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ABSTRACT

Leonard Bernstein’s Piano Music: A Comparative Study of Selected Works

by

Leann Osterkamp

Advisor: Dr. Jeffrey Taylor

Much of Leonard Bernstein’s piano music is incorporated in his orchestral and theatrical works. The comparison and understanding of how the piano works relate to the orchestral manifestations validates the independence of the piano works, provides new insights into Bernstein’s compositional process, and presents several significant issues of notation and interpretation that can influence the performance practice of both musical versions.

The chronological and historical significance of his piano music has been sometimes inaccurately recorded and/or generalized. In understanding the factual chronological, social, and political relationships behind the piano works and their orchestral manifestations, I argue that the piano works, both unpublished and published, are significantly influential to the development of American music and New York aesthetics in the twentieth century. This research also explores why several unpublished completed piano works held in the Library of Congress have been withheld.
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INTRODUCTION

The centenary of Leonard Bernstein marks a season of extensive programming and celebration to commemorate the compositional achievements of a man immortalized for his conducting, composing, writing, speaking, and political involvement. In marking the centennial, the Leonard Bernstein Office in New York City maintains a website for audience, presenters, and curious intellectuals to explore the works and story behind the great man. The website states, “On this page you will find resources to help you discover and program Bernstein’s works.” Upon visiting the tab for viewing his compositions of note, the only piano work to be mentioned is the variation set Touches. On a website intended for educational resource and information, why would Bernstein’s representatives choose to exclude more than thirty currently published works for solo piano? Additionally, why do more than a dozen completed piano works held in the Library of Congress remain unpublished?

One possible explanation is that much of Bernstein’s piano music is incorporated into his other significant orchestral and theater works. This recycling of material paints a cloud of secondary importance on much of the piano repertoire. The majority of Bernstein’s piano works are short, often no longer than two or three pages in length. When the music appears in orchestrations it is always incorporated into a larger musical structure. At times the piano work is extended, modified, or varied. Alternatively, the piano score can appear musically identical, serving as an independent scene or episode within a larger musical structure. Most of the piano works have essentially become musical synecdoches, representing only a part of the more well-

---

known larger whole. I believe most are viewed similarly to published sketches or reductions rather than as independent progressive piano works of twentieth-century America.²

In the publication and archival flurry of the twenty-seven years since his death, the chronological and historical significance of his piano music is sometimes inaccurately recorded and generalized. In this dissertation, I will explore the actual chronological, social, and political relationships behind the piano works and their orchestral manifestations. I argue that the piano works, both unpublished and published, are influential in understanding the development of American music and New York aesthetics in the twentieth century. My research provides evidence for considering the piano pieces as independent works apart from their better-known presentations in orchestrations. The comparison and understanding of how the piano works relate to the orchestral manifestations provides new insights into Bernstein’s compositional process and presents several significant issues of notation and interpretation that influence the performance practice of these works.

The orchestrations of the piano pieces often clarify musical and interpretive issues. The musical material is presented in more developed structures and employs more notation for articulation, bowing, phrasing, and breathing. The composer himself defines good orchestration as something “that’s exactly right for the music and lets the music be heard in the clearest and

² When asked about the reuse of a particular piano work in Bernstein’s Symphony No.1: Jeremiah, James Tocco, a pianist who performed Bernstein’s music in the 1980s, remarked that he simply assumed “the piano version probably still came first since Bernstein composes at the piano.” This quote illuminates a general theory about Bernstein’s compositional process and was incorporated in previous academic research: March 13, 1985 interview by Sigrid Luther, “The Anniversaries for Solo Piano by Leonard Bernstein,” (DMA diss., Louisiana State University, 1986), 31.
most effective way.” Bernstein is able to more clearly communicate polyrhythms, implied metric impulses, and subtleties in timbre through the orchestral medium. This research shows how Bernstein actively refines and revises musical material when recycling. It is academically sound, considering Bernstein’s compositional process, to retroactively apply the revisions found in the orchestrations to the corresponding musical material in the earlier piano works.

All reinterpretations are suggestions backed by strong evidence resulting from my personal cumulative research and comprehensive knowledge from the archive. Understanding how Bernstein notates an alternate presentation of a score deepens the artist’s understanding of the inherent musical material and influences his/her interpretation. The literal application of some notation can be subjectively argued in cases where the notation carries equal value for an instrumental purpose as it does for a musical intent. Even in these subjective cases, the musical intent resulting from orchestration informs the pianist of emotion, character, and style. Though the emotional content of the music is beyond the scope of this study, the pathos behind the music must be acknowledged, particularly in dealing with a composer that wrote consistently with a significant emotional and/or spiritual aim.

Even though this study aims to be as comprehensive as possible, the research may not address all of Bernstein’s recycling of his piano output. The Leonard Bernstein Collection contains many hundreds of sheets that contain unidentified sketches. I believe that I was able to uncover all scores, manuscripts, letters, and sketches from the collection that relate to the works addressed in each section. However, this research should be viewed as an entry point into an

---

ongoing project that will, in time, present further compositional relations and will argue for the exposure of several works from the unpublished collection.⁴

Many piano works are undated or have been inaccurately archived. Prior to tracing the compositional progression of each work, I briefly approach each composition from a historical standpoint. This allows for a contextualization of each analysis and presents new original research for each piece. Many orchestral works used in this study have had multiple publications, often appearing in revised editions. For this study, when not otherwise specified, I consistently reference the most current publications. There are cases in which the compositional date of a solo piano work post-dates the compositional date of a related orchestral work.⁵ In these cases, the original orchestration may have been revised after the appearance of the following solo piano work. My fundamental arguments and claims are not significantly modified by this issue. Large-scale modifications to the orchestral scores relevant to this research are addressed by chapter.

The application of this research is two-fold. The archival research is a furthering of the work done by Jack Gottlieb and should be used to correct current errors in publication, help further specify documents in the Leonard Bernstein Collection, and should be more generally used to understand the historical background of select compositions. The comparative analysis should be used to inspire and clarify artistic choices taken by the performer of the piano works. In performing the Seven Anniversaries, for example, I was able to more clearly communicate rhythm and character after understanding that five of the pieces in the collection were initially intended to be a Partita for Piano, the works themselves functioning as various baroque dance

⁴ Many of the orchestral works mentioned also contain recycled music from other theater, chamber, and orchestral pieces.

⁵ It cannot be stated that the piano piece is only a reduction of the related orchestral work. This issue will be addressed at it appears.
forms. Understanding *In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky* as a sarabande allowed me to more deeply understand the character and tempo. Contrary to the notation in *In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky*, sarabandes typically have a small emphasis on the second beat. This new metric perspective, paired with the contrapuntal independence of each voice in the left hand (illuminated in the orchestration), informed my performance of the piece in a way that was unobtainable from the piano score alone.
PRIOR RESEARCH

My research historically contextualizes Bernstein’s compositions and orchestrations within the environment of the 1900s. Informing this historical background will be scholars discussing a diverse range of issues influential to Bernstein’s artistic output. Though there are several published scholars on the subject of music and culture in the 1900s, the most related to my research include Carol Oja, Barry Seldes, Jack Gottlieb, Leon Botstein, Humphrey Burton, and Alex Ross. A majority of my sources are letters, writings, and lectures of Bernstein.

Bernstein’s musical style has been addressed by most scholars who seek to write biographies of his life, leading many of the previously mentioned scholars to be included in this category. This category is also expanded into the dissertation work of students such as Lars Erik Helgert, Sigrid Luther, and James Moore. Scholars who have focused on individual collections of works include Sigrid Luther, Elizabeth Crist, Ethan Nash, Helen Smith, and Philip.

---

6 There are many biographies written on Leonard Bernstein. His daughter Jamie Bernstein believes Humphrey Burton’s biography to be the most accurate biographical source. Therefore, Burton’s biography is used as the exclusive biographical resource for briefly contextualizing Bernstein’s earlier years in the opening sections. As all of the research following the opening sections exclusively uses primary resources from the Leonard Bernstein Collection in deducing biographical information, there is no need to further discuss, abbreviate, or respond to other published biographies.


Some scholars focus on specific attributes of his music, such as Helgert’s focus on jazz elements and Moore’s focus on tonality. Composers close to Bernstein, such as Ned Rorem, have contributed opinionated analyses of Bernstein’s style, as seen in Rorem’s “Leonard Bernstein (An Appreciation).” Geoffrey Block approaches Bernstein’s style by analyzing Bernstein’s own writings about himself and his musical environment. Though some scholars touch on performance practice of select compositions, such as Ethan Nash, no scholar has specifically focused on performance practice for the piano. Discussions of Bernstein’s recycling of music in different musical mediums has been minimally addressed. Most scholars point out the recycling of musical material but do not explore the subject beyond acknowledgement.

Helen Smith’s work in *There’s A Place for Us: The Musical Theatre Works of Leonard Bernstein* comes close to the first analytical step in my research, recognizing the appearance of a musical cell in both solo piano version and orchestrated version. However, after she recognizes


the recycling of material, she focuses solely on how the theme is used in *Candide*. She does not analyze how the orchestration relates to its initial piano version or how this, in turn, relates to performance practice of the piano work.

No scholar has focused specifically on the relation of Bernstein’s piano works to their later manifestations, has provided comparative analysis between the manifestations, or has discussed piano performance practice issues relating to this work. No scholar has reviewed published piano material using the primary source material of the Leonard Bernstein Collection at the Library of Congress since Jack Gottlieb. Several issues relating to inaccuracies in publication are a result of the age of the research. Most lengthy research is dated from over twenty years ago, before much material was available or initially organized by Jack Gottlieb, Michael Barrett, Helen Coates, and other important members of the Leonard Bernstein Office.

A large volume of work has been written regarding Bernstein’s contribution to music education.\(^\text{18}\) This work is not directly related to my research and will not be used as a direct resource. However, scripts of Bernstein’s *Young People’s Concerts*\(^\text{19}\) and lectures will be used to provide evidence as to how the composer personally understood orchestration, arranging, and his own musical identity.

---


\(^\text{19}\) Leonard Bernstein, *Young People’s Concerts* (Amadeus Press, 2006).
A BRIEF LOOK INTO THE FIRST YEARS

The years between 1920 and 1930 were formative for Bernstein’s work as a composer. Although he did not live in New York City until 1939, his proximity in Boston and the impact of the radio brought much of the significant musical scene within New York to the young Bernstein throughout the 1920s, shaping his foundation. It is hard to believe, with today’s legacy of Bernstein, that his first experience listening to a live symphony concert did not come until May 1932 at age thirteen. Until this point, the Victrola phonograph, his piano, and the radio “proved to be the prime instrument(s) of young Bernstein’s awakening musicality.” The radio introduced him to fashionable contemporary music and artists including vocalists, popular music, comedy songs, and novelty pieces.

Bernstein was referred to his first piano teacher, Helen Coates, by Heinrich Gebhard. His first official piano lesson was on Saturday October 22, 1932, at 1:00 in the afternoon. Six years later, an August 21, 1938 program for the Scituate Yacht Club shows Bernstein presenting Hindemith’s Sonata No. 2, Beethoven’s Sonata Op. 79, Brahms’ Intermezzo in e-flat minor.

---


21 Heinrich Gebhard was a prominent piano teacher in the Boston area. Bernstein studied with him for four years while at Harvard. Bernstein’s Sonata for Piano was dedicated to Gebhard. Humphrey Burton believes that Bernstein performed the Sonata for Piano for Dimitri Mitropoulos at Harvard. Though this event seems plausible, the information is not cited. Chronologically, this story is puzzling, as the Sonata for Piano has a published compositional date of 1938 and Burton claims that Mitropoulos met Bernstein in 1937. Perhaps this particular performance of the Sonata for Piano happened at a later date? Burton, Leonard Bernstein, 25, 34, 36.

22 Coates was Bernstein’s piano teacher from 1932-1935. In 1944, she became his secretary until her death in 1989. Her documentation, communication, and dedication towards her protégé created the foundation for the Leonard Bernstein Collection in the Library of Congress.
Chopin mazurkas, Schumann’s *Novelette*, Bach’s *Chromatic Fantasy and Fugue*, Debussy’s *Poissons D’or*, Liszt’s *Hungarian Rhapsody No. 13*, and his own *Music for the Dance No. 1*.\(^{23}\) It is believed that in 1932, the same year he began formal piano study, Bernstein composed his first work, a piano concerto entitled *The War of the Gypsies and the Russians*.\(^{24}\)

In college at Harvard from 1935 to 1939, Bernstein fell under the influence of specific individuals who significantly influenced the young artist in ways that are seen throughout the duration of his life. His formal education in traditional music study at Harvard was fostered by Professors Arthur Tillman, Walter Piston, and David Prall.\(^{25}\) During this time, Bernstein was given the score to Aaron Copland’s *Piano Variations*, a piece he frequently performed and studied. Bernstein described his experience of performing the work by stating, “A new world of music had opened to me in this work – extreme, prophetic, clangorous, fiercely dissonant,

---

\(^{23}\) The Leonard Bernstein office believes that *Non Troppo Presto* is the score for *Music for the Dance No. 1*. I do not believe this to be feasible. The pieces included in *Music for the Dance No. 1* are marked *Allegretto* and *Vivacissimo*. In all of Bernstein’s compositional output, he remains consistent on his tempo indications. The 1937 score of *Non Troppo Presto* is also the second version of the work. The original manuscript for *Non Troppo Presto* (before 1937, undated) is included as the third piece of a larger set, preceded by an interlude which contains music later used in *Age of Anxiety*.

\(^{24}\) The piano concerto was never completed. Therefore, *Psalm 148* (1935) is often considered his first work. *The War of the Gypsies and the Russians* shows Bernstein’s fascination with pianism, showcasing virtuosic octaves and passagework on nearly every presentation of the solo piano. The score is heavily influenced by large-scale romantic concerti, such as Tchaikovsky, Rachmaninoff, and Schumann based on the textures and interplay of the soloist with the orchestra.

\(^{25}\) Studying under Tillman places Bernstein in the Nadia Boulanger lineage. Piston was most influential in the areas of counterpoint and harmonic discipline.; David Prall was Bernstein’s aesthetics professor. He argued that a person’s aesthetic reaction to art is in itself a form of knowledge, essentially valuing the emotional value of art at a level of rational formal analysis. Barry Seldes, *Leonard Bernstein: The Political Life of an American Musician* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 12-14.
intoxicating.” Bernstein met Copland in 1937 in New York City. After hearing Copland’s Bolero in Boston in 1938, Bernstein reached out to Copland for mentorship, to which Copland replied, “Of course come to N.Y. and of course I’ll be delighted to tell you all I know. But be sure to learn a lot about counterpoint first. No-one can beat Piston at that.” Bernstein absorbed Copland’s style and expertise through deep study of his music.

I remember I was writing a violin sonata during those Harvard days and a two-piano piece, and a four-hand piece and a string quartet. I even completed a trio. I would show Aaron the bits and pieces and he would say, “All that has got to go… This is just pure Scriabin. You’ve got to get that out of your head and start fresh… These two bars are good. Take these two bars and start from there…” He taught me a tremendous amount about taste, style and consistency in music.

Music from the referenced Piano Trio was recycled in later works such as On the Town, showing that Copland’s guidance on Bernstein’s earlier works had indirect yet far-reaching influence as Bernstein recycled musical material. Forty-two years later, when introducing Copland at the

---

26 Burton, Leonard Bernstein, 41.

27 Burton, Leonard Bernstein, 50.

28 Burton, Leonard Bernstein, 43. Copland explored the same genres as Bernstein, often in a close temporal proximity. Copland composed his piano trio Vitebsk in 1928, nine years before Bernstein’s 1937 Piano Trio. The piece is one of the only instances in which Copland deals with his Jewish heritage, a heritage which is prominent throughout the early works of Bernstein. Though Bernstein’s variation set Touches did not appear till 1981, fifty-one years past the appearance of Copland’s Piano Variations, the two composers’ piano sonatas appeared almost simultaneously in 1938 (Bernstein’s Sonata for the Piano) and 1939-41 (Copland’s Piano Sonata).

29 The Piano Trio is one of the earliest documented instances of Bernstein reusing musical material. Bernstein also references specific elements of Copland’s compositional process that
Kennedy Center Honors in 1979, Bernstein described him as “my first friend in New York, my master, my idol, my sage, my shrink, my guide, my counselor, my elder brother, [and] my beloved friend.”

Bernstein’s musical works are not only influenced by his mentors but they also reference or respond to situations and people of his time. Much of the historical lineage of his musical output stems from social motivations. Alex Ross describes Bernstein’s role in American musical nationalism as a “two-tiered conception, which acknowledges in equal measure music’s autonomy and its social function.” Bernstein’s piano music is an autobiographical resource as well as a synecdoche for twentieth-century American culture, as the following chapters will demonstrate. Every compositional lineage simultaneously illuminates his intellectual process and reveals a story about how Bernstein the man and composer was influenced by the world and culture surrounding him.


31 Alex Ross, The Rest is Noise: Listening to the Twentieth Century (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2007), 132-133. He goes on to describe why the use of “black music [jazz] fulfilled Bernstein’s demand for a ‘common American musical material.’”
Bernstein’s influence on the musical culture of the twentieth century was extensive. He served as the leading figurehead of American music, shaping the stature of classical music in America and abroad. Outside of being an influence on the perspective and politics surrounding music, he directly dictated the literal manifestation of music in New York. As director of the New York Philharmonic and as a worldwide maestro and educator, he was in direct control of which new works would receive premiers and recognition.

In 1939 Bernstein completed his Harvard dissertation entitled, “The Absorption of Race Elements into American Music.” In this document, Bernstein aims to prove that American music has no single folk music but, rather, it is an amalgamation of several folk musics of other cultures. I believe this study resulted from Bernstein feeling a deep sense of pessimism about the direction of music in the 1930s. In a letter dated March 23, 1938, Aaron Copland wrote the young nineteen-year-old Bernstein,

As for your general “disappointment” in Art, Man and Life I can only advise perspective, perspective, and yet more perspective. This is only 1938. Man has a long time to go. Art is quite young. Life has its own dialectic. Aren’t you always curious to see what tomorrow will bring? Of course, I understand exactly how you feel. At 21, in Paris, with Dada thumbing its nose at art, I had a spell of extreme disgust will all things human. What’s the use – it can’t last and it didn’t last. The next day comes, there are jobs to do, problems to solve, and one gets gradually inured to things.\(^\text{32}\)

\(^{32}\) Letter from Aaron Copland to Leonard Bernstein, 23 March 1938, 16/44, Leonard Bernstein Collection, Music Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
Bernstein did not directly associate himself with any of the current compositional schools of the early twentieth century. Even as late as 1978, Bernstein told interviewers that he felt the avant-garde composers of the twentieth century were firmly planted against him. However, Bernstein did absorb elements of every contemporary style. Though he chose not to exclusively identify himself with any given trend, he incorporated elements of several types of music. Often, he limited himself to a few elements as a compositional device, giving himself a select number of rhythms to utilize or pitches to use, for example. This compositional device takes from both the minimalist and set-theory movements. In line with the folk movement, he often referenced the music of his Jewish heritage or drew on elements of other cultures and religions. His works For Jessica Fleischmann and Sonata for Piano show elements of extended piano technique. His piece 5 Against 2 shows an interest in computer-generated music. Several of his works employ complex meters or are written without time signature.

Though there are several traces of twentieth-century compositional trends in his music, Bernstein was a neo-classicist to his core. Nearly every work of Bernstein has a traditional structure. A majority of his harmonic language has a basis in traditional functional harmony. Bernstein often uses cryptograms in reference to several of the composers he championed and lectured on, including J. S. Bach, Beethoven, and Schumann.

---

33 Leon Kirchner sent Bernstein a frustrated letter in September of the same year after seeing the interview. He was named as one of the avant-garde composers against Bernstein, a title he refuted. He calls Bernstein’s claim “shockingly opportunist and irresponsible.” Letter from Leon Kirchner to Leonard Bernstein, September 1978, 32/29, Leonard Bernstein Collection, Music Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

34 Pieces such as his Sonata for Piano directly use set-theory, building the full structure from limited pitch collections.
As a figurehead of American classical music, Bernstein had a significant role in United States politics. In line with composers, such as Pierre Boulez, Bernstein wrote frequently to the nation’s leaders. President Lyndon Johnson appointed Bernstein as a committee member for selecting the Presidential Scholars in the Arts in 1964. First lady Eleanor Roosevelt frequently wrote to Bernstein discussing monetary funding for important arts programs in the country. President John F. Kennedy wrote to Bernstein,

I am hopeful that this collaboration between government and the arts will continue and prosper. Mrs. Kennedy and I would be particularly interested in any suggestions you may have in the future about the possible contributions the national government might make to the arts in America.\textsuperscript{35}

Bernstein was also deeply involved with several other social and political movements in New York and around the world including the Black Panther Movement and the Berlin Wall.

As director of the New York Philharmonic, Bernstein largely dictated which new orchestral works made it to the public. Countless composers and performers wrote to Bernstein inquiring about performances of given scores, collaborations, or writings. Composers who wrote to Bernstein in this capacity include, but are not limited to, Gian Carlo Menotti, Johnny Mehegan, Alberto Ginastera, Benny Goodman, Henry Cowell, Karlheinz Stockhausen, Elliott Carter, Olivier Messiaen, and Dmitri Shostakovich. Composers understood Bernstein’s influence on their careers as composers, as illustrated by the frequent, at times desperate, correspondence

of some composers. Composers also acknowledged Bernstein’s advocacy for artists that had struggled to gain wide-spread recognition with the general public. Cowell wrote to Bernstein, “Your selection, performance, and discussion of the works of Ruggles, Riegger, and Becker was magnificent and you showed great courage.”

Not only did composers understand how Bernstein influenced their mark on twentieth-century culture through performances but they acknowledged the profound effect that Bernstein’s music had on their own compositional process. In the Leonard Bernstein Collection, there exists over a hundred letters to Bernstein that show notable composers acknowledging the profound influence Bernstein’s compositions had on their music. Some of these composers include John Corigliano, Chick Corea, Aaron Stern, Henry Cowell, Peter Maxwell Davies, Michael Jackson, Dizzy Gillespie, George Rochberg, Ned Rorem, Bright Sheng, and Frank Sinatra. The composers in this category range from popular music to conservatively classical. John Corigliano writes, “this [Mass] was the first piece I’ve heard in over five years that really excited me, made me want to write music… It’s so damned simple and yet does so much more than a thousand unimportant notes… Thank you for making music exciting again.” Aaron Stern writes, “You have made a lasting contribution to our culture as a composer, performer, teacher

36 Henry Cowell, Karlheinz Stockhausen, and Gian Carlo Menotti all sent numerous inquiries to Bernstein, over time becoming impatient or desperate in tone. These inquiries are cited from the Letters collection of the Leonard Bernstein Collection, Music Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., each composer’s correspondence found in his respective folder, titled by name.


and inspiration.”

Ned Rorem writes, “Bravo, dear Lenny, for making the whole music scene finally look more encouraging. No one in the world is more right for the job and it’s a good sign for America and for the world.”

Dizzy Gillespie writes, “Looking at you on Channel 2 today, I just discovered that the ‘beat’ is not in the ‘wave’ but in the ‘jerk’ of the wrists. Thanks for everything.”

George Rochberg defined Bernstein’s larger purpose as figurehead of American music by writing,

I’m prompted [to write] notably by my long-standing admiration for your achievements and high musicianship but also, even though we’ve never met, by the fact that our names are now being linked in regard to ideas on music which are surely basic to beginning to understand music as a unique and special form of human speech… There are very few of us who are consciously striving to maintain our culture and to revitalize its continuation and living contact between them becomes essential.

His search for American identity, which began roughly in 1938, was omnipresent in his compositional career, influencing composers to continue their own personal search for how they could promote and further American culture. Bernstein shaped America’s perspective on music

---


and built bridges between politics and art. Bernstein was one of the single most influential people in defining twentieth-century American culture in New York. Without Bernstein, it is questionable whether America would have as strong of a musical identity as it does today.
Chapter 1, Section I: Non Troppo Presto (1937) and On the Town (1944)

Following the premiere of Symphony No.1: Jeremiah on January 28, 1944, Jerome Robbins and Bernstein began the creation of what would become a sensational hit and a social critique, the musical On the Town. At age twenty-five, Bernstein had established himself in New York as a notable conductor, composer, and social commentator in the midst of the Second World War. Mark Horowitz points out that the show was politically and socially significant because of its focus on female characters, its equal presentation of black and white characters in societal roles, the casting of a Japanese-American in the premiere during the war years, and the use of Everett Lee as conductor, the first black conductor on Broadway. In relation to Bernstein’s affinity towards the piano, the show is also notable in its recycling of his 1937 solo piano work Non Troppo Presto.

43 Bernstein had successfully undergone his New York Philharmonic debut shortly before on November 14, 1943.

44 This information was presented in a lecture at Catholic University on October 24, 2011. Mark Horowitz is Library of Congress, Music Division, Senior Music Specialist. The political and social relevance of On the Town is wonderfully discussed in depth by Carol Oja, Bernstein Meets Broadway (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 83-221.
Non Troppo Presto was not published until January 6, 2011, previously being held exclusively as a manuscript in the Library of Congress.\textsuperscript{45} It is clear that the 1937 work is not just a sketch. Jack Gottlieb’s research led him to believe that this piece was \textit{Music for the Dance No.1}. Even though this assertion fits with the chronological progression of Bernstein’s manuscripts, it fails to take key attributes of Bernstein’s compositional style into account. The complete \textit{Non Troppo Presto}, in its published form, was composed on June 12, 1937, dated and signed by Bernstein with a dedication to Mildred.\textsuperscript{46} This complete work was preceded by another manuscript.\textsuperscript{47} This manuscript contains the same musical material as \textit{Non Troppo Presto} in a slightly less developed form.\textsuperscript{48} The work contains the tempo indication \textit{Presto} and is labeled \textit{III}, showing an obvious intention of inclusion within a set. The piece prior is labeled \textit{II. Interlude}.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{45} \textit{Non Troppo Presto} is a clear ternary solo piano character piece. It contains two outer sections that present straight running sixteenth-note passages above a staccato bass that mimics a passacaglia style, though it is not a literal passacaglia itself. The piece is coherently unified by its primary step-wise motive. In the \textit{A} sections, almost every strong beat exhibits a stepwise motive of a pitch rising a whole-step and descending back a whole-step to the initial pitch. Motivic variance is achieved in many measures of the opening section by using a half-step in place of the original whole-step. Bernstein uses the collocation of the whole-step motive with its half-step variant to create a larger structural narrative for the work. Further use of developing variation is achieved by using inversion and doubling. \textit{Non Troppo Presto}, 12 June 1937, 1066/21, Leonard Bernstein Collection, Music Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

\textsuperscript{46} Mildred Spiegel (later Zucker) was a dear friend of Bernstein’s throughout his entire life. Her large volume of letters to Bernstein (particularly in his college years) serves as one of the main sources of biographical material for the composer.

\textsuperscript{47} \textit{III. Presto}, unknown, 1076/1, Leonard Bernstein Collection, Music Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

\textsuperscript{48} The opening is only one measure long compared to the later three. It is a clear working score, as material is crossed off and shorthand notation is used. The handwriting is significantly less clean than Bernstein’s handwriting in finished scores. The work is missing pages.

\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Presto} is present only with this single piece, logically showing the absence of a first piece in the set.
In line with Gottlieb’s assertion, Bernstein performed a set entitled Two Pieces to be Danced (for Anna Sokolow) on December 21, 1937. I believe this set became Music for the Dance No. I, performed by Bernstein at a concert on June 12, 1938 because Music for the Dance No. I, like the set for Anna Sokolow, contains two pieces, Allegretto and Vivacissimo. If this is true, this would mean that Gottlieb assumed that Non Troppo Presto was Vivacissimo or Allegretto. However, this assumption goes contrary to a fundamental aspect of Bernstein’s compositional process. Bernstein rarely ever, in his entire compositional career, changed a tempo marking when he revised and revisited works. Though he might alter expressive markings or further specify tempo markings, he was consistent with the basic tempo of any given piece of music. Therefore, I believe that Non Troppo Presto was part of a larger set, possibly for chamber ensemble, but was not related to Music for the Dance No. I. My argument is further justified by the fact that the preceding II. Interlude indicates that it may be performed by cello and flute. Even if this was a rare exception of Bernstein modifying tempo, there is documentation of Bernstein performing Music for the Dance No. I as late as August 21, 1938. He would have programmed the set with corresponding tempo markings to match his 1937 finished manuscript. The music of Non Troppo Presto appeared in Act 1 of On the Town in the “Presentation of Miss Turnstiles” seven years later.

Though the piano work is not traditionally tonal, the work generally centers itself on C with hints of the major mode. This is achieved by consistency and repetition of at least one of the

50 I believe that the first piece of Seven Anniversaries, For Aaron Copland (1942) was perhaps Allegretto. It maintains the same tempo indication. The work was also the basis for the 1942 Partita for Piano, showcasing a collection of baroque dance piece for the piano.

51 The June 12, 1938 recital also included his Music for the Dance No. II, presenting the currently published set, excluding the Waltz Time piece. Music for the Dance No. II was composed in 1938.
pitches contained in a C Major triad on most strong metric pulses. The bassline contains clear harmonic implications to support this key area. In *On the Town*, Bernstein maintains the contrapuntal texture and key area of *Non Troppo Presto* but distills and clarifies the harmonic implications of the bassline by stripping away many of the chromatic pitches, selecting choice elements, and modifying metric emphasis. Bernstein used a piano in his orchestration. Even with the same timbre available and the same instrumental technical capabilities at his disposal, he intentionally chose to compositionally modify the music in this manner.

The orchestration of *On the Town* invites a reinterpretation of phrasing, dynamic markings, and articulation in the piano performance practice of *Non Troppo Presto*. *On the Town* only utilizes the A section of the piano work, eliminating the developing variation of the B section. Chapter 1. Section I. List 1 presents a list of possible reinterpretations for *Non Troppo Presto* based on the later indications in *On the Town*.

**Chapter 1. Section I. List 1**: List of Possible Reinterpretations for *Non Troppo Presto*

u = upper staff, l = lower staff

4: *mp* should be changed to *p*
4, 5, 6, 8, 10 u: add a phrase slur to each quarter beat, grouping every four 16\(^\text{th}\) notes
6 u: add accents to quarter-beat 1 and 3
6: *crescendo* may be eliminated
7, 9, 11, 12 u: the first 8\(^\text{th}\) note should be consistently accented, followed by a slurred group of two 16\(^\text{th}\) notes, followed by a phrase slur on each quarter beat, grouping every four 16\(^\text{th}\) notes for the remainder of the measure
7: add *subito mf* on the second 8\(^\text{th}\) note of the measure

---

8: add hairpin cresc. to the second half of the measure
9: eliminate cresc. and add f on the downbeat of the measure, followed by a subito mf on the second 8th note of the measure
10: eliminate hairpin descresc. for the first half of the measure and replace with a hairpin cresc.
11: the p should be replaced by a mf

From the pianist’s perspective, is not clear whether Non Troppo Presto should be metrically felt in one, two, or four. A metric feel in four is key to understanding the markings of Non Troppo Presto in a musically natural way. Though the time signature implies four, the placement of the primary motive compositionally implies a feeling of two. The left-hand is also beamed to imply a feeling of two in the work. In terms of harmonic phrasing (tracing the implied authentic cadences), the work could also be argued to be felt in one. On the Town shows that the right-hand passagework of Non Troppo Presto should be consistently felt in four. In observing the clarinet writing, the breath markings and alteration of player on every beat makes the ribbon of sixteenth notes have a very clear and audible feeling of four and creates a subtle internal dialogue between two instrumentalists. When Bernstein adds the strings to this material, the string writing does not implicitly demand the use of a matching bowing, but a corresponding bowing is still inherently natural for the violins, emphasizing this metric assertion. The pianist

---

53 Primary motive, Reference Footnote #3.
54 Each measure contains a complete harmonic cycle, implying an authentic cadence resolving on each downbeat.
55 I believe the violin doubling of the clarinets is only used for a dynamic, structural, and textural purpose as opposed to being an equal melodic partner to the clarinets. The clarinet texture is consistently maintained above the violins, maintaining the solid sense of four. Violins are only added to a single gesture within the section that requires a sense of excitement and dynamic buildup.
should consider performing *Non Troppo Presto* in a clear feeling of four, making an allowance for the right-hand material to function as a duet (mirroring the texture of the clarinets) compared to streamlined passagework.

In the context of the theater, Bernstein needed to be laboriously precise in his musical direction. As a result of plot development considerations, I would argue that the markings in the *On the Town* orchestration are more natural to performance, resulting in a more organic musical progression. The orchestral indications remedy some of the musically unspecific passages (i.e. mm. 4-5) in the earlier piano version. The reinterpretations elucidate the larger structure in a more organic way and allow for the motivic cohesion to have a greater developmental clarity and significance. The pianist should also use Bernstein’s distillation of harmonic motion presented in the bass line of *On the Town* to inform voicing and articulation decisions for the left hand.\(^{56}\)

As it is compositionally characteristic of Bernstein to use referential humor in his works, was Bernstein intentionally correlating Mildred Spiegel to “Miss Turnstiles” or was the recycling simply a matter of compositional convenience?\(^{57}\) Miss Subways was an iconic part of New York City culture from 1941-1976. Bernstein’s incorporation of Miss Subways into *On the Town* gave the work a distinct New York trademark. Years later, Betty Comden hypothesized that the

\(^{56}\) For example, the implied harmonic motion of dominant to tonic across the barline moving from m. 4 to m. 5 in *Non Troppo Presto* is validated by observing the strings and piano writing at Rehearsal O in “Miss Turnstiles” in *On the Town*. By eliminating many of the chromatic pitches in the LH of the piano work, the bass motion of a constantly repeating C, D, G simplifies the harmonic texture and makes an auditory understanding of V to I even more apparent.

\(^{57}\) One of the most palpable examples of referential humor is seen in Bernstein’s *Bridal Suite*, composed in 1960 for the wedding of his friend Adolph Green to his (third) wife Phyllis Newman. As Adolph was significantly older than his wife at the time of the marriage, Bernstein jokingly superimposes the famous tune “Just in Time” over J. S. Bach’s famous C Major Prelude in the “Prelude.” The “Prelude” also includes a reference to Strauss’s *Don Juan*, ending with the musical tag “and many more.”
musical had helped to inspire a significant shift in the diversity of Miss Subways’ contestants. She claimed that before the forties, “There were never any black Miss Subways, or Puerto Rican or Oriental or even Jewish. And of course, Sono Osato was a very exotic-looking girl. She would not have been a typical Miss Subways of that period.” 58 The contest inevitably took on a feminist role by providing a personal description of each candidate, focusing on the jobs, talents, and goals of every woman. I believe that it is likely that this musical reference was intentional, Bernstein jokingly framing Mildred as the stereotypical New York American “girl next door.”

Chapter 1, Section II: *Lamentation* (1939), *In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky* (1942), and *Symphony No. 1: Jeremiah* (1942)

Though it is common knowledge that the piano work *In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky* shares musical material with the “Lamentation” movement from Bernstein’s *Symphony No. 1: Jeremiah*, the accurate compositional dates and circumstances surrounding both works are often incorrect or not present at all. The factual historical dates presented in this chapter reveal potential issues in publication error and fundamental misunderstandings behind the significance and greater meaning of both works.

*Symphony No. 1* was first performed in 1944 with the Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra. Bernstein’s original program note unveils the compositional process and timeline of the works while commenting on their external sources for emotional reference and programmatic understanding.

---

59 A representation of this is the work of Sigrid Luther. Sigrid Luther, “The Anniversaries for Solo Piano by Leonard Bernstein,” (DMA diss., Louisiana State University, 1986). Not only is the death date of Nathalie misrepresented, but the order of compositional manifestations is merely hypothesized.
In the summer of 1939 I made a sketch for a “Lamentation” for soprano and orchestra. This sketch lay forgotten for two years, until in the spring of 1942 I began a first movement of a symphony. I then realized that this new movement, and the scherzo that I planned to follow it, made logical concomitants with the “Lamentation.” Thus the symphony came into being, with the “Lamentation” greatly changed, and the soprano supplanted by a mezzo-soprano. The work was finished on 31 December 1942 and is dedicated to my father… As for programmatic meanings, the intention is again not one of literalness, but of emotional quality…The movement (“Lamentation”), being a setting of poetic text, is naturally a more literary conception. It is the cry of Jeremiah, as he mourns his beloved Jerusalem, ruined, pillaged, and dishonored after his desperate efforts to save it. The text is from the book of Lamentations.\(^6\)

Bernstein claims that his initial sketch of *Lamentation* was not reused until the spring of 1942. Though Bernstein refers to the work as a sketch in this context, a letter sent from Bernstein to Aaron Copland on August 29, 1939 describes the piece as a finished work.\(^6\)

> I’ve just finished my Hebrew song for mezzo-soprano and orchestra. I think it’s my best score so far (not much choice). It was tremendous fun. Under separate cover, as they say, I’m sending the *Lamentation* for your dictum.

\(^6\) Leonard Bernstein, Program Note to *Symphony No. 1: Jeremiah (1944)*, (Wisconsin: Boosey & Hawkes, 1992).

\(^6\) The completion date on the manuscript reads August 25, 1939.
Please look at it sort of carefully, it actually means much to me. Of course, no one will ever sing it, it’s too hard, and who wants to learn all those funny words? Eventually the song will become one of a group, or a movement of a symphony for voice and orchestra, or the opening of a cantata or opera, unless you give a very bad verdict.\textsuperscript{62}

There is a clear distinction between a sketch and an independent work that is part of a larger whole. Furthermore, there is a distinction between a work intended to be part of a larger group and a work that is merely included in a larger collection for the sake of longevity and performance. In this case, \textit{Lamentation} was conceived as an independent work that would be used as a part of a larger set merely for likelihood of performance.

\textit{In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky}, which also shares a substantial amount of the musical material found in the final third movement “Lamentation” of \textit{Symphony No.1}, was composed on January 14, 1942.\textsuperscript{63} The published version of \textit{Seven Anniversaries} was not finalized until around 1943. The anniversary set went through two significant versions before the final published rendering. One version was a set originally entitled \textit{Partita for Piano} and contained five Baroque dance pieces. \textit{In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky} was included in this 1942 set as \textit{Sarabande (in memoriam of N.K.)}. In the same year, the piece was included in a set


\textsuperscript{63} This is the accurate date provided on the manuscript in the Library of Congress. The published version incorrectly labels Nathalie Koussevitzky’s death as January 15, 1942 and the compositional date as 1943. Nathalie died on January 11, 1942 and the work was composed in the three days following her death.
entitled *Six Piano Pieces*.\textsuperscript{64} I believe that conceiving the work as a sarabande is highly informative to a convincing performance of *In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky* in relation to tempo, character, and style.

Bernstein needed to finish *Symphony No.1* quickly. In 1942, he ended his formal studies at Curtis and moved to New York City to pursue the next chapter of his career. In an effort to help facilitate that process, he entered a composition competition at the New England Conservatory for which he intended to submit his *Symphony No.1*. Testimony of his close friends and the fact that Bernstein finished the completed work on December 31, 1942 (the final deadline for the competition) prove that there was a significant time crunch imposed on the completion of the symphony.

Bernstein decided to enter his *Jeremiah Symphony* into a competition organized by the New England Conservatory, for which his Tanglewood conducting mentor Serge Koussevitzky was serving as chairman of the jury. He made significant changes to his song sketch, shifting the vocal part to mezzo-soprano, and in a frantic burst of activity, he worked around the clock to complete the entire symphony before the December 31, 1942 deadline. Bernstein enlisted his sister Shirley and friends David Diamond and David Oppenheim to help with copying and proofreading, and his roommate Edys Merrill hand-delivered the score to Koussevitzky's Boston home on New Year's Eve. He did not win the

\textsuperscript{64} Though it is clear that the January 14 manuscript is the initial manifestation of the music, it is uncertain whether *Partita for Piano* or *Six Piano Pieces* came first. The edits on *Six Piano Pieces* may indicate that it is the earlier of the collections.
competition, but his *Jeremiah Symphony* would nonetheless bring him
great success.\(^{65}\)

Therefore, as Bernstein composed the symphony for the competition, he looked back at
earlier compositions to expand and complete a three-movement symphony in the time available.

*Lamentation* (1939) does not include material found in *In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky*.
The final version of the *Symphony No.1* “greatly changed” *Lamentation* by combining music
from *Lamentation* with the already completed *In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky*. Perhaps
Bernstein added the musical material of *In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky* to the movement
“Lamentation” to not only save time, but to also catch the emotional attention of Maestro
Koussevitzky.

When Bernstein recycles the musical material of *In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky* in
*Symphony No. 1*, he transposes the music up by whole step but maintains the original rhythms.
The piano scores and the score to *Symphony No. 1* are carefully notated with articulation and
phrase markings, yet these markings are often inconsistent.\(^{66}\) The variance of these markings is
important to performance practice, as the textural simplicity of the music pronounces every
nuance, significantly changing the emotional and linguistic output of any given phrase. After the
vocal opening of the third movement (m. 59), Bernstein presents the exact musical material of
the first twelve measures of *In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky*. The music is presented by the

\(^{65}\) Leonard Bernstein Office, “Symphony No.1: Jeremiah (1942),” Accessed June 7, 2017,

\(^{66}\) The three piano scores are virtually identical except for some very small differences. Both
1942 versions contain a slur connecting m. 10 first beat to third beat. The score from *Six Piano
Pieces* also contains a tenuto mark on the second beat of m. 11 and the indication *con pedale* in
the B material.
woodwinds for eight bars and then given to the strings for the remaining four bars. These twelve bars constitute only the initial opening A section of the piano work.\textsuperscript{67} Even taking the issue of breath/bow markings into account for this section, the music is still inconsistent in phrasing.

\textbf{Chapter 1. Section II. List 1} presents a list of possible reinterpretations to \textit{In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky} based on the indications found in \textit{Symphony No.1}.

\textbf{Chapter 1. Section II. List 1: A List of Reinterpreted Musical Indications for the A Section of In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky (using mm. 58-70 of Symphony No.1)}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{u} = upper staff, \textit{l} = lower staff
\item 1 \textit{u}: eliminate current slur. add slur connecting top B5 to C#5 on the downbeat of following measure
\item 1,2: eliminate hairpin \textit{descresc.} mark
\item 2 \textit{u}: eliminate current slur. add slur connecting top B5 to C#5 on the downbeat of the following measure
\item 3 \textit{l}: eliminate current slur. add slur connecting first quarter beat to third quarter beat
\item 3,4 \textit{l}: on third beat, tie F#4 to an added quarter note F#4 on the downbeat of the following measure. this spacing choice would omit the current D4, eliminating the doubling and providing a 4-note simultaneity.
\item 4 \textit{u}: add tenuto mark to first quarter note. eliminate current slur. add slur connecting second beat D5-E5. add slur connecting second beat G4-A4.
\item 4 \textit{l}: add tie connecting first beat B3-B3. add tie connecting second beat E4-E4.
\item 4: add hairpin \textit{cresc.} beginning on the second beat, ending at the downbeat of the following measure
\item 5 \textit{u}: add slur connecting C5-A5
\item 5: eliminate hairpin \textit{cresc.}
\item 6: add \textit{p} marking on the downbeat. add \textit{poco} next to hairpin
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{67} \textit{In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky} is a basic ternary form \textbf{ABA’}. 
6 l: add slur connecting A3-B3. add slur connecting F#4-E4
7,8: add *decrese*.
8: *p* replaces *pp*. (suggested retention of the *teneramente* to mirror the timbre change of woodwind-strings)
10 u: eliminate current slurs in lower voice on second and third quarter beats. add slur connecting lower voice second beat B5-A4
10 l: add slur connecting first beat A#4-G#4. add tie connecting second beat C#4-C#4. add slur connecting third beat to the downbeat of the following measure
11 u: add slur connecting second beat A4 to the downbeat of the following measure. lower voice F#4 on second beat modified to dotted quarter note, melodically related to the top voice of lower staff. *mp* replaces *p*
11 l: B3 added and held in conjunction with written G3
12 u: add slur connecting D5 to downbeat of the following measure

In the A section of *In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky*, the pianist is expected to vary the restatement of material only using dynamics and the indication *teneramente*. Symphony No. 1 does not utilize either of these indications from the piano score. Rather, the change is employed through orchestration and phrasing. Woodwind timbre is used for the first statement and string timbre for the restatement. The phrasing of the first statement slurs over the barline whereas the second statement mirrors the piano writing in rearticulating each downbeat, emphasized by the indicated bow markings.

It is important to consider the large number of ties in *Symphony No. 1*. Re-striking a pitch on the keyboard can be intentional to reiterate and enhance the harmonic interplay on each beat. However, reinterpreting the piano score with some of these ties could help create further
independence of each line. It is easy for the pianist to interpret the left hand of the score as purely harmonic and accompanimental to the melodic material of the right hand. However, in the orchestral score, Bernstein takes great care to emphasize the melodic independence of each line, making the music into a contrapuntal quartet. This is maintained in both the woodwind and string appearances, as each of the four parts is played by a separate performer. I would argue that some of the ties and longer slur markings presented in Symphony No.1 could greatly benefit the independence of line in the piano work and help to lengthen the contrapuntal tension and melodic line.

After a return to further vocal material, Bernstein again presents the material from In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky (m. 107), this time as a nearly complete rendition of the piano work without transposition. Again, small yet significant changes of phrasing and articulation appear. In addition, this presentation emphasizes the musical progression of the piece by thickening and thinning the orchestration to highlight the emotional structure of the music.

Chapter 1. Section II. List 2 presents a list of potential reinterpretations that can be considered in connection with this full representation of In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky.

---

68 The piano work is not slow enough to merit a repetition of attack on these notes. This contends with the argument that the sustained notes are solely a matter of instrumentation. The latter ties are a change in voice leading independence, not a matter of pitch sustain.

69 Mm. 13-16 of In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky (the beginning of the B section) are substituted by three measures of alternate, but similar, material.
Chapter 1. Section II. List 2: Ending of *Symphony No.1: Jeremiah* (Second Appearance of Nearly Full Presentation of *In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky* beginning m.107) – Possible Reinterpretations to the Piano Score.

u = upper staff, l = lower staff

1 l: eliminate slur markings that connect the final beat to the downbeat of the following measure
1: eliminate the hairpin *descresc.* mark
2 l, u: add a tenuto mark to the first note
3 l: beam all upper notes as an individual voice independent from the bottom notes. in the bottom voice, replace the current slur with a slur from downbeat E3-A3. in the upper voice, tie the final F#4 to another added quarter note F#4 on the following downbeat
4 u: add tenuto mark on first quarter note. eliminate current slur. add slur connecting second beat D5-E5. add slur connecting second beat G4-A4
4 l: add a tie from downbeat B3-B3. add a tie from second beat E4-E4.
6 l: add tie connecting B3-B3. slur connecting F#4-E4
7 l: add tenuto marks on every quarter note F#4
8: *p* replaces *pp.* (suggested retention of the *teneramente* to mirror the timbre change of solo strings-tutti con sord)
10 l: add slur connecting quarter beat two and three
11 u: F#4 on second beat modified to dotted quarter note, melodically related to the top voice of lower staff. add slur connecting second beat A4 to consecutive D5
11: eliminate hairpin and *p* markings
11 l: add tenuto marking on first chord. B3 added and held in conjunction with written G3
12: eliminate hairpin
17 l: eliminate slur from third 8\textsuperscript{th}-note F3-F#3
17 u: add tenuto marking to last 8\textsuperscript{th}-note chord
18 l, u: eliminate slur markings on the second half of the measure
19 l, u: add tenuto markings to downbeat dotted quarter notes. eliminate slur markings on the second half of the measure
20 l, u: add tenuto markings to downbeat quarter note, third and fourth 8\textsuperscript{th}-notes, and final quarter note. eliminate slur on second quarter beat.
20: eliminate rit.
21: eliminate sub. p. add hairpin descresc. on downbeat (indicating natural decay of the instrument). change third beat pp to p
22 u: add tenuto to first chord. add slur connecting top B5 to C5 on following downbeat
23 u: add indication mp solo to the melodic line beginning on the third beat in the lower voice

This second presentation of In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky material in Symphony No.1 again creates independence of line for the lower melodic material using ties. I believe the piano score could arguably be reinterpreted with many of these ties, as they show a development in notational clarity. They highlight a musical aim that is implied in the piano score but is not as clearly notated. The tenuto markings are used to better convey the weight, affect, pacing, and tone of the musical material. Therefore, in performing the B section of the piano work, the pianist should not be overly gestured and should, rather, have a sense of weight on each new harmony though the music necessitates a forward momentum.

Though In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky clearly states a rit. at m. 20, I argue that the artist should find a middle ground between this indication and that of Symphony No.1 to ensure a full arrival on the B Major harmonic climax. Allowing the energy to dissipate before the fermata creates an anticlimactic arrival and fails to set up the ending of the work.

I believe that all existing versions of the music present in In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky share a common musical aim. The chronological compositional development shows a furthering and refinement in Bernstein’s markings as he lived with the music. With
orchestration, Bernstein was forced to delve into specificity. Individual performers are only given parts, without the ability to visualize a full score in performance. The specificity in markings is necessary for performers to come together as an orchestral section and as a full ensemble. *Seven Anniversaries* is published with the compositional date of 1943. Bernstein did not revisit or revise the score *In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky* after completion of *Symphony No. 1*. I believe this is mostly a result of limited time. It is possible that the 1942 *Partita for Piano* and *Six Piano Pieces* were alternative versions of collections Bernstein proposed for publication, while under the deadline of the *Symphony No. 1*, before finalizing on the anniversary collection.

Though the articulation and phrasing of the earlier piano scores is modified and refined, the musical structure and content is maintained. All other chapters that explore the recycling of earlier piano works into later orchestral manifestations will demonstrate this same compositional trademark.
Chapter 1, Section III: For Aaron (1942) and Age of Anxiety (1949/1965)\textsuperscript{70}

The August 1942 solo piano work For Aaron exists in an unpublished score at the Library of Congress Leonard Bernstein Collection. The work is dedicated to Aaron Copland. This work was composed the same year as Partita for Piano which included what is now published as For Aaron Copland.\textsuperscript{71} For this reason, I believe this work was withheld from publication to avoid a duplicate dedication. For Aaron is in an ABCB’C’ form. In line with Bernstein’s compositional process explored in the previous sections, the B material is used nearly in its entirety in the finale of Age of Anxiety.\textsuperscript{72} Only the arpeggiated triad gestures of the A and C material are recycled along with the opening P4 gesture that begins B and B’.\textsuperscript{73} For this reason, the original larger structure of For Aaron is not maintained.

The modification of the meter from an eighth-note to a quarter-note pulse creates structural cohesion with the rest of Age of Anxiety. It also provides more visual clarity for the orchestra. Though most of the musical material is kept the same when Bernstein recycles the B material into Age of Anxiety, slight specificities regarding notation and musical direction are added to the material. Chapter 1. Section III. List 1 shows possible reinterpretations to For Aaron based on the notation present in Age of Anxiety.

\textsuperscript{70} Age of Anxiety was revised in 1965. The most substantial changes were to the Finale. The analysis discussed in relation to the Epilogue is based on the 1965 version, not the 1949 rendition. Bernstein notes, “I am now satisfied that the work is in its final form,” regarding his changes to the structure of the piece in 1965. Leonard Bernstein, Notes to Age of Anxiety (Wisconsin: Boosey & Hawkes, 1966).

\textsuperscript{71} For the historical lineage of the Seven Anniversaries reference Chapter 1 Section II.

\textsuperscript{72} Epilogue: Rehearsal D-F (full B material with modification) and Rehearsal H-I (without the final 4 measures of B).

\textsuperscript{73} Epilogue: Rehearsal G and piano cadenza (A gestures), Rehearsal J until Fine (B and B’ opening gesture).
Chapter 1. Section III. List 1: Possible Reinterpretations to For Aaron B Material Based on the Notation of Age of Anxiety

u = upper staff, l = lower staff

5 l: add tenuto mark to C4
6: change $^2_8$ to $^3_8$ and eliminate the breath mark, adding a dot to the quarter note instead
7 l: add tenuto mark to C4
8 l: add tenuto mark to E4
9 l: add tenuto mark to E4
10 u: eliminate current slur. add slur connecting downbeat F#5-G5. add slur connecting second F#5-E5
10 l: add tenuto markings on both E4 pitches and F#4. add slur connecting second E4-F#4
10: add hairpin cresc. on the first two 8\textsuperscript{th}-note beats. add mf and a hairpin cresc. beginning on the third 8\textsuperscript{th}-note beat, ending with f on the final quarter-note of the measure
11: add indication tenderly. eliminate hairpin cresc.
12: add indication mp and a hairpin cresc. in replacement of the hairpin descresc. on the final quarter-note beat of the measure

Another recycling of an earlier work is present in the opening bars of the first movement of Age of Anxiety. The duet recycles music from a piano manuscript dating before 1937,

---

\textsuperscript{74} Based on both Rehearsal D-F and Rehearsal H. Age of Anxiety repeats the m. 7 gesture and adds embellishments to mm. 8, 9, 10, and 12. These additions are done to correlate the musical material to earlier parts of the concerto and, therefore, are not relevant to understanding specificities regarding the piano material. They are not discussed since they relate to contextual structural relevance and do not illuminate inherent traits of the original musical material.

\textsuperscript{75} Though the instrumentation is not clear, the work is included in this paper with the aim of being comprehensive.
entitled *Interlude.* The division of phrase groups and time signatures are modified. *Age of Anxiety* breaks up the originally continuous duet into smaller phrase units. **Chapter 1. Section 3.**

**List 2** lists these possible phrase units to be recognized in the performance of *Interlude. Age of Anxiety* never changes from its initial \( \frac{4}{4} \) time-signature, slightly altering the metric pulse and note duration of the musical material in *Interlude. Interlude* originally presented sections in \( \frac{3}{4} \) and \( \frac{5}{4} \).

The musical material of the earlier piano work is, again, used almost in full.

**Chapter 1. Section III. List 2: Consideration for Smaller Phrase Units in *Interlude* Based on the Divisions in *Age of Anxiety***

I. Add slur connecting m. 1 to the third beat of m. 3  
II. Add slur connecting the fourth beat of m. 3 to the third beat of m. 7  
III. Maintain slur connecting the fourth beat of m. 7 to the final beat of m. 12  
IV. Add slur connecting m. 13 to the third beat of m. 14  
V. Add slur connecting m. 15 to the final beat of m. 16  
VI. Add slur connecting m. 17 to the second eighth note of the upper staff in m. 19  
VII. Add slur connecting the second beat of m. 19 to the downbeat of m. 22

*Interlude* originally indicates that the score may be played by cello and flute. This would indicate a different color and articulation for the pianist in each independent voice, treating sustain and breathing appropriately. In the presentation in *Age of Anxiety*, Bernstein modifies his orchestration to a clarinet duo. A duet of the same timbre adds unification of color and articulation but ambiguity of independence to each voice. The pianist should consider matching

---

76 A more complete reference to this piece is present in Chapter 1, Section I.

77 Pitches are also modified. This issue, like the embellishments added to the **B** material, is related to structural cohesion, not to inherent traits of the original material.
the articulation, color, and phrasing of both voices while still maintaining the independent shaping of each line.
Chapter 1, Section IV: *For Susanna Kyle* (1949) and “Prelude to Act II” *Peter Pan* (1950)

In 1942, Betty Comden married Steven Kyle with whom she mothered two children, one of whom is Susanna Kyle, who was born July 24, 1949. In celebration of her birth, Bernstein composed *For Susanna Kyle*, currently published as the last of the *Five Anniversaries*. This publication placement is curious in that all the other *Five Anniversaries* are included in *Serenade after Plato’s “Symposium.”* Though *Five Anniversaries* went through different versions for publication, *For Susanna Kyle* was consistently included within the collection.

Perhaps the sole reason for *For Susanna Kyle* being the only piece in the collection to not be included in *Serenade* is that the piano work was already recycled as an introduction to Act II in *Peter Pan* in 1950, four years before *Serenade*. *Peter Pan* has an ambiguous publication and compositional history. A final revised version of the work was completed through a collaboration of Alexander Frey, Garth Edwin Sunderland, and Scott Eyerly. It includes several previously unpublished or forgotten works of Bernstein. According to Garth Edwin Sunderland, this most current comprehensive manifestation “reflects the most thorough incorporation of the music into the play, and for the first time presents it in an accurate and comprehensive orchestral full score.” However, it is difficult to delineate the actual orchestrator, editor, and playwright in much of the score. Changes, edits, and orchestrations were done by Sid Ramin, Garth Edwin Sunderland, Trude Rittman, and Alec Wilder. The composition of *Peter Pan* was done somewhat

---

78 Betty Comden was born Elizabeth Cohen on May 3, 1917. Betty Comden, lyricist, is most remembered for her partnership with Adolph Green on several collaborative hits with Bernstein, including *On the Town*, *Wonderful Town*, and *Peter Pan*.

79 This was undertaken more than fifty years after its initial performance in 1950.

in fragments as Bernstein would send sections and pieces by mail to quickly be added to the full score. Bernstein’s clean handwritten introduction to Act II has no corrections and appears to be a literal copy job of the original *For Susanna Kyle* (which does show Bernstein’s edits to the original score). Sunderland also states, “This *Peter Pan* is not a musical – Bernstein did not structure a musical/dramatic totality as he did for other stage works, and was not a direct collaborator on the production… Many curious changes were made to the score after it left Bernstein’s hands.”

Similar to *In Memoriam: Nathalie Koussevitzky*, *For Susanna Kyle* was used in *Peter Pan* due to lack of time. However, *Peter Pan* cannot accurately inform the performance of *For Susanna Kyle* as the authorship of the orchestration cannot be validated.

---

81 Ibid.
CHAPTER 2: SEVERAL PARTS TO A LARGER WHOLE

Chapter 2, Section I: *Five Anniversaries* and *Serenade after Plato’s “Symposium”* (1954)

The *Serenade after Plato’s “Symposium”* was completed in 1954. Its appearance was accompanied with a statement by Bernstein.

There is no literal program for this *Serenade*, despite the fact that it resulted from a re-reading of Plato’s charming dialogue, “The Symposium.” The music, like the dialogue, is a series of related statements in praise of love, and generally follows the Platonic form through the succession of speakers at the banquet. The “relatedness” of the movements does not depend on common thematic material, but rather on a system whereby each movement evolves out of elements in the preceding one… Aristophanes does not play the role of clown in this dialogue, but instead that of the bedtime story-teller, invoking the fairy-tale mythology of love.\(^{82}\)

Aside from the statements regarding musical character, it is most important to focus on Bernstein’s idea of evolution within the music. The *Serenade* contains complete manifestations of four of the currently published *Five Anniversaries*, believed to be composed over the span of 1949-51.\(^{83}\) Therefore, is Bernstein acknowledging, by transitive property, that the *Five Anniversaries*, though not thematically related, are related by some element(s)?

---

\(^{82}\) Leonard Bernstein, Notes to *Serenade after Plato’s Symposium* (Wisconsin: Boosey & Hawkes, 1965).

\(^{83}\) The fifth piece *For Susanna Kyle* in the set of *Five Anniversaries* was used as the introduction to Act II of *Peter Pan*, as discussed in the previous section. *Serenade* also includes an unpublished piece from the first edition of *Five Anniversaries* entitled *For Sandy Gellhorn*. The exact composition date of each piano work in the collection cannot be exactly determined.
There is no clear indication that these piano pieces are intended to be played in succession. Many scholars, including Luther Sigrid, Jack Gottlieb, A. T. McDonald, and L. J. Lehrman have taken varying approaches to understanding the potential programmatic and musical correlations between *Five Anniversaries* and *Serenade*. Primarily using comparative and analytical analysis, these studies have a retrospective approach, imposing programmatic elements of *Serenade* onto the earlier piano works. However, the copyist’s manuscript of the *Five Anniversaries* at the Library of Congress shows that the set went through at least two significant versions, one in 1960 and another in 1964. The 1960 version, with an enclosed letter from G. Schirmer, is substantially different from the published version (1964) used by most scholars. *For Elizabeth B. Ehrman* was, originally, not present in the collection. There was

---

84 This issue is raised in the following correspondence: Jack Gottlieb to Luther Sigrid, June 9, 1986. Gottlieb claims that the pieces can/ have been performed individually and as sets.


87 The letter dates from 1966, informing Bernstein to destroy the 1960 originals as the collection published in 1964 is significantly different.
another work entitled *For Sandy Gellhorn* that never made it to publication. The current published *For Sandy Gellhorn* was originally entitled *For Martha Gellhorn Matthews*.  

I believe the collection was changed as a result of the 1963 divorce of Martha Gellhorn from her husband. Bernstein wished to eliminate the dedication to her married name. Therefore, he chose to keep the music but change the dedication to her son Sandy. He deleted the other piece dedicated to Sandy to avoid redundancy. In order to achieve the demand for five works in the collection, Bernstein added *For Elizabeth B. Ehrman* to the final collection, completing the current version published today. In short, the published collection is lacking a complete piano work that was composed in connection with these other works. It also includes a work that was originally not composed in connection with the collection. These discrepancies make some of the prior investigations into thematic relation questionable. My research reveals that music of the original *For Sandy Gellhorn* is used in the “Socrates; Alcibiades” movement of *Serenade*, a fact overlooked by many previous scholars.

The piano collection has inherent musical and compositional ties that can be more clearly understood from an analysis of their usage in *Serenade*. I believe that previous analysis done on the collection using the *Symposium* as a programmatic guide is largely speculative and subjective. Based on the historical interchanging and manipulation of the piano set, I do not

---


89 Though official documentation has not yet been found, I speculate that this piece was composed in 1954 for the wedding of Martha Gellhorn to Mr. Matthews.

90 One could argue that Bernstein could have kept the original pieces and further changed the dedications. I believe that Bernstein used the circumstance to replace the original *For Sandy Gellhorn* with a piece that is stronger pianistically. *For Elizabeth B. Ehrman* is more idiomatic for the instrument than the early *For Sandy Gellhorn*. 
believe that the piano works were conceived to be performed in a particular order. From the piano works preceding *Serenade*, Bernstein could select particular musical material to fit the character of *Serenade*’s given plot. Even though most of the piano works preceded *Serenade*, the official published collections of the *Five Anniversaries* appeared after *Serenade*, dating from 1960 and 1964. Therefore, the notation and orchestration of *Serenade* should be seen as both a refinement of former piano material and as a predecessor to the published collection.⁹¹

*Serenade* includes manifestations of *For Elizabeth Rudolf, For Lukas Foss, For Elizabeth B. Ehrman, For Sandy Gellhorn* (the original), and *For Sandy Gellhorn* (the published work, formerly entitled *For Martha Gellhorn Matthews*). The work is essentially a violin concerto and is built from five varying movements: 1) Phaedrus; Pausanias 2) Aristophanes 3) Erixymathus 4) Agathon and 5) Socrates; Alcibiades. Of relevance to this study are the movements “Phaedrus; Pausanias,” “Aristophanes,” and “Socrates; Alcibiades.” While exploring the relatedness of these movements, I will address critical issues regarding articulation, phrasing, notation, and character.

---

⁹¹ All manuscripts included in the original 1960 Schirmer edition have distinct red pencil markings that indicate their titles and placement for inclusion in the set. All manuscripts associated with both the 1960 and the 1964 version have annotations in blue pencil. The markings in blue pencil do not coincide with the published piano scores nor do they consistently match with the orchestral versions of the musical material. I am continuing to trace the markings in blue pencil to more accurately define the compositional dates of all works involved, as well as any remaining issues of revision that may be understood from this lineage.
i. “Phaedrus; Pausanias” and *For Sandy Gellhorn* (the published work, formerly entitled *For Martha Gellhorn Matthews*).

The orchestral version of the musical material shared with *For Sandy Gellhorn* autonomizes individual variations of the piano work. A developing variation form, the structural outline of the 1964 *For Sandy Gellhorn* is [Gesture (m. 1-4)- Var. I (m. 5-14)- Var. II (m. 15-25)- Var. III (m. 16-32)- Codetta (m. 33-44)]. All sections are delineated in the piano score by fermatas, followed by an abrupt change in texture. The 1960 version of the piece, *For Martha Gellhorn Matthews*, had an additional Var. IV and additional coda. This eliminated musical material does not appear in *Serenade* and will, therefore, only be mentioned. In terms of informing performance practice of the 1964 version, the pianist should consider reincorporating grace notes a step below the dotted half notes in m. 33 and m. 36 from the 1960 version. In *Serenade*, the 1964 version of *For Sandy Gellhorn* is never fully presented in its original structure. The piano version sounds through-composed, as the piece is essentially a developing variation form on a gesture. The isolation of independent variations within the orchestration gives the pianist a clear indication of the boundaries for each correlating section within the piano...
score. The newly composed material in *Serenade*, that is used to connect these variations, provides further insight as to how the variations musically relate.

“Phaedrus; Pausanias” is in sonata form with the omission of a development section and does not contain any musical material from *For Sandy Gellhorn*’s Variation III and codetta.\(^9^2\)

The second theme of the movement (rehearsal I-N) mirrors the structure of *For Sandy Gellhorn*. Gesture (rehearsal J mm. 1-6), Var. 1 and 1’ (rehearsal J mm. 7-12 and rehearsal L mm. 1-8), and Var. 2 (rehearsal M mm. 1-9) of the Second Theme (B section) utilize the same or similar musical material to Gesture, Variation I, and Variation II in the piano work. Developing variation plays a substantial role in the musical development of both *For Sandy Gellhorn* and *Serenade*, a compositional process Jack Gottlieb also describes as “thematic concatenation.”\(^9^3\)

**Chapter 2. Section I. Figure 1** presents a structural outline of “Phaedrus; Pausanias,” showing how the corresponding structural components of *For Sandy Gellhorn* fit within the larger orchestral movement. The differences between Gesture, Var. 1, and Var. 2 in “Phaedrus; Pausanias” and Gesture, Variation I, and Variation II in *For Sandy Gellhorn* inform issues of articulation, phrasing, and metric clarity in the performance of *For Sandy Gellhorn*.

---

\(^9^2\) The development is likely omitted due to the already developmental nature of the musical material.

Chapter 2. Section I. Figure 1: Structural Outline of “Phaedrus; Pausanias”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>SUBSECTION</th>
<th>MUSICAL MATERIAL USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction: Lento</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accumulation of strings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Beginning – Rehearsal E m. 5</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Theme: Allegro (A)</td>
<td><em>Rehearsal E m. 5 – Rehearsal I</em></td>
<td>Four-note main motive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Theme: Dolce (B)</td>
<td><em>Rehearsal I – Rehearsal N</em></td>
<td>Includes development of four-note motive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Theme: Allegro (A’)</td>
<td><em>Rehearsal N – Rehearsal Q</em></td>
<td>Fuller orchestration of A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Theme: Dolce (B)</td>
<td><em>Rehearsal Q – Rehearsal V</em></td>
<td>Includes development of four-note motive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codetta</td>
<td><em>Rehearsal V - End</em></td>
<td>All thematic material included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most significant differences between *For Sandy Gellhorn* and “Phaedrus; Pausanias” are the changing of the sixteenth-note pickups into grace notes, the alteration of the time-signature, and the punctuated notes for metric emphasis present in the added accompaniment of “Phaedrus; Pausanias.” The only time that the notated pickup notes present in *For Sandy Gellhorn* are used in “Phaedrus; Pausanias” is in Var. 2 by both the solo violin and the orchestra. Aside from Var. 2, the solo violin substitutes grace notes for all pickup notes. I believe Bernstein differentiated the articulations in “Phaedrus; Pausanias” to provide a whimsical and light freedom to Var. 1 to more clearly contrast a calculated and weighty Var. 2. The weightiness of
Var. 2 is further intensified by a lack of staccato markings or rests, instead using a dotted note value before each notated pickup. Though *For Sandy Gellhorn* also omits staccato markings in Var. 2, the rhythm of Var. 1 remains constant, including the original sixteenth rests. The difference of notation in “Phaedrus; Pausanias” provides a further clarity and polarization of character between sections that is only slightly implied by the notation of *For Sandy Gellhorn*. 

The time signatures differ from quarter note values in *For Sandy Gellhorn* (\(\frac{2}{2}\) and \(\frac{3}{4}\)) to eighth note values in “Phaedrus; Pausanias” (\(\frac{2}{4}\) and \(\frac{3}{8}\)). This change allows the B section in the violin concerto to easily transition to and from the A section material, as the A section and Introduction are related by a 2:1 ratio, employing eighth notes as the common beat. Therefore, I see this change as one of merely contextual convenience. I believe that both Var. I and Var. II of *For Sandy Gellhorn* could benefit from using the time signature (\(\frac{2}{2} + \frac{3}{4}\)). The equivalent was used in Var. 2 of “Phaedrus; Pausanias” to clearly delineate the phrasing in contrast to the First Theme’s \(\frac{3}{8} + \frac{2}{4}\) phrasing.

Though there is no current proof as to the exact chronology of these works, I hypothesize that *For Sandy Gellhorn* post-dates Serenade. Therefore, I believe the use of notated pickup notes in the piano work was done for pianism and notational clarity. If Bernstein had kept the grace note notation, the upper notes would likely not have the intended articulation, the correct melodic quality, or rhythmic consistency on the piano.\(^94\)

\(^{94}\) Further justification for this post-dating is demonstrated by the fact that the original manuscript of *For Martha Gellhorn Matthews* presents grace notes in the codetta, showing an intentionality behind the sixteenth-note pickups in the earlier sections.
ii. “Aristophanes” and *For Elizabeth Rudolf* and *For Lukas Foss*

Both *For Elizabeth Rudolf* and *For Lukas Foss* are present in all versions of *Five Anniversaries*, giving these works a historical relatedness. The manuscripts of both piano works contain sketches of further *Serenade* material, showing that the works were likely composed prior to *Serenade*. In *Serenade*, Bernstein creates a simultaneous micro- and macro-ternary structure. **Chapter 2. Section I. Figure 2** demonstrates how each piano work becomes part of a macro-ternary form while maintaining a micro-ternary structure.

**Chapter 2. Section I. Figure 2**: Macro- and Micro-Ternary Structures in “Aristophanes”

**Structural Outline for *For Elizabeth Rudolf***

```
| a | b | a' | Coda (b') |
```

**Structural Outline for *For Lukas Foss***

```
| c | d | c' |
```

Structural Outline for “Aristophanes,” the Macro-Ternary Structure

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[a b a' coda (b') ]</td>
<td>[c d c']</td>
<td>[a a']</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CODA (A+B)
```

---

95 *For Elizabeth Rudolf*: a (mm. 1-16), b (mm. 17-46), a’ (mm. 47-55), codad (mm. 56-69)

*For Lukas Foss*: c (mm. 1-16), d (mm. 17-32), c' (mm. 33-54)

“Aristophanes”: A [a (mm.1-16), b (mm. 17-46), a’ (mm. 47-55), coda (mm. 56-65)], B [c (mm. 66-82), d (mm. 83-88), c’ (mm. 89-99)], A [a (mm. 100-117), a’ (mm. 118-137)], codad [(mm. 138-end)]
A noticeable change to the micro-structure is the absence of the b section within the recap of the A section. Bernstein presents a coda at the end, combining material from both For Elizabeth Rudolf and For Lukas Foss. For Elizabeth Rudolf is published immediately preceding For Lukas Foss in Five Anniversaries, mirroring the order of musical material in “Aristophanes.” I believe Bernstein intended this order for these two works. This belief is supported by the Serenade sketches present on the manuscripts.

The modifications to articulation, phrasing, pitch, rhythm, dynamics, and expressive markings present in “Aristophanes” show a clarification of notation from the earlier piano works.

**Chapter 2. Section I. List 1** lists considerations for the performance of For Elizabeth Rudolf based on the notation of “Aristophanes.” **Chapter 2. Section I. List 2** lists considerations for the performance of For Lukas Foss based on the notation of “Aristophanes.”

**Chapter 2. Section I. List 1**: Considerations for the Performance of For Elizabeth Rudolf Based on “Aristophanes”

l = lower staff, u = upper staff
* = gestural or motivic reference to other anniversaries present in Serenade
** = note discrepancy

1 l: add staccato to first note. eliminate current slur. add grace note C4 to the second beat*. add slur connecting second beat to the downbeat of the following measure
3 u: add grace note B4 to second beat
3 l: add grace note C4 to modified second beat B2**. add slur connecting B2 to the downbeat of the following measure

---

96 A sketch for the coda can be seen on the bottom of the For Lukas Foss manuscript.

97 Though the differences in note additions and discrepancies can be subject to argument, the musical structure and character that is highlighted by Bernstein’s articulations, dynamics, and expressive markings are objectively necessary for an accurate reading of the musical material in both instrumental mediums.
6 u: add grace note B4 to the second beat
6 l: add marcato marking to second beat
7 l: add marcato marking to first beat
7 u: add marcato markings to both second beat eighth notes
8: add expressive marking *warmly*
8 u: add marcato markings to both present simultaneities
9 u: end slur marking from m. 8 on downbeat. add slur connecting second beat to
downbeat of the following measure. add marcato marking to the first beat. modify
current A4 of the second beat to B4**
10 l: possible alteration of first beat to a quarter note
10 u: second beat slur breaks on the final eighth note of the measure and begins again
on the downbeat of m. 11
12 u,l: slur beginning on m. 11 break on second beat
13 l: add slur beginning on the first beat and ending on the second beat of m. 14
13 u: add slur connecting C#5 to B5
14 u: add slur connecting A4 to D5. modify current E4 to a quarter note followed by an
added quarter rest.
15 u: eliminate current slur. add slur connecting G#4 to A#4
15 l: eliminate current slur. add slur connecting C#3 to B2
16 u: add trill on current D#4
16 l: add slur connecting A#2 to B2
17: add *una corda*
17 l: add staccato to first note. eliminate current slur. add grace note C#3 to the second
beat*. add slur connecting second beat to the downbeat of the following measure
18 u: add grace note B#4 to the second beat
18 l: add grace note C#3 to the second beat
21 l: add marcato marking to first beat
22 l: add staccato marking to first beat. add grace note C#3 to the second beat. add
marcato marking to the second beat
22 u: add grace note B#4 to the second beat lower voices.
23 u: slur beginning in m. 22 ends on second beat.
24 u: add slur connecting D#5 to the downbeat of the following measure.
24 l: add staccato marking to the second beat.
25 u: add marcato marking to the second beat.
25 l: add grace note B#2 to the first beat. add a staccato marking to the first beat. add a marcato marking to the second beat.
26 u: add marcato marking to the second beat
27: add hairpin descresc. from first to second beat
28 u: slur beginning on the second beat of m. 26 ends on the first beat. add a slur beginning on the second beat to end on the downbeat of m. 30.
28: add hairpin descresc. from the second beat to the first beat of the following measure
30: add hairpin descresc. from first to second beat
31 l: add marcato marking to the second beat
32 l: add marcato marking to the second beat
32 u: add grace note B#4 to the second beat lower voices
33 u: add breath mark between the first and second beat
34 l: add marcato marking to the second beat
36 u: end slur beginning on the second beat of m. 35 on the second beat
37 u: add slur beginning on the first beat until the downbeat of the following measure
37: add hairpin cresc. from the second beat to the first beat of the following measure
40: substitute f for mf
40 u: modify second beat D#6 to eighth note followed by 8th-note G#5**
41: pp should appear on the first beat
42 u: C#6 should continue to be held until m. 45 first beat. add grace note B#5 to the second beat lower voices
45: add grace note B#5 to the second beat lower voices. move upper held C#6 to B#5 on the second beat, to be held until m. 47 downbeat
46: substitute pp for mf
47 u: end slur on the second simultaneity
48 u: add slur from second beat to the downbeat of the following measure
49 u: second beat slur ends on the final 8th-note of the measure
50 u: add slur on first beat to end on the downbeat of m. 51. add marcato markings to both simultaneities
50 l: slur ends on the second beat of the measure
51 l: add slur connecting F#3 to G3
51 u: add marcato marking to the second beat
52 u: add slur connecting C#5 to B4. add slur connecting G#4 to the downbeat of the following measure
52 l: second beat G2 transposed up an octave to G3
52: omit dim. marking
53 u: add slur connecting top voice A4 to D5. add hairpin descresc. from first to second beat
53 l: substitute half note F#3 for current pitches
54 u: add slur connecting G#4 to A#4
55 u: add trills to both B3 and D#4

The addition of grace notes in the A section of “Aristophanes” is an example of an “evolving element,” relating to the grace notes present in the musical material of For Sandy Gellhorn, present in the prior movement “Phaedrus; Pausanias.” In observing the markings present in “Aristophanes,” the longer phrase markings of For Elizabeth Rudolf are often replaced by shorter slurs in preference for a clarification of beat and gesture. The effects of given gestures are often more specifically notated in “Aristophanes.” Bernstein adds hairpin decrescendi to the accompaniment material beneath the main melody of the b section. These markings emphasize the individuality and ‘strong to weak’ characterization of each slur gesture. The added trills that resolve each a section allow Bernstein to more clearly articulate the cadences.

The published version of For Elizabeth Rudolf virtually matches its original manuscript though the original manuscript lacks some of the slur markings present in the left-hand accompaniment of the published score.
Chapter 2. Section I. List 2: Considerations for the Performance of For Lukas Foss Based on “Aristophanes”

l = lower staff, u = upper staff

1: add expressive marking *singing* to both voices
6 u: end slur on second D5
7 u: eliminate longer slur. add a slur connecting A-flat4 to G5. add slur connecting F5 to E-flat5. add slur connecting D-flat5 to C5
9 u: eliminate longer slur. add a slur connecting A-flat4 to G5. add slur connecting F5 to E-flat5. add slur connecting D-flat5 to C5
10 u: eliminate longer slur. add slur connecting A-flat4 to G4. eliminate slur from the final 8th-note to the downbeat of the following measure
11-16 u: sustain lower F4 and B4 until the pitches are reiterated. repeat for every presentation of the pitches within this section
11-16 l: add slight accent markings to every C2 and D3 (beginning of each slur)
12 u: eliminate longer slur. add slur connecting second 8th-note B4 to third 8th-note G5. add slur connecting fourth 8th-note B4 to third beat G5.
13 u: eliminate longer slur beginning on the final 8th-note of the measure. add slur connecting final 8th-note B4 to following downbeat G5. add slur connecting second 8th-note B4 to second beat G5
17: substitute *mp* for *pp*. add articulation indication *ma non troppo secco*
22 u: add accent marking on third 8th-note B octave
22 l: add accent marking on third beat D# octave
24 u: add accent marking to second beat A5
25 u: add accent marking to third beat A5. begin hairpin *cresc.* on the final 8th-note beat of the measure to be continued until the second beat of m. 26
26 u: add accent marking to second beat D6
26 l: add hairpin *cresc.* from second to third beat. add accent marking to third beat D3
27-28 u, l: including the 8th-note pickup to m. 27, add a marcato accent marking on every octave
29 l: add staccato markings on all notes, excluding the first 8th-note
29 u: add staccato marking on third beat G-flat5
30 u: add staccato marking on all 8\textsuperscript{th}-notes. add marcato markings on the final 8\textsuperscript{th}-note of the measure and the downbeat of the following measure.

30 l: add accent marking on third beat C-flat3

32 u: add a marcato marking to the second beat G-flat5

32 l: add a slur to the final C3 quarter note connecting to an added B-double-flat2 8\textsuperscript{th}-note of the downbeat of the following measure

33 l: transpose A-flat2 up an octave and add a marcato marking. transpose B-double-flat2 up an octave and add a marcato marking

34 l: transpose C3 up an octave. eliminate longer slur. add slur connecting C4-F3. add slur connecting A-flat3 to D-flat3. add marcato markings on C4 and A-flat3

35 l: add marcato markings on C3 and C#4.

35 u: eliminate slur beginning on the final 8\textsuperscript{th}-note. add a marcato marking to the final 8\textsuperscript{th}-note

36 u: add a slur connecting D-flat2 to C4. add a marcato marking to A4. add expressive marking \textit{piu espressivo} to the final 8\textsuperscript{th}-note of the measure

36 l: eliminate longer slur. add a marcato marking to C4. add a slur connecting D-flat3 to C3. add a marcato marking to A3

37 l: add marcato markings to both E-flat3 pitches

37 u: eliminate longer slur marking beginning on the final 8\textsuperscript{th}-note

38 u: add slur connecting F5 to E-flat5. add a marcato marking to A4

38 l: eliminate longer slur marking. add a marcato marking to E-flat4. add slur connecting F4-C4. add slur connecting C#4 to the downbeat of the following measure. add a hairpin \textit{cresc.} beginning on the final 8\textsuperscript{th}-note to the downbeat of the following measure

39 u: eliminate longer slur. add slur connecting A4-A5. add slur connecting G#5-E5. add slur connecting D5-C#5. add hairpin \textit{cresc.} from the second 8\textsuperscript{th}-note to the third beat. add \textit{f} on the third beat

41 l: add marcato markings on all dotted quarter notes

41 u: eliminate longer slur. add slur connecting A4-A5. add slur connecting G#5-E5. add slur connecting D5-C#5
The articulation between *For Lukas Foss* and “Aristophanes” differs significantly in the sections. Bernstein uses articulation and dynamic variance in *For Lukas Foss* in order to clarify the independence of each line in the texture. This variance is unneeded in “Aristophanes,” as Bernstein is able to achieve the same desired independence with instrumentation and timbre. In observing the markings present in “Aristophanes,” the longer phrase markings of *For Lukas Foss* are often replaced by shorter slurs in preference for a clarification of beat and gesture. The
texture of the d section in “Aristophanes” is more marked and accented, with an indication to not play overly staccato. The performer of For Lukas Foss should prioritize gestural and metric clarity.

The longer phrase markings presented in the published score of For Lukas Foss can also be viewed as a further expansion of notation from Serenade. The original manuscript of For Lukas Foss completely lacks articulation in certain passages. Considering that the final version of For Lukas Foss was published post-Serenade, I believe that some of the longer phrase markings could be an intentional lengthening of phrase from “Aristophanes,” using the orchestration as an influence on the piano work.

In Bernstein’s corrections to his published full score of Serenade, he questions the clarity of his time signature marking in the piano score, 4\(^\text{+3} / 4\). Interpreting his corrective markings on the score, he appears to believe that 4\(^\text{+3} / 4\) insinuates a 7\(^4\) time-signature, leading him to modify the time signature to C \( + \frac{3}{4} \) in “Aristophanes.” Though the published For Lukas Foss maintains the same notation as its original manuscript, I believe that the pianist should consider C \( + \frac{3}{4} \) as the more accurate time signature for the piece. Visualizing C \( + \frac{3}{4} \) subconsciously creates an independence of the \( \frac{3}{4} \) measures which, in turn, highlights the differing melodic contour.
iii. “Socrates; Alcibiades” and For Elizabeth B. Ehrman and For Sandy Gellhorn (the original)

The movement “Socrates; Alcibiades” contains two nearly complete presentations of the musical material from For Elizabeth B. Ehrman. Similar to the other pieces in Five Anniversaries, For Elizabeth B. Ehrman is in a ternary form. The structure is A (1[m. 1-5] – 2 [m. 5-9] – 1’[m. 10-13]) – B (3 [m. 14-21] – 4 [m. 22-31]) – A’ (2 [m. 32-35] – 1’[m. 36-42]).

All numerical labels represent structurally significant subsections of the larger ternary form. For Elizabeth B. Ehrman was not added to the Five Anniversaries set until around 1964. The original manuscript of the piece suggests that it was composed after Serenade, as Bernstein’s handwriting shows a cutting of material originally present in “Socrates; Alcibiades.”

“Socrates; Alcibiades” differs from the ternary structure of For Elizabeth B. Ehrman slightly by subsequently presenting subsections 1 and 2 in the A section twice, once with the orchestra and once with the soloist. The movement also eliminates the subsection 1’ in the A’ section, substituting newly composed music. By identifying what musical material from For

---

98 The date of composition is my personal speculation. I found that the manuscript, in keeping with Bernstein’s general handwriting trends, was very clean and free of error, indicating that the piano manuscript was copied from another source. As the musical material matched that of “Socrates; Alcibiades,” I believe the source was Serenade. In order to rule out the possibility of the work being copied from an earlier missing piano manuscript, which would open up the possibility of the piano manifestation pre-dating Serenade, this investigation is ongoing.

99 This difference in structure is one of the pieces of evidence that indicates that For Elizabeth B. Ehrman post-dates Serenade. The manuscript of For Elizabeth B. Ehrman indicates that Bernstein wanted to subsequently present subsections 1 and 2 in the A section twice in the piano score. The notation is completely clean with no signs of revision. The manuscript shows that he chose to cross out the repetition for the final piano manifestation with a simple X; Leonard Bernstein, Serenade after Plato’s “Symposium.” (Wisconsin: Boosey & Hawkes, 1988), 71-73 and 88-89.

100 Leonard Bernstein, Serenade after Plato’s “Symposium,” (Wisconsin: Boosey & Hawkes, 1988), 75 and 92.
Elizabeth B. Ehrman is used as transitionary rather than foundational material in “Socrates; Alcibiades,” the function of the music in its keyboard context can be more clearly understood. Bernstein’s notation in “Socrates; Alcibiades” can inform the interpretation of For Elizabeth B. Ehrman since the musical material of the piano work was taken from the orchestral movement.

Chapter 2. Section I. List 3 lists possible interpretations of For Elizabeth B. Ehrman based on the notation found in “Socrates; Alcibiades.”

Chapter 2. Section I. List 3: Possible Reinterpretations of For Elizabeth B. Ehrman Based on “Socrates; Alcibiades.”

l = lower staff, u = upper staff

1 u: consider eliminating all slurs and playing every 16th-note with an added accent marking in f. consider maintaining current markings with an additional slur over the last three notes of the measure. performer may choose to not modify this measure.
2 u: add an accent marking on D5
2 l: add an accent marking to the octave
3 u: add a slur marking connecting the final two notes of the measure
5 u: add a slur connecting the C5 to the following B-flat4. modify the marcato marking on the fourth 16th-note to an accent marking. add a staccato marking on the final note of the measure
5 l: add marcato markings on the first and fourth 16th-notes
6 u: add a slur connecting the C5 to the following B-flat4. modify the marcato marking on the fourth 16th-note to an accent marking. add a staccato marking on the final note of the measure
6 l: add marcato markings on the first and fourth 16th-notes
7 u: modify the marcato marking on the first note to an accent marking. add staccato markings to the final two notes of the measure. add a slur connecting the final two 16th-notes of the measure
7 l: eliminate accent markings. add marcato markings on the first and fourth 
16th-notes
8 u: modify all marcato markings to accent markings
8 l: eliminate accent markings. add marcato markings on the first and fourth 
16th-notes
9 u: modify the marcato marking on the first note to an accent marking. add a 
staccato marking to the third 16th-note. add staccato markings to the final two 
notes of the measure. add a slur connecting the final two 16th-notes of the 
measure
9 l: eliminate accent markings. add marcato markings on the first and fourth 
16th-notes
10 u: eliminate slur marking and all staccato markings. add an accent marking 
to every note. add a hairpin des cresc. to the second half of the measure
11 u: eliminate slur marking. add accent markings to both notes.
11 l: replace dynamic marking f with mf
12 u: eliminate slur marking. add a slur marking beginning on the first note 
lasting till G4 on the following measure
14-21 l: consider adding a canonic stretto with the presented gesture entering on 
every half measure, ending the downbeat of m. 22
14 u: add slur connecting B-flat4 to B-flat5
16 u: modify rhythm to be three equal 8th-note values. add a slur connecting A5- 
F#5
17 u: add slur connecting B-flat4 to the A5 of the following measure 
19 u: add slur connecting the final B-flat5 to the G5 of the following measure 
20 u: add slur connecting the final three notes of the measure 
22 u: add slur connecting the final two notes of the measure 
23 u: add slur connecting first two notes of the measure. eliminate current slur 
on the second half of the measure
24 u: add slur connecting B4-C5
26 u: add slur connecting B4-C5
The original *For Sandy Gellhorn* was used as an interlude in the movement “Socrates; Alcibiades.” Nearly the entire piece is presented in the interlude, maintaining the original duality of key signature. The texture of the work is kept to two canonic voices, one presented by the solo violin and the other by solo cello. “Socrates; Alcibiades” modifies a significant amount of articulation, phrasing, and pacing. Though the exact composition date of *For Sandy Gellhorn* is unknown, I believe the date present on the score, April 23, 1951, approximates the year of

---

101 There are a few small modifications to duration and pitch. These changes are minimal and insignificant to comparative analysis.
composition. The music of “Socrates; Alcibiades” furthers this assertion, as its modifications serve to refine and clarify the musical material of For Sandy Gellhorn. Chapter 2. Section I.

List 4 lists possible reinterpretations to For Sandy Gellhorn based on the compositional modifications of “Socrates; Alcibiades.”

Chapter 2. Section I. List 4: Possible Reinterpretations to For Sandy Gellhorn Based on Compositional Modifications of “Socrates; Alcibiades.”

u = upper staff, l = lower staff

3 u: add a tempo on the downbeat. Slur beginning on final 8th-note of the measure should last until the D5 of the following measure
3 l: add marcato markings on all notes
4 u: add slur connecting B5 to the following G5. add marcato markings to 16th-notes G5, A5, B-flat5. add a tempo beginning on the fourth beat of the measure
4 l: add poco string. on the downbeat of the measure, lasting till the fourth beat. add a tempo to the fourth beat of the measure. add marcato markings to all notes
5 u: add marcato markings to the first four 16th-notes. modify accel. to poco rall.
6 u: add ff beginning on the third beat. add marcato markings on all notes in the second half of the measure
6 l: add a hairpin crescendo to the fourth beat of the measure. add marcato markings to all 16th-notes in the measure

102 I believe the date on the score is not intended to be a birthdate (like the other anniversary pieces), as Sandy was adopted by Martha in Italy in 1949. The original manuscript has the writing “For Sandy Gellhorn. Happy Birthday.” The date April 23, 1951 was written on the score in Bernstein’s later edits around 1960. Bernstein circles 1951 with a question mark, possibly showing that he was retrospectively approximating Sandy’s birthday, possibly using his own compositional timeline as a reference.
7: add marcato markings to all notes in the first beat. add hairpin crescendo to the fourth beat of the measure.
8: modify slur beginning on D6 to end on following B-flat5. add riten. to the first beat. add accel. to the fourth beat. modify slur beginning on fourth beat G5 to end on the final note of the measure.
8: eliminate slur beginning on third beat F#4. add slur connecting third beat A4 to the 16th-note G4.
9: add a tempo to the downbeat.
9: eliminate all current slurs. add slur connecting second beat A4-G4. add slur connecting G3-A3. add slur connecting B3-C#4.
10: add slur connecting third beat F6 to E-flat6. add movendo to the first beat.
10: eliminate current marcato markings. add slur connecting F#4-D4. add slur connecting fourth beat B3-F#4. add a hairpin crescendo to the fourth beat.
11: eliminate all marcato markings. add slur connecting second beat E-flat6-C6. correct * current 16th-notes on the third beat to 32nd-notes. add slur connecting third beat A5-D6. add slur connecting fourth beat E-flat6 to A5. add cresc. beginning on the third beat.
11: add slur connecting the first and second 16th-notes. add slur connecting the third and fourth 16th-notes. add marcato markings to all notes in the first beat. add slur connecting third beat F#4-B3. add slur connecting the fourth beat C#4-G4.

*misprint to published score

The modifications to articulation and phrase markings in “Socrates; Alcibiades” are intended to maintain the character contrast between the music preceding and following the pp sub. By exclusively using marcato markings prior to the pp sub. and legato markings after, Bernstein refines the structure and consistency of the musical material. The phrase markings also
help to clarify metric beats at thicker moments in the texture. The modifications to tempo and pacing have a practical use in unifying the two solo instruments. They also serve to create more gradual climaxes and to punctuate specific moments of arrival in the musical material. Reinterpreting *For Sandy Gellhorn* with these suggestions clarifies phrasing, creates a further independence of line between the two voices, and provides a more organic structure.

iv. Implications Regarding Compositional Approach

*Serenade* reveals invaluable information about Bernstein’s compositional process. I believe *For Elizabeth Rudolf, For Lukas Foss, and For Sandy Gellhorn* (original) have composition dates preceding *Serenade*, meaning that the musical material was recycled and modified in the orchestration process. In all of these cases, nearly the complete piano works are used in *Serenade*. The pitches and note values are generally maintained while the dynamics, phrasing, and articulations are modified to clarify structure, meter, and character. As Bernstein lives with his musical material, the music does not drastically change but his notation matures and refines his musical vision.

I believe both *For Sandy Gellhorn* (published) and *For Elizabeth B. Ehrman* post-date *Serenade*, meaning that both piano works were taken from the musical material of the violin concerto and were modified to be more idiomatic for the piano. Unlike the piano works pre-dating *Serenade*, only portions of these later piano works are present in the concerto. Often, pitches, durations, and textures significantly differ between the piano and orchestral versions of the music. Essentially, Bernstein uses musical material from an orchestral piece to inspire a keyboard work but significantly modifies the structure to function on a smaller scale and modifies the durations and articulations to be more pianistic. The difference in compositional
process between moving from piano to orchestra versus orchestra to piano is fundamental to understanding Bernstein’s compositional approach.
Chapter 2, Section II: Sabras, Cesarina Riso (1950s), Ilana (1950s), and Candide (1956)

Ilana: The Dreamer (Ilana) from Leonard Bernstein’s collection of Four Sabras, is used as foundational compositional material in Candide.\textsuperscript{103} The Four Sabras are ambiguous in regards to exact compositional date. A work by the name of Cesarina Riso, found in the same box of the Leonard Bernstein Collection, shares almost identical musical material with Ilana. Based on the contextual evidence of the archive, I believe that both Ilana and Cesarina Riso come from the 1950s, Cesarina Riso acting as the original version. Cesarina Riso was likely conceived as an anniversary prior to its final inclusion in the Four Sabras.\textsuperscript{104} The only differences between Ilana and Cesarina Riso are in the dynamic markings. Chapter 2. Section II. List 1 lists the dynamic differences between the two piano scores.

Chapter 2. Section II. List 1: Differences in Dynamic Marking Between Ilana and Cesarina Riso

\begin{itemize}
\item C = Cesarina Riso, I = Ilana
\item 4: C (third beat \textit{p}) I (no indication)
\item 5: C (no new indication) I (third beat hairpin cresc.)
\item 6: C (no new indication) I (\textit{mp} on downbeat/third beat \textit{p})
\item 13: C (\textit{mf} on downbeat)* I (\textit{mp} on downbeat)
\item 15: C (\textit{mp} on downbeat) I (\textit{mf} on downbeat/hairpin descresc. on final two beats)
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{103} The title page of the original manuscript reads Six Sabras. Jack Gottlieb believes that they were never composed. Jack Gottlieb, “Four Sabras,” liner notes to Leonard Bernstein: A Jewish Legacy, Jack Gottlieb, piano (Naxos/Milken Archive CD 94072, 1993). There exist three published versions of Candide. The New York City Opera House version comes from 1982, the Scottish Opera version from 1988, and the Concert version from 1989, rev.1993. The latter two versions are virtually identical, leading those scores to be the most recent, valid, and important reference points for the orchestration.

\textsuperscript{104} Cesarina was the owner of the Villa Riso and was an active touring concert pianist. Her most notable concerts were in the 1950s, including a performance with Bernstein conducting. The anniversary likely marks a fondness Bernstein had towards his collaborator.
18: C (no indication) I (hairpin cresc and descresc)

*Interestingly, this indication is more closely aligned to the f marking in Candide, even though Bernstein modified the dynamic to be softer in Ilana.

The musical material of Ilana is recycled in three separate scenes of Candide, “Candide’s Lament,” “Paris Waltz Scene,” and “Quartet Finale.” The recycled theme from Ilana is referred to as the “Cunegonde theme” by John Mauceri. Bernstein’s development of the “Cunegonde theme” addresses issues of voicing, color, articulation, and phrasing present in the earlier solo piano work.

“Candide’s Lament” is the only scene in Candide to include all themes and motives from Ilana. The scene begins (mm. 1-13) with an instrumental introduction comprised of two statements of Ilana’s closing theme. The closing theme is presented with a chordal accompaniment, showing it to be an independent melodic line. In Ilana, the closing theme is not used until the coda and is presented in dialogue with the main theme. This dialogue makes it unclear whether the main theme is still the primary voice with the closing theme as accompaniment or whether the “new” material of the closing theme becomes of an equal principal melodic focus. This question can only be speculated upon in Ilana, which fails to give concrete evidence to a particular interpretation. The orchestration of “Candide’s Lament” indicates that, in the coda, the closing theme and main theme are of equal melodic importance.

------------------------


106 Ilana is structurally one large period, consisting of a parallel antecedent and consequent phrase, and ending with a coda. The coda presents a new “closing theme” that appears in dialogue with the main theme that begins each A phrase. A–A’–CODA

107 The accompaniment of “Candide’s Lament” is comprised of string pulsation off-beats. This texture is reminiscent of the second movement of Bernstein’s Piano Sonata which presents a melody above a similar undercurrent of pulsating off-beats.
In “Candide’s Lament,” the bassoon is used exclusively for accompaniment material whereas the flute and voice are used primarily for main melodic voices until m. 35. At this point, the bassoon plays the main theme in dialogue with the closing theme, played by both flute and voice. As the main theme is played by a purely accompaniment instrument and the closing theme by a purely soloistic instruments, the orchestration indicates that the coda presents the closing theme as the primary voice with the main theme serving as accompaniment. This same device is seen in m. 47 of “Candide’s Lament” when the cello takes over the main theme in dialogue with the closing theme. The cello, until m. 47, has also only functioned as accompaniment up until this point. Furthermore, the character Candide sings all thematic material, including the closing theme. This implies that all thematic material within the piece inherently has a melodic or vocal character. In performing Ilana, the pianist should provide all thematic material with an appropriate voicing and soloistic singing tone, taking care to voice the closing theme as an equal primary melodic line in the coda.

An exact appearance of the original structure of Ilana is presented in mm. 20-40 of “Candide’s Lament.” The antecedent statement of the main theme shadows Candide’s vocal line with two flutes, while the bass movement is played by bass clarinet and punctuated by bassoon. Bernstein modifies the orchestration at the harmonic shifts on the downbeats of m. 25 and m. 27, illuminating the harmonies by the addition of harp and bassoon. The bassoon is added to enhance the crescendo and to quickly change the color of the sound as it develops while the harp punctuates the chord upon arrival. Therefore, Bernstein’s markings on the corresponding harmonies in Ilana at m. 6 and m. 8 indicate a change in color, not just simply phrasing and articulation.
Bernstein’s orchestration also informs the structure and character of the music. In the consequence of the main theme, the only indicated musical variation in Ilana is that the theme is presented an octave higher. “Candide’s Lament” completely changes orchestration for the restatement of the theme, suggesting that the pianist should provide a different color and sound to the consequent phrase of Ilana. Ilana exclusively presents all thematic material in major. “Candide’s Lament” juxtaposes the thematic material in minor (mm. 1-19), providing a depth of character. The upward leaping gesture of the main theme paired with the plot and tonal context presented in “Candide’s Lament” shows the theme to have an aspect of longing, a character that is difficult to grasp from the piano score alone.

The instrumentation of “Candide’s Lament” also clarifies matters of articulation and phrasing. The breathing instructions given to the flutes in the antecedent phrase at m. 23 specify no breath plus a crescendo. In contrast, Ilana presents a crescendo in m. 4 that appears to only last one beat, a tenuto marking, and a two-measure slur. I believe these markings can easily be misconstrued as solely a climax on the tenuto note, disrupting the motion of the phrase. “Candide’s Lament” clearly indicates that the crescendo lasts until the following downbeat and that the motion of the phrase continues until the end of the slur. The breath mark presented in m. 25 of “Candide’s Lament” indicates that the following two measures are distinctly independent and reflective as the music makes a diminuendo. Ilana, lacking any breath indication, provides a subito p in m. 6. The slight amount of time required to achieve the subito creates a similar effect to that of a breath mark but does not afford the same amount of poignancy and structural clarity.

Essentially, the slurs of Ilana can be ambiguous to the pianist, as there is no differentiation between markings intended for inflection, articulation, or duration of phrase. The slurs and markings of Ilana work contrary to the melodic motion and often result in a disruption
of the intended vocal inflection. I believe the most accurate performance of the piano work will rely on the text of Candide to inform the phrasing and melodic motion of the right hand. Vocal performance combines the unique ability to perform long melodic lines with forward motion (from the breathing) while simultaneously highlighting sub-phrases within the larger period (diction, consonant emphasis, etc.). Though it is clear that Bernstein initially intended to have this duality of long line and finesse of sub-phrasing within Ilana, this dualism is difficult to accurately depict in keyboard writing. Observing how the woodwinds, strings, and voice achieve this duality in “Candide’s Lament” helps inform the pianist of specificity in phrasing.

Chapter 2. Section II. List 2 presents a list of reinterpretations to Ilana based on the markings used in “Candide’s Lament.”

Chapter 2. Section II. List 2: Reinterpretations to Ilana Based on the Markings of “Candide’s Lament”

u = upper staff, l = lower staff

4 u: eliminate tenuto marking. substitute hairpin crescendo with a crescendo indication to last until the downbeat of the following measure
12 u: eliminate tenuto marking. substitute hairpin crescendo with a crescendo indication. eliminate the slur beginning on the third beat of the measure. add a slur connecting the final two 8th-notes of the measure
13 u: add a slur connecting the first two 8th-notes of the measure. substitute the mp dynamic for a f. add a slur connecting the last two 8th-notes of the measure
13 l: eliminate slur

Mm. 4-5 of Ilana illustrate Bernstein notating sub-phrasing within a longer two-measure phrase, as exemplified by the simultaneous slur markings.
14 u: add a slur connecting the first two quarter notes of the measure. add a hairpin \textit{descrescendo} for the first two beats of the measure. (option: add slur connecting the final two 8\textsuperscript{th}-notes of the measure if option for 15u is utilized)
15 u: add a marcato mark on the first note. (option: add slur connecting the first two quarter notes)
16: add \textit{rallentando} indication for the last quarter beat of the measure
16 u: end slur on the final 8\textsuperscript{th}-note of the measure

The comparative analysis of \textit{Ilana} to its full recycling in “Candide’s Lament” clarifies the duality of long phrasing and sub-phrasing within the piano work while also elucidating nuances in voicing and color. In “Candide’s Lament,” the vocal part is entirely void of notation and can only be analyzed for phrasing nuance using the inherent attributes of the text.\textsuperscript{109} The A’ phrase is sung by the soprano character Cunegonde, marking a clear structural repeat of A for the listener and achieving the effect the transposition up an octave in \textit{Ilana} aimed to grasp. The following two instances of recycling within \textit{Candide} demonstrate a different type of recycling as the musical material of \textit{Ilana} is used more generally than literally.

The “Paris Waltz Scene” utilizes the parallel phrases of \textit{Ilana} but excludes the closing theme entirely, as well as the coda. The key and time-signatures are maintained. However, Bernstein implements rhythmic augmentation, expanding each gesture to double value as well as making significant changes to articulation. The strong rhythmic pulsation on every three beats in

\textsuperscript{109} The text of “Candide’s Lament” reads, “Conegonde! Conegonde! Conegonde! Conegonde, is it true? Is it you so still and cold, love? Could our young joys, just begun, Not outlast the dying sun? When such brightness dies so soon Can the heart find strength to bear it? Shall I ever be consoled, love? No, I swear it By the light of this lover’s moon. Though I must see tomorrow’s dawn, My heart is gone where you are gone. Shall I ever be consoled, love? No, I swear it By the light of this lover’s moon. Goodbye, my love, my love, goodbye. Goodbye, my love, my love, my love, goodbye.” To understand the inherent nuances of phrasing requires a more in-depth discussion about the breathing and diction practices of this English text. As this matter of vocal coaching is not concretely objective analysis, I will only mention its relevance to the melody for this study.
partnership with this augmented melodic phrase gives an entirely different musical structure to the same musical material present in *Ilana*. In the first notated slur of *Ilana*, it is musically natural to give a slight weight to the downbeat of the first measure. The tenuto mark written on m. 2 indicates the final note of the primary musical gesture.\textsuperscript{110} Though the primary gesture is augmented to span four measures, the same two metric points in the gesture are emphasized in “Paris Waltz Scene” by accentuation and the waltz meter. I believe the metric emphasis of “Paris Waltz Scene” to be crucial to interpreting the score of *Ilana*.

The first informative discrepancy pertains to the primary gesture of the music. *Ilana* presents two even eighth notes that appear to function as a slurred pickup to the first downbeat. “Paris Waltz Scene” prolongs the first note, providing a higher rhythmic energy and stronger articulated weight on the following downbeat. The melodic material of *Ilana* has metric weight only on the downbeat of each measure. When only prioritizing the downbeat of each measure, the melody sounds in a slow two, emphasized by the phrasing of the bass. The varied rhythm of “Paris Waltz Scene” alternates which beat receives the metric weight in each measure. This is a fundamentally different interpretation and sound for the musical material. Prioritizing both the first and third beat results in the melodic material feeling securely in six. If this metric interpretation in six is applied to *Ilana*, the ear is drawn away from the larger phrase units and focuses on the individual slurs and nuances of the melodic material.

“Candide’s Lament” validates, through orchestration, that the slight dynamic contrast and tenuto markings shown on the downbeat chords of m. 6 and m. 8 of *Ilana* signify a desire for a unique color change and musical emphasis. The orchestration of “Paris Waltz Scene” does not

\textsuperscript{110} A single gesture spans a two-measure unit. I am labeling the primary gesture as the two-measure gesture that serves as the beginning material of each parallel phrase within the period. The primary gesture repeats twice within each phrase.
emphasize these moments through timbre change but, rather, through a metric shift. At these significant harmonic moments, Bernstein provides the listener with a hemiola, temporarily suspending the very stable waltz meter.

The single-line accompaniment of Ilana results in the implied harmony having an equivocal nature. Though gestures, such as the very opening gesture, are harmonically obvious, the bass motion often presents simultaneities that suggest altered harmonies. “Paris Waltz Scene,” however, by the very nature of waltz writing, presents a clear bass pitch followed by the clear completion of a tonal, and mostly triadic, chord on the second and third beat. Though some pitches are slightly altered to create a functional progression within the orchestration, the bass motion of Ilana is often retained. Therefore, many of the presented triads illustrate the implied harmonic accompaniment of Ilana, further informing the pianist as to the phrasing and nuance associated with pacing the melody with the underlying harmonic motion.

The “Quartet Finale” omits the closing theme of Ilana making “Candide’s Lament” the sole key source necessary to understanding the intended voicing and structure of Ilana, as it includes all themes. Similar to “Paris Waltz Scene,” “Quartet Finale” presents the two parallel phrases in their entirety. However, this recycling is unique as the key is transposed up to F Major from the original E-flat Major and the time-signature, significant to all previous comparison, is altered to $\frac{3}{2}$. This new time-signature firmly presents the music in three. With the addition of a new running quarter-note accompaniment texture, the original two-bar phrases are no longer clearly heard. The augmentation of the time-signature shortens the musical phrase into single bars, illuminating the text in a more solemn manner. The variation “Quartet Finale” provides only serves to repeat issues already explored and, therefore, need not be discussed in any more depth.
Candide further validates the compositional practice Bernstein used in recycling earlier piano material in orchestrations. The compositional material, even when modified, is used almost in full. Candide serves to provide additional clarification in regards to articulation, metric phrasing, and color.
Chapter 2, Section III: Mixolydian Mixup (1966), For Aaron Stern (1986), Opening Prayer (1986), and Concerto for Orchestra: Jubilee Games (1986)

November 15, 1986
For Aaron Stern

1966 Mixolydian Mixup
December 5, 1986 Opening Prayer
December 1988 Variations on an Octatonic Scale

September 13, 1986 1st version of Jubilee Games
May 31, 1988 2nd Version of Jubilee Games
April 24, 1989 3rd Version of Jubilee Games

Perhaps the most pronounced example of Bernstein’s compositional recycling is the Concerto for Orchestra: Jubilee Games, as it employs material from three distinct earlier works. Originally intended for the fiftieth anniversary of the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra (IPO), the first version appeared in a performance at Avery Fischer Hall with the IPO on September 13, 1986.111 One of the original two movements, “Diaspora Dances,” contained recycled piano material from his 1966 work, Mixolydian Mixup.

The unpublished piano work Mixolydian Mixup presents a recurring theme over a consistent ostinato bassline. The RH thematic material creates an A A (mm. 5-12) – A’ A’ (mm. 13-20) – A”A (mm. 21-28) structure in conjunction with the larger ternary form. The A (mm. 5-12) B (mm. 13-20) A (mm. 21-28) ternary is defined by the ostinato bass, as the G Major bassline in the A sections is contrasted with a g minor bassline in the B section. The work also contains a short four-measure ostinato introduction and a short five-measure chordal interlude.

111 Referring to a passage in Leviticus, every fiftieth year marks a “Jubilee Year” in which the Judaic and Christian faiths proclaim a year of mercy, forgiveness, and freedom. The title was given in reference to the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra’s fiftieth anniversary. The labeling Concerto for Orchestra is used interchangeably with Jubilee Games.
before the complete repetition of the ABA material. The work alternates between $\frac{5}{8}$ and $\frac{2}{4}$ throughout. This compositionally simplistic work is transformed significantly in the orchestration by key, meter, articulation, phrase structure, doublings, and added material.\textsuperscript{112} Omitting the alteration of time-signatures, *Jubilee Games* presents the material in $18_8$ with the implied groupings of $(2^3+4)/(2+3+4)$. The grouping and inherent character of the theme make the music instantly recognizable. The new time signature incorporates four bars of the piano work into a single bar, assembling a complete melodic arch within a single measure. The ostinato bassline of *Mixolydian Mixup* is significantly changed in *Jubilee Games*. The new variable contour of the orchestrated bassline serves to highlight the desired metric groupings of the $18_8$ meter. The original piano ostinato presents a straightforward rising and falling contour (scalar rising on $\frac{5}{8}$, scalar falling on $\frac{2}{4}$) which places a significant musical weight on each returning low G, grouping the theme into $9_8$. In contrast, the leaping quality of *Jubilee Games* creates a buoyancy and lightness in the bass that prolongs the melodic gestures and phrasing and uses deflection to underscore the internal metric groupings.

The piano score has no indication of articulation or phrasing in regards to the melodic line, except for the single marcato marking at the first entrance of the theme. *Jubilee Games* adds a specificity of articulation and melodic phrasing to the theme. **Chapter 2. Section III. List 1** presents a list of recommended articulations to apply to the performance of *Mixolydian Mixup*, based on the specificity found in *Jubilee Games* twenty years later.

\textsuperscript{112} *Jubilee Games* is often in the key of F, a whole-step lower than *Mixolydian Mixup*. 
Chapter 2. Section III. List 1: Recommended Articulations for the Performance of Mixolydian Mixup, Based on Jubilee Games

u = upper staff, l = lower staff

1-28 l: all notes should be light and staccato
1-28 u: add marcato markings to all quarter notes. add staccato markings to all 8th-notes

The use of $^{18}_8$ creates a longer melodic cohesion that more easily identifies the phrase structure, enabling performers to employ timing nuances and dynamic gradation. These phrase structures are only indicated within the piano score by the subito markings Bernstein provides at the beginning of each four-bar phrase (the $^{18}_8$ equivalent). As the original ostinato of Mixolydian Mixup lacks the ability to create forward musical motion, Bernstein uses an echo effect on every restatement of the theme to create melodic interest. Every phrase is presented forte, followed by a repetition in subito p. This dynamic pattern is present in each section of the ternary form. This echo effect is unnecessary in Jubilee Games as the articulations, modified ostinato, addition of new material, and instrumentation transform the musical material of Mixolydian Mixup into a larger-scale form which builds musical momentum up until the climax tutti at mm. 129-133 of “Diaspora Dances.”

The musical material of Mixolydian Mixup is presented three times in Jubilee Games, expanded and developed by newly composed original material. A and A’’ present the theme

---

113 Mixolydian Mixup directs the pianist to perform a four-bar chorale after the ostinato before doing a full repetition of the ostinato ternary form.

114 The first presentation of Mixolydian Mixup (mm. 1-13, including opening vamp) within Jubilee Games is followed by newly composed material. After two more complete presentations of Mixolydian Mixup (Rehearsal C – Rehearsal D m.4 and Rehearsal M – Rehearsal N), Jubilee Games ends with further new material. The work takes on the structure ABA’A’’C, the A sections containing Mixolydian Mixup musical material.
interrupted by two $\frac{9}{4}$ measures in which the orchestra members whisper “Hai” or “Hayim,” a Hebrew word whose meaning refers to life. Not only does Bernstein literally infuse “life” into his thematic material, but I believe that the use of the $\frac{18}{8}$ time-signature, the addition of articulation, and the new contextual re-workings of the theme compositionally infuse life into a once underdeveloped piano work.

Bernstein’s instrumentation presents both a juxtaposition of articulation and unusual doublings. *Jubilee Games* m. 125 shows the flute, harp, and mandolin presenting the theme in marcato juxtaposed with a simultaneous legato presentation of the theme in the alto saxophone. The accompaniment material juxtaposes a legato clarinet in b-flat with *pizz.* violincelli. Only two bars later in m. 127, a marcato alto flute, English-horn, and piano are added to the instrumentation of the theme while a staccato bassoon and *pizz.* viola are added to further contrast the accompaniment. This variance allows *Jubilee Games* a wide variety of color, articulation, and character within both the theme and the ostinato textures. Interpreting retrospectively, each thematic repetition of *Mixolydian Mixup* should extract a new articulation and color. Observing all of Bernstein’s unusual instrumental doublings provides a basis for this exploration.

On December 15, 1986, Bernstein premiered a work for baritone and orchestra at Carnegie Hall entitled *Opening Prayer*. This work was recycled and used to become the second movement, “Benediction,” of the now three-movement version of *Jubilee Games*. This second version of *Jubilee Games* was premiered May 31, 1988 by the IPO in Tel Aviv. *Opening Prayer*

---

115 The musical material, notation, and directional markings are virtually identical between *Jubilee Games* and *Opening Prayer*. The comparative analysis done in this chapter is equally applicable to either orchestral work.
used recycled piano material from *For Aaron Stern*, composed November 15, 1986, one month prior.  

*For Aaron Stern* is published as part of *Thirteen Anniversaries*. Unlike the earlier *Four Anniversaries, Seven Anniversaries, or Five Anniversaries* that have historical or compositional relatedness, the *Thirteen Anniversaries* were not conceived as a performance cycle or collection. Rather, *Thirteen Anniversaries* is an assorted collection of earlier music, compiled for publication purposes. The first edition of the *Thirteen Anniversaries* was published by Boosey & Hawkes in June 1989.

*For Aaron Stern* is a binary work A (mm. 1-12) A’ (mm. 13-24). Each section consists of a twelve-bar melody. A’ is marked slower and with a greater range of dynamic contrast, spanning from pp-f in contrast to the original statement that ranges from p-mf. “Benediction” maintains this structure, orchestrating A (Rehearsal B-D) with woodwinds and A’ (Rehearsal D-E) with strings. *For Aaron Stern* is the core musical foundation of “Benediction.” In between short outer sections of original orchestral material, Bernstein presents the full *For Aaron Stern* with only minor revisions to some transitionary material. The dynamic markings, key, pitches, and nearly all phrase indications are kept the same, except for some doublings. The only

---

116 The piece *For Aaron Stern* was originally entitled *For Aaron on Aaron’s Birthday*. The original manuscript contains markings by Bernstein in blue pencil indicating how he intended to orchestrate the material.

117 There was likely a request from Boosey & Hawkes to have another anniversary collection for publication circa 1988. The collection was likely given the anniversary title by the publisher as a continuation of the earlier collections for publicity and recognition. The un-relatedness of the individual pieces of the collection is illuminated by the diversity of compositional dates.

118 The music of *For Aaron Stern* is preceded by a short orchestral introduction and followed by a brief baritone solo.
structural change made to *For Aaron Stern* is a three-bar extension at the transition between A and A’, presented at mm. 23-26 of “Benediction.” Every crescendo is enhanced by a doubling of the arpeggiated accompaniment material below the melody. This informs the performer of *For Aaron Stern* that the dynamic markings are not solely indications for the volume of the melodic line. Rather, the markings are also indicative of the texture and viscidness of the music. The left hand should be used to enhance the fullness and richness of the dynamic builds.  

“Benediction” presents three alterations of articulation in the melody of the A’ section. I believe most are intended for bowing purposes and, therefore, do not inherently change the pianist’s interpretation. However, the forte climax of *For Aaron Stern* could be better represented by using marcato markings. At the climax, *For Aaron Stern* merely has the marking legato ma chiaro (connected yet clear). In “Benediction,” Bernstein substitutes the legato texture with marcato markings. The pianist should observe the specificity of bowings presented in “Benediction” and clearly articulate a marcato sound on every melodic note in the forte buildup of *For Aaron Stern*.  

As the pianist is without the benefit of sound accumulation and sustain the orchestra can provide, this will guarantee that mm. 19-21 have the needed prominence and heft to structurally function as a climax for the work in a slow adagio tempo.

It is interesting to note that *Concerto for Orchestra* was modified a third time, appearing April 24, 1989, also in Tel Aviv with the IPO. Yet another movement entitled “Mixed Doubles,” a variation set, was added to the three existing movements. This movement, also a recycling of earlier material, harkens back to Bernstein’s December 1988 *Variations on an Octatonic Scale*

---

119 I believe the pianist may consider adding doublings at the cresc. of the A’ section in the left hand to provide an added richness and variance of texture.

120 Specifically, 20 u: elimination of slur on the second half of the bar. add slur connecting E5 to following F5. add marcato markings to the final G#5 and E5.
for recorder. *Jubilee Games* is truly the epitome of Bernstein’s aptitude for reusing compositional material.

*Jubilee Games* again demonstrates that when piano scores precede orchestral manifestations of the same music, the complete score is generally used. Though a clarification and development of notation is present in the later orchestration, the pitches, values, and inherent musical structure are maintained.
CHAPTER 3: LATER YEARS

Chapter 3, Section I: \textit{In Memoriam: Helen Coates} (1970) and \textit{Mass} (1971)

Leonard Bernstein’s \textit{Mass} (1971) recycles musical material from \textit{In Memoriam: Helen Coates} and \textit{Aaron’s Canon}.\footnote{121 \textit{In Memoriam: Helen Coates} is published as one of the \textit{Thirteen Anniversaries}; \textit{Aaron’s Canon} is still currently unpublished as a work for violin/piano in the Library of Congress. \textit{Aaron’s Canon}, 14 Nov. 1970, 1045/2, Leonard Bernstein Collection, Music Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.} \textit{Aaron’s Canon}, a work for violin and piano, was composed November 14, 1970 in honor of Aaron Copland’s seventieth birthday celebration. At a party held for Copland, Isaac Stern and Bernstein performed the work, one that Bernstein describes as “crazy modern music.”\footnote{122 Rita Reif, “MacDowell Gala Adds to Birthday Tributes for Copland,” \textit{New York Times on the Web}, Accessed May 9, 2017. http://www.nytimes.com/books/99/03/14/specials/copland-tributes.html.; According to the article, Bernstein had to bring the stand to the party and help Stern find his music before presenting the roughly two-minute long work to Copland.} \textit{In Memoriam: Helen Coates}, though published with the date July 17, 1970, is dated in the Library of Congress July 18, 1970. Helen Coates died February 27, 1989, nineteen years after the date of composition. The title \textit{In Memoriam: Helen Coates} was, therefore, changed for inclusion in the \textit{Thirteen Anniversaries} from Bernstein’s 1970 title, \textit{For Helen, With Love, From Lenny}. This is further validation of the \textit{Thirteen Anniversaries} being an assortment of pieces needed for a larger publication purpose and not as any pre-conceived performance set or cycle. \textit{In Memoriam: Helen Coates} was not significantly revised after the publication of \textit{Mass}, as I believe the work was chosen for publication and submitted within a short three-month time span. The published score is a near replica of the original manuscript.\footnote{123 The only notable discrepancy is that the original manuscript used a repeat sign with first and second endings for the A and A’ material. The published version notates the full score. On a}
In Memoriam: Helen Coates is a structurally simplistic work in binary form. The reprise of A’B’ is a shortened version of the original material. One of the most distinctive musical features about the piano work is that every section and four-bar phrase ends by fading away dynamics and impetus. In contrast, the same musical material in Mass often builds structurally towards a climax. This crucial difference in musical structure and momentum is achieved by compositional choices in dynamic, instrumentation, phrasing, metric emphasis, and stretto.

Chapter 3. Section I. List 1 presents a list of potential reinterpretations for the A and A’ sections of In Memoriam: Helen Coates based on the indications and markings presented in “Meditation No.1” from Mass (mm. 1-16 and mm. 46-58).

Chapter 3. Section I. List 1: List of Potential Reinterpretations for the A and A’ Sections In Memoriam: Helen Coates Based on Mass

u = upper staff, l = lower staff

1: addition of expressive marking con intensio

1 u: underneath the larger phrase marking, add smaller slur connecting the downbeat of beat 1 to the downbeat of beat 2. underneath the larger phrase

proof for the publication, Bernstein notes the possibility of playing the initial A’ at a softer dynamic to contrast the opening. This marking to the proof did not make it to publication.

124 A (mm. 1-11) A’ (mm. 12-18) B (mm. 19-27) – A’ (mm. 28-34) B’ (mm. 35-38)

125 For example, the opening dotted-rhythm motive is very intense and present, yet quickly fades after four bars with a sustained note and descrescendo.

126 In relation to In Memoriam: Helen Coates, Mass has a similar though slightly modified structure. A (mm. 1-11) A’ (on organ, mm. 11-16) B (mm. 17-25, extension from mm. 25-40) B’ (reprise, mm. 40-46) A” (codetta, mm. 46-fine)

marking, add slur connecting the final D5 of m. 1 to the G4 of the following measure
2: elimination of hairpin descresc.
2 u: addition of breath mark before the final quarter beat. underneath the larger phrase marking, add slur connecting third beat E-flat5 to C5
3 u: underneath the larger phrase marking, add smaller slur connecting B-flat4 to G4. underneath the larger phrase marking, add smaller slur connecting F#4-A4
5: substitute p with mp
5 l: eliminate slur marking
5 u: eliminate larger slur. add slur F#4-A4. add marcato marking to second beat B-flat4. add slur B-flat4 to G4
6 u: eliminate larger slur. add slur F#4-A4. add slur B-flat4 to E-flat5. add marcato marking to E-flat5 and D-flat5. add hairpin cresc. from third beat to downbeat of following measure
7: substitute mf with f
8: add breath mark at the end of the measure
9 l: eliminate slur mark
9 u: eliminate larger slur. add slur F#4-A4. add marcato marking to second beat B-flat4. add slur B-flat4 to G4
10: eliminate hairpin descresc.
10 l: eliminate longer slur marking. add slur connecting first beat chord to second beat
10 u: eliminate larger slur. add slur F#4-A4. add slur B-flat4 to A4. add marcato marking to quarter note A4. eliminate tie into the following measure
11: add hairpin descresc.
12 u: eliminate longer slur marking. slur downbeat E-flat5 to final C5
12: substitute f with pp
12 l: eliminate marcato markings on bass chords. add slur connecting first beat chord to second beat
13 u: add accent mark to downbeat B-flat4. add slur connecting downbeat B-flat4 to G4
13: eliminate hairpin *descresc.* and *f.* add hairpin *cresc.* beginning on the third beat until second beat of the following measure
13 l: add slur connecting final chord to the following downbeat
16: eliminate *mf*
17 l: eliminate longer slur marking. add slur connecting first beat chord to second beat
17 u: eliminate tie of final G4 to the following downbeat

Within the corresponding A and A’ material in *Mass*, the instrumentation of full strings and organ allows for a consistent sound of fullness and sustain that the timbre of the piano is unable to achieve. In order to compensate for the piano’s inability to sustain, Bernstein uses longer slur markings in *In Memoriam: Helen Coates* to indicate melodic phrases within the largo tempo. In the *Mass* orchestration, Bernstein accounts for changes in timbre by slightly modifying his phrase markings.\(^{128}\) With the capabilities of Bernstein’s new instrumentation in *Mass*, he characterizes the A material by adding the direction *con intensio* along with shorter phrase markings to achieve a more insistent and breathless quality in the music. This phrase reduction is further emphasized by the constant bow-changing of the strings and notated breath marks that punctuate the ends of larger sections of thematic material. Bernstein never uses exact repetition within *Mass*, capitalizing on noticeable variations of the musical material to enable cohesive structure. The A’ material is played by the organ and is shifted metrically, forming a type of stretto. This stretto allows the bassline to have a consistent forward quarter-beat motion, in contrast to the dramatic lingering the half notes provide in *In Memoriam: Helen Coates*. This

---

\(^{128}\) Unlike m. 12 of *In Memoriam: Helen Coates*, which utilizes exact repetition of the opening material, *Mass* transfers the same musical material from the strings to the organ. When the music switches from strings to a timbre of a keyboard instrument, the phrasing is slightly prolonged. However, the organ phrasing is still noticeably more fragmented than that of the piano, despite being from the same instrumental family, as the organ is capable of longer sustain.
insight provides the pianist with a musical characterization that is otherwise absent in the piano score due to Bernstein’s prioritization of notating sustain over character.

Bernstein changes the musical momentum and structure of the B section by presenting new contrapuntal lines, articulations, and phrase indications within the orchestration. The initial B section of In Memoriam: Helen Coates presents two identical statements of a four-bar phrase, all within a constant pp dynamic. In the B section of Mass, the repetition of the four-bar phrase begins with a pickup and adds a moving tenor line beneath that gives a forward momentum to otherwise suspended material. This forward directional focus is emphasized with a crescendo. As with the A section, Bernstein modifies phrase markings in connection with instrumentation.

Chapter 3. Section I. List 2 presents a list of potential reinterpretations for the B sections of In Memoriam: Helen Coates based on the indications and markings presented in Mass (mm. 17-24 and mm. 40-45).

Chapter 3. Section I. List 2: List of Potential Reinterpretations for the B Sections In Memoriam: Helen Coates Based on Mass

u = upper staff, l = lower staff

19 u: underneath the larger phrase marking, add slur connecting G5-F5, E5-C5
20 u: underneath the larger phrase marking, add slur connecting F#5-G4
21 u: underneath the larger phrase marking, add slur connecting F5-E5, D5 to B-flat5
22 u: modify first beat rhythm to exactly match the opening rhythmic motive. underneath the larger phrase marking, add slur connecting E-flat5 to C5. modify second beat half-note to quarter note. add a breath marking in between second and third beat. add third beat quarter note G5, tied to the following downbeat as an anticipation
Though Bernstein maintains identical pitches and key area in the B material of both In Memoriam: Helen Coates and Mass, the key signature is modified. In Memoriam: Helen Coates uses an authentic cadence in the left-hand to resolve to a clear G Major sonority on the downbeat of the B section. This is accompanied with a corresponding G Major key signature. Mass transitions to a written key signature of C Major, visually giving the downbeat G Major sonority a different harmonic interpretation. This discrepancy is unrelated to transposing instruments or idiomatic writing for orchestra, as the strings and organ used in this section are not transposing instruments and are comfortable in the key of G Major. Therefore, I believe this compositional
intention is meant to highlight an ambiguity of key area that can be used in interpreting both works.

Within the first two measures of the B section, Bernstein presents two implied cadences, one in CM and one in GM. In the context of the GM key signature of In Memoriam: Helen Coates, the harmony of the first two measures can be interpreted as a G: \( I - V^7/IV - IV^6_4 - V^6_4 - I \), functioning in a traditional subdominant-dominant-tonic function in GM over a G pedal tone. Mass, with the modification to CM and the addition of underlying contrapuntal lines in Violin II and Viola, has a corresponding harmonic progression of C: \( V - V^7 - I^6_4 - G : (V - vi^6) \) over a G pedal tone. The third measure of the B section in both works eliminates the leading tone F# on the downbeat, implying a G7\(^{+9}\) sonority. Though this sonority momentarily appears to reiterate the G: \( V^7/IV - IV^6_4 \) or C: \( V^7 - I^6_4 \) motion seen in the first measure of the B section on the second beat, the lowering of B4 to B-flat4 in beat three transforms the original C-Major sonority into c-minor. This particular moment exemplifies the B section’s ambiguity of key.

This moment is strongly rooted in c-minor, despite the G pedal point, surrounding chromatic contrapuntal lines, and lack of cadence. Bernstein achieves this in both works by using the original opening motive of the work at this moment, maintaining register, pitch, and metric placement. In Mass, Bernstein uses the identical motive while maintaining the original rhythm. This very clear compositional reflective memory device immediately directs the ear back to the original c-minor key area of the A section even though, theoretically, there exists no clear authentic cadence within c-minor. As In Memoriam: Helen Coates rhythmically alters the original c-minor motive, the retrospective relationship is not as obvious as it is in Mass. The c-minor appearance in this context comes across as modal mixture as opposed to a type of memory device. Though the piano work lacks this rhythmic motivic reference, an understanding of the
implied reference and harmonic intent is necessary in order to achieve the correct melodic phrasing and character within this section of music. The pianist should be aware of the c minor implication though it is not rhythmically highlighted in the piano score. Instead of viewing the B section as independent, the pianist should understand this section from the lens of motivic development.

There is a discrepancy on the note C4 and C#4 immediately preceding the B section. The C4 in *In Memoriam: Helen Coates* is harmonically sound as part of an implied D7 chord resolving to the GM sonority on the following downbeat. The C#4 presented in m. 16 of *Mass* does not make sense harmonically or contrapuntally in context. The C#4 prevents the authentic cadence to GM. Bernstein, in creating an exact repetition of all A material, could have used the C# to reference the one present in m. 10 of *In Memoriam: Helen Coates*. However, this retrospective reference does not have a compositional or structural purpose, as did the one discussed in the B section. Though this would appear to be a misprint, the manuscripts and proofs of *Mass* and *In Memoriam: Helen Coates* show this discrepancy to be intentional.

*Mass* further demonstrates how Bernstein compositionally recycles music from keyboard into orchestration. Furthermore, the proof of *In Memoriam: Helen Coates* for publication in *Thirteen Anniversaries* shows that Bernstein did not always retroactively apply his musical developments after orchestrating a work. I believe this to be related to pianism and to a lack of time for editing and revision.129

---

129 Time was a significant factor in Bernstein’s compositional process. Particularly in the later years of his life, his calendar and the letters from his secretaries show that his performance and commission schedule was hardly human.
Chapter 3, Section II: *For Jessica Fleischmann* (1965), *Dybbuk* (1974), and *For Jessica Fleischmann* (1977)

![Timeline Diagram]

Part of Bernstein’s *Thirteen Anniversaries*, *For Jessica Fleischmann* presents an interesting case of a published solo piano work appearing in two different forms, one preceding and one following the orchestral ballet, *Dybbuk*. *Dybbuk* further justifies that Bernstein’s process of expanding a piano work into an orchestration is a completely different process from his reducing of an orchestration into a solo piano work.

*For Jessica Fleischmann* is published with the date June 13, 1977. *For Jessica Fleischmann* is a clear ternary character piece ABA, the A sections (mm. 1-9 and mm. 19-27) are unified with the B section (mm. 10-18) both harmonically and texturally. For Jessica Fleischmann is a clear ternary character piece ABA, the A sections (mm. 1-9 and mm. 19-27) are unified with the B section (mm. 10-18) both harmonically and texturally. The original two manuscripts are unpublished and are at the Library of Congress. Both manuscripts are virtually identical. Both do not have the complete B section present in all later versions of the musical material. The first manuscript has the date 1965. I believe that the second manuscript is simply a
copy of the same music, dating from October 1965. I believe the second manuscript was intended as a birth gift for the daughter of Leonard Bernstein’s friend Ernest Fleischmann, impresario of the Los Angeles Philharmonic, as she was born September 19, 1965. Bernstein did not consider *For Jessica Fleischmann* for independent publication until the late 1970’s, likely for *Thirteen Anniversaries*, at which point he completely revised the score based on *Dybbuk*, accounting for the published compositional date of June 13, 1977. Furthermore, the musical material in the Library of Congress contains a note in blue pencil at the bottom of the page that reads “Sketch for Dybbuk (Jessica Fleischmann anniversary)/60’s/LB.” This note dates from the 1980s since *For Jessica Fleischmann* is referred to as an anniversary. It is an acknowledgement of the recycling of musical material from the 1965 piano work into *Dybbuk*.

Both 1965 manuscripts are complete. In line with Bernstein’s compositional process, Bernstein maintains the complete structure of the original manuscripts in *Dybbuk*. Though the modification of time signature and the expansion of the B section are typical of Bernstein’s compositional recycling, the significant modification to pitch and rhythm is atypical. I believe this is why Bernstein labels the 1965 version as a sketch, the word sketch referring more to the transformation of the music over time rather than to the completeness of the original manuscript. The Library of Congress 1965 manuscripts provide a primary source of information regarding Bernstein’s compositional procedure as he incorporates a piano work into a larger orchestration.

---

130 The manuscripts were determined to be in this chronological order based on edits made to the scores. The first manuscript shows several edits by Bernstein directly to the score. The second manuscript is notably clean and the markings are premeditated.

131 This is another example of a random inclusion into the *Thirteen Anniversaries* collection.

132 Sketch for Dybbuk (Jessica Fleischmann anniversary), circa 1965, 1052/3, Leonard Bernstein Collection, Music Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. This postscript is in Bernstein’s hand.
and then later revisits and revises the piano score after orchestrating. This re-visitation parallels my own retrospective performance practice procedure, emphasizing Bernstein’s continuous refinement of directive markings and consistency of musical aim regardless of instrumental materialization. **Chapter 3. Section II. List 1** lists reinterpretations to the 1965 manuscript of *For Jessica Fleischmann* that were compositionally undertaken by Bernstein based on the notation of his ballet *Dybbuk*.

**Chapter 3. Section II. List 1**: Reinterpretations to the 1965 *For Jessica Fleischmann* by Bernstein, Based on the Notation of *Dybbuk*.

I. The time signature is changed to $2\frac{3}{4} + \frac{3}{8}$ from $3\frac{5}{4}$.

II. The 1965 score employs simple triadic harmony. *Dybbuk* adds chromatic tones and extended harmony.

III. The 1965 bassline consists of simple pitches that only appear on the second beat and the second half of the third beat. *Dybbuk* significantly modifies the rhythm of both the bassline and the melodic material.

IV. The **B** section of *Dybbuk* adds bass material and lengthens the development of the section.

*Dybbuk* and *For Jessica Fleischmann* (revised afterwards for publication) are nearly identical in relation to articulation, phrasing, and dynamic. The only significant notational difference is the large-scale structural build of “*Leah: Maiden’s Dance*” in comparison to *For Jessica Fleischmann*. “*Leah: Maiden’s Dance*” extends the **B** section, adding a *scherzando* section that infuses material from **A** into the **B** section. *Dybbuk* is essentially an extended version of *For Jessica Fleischmann*.\(^{133}\) As Bernstein revisited *For Jessica Fleischmann* after *Dybbuk*, it

---

\(^{133}\) The following is a list of structural differences to illustrate the full evolitional understanding of this compositional lineage.
is intentional that he chose to omit the extended repetitions and variations in the ballet. These cuts show his common compositional trait of distilling only the primary musical material of an orchestration when reducing to the keyboard but maintaining specificity of musical notation.

Though both works are marked with a quarter note = 66, the piano solo is marked *Quasi allegretto* whereas the ballet is marked *Andantino*. I believe this difference is instrumental, as the piano does not have the ability to sustain the notation long enough to enable a clear melodic line. The indication for *For Jessica Fleischmann* is there to emphasize the necessity of a longer melodic gesture to maintain the singing and reverberant quality of *Dybbuk*, which includes cymbals and harp, provides.

*For Jessica Fleischmann* contains a fossil of *Dybbuk* beyond the revisions to the time signature, tempo, B material, and rhythmic durations. With its extended technique indication of creating “a sound like ‘tsk,’” or “a light tap or snap,” the pianist must imitate the orchestral effect and timbre of small cymbals. Bernstein allows the substitution of tapping or snapping in replacement of the timbre achieved by cymbals, likely for the ease of performance for the pianist. This is one of only two extended-performance-technique indications in the

---

1. The final bars (*Dybbuk*, m. 55-64/*For Jessica Fleischmann*, m. 13-19) of the B section in both works are identical in terms of musical material and gesture, but differ in metric placement until the return of the A material.
2. This brief change of metric structure swaps the metric emphasis of the two closing gestures, changing their structural function and momentum.
3. “*Leah: Maiden’s Dance*” initially repeats the A section twice before entering into the B material. The second presentation of the A section is transposed into G Major, the initial key of the B section.

---

134 The 1965 manuscripts have the marking *Andantino* and *Andantino teneramente*.

135 This was unneeded in the 1965 manuscripts since the original time signature did not pose the same issue.
entirety of Bernstein’s solo piano repertoire. On the proof of the *Thirteen Anniversaries*, the copyist originally put the exact indication present on the *Dybbuk* score, “Preferably a sound made by the dancers: e.g., “tsk,” or a light clap.” Bernstein modifies this indication on the proof to what is now seen on the published score.

---

136 The other is using the forearm to create large cluster chords in *Sonata for Piano*. 
Chapter 3, Section III: *For Stephen Sondheim* (1965) and *A Quiet Place* (1984-1986)

In the revision and expansion of *A Quiet Place*, Bernstein uses musical material from his earlier piano work *For Stephen Sondheim*. For Stephen Sondheim became part of the Thirteen Anniversary set in 1989. The piano work went through some minor revisions between 1965 and 1989, mainly concerning misprinted pitches. The only materials from *For Stephen Sondheim* used in *A Quiet Place* are the right-hand gestures presented in the first six measures of *For Stephen Sondheim*, along with the accompanying chromatic descending line.

These gestures are used briefly in Act III of *A Quiet Place*, appearing in “Laughing Chorus” and the following “Scene.” The gestures are not used as developmental material, nor do they significantly differ from the material written for the keyboard. Therefore, the only mentionable traits of the orchestration in *A Quiet Place* are the independence of voices and the faster tempo. Bernstein emphasizes the independence of the melodic gesture and its accompanying chromatic descending line by assigning each voice to a unique instrumental timbre. Every presentation of the gesture is presented at a significantly faster tempo in *A Quiet Place*, suggesting that while performing *For Stephen Sondheim*, the pianist should maintain a forward musical motion.

---

137 *A Quiet Place* was originally a one-act work.

i. Meditations Before a Wedding (1984)

The eight songs of the collection Arias and Barcarolles began as a 1988 work for piano four hands with a SABB singer orientation.\(^{138}\) In 1988/9, Bernstein, in partnership with Bright Sheng, orchestrated the collection and reduced the vocal orientation to a single mezzo-soprano and baritone.\(^{139}\)

Meditations Before a Wedding is an unpublished manuscript in the Library of Congress, dating from 1984. This music is used in the “Prelude” of Arias and Barcarolles. The piano work is a ternary structure, the B section (mm. 32-69) presenting the recycled material to be used four years later. The A sections (mm. 1-31 and m. 70-75) are improvised fantasies that insinuate a wandering mind, including a transcription of a mechanical bird that was present in Bernstein’s studio. Though the B (recycled) section of the piano work is cut and modified in “Prelude,” the same key, \(\frac{7}{8}+\frac{3}{4}\) meter, and some of the original text is kept consistent.\(^{140}\) “Prelude” keeps the abrupt, loud climax present in the B section of Meditations Before a Wedding. However, the

\(^{138}\) The title is a result of an April 5, 1960 concert in which Bernstein was a pianist-conductor with the New York Philharmonic performing Mozart’s Piano Concerto in G Major, K.453 and Gershwin’s Rhapsody in Blue for President Eisenhower at the White House. Bernstein writes, in a note attached to his manuscript, that President Eisenhower stated, “Ya know, I liked that last piece you played; it’s got a theme. I like music with a theme, not all them arias and barcarolles.” The title of this collection is intentionally aimed at this statement.

\(^{139}\) Before the orchestration, the work had been briefly reduced to a piano four hand work with only two singers. The work also exists in a fuller orchestration dating from 1993 by Bruce Coughlin. However, as Coughlin’s orchestration was not done in partnership with Bernstein, this particular orchestration is not relevant to this study.

\(^{140}\) Though Meditations Before a Wedding is a solo piano work, Bernstein incorporates a lyric in the B section of the piece. There is a direction by Bernstein that the lyric should “not be sung aloud.”
structural significance and auditory impact of the climax differs for both works, as it is prepared in two different ways.

“Prelude” differs from Meditations Before a Wedding in the placement of slur markings in both accompaniment and melody. The accompaniment of “Prelude” consistently separates and punctuates the last two notes, metrically emphasizing the last quarter note, of each rising gesture. The beginning of every $\frac{7}{8}$ measure is delineated by the entrance of another instrument on the downbeat. The beginning of every $\frac{3}{4}$ measure is delineated by a break in slur at the barline, clearly articulating the downbeat. Though the meters are clearly distinguished, the consistency of Bernstein’s metric accentuation of the downbeats and of the quarter notes makes the work feel in three with an emphasis on every second beat. The $\frac{7}{8}$ bar essentially functions to slightly stretch the first beat of every other measure, as the metric gesture unifies the two disparate time signatures into a single statement. The climax of “Prelude” articulates every pitch with a written accent, eliminates slurring, and emphasizes every felt second beat with a cymbal crash. Structurally, the climax is felt as a boiling point of a persistent repeating gesture that has been simmering beneath the melodic line.

In contrast, every rising gesture in the accompaniment of Meditations Before a Wedding is entirely slurred, adding weight to the beginning of each gesture. This articulation results in each gesture ending with a non-accented metrically weak quarter note. Additionally, every slur goes across the barline, eliminating downbeats and, therefore, any delineation of the two coinciding meters. This articulation results in a slight emphasis on the final quarter beat of each measure, convoluting any clear metric gesture, favoring an ambiguity of meter. The climax of Meditations Before a Wedding stresses every downbeat and quarter-beat duration with a written accent, mimicking the gestural emphasis Bernstein incorporates in “Prelude.” However, as the
meter and the gestural emphasis of the second beat is not established pre-climax in *Meditations Before a Wedding*, the climax functions as developing variation instead of a boiling point of a persistent repeating gesture. I believe that the lack of establishing gestural emphasis pre-climax leads to a lack of unification between sections and weakens the impact of the structural climax. Therefore, I argue for the pianist to apply the articulation present in “Prelude” to the performance of the B section from *Meditations Before a Wedding*. The marcato markings that Bernstein presents on the quarter note arrival of each gesture in the piano score should be punctuated and the downbeat of each measure should be clearly felt.

The structural difference created by the variation of articulation within the accompaniment is heightened by a change of melodic phrasing. In *Meditations Before a Wedding*, the slur markings of the melody are correlated with the intended rhyme scheme of the lyric. The original lyrics are shown here with each dash representing the end and beginning of a new phrase marking, demonstrating the intended rhyme.

I love you/ it’s easy/ to say it/ and it’s easy/ to rhyme it/ the climate/ is breezy/

I love you/ too/ not one, two…/ not easy/ to…

As “Prelude” leaves out much of the original lyric and modifies it slightly, the slur markings are changed to create a longer forward-moving line. The lyrics shown here show the clear differentiation of phrasing Bernstein notates by marking *no breath* after “say it.”

I love you (/) It’s easy to say it, And so easy to mean it too/ I love you

Constant to both works is the independence of the words “I love you,” as the phrase is the subject material for both lyrics. Though the melodic phrasing should match the rhyme scheme of the unspoken words in *Meditations Before a Wedding*, I believe the pianist should employ a

---

141 This breath is not indicated but is common to performance practice of the work.
forward motion in keeping with the long-winded effect of “Prelude,” only aiming to emphasize the “I love you” statements. This musical effect achieves the intended message of the text.142


The lineage of the piano work In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz began with a song written for Bernstein’s mother entitled First Love, for my Mother, dated February 18, 1986 by Bernstein. In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz is structured as a song without words. When applying the text of First Love, for my Mother to the piano work, the melodic phrasing matches the meter and rhyme scheme of the poetry. The exact date of the manuscript of In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz is uncertain. However, the annotations on all manuscripts containing this musical material indicate that In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz was the fourth manifestation.143 Bernstein marks the compositional date of In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz as March 1986 on the proof for the Thirteen Anniversaries. As the proof of the score cannot have been from before 1988, I believe Bernstein decided to use the date of First Love, for my Mother, since virtually nothing was modified between the versions. The key, pitches, and melodic phrasing are almost entirely maintained.144 I believe that In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz dates from 1988/9.

142 I believe that the lyric discusses how logic can become a fleeting noise in relevance to the punctuated proclamations of love.

143 The first was First Love: for my Mother (1986), the second was a version in memory of Jack Romann (circa June 1987), the third is “Nachspiel” in Arias and Barcarolles (1988), and the fourth is the piano solo version In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz.

144 In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz is attributed slur markings to mirror the breathing and clauses of the original text of First Love: for my Mother.
Originally in reference to his sketch for Jack Romann, Bernstein writes “in memoriam…” above the title of “Nachspiel” in *Arias and Barcarolles.*“Nachspiel” has an interlude at the exact place that *First Love, for my Mother* contains a piano interlude. At this interlude, Bernstein transfers the melody from the solo Violin II to solo Violin I. The symbolism of this compositional device is poignant in that both sections have identical timbres, yet the playing style of two separate groups of people will subtly change the sound and, therefore, create a dialogue. The interlude also includes the presentation of chords on the third beat and select doublings on some measures to move the momentum forward and slightly thicken the orchestration.

*In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz,* though identical in pitch, tempo, key, and phrasing to *First Love, for my Mother,* has no musical differentiation or indication at the interlude section. The pianist should aim to musically differentiate the interlude section by adding dynamic contrast, a change in color, or musical momentum. Surprisingly, Bernstein goes contrary to differentiation in the interlude by marking *sempre p* and *non cresc.,* specifically directing the pianist to not build the structure. It is curious that Bernstein did not notate musical differentiation in the interlude, inconsistent with his prior manifestations of the music.

Another important musical feature to consider in the performance of *In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz* is the 1988 indication of *sempre senza rubatone nuances* in *Arias and Barcarolles,* not present in the 1989 piano publication. *In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz* is only marked *adagio.* I find

---

145 Jack Romann was the director of the concert and artist department for the Baldwin Piano Company. In the proof of the score Bernstein crosses of “in memory of Jack Romann” and replaces it with “in memoriam…” I believe this was done for social reasons. The death of Jack Romann was a result of the AIDS epidemic of the time. John Corigliano, in a letter to Bernstein, indicated that he planned on dedicating the fourth movement of his Symphony No. 1 (1988-1989) to Jack Romann. Perhaps, for this reason, Bernstein removed his personalized dedication.
that the earlier indication to abstain from rubato is necessary to achieve the simplistic vocal quality of the melodic line and to maintain a waltz meter. It allows the piece to have a complex bittersweet character. *In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz* also lacks phrasing indications for the bassline. The 1988 phrasing of the bassline lengthens each phrase by going over the barline in places where the melody is more highly segmented for poetic reasons. The bassline coincides with the slurring of the melody only at the ends of each poetic phrase, marking the end of a poetic rhyme or thought. The pianist should incorporate this phrasing into the left hand of the piano work, as it enhances the seamlessness of the musical momentum, as well as ensures that there is no unnatural rubato. Chapter 3. Section IV. List 1 lists a suggested phrasing of the bassline for *In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz* based on the phrasing presented in the 1988 “Nachspiel.”

**Chapter 3. Section IV. List 1: In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz Suggested Bassline Phrasing from “Nachspiel”**

I. Slur connecting m. 1 – m. 3  
II. Slur connecting m. 4 – m. 6  
III. Slur connecting m. 7 – m. 8  
IV. Slur connecting m. 9 – m. 11  
V. Slur connecting m. 12 – m. 14  
VI. Slur connecting m. 15 – m. 16  
VII. Slur connecting m. 17 – m. 19  
VIII. Tie connecting m. 20 – m. 22  
IX. Slur connecting m. 23 – m. 24  
X. Slur connecting m. 26 – m. 28  
XI. Slur connecting m. 29 – m. 30  
XII. Slur connecting m. 31 – m. 32

---

146 The phrasing of the bassline is only present in the orchestral 1988 “Nachspiel” publication.
The phrase slur markings of the melodic material are not present until the 1988 “Nachspiel” publication. They are not present in any piano manuscripts of the musical material until the 1988-1989 proof of In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz (save for the piano interlude, m. 16 – m. 24, as there is no text to dictate phrasing). The gestural-phrasing of the 1986 First Love, for my Mother text implies the later phrase markings seen in In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz. The lyrics are shown here with each dash demonstrating gestural phrasing.

My first love,/ Jennie B./ Eighty-eight./ Young to me./ My second love/ is eighty-eight too./ Eighty-eight keys/ that sing to you…[interlude]… thus do I/ dedicate/ eighty-eight/ to my/ two first loves

The first manuscript for “Nachspiel,” dated June 1987, also only indicates slur markings for the piano at the interlude. This manuscript is the first time that a humming descant is added. Bernstein specifically marks the phrasing of the descant line in the manuscript. The descant phrasing punctuates some of the relations within the text that function on a bigger structural scale than the slurs used to illuminate the aforementioned gestural-phrasing structure. The lyrics are shown here with each dash demonstrating the phrasing of the larger structural groupings within the text.

My first love,/ Jennie B./ Eighty-eight. Young to me./ My second love is eighty-eight too./ Eighty-eight keys that sing to you…[interlude]… thus do I/ dedicate/ eighty-eight/ to my/ two first loves

As the 1988 “Nachspiel” contains both the descant phrasing and the gestural-phrasing of the melodic material, the movement successfully presents the different layers of structural relatedness within the original poetry. Though the gestural phrasing is present in the final published version of In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz, the larger
structural groupings are not. I believe it necessary for the pianist to be aware of the larger structural groupings to ensure a correct musical interpretation of the piece.

There also exists a sketch entitled (Nachspiel). Though it contains the same musical material, it is incomplete, as it does not include any prior phrase indications. The title shows its musical origin and historically places it around 1989. It was a copy used for outlining a section of Bernstein’s *Sonata for Piano and Page Turner*, a work that was never completed. The sketch is representative of Bernstein’s compositional conglomeration of various versions and ideas into a finalized piano score. The end of the sketch contains a quotation of the lyrics from the *First Love, for my Mother*, showing the ever-present influence of the primary source on all later manifestations. The two dates annotated on the top of this sketch show the preparation for the *Thirteen Anniversaries* publication, as the anniversary *For Felicia, On Our 28th Birthday (& Her 52nd)* precedes the anniversary *In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz*.147 On the score itself, are stage indications referring to the *Sonata for Piano and Page Turner*, showing the document to be a sketch used for yet another recycling purpose.148

The 1988-1989 proof of *In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz* shows Bernstein correcting the score to include the gestural-phrasing slur markings in the melodic material to match those present in

---

147 The sketch shows Bernstein mapping out the order of the anniversaries, as he wrote “Feb. 6 (Felicia’s birthday)” followed by “For Ellen Goetz (R.I.P)” in the upper right-hand corner. The date for Goetz present on this sketch is peculiar. Bernstein labels Goetz’s death as “Jan. +25.” Goetz did not die until January 27, 1986. I believe Bernstein used this as shorthand to quickly jot down the general timeframe in which she died, knowing that he would correct the date later for publication. The proof of *In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz* states “dates to come” in place of her birth and death date. This validates that Bernstein had to accurately research the information for the 1989 publication. *For Felicia, On Our 28th Birthday (& Her 52nd)* was also originally *For Claudio Arrau*, emphasizing the later date of this sketch.

“Nachspiel.” A note in the upper left corner reads, “I added slurs, OK?”149 “Nachspiel” showcases Bernstein’s compositional process of specifying phrasing and articulation when recycling music into an orchestration. *In Memoriam: Ellen Goetz* demonstrates specified notational changes applied retroactively from an orchestration.

---

149 Michael Barrett, a personal assistant to Bernstein and a primary source for score editing events, believes this particular note to be in the hand of Jack Gottlieb.
SUMMATION/ CONCLUSION

This dissertation helps affirm that Leonard Bernstein was one of the single most influential people in molding twentieth-century American aesthetics and culture. The historical lineage of the works discussed is documented to correct previous discrepancies, such as incorrect published dates, and to add to the biographical understanding of the musical icon. Exploring Bernstein’s process of musical recycling proved unequivocal trends in his compositional process. When a solo piano work precedes its recycling in an orchestrated work, the full piece is generally used with modifications and specifications made to the notation. When an orchestral work precedes recycling in a solo piano work, the work is often cut and modified with little to no modification to the notation and articulation.

Several existing solo piano works are currently unpublished. All works labeled as meditations remain unpublished, perhaps as publishers are not sure how to contextualize them in Bernstein’s output. Several anniversary-like pieces are withheld from publication, notably those that occurred at the end of his life and those that are dedicated to people who already have a published anniversary attributed to them.

In Piano Literature courses offered at Juilliard for the last couple of decades, Leonard Bernstein has not been a core part of the twentieth-century repertoire curriculum. One of the leading conservatories has not recognized Leonard Bernstein as being a key cultural leader of American music. This paper argues for a change in twentieth-century American history and literature curricula as well as a general perspective of Bernstein’s piano repertoire.

In 2018, eighteen years since Bernstein’s death, the most frequently performed piano work is the variation set *Touches*. The work was composed for the Van Cliburn Competition, giving it significant publicity. It is pianistic, flashy, and programs well, as it is roughly eight
minutes long. Less frequently, performances of the *Five, Four*, or *Seven Anniversaries* are programmed. Performances of his longest work *Sonata for Piano* and of individual shorter works are rare. Perhaps for the *Sonata for Piano*, one may point to Bernstein’s description of the culture surrounding contemporary piano music as far back as 1938. “But [a program] of all modern music!... Either the woman [pianist] is extremely wealthy, I argued, and enjoys appearing before an audience; or she is a martyr; or she is a bad pianist who hopes to hide behind a program that nobody knows... or she is an idiot.” However, how does one accept this perspective when works that employ similar modernist techniques are performed today with more frequency, such as works by Bolcom, Copland, Berg, Cage, Cowell, Barber, and Ives?

Bernstein’s piano music is not flashy, technical, or clangorous for the sake of showmanship. The piano music consistently exemplifies a deeply thought out craftsmanship of a musical intent which utilizes traditional compositional techniques while simultaneously encapsulating a sense of American culture by blending elements of folk, jazz, neo-traditionalism, and modernistic sounds. Played well, his piano music does not put the spotlight on the pianist’s technical prowess but rather on the music itself. Twentieth-century America until today has focused attention and marketing on novelty, competitions, showmanship, or scholarship and refinement of celebrated seventeenth-nineteenth-century composers. There is little market demand for pianists who focus on a scholarship and refinement of twentieth-century music that is not outwardly technical, novel, or controversial. Additionally, Bernstein had equal dominance in both the musical theatre and classical spheres. To the broader public, Bernstein is most widely known for *West Side Story, On the Town, Wonderful Town*, the Young People’s Concerts, and

---

his conducting. The often-cerebral quality of his piano music does not immediately match with the average listener’s image of Bernstein, leading to a further misunderstanding of musical context.

I believe that, for these reasons, Bernstein’s piano music has not had a platform in which to be performed. Without a platform, the historical significance of this music has not had appropriate scholarship. The orchestral manifestations of the music have had greater success, largely because of the greater exposure. I argue that inclusion of Bernstein’s piano music into twentieth-century piano literature is mandatory for students to understand American music, the musical and social climate in the twentieth century, and that exposure to this music will lead to an increased interest in scholarship and performance of these works.

On a final note, this research has significantly changed my personal perspective on twentieth-century performance practice. When I first learned Bernstein’s piano music, I ran into several musical difficulties, often finding markings to be awkwardly placed, accents to be cumbersome, and passages to seem uncharacteristically bland. After deep study of his complete output, I found that my difficulties stemmed from a lack of understanding about the compositional elements of the music. American music from the twentieth century cannot be solely approached with a classically-trained ear. The pianist has to be able to hear in several styles simultaneously. Many works require the pianist to feel the music with a jazz pulse while maintaining a classical refinement in voice leading or to understand an implied mixed meter in an accompaniment with a simultaneous regularity in a melodic line. The music intentionally blends pop, jazz, classical, and folk into one music so the pianist must be able to approach each work both technically and auditorily from every perspective at once.
APPENDIX

The Unpublished Works Held in Library of Congress

In 2016, Michael Barrett introduced me to seven unpublished works. In July of 2017, I uncovered several other scores for solo piano that are unpublished, residing in the Library of Congress. As many of these works are complete (some were formerly published), their withholding from current publication is questionable. This appendix serves to make a case for their compositional independence and importance in a first effort to contend for their publication.

1. 5 Against 2

A computer-generated composition, this work demonstrates Bernstein’s interest in experimental music. As a majority of Bernstein’s output is neo-traditionalist, this work serves to show that Bernstein was fully aware of twentieth-century composers’ fascination with computer programming, enabling composers to write pieces that were virtually impossible for performers to play. Though both hands have a $\frac{5}{4}$ time-signature, the right-hand is consistently in divisions of five while the left-hand is consistently in divisions of two or four. As the piece progresses, Bernstein complicates the rhythm by employing off-beats and smaller subdivisions. This work is also attributed the snarky title, *Play This*. I believe this work was withheld because it was computer-generated and gives the impression of being a compositional experiment. I think the work demonstrates Bernstein interacting with novelties of the twentieth century and, therefore, is valid to understanding Bernstein’s compositional interaction with current trends.

---

151 Audio recordings of these works are now published on my album *The Complete Solo Piano Works of Leonard Bernstein*, CD (New York, NY: Steinway and Sons, 2017).
2. *For Sandy Gellhorn*

   Reference Chapter 2 Section I.

3. *Folk Dance*

   The work employs a folk character in sound, as its title suggests. The left hand of the work holds sustained harmonies in a drone-like fashion. The right hand consists of four themes. Each theme consists of a *scherzando* duet in mixed meters. These themes all contain variations and references to every other theme present in the work. As Bernstein uses shorthand at the end of the score, I believe the work was withheld with the assumption that it is incomplete. In closely reading Bernstein’s shorthand, the work is complete, even containing musical direction. I believe this work is important in showing Bernstein’s interest in folk influence. Bernstein was concerned with defining American music, claiming that American folk music was simply an amalgamation of the folk music of several cultures and nations.

4. *For Aaron*

   Reference Chapter 1 Section III.

5. *For Arthur Gold, in loving memory*

   The work is in the character of a berceuse. The left-hand accompaniment consistently provides a rocking or pulsating character beneath melodic material in the right hand. The work comes from the end of his life on January 4, 1990. The manuscript employs much of his shorthand and also shows some of his edits to material. Since his shorthand can be subjective, I believe the score was not published for this reason. I believe this work is significant in showing his compositional voice at the very end of his life. The anniversary collections are invaluable in obtaining glimpses into Bernstein’s compositional voice throughout the entire span of his life. Having more sources from 1990 would advance this biographical understanding.
6. *For Helen, another happy birthday*

This piece was composed July 14, 1972. The piece is on three staves, texturally resembling a trio with a single independent voice on each staff. The voices employ either walking eighth notes or a combination of a dotted-quarter-note and quarter-note on any given measure in the $\frac{5}{8}$ time-signature. The voices often are in imitation. The work is cleanly notated with no shorthand. Perhaps the only explanation of this work being withheld from publication is that it was forgotten after not making publication in the anniversary sets, especially since other anniversaries are already dedicated to Helen Coates. This work is significant in studying Bernstein’s chamber music writing and counterpoint. The interaction of the three distinct voices showcases Bernstein’s brilliance in creating variation with limited compositional devices, as he limits the rhythmic and tonal variety yet achieves significant variation within the work.

7. *35, for Sono and Vic*

This one page work dates from 1978. It is a simple parallel binary form AB – A’B’. The work is primarily comprised of C Major arpeggiation followed by various cadential material.

8. *Valse Lente, Fur Gereda*

*Valse Lente* is a twenty-measure waltz. Entirely triadic and consonant, the waltz is a simplistic melody-over-accompaniment texture. The accompaniment is consistently arpeggiated.

9. *Mixolydian Mixup*

Reference Chapter 2 Section III.

10. *Valse Lente, for GAEA*

This waltz is in a ternary structure ABA. The work, composed in August 25, 1967, is a birthday present for Bernstein’s friend Gaea Pallavicini. The work is a cryptogram, as Bernstein uses the pitches G-A-E-A to encode the name GAEA into almost every phrase and gesture.
11. Meditations Before a Wedding

Reference Chapter 3 Section IV.

12. For Steven Sondheim, The Waltz Kind de Nos Jours

This piece is a classic waltz miniature dating from March 22, 1961. I believe this work was withheld from publication because the original manuscript was unclear (it has since been transcribed neatly by Mark Horowitz). I also believe that this work shows Bernstein’s mastery of composition, as the work is in a style completely unlike Bernstein’s typical compositional voice.

13. Fourth Grade Tears (For Nina)

The piece employs a single motive that repeats five time, each time presenting a new variation of the motive. The musical material of the piece is somewhat similar to the texture of For Jessica Fleischmann, understandable as it was composed within the same time span. The work dates from June 7, 1972. I believe this composition was accidentally overlooked for publication or was withheld since there already exists an anniversary for Nina.

14. History of Music from 1920 to 1945 in 20”

Though fully notated and complete, the piece is only ten measures in length. I believe the short duration of the piece is the reason for it being withheld from publication. The piece is dedicated to his daughter Jamie. Though not an exact cryptogram, Bernstein assigns each syllable of Jamie’s name to a pitch. The resulting motive is used to develop the piece. As cryptograms were a favorite compositional device of Bernstein, I believe this work is an important representative example of Bernstein’s legacy.

15. Largo

I believe this piece to be part of the undiscovered set discussed in Chapter 1 Sections I and III. Similar to the Interlude in this early set, which is a musical precursor to Age of Anxiety,
the piece begins with a simple melodic line, doubled by a second voice. After twelve bars, the right-hand transitions to melodically functioning triads while the left hand adds a countermelody in octaves beneath. Once this collection is fully discovered and completed, I believe that this early set could be a significant missing puzzle piece in the history of his compositional output.

16. *Meditation in Sid Major*

I believe this work is withheld from publication due to its messy notation. The work presents a simple theme in the right hand, accompanied by a mixture of rolled and blocked chords in the left hand. The work dates from February 1989. This piece, again, serves as another biographical gem dating from the final years of his career.

17. *Meditation (on a prayerful Theme My Father Sang in the Shower Thirty Years Ago)*

This work dates from January 1962. The work is a small variation set on two different but related themes. The work was printed at one point in time. Its reason for being withheld I believe to be either personal or monetary. The work is an important example of Bernstein’s variation technique, as *Touches* currently exists as the sole piano variation set.

18. *Virgo Blues*

This piece is a theme, originally dedicated to his daughter Jamie on her twenty-sixth birthday on September 8, 1978. The dedication reads, “with love and high hopes.” The theme was used nearly verbatim for the theme of *Touches*. I believe it is withheld from publication since it is fully published in *Touches*. I believe it would be informative to include the publication of *Virgo Blues* with *Touches* to provide historical and musical context.

---

152 The 31st notated quarter-note is an E₅ in *Virgo Blues* and is an F₅ in *Touches*. 
19. “Greig”

As the title suggests, this work is a character piece, mimicking the compositional style and sound of Edvard Greig. I believe this work is withheld because much of it is written in compositional shorthand, making it appear to be incomplete. I believe this work is important in showcasing Bernstein’s ability to mimic the compositional styles of other composers. It also shows that Bernstein’s compositional prowess came from a deep study of other composers.

20. One-Minute for Charlie

The work contains only two textures, a dramatic arpeggiated opening gesture and ominous stepwise triadic motion. The work is built by alternating between these two textures in an A B A B’A form. I believe this work has not yet been published since it was composed at a later time in Bernstein’s life (March 1985), is short, and was not included in any of the anniversary collections. The piece is important in seeing how Bernstein can create a full dramatic work with only two textural elements. The work is dedicated to Charles Harmon.

21. For Nicky Slonimsky

In this short anniversary-like piece, Bernstein masks the Happy Birthday tune within a musical texture of various styles. Orchestral snippets of other composers are quoted in the piece, the most obvious being the opening of Tristan and Isolde. The work dates from February 7, 1989. I believe the late compositional date and the lack of inclusion in the Thirteen Anniversaries collection has resulted in the piece being withheld. This is an important example of showing Bernstein’s ability to quote popular references. As quotation appears in other important works from his repertoire, this work is useful in understanding how and when Bernstein uses quotation.
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