

https://dspace.org/

Modest Musorgsky's Pictures at an exhibition, with special reference to a comparative analysis of selected movements of orchestrations by Maurice Ravel and Leo Funtek

Van Wyk, Heidi

2014-05-13
http://hdl.handle.net10539/14655

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

The copyright of the above-mentioned described thesis rests with the author or the University to which it was submitted. No portion of the text derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author or University (as may be appropriate). *Short quotations may be included in the text of a thesis* or dissertation for purposes of illustration, comment or criticism, provided full acknowledgement is made of the source, author and University.

Modest Musorgsky's *Pictures at an Exhibition,* with Special Reference to A Comparative Analysis of Selected Movements of Orchestrations by Maurice Ravel and Leo Funtek

by

Heidi van Wyk

A Research Report submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Music in Performance in the Faculty of Humanities, Wits School of Arts, University of the Witwatersrand

Supervisor: Prof. Jeanne Zaidel-Rudolph

August 2004

Dedication

This research report is dedicated to my loving and supportive mother Rika, and caring and devoted piano teacher, Pauline. They are both examples of strength, perseverance and depth. They demonstrate that no obstacle and adversity is too great to prevent that which one wants to achieve. They are an inspiration for my work! Thank you.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Jeanne Zaidel-Rudolph for all her patience, constructive advice and enthusiasm. I realise that you, Jeanne sometimes did more than expected and this dedication did not go unnoticed. I am very honoured to work with a composer of your calibre and integrity.

Malcolm Nay, it was wonderful to work with such a passionate musician and a supportive and sensitive person; it was highly inspiring for my playing. I learnt a great deal of technique and understanding of music from both you and Pauline which I can apply and build on in future.

Pauline Nossel, I will always remember you as a perfectionist who gives music a new dimension. I regard you not only as a teacher, but will always consider you as a friend.

I thank my family for their support throughout this whole degree process; for all the phone calls and words of encouragement. I would also like to thank those who flew up from Cape Town for my final recital - it meant a great deal to me.

It is a privilege to have friends who support me and show such interest in my work, in particular Christi Roode who shares my passion and believes in me.

Table of contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i

INTRODUCTION iv

CHAPTER I

Biographical sketches of Musorgsky, Ravel and Funtek

1. Modest Musorgsky 1

1.1 Musorgsky's musical language with reference to: tonality and harmony, melody, rhythm and metre 11

1.2 Realism 21

2. Maurice Ravel 27

3. Leo Funtek 32

CHAPTER II

Pictures at an Exhibition

Origin and Historical Background 35

CHAPTER III

A Comparative Analysis of the Ravel and Funtek Orchestrations of the first 'Promenade' with reference to the following: 54

· instrumentation

· texture

· dynamic indications

· voice leading

· spacing

· doublings

· registers

· timbre

· articulation

· rhythmic adaptations

· additions to the piano score
· omissions from the piano score

CHAPTER IV

A Comparative Analysis of the Ravel and Funtek Orchestrations of Part 5 - 'Ballet of the Unhatched Chickens'. 69

CHAPTER V

A Comparative Analysis of the Ravel and Funtek Orchestrations of Part 10 - 'The Great Gate of Kiev'. 76

CONCLUSION 85

BIBLIOGRAPHY 87

APPENDIX A

The piano score of the 'Promenade' by Musorgsky.
The orchestral score of the 'Promenade' by Ravel.
The orchestral score of the 'Promenade' by Funtek.

APPENDIX B

The piano score of 'Ballet of the Unhatched Chickens' by Musorgsky.
The orchestral score of 'Ballet of the Unhatched Chickens' by Ravel.
The orchestral score of 'Ballet of the Unhatched Chickens' by Funtek.

APPENDIX C

The piano score of 'The Great Gate of Kiev' by Musorgsky.
The orchestral score of 'The Great Gate of Kiev' by Ravel.
The orchestral score of 'The Great Gate of Kiev' by Funtek.

Introduction

This research report investigates the fascinating and diverse approaches by two esteemed musicians to the orchestral transcription of *Pictures at an Exhibition* (1874) by the Russian composer, Modest Musorgsky (1839-1881). Ravel (1875-1937) is a prominent composer and orchestrator while Funtek (1885-1965) is a lesser known conductor and orchestrator. Each displays a very different conceptualization of Musorgsky's work, yet each application in its own way is musically sound and valid. This study illustrates these two individual and unique orchestrations. Funtek demonstrates a more literal and narrative approach to his transcription while Ravel employs a more elaborate, embellished and creative interpretation of the original. Biographical and historical information on *Pictures* has been obtained from several sources; however Russ (1992) has done the most extensive musical research and analysis on this work. Although much has been written about Ravel, minimal sources are available for biographical and musical information on Funtek.

In researching sources for information on Musorgsky's musical ability and his own 'style' of orchestration, it became evident to this author that whatever orchestrations Musorgsky produced were either incomplete, or revised and edited by Rimsky-Korsakov (1844-1908), e.g. Mlada, Night on the Bare Mountain, Boris Godunov, Khovantchina and The Fair at Sorótchintzy. Therefore any investigation into the 'authenticity' of the orchestrations will not be dealt with in this report. What will be addressed is the degree to which each orchestrator remains close to the literal writing, character and nuances found in the original piano score.

Pictures was never publicly performed during Musorgsky's lifetime due to its 'unpianistic' idiom (Russ, 1992. 25) as well as the criticism levelled towards it by the musical cognoscenti. It was only in 1915 (forty one years later) at the Moscow Conservatory that the work became a standard piece in the repertoire of concert pianists (von Riesemann, 1971. 293).

Russ maintains that *Pictures* can probably be considered to be the most orchestrated and arranged work in the piano repertoire. Its popularity has led to at least fifteen orchestrations as well as other kinds of transcriptions, dating from 1886 to 1982. The first orchestration of this work was done by composer and conductor Michael Touschmaloff (1861-1896), who orchestrated it in 1886, although his version was first performed only in 1891. There were also orchestrations done by Sir Henry Wood (1869-1944), Leo Funtek, Maurice Ravel, Lucien Cailliet (1891-1984), Leopold Stokowski (1882-1977) and Walter Goehr (1903-1960). Lawrence Leonard transcribed *Pictures* as a work for piano and orchestra. There are also transcriptions of the Suite for large brass ensemble (1979) and for brass band by Elgar Howarth (1981). Sergei Gorchakov's (1905-1976) orchestral arrangement appeared in the USSR in 1954. Vladimir Ashkenazy (b.1937-) (who has performed *Pictures* as a pianist and has conducted both orchestrations by Ravel and Funtek), has also penned an orchestral version of the work. There are several other interesting instrumentations to be found ranging from those for symphonic band to accordion and guitar. Several arrangements for organ also exist, notably by Wills and Camilleri (Russ, 1992. 77-78).

This research report explores biographical details of the three great musicians and to what extent their background influences the composition and the two orchestrations of the piano work, *Pictures at an Exhibition*. In addition it will investigate and highlight the differences and similarities between the two orchestrations, one by the French composer, Maurice Ravel and the other by the Finnish composer, Leo Funtek. This study aims to show how one might reach a critical evaluation as to which seems closer to the original piano composition. The analysis will refer to various parameters such as instrumentation, texture, dynamic indications, voice leading, spacing, doublings, timbre, articulation and tempo, as well as additions to and omissions from the original piano score. For the purpose and scope of this research report, only selected parts of the piano work will be analysed namely, the first 'Promenade', 'Ballet of the Unhatched Chickens' and 'The Great Gate of Kiev'. The sections chosen are representative of the highly individual approaches and techniques by the two orchestrators. The whole Suite consists of ten relatively short pieces with five 'Promenades' randomly inserted

between some of the sections. The 'Promenades' serve as interludes which depict how Musorgsky, the 'gallery-visitor' at the Exhibition reacted to the pictures he saw (Bricard, 2002. 11).

The rationale for selecting Leo Funtek as one of the orchestrators in this research report is that his orchestration is considered to be a hitherto unknown and undervalued work, one that has only recently been exposed outside Finland. The Radio Finnish Orchestra brought it to international attention by taking the initiative to play it on foreign tours during 1986. Ravel's orchestration, completed in 1922 on the other hand, took complete precedence over others for many years. Its popularity was probably due to the glorious and colourful orchestral arrangement that is so characteristic of Ravel's compositions in general. Ironically both composers orchestrated this same piece a few months apart in 1922 (unbeknown to one another), although Funtek only began to achieve recognition for his work relatively recently (Aho, 1986. Liner notes. Grammofon. AB BIS).

CHAPTER I

Biographical Sketches of Musorgsky, Ravel and Funtek

1. Modest Musorgsky (1839-1881)

The life of Russian composer, Modest Petrovich Musorgsky, was marked by significant personal, historic, political and cultural events which had a profound impact on his well-being and art. One such event was the rise of Russian nationalism that manifested itself for the first time in 1836 with the performance of Mikhail Glinka's (1804-1857) patriotic opera *Life for the Czar* - this nationalism in music spread rapidly to artistic areas other than opera (Bricard, 2002. 6). Bricard explains how "Russians were tired of importing ideas in art, literature and music from Europe and now needed a renaissance with a distinctive Slavic character. Russia possessed a wealth of folk songs, liturgical music and fairy tales that could serve as an inspiration for composers and give their music a national character. Established composers Glinka and Alexander Dargomïzhky (1813-1869) prepared the groundwork for a Russian national music school by exploiting these assets" (Bricard, 2002, 6).

In 1856 Alexander Borodin (1833-1887), later one of the members of the 'Balakirev Circle', met Musorgsky for the first time. The following winter, one of his regimental comrades introduced Musorgsky to Dargomïzhky. The influence of this new acquaintance marked a turning point in the whole development of Musorgsky's personality and in the direction of his creative abilities. Dargomïzhky held musical evenings at his house once a week where his own and Glinka's works were the main feature of the evening. During these evenings Musorgsky also became acquainted with César Cui (1835-1918) and Mili Balakirev (1837-1910). These new friendships and gatherings were pivotal in Musorgsky's musical career since Musorgsky and Cui immediately formed a close relationship; they often played duets together and discussed harmony. Later he received lessons in theory from Balakirev. These acquaintances and

events led to Musorgsky's career change from officer to composer (von Riesemann, 1971. 23).

An avid supporter of musical nationalism, Musorgsky became a member of a group whose main aim was to develop this trend. The group had an ideological leader, Vladimir Stasov (1824-1906) (an art historian and later a librarian to the Imperial Public Library in St Petersburg), who called the group the *moguchaya kuchka* (mighty little heap); they were also identified as the *Mighty Five, the Balakirev Circle* or the *Russian Five*. Other members of the group included Balakirev, César Cui, Alexander Borodin, and Rimsky-Korsakov (Bricard, 2002. 6). With the exception of Balakirev, the members of the circle were all aristocratic amateurs in composition, who had no professional training (Russ, 1992. 2). Stasov characterized each member of the *Mighty Five* as follows:

"Balakirev was the most inspired; Cui, the most graceful; Rimsky-Korsakov, the most learned; Borodin, the most profound; and Musorgsky, the most talented" (Bricard, 2002. 6).

Balakirev, two years Musorgsky's senior, was a highly respected composer who managed, through self-education, to overcome the difficulties posed by a lack of formal training. He wielded great influence on those around him and was known for his dogmatic musical instruction. Nonetheless, Musorgsky was willing to submit himself to this musical domination and asked Balakirev for regular musical instruction in composition. This manifested in their playing piano duet arrangements and analysing all the Beethoven symphonies, compositions by Schubert, Berlioz, Liszt, Glinka, Dargomïzhky, as well as some works by Bach, Handel, Haydn and Mozart. However, Balakirev's idealism turned out to be of little interest to Musorgsky (Sadie, 2001. 542). Balakirev's aim was, like the rest of the Balakirev circle, to create a new individual Russian musical style built on the innovations of Glinka, commonly regarded as the father of Russian music. Innovativeness, originality and the practical acquisition of skills were also of great importance to Musorgsky's tutor (Russ. 1992. 2).

Unfortunately Musorgsky had little interest in extended instrumental composition. He later discovered that his true genius lay in realistic vocal works. His only major piano work, though not based on a conventional structure, is the loosely arranged collection of descriptive pieces called *Pictures at an Exhibition* (*Kartinki s vystavki*), the subject of this research report. Balakirev only encouraged Musorgsky to write instrumental, symphonic and sonata-form compositions. Musorgsky's only piece in sonata form, *Allegro in C* for piano duet, composed in 1858, was not a success. Balakirev's interest in folk music and his ability to use it to transform his own musical language in an innovative and original way was of much more significance to Musorgsky. Some of Balakirev's harmonic influences are noticeable in Musorgsky's weaker works, though *Pictures* seems to be mainly the work of Musorgsky himself (Russ, 1992. 2). Balakirev recalled:

"As I am no theorist, I could not give Musorgsky instruction in harmony, so I confined myself to explaining the different forms of composition... I pointed out the technical structure of these compositions as we went through them, and got him to analyse the various musical forms. So far as I remember, there were few actual professional lessons; these came to an end, for one reason or another, and were succeeded by friendly exchange of opinions" (von Riesemann, 1971. 23-25).

Musorgsky himself stated that he owed his earliest conscious artistic impressions to his nanny. In his autobiographical sketch he tells us:

"Thrown so much in my nurse's society, I soon became familiar with all the Russian fairy tales... The acquaintance thus formed with the spirit of the people and their modes of life furnished the chief incentive to my earliest interpretations on the pianoforte, even before I knew the most elementary rules of piano playing" (von Riesemann, 1971. 10).

However, Musorgsky never made direct artistic use of the varied multi-coloured scenes of the Russian fairyland that his nurse unveiled before him. This wide and promising field he left to Rimsky-Korsakov, while he confined himself to the realistic side of Russian life. The only artistic results of this influence in Musorgsky's work can be observed in the scene of the second act of *Boris Godunov* between the children and their

nanny, his song-cycle *The Nursery* (von Riesemann, 1971. 10) and 'Tuileries' from *Pictures at an Exhibition*; the latter is a portrayal of children with their nannies in the 'Tuileries' gardens and how the children are playing and arguing among themselves (Score; Funtek. Mussorgsky. 1990. 6).

Musorgsky was a musical child prodigy and displayed signs of extraordinary talent from a very early age. As a young boy he began to improvise even before he had any formal tuition. He received his first piano lessons from his mother, who was soon superseded by a German governess as his teacher (von Riesemann, 1971. 11).

From 1849 to 1853 Musorgsky was enrolled in a German classical preparatory school in St Petersburg, regarded as the best secondary school at the time. Here Musorgsky received his musical training from Anton Herke, of Polish descent, who was considered one of the best pianists and teachers in St Petersburg. Herke was a pupil of Adolf Henselt, who was a renowned pianist and resided in St Petersburg from 1838. Musorgsky's lessons with Herke were probably intended to serve as preparation for a more advanced course under Henselt, but this was never realized. Herke introduced Musorgsky to a wide range of European music and under his tutoring he acquired a sound technique and excelled as a pianist (Russ, 1992. 1).

Although capable of doing so, Herke never taught Musorgsky the foundation of theory and harmony; something that Musorgsky would undoubtedly have mastered with ease and which could have saved him much labour and frustration later in life. Herke's main interest seemed to have been in Musorgsky's remarkable piano playing. This lack of a sound theoretical foundation contributed to Musorgsky's individual approach to composition later in his life. Musorgsky continued lessons with Herke until the end of his military schooling and there is no mention of another teacher after Herke (von Riesemann, 1971. 14-15). It is common knowledge that Musorgsky was always able to play his compositions on the piano even before anything was written on paper. Therefore, although he did not acquire any theoretical training during his lessons with

Herke, he could still apply principles to his compositions which were learnt during these years of studying piano.

During this period Musorgsky also laid the foundation of his knowledge of foreign languages in his studies including Italian, French, Polish, Latin and German. This was reflected in the variety of languages employed in *Pictures* e.g. 'Il Vecchio Castello' (Italian), 'Tuileries' (French) and 'Bydlo' (Polish), to name a few (Bricard, 2002. 11). Incidentally, despite all the foreign scenes of the various pieces in *Pictures*, Musorgsky never left his native land, but spent most of his life in St Petersburg (Russ, 1992. 2).

After preparatory school he was enrolled at the Guards' Cadet Academy in St Petersburg. During Musorgsky's last two years in the Cadet School, he became acquainted with the divinity master of the Academy, Father Krupsky. Under his guidance Musorgsky was initiated into the Byzantine Catholic Church music of Russia. The foundation he received from Father Krupsky in this genre was of great significance in establishing his knowledge and profound understanding of the essence and spirit of Russian Church music which he later displayed in many of his works, great and small (von Riesemann, 1971. 12, 13, 16). A manifestation of the church influence also appeared later as a choral section in the last piece of *Pictures*, 'The Great Gate of Kiev' from bars 30 to 46 and bars 64 to 80.

E.g. bars 30 to 46: (Score: Funtek. Mussorgsky. 1990. 129).



E.g. bars 64 to 80: (Funtek. Mussorgsky. 1990. 133).



The Emancipation Proclamation was issued by Alexander II (1818-1881) on February 19, 1861:

"Declare to all our loyal subjects...

...All those people now bound to the soil will receive at the proper time to the full rights of free rural residents.

...The landowners, maintaining their possession of all lands now belonging to them will place at the disposal of the peasants a certain quantity of field soil and other lands according to given regulations..." (Bricard, 2002. 6).

This Great Reform declaration, which included the elimination of serfdom amongst other things, brought on Musorgsky's eventual poverty. The division of property affected his mother who tried to maintain the Musorgsky family's former way of living, though on a more modest scale than they were used to on their family estate in Karevo, where Musorgsky used to spend nearly all of his summers. This also resulted in a loss of income for Musorgsky from his family estates and forced him to seek refuge within the Russian civil service bureaucracy, living in circumstances not associated with aristocracy. Musorgsky consequently fell into the despair of alcoholism (Taruskin, 1993. 384).

In 1863, Musorgsky was forced to accept a low-grade appointment as an official in the Engineering Department of the Ministry of Transport. He spent the next eighteen years of his life surrounded by corruption and in relative obscurity in his working environment in the civil service, since he could not earn enough money as a full time composer; this most likely contributed to his negative mental state. His mother died in 1865; besides his

emotional pain, her death also brought material consequences. Shortly after she passed away, he paid a musical tribute to her memory in the song *Prayer,* based on Lermontov's poem of the same name. This is the first work in which Musorgsky made use of his knowledge of Byzantine Catholic church music gained from Father Krupsky. Later that year, Musorgsky's emotional well-being started to mirror his gloomy circumstances. After the many setbacks suffered, including his mother's death, the decline of his financial resources and the burden of his official duties, Musorgsky was on the verge of a nervous breakdown (von Riesemann, 1972. 92, 94, 95). Rimsky-Korsakov built up a very close relationship with Musorgsky during this time.

From 1875 onwards the 'Balakirev circle' started to break up. Rimsky-Korsakov's book, *My Musical Life*, has an interesting remark about the relationship of Cui and Balakirev towards Musorgsky. He writes:

"Although in the sixties Balakirev and Cui were close friends of Moussorgsky's, and genuinely fond of him, their behaviour had always a certain condescension in it, as elder men towards younger, from whom, in spite of his undoubted talent, little was to be expected. It seemed to them that something was lacking in him and that he, more than the rest, was in need of good advice and critical guidance" (von Riesemann, 1971. 119).

Although Musorgsky felt abandoned by the group, he remained good friends with Ludmilla Ivanovna Shestakova (Glinka's sister whom he met in 1867) from whom he received friendship and sympathy. Their fifteen-year friendship lasted until his death, and helped him overcome many difficulties (von Riesemann, 1971. 277, 283, 286). "Musorgsky's circle of friends and acquaintances was composed chiefly, but not exclusively, of members of the musical world down to this latter period of his life. He kept up friendly relations with representatives of other arts, however, especially those whose artistic views did not clash with his own progressive temper and his impulse to shatter the traditional rules of art. Among these, besides the sculptor Antolsky and the painter Riepin, was the architect Victor Hartmann, a friend of the Stasov family" (von Riesemann, 1971. 287). The latter was on intimate terms with the whole 'Balakirev

circle', but especially with Musorgsky and Stasov. Hartmann's premature death in 1874 at the age of thirty-nine made a deep impression on Musorgsky.

After 1878 Musorgsky occasionally went to stay with an acquaintance, the painter Naumov, who did not play a positive role in the composer's life. Naumov had a weakness for drink and this most likely encouraged this weakness in his guest, which soon led to Musorgsky's final ruin. Musorgsky's old friends, Ludmilla Ivanovna Shestakova and Rimsky-Korsakov did not have a high opinion of his new acquaintance. Ludmilla wrote to Stasov in August 1878:

"If it were only possible to get him away from Naumov, we may still save him yet" (von Riesemann, 1971. 326).

According to von Riesemann, Musorgsky was of a different opinion. Musorgsky viewed Naumov as a friend that he had outside his usual circle of musicians and people of intellectual distinction. Naumov appealed to the more human side of the composer and perhaps he also received more artistic sympathy from Naumov and his comrades than from his friends in the professional world (von Riesemann, 1971. 324). Rimsky-Korsakov mentioned this fact with reproach and without understanding the true reason for Musorgsky's behaviour in *My Musical Life*:

"About that time we found that he (Musorgsky) used to sit in the Maly Yaroslawetz Restaurant and other taverns till the small hours, over a bottle of brandy, alone, or in the company of new friends and boon companions who none of us knew. When he dined with us, or elsewhere, Musorgsky generally refused wine at table, but later in the evening he was irresistibly drawn to the Maly Yaroslawetz Restaurant" (von Riesemann, 1971. 324).

In 1879, Musorgsky went on a concert tour with Madame Leonova, who performed some of his works as part of the programme. This tour took him beyond the limits of St Petersburg and the Government of Pskov, to Poltava, Elizavetgrad, Nikolaiev, Kherson, Sebastopol and Yalta. During this tour, he made the resolution to give up his office work and devote himself entirely to music. The success that he had gained as composer and

pianist during the trip strengthened his confidence in his ability to make a living with his music. It was almost a year before he carried out his resolution, during which time he completed his opera, *Khovantchina* and became determined not to give in to depression (von Riesemann, 1971. 335, 340, 341).

Towards the end of 1880 a fight for survival started as Musorgsky was faced with the threatening reality of poverty and possible starvation. In a desperate attempt to obtain an income he consented to taking the position of an assistant teacher in D.M. Leonova's school of singing, which she had opened in St Petersburg, although it did not pay well and took up much of his time. Musorgsky later decided to 'devote his whole personality to art', but all he could find to occupy this devotion was to accompany Madame Leonova's pupils at numerous concerts (von Riesemann, 1971. 348, 349). Unfortunately, the majority of these were charity concerts for needy students of the Art Academy, although ironically, Musorgsky needed the financial assistance as much as the group of students among whom the proceeds of the concerts were divided! Musorgsky's second last public appearance was at a commemoration of Dostoievsky's death on January 25, 1881. He performed publicly for the last time as an accompanist for a singer on February 9 that same year (Sadie, 2001. 549).

Musorgsky's end came sooner than expected. Although his mind could bear the strain, his body could not. This nervous tension was intensified by the boycotting of *Boris Godunov* and his material deprivations created by poverty (von Riesemann, 1971. 350). The only account of his final breakdown is contained in the recollections of Madame D.M. Leonova. She recalls how Musorgsky appeared very nervous while accompanying the singer during his last performance on 9 February 1881. Two days later he visited her 'in a state of great nervousness'. That evening he fainted and had an epileptic fit. He spent the night at Madame's house on account of his nerves. Musorgsky spent the whole night sleeping in a sitting position and the next day he had three more seizures (Sadie, 2001. 549). Von Riesemann claims that she decided to consult some of his friends the following day, those who had shown him their sympathy before. Musorgsky's friends persuaded him to go to a hospital and he was booked into the Nikolai Military Hospital in

the Smolna suburb of St Petersburg. "It is hard to determine the exact cause of his illness, but Rimsky-Korsakov bluntly calls it 'the white fever', the Russian term for 'delirium tremens'. A French writer on music, Robert Godet, who took the trouble to have Musorgsky's illness diagnosed on evidence of dates, came to the conclusion that the disease that Musorgsky died of was the last stage of chronic nephritis" (Bright's disease is chronic inflammation of the kidneys) (von Riesemann, 1971. 350, 351).

Before his death, some time between the 2nd and 5th March 1881, he sat for the painter Riepin for the famous portrait, the original being in the Tretiakov Gallery in Moscow (von Riesemann, 1971. 352). Musorgsky died on the morning of his forty-second birthday on March 16, 1881. His funeral took place on March 18 and ironically, no cost was spared by his 'friends'. He was buried in the cemetery of the Alexander-Nevsky Monastery, close to the grave of his predecessor Michael Glinka. A dictum of the sculptor Antolsky, his friend in early days states:

"He (Musorgsky) only is an artist who loves humanity as passionately as he loves art – who dedicates his whole life to art for the sake of humanity. Only in such favoured beings is the divine spark to be found, bright and unquenchable; and that, in art, is one thing needful, for when the soul ceases to lend its sympathy, the death of art begins" (von Riesemann, 1971. 354, 357).

1.2 Musorgsky's musical language with reference to tonality and harmony, melody, rhythm and metre

Tonality and Harmony

To Musorgsky neither the character of the keys, nor the outer appearance of logic in tonal structure was of much importance. He nonetheless had a good sense of the value of key relationships. "In other words, Musorgsky's sense of tonality does not depend upon the affirmation of tonic, dominant and subdominant, which he exploits or not, according to the needs of the moment. He feels no need to begin or end with any such affirmation" (Calvocoressi, 1956. 292). This appears, e.g. in his song, "*The Ragamuffin* which starts in C major. After a modulating section in which this key reappears several times, the end comes in G major, quickly but firmly established as a tonic – a noteworthy extension of the idea ending on the dominant..." (Calvocoressi, 1956. 293). In the first 'Promenade' however, we have an example in which Musorgsky retains the integrity of the key (in this case Bb major), but with forays of the music into more distant keys such as Db and F major. He also displays frequent use of the 'secondary dominant' harmonic technique (e.g. bar 23 of the 'Promenade'). (Score; Mussorgsky, 1952, 1)



In an interesting way Musorgsky's lack of formal training in theory contributed to his very unique approach to the usage of or lack of harmonic and contrapuntal procedures. "Harmonic techniques in *Pictures* are many and varied. Just as each picture has its own formal structure, so each has its own characteristic harmonic procedures. Musorgsky's vocabulary of chords is unremarkable except for a few whole-tone and octatonic products; it is the way they are employed that is original and varied (Russ, 1992. 63).

Bricard states that his chord combinations are not remarkable in themselves but his "chord progressions are often innovative" (Bricard, 2002, 10). "Superficially, Musorgsky's harmony often adds colour and weight to an essentially linear structure, rather than having a structural function itself... His restrained use of passing and auxiliary notes and the almost complete absence of suspensions are symptomatic of a technique in which each vertical note has harmonic potential" (Russ, 1992. 63). Bricard mentions that although there is little or no pure counterpoint in *Pictures* there is linear movement that appears in some of the 'Promenades' and in "Samuel" Goldenburg and "Schmuÿle" that suggests counterpoint (Bricard, 2002.10). Russ is of the opinion that "there is little or no imitative counterpoint; while the kind of free polyphony that derives from folk heterophony and free two-part writing are widespread, strict imitative counterpoint and any kind of quasi-fugal writing have no place in Musorgsky." (Russ, 1992. 63).

Criticism was levelled at Musorgsky because of the perceived disparity between his natural talent and his compositional technical facility that he seemingly lacked. "Indeed, in many ways Musorgsky's methods look beyond the theory of his time. He had little respect for the conventions of musical grammar, being more interested in sonorities than rules. The castigation of much of Musorgsky's music for its lack of sound harmonic technique is one of the great injustices perpetrated upon him by his contemporaries. It is true that Musorgsky lacked polish in handling one particular type of compositional technique: the sophisticated major-minor system with its complex prolongational procedures and highly complex functional harmony (but compensating lack of sophistication in melodic procedures and rhythm), often encapsulated in sonata form. But this type of abstract tonal sophistication is of little relevance to Musorgsky's structures; indeed, it may well detract from what he is expressing" (Russ, 1992. 63).

"...in some of Musorgsky's poorer piano music the influence of Balakirev's harmony is strong, but it appears rarely in *Pictures*; we may detect a hint of his teacher in the most oriental piece, 'Goldenberg' with the progression Bb minor III - III5#...- I (Bars 25-26) with its raised fifth in the second chord. Balakirev's incessant modulation is not found in


Pictures. Within individual pieces substantive modulations are rare and changes of key tend not to be anticipated or prepared; they take place when the moment demands. Key signatures of more than three accidentals are common, particularly in the earlier part of the work...", e.g. 'Gnomus' has a key signature of six flats (Eb minor) (Russ, 1992. 64).

Russ refers to specific chordal and harmonic entities that Musorgsky uses: "The widespread use of diminished sevenths and the extension of mediant relationships is a feature of nineteenth-century music and particularly of Russian music from Glinka onwards. In 'Goldenberg' the second section is in the mediant minor with a melodic emphasis on the submediant note (Bbb) as part of a b6-5 motion in that key. Seventh chords of all kinds are widespread in *Pictures*; they are used in unconventional ways and sometimes as freestanding sonorities without any obligation to resolve, reflecting a free and expressive attitude to dissonance most apparent in 'Catacombs'. The flat-submediant chord, often with a seventh attached or recast as a German sixth, is a particular favourite, reflecting a desire to move from functional dominant-tonic harmony to a more colourful palette (dominant-tonic progressions may be absent for considerable periods in this work). A good example comes at the beginning of 'Chicks' where a German sixth prolongs the tonic without progressing through the dominant" (Russ, 1992. 64).

Musorgsky uses a combination of quite traditional harmonic procedures with more interesting unconventional chordal arrangements, e.g. in 'Gnomus', functional harmonies are distant to the key signature of Eb minor. "Tonic triads appear rarely, dominant triads are completely absent; but contextual emphasis is placed on the tonic and dominant notes, particularly in the bass; there are no conventional cadences" (Russ, 1992. 65). It was quite adventurous at the time (1874) for a composer to infuse different sections of a piece or set of pieces with very different harmonic procedures. "The goal of the first seventeen entirely monodic bars is clear: they gravitate to the dominant note, Bb, which falls to the tonic in the bass of bar 19" (Russ, 1992. 65). An interesting ambiguity of keys exists e.g., "the leading note D natural suggests Eb minor despite the strong contextual emphasis on Gb in bar 2. The opening eighteen bars employ a seven-note collection with an interpenetration of Eb minor, phrygian, chromatic and whole-tone qualities. The


supertonic is flattened (phrygian), the fourth, Ab, is missing (preventing the establishing of the formation of the tritone Ab/D which could help to reinforce the Eb tonality) and, in bars 5-10 and 12-17, a descending whole-tone tetrachord (Gb, Fb D, Bb) is outlined" (Russ,1992. 65).

(Ex. Russ, 1992. 66):



Since the mid-nineteenth century the octatonic scale had become very popular among the Russian composers. Russ explains some of the various ways in which they incorporated this compositional technique: "In Musorgsky, the repeated juxtaposition of two dominant sevenths on roots a tritone apart to form the bell chords in the coronation scene in *Boris* is a distinctive octatonic progression. The somewhat novel harmonic language of 'Tuileries' seems in places to arise from the mixing of octatonic and diatonic writing, though the complex interpenetration of the two does seem to suggest that there is octatonic flavouring here rather than overt systematic use of the scale. As shown in the example, the melodic and harmonic content of bars 1-4 comprises a hexachord drawn from an octatonic scale on B: B, B#, Cx, D#, E#, F#, G#" (Russ, 1992, 67).

(Ex. Russ, 1992. 68):




Melody

Russ is of the opinion that there are influences of folk music in *Pictures*. He also explains where Musorgsky's nationalistic inspiration comes from and how it is included in this work. "*Pictures* divides into the obviously folk-inspired pieces with diatonic, conjunct melody and simpler harmonic style ('Promenade,' 'Castello,' 'Bydlo', and 'Kiev') and the more instrumental pieces with chromatic melody and more advanced harmonic techniques where the influence of folk music is less overt ('Gnomus', 'Tuileries', 'Chicks', and 'Limoges'). Musorgsky is essentially a linear composer and the shapes of Russian folk music are often detected in his melodies, but they also affect his harmonic language" (Russ, 1992. 50). Though Musorgsky was not a folk song collector *per se,* he had been exposed extensively to native folk singing as a child and he always had an ear for national songs and folk singers such as Trofim Ryabinin (one of his songs was employed in *Boris*). He was also influenced by his teacher Balakirev's collecting and arranging of folk music and his employing of the material by transforming it into his own musical language. Actual folk melodies do not appear in *Pictures* (except for the chorale melody in 'Kiev' from bars 30 to 46 in Ab minor and from bars 64 to 80 in Eb minor), but folk-influence can materialize in many other ways e.g., in modal alterations, a narrow range, repeated small diatonic groups, heterophony, parallelism and the use of pedals (Russ, 1992. 50).

According to Russ, Musorgsky also included modal techniques in *Pictures*. "Russian folk music, which favours the major or natural minor modes, is often modally wayward (*peremennost*), shifting from one tonic to another. Melodies may be found to have a tonic a tone lower at the end of a song or a phrase. A little of this quality can be found in the opening 'Promenade' whose shifts through various harmonic regions may owe more to *peremennost* than to conventional harmonic processes. Perhaps surprisingly...the pentatony at the opening of the piece is not common in Russian folk music, and this is its most striking appearance in Musorgsky's output" (Russ, 1992. 50).

'Castello' is the most modal piece in the set. Its principal melody is Aeolian, as manifested by the natural seventh degree, although the raised seventh degree does tend to appear in the inner parts particularly at cadences. When the A sharp becomes an A natural the music is Phrygian. "'Castello' contains some diatonic melismatic writing that possibly reflects the influence of a type of melismatic peasant song known as the *protyazhnaya.* This type of song has a tendency for the opening statement to ornament a fifth falling to the tonic, a characteristic found at the beginning of 'Castello' and a number of other pictures (See example below). 'Bydlo' shows the same influence and is in the same key, G# minor. Here the end of the falling fifth is placed an octave higher" (Russ, 1992. 51, 52).

E.g. 'Castello' bars 6 to 8 (Bricard, 2002. 24)



The melody alone in the second section (bars 27-37) of 'Castello' suggests tonicising F#, the natural minor leading note – a quality closely associated with the folk model; however, Musorgsky tonicises bII instead and F# is harmonised as the third of the subdominant of A. This tonicisation of the flat supertonic, indicating either Neapolitan harmony or Phrygian mode follows on from the use of that chord in bar 5 to articulate the second phrase, reflecting a tendency of Russian folk music to emphasise the second degree of the scale (Russ, 1992. 52, 53).

"Out of context the opening melody in 'Bydlo' could be heard as phrygian (a rare mode in Russian folk music) on D#, with the characteristic flattened second, E. Although this is ultimately a mistaken interpretation, it is significant that the phrygian qualities of the chorale beginning in bar 30 of 'Kiev' are dealt with in the same way and that the chorale

is in the enharmonically equivalent key of Ab minor (G# minor)" (Russ, 1992. 53). The fading out to a single note in 'Bydlo' seems to reflect Russian folk music. But generally the plagal cadences and melodic cadential formulas associated with Russian folk music are not found in *Pictures*; however "one exception is the archaic v-vi-i ending to the chorale in 'Kiev' (bars 43-5)" (Russ, 1992. 53).

Musorgsky made very little use of the usual ornamentation such as arpeggios and trills. Trills are only used in 'Gnomes', to produce a low, rumbling effect, and in 'Ballet of the Unhatched Chickens', to give the effect of fluttering feathers (Bricard, 2002. 10).

The melodies used in 'Promenade' are closer to the Russian folk song than in any of the other pieces in *Pictures,* although the tendency to repeat distinctive rhythmic and melodic shapes established at the beginning of each piece occurs frequently throughout *Pictures.* (Russ, 1992. 53) "Heterophony is also a common feature of 'Promenade'... In heterophony, 'starting with the a solo intonation (*zapevalo*), the ensemble of singers would without any warning split into parts, each of which was also a self-sufficient melody not too divergent from the one that could conceivably be termed 'principal'. Musorgsky was the first composer to 'attempt to re-create Russian folk heterophony in all of its details', and its influence can be heard in some of his choral music" (Russ, 1992. 53). An example of heterophony in *Pictures* appears in the first three bars of the first 'Promenade' where the single melody line splits into five voices between the second and third bar (See example below).

E.g. 'Promenade' bars 1 to 4 (Score; Musorgsky, 1952. 1).



Rhythm and Metre

Many of the irregular metres and rhythmic schemes of Russian folk-tunes are recognisable in Musorgsky's music. This enabled him to make a remarkably close imitation of human speech tones and inflections in his vocal works and in his instrumental music; imitation of human gestures and motion which emphasises the aspect of realism in his music. Calvocoressi asserts that nearly all his metric and rhythmic innovations were simply more or less mindless imitations of the metres and rhythms of Russian verse. "The allegation may seem plausible, considering the instances of strictly syllabic treatment that occur in his works...For instance, in *The Wild Winds Blowing* 6\4 and 4\4 alternate for purely musical reasons, as made clear by the fact that in this song he uses several notes to a syllable. The same is true of the changes in *Kallistratushka* – notably 7/4, 4/4, 3/2. In *The Ragamuffin,* the lines are mostly pentasyllabic. But Musorgsky introduces 6/4 and 3/2 bars between the 5/4 bars, in order to achieve changes of tone and pace. And a moment comes where the scheme suddenly broadens for a while, the melody proceeding in minims, with the time-signature 3/1, to make a change of tone in the ragamuffin's taunts" (Calvocoressi, 1956. 257).

There are fewer significant examples of irregular rhythmic and metric schemes that occur in his instrumental works, except for *Pictures at an Exhibition.* In this work the alternation of 6/4 and 5/4 in the 'Promenades' has a realistic purpose in that it is a representation of Musorgsky's visit to the exhibition where he at first drifts aimlessly from left to right from one picture to another and then briskly moves towards the pictures that caught his attention. (Calvocoressi, 1956. 259).

In Musorgsky's works there is a clear distinction between instrumental and vocal themes. It appears that many of his main themes in his dramatic music were conceived in instrumental and not vocal terms, e.g. the themes of 'Promenade' and 'Gnomes' are clearly instrumental, but the two used in 'Bydlo' are song-tunes. This distinction can be drawn because the instrumentally conceived themes are "utterly simple, restricted in compass, and consist of the plainest intervals, invariably diatonic except for a few themes of the picturesque order such as those of 'Gnomes' and 'Baba-Yaga' - the only order of themes, too, in which changes of metre occur" (Calvocoressi, 1956. 264). A

noteworthy characteristic of his works is that very few begin with an upbeat. In Calvocoressi's opinion, the 'Promenade' begins with a two-note upbeat although it is not written as such. Upbeats at times also occur at the beginning of vocally conceived themes such as the one in 'Il Vecchio Castello'. When Musorgsky tries to give an impetus to the beginning of a phrase he sometimes does so by using an appoggiatura on the downbeat (Calvocoressi, 1956. 264).

According to Russ, 'Promenade' is often regarded as an example of Musorgsky's 'Russian' metric variability, although it is not so characteristic of this work considering that most of the pieces use only one metre. The effectiveness of the 'Promenades' partly arises from this flexibility that is in contrast with the regular metres of the surrounding pieces (Russ, 1992. 61). Each piece seems to have its own distinctive rhythmic pattern, which on the whole is not particularly complicated, except in 'Goldenberg' where we do find a degree of rhythmic intricacy. Bearing in mind that harmonic suspensions are not characteristic of Musorgsky's style, it is not surprising that syncopation is a rare feature. However, the only example of its consistent use in *Pictures* is in the trio of 'Chicks', "literally the most four-square piece in terms of phrase structure... Some syncopation does appear in 'Gnomus', which also features off-beat *sforzando* accents, rhythmic disruptions and hemiola effects; true hemiola occurs at the end of 'Kiev'. 'Limoges' also has frequent off-beat *sforzando* accents (six in bar 3 alone)" (Russ, 1992. 62). (E.g. score; Musorgsky, 1952. 16).



There is some rhythmic interest in this work with regard to unconventional phrase lengths. Musorgsky's juxtaposition of 5\4 and 6\4 in the 'Promenades' adds up to an eleven beat unit, "reflecting his liking for prime numbers" (Russ, 1992. 62). Using the counting of bars or crotchets as a means of establishing the beats, there are some more irregular phrases to be found elsewhere. "The strophes of 'Castello' are all of irregular

lengths; in the centre of 'Gnomus' we find seven-bar phrases (bars 38-45 and 47-53); and in the centre of 'Bydlo' eleven-bar units (bars 10-20 and 27-37). 'Con Mortuis' falls into two halves, each with sixty crotchets (the first section is prefaced by three upbeats) with an irregular first section (3+1, 12, 15, 15, 17) contrasting with a regular second (4×12)" (Russ, 1992. 62).

Bricard describes the rhythms as "varied" and refers to the way in which Musorgsky "exploits all the capabilities and resources of the piano to produce a variety of sounds and how he is more interested in the resulting sonorities than in the technique of creating them" (Bricard, 2002. 10).

Musorgsky's use of irregular metres and rhythmic designs in *Pictures* is driven therefore by his impetus to reflect a naturalistic and realistic depiction of both instrumental and vocal themes.

1.1 Realism, "Aesthetic of Truth"

Musorgsky identified strongly with the style associated with realism in the arts. He embraced the elements of realism which manifested in and gave expression to his musical and creative ideas. The various aesthetics and definitions of realism profoundly affected Musorgsky's approach to his art.

Nikolai Chernyshevsky's *Aesthetic Relationship of Art to Reality* (1855) was a very influential document in shaping the ideas of Russian writers, artists and musicians among whom Musorgsky is a representative. The philosopher states that "true beauty resides in life and the primary purpose of art is to reproduce reality" (Russ, 1992. 9). Stasov claims that Musorgsky came under the influence of Chernyshevsky's views on realism. The novelist's belief that "art cannot exist for its own sake, but must educate and uplift mankind, and reveal 'artistic truth'" made a particularly great impression on the composer (Sadie, 2001. Vol. 18. 543). Dargomïzhsky was also inspired by the philosopher and started "the idea of setting the text of a play word for word as it was written, without re-working it into a libretto" when he composed Pushkin's *The Stone Guest* in 1866. Dargomïzhsky formulated the credo of Russian realism in a letter in 1857 which was also embraced by Musorgsky: "I want the note to express the word, I want truth" (Dahlhaus, 1985. 73). He was clearly inspired by Nikolai Chernyshevsky's manifesto, *Aesthetic Relationship of Art to Reality* which provided the realism of Russian literature with an aesthetic set of guidelines as well as quotable catchwords (Dahlhaus, 1985. 73).

There are many other ways to describe realism. Dahlhaus's definition of realism can be outlined as "a style which owes something though not everything, to French literary and artistic theory of the 1850s, of which the most influential spokesman and publicist,...was Jules Champfleury, who published *Le réalisme* in 1957" (Dahlhaus, 1985. 60). Champfleury outlines realism as follows: "(1) an – as far as possible – objective representation of (2) social reality, set in either (3) the present time or (4) a concrete past, a reality which (5) also extends to areas which were previously excluded from art as

'unsuitable', and the depiction of which (6) frequently breaks the traditional rules of stylization" (Dahlhaus, 1985. 60).

Dahlhaus states that the striving for objectivity was also a characteristic of realism in art entailing that which was publicly observable, e.g. in opera as is clearly demonstrated in Meyerbeer's *Le Prophète* and Musorgsky's *Boris Godunov*. "...the effort to appear objective – the 'impassibilité' advocated by Gustave Flaubert, who claimed to put it to use in his own novels – almost gives a whiff of romanticism suppressed: the proof of objectivity is its anti-subjectivity. It remains to be shown, however, that 'impassibilité' is not merely a psychological category; if it is also an aesthetic category – and in opera that means a dramaturgical one – the proper place to consider it is not so much in speculation about creative artistic processes as rather in the analysis of the functions of music in the representation or realization of dramatic fables" (Dahlhaus, 1985. 60). Dahlhaus clarifies this statement by pointing out the "perceptible relationship between the musical dramaturgy – the function of the music in the realization of the action – and the different emphasis given to the private or social aspects of the plot" (Dahlhaus, 1985. 61). Through this discussion of categories of dramaturgy and compositional technique he refers directly to Flaubert's aesthetic categories - 'aesthetics of the truth'. His statement also implies that realism is something that depicts real life drama through physical movement accompanied by related music.

Dahlhaus also mentions that within this stylistic sphere, 'the artist is not simply a passive recorder; in his selection and creation he explains and passes judgement on the reality he portrays, and thus gives his art a moral dimension as well'. Thus we see a 'subordination of aesthetic values to moral and social values'. He describes the theory of realism as a "'double mimesis' theory, in which reality is reflected in feeling, and feeling in music" (Dahlhaus, 1989. 264).

Dahlhaus and Russ both compare realism to the romantic style describing realism as an anti-romantic feature, considering that romanticism implies "exaggeration, sentimentality, melodrama and concern with the composer's self-expression over the subject in hand, while the realist artist is always by definition more detached". Despite the contrast between these two movements, realism is very much a part of the Romantic

era. Musorgsky is its clearest musical adherent, but it is also apparent in works of other composers, notably Bizet's Carmen, Janacèk or to a lesser extent, the works of the Italian Verismo (Dahlhaus, 1989. 264). Dahlhaus states that realism in music emerged against a background of romanticism and that it survived until the end of the century, after it had ceased to exist in other arts. However, Russ is of the opinion that "realism was never more than a peripheral phenomenon in the music of the nineteenth century" (Russ, 1992. 12).

Émile Zola in his article on "Naturalism in the Theatre" refers to the historical progression of theatrical writing which moves from the Middle Ages through Classicism and Romanticism and finally to the great need and search for truth wherein man is depicted as a physiological being and not as a metaphysical being – this was called "Naturalism", an outgrowth of "Realism" (Zola, 1968. 358).

The idea of realism in Russian music gained popularity with the recognition by Stasov, the aesthetic ideologist of 'The Five'. Stasov, a publicist in the progressive atmosphere in Russia during the 1860s, instinctively interpreted the doctrine of realism as "a means firstly to place the music of Balakirev and his rebel circle on the same footing as the great Russian epic, secondly, to demonstrate his, and their, modernity by appropriating the slogans of French art and literature criticism of the 1850s, and thirdly to assert their independence both of Italian opera, which the general public preferred, and of Wagnerian music drama, whose declared intentions were beginning to disturb the intelligentsia" (Dahlhaus, 1985. 73).

Musorgsky clearly tried to incorporate these ideas of realism into his music and he loyally supported them for the rest of his life, writing, e.g. in 1880 that 'art is a means of communicating with people, not an aim in itself'. Characteristics of his realistic beliefs first appear in 1866 in his songs, *Gopak* ('Hopak'), *Svetik Savishna* ('Darling Savishna'), *Akh ti p'yanyaya teterya!* ('You drunken sot!') and the *Seminarist* ('The Seminarist') (Sadie, 2001. Vol.18. 544). Even though this statement firmly remained part of his belief, his music throughout the 1870s slowly moved away from the extremes of the realistic style (Sadie, 2001. Vol. 18. 543).

Calvocoressi quotes the *Encyclopaedia Britannica's* definition of realism as: 'Realism is an art, is opposed to idealism in various senses. The realist is: 1) he who deliberately declines to select his subjects from the beautiful or harmonious, and more especially he who describes ugly things and brings out details of an unsavoury sort (a definition also quoted by von Riesemann); 2) he who deals with individuals, not types; 3) most properly, he who strives to represent facts exactly as they are.' The definition becomes clearer when it is seen in opposition to formalism and romanticism. Calvocoressi criticizes the first statement explaining that it is in contradiction with what it stands for, e.g. Bielinsky's praise for Gogol having depicted "ordinary human beings, not pleasant exceptions only". Calvocoressi felt that had the principle of ugliness been a requirement of realism during his time, he would have added "nor unpleasant exceptions" to the doctrine. The second definition refers to the selection of any realistic subject by a painter, writer or musician and the method of his interpretation or treatment of the subject. Even though the artist might have a realistic vision of it, one that incorporates all its features by exaggerating or understating some, they still do not succeed in giving us a realistic representation of it. With reference to the third statement, the representing of realistic facts means the "exaggeration of neither their beautiful nor their ugly features" (Calvocoressi, 1956. 87).

Calvocoressi is of the opinion that all arts are structured by some form of interpretation and formalization – that is, the selection, elimination and organization of features. It is unavoidable that formalization tends to create structured forms within these features which would consequently generalize expression rather than nurture the accurate expression which is the aim of realism. "Therefore, the ideal of realism is a maximum of efficiency in veracity, and a minimum of formalization. The realist artist is he who aims at accurate expression, not generalized expression; and when he has achieved it, does not attempt to add to it" (Calvocoressi, 1956. 88). He also explains that the realistic composer isolates the type of emotions that he wants to communicate by finding them in the character of his subjects. These subjects are placed in the foreground, which means that he exposes the cause of his emotions and not his reactions to them, trusting that this is the most certain way of communicating the right emotion. "No other way of representing facts as they really are is conceivable in art" (Calvocoressi, 1956. 88).

These statements on realism are exactly what the Russian writers stood for, and what Musorgsky aimed for. However, Calvocoressi maintains that his critics did not make it clear whether they felt that Musorgsky was more of a realistic composer than simply a composer and a realist (Calvocoressi, 1956. 88).

Vocal music was at the heart of realism. Musorgsky's best and most realistic work was delivered in the sphere of song opera for its ability to incorporate speech-tones into the music and to depict Russian life 'realistically'. Although instrumental music was a poor substitute for realism, *Pictures* embodies a very conspicuous imitation of vocal music in contrast with the qualities of the piano, which are not exploited to its full capacity (Russ, 1992. 10). It is debatable whether Musorgsky deliberately avoided 'pianism' in *Pictures*.

Realistic depiction of characters can also be achieved in music without a text, through imitating manner of speech, e.g. in *Pictures*: the shouts of children and their playing rhymes in 'Tuileries', the contrasting speech characteristics of the two Jews in 'Samuel Goldenberg' and the various shouts and calls in 'Limoges'. Realism also includes placing specific character types in particular places, e.g. Musorgsky places himself at the exhibition, the troubadour in front of the medieval castle, the children in the garden of the 'Tuileries', the women in the market at 'Limoges' or the masses singing in 'Kiev'. In musical prose, another manifestation of realism, some of the most extreme harmonies and freedom of structure occur. 'Catacombs' comes closest to this form of realism. As an individual piece 'Catacombs' does not make much sense, though in relation to the other pictures the realistic description and musical structure become clearer (Russ, 1992. 10, 11).

Other features of musical realism can be identified in *Pictures* in 'Catacombs', 'Gnomus' and to an extent 'Baba-Yaga' where reality and truth of expression is emphasised over beauty. Effects like e.g. the lumbering of the ox-cart in 'Bydlo' is created by 'unbalanced or dissonant piano writing' (Russ, 1992. 11). Another feature of realism is the depiction of simulation of movement in music created by a realistic process called rhythmic transposition, which entails the imitation of the sonorous and non-sonorous rhythms (Calvocoressi, 1956. 89). This is perceived in Musorgsky walking through the exhibition, the awkward motion of the gnome, the lumbering cart in 'Bydlo', the fluttering chicks

and 'Baba-Yaga's' flight. Russ stated that Musorgsky's "stylistic consistency is often compromised by realism" (Russ, 1992. 11).

Russ states that realism offers more than realistic word- or scene-painting. The descriptive qualities must be concurrent with real life and usually with social justice. "Musorgsky never actively involved himself in politics, but some of his songs and operatic scenes are critical of the establishment. *The Seminarist* (1866), an open attack on the clerics, was banned from publication by the ecclesiastical censor. *The Forgotten One* (1874) was based on a painting which offended the Tsar. Criticism of the historic Tsar jeopardised the production of *Boris Godunov*; the revised version of 1874 incorporated sensitive material from Khudiakov's *History*. Khudiakov, who was exiled and had his name suppressed, was one of the group behind the assassination attempt on Tsar Alexander II on April 4, 1866." (Russ, 1992. 11). "Realism placed importance on accurate historical source material, those with a message for nineteenth-century society having special significance" (Russ, 1992. 89).

Social and political messages are very difficult to find in *Pictures*. Soviet critics read far more into the work than Western listeners. With a critical look at the nobility and suffering of the peasant in 'Bydlo', it can either be interpreted as fantasy, or the suspicious Russian mind could perhaps hear a different layer of meaning. 'Should 'Kiev' be taken at its face value or is this, considering Musorgky's populist leanings and social messages appearing elsewhere in his work, both a celebration of Russian greatness and a reflection of a more general tendency among realist artists to deal with 'sedition and rebellion?' (Russ, 1992. 11).

Rimsky-Korsakov comments on Musorgsky's works:

"...In *Kalistrat* we find the first hint of that realistic method that Musorgsky was soon to adopt, while in *Night* he still exhibits the idealistic side of his talent, which later on he deliberately trampled in the mud...His compositions in this latter style are wanting in two respects - elegance of form and perfect clearness in the working-out of his ideas, defects due to his absolute ignorance of both harmony and counterpoint..." (von Riesemann, 1971. 161).

2. Maurice Ravel (1875-1937)

Maurice Ravel was born on the Côte d'Argent at Ciboure, a small village not far from Saint-Jean-de Luz. Although he was of Swiss-Basque (Spanish) descent, Swiss on his father's side and Spanish on his mother's side, Ravel remained completely French (Nichols, 1987. 25, 28). Maurice took his first piano lessons at the age of six with Henri Ghys. Six years later Ravel started harmony lessons with Charles René, a former pupil of Delibes. In 1889, at the age of fourteen, he entered the Paris Conservatoire, the same year the Great Exhibition was held at the Esplanade des Invalides where he came into contact with oriental and other music from foreign countries. He was exposed to Eastern art by artists and musicians including Satie and Chabrier as well as Russian music by Rimsky-Korsakov (Myers, 1960. 13-14).

During the time of the Exhibition Ravel became acquainted with the work by the Impressionists, Symbolists and the Neo-Realists who were at their peak; Seurat, van Gogh, Lautrec and Rousseau were exhibiting at the Fifth Salon des Indépendants. Ravel and Musorgsky had a lot in common with reference to the nationalistic political circumstances surrounding their respective countries. It was the year when General Boulenger fled the country. As a symbolization of the artistic and intellectual activity, the escape of convention as well as the rebirth of a new searching spirit in the arts and in human activity, the highest building in Europe was built on the Champs de Mars, a Tower designed by Gustav Eiffel. This symbol of France's nationalism is representative of a second material and spiritual renaissance (Myers, 1960. 15).

Ravel was determined to equip himself with the necessary tools as a master craftsman in the basic parametric techniques of music. That is why he concentrated a great deal on the technique of composition at the Conservatoire from 1895 to 1905, studying harmony and counterpoint and analysing classical scores in order to gain familiarity with the musician's craft. He was aware of the inherent value of the conventions and rules of academic tutoring, and although he accepted the discipline they imposed on him with the aim to perfect his technique, he had an independent spirit. Ravel knew instinctively that the kind of music he intended to write would bear little resemblance to those models

accepted within the academic circles. However, the study of technique *per se* had always fascinated him. He frequently quoted Massenet at one of his lectures on composition:

"In order to know your own technique you must learn the technique of other people" (Myers, 1960. 20).

At the Conservatoire he was a pupil of André Gédalge whom he held high in esteem; he also attended Fauré's composition class. Here are his impressions of these two masters:

"In 1897, while studying counterpoint with André Gédalge, I entered the composition class of Gabriel Fauré. I am so pleased to say I owe all the most valuable elements of my technique to André Gédalge. As to Fauré, I profited no less from his advice *as an artist*" (Myers, 1960. 21).

Ravel once replied as follows when asked by Mme André Bloch how he composed, how he sketched out his works and how he put them to use:

"I don't have ideas. To begin with, nothing forces itself on me."

"But if there is no beginning, how do you follow it up? What do you write down first of all?"

"A note at random, then a second one and, sometimes, a third. I then see what results I get by contrasting, combining and separating them. From these various experiments there are always conclusions to be drawn; I explore the contents and developments of these. These half-formed ideas are built up automatically; I then range and order them like a mason building a wall. As you see, there's nothing mysterious or secret in all this" (Nichols, 1987. 55).

His approach to composition is completely in contrast to that of Musorgsky, who was able to play his whole composition or extracts of the works on the piano before he wrote anything down on paper.

Ravel's approach to the orchestra originates from his perplexing attitude towards music in general. Like so many other orchestral composers, he valued vivacity, decoration and charm as musical ideals; although according to Davies he was in no way constrained by

their preconceived aesthetic. "He was not just a subtler Bizet or a less reactionary Saint-Saëns. His breathtaking virtuosity certainly went beyond theirs, but there is much more to the issue than that. Whereas they were content to exploit the formidable gifts entrusted to them, Ravel went further by bending all his efforts towards becoming "*technician extraordinaire*" (Davies, 1970. 6). Ravel had quickly acquired a unique grasp of the mechanics of the orchestra, enhanced by his repeated reading of Widor's *Technique de l'Orchestre Moderne*, his constant demanding of players about the potentialities and abilities of their instruments, and his willingness to analyse the most intricate of scores. This 'unhealthy' interest in technique was accompanied by this other obsession that had a marked effect on everything that he wrote (Davies, 1970. 6).

Ravel possessed a perfect ear for combining a precise and accurate amount of instrumental sonorities, delicate changes of tone-colour and the balance of opposing timbres. He had a tendency to use instruments in unusual registers and make them play out of character, e.g. the horn impersonating the trumpet or vice versa. His dynamic effects are minutely calculated with nothing being left to chance. He expected his interpreters to take his instructions literally, with little room for 'personal interpretations' (Myers, 1960. 113). This is evident in his orchestration of Musorgsky's *Pictures*.

Ravel approached the composition of his music through a period lens. As far as he was concerned, 'Baroque' and 'Rococo' were interchangeable terms, and sometimes he would combine these styles with contemporary characteristics simply for the sake of shocking the bourgeois, e.g. his *Valses Nobles et Sentimentales* (1911) progresses through a succession of styles, ranging from Schoenbergian dissonance to Biedermeier's grace, ending in a display of Straussian "schmalz" (Davies, 1970. 7).

Another characteristic of Ravel's music is its dance-like character. His collaboration with Diaghilev undoubtedly contributed to this quality to a certain extent. More significant is his geographical connection with his native Ciboure. "Despite his Frenchness in many matters the composer had precious little French blood in him, his father being Swiss and his mother Basque (Spanish). It was the latter's influence that dominated his musical preferences, which were essentially for the rhythmic tensions of Spanish, Latin-American

and North African dance forms" (Davies, 1970. 7, 8). His travels in the Near East acquainted him with the native way of thinking, which knowledge he also incorporated into his works. A similar trend developed with his visits to New York, where he was introduced to jazz rhythms. Notwithstanding these influences, Ravel continued to be true to his nature (Davies, 1970. 7, 8).

With this preference for dance-forms in general Ravel reverts to set forms and exposes his affinities with the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century clavenists to whom he pays tribute in *Le Tombeau de Couperin.* It also coincides with his conception of music as being primarily a *divertissement.* He regarded the dance-form as an anti-romantic, objective form, strictly impersonal and at the same time the foundation of all music. Thus, with this musical form Ravel felt comfortable and could be 'emotionally disengaged'. Davies elaborates on this emotionally detached compositional approach of Ravel by referring to the composer's avoidance of writing, e.g. in the symphonic form – "the one musical form *par excellence*" that depends on inner conflict, dramatic development, contrast and at least to some degree on emotional and nervous tension. *La Valse* is perhaps the nearest that Ravel ever came to the expression of an inner tension, amounting almost to disequilibrium, in quasi-symphonic form. The same note of some sort of *personal* tragedy can be detected here as in the *Concerto for the Left Hand,* due, perhaps, to a premonition of the mental darkness in which the composer was doomed to spend the last years of his life. *La Valse*, in fact, in spite of the purely pictorial and objective character ascribed to it by its author, may more properly be looked upon as a kind of "*dance macabre*" (Myers, 1960. 112, 113).

The First World War and the death of his mother left Ravel emotionally devastated. This as well as Diaghilev's rejection of *La Valse* (completed in 1920) resulted in his interest in transcription rather than original composition at the time. Most of Ravel's major orchestral works were first written as piano pieces, and therefore transcription was almost second nature to him; his detached approach and concern with polish and perfection of the work involved, greatly appealed to him. While he was orchestrating *Pictures* as well as works by Chabrier and Debussy, he had also orchestrated his own *Le Tombeau de Couperin* in 1920. This was not the first time that Ravel had worked on Musorgsky; he

am Mamatela

ı: "Christine Lucia" <luciac@artworks.wits.ac.za>
"Miriam Mamatela" <mamatelam@hse.wits.ac.za>
08 February 2005 05:26 PM
ect: Re: Heidi van WYk

ecitals were 71% and 68%, if that's what she means by 'practical work'.

Original Message -----
ı: Miriam Mamatela
Christine Lucia
: Tuesday, February 08, 2005 8:37 AM
ect: Re: Heidi van WYk

r Professor Lucia

nk you very much for your response.

le wanted her practical work mark. So I would like to know that 68% is the practical work mark?

ıse do not forget marks for the other two students.

nk you.

iam

- Original Message -----
om: Christine Lucia
: Mirriam Mamatela
: Nicoleen Potgieter ; Liz Delmont ; Lushy Konar ; rudolphj@artworks.wits.ac.za
nt: Friday, February 04, 2005 11:16 AM
bject: Heidi van WYk

ear Mirriam

e Heidi van Wyk:

and Stravinsky had collaborated on the completion of *Khovantchina*, the score of which is now lost. Ironically, Ravel and Musorgsky were great opposites in certain respects; whereas Musorgsky was a Populist-realist, Ravel can be described as a detached person with affecting indifference and a belief in art for art's sake, a person who idolised Mozart. However, the parallels between the two are even more striking. "Neither man ever married and their sexual make-up is a mystery. Both lived rather isolated lives; both shared artistic fascinations with childhood, animals, fantasy and fairy-tale. So it is not surprising that the scenes in *Pictures* appealed to Ravel. He was probably also fascinated by Musorgsky's Russian portrayal of French scenes" (Russ, 1992. 79). Russ describes Ravel as "the master craftsman of the sonic movement, every sound is perfectly placed and scored, but despite his lack of 'patience with clumsiness and crudeness of technique' he appears not to have found any fault with Musorgsky's music. Indeed, he 'was very much influenced by Musorgsky in matters of texture, harmony and declamation'" (Russ, 1992. 79) (Calvocoressi, 1938. 202).

Ravel's orchestral version of *Pictures* was produced in October 1922 after being commissioned in 1920 by the Russian-born conductor, Sergey Koussevitsky (1874-1951), for an orchestration "in the manner of Rimsky-Korsakov". The première took place in Paris on 19 October 1922 (Russ, 1992. 77).

3. Leo Funtek (1885-1965)

Funtek was born in 1885 in the Slovenian capital Ljublana, which was at that time still part of the Austrian Empire. Very limited information regarding his early years is available. Funtek was sent to study in Leipzig at the age of 18, both at the Conservatory and the University. He studied violin under the noted violinist and teacher Hans Sitt, whose brother was the leader of the Helsinki Philharmonic at the time. In 1906 Anton Sitt offered Funtek the post of leader of the orchestra. He accepted, and during the same year, married Bertha Liljeström, a local pianist.

After three years in the orchestra, Funtek accepted the position of conductor in Vyborg, the Carelian capital, where he worked for two years. As an accomplished violinist and chamber musician, Funtek decided to concentrate on becoming a pianist. During these two years in Vyborg, he used his summer vacations to master the instrument, using Chopin's *Etudes* to develop his technique. This was the beginning of his keyboard career (Haapakoski, 1993. 23).

In 1911 Funtek accepted the position as violin teacher in the Helsinki Conservatory, later the Sibelius Academy. He was a very active performer from the beginning. He played the violin in the following works in the first two chamber concerts of the Conservatory in September and October 1911; Franck's Sonata in A, Brahms Trio in B, Haydn Quartet in D, Vitali's Chaconne, and Mozart's Quartet in G Minor. In the third concert of the season he surprised his audience by appearing as a pianist. He played an arrangement for two pianos of Mahler's *Second Symphony* with a colleague, Paul van Katwyk. He was later to replace Oskar von Merikanto as Finland's busiest accompanist, after the death of the latter in 1924. According to a contemporary writer, Funtek was once asked to show Eugene Ysaye how the Sibelius *Violin Concerto* should be played. Funtek stood up and without hesitation played the passage brilliantly (Haapakoski, 1993. 24).

At the outbreak of the First World War, Funtek emigrated to Sweden where he was employed by the Stockholm Opera Orchestra as their second 'leader'. He filled this

position for the next five years. At the end of the war, Funtek returned to Finland where he resumed his job at the Conservatory. He also continued to write concert reviews for the *Svenska Pressen* (later the *Nya Pressen*), an activity he had commenced before the war. Due to his wife being of Swedish descent, Funtek soon perfected the language and became the leading music critic of the Swedish-speaking press in Helsinki. Within this journalistic career, he was well-known for his concise and unbiased reviews, combined with his ability to state matters 'to the point' and with the desired wit (Haapakoski, 1993. 24).

From 1925, Funtek's field of activities included conducting, teaching (of chamber music, violin, orchestration and conducting), performing (as violinist and pianist), and music journalism. In addition, he also made various musical arrangements from as early as 1912, e.g. *Spring Song* (an orchestral poem by Sibelius, for violin and piano), a ballet score based on Chopin's music, piano works by Cyril Scott, a number of Finnish songs, (e.g. seven songs by Yrjo Kilpinen), the entire *Musique Religieuse* op. 113 by Jean Sibelius, as well as orchestral versions of some piano works by Erkki Melartin and Oskar Merikanto. His greatest achievement in this field can be considered his orchestration of *Pictures at an Exhibition* by Musorgsky which he wrote in 1922, the same year as Maurice Ravel's orchestration of the same work. His arrangement has become a standard work in the repertoire of Finnish orchestras. The Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra has toured with this orchestration in different countries outside Finland and made recordings under Leif Segerstam (BIS-CD-325) (Haapakoski, 1993. 24).

Leo Funtek had an extensive operatic repertoire as conductor, which included operas by Wagner, Verdi, Janacek *(Jenufa),* and Musorgsky (*Boris Godunov*) and new Finnish operas of the time by e.g. Leevi Madetoja (*Ostrobothnians),* Ilmari Krohn (*The Flood,* also to a great extent orchestrated by Funtek)). The *Nya Pressen,* a concert review paper, described Funtek's interpretation of *Boris Godunov* as "kindred interpretation of Musorgsky's music which made a lasting impression". According to critics, "Verdi was very close to his heart," and "his Wagner was full of splendour and power which captivated the listener" (Haapakoski, 1993. 25).

"Leo Funtek had a quiet, kind nature, his temper only raised at the display of neglect and musical incompetence". He was a devout Roman Catholic who started each day by attending the holy Mass. His other passions included shooting and literature. His house contained a sizeable library that was a dominating feature of his home (Haapakoski, 1993. 25).

Paavo Berglund, a conducting student of Funtek, described his pitch as phenomenal. According to Berglund, one of Funtek's famous statements was: "Don't make any corrections! The notes are right; only the notes are played wrong". In 1951, composer Sempo Nummi wrote:

"What an enjoyment it was to listen to Funtek's total mastery of the orchestra. He is the last of our 'continental' conductors, the last of the dinosaurs in the full meaning of the word" Haapakoski, 1993. 25).

In 1961, Funtek conducted Bruckner's *Ninth Symphony* in his farewell concert with the Helsinki Philharmonic. Erik Tawaststjerna praised "the great lines that have always been distinct in Funtek's performances". Tawaststjerna was a frequent visitor of the opera house and could express an informed opinion. Leo Funtek died in 1965 at the age of 80 after several years of ill health and seclusion (Haapakoski, 1993. 25).

Kalevi Aho, musicologist and composer, is of the opinion that "Ravel's arrangement stands in the same relation to Funtek's as Rimsky-Korsakov's 'corrections' to Musorgsky's original manuscripts. Ravel's version is glorious and colourful but Funtek's more closely resembles the world Musorgsky wanted to express" (Haapakoski, 1993. 25).

CHAPTER II

Pictures at an Exhibition

Origin and Historical Background

Russian musicologist and author Alexandra Orlova wrote:

"The piano suite Kartinki s vystavki [Pictures from an Exhibition] *is one of Musorgsky's greatest works. It is far from being a simple 'illustration' of Hartman's drawings. It is a profoundly philosophical work, a meditation on life and death, on history, on the people, and on man in general"* (Orlova, 1991. 173-174).

The original manuscript of *Pictures* is preserved in the manuscripts department of the Saltykov-Schedrin Public Library in St Petersburg. The score consists of a title page and twenty-five pages including eight double sheets of manuscript paper sewn together. Musorgsky's writings, all in ink, are clear and have few errors. Alterations and corrections are made in pencil or by scraping-out the unwanted notes with a sharp object and then inking in new ones. Larger-scale alterations are indicated by the crossing out of a sizable passage or by covering the unwanted section with strips of new manuscript paper tied to each margin. In all cases where Musorgsky has made alterations it is possible to study both versions. A small number of duplicates of the autograph were produced in 1975 (Russ, 1992. 21).

Russ maintains that Musorgsky's manuscript required only a few editorial changes, e.g. it is not always clear where his *slurs* begin and end; the *staccato* markings are sometimes vague or inconsistent and some *accidentals* are missing, but the context makes it quite clear what they should be. There are a few inaccuracies in the notation of the rhythm in 'Tuileries' and some editors have experienced difficulties with the rhythmic notation in 'Goldenberg' (Russ, 1992. 21).

Musorgsky wrote the manuscript of *Pictures* in about 20 days, approximately 2-22 June O.S.[1] There is also evidence that his mind was clear at the time, presumably without alcoholic diversions (a substance which affected most of his adult life), when one considers the controlled and systematic way as well as the short period of time in which this work was completed. The last page of the manuscript is dated '22 June, 1874 St Petersburg'. It was probably followed by a few days of tidying-up during which time some of the small alterations may have been made before the dedication to Stasov, dated 27 June 1874. A half-erased remark in blue pencil was still noticeable: 'For press. Musorgsky, 26 July 1874'. Although Musorgsky wrote 'for press' on the bottom right-hand corner of the title page of the autograph, 26 July/7 August 1874 (a reference to the O.S. system) one month after the completion of the work, there is no indication that any publisher was interested in the manuscript. He was most likely just extremely optimistic and fantasised about the success of the musical cycle (Russ, 1992. 22). There are no rough sketches and very little information of the actual composition of this work. However, it is generally known that "Musorgsky composed at the piano and tended only to produce a finished score; usually he was able to play complete compositions, or substantial portions of them, well in advance of the date of the manuscript" (Russ, 1992. 17). In the following letter from Musorgsky to Stasov (probably 12/24 June), he gives the impression of a highly inspired composer intensely absorbed in his work (This is the only reference to *Pictures* in Musorgsky's letters):

"Hartman is boiling as Boris boiled; sounds and ideas have been hanging in the air; I am devouring them and stuffing myself – I barely have time to scribble them on paper. I am writing the fourth number – the links are good (on 'promenade'). I want to finish it as quickly and as securely as I can. My profile can be seen in the interludes. I consider it successful to this point. ... The titles are curious: 'Promenade (in modo russico)'. No. 1, 'Gnomus' – intermezzo (the intermezzo is untitled); No. 2, 'Il vecchio castello' – intermezzo (also untitled); No. 3, 'Tuileries' (*dispute enfants après jeux*); right between the eyes, No. 4, 'the Sandomirsko Bydlo' (*le télègue*) (*le télègue,* obviously is untitled, which is between us). How well it is working out ... I want to add Vityushka's [i.e. Victor Hartman's] Jews" (Russ, 1992. 17).

[1] "O.S stands for Old System Julian Calender, which was 12 days behind the presently used Gregorian calendar. The Julian calendar, was used in Russia until after the 1917 revolution when the Gregorian calendar, which had long been adopted by the rest of Europe, came into use" (Bricard, 1992. 3).

From this reference to *Pictures* in Musorgsky's correspondence, it is not easy to tell how much of the overall structure he had in mind when he started the composition. The letter above suggests that he worked at the first five pieces in order and was about to start with the sixth. It is not clear whether he had fully formulated his ideas for the other pieces at this point, but he does give the impression that the work was composed in the format of its final sequence (Russ, 1992. 17-18). The second half of *Pictures* is described in a letter from Stasov to Rimsky-Korsakov in the following excerpt:

"Musoryanin has positively completed and written the last stroke of his piece on Hartman. The *second part* you don't know at all, and there, I think are the very best things. 'The Limoges Gossips at the Market' – an enchanting scherzino and very pianistic. Then comes 'Baba-Yaga' – excellent and powerful, and in conclusion – 'The Kiev Bogatyr's Gate' – in the manner of a hymn or finale a la 'Slavsiya' – of course a million times worse and weaker, but all the same a lovely, mighty and original thing. There is a particularly lovely church motif: 'As you are baptised in Christ', and the ringing bells are in a completely new style. In this second part are a few unusually poetic lines. This [musical quotation] is the music for Hartman's picture of the 'Catacombs of Paris' all made of skulls. Musoryanin has begun with a depiction of a gloomy vault (long stretched chords, purely orchestral, with great [pause mark]). Then tremolando comes in a minor key the theme of the first promenade, - these are faint lights glimmering in the skulls, and here suddenly is sounded the magic, poetical appeal of Hartman to Musorgsky" (Russ, 1992. 18).

With reference to Musorgsky's inspiration of this work Brown states that "Musorgsky was not a composer who was able to excel in the composition of absolute music, and the instrumental forms were only to be satisfactorily exploited if they were inspired extra-musically. That is why the *Pictures at an Exhibition* for piano were so successful" (Brown, 1982. 19). It is the opinion of this author that the quality of the music could support the view that it could stand independently even without the programmatic content.

Excluding his orchestral tone poem, *St John's Night on the Bare Mountain* (1867), it is considered his only substantial instrumental composition. The two things that these works have in common are that they were both highly inspired works that were composed in a short period of time, *Pictures* in 22 days and *St John's* in 12 days. They were also both not performed during Musorgsky's lifetime (Calvocoressi, 1956. 76).

Victor Hartman, a close friend of Musorgsky, died on 23 July/4 August 1873 (refer to O.S. system) of an aneurysm, at the age of thirty-nine. Hartmann's early death came at a time just as he reached a point where he might have been able to realise some of his creative and architectural concepts. Musorgsky was greatly distressed by this waste of talent and also blamed himself for not recognizing and acting on the symptoms of a previous attack, which occurred while he was walking home with him (Bricard, 2002. 9) (Russ, 1992. 15). However, Musorgsky did seem to realise that Hartman had a remarkable talent, though was not a genius (despite his reference to Hartman as such in his autobiography).

Little, if any, of Hartman's architectural work remains, and his work as a painter, illustrator and designer was short-lived. Alfred Frankenstein (1906-1981), the American author, music and art critic also pointed out that although Hartman's pictures are skilful, they are far from extraordinary. "They provide insight into the imaginative and creative processes whereby the visual conceptions of a man of talent may be turned into the tonal conceptions of a man of genius" (Frankenstein, 1939. 269). One could only speculate that this might be a reference to Musorgsky's *Pictures*.

Vladimir Ashkenazy, contemporary pianist and conductor, has the following opinion of Musorgsky's composition:

"The pictures (visual) gave an impulse to compose *Pictures*, which is the result of Musorgsky's affinity to Hartman. There is of course a possibility that he might have composed it otherwise. The music does not have much to do with the pictures itself. Musorgsky was 34 when he composed *Pictures* and he knew Hartman for two years. After Hartman's death his alcoholism worsened; it all happened around the same time his mother, also his first love, died" (Ashkenazy, Video, Nupen. 1991).

This view must also be perceived against the background of another statement made by Ashkenazy which implies that Russians in general are very suspicious people and they do not take things at face value. For instance, when they gaze at a picture they would not just see a picture, but look for a hidden message behind the picture. This would explain

why Ashkenazy was of the opinion that "there is of course a possibility that he might have composed it (*Pictures*) otherwise".

After Hartman's death, Stasov arranged a Hartman Memorial Exhibition of his paintings, drawings, sketches and designs with the help of Count Paul Suzor, president of the St Petersburg Architectural Association. It was opened during the second week of February 1874, and ran until March in the Hall of the Academy of Artists in St Petersburg. Stasov described the exhibition:

"One-half of these drawings show nothing typical of an architect. They are all lively, elegant sketches by a genre-painter, the majority depicting scenes, characters and figures out of everyday life, captured in the middle of everything going on around them: on streets, and in churches, in Parisian catacombs and Polish monasteries, in Roman alleys and in villages around Limoges. There are carnival characters *à la* Gavarni, workers in smocks, priests with umbrellas under their arms riding mules, elderly French women at prayer, Jews smiling from under their skull caps, Parisian rag-pickers...landscapes with scenic ruins, magnificently done with a panorama of the city...Architecture fills the other half of his drawings" (Russ, 1992. 16).

Of the 400 works that Musorgsky viewed at his Memorial Exhibition, less than 100 can be accounted for today. Russ is of the opinion that only six of Hartman's designs and illustrations that relate directly to *Pictures* can be identified in the Exhibition with certainty. This can be explained by the confusion created by the items being added to the Exhibition as it progressed, without being listed in the catalogue. Of the over four hundred works by Hartman exhibited, less than one hundred were formally catalogued (Russ, 1992. 16).

Musorgsky was deeply moved by his friend's death and planned to make a tribute to him by 'drawing in music' the best pictures by his deceased friend. He represented himself in the 'Promenade' as he strolled through the Exhibition, joyfully or sadly recalling the highly talented deceased artist (Calvocoressi, 1965. 182). There is, unfortunately, no record of Musorgsky's visit to the Exhibition, or exactly when he conceived the idea of his musical tribute. Stasov claimed in a letter of 1903 to Arkady Kerzin that he himself

made suggestions as to the content of the work. However, there is no evidence to support this other than the knowledge of his close relationship to Musorgsky and the way in which they constantly discussed Musorgsky's projects. It is therefore not inconceivable that Stasov had a hand in shaping *Pictures*, the same way he did by suggesting the scenes for the *Songs and Dances of Death* (1875) (Russ, 1992. 16).

Musorgsky's concern to depict life, and to project a free style not restricted by the rules of the idealistic 'sonata-form' world of his contemporaries (Russ, 1992. 13) resulted in him not making use of the sonata form in this work. It is a continuation of his increasing concern with being authentically and fully Russian, original and independent of German 'routine', German 'methods' and the German 'spirit'. "He stands firm in his belief that music should be a means and not an end. Consequently he was very far from developing a sense of abstract musical form, and was better able to think in terms of illustrative music" (Calvocoressi, 1956. 74).

Musorgsky also embarked on works with Judaic topics, although this 'liberal interest' did seem to influence neither his style of writing nor his harmonic approach (tonality). It is interesting that he was motivated to do so, because of the negative attitude of the Tsarist regime toward its Jewish population. Brown explains that "in Musorgsky's circles the attitude towards the Jews varied. We can observe the contrast between Balakirev's outspoken anti-Semitism and Rimsky-Korsakov's generous helpfulness and sympathy toward his Jewish students and colleagues. Musorgsky tended toward the latter's liberalism; his heart went out to the underdog, the poor and the oppressed whatever their origin. The Jews interested him as an ethnic, not a religious, minority. As such, he (Musorgsky) referred to them in a letter, comparing them favourably to the Czechs, 'The Jews leap with joy when they hear their own music ...their eyes shine ...I have seen it more than once.' But narrow nationalism in music did not appeal to him. 'Must our music really be locked behind our borders?'" (Brown, 1982. 92).

In spite of the unique and individual character of Musorgsky's music, it always possessed very strong underlying Russian characteristics. "He was not very flexible in terms of

ethnic authenticity; he always sounds Russian, whether in *Salammbô*, (an unfinished opera), or *Joshua*, (a choral work)" (Brown, 1982. 92).

Musorgsky was also hesitant to incorporate oriental features into his compositions, unlike the rest of 'The Five'. He integrated these Eastern qualities in a very subtle way, projecting a mere hint thereof, although it was recognized by Stasov, Cui and other critics (Brown, 1982. 93).

It is not possible to find a unifying 'Jewish' style in his Judaic topics; "his musical idiom was always personal, yet flexible enough to lend itself to words that have human impact over body and beyond their biblical roots" (Brown, 1982. 93). The addition of the musical portrait of the 'Two Jews, One Rich, One Poor', the sixth piece of his piano suite, *Pictures at an Exhibition*, was apparently an afterthought. "The pompous theme depicting the rich man, the plaintive supplications of the pauper, and the final superimposition of both themes, are strokes of ingenious inspiration. The Jewish inflection is handled with taste and restraint.

Musorgsky generally preferred binary and ternary forms. The most representative example of his use of ternary form is found in the 'Ballet of the Unhatched Chicks', in which he employed the instrumental form of Scherzino and Trio. He also used ternary form in 'The Hut on Hen's Legs' (Bricard, 2002. 10).

Pictures was composed during the time when the 'Balakirev circle' started to break up. In addition to various other reasons the members also regarded his music as wayward and sometimes illiterate, and as a result his relationship with them became distant. His compositions were free of the influences of the rest of the group with the exception of Stasov. Musorgsky could not relate to the group's idealistic over-concern with technique and tradition and their disinterest in venturing out of the boundaries of these rules. This is what gradually forced Musorgsky towards friendships with people practising other forms of art, e.g. the poet Arseny Golenischev-Kutuzov, the sculptor Antokolsky, the painter Repin and the architect Victor Hartman (Russ,1992. 13).

Musorgsky did not play any of his *Pictures* in public, nor did it enter the repertoire of Russian pianists, who considered the work unpianistic during his lifetime. "The imaginative orchestration of Maurice Ravel (1922) paved the way for world-wide success" (Brown, 1982. 92, 93).

Two days before Musorgsky's death, Stasov requested that T.I. Filippov, an admirer and government official, be appointed as the composer's executor. It was only after Musorgsky's death that Filippov quickly arranged with a publisher, Bessel, to acquire, without a fee, the rights to all of Musorgsky's unpublished works, including *Pictures*. Bessel had shown interest in Musorgsky's work during his lifetime, having enough faith in his work to publish a vocal score of the second version of *Boris Godunov* before it was accepted for performance. Rimsky-Korsakov was appointed to edit most of Musorgsky's finished works and he also undertook to set in order and complete all the unfinished works (Russ, 1992. 22). In the first edition published by Bessel, Vladimir Stasov wrote brief comments on the contents of the cycle as mentioned below (Bricard, 2002. 10).

What follows is a discussion of all ten pieces (as well as the 'Promenades') of *Pictures* in order to obtain a holistic overview of the work.

'Promenades/Intermezzi'

Stasov stated: "*The introduction has the name* 'Promenade'".

Bricard maintains that in the autograph (bars 1 – 19), on the first page of the introductory 'Promenade', Musorgsky had written treble and bass clefs, but that the key signatures and notes are placed in a way that is appropriate to the alto or C clef. From bars 20 to the end, Musorgsky's key signatures and pitches are compatible with the treble and bass clefs. Rimsky-Korsakov first discovered this mistake in the autograph and it is most probable that he corrected it prior to the first publication. One can only speculate over Musorgsky's actual intentions (Bricard, 2002. 10).

The music of the 'Promenades' depicts Musorgsky as he walks back and forth from one painting to another. The rhythmic alternation between 5/4 and 6/4 illustrates the clumsy walking of the overweight composer who weighed over 200 pounds. The function of the 'Promenades' is to give structure to the cycle and serve as interludes that unite the *Pictures at an Exhibition.* The theme of 'Promenade' is not based on Hartman's pictures and appears in variations that express Musorgsky's moods and feelings as he walks from picture to picture (Bricard, 2002. 11). The second 'Promenade' appears after 'Gnomus', the third after 'Il Vecchio Castello', the fourth after 'Bydlo' and the fifth is written after "Samuel" Goldenburg and "Schmuÿle". Although the second, third and fourth recurrence of the opening idea were titled 'Promenades' in most editions, they were untitled in the autograph (Musorgsky called them *Intermezzi*). These pieces are preserved in their original state without key signatures (Russ, 1992. 24). In the autograph, the fifth 'Promenade' restates the introduction; it is titled 'Promenade' and is also given a key signature. Ravel omits this 'Promenade' in his orchestration, an omission that some feel "detracts from the balance of the work" (Bricard, 2002. 11). Rimsky-Korsakov's edition, the orchestrations of Ravel and Funtek, as well as many subsequent editions omit the *attacca* markings (i.e. continuing immediately to the next section or movement without a break) at the end of each 'Promenade' (Bricard, 2002. 11).

'Gnome'

Original title in Latin: *Gnomus*
Sempre vivo (crotchet = 120), Eb minor.
Stasov remarked: "Sketch representing a little gnome clumsily walking on deformed legs".

Hartman's picture was a carved wooden nutcracker shaped as a gnome for a Christmas tree. The 'gnome' possessed the ability to break the shells with his jaws and his face could be described as wrinkled and comical. These nutcrackers are still made in Switzerland and were very popular in Russia at the time (Score; Mussorgsky, 1952. 1). The grotesque leaps in the music combined with the implied clumsy crawling movements, are suggestive of the gnome waddling around (von Riesemann, 1971. 291).

This character looks forward to the future *Scarbo* in Ravel's *Gaspard de la Nuit* (Bricard, 2002. 11).

'The Old Castle'

Original title in Italian: *Il vecchio Castello*
Andantino molto cantabile e con dolore (crotchet = 56), G# minor.
Stasov's comment was: *"A medieval castle before which stands a singing troubadour".*

The Italian title suggests that this was one of Hartman's watercolour sketches done in Italy, during the late 1860s when he travelled through Western Europe studying architecture (Bricard, 2002. 11). In this painting of a castle, Hartman tried to project the size of the castle with the figure of a troubadour standing in front of the building singing to the accompaniment of a lute. This explains Musorgsky's sustained, moonlit, serenade-like character for this movement (Score; Mussorgsky, 1952. 1). The piece is constructed over a G-sharp pedal point which is sustained throughout the entire piece. The melody is modal and flowing within a 6/8 time-signature (Bricard, 2002. 11).

'Tuileries (Dispute of Children after Play)'

Original title in French: *Tuileries (Dispute d'enfants après jeux)*
Allegretto non troppo, capriccioso (crotchet = 144), B major.
Stasov referred to this as: *"A walk in the Tuileries gardens with a group of children and nursemaids".*

Musorgsky spelt 'Tuileries' as 'Tuilleries' by mistake in the autograph. The work can be placed in the same category as 'Il Vecchio Castello'. In Hartman's watercolour he depicted a picture of the famous gardens in Paris and livened it up with a group of quarrelling children (Score; Mussorgsky, 1952. 1). The voices of the noisy children as they play and the reprimands of their nursemaids are clearly expressed in this musical picture. 'Tuileries' is an example of Musorgsky's ability to portray the children's world; he related to them very well and adored their sincerity and creative imagination. This

ability is also exposed in other compositions, notably *The Nursery*; a group of songs for voice and piano. The second piece of that cycle, *In the Corner*, was dedicated to Hartman (Bricard, 2002. 11).

'Cattle'

Original title in Polish: *Bydlo*
Sempre moderato, pesante (crotchet = 88), G# minor.
Stasov's comment: "*A Polish wagon on enormous wheels is drawn by oxen*".

This picture is set in Sandomir, an ancient city in Poland with many architectural monuments. Hartman spent a month in Sandomir in 1869 on his way back from Western Europe, before he returned to Russia. There he painted many scenes of life and happenings in the ghetto, including the 'Two Polish Jews'. 'Bydlo' (Cattle) is based on a sketch of an ox-cart with huge wooden wheels travelling along a mud-covered road (Score; Mussorgsky, 1952. 1).

The melody is a folk song in the 'aeolian' mode and is presumably sung by the driver of the cattle cart (von Riesemann, 1971. 292). The theme is accompanied by heavy reiterated left-hand chords that depict this huge cart rumbling down the road. Musorgsky's intention was for the appearance of the wagon to be a surprise, which is why he did not name the cart in the title and indicated an *ff* together with a *crescendo* marking at the beginning of the piece. He wrote to Stasov: "Right between the eyes 'Sandomirzsko bydlo' – 'Sandomir cattle' (*le télègue*) it stands to reason that *le télègue* isn't named, but this is between us." *Le télègue* is Musorgsky's 'Frenchification' of *telega*, which is the Russian translation for 'cart'. Rimsky-Korsakov ruined this surprise by changing Musorgsky's original indication to a *p* and increased the volume as the work progressed (Bricard, 2002. 11). Consequently he exposed Musorgsky's secret by doing so. There is no picture of cattle or a wagon that appears in the Exhibition catalogue and Musorgsky's secrecy concerning the cart is not satisfactorily explained until the dynamic surprise at the opening of the piece.

The piece is in ternary form, with no strong melodic or tonal contrasts. The same accompaniment pattern continues throughout the middle section and the theme becomes fragmented in the coda. Overall, the length of the work is determined by an external factor – the time it takes for the cart to die away into the distance. In musical terms the piece is too short; if considering the weight of the musical material, the listener needs more time to digest the output (Russ, 1992. 40). In this respect the programmatic content is more necessary to validate and understand the music.

'Ballet of the Unhatched Chicks'

Original title in Russian: *Balet Nevylupivshikhsya Ptentsov*
Scherzino vivo, leggiero (crotchet = 88), F major.
Stasov's comment: "*Hartman's sketch of ballet costumes for a picturesque scene of the ballet* Trilbi".

This watercolour sketch is an example of Hartman's work as a stage and costume designer in 1870 and is preserved in Leningrad. He designed the costumes for the staging of the ballet *Trilbi* at the Maryinsky Theatre in St Petersburg. The cast included a number of boys and girls from the theatre school, dressed up as canaries. Others dressed up as eggs. The plot was based on the Frenchman Charles Nodier's short story *Trilby or the Elf of Argyle* (1822). The Exhibition Catalogue describes the sketch as "*Canary-chicks, enclosed in eggs as in suits of armour. Instead of a head dress, canary heads, put on like helmets, down to the neck.*" The simplicity of the description attracted Musorgsky. The designs only illustrated a side view of the complete costume, a front view with part of the helmet removed, and a side view of the helmet. The picture does not give any dimensions or details of materials and construction, but the proportions are well thought through (Russ, 1992. 41).

Musorgsky exploits the upper registers of the piano skilfully to imitate the chicks tapping to break their shells and the little shrieks as they burst out. The '*ppp*' trills depict the chicks with their fluffy feathers as they stumble around (Russ, 1992. 42). The *attacca*

indication (begin what follows without any pause or break) at the end of this piece was omitted by Rimsky-Korsakov and many subsequent editions (Bricard, 2002. 12). It is also omitted in the orchestrations by Ravel and Funtek; possibly because the moods of the two sections are in such contrasts, i.e. light and 'fluffy' (depicting the chickens) as opposed to the dark brooding mood of the next piece, that a break was desirable.

"Samuel" Goldenberg und "Schmuÿle"

Original title in Yiddish: *"Samuel" Goldenberg und "Schmuÿle"*
Andante. Grave-energico (crotchet = 48), Bb minor.
Stasov's comment: *"Two Polish Jews, the one rich and the other poor".*

This piece, including its characters, can perhaps be considered one of the boldest ventures in program music ever attempted in miniature form. This can be due to the reference to two of the most amusing caricatures in all music – the two Jews. The first one, "Samuel", is a rich Polish Jew who is comfortable and laconic in talk as well as slow in movement (Bricard, 2002. 12). This feeling is carried over into the music in an assertive theme with something of an oriental quality in the rhythmically intricate ornamentation and the use of augmented intervals. The second one, "Schmuÿle" (Yiddish for "Samuel"), is a poor beggar, hungry, restless and nervous as depicted by an almost uncontrollably high pitch with a tremolo triplet representing his teeth chattering or his body trembling; a touch of orientalism can also be detected. In the end the rich Jew, 'Goldenberg', a nasty character, gives nothing to the beggar and simply sends him off with a flea in his ear (Russ, 1992. 44).

The Jews are musically portrayed with the focus on characteristic and comic effect. Musorgsky's musical power reaches a highpoint with this unique musical joke; he proves that he can reproduce the 'intonations of the human speech' not only for the voice, but also on the piano (von Riesemann, 1971. 292). The first and second themes are combined in the final section. The union of these two stereotypical Jews is signified by placing

quotation marks on both "Samuel" and the equivalent Yiddish name "Schmuÿle" (Bricard, 2002. 12).

Musorgsky's original title *"Samuel" Goldenberg und "Schmuÿle"* was initially discarded probably because of the alleged derogatory references to Jews. Stasov made use of a 'non-offensive' title, *Two Jews, One Rich, the Other Poor*, in his obituary to Musorgsky in 1881 as well as in a letter of an uncertain date from Stasov to Kerzin. However, the correct title, *"Samuel" Goldenberg und "Schmuÿle"*, is written in Musorgsky's own hand in the autograph manuscript and this title is used at this present time (Bricard, 2002. 13).

'Limoges. The Marketplace (The Big News)'

Original title in French: *Limoges. Le marché (La grande nouvelle)*
Allegretto vivo, sempre scherzando (crotchet = 120).
Stasov's comment: *"Frenchwomen furiously disputing in the marketplace"*.

Hartman painted more than 150 watercolour pictures in the town Limoges, most of them of the famous cathedral of that French city. Only 75 of these pictures were listed in the Exhibition Catalogue for the exhibition; however, none of them contained a scene of a marketplace or the women in them that Musorgsky portrayed in his music. This portrayal of French market women furiously gossiping, chattering and quarrelling behind their carts was probably Musorgsky's own invention (Bricard, 2002. 13). Two brief introductory texts or 'programmes' written in French were discovered crossed out by Musorgsky in the margins under the title of the autograph. He made two attempts to suggest in prose the conversation expressed in the music. It is a pity that he scratched them out for they provide a helpful guide to the interpretation of the music. The first paragraph reads as follows (Score; Mussorgsky, 1952. 2):

The Big News: "Monsieur Pimpant from Panta-Pantaléon has found his cow – the one that ran away". "Yes, Madame, that was yesterday". – "No Madame, the cow was astray from the neighbourhood". – "No Madame, the cow was not astray at all..." (Bricard, 2002. 13).

Musorgsky was not satisfied with this attempt and rewrote it:

The Big News: Monsieur de Puissangeout has found his cow "Runaway". But the good women of Limoges will have nothing whatsoever to do with this incident because Mme. de Remboursac has acquired very fine porcelain dentures, while on the other hand Mr. De Panta-Pantaléon's obtrusive nose obstinately remains as red as a peony (Bricard, 2002. 13).

This piece can be seen as a 'study in intonation', with reference to the masterly fashion in which the scolding of the wrangling market women is reproduced, e.g. with the use of whole-tone material (von Riesemann, 1971. 292). This work can be considered as a scherzo with a ternary structure. Despite the key-signature changes at bar 12, the nature of the material and harmonic language diminishes the impact of the change. Although it is one of the most difficult pieces in the set, it also is the most pianistic (Russ, 1992. 45).

'Catacombs (A Roman Burial Chamber)'

Original title in Latin: *Catacombae (Sepulcrum romanum)*
Largo (crotchet = 57), B minor - the piece leads *attacca* to the next one.
Stasov's comment: "*Hartman's picture shows the artist himself viewing the Paris Catacombs by the light of a lantern*".

The Exhibition Catalogue has the following description of this picture: "*Interior of Paris catacombs with figures of Hartman, the architect Kenel, and the guide holding a lamp*" (Bricard, 2002. 14).

This watercolour picture is preserved in the Russian museum in Leningrad. In this picture Hartman depicts himself, Vasily Kenel (a friend from the Academy) and their guide, with their backs to the art appreciator exploring the catacombs by lamplight. On the right side of the painting there is a pile of skulls facing us. In the margin, between 'Catacombs' and 'Con mortuis', Musorgsky also wrote a remark in pencil:
"Latin text would be fine: the creative genius of the late Hartman leads me to the skulls and invokes them; the skulls begin to glow" (Russ, 1992. 46).

This is the point where Musorgsky was drawn into the pictures themselves. This idea of the glowing skulls was probably inspired by the illustration where in the lamplight the skulls themselves seem to light up (Russ, 1992, 46). Bricard remarks on the catacombs that symbolize "death and the helplessness of humans to fight its inevitability" (Bricard, 2002.14.). The 'death' theme features in much of Musorgsky's life and creative output, notably in the death of Tsar Boris; the deaths of his mother and Hartman also had a profound effect on him (Russ, 1992. 46).

The alternation between *ff* and *p* in the slow, sustained chords gives the effect of an echo in the cave. There is no key signature and the melody is practically non-existent, probably as a result of the vague tonality. The *attacca* at the end is omitted in some piano editions (Bricard, 2002. 14) as well as in Ravel's orchestration.

'With the Dead in a Dead Language'

Original title in Latin: *Con Mortuis in Lingua Mortua*
Andante non Troppo, con lamento, B minor.
Between 'Catacombs' and 'Con Mortuis' Musorgsky wrote a footnote in Russian in pencil in the right-hand margin:

A Latin text: "with the dead in a dead language. Well may it be in Latin! The creative spirit of the departed Hartman leads me toward the skulls and addresses them – a pale light radiates from the interior of the skulls" (Bricard, 2002. 14).

Musorgsky made a vocabulary mistake in the title itself: 'Con mortuis' should read 'Cum mortuis' (Russ, 1992. 46). The main lyrical theme is a variant of the 'Promenade' theme and appears as a kind of epilogue. Both 'Catacombs' and 'With the Dead in a Dead Language' are the most introspective pieces and reflect Musorgsky's morbid side and his reaction to Hartman's death. This piece is a challenge for pianists to keep the right-hand in a sustained tremolo, as well as even and soft, especially as the skulls reach their full illumination (bar 11) (Bricard, 2002. 14).

'The Hut on Hen's Legs (Baba-Yaga)'

Original title in Russian: *Izbushka na Kur'ikh Nozhkakh (Baba-Yaga)*
Allegro con brio, feroce (crotchet = 120), C major.
Stasov's comment: "*Hartman's sketch depicted a clock in the shape of Baba-Yaga's hut on chicken's legs. Musorgsky added the witch's ride in a mortar*".

Hartman's drawing is a design for a Russian fourteenth century clock in the form of Baba-Yaga's hut, made of bronze and coloured enamel that is covered with an elaborate design depicting animals and fairy tales. It is one of his few works that is preserved in the State Public Library in Leningrad (Bricard, 2002. 14). However, Musorgsky's composition is more focussed on Baba-Yaga's ride through the air rather than with the clock (Score; Mussorgsky, 1952. 2).

'Baba-Yaga' is a witch in Russian folklore. She lives deep in the woods in a hut on chicken claws, which enables her to turn in any direction to face each unfortunate strider. She lures lost children, eats them and then crushes their bones in the mortar which she uses to ride through the woods. She propels herself with the pestle and covers her tracks with a broomstick (Russ, 1992. 47).

This is considered one of the few virtuoso pieces in the cycle. Assuming that the metronome indication is correct, then the marking, crotchet = 120, leaves each bar with exactly the duration of one second (Russ, 1992. 47). This and the driving rhythm of the octaves in the first and last sections are symbolic of the ticking of a clock. Musorgsky also employs a variety of colours, sonorities and dynamics to create the mysterious atmosphere of the middle section (Bricard, 2002. 14).

'The Great gate of Kiev' - 'The Bogatyr's (Knight's) Gate'

Original title in Russian: *Bogatyrskie Vorota (vo stol nom gorode vo Kieve)*
Allegro alla breve (Maestoso con grandezza) (crotchet = 84), Eb major.

Stasov's comment: "*Hartman's sketch represented his architectural project for a city gate for Kiev in the old solid Russian style with a cupola in the shape of a Slavic helmet*".

Hartman acquired his inspiration for this sketch when he entered a competition for a design for a gate that was to be constructed in commemoration of the escape of Tsar Alexander II from an assassination attempt on April 4, 1866. The competition was called off due to lack of funds and the gate was never erected, although Hartman still considered his design to be his finest work (Bricard, 2002. 15).

Stasov, the Russian critic claims that the metronome markings used for this movement were given to him by Rimsky-Korsakov, who obtained them from Musorgsky's own playing of the music (Score; Mussorgsky, 1952. 2).

'Bogatyr' refers to mythological Russian heroes who were inhabitants of Kiev and whose chief occupation was hunting. This last piece of the cycle includes imitative ringing bells, as well as a Russian chorale (*As you are Baptized in Christ* appears in the two sections marked *senza espressione*); the whole work is united by the incorporation of the powerful return of the opening 'Promenade' theme (bars 97–104) (Bricard, 2002. 15). The hymn is no reflection of Musorgsky's faith or lack thereof; it is incorporated due to its associations with Russian history and culture and because of the chapel in Hartman's design (Russ, 1992. 49). The term *senza espressione* that appears in the chorale sections from bars 30 to 46 and 64 to 80 is a rare indication in keyboard notation at that time. Ravel also used the marking in *Le Gibet*, one of a set of three pieces in *Gaspard de la Nuit* written in 1908. Ravel never met Musorgsky, but he was influenced by the Russian School and was also completely familiar with *Pictures at an Exhibition* through his orchestration of the work. The influence of *Pictures* is widespread, and is very noticeable in Borodin's 'Au Couvent' (1885) and Debussy's 'La Cathédrale Engloutie' (1910) (Russ, 1992. 49).

This cycle of piano pieces was completely ignored during Musorgsky's lifetime. It was printed for the first time six years after his death in 1881; it was hardly ever heard in the concert hall, and due to its great technical and musical difficulty, it was also impossible for amateurs to play at home. It was only from 1920 that the cycle became a standard work in the European concert repertoire (von Riesemann, 1971. 293). "This musical picture is unsurpassed in grandeur and majesty and possesses an unquestionable Russian national character" (Bricard, 2002. 15).

CHAPTER III

A Comparative Analysis between the Ravel and Funtek Orchestrations of the first 'Promenade'.

A comparative analysis between the orchestrations of Musorgsky's piano work *Pictures at an Exhibition* by Funtek and Ravel will focus on the following aspects: instrumentation, texture, dynamic indications, voice leading, spacing, doublings, timbre, articulation as well as additions and omissions from the piano score. Three of the ten pieces in the work will be discussed and analysed, namely the first 'Promenade', 'Ballet of the Chickens in Their Eggs' (part 5) and 'The Great Gate of Kiev' (part 10) also known as 'The Bogatyr Gate'.

A comparison of the complete instrumentation used by Ravel and Funtek respectively:

RAVEL	FUNTEK
Woodwind	**Woodwind**
1 Piccolo	2 Piccolo's
3 Flutes	2 Flutes
3 Oboes (3rd doubling Cor Anglais)	3 Oboes
2 Clarinets in A and Bb	1 Clarinet in Eb, 2 Clarinets in Bb and A,
2 Bass Clarinets in A and Bb	1 Bass Clarinet
2 Bassoons	2 Bassoons
1 Double Bassoon	1 Double Bassoon and 1 English horn
Brass	**Brass**
1 Alto Saxophone	
4 Horns in F	6 Horns in F and E
3 Trumpets in C	4 Trumpets in C
3 Trombones	4 Trombones
1 Tuba	1 Tuba
Percussion	**Percussion**
glockenspiel, tubular bells, xylophone, triangle, rattle, whip, side drum, bass cymbals, tam-tam, timpani, 2 harps, celesta	glockenspiel, 4 timpani, xylophone, triangle, tabor [1], side drum, bass drum, cymbals, tam-tam, piano, 2 harps, celesta
Strings	**Strings**

[1] The tabor referred to in Funtek's percussion section is a very long deep drum, in most cases equipped with a single snare. It is an instrument rarely seen in the United States. In Italian it is called a *Tamburo* and in German and French a *Tambourin*. Consequently even eminent conductors have made the mistake of having it played on the *Tambourine*. An example of the use of this instrument in contemporary music is Aaron Copland's *Appalachian Spring* (Kennan and Grantham, 2002. 252).

Funtek uses similar woodwinds but uses four more brass instruments than Ravel. Ravel has an Alto Sax and Funtek more drums and a piano.

Promenade I

A Comparison of the instrumentation:

RAVEL	FUNTEK
Woodwind	**Woodwind**
1 Piccolo	1 Piccolo
2 Flutes	2 Flutes
3 Oboes	3 Oboes
2 Clarinets in Bb	2 Clarinets in Bb
Bass Clarinet Bb	
2 Bassoons	2 Bassoons
Double Bassoon	Double Bassoon
Brass	**Brass**
4 Horns in F	4 Horns in F
3 Trumpets in C	2 Trumpets in C
3 Trombones	3 Trombones
Tuba	Tuba
Percussion	**Percussion**
N\A	3 Timpani
Strings	**Strings**

It is interesting to observe in the two scores that Ravel, being of French origin, writes his instrumentation in Italian; Funtek, originally from Finland, denotes all his instrumentation in German. It is evident that there are not any significant differences between the choice of instrumentation by the two composers in this piece. Ravel adds bass clarinet in Bb, whereas Funtek uses two trumpets instead of three and added three timpani. However, the main difference can be observed in the application of the respective instrumentation. Ravel's arrangement has a dominant brass section and therefore comes across as heavier and louder even though he has almost the same instrumental compilation. One must bear in mind that Ravel's orchestration originated as a result of a commission by the Russian-born conductor, Sergey Koussevitzky (1874 - 1951) for an orchestration of Musorgsky's piano work, *Pictures at an Exhibition*, 'in the manner of Rimsky-Korsakov'. The latter also mentions the 'energetic power' of the brass in his book on orchestration - *Principles of Orchestration* (1912).

This stylistic application of Rimsky-Korsakov can already be demonstrated at the beginning of the first 'Promenade': in the first two bars Ravel begins the piece with a trumpet playing a single-line melodic theme projecting a strong, majestic, fanfare-like sound. In bars 3 and 4 the chordal section of the original piano version is allocated to the brass section only, which makes the music sound full, thick and strident. The melody still continues in the trumpet, but is now doubled with horn I and an octave lower in horn IV, i.e. no mixing of colours – the colours are separate and pure i.e. brass.

Funtek's opening melody in bars 1 and 2 consists of a combination of three timbres (i.e. instrumental colours), two flutes, two oboes and violins. This is an example of "composite colour" – "the greatest differentiation of the three elements could have been achieved by the use of sharply contrasting colours, Wagner chose to present each element in a composite tone colour produced by at least one woodwind, one brass instrument, and one string group. Yet in performance the three elements stand out sufficiently from each other; partly because of the differences between the *composite colours* and partly for purely musical reasons – differences in articulation, note values, and registers" (Kennan and Grantham, 2002, 296). The chordal section in bars 3 and 4 is divided amongst a larger group of woodwind instruments in addition to the whole string section. The melody still continues in the same instruments, i.e. two flutes, two oboes and violins I. Although there are more instruments in Funtek's orchestration, the musical result is less strident than Ravel's brass usage.

The first four bars provide an interesting illustration of the different textural and timbrel applications between the two orchestrators. To demonstrate Ravel and Funtek's significant difference of approach towards texture, Funtek creates a seemingly bigger texture on the surface through doublings with two different timbres in bars 3 and 4; four woodwinds (flutes I and II and oboes I and II) and strings double the melody, one woodwind and three different string groups double the bass (bassoon II, cellos, double basses and the lower notes of the violas' double stops); two woodwinds (oboe III and clarinet II in Bb) together with two strings (violins II and the upper notes of the violas'

double stops) project the harmony notes. Funtek skilfully employs various textures within two timbres to create a more *composite colour* without sounding too grandiose.

In contrast Ravel's orchestration of this section makes use of fewer instruments than Funtek. However, his choice of homogenous brass instruments that inherently have a more powerful sound ('energetic power, free or restrained...' of the brass, as quoted earlier by Rimsky-Korsakov), gives the impression of greater forces than Funtek's larger grouping and combination of woodwind and string instruments, which create a more refined sound.

One would expect that horns I and II would be written on one stave and horns III and IV on the stave below. We see from Ravel's arrangement that tradition plays a role and it is indeed written in this format so as to interlock on paper i.e. horns I and III are written on two different staves, the higher notes of a chord are allocated to them respectively and the lower notes to horns II and IV (Kennan and Grantham, 2002. 129). Funtek on the other hand groups horns I and III together on one stave and II and IV on the other e.g. in bars 9 to 24 in the first 'Promenade'. Although he groups this section differently from Ravel, he still retains the principle of horns I and III playing the higher notes and horns II and IV playing the lower notes.

With reference to the aspect of articulation, Ravel shortened Musorgsky's phrasing indication in the trumpet in bar 1, from beats 4 and 5 to a *slur* over the two quaver notes on the 4th beat, creating an accent on both the 4th and 5th beat to accommodate the embouchure of the trumpet. This is contradictory to the original indication from beats 4 to 5 in the piano score which suggests a more flowing articulation. The same reduction occurs in beats 1 and 2 of the 2nd bar. This appears again in the following two-bar phrases in bars 3 and 4, 5 and 6 and 7 and 8. From bars 1 to 8 the quaver motif together with the phrasing only appears in the trumpet I. In bar 3, where trumpet I is joined on the melodic line by horns I and IV (an octave lower), the horns do not play the quavers or any slurs, i.e. on the 4th beat in bar 3 and the 1st beat in bar 4. These are examples of the kind of artistic license that Ravel utilised to emphasize the 'marked' nature of the music.

Funtek obeyed Musorgsky's articulation indications with reference to the slurring, except for his own addition in bar 4, beats 5 and 6 in the string section, where he added a slur that does not appear in the original score. The purpose of this indication seems to be to accentuate the 1st of the two beats i.e. the 5th beat. It is also consistent with idiomatic string writing and to indicate bowing.

An example of a different application of articulation and instrumentation resulting in a different musical phrasing and flow appears in bars 6 and 8. Both composers continue the *tenuto* indications of the first two bars on every beat from bars 3 to 8. They make this addition to all the instruments even though it does not appear in the original score. (An exception occurs in Funtek, who does not add the *tenutos* on the instruments that play the melodic line on the 5th beat in bars 6 and 8). These instruments include flutes I and II, oboes I and II and the violin I section. Funtek's phrasing in these bars is also marked from the 5th to the 6th beat, whereas Ravel's phrasing is marked on the two quavers on only the 5th beat. This results in Ravel's orchestration of these two bars (which includes six brass instruments), sounding pedantic and with separate beats. Funtek's two-beat phrase together with the eliminated *tenuto* on the 5th beat is more flowing together with the addition of a *composite* timbre; a combination of woodwind and strings.

This section from bars 1 to 8 is still *forte*, a dynamic indication that both arrangers obey with regard to the original score, although Funtek added a *mezzo forte* to horn III in bars 5 and 7. In the same instrument he also marked *leggiero* on the 4th and 5th beats of bar 5. It is likely that he wanted the horn to blend in as much as possible and not play too much of a dominating role, as well as to achieve a balance between the woodwind and the string instruments. The choice of the horn might possibly be because its tone can be ideal for the background and it is possible for the "middle register to be made unobtrusive without losing warmth or body" (Kennan and Grantham, 2002. 130).

With reference to the tempo, Funtek adds a metronome indication, 'crotchet = 96-100' in addition to the verbal performance directions given both in Musorgsky and Ravel i.e. *Allegro giusto, nel modo russico; senza allegrezza, ma poco sostenuto.*

In bars 5 to 8, Ravel continues to make use of a homogenous timbrel section i.e. the brass section. He employs trumpet I again to play the single melodic line from bar 5 up to the 2nd beat of the 6th bar and bar 7 up to the 2nd beat of the 8th bar. The *tutti* in bars 6 and 8 is played by horn I and trumpets I and II. The upper bass note is played by trombone III doubled in horn II and the lower bass note is played by the tuba. Although he has combined only four different timbres albeit of the same brass section, the texture of this section is still thick due to the loud nature of these instruments.

In contrast to Ravel, Funtek's orchestration of the same section is much larger (i.e. more instruments) yet less strident. Where Ravel employs a single trumpet in bar 5 up to the 2nd beat of the 6th bar and bar 7 up to the 2nd beat of the 8th bar, Funtek combines two woodwinds, one brass and strings, namely oboes I and II, horn I and violins I. Though Funtek makes use of twelve instruments in his *tutti* in the four last beats of bars 6 and 8, it is still only a combination of woodwind and strings. It consists of flutes I and II, oboes I and II, clarinet II and bassoons I and II as well as the string section. This combination of woodwind and strings results in a gentler quality in spite of it being a larger group.

Antiphonal is a term describing works in an ensemble divided into two distinct groups, performing in alternation and together. (Sadie, Vol. I. 749). A perfect illustration of *antiphonal writing*, a particular feature of the 'Promenades', is first found in Ravel's orchestration of the 'Promenade' (Russ, 1992. 82). This contrasts strings, with woodwinds combined with strings e.g., in bar 9, strings only; bar 10, winds together with strings; bar 11, strings only; bar 12, woodwinds and strings.

From bar 10 to 17 Ravel combines different articulations, note values and registers. An illustration of the variety and considerable amount of articulations and doublings added in this section is found e.g. in bar 10: the cellos and double basses play *pizzicato* in their middle register for the whole bar, accompanied by violins I playing the melody and doubled an octave lower by violins II. All the violins play slurs on the 2nd, 4th and 5th beats of the bar with *tenutos* on the first note of each slur consequently accentuating the first note this motif. The combination of slurs and *tenutos* also occur on the same beats in

oboe I and clarinet II. In bars 10 and 13 Ravel only added slurs to the instruments playing the melody, emphasizing the melodic contour created by instruments playing in unison in these two bars. Bar 13 is a repetition of the musical material of bar 10, although bar 13 contains a larger orchestra; it is three tones higher and it has *staccatos* on the last beat, except in the brass section, which has *tenuto* markings, thus helping to retain its ponderous character.

An investigation into aspects of articulation reveals that Ravel is very creative in designing differentiated combinations. He adds slurs in bars 9, 11 and 12 on beats 5 to 6 respectively in the cellos and double basses. In clarinet I he adds an additional *tenuto* on the 4th, 5th, and 6th beats in bar 10. In bar 11 there is also an *arco* indication in the cellos and double basses after he indicated *pizzicato* in the previous bar, thus altering the timbre. Bar 12 contains detailed 'down-bow' as well as slur markings in the string section as well as other instruments. The 'down-bow' indication in the cellos and double basses is a means of accentuating the bass notes more intensely. An example of reducing the number of beats in this section of Ravel's orchestration appears in bar 12 on the 4th and 5th beats in bassoon I and double bassoon. The two Bb crotchets in the original score are tied and lengthened into one Bb minim. He also incorporates *composite colouring* from bars 9 to12. The strings in bar 9 are alternated with the combination of strings and woodwind in bar 10. The same alternation occurs between bars 11 and 12. The combination of the various articulation indications and *composite colouring* illustrates Ravel's imagination and his colourful approach. This is achieved through the varied and clear articulation markings such as *slurs*, *tenutos*, *pizzicato's* and doublings which are in contrast to the absence of specific articulation indications in the piano score. There is also an aesthetic decision to sustain some instruments to maintain the flow of the music by lengthening the note values i.e. instead of two crotchet beats, only a minim is executed.

In contrast to the above, Funtek's orchestration of the same passage seems to facilitate a more flowing legato line due to his limited application of slurs and calculated placing of *tenutos*. Here we see a more modest usage of *composite colouring*. He adds only a few

articulations, mainly phrasing and *tenutos.* In bars 9 and 12 there are phrasing indications in bassoon I and II, trombone III and tuba from beats 1 to 4; double bassoon from beats 1 to 6 and cellos and double basses from beats 5 to 6. In the same bars mentioned there are added *tenutos* on the 5th and 6th beats in bassoon I, trumpet III, tuba and double basses. The articulation indications are added only to instruments playing the bass line. Funtek indicates a 'down-bow' indication on the 2nd violins in bar 12, which results in an accent in both desks. The melody is doubled an octave higher in the piccolo and flutes I and II; harmony notes are also doubled an octave higher in trumpet I and an octave lower in horn IV and trombone II. This spacing of instruments results in a thinner texture, though a larger spread of register. Ravel did not have any doublings in this passage from bars 9 to 12, which results in his arrangement of this section being thicker in texture. He preferred rather to combine it with *antiphonal writing* and therefore it is obvious that the two composers had quite opposite concepts of the same passage.

In Funtek's orchestration it seems questionable whether the three E naturals in bar 10 in horn IV are intentional; it seems more likely to assume that it is merely a printing error, since the three E's should be E flats sounding Ab according to the harmony.

With reference to dynamic indications, Musorgsky maintained a *forte* indication throughout the 'Promenade'. Funtek adhered to this marking and even stressed it with a *sempre forte* indication until the end of the 'Promenade'. In contrast to this monotonous dynamic level, Ravel had a wide variety of dynamic indications to suit the character of his orchestration. He starts the piece with a *forte* marking as is indicated in the original score. In bars 9 to 12 he changes it to *mezzo forte*. There is a *crescendo* in bar 12 that leads up to a *forte* in bar 13 (the bar mentioned earlier that employs the most instruments thus far). In bar 14, only one bar after he has reached a climax, he starts to decrease the intensity in sound to *mezzo forte* by diminishing the amount of instruments and utilizing a mixture of *staccato, pizzicato* (beats 1 to 4 in the double basses) and *arco* articulations (beats 5 to 6 in the double basses). The dynamic level is decreased to *piano* in bar 15 by also incorporating the same articulations as in the previous bar, followed by a *decrescendo* in bar 16. In bar 17 he rapidly starts to increase the volume by indicating

mezzo forte to *forte* within one bar. On the *forte* he also employs accents, 'down bows' and *tenutos* in a combined effort to enhance the dramatic effect. He sustains this dynamic indication until the end of the piece, bar 24. This again underlines Ravel's original and creative imagination and ingenuity. This is greatly in contrast with the piano score of this 'Promenade' that only has a *forte* dynamic indication.

It is also noteworthy that the only other articulation markings are found in the first eight bars of the piece. One could perhaps argue that Musorgsky's intention was to set a phrase pattern with these alternating 5/4 and 6/4 bars at the beginning of the 'Promenade' and that Musorgsky felt that he had already set a pattern and a style and saw no need to add anything further throughout the piece; Here is an extract from the first 'Promenade' to illustrate Musorgsky's approach to the music and possible intention (Score: Musorgsky, 1952. 1):

Bars 1 to 4



Bars 5 to 8



Bars 14 and 15 reflect widely contrasting interpretations and approaches between Ravel and Funtek. The latter appears to use 'instrumentation' rather than 'orchestration' i.e. he transfers notes that are present in the piano score allocating them to different instruments, but he very seldom goes beyond what is written e.g., in this whole section Funtek did not add or omit a single articulation. One of his most 'elaborate' alterations is the rhythmic augmentation in the trumpet in bar 15 (beats 2 to 4); in addition to this the trumpet

alternates between inner harmony notes and melody notes. Therefore Funtek's creativity can be heard not so much as embellishments but as subtle changes of emphasis by leaping from notes of harmony to notes of melody. There is a hint of *klangfarbenmelodie* usage. Funtek's predominant technique of doubling instruments on unisons and octaves creates a spread of the orchestral forces and has the audible effect of a thinner texture. This approach is consistently characteristic of his orchestration e.g. the melody is divided amongst the 2nd and 3rd oboes as well as violins 1; the piccolo plays the melody an octave higher from bars 9 to 12 and two octaves higher from bars 13 to 24; horns I and III and violas play the melody an octave lower; and horns II and IV play the harmony notes an octave lower e.g. bars 13 to 14. He combines three timbres in a *composite colour*; woodwind, brass and strings in contrast with Ravel's combination of only woodwind and strings, his predilection for less 'mixed' colours.

Ravel responds to motivic repetition in an individual way - he applies *klangfarbenmelodie* i.e. the instrumental colour changes often while the one melody is unfolding. He differentiates phrases that are formed by note repetition. This is clearly illustrated in bars 14 and 15 which employ an 'echo effect'. This is perceived by the division of each bar into units of 4 + 2. The effect is created by a combination of aspects including *antiphonal writing* between winds and strings, the alternating of *pizzicato* and *arco* in the double basses and the calculated addition of *staccatos* on the 4th and the 6th beats in all the other instruments.

With reference to orchestral doublings, Funtek adds doublings in registers not found in the piano score, which give an extended dimension e.g. from bar 9 until the end of the 'Promenade' the piccolo doubling creates a penetrating and "opening out" sound. In contrast to Ravel's orchestration Funtek's orchestration of bars 9 to 11 is considerably larger in number than Ravel's; he creates a spread across the orchestra without highly differentiating attacks and does not apply responsorial technique like Ravel.

A characteristic of Funtek's orchestration is his usage of long note values derived from harmony notes of shorter value giving a sustained and legato effect. An example of this is

in bars 9 and 12 in the violas, horns II and IV, trumpets I and II as well as trombones I and II in both bars respectively. Here Funtek lengthens the harmony notes in the score that appear as two dotted minims in the middle of the octaves of the melody in the treble clef, to a dotted semibreve. In bar 11 the harmony notes in the treble clef that appears as a dotted minim and dotted crotchet are tied. These augmented notes in bar 11 are played by the same combination of instruments as in bars 9 and 12.

Judging from their contrasting arrangements and interpretations, it is clear that Funtek's interpretation of the score of bars 9 to12 differs from Ravel's. Funtek interprets bars 9 to 12 almost as one unit, whereas Ravel's arrangement seems to be more fragmented. In Ravel's orchestration bars 9 and 11 consist of only one timbre; the strings introduce the melody in the one bar, and then the woodwinds together with the strings answer with a chorus in the adjacent bars, i.e. 10 and 12. This creates the impression of being fragmented, instead of flowing as a two- or four-bar phrase. In Funtek's orchestration the same instruments are used in the orchestration from bars 9 to 12. He creates two-bar phrases and therefore creates flow, regularity and unity in the music. In his arrangement he integrates three contrasting timbres; woodwinds, brass and strings - this creates *composite colouring.*

Both Ravel and Funtek make use of a *cumulative effect.* This implies that instead of using the entire orchestra from the beginning of the piece or in certain passages, various timbres are added one, two or more at a time in order to accentuate certain themes and subjects, or to reach a climax leading to the *tutti* (Kennan and Grantham, 2002. 296) e.g. Ravel does not make use of the full orchestra until the last four bars of this piece. In the first four bars he starts with:

Bars 1 to 4:
4 Horns in F
3 Trumpets in C
Trombone III
Tuba

In bars 5 to 8 Ravel decreases the orchestra by three instruments i.e. horns III and IV and trumpet III.

Bars 5 to 8:

Tuba

After bar 8 the Tuba is excluded and only reappears in the last four bars of the 'Promenade'. Ravel employs only one horn, (horn I) in bar12 and bars 16 to 18. For one bar, in bar 13, he employs all four horns for the last time before bar 19, until the last bar, (bar 24) where he integrates all four.

Accumulations:

Bars 9 to12 he adds:
Oboes I and II
Clarinets I and II
Bassoons I and II
Double Bassoon
Horn I

Bars 13 to 16 he adds:
Flutes I and II
Piccolo
Oboe III
Bass Clarinet in Bb
Strings
Trumpets I and II

In Bars 17 to 20 he adds:

Flute III
Horns II, III and IV

Bars 21 to 24 he adds:

Trumpet III
Tuba

This is an illustration of how Ravel employs the *cumulative effect* in order to achieve a more dramatic build up and result towards the end of the 'Promenade'. This technique together with the combination of *antiphonal writing, composite colouring* and the added articulations contribute to the rich and colourful climax-building of the piece.

In contrast Funtek starts with a bigger orchestra:

Bars 1 to 4:
Flutes I and II
Oboes I, II and III
Clarinets I and II in Bb
Bassoons I and II
Strings

In bars 5 to 8 he exchanges two instruments from the wind section, oboe III and clarinet I, for an instrument from the brass section, horn I, which is used to double the melody together with the woodwind and string sections to give it a different timbrel colouring.

Accumulations:

Bars 5 to 8 he adds:

1st Horn in F

Bars 9 to 12 he adds:
Piccolo I
Oboe III
Double Bassoon
Horn II and IV
Trumpet I and II
Trombones I, II and III
Tuba

Bars 13 to 16 he adds:
Percussion - Timpani

Unlike Ravel, in **bars 17 to 20** and **bars 21 to 24** Funtek adds nothing more.

This creates the impression that Funtek reaches the climax of his *cumulative effect* much sooner than Ravel does, considering that he already makes use of his full orchestra by the 16th bar.

In this same section from bars 13 to 16 and even up to the end of the piece, Funtek did not add nearly as many articulation indications as Ravel. In bar 14 Funtek indicates *tenutos* in trumpets I and II on each of the 6 beats. In the violins and violas in bar 16 there are slurs from the 2nd to the 3rd beats with a *tenuto* on each of the crotchets. On a few occasions he creates his own harmonic motifs instead of reflecting the linear motifs shaped naturally from the chords in the piano score. This can be observed in bar 13 in flute II and trombone I which play a complementary motif. Flute II plays an octave higher than the rest of the harmony notes of the chordal passage in the piano score. Funtek has a very balanced and evenly spaced orchestration in this section considering that he has at least one or more of each instrument representing each timbre in all the voices i.e., melodic line, harmony notes and bass voice. This is illustrated in bars 13 and

14 where the melody consists of a combination of two woodwind instruments and strings: violins doubled an octave higher with a woodwind instrument and doubled an octave lower with two brass instruments and strings (the violas). Thus, a combination of woodwind, brass and strings spread over three octaves results in a more transparent texture, though a well-balanced mixture of timbres. The bass as well as harmony notes consist of a combination of woodwind, brass and strings, creating in a way a completely new instrumental colour.

In order to increase the dramatic effect in the section from bars 9 to 17, Ravel employs a wide variety of orchestration techniques and dynamic contrasts; for example he adds eight instruments in bar 13. The instruments are employed together as a group only in bar 13 and again as a unit in the last bar (bar 24) with an added tuba. The section from bars 9 to 17 becomes even more spectacular in effect as Ravel utilizes dynamics and octave doublings to accompany the alternating growing and diminishing orchestra. The melody is doubled an octave higher in the piccolo in bar 13, which also contributes to the responsorial and 'quasi-echo' effect in bars 14 and 15.

As the piece progresses towards the end, Ravel adds more articulation indications. In the piano score there are no articulations; as one might argue that the majestic, chordal style 'speaks for itself'. Even though the *tenutos* are not added anywhere in the piano score from bar 3 onwards, this manner would most probably be the way in which a pianist would execute the chords. In this light, by adding the *tenutos* one could argue that Ravel did not necessarily take such a great liberty. Regardless of this, we need to acknowledge that he did add a significant amount of articulations, especially from the middle of bar 17. He added a combination of accents, *tenutos* and slurs on almost all of the notes. He also sporadically combined 'down-bow' markings and double stops together with these signs in order to create even bigger accents, e.g. the melody played in violins I on the 4th beat of bar 17 starts with a *tenuto* together with a 'down-bow' for greater emphasis. The 5th beat starts with a *tenuto* as well as a slur between the two quaver notes on the beat. There is one note where he combines three forms of accentuation, e.g. in the 2nd violins in bar 19 on the 2nd beat he makes use of a combination of a 'down-bow', an accent and a

double-stop. He utilizes this means of accentuating from bar 19 beat 4 until the last bar (bar 24). This results in the music sounding powerful, perhaps occasionally laboured.

Ravel makes the section from bars 17 to 20 even more theatrical by combining a substantial amount of articulations, change of note values and the use of octave doublings. In bar 17, 4th beat, Ravel adds his own rhythmical motif in horns I and III. It is six bars long and is divided into an accented minim slurred with a quaver, two semi-quavers and a dotted minim. This six-beat rhythmical motif occurs again in bar 19; another confirmation of Ravel's overlay of his own creative ideas.

Funtek's orchestration of the section from bars 17 to 24 is a continuation of bars 9 to 16 with few additions. It incorporates the same instrumentation, doublings and octave doublings in combination with the piccolo playing two octaves higher instead of one. There are minor additional articulation indications e.g. in bar 20 in the strings, there are slurs added on the third beat as well as tenutos on the last four beats. The slur markings also appear in the strings in bar 21 and there are accent indications on the last three beats in violins I in bar 24. These are predominantly to indicate string bowing and this is the extent of his additions in this last section.

CHAPTER IV

A Comparative Analysis between the Ravel and Funtek Orchestrations of part 5 in, 'Ballet of the Unhatched Chickens'.

This is what the orchestrators named the same piece respectively:
Ravel - 5. **Ballet des Poussins dans leurs coques**
Funtek - **Ballet der Kuchlein in ihren Eierschalen**

Besides the different use of language in naming the pieces there is also another difference between the overall compilations of the two orchestrations. Ravel numbers the names of all the pieces excluding the 'Promenades'- which is the way it appears in the original piano version of Musorgsky, whereas Funtek only numbers the 'Promenades'. The original title is in Russian: 'Balet Nevylupivshikhsya Ptentsov' and its exact translation into English is 'Ballet of the Unhatched Chickens'. Musorgsky uses a combination of six different languages for the various names of the ten pieces of *Pictures*. This comprises Russian, Latin (*Gnomus*), Italian (*Il Vecchio Castello*), French (*Tuileries – Dispute d'enfants après jeux*), Polish (*Bydlo*) and Yiddish (*"Sameul" Goldenberg und "Schmuyle"*) (Bricard, 2002. 11-15).

This piece is in ternary form and is divided into the following sections, 'Scherzino', 'Trio' and 'Da Capo il Scherzino, senza Trio, e poi Coda'; all parts end with a repeat marking (he also uses ternary form in the 'Hut on Hen's Legs') (Bricard, 2002. 10). Funtek adhered to the repeat indications, but Ravel took the liberty of writing out the repeat sections in order to change the orchestration for dramatic purposes.

A comparison of the complete instrumentation used by Ravel and Funtek respectively in part 5.

RAVEL	FUNTEK
Woodwind	**Woodwind**
1 Piccolo	1 Piccolo
2 Flutes	2 Flutes
2 Oboes	2 Oboes
2 Clarinets in Bb	1 Clarinet in Bb
1 Bassoon	English horn
Brass	**Brass**
2 Horns in F	1 Horn in F
	3 Trumpets in C
Percussion	**Percussion**
Cymbals, Triangle,	Cymbals, Triangle, Glockenspiel, Tambourine,
Tabor	Timpani
Celesta	Celesta
1 Harp	1 Harp
Strings	**Strings**

The main difference is in the brass section; Funtek employs four instruments instead of Ravel's two.

As in many of the other movements, Funtek adds a tempo indication: 'crotchet = 126', in addition to the verbal performance directions given by Musorgsky, also employed by Ravel and Funtek i.e. *Scherzino. Vivo leggiero.* Regarding metronome indications, it is clear according to a letter dated January 31, 1903 from Stasov to Arkady Kerzin, that Stasov and Rimsky-Korsakov met at the home of the composer, Alexander Glazunov, to discuss the tempi of the pieces of *Pictures*:

"*We sat down at the piano, Rimsky-Korsakov played each number over a few times, and then we recalled how our Musorgsky had played them – remembered, tried them, and, finally, fixed the right tempi with the aid of a metronome*" (Bricard, 2002. 5).

O. Thumer, editor of the Augener Ltd. 1914 edition, first published the metronome indications. They can also be found in the International Music Company edition (1952).

However, there were three obvious errors, which probably occurred in translation or engraving. The tempo indications for 'Cattle' should have been indicated as a 'quaver = 88', not a 'crotchet = 88'; 'Ballet of the Unhatched Chickens' was originally indicated as a 'minim = 88', not a 'crotchet = 88'; 'The Bogatyr Gate' indicated as a 'minim = 84' and not a 'crotchet = 84'. In some instances these recollections have been questioned by some (Bricard, 2002. 5).

The combination of different timbres in the first four bars of this part is an illustration of Ravel and Funtek's opposite approaches throughout this section. Funtek e.g. divides the alternating chords in the piano score between the woodwind and brass sections in playful alternating *staccato* quavers. The woodwind consists of flute I (playing the melody) and flute II and oboe II; the brass section is played by the 3 trumpets in C – indicated *con sordini*. The piano part in the score is doubled by the celesta (excluding the *acciaccaturas*), which adds a bell-like tone, consistent with the *ppp* dynamic indication accompanying it. The harp plays the lowest note of the left hand chords of the piano on the 2nd and 4th quavers, except in the 2nd bar where it plays on the 2nd and 3rd quavers. It is also supported by *pizzicatos* divisi in violas in the 2nd and 4th bar. The playful alternation between the woodwind and brass (the orchestration of the chord-motif in the piano score mentioned earlier) in combination with the other two timbres (percussion and strings) gives the piece a subtle 'mixed colour' sound, vibrant but still muted.

Whereas Funtek alternates the chord motif between two timbres, supported by the celesta, Ravel orchestrates the motif within the woodwind section only – flute I, oboes I and II and clarinets I and II, supported by the harp. However, Ravel also enhances this passage with the violas that play on the 1st beat of bars 1 and 3 and the violins that play *pizzicato* chords on the 2nd beat of bars 2 and 4. Ravel makes this passage even more dramatic by adding cymbals and a bassoon together with the violins playing as a *staccato* quaver on the same beats. The result of this approach is a creative combination of different timbres, although the restriction of the chord-motif to only one timbre (woodwind) dominates the sound to such an extent that the passage has a more homogeneous sound than Funtek's.

In the passage from bars 13 to 20 Ravel makes use of a combination of *antiphonal* writing and *klangfarbenmelodie*. The scale-like passage in the left hand of the piano in combination with the *acciaccatura* motif in the right hand is orchestrated by alternating the motif between various instruments. This creates a conglomerate of colour and texture, e.g., the scale-like passage commences in the violas together with the bassoon in bar 13 and shifts to violins II together with oboe I in bar 14. It returns back to the combination of violas and bassoons in bar 15 and violins II and oboe I in bar 16. This interchange takes place simultaneously with the alternation of the *acciaccatura* motif between two timbres, e.g. the motif starts in oboes I and II in bar 13 and moves to clarinets I and II in bar 14. The motif moves back to oboes I and II in bar 15 and returns again to clarinets I and II in bar 16. In bars 17 and 19 flutes I and II are also brought in to this alternation between colours. The alternation continues until bar 20. The result of this approach is the playful exchange in contrasting tone colours of the motifs in the piano score. This creates a responsorial dimension and very colourful texture.

In this same passage Funtek did not embellish on the piano part; he merely assigned instruments to the music as mentioned earlier, allocating the notes that are present, e.g. the scale-like passage is played by the violas and trumpet I from bars 13 to 20. He adds clarinet I to this passage from bars 19 to 20 as the dynamic level increases. The *acciaccatura* motif is played by flutes I and II from bars 13 to 20. To accommodate the increasing dynamic level he adds oboe I in bars 17 and 18 and in addition to this, oboe II in bars 19 and 20. He adds some timbrel enrichment by utilizing a cymbal from bars 13 to 16 followed by a glockenspiel playing the *acciaccatura* motif, but without the *acciaccatura* from bars 17 to 20.

From bars 23 to 38 Ravel incorporates a large variety of articulation indications, e.g. *legato*, *staccato*, *pizzicato* and *con sordino*. This is combined with the diminishing of note values and octave spacing, e.g. the *trill* motif in this section is played by violins I, divisi. Flute I plays the grace note as an *acciaccatura*, and the *trill* lasting for a minim duration in Musorgsky's score is played as a quaver *staccato* by flutes I and II. These two instruments continue to play the motifs together in this way for the duration of bars

23 to 38 accompanied by *pizzicato* cellos which play the lowest notes on the 1st beat of every 2nd bar. The violas play on every 1st and 2nd beats of each bar from bars 23 to 30. This is in combination with the F pedal in horn I (indicated *con sordino*) that plays the tied minim held over every two bars from bars 23 to 24, 25 to 26, 27 to 28 and 29 to 30. Ravel enhances the 'accompaniment' of this section even more by adding a *legato* effect in the bassoon section. He creates this by writing four quavers in a bar of which each of them are *slurred* in pairs. This effect continues from bars 23 to 30.

Bars 31 to 38 are an exact replica of bars 23 to 30, but Ravel chooses to change the instrumentation by making use of a larger orchestra for dramatic and dynamic purposes that can also be described as a *cumulative effect.* This is in contrast with Funtek who adheres to the original score and writes a repeat sign after the section from bars 23 to 30 as well as from bars 39 to 46, thereby just repeating without any variation. Ravel has a more creative approach in differentiating between the exposition and the repeat of the theme. Ravel adds an oboe, clarinet, horn, tambourine, celesta and harp to enrich his orchestration from bars 31 to 38. Violins I, together with flutes I and II continue to play an octave higher than in the score while violins II play double stops on every 2nd beat giving a quasi-syncopated effect. He also adds an E# that does not appear in the score (and is not part of the implied harmony) in the harp on the 1st two quavers of each of these bars. Horns I and III play a more elaborate motif than found in bars 23 to 30 based on the low bass notes, though still with a *con sordini* indication.

In contrast with Ravel's elaborate orchestration, Funtek's interpretation of bars 23 to 30 is more subdued. He does, however, employ diverse articulations and rhythmic adjustments, string harmonics and octave doublings, e.g. the *trill* motif is played by a piccolo, doubled by the celesta. The latter plays the grace note as a semi-quaver and the *trill* as an extended note with no decoration. The note below the *trill* is played by flute I. Both arrangers orchestrate the bass note with horn I as a tied minim, although Funtek does not give an additional *con sordino* indication. The accompaniment is created by a playful alternation between two timbres; the English horn, indicated *con sordino,* plays the moving part in the bass on every 1st and 3rd beat with the harp playing 'F's on every

2nd quaver in the tenor doubled at an octave higher. Violins I play harmonics on 'F' and 'B' for this whole passage regardless of the change of harmony, almost like a pedal point. All of the motifs identified and discussed continue to be played by the same instruments from bars 23 to 30 and again for the repeat from bars 31 to 38.

Funtek's orchestration of this section (bars 23 to 30) creates a thinner texture than Ravel's due to his distribution of the accompaniment between two instruments and very little movement or embellishment within the orchestration. He incorporates the following instruments and does not at any point add or omit any: piccolo, flute I, English horn, horn I, celesta, harp and violins I. The latter has a *ppp* dynamic indication, the harp a *p* sign and the rest is marked *pp*. These low dynamic levels in combination with the thin orchestrated lines contribute to the transparent texture of his orchestration.

This is in contrast with Ravel who employs one less instrument from bars 23 to 30, but has much more movement and *articulation indications* within his orchestration, despite a *pp* indication. From bars 31 to 38 Ravel integrates 13 instruments, all indicated *pp* except for the celesta, *p* and harp, *mf*. The moving part of the accompaniment is distributed amongst the bassoon (that plays four quavers slurred in pairs in every bar) together with the violas, which play *pizzicato* crotchets on every beat. The *trill* motif in the piano score is played in minims and crotchets in violins I in contrast with flute I that plays the same note as a *staccato* quaver preceded by an *acciaccatura*. Although the dynamic indications in the repeat section are similar, Ravel's orchestration is more lavish and also has a bigger instrumentation after the repeat sign (there is however no formal indication of a repetition of the section from bars 31 to 38), whereas Funtek only indicates an exact repeat of the same section (the way it appears in the piano score as mentioned earlier).

Ravel makes use of even more elaborate additions of *articulation markings* later in bars 47 to 54. The accompaniment consists of a combination of 'F's that appear "flutter-tongued" in the flute on every 2nd beat; the 'F' also appears as repeated quavers marked *staccato* preceded by an *acciaccatura* in the piccolo (four octaves above middle C) on every 2nd beat. Another 'F' is played by clarinet I as quavers preceded by *acciaccaturas*

on every 1st beat. This creates a playful interchange between clarinet I, the flutes and the piccolo. In the same bars i.e. bars 47 to 54, Ravel uses repetitive quaver notes in horn I, the harp doubled in octaves on every 1st beat and harp *harmonics* on every 2nd beat, the oboe leaping in octave semiquavers and the bassoon playing in quavers on every 1st beat. There are also added percussion instruments including the triangle, tabor and the cymbals. The melody appears only in the violin I section while the rest of the strings play a role in the accompaniment.

A similar effect is created by Funtek in the passage from bars 23 to 30, but with different instruments. Funtek combines fewer elements of *articulation* namely *harmonics* in the violins, a *roll* on the timpani and off-beats in octaves in the trumpet. The melody is played by the piccolo doubled by the celesta. He adds a *staccato*-marking on the 4th quaver of each bar of the melody in both instruments. The accompaniment in the bass is played by the English horn and doubled an octave higher by flute I. The F in the tenor voice is given to trumpet II and doubled an octave higher in trumpet I. He adds two percussion instruments including a single timpani and triangle. The timpani has a *trill* marking. This section is very representative of Funtek's characteristic style of doubling voices together with wide spacings; this results in a thinner texture.

Both orchestrators continue to apply their respective, individual techniques until the end of this piece, Ravel combining many and varied layers, in contrast with Funtek's simplicity of orchestration. However Ravel's piece ends with 78 bars and Funtek's with 80. Ravel applied 'poetic licence' and took the liberty of eliminating the two last bars before the *coda* to avoid another repeat of the 'shriek' figure, a compositional choice.

CHAPTER V

A Comparative Analysis between the Ravel and Funtek Orchestrations of part 10 in, 'The Great Gate of Kiev'.

Ravel – **10. La Grande Porte de Kiev**

Funtek – **Das Große Tor von Kiew**

The original title in Russian is 'Bogatyrskie Vorotka' (vo stol nom gorode vo Kieve). Stasov's comment on the picture: "Hartmann's sketch represented his architectural project for a gate for Kiev in the old solid Russian style with a cupola in the shape of a Slavic helmet" (Bricard, 2002. 15).

Comparison of the complete instrumentation used by Ravel and Funtek respectively.

RAVEL	FUNTEK
Woodwind	**Woodwind**
	2 Piccolos
3 Flutes	2 Flutes
3 Oboes	3 Oboes
2 Clarinets	1 Clarinet in Eb, 2 Clarinets in Bb
1 Bass Clarinet	1Bass Clarinet
2 Bassoons	2 Bassoons
1 Double Bassoon	1 Double Bassoon
Brass	**Brass**
4 Horns	6 Horns
3 Trumpets in C	4 Trumpets in C
3 Trombones	4 Trombones
1 Tuba	1 Tuba
Percussion	**Percussion**
Timpani, Glockenspiel, Cymbals, Bass Drum, Tubular Bells, Tam-Tam	Timpani in Eb and Bb, Glockenspiel, Tam-Tam, Triangle, Piano, Cymbals
2 Harps	2 Harps
	Celesta
Strings	**Strings**

Funtek's instrumentation is much larger than Ravel's namely the additional 2 piccolos, the Eb clarinet, 2 horns, 1 trumpet, I trombone, piano and a celesta. The use of these instruments, particularly the piccolos in Eb, contribute to a penetrating upper register and lends a specific bell-like and piercing quality to the whole colour. By employing them Funtek stretches the whole *tessitura* and expands it greatly. Ravel, in contrast omits high woodwinds and strings in the opening twelve bars. He only uses 2 bassoons, 1 double bassoon in combination with 11 brass instruments – the resulting soundscape is mellower than Funtek's. Although Funtek introduces the piano as an orchestral instrument, the role it plays is simply a supportive harmonic and timbrel role and in fact it is not prominent or soloistic at all. He employs the orchestral piano for the first time in bars 22 to 29 where it does not play a full chord and consists of two notes of the harmony notes. The notes are also tied semibreves that stretch over two bars, which results in the piano playing a very 'low key' role. The piano occurs for the second time from bars 81 to the end (bar 174). From bars 81 to 110 it doubles the bass notes in octaves on the offbeat; from bars 110 to 113 the piano in the arrangement continues with chords on every beat in contrast to the downward scale passage in the score. From bars 114 to the last bar, the piano in the arrangement follows the rhythm of the original score (except in bars 122, 126, 131 and 133 to 135) as well as the harmony of the chords, although in different inversions. Throughout this section the piano still only plays a supportive role, for it consists of harmony notes and does not play the melody. It is also dominated by the whole orchestra with a big brass section including four horns which later become 6 horns.

In contrast with Ravel, Funtek employs almost the whole orchestra throughout 'Kiev', giving the impression of purely allocating the notes of the score to different instruments. In order to employ such a vast amount of instruments throughout the piece, he has to make use of unison doublings and octave doublings. This results in a more differentiated texture, though a 'mixed colour' of sound. This uni-dimensional approach can even begin to pall.

Ravel on the other hand, makes use of a variety of orchestral techniques, *composite colouring* amongst others; making use of different timbres in contrast with each other. At

the end of the piece, (from bar 162 randomly to the end, bar 176) he adds six bars. He employs the whole orchestra for the first time and takes the liberty of adding motifs (bars 137 to 155) and bars that are not in the original score, creating a grand, stately and powerful finale. Ravel took much liberty in his orchestration of this piece with reference to his addition of seven bars. Ravel added one bar after bar 113, acting as an extension of the descending passage from bars 111 to 113. Ravel added the rest of the bars at the end of the piece after bars 162, 163, 168, 169 and two after 176 to support the increasing resonance build up and power of the orchestra.

Though Funtek's orchestration of the section ranging from bars 1 to 12 is much larger in numbers than Ravel's, the latter's sounds much bolder and more strident than Funtek's. Ravel employs two woodwind instruments in combination with eleven brass instruments and a timpani with subtle lengthening of note values and no octave doublings within the respective instruments. This is followed by the sudden addition of the whole woodwind section in bar 13, creating the effect of *composite colouring*. The result is that of a triumphant and powerful beginning of this piece called 'The Great Gate of Kiev'. (Examples of rhythmical augmentation in this section of Ravel's orchestration can be found in bar 3 beats 3 and 4 in bassoons I and II, double bassoon, horns, trumpets II and III and trombone II; also in bar 5 in beats 1 and 2 in bassoons I and II, double bassoon, horns and trumpet II; bar 7 beats 1 and 2 in bassoon I and II, double bassoon, horns and the trumpet; bar 11 beats 3 and 4 in bassoons I and II, double bassoon, horns, trumpets II and III).

In this same section (bars 1 to 12) Funtek employs the whole woodwind and brass section in a widespread spacing of pitch and tone-colour as a result of all the octave doublings. Funtek's extensive incorporation of lengthening of note values which reduces the frequency of beats in bars 3, 4, 5, 7, 11 and 12 amongst the instruments playing harmony notes, contributes to a more static and transparent texture. This technique is largely applied throughout the piece (the augmentation occurs in the oboes I, II and III, clarinets I and II, 6 horns and trumpets II, III and IV). The octave doublings appear in seven woodwind instruments (piccolos I and II, flutes I and II, oboe I, clarinets I and II).

In spite of Funtek's larger number of instruments, his orchestration creates a thinner texture as a result of octave doublings and subtle lengthening of note values in contrast with Ravel's orchestration that incorporates a dominant brass section and not any of these afore mentioned elements with reference to this section.

Funtek adds an Eb to the score in oboe I in bars 3 and 11 on the 4th beat; it is a note that fits into the harmony, but is not actually in the piano version. There is also an added C in the bass clarinet in bar 4 beats 3 to 4, a note that is not part of the harmony; consequently it creates some dissonance. Bassoon II plays the lower bass line and leaps an octave higher to a G instead of the lower G on the 3rd beat of bar 6, since it cannot reach a note lower than a Bb.

Musorgsky incorporates a Russian chorale (*As You Are Baptized in Christ*) in bars 30 to 47 and bars 64 to 81. Both Ravel and Funtek adhere to the articulation indication, *senza espressione* for these sections in the score. It is interesting to note that the first time the chorale appears (bars 30 to 47), it is indicated *p* and the second time the chorale appears it is indicated *ff* in the score. Both orchestrators adhere to the dynamic indication in the score the first time but mark it *p* the second time as well. The sudden *p* indication in this section, which is adjacent to the previous section that is still *f*, generates the effect of *subito p,* although it is not directly indicated. The decreased volume is also in accordance with a hymnal church-like atmosphere. Funtek utilizes a *homogenous* section of strings i.e. violins I and II, violas and cellos both the first and second time the chorale appears. In contrast with Funtek, Ravel employs a *homogenous* woodwind section, namely clarinets I and II and bassoons I and II the 1st time the chorale appears form bars 30 to 47, but makes use of the *cumulative effect* the 2nd time the chorale appears from bars 64 to 81. He creates this effect by opening the chorale 'repeat' with the same instruments as the previous one, clarinets I and II and bassoons I and II, but in bar 68 he adds flutes I, II and III and in bar 73 he adds a bass clarinet, lending a dark colour to the ensemble.

An example of a diverse contrast in creativity between the two composers can be observed in the section from bars 111 to 113. Ravel embellishes the straightforward

descending passage from the Ab three octaves above middle C to a C three octaves below middle C in his own distinctive manner. He combines a variety of instruments playing downward passages at different stages, thus incorporating *klangfarbenmelodie* and the *cumulative effect* as the passage reaches its lower register. Flute I and violins I plays downward scales in octaves starting on an Ab one octave below the Ab in the score, followed by a octave starting on G, then on F and then on E ending on D. Clarinets I and II, violins I and II and the violas play a two-octave scale in bar 111 starting on the same Ab as the instruments mentioned earlier. In bars 112 and 113 they become fragmented and play downward passages divided into unpredictable and irregular units. Oboes I, II and III apply the same principle.

The *cumulative effect* becomes apparent in bars 112 and 113. Bassoon I and the cellos are added to the orchestration in bar 112 (beats 1 and 2); in the rest of the bar, beats 3 and 4, bassoon II is added and the cellos start to play *divisi* in octaves. In bar 113 Ravel adds a bass clarinet and a double bass to continue with the downward passage. At this point there is a juxtaposed bar that does not appear in the score in which he gives the descending passage a flamboyant ending. Due to the low register of this passage, the flutes, oboes and violins are unable to participate and merely contribute by playing harmony notes on the 3rd beat of this additional bar. The application of *klangfarbenmelodie* is effective in the way the instruments are omitted one by one. The flutes stop playing on the 1st beat of bar 113, followed by oboes I and II and violins I on the 2nd beat and on the 3rd beat oboe III and violins II end their descending passage respectively.

Funtek's approach to this section makes it seem like a different piece of music altogether. He does not incorporate the descending passage at all and embellishes on the score only by means of chords and repetitive, ostinato-like patterns, wide spacing of pitch registers, the use of percussion instruments and *composite colour*. He incorporates a piccolo and flutes I and II to play two different ostinato patterns three octaves above middle C. Oboes I and III also play different ostinato patterns two octaves above middle C. Six horns, 4 trumpets and 4 trombones play chords elongated over two bars at a time from bars 111 to

112 and 113 up to the juxtaposed bar, bar 114. The piano, a colouristic and harmonic addition, together with the harp play chords in minims i.e. on every 2nd beat; the harp arpeggiates the chords and the right hand chords are played an octave higher on every 2nd beat. The section ends with a harp *glissando* that starts on the 3rd beat of bar 113 and ends on the last beat of the juxtaposed bar. The celesta creates a kind of a *tremolo* effect with chords alternating with a single note in quaver note values. The string section plays an arpeggio-like motif in measured *tremolo*-figurations producing a "shimmering, ethereal effect" (Kennan, 2002. 61). They move in an ascending direction that is contradictory to the descending scale passage in the score. The passage from bar 111 can be regarded as a continuation of the section from bars 107 to 110. The exclusion of the scale passage in this section results in a complete change of character of the original music.

The dynamic indication of Funtek's orchestration of bars 107 to 110 is *mp* together with a *sempre crescendo*. The latter is indicated again in bar 111; this in combination with the timpani rolls and cymbals increases the volume systematically with the rest of the orchestra up to the added bar, which makes for a dramatic and dynamic climax. In the same section, Ravel has a *ff* indication at the same time as instruments in with the lower register; the descending passage and the *cumulative effect* are elements that contribute towards a resounding and powerful climax. Both these orchestrations do not observe the dynamic indication in the piano score from bar 107 to 113 which is *f* with a *poco a poco più crescendo* marking in bar 108 rather applying their individual techniques.

There is an additional bar after bar 113 in both orchestrations; this could possibly be to create a sense of balance, e.g. bars 107 to 110 create a four-bar phrase, followed by bars 111 to 113 with the added bar that forms another four-bar phrase, therefore creating a sense of balance. It is therefore understandable that both Ravel and Funtek felt the need to equalise the phrase lengths. The piano score consists of a four-bar phrase (bars107 to 110) followed by a three-bar phrase (bars 111 to 113). Funtek opens the section from bar 114, the *meno mosso sempre maestoso* section, with the full orchestra and continues with it to the end. There are a few exceptions where some instruments are temporarily left out

e.g. the tam-tam from bars 131 to 161, the glockenspiel from bars 137 to 161, horns I and III from bars 146 to 158 and oboe III from bars 146 to 161. Ravel's opening of this section does not consist of the full orchestra; on the contrary, he diminishes the orchestra to eight instruments only accompanied by the strings from bars 136 to 141. From then onwards he utilizes the *cumulative effect* and systematically adds instruments until the finale. Again Funtek's orchestration has a thinner, more transparent texture due to his use of wide spacing, which is a result of his tendency to incorporate a lot of octave doublings, e.g. in bars 114 to 121 with reference to the melody, the piccolo, flute II, oboe III, trumpets I and II and trombone I, some doubling the Eb either at the unison or in octaves above or below. The G bass notes are played by the bass clarinet, bassoon I and trombone IV; and by the bassoon I and tuba doubling the G pitch.

Ravel orchestrates this same section with no octave doublings and creates greater intensity by ignoring the leaps in the piano score and keeping the harmony of each bar in chords staying in the same place in the string section. Funtek on the other hand incorporates the leaps into the string section and doubles this with a piano and a glockenspiel. One could argue that Ravel's interpretation of this section sounds rather pedantic with less movement than that which is created by Funtek who incorporates the leaps within a combination of three timbres. The other interpretation of Ravel's usage of repetitive chords in the strings with no inversions as indicated in the score could be that they create more tension.

With reference to the parameter of dynamic indications, Funtek is not as adventurous as Ravel.

With regard to rhythmic devices, Ravel's response is more subtle and he observes the contrasts between rhythmic groupings of 2's and 3's, whereas Funtek is more pedantic rhythmically and does not achieve the climax building that Ravel does. This different approach by each arranger occurs almost throughout the piece, i.e. from bars 114 to 135. In this extract Ravel continues with a triplet figure throughout the string section, which projects a very light texture. From bars 136 to 155 Ravel creates movement by doubling

each note of the triplet figure in the violins and viola section. This is accompanied by tied semibreves in the woodwind and brass section that create colourful chords and a melody implied by the harmony of the triplets in the score.

The indication *Grave, sempre allargando* that appears in the piano score in bar 162 also appears in Funtek's score, but Ravel did not take any notice of it. It is also at this point that Ravel started to add bars, as mentioned earlier; after bars 162, 163 168, 169 and two bars after bar 176 (the last bar). He took this liberty of creating a *crescendo* and build up in order to accommodate the increased resonance and power of the orchestra, because the only addition within these juxtaposed bars is a rhythmical augmentation of the previous chord.

In contrast to Ravel's very bold 'artistic licence' of this section, Funtek only changed the dynamic indication from *ff* to *fff* in bar 162; in bar 169 there is a *crescendo* marking that leads to *ffff* in bar 163. The author is of the opinion that it is of no consquence whether the indication is *ff*, *fff* or *ffff* at this point of the work for the piece is at its climax and is being played by a *tutti* orchestra.

In a general overview of this piece Funtek's orchestration can be described as very linear, literal to the score, merely allocating the notes of the score to the various instruments without extending this in a creative way. He incorporates the whole orchestra almost throughout the piece, except in the chorales as mentioned earlier, which makes the work sound quite predictable and unvaried. However, in restraining himself, he did accomplish something that few arrangers do and that is, he interpreted and projected the character of the original work and not that of his own creative thinking (i.e. re-composition).
In contrast to Funtek's orchestration, Ravel's interpretation is very original, overlaid with a personal stamp. He understood the music and embellished it in a very creative, exciting and tasteful manner. It never sounds like a distortion of the original; on the contrary he raises it to a new level of artistic brilliance. Although both orchestral versions of this piano work by Musorgsky, *Pictures at an Exhibition*, are so opposite in almost every

aspect they can both be considered to be highly successful interpretations of the work in their own individual manner and application.

Conclusion

Pictures at an Exhibition has found its way into the repertoire of major concert pianists as well as world-renowned orchestras. The music is engaging, dramatic and highly pictorial. Its character is intrinsically Russian and the music is peppered with charming embellishments and subtle nuances.

It is predominantly Ravel's orchestrated version of the piano work that is performed internationally by orchestras today. Ravel succeeded in capturing not only the charm and beauty of the original piano work but infused it with his own compositional creativity in a rich palette of orchestral colours.

Funtek, however, was also a very accomplished and versatile musician. He played several roles as conductor, teacher, performer and orchestrator. One of the most salient differences between Funtek and Ravel which has a bearing on this study is that Funtek was not a composer of original music. "In the same year as Maurice Ravel he orchestrated Musorgsky's *Pictures at an Exhibition.* Funtek's arrangement has kept its place in the repertory of Finnish orchestras. The Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra has toured with it widely and has recorded it under Leif Segerstam" (BIS-CD-325). According to Kalevi Aho, composer and musicologist, "Ravel's arrangement stands in the same relation to Funtek's as Rimsky-Korsakov's 'corrections' to Mussorgsky's original manuscripts. Ravel's version is glorious and colourful but Funtek's more closely resembles the world Mussorgsky wanted to express" (Haapakoski, 1993. 23).
This is borne out by Funtek's predilection for mellower and less strident instrumentation than Ravel's. There are occasionally similarities in their approaches however e.g. the climax building at the end of 'The Great Gate of Kiev' in which Funtek also employs a huge brass section to achieve the desired volume, a texture and timbre that is quite common in Ravel's orchestrations.

Funtek tends to score in monochromatic textures i.e. retaining exactly the same instrumental grouping over a long span of music which reflects the uncomplicated and linear style of Musorgsky's music in *Pictures*. It is characteristic of Funtek as orchestrator to incorporate doublings at the unison and octave doublings, which results in a more diffused and thinner texture. Funtek is more of an 'instrumentator' than an 'orchestrator', since he remains more literal in his interpretation of the score and rarely takes much poetic or musical licence. His textures are widespread and transparent and his approach remains deferential and subservient to the score.
In contrast Ravel tends to orchestrate in 'technicolour', continuously contrasting instrumental groups with one another in responsorial fashion: he is innovative, creative and acutely aware of dramatic effects. He courageously adds to the score and subtracts from it. He does not incorporate many doublings and wide spacings, and consequently his orchestration sounds thicker, more intense and more majestic.

In analysing the different approaches of the two orchestrators, it becomes clear that Ravel is more adventurous and daring by going as far as to change, alter, omit and add notes, dynamics, articulations and rhythms not found in the original. Funtek seems quite reluctant to do this and reserves it for the rare occasion. These two contrasting approaches, evidenced by the two composer-orchestrators, have resulted in significant orchestral works which display fascinating opposing elements and character. Ravel's textures on the whole are lush, sonorous and thick in contrast to Funtek's textures which are more transparent and thinner. Although both orchestrators' interpretations of *Pictures* are uniquely individual and contrasting in almost every respect, the undeniable quality and acceptance into the orchestral repertoire of both orchestral versions makes each of their contributions authoritative and valid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aho, K., 1986. *Modest Musorgsky: Pictures at an Exhibition. Night on a Bare Mountain. Songs and Dances of Death.* Liner notes for Grammofon AB BIS.

Abraham, G., ed. S. Sadie. 1980. *The New Grove Russian Masters 1.* London: Macmillan Publishers.

Brown, M.H. 1982. *Musorgsky in Memoriam* 1881 – 1891. Michigan: UMI Research Press.

Brook, D. 1946. *Six Great Russian Composers.* London: Templar Press.

Calvocoressi, M.D., ed. G. Abraham. 1956. *Modest Mussorgsky.* London: Rockliff Publishing.

Calvocoressi, M.D., ed. J. Westrup. 1974. *Mussorgsky.* London: J.M. Dent & Sons.

Calvocoressi, M.D. 1938. "From My Note Book". *Musical opinion*, 61 (1937), p.202.

Dahlhaus, C., trans. J. Bradford Robinson. 1989. *Nineteenth Century Music.* Los Angeles: California Press.

Dahlhaus, C., trans. M. Whittall. 1985. *Realism in the Nineteenth Century Music.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, L. 1970. *Ravel: Orchestral Music.* London: Cox & Wyman.

Ewen, D. 1945. *The Book of Modern Composers.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Forsyth, C. 1936. *Orchestration.* New York: The Macmillan Company.

Foster, S.1984. "Pictures at an Exhibition: Erinnering an Viktor Hartmann". *Notes*, 42n2, 395-6.

Frankenstein, A. 1939. Victor Hartman and Modeste Musorgsky. *The Musical Quarterly* XXV/3, July, 269.

Greenish, A.J. 1953. *The Student's Dictionary of Musical Terms*. London: Stainer & Bell.

Haapakoski, M. 1993. "Leo Funtek, Man who was a whole Conservatory". *Finnish Music Quarterly*, March, 23-25.

Herbert, T. 2001. *Music in Words*. London: The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of music.

Hutcheson, E. 1964. *The Literature of the Piano*. London: Hutchinson & Co.

James, B. 1983. *Ravel his Life and Times.* New York: Hippocrene Books.

Kennan, K. and Grantham, D. 2002. *The Technique of Orchestration.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Manual, R. 1972. *Maurice Ravel*. New York: Dover.

Myers, R.H. 1960. *Ravel: Life and Works*. London: Gerald Duckworth.

Nichols, R. 1987. *Ravel Remembered.* London: Faber and Faber.

Orlova, A., ed. and trans. R.J.Guenther. 1983. *Musorgsky's Days and Works: A Biography in Documents*. Michigan: UMI Research Press.

Orlova, A., trans. V. Zaytzeff and F. Morrison 1991. *Musorgsky Remembered.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Ottermann, R. and Smit, M. (eds.) 2000. *South African Music Dictionary.* Western Cape: Pharos.

Piston, W. 1955.*Orchestration.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Piston, W. 1983. *Harmony.* London: Victor Gollancz.

Rimsky-Korsakov, N.A. 1924. *My Musical Life.* London: Martin Secker.

Rimsky-Korsakov, N.A. 1912: *Principles of Orchestration.* Steinberg, M (ed.), trans. T. Front. New York: Dover Publications.

Russ, M. 1992. *Musorgsky Pictures at an Exhibition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sadie, S. and Tyrell, J. (eds.) 2001. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians II.* Vol. I, 749. New York: Macmillan Publishers.

Sadie, S. and J. Tyrell. (eds.) 2001. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians II.* Vol. 1, 527-557. New York: Macmillan Publishers.

Sadie, S. and J. Tyrell. (eds.) 2001. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians II.* Vol. 18, 539-549. New York: Macmillan Publishers.

Stephen Johnson, liner note to *Mussorgsky. Pictures at an Exhibition.* 1991. Compact disc. Virgin Classics.

Strauss, R. (ed.), trans. T. Front. 1904. *H. Berlioz: A Treatise on Modern Instrumentation and Orchestration.* Berlin, Hinrichsen.

Taruskin, R. 1993. *Musorgsky: Eight Essays and an Epilogue*. Chichester: Princeton University Press.

Von Riesemann, O., trans. P. England. 1971. *Moussorgsky*. New York: Dover.

Zola, É., trans. A. Bermel. 1968. "Naturalism in the Theatre". *The Theory of the Modern Stage.*

CD RECORDINGS

Modest Musorgsky. Pictures at an Exhibition. Orchestrated by Leo Funtek. The Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra. Conducted by Leif Sergerstam. 1986. Compact disc. Grammofon. AB BIS.

Mussorgsky. Pictures at an Exhibition. Piano soloist: Mikhail Pletnev.1991. Compact disc. Virgin Classics.

Mussorgsky-Ravel, Pictures at an Exhibition. Orchestrated by Maurice Ravel. The New Philharmonic Orchestra. Conducted by Lorin Maazel. 1963. Compact disc. EMI Records.

VIDEO

Mussorgsky. Pictures at an Exhibition, orchestrated by Leo Funtek. The Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra, conducted by Vladimir Ashkenazy. Soloist: Vladimir Ashkenazy. 1991. A Christopher Nupen Film. Teldec Video.

SCORES

Moussorgsky, M. 1929. *Moussorgsky–Ravel Tableaux D'une Exposition.* London: Boosey & Hawkes.

Mussorgsky, M. 1990. *Modest Mussorgsky, Orchestrated by Leo Funtek.* Espoo, Finland: Fazer Music.

Mussorgsky, M. 1952. *Pictures at an Exhibition for the Piano.* New York: International Music Company.

APPENDIX A

- **The piano score of the 'Promenade' by Musorgsky**

- **The orchestral score of the 'Promenade' by Ravel**

- **The orchestral score of the 'Promenade' by Funtek**

Pictures at an Exhibition

Promenade

MODESTE MUSSORGSKY
(1839-1881)
(Composed in 1874)

version, edited by PAUL LAMM
d by ISIDOR PHILIPP

Allegro giusto, nel modo russico; senza allegrezza, ma poco sostenuto ♩ = 104



Copyright 1952 by International Music Company, New York City

TABLEAUX D'UNE EXPOSITION

All Rights Reserved
Tous droits réservés

IMPORTANT NOTICE
The unauthorised copying of the whole or any part of this publication is illegal

PROMENADE

M. MOUSSORGSKY
Orchestration by
Maurice Ravel



Copyright 1929 by Edition Russe de Musique
Printed by arrangement Boosey & Hawkes Inc. New York.

Propriété en co-édition Editions A.R.I.M.A. et Editions Boosey & Hawkes.

Printed in England
B & H. 8729


1
Cor. I.II
Tr. I.II
Trb.III Tuba
Pfte.
2
Ob. I.II.
Cl. I.II
Fg. I.II
Cfg.
Cor. I.II.
2
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
mf
div.
unis.
pizz.
arco


3
Fl.
Fl. picc.
I.II
Ob.
III
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
Cfg.
Muta in Flauto grande
I.II
Cor.
III. IV
Tr. I.II
3
VI.I
VI.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
div.
unis.
pizz.
arco
Pfte.


4
I. II
Fl.
III
Ob.
I.II.III
Cl.
I.II
Cl.b.
Fg.
Cfg.
I.II
Cor
III.IV
Tr.
I.II.III
Trb.I
4
VI.I
VI.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
a 2
div.
unis.
arco


Б
a 3
I.II.
III.
a 2
5
Fr. III.III
Trb.
Tba
f
Б
div.
a 3
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.


4
I.II
Fl.
III
Ob.
I.II.III
Cl.
I.II
Cl.b.
Fg.
Cfg.
I.II
Cor
III.IV
Tr.
I.II.III
Trb.I
4
VI.I
VI.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
mf
f
a 2
div.
unis.
arco


5
a 3
I.II.
III.
Ob.
Cl.
Cl.b.
Fg.
Cfg.
Cor.
Tr.
Trb.
Tuba
f
div.
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.

Pictures at an Exhibition


Promenade I

MODEST MUSSORGSKY
Instr. von /Orch. by Leo Funtek

Allegro giusto, nel modo russico; senza allegrezza, ma poco sostenuto ♩ = 96 - 100



Allegro giusto, nel modo russico, senza allegrezza, ma poco sostenuto




1.
Fl.
2.
1.
Ob. 2.
3.
1.
Klar.
2.
Fg.
Kfg.
3.
Hrn.
2. 4.
Tr.
1. 2.
Pos.
3.
Tuba
Pk.
1. V.
2. V.
Br.
Vc.
Kb.
f
mf
leg.


2
3
Picc.
sempre f
gva
1.
Fl.
2.
sempre f
1.
Ob. 2.
3.
sempre f
1.
Kl.
2.
sempre f
Fg.
sempre f
Kfg.
a 2
1. 3.
Hrn.
2. 4.
Tr.
1. 2.
Pos.
3.
Tuba
Pk.
1. V.
2. V.
div.
Br.
Vc.
u. Kb.


1.
Fl.
2.
1.
Ob.2.
3.
1.
Kl.
2.
Fg.
Kfg.
1.
Hrn.3.
2. 4.
1.
Tr.
2.
1. 2.
Pos.
3.
Tube
Pk.
1. V.
2. V.
div.
Br.
div.
Vc.
u. Kb.
sempre f
f


Fl. 1. 8va
Picc.
1.
Fl.
2.
1.
Ob. 2.
3.
1.
Kl.
2.
Fg.
Kfg.
1. 3.
Hrn.
2. 4.
1.
Tr.
2.
1. 2.
Pos.
3.
Tuba
Pk.
1. V.
2. V.
div.
Br.
div.
Vc.
u. Kb.
à 2
f


Fl. 2.
1.
Ob. 2.
3.
1.
Kl.
2.
1.
Fg.
2.
Kfg.
(a 2)
1. 3.
Hrn. 2.
4.
1.
Tr.
2.
1. 2.
Pos.
3.
Tuba
Pk.
1. V.
2. V.
div.
Br.
div.
Vc.
u. Kb.
poco sost.
attacca

APPENDIX B


- **The piano score of 'Ballet of the Unhatched Chickens' by Musorgsky**

- **The orchestral score of 'Ballet of the Unhatched Chickens' by Ravel**

- **The orchestral score of the 'Ballet of the Unhatched Chickens' by Funtek**


5. Ballet of the Chicks in Their Shells







6. Two Polish Jews, One Rich, the Other Poor





5. BALLET DES POUSSINS DANS LEURS COQUES




49
50
Fl. I, II
Ob. I, II
Cl. I, II
Fg.
Perc.
A. pz
cresc.
49
50
Vl. I
Vl. II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
unis.
div.
unis.
cresc.
Pfte.


51
Fl. I, II
Ob. I, II
Cl. I, II
Fg.
Cor.
Arpa
Vl. I
Vl. II
Vla.
Pfte.
mp cresc.
ff
a 2
f
mf
cresc.
TRIO
52
pp
con sord.
div. arco
pizz.
Vc.
B. & H. 8729


83
Fl. I,II
Ob. I,II
Cl. I,II
Fg.
pp
I
Cor.
III
con sord.
Tamb.
jeu ordinaire
sur la caisse
pp
p
Cel.
Arpa
53
VI.I
VI.II
div.
pp
arco
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.


54
Fl. I.II
Fl. picc.
Ob. I.II
Cl. I.II
Fg.
I
Cor.
III
Tamb.
Cel.
Arpa
54
Vl.I
Vl.II
div.
unis.
Vla.
Vc.
Pfte.


55
(Tremolo dental)
Fl. I.II
Fl. picc.
Ob. I.II
Cl. I.II
Fg.
I
Cor.
III
Trg.
Tamb.
Ptti.
jeu ord.
sur la caisse
pp
Arpa
55
unis.
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
pizz.
Vc.
8
Pfte.


Fl. I.II
Fl. picc.
Ob. I.II
Cl. I.II
Fg.
I
Cor.
III
senza sord.
Trg.
Tamb.
Ptti.
Arpa
VI.I
VI.II
Vla.
Vc.
Pfte.


55A
Fl. I.II
Ob. I.II
Cl. I.II
Fg.
Pctl.
Arpa
pp
55A
VI.I
VI.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
pizz.
div.
Pfte.
una corda
pp


55B
Fl. I, II
Ob. I, II
Cl. I, II
Fg.
Perc.
Arpa
55B
pizz.
Vl. I
unis.
div.
Vl. II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
8
Pfte.


55c
55d
Fl. I.II
Ob. I.II
Cl. I.II
Fg.
Arpa
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
mp
cresc.
unis.
mf


Fl. I.II
Fl. picc.
Ob. I.II
Cl. I.II
Fg.
Cor.
Arpa
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
a 2
1.
I. senza sord.
pizz.
div.
dim.

Ballett der Küchlein in ihren Eierschalen

Scherzino
Vivo, leggiero ♩ = ca 126




1
Picc.
1.
Fl.
2.
Ob.
1.
Tr. 2.
3.
Tamb.
Bck.
Cel.
Harfe
1.
Br. 2.
soli
3.
pp
ppp
8va


poco cresc.
poco cresc.
8va
mf
(loco)
cresc.
8va
mf
cresc.
1.
mf
cresc.
mf
cresc.
poco cresc.
mf
mf
cresc.
p
8va bassa
cresc.
pochissimo cresc.
poco cresc.
mf
cresc.
8va
mf
crew.


3
Solo
Picc.
1. Fl.
2.
1. Ob.
2.
Engl. horn
Kl.
Hrn.
1. Tr.
2.
Pk.
Gl.sp.
Tamb.
Cel.
Harfe
1. V. div.
1. Br. soli
2, 3.
con sord.
Trio
8va


4
Picc.
Fl.
(1.)
Ob.
Engl. horn
Kl.
Hrn.
1. Tr.
2.
Pk.
Trgl.
Cel.
arfe
V.
Br.
p
pp
ppp
con sord.


Picc.
Fl.
(1.)
Ob.
Engl. horn
Kl.
Hrn.
1. Tr.
2.
Pk.
Trgl.
Cel.
Harfe
1. V. div.
8
Da Capo il Scherzino, senza Trio, e poi Coda
Coda
8
dimin.


5
pp
sempre pp
ppp
pp sempre
6



⊕-⊕
Diese Takte sind aus dem Manuskript der ursprünglichen Orchesterpartitur irgendwann gestrichen worden.

APPENDIX C


- **The piano score of 'The Great Gate of Kiev' by Musorgsky**

- **The orchestral score of 'The Great Gate of Kiev' by Ravel**

- **The orchestral score of the 'The Great Gate of Kiev' by Funtek**

10. The Great Gate of Kiev




dimin.
8
f energico
ff
senza espr.


dimin.
sf
Ped.
cresc.
f
mf cresc.


8
f
poco a poco più cresc.
8
Meno mosso, sempre maestoso
ff
simile


mf
simile
cresc.
f
cresc.
poco a poco rall.
Grave, sempre allargando
ff

10. LA GRANDE PORTE DE KIEV

103 Allegro alla breve. Maestoso. Con grandezza

3 Flauti
3 Oboi
2 Clarinetti Sib(Bb) e Clarinetto basso
2 Fagotti
Contrafagotto
I. II
Corni in Fa (F)
III. IV
3 Trombe in Do (C)
Tromboni I. II
Trombone III e Tuba
2 Timpani Sib e Mib Bb & Eb
Gran Cassa
Glockenspiel Campane in Mib(Eb)
2 Arpe

103 Allegro alla brève. Maestoso. Con grandezza

Violino I
Violino II
Viola
Violoncello e Contrabasso
Pianoforte


104
I.II
Fl.
Ob.
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
Cfg
I.II
Cor. III.IV
Tr.
Trt. I.II
Trb.III Tuba
Timp.
Gr.C.
104
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc. Cb
Pfte.


108
a3
I.III.
Fl.
Ob.
Cl.I,II
Clb.
Fg.
I.II
Cfg.
I.II
Cor.
III.IV
Tr.
Trb.
I.II
Trb.III
Tuba
Timp.
Perc.
Gr.C.
105
div.
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
unis.
Pfte.
cresc.


a 3
I. III
106
Flauto III. Muta in Flauto piccolo
Fl.
I. II
I. III
Oboe III. Muta in Corno Inglese
Ob.
a 2
(senza espressione)
Cl. I. II
Cl.b.
Fg. I. II
(senza espressione)
Cfg.
I. II
Cor. III. IV
Tr.
Trb. I. II
Trb. III Tuba
Timp.
Perc.
Gr. C.
Perc. Gr. C.
106
div.
VI. I
VI. II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
(senza espressione)


107
a 2
Fl. I.II
Fl. picc.
Ob. I.II
Cl. I.II
Fg. I.II
Cfg.
I.II
Cor. III.IV
Trb.III Tuba
Timp.
Arpa I
Arpa II
107
unis.
VI.I
VI.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
dimin.
f energico.


132
Fl. I.II
Fl. picc.
muta in Fl. grande
Ob. I.II
C.I.
a2
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
Cfg.
I.II
Cor.
III.IV
Trb.III
Tuba
Timp.
Gr.C.
Arpa I
Arpa II
VI.I
VI.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
div.
unis.
Pfte.


103
133
Fl.
Ob. I.II
C.I.
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
Cfg.
a2
I.II
Cor.
III.IV
Tr.
Trb. I.II
Trb.III
Tuba
Timp.
Perc.
Gr.C.
Arpa
I.II
8va bassa
108
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Sul G (Sol)
unis.
div.
Pfte.
53
57


a 3
I.III
II.
Fl.
Ob. I.II
a2
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
Cfg.
I.II
Cor.
III.IV
Tr.
I.II.
Trb. I.II
Tuba
Timp.
Gr.C.
Ptcl.
Ptcl. Gr.C.
Arpa I.II
8va bassa
Sul G (Sol)
div.
unis.
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pte.


109
I.III.
II.
a3
Fl.
a2
Ob. I.II
muta in Oboe
C.I.
Cl. I.II
p senza espress
Cl.b.
a2
Fg. I.II
p senza espress
Cfg.
a4
Cor.
Tr.
Trb. I.II
Trb.III Tuba
Timp.
Arpa I.II
109
Vl.I
unis
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
8
Cb.
Pfte.
ff
senza espr.
63
68
72



110
Fl.
III. muta in Fl. piccolo
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
mf
I.II
Cor.
III.IV
mf
Tuba
Tuba
mf
Ptcl.
Tam.T.
Ptcl.
p
vibr.
I. Tam.
vibr.
Camp.
mf
Arpa
mf
110
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
pizz.
mf
Vc.
pizz.
sf
Cb.
pizz
mf
Pfte.
dimin.
80
mf
sf
sf



Cl.b.
I.II
Cor.
III.IV
Tuba
Ptti.
Tam.T.
Camp.
Arpa I
VI.I
VI.II
div.
arco
Vla.
div.
arco
Vc.
div.
Cb.
Pfte.


111
Fl. I.II
Fl. picc.
Ob.
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
cresc.
a2
I.II Cor. III.IV
Trb. I.II
Trb.III Tuba
Tuba
3° Trb.
Timp.
Ptcl. Tam.T.
Camp.
Ptcl.
Tam.T.
Arpa I
LA♯(A♯) DO♮(C♮)
111
div
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
arco
pizz.
Pfte.


112
Muta in Flauto Grande
Fl. I.II
Fl. picc.
Ob.
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
Cfg.
I.II Cor.
III.IV
Tr.
Trb I.II
Trb.III Tuba
Timp.
Ptci. Tam.T.
Camp.
Arpa I
Arpa II
gliss.
112
div. in 3
pizz.
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
unis.
Pfte.


140
Fl. I.II
Ob. I.II.III
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
Cfg.
I.II
Cor. III.IV
Tr. I.II.III
Trb. I.II
Trb.III Tuba
Timp.
Perc. Tam.T.
Glsp. Camp.
Arpa I
Arpa II
VI.I
VI.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Picc.
113
cresc.
sf cresc.
poco a poco più cresc.
B. & H. 8729


114
Fl.
I.II
Ob.
III
Cl.
I.II
Cl.b.
Fg.
I.II
Cfg.
I.II
Cor.
III.IV
Tr.
Trb.
I.II
Trb.III
Tuba
Timp.
Perc.
Camp.
Arpa
I.II
114
VI.I
VI.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
unis.
div.
arco


115
Meno mosso sempre maestoso
Fl. I.II.III
Ob. I.II.III
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
Cfg.
I.II
Cor.
III.IV
Tr.
Trb. I.II
Trb.III
Tuba
Timp.
Ptti.
Ptti.
vibrato
115
Meno mosso sempre maestoso
div.
in 3
arco
pizz.
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
unis.
Pfte.


116
Fl. I.II.III
Ob. I.II.III
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
Cfg.
I.II. Cor.
III.IV
Tr.
Trb. I.II
Trb.III Tuba
Timp.
Pctl. Gr.C
Gr.C.
Pctl
116
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
ff
a2
a3
div.
unis.


117
Fl. I.II.III
Ob. I.II.III
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
Cfg.
I.II
Cor.
III.IV
Tr.
Trb. I.II
Trb.III Tuba
Timp.
Pttl. Gr.C.
Gr.C.
Pttl.
117
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
unis.
div.
a2
a3


118
Fl. I.II.III
Ob. I.II.III
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
Cfg.
I.II Cor.
III.IV
Tr.
Trb. I.II.
Trb.III Tuba
Timp.
Perc.
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
mf
a3
a2
I.III.
II.
div.
unis.


I.II
Fl.
III
Ob.
I.II
Cl.
I.II
Cl.b.
Fg.
I.II
cresc.
mf
cresc.
cresc.
cresc.
cresc.
I.II
Cor.
III.IV
II.
mf
cresc.
III.
mf
cresc.
VI.I
VI.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
cresc.
cresc.
unis.
cresc.
cresc.
cresc.
Pfte.


Fl. I, II
Ob. I, II
I.a
Cl. I, II
Cl.b.
Fg. I, II
Cfg.
I, II
Cor.
III, IV
II.
III.
Vl. I
Vl. II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
cresc.


119
I.II
Fl.
III
Ob.
I.II.III
Cl.
I.II
Cl.b.
Fg.
Cfg.
f
cresc.
cresc. sempre
a2
I.II
Cor.
III.IV
Tr.
Trb.
I.II
Trb.III
Tuba
mf
Timp.
119
VI.I
VI.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
div.
in 3
cresc. sempre


120
a2
Poco a poco rallentando
Fl. I
Fl. II
Ob. I
Ob. II
Cl. I
Cl. II
Cl. b.
Fg. I
Fg. II
Cfg.
Cor. I
Cor. III
Cor. II
Cor. IV
Tr. I
Tr. II
Trb. I
Trb. II
Tuba
Timp.
Perc.
Gr. C.
Pizz.
Vl. I
Vl. II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
in 2
unis.
div.
Poco a poco rall.


150
121
Fl. I.II.III
Ob. I.II.III
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
Cfg.
I.II Cor.
III.IV
Tr.
Trb. I.II
Trb.III Tuba
Timp.
Trg.
Perc.
Gr.C.
Tam.T.
Camp.
Arpa I.II
121
VI.I
VI.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
vibrato
unis.
div.


Fl. I.II.III
Ob. I.II.III
Cl. I.II
Cl.b.
Fg. I.II
Cfg.
I.-IV.
Cor. III IV
Tr.
Trb. I.II
Trb.III Tuba
Timp.
Trg.
Perc.
Gr.C. Tam.T.
Camp.
Arpa I.II
div.
Vl.I
Vl.II
Vla.
Vc.
Cb.
Pfte.
Tam.T
Gr.C.
avec baguette
A
170
171
172
173
174
175
176

Das große Tor von Kiew




Picc.
1.
Fl.
2.
1.
Ob. 2.
3.
Es-Kl.
1.
B-Kl.
2.
Bassk.
Fg.
Kfg.
2
à 2
1.3.
Hrn. 2.
4.
à 2
1.2.
Tr. 3.
4.
1.
Pos.
2.3.
Tuba
f
mf
cresc.


4
senza espressione
.V.
.V.
Br.
/c.
senza espressione
energico (= 63)
5
1.
Picc.
2.
Fl. 1.
Kfg.
(molto tenuto)
soli à 3
1.2.
3.
Hrn.
4.
marc.
1.
2.
Pos.
3.
Tuba
(molto tenuto)
Harfe
marc.
Harfe
marc.
I.V.
2.V.
Br.
Vc.
dimin.
dimin.
dimin.
dimin.
dim.
f energico


1.
Picc.
2.
1.
Fl.
2.
Klg.
(à 3)
1.2.
3.
Hrn.
4.
1.
Pos.2.
3.
Tuba
8va
Harfe
8va
Harfe


6
(molto tenuto)
(molto tenuto)


7
senza espressione
1.V.
2.V.
Br.
Vc.
p
senza espressione
ff
dimin.
8
1.
Ob. 2.
3.
Es-Kl.
B-Kl. 1.
2.
à 2
ten.
mf
Fg.
1.3.
Hrn.
2.4.
5.6.
Clavier
con ped.
non div.
1.V.
2.V.
Br.


Picc. 1. 2.
Fl. 1. 2.
Ob. 1. 2. 3.
Es-Kl.
B-Kl.
Fg.
Kfg.
1.3. Hrn. 2.4. 5.6.
Klavier
Glock.
Cel.
Harfen
unisono
1.V.
2.V.
Br.
mf
cresc.
(à 2)
8va
69
90


♩ = 72
ten.
8va
Fl. 1.
2.
Ob. 1.
2.
3.
s-Kl.
3-Kl.
Fg.
Kfg.
à 4
1.2.
3.4.
Hrn.
5.6.
(à 2)
1.
Tr. 2.
3.4.
soli
marc. ten.
à 2
Klavier
Pk.
Glock.
p poco a poco cresc.
(loco)
Cel.
Harfen
Tasono
1.V.
2.V.
Br.
100


11
cc. 1. 2.
sempre cresc.
Fl. 1. 2.
1.2. Ob.
3.
Es-Kl.
B-Kl.
Fg.
Kfg.
(à 4)
1.2. 3.4. Hrn.
5.6.
1. 2. Tr.
(à 2)
3.4.
cresc.
Klavier
Pk.
Bck.
Glock.
p
Cel.
Harfen
unisono
1.V.
2.V.
Br.
8va


à 2
cc. 1. 2.
Fl. 1. 2.
1. 2. 3.
s-Kl.
-Kl.
asskl.
Fg.
Kfg.
1.3. 2.4. Hrn.
5.6.
1.2. Tr.
3.4.
1.2. 3.
lavier
Pk.
Bck.
Glock.
Cel.
Harfen nisono
non arp.
1.V.
2.V.
Br.
mp cresc.
sempre cresc.
pp cresc. poco a poco
mf sempre. cresc.
f
poco a poco più cresc.


(à 2)
Picc.
1.
Fl. 2.
1.
Ob.
2.3.
Es-Kl.
B-Kl.
lasskl.
Fg.
Kfg.
1.3.
2.4.
Hrn.
5.6.
r. 1.2.
3.4.
ss. 1.2.
3.
lavier
Pk.
Bck.
Glock.
Cel.
Harfen
nisono
1.V.
2.V.
Br.
sempre cresc.
pp
mf cresc.
8va
gliss.
110
113


13
Meno mosso, sempre maestoso (o = 44)
à 2
Picc.
Fl.
1.
Ob.
2.3.
Es-Kl.
B-Kl. 1.
2.
Basskl.
Fg.
Kfg.
1.3.
4.
Hrn.
2.5.
6.
1.2.
Tr.
3.4.
1.2.
Pos.
3.4.
Tuba
Klavier
Tamtam
Glock.
non div.
1.V.
2.V.
Br.
Vc.
Kb.
Meno mosso, sempre maestoso


14
Picc.
Fl.
Ob. 1.2. 3.
Es-Kl.
B-Kl. 1. 2.
Basskl.
Fg.
Kfg.
1. 3. 4. Hrn.
2. 5. 6.
1.2. Tr.
3.4.
1.2. Pos.
3.4.
Tuba
Klavier
Tamtam
Glock.
1.V.
2.V.
Br.
Vc.
Kb.
sempre ff
ff



15
(à 2)
16
Picc.
Fl.
Ob. 1.2. 3.
Es-Kl.
B-Kl.
Bassk.
Fg.
Kfg.
1.3.
Hrn. 2.
5.6.
1.2. Tr.
3.4.
1.2. Pos.
3.4.
Tuba
Klavier
Tamtam
Glock.
1.V.
2.V.
Br.
Vc.
Kb.
mf
fff
div.


à 2
Picc.
Fl.
1.
Ob.
2.3.
Es-Kl.
B-Kl.
Basskl.
Fg.
Kfg.
1.3.
Hrn.
2.4.
5.6.
1.2.
Tr.
3.4.
1.2.
Pos.
3.4.
Tuba
Klavier
1.V.
2.V.
div.
Br.
div.
Vc.
Kb.
poco a poco cresc.
cresc.


(à 2)
17
Picc.
Fl.
Ob. 1. 2.
Es-Kl.
B-Kl.
Bassk.
Fg.
Kfg.
2.4. Hrn.
5.6.
1.2. Tr.
3.4.
1.2. Pos.
3.4.
Tuba
Clavier
1.V.
2.V. div.
Br. div.
Vc.
Kb.
f
sempre cresc.
cresc.


18
poco a poco rall.
rit.
Picc.
Fl.
Ob.
Es-Kl.
B-Kl.
Basskl.
Fg.
Kfg.
1.3.
Hrn.
2.4.
5.6.
Solo
1.2.
Tr.
3.4.
1.2.
Pos.
3.4.
Tuba
Klavier
Pk.
1.V.
2.V.
div.
Br.
div.
Vc.
Kb.
poco a poco rall.


Grave, sempre allargando
19
20
a 2
Picc.
Fl.
1.
Ob. 2.
3.
Es-Kl.
B-Kl.
Basskl.
Fg.
Kfg.
1.3.
2.4.
Hrn.
5.6.
1.2.
Tr.
3.4.
1.2.
Pos.
3.4.
Tuba
Klavier
Pk.
Tamtam
Trgl.
Bck.
Glock.
1.V.
2.V.
div.
Br.
div.
Vc.
Kb.
cresc.
fff
non div.
div.
Grave, sempre allargando
ff



1. Presentation Jug



2. Cathedral Tower, Périgueux



3. A Jewish Market Woman, Sandomir






5. A Polish Jew, Sandomir



6. A Jewish Beggar. Sandomir





8. Clock in the Form of Baba-Yaga's Hut



9. The Great Gate of Kiev