
3 The American pianist David Saperton (1889-1970) stands out as a tireless champion of Godowsky during and after the composer’s lifetime, mastering all of the composer’s original works (including the Passacaglia) and transcriptions.
Because the passacaglia theme is a well-known one, even conservative concert audiences should welcome it as a virtuosic showpiece for orchestra.\(^4\)

For the listener, the musical content of my *Petite Suite Française* is likely to be immediately accessible, making it easy to concentrate on details of scoring. The work could be described as an affectionate tribute to French romanticism. Melodies and harmonies are probably closer to Poulenc than any other French composer (especially in the outer sections of the second movement, *La Promenade*), but other influences, not exclusively French, should be discernable. The third movement (*Le Blues*) owes something to Gershwin and Rachmaninoff, and the middle section of the second movement is reminiscent of Grieg.\(^5\)

Some of the harmonic progressions dictated by the canon in the fourth movement (*Le Grand Canon Romantique*) remind me of Berlioz, while the climax carries a suggestion of the more exotic works of Franck.\(^6\) Fauré is another influence in various places throughout the suite.

It will be obvious that a thorough understanding of all the instruments of a large ensemble is essential for good results when writing for orchestra or wind orchestra. My training is largely self-taught. As a child I began collecting orchestral scores, keen to understand how such music was constructed, especially scoring. Later, as a professional orchestral player on french horn (and later still, after switching to trombone) I experienced practical aspects of performance and what influence the conductor might have over elements of balance, phrasing and articulation. It was not until I was well over thirty years old that I felt confident enough to try conducting myself, successfully graduating to some of the most difficult operatic repertoire written by such composers as Berg, Britten, Janacek and Richard Strauss.\(^7\) All this experience has been extremely helpful for developing a strong instrumental technique when writing works of my own for large instrumental forces.

My compositional method is to write a new piece (or transcription) with pencil and manuscript paper in the same way most composers have done for centuries. I begin with

---

\(^4\) The opening of Schubert's "Unfinished" symphony. The Passacaglia was written as a tribute to Schubert on the hundredth anniversary of his death.

\(^5\) A second Norwegian influence is present in the opening theme of the movement. The *Valdres March* by Johannes Hanssen (1874-1967) also begins with an arpeggiated figure for solo trumpet. It was hearing this charming march a few years ago that provided the spark for me to write *La Promenade*. There are other similarities: the form (ABA) and the use of counter-melodies in the reprise. However, unlike the Hanssen march, no folktunes are present in my composition.

\(^6\) Such as *Psyché*.

\(^7\) Mostly with Australia's national company, Opera Australia and its predecessor, The Australian Opera.
some idea of the scope of the entire work, which may be dictated from requirements of a
commission. Preliminary sketches follow (which may be a melody or theme written on a
single staff). If writing a work for orchestra or wind orchestra I construct a short score on
three or four staves. Occasionally I will put in some text to remind myself what instrument is
likely to play a certain passage, but details of scoring come later. The basic content of the
piece will be entirely finished before making a draft of the complete score.

Although the use of a keyboard is frowned upon by some, especially if composing a
non-keyboard work, I frequently use a keyboard when composing; otherwise time is wasted
later correcting mistakes. Having been a french horn player for many years, my strongest
sense of pitch is still in F, not C, horn parts being written a fifth higher than sounding.
Hearing a compositional note in my head, I might easily write a C# as a G#. A quick check
with a keyboard saves me a great deal of time.

After completing a large ensemble work in short score, I might make further notes
regarding choice of instruments before turning to my computer. Although I also use the
Sibelius notation program, I mostly use Mosaic for producing a finished score and parts.
But I do not use a keyboard to enter music into my score. If I did, it would be tempting to
play line after line into staff after staff without thinking too much about alternatives. By using
the computer (typewriter) keyboard I do not work too fast; I think more about what I am
doing. All the finer details of articulation, balance and colour come during this process,
which I find is the most rewarding part of composition. The hard creative labour has been

8 A horn player reads a written C, but it sounds as an F a fifth below. This sense of pitch becomes ingrained out
of the necessity for accurate pitching of the notes.

9 I was an excellent sight-singer in my school choir. But after learning the french horn, I could no longer sight-
sing at concert pitch. I am sure this is also why I find it impossible to improvise at the keyboard. Having perfect
pitch is obviously a great advantage in writing down the sounds in one’s head without error. However, whether
a composer used, or did not use, an aid such as a keyboard is irrelevant when judging the final composition.
Chopin, for example, always used a keyboard; see Alfred Cortot, *Aspects de Chopin* (Paris: A. Michel, 1949).
Poulenc (a brilliant improviser) also used the keyboard. For example, his ballet *Les Animaux Modèles* was
completed first as a piano score. Honegger (a master of orchestration himself) later praised Poulenc’s
other hand, Berlioz, who could not play the piano at all, never used a keyboard. See especially his description of
the “Prix de Rome” competition, where competitors were each provided with a piano: Hector Berlioz, *Mémoires*
(Paris: C. Lévy, 1878)

10 Made by Mark Of The Unicorn, whose major current program is Digital Performer, much used by composers
using sound samples. Mosaic is no longer available.
done already, so decisions about which instrument should play what, and how it should be played, gradually bring the work to life.\textsuperscript{11}

The days when a publisher would take a manuscript from a composer and assume responsibility for producing the engraved score and parts have almost gone. Most composers, especially younger ones, are expected to produce engraved sheet music themselves if they want it considered for publication. This is fairly easy today, with computers and excellent software available. My wind orchestral works and brass chamber works have been published with scores and parts engraved by myself, using a computer. None of my orchestral works have been commercially published, but I offer high-quality material for performance.\textsuperscript{12}

The ability of a computer to play a score (however crude the actual sounds) is very helpful for making corrections. However, the short arrangement of Fauré for strings (the last variation from his Theme and Variations, opus 73, for solo piano) is included as a demonstration of the high-quality sound samples available today (where actual players are recorded), and the expertise required for manipulating them to achieve a realistic performance. Because I wanted all the works submitted to be available in sound as well as in score, I have made a digital realization of each (excepting the concert performance recording by the Elder Conservatorium Wind Orchestra) for inclusion on the accompanying CDs. It was a delight to me to discover that digital sound samples of orchestral instruments have approached a realism that can convince an educated listener, even professional musicians, that a real orchestra is performing. A detailed explanation of how sounds often need to be adjusted will follow in Chapter Five of the exegesis.

\textsuperscript{11} The technology is open to abuse if a composer goes to their computer too soon. This is especially the case when writing for a large ensemble, where there are so many decisions to make regarding scoring. Unfortunately computers are largely responsible for a continuous flood of music that should never be written. At any time in history, the vast majority of music written has been worthless or, at best, mediocre. But until recently a composer at least had to learn basic theory in order to commit ideas to manuscript; now anybody with an electronic keyboard can doodle a composition into a computer with one finger without the necessity of learning anything about music; the computer software can even put in harmony and instrumentation as well as printing the finished score and parts.

\textsuperscript{12} Self-publishing is increasingly common for writers of all kinds, partly due to the recent collapse of many publishing houses.
PART A
PORTFOLIO OF COMPOSITIONS

Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Orchestra</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>Bagatelles for symphony orchestra</td>
<td>page 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>Bagatelles for wind orchestra</td>
<td>page 134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>Passacaglia transcription for symphony orchestra</td>
<td>page 245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4</td>
<td>Petite Suite Française for symphony orchestra</td>
<td>page 315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5</td>
<td>Last Variation transcription for string orchestra</td>
<td>page 393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Bagatelles

Part 1

1) Prelude
2) Little Fanfare page 4
3) Serial Beethoven page 14
4) Ludwig Wagner page 26
5) Raising the Standard page 31

Part 2

6) Prelude page 47
7) Tchaikovsky page 53
8) Introduction and Soliloquy page 66
9) Whirlwind page 82
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piccolo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flutes 1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor Anglais</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bb Clarinets 1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bb Bass Clarinet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassoons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrabassoon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Horns 1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Horns 3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Trumpet 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Trumpets 2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trombones 1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trombone 3/Tuba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timpani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**sostenuto \( \breve{\} \) \( \text{or} \) c.50

**Bagatelles part 1**

1. Prelude

David Stanhope

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
Bagatelles

2. Little Fanfare

\[ \text{Picc.} \]
\[ \text{Fl1.2} \]
\[ \text{Ob1.2} \]
\[ \text{C.A.} \]
\[ \text{Cl1.2} \]
\[ \text{BCl.} \]
\[ \text{Bn1.2} \]
\[ \text{Cbn.} \]
\[ \text{Pc.} \]
\[ \text{Vln1} \]
\[ \text{Vln2} \]
\[ \text{Va} \]
\[ \text{Clo} \]
\[ \text{Bs} \]

\[ J = \text{c.112} \]

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
as if a final cadence, sharply cut off before the final chord; but if performing "Little Fanfare" by itself, add a final C major chord in the 2/4 bar (most instruments repeating their last notes, bass instruments and cymbals the first note in last 4/4 (basses, c/g low C))
Bagatelles

3. Serial Beethoven

80 \( \frac{1}{4} = \text{c.} 48 \)

Picc.

Fl1.2

Ob1.2

C.A.

Cl1.2

BCl.

Bn1.2

Cbn.

Tpt1

Vln1

Vln2

Va

Clo

Bs

H \( \text{più mosso} \ \frac{1}{4} = \text{c.} 72 \)

Vln1

Vln2

Va

Clo

Bs

rit.

a tempo

\( \text{solo, unmuted} \)

\( \text{espress.} \)

\( \text{solo, unmuted} \)

\( \text{espress.} \)

\( \text{solo, unmuted} \)

\( \text{espress.} \)

\( \text{espress.} \)

\( \text{espress.} \)

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
Bagatelles

G.P. [L] a tempo (J = c.72)

Picc.

Fl1.2

Ob1.2

C.A.

Cl1.2

BCl.

Bn1.2

Cbn.

Hn1.2

Hn3.4

Tpt1

Tpt2.3

Tbn1.2

Tbn3/T

Imp.

Pc.

Vln1

Vln2

Va

Clo

Bs

Ze "Turid" Thymphony*

"as it used to be known in Adelaide

stop cymbals sharply

snare drum

stop tam-tam sharply

NOBODY MOVE!

a tempo (J = c.72)
Bagatelles

Picc.

Fl1.2

Ob1.2

Cl1.2

Bn1.2

Pc.

unmute mute
(strings stay muted)

unmute mute

unmute mute

unmute mute

unmute mute

(f) glock.

dustbin lid

vibraphone

chimes

* dropped at an angle (on dome side) to make a crash and rolling clatter

div. in 3 arco pizz., tutti

div. in 3 arco pizz., tutti

div. arco

div. arco

div. arco

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
*ask the percussion to devise something here; for example, the timpanist could push something (or several things) over, or off the stage. A fermata could sustain the wind and brass chord if necessary (breathe at will) but no break in the orchestral sound should be made.
Bagatelles

Picc.
Fl1.2
Ob1.2
C.A.
Cl1.2
BCl.
Bn1.2
Cbn.
Hn1.2
Hn3.4
Tpt1
Tpt2.3
Tbn1.2
Tbn3/T
Timp.
Pc.
Vln1
Vln2
Va
Clo
Bs

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
Bagatelles
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Bagatelles part 2

287 sostenuto \( \dot{J} = \text{c.} \cdot 50 \)
6. Prelude

David Stanhope
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Bagatelles

Picc.
Fl.1.2
Ob.1.2
C.A.
Cl.1.2
B.Cl.
Bn.1.2
Cbn.
Hn.1.2
Hn.3.4
Tpt.1
Tpt.2.3
Tbn.1.2
Tbn.3/T
Timp.
Pc.
Bs

rit.

attacca

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
7. Tchaikovsky

Molto cantabile $j = c.50$

**Flutes 1.2**

**Oboes 1.2**

**A Clarinets 1.2**

**Bassoons 1.2**

**F Horns 1.2.3.4**

**C Trumpets 1.2**

**Trombones 1.2**

**Bass Trombone/Tuba**

**Timpani**

**Violin 1**

**Violin 2**

**Viola**

**Cello**

**Double Bass**

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
Bagatelles

336 rit. a tempo rit. a tempo

Fl.  
Ob.  
Cl.  
Bn.  
Hn.  

Tpt.  
Tbn.  
BT/T.  
Timp.  

Vln.1  
Vln.2  
Vla.  
Vc.  
Bs.  

rit. a tempo rit. a tempo

sul G

pp

pp

pp

pp

pp

pp
Bagatelles

379  poco rit. al fine  attacca

Fl.
Ob.
Cl.
Bn.
Hn.
Tpt.
Tbn.
BT/T.
Timp.
Vln.1
Vln.2
Vla.
Vc.
Bs.

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
8. Introduction and Soliloquy

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
Bagatelles

**broaden**

pesante \( \frac{j}{c.52} \)

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
Bagatelles
Soliloquy (Psalm 109)

rubato $\frac{1}{4} = c.60$

The trombones should (mostly) play with a detached articulation, following the words in a declamatory style.

Or it could be sung by a bass or bass-baritone (trombones tacet)

Hold not thy peace, O God... of my praise; for the mouths of the deceitful are

note: the rubato is made by a lengthening of the tenuto note wherever it occurs; this is clearly marked in all parts on every occasion!

rubato $\frac{1}{4} = c.60$
opened against me:

They have spoken against me with a lying tongue.

They compassed me about also with words of hatred; and fought against me without cause.
Bagatelles poco pesante

I came also a reproach to them: when they looked upon me they shaked their heads.
For my love they are my adversaries: but I give myself unto prayer.

Set thou a wicked man over him:

a tempo

rit.

a tempo
and let Satan sit at his right hand. When he shall be judged, let him be condemned: and let his prayer become
Let it come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones. Let his days be few;
and let another take his office. Let his children be father-less, and his... wife...
a widow.
Let the ex-tor-tioner catch all that he hath; and let the stran-gers spoil his labour.
Let his posterity be destroyed; and let his name be blotted out. Let this be the re-

Let this be the re-
ward of mine adversities... and of them that speak evil against my soul.

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
9. Whirlwind

Piccolo

Flutes 1.2

Oboes

Cor Anglais

Bb Clarinets 1.2

Bb Bass Clarinet

Bassoons

Contrabassoon

F Horns 1.2

F Horns 3.4

C Trumpet 1

C Trumpets 2.3

Trombones 1.2

Trombone 3/Tuba

Timpani

Percussion

Violin 1

Violin 2

Viola

Cello

Bass

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
molto meno mosso \( \cdot = c.52 \) rit.

\[ \text{molto meno mosso} \quad \text{lengthen this 1st beat a little to allow crescendo and breath} \]
### Bagatelles

#### Part 1

1) Prelude  
2) Little Fanfare  
3) Serial Beethoven  
4) Ludwig Wagner  
5) Raising the Standard  

#### Part 2

6) Prelude  
7) Tchaikovsky  
8) Introduction and Soliloquy  
9) Whirlwind
Bagatelles part 1
1. Prelude

Piccolo
Flutes 1.2
Oboes 1.2
Cor Anglais
Bb Clarinets
Bb Bass Clarinets
Bb Contra Bass Clarinet
Bassoons
Eb Alto Saxophones
Bb Tenor Saxophone
Eb Baritone Saxophone
Bb Trumpets
Horns in F
Trombones
Euphoniums
Tubas
Timpani
Percussion

sostenuto $j = \text{c.50}$

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
Picc.
Flutes
Oboes
C.A.
Clars.
Bs.Cl.
Cb.Cl.
Bns.
A.Sxs.
T.Sx.
B.Sx.
Trpts.
Horns
Trbs.
Euphs.
Tubas
Timp.
Perc.

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
as if a final cadence, sharply cut off before the final chord; but if performing "Little Fanfare" by itself, add a final c major chord in the 2/4 bar (most instruments repeating their last notes, bass instruments and cymbals the first note in last 4/4 (tubas, cbcl low C))
Tempo doppio (in 1) $\Rightarrow$ c. 72
*ask the percussion to devise something here; for example, the tam-tamist could push something (or several things) over, or off the stage. A fermata could sustain the wind and brass chord if necessary (at*; breathe at will) but no break in the orchestral sound should be made.
5. Raising the Standard
Bagatelles part 2

6. Prelude

Piccolo

Flutes

Oboes

Cor Anglais

Bb Clarinets

Bb Bass Clarinet

Bb Contra Bass Clarinet

Bassoons

Eb Alto Saxophones

Bb Tenor Saxophone

Eb Baritone Saxophone

Bb Trumpets

Horns in F

Trombones

Euphoniums

Tubas

Timpani

Percussion

sostenuto = c.50
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molto cantabile (l'istesso) \( \frac{j}{d} = \text{c.50} \)
8. Introduction & Soliloquy

\( \text{\( j = c.60 \)}} \)

Picc.

Flutes

Oboes

C.A.

Clars.

Bs.Cl.

Cb.Cl.

Bns.

396

Picc.

Flutes

Oboes

C.A.

Clars.

Bs.Cl.

Cb.Cl.

Bns.

A.Sxs.

T.Sx.

B.Sx.
Picc.

Flutes

Oboes

C.A.

Clars.

Bs.Cl.

Cb.Cl.

Bns.

A.Sxs.

T.Sx.

B.Sx.

Trpts.

Horns

Trbs.

Euphs.

Tubas

Timp.

Perc.

half-closed (quarter-tones), imitate trombones

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
Hold not thy peace, O God... of my praise; for the mouths of the deceitful are

The trombones should (mostly) play with a detached articulation, following the words in a declamatory style.

Or it could be sung by a bass or bass-baritone (trombones tacet)
o-pens a-gainst me: they have spoken a-gainst me with a lying tongue. They compassed me about also with
words of hatred; and fought against me without cause. I became also a reproach to them:
when they looked upon me they shaked their heads. For my love they are my adversaries:

© Copyright 2015 David Stanhope. Photocopying illegal.
but I give myself up to prayer. Set thou a wicked man over him: and let Satan sit at his right hand.
When he shall be judged, let him be condemned: and let his prayer become sin; let it come into his
bowels like water, and like oil into his bones. Let his days be few; and let another take his
Let his children be father-less, and his wife a widow.
Let the ex-tor-tion-er catch all that he hath; and let the strangers spoil his labour. Let his po-ster-i-ty be de-
stayed; and let his name be blotted out. Let this be the reward of mine adversaries... and
9. Whirlwind

of them that speak evil against my soul.
Leopold Godowsky

Passacaglia

Orchestration by David Stanhope

SCORE

David Stanhope
© 2015
Note: this work, originally for piano solo, is in the public domain EXCEPT (at the time of writing - 2015) in the United States of America.

David Stanhope
Passacaglia

andante moderato \( \text{\textbf{J}} = \text{\textbf{c.100}} \)

Leopold Godowsky

orchestrated Stanhope

1

Piccolo

Flute

Alto Flute

Oboe

Cor Anglais

Bass Oboe

A Clarinets 1.2

Bb Bass Clarinet

Bassoons 1.2

Contrabassoon

F Horns 1.2.3.4

C Trumpet 1.2.3

Trombones 1.2

Bass Trombone/Tuba

Timpani

Percussion

Celesta

Harp

andante moderato \( \text{\textbf{J}} = \text{\textbf{c.100}} \)

Violins 1

Violins 2

Violas

Cellos

Basses
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Passacaglia

rall.  \( \boxed{k} \) a tempo, molto espress.

---

Vln.1

Vln.2

Vla.

Ce.

Bs.

---
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Passacaglia

più mosso (\( \text{\textit{j}} = 138 \))
(molto allarg.) [V] Passacaglia

tranquillo (\( \text{\( \frac{\text{\( j \)}}{\text{\( = \) c.80}} \)\)} )

con tenerezza

Passacaglia

182 (a tempo) rall. W molto tranquillo (J = c.60)


(a tempo) rall. molto tranquillo (J = c.60)

©copyright David Stanhope 2015
allegretto ($= c.100$)
Passacaglia
Passacaglia

poco rall. a tempo

transuito (\( \dot{J} = 60 \))

Pic.

Fl.

A.F.

Ob.

C.A.

Cls.

Bcl.

Bns.

Cbn.

Hns.

Tpts.

Trbs.

T/Tb.

Perc.

Cel.

Hp.

Vln.1

Vln.2

Vla.

Ce.

Bs.

pp

mutes 1.

mutes 3. mute

chimes

poco rall.

a tempo

transuito (\( \dot{J} = 60 \))

\( \text{Copyright David Stanhope 2015} \)
Passacaglia

più mosso (\( j = c.88 \))

©copyright David Stanhope 2015
Passacaglia

\[ \text{tranquillo (}\ \mathbf{J} = 60) \]
Passacaglia
rall. con fuoco

(\( j = \text{c.84} \))
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(poco più mosso \( \frac{d}{=} = 76 \)) Passacaglia

\( \text{(l'istesso } \frac{d}{=} = 76) \)
Passacaglia

Pic.

Fl.

A.F.

Ob.

C.A.

B.O.

Cls.

Bcl.

Bsn.

Cbn.

Hns.

Tpts.

Trbs.

T/Tb.

Tp.

Vln.1

Vln.2

Vla.

Ce.

Bs.
Passacaglia

andante espressivo \( (J = c.92) \)
Passacaglia
rall. e smorzando
presto non troppo $j \approx c.69$

Passacaglia
rall. e smorzando
presto non troppo $j \approx c.69$

Passacaglia
rall. e smorzando
presto non troppo $j \approx c.69$
Passacaglia
Passacaglia

più sostenuto

Copyright David Stanhope 2015
Passacaglia

andante sostenuto, sempre espressivo \( \frac{d}{4} = c.46 \)

\( \text{Ob.} \)
\( \text{C.A.} \)
\( \text{B.O.} \)
\( \text{Cls.} \)
\( \text{Bcl.} \)
\( \text{Bns.} \)
\( \text{Tp.} \)
\( \text{Hp.} \)
\( \text{Vln.1} \)
\( \text{Vln.2} \)
\( \text{Vla.} \)
\( \text{Ce.} \)
\( \text{Bs.} \)

Soft sticks

\( (\text{still muted}) \)

\( \text{gliss. (feathery)} \)

\( \text{3 desks, div.} \)

\( \text{3 players} \)

\( \text{2 players} \)

\( \text{2 players} \)

\( \text{copyright David Stanhope 2015} \)
più mosso* (\( \text{j} = c.50 \)) *i.e. a little faster than opening of fugue
It may be better to make more rall. in this bar before resuming the original fugue tempo (except a little steadier)
PETITE SUITE FRANÇAISE

Orchestra

SCORE

David Stanhope
© 2015
Petite Suite Française

1. La Joie page 1
2. La Promenade page 22
3. Le Blues page 38
4. Le Grand Canon Romantique page 56
Petite Suite Française

6

Picc.
Fl1.2
Ob1.2
C.A.
Cl1.2
BCl.
Bn1.2
Cbn.
Hn1.2
Hn3.4
Tpt1
Tpt2.3
Tbn1.2
Tbn3/T
Timp.
Pc1.2
Pc3
Vln1
Vln2
Va
Clo
Bs
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Petite Suite Française

Picc.

Fl1.2

Ob1.2

C.A.

Cl1.2

B.Cl.

Bn1.2

Cbn.

Hn1.2

Hn3.4

Tpt1

Tpt2.3

Tbn1.2

Tbn3/T

Timp.

Pc1.2

Pc3

Vln1

Vln2

Va

Clo

Bs
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2. La Promenade

J = c.92

Piccolo

Flutes 1.2

Oboes 1.2

Cor Anglais

Bb Clarinets 1.2

Bb Bass Clarinet

Bassoons 1.2

Contrabassoon

F Horns 1.2

F Horns 3.4

C Trumpet 1

C Trumpets 2.3

Trombones 1.2

Trombone 3/Tuba

Timpani

Percussion 1.2

Percussion 3

Violins 1

Violins 2

Violas

Cellos

Basses
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Petite Suite Française

Picc.

Fl1.2

Ob1.2

C.A.

Cl1.2

BCl.

Bn1.2

Cbn.

Hn1.2

Hn3.4

Tpt1

Tpt2.3

Trb1.2

Tbn3/T

Timp.

Pc1.2

Pe3

Vln.1

Vln.2

Va.

Co.

Bs.
3. Le Blues

38

$\begin{align*}
1 & \quad \text{J = c.66} \\
\text{Piccolo} & \\
\text{Flutes 1.2} & \\
\text{Oboes 1.2} & \\
\text{Cor Anglais} & \\
\text{Bb Clarinet} & & \text{espress.} \\
\text{Eb Alto Saxophone} & \\
\text{Bb Bass Clarinet} & \\
\text{Bassoons 1.2} & & \text{mf} \\
\text{Contrabassoon} & \\
\text{F Horns 1.2} & \\
\text{F Horns 3.4} & \\
\text{C Trumpet 1} & \\
\text{C Trumpets 2.3} & \\
\text{Trombones 1.2} & \\
\text{Trombone 3/Tuba} & & \text{(soft or medium sticks)} \\
\text{Timpani} & & \text{pp} \\
\text{Percussion 1.2} & & \text{tam-tam} \\
\text{Percussion 3} & & \text{pp} \\
\text{Violin 1} & \quad \text{J = c.66} \\
\text{Violin 2} & \\
\text{Viola} & & \text{mute} \\
\text{Cello} & & \text{pp} \\
\text{Bass} & & \text{(unmuted)} \\
\end{align*}$
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Petite Suite Française

41  \[ \text{E} \]  \[
\text{C.A.} \]
\[
\text{Sax.} \]
\[
\text{Timp.} \]
\[
\text{Pcl. 2} \]
\[
\text{Vln 1} \]
\[
\text{Vln 2} \]
\[
\text{Va} \]
\[
\text{Clo} \]
\[
\text{Bs} \]
\[
\text{tempo 1} \quad \underline{j} = \text{c.66}  
\]
\[
\text{espress.} \]
\[
\text{espress. (non rubato)} \]
\[
\text{tam-tam} \]
\[
\text{pp} \]
\[
\text{rit.} \]
\[
\text{a tempo} \]
\[
\text{Fl 1.2} \]
\[
\text{Sax.} \]
\[
\text{Tpt 1} \]
\[
\text{Timp.} \]
\[
\text{Pcl. 2} \]
\[
\text{Vln 1} \]
\[
\text{Vln 2} \]
\[
\text{Va} \]
\[
\text{Clo} \]
\[
\text{Bs} \]
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Petite Suite Française

57 accel. (beat \( \frac{1}{4} \))

Picc.

Fl1.2

Ob1.2

C.A.

Cl.

Sax.

BCl.

Bn1.2

Cbn.

Hn1.2

Hn3.4

Tpt1

Tpt2.3

Tbn1.2

Tbn3/T

Vln1

Vln2

Va

Clo

Bs
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Petite Suite Française

Picc.
Fl1.2
Ob1.2
C.A.
Cl.
Sax.
Bcl.
Bn1.2
Cbn.
Hn1.2
Hn3.4
Tpt1
Tpt2.3
Tbn1.2
Tbn3/T
Pc3
glockenspiel
Vln1
Vln2
Va
Cln
Bsn

\( \text{c.60} \)
4. Le Grand Canon Romantique

Piccolo

Flutes 1.2

Oboes 1.2

Cor Anglais

A Clarinets 1.2

Bb Bass Clarinet

Bassoons 1.2

Contrabassoon

F Horns 1.2

F Horns 3.4

C Trumpet 1

C Trumpets 2.3

Trombones 1.2

Trombone 3/Tuba

Timpani

Percussion 1.2

Percussion 3

Violin 1

Violin 2

Viola

Cello

Bass
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Petite Suite Française
Gabriel Fauré
Arranged David Stanhope

Dernière Variation
From Theme and Variations, Op. 73

String Orchestra

Score

© David Stanhope 2015
Dernière Variation

andante molto moderato espressivo $= c.48$

Gabriel Fauré
arranged David Stanhope

*con sordini if a large ensemble

** original tempo for piano is 56; Theme and Variations opus 73.

Arrangement © Copyright David Stanhope 2015
PART B
RECORDINGS

B.1 track listing for CD 1a

1. Bagatelles for symphony orchestra part 1 11.08
2. Bagatelles for symphony orchestra part 2 16.16
3. Bagatelles for wind orchestra 29.09

B.2 track listing for CD 1b

1. Passacaglia original version for piano solo 18.00
2. Passacaglia transcribed for symphony orchestra 16.59

Petite Suite Française for symphony orchestra
3. La Joie 2.58
4. La Promenade 4.11
5. Le Blues 5.01
6. Le Grand Canon Romantique 3.15
7. Last Variation transcribed for string orchestra 2.05

Although Bagatelles is submitted as two separate works, for the purposes of timing (the portfolio being restricted to approximately sixty minutes of content) it counts as a single work; the version for symphonic wind orchestra was premiered on the 22nd of August, 2015, by the Elder Conservatorium Wind Orchestra at Elder Hall, Adelaide, conducted by the composer. The recording of this performance is given (track 3 of CD 1a). The performance of the original version of the Passacaglia is taken from the CD David Stanhope Plays (see sources). All other performances are digital realizations by David Stanhope.

B.3 track listing for CD 2 (music examples)

Bagatelles excerpts:
1. Prelude (1), orchestral version (score page 1) 2.09
2. Prelude (1), wind orchestral version (score page 1) 1.58
3. Prelude (6), wind orchestral version (score page 44) 1.54
4. Serial Beethoven, orchestral version (score page 19) 0.16
5. Serial Beethoven, wind orchestral version (score page 19) 0.19
6. Serial Beethoven, wind orchestral version (score page 22) 0.36
7. Raising the Standard, orchestral version (score page 33) 1.30
8. Raising the Standard, wind orchestral version (score page 37) 0.58
9. Tchaikovsky, wind orchestral version (score page 50) 0.22
10. Tchaikovsky, orchestral version (score page 53) 0.26
11. Soliloquy, orchestral version (score page 72) 0.37
12. Whirlwind, orchestral version (score page 83) 0.25
13. Whirlwind, wind orchestral version (score page 75) 0.23
14. Whirlwind, orchestral version (score page 90) 0.49
15. Whirlwind, wind orchestral version (score page 81) 0.54

**Passacaglia excerpts:**
16. original version (exegesis pages 424-426) 1.53
17. orchestral version (score page 1) 1.31
18. original version (exegesis page 428) 0.17
19. orchestral version (score page 13) 0.19
20. original version (exegesis pages 429-430) 0.44
21. orchestral version (score page 17) 0.49
22. original version (exegesis page 432) 0.25
23. orchestral version (score page 41) 0.19
24. Cadenza, original version (exegesis page 433) 0.23
25. Cadenza, orchestral version (score page 51) 0.30
26. Fugue, original version (exegesis pages 434-435) 0.50
27. Fugue, orchestral version (score page 56) 0.49
28. Fugue, original version (exegesis pages 436-438) 0.37
29. Fugue, orchestral version (score page 61) 0.37

**Last Variation excerpts:**
30. opening 1 (score page 1) 0.33
31. opening 2 (score page 1) 0.31
NOTE:
3 CDs containing 'Recorded Performances' are included with the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

The CDs must be listened to in the Music Library.
PART C

EXEGESIS
Chapter One

Introduction

The twenty-first century presents significant problems for permanent large instrumental ensembles. It is generally recognized that the cost of maintaining symphony orchestras and opera houses threatens their future existence; those that can no longer rely on government funding or private sponsorship are particularly vulnerable. The conductor Iván Fischer recently remarked “symphony orchestras in their present form have only a few more decades left, at most”.\(^1\) But although financial restrictions may be the main reason for orchestral decline, there are other detrimental influences that have been growing over a long period of time, not generally recognized. In the same interview, Fischer added:

> Will American-style civic pride or the goodwill of European politicians really be enough to feed these large beasts that are basically the same now as they were a century ago? I would welcome a more flexible musical family that could adapt its size and resources to what different composers and audiences require.\(^2\)

A “more flexible musical family” in the future might be welcome, but financial problems could well remain if the family retains a structure of professional and permanent personnel. A high-quality non-professional musical family could be an answer, or at least an alternative, for future composers and audiences.

Before comparing, and discussing the differences between, the symphony orchestra and the wind orchestra, it is necessary to look briefly at relevant historical background.

For about a hundred years the appreciation of music has slowly been affected by a phenomenon that historian Norman Davies has described as “the devaluation of sound”.\(^3\) Since the early days of recordings to the current widespread use of computers and digital devices that are dominated by vision, music has played an increasingly subordinate role,

---

1 Conductor of the Budapest Festival Orchestra; quoted in *BBCfm guide* (August 2014)
often no better than musical packaging or background noise.\textsuperscript{4} As long ago as 1934, in the early days of radio, Constant Lambert complained about the over-proliferation of music, writing that it represented a decline in value.\textsuperscript{5} George Orwell also complained about background music (muzak today) being a deliberate distraction from serious conversation and thought.\textsuperscript{6} Other “advances” such as amplification led to quantity replacing quality, especially in popular music.\textsuperscript{7}

This devaluation has had a marked effect on the performance of music for orchestra, whether symphonic or operatic. Falling audiences and increasing costs have led such institutions to programme a larger proportion of popular works, with consequent diminution of other repertoire. Other developments involve a change of artistic territory. A single example should suffice: in 2011, the Artistic Director of Opera Australia, Lyndon Terracini said in a public lecture: “Opera companies and orchestras of significance worldwide are closing at an alarming rate... We can blithely ignore the fact...or we can change...brave programming is having the courage to programme what critics will criticize you for, but will make a genuine connection to a real audience.”\textsuperscript{8} Since 2012 Opera Australia has programmed long seasons of musicals within its main seasons. In 2015, for example, Cole Porter’s “Anything Goes” received sixty-seven performances from September the 5th to October the 31st.\textsuperscript{9} The days when an Australian opera-lover had a choice of at least three major productions of opera in nearly every week of a season appear to be long gone.\textsuperscript{10}

These trends of programming make it harder and harder for today’s composers to have large-scale works performed. But there is one large-scale ensemble that is not in decline - the wind orchestra. Percy Grainger was a pioneer in breaking new ground where instrumentation was concerned, and a composer who considered the wind orchestra superior

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{4} This is not to deny the enormous resources now available for the music-lover, who can find and hear almost any existing composition from the earliest Gregorian chants to the present day through recordings and the internet. But that is not relevant here.
  \item \textsuperscript{5} Constant Lambert, \textit{Music Ho! A Study of Music in Decline} (London: Faber & Faber, 1934)
  \item \textsuperscript{6} George Orwell, \textit{Pleasure Spots} (London: Tribune, 1946)
  \item \textsuperscript{7} See also Lydia Hutchinson’s \textit{A Boomer’s Lament on the Devaluation of Music} (Article in \textit{Less Noise, More Soul} (Milwaukee: Hal Leonard, 2013)
  \item \textsuperscript{8} Lyndon Terracini, Peggy Glanville-Hicks Annual Lecture, (2011)
  \item \textsuperscript{9} Opera Australia, \textit{Calendar} (opera.org.au, 2015). In August 2015 the O.A. announced that “My Fair Lady” is scheduled for 2016 (79 performances at the Sydney Opera House, August 30th to November 5th).
  \item \textsuperscript{10} See Wikipedia \textit{The Australia Opera, operas performed during 1970–1996} (Date accessed August 4th 2015. As there is no other source for this information available, it is necessary to cite Wikipedia. But the writer can personally vouch for the accuracy of this list, having been a member of the company’s music staff and conductor from 1986-2001.)
\end{itemize}
to the symphony orchestra in certain aspects, particularly in matters of balance.\textsuperscript{11} He wrote a number of seminal original works, as well as re-arranging several of his popular orchestral works, for wind orchestra.\textsuperscript{12} Other composers such as Holst and Vaughan-Williams recognized the merits of the wind orchestra, but in their day the concert hall was dominated by convention: composers of large-scale works needed to write for symphony orchestra, especially in the traditional forms of symphony, concerto, and opera, if they wished to be taken seriously by the musical establishment.\textsuperscript{13} The situation today demands a fresh approach by many composers of large-scale music if they wish such music to be performed. Joseph Wagner, an American writer of a number of books on orchestration, wrote in 1970:

The need for a new library of original band music of artistic and imaginative merit became and still is the objective of all musicians who believe in the unlimited scoring potentials of the wind-percussion ensemble. The time has come to discard the old idea that a concert band is an orchestra without strings relegated to the performance of utilitarian, inferior music.\textsuperscript{14}

Current Professor of Music and Director of Bands at Lipscomb University in Nashville, Tennessee, Stephen L. Rhodes, wrote in 2007:

The 20th century has seen a steady growth in original literature for the wind band, especially since 1940. Significant efforts have been made to improve the band's repertoire, both in substance and originality, while creating more functional and consistent instrumentation. However, this trend has been somewhat slow in coming.\textsuperscript{15}

Why the reluctance for leading composers to write for wind orchestra? A barrier is the snobbish prejudice against the word “Band”. For those who know what a Concert Band is, there is no prejudice, but for many composers (and audiences), “band” conjures up a picture of military marches, or brass playing in a park rotunda. Thus many Concert Bands adopt different nomenclature to avoid confusion.\textsuperscript{16}

The standard symphony and wind orchestras have designated instrumentation with some overlap; the following lists highlight the differences in \textbf{bold} type:

\textsuperscript{11} For example \textit{Elastic Scoring}, preface to \textit{Spoon River} (New York: Schirmer, 1930)\newline\textsuperscript{12} For example \textit{Hill-Song No.2, The Power of Rome and the Christian Heart} and \textit{Lincolnshire Posy}\newline\textsuperscript{13} Gustav Holst, \textit{Suite No.1 in Eb, Suite No.2 in F}; Vaughan-Williams, \textit{Folksong Suite}\newline\textsuperscript{14} Joseph Wagner, \textit{Band Scoring IS Composition}, (article in \textit{Music Journal}, Issue 188, February 1970, p.26)\newline\textsuperscript{15} Stephen L. Rhodes, \textit{A History of the Wind Band} (Chapter 12, Twentieth-century Repertoire (Lipscomb University website (www.lipscomb.edu)), 2007)\newline\textsuperscript{16} It is just as legitimate for a Concert Band to call itself a “Wind Orchestra” for the same reason the Australian Chamber Orchestra does not call itself “Australian String Band”. Hence we have the “Elder Conservatorium Wind Orchestra”.
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Standard symphony orchestra:
- woodwind (piccolo, flutes, oboes, cor anglais, clarinets, bassoons)
- brass (french horns, trumpets, trombones, tuba)
- timpani and percussion
- harp
- keyboards
- strings (1st and 2nd violins, violas, cellos, basses)

Standard wind orchestra (Concert Band):
- woodwind (piccolo, flutes, oboes, cor anglais, clarinets, bassoons)
- extra flutes
- extra clarinets
- contrabass or contraalto clarinet
- saxophone section
- brass (french horns, trumpets, trombones, tuba)
- euphoniums (usually two)
- extra tubas (at least two altogether)
- timpani and percussion

There are a number of points that should be noted when reviewing these lists:
- One clarinet player in a symphony orchestra will expect to play saxophone on occasions, but rarely is more than one such instrument required, almost always the alto saxophone. Standard wind orchestras will have four saxophones - two altos (one player may also play soprano saxophone), tenor and baritone.
- A euphonium or tenor tuba will occasionally appear in the symphony orchestra, usually played by one of the trombonists.
- Some wind orchestras carry a string bass as standard (a very large ensemble may have as many as four or five).
- Some wind orchestras carry a keyboard player as standard (often an electric keyboard will substitute for missing instruments such as tuba in a junior ensemble), but more often it will be a wind, brass or percussion player who plays a keyboard when required.
• The Eb alto clarinet used to be a standard instrument in the wind orchestra but is rarely written for today. If it is required, usually an old instrument, suffering from neglect, is given to an unfortunate Bb clarinet player who is not used to it. To some extent the high Eb clarinet is also now fading from view, although a good-quality instrument will usually be available. Clarinets in A are almost never used in the wind orchestra.

• Other non-standard instruments both ensembles expect to have available could include alto flute and cornets.

• Rarer instruments are likely to be just as easy (or difficult) to include in either ensemble. A number of instruments such as heckelphone, bass trumpet, wagner tubas, alto and contrabass trombones, cimbasso (Italian opera), will almost certainly remain the province of symphony and opera orchestras.

• Note that the percussion sections of both ensembles are virtually identical.

The following list summarizes the advantages peculiar to each ensemble’s complement:

Symphony orchestra:

• String sections - a huge advantage over the wind orchestra, a timbre that the latter does not have (apart from string bass), and the ability of stringed instruments to sustain a long melodic line or accompaniment without needing to break for breath.

• Harp (a harp may occasionally appear in a wind orchestra, but usually only as a solo instrument).

• Keyboards such as celeste and harpsichord.

Wind orchestra:

• A better-balanced ensemble (arguably) than the modern symphony orchestra.

• Better articulation in the low register.

• Better phrasing than strings, if bow-changes produce an uneven line (bellows effect).

• The saxophone section. Not only for their punch or bite in the middle and low registers, but for the expressive qualities in solo melodic line (which is why composers such as Bizet, Ravel and Rachmaninoff used it occasionally to great effect).17

17 Respectively L’Arlesienne, Bolero, Symphonic Dances
It is not generally realized that orchestral balance has changed considerably over the last five or six decades. But problems of balance due to orchestration have existed since the 18th century. Here is a notorious example from Beethoven’s Egmont Overture (Ex.1.1):

Ex.1.1 Egmont Overture, bars 259-262 (author’s reduction)

If the horns play with the written dynamics, it will sound thus (Ex.1.2):

Ex.1.2 Egmont Overture, bars 259-262 (author’s transcription)

This is clearly not what Beethoven intended; all notes of the chords should be equal, but with the top line (or *hauptstimme*) slightly prominent. If the horns reduce their dynamic to match the winds, the result is far too weak, especially as it follows directly after a loud orchestral tutti. The only practical solution for a modern orchestra is to rescore the chords by dividing

---

18 That is, since the time of the orchestra’s inception with instrumental families that have remained the basis of the orchestra until today - strings, winds, brass and percussion.
19 *Hauptstimme* - literally “head voice”, a term much used by composers of the 2nd Viennese School, useful during this discussion.
the horn parts, allowing them to play notes that were impossible with the valveless horns of Beethoven’s time. But here is an example for which there is probably no solution, from the end of Brahms’s second symphony (Ex.1.3):

Ex.1.3a Brahms 2nd Symphony, 4th mvt., bars 404-410
Source: Breitkopf & Härtel (1926)

Note that this passage would have caused problems when it was originally written, even with small-bore natural horns; also the written F for the second pair of horns (the hauptstimme) can only be put in tune by the players half-closing the opening of the bell with the right hand, which weakens the tone and volume.
The musical logic of this section dictates that the quavers in the bassoons, cellos and basses starting at bar 413 should match the previous two phrases, but this is simply not possible - the listener always perceives the *hauptstimme* as transferred to the trumpets, first pair of horns and violins. Grainger’s remark that the orchestra was top-heavy - “too many violins, too few cellos” is clearly accurate in this case.  

The symphony orchestra’s major balance problem today is the brass, especially horns, trombones and tuba. With an apparent motto of “louder is better”, the bore of these brass instruments has become much larger, along with larger mouthpieces. In a *fortissimo* tutti, the brass sound becomes brighter and exciting, but often too loud for the strings and woodwind. If the conductor asks the brass to play softer so that the melodic lines of strings and

---

21 BBC interview with John Amis, c.1950. An improvement could be made by adding the violas to the quavers (an octave above the cellos) although this is still not likely to be sufficient to solve the imbalance. Adding the tuba to the cello or bass line might appear to be a solution, but few (if any) conductors would dare to do something as un-Brahmsian as this.
woodwind can be heard, the bright brassy excitement disappears, becoming bland and uninteresting.\textsuperscript{22} However, the modern wind orchestra can tolerate large-bore brass without suffering bad balance because of the extra wind instruments.\textsuperscript{23}

The financial situation that affects the independent professional symphony orchestras has a significant effect on repertoire.\textsuperscript{24} New music does not draw large audiences, hence a usual reluctance to programme it.\textsuperscript{25} Because the wind orchestra is rarely a professional group, box office returns are not so important; also its audience expects to hear a lot of new music. As a concert-giving ensemble, the wind orchestra only became established in the twentieth century, hence the enthusiasm for new repertoire written specifically for it. The decline of the professional symphony orchestra (and opera houses) is not so much the threat of collapse, closure or cuts, (which nonetheless is happening across the western world) but in the repertoire it performs - a smaller range of compositions with a stronger bias toward the popular. Extra visual components, such as the occasions when an orchestral performance accompanies a film, may relegate sound to secondary status.

Independent professional wind orchestras such as the Tokyo Kosei Wind Orchestra or the Dallas Wind Symphony are rare. Many of the best wind orchestras are student groups in universities or colleges. An outstanding example, founded by Frederick Fennell in 1952, is the Eastman Wind Ensemble, which is well-known through several commercial recordings, beginning in 1953 on the Mercury label. More recently, the Royal Northern College of Music Wind Orchestra, conducted by Timothy Reynish or Clark Rundell, has produced many CDs

\textsuperscript{22} For example, compare the first recording of Stravinsky’s \textit{Rite of Spring} (Orchestre Symphonique de Paris/Monteux, HMV, 1929) with a modern performance (not a modern recording, where balance can be artificially adjusted). In the early recording the brass balance well with the winds and strings. Note also the change in timbre of wind and brass from the incisive, earthier quality of the early 20th century to the typically refined, polished orchestral sounds of the 21st. Which is more appropriate when performing such a work as the \textit{Rite of Spring}?

\textsuperscript{23} Most of the symphony orchestra repertoire is written for double or triple woodwind, meaning 8 to 12 players; the wind orchestra complement of woodwind is usually a minimum of 17, or 21 if the saxophone section is included. Although the wind orchestra also carries extra brass, the large-bore complement of french horns and trombones is generally no larger than that of the symphony orchestra; the euphoniums and extra tubas are necessary for middle to bass range balance (somewhat equivalent to the cello and bass sections of the symphony orchestra).

\textsuperscript{24} The repertoire of state-funded (broadcasting) orchestras is not so much at risk, many maintaining adventurous programming, including new music. However, ongoing cuts to funding have resulted in mergers or disbandments, for example: the merger of the two leading orchestras of Germany’s Südwestrundfunk in 2012, the disbandment of Danish broadcaster DR’s Danish National Chamber Orchestra in 2015.

\textsuperscript{25} This effect has been clearly seen in Australia since the time when the major symphony orchestras became independent and no longer supported financially by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation. The few new compositions performed tend to be short, given in the first half of a concert, followed by a popular symphony in the second half.
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for Chandos. Clearly the standard of such student ensembles is equal to that of the highest professional ensemble. In countries where wind orchestras flourish, the proliferation of wind orchestras in schools helps to maintain pressure on universities and colleges to continue supporting such ensembles at the tertiary level. An important point to make is that the wind orchestra is more democratic than the symphony orchestra. The best players (especially brass) often prefer to play in a wind orchestra because they get much more to do.

For composers, international boundaries hardly exist where the wind orchestra is concerned. An unknown Australian composer can receive a première at a United States university without difficulty if the composition has been recommended through the network of contacts that exist between music directors, whereas the possibility of the same composer gaining a première from any American symphony orchestra (which naturally gives preference to American composers) is virtually unthinkable. Australian universities generally support wind orchestral programs. The Elder Conservatorium of Music at the University of Adelaide has a long tradition of maintaining such a program under the direction of Robert Hower, while the Sydney Conservatorium of Music has recently established an American-style wind orchestral program.

26 “Brilliant playing...the finest wind orchestra in Britain” *Gramophone Magazine*, 2007
27 Primarily the U.S.A., Japan, Australia and the U.K., the last-named also having a long tradition of brass bands. For those interested in the history of the wind band, an easily available study can be found on the internet: *A History of the Wind Band*, by Dr. Stephen L. Rhodes, explores bands of all kinds from the mediaeval to the end of the 20th century (Lipscomb University website (www.lipscomb.edu/)), 2007). See also Warren Offert’s *The Development of a Wind Repertoire: a history of the American Wind Orchestra* (PhD thesis, Florida State University, 1992)
28 Generally speaking, musical material is more equally spread in the wind orchestra. In the symphony orchestra, the strings have the lion’s share of virtually all the repertoire up to the early twentieth century, and in much since then. A further advantage of the wind orchestra is that the doubled instruments can be split into separate parts (for example, two or three players on each of the usual three clarinet parts means there are six or nine parts available if desired).
29 My earliest works for wind orchestra (Folk-Songs for Band Suites 1 and 2) were premiered at Florida State University, both being played at a very high standard by the top ensemble. The excellent music director, James Croft, recommended me to Australian music directors, especially Russell Hammond, director of the Australian National Wind Orchestra. Then my works began to be played in Australia.
30 The Elder Conservatorium Wind Orchestra produced a CD of my works for Tall Poppies Records in 1996 (*Little Ripper!* - see sources). The Sydney Conservatorium Wind Symphony, conductor John Lynch, will present six major concert programmes in 2016, including a number of world and Australian premières.
The stage setting of both ensembles makes an interesting comparison:

Figure 1: Symphony orchestral seating plan (author’s sketch)

This is a fairly typical symphony orchestra’s seating (stylized, showing the basic divisions of space) - strings at the front from one side of the stage to the other, wind in the middle with principal players making a square, and horns on the left. The rest of the brass is to the right (often in a single line) with timpani and percussion central at the back. Harp and keyboards are usually on the left.

Figure 2: Wind orchestral seating plan
Source: Irigden.wordpress.com, wind orchestra seating examples, free images
A wind orchestra is usually seated in a series of semi-circles, with woodwind mostly at the front, brass somewhere in the middle, and percussion along the back. But where individual instruments are concerned there is considerable variation; much depends on the music director’s preference, but it may also depend on the repertoire being played. Although the semicircles are shown in the above arrangement, the instrumental placement might not be ideal. Whoever designed the plan in the above diagram decided to put most of the bass instruments together at centre left. All the clarinet family is on the left and the double reeds are together on the right, which is good for contact within both those sections. But the saxophone section is broken up with the horns blowing directly into some of them - it might be better to swap the horns with lower saxophones and contra clarinet and reverse the order so that the contra clarinet and baritone saxophone are near the bassoons. However, then the tubas are a long way from the other bass instruments. But regardless of the setup, one thing stands out: there is never a group of forty to sixty stringed instruments between the players and the audience. This means that woodwind instruments at the front are far less likely to be swamped by the heavy brass (which often happens in an unbalanced symphony orchestra).
Chapter Two

Bagatelles

2.1 Introduction

The title Bagatelles was chosen because this new work consists of a number of short or fairly short movements, providing numerous examples of contrast and differing styles. There are many thousands of arrangements of orchestral works for wind orchestra,\(^{31}\) far fewer arrangements the other way round,\(^{32}\) but at this stage no works have been found in which versions of the same work have been written simultaneously for both ensembles. By doing so, Bagatelles seeks to demonstrate that the wind orchestra is just as viable an ensemble to write for as the symphony orchestra. The major composition of the portfolio is therefore presented in two separate versions: 1) symphony orchestra and 2) wind orchestra. The instrumental differences between the two ensembles mean that different choices must be made regarding scoring. Comparison between the two versions will make these differences clear and how various problems of orchestration can be solved.

2.2 Movements and titles

Part 1

1. Prelude
2. Little Fanfare
3. Serial Beethoven
4. Ludvig Wagner
5. Raising the Standard

Part 2

6. Prelude
7. Tchaikovsky
8. Introduction and Soliloquy
9. Whirlwind

\(^{31}\)To take one composer at random as an example: www.sheetmusicplus.com lists one hundred and eighty-nine different arrangements of works by Gioachino Rossini for concert band (viewed 4th September 2015).

Each part begins with the same prelude, differently scored (1, 6). There are two fanfares, the first in triple metre, the second in duple metre (2, 5), a twelve-tone movement (3) and an overtly romantic melody with suitable accompaniment (7). (4) is the shortest bagatelle, a little joke where some themes from Beethoven’s fifth symphony and violin concerto are combined with the accompaniment of the prelude to Act Three of Lohengrin. The last two Bagatelles are the most serious - denser harmonies and more dissonance. After an introduction, which includes a few quarter-tones in the trombones, (8) is written in declamatory style following some words from Psalm 109, while (9) is a virtuosic tarantella. The following discussion gives some examples that show necessary decisions regarding scoring where differences in complement of the two ensembles were particularly involved. (Examples linked to CD 2)

2.3 Prelude, (1) orchestral version (score page 1, CD 2 track 1)

This version was written first and scored for strings only. The growing tension of the crescendo does not need any additional instruments to reach an effective climax. It also contrasts with the Little Fanfare, which is mostly given to woodwind and brass. For the version for wind orchestra, the easiest way to score it, using a computer, would have been to explode the string lines onto separate staves, then paste each line into one of the wind lines and then do some re-pasting to add brass when it got louder. This lazy method has not been followed. When transcribing a piece of music to another instrumentation, it is essential to absorb the original and recreate it from scratch for the best result.

2.4 Prelude, (1) wind orchestral version (score page 44, CD 2 track 2)

The repeated notes have been given to vibraphone and glockenspiel and the scales to woodwind, alternating solo double reeds with flutes and clarinets at the beginning. Later, when it gets louder, single brass instruments have the scales. Contrasts in colour and the natural expressiveness of solo instruments make this very different from the string version, but just as successful. Of course there is not as much contrast with the Little Fanfare, but the saxophones are kept out of the Prelude (apart from a few notes to warm up) so that they replace the clarinet lines at the start of the Little Fanfare, bringing in a new colour. 33 After the completion of this version of the Prelude, the same kind of version was given to the orchestra.

33 A potential balance problem with a large ensemble (perhaps nine or more clarinets being too loud) is also solved. Solo clarinets might not be enough to balance the non-solo flutes.
for their second Prelude. Which left the necessity of creating a third version for the wind orchestral second Prelude.

2.5 Prelude, (6) wind orchestral version (score page 44, CD 2 track 3)

Here the first part has been dropped by an octave, with the scales given to muted brass, a new timbre. Where the brass took over the scales in the first prelude, here the wind play the scales in the original high register. The aggressiveness of the muted brass at the climax contrasts with the romantic bagatelle that follows.

2.6 Serial Beethoven, (3) orchestral version (score page 19, CD 2 track 4)

This bagatelle is a satire on twelve-tone writing, beginning with an over-serious introduction that becomes more ridiculous as it proceeds; the tone-row on which the bagatelle is based is created from the theme of the fourth movement of Beethoven’s third symphony (Ex.2.1):

Ex.2.1 Beethoven: 3rd Symphony, 4th movement, bars 12-19 (author’s manuscript)

By playing the tone-row slowly serioso, but with very impractical mute changes (especially for the larger instruments), a visual joke adds to the humour.

2.7 Serial Beethoven, (3) wind orchestral version (score page 19, CD 2 tracks 5 & 6)

A different joke is made by having solo instruments begin the tone-row, playing one note each in turn (track 5). This method becomes extended on page 22 (section beginning at bar 160, track 6) with solo instruments playing fragments over and under the tone-row line, whereas in the orchestral version the instrumentation is confined to three string lines (as it is in the original Beethoven for this variation).

2.8 Raising the Standard, (5) orchestral version (score page 33, CD 2 track 7)

It is often beneficial if a composer or arranger makes it obvious where they expect players to breathe, giving rests where possible. This is particularly so with the large-bore
brass instruments prevalent today. Bars 243 to 250 show the three lines in octaves shared by the three trombones and tuba rather than all four playing at once, giving plenty of spaces for breaths. At the fortissimo passage from bar 265 the trombone players will likely need to breathe every bar; the rests will ensure a breath in the middle of each bar, rather than elsewhere. Thus the phrasing (with each bar leading to the first beat without a gap) will be uniform. But this passage has been scored differently in the wind orchestral version.

2.9 Raising the Standard, (5) wind orchestral version (score page 37, CD 2 track 8)

The six bars of rising chords, starting at bar 257, can easily be sustained with no gaps in the orchestral version (violins and violas), but to gain the same continuity the chords have to be shared in the wind orchestral version. The clarinets and bass clarinet take bars 257-258, the saxophones bars 259-260 and the clarinets and trombones bars 261-262. The scoring for the fortissimo passage from bar 265 is also shared: because there are four trumpets and two alto saxophones playing the melody here, the horns can share the rising chords with the trombones and euphoniums instead of playing the melody, making the passage easy for all to breathe without gaps in the texture. The sustained notes in the clarinets, 2nd flute and tubas should also be continuous, because the doubling (or tripling) of players will make it easy to stagger the breathing. 34

2.10 Tchaikovsky, wind orchestral version (score page 50, CD 2 track 9), orchestral version (score page 53, CD 2 track 10)

Here is a different example of strings versus winds, a romantic melody in four- or five-part harmony. For the wind orchestral version, (which was written first) this is given to the saxophone quartet. Although it will sound very different from massed strings, it should be just as expressive in the hands of good musicians. Working from the short score manuscript, it was easy to put the four lines in the saxophone parts and, where a fifth line was added, put the bass clarinet on an inner line, keeping the baritone saxophone at bottom. The first alto saxophone had the melody throughout. But after completion of the string version the allocation of melodic lines in the saxophone version underwent re-appraisal. There would be a strong likelihood of the first alto player breathing in the wrong place, breaking the intended phrasing. To make sure this could not happen, the line was changed by giving the second

34 Experienced tuba players in a wind orchestra stagger breathing automatically in sustained passages. The same approach is found in brass bands (usually four tubas).
player part of the melody. Now there is space for both players to breathe in the right places, and the second player will also appreciate having a more interesting line.

In the string version the first violins have been directed to play on the G string. This is not just for the richer tone, but because it forces the players to use portamento at the falling sevenths, which is desirable. As it is all on the G string, the players could begin with an upbow, but downbow is better; if they start with an upbow, there will be a tendency to make the second beat too heavy. Starting with a downbow means the natural weight will fall at the second bar, fitting with the other strings and giving the right shape to the phrase.  

2.10 Soliloquy, orchestral version (score page 72, CD 2 track 11)

This is the second part of the eighth bagatelle. Note the text is written over the notes; the unison trombone players are not expected to sing, but the words should help get the stresses right. How the accompanying motif is played, which is intended to sound like a very drawn-out breath, is most important. For wind instruments this is easy - a slow crescendo of repeated notes and a sudden drop in dynamic. However, for the strings, this motif is not so easy if it is to sound right. Bowing is significant here. If there were no bowing marked, the players would start in the downbow and then the sudden drop to piano would be in the upbow, which would be the easy way to do it, and would also seem logical. But to sound like breathing, the marked bowing is better, although harder to do. It would be tempting to mark all of the five crotchets in upbows, but the players would probably run out of bow, especially with the tenuto on the last crotchet. But the stylistic intention should be clear as written, the one downbow not disturbing the breathing effect.

2.11 Whirlwind, orchestral version (score page 83, CD 2 track 12), wind orchestral version (score page 75, CD 2 track 13)

The differences in scoring for this final virtuosic bagatelle should clearly demonstrate necessary decisions when organizing the same musical material for different ensembles. The

---

35I recommend not marking too many bowings unless the writer knows exactly what they are doing. The chances are the section leaders will change the bowing anyway, but they (and the conductor) may take more notice of the important ones if not too many others are indicated. I also strongly recommend to any composer or conductor Charles Gigante’s book Manual of Orchestral Bowing (Bloomington: Indiana University School of Music, 1953).
section beginning at rehearsal letter PP in both versions includes scoring that is the same but with other aspects different. The orchestral version is a little lighter in texture; the whirlwind pattern that begins in the bass clarinet, adding clarinets and a bassoon over the next three bars, is passed to the double-reeds at bar 490, than to muted horns at bar 492 and finally to divided upper strings at rehearsal letter QQ. In the wind orchestral version the whirlwind is louder - beginning in saxophones, passing to unmuted horns, back to saxophones and finally to all the upper wind. The single notes pizzicato punctuation in the orchestral version is so clear that some of the accents in other lines were dropped as unnecessary. Other adjustments for balance (such as muted trombones at QQ versus soft strings in the orchestral version, but unmuted horns versus massed winds in the wind orchestral version) are not only necessary but also provide different timbres to be enjoyed.

2.12 Whirlwind, orchestral version (score page 90, CD 2 track 14), wind orchestral version (score page 81, CD 2 track 15)

Giving the accompanying patterns that begin at rehearsal letter RR and later at TT to spiccato strings in the orchestral version was an easy decision, but raised a problem for the wind orchestra where breathing was concerned. The solution at RR was a more agitated version with the low wind and low saxophones juggling the patterns between instruments - more virtuosic, but not inferior to the murmuring strings version, even though the sounds are very different. At TT, a less intrusive scoring still provides places for players to breathe, and the slight punctuating double bump at the beginning of each pattern (where the breaths are taken) is no disadvantage, fitting with the urging prods of the percussion (which is the same throughout in both versions).

2.13 Summary

The differences between the two versions of Bagatelles are not mere technical adjustments made from necessity. Each version has its own legitimate character; the differences serve to add further interest to the musical content. It is hoped that the above examples show decisions that bring each ensemble to best advantage; when writing for any combination of instruments, it is the composer’s duty to exploit the intrinsic capabilities of that combination in order to express musical ideas clearly and concisely. If the two versions of Bagatelles had been written at different times, either could have been a transcription of the other - neither version can claim superiority in this regard.
Normally a composer will make only one choice of ensemble when preparing a new composition. Until relatively recently, the symphony orchestra was the obvious answer for most composers wanting to write for large forces. But the emergence of the wind orchestra as a viable alternative is something that should not be ignored by today’s composers wishing to express ideas requiring a large instrumental palette. One should remember that the medium a composer chooses for expressing a musical idea is secondary to the idea itself. As Grainger pointed out in his essay *Elastic Scoring*, tonal balance is far more important than instrumental colour. 36 One should also remember that a composer has to make many choices within the chosen ensemble, any of which may present a musical idea with equal clarity. 37 This concept is explored further in the following chapter.

---

37 For a simple example, should a particular melody be given to the 1st violins, or should it be a flute, oboe or clarinet solo? Depending on the context, each may be just as expressive as the others, although possessing different characteristics.
Chapter Three
Passacaglia

3.1 Introduction

Transcription is the process of transforming a composition from its original instrumentation to another. Transcriptions of opera scores for piano were essential for rehearsals (vocal scores, almost always for two hands). Piano transcriptions of orchestral works were often considered promotional necessities; before recordings were available in the early 20th century, publishers routinely commissioned and published such transcriptions simultaneously with the orchestral score, especially symphonies and overtures, both for two hands or four hands. The quality of such arrangements varied considerably, often displaying little invention, but merely making a literal transfer of the notes to the keyboard. Four-handed versions were generally more successful, especially if written for two pianos rather than piano duet.

Two-handed transcriptions by exceptional pianists such as Liszt (an extraordinarily large number of imaginative transcriptions, especially symphonies by Beethoven and Berlioz) or Klindworth (Tchaikovsky’s Francesca da Rimini, especially the two-handed version), show genuine creativity while remaining as faithful as possible to the original work. Some composers, such as Brahms, made their own keyboard transcriptions of their major works. Keyboard transcriptions of works for orchestra have continued to be made until today; many virtuosic pianists have delighted in transcribing favourite orchestral pieces for piano solo, such as Guido Agosti’s Danse Infernale, Berceuse et Finale from Stravinsky’s L’Oiseau de Feu. It is unlikely this tradition will ever die.

It is important not to confuse transcriptions with paraphrases, where the original material is treated with more freedom, for example Godowsky’s and Tausig’s paraphrases of Johann Strauss. Liszt also wrote many paraphrases of other composers’ works, as well as “straight” transcriptions. It is best to avoid using the word “arrangement”, which can have several connotations.

Orchestral transcriptions, unlike transcriptions for piano demanded by publishers, are generally not necessities, although they may be promotional. For an orchestral transcription to have merit, there must be genuine creativity and imagination on the part of the
Most orchestrations are made without the original composer’s permission (because, in most cases, the composer is dead and the work out of copyright), but there are significant exceptions where a composer has willingly agreed for another to make such a transcription. Of particular interest are the cases where a composer has orchestrated a keyboard work of their own; the recreative process can lead the composer to make changes or additions to the original.

For an orchestration to be successful, there should be good reasons for making it and, ideally, the result should sound as if it were originally written as an orchestral work. Other benefits might be:

- bringing the work to a wider audience (especially if the work is little-known in its original form)
- showing fresh insights regarding structure (polyphony) by the use of contrasting timbres
- melodic expressiveness in legato
- greater control over dynamics (the pianoforte’s greatest weakness is its inability to control the dynamic of a note after the hammer has struck the string)

Two examples of this genre that demonstrate all the above qualities are Ravel’s transcription of Mussorgsky’s Pictures at an Exhibition (very well-known) and Schoenberg’s transcription of J.S.Bach’s Prelude and Fugue in Eb (not well-known). Ravel’s transcription is by far the most famous version of the Mussorgsky original for piano solo. Unfortunately it includes several errors from the original publication, which was also heavily edited.

---

38 It is also an excellent preparation for a student seeking to gain experience in orchestral writing before embarking on an original composition for orchestra.
39 For example, five of Rachmaninoff’s Études-Tableaux orchestrated by Respighi.
40 For example, Bizet’s Petite Suite - five movements of the suite Jeux D’Enfants for piano duet, Liszt’s symphonic poem Mazeppa (partly based on his Transcendental Study No.4 for piano), Grieg’s Lyric Suite (from Book Five of the Lyric Pieces for piano) and Dvorák’s Slavonic Dances (originally for piano duet).
41 For example, regarding his orchestration of Smetana’s string quartet From My Life, George Szell remarked in justification that the extraordinary number of arpeggios in the work were sufficient indication that Smetana found four string instruments inadequate for expressing his musical ideas. He also observed the marking quasi tromba in the polka section of the second movement. “All these considerations,” wrote Szell, “made me decide to arrange this Czech masterpiece for the orchestra. It deserves wider musical horizons in orchestral form than are possible for the string quartet.” (sleeve notes to his recording - see sources)
42 Originally for organ, commonly known as the “St. Anne”.
43 Other orchestrations include those by Henry Wood, Leopold Stokowski, Vladimir Ashkenazy and Leonard Slatkin. There are also several transcriptions for different ensembles, such as Elgar Howarth’s version for brass ensemble, William Lovelock’s version for wind quintet and Duke Ellington’s version for jazz band.
44 By Rimsky-Korsakov, who also produced heavily edited versions of Mussorgsky’s operas Boris Godunov and Khovanshchina.
Nevertheless, a comparison with the original shows brilliant decisions by Ravel regarding tone-colour, articulation, phrasing and additions.\textsuperscript{45} Schoenberg’s Bach transcription is less successful for two reasons: first, the constant breaking of the Prelude’s original keyboard lines by the changes of timbre, caused by shifting from one instrument (or group of instruments) to another, distracts attention from the music itself; loss of clarity is the result. The first part of the fugue is the most successful part of the transcription, being almost entirely for winds alone. If well balanced, the musical argument presented by the five voices is clear to the listener. The second and third parts of the fugue (where strings and brass predominate respectively) suffer a little from the sheer busy-ness of the voices.\textsuperscript{46} Transcriptions of “busy” Bach fugues are best appreciated if played by instruments of a similar timbre.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{45} Percussion being only the most obvious. More subtle (including deliberate changes to the original) can be found with careful study. The Boosey and Hawkes pocket score of the Ravel prints the original version for piano at the bottom of each page, which corrects some, but not all, of the mistakes in the Rimsky-Korsakov edition. See also James Hopkins “a large number [of changes] constitute significant revisions in order to create a music that was as idiomatic to orchestra as to piano” \textit{Ravel’s orchestral transcription technique} (Doctoral dissertation, Princeton University, 1969).

\textsuperscript{46} The same could be said about many of Leopold Stokowski’s orchestral transcriptions of Bach. However, his transcription of that composer’s \textit{Komm, süßer Tod} (a slow-moving sacred song) is far more successful, although Stokowski’s own recording is roughly twice as slow as the original.

\textsuperscript{47} For example, hear the Fugue in G Minor (“Little Fugue”) played by a string, brass, saxophone or even harmonica quartet. See also Grainger’s remarks about tonal balance in \textit{Elastic Scoring} (ibid.)
3.2 An example from Liszt

Before proceeding to the Godowsky transcription, here is a simpler example of a typical problem that often confronts the transcriber (Ex.3.1, 3.2):

Ex.3.1 Beethoven 4th symphony, 2nd mvt., bars 65-66. Source: Hawkes pocket score, 1941

Ex.3.2 Beethoven/Liszt 4th symphony, 2nd mvt., bars 65-66. Source: Durand (1954) (author’s copy, showing performance markings)
Supposing the original symphony did not exist, and the Liszt transcription was the original, how could one orchestrate this, especially the arpeggios? Whatever the decision, one could not possibly be too literal here; the solution has to be reconceived in orchestral terms. Arpeggios like this are often a stumbling block for orchestrators. One might decide that the arpeggio is just a way of playing a large sustained chord, and that the resonance of the pattern helps to sustain the decay of the melody notes. But if one dispenses with the arpeggio altogether in favour of sustained chords, there is no movement or flow when the melody is playing crotchets. One might add a harp to play the arpeggio with the sustained chords (the easy solution), but without harp the orchestrator has to make up something else which gives harmony and movement.

3.3 Passacaglia - outline of approach to orchestration

Godowsky’s Passacaglia is based on the first eight bars of Schubert’s “Unfinished” Symphony, consisting of forty-four variations, cadenza and fugue. To be successful, this orchestration of the Passacaglia must not only sound like an original work for orchestra, but also preserve its virtuosic character. Other points to consider include:

- Overall shape and continuity
- Careful observation of all original markings: dynamics, articulations, pedaling, expression, tempo
- Use of orchestral families (winds, strings, brass, percussion) when a uniform timbre is desirable
- Use of contrasting instruments to define melodic lines and give clarity to polyphony
- Use of solo instruments when appropriate for greater expressiveness
- Personal creativity

The last point is crucial for achieving success; it includes:

- Absorption of the original before rethinking in terms of the new medium
- Where to rewrite patterns peculiar to piano technique that are inappropriate for orchestra
- Where to make additions, whether implied in the original or not
- Where to make (or suggest) changes to tempo

48 The virtuosity required to perform the original is not a mere showing-off of technique. The complex polyphonic texture of the majority of the work also demands absolute finger independence and considerable stamina. Of the Passacaglia, Horowitz is believed to have given up trying to learn it, saying “hopeless, it needed six hands to play it”. Jeremy Nicholas, Godowsky, the Pianists’ Pianist (Hexham: Appian Publications and Recordings, 1989).
- Use of unpitched (or imprecisely pitched) percussion instruments

Of course a host of other decisions of detail have to be made as well, but the following examples illustrate most, if not all, of the points above.

3.4 Passacaglia, original version (CD 2 track 16)

Ex.3.3a Godowsky Passacaglia, bars 1-8
Ex.3.3b Godowsky Passacaglia, bars 9-34
Ex. 3.3c Godowsky Passacaglia, bars 35-50

Source: Carl Fischer (1928)
3.5 Passacaglia, orchestral version (score page 1, CD 2 track 17)

For the first section (theme and five variations, up to letter F), two alternatives were considered: to begin with cellos and basses (as in the Schubert “Unfinished” Symphony) and then gradually add more strings through the first three variations before bringing in wind instruments at letter D, was the most obvious of the alternatives. But it seemed better to use solo winds for greater individual expressiveness immediately after the opening theme; once the bass oboe was chosen for the melody at the first variation (letter A), many other things fell into place. As the melody rose upward, the cor anglais took over at letter C before passing the line to the oboe at letter D. The pensive timbre of these three double-reeds is particularly apt, given the *mesto e misterioso* marking at the beginning.\(^49\) The opening is confined to divided basses alone, with the harp supporting the lower octave and making sure of the inclusion of the low B natural (harp C flat) at the end of the theme.

Letter D is the first place where a significant change has been made to the original. The offbeat quaver accompaniment of the upper notes is a common approach in piano writing, supplying the harmony but allowing the main melodic line to stand out freely. But in an orchestral version, the penetrative quality of the oboe has no difficulty in standing out against flutes and horn. Looking ahead to letter H, where offbeat pizzicato quavers are an obvious choice, having offbeat quavers at letter D as well might seem excessive in an orchestral version. They were replaced by following the inner line shared between the pianist’s thumbs in the original, producing pairs of falling quavers in the upper flute line.\(^50\) The full strings finally enter at letter E with a repeated contraction of the theme, rounding off the first section. There is thus a number of elements for continuity through the first forty-nine bars - choice of instruments, growth of expressiveness, and logical use of material when making desirable changes to the original.\(^51\)

3.6 Passacaglia, use of celeste and harp

Simple arpeggios such as found in the Beethoven-Liszt example above rarely occur in Godowsky who, being one of the great polyphonic writers for keyboard, always sought to

\(^{49}\) The ability to use the poignant expressiveness of oboe, cor anglais and bass oboe over a range of nearly four octaves was significant throughout the transcription. Note especially the first three entries at the beginning of the fugue. The bass oboe returns at two key points (Cassandra-like) with the passacaglia theme - letter N and X.

\(^{50}\) These are also a logical contraction of the falling crotchets of the first bassoon at letter C.

\(^{51}\) Godowsky’s own works are full of examples where an accompanying figure is derived from thematic material or counter-themes heard elsewhere. Such an approach helps to bind a composition together and contributes to its musical logic.
turn simple accompanying harmony into melodic line. Even when they are present, there is often a beauty or charm about Godowsky arpeggios that must be preserved in an orchestration. Celeste and harp are the two main instruments that can be used for this, shown in the following two examples.

3.7 Passacaglia, original version (CD 2 track 18), orchestral version (score page 13, CD 2 track 19)

Ex.3.4 Godowsky Passacaglia, bars 145-153. Source: Carl Fischer (1928)
Having the melody with celeste accompaniment and a naked line in the bass seemed unexciting compared with the original. So, perhaps inspired by the crossing hands of the pianist, springing bow arpeggios were added. Now the chromatic bass line blends in better with the fluttering excitement produced by the strings showing off one of their best effects.

3.8 Passacaglia, original version (CD 2 track 20), orchestral version (score page 17, CD 2 track 21)

Ex.3.5a Godowsky Passacaglia, bars 177-184
Ex. 3.5b Godowsky Passacaglia, bars 185-192
Bearing in mind that the piano pedal sustains much of the harmony in the semi-quaver patterns, harmonic lines for the strings and woodwind have been added, based on the semi-quavers. Godowsky has given some of those lines already, so it was not difficult to create a few others. But the semi-quavers in the second and third bars of the right hand are identical; to avoid repetition and improve flow, the first bar of this line was given to the violas in crotchets, and the second bar to the second violins in a variation similar to the cello line. The first bar in the second violins required some invention, covering the important E# on the first beat and then leap-frogging the violas to join the next bar, picking up the A# on the third beat, transposed up an octave. Without these added lines the music would not have sufficient warmth or body, especially after the massive cadence leading into letter V. The harp key is C flat major rather than B major (which uses more open strings for more resonance. There still have to be several enharmonic changes to make the patterns playable). In the following variation the harp provides the supporting arpeggios in the bass, while the climbing pattern in the flutes and piccolo sustains the harmony as it would be when played with pedal on the piano. Solo strings and divided cellos add to the expressiveness. It also seemed appropriate to put the arpeggio figure onto the third beat as well, played by the celeste.

52 Note that solo string samples were not available for the digital realization on the CDs.
3.9 Passacaglia, original version (CD 2 track 22), orchestral version (score page 41, CD 2 track 23)

Ex.3.6 Godowsky Passacaglia, bars 297-305. Source: Carl Fischer (1928)
This is the exhausting variation which Godowsky based around the opening theme of Schubert’s Erl King. Because it is as loud as anything else in the work, it calls for the full orchestra playing at full volume. However, there is not much new thematic interest apart from the Erl King theme, which is rather repetitive. In the original, excitement is generated by the extreme difficulty of the variation, with both hands flying all over the keyboard. To make the orchestral version just as exciting (instead of just being noisy), the Erl King theme is turned into a canon. As Godowsky treats the Unfinished Symphony theme in canon and double canon elsewhere, an Erl King canon seemed appropriate and fits easily, with the sextuplet imitated on the third beat by the snare drum. It was also a place to give a rare tune to the timpani, adding extra power to the tremolo strings.

3.10 Passacaglia - Cadenza, original version (CD 2 track 24), orchestral version (score page 51, CD 2 track 25)

Ex.3.7 Godowsky Passacaglia, cadenza. Source: Carl Fischer (1928)
Much of the florid original writing of the cadenza had to be recast in orchestral terms, first by changing the note values and inserting time signatures for ease of reading. The *veloce* semi-quavers in the right hand cannot all be transcribed literally without sounding clumsy, yet one needs a triplet pattern to preserve impetus. However, at the beginning of the cadenza there is a clear division of material with the upper notes - the second or third note of each triplet - making one line, the mostly descending chromatic notes below making another. The upper notes have been transcribed as offbeat duplets in the violins, and a doubling of some of the second notes of each triplet in the lower line preserves the original pulse while being much more appropriate for rapid wind writing.

3.11 Passacaglia - Fugue, original version (CD 2 track 26), orchestral version (score page 56, CD 2 track 27)

Ex.3.8a Godowsky Passacaglia, Fugue bars 1-20
Ex.3.8b Godowsky Passacaglia, bars 21-40. Source: Carl Fischer (1928)

At the beginning of a fugue one does not expect anything other than a clear statement of each voice, so orchestration was easy for several bars. However, the fourth entry (bar 29) raised a dilemma: the third entry and following line for bass oboe and violas either joins the fourth entry (as it does in the original version), or drops out entirely. Neither alternative
works satisfactorily. Although adding a voice to this existing fugue was a liberty, especially as Godowsky could have included it himself by dropping the lower octave of the fourth voice, nevertheless that decision was taken as better than the alternatives.

3.12 Passacaglia - Fugue, original version (CD 2 track 28), orchestral version (score page 61, CD 2 track 29)

Ex.3.9a Godowsky Passacaglia, Fugue bars 80-87

---

53 Primarily as the fourth entry is out of range for the violas and bass oboe; playing it an octave higher overloads the line, and to double one of the upper lines means clumsy adjustments have to be made for balance. Dropping the violas and bass oboe leaves a hole and detracts from the expected growth through the fugal entries.

54 This will be for others to judge, especially the change to harmony in bar 426 (orchestral score).
*) The stems upward are intended for the right hand, downward, for the left hand.

Ex.3.9b Godowsky Passacaglia, Fugue bars 88-96
Ex. 3.9c Godowsky Passacaglia, Fugue bars 97-102. Source: Carl Fischer (1928)
Before the final crescendo and coda, the high point of the fugue comes with the *maestoso* section and the chaotic *poco piu mosso* which follows, Godowsky spreading the original onto four staves. Included in the additions to the orchestrated version are the quavers in glockenspiel, celeste and harp in the *maestoso* (derived from previous accompanying figures), and thirds, sixths and trills to the triplets in the *poco piu mosso*, along with some suggested changes to tempo not found in the original Godowsky. The *poco piu mosso* section is a prime example of the necessity of absorbing the original and recreating it successfully when the full orchestra must be used, without losing any of the original thematic content.

---

55 It is likely all pianists would instinctively make a *ritardando* into the *maestoso* and adopt a slower speed until the *poco piu mosso*, despite the absence of metronome markings.
Chapter Four
Petite Suite Française

4.1 Introduction

This work for symphony orchestra is written in a consistent style, which seeks to put into practice the principles of good scoring for the modern orchestra, especially where balance is concerned. The choice of style is primarily to allow the listener easy grasp of the musical material, so that the demonstration of orchestral technique is clear. French influence is primarily found in the choice of harmonies, the contrast between common chords and others with added 2nds, 6ths and 7ths being somewhat reminiscent of French romanticism, especially late romantic composers such as Poulenc. The following notes highlight certain scoring decisions in each movement.

4.2 1st Movement

- Letters A to C (pages 3 to 8), E to G (pages 12 to 17): brass are muted to allow forte quavers and softer sustained notes to balance with wind quavers, which have to be marked forte for balance against the mezzoforte violins and cor anglais melody, which will still dominate. For variety, glockenspiel is added to the melody on repeat.
- At letters D and H brass can be unmuted for the two climaxes.
- At bar 113 (page 20) all bass instruments play the bass quavers to allow the chords above to be played with a sustained fortissimo without drowning the important bass line.

4.3 2nd Movement

- Careful articulation should create the right mixture of lightness and contrasting legato and tenuto. For example, the quavers in the opening trumpet solo are marked staccato, but the accompanying single quavers in strings and bassoon are not; a staccato accompaniment may sound too brittle and not allow the solo to stand out as much. But in bars 3 and 4 the secondary thematic fragment in the violins and clarinets is also marked staccato to draw a little more attention to itself (this idea is extended in bars 20 to 22). The recurring accented crotchets mimic the strolling of the promenader.
- At letter N the brass must play the melodic quavers as well as chords for balance in a genuine fortissimo.

- At letter O (page 31) there are three melodic lines that all need to be heard clearly - the opening melody, now with unison trumpets, oboes and first violins an octave higher, which should be the loudest line; the quavers based on the middle section, here given in an extended line for unison horns and violas, which should be the second loudest line; and the dancing quaver and semi-quaver patterns in the piccolo, flutes, clarinets and glockenspiel, which should be about equal in volume with the accompaniment. The accents and staccato of the first line will stand out against the legato second line, while the semi-quavers of the third line provide another contrast, especially with the high pitch of piccolo and glockenspiel.

- At the full orchestral climax at bars 76 to 79, the three families of strings, winds and brass each contain all elements (or nearly all) of the melodic, harmonic and bass lines - the orchestra coming back together after the polyphony of the previous section.

4.4 3rd Movement

- At letter A (page 39), the strings have “free bowing” marked. Although string players do not need gaps for breaths, the sound must stop for a tiny fraction of a second whenever the bow changes direction. A resonant acoustic will generally cover this, but there is always a tendency for the so-called “bellows effect” - a slight swelling of sound as the bow moves from rest toward the middle of the bow. Free bowing, where the players should deliberately change bow in different places, encourages an even sound in a long sustained legato line.

- Wind players can sustain a legato line without breath for twice or three times the length of a single string bow playing the same line at a similar dynamic. At letter C (page 42), the wind players could probably sustain four or five bars without needing to breathe, but eventually must break the line for breath (although “circular breathing” without breaks can be done by some players). Remembering that a good musician will make a breath part of natural expression, just as a good singer does, one might stagger the slurs of the four accompanying lines. However, the low brass quartet can assist, dovetailing with the wind for bars 26-27 and bars 30-31. The gentle swell and muted commentary by the trumpets in these bars make it a logical place to change instrumental colour. Now there are no breaks in the accompanying lines. The solo
instruments - first the flute, then the alto saxophone - will breathe naturally between phrases over the seamless carpet of accompaniment.

- At letter F (page 46), the continuous tremolos in the strings present another option for even, unbroken accompaniment.

### 4.5 4th Movement

- Percussion players always welcome an opportunity to play on their own, and a brief percussive introduction to the final movement also breaks the tranquil mood left by the third movement, making the beginning of the fourth movement proper at letter Q (page 58) less of a jolt to the listener.

- At bar 11 and following, the accompanying semi-quavers and supporting harmony in the violins, violas and horns are marked *mezzoforte*, while the canon lines (which should both be prominent) are marked *forte*. However, at bar 20 and following, the accompanying quavers and semi-quavers, transferred to the wind, are marked *forte*, while the canon lines (which will still be prominent) in the strings, tuba and contrabassoon are marked *mezzoforte*. Supporting harmony in the trombones is reduced to *piano*. If the dynamics were not adjusted in this way, the bubbling energy of the wind might not be heard at all. At bar 31 and following (page 65), the semi-quavers become separate bows in the upper strings for necessary greater power against the overall crescendo.

- The *grandioso* chorale at letter T (page 66) presents breathing questions, especially for the lower (big-bore) brass. All the instruments that play a minim at the beginning of bar 37 will naturally breathe after it, but this breath will be covered by the first trumpet, upper horns and cymbals. A compulsory breath is marked in bar 39, for which the conductor should allow time. This should encourage the players not to breathe after the minim in bar 40, which would break the phrase in an undesirable place.\(^{56}\)

- The convention today for xylophone is to write notes an octave lower than they sound. Some past composers expected it to sound at the pitch written, especially when the instrument was first introduced into the orchestra, leading to errors occasionally

\(^{56}\) It is almost certain that the lower brass will also snatch a breath somewhere in bars 40-41, but the horns and trumpets should not need to do so if enough time is given for the breath in bar 39. As a general rule, composers and orchestrators need to be aware that a quick "snatch" breath can never fill the lungs more than about half capacity.
being made in execution. At letter W (page 73), the xylophone part\textsuperscript{57} is marked "loco", indicating it should sound at pitch. In the conductor's score this allows a little less clutter without low ledger-lines or an \textit{octava bassa} line for two or three bars. In the orchestral part, however, one could write it all an octave lower as convention dictates. But, notwithstanding the convention, it is still a good idea to write "sounding at pitch" or "sounding an octave higher" to be absolutely sure a mistake is not made by the player.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{57} Written for a four-octave instrument, range middle C to top C on a piano.  
\textsuperscript{58} Mistakes are less likely for the glockenspiel, which rarely exists in a range other than a standard two-and-a-half octaves. But it does no harm to add "sounding two octaves higher" in the part (and possibly score too), especially if the outer ranges of the instrument are not used.
Chapter Five
Last Variation

This arrangement for string orchestra of the last variation from Fauré’s Theme and Variations Opus 73, originally for piano, has been included to demonstrate recent technological advances in digital sound samples. It is important to realize that there is no difference between digital sound samples recorded by actual players in a studio than a modern digital orchestral recording. Both techniques translate the “real” sounds into digital forms. The difference is that sampled sounds are, for the most part, single notes that have to be put together to make an instrumental performance.59 A common criticism of computer-generated recordings is that they sound mechanical; this is no longer true if the raw sounds are of high quality and are controlled by someone with expertise. It is not sufficient merely to have technological ability - one needs to manipulate the sounds in the same way a good conductor rehearses an orchestra.

By constructing the score of Last Variation with the notation program Sibelius, it was possible for other “translator” software to select the appropriate individual sound sample required for each note. The first example on CD 2 (track 30) presents the opening bars exactly as written in conventional notation, with no adjustments made. The second example (track 31) shows the same bars after adjustments have been made, including the flexibility possible with rubato and portamento.

Stringed instrument samples are the hardest sounds to make convincing, especially in legato. Although one has considerable control over the sounds, the variation that occurs in a simple legato phrase played by live musicians is also considerable. For example: in any string section, with each player having an instrument with its own unique sound, the variations that occur through differences in timbre, pitch and vibrato approach the infinite - constant subtle fluctuations of sound, with no single note ever sounding exactly the same as another. This is one of the major characteristics that gives realism to a string section.60

59 Sound sample libraries usually include recorded scales and legato transitions from one note to another; similarly, string samples include portamenti.
60 Wind and brass instrument samples cause fewer problems for the user, partly because they mostly consist of recorded sounds by single players, instruments that use no vibrato being the easiest. For unison sounds (such as two or three trumpets, or four horns), other complete sets of samples are often given. Percussion sounds are
The best sound sample libraries are aware of this characteristic variety and seek to replicate it in a number of ways. Detached notes are each given alternative sounds. For example: a string section playing a staccato middle C will have a number of different staccato middle Cs recorded at each dynamic available. Thus a series of short notes will avoid the so-called "machine-gun effect", the computer choosing alternative sounds for the same note or notes at random, mimicking the slight variations that occur with a live string section. However, there are usually fewer options where legato sounds are given, although downbow, upbow, and different accents are amongst the variations one can use. There are also variations of attack and decay which will especially affect the movement from note to note.

Ultimately, it is up to the ear of the user. My method in this short transcription was to create a draft of the score and link it to the relevant sound samples. Then, on playback, I was able to decide what did not work satisfactorily, and take the necessary steps to fix the problems. Where strings are concerned, I have found it useful to create a duplicate for each staff, allowing the same notes for each instrument to be entered in a slightly different way. This may involve alterations such as the anticipation or delay of a note’s entry, changing the duration of a note, different dynamics, different articulations, or changing the position of a portamento. This near duplication of a musical line allows the sounds (when both staves are combined in playback) to be modified beyond the limits possible with a single staff. An alteration that creates a slight stagger in the vertical ensemble of the two staves often results in a smoother legato when both staves are played simultaneously, including the slight raggedness which can occur naturally in a string section. To make modifications to the tempo of the whole ensemble is easily done by changing the metronome mark at any point desired. The computer is capable of inserting an accelerando or ritardando, but usually this will not be precise enough. To produce the right rubato in Last Variation, I occasionally inserted several different metronome markings within a few seconds, including a few for only a fraction of a beat’s duration. Changes to the overall sound were made by selecting different microphone placements and settings.61

For playback of a sound sampled score, one is limited by the power of the computer(s). If a score exceeds that power, playback is distorted. I have found it best to

---

61 As the original sounds were recorded with sets of microphones in different places in a studio, changes to the mix of those microphones are available in the samples.
export individual staves to an editing program which can play a score without error, however complex the score may be. This has an added advantage in that further modifications can be made, especially where balance is concerned.62

I am aware of my own limitations at this early stage of personal experience with sound samples. It has taken time to develop a sufficient understanding of the software to produce realizations of the quality submitted on the CDs. The more experience I gain, the better my technique will be. I am also aware that all these examples could be improved (or rather, will be improved) with the purchase of other sound sample libraries. In the Fauré example given, further improvements could be made by adding solo string samples (as if adding the leader of each section) to provide more colour and individuality. The other digital realizations submitted in the portfolio (nearly all sounds being sourced from the same library) could be improved by constructing an orchestra from different libraries of similar quality, producing more variety and giving alternatives. For example, the legato for a certain instrument from one library may sound better in a particular context than the same instrument from another library. The “rehearsing” of the digital orchestra can continue until the “conductor” is satisfied.63

One criticism of such realizations is that they are too accurate - a real orchestra always produces moments of less-than-perfect intonation, ensemble and balance. One can add imperfections to digital realizations, including all manner of accompanying sampled noises from wind and brass players’ breathing to chair creaks, but whether this is necessary or desirable from the composer’s point of view is something of a dilemma. An archive performance of a work, as perfect as can be made, might be preferable to a more realistic one. Thus a composer’s work can be presented, with every detail perfectly in place, as a guide to future human performance. Other criticisms, often made by musicians (or musicians’ unions) worried about current and future employment, raise ethical considerations. This concern is discussed in the final chapter.

62 This is no different from the adjustments a studio engineer makes when recording an ensemble where each instrument (or instrumental section) has its own microphone(s).
63 And the digital players never get tired.
Chapter Six
Conclusion

The contribution that this creative project makes to the discipline should be understood in relation to the discipline of Musical Composition. In each case, the works submitted in the portfolio form part of an established tradition, both in terms of orchestral forces and in terms of formal structure. At the same time, however, they seek to extend and develop the respective traditions. The presentation of one of the works, Bagatelles, in parallel versions, demonstrates the potential of the wind orchestra as an alternative to the symphony orchestra for composers wishing to write for large instrumental forces. This is particularly relevant in relation to the situation facing symphony orchestras today, described in the essay of historical background. The scores of the portfolio presented in digital form, using the sophisticated sound samples available today, show the potential of such realizations for promotion of new works.

The opinions regarding composition expressed in this exegesis are the product of several years of experience in the music world. Any artistic creation represents an attempt by the artist to communicate; composers need their works to be heard by others. As far as the means that allows music to be heard, it is natural for composers to write for the instrumental forces that appeal to them. As a child, I preferred orchestral music to solo, vocal or chamber music. That preference - music requiring large numbers of instruments - has stayed with me until today. The difficulty I experienced in achieving performances of my orchestral works led me to the wind orchestra, for which I have written several compositions (see appendix). A recent personal discovery of high-quality sound samples has offered me a second alternative.

When considering the ethical aspects of using sound samples instead of live performers, one must realize that advances in technology make such options inevitable. For example: film studios mostly require an orchestral soundtrack to be submitted in a sound-sampled version before hiring an actual orchestra to record it; now that sound samples of high quality are available, small studios (who cannot afford to hire the London Symphony
Orchestra or equivalent) save a considerable amount of money by using a sound-sampled orchestra already provided by the composer.\(^6^4\)

Although advances in technology have already had negative effects on music of all kinds, the advance in sound-sample technology offers something positive. Music that might otherwise never be heard at all has a chance of existence. Does that mean more junk added to that which exists already? Yes, but that is already happening on a large scale (see footnote on page 10), will continue and cannot be prevented. But a positive approach to sound samples points not only to alternative opportunities for living and future composers to hear, promote and communicate to others their instrumental works almost immediately after composition, but also the possibility of resurrecting forgotten or unjustly neglected works of past composers which deserve to be heard.

If objections are raised concerning the “too perfect” renditions given by sound-sampled recordings, it should be remembered that editing of recorded performances has existed since the invention of electronic tape. Today the technology exists to remove all kinds of flaws within a recorded performance to the extent of changing or replacing a single note of a chord without affecting the other notes of the same chord. The progress (if that is what it is) toward the production of perfect recordings is not confined to the use of digital samples.\(^6^5\)

Final words regarding one of the differences between the professional and non-professional, clearly demonstrated by the professional orchestra and non-professional wind orchestra: without an audience, the professional orchestra would not exist. But the players of a non-professional wind orchestra come together primarily because they want to enjoy making music together, not because they are being paid to do so. An audience is a bonus, but often not a necessity.\(^6^6\) At present, the orchestral version of Bagatelles has no forthcoming

---

\(^6^4\) Film directors and producers obviously want to hear the composer’s score to make sure they like it before recording the live orchestra. Before this technological advance, much money was wasted on recording film scores that were discarded.

\(^6^5\) A perhaps unfortunate result of “perfect” recordings has been their effect on live performances. It might be laudable to encourage performers to give a concert without making a single mistake, but spontaneity and risk-taking (which may produce more exciting or interesting interpretations) are usually discouraged. Performance competitions, which base their results strongly on no mistakes, are especially prone to this effect.

\(^6^6\) There will always be an audience of some size at a non-professional concert, but the size of box-office returns (with cheap ticket prices or free entry) is not a major factor, with monies gained usually confined to expenses such as the hire of the concert hall and rehearsal venues. The enjoyment of the players (and development, where educational establishments are concerned) is the main reason wind orchestras exist and thrive.
live performance scheduled by any professional orchestra. But the wind orchestral version has already been performed by a fine non-professional ensemble; subsequent promises of future performances have also been received from other ensembles.
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Appendix

Compositions by David Stanhope:

**Opera**

**Orchestra**
*Two Folk-Elegies* (unpublished, 1991)
*Olympic Fireworks* (unpublished, 2000)
*Grand Fanfare* (unpublished, 2000)
*Petite Suite Française* (unpublished, 2015)
*Bagatelles* (unpublished, 2015)

**Orchestral transcriptions**
*Passacaglia* (Godowsky, unpublished, 2015)
*Last Variation* (string orchestra, Fauré, unpublished, 2015)

**Wind Orchestra**
*Bagatelles* (unpublished, 2015)
*Folksongs for Band, Suite No. 1* (H.L.Music 1997)
*Folksongs for Band, Suite No. 3* (3H.L.Music 1993)
*E.G.B.D.S.* (H.L.Music 1999)
*Songs Without Words* (saxophone quartet and wind orchestra, Southern Music Co., 2002)
*Australian Fantasia* (Southern Music Co., 2006)
*Olympic Fireworks* (Southern Music Co., 2003)
*Concerto for Band* (H.L.Music, 1994)
*The Little Ripper March* (H.L.Music, 1993)
*The Demon Fanfare* (H.L.Music, 1996)
*The Bold Benjamin* (male chorus and wind orchestra, H.L.Music, 1995)
*Retreat and Pumping Song* (H.L.Music, 1997)
*Grand Fanfare* (Southern Music Co., 2002)
*Endpiece* (Southern Music Co., 2003)
*Promenade* (Southern Music Co., 2004)
*Fanfare & Children’s March* (Southern Music Co., 2006)

**String Orchestra**
*String Songs* (string orchestra, unpublished, 2004)
*Battle Concerto* (two solo trumpets, timpani and string orchestra, unpublished, 2011)

**Brass Band**
*March, Blues and Tarantella* (unpublished, 2010)
*A Leadsman, a Lady and a Lord* (Novello, 1985)
*The Little Ripper March* (unpublished, 1989)
*Droylsden Wakes* (unpublished, 1989)
Chamber music for Brass

*Olympic Fireworks* (brass and percussion, Southern Music Co., 2005)

*Endpiece* (brass decet, unpublished, 1990)

*Four Concert-Studies* (trombone quartet, Tezak, 1985)

*Hornplayers’ Retreat and Pumping Song* (horn octet, Hornists’ Nest, 1980)

*Cortettes* (horn quartet, Hornists’ Nest, 1976)

*Three Folksongs for Quintet* (brass quintet, Southern Music Co., 2001)

*Day in the Life of Jim Dempsey* (brass quintet, Southern Music Co., 2002)

*Ceremonial Fanfares* (brass quintet, Southern Music Co., 2007)

*The Australian Fanfare* (nine trumpets, Southern Music Co., 2003)

Songs for Voice and Piano

*Felix Randal* (unpublished, 1995)

*Jolly, Geordie, Jane* (unpublished, 1987)

*In Brisbane* (unpublished, 1993)

Works for Piano

*Petite Suite Française* (unpublished, 2015)

*Three Folksongs for Pianola* (cut and recorded by Rex Lawson, 1984-6)

Translations for Piano

*Scherzo Prestissimo* (Borodin: scherzo from Symphony No.1)

*The Tryst* (Sibelius: song for voice and piano)

*March of the Toys* (Herbert: from operetta *Babes in Toyland*)

*The Little Ripper March* (Stanhope)

*Father and Daughter* (Grainger: Faeroe Islands folk music setting for chorus and orchestra)

As a composer, David Stanhope is represented by the Australian Music Centre. Copies of all his works will soon form a collection in the AMC archive.