

**Rachmaninoff's Fourth Piano Concerto, op. 40:  
1926, 1928 & 1941.**

**Scott Davie**

A Research Paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the Degree of Master of Music (Performance)

Sydney Conservatorium of Music  
University of Sydney  
March 2001

## CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	Page 1
2. HISTORY OF THE FOURTH PIANO CONCERTO	9
3. PRIMARY SOURCES	22
4. RACHMANINOFF AND THE NATURE OF REVISION	33
5. ANALYSIS	43
6. CONCLUSION	90
APPENDIX – EXAMPLES	95
BIBLIOGRAPHY	194

I would like to acknowledge my gratitude to Leslie Howard for alerting me to the existence of the original version of Rachmaninoff's Fourth Piano Concerto, and for helping with access to the various scores of this work. Special thanks to Robert Threlfall for, among other things, his preparation of a two-piano score of the original version. I would also like to express my thanks to Dr. Peter McCallum for his patient supervision of this project, and to Phillip Shovk for providing useful translations of Russian texts.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper looks at the history of the Fourth Piano Concerto, in G minor, op. 40, by Sergei Vassilyevich Rachmaninoff (1873-1943). From its initial sketches around 1914 to its first performances in 1926, its revision in the following year and subsequent performances and publication in 1928, and then to its final revision, performances and recording in 1941, work on this concerto covers over a third of Rachmaninoff's life, making it a unique work for the composer.<sup>1</sup> The Fourth Piano Concerto was generally poorly received, however, with negative critiques being published after Rachmaninoff's performances of all three versions of the work.<sup>2</sup> In the past 20 years, noted Rachmaninoff scholars such as Robert Threlfall and David Butler Cannata have speculated as to whether the original version of the Fourth Piano Concerto is superior to its revised versions, basing their opinions on the manuscript of the full score, housed in an archive in the Library of Congress.<sup>3</sup> While a definitive answer may not be known until this earliest version is published and performed again, the paper attempts to address the question through a comparative analysis of the three versions, basing the study on a facsimile of the original manuscript that has been made available privately.

Study of the Fourth Piano Concerto raises issues regarding the nature of revision, and its context in both Rachmaninoff's output and within his life. While it has been possible to study the nature and extent of revisions to other major works, such as the First Piano Concerto and the Second Piano Sonata, the unpublished status of the original version has hindered study in this case. Opinion is generally split over the merit of

revised versions in the cases of many composers, Bruckner and Liszt among them. There are some that argue that in the case of a revised work, such as the Second Piano Sonata of Rachmaninoff, too much of the original has been taken away.<sup>4</sup> The question of superiority among differing versions is especially of interest in the case of the Fourth Piano Concerto, as no version of this work has found particular success. In general, the most commonly known version of the Fourth Piano Concerto (the revision of 1941) has been acknowledged as being a comparatively weak work, and it is perhaps because of this that speculation on the original version has arisen.<sup>5</sup> Despite Rachmaninoff's successes, a "strain of indecision, uncertainty and lack of confidence"<sup>6</sup> has been noted in his life. His vulnerability as a composer can be noted also in his reaction to the disastrous premiere of his First Symphony. It is a possibility that Rachmaninoff's initial judgement of the Fourth Piano Concerto was affected by doubts at a time when he acknowledged that composition was difficult.

Rachmaninoff is primarily remembered as a composer and as a pianist. He was also a noted conductor, yet his work in this field (and his reputation for it) is centered mainly on his time in Russia prior to his emigration in 1917. There are some that similarly contend, among them many early 20<sup>th</sup> century Russian musicologists, that Rachmaninoff's compositional career also faded after leaving Russia.<sup>7</sup> The Fourth Piano Concerto lies at a crucial point in this discussion, as its first version was the first original work by the composer in exile: it was preceded by eight dormant years, and followed (with the exception of the Three Russian Songs, also completed in 1926) by another four dormant years. More recent scholarly comment on Rachmaninoff's works

post-1930 indicates that they are among his finest. The maturing of his melodic style, harmonic language, and his approach to form and orchestration, are evident in his final works: the Rhapsody on a Theme of Paganini, the Third Symphony, and the Symphonic Dances. Despite its lack of success, the essence of these developments in Rachmaninoff's compositional style can also be found in the Fourth Piano Concerto.

The piano concerto, as a genre, had proven quite successful for Rachmaninoff in the years prior to 1917. His first published opus was the First Piano Concerto, a work completed in 1893 yet revised and republished in 1917/18. His most successful work for many years – certainly by popularity – was the Second Piano Concerto, composed immediately after the period of inactivity that followed the premiere of the First Symphony. The Third Piano Concerto was for some years a less popular relation to its predecessor but has, in the past fifty years, become a corner-stone of the Romantic repertoire. By the age of 45, when Rachmaninoff left Russia, these concertos, along with three symphonies (and the choral 'symphony' The Bells), three operas, two major religious works, three sonatas and numerous songs and miniature piano works, afforded him a level of confidence as a composer. To what extent, though, he felt that the concerto genre failed him with the composition of the Fourth Piano Concerto can perhaps be gleaned in his choice of a different format for his last work in the piano / orchestra genre, the Rhapsody on a Theme of Paganini, which is in theme and variation form.

Considering Rachmaninoff's fame as a pianist, it is relevant to assess the significance

of his compositions in the concerto genre. David Butler Cannata suggested in 1983 at a 'Rachmaninoff Congress' in Canada<sup>8</sup> (and again in more detail in his 1991 dissertation)<sup>9</sup> that the piano concertos of Rachmaninoff create stylistic divisions in his compositional output: all of these divisions decrease in size, but begin with a concerto and end with the composition of a symphonic work. Thus, looking at the First Concerto in its original form, one can note that the structure of the melodies, the rich yet traditional harmony and clear-cut form, mark the majority of his first sixteen opuses. This period is seen to culminate with the First Symphony. The obvious maturing of his style in his Second Piano Concerto draws comparison with the other works in the next period, concluding with the Second Symphony and, perhaps more importantly, the symphonic poem 'Isle of the Dead'. The Third Piano Concerto can be seen to mark, again, a period of greater stylistic maturity, and, with particular relevance to this concerto, a greater freedom in his approach to form. This period could be seen to roughly conclude with the choral-symphonic work, 'The Bells'.

Similarly, the Fourth Piano Concerto marks the beginning of another period of development in compositional style, finding its culmination in Rachmaninoff's final – and perhaps greatest – symphonic works. It should be noted, however, that Dr. Cannata suggests that this period contains only the Fourth Piano Concerto and the Three Russian Songs, and that another period is commenced with the Rhapsody on a Theme of Paganini and ended with the Third Symphony and the Symphonic Dances. The fact, however, that the final version of the Fourth Piano Concerto postdates the Symphonic Dances complicates the idea. Of more pertinence, perhaps, is a question of whether the original

version of the Fourth Piano Concerto reveals more about this final creative period of Rachmaninoff's life than the commonly heard version of 1941 has so far indicated.

A comparison of Rachmaninoff's compositional development based solely on his concertos shows that the most marked difference in style lies between the Third and Fourth Piano Concertos – the Third seemingly indulgent in its scope, the Fourth from its outset marked by concerns of length. The Fourth Piano Concerto also marks a greater complexity in rhythmic and thematic development than the Third Piano Concerto, and a distinct shift in Rachmaninoff's overall concept of orchestration. Indeed, the rhythmic complexity and reliance on solo playing from all sections of the orchestra that challenge ensemble in the Third Symphony and the Symphonic Dances are equally evident in the Fourth Piano Concerto. It is perhaps because of these inherent difficulties of ensemble, particularly in the third movement, that the concerto has unwittingly been dealt many of its criticisms.

Regarding Rachmaninoff's attempts to find a better form for the work through revision, Barrie Martyn, in 'Rachmaninoff: Composer, Pianist, Conductor', comments on the final version of the Fourth Piano Concerto:

“.....the changes to which he subjected it were aimed specifically at improving its formal structure rather than its public acceptability. What audiences expected and wanted was a wholly different concerto from the one Rachmaninoff wrote; what he gave them is a work of considerable originality in an unfamiliar vein, a work which, though uneven, has several memorable moments of real inspiration.”<sup>10</sup>

It is quite certain that Rachmaninoff was aware of the originality of this work and of the departure in style from the Third Piano Concerto, yet the “unevenness” referred to could

have more to do with the nature of the revision process. Indeed, analysis of the original version shows a greater cohesiveness overall, and a sense of organic growth in the piano writing that is not as evident in the final version.

In 1873, the year of Rachmaninoff's birth, the 'Nationalist school' of composition – beginning in St Petersburg with 'the mighty handful' – was still relatively new. By the time he graduated from the Moscow Conservatory, the Russian piano concerto was exemplified by a few early models: the works of Balakirev, Rimsky Korsakov, Arensky, Anton Rubinstein and Tchaikovsky.<sup>11</sup> By the second decade of the twentieth century, distinctive national schools of composition in Europe were succumbing to a more global currency, and Rachmaninoff may have been searching for relevance in this new order. In some senses, the Fourth Piano Concerto may be an indication of Rachmaninoff's attempts to address a newer age in music.

In order to assess most clearly Rachmaninoff's work on the Fourth Piano Concerto, the following chapters look at the complete history of the work and examine all primary sources of the concerto. The paper then looks at the nature and concept of revision in Rachmaninoff's works – a stage of the creative progress he applied to many works, including the Third Piano Concerto in recorded format. The extent to which insecurity about the Fourth Piano Concerto is intertwined with his own personal doubts can be noted in his correspondence, and this is also assessed. An analysis of the concerto in its three differing versions is then presented, and the current performance situation discussed.



I would like to acknowledge at this point a temptation to believe that, with all the years that Rachmaninoff put into the composition of the Fourth Piano Concerto, and realising that there were other noble projects he abandoned, within time his hopes may somehow be vindicated.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a definitive listing of all three versions of the Fourth Piano Concerto, see Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, *A Catalogue of the Compositions of S Rachmaninoff*, London: Scolar Press, 1982, pp. 126-33.

<sup>2</sup> For an assessment of public sentiment and references to reviews of the Fourth Piano Concerto, see Barrie Martyn, *Rachmaninoff: Composer, Pianist, Conductor*, Aldershot, Hants (Eng): Scolar Press, 1990, pp. 299-300.

<sup>3</sup> Robert Threlfall, 'Rachmaninoff's Revisions and an Unknown Version of his Fourth Concerto', *Musical Opinion* 96 (February 1973), pp. 235-37. In this article, Threlfall outlines his discovery of the original manuscript in the Library of Congress in 1967. David Butler Cannata, *Rachmaninoff's Changing View of Symphonic Structure*, Ph.D. diss., University of New York, 1992. Ann Arbor Mich.: UMI 1993. An opinion about the original version of the concerto is stated on p. 178.

<sup>4</sup> Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 322.

<sup>5</sup> For one of the most caustic appraisals of the Fourth Piano Concerto, see John Culshaw, *Sergei Rachmaninov*, London: Dennis Dobson Ltd, 1949, pp. 92-5.

<sup>6</sup> Robert Threlfall, op. cit., p. 235.

<sup>7</sup> For annotations to many un-translated Russian musical commentaries, see Robert Palmieri, *Sergei Vasil'evich Rachmaninoff: A Guide to Research*, New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1985.

<sup>8</sup> David Butler Cannata, 'Rachmaninoff's Concept of Genre', *Studies in Music*, 15 (1995) London (Canada): Department of Music History, faculty of Music, University of Western Ontario, pp. 59-73.

<sup>9</sup> David Butler Cannata, *Rachmaninoff's Changing View of Symphonic Structure*, Ph.D. diss., University of New York, 1992. UMI, Ann Arbor, Michigan: 1992.

<sup>10</sup> Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 308.

<sup>11</sup> For a comprehensive overview of the early history of Russian music from a Russian composer's point of view, see Stuart Campbell, ed. and trans., *Russians on Russian Music: 1830-1880*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

## 2. HISTORY OF THE FOURTH PIANO CONCERTO

The Fourth Piano Concerto is first mentioned in literature in April 1914, only four years after the completion of the Third Piano Concerto. The mention (simply, “Rachmaninoff is working on a fourth concerto”) occurred in the Moscow-based music periodical ‘Muzika’.<sup>1</sup> At this time, there would be three further years before Rachmaninoff left Russia, and thirteen years before the first version of the Fourth Piano Concerto would be heard. However, the extent that Rachmaninoff was actually working on the Fourth Piano Concerto in a time of tremendous creativity is difficult to assess.

The usual place for Rachmaninoff to commence large-scale compositions was at the family estate southeast of Moscow, Ivanovka. Barrie Martyn speculates about the summer of 1914, stating that, though Rachmaninoff’s stay at Ivanovka was unusually long, he did not produce a major work.<sup>2</sup> In a letter to his friend and colleague, Alexander Goldenweiser, Rachmaninoff comments on the difficulty of work at the time:

“The summer has passed and for me it passed badly. I was very busy until 15 June, but the whole time my work didn’t get along; it didn’t satisfy me, and by the time mentioned I had reached the point of being unable to control either the work or myself so I gave up working. After a long period when work has not satisfied me this point always comes upon me.”<sup>3</sup>

It is not clear, however, which work his comments might refer to. Rachmaninoff had also been contemplating a ballet score for Michel Fokine at this time, ‘The Scythians’, which was later abandoned. (Some of the material for this, however, made its way into his final work, the Symphonic Dances.<sup>4</sup>)

There is a stronger reason, however, for dating the inception of the Fourth Piano Concerto to 1914: in all three versions of the concerto, the *Largo* movement incorporates a section of the Étude-Tableau in C minor, op. 33, no. 3. This collection of études was originally intended to contain nine pieces, as can be noted in Gutheil's notice of publication in 1914.<sup>5</sup> However, when the études were published they were offered not as a set but individually, and numbers 3, 4 and 5 were excluded. Whether Rachmaninoff had doubts about the standard of these études is unlikely: the fourth, nicknamed 'Little Red Riding Hood', was later published in the Études-Tableaux op. 39, and has gained more recognition than others in the set (being included in Respighi's orchestrated selection). The third and fifth études of the original set were published posthumously in 1948 as part of the Russian Collected Works edition, the connection between the third étude and the Fourth Piano Concerto being unknown until this time. It seems logical to assume that Rachmaninoff's reason for the exclusion of the third étude from publication was that he had decided to use it in the concerto. In the case of the fifth étude, it may have been a similarity of key and motif with the First Piano Sonata that influenced a decision to withhold it. The actual date of composition for these pieces is 1911, three years before their publication.<sup>6</sup>

In the third Étude-Tableau, two separate sections precede the ten bars borrowed for the second movement of the Fourth Piano Concerto. The first section, in C minor, is marked *Grave* and is funereal in character, while the second, marked *meno mosso, molto tranquillo*, is centered in C major over a low C pedal. In the Fourth Piano Concerto, however, the proportions of the movement are somewhat different: a melodic motif based

over a falling third is passed between piano and orchestra in a variety of harmonisations for a greater part of the movement. A short, robust section based on the chromatic form of the motif interrupts the tranquility of the movement, yet the music eventually resolves in C major. It is at this point that Rachmaninoff reuses the ten bars from the *étude*; these bars, of an entirely different melodic type and covering a more prolonged harmonic progression than the principle subject matter, form an emotional core to the movement. Whether Rachmaninoff had realised that he could adapt these ten bars in this way as early as 1914 could perhaps be resolved through a study of extent sketch materials.

In 1917, the year Rachmaninoff was to leave Russia, a mention of the Fourth Piano Concerto appeared in a Russian musical gazette. It simply stated:

“at the present time Sergei Vassilyevich Rachmaninoff is working on his Fourth Concerto.”<sup>7</sup>

Whether this comment is based on an actual information from Rachmaninoff, or whether it is anecdotal, is not made clear. In the two years before Rachmaninoff left Russia, he had completed the set of *Études-Tableaux*, op. 39, and his final collection of songs, op. 38. In the last months of 1917, he began (although he did not fully complete) a revision of the First Piano Concerto, which, in light of the success of the Second Piano Concerto, he had acknowledged as a priority.<sup>8</sup> This was a busy and stressful year for Rachmaninoff and it is, therefore, curious to consider if he also found time to work on the Fourth Piano Concerto.

Sketches for the Fourth Piano Concerto, mentioned in a number of sources, also

lend credibility to the possibility of Rachmaninoff working on it in the years before he left Russia.<sup>9</sup> The archive of material donated to the Music Division of the Library of Congress in Washington, DC, by his widow (ML30.55a), contains much that relates to the Fourth Piano Concerto, including the manuscript of the original 1926 version.<sup>10</sup> This archive consists mainly of material from his time in the West and will be looked at in greater detail in the following chapter. While most of the sketches are undated, they frequently contain sections, or ideas, from other works that clearly can be dated.<sup>11</sup> It is obvious that these sketches for the Fourth Piano Concerto were of sufficient importance to him to be taken as he left Russia. The majority of his belongings that remained in Russia (his library of manuscripts and scores, including the still missing manuscript of the First Symphony) were, for many years after his departure, scattered between a number of places. They now form an archive in the State Central Glinka Museum of Musical Culture in Moscow (Fond 18) and have been extensively catalogued.<sup>12</sup> There is only one identified reference in the Moscow collection to sketch material relating to the Fourth Piano Concerto but it dates, unusually, from 1923.<sup>13</sup>

On leaving Russia in December 1917, Rachmaninoff was under considerable financial pressure to find work.<sup>14</sup> Having supported his family through composition for most of his mature years in Russia, he set about learning repertoire for solo recital work (his appearances as a pianist having typically occurred in performances of his own works). The first concerts undertaken were a series of performances in Norway and Sweden. At the time, he also entertained the idea of focusing his career again on conducting. After receiving offers from the Boston and Cincinnati Orchestras, he decided against furthering

that career due to the workload involved.<sup>15</sup> These offers, however, were pivotal in gaining entry visas to the United States for Rachmaninoff and his family. Whether it was the ease in which work as a pianist was to appear, or whether it was a real preference for solo performance, Rachmaninoff firmly established a reputation in America as a concert pianist. Indeed, the yearly cycle of concerts across much of the northern American continent commenced from his second year in exile.

With Rachmaninoff's time now consumed by constantly learning new repertoire, and with an extensive season of concerts and travelling, one notes an instant absence from conducting and composition. His inability to compose is clearly marked in his correspondence of the time. To his friend, Nikita Morozov, Rachmaninoff wrote in 1923:

“Your main question, that I find in all your letters, as to my creative work, I must answer thus: either from over-fatigue or from loss of the composing habit (it's been five years since I worked on composition), I am not drawn to this matter, or rarely drawn. This does take place when I think about my two major compositions that I started not long before leaving Russia. When I think of these, I long to finish them.”<sup>16</sup>

Konstantin Igumnov, a close friend of Rachmaninoff, later stated a belief that these two works referred to were the unfinished opera 'Monna Vanna' and the Fourth Piano Concerto. To Medtner, also in response to a question about composing in 1924, he answers:

“How can I compose without melody?”<sup>17</sup>

However, it is evident from the sketch material that Rachmaninoff was working at least intermittently on the Fourth Piano Concerto. For example, the manuscript of the cadenza written for performances of the Second Hungarian Rhapsody by Liszt in 1919, located in

the archive of the Library of Congress, has on its reverse a fragment from the last movement of the concerto.<sup>18</sup> The extent, though, to which the concerto had begun to evolve is generally not possible to determine from comments about sketch materials.

An annual summer break in Rachmaninoff's performing schedule was to become of utmost importance to his later work as a composer. Indeed, all of the remaining major works were completed in these summers breaks: the Fourth Piano Concerto and the Three Russian Songs were completed in Dresden; the Variations on a Theme of Corelli in a chateau outside Paris; the Third Symphony and numerous transcriptions in Vila Senar, in Switzerland; and his final complete work, the Symphonic Dances, in Huntington, Long Island. Between 1918-1925, Rachmaninoff averaged between 30-70 performances of recitals and concertos per year. In 1926, the year of composition of the Fourth Piano Concerto, however, there were no scheduled concerts.<sup>19</sup> Rachmaninoff, perhaps realising that he had firmly established his career, and having recovered what he had quite literally lost on leaving Russia, had decided to take a break. He referred to the year as his 'sabbatical', and he intended, again, to produce major compositions. Indeed, Bertensson and Leyda in their book, 'Sergei Rachmaninoff: A Lifetime in Music', assert a belief that Rachmaninoff was hoping to support his family through royalties from his compositions of that summer: the Fourth Piano Concerto and the Three Russian Songs.<sup>20</sup>

In 1925, Nicholas Medtner, in a letter to Alexander Goldenweiser, refers to

Rachmaninoff playing portions of the Fourth Piano Concerto:

“He ran through different passages of his fourth concerto, which he had drafted in 1917 and which, at last, he is intending to take in hand this winter. It is of course



the same authentic Rachmaninoff, but overall he played it too fragmentarily and too little of it to make a proper judgment”<sup>21</sup>

Rachmaninoff was obviously not certain about aspects of the Fourth Piano Concerto at that time. As soon as he had received the copyist’s draft of the two-piano version of the concerto shortly before leaving Dresden in 1926, he began expressing doubts about the work’s length. It is worth noting, however, that he had sufficient faith in the composition to send it for copying. In a letter to Medtner, dated 9 September, 1926, he states his horror at finding that the work ran to 110 pages in two piano score:

“I glanced at its size .....and was terrified! Out of sheer cowardice I haven’t yet checked its time. It will probably be performed like ‘the Ring’ on several evenings in succession. And I recalled my conversation with you on the theme of length and the need to cut down, compress, and not to be long-winded, and I was ashamed.”<sup>22</sup>

It is of interest to note that ideas such as economy of form and length were now, in post-Wagnerian times, popular themes, and it is probable that Rachmaninoff was aware of the emerging Neo-classical style: a shorter, leaner, less emotional type, pioneered by fellow émigré Igor Stravinsky, among others. In the letter, Rachmaninoff goes on to identify an issue with the last movement of the work, the movement which would become the most radically reworked and problematic section of the concerto over the two successive revisions:

“Apparently the whole trouble is in the last movement. I’ve heaped up something there! In my mind I have already begun to track down cuts.”

However, he goes on:

“I’ve found one, but only of eight bars in all and that is in the first movement, which is the one which has not scared me by its length.”

The next two sentences of the letter seem to identify a fault yet, in consideration of later

music of the twentieth century, it could be seen as a strong point for the work:

“Moreover, I have spotted that the orchestra is almost never silent, which I consider a big fault. That means that it is not a piano concerto but a concerto for piano and orchestra. I also noticed that the theme of the second movement is the theme of the first movement of Schumann’s concerto. How is it you did not tell me?”<sup>23</sup>

How much the final part of the quote affected him cannot be gauged. While the falling three notes (mediant to tonic) are indeed the same as the first movement theme in Schumann’s Piano Concerto, they appear in the minor key in that work (the second subject containing the only reference to the theme in the major key). This is at variance with the motif of the Fourth Piano Concerto, which, while harmonised in many different ways, usually states the melody over the major interval. Regardless, it is a similarity that usually goes unnoticed. John Culshaw also points out a similarity between the motif of the slow movement and the nursery rhyme ‘Three Blind Mice’.<sup>24</sup>

The work was premiered in its original version in Philadelphia on 18 March, 1927, with Rachmaninoff playing the piano and Leopold Stokowski conducting, but reviews were not kind. Pitts Sanborn, in the ‘Evening Telegram’ in New York wrote on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of March, that the work was:

“long-winded, tiresome, unimportant, in places tawdry.....Mme. Cecile Chaminade might safely have perpetrated its on her third glass of vodka.”<sup>25</sup>

Lawrence Gilman wrote in the ‘Herald Tribune’ that despite its:

“somewhat naïve camouflage of whole-tone scales and occasionally dissonant harmony [it] remains as essentially nineteenth century as if Tchaikovsky had signed it”.<sup>26</sup>

Samuel Chotzinoff wrote in his review for the ‘World’ that:

“one was left with the impression that a lot was said, but not of any particular importance”.<sup>27</sup>

It is of interest to note that Josef Hoffmann, dedicatee of Rachmaninoff’s previous concerto, was at the first performance and, more sympathetically, wrote of it:

“I like your new concerto extremely well. Although it seemed to me that it would be rather difficult to play with an orchestra, particularly because of its frequent metric changes. I sincerely hope that this won’t be an obstacle to other performances of the concerto. It certainly deserves them from a musical as well as a pianistic point of view.”<sup>28</sup>

In consideration of the extent to which the concerto was to undergo major revisions, it is also perhaps pertinent to note the almost ironic response of Medtner, dedicatee of the concerto, to Rachmaninoff’s original letter concerning the concerto’s length. On September 13, 1926, he wrote:

“I cannot agree with you, either in the particular fear that your new concerto is too long, or in general on your attitude to length. Actually, your concerto amazed me by the fewness of its pages, considering its importance [.....] it is not the length of musical compositions that creates an impression of boredom, but it is rather the boredom that creates the impression of length.....”<sup>29</sup>

The ‘sabbatical’ year had also seen the completion of Rachmaninoff’s following opus, the Three Russian Songs, op. 41, a work whose seeds can be found in sketches dating from as early as 1916.<sup>30</sup> Both works were premiered in the same concert with the Philadelphia Orchestra and Stokowski. The Three Russian Songs, which is now an even rarer composition than the concerto, was the more popular of the two at the time.<sup>31</sup>

Stokowski, in a letter of appreciation, wrote of the two works:

“The more I try to penetrate the inner essence of your new concerto and the Russian Songs, the more I love this music.”<sup>32</sup>

Rachmaninoff, however, was dissatisfied with the Fourth Piano Concerto and set about revising it. In a letter to his friend, Yuly Conus, the future father-in-law of a daughter, he wrote on 28 July, 1927:

“After 1 and a half months of assiduous work I have finished the corrections to my concerto....the first twelve pages have been rewritten, as also the whole coda.”<sup>33</sup>

The revisions to the very opening of the work were minor details of orchestration while the coda was, in fact, rewritten. In this letter, Rachmaninoff gives no clue as to the scope of other changes that were to take place. Notably, to the bridge passage in the recapitulation of the first movement (possibly including the eight bars doubted in the letter to Medtner), and the opening of the final movement and changes to its development and recapitulation. There are many other changes in piano writing and orchestration throughout. Most notably, he does not mention the total removal of the second theme from the recapitulation in the final movement. In total, 114 bars of the original 1016 bars were removed or remodeled.

The work was finally published in its second version in 1928, as the inaugural print of the publishing house “TAÏR” (based on the first two letters of this daughters’ names: Tatiana and Irena) which Rachmaninoff had set up, no doubt aware of compatriot émigré Koussevitsky’s financial successes through printing. Performances of this version took place in December, 1928, the first conducted by Sir Henry Wood in London.

A further five performances occurred in The Hague, Amsterdam, and in Paris, with a performance in Berlin the following year. However, the work again did not find success and Rachmaninoff ceased including it in his repertoire.<sup>34</sup>

As certain portions of the Fourth Piano Concerto, notably the ending, are the last original music that Rachmaninoff composed (post-dating his final opus, the Symphonic Dances), it is necessary to assess the intervening years and the compositions that Rachmaninoff completed. It is perhaps the general failure of the Fourth Piano Concerto in both the 1926 and 1928 versions that led Rachmaninoff to compose almost nothing for the next few years. The sole work that was to appear was the transcription of Rimsky Korsakov's 'Flight of the Bumblebee'. In the late summer of 1930, Rachmaninoff returned to composition with the Variations on a Theme of Corelli, a piece written for his solo repertoire on a theme probably introduced to him by violinist Fritz Kreisler, with whom he had been performing and recording.<sup>35</sup> The obvious thinning in the style of his piano writing in this work, and the subsequent rewriting of the Second Piano Sonata in 1931 (which carries the trait still further), has been noted as a turning point in the composer's approach to piano writing.<sup>36</sup> Such contrasts can similarly be easily noted when comparing a work such as the Third Piano Concerto with the Fourth Piano Concerto. As some of the later set of *Études-Tableaux* contain examples of even larger pianistic gestures than the Third Piano Concerto, the style of writing, from the first version of the Fourth Piano Concerto on, does suggest a marked revision in Rachmaninoff's concept of pianism. It should be noted that this trend can be further observed in the progression of the piano style in the subsequent revisions of the Fourth Piano Concerto.

An additional composition based on theme and variation form dates from 1934 in the Rhapsody on a Theme of Paganini, Rachmaninoff perhaps being wary of penning another work for piano and orchestra in conventional concerto structure. The work was

an immediate success and this undoubtedly pleased and inspired him, as the Third Symphony was composed soon after in 1935-36. Here again, however, he produced a work that did not generate initial interest; composition again ceased. While a busy schedule of concerts continued, Rachmaninoff again expressed a desire to modify his Fourth Piano Concerto in a letter to Yevgeny Somov in 1938.<sup>37</sup> Nothing, however, was to be done until after the composition of his final work, the Symphonic Dances, op. 45, in 1940.

After Rachmaninoff's final appearance as a conductor in 1941, with a performance of 'The Bells' and the Third Symphony, he returned for the summer to Huntington, Long Island, and commenced the final revision of the Fourth Piano Concerto. Again, the reworking was radical, reducing it from 902 bars to 824 bars (the work now having been reduced by almost a fifth of its original size). While greater details are provided in the analysis of this revision in a later chapter, it suffices to mention that: much of the second movement piano part was entirely rewritten in the middle and final sections; the second subject of the final movement was again rewritten, and the recapitulation of the first subject was entirely removed; the coda was again rewritten, this time quoting from the climax of principal subject matter in the development section of the first movement; and the final structural cadence of the work was changed from perfect to plagal.

Again, and sadly, the concerto failed to generate much enthusiasm. Edwin Schloss, in the 'Philadelphia Record' commented that the work was "fragmentary in shape" and added:

"with all due respect to the artist who wrote it, and for all its fine pianism, [it is] a trifle dull."<sup>38</sup>

Rachmaninoff performed the work seven times in this version in American cities, and recorded it – his final performance of a work which had covered more than a third of his life – with Eugene Ormandy and the Philadelphia Orchestra in December 1941, just one and a half years before his death.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> *Muzika*, 12 April, 1914, p. 318.
- <sup>2</sup> Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 298.
- <sup>3</sup> Quoted in Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 298.
- <sup>4</sup> Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., p. 145.
- <sup>5</sup> A facsimile of this publication notice is reprinted in Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., p. 104.
- <sup>6</sup> The complicated nature of publication for both sets of *Études-Tableaux* are explained in detail in Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., pp. 105-6 & 124-5.
- <sup>7</sup> *Russkaya muzikal'naya gazetta*, no. 17/18, 1917, p. 353. Quoted in Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 355.
- <sup>8</sup> For some years it was thought that the First Piano Concerto revision was completed in Russia. Dover unknowingly published the revision thus far completed as part of its Full Score edition of all works for piano and orchestra, and the differences can be noted between this version and the version now commonly performed.
- <sup>9</sup> Barrie Martyn, op. cit., and Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., both refer to sketch material in their discussions of the Fourth Piano Concerto.
- <sup>10</sup> David Butler Cannata, op. cit. The history of the Washington collection is described in some detail in pp. 15-20, and the Moscow collection in pp. 13-4.
- <sup>11</sup> Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., p. 127.
- <sup>12</sup> Three progressively updated and so far un-translated catalogues were written by E. N. Aleksevva, E. Bortnikova (1955), and M. G. Rytsavera (1980).
- <sup>13</sup> David Butler Cannata, op. cit., p. 72. Cannata notes the omission of sketch material located in the Moscow collection for the Rhapsody on a Theme of Paganini in Threlfall and Norris's Catalogue, yet does not note the similar omission of sketch material in Moscow for the Fourth Piano Concerto.
- <sup>14</sup> Barrie Martyn, op. cit., pp. 291-4. A fairly comprehensive description of Rachmaninoff's emigration is covered in these pages.
- <sup>15</sup> Sergei Bertensson and Jay Leyda, op. cit., p. 212.
- <sup>16</sup> Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 296. It is not made clear from the letter what these "two major works" were.
- <sup>17</sup> This letter is quoted in Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 299.
- <sup>18</sup> Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., p. 127.
- <sup>19</sup> A complete repertoire list and schedule for Rachmaninoff's concert seasons can be found in Barrie Martyn, op. cit., chapter 10 ('Concert Statistics').
- <sup>20</sup> Sergei Bertensson and Jay Leyda, op. cit., p. 252.
- <sup>21</sup> This letter is quoted in Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 299.
- <sup>22</sup> This letter is quoted in Sergei Bertensson and Jay Leyda, op. cit., p. 246.
- <sup>23</sup> Sergei Bertensson and Jay Leyda, op. cit., p. 246.
- <sup>24</sup> John Culshaw, op. cit., p. 94.
- <sup>25</sup> Sergei Bertensson and Jay Leyda, op. cit., p. 249.
- <sup>26</sup> *Ibid.* Quoted on p. 248. Curiously, there is not much evidence of "whole-tone scale" writing in the Fourth Piano Concerto. Rather, a melodic minor scale beginning from the fifth degree appears throughout.
- <sup>27</sup> *Ibid.* Quoted on p. 249.
- <sup>28</sup> *Ibid.* Quoted on p. 248. Hoffmann never played the Third Piano Concerto, of which he is the dedicatee.
- <sup>29</sup> *Ibid.* Quoted on p. 246.
- <sup>30</sup> Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., p. 134.
- <sup>31</sup> For a review that suggests a contrast in standard between these two works, see Richard Stokes writing for 'The Evening World', quoted in Bertensson and Leyda, op. cit., p. 250.
- <sup>32</sup> Letter quoted in Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 312.
- <sup>33</sup> Quoted in Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., p. 130.
- <sup>34</sup> Performance and publication details for the 1928 version are listed in Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., p. 130
- <sup>35</sup> Rachmaninoff was later aware that the theme was not by Corelli but used by him in his 'La Folia' variations. Apparently, the manuscript of Rachmaninoff's work in the Library of Congress has an amended title. See Threlfall and Norris, op. cit., p. 136.
- <sup>36</sup> Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 320.
- <sup>37</sup> *Ibid.* P. 300.
- <sup>38</sup> Quoted in Bertensson and Leyda, op. cit., p. 367.



### 3. PRIMARY SOURCES

In considering the compositional process of Rachmaninoff's Fourth Piano Concerto, it is necessary to identify and define the primary sources of the work. As stated previously, Rachmaninoff's archival material is primarily housed in two collections: the State Central Glinka Museum of Musical Culture in Moscow (which houses the majority of effects dating up to 1917) and the Library of Congress in Washington, DC, (which houses the majority of materials post 1917). The Rachmaninoff archive housed in the Music Department of the Library of Congress contains much that is of importance to the discussion of the Fourth Piano Concerto, including material that was taken with him when leaving Russia, and material from his time in the West, including the original manuscript. The following chapter looks at: the pre-1926 sketch material; the original 1926 version; the version of 1928; and the final version of 1941.

#### Sketches

The Rachmaninoff archive in the Library of Congress (ML30.55a.R3) was opened with the deposit of a collection of manuscripts, scores and recordings by Rachmaninoff's widow, Natalia Rachmaninoff, née Satina, in November 1950,<sup>1</sup> in which the manuscript of the 1926 version of the Fourth Piano Concerto manuscript was included. The then Assistant Chief of the Music Division, Edward Waters, defined the archive in the Library's 'Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions' in 1951, and mentioned that there was "a large quantity of very important sketches" which he expected to see identified.<sup>2</sup>

Bertensson and Leyda, in their 1965 book on Rachmaninoff, also recognised that the sketches in the Library of Congress were still to be fully itemised.<sup>3</sup> Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, in their catalogue of Rachmaninoff's works, stated that by 1979 the "thoroughly analytical description and treatment envisaged by Mr. Waters" was still awaited.<sup>4</sup> In the pursuing pages, they then identify precisely the musical effects that Rachmaninoff took with him from Russia in 1917, and which are located in the archive. Included are the first act of the uncompleted opera 'Monna Vanna', small piano pieces including the 'Oriental Sketch', and four sketchbooks in which material relating to the Fourth Piano Concerto can be found. Threlfall and Norris state:

"All these books have been used to a greater or lesser extent: some are completely full, others more than half empty. All doubtless accompanied the composer from Russia; indeed, some contain notes for works completed (or published) before then."<sup>5</sup>

Even though it had taken over 30 years, they now positively confirm that Rachmaninoff had indeed commenced his work on this concerto before leaving Russia. From this material, it appears likely that work was commenced at least by the time of the sketchbook that also contains a draft of 'From the Gospel of St. John', a song for bass and piano, published (without opus number) in 1915.<sup>6</sup>

David Butler Cannata discusses further details in connection with this archive in his dissertation "Rachmaninoff's Changing View of Symphonic Structure". He recognises the importance of the donation (leading to similar archives for Kreisler, Koussevitsky and Medtner) and discusses the original 'Finder's Aid' devised by Rachmaninoff's sister-in-law, Dr. Sophia Satina. He states that the "impenetrable taxonomy" of this noted botanist's filing scheme somewhat hampered the incorporation of subsequently added

documents and, for this reason, he undertook a “conservation project” of the archive and fully itemised its contents.<sup>7</sup> An updated ‘Finder’s Aid’ by David Butler Cannata is now filed with the collection in the Music Division.

The materials in the four sketchbooks in the Library of Congress archive are of particular relevance for dating Rachmaninoff’s initial work on the Fourth Piano Concerto.

Threlfall and Norris list the material in these sketch books relating to the Fourth Piano Concerto.<sup>8</sup> To show the extent of this draft material, it is important to note the following information here. Of the first sketchbook, they state that it contains among 32 pages (perhaps including other things) a four stave setting of “most of the first movement of the Fourth Piano Concerto; however, the opening thematic statement appears toward the end of this ... book”. This sketchbook is undated. The second contains the draft for the setting of ‘From the Gospel of St John’, the finished manuscript of which is dated 16 February, 1915. Logically, one can assume that the “sketches for the latter part of the first movement of the Fourth Piano Concerto and for the third movement: extending from after the soloist’s ‘small note flourish’ (after the D flat section) until the coda” also occur from somewhere near this date. Interestingly, this passage in the sketchbook includes the recapitulation of the first and second subjects of the third movement – material that would later be removed by Rachmaninoff in his revisions. The third sketchbook contains material relating to two of the *Études-Tableaux* (op. 39, nos. 2 & 3, which were published in 1917), and the Third Symphony (not completed until 1937). The final sketchbook that Threlfall and Norris list was donated to the Library of Congress by the inheritors of Alexander Siloti’s estate, and

it contains sketches for the first of the Symphonic Dances (which would not be completed until 1940), and for the Fourth Piano Concerto. It is titled and dated in Russian “Sergei Vassilyevich Rachmaninoff / 1920-21 / America”. It contains sketches for the transition between the first and second subjects in the first movement (a section that was substantially revised in 1941), a part of the second subject in the exposition of the third movement (rewritten in all three versions), and the “latter part of that movement”. (Threlfall and Norris curiously state later in their catalogue that this sketch only contains “notes for the following section of the finale (Tempo 1 before 57 until 62, 1928 score)”. If it is indeed the latter, this sketch would cover only a fragment of the development of this movement.<sup>9</sup>)

While discussing the Fourth Piano Concerto in detail later in their Catalogue, Threlfall and Norris mention three other loose-leaf sketches in the Library of Congress archive.<sup>10</sup> The first of these is identified as “a double sheet giving a draft of the D flat major section of the last movement”. Again, the second subject of the final movement (in D flat major) finds quite different settings in the subsequent revisions. Also, a “separate gathering of paper bearing a pencil sketch of the second movement”. There is no indication here as to which part of the second movement is covered, or if the phrase borrowed from the *Étude-Tableau* is included. All of these sketches are undated. The final sketch to which Threlfall and Norris refer again dates Rachmaninoff’s work on the Fourth Piano Concerto. A sketch for the beginning of the development section of the third movement can be found on the reverse of the previously mentioned page containing the cadenza to Liszt’s Second Hungarian Rhapsody, written and recorded in 1919 (but not published

until 1926). This again dates work on this concerto significantly earlier than 1926, yet in this instance probably outside of Russia.

While writing in 1982, Threlfall and Norris refer to the updated (1955) catalogue of the State Central Glinka Museum of Musical Culture by Ekatarina Bortnikova, yet they make no mention of the subsequent updating by Mariana Rytsavera in 1980. In his dissertation of 1992, David Butler Cannata mentions two items (Fonds 18.1423 and 18.1424) in Moscow that relate to his discussion on the Rhapsody on a Theme of Paganini.<sup>11</sup> While pointing out the absence of this Russian sketch source in Threlfall and Norris' Catalogue entry for the Rhapsody, he does not note the absence of this sketch source in their entry for the Fourth Piano Concerto. Without a translation of Rytsavera's catalogue, it is not possible to identify exactly which parts of the Fourth Piano Concerto appear here in sketch form, but Cannata continues: "previous scholars have only identified this source as containing material used for the Fourth Concerto and the Three Russian Songs." Presumably, he is referring to Russian scholars. He also states: "the many [!] sketches for the Fourth Concerto and the Three Russian Songs that appear before the [back of page] 32 indicate that Rachmaninoff had this book handy between 1923-6". This substantial sketch material, not cited in any other English language work of Rachmaninoff so far seen, could be of some use in answering questions about the evolution of Rachmaninoff's ideas in the years that he worked on the Fourth Piano Concerto.

## 1926 version

The 1926 manuscript of the Fourth Piano Concerto is the most pertinent to this discussion and, as mentioned previously, is located in the Rachmaninoff Archive in the Library of Congress. In assessing the sketch material, Threlfall and Norris point out that Rachmaninoff usually worked on a four-stave particell. Also, that “the actual orchestral setting appears to have been, for Rachmaninoff, the last link in the chain.”<sup>12</sup> The 1926 manuscript takes the form of a complete orchestral score with sufficient attention to detail to assume that it was intended for use as the Stichvorlage for printing. The manuscript contains a title-page which reads “Concert pour Piano (No.4) / op. 40. / S. Rachmaninoff” and there follows 171 numbered pages of thirty-stave paper. The work is written in ink but with pencilled bar lines. On the first page, “S. Rachmaninoff / (op. 40.)” is written in pencil in the top right hand corner of the page. On the final page of the manuscript, “January – August 25 / New York – Dresden” is inscribed. While the year of 1926 is not written on the manuscript, its performance on 18 March, 1927, and various correspondences indicate that the above date is conclusive. As was customary for Rachmaninoff when writing a ‘fair copy’ or Stichvorlage of an orchestral work, the orchestral part appears in a second piano setting at the base of each page. According to Threlfall and Norris, there are no paste-overs and no engraver’s marks yet they state that there is a loosely inserted four-page section which relates to the section of the score that links the first and second subjects in the exposition of the first movement.<sup>13</sup> It appears that this section of the bridge passage – removed in 1941 – had an alternative working. Threlfall and Norris suggest that it may have been an earlier

reading as the four-page insert is without page numbers. There is evidence that some bowing markings were added at a later date.

It is presumed that another copy (a copyist's copy) must have been made of this manuscript and, if so, it would appear that that score is now lost. It is logical to assume the existence of the copy as the original orchestral parts, which have also been lost, would more probably have been made from a copy and not from the manuscript. It is also presumed that the copy of the full-score was updated by Rachmaninoff for use as the Stichvorlage of the second version of the concerto. Had he used the manuscript, the original version would likely now be lost for ever. A two-piano copy was also prepared, the copy over which Rachmaninoff expressed horror at its 110-page length. That score was updated for use as the Stichvorlage of the two-piano version of 1928, and is now located in the British Library, on loan from Boosey & Hawkes, Ltd.<sup>14</sup>

The 1926 version has never been published, though anecdotal evidence suggests that the current heirs to Rachmaninoff's estate may be contemplating a future edition.<sup>15</sup>

Inexplicably, a facsimile of page 152 from the original manuscript was published in a compendium, 'Musical Autographs', in 1955 and reprinted by Dover in 1965.<sup>16</sup>

### 1928 version

As stated above, Threlfall and Norris assert that the lost copyist's copy of the 1926 full score referred to must have been used and updated in the preparation for the publication

of the full score of the second version of the Fourth Piano Concerto in 1928.<sup>17</sup> There would certainly have been no need for a complete handwritten manuscript of this version. This updated score of the first version is, as mentioned above, lost. A facsimile from the updated two-piano score in the British Library appears in Threlfall and Norris' Catalogue, showing a passage from the newly written coda of the last movement.<sup>18</sup>

The second version of the Fourth Piano Concerto was eventually published as the inaugural print of the publishing house that Rachmaninoff set up in 1927. In 1928, a 144-page full score and a study score were published by Editions TAÏR as plate number 1. The orchestral parts were issued as plate no. 2, and the two piano version, "reduction pour 2 Pianos a 4 mains par l'auteur," was published as plate no. 3.

#### 1941 version

The final version of the Fourth Piano Concerto was finished in 1941 but not published until 1944, after Rachmaninoff's death. It is evident that Rachmaninoff 'cannibalised' a 1928 full score in forming this version.<sup>19</sup> This score, used as the Stichvorlage for printing, is located in the Library of Congress archive. Threlfall and Norris suggest that in the process of arriving at the printed edition another version was created (there being a number of inserts that have fallen loose which do not fit the score in the archive.)<sup>20</sup> The eventual printing of the 136 page full score was undertaken by Charles Foley, New York, curiously without a plate number and advising that the work was "as revised by the composer in 1942". Whether this date is an error or whether it was in fact based on



revisions made at a later date (possibly after Rachmaninoff's recording of the work in December 1941) is unknown. The two-piano version was published two years later in 1946, again by Charles Foley, this time as plate no. 2302. Containing 79 pages (well short of the original 110), the second-piano part was completed by Robert Russell Bennett. There are, however, many small errors in detail in this widely-used publication – a relatively unique case in Rachmaninoff's output, the composer having proof-read works published in his lifetime.

The Russian State publishing house, 'Muzgiz', published a full score of the final version of the Fourth Piano Concerto in Moscow in 1965 as part of their 'Rachmaninoff Complete Works' edition (plate no. 25195). They drew attention to the discrepancies between the two American publications in the forward of their publication.<sup>21</sup> The most recent edition is published by Belwin Mills, and a miniature score is published by Eulenberg (1225).

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Some sources incorrectly list the date as 1951. See David Butler Cannata, op. cit., p. 16.
- <sup>2</sup> Edward Waters, *Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions*, vol. 9 no. 1, November 1951. Washington, DC.; Library of Congress, pp. 39-42.
- <sup>3</sup> Sergei Bertensson and Jay Leyda, op. cit., p. 402.
- <sup>4</sup> Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., p. 16.
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid, p. 17.
- <sup>6</sup> Ibid, p. 17. Also, see p. 172.
- <sup>7</sup> David Butler Cannata, op. cit., pp. 17-9.
- <sup>8</sup> Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., p. 17.
- <sup>9</sup> Ibid, p. 127.
- <sup>10</sup> Ibid, pp. 126-33. The complete listing for the Fourth Piano Concerto is covered in these pages.
- <sup>11</sup> David Butler Cannata, op. cit., pp. 70-2. Amusingly, Cannata also notes that Rachmaninoff's idea of inverting the Paganini theme – an opportunity missed by Paganini and Brahms – was one of the first that occurred to the composer.
- <sup>12</sup> Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., pp. 17-8.
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid, p. 126. These four pages are not part of the facsimile that has been lent to me.
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid, p. 130.
- <sup>15</sup> Alexandre (Conus) Rachmaninoff and Natalie Wanamaker Javier. Royalties can be claimed from the date of first publication and not from the date of composition.
- <sup>16</sup> Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., p. 127.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid, p. 130.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid, p. 128.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid, p. 31.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid, pp. 131-2. The following publication information can be found in these pages.
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid, p. 132.

#### 4. RACHMANINOFF AND THE NATURE OF REVISION

The aim of this chapter is to identify the type and manner of revisions that occur around the time of Rachmaninoff's work on the Fourth Piano Concerto and, in so doing, place his work on this concerto in context for the ensuing Analysis chapter. To achieve this, the Third Piano Concerto, written in 1910, is assessed. Additionally, the issue of Rachmaninoff's self-doubt, noted by previous scholars,<sup>1</sup> is studied through his correspondence with Marietta Shaginian. It is conceivable that the degree of self-doubt that Rachmaninoff expresses in these letters brought about perhaps unnecessary revisions to the Fourth Piano Concerto.

While the Third Piano Concerto has been unaltered since its first publication, Rachmaninoff (who performed the work more than 80 times) was known to make cuts, reducing it by up to a fifth in his recording of 1939-40.<sup>2</sup> It is this notion of reduction in length that is critical in evaluating the revisions to the Fourth Piano Concerto. The Third Piano Concerto also contains a number of *ossias*, or alternative readings, most important being the cadenza of the first movement. Study of the manuscript has shown that the majority of these *ossias* were original figurations (the more commonly played versions being pasted over) indicating that these passages are a less substantial yet still significant example of revision.<sup>3</sup>

In considering early gramophone recordings, commentators often cite the difficulties that technicians faced in accommodating a large work onto 78 rpm discs. The relatively

short playing time that these discs afforded required that many sides would be needed in a work of great length (with the change of sides of the disc necessitating obvious places of pause in the music). Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, in their catalogue of Rachmaninoff's works, suggest in their entry for the Third Piano Concerto:

“The composer evidently sanctioned, and himself observed (in his recording and in some performances) a number of cuts in this work nominally (though not necessarily) to accommodate its bulk to the exigencies of 78 rpm discs.”<sup>4</sup>

Barrie Martyn, however, contends that in the case of the Third Piano Concerto only one of the cuts occurred at an otherwise inopportune moment for changing disc sides.

Moreover, that the recording was produced on nine sides with the tenth being unusually manufactured blank:

“providing ample space for the restoration not only of the cut in the Intermezzo but of those in the finale too.”<sup>5</sup>

It can therefore be noted that Rachmaninoff was aware of the concerto's alleged excess of length some 30 years after its composition and only 2 years before the final version of the Fourth Piano Concerto in 1941.

There is some anecdotal evidence of Rachmaninoff's performances of this work, and these comments may serve in an attempt to assess his preference for the work's ideal form in his later life. The Third Piano Concerto had originally failed to find the same success enjoyed by the Second Concerto until a youthful Vladimir Horowitz enjoyed substantial fame programming the work on international tours. Horowitz played the work to Rachmaninoff in the basement of Steinway and Sons in New York in 1928, shortly after arriving in America from Russia, and recording the work in 1930. He made two subsequent recordings of the work in 1951 and 1978. The recommendations

that he claims Rachmaninoff made about revisions to the work, and the confidence with which Horowitz claimed to be championing the composer's wishes, bear some importance for this discussion.<sup>6</sup>

In the first movement of the Third Piano Concerto, the first cut that Rachmaninoff observed in his recording is of a relatively slight nature: in the second subject (itself containing an introduction, exposition, development and recapitulation) the latter part is cut by 8 bars. This saves, as Martyn states, only 7 seconds of music.<sup>7</sup> Curiously, Threlfall and Norris' catalogue contains a facsimile of this page of the manuscript.<sup>8</sup> It shows that this section was of previous concern to the composer, having been originally more extended. Horowitz did not observe the cut of 8 bars in any of his recordings of the work. The manuscript of this work also reveals that the larger of the alternative cadenzas of the first movement – the one which appears as an *ossia* in the printed score – is the original.<sup>9</sup> However, Rachmaninoff recorded (and appears to have preferred) the smaller cadenza. Martyn believes that it was not until Giesecking's performance of the concerto (a recording from 1939 survives) that the larger cadenza was again heard.<sup>10</sup> In Rachmaninoff's recording, the tonic major climax of the cadenza (identical in both versions) was shortened by 2 bars. Horowitz also observed this cut in his recordings of the work, stating that the two bars were musically "absolutely impossible".<sup>11</sup> While omissions of a few bars may seem trivial, such rudimentary revisions of patterns appear frequently in Rachmaninoff's revisions of the Fourth Piano Concerto, most notably in the treatment of the principal subject in the second movement.

The Intermezzo movement of the Third Piano Concerto contains only one major cut in Rachmaninoff's recording. The *Piu vivo* passage which follows the cadence into F major that leads, in turn, to the B flat major statement of the theme, is removed. (The perfect cadence of the harmonic progression, though, is retained.) However, in so doing, the cyclical nature of the work is affected: the statement of the principal subject of the first movement in the violins (set against secondary subject matter in the piano) is no longer heard. Horowitz also observed this cut in his first recording yet made a shorter cut to this section in 1958, and played the section in its entirety in his final recording. This is the cut that necessitates the changing of disc sides, and lends credibility to Jorge Bolet's assertion that Rachmaninoff always played the section in performance.<sup>12</sup> It also perhaps shows Rachmaninoff's recognition of the necessity of the section in the overall cyclic structure of the concerto. Some performers have shown themselves willing to cut part of the orchestral recapitulation which concludes the movement (including Horowitz in his first two recordings), although Rachmaninoff did not observe this in his recording.

The cuts in Rachmaninoff's recording of the Finale movement, however, seem more in line with the composer's performances of the work. The first removed the opening statement of the second subject – continuity being preserved in the orchestral *tutti* in the same key of G major that follows. This statement of the second subject, which is heard again in the recapitulation and which also lends to the colossal ending of the concerto, appears to have been seen as superfluous by Rachmaninoff. The statement of the second subject is also omitted in Horowitz' first recording of the work. This type of omission is of great relevance in consideration of the Fourth Piano Concerto, where

the restatement of the second subject in the final movement was progressively cut in the subsequent revisions. (Likewise, a portion of the second subject in the final movement of the Second Piano Sonata was cut in the revision of 1931.) The second cut in the Finale of the Third Piano Concerto affects the middle E flat major *scherzando* section, where the third of four variant passages is removed. Again, the revision appears to be in consideration of length, and, again, Horowitz adheres to the same cut in the first and second of his recordings. Gina Bachauer confirms that this omission was usual in Rachmaninoff's performances of the work.<sup>13</sup>

In 1958, Van Cliburn re-established the larger of the two cadenzas in his famous recording of the Third Piano Concerto, and from this time there has been more interest in the actual score. Indeed, proceeding from this time most of the cuts have been restored and it is now common practice to perform the work complete. The various *ossias* that appear throughout the work are, however, rarely heard (excepting the original cadenza); Rachmaninoff himself recorded the large-print figurations instead and, presumably because of their comparative simplicity, most others do likewise. This notion of creating a more playable, less difficult version of a work may bear some influence in Rachmaninoff's attitude toward revision. For example, the 2 bars at the climax of the cadenza in the first movement are, while being musically difficult, also very exposed and notoriously difficult to play accurately. Likewise, the larger of the two cadenzas creates certain technical concerns for pianists – chiefly the risk of over-exertion and subsequent exhaustion. The same may be said for the first statement of the second subject in the Finale: while the passage may seem innocuous when considered singularly, in context it

appears after five minutes of ceaselessly difficult writing. Some forethought should be applied if this melody is to be played accurately. The *ossia* on the final page of the score (the playing of quaver octaves instead of triplet crotchets) may also be playable in isolation, yet after forty minutes of performance, the idea seems perhaps foolish.

It was perhaps the modern uniqueness in being both composer and performer of a work that led Rachmaninoff to make revisions, these perhaps based on proven performance experience. The inherent difficulty of sustaining momentum and of retaining audience interest are common concepts in performance, concepts of which Rachmaninoff had first hand experience. Clearly, it seems he had begun to form opinions on the ideal length of a composition in this genre in the years spent performing the Second and Third Piano Concertos. Crucially, he was to submit the Fourth Piano Concerto to similar proportions of revision as applied to the Third Piano Concerto. The extent of these are discussed in the following chapter.

In further considering the revisions made to the Fourth Piano Concerto, it is perhaps necessary to consider the nature of revision and to attempt to identify those parts of the psyche that are brought into play. Literally, a revision is a second look (or re-look) at a work. It is, perhaps, an assumption of many who appreciate a piece of music or a work of art that what is presented is a complete and, sometimes, sacrosanct entity. However, it could be shown that to the practitioners of art a work is often the accumulation of disparate thoughts, or a modified form of an original thought. It would, therefore, seem to follow that the act of revision (or, similarly, editing) is a natural



part of the creative process. The question must, therefore, arise as to the point when a work is complete. As examples, nineteenth century American poet, Walt Whitman, published one work within his lifetime ('Leaves of Grass'), yet over 37 years and eight editions he added to, and revised the ordering of, his book continually.<sup>14</sup> Anton Bruckner, likewise, spent a considerable portion of his time revising and adjusting his compositions both before and after they had gone to print.<sup>15</sup> It seems the reason for this process of revision may be an attempt to produce art in perfect form. Ironically, realisation of this perfect form can also be illusory, and revision can sometimes be a failure. Some may argue, for instance, for the simplicity and naivety of Whitman's original publication; some may argue for the original version of a Bruckner Symphony. While it may suffice to term a revision as an attempted correction or improvement of a work (regardless of whether it is successful), reasons for doubting the work's original form should, in the case of Rachmaninoff, be addressed.

It has many times been noted, especially in regard to the First Symphony, that Rachmaninoff was vulnerable to negative criticism. Through his letters, one finds threads of similar introspection. In studying Rachmaninoff's published (and translated) correspondence, one notes keenly the composer's honesty and humility, whether the letter is to a colleague asking for advice about a problematic work or whether the letter is to a friend expressing encouragement or commiseration.<sup>16</sup> As Barrie Martyn suggests, however:

"in his letters to [Marietta] Shaginian, Rachmaninoff revealed more of his intimate thoughts, his foibles, his innate lack of self-confidence than to any of his other correspondents."<sup>17</sup>

The letters that relate to this relationship, addressed initially to Shaginian's pseudonym, 'Re', commenced in February 1912 and deal initially with the choice of texts for Rachmaninoff's late songs. By the time of their last meeting in July 1917 – Shaginian's identity having been divulged early on – she had become a close friend of the composer. In 1943, she published a selection of the letters, and an account of their friendship.<sup>18</sup>

While it may be unwise to seek to conclude too much about Rachmaninoff's state of mind from these letters, they do, however, refer to beliefs about his abilities. They also relate to the period of time when Rachmaninoff commenced his sketches for the Fourth Piano Concerto. It may suffice to quote briefly from a couple of these letters.

From March 29, 1912, and referring to negative critiques:

“I don't read them; somehow none of this is very convincing to me. I must say, from the depth of my soul, that I am more inclined to trust the latter than the former because there is in the whole world no critic more doubtful of me than I am of myself.....”<sup>19</sup>

From 8 May, 1912:

“You look to me for something that isn't there, and you wish to see me as the sort of person I'll never be. My 'criminally sincere humility' I am sorry to say does exist – and my 'ruin by philistinism' I imagine, as you do, to be in the not very distant future. This is all true! and it is true because I have no faith in myself. Teach me to have faith in myself, dear Re! Even half as much faith as you have in me. If ever there was a time when I had faith in myself, that was long ago – long, long ago – in my youth! .....isn't it significant that I have had almost no other doctor, for these past twenty years, than the hypnotist Dahl, and my two first cousins (one of whom I married ten years ago.....) All these persons, or rather, doctors, taught me one thing: to take courage and have faith. Sometimes I have succeeded in this. But the illness hangs on to me tenaciously and with the passing years digs in ever more deeply, I fear. No wonder if I should, after a while, make up my mind to abandon composition altogether and become, instead, a professional pianist, or conductor, or a farmer, or even, perhaps, an automobilist

[.....] And I am soul-sick, dear Re, and I regard myself as disarmed and aging as well. If there's any good in me, I'm not sure that any of it is in the future.....”<sup>20</sup>

And in Shaginian's words, from May, 1916:

“Rachmaninoff looked haggard and spent....for the first time in my life I saw tears in his eyes. In the course of our conversation he several times wiped them away but they welled up again. I had never seen him before in such total despair. His voice broke the whole time. He said that he was not working at all, whereas before he always used to work at Ivanovka in the spring; that he had no desire to work and that what galled him was the awareness of being incapable of creative work and the impossibility of being anything more than ‘a well-known pianist and a mediocre composer’ .... ‘If I had always been only that, and recognised it, it would be easier for me, but I did have a talent when I was young; I wish you knew how easily, casually, almost as a joke, I was able to sit down at the piano and turn out a piece, to begin composing in the morning and by evening have it finished. And I still have in me a need for creative work, but the desire to bring it out, the ability to bring it out – all this has gone forever!’ ..... He told me about his First Symphony... He assured me that everything I was constantly writing to him about was already in it, but no one had seen it. He cited the example of a tree; if you pinch its young shoot with a finger it stops growing, and that is how he was ‘pinched’ at his very dawn, when he was sending out his shoots .... Any would-be musician not ashamed to court failure in music got crowned with laurels as an innovator, was proclaimed ‘advanced’, ‘original’ and God knows what, but his own originality had been stifled in the bud .... He spoke of the impossibility of living in the state he was, and all this in a terrible dead voice, almost that of an old man, with his eyes lifeless and his face grey and ill.”<sup>21</sup>

These quotes appear to convey an underlying trait, and show that, at times at least, Rachmaninoff had acute doubts about his work. I contend that these doubts were crucial in his evaluation of the Fourth Piano Concerto. As noted previously, the critiques of this new work after its first performances were dismissive. Also noted was that he had begun expressing doubts (or fears) about the length and scope of the work as soon as it was first completed. Perhaps sadly, Medtner's reply to Rachmaninoff's original letter about length was not taken into account. The undoubted irony in the case of the Fourth Piano Concerto is that in its revised state it still failed to find the acceptance that Rachmaninoff believed it deserved.

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert Threlfall, op. cit., p. 235.

<sup>2</sup> Barrie Martyn, op. cit. Martyn provides Rachmaninoff's concert statistics in chapter 10, and his discography in chapter 14.

<sup>3</sup> Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., p. 95.

<sup>4</sup> Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., p. 99.

<sup>5</sup> Barrie Martyn, op. cit., pp. 287-8.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, pp. 214-7. Martyn chronicles Horowitz's involvement with the Third Piano Concerto and quotes him: "Without false modesty, I brought this concerto to light. I brought it to life, and everywhere! Rachmaninoff had not won the recognition with the concerto that he thought he deserved."

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, p. 215.

<sup>8</sup> Robert Threlfall and Geoffrey Norris, op. cit., p. 96.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, p. 95.

<sup>10</sup> Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 212.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, p. 212, for this quote.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, p. 216.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, p. 216.

<sup>14</sup> Walt Whitman, *Leaves of Grass*, (1892), New York: First Vintage Books, 1992. Page 705 provides a chart of the varying editions, provided by the editors of this definitive volume.

<sup>15</sup> Benjamin Korstvedt, *Anton Bruckner: Symphony No.8*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 68.

<sup>16</sup> Sergei Bertensson and Jay Leyda, op. cit. Many letters of Rachmaninoff's are published in this book, however, the complete collection of his letters – *S.V.Rakhmaninov: Pisma* [Letters] ed. Z Apetian, 1955, 3 vols – has not yet been translated.

<sup>17</sup> Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 235.

<sup>18</sup> Marietta Shaginian, 'S.V.Rakhmaninov k Re i S.V.Rakhmaninov, prilozhenie k pis'mam' [S. V. Rachmaninoff's letters to "Re" and annotations o Rachmaninoff's letters], *Novy mir* 4 (1943), pp. 105-13. Not translated, although many of these letters are reprinted in Bertensson & Leyda and Martyn.

<sup>19</sup> Sergei Bertensson and Jay Leyda, op. cit., p. 178.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, p. 179-80.

<sup>21</sup> Quoted in Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 262.

## 5 ANALYSIS

This chapter takes the form of an analysis and comparison of all three versions of the Fourth Piano Concerto. Through this analysis, the tendencies toward what Rachmaninoff hoped would be a leaner, tighter work are detailed, and a commentary on exactly how these re-workings brought about fundamental changes in the structure of the work is provided. All references are made to the 1941 version through the use of the figure numbers published in this score, with indications of plus (+) or minus (-) bar numbers. Examples are given where required.

In all versions of the Fourth Piano Concerto, the dimensions of orchestral scoring remain the same. Including the solo piano part, the work is scored for piccolo (last movement only), 2 flutes, 2 oboes (only 1 required in the second movement), cor anglais, 2 clarinets and 2 bassoons. The brass section is standard with 4 horns, 2 trumpets, 3 trombones and 1 tuba. The score requires 3 timpani (in D, C, B,) and a larger collection of percussion instruments for the last movement, including triangle, tambourine, side drum (*tamburo militaire*), cymbals and bass drum. The string section of the orchestra is standard, requiring violins I & II, violas, cellos and double basses.

### First Movement

The first movement, *Allegro vivace (Alla breve)*, of the Fourth Piano Concerto is in a modified first movement sonata form. The first and second subjects are connected by a

bridge passage to form the exposition. A development section incorporates elements of the first subject and uses this material to form its climax. The recapitulation section reverses the order of the first and second subjects before a short coda. The original version of the Fourth Piano Concerto's first movement consisted of 367 bars. By 1928, it was reduced to 346 bars, and in 1941 it was reduced further to 313 bars. Essentially, the successive revisions serve to shorten both bridge passages: that which connects the first and second subjects in the recapitulation is reduced and fundamentally altered in the revision of 1928, and the bridge passage of the exposition is shortened in a slightly less substantial way in 1941. There is also some rewriting of the development section.

Whilst none of the revisions substantially alter the background structure of the work, they do affect certain aspects of thematic dominance. For example, a chromatic variant of part of the first subject which forms the basis for both bridge passages and for parts of the development section (and which can be seen to form a link to the opening chromatic interval of the second subject) is lessened in stature with the excision of 23 bars of this motif in the revision to the exposition undertaken in 1941. Also, the restatement of the first subject at the climax of the bridge passage in the recapitulation is perhaps made less obvious with the omission of part of the opening *tutti* that preceded it when first heard in the exposition. This material was part of 19 bars of the bridge passage, including material that grew out of the chromatic motif, that was removed in the first revision of 1928.

There are additional areas of alteration to piano textures, minor excisions of repeated bars, changes to dynamics and phrasing, and minor amendments to orchestration.

Rachmaninoff's letter to Yuly Conus in July 1927 refers to the first matters of revision in the Fourth Piano Concerto (as quoted previously):

“After 1 and a half months of assiduous work I have finished the corrections to my concerto.....The first 12 pages are rewritten, and also the whole of the coda.”<sup>1</sup>

Given that the work was not published until 1928, it is doubtful if Rachmaninoff's “assiduous work” was complete. His reference to “12 pages”, is also curious. The rewriting that this comment refers to concerns matters of orchestral texture in the first subject, yet (presuming Rachmaninoff is referring to the full score) twelve pages of manuscript cover considerably more than just the first subject. It is possible, though perhaps unlikely, that Rachmaninoff had also considered cutting the part of the ensuing bridge passage that was not removed until the later revision of 1941. (If the reference was actually to the two piano score which Rachmaninoff had already received from the printers for proofing, it would involve material up to and including the second subject which remains, however, almost totally unaltered in all versions.) One could equally consider that the reference to page numbers was a simple exaggeration.

The only change to the opening of the first movement occurred in the revision that Rachmaninoff made in 1928. It was not altered again in the revision of 1941. While Threlfall and Norris state that the orchestral *tutti* which opens the first movement originally involved “more elaborate harmonies”, this is presumably only by implication of the descending chromatic woodwind parts which originally stood at this point (ex. 1a). It is curious to consider why Rachmaninoff removed these descending chromatic woodwind parts as they would have certainly added colour to the fanfare-like opening. Yet it is conceivable, considering that in the orchestral *tutti* the entire orchestra is playing

a syncopated pulse, that ensemble difficulties may have prevented an accurate rendition of the score. Indeed, his decision to remove these descending chromatic parts may be based entirely on a less than perfect reading in the first performances.

Alternatively, Rachmaninoff may have felt that it made the texture too complicated. With the exception of the woodwind parts, the remainder of the orchestral scoring in these opening bars is unchanged (ex .1b).

The first subject of the first movement is introduced after the opening 6 bars of dominant preparation. The 16 bar theme is given to the piano in double octave chords. One can note the similarity of piano writing and orchestral accompaniment here with the second statement of the second subject in the third movement of the Third Piano Concerto – duplet patterns accompanying in the latter instead of triplets. At the piano's entry of the first subject, the rapid triplet figure in the lower strings is passed to the woodwind and horns parts. In the original version of 1926, these 16 bars of triplets contained very few places for the woodwind players to breathe (ex. 2a). While the parts are not entirely unplayable, it is possible that the woodwind players found the pulsing patterns which Rachmaninoff formed by removing the prominent beats (beats on which there were already strong string *pizzicati*) easier and perhaps better suited to ensemble playing in the revision of 1928 (ex. 2b). Indeed, accents that were also added to these woodwind parts might aid ensemble. Rachmaninoff introduces and terminates the woodwind parts a bar earlier in the original version of 1926. He also introduces the triplet figure of the horns earlier and generally strengthens their part by including the full four horns as the first subject continues. The string parts of the first subject remain



generally unchanged with the exception of the *pizzicato* and *arco* indications.

From figure 1 +4, the majority of the string notes are scored *arco* in the 1926 version and *pizzicato* in the 1928 version. Through all of this, the piano part remains generally unchanged.

To all extents and purposes, the “entire rewriting of the first 12 pages” creates only minor and subtle changes of texture. The length of the first subject is not reduced, there are no changes to the melody and almost no change to the harmonic fabric of the music. It is more likely that Rachmaninoff’s intention in revising this section was to bring about a cleaner, perhaps simpler, accompaniment to the statement of the piano theme.

The next area of the first movement that underwent revision follows almost directly after the statement of the first subject and involves about half of the original bridge passage. This revision occurred in 1941 although, as stated previously, Rachmaninoff may have considered reducing this section as early as 1927, including this section in his reference to “12 pages”. The first subject, while in the tonic of G minor, is introduced by the opening orchestral *tutti* in the dominant, D major. The statement of the theme also ends in the dominant. The role of the bridge passage is to set up the key of B flat major, the key of the second subject. Rachmaninoff makes a cut in the bridge passage by using the inherent thread of D major to seamlessly skip material. The first 5 bars of the bridge passage remain and the cut occurs at what is now figure 6 +1. These first 5 bars are based on the chromatic falling part of the melody that concludes the first subject (ex. 3a and b). Originally, the music then developed what could be considered a motif for the bridge passage (noting that Rachmaninoff uses this motif at the same place in the bridge

passage of the recapitulation) (ex. 3c). This motif is based on the middle, and most prominent, part of the first subject, yet in development here it is in a chromatic form and without the quaver notes. Rachmaninoff also uses this motif to open the development section at figure 13 +4 (ex. 4) and it is used extensively throughout the development section.

In the 23 bars that were removed from this bridge passage, Rachmaninoff had developed the motif by exploring its chromatic capacity. In the 1926 and 1928 versions, the triplet quaver figurations in the piano part that commence this section also incorporated semiquavers. There was also some passing of the chromatic form of this motif between the woodwinds (oboe and bassoon, then clarinet and horn) and piano. This section also contained a short harmonic cycle which hinted briefly at the key of the second subject, B flat major (ex. 5). It is after this point, where the upward scale that begins the first subject reappears, that Rachmaninoff cuts back to the original music in the revision of 1941 (figure 6 +1) (ex. 6). What follows in the bridge passage after this point is an extended woodwind solo that follows the contours of the falling line, borrowed from the conclusion to the first subject but here moving by thirds.

This bridge passage has been negatively critiqued. Barrie Martyn, when referring to the revised reading of this section in his analysis of the 1941 version, describes it:

“After the conviction of the opening the ensuing bridge passage, despite its energy, is musically flaccid.....”<sup>2</sup>

There are, perhaps, musical difficulties with this section. After the majestic and forthright opening, some skill is needed to transfer smoothly to a more lyrical, chamber-like style.

Also, it is necessary to convey to the audience here the degree to which the themes of this concerto are inter-linked. It should be noted that, by comparison, the structure of this concerto is more complex than the conservative structure and style of Rachmaninoff's most popular concerto, the Second Piano Concerto. In style, the Fourth Piano Concerto could be considered, perhaps, more intellectual.

The music in all versions continues mainly unaltered after the bridge passage revision, with the exception of the orchestral entry at 8 +3 which is altered in both revisions (ex. 7a, b and c) and the F major piano figuration at 9, which is altered and reduced by 2 bars in the 1941 version (ex. 8a and b). The second subject also appears mostly intact in the successive versions with the excision of only one bar (already repeated once in a simpler form) which would have stood before figure 12 –4 in 1941 (ex. 9). Possibly, Rachmaninoff felt that the further repetition of this bar was either indulgent or superfluous.

It is conceivable that the concluding part of the second subject, *Allegro assai*, could be seen as the beginning of the development section. (It is worth noting that the second subject of the first movement of the Third Piano Concerto also contains an *allegro* concluding section.) It is, however, the point where Rachmaninoff transforms the opening interval of the second subject into a new motif (ex. 10). This minor ninth / falling semitone motif is used extensively in the movement and, as shall be seen, forms a substantial part of the thematic development of the third movement.

The next revision to the first movement is 22 bars into the development section. From 15

–4, the rhythm of the orchestral parts are different in both of the following versions (ex. 11a,b,c). Rachmaninoff also altered the piano writing in this section (15 –4 to 15 +7) in the 1941 version, making its appearance somewhat stronger. The original piano part essentially developed the overlapping of the triplet quaver lines between right and left hands. In the 1941 version, the parts overlap more frequently and some lines are doubled at the octave, again giving extra strength (ex. 12a, b). At 15 +4, the descending figuration was originally a further development of the triplet quaver writing in a lower register. Clearly, the descending semiquaver passage at 15 +4 in the 1941 version allows the pianist to close the first part of this development section more dramatically and strongly (ex. 13 a and b). An extra bar was added at the close of this passage in the 1941 revision.

The next part of the development section proceeds intact and is more similar to the type of writing that Rachmaninoff had employed in previous works, notably in the development of the first movement of the Third Piano Concerto. Until the *accelerando* at figure 17 (the direction curiously absent from the 1928 score), the only difference in the subsequent revisions to this movement is in the left hand of the piano part at 17 –2. Here in the 1926 version, quaver writing similar to the accompaniment at the opening of this section originally stood. At figure 18, the music continues in 3/2 in the 1941 version. In the 1926 version, however, Rachmaninoff reverts to cut common time at 18 –3 (in the 1928 version, at 18 –2 ½). However, revisions so far in the development section are much lighter in substance than later ones.

From figure 18 to 20, the piano writing was quite different in the 1926 version.

Originally, the piano continued in the same style of unbroken triplet quaver writing for 6 bars (ex. 14a). The original style of writing here is again more comparable with the development section of the first movement of the Third Piano Concerto. In the revision of 1928 (which remains unaltered in the 1941 version) the piano plays 4 note patterns, making the music more rhythmic and changing the overall character of the music from what had preceded it (ex. 14b). The orchestral parts were also changed here. Originally, the clarinets and bassoon matched the triplet pattern of the piano part, while the cor anglais highlighted the descending minims underlying the patterns. The upper strings played the last two notes of sextuplet semiquavers figures to rhythmically strengthen the major minim beats of the bar. In the revision of 1928, however, flutes in thirds answer the piano pattern on off-beat crotchets, joined in this syncopation by upper strings and clarinets.

The rhythmic nature of the piano part is altered from figure 19 so that all patterns now begin after one quaver, originally some patterns began on the second crotchet beat. From 20 –5, repeated semiquavers were removed from this pattern in 1928 (ex. 15a, b). Essentially, the whole character of the development section between figure 18 and 20 is changed in the revision of 1928. It is possible that the sharper rhythm and simpler piano writing were revisions that Rachmaninoff undertook to improve and facilitate ensemble at this point. It can be imagined, however, that the music as it originally stood created a more organic and progressive path toward the climax of the development section.

With the exception of the placing of one piano chord at 21 +1 and an adjustment to the

semiquaver passage in the piano part at 23 –2, the remainder of the development section and its climax remain unaltered in the two revisions.

As stated earlier, Rachmaninoff recapitulates the second subject before the first (even though the ascending scale of the first subject appears as if to momentarily confuse the audience immediately before the flute announces the second subject at 24). In the versions of 1928 and 1941, the piano writing in the second subject at figure 24 is different in minor detail, and the close of this phrase is different in all versions. In 1928, Rachmaninoff added a musical response to the close of the phrase (copying flute and cor anglais in sixths) to the piano part. By 1941, he had decided against this and gave the response to the lower woodwinds and changed the time signature to accommodate the removal of two beats (ex. 16a,b,c). At 25 +4, the piano writing in the 1926 version differs slightly in detail in the same way as the preceding phrase had.

The revisions to the first movement take on greater scope at the bridge passage of the recapitulation that follows, most of these revisions stemming from 1928. Figure 26 marks the beginning of the bridge passage with a restatement of the motif that commences the development section. In 1926, Rachmaninoff had begun developing the chromatic variant of this motif at 26 +4 in much the same way he had in the exposition. In the revision of 1941, however, he decides against using this motif and instead writes figurations identical to the single staff writing that follows (26 +7) (ex. 17a, b). At figure 27, four bars stood until 1941 that further developed the chromatic variant of the motif in two 2 bar phrases. A similar sequence of phrases were part of material removed from the

first bridge passage, also in 1941. In the music that follows, Rachmaninoff doubled the triplet writing in octaves in the piano part immediately in the 1926 version (ex. 18a,b), in the same way that he does in the following bars at 28 –4 in the later versions. It is worth noting that the figuration of this section has been rewritten on the staves above and below the piano part in the manuscript. Originally, Rachmaninoff wrote triplets in the right hand, accompanied by the underlying crotchet melody in the left hand. The exact form of the pattern is different in the 1928 and 1941 versions.

From figure 28 to 30, Rachmaninoff makes the most major alteration in 1928. (Although, two further bars of figuration were altered at 29 –2 in 1941.) In the later versions (ex. 19), the bridge passage from figure 28 develops the chromatic variant of the motif for 4 bars before arriving at an E flat major chord. At this point the orchestra plays the *tutti* (this time with piano) that opened the concerto. A harmonic sequence from 29 +2 (recycled from the original version) then leads the music to G minor for the recapitulation of the first subject. In all, the bridge passage in this version lasts for 35 bars. In the original version (ex. 20), however, the bridge passage serves a slightly different, and longer, purpose. At 28 +4, the music returns to 3/2 for 4 bars of embellishment over a diminished seventh chord on E flat, incorporating the triplet quavers in the piano part that had preceded it. After these 4 bars, Rachmaninoff introduces a rising chromatic scale in the clarinet and bassoon (taken over by the flute) in 3/4. Again, the piano continues with the triplet pattern, and the music, starting from *pianissimo* at 29, rises to *fortissimo* throughout this passage. After 6 bars of 3/4, the music returns to 4/4 and the piano figuration intensifies to incorporate octaves and repeated notes in the triplet pattern. The

point that was reached in E flat major for the restatement of the orchestral *tutti* is now reached in D major, the key in which it appeared at the opening and the dominant of the first subject. The *tutti* (which is only 2 bars long in the revised versions) now appears as it did at the opening of the concerto (4 bars). The piano ends these 4 bars by playing part of the upward scale of the first subject.

In the revised versions, Rachmaninoff stated the recycled harmonic progression and then commenced the arpeggiated accompaniment of the first subject immediately. In the original version, however, the harmonic progression (slightly altered) is heard before a further 6 bar harmonic development in chromatic triplet quaver chords in the piano part. The orchestra, over an E flat pedal point, increases and then lessens in volume before violins I enter with their *tranquillo* restatement of the first subject and only then does the piano part commence its arpeggiated accompaniment. In this form, the bridge passage in the 1926 version comprises 61 bars, and a more obvious recapitulation of the first subject is given.

In the lower notes of the arpeggiated piano writing, the 'Dies irae' motif can be noted, showing that it underpins the first subject. It should also be observed that in the original version, the cor anglais solo that concludes this restatement of the first subject is given to a solo violin, providing perhaps a greater sense of cohesion with the violin restatement of the first subject which precedes it.

The revision to this bridge passage is indubitably the most radical in the first movement. While the original bridge passage of the recapitulation may have appeared too weighty, it



did, in effect, stand for much more than a simple connection of subjects. Two substantial harmonic progressions, involving the sort of writing that is typical of Rachmaninoff, and a climax that formed a contrast to the atypically subdued restatement of the first subject, were removed. It is quite possible that, in this instance, a quest to reduce the length of the work led to the removal of necessary material which perhaps gave context to what remains. It is also possible that the speed with which the already abbreviated second subject progresses to the restatement of the first subject in the revised versions – passing a reference to the opening orchestral *tutti* now only two bars long, with very little build-up and in a foreign key – is too quick overall. Perhaps there is not enough time for the full weight of what is written to sink in. It should also be noted that the climactic material that was removed was an example of the style of writing that many later critics of the concerto missed.

The only other revision to the first movement occurs in the brief and often maligned coda (34 +4). Detractors suggest that the 3/4 time signature used for the coda seems out of place because it is not previously used in the movement. It is however used (if only briefly) in the 1926 version. (Indeed, the occurrence of time signature changes overall are greater in the earlier versions.) Of this coda, the orchestral part remains essentially the same. The piano part, however, in the 1926 version begins with semiquavers, again providing an organic link with what preceded it (ex. 21a, b). It is possible that the change of time signature and speed at this point proved difficult for piano and orchestra to play together accurately. The simplified chords that replaced these semiquavers in the 1928 revision certainly facilitate ensemble. Interestingly, in the second last bar the piano was

originally silent on the middle beat. Again, Rachmaninoff may have felt that the syncopation of the ending may have required the piano part to ‘beat-out’ these closing bars more literally. The silence on this beat in the 1926 and 1928 versions, however, creates a slightly more open (perhaps more light-hearted) ending.

To summarise, the most radical revisions occur in the two bridge passages of the first movement and, while they do not affect the overall structure, they do alter the dominance of certain motifs. The minor revisions to piano texture occur predominantly in the development section.

### Second Movement

The revisions that Rachmaninoff made to the second movement, *Largo*, of the Fourth Piano Concerto are less substantial than those made to the first movement and the final movement (as will be noted later), and differ more often in detail. Whereas a total of 54 bars were removed from the first movement, only 5 are removed from the second movement: in 1926, the movement stood at 82 bars, in 1928 it stood at 80 bars, and it was further shortened to 77 bars in 1941. More often in the second movement, the revisions are concerned with the excision of supposedly redundant bars or with the redistribution of material between piano and orchestra. There is also rewriting of piano textures in both the more violent middle section and in the climactic third section of the movement.

The second movement is in a tripartite structure. A short piano introduction, which unusually seems to be in a ‘free-form’ style and which gives little clue as to the tonic of C

major, forms the first 5 bars of the movement. (Barrie Martyn curiously states in his analysis of the 1941 version that a suggestion of the first subject of the first movement lies in the upper inner voice of the piano writing (ex. 22).) The major thematic motif of the movement is then introduced: a falling three note motif over a major third in common time (ex. 23a). This is then developed for 38 bars (final version), or roughly half of the movement. There is no definitive ‘long theme’ version of the first subject. As in the second movement of the Third Piano Concerto, the core motif supplies any number of longer or shorter forms that, even though they frequently modulate to different keys or are extended, they appear aurally unified as a single subject. A second section, based on a chromatic variation of the theme (ex. 23b), occurs before the music again returns to the tranquility of the first section. The music, now firmly back in the tonic, then reverts to the ten bar phrase borrowed from the *Étude-Tableau*, op. 33, no. 3, for the third section of the music (ex. 23c) before it, too, dissipates into a remembrance of the first subject. The music ends with a pause on a D major seventh chord (second inversion) which leads *attaca subito* into the final movement of the concerto.

The introduction and the first statement of the main theme in both orchestra and piano remain intact in all three versions of the work. The first revision occurs at figure 34 –4 where, after a complete phrase of the first subject, the orchestra again plays gently the falling three note motif. In the 1926 and 1928 versions, the orchestra played two bars of this motif before the line was taken over by the piano, on which it repeated the preceding bar again before modulating to A major for the next orchestral statement of the motif (ex. 24a). In 1941, Rachmaninoff introduced the piano half way through the second bar of the orchestral statement at 34 – 3, doubling the orchestral line, and thereby removing

the necessity of repeating the bar again (ex. 24b). Rachmaninoff revises the following phrase in a similar way in 1941. At 34 –1, the orchestral statement in A major is similarly reduced to one bar before the piano enters and again at 34, the orchestral statement of the motif in D flat major is reduced to one bar before the piano entry. This type of revision is interesting: it is conceivable that Rachmaninoff was attempting to avoid a ‘4+4’ type of phrasing, perhaps feeling that such a structure would appear too classical. To assume that such rudimentary excision of bars is to accommodate a shorter playing time would be to underestimate the composer. As the revision stands, the harmonic movement and its inherent complexity is quickened. Whether the original version of these bars would appear to new audiences as too classical is a hypothetical speculation. In the final triplet quaver, left hand, of the second phrase referred to at 34 -1, a C is removed from the chord. This is the first revision of this movement in the 1928 version.

In the ensuing phrase after the piano’s entry at 34 +1, the setting was for piano alone until 1941. In the revision, Rachmaninoff gives the two bars of the motif in F minor to the full orchestra (34 +2). At this point, the volume of the orchestra could be considered to give more weight to this statement of the motif in the minor tonality. Additionally, the move to F major after two bars offers a new opportunity of timbre change when the piano takes over the line in the 1941 version. It may have also appeared logical to give the orchestra more music, 3 bars having been removed from the previous phrases.

The following 4 bars of piano writing underwent minor changes in both of the revisions. The inner voice of the piano part at 34 +4 involved triplets on the last crotchet beat in the 1926 version, semiquavers in 1928 and two quavers in 1941. In the following bar,

the bass line was altered in 1941 so that it now moves by chromatic step and in the two bars that follow the harmony was changed and a crotchet removed from the phrase in 1928 (ex. 25a, b). Such revisions as these certainly add complexity and richness to the harmony, however the harmony of the original version cannot be considered simple by contrast; the whole point, it seems, of Rachmaninoff's use of this motif is to discover new harmonic forms in which the motif can appear.

At figure 35, the orchestral entry was marked *piano* and *dolce* in the 1926 version. In 1928 it was marked *mezzo forte* and *cantabile*, and in 1941 it was marked *forte*. This louder statement of the motif at 35 bears a stronger relationship and connection to the previous *forte* entry after 34 that was scored for full orchestra in 1941. The ensuing piano phrase continues unchanged in the successive version with the exception of three extra notes that were added to the right hand flourish at 35 +4.

In the 1926 version, the augmented diminished seventh chord over a G pedal in the bar prior to figure 36 resolved into a further two bar statement of the motif in C major before the second section, *L'istesso tempo, ma agitato*, began (ex. 26a). These two bars were removed in 1928, the two quavers that form the upbeat to figure 36 in the later versions having originally been written as crotchets (ex. 26b). The upbeat to the *agitato* section in the earliest version involved a rapid ascending scale, similar to the pattern that is then set up in the following bars.

From figure 36 to 37, Rachmaninoff revised the piano writing entirely in the revision of 1941. The piano chords that double the brass's violent minor version of the motif in the

1941 version (ex. 27b) was originally scored as rumbling, rapid, descending piano passages in the first two versions of this movement (ex. 27a). A pattern was built on descending semiquaver sextuplets, a single chromatic line in the left hand and a combination of thirds, fourths and fifths in the right hand. The ascending runs on the final crotchet beat of the bars still stood but covered just over one octave instead of almost two in the revision of 1941. The climax of this phrase (figure 37 -2) consisted of a torrent of rapid broken chords in the earlier versions (ex. 28a), descending from the top octave of the piano. The single note ascending scale that leads into figure 37 in the 1941 version stands in place of the conclusion to this downward passage (ex. 28b). While these revisions do not drastically change the character of the section (it still appears as if by surprise) it does give the pianist considerably less to do. The original piano writing was of some difficulty and was perhaps intended as a *bravura* passage. It is possible that the relatively low scoring of these descending torrents prevented the piano from being easily heard amongst the *forte* tremolo strings and the *marcato* horns. It is equally feasible that the combination of the complex piano writing with the sudden change of character created some difficulties for ensemble. The original passage was in a style of writing more in keeping with the Third Piano Concerto and the Second Piano Sonata and would have been, in optimal performance situations, quite remarkable.

In the next section from figure 37, the music dies down before the third section, borrowed from the *Étude-Tableau*, is introduced. The ascending line of the piano part remains unchanged in all three versions although the piano originally played a low C pedal on the first beat of each bar. Also, the right hand chords at the beginning of each

bar were more widely spaced in 1926, yet contained fewer notes in the 1928 version (ex. 28a,b). From 37, the cor anglais played a solo for 8 bars in the 1926 version. This was reduced to the latter 4 bars of the solo in 1928, the left hand of the piano part now hinting at the counterpoint as it originally stood (ex. 29a,b). At figure 38, the music resolves in C major. Until 1941, violins I played the falling three note motif again with the same string orchestration at this point. Now, the motif is only implied – the bass parts remaining the same but the melodic motif absent (ex. 30a, b). At the piano entry two bars later, again the motif in the top voice of the right hand is absent for the first bar in the 1941 version. Perhaps Rachmaninoff felt that it provided a more sophisticated reading if the motif was only alluded to. It is also possible, though, that in later years Rachmaninoff did not wish the motif, which some had suggested recalled the theme of the Schumann Piano Concerto or the nursery rhyme ‘Three Blind Mice’, to appear more times than necessary.

The most notable revision occurs in the third section that follows in 1941 (fig. 39 – 40). While the changes to the orchestral scoring are relatively minor, the repeated triplet chords of the 1941 piano part (ex. 31b), one of the most memorable parts of the concerto for some, were written as a more complicated quaver/semiquaver passage in the 1926 and 1928 versions of the concerto (ex. 31a). Indeed, the original setting in the *Étude-Tableau* involved a similarly complicated accompaniment (ex. 31c). As it stood in the 1926 and 1928 versions of the concerto, the right hand piano part played ascending quaver seconds and then descending single note patterns whilst the left hand covered four octaves in semiquaver / quaver patterns. In the latter bars of this phrase, the piano writing

was reduced in complexity to some extent and the following single note melodic pattern in the right hand is of considerable tenderness and delicacy. The off beat quaver melody that the piano outlines in the repeated chords of the 1941 version were originally given to violins I. In the 1941 version, the main melody is taken from violins II and given to violins I. The overall effect of this section is not entirely changed by the revision of 1941, the upward form of the melody combined with the extended harmonic sequence still form a contrast with the previous sections. Yet again the revisions give the pianist considerably less to do. While it may seem likely, at a superficial level at least, that the piano part is again 'beating out' the rhythm to aid ensemble, it is perhaps less likely that the original setting would have caused problems. It is more likely that the inherent push towards simplicity by Rachmaninoff in his later years was a sole aesthetic reasoning behind his desire to change the piano writing here. In either setting, it is still one of Rachmaninoff's most inspired moments.

In the final 4 bars of the movement, the cello and double bass parts are altered in the revision of 1941. In the third last bar, these instruments are now tacit on the first beat of the bar. In the second last bar they originally, and interestingly, played a B flat instead of the tonic C, perhaps in an attempt to more obviously disintegrate the tonality before the final movement (ex. 32a, b).

To summarise, the revisions to the first section of the second movement are of a minor nature and deal primarily with the excision of bars and slight alteration to matters of counterpoint. The more major rewritings of this movement occur in the second and third



sections, the piano textures being considerably changed.

### Third Movement

The most radical revisions that Rachmaninoff made to the Fourth Piano Concerto occur in the third movement, *Allegro vivace*. Whereas the previous revisions did not alter the underlying structure of either movement, they now do. In the 1926 version of the concerto, the final movement was a fairly standard first movement sonata form: introduction, first subject, bridge passage, second subject, development (which is largely based on the motif from the second subject of the first movement), recapitulation of first and second subjects, and an extended coda (based on the motif from the second subject of the first movement and the second subject of this movement). By the 1941, the structure of the final movement had become episodic. In short, the introduction is largely cut, the second subject in the exposition loses a lot of its melodic contour, the development is altered in detail, the recapitulation is removed and instead the music moves directly to the coda (now incorporating material from the first subject of the first movement as a climax.) Only the closing 15 bars of the original ending remain. The version of 1928 can be seen as a compromise, or progression, between these two forms, with the coda primarily based on the second subject of the movement. As can be imagined, removal of the recapitulation creates a much shorter score. The movement contained 567 bars in the 1926 score, 476 bars in 1928 and 434 bars in 1941. In short, the analysis that follows will focus on the music that was removed (the introduction and the recapitulation) and music that was rewritten in all three versions (the second subject in the exposition, some of the

development section and the coda.)

In the 1928 and 1941 versions of the Fourth Piano Concerto, the third movement commences with a short introduction (ex. 33b). A Neapolitan II cadence (an A flat major chord followed by the dominant chord of D major) are stated *fortissimo* and a second bar of dominant material, marked *forte*, follows. Ten bars that develop the falling second motif (E flat-D) of the Neapolitan cadence follow before the chromatic run in the piano reaches the first subject in the tonic, G minor. These ten bars were the penultimate bars of the original introduction. In the version of 1926, the introduction was of greater length (ex. 33a). It commenced quietly, built to a *forte*, and then fell back to the 10 bars used in the introduction of 1928. As mentioned previously, a motif from the second subject of the first movement (a leap of a minor ninth which resolves a semitone down to the octave) is used to great extent as a motif in this movement. This motif is closely related to, and used at variance with, the octave leap that commences the first subject (ex. 34).

In the original introduction, Violins II introduce the minor ninth motif which is followed by a triplet form of the quaver duplets of the first subject, and which are accompanied by *pizzicato* stings and *staccato* woodwind and horns. This phrase is repeated again before the woodwinds and horns develop the triplet rhythm for a further 3 bars. At this point, Rachmaninoff scores the motif *marcato* in the trumpets and trombones. This is accompanied by a syncopated string accompaniment on parallel chromatic triads. The ten bars used in the later versions of the introduction follow this. In all, the 26 bars of the

original introduction remain in the tonality of the dominant and the Neapolitan II cadence underlies much of the material.

Skill can be noted in the inter-connection of movements in most of Rachmaninoff's large works. In the same way that movements of his symphonies are linked by a motif, his concerto movements are often linked harmonically. The opening of the second and third movements of the Second Piano Concerto serve to modulate seamlessly from the previous movement. Likewise, the opening of the second movement of the Third Piano Concerto serves to move from D through to D flat. The second and third movements of the Third Piano Concerto are joined by a passage built on a modulation back to D. In this light, discussion of the function of the opening of the third movement of the Fourth Piano Concerto is pertinent. The close of the second movement of the Fourth Piano Concerto creates the dominant for the next movement, and, in the 1926 version, the tranquility of the second movement was designed to pass quietly yet quickly into the music of the introduction. (The join between the second and third movements of the Second Piano Concerto are similar while not actually containing an *attaca subito* direction.)

Contemplating the reasons why Rachmaninoff decided to commence with a bang, literally, raises some interesting thoughts. It may be possible that he felt self-conscious about the slow movement, which, even though it rises to a considerable level of climax, was of a markedly different nature than his previous compositions in this genre. Additionally, the actual motif of the slow movement is not developed into a truly

definitive statement and the movement closes with its disintegration. Commencing the third movement softly creates some difficulties, especially if the mood of the *Largo* has been broken. If a comment by Rachmaninoff about rudimentarily cutting parts of the Corelli Variations at the point in performance when he can hear audience members coughing is believed,<sup>3</sup> it is possible that he felt too exposed, as both composer and soloist, at this point. Commencing the third movement with two loud chords easily and quickly dispels the mood of what preceded it. (It is perhaps important to remember that Rachmaninoff did not work professionally as a pianist to the same extent when he composed his earlier concertos.) It is likely that, in a quest for a shorter concerto, Rachmaninoff decided that the original introduction, even though it is finely written and scored, was simply not necessary.

With the exception of 4 bars of pattern that is established at figure 45 +5 – an entry on B flat and A flat is deleted (ex. 35) – the first subject proceeds largely intact. These two 2 bar phrases were obviously viewed as redundant in 1941. Additionally, violin II, viola and cello parts are rewritten in minor detail for one bar in 1928 at 49 –5. In total, there are two complete statements of the theme (the second in quaver triplets) in the exposition of the first subject.

The 2 bar introduction to the second subject that now stands at figure 49 was rewritten for the 1941 version of the second subject. In 1926 and 1928, it consisted of a syncopated crotchet rising scale in the woodwinds and upper strings modulating to D flat major, similar in configuration to the 2 bar phrase in the piano part that precedes it (ex. 36a). In

the 1941 version, the harmony and scoring remain similar, yet the upward motion is re-scored as triplet arpeggiated triads (ex. 36b). As the second subject was rewritten in all three versions, they will be dealt with separately in the following paragraphs. The overall length and structure of the subject remains the same however. A cursory analysis shows that it has 4 main phrases: the first and second are similar (a 4 + 5 bar phrase in the first instance, the last 5 bars repeated again in the second instance), the third phrase is 16 bars long and involves an upward scale in the melody and greater harmonic diversity, while the fourth is again similar to the first, this time extended by 3 bars.

In 1926, the theme of the second subject was stated in the piano part in double octave chords, accompanied by descending triplet quaver patterns in violins I and cellos (ex. 37a). At this point, the melody consisted of falling seconds and thirds in quavers and dotted crotchets. These falling seconds and thirds of the second subject bear close relationship with the famed 'Dies irae' motif, found in many of Rachmaninoff's large works from his First Symphony to the Symphonic Dances. The first 4 bars of the melody fell in this manner before the 5 bars that followed led the melody back up to a climax of the phrase. The second phrase of this subject is similarly scored. The manner of piano writing here is similar to the final statement of the second subject in the coda of the third movement of the Third Piano Concerto. It is of interest to note a dotted compound figure in the horns which throughout this theme serves to strengthen the structure of the phrases. This dotted rhythm is also transformed in the successive versions. The middle 16 bars of the subject continue the melody in the right hand in octave based chords while the left hand takes over the triplet quaver figure, now spread over three octaves. These 16

bars of piano writing remain the same through the successive versions. The last phrase is scored for the piano as it was for the first phrase, the triplet quaver figure, though, now given to the woodwind and marked *leggiero* (ex. 37b). The strings play a variant of the dotted compound triplet figure in accompaniment and the triangle and cymbal are introduced. The ‘light’ and bright scoring at this point gives some clue as to the character that Rachmaninoff would later develop for the second subject in the final version. In all, though, the sweeping melodic line and strong writing for piano here are more in keeping with Rachmaninoff’s usual style for this type of second subject melody in the final movement of a work.

In the version of 1928, Rachmaninoff gives the opening of the first phrase of the subject to the piano alone and sets a simplified version of the melody in the top voice of the right hand against a complicated accompaniment of triplet quavers in both hands (ex. 38a). This setting is of some pianistic difficulty. It is interesting to note that Rachmaninoff adds a 4 beat bar to this phrase as he similarly extends the same phrase in the restatement of this theme in the recapitulation of the 1926 version. The dotted compound rhythm appears in the trumpet and side drum parts, united with the triad-based triplet figure in the strings, again to emphasize the structure of the subject. In the first 4 bars of the second phrase of the subject, Rachmaninoff gives the melody to the cor anglais and clarinets, while giving the triplet figure (also incorporating semiquavers) to the piano (ex. 38b). For the second half of the phrase, the melody returns to the piano part, and in the 5 bar extension Rachmaninoff gives the melody to violins I and introduces a new version of the triplet accompaniment to the melody in the piano part. He

makes much greater use of this figuration in the 1941 version (ex. 38c). The middle phrase of the second subject remains the same in this version, yet the final phrase is again altered. In the fourth phrase, Rachmaninoff gives the melody to the piano, this time set in the same way as in the 1926 version, but now accompanying the melody with swirling semiquavers in the upper woodwinds parts and with *pizzicato* strings playing the triadic triplet figure (ex. 38d). The triangle, side drum and cymbal parts remain. This version offers much of the melody to the pianist and it is still quite rhapsodic, yet the unbroken 'solo' of the first version, however, has begun to disappear.

In the version of 1941, Rachmaninoff goes a considerable step further by removing much of the melody. The first 4 bars (49 +2) of the first phrase are only the harmonic remains of the melody, and the triplet figure, now shared between the piano and strings, stands as the theme. The dotted compound rhythm is now incorporated into the piano part (ex. 39a). The second 5 bars of the phrase (50 –2) retains the melody but in a simpler, crotchet form and given as a solo to the horn. The piano accompaniment to the simplified theme is the same as was used for the 5 bar extension of the second phrase in the 1928 version (ex. 39b). This phrase is extended by one bar to accommodate a slight alteration to the melody. The middle 16 bars of the subject again remain the same in this version. The last phrase of this subject returns to the similar treatment that opened the section, the triplet figure now shared between upper woodwind as well, and with trumpet taking over the dotted compound rhythmic figure (ex. 39c).

By now, the second subject has changed entirely in character. The sweeping melody and

rhapsodic treatment are, excepting the 16 bar phrase, entirely removed in the 1941 version and in its place stands a section which, combining the dotted and triplet rhythms, suggest a lighthearted, martial character. It is obvious that Rachmaninoff's opinion about changing the character of this section was not swayed by the oft-perceived necessity of creating a solid contrast between the first and second subjects. The absence of the sweeping melody in the 1941 version and the absence and further development of it in the recapitulation section effectively creates a major character change for the movement. It is arguable, and definitely supportable, that Rachmaninoff's writing of the second subject, both in the exposition and in the recapitulation of the 1926 version, are among some of his finest piano writing.

In all three versions of the Fourth Piano Concerto, the development section of the third movement appears to begin with a false start (figure 54 to 57 –8). An abbreviated restatement of the first subject dies away before the piano enters in 4/4 (ex. 40a). After a few bars which develop and transform the falling semitone motif in thirds, the piano concludes the section with a small cadenza passage. Immediately, the music again establishes Tempo I. Study of the opening of the 1926 version of this movement reveals a greater connection within this section. In 1928, Rachmaninoff revised this *tutti* to the 11 bars that remain (ex. 40b) in the 1941 score (with the exception of the bar at 54 +3 which did not include the upbeat string run into 54 +4). In the original version, however, the *tutti* contained a further 5 bars and there was some slight alteration to the rhythm at the end of the first 11 bars (ex. 40a). In this extended *tutti*, trumpet and trombone sound out the minor ninth form of the leap against an accompaniment of chromatically moving



triads in tremolo strings, similar to bar 13 of the original introduction. Also, the falling minor second that is a characteristic of this motif is extended. These notes, G flat-F, mirror the first notes of the piano entry, now adding a greater sense of context. Rachmaninoff was undoubtedly pleased with the section that follows as, although it bears no major structural purpose, it was kept in all versions of the concerto even though it could have been quite easily removed. (A similar instance of descending thirds in chromatic juxtaposition can be found in the *Étude-Tableau*, op. 33, no. 6, written at the same time as the earliest sketches for this concerto.) In short, the passage serves to modulate back to the key of D major, the dominant of the concerto, the delicate cadenza forming the conclusion of this modulation. It should also be noted that the descending single note minims in the piano part at figure 56 were originally ascending 3 note chords, accompanying a clarinet solo that hinted at the first subject of the first movement (a rising scale) and then the second subject of this movement (falling thirds) (ex. 41a, b). This line has been amended in the manuscript and it appears it was written in a lower register. The decision to score the solo for an A clarinet and not for the B flat clarinet used elsewhere in this movement may have also caused this passage's rewriting in the manuscript.

The development section continues intact until figure 58 with the exception of a slight alteration to the dotted rhythm of the counter subject in the viola part, treated in a fugato style in this section, in the 1928 revision. The now amended form of this dotted rhythm continues throughout this section.

At figure 58, Rachmaninoff transposes the music up a semitone in the version of 1941

until figure 62. This part of the movement, which is developing the first subject, originally commenced on the tonic, G (ex. 42a). In the revision of 1941, it commences up a semitone on A flat (ex. 42b). Apart from the modulation, the piano part and the orchestration survive intact for 24 bars. It is possible that Rachmaninoff was attempting to obfuscate the harmonic gravity of the tonic at this point. Following this in the 1941 version, the piano then states a short form of the first subject twice from figure 62 to 64, once on a B flat and once on an E flat, before a further 3 bars that restate the falling second of the motif (ex. 43b). These last three bars remain in the earlier versions of the movement, however the section that preceded it was 26 bars longer in the 1926 version (ex. 43a) and 24 bars in the 1928 version. In these two earlier versions, two 4 bar statements of the rising octave / falling second motif, followed by the concluding descending line of the first subject in the strings and woodwind, were accompanied by the semiquaver figuration of the first subject in the piano part. In the following bars, Rachmaninoff employed the use of fugato in a two bar form of the motif among the woodwinds, horns and individual string sections, the piano playing triplet figurations that mirrored these entries. Two short-form statements of the first subject in quaver triplets then follow, and lead into the three bars which survive (figure 64 –3) in the 1941 version. (In 1928, the piano part in the triplet section is simplified in the first half but reverts to semiquavers for the short-form statements of the first subject that follow.) Rachmaninoff obviously considered this amount of development, despite the interesting and modern sounding profusion of dissonances created by the overlapping minor seconds, to be too long.

Structurally, the following section of the development from figure 64 to 66 is the same

in all three versions. In 1928, however, Rachmaninoff altered the layout of the piano part and, while keeping the upper-voice melody of the accompaniment, altered the harmony so that a major chord harmony begins every second bar rather than a minor chord. He also altered the orchestration (ex. 44a, b). At fig. 66, Rachmaninoff states the first subject in its 4 bar form in the revision of 1941 and scores the theme for trumpet. This is accompanied by descending semiquavers alternating with the previous figure in the piano part (ex. 45). In 1926, however, Rachmaninoff continued the rising fugato dotted rhythm of the orchestra and introduced a *forte* double octave chord-based descending chromatic line into the piano part (ex. 46a). This descending pattern of *forte* chromatic chords later played an important role in the recapitulation section of the original version. In 1928, these descending chords were altered so as to involve the rhythmic semiquaver figure that originally stood in the woodwind parts (ex. 46b). From figure 68, the music survives intact in all versions, with the exception of the semiquaver passages in the piano part at 68 +1-4, which are now written as a continuous passages, and which are strengthened by the addition of an extra note, making two note chords (ex. 47a, b). This revision occurred in 1941.

As can be noted from the previous three paragraphs, the development section is altered in a number of ways. While the overall structure is unchanged (the progression from the tranquil, brief piano cadenza to the frenzied climax of the development being the underlying impetus) the section is reduced by about 1/5<sup>th</sup> of its length in the 1941 version. While Rachmaninoff removed a number of bars that deal with the development of the octave leap / falling semitone motif, he was careful to reassign the bars that restate

the first subject. It appears that Rachmaninoff was keen to tighten (and therefore shorten) this development section.

In terms of 'revision', what follows in the Fourth Piano Concerto is remarkable as, from this point, Rachmaninoff writes three almost entirely different works.

While the closing moments of the movement and the occasional chord or passage are recycled, much of the music is entirely new in the versions of 1928 and 1941, and the overall structure is different on each occasion. Generally speaking, in the first version there follows the recapitulation of the first subject, a reference to the first movement, the recapitulation of the second subject and then a short coda that commences from a D pedal point and which eventually leads to a structural perfect cadence. In the second version, there is a recapitulation of first subject, first movement reference, and then a coda which, while still commencing on the D pedal, is composed mainly from material derived from the second subject. In this version, material that made up the structural perfect cadence in the 1926 version is used again but this time followed by a plagal cadence. In the final version, however, the music goes immediately to the reference to the first movement. The coda then follows, again beginning on a D pedal but now incorporating the rising scale of the first subject of the first movement – rising harmony, endemic to all versions of the coda, can be found underlying it. Most of this material is new and is now followed by an almost exact restatement of the climax from the development of the first movement, before closing with a plagal cadence. In both of the revisions, the movement is progressively shortened. The three different endings will now be considered individually. These endings are included as examples: the 1926 version is ex. 48, the 1928 version is ex. 49 and the 1941

version is ex. 50. As Rachmaninoff's revisions to the concerto removed substantial amounts of material, his system of figure numbers was altered. References to the score will now be indicated by the use of the figure numbers pertinent to the particular version being cited.

### 1926 version

In 1926, five bars of climactic dominant pedal stand at figure 73 in 3/4 time with a repeated *tutti* rhythmic figure and chords spaced over the entire keyboard before the first subject is recapitulated *marcato* by trumpets and trombones (figure 74). The piano part is scored as descending double octave chromatic chords in a similar pattern to what had originally stood in the development section of this version (ex. 47a). These descending chords are matched *fortissimo* by the entire upper string section, *divisi*, from the same altitude as the piano part. The entire percussion section play in the 5 bar lead up to, and on first beat of, the recapitulation and the bass drum and timpani are scored in the first 4 bars of the recapitulation. This must have been quite an impressive moment. The theme is given to the horns for the second four bars before the music dies down with repetitions of the falling minor second of the motif, G-F sharp (figure 75). This falling pattern is harmonised a number of times, until a perfect cadence is reached in C major. It is at this point that a reference is made to the opening of the first movement, complete in this version with the descending chromatic triplet quaver line that was originally part of the opening *tutti* (figure 76). The ensuing cadence, however, which should be perfect, lands in the key of E minor and over a harmonic line in the woodwind and brass there is a

downward piano semiquaver cascade in a two-hand tremolo figuration to a perfect cadence in B major for the restatement of the second subject (figure 77 +2).

Through the entire statement of the first two phrases of the second subject, the melody is given predominantly to violins I, while the piano accompanies with an almost unbroken passage of semiquaver duplets that matches the harmonic layout of the theme. This style of figuration, unusual for Rachmaninoff, fits well under the hand and has the potential for great expressive beauty. Some bars are extended with the indication of 4/4 (as was done in the first statement of this theme in the 1928 version) (see figure 77 +3 and 78 +1). The middle 16 bars (figure 79) contain similar writing for the piano as it did in the exposition, this time, however, enjoined by fanfare-like outbursts of the triplet rhythm in the stings and upper woodwinds (the pattern that accompanied this section in the exposition). At the beginning of the fourth phrase of this theme, Rachmaninoff indicates an increase in pace, *poco a poco piu mosso*, and begins to alter the theme (figure 81 -2). It is stated now in the piano part and the semiquaver accompaniment figure that the piano played in the first two phrases is heard in the upper woodwinds and strings. It is at this point that the writing becomes most inspired, with the melody undergoing two climactic modulations (figure 82 -2 and 82 +6). The left hand accompaniment increases its compass to include semiquaver chromatic passages, creating sonorities that relate to similar passages in the Third Piano Concerto, and to include triplets that now briefly cover the falling thirds of the theme in diminution. The second climactic cadence leads the music back to C major where a further indication of speed, *agitato e sempre accelerando*, is marked (figure 83). At this point, woodwind and, eventually, strings,

develop a phrase of the second subject against tremolo lower strings whilst the piano accompanies with a triplet figure. The music modulates and crescendos through three phrases of this material before cadencing over an A major chord (in second inversion) onto the D pedal for the coda (figure 85). In all, this restatement of the second subject, and some development of it, covers 69 bars.

The coda begins *vivace* in 2/4 time with a low held D in the lower strings, and with a prominent rhythm in the timpani. The octave leap / falling semitone motif is heralded in the violins in a syncopated sequence. This motif is the basis for much of the coda in this version. After 13 bars, the piano part enters with this motif and the music further builds. After 8 bars, the piano develops the falling semitone motif to include thirds (figure 87). After a further 16 bars of this treatment, Rachmaninoff notes another increase of speed, *piu mosso*, and the piano plays a series of runs in triplets (figure 88 +8). These runs, marked *leggero*, have been rewritten in the manuscript. It is clear that the original pattern involved triplets in the right hand and quaver duplets in the left hand. A variant of the motif in the flute and oboe continues to propel the music as this 4 bar phrase is repeated 3½ times in ever rising harmonic sequences. A similar series of runs in triplets can be found in all three versions of the coda. At the end of the fourth repetition, Rachmaninoff reaches the chord of B major (a seventh chord in third inversion, containing a G-F sharp suspension (figure 90 –6)). This chord forms a point of structural importance in all three versions of the work. A two bar phrase that is built on this chord and which involves the falling semitone, G-F sharp, is repeated three times before a change of time signature to 3/4 signals a further abbreviation of harmonic movement

(figure 90). This time, three 1 bar cadences (G major chords preceded by E flat minor chords, a variation on Neapolitan sixth harmony without the dominant chords) propel the music back into 2/4 for the final part of the coda (figure 90 +4). The speed indication at this point is *presto*.

The music returns to *piano* as oboe and cor anglais repeat the falling second of the motif in crotchets against rapid semiquaver patterns in the piano. At the end of the first 3 bar phrase, strings, horns and timpani interrupt with a *forte* repeated note exclamation (figure 90 +9). Again, the phrases begin to shorten and the harmonic sequences rise ever higher. After 16 bars of this *presto* section, the piano reaches a rising chromatic sequence of quaver chords (figure 91). For 8 bars, the strings and woodwinds match this pattern in syncopation before eventually playing the two-quaver rhythm of the falling second motif with piano but now in canon at the half bar (figure 92 -2). The key of A flat major is unexpectedly reached for a brief and swift statement of the second subject, now transformed into 2/4 time, played in thirds by *staccato* flutes and violins I, and harmonised with a rising sequence of chromatic diminished chords (figure 92). The piano part (the music being at a peak of frenzy) plays a rapid sequence of semiquavers as the phrases again shorten and rise by chromatic step in the bass line (figure 92 +6). The key of D major is eventually reached after 10 bars and it is at this point that the structural perfect cadence of the coda is attained (figure 93). A three bar phrase is repeated twice which further reinforces the dominant key, piano semiquavers continuing against the *staccato* thirds of the orchestra. After this point, the time signature changes to 3/4. Over two bars, the music briefly passes from the dominant to F sharp minor and F



major, providing an increase in the sense of breathlessness when piano part and orchestra are tacit on the first beat of the bar (figure 93 +6). Over the next 4 bars and against a backdrop of repeated syncopated Bs on the piano, the brass section rapidly blast the chords of C sharp minor, E flat major, B minor before the key of G major is reached. This extraordinary sequence of chords could have been seen to obfuscate the tonality of G major, the tonic, yet the declamatory reinforcement of the dominant in the previous 7 bars creates an aural link to the tonic. At this point, a 15 bar sequence involving descending major / minor seventh chords is used by Rachmaninoff to close all three versions of the movement (figure 94). The woodwinds and upper strings match the piano in this semiquaver descent. Apart from the second 4 bar phrase, which is in two-hand tremolo chords over the same harmonic pattern, and the removal of a chord at the conclusion of the work, the final two pages of the 1926 version remain the same in the later revisions.

In short, and before proceeding with an analysis of the coda in the 1928 version, the music that Rachmaninoff composed for the original version of the coda is quite extraordinary. Far from exhibiting any inferior qualities – poor music that the composer may have wished to erase – the writing is of a similar standard to his later fine works. In style, it is quite different from anything that Rachmaninoff had done to date in a large scale work, yet it utilises the same innovative approach to harmony and phrase length that can be noted in some of the later *Études-Tableaux*, preludes and songs. Over this extended format, the music presents a dizzying array of tonal centres. This, combined with the extraordinary manipulation of the rising ninth / falling semitone motif in ever

shortening patterns, provides an astonishing level of musical excitement. The use of the repeated dominant chord in those bars prior to the final G major passage-work lends the concerto a satisfying sense of conclusion, perhaps necessary after the kaleidoscopic harmony that has preceded it. It should perhaps also be added that the music is of considerable difficulty, both for the pianist and ensemble. The coda in this version is 124 bars long. Including the second subject (69 bars) and the recapitulation (35 bars), the entire ending from the common point of departure in all three versions (figure 71 in the 1941 score) is 228 bars.

#### 1928 version

In the version of 1928, the point of departure (figure 69 in the 1928 version) is again followed by a recapitulation of the first subject. The orchestra repeats the dominant pedal as in the 1926 version for 5 bars but this time the piano part, originally playing dominant chords with the orchestra, is *tacit*. At the point of recapitulation, Rachmaninoff now restates the first subject softly in the piano part in the same semiquaver figuration that opened the movement (figure 70). An off beat tambourine part is included in the scoring. After the first 4 bar phrase, however, Rachmaninoff weakens the arrival at the tonic by transposing the next phrase to A minor (figure 71). The following phrase lands on B but here Rachmaninoff scores a descending chromatic line for the trumpet whilst giving the piano part a descending chromatic semiquaver run (figure 72 –3). At this point, the reference to the opening *tutti*, this time without the descending chromatic quavers in the woodwind, occurs in C major (figure 72). Again,

the cadence arrives at an E minor chord but this time the upper strings, and later woodwinds, play semiquavers and the piano plays descending triads (figure 72 +4).

At this point in the 1926 version, the music modulated to B major for the second statement of the second subject. Here, however, the cadence lands on a D pedal for the coda. The time signature changes to 2/4 and it is marked *L'istesso tempo* (figure 72 +8). This time signature remains for almost all of the ensuing coda. Curiously, the orchestra part lacks bar lines for the next 16 bars and the word 'cadenza' appears. The 16 bars, however, last only a few seconds and it is doubtful that an audience would recognise these bars as a cadenza. A similar point is reached at the arrival of the coda in the third movement of the Third Piano Concerto yet bar-lines are marked in this score. The music is based on descending 4 note *staccato* crotchet patterns and after 16 bars, the orchestra enters (figure 73). Low strings and bassoon play the octave leap / falling semitone motif for 8 bars before the piano, using a similar rhythmic figuration, plays the second subject in a modified form (figure 74). Here, it is fast and the falling thirds of the melody are in the upper voice of the right hand piano part. The accompanying harmony is based on major / minor seventh chords and a triplet pattern is set up in the woodwind parts. After one phrase, the octave leap / falling semitone motif is heard in the horn and viola parts. Two shorter 2 bar statements are heard, before a 3 bar phrase includes the falling thirds of the second subject in crotchet form in the horns (figure 75 –3). After an indication of *piu mosso*, Rachmaninoff continues his utilisation of the second subject by stating a simplified version of the middle 16 bars of the theme in the string parts, accompanied by rapid triplet quaver figurations in the piano part (figure 75). This section

of the coda proceeds for 27 bars and there is some manipulation of the melody, similar to its manipulation in the second statement of this theme in the recapitulation of the 1926 version (figure 77 and 77 +4).

Rachmaninoff then borrows the triplet run passage from the 1926 version, everything up to now in the coda having been entirely rewritten, and adds the direction *piu vivo* (*piu mosso* in the earlier version) (figure 78). Rachmaninoff uses the harmonic and melodic structure of this section (figure 88 +8 in the 1926 score) yet simplifies the melodic contours in the upper strings. The piano part is rewritten to incorporate a rising / falling chromatic motif yet is still based on triplet quaver runs as it was before. The music again reaches the B major seventh chord in third inversion and the piano writing and scoring at this point are the same (figure 79). In the first version at this point, there followed 3 further bars of cadences before a *presto* section. Here, however, Rachmaninoff extends the phrase by 4 bars (figure 79 +6) which leads to the restatement of the second subject in A flat in the woodwinds as it appeared in the original version of the coda (figure 80 in this score, figure 92 in the 1926 score). The 5 bar extension preceding this A flat major section will be used again in the 1941 version. The piano writing is mostly similar as the music rises in harmonic sequence to reach the dominant, D major. At this point, however, the piano plays the quaver rhythm of the orchestral part in the original version and the semiquavers, originally taken by the piano, are now played by piccolo, flutes and clarinets through this 8 bar phrase (figure 81). At this point in the original version, Rachmaninoff scored offbeat Bs over a series of juxtaposed chords. Now, however, he extends the phrase so as to reach a C minor seventh chord, the subdominant of G (figure

82). Over this, he writes an ascending *tremolo* chord passage in the piano part accompanied by an 8 bar *tutti* crescendo. At the top of this run (figure 83), he arrives at the tonic chord for the same 15 bars of music, slightly modified, that formed the ending in the 1926 version. Effectively, by following the repetitions of the dominant chord with an extended passage on the subdominant minor chord, Rachmaninoff creates a plagal cadence.

In short, Rachmaninoff produced a coda that, while incorporating some of the octave leap / falling semitone motif on which most of the original coda was based, relies heavily on the second subject. It is obvious that Rachmaninoff had recognised the need to make use of the second subject in the 1928 version, having removed its reappearance in the recapitulation. The second subject, however, is far from languid in his use of it here. It commences at a faster tempo and there is a further increase of pace. Some passage work remains from the first version although the entire coda now stands at 134 bars. With a recapitulation that now comprises only 24 bars, the entire ending from the common point of departure is 158 bars.

#### 1941 version

In 1941, Rachmaninoff again writes an entirely different ending to the Fourth Piano Concerto. With the change of the last quaver of the bar in the piano part, the music now goes straight to the reference to the opening of the concerto (figure 71 in the 1941 score). These four bars of the opening *tutti* are scored exactly as they were in the 1928 version.

Again the cadence lands on an E minor chord but the semiquaver figure of the piano part is now scored for strings (figure 71 +4). The piano part is given crotchet chords and a descending chromatic bass line can be noted in the lower voice. This 6 bar phrase leads to the D pedal point for the coda (figure 72).

Whereas the coda in 1926 was based almost entirely on the octave leap / falling second motif, and in 1928 it was based primarily on the second subject, the first part of this coda is based on a rising scale passage, reminiscent of the first subject of the first movement. Indeed, that subject forms the climax to this version. Also, the coda in the previous two versions was written primarily in 2/4, while, in this version, the coda is written in 3/4 up to the climactic restatement of the first movement material; the time signature of 2/4 is introduced for the final pages only. To commence, the piano repeats low Ds in alternation with the timpani. Against this, bassoons begin the rising scale motif in thirds. The bass note of D remains as a pedal point in the double basses until figure 76 while the piano continues the rising scale motif in *staccato* chords. The piano takes over a triplet figure (perhaps a reminiscence of the second subject accompaniment) that has been hinted at in the upper strings (figure 75 –4). Rachmaninoff bases the music again on rising chromatic harmony, and elements of the falling second motif can be seen in the bassoon part. Eventually, this falling motif transforms to cover a third – the second subject now being hinted at more strongly (figure 76). At this point, the character changes slightly and the piano triplets lose a note and the falling motif is elongated. The piano part is then given rising / falling chromatic triplet runs whilst the harmony continually rises chromatically (figure 77). At the top of the second run in the piano part

(figure 78), the first subject of this movement is recalled, the accompanying figuration similar to its appearance in the exposition. However, the subject is not stated completely but manipulated to further raise the harmony by chromatic sequence. In neither of the previous codas is this subject actually referred to. The music passes by a series of chords over a hemiola (figure 79) which resembles, in some sense, the unrelated sequence of chords that lay immediately prior to the final G major passage-work at figure 94 –4 in the 1926 score.

The dominant is eventually reached (figure 80 –6) and at this point Rachmaninoff chooses to form a climactic and substantial recapitulation, not with material from this movement but with the return of the first subject from the first movement (figure 80). A rising scale, endemic to this coda, precedes this restatement of material in the piano part, resembling most closely the opening phrase of the concerto. The restated material appears in the same manner as it appeared in the climax of the development section of the first movement (figure 21 +2), now, however, in the tonic of G major. The rhythm is altered slightly and the accompanying piano part is also altered – this time anchored by chords and octaves in the bass. It is curious to consider if this very brief recapitulation is weakened by stating the material as it appeared at the climax of the development section of the first movement and not by alluding to it as it appeared in the exposition. It could perhaps be felt that audiences may have found difficulty in identifying it accurately.

Rachmaninoff closes the section with an elongation of the descending chromatic line that

ends the first subject of the first movement (figure 81). The orchestra at this point incorporates similar juxtaposed harmonies that have been noted elsewhere. The descent of the chromatic line in the piano part ends on the same B major seventh chord that underpinned structural points in the other versions (figure 82). This time, however, the chord is in root position and the G-F sharp suspension is absent. Instead, Rachmaninoff builds three 2 bar phrases of rising quaver triplet pattern in the piano part. These phrases are followed by a pattern similar to that which followed the B major seventh chord in the 1928 version, previously in 2/4 but now in 3/4 (figure 83 in this score, figure 79 +6 in 1928). This time however, instead of leading to the statement of the second subject that occurred in A flat major in the 1928 version, he precedes directly to that part of the coda which was based on the repeated Bs in an identical scoring to the 1928 version (figure 84 –4). In doing this, he misses the reinforced dominant pedal that stood prior to this passage in both earlier versions and which naturally followed out of the A flat major statement of the second subject in 2/4 (a Neapolitan II cadence). From here, the music concluded in the same way as it did in the 1928 version (figure 85 –4), the underlying structural cadence now quite clearly plagal. The rhythm of the final bar is altered, however. The powerfully rhythmic endings of large-scale works was something of a signature mark for Rachmaninoff and it is presumed that the final chord of the concerto was not removed without consideration. Speculatively, he may have felt that ending the work with two repeated quaver, as opposed to the two repeated quavers and crotchet of both previous versions, was somehow a more sophisticated reading.

In short, Rachmaninoff's thoughts on how the concerto should end have changed



dramatically in this version of the coda in 1941. Without a recapitulation of first subject material, he chooses instead to pass directly to the reference to the opening *tutti* and then into the coda. The rising harmonic sequences that were endemic to both versions are transformed to become the melodic impetus for the first part of the coda. This serves as long term pedal over D, forming as it does a perfect cadence for a new recapitulation, this time from the first subject of the first movement. It may have been Rachmaninoff's belief that the build up of dominant pedal passages and the recapitulation of first movement material in the tonic would provide the satisfying harmonic conclusion to the work that he believed was necessary. The 22 bars that follow, however, weaken the sense of the tonic, passing over a B major seventh chord before reaching a plagal cadence. Without the recapitulation of the first subject material that occurred in 1926 and 1928, the coda is reduced by 35 bars. The newly written coda, from the common point of departure, is now only 125 bars long.

In summarising the third movement of the Fourth Piano Concerto over the three versions, the removal of the recapitulation of first and second subjects and the replacement with a recapitulation of the first subject from the first movement led to a structure that is largely episodic. The third movement began under different circumstances with the removal of the quiet introduction with a short, loud outburst. Generally, the character of the movement was substantially changed by the revisions of the second subject, the initial contrast of a highly melodic theme disappearing. There was also some rewriting of the original development section. The version of 1928 was, in a retrospective sense, a compromise most easily characterised by the incorporation of

the absent recapitulation of the second subject into much of the newly written coda.

---

<sup>1</sup> Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 300.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 300.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p. 320.

## 6. CONCLUSION

To summarise the revisions to the Fourth Piano Concerto discussed in the preceding analysis chapter, 192 bars of music were removed over a period of 25 years. In the first movement, the reduction in size of both bridge passages lessened the importance of secondary melodic material, and gave less structural importance to the reappearance of the first subject in the recapitulation; rewriting in the development section altered the character of the piano part. In the second movement, the character of the piano part was vastly altered in the second and third sections, and there were some minor adjustments to phrase length, orchestration, and harmony in the first section. The most radical changes occurred in the third movement, the underlying ‘first movement sonata form’ being gradually eradicated, while the quiet introduction was removed, altering the connection between movements. The initially-envisaged contrast in character between the first and second subjects was gradually lessened, the second subject retaining only a fragment of its original melodic contour in the final version, and removal of material and alterations in piano writing occurred in the development section. In the original version, the first and second subjects were recapitulated before a fiery coda. In 1928, however, the first subject was recapitulated before moving straight to the coda, now incorporating the second subject. In the 1941 version, the recapitulation of the first and second subjects was dispensed with entirely, and the coda heralded an actual recapitulation of first movement material. Rachmaninoff used the final pages of the original ending in all three versions.

As Rachmaninoff's major concern in revising the Fourth Piano Concerto was its length, it may serve some use to compare the lengths of his recordings of all works for piano and orchestra.<sup>1</sup> Rachmaninoff's recording of the Fourth Piano Concerto (in December 1941, with Eugene Ormandy and the Philadelphia Orchestra) lasts 24'39". The duration of his recordings of the other concertos are: First Piano Concerto, 24'51"; Second Piano Concerto, 31'33" (1929 recording); Third Piano Concerto, 34'01" (from a considerably revised score); and the Rhapsody on a Theme of Paganini, 22'10". The Fourth Piano Concerto is therefore the second shortest of all his works for piano and orchestra.

The Third Piano Concerto, Rachmaninoff's longest work in this form, is respectably performed in its complete version (and with the larger of the two cadenzas) in a little under 45 minutes. (At a more cautious speed, it can sometimes last over 50 minutes). The Fourth Piano Concerto in the final 1941 version is therefore almost half the length of its predecessor. In Rachmaninoff's relentless quest for a shorter version of this work, it is curious to consider how much of the work's duration he razed. In a realistic estimate, the bridge passage material from the first movement of the concerto may add 2 – 3 minutes. The second movement, where the revisions were mainly concerned with rewriting of textures, would add less than a minute. In the third movement, the longer introduction may also add less than a minute, and the recapitulation of the first and second subjects may add 3 – 4 minutes. The codas, whilst substantially rewritten on each occasion, are of roughly the same duration. With a further 7 – 8 minutes of performance time, the Fourth Piano Concerto, using Rachmaninoff's *tempi* as a guide, would last for

31-32 minutes – or roughly the length of the Second Piano Concerto. The question of course begs: would a contemporary audience find a performance of the Fourth Piano Concerto in its original version too long?

While the chance for public and performers alike to learn and hear this work would be welcomed by those who have studied the score, there is a possibility that a suggestion might be made for a composite version. The Second Piano Sonata, since Horowitz's performances of it, has similarly had parts of the two authentic versions combined. It was noted that some of the amendments to the score, especially the 1928 version, were aimed at greater orchestral clarity and facility. For example, the woodwind parts in the opening *tutti* appear to have been made more playable in the second version. Likewise, in the second movement, the slight alterations to the harmony may indeed represent a richer score and a better reading of certain passages. However, this idea of a composite score, contentious for some, may run the risk of disservice. It may instead be possible to issue a 'critical edition' two-piano score that uses *ossias* and *vi-de* signs to show the later readings of smaller passages and to include an appendix containing the rewritten codas of the 1928 and 1941 versions. A full-score in this manner would be impossible. While a 'critical edition' may offer advantages to scholars, and while it would allow performers of this work the opportunity to evaluate for themselves the revisions that Rachmaninoff made, it is more likely that the manuscript version will be published as is. Regardless, it is hoped that a better understanding of the piece will provide insights to its interpretation.

\*

The Fourth Piano Concerto appears to have led an awkward life. It seems oddly sad that Rachmaninoff spent such a considerable portion of his life with this concerto without it ever finding overall acceptance. In light of the fact that some of the works which did not receive initial success have come to be regarded as very fine – the First and Third Symphonies being examples – it is curious to consider if there will be any more in the Fourth Piano Concerto’s story. Rachmaninoff undoubtedly spent a lot of time considering solutions to problems he saw with the work; from the outset, it seems, he had decided that it was too long. It is my opinion that the final version of the concerto is not the best version, and I favour the original score. However, the final version is far from inferior music, and those who are familiar with the recording of Arturo Benedetti Michelangeli<sup>2</sup> have noted that the concerto does not deserve “the neglect” that it receives.<sup>3</sup> Whether, however, audiences are intuitively wanting more – a response to a dissatisfying brevity in the final movement, perhaps – may only be known if the original version of the concerto becomes a part of the wider repertoire. One hopes that in its original version the work may have an honest, considered hearing, something it appears not yet to have had. Audiences, perhaps, may come to see the Fourth Piano Concerto as the innovative, poetic and dramatic work that it is, and find that the ‘Rachmaninoff’ many love is as evident here as in any of his other works.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sergei Rachmaninoff, *The Complete Recordings*, BMG Classics (09026 61265 2), 1992.

<sup>2</sup> Sergei Rachmaninoff, *Piano Concerto No.4 in G minor, Op.40*. EMI Records Ltd. (CD 749326 2),1988 (1958). Arturo Benedetti Michelangeli, Ettore Gracis, Philharmonia Orchestra.

<sup>3</sup> Barrie Martyn, op. cit., p. 308.



## APPENDIX – EXAMPLES

Unless otherwise indicated, the following examples are all from the Fourth Piano Concerto, op. 40, by Sergei Rachmaninoff. Every effort has been made to provide sufficient examples, although the use of the final version score for general reference would be beneficial.

As Rachmaninoff's sequence of figure numbers was necessarily altered for subsequent versions, the creation of reference points suitable for cross-comparison is problematic. Accordingly, all references to figure numbers in the following examples are to the 1941 version. Square brackets are used in the examples when referring to the 1926 or 1928 versions when denoting figure numbers for rewritten or removed passages, showing where they would correlate with the 1941 version; they do not necessarily denote the figure numbers Rachmaninoff used in the earlier versions. The use of rounded brackets indicates that a particular example exists in another version of the concerto but is not the one being directly quoted from.

Ex. 1a First Movement, 1926, II - 4

Allegro vivace (Alta breve)

Flute  
oboe

Strings  
Horns

clarinet

*p* *cresc.*

Ex. 1b First Movement, (1928) 1941, III - 4

Allegro vivace (Alta breve)

WOODWINDS

String

Horns

*cresc.*

Ex. 2a First Movement, 1926, II

Piccolo

Flutes 1, 2

Oboes 1, 2

Cor Anglais

Clarinets 1, 2

Bassoons 1, 2

Horns (1, 2)

Trumpets 1, 2

Trombones 1, 2 + Tuba

Timpani

Piano

Violins I

Violins II

Violas

Cellos

Double Basses

Ex.2b First Movement, (1928) 1941 □ -1

FL. I & II  
Ob. I & II  
C. In G  
CL. I & II  
Fag. I & II  
H. I  
H. II  
Trom. I  
Trom. II  
Tuba  
Timpani  
Piano  
Viol. I  
Viol. II  
Viola  
Vcllo  
Cb. Bass

FL. I & II  
Ob. I & II  
CL. I & II  
Fag. I & II  
H. I  
H. II  
Trom. I  
Trom. II  
Tuba  
Timpani  
Piano  
Viol. I  
Viol. II  
Viola  
Vcllo  
Cb. Bass

Ex.3a First Movement, First Subject, all versions, [1] +2

Handwritten musical notation for Ex.3a, showing three staves of music. The first staff is a treble clef with a key signature of one flat and a 3/4 time signature. The second and third staves are also treble clef. Brackets and annotations highlight specific features: "developed as motif in bridge passages" under the second staff, and "chromatic descending line" under the third staff.

Ex.3b First Movement, all versions, [5] +1

Handwritten musical notation for Ex.3b, showing piano accompaniment for the first movement. It includes a tempo marking "Poco meno mosso" and dynamic markings "poco cresc", "p", and "pp". The notation is spread across three systems of staves.

Ex. 3c First Movement, (1926) 1928, [6] + 1

The image shows a handwritten musical score for a piano and orchestra. The piano part is written on a grand staff with treble and bass clefs. The orchestral part is also on a grand staff, with labels for 'oboe', 'strings', and 'bassoon'. The piano part features a melodic line with a 'm.f.' dynamic marking. The orchestral part includes a 'p' dynamic marking. A bracket under the piano part's lower staff identifies a specific motif as a 'chromatic variant without quavers'.

Piano

Orch.

oboe

strings

bassoon

m.f.

p

motif of bridge passage  
(chromatic variant without quavers)

Ex. 4 First Movement, all versions, [13] + 7

Tempo come prima (Alla breve)

Orch.  
Strings

Orch.

Ex. 5 First Movement, (1926) 1928, [16] + 17

woodwinds

Ex. 6 First Movement, (1926) 1928, [19] + 21

strings

woodwinds

flute

Ex. 7a First Movement, 1926, [8] + 3

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 7a, labeled "Orch." and "p strings". The score is in G major (one flat) and 4/4 time. It consists of two staves. The upper staff contains a melodic line with eighth and sixteenth notes, including a trill. The lower staff contains a bass line with eighth notes. A dynamic marking of "p" is present. A crescendo hairpin is shown over the final two measures, which end with a fermata.

Ex. 7b First Movement, 1928, [8] + 3

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 7b, labeled "Orch." and "strings". The score is in G major (one flat) and 4/4 time. It consists of two staves. The upper staff contains a melodic line with eighth notes and a trill. The lower staff contains a bass line with eighth notes. A dynamic marking of "p" is present. A crescendo hairpin is shown over the final two measures, which end with a fermata.

Ex. 7c First Movement, 1941, [8] + 3

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 7c, labeled "Orch." and "Strings p". The score is in G major (one flat) and 4/4 time. It consists of two staves. The upper staff contains a melodic line with eighth notes and a trill, with an annotation "flute Clarinet" and a dynamic marking of "f". The lower staff contains a bass line with eighth notes and a dynamic marking of "p". A crescendo hairpin is shown over the final two measures, which end with a fermata.



Ex. 8a First Movement,  
(1926) 1928, [a]

Piano

The first system of the score consists of two staves. The top staff is for the Piano, starting with a treble clef and a key signature of two flats. It features a melodic line with eighth-note patterns and a dynamic marking of *p*. The bottom staff is for the Orchestra, starting with a bass clef and a key signature of two flats. It contains a bass line with a dynamic marking of *p*. Both staves are connected by a brace on the right side.

The second system of the score is for the Piano, consisting of two staves. The top staff has a treble clef and a key signature of two flats. It contains a melodic line with a dynamic marking of *pp* and a *rit.* marking. The bottom staff has a bass clef and a key signature of two flats. It contains a bass line with a *dim.* marking. The system concludes with a double bar line.

The third system of the score is for the Piano, consisting of two staves. The top staff has a treble clef and a key signature of two flats. It contains a melodic line with a *rit.* marking. The bottom staff has a bass clef and a key signature of two flats. It contains a bass line with a *dim.* marking. The system concludes with a double bar line.

Ex. 8b First Movement,  
1941, [9]

Piano

Handwritten musical score for Piano and Orchestra. The Piano part is written in treble clef with a key signature of two flats (B-flat and E-flat). It begins with a piano (*p*) dynamic and features a melodic line with eighth notes and a triplet of eighth notes. The score includes markings for *dim.* (diminuendo) and *rit.* (ritardando). The Orchestra part is written in bass clef and consists of a few notes, also marked with *rit.*

Handwritten musical score for Piano and Orchestra. The Piano part is written in treble clef with a key signature of two flats. It begins with a *pp* (pianissimo) dynamic and features a melodic line with a *dim.* marking. The score includes markings for *pp*, *mf* (mezzo-forte), and *bd.* (basso continuo). The Orchestra part is written in bass clef and consists of a few notes.

Ex. 9 First Movement  
 (1926) 1928, [III+4]

Piano

Orch.

bar removed

*p* *dim.* *mf* *veloce*

*p* *cola parte*

Ex. 10 First Movement, Second subject + Motif, (all versions)

[9] + 5

[12] - 3

Ex.11a First Movement, 1926, 15-4

Handwritten musical score for Ex.11a, First Movement, 1926, 15-4. The score is for an orchestra (Orch.) and consists of two staves: a treble clef staff for bassoons and a bass clef staff for strings. The key signature has one flat (B-flat). The bassoon part starts with a dynamic marking of *mf* and includes an upward-pointing arrow. The strings part starts with a dynamic marking of *mf*. Both parts feature a melodic line with slurs and accents. The piece concludes with a double bar line and a fermata.

Ex.11b First Movement, 1928, 15-4

Handwritten musical score for Ex.11b, First Movement, 1928, 15-4. The score is for an orchestra (Orch.) and consists of two staves: a treble clef staff for bassoons and a bass clef staff for strings. The key signature has one flat (B-flat). The bassoon part starts with a dynamic marking of *P* and includes an upward-pointing arrow. The strings part starts with a dynamic marking of *mf*. Both parts feature a melodic line with slurs and accents. The piece concludes with a double bar line and a fermata.

Ex.11c First Movement, 1941, 16-4

Handwritten musical score for Ex.11c, First Movement, 1941, 16-4. The score is for an orchestra (Orch.) and consists of two staves: a treble clef staff for bassoons and a bass clef staff for strings. The key signature has one flat (B-flat). The bassoon part starts with a dynamic marking of *pp*. The strings part starts with a dynamic marking of *mf*. Both parts feature a melodic line with slurs and accents. The piece concludes with a double bar line and a fermata.

Ex.12a First Movement, 1926, 1928, 15-4

Handwritten musical score for Ex.12a, First Movement, 1926, 1928, 15-4. The score is for piano (Piano) and consists of two staves: a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The key signature has one flat (B-flat). The piano part starts with a dynamic marking of *p*. The score features a complex melodic line with many slurs and accents. The piece concludes with a double bar line and a fermata.

Ex. 12b First Movement, 1941, 16-4

Handwritten musical score for Ex.12b, First Movement, 1941, 16-4. The score is for piano (Piano) and consists of two staves: a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The key signature has one flat (B-flat). The piano part starts with a dynamic marking of *p*. The score features a complex melodic line with many slurs and accents. The piece concludes with a double bar line and a fermata.

Ex. 13a First Movement, (1926) 1928, [15] + 3

Piano

*mf cresc.*

*f*

*dim.*

*f*

Ex. 13b First Movement, 1944, [15] + 3

Piano

*mf*

*f*

*dim.*

*f*

Ex. 14a First Movement, 1926. 118

Handwritten musical score for Piano and Orchestra (Orch) for measures 1-5. The Piano part is on a grand staff with dynamic markings #p, p, and pp. The Orchestra part includes staves for Strings, bassoon, and clarinet (etc.).

Handwritten musical score for Piano for measures 6-10. The score is on a grand staff with dynamic markings #p, p, and pp. There are fermatas and accents under some notes.

Ex. 14b First Movement,  
(1928) 1941, [18]

Piano

Orch

18

18

*p*

*p*

*poco sforsando*

*flutes*

*Tuba*

*clarinets*

*violin*

Ex. 15a First Movement, 1926, [19] +3

Piano

*f*

Ex. 15b First Movement, 1928, 1941, [19] +3

Piano

*f*

*crese.*

Ex. 16a First Movement, 1926, [24] + 4

Piano

pp

pp

Orch.

Flute

Cor Anglais

mf

Horns

Bassoons

Ex. 16b First Movement, 1928, [24] + 4

Piano

mf

p

Orch.

Flute

Cor Anglais

mf

Horns

Bassoons

Ex. 16c First Movement, 1941, [24] + 4

Piano

mf

p

Orch.

Flute

Cor Anglais

mf

Horns

Bassoons



Ex. 17a First Movement, (1926) 1928, [26] +4

musical score for piano and orchestra. The piano part is in the upper staves, and the orchestra part is in the lower staves. The piano part features a melodic line with a *mf* dynamic and a *dim.* marking. The orchestra part features a rhythmic accompaniment with a *pp* dynamic.

Ex. 17b First Movement, 1941, [26] +4

musical score for piano and orchestra. The piano part is in the upper staves, and the orchestra part is in the lower staves. The piano part features a melodic line with a *mf* dynamic. The orchestra part features a rhythmic accompaniment.

musical score for piano and orchestra. This is a continuation of the score from Ex. 17b. The piano part is in the upper staves, and the orchestra part is in the lower staves. The piano part features a melodic line with a *dim.* marking.

Ex. 18a First Movement, 1926, [27]

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 18a, First Movement, 1926, [27]. The score is written on four staves. The top two staves are in treble clef, and the bottom two are in bass clef. The music features a complex melodic line in the upper staves and a more rhythmic accompaniment in the lower staves. Dynamics include 'p' (piano) and 'cresc.' (crescendo). A dashed line with an arrow points to a specific note in the lower right section of the score.

Ex. 18b First Movement, 1941, [27]

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 18b, First Movement, 1941, [27]. The score is written on four staves. The top two staves are in treble clef, and the bottom two are in bass clef. The music features a complex melodic line in the upper staves and a more rhythmic accompaniment in the lower staves. Dynamics include 'p' (piano) and 'cresc.' (crescendo).

Ex. 19 First Movement, (1928) 1941, [28]-1

Piano

Orch.

1

2

m.g.

identical in all versions

rewritten in 1928 →  
two bars rewritten in 1941

Ex. 19 (continued)

29

The musical score consists of two systems of piano and violin parts. The piano part is written in two staves (treble and bass clef), and the violin part is in a single staff (treble clef). The key signature has one flat (B-flat), and the time signature is 4/4. The score includes several performance markings: *mf*, *crca*, *ff*, *marcato*, *cantabile*, *dim.*, and *p*. The score is divided into measures, with measure numbers 29 and 30 indicated in boxes. The first system (measures 29-30) is marked *mf* and *crca*. The second system (measures 31-32) is marked *ff* and *marcato*. The third system (measures 33-34) is marked *cantabile*. The fourth system (measures 35-36) is marked *dim.* and *p cantabile*. The fifth system (measures 37-38) is marked *dim.*. The score includes the following annotations: "recapitulation of opening tutti" (under measures 31-32), "recapitulation of first subject" (under measures 37-38), and "cresc." (under measure 35).

Ex. 20 First Movement, 1926, [28] -1

*lasciato*

Piano

Orch.

*p*

*pp*

*p*

*Tempo più vivo*

1

2

Viol 2

rewritten in subsequent versions  
→

Ex. 20 (Continued)

28

Handwritten musical score for two staves, labeled 1 and 2. The system contains measures 28 through 31. The notation includes complex rhythmic patterns with many beamed notes and rests. Measure numbers 28, 29, 30, and 31 are indicated at the bottom of the staves.

Handwritten musical score for two staves, labeled 1 and 2. The system contains measures 32 through 35. It includes dynamic markings such as *pp* and *ppp*, and performance instructions like *more cresc.*. Measure numbers 32, 33, 34, and 35 are indicated at the bottom of the staves.

Handwritten musical score for two staves, labeled 1 and 2. The system contains measures 36 through 39. The notation continues with complex rhythmic figures. Measure numbers 36, 37, 38, and 39 are indicated at the bottom of the staves.

Ex. 20 (continued)

recapitulation of opening tutti

The image shows a handwritten musical score for Ex. 20 (continued), consisting of three systems of piano and bass staves. The score is written in a major key with a 2/4 time signature. The tempo is marked "Allegro vivace". The first system starts at measure 28 and ends at measure 32. The second system starts at measure 33 and ends at measure 37. The third system starts at measure 38 and ends at measure 42. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, slurs, and dynamic markings like "p" and "f". There are also some handwritten annotations and corrections in the score.

Ex. 20  
(continued)

Handwritten musical score system 1, measures 311-312. It features two staves, 1 and 2. Staff 1 has a treble clef and contains a melodic line with triplets and a dynamic marking of *f*. Staff 2 has a bass clef and contains a bass line with triplets and a dynamic marking of *f*. A box containing the number 311 is placed above the first measure of staff 2. The system concludes with a double bar line and the measure number 312.

Handwritten musical score system 2, measures 313-314. It features two staves, 1 and 2. Staff 1 has a treble clef and contains a melodic line with triplets and a dynamic marking of *f*. Staff 2 has a bass clef and contains a bass line with triplets and a dynamic marking of *f*. The system concludes with a double bar line and the measure number 314.

Handwritten musical score system 3, measures 315-316. It features two staves, 1 and 2. Staff 1 has a treble clef and contains a melodic line with triplets and a dynamic marking of *p*. Staff 2 has a bass clef and contains a bass line with triplets and a dynamic marking of *p*. A box containing the number 315 is placed above the first measure of staff 1. The system concludes with a double bar line and the measure number 316. Below the staves, the text "recapitulation of first subject" is written.

Handwritten musical score system 4, measures 317-318. It features two staves, 1 and 2. Staff 1 has a treble clef and contains a melodic line with triplets and a dynamic marking of *p*. Staff 2 has a bass clef and contains a bass line with triplets and a dynamic marking of *p*. A box containing the number 317 is placed above the first measure of staff 1. The system concludes with a double bar line and the measure number 318. The word "cresc." is written above the staves.



Ex 21a First Movement, 1926, [32] + 4

Allegro vivace

Piano

[Allegro vivace]

Orch.

*f*

Piano

*p*

*ff*

Ex. 21b First Movement, (1928) (1941, 32) + 4

Allegro vivace

Piano

Allegro vivace

Orch.

*p*

This block contains the beginning of the musical score for Ex. 21b. It features two staves: the top staff is for Piano and the bottom staff is for Orchestral (Orch.) parts. Both are marked 'Allegro vivace'. The piano part starts with a treble clef and a key signature of one flat. The orchestral part starts with a bass clef and a key signature of one flat. The piano part has a dynamic marking of *pp* (pianissimo) and the orchestral part has a dynamic marking of *p* (piano).

*cresc.*

*sf*

*cresc.*

*sf*

*sf*

This block shows the continuation of the musical score for Ex. 21b. It consists of two systems of staves. The top system has piano and orchestral parts. The piano part has a *cresc.* (crescendo) marking and the orchestral part has an *sf* (sforzando) marking. The bottom system also has piano and orchestral parts. The piano part has a *cresc.* marking and the orchestral part has an *sf* marking. The piano part ends with a double bar line and a repeat sign.

Ex. 22 Second Movement, all versions, 33 - 5

Largo

Piano

derivative of first *sf* First Movement

*p*

*pp*

Largo

Orch.

This block shows the beginning of the musical score for Ex. 22. It features two staves: the top staff is for Piano and the bottom staff is for Orchestral (Orch.) parts. Both are marked 'Largo'. The piano part starts with a treble clef and a key signature of one flat. The orchestral part starts with a bass clef and a key signature of one flat. The piano part has a dynamic marking of *p* (piano) and the orchestral part has a dynamic marking of *pp* (pianissimo). There is a handwritten note above the piano part: 'derivative of first *sf* First Movement' with arrows pointing to specific notes in the piano part.

Ex. 23a Second Movement, First subject, all versions, 33



Ex. 23b Second Movement, chromatic variant of first subject, all versions, 36



Ex. 23c Second Movement, theme borrowed from Etude Talleux Op 33 No 3, all versions, 37



Ex. 24a Second Movement, 1926, 1928, 34 - 5

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 24a. It consists of two systems of staves. The top system is labeled 'Piano' and the bottom system is labeled 'Orch.'. Both systems are in common time (C). The Piano part features a complex texture with multiple triplet figures and slurs. The Orchestral part features a similar texture with multiple triplet figures and slurs. The score includes dynamic markings such as 'p' and 'pp'.

Ex. 24b Second Movement, 1941, [34]-5

Musical score for Ex. 24b, Second Movement, 1941, measures 34-5. The score is for Piano and Orchestra. The Piano part features a melodic line with triplets and dynamic markings including *p*, *mf*, *dim.*, and *pp*. The Orchestra part provides a rhythmic accompaniment with chords and triplets.

Ex. 25a Second Movement, 1926, [34] + 5

Musical score for Ex. 25a, Second Movement, 1926, measures 34 + 5. The score is for Piano. It features a complex melodic line with triplets and dynamic markings including *dim.* and *p*.

Ex. 25b Second Movement, 1928, [34] + 5

Musical score for Ex. 25b, Second Movement, 1928, measures 34 + 5. The score is for Piano. It features a complex melodic line with triplets and dynamic markings including *dim.* and *p*.

Ex. 26a Second Movement, 1926. [30]-1]

L'istesso tempo  
ma agitato

pp dim. pp ppp

ppp pp ppp pp

8ª bassa

48

Ex. 26b Second Movement, (1928) 1941

L'istesso tempo, ma agitato

Piano p dim. ppp

ppp pp ppp

Orch ppp pp

Ex. 27a Second Movement, 1926 (1928). [36]

*L'istesso tempo, ma agitato*

The first system of the musical score consists of two staves. The upper staff is in treble clef and contains a complex melodic line with many slurs and ornaments. The lower staff is in bass clef and provides a rhythmic accompaniment. Dynamic markings include *f* (forte) at the beginning, *dim.* (diminuendo) in the middle, and *6° basso* (sixth degree bass) at the end. Fingering numbers are visible above the notes in the upper staff.

**[36]** *L'istesso tempo, ma agitato*

The second system also consists of two staves. The upper staff continues the melodic line from the first system. The lower staff features a more pronounced accompaniment. Dynamic markings include *sf* (sforzando) and *marcato* (marked). Fingering numbers are present above the notes.

The third system continues the two-staff format. The upper staff has a melodic line with various slurs and ornaments. The lower staff provides accompaniment. Dynamic markings include *sf*, *dim.*, and *p* (piano). Fingering numbers are visible above the notes.

The fourth system consists of two staves, continuing the musical piece. The upper staff has a melodic line, and the lower staff has an accompaniment. Dynamic markings include *sf* and *p*. Fingering numbers are visible above the notes.

Ex. 27b Second Movement, 1941, [26]

*L'istesso tempo, ma agitato*

The musical score is divided into two systems. The first system is for Piano 1 (p1) and Piano 2 (p2). The second system is for Piano 1 (p1) and Piano 2 (p2). The score includes dynamic markings such as *ff*, *m.g.*, *m.d.*, and *f*. It also features complex rhythmic patterns and slurs. The tempo is marked *L'istesso tempo, ma agitato*. The score is written for two pianos (p1 and p2).

Ex. 28a Second Movement, 1926 (1928), [36] + 4

Musical score for piano, measures 36-40. The score is in 3/4 time and features a complex texture with multiple layers of chords and moving lines. The key signature has two flats. Dynamics include *ff*, *dim.*, and *p*. A *tr* (trill) is marked above the first measure. The word *trios* is written below the first measure.

Musical score for orchestra, measures 36-40. The score is in 3/4 time and features a complex texture with multiple layers of chords and moving lines. The key signature has two flats. Dynamics include *ff* and *pp*. The word *orch.* is written below the first measure.

Musical score for piano, measures 41-43. The score is in 3/4 time and features a complex texture with multiple layers of chords and moving lines. The key signature has two flats. Dynamics include *f*. The tempo/mood marking *cantabile e tranquillo* is written above the first measure.

Musical score for piano, measures 44-46. The score is in 3/4 time and features a complex texture with multiple layers of chords and moving lines. The key signature has two flats. Dynamics include *p*. A box containing the number 39 is located at the beginning of the first measure.



Ex. 28b Second Movement, 1941, [36] + 4

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 28b, Second Movement, 1941, measures 36-39. The score is for piano and harp. The piano part has two systems. The first system shows measures 36 and 37, with dynamics ranging from *ff* to *mf*. The harp part also has two systems, with dynamics including *pp* and *mf*. The piano part includes first and second endings for measures 38 and 39.

Ex. 29a Second Movement, 1926, [37] + 3

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 29a, Second Movement, 1926, measures 37-39. The score is for piano and orchestra. The piano part has two systems, with dynamics including *dim.* and accents. The orchestra part is for cor anglais, with dynamics including *dim.* and accents.

Ex. 29b Second Movement (1928) 1941, [37]

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 29b, Second Movement (1928) 1941, measure 37. The score is for piano and orchestra. The piano part has two systems, with dynamics including *dim.* and accents. The orchestra part is for cor anglais, with dynamics including *dim.* and accents.

Ex 30A Second Movement, (1926) 1928, [38]

Piano

Come prima

pp

Ex 30B Second Movement, 1941, [38]

Come prima

pp

Ex 31 a Second Movement, (1926) 1928, [39]-1

39

Piano

*poco cresc.*

39

Orch.

*p cantabile*

Theme

1

2

*poco cresc.*

1

2

*din.*

Fin. 2

Ex. 31 c Etude-Tableaux Op 33 N°3 in C, 1911 [published 1948], p. 3 15

poco a poco agitato

cresc.

portion borrowed for Fourth Piano Concerto, Second Movement

poco tranquillo

mf

dim.

p

Ex.31b Second Movement, 1941, [39] -1

1

*mf pesante*

39

*p cantabile*

39

*pp*

1

*cresc.*

2

*cresc.*

1

*ff*

2

Ex. 32 a Second Movement,  
1926, [40+4]

The image shows a handwritten musical score for Piano and Orchestra. The score is divided into two systems. The first system shows the beginning of the piece, with the Piano part starting with a *tr* (trill) and *pp* (pianissimo) dynamic. The Piano part features a melodic line with a *quasi glissando* marking and a *pp* dynamic, followed by a *mf* (mezzo-forte) dynamic. The Orchestra part starts with a *pp* dynamic and features a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes with triplets. The second system continues the Piano and Orchestra parts, with the Piano part ending with a *tr* and the Orchestra part ending with a *tr*. The score includes various musical notations such as dynamics (*pp*, *mf*), articulation (*tr*, *quasi glissando*), and performance instructions (*attacca subi*).

Ex.32b Second Movement,  
1941, [40] +4

Piano

Orch.

quasi crescendo  
pp M.G.  
pp

43  
attacca subito  
attacca subito

Ex. 33a Third Movement, 1926, [41] - 26

43

III

Allegro vivace

PIANO

Orch.

Allegro vivace

*p* *mf* *f*

motif

1

2

1

2

43

13



Ex. 33a (continued)

used in 1928, 1941

The musical score consists of three systems of two staves each, labeled 1 and 2. The first system shows a piano introduction with a *pp* dynamic. The second system includes markings for *poco cresc.*, *pp*, and *dim.*. The third system begins with the instruction *leggiero* and features a complex, rapid melodic line in the upper staff, with *dim.* and *pp* markings. The score concludes with a page number 36 in the bottom right corner.

Ex. 33b Third Movement, (1928) 1941, III  
41 - 12

Allegro vivace

PIANO

Orch.

1

2

*poco cresc.*

*pp*

*dim.*

*leggiero*

*dim.*

*pp*

Ex. 34 Third Movement, First subject, [41], all versions

Ex. 35 Third Movement, 1926, 1928, [46] - 4

Ex. 36a Third Movement, (1926) 1928, [49]

Ex. 36b Third Movement, 1941, [49]

Ex. 37a Third Movement, 1926, [49] + 2

*a Tempo meno mosso* 53

Piano

Orch.

1

2

1

2

127

130

133

Ex. 37b Third Movement, 1926, [53]

Musical score for piano, measures 53-55. The score is in 3/4 time and features a complex harmonic texture with many accidentals. The piano part is marked with a forte *f* dynamic.

Musical score for piano and orchestra, measures 56-58. The piano part is marked *leggiero* and *p*. The orchestra part is marked *woodwind* and *strings*. The piano part includes triplets and slurs.

Musical score for piano, measures 59-61. The score continues with complex harmonic textures and many accidentals.

Musical score for piano, measures 62-64. The piano part includes triplets and slurs. The score ends with a *f marc* dynamic marking.

Ex. 38a Third Movement, 1928, [49] + 2

50

*a Tempo meno mosso*

Piano

Ord.

1

2

1

2

Trumpet, solo drum

Strings, woodwinds

Ex. 38b Third Movement, 1928, [50] + 3

The musical score is written in G major and 3/4 time. It consists of four systems of staves. The first system shows a piano part with a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The second system includes woodwinds, upper strings, and lower strings. The third system continues the piano part. The fourth system shows a piano part with a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. Dynamics include *p*, *pp*, and *m.d.* (mezzo-forte). There are also markings for 's' (sforzando) and '8' (octave).

Ex. 38c Third Movement, 1928, 51

Piano

*p* *mp*

*cantabile*

51

Orch.

*mp* Violins I

clarinets, bassoons

Ex. 38d Third Movement, 1928, 53

Piano

*f*

53

Orch.

*mf* Flutes, clarinets

upper strings



Ex. 39a Third Movement, 1941, [49] + 2

51

*a Tempo meno mosso*

Piano

*f* *mf* *m.g.* *m.g.* *m.g.*

Orch.

*po meno mosso*

*sf* *p* strings

*m.g. p* *cresc.*

horn *mf* *cresc.*

[50] *mf* *dim.*

[50] (horn) *ppp* strings

Ex. 39b. Third Movement, 1941. [51]

Musical score for Ex. 39b, Third Movement, 1941, measures 51-53. The score is in 3/4 time and features piano accompaniment and woodwinds. The piano part (1 and 2) includes triplets and dynamic markings such as *p* and *mf*. The woodwind part includes a flute and clarinets/bassoons, with dynamic markings like *p* and *mf*. The key signature has two flats.

Ex. 39c. Third Movement, 1941, [53] -1

Musical score for Ex. 39c, Third Movement, 1941, measures 53-55. The score is in 3/4 time and features piano accompaniment and woodwinds. The piano part (1 and 2) includes triplets and dynamic markings such as *p* and *mf*. The woodwind part includes horns, woodwinds, and strings, with dynamic markings like *mf* and *marc.*. The key signature has two flats.

Ex.40a Third Movement, 1926, [54]

Tempo 1?

Piano

57 Tempo 1?

Woodwinds, strings, Brass

Orch.

*ff marcato*

2

*ff*

15

3

58

19

Strings

*a tempo (d=d)*

1

*rit.*

*pp*

*canabile*

*m.g.*

*m.g.*

*m.g.*

2

*pp*

*a tempo (d=d)*

11

Ex 40.6 Third Movement (1928) 1941, [54]

57

[54] Tempo I

piano

[54] Tempo I

Orch.  
ff marc.

ff

a tempo (♩=♩)

mf cantabile

m.d. m.d.

a tempo (♩=♩)

pp

Ex. 41a Third Movement, 1926, [56]

Piano

mf m.d. mp p

pp mf mp

Orch.

56 clarinet rit. dim.

Strings

Ex. 41b Third Movement, (1929) 1941, [56]

Piano

pp mf dim.

Orch.

56 pp poco

Ex. 42a Third Movement, 1926, 1928, [58]

Ex. 42b Third Movement, 1941, [58]

Ex. 43a Third Movement, 1926, [62]

Ex.43a (continued)

84

1  
2  
Flute  
Horns  
strings  
274

1  
2  
Bassoon  
279

1  
2  
lower strings  
283

first subject

Ex. 43a (continued)

3 bars common to all versions

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 43a (continued). The score is written on two systems of staves. The first system consists of two staves, labeled '1' and '2', with a brace on the left. The second system also consists of two staves, labeled '1' and '2', with a brace on the left. A vertical line with a bracket above it spans across the first three bars of both systems, labeled '3 bars common to all versions'. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings like 'f' and 'p'.



Ex. 43b Third Movement,  
1941, [62]

Handwritten musical score for measures 62 and 63. Measure 62 is labeled "first subject" with an arrow pointing to the first note. Measure 63 is labeled "motif" with a bracket. The score is in G major, 3/4 time, and includes piano (*p*) dynamics.

Handwritten musical score for measures 63 and 64. Measure 63 is labeled "63" and includes dynamics *cresc.*, *mf*, and *p*. Measure 64 is labeled "63" and includes dynamic *mf*. The score is in G major, 3/4 time.

Handwritten musical score for measures 64 and 65. Measure 64 is labeled "64" and includes dynamics *cresc.* and *f*. Measure 65 is labeled "65" and includes dynamic *f*. A bracket above measure 65 is labeled "common 3 bars". The score is in G major, 3/4 time.

Ex. 44a Third Movement,  
1926, [64]

Musical score for Ex. 44a, Third Movement, 1926, measures 63-64. The score is written for piano and features a complex rhythmic pattern with many sixteenth and thirty-second notes. Measure 63 is marked with a circled '63'. Measure 64 is marked with a circled '64'. The piece concludes with a fermata over a final chord.

Musical score for Ex. 44a, Third Movement, 1926, measures 65-66. The score is written for piano and continues the complex rhythmic pattern from the previous system. Measure 65 is marked with a circled '65'. Measure 66 is marked with a circled '66'. The piece concludes with a fermata over a final chord.

Ex. 44b Third Movement, [64]  
(1928) 1941, [64]

Musical score for Ex. 44b, Third Movement, 1928/1941, measures 63-64. The score is written for piano and features a complex rhythmic pattern with many sixteenth and thirty-second notes. Measure 63 is marked with a circled '63'. Measure 64 is marked with a circled '64'. The piece concludes with a fermata over a final chord. Performance markings include *stacc.* and *p*.

Musical score for Ex. 44b, Third Movement, 1928/1941, measures 65-66. The score is written for piano and continues the complex rhythmic pattern from the previous system. Measure 65 is marked with a circled '65'. Measure 66 is marked with a circled '66'. The piece concludes with a fermata over a final chord. Performance markings include *cresc.* and *p*.

Ex. 45 Third Movement, 1941, [66]

piano

68

66

Orch.

trombone

last subject

celli, bassi

Detailed description: This block shows the beginning of a musical passage. The piano part (top) starts at measure 68 with a treble clef and a key signature of two flats. It features a melodic line with a fermata over the final note. The orchestra part (bottom) starts at measure 66 with a bass clef and a key signature of two flats. It includes parts for trombone, cellos, and basses. The trombone part is marked with a forte 'f' dynamic and includes the instruction 'last subject'. The cellos and basses part is marked with a piano 'p' dynamic.

1

2

strings

(trombone)

woodwind

Detailed description: This block shows the string and woodwind parts for measures 66-68. The strings part (top) is marked with a piano 'p' dynamic and features a complex rhythmic pattern. The woodwind part (bottom) includes a trombone part marked with a piano 'p' dynamic and a woodwind part. The woodwind part has a '2' above it, possibly indicating a second ending or a specific woodwind instrument.

67

68

1

2

Detailed description: This block shows the piano and orchestra parts for measures 67-68. The piano part (top) starts at measure 67 with a treble clef and a key signature of two flats. It features a melodic line with a fermata over the final note. The orchestra part (bottom) starts at measure 67 with a bass clef and a key signature of two flats. It includes parts for strings, woodwinds, and brass. The strings part is marked with a piano 'p' dynamic. The woodwind part has a '2' above it. The brass part includes a trombone part marked with a piano 'p' dynamic.

Ex. 46a Third Movement, 1926

[66]

Piano

Orch.

woodwinds

Violins I

cor anglais, clarinet

Piano

Orch.

lower strings

Ex. 46b Third Movement, 1928, [66]

Piano

mf

Ex. 47a Third Movement, (1926) 1928, [68] + 1

Piano

*mf* *cresc.*

Ex. 47b Third Movement, 1941, [68] + 1

*p*

Ex. 48 Third Movement, 1926, [71-3]

69

common to all versions

1  
2

344 349

1  
2

74 recapitulation of first subject  
marcato

350 359

1  
2

360 369

Tab 2

Ex. 48 (continued)

70

Musical score for measures 70-75. The score is written for two staves, labeled 1 and 2. Staff 1 is the upper voice and staff 2 is the lower voice. The music is in a complex rhythmic pattern with many sixteenth and thirty-second notes. A *dim.* (diminuendo) marking is present above the first measure of staff 1. A circled measure number 75 is located above the first measure of staff 2. The piece concludes with a double bar line and the number 352.

Musical score for measures 76-81. The score is written for two staves, labeled 1 and 2. Staff 1 is mostly empty with a *rit.* (ritardando) marking above it. Staff 2 contains the main musical activity, including a *dim.* marking above the final measure. The piece concludes with a double bar line and the number 364.

Musical score for measures 82-88. The score is written for two staves, labeled 1 and 2. Staff 1 is mostly empty with the instruction "opening tutti" and a downward-pointing arrow above it. Staff 2 begins with a circled measure number 82 and contains the main musical activity. A *p* (piano) marking is present below the first measure of staff 2. The piece concludes with a double bar line and the number 368.

Ex. 48 (Continued)

71

1  
2

*f* *dim.* *f*

372

1  
2

*p* *poco rit.*

376

a Tempo meno mosso

1  
2

*p* *pp*

377

380



Ex. 48 (continued)

72

Musical score for measures 72-77. The score is written for two staves, labeled 1 and 2. The key signature has two flats. The first staff (1) contains a melodic line with a dynamic marking of *p* at the beginning and *arab.* later. The second staff (2) contains a bass line with a dynamic marking of *mf* at the end. The text "Second subject" is written below the second staff. The measure number 77 is indicated at the end of the system.

Musical score for measures 78-83. The score is written for two staves, labeled 1 and 2. The first staff (1) contains a melodic line with a dynamic marking of *f* at the end. The second staff (2) contains a bass line with a dynamic marking of *p* and the instruction *poco marcato*. The measure number 78 is indicated in a box above the second staff. The measure number 83 is indicated at the end of the system.

Musical score for measures 84-89. The score is written for two staves, labeled 1 and 2. The first staff (1) contains a melodic line with a dynamic marking of *f* at the beginning. The second staff (2) contains a bass line with a dynamic marking of *p* at the end. The measure number 89 is indicated at the end of the system.

Ex. 48 (cont.)

78



1

2

395

79 middle 16 bars

1

2

399

404

Detailed description: This page contains three systems of musical notation for a piano piece. Each system consists of two staves, labeled '1' and '2'. The first system (measures 395-398) features a complex, rhythmic melody in the upper staff with many sixteenth notes and slurs, and a more rhythmic accompaniment in the lower staff. The second system (measures 399-403) includes a 'dim.' (diminuendo) marking in both staves and a bracketed section labeled '79 middle 16 bars' in the upper staff. The third system (measures 404-407) continues the melodic and accompanimental lines, with some triplets and slurs in the upper staff. The page number '78' is at the top right, and measure numbers '395', '399', and '404' are at the end of their respective systems.

— Ex. 48 (cont)

74

The musical score consists of three systems, each with a piano (1) and bass (2) staff. The first system starts at measure 74 and ends at measure 80, marked with a box containing the number 80. The second system starts at measure 81 and ends at measure 87, marked with a box containing the number 87. The third system starts at measure 88 and ends at measure 94, marked with a box containing the number 94. The tempo marking "poco a poco più mosso" is placed above the third system. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings like *f* and *p*.

80

87

94

poco a poco più mosso

Ex. 48 (cont.)

78

First system of musical notation, measures 421-425. It consists of two staves, labeled 1 and 2. Staff 1 contains a complex melodic line with triplets and slurs. Staff 2 provides a harmonic accompaniment. Dynamics include *p*, *mf*, and *f*. The key signature has one sharp (F#).

Second system of musical notation, measures 426-430. It consists of two staves, labeled 1 and 2. Staff 1 continues the melodic line with slurs and accents. Staff 2 continues the accompaniment. Dynamics include *p* and *mf*. The key signature has one sharp (F#).

Third system of musical notation, measures 431-435. It consists of two staves, labeled 1 and 2. Staff 1 features a highly technical melodic passage with many slurs and accents. Staff 2 continues the accompaniment. Dynamics include *mf*, *f*, and *mf*. The key signature has one sharp (F#).

Ex. 48 (cont.)

76

*Agitato* ~~*ritardando*~~ *accelerando*

1  
2

trill

trill of second subject

433

437

442

447

atan

Ex. 48 (cont.)

The musical score is divided into three systems, each with two staves (1 and 2).  
- **System 1:** Starts with a treble clef and a key signature of one sharp (F#). The tempo is marked 'Vivace'. It features a complex rhythmic pattern with many sixteenth and thirty-second notes. A 'Coda' section begins at measure 188, marked with a box containing '188'. The system ends at measure 249.  
- **System 2:** Continues the piece with similar rhythmic complexity. It includes dynamic markings such as 'p' (piano) and 'f' (forte). The system ends at measure 251.  
- **System 3:** The final system, starting at measure 252. It continues the intricate rhythmic patterns and concludes with a final cadence at measure 264.

Ex. 48 (cont.)

78

Musical score for Ex. 48 (cont.), consisting of three systems of piano and bass staves. The first system includes markings for *dim.*, *p*, and measure numbers 47 and 47. The second system includes measure numbers 48 and 49. The third system includes the tempo marking *Più mosso* and measure number 49. The score is written in a key signature of one flat and a 3/4 time signature.

Ex. 48 (cont.)

79

Handwritten musical score for the first system of Ex. 48 (cont.), measures 487-491. The system consists of two staves, labeled 1 and 2. Staff 1 is the upper voice, and staff 2 is the lower voice. The music is in a major key with a 3/4 time signature. It features complex rhythmic patterns, including triplets and sixteenth notes. A fermata is placed over the final measure of the system. The measure number 491 is written at the end of the system.

*sempre accel.*

Handwritten musical score for the second system of Ex. 48 (cont.), measures 492-496. The system consists of two staves, labeled 1 and 2. The music continues with complex rhythmic patterns. A fermata is placed over the final measure of the system. The measure number 496 is written at the end of the system.

B major 7<sup>th</sup>

Handwritten musical score for the third system of Ex. 48 (cont.), measures 497-503. The system consists of two staves, labeled 1 and 2. The music continues with complex rhythmic patterns. A fermata is placed over the final measure of the system. The measure number 503 is written at the end of the system.



Ex. 48 (cont.)

80

Musical score for Ex. 48 (cont.), consisting of three systems of two staves each (labeled 1 and 2). The score is written in treble and bass clefs. The first system includes the tempo marking "Pronto" and the dynamic marking "leggiero". The second system includes the dynamic marking "dim.". The third system includes the dynamic marking "p". The score is numbered 80, 81, and 82 at the end of each system.

Ex. 48 (cont.)

81

Musical score for measures 90-91. The score is written for two staves, labeled 1 and 2. The key signature has one sharp (F#) and the time signature is 3/4. Measure 90 features a piano (*p*) dynamic. Measure 91 features a forte (*f*) dynamic and a *cresc.* marking. The notation includes various rhythmic values and articulation marks.

Musical score for measures 92-93. The score is written for two staves, labeled 1 and 2. Measure 92 features a piano (*p*) dynamic. Measure 93 features a forte (*f*) dynamic and a *cresc.* marking. The notation includes various rhythmic values and articulation marks. The text "Second subject" is written below the second staff.

Musical score for measures 94-95. The score is written for two staves, labeled 1 and 2. The notation includes various rhythmic values and articulation marks. A *cresc.* marking is present in the second staff. The page number 539 is visible at the bottom right of the score.

Ex. 48 (cont.)

92

The musical score consists of three systems of two staves each, labeled 1 and 2. The first system includes a circled measure number '93' and the instruction 'Dominant pedal' written below the bass staff. The second system continues the piece. The third system includes measure numbers '94' and '95' and the instruction 'Tonic' written below the bass staff. Performance markings include 'p' (piano), 'mf' (mezzo-forte), and 'marcato' in both staves of the third system. The score is written in a key with one flat and a 3/4 time signature.

Ex. 48 (cont.)

85

The musical score for Ex. 48 (cont.) is presented in three systems, each with two staves (1 and 2). The first system (measures 83-88) features a melodic line in staff 1 with slurs and a dynamic marking of *p*. The second system (measures 89-94) includes a dynamic marking of *ff* and a measure number of 93. The third system (measures 95-97) shows a final melodic phrase in staff 1 with a dynamic marking of *ff* and a measure number of 96. To the right of the third system, there are four empty staves. The page number 85 is located in the upper right corner.

Ex. 49 Third Movement, 1928, [71] - 3

68 *Common to all versions*

1 *cresc.*

2 *cresc.*

69

70 *recapitulation of first subject*

71

...tr.

Ex. 49 (cont.)

8 67

The musical score consists of three systems of staves. The first system has two staves, labeled 1 and 2. The second system also has two staves, labeled 1 and 2. The third system has two staves, labeled 1 and 2. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings. Key markings include 'L'istesso tempo (♩ = ♩)' in both systems 2 and 3, and 'opening tutti' below the second staff of system 3. Dynamic markings include 'dim.' in the first system, 'p' and 'cresc.' in the second system, and 'ff' in the third system. The score is numbered 8 at the beginning and 67 at the top right.

Ex. 49 (cont.)

68

The musical score consists of three systems, each with two staves (1 and 2).  
System 1: Staff 1 is marked *marcato*. Staff 2 has a *p* dynamic marking.  
System 2: Labeled *Coda* and *Lo stesso tempo (♩=♩)*. Staff 1 is marked *p marcato*. Staff 2 is marked *cadenza* and *f-p*.  
System 3: Staff 1 has a *p* dynamic marking. Staff 2 is marked *Cadenza*.

Ex. 49 (cont.)

69

Musical score for measures 69-73. The score is in two systems, labeled 1 and 2. The key signature has one sharp (F#) and the time signature is 3/4. Measure 69 is marked with a *mf* dynamic. A *motif* is indicated in measure 70. Measure 71 is marked with a *p* dynamic. Measure 72 is marked with a *mf* dynamic. Measure 73 is marked with a *dim.* dynamic. The bottom staff of each system contains a bass line with sustained notes.

Musical score for measures 74-78. The score is in two systems, labeled 1 and 2. The key signature has one sharp (F#) and the time signature is 3/4. Measure 74 is marked with a *p* dynamic. The section is labeled "second subject" above the first staff. Measure 75 is marked with a *poco cresc.* dynamic. Measure 76 is marked with a *p* dynamic. Measure 77 is marked with a *mf* dynamic. Measure 78 is marked with a *mf* dynamic. The bottom staff of each system contains a bass line with sustained notes.

Musical score for measures 79-83. The score is in two systems, labeled 1 and 2. The key signature has one sharp (F#) and the time signature is 3/4. Measure 79 is marked with a *cresc.* dynamic. Measure 80 is marked with a *cresc.* dynamic. Measure 81 is marked with a *cresc.* dynamic. Measure 82 is marked with a *cresc.* dynamic. Measure 83 is marked with a *cresc.* dynamic. The bottom staff of each system contains a bass line with sustained notes.

Fine



Ex. 49 (cont.)

70

Musical score for Ex. 49 (cont.), consisting of three systems of two staves each (labeled 1 and 2). The score is in 3/4 time and features complex rhythmic patterns and dynamic markings.

System 1 (measures 70-75):  
Staff 1: *Più mosso*  
Staff 2: *Più mosso*, [75] middle 16 bars

System 2 (measures 76-81):  
Staff 1: *p*  
Staff 2: [78]

System 3 (measures 82-87):  
Staff 1: *dim.*  
Staff 2: *dim.*, *p*

Table 2

Ex. 49 (cont.)

Musical score for Ex. 49 (cont.), consisting of three systems of piano and bass staves. The first system (measures 71-77) features a piano part with a melodic line and a bass part with a rhythmic accompaniment. The second system (measures 78-84) includes dynamic markings such as *dim.*, *p*, and *pp*, and a tempo change to *Più vivo*. The third system (measures 85-91) continues the piece with complex piano textures and a steady bass accompaniment. The score is marked with measure numbers 71, 77, and 78.

Ex. 49 (cont.)

72

The musical score consists of three systems, each with two staves (1 and 2). The first system starts with a treble clef and a key signature of one sharp (F#). It features a complex melodic line in staff 1 with many slurs and ties, and a more rhythmic accompaniment in staff 2. The word "cresc." is written above the first staff. The second system continues the piece, with a circled measure number "73" in the second staff. The word "B major 7" is written below the second staff. The third system also continues the piece, with "cresc." written above the first staff and "p" written below the second staff. The score ends with a double bar line.

Titr 2

Ex. 49 (cont.)

73

**System 1:** *Presto*  
1. *mf*  
2. *cresc.*

**System 2:** [80] *Presto*  
2. *pp*  
*Second subject*

**System 3:** 1. *mf*  
2. *cresc.*  
*Dominant pedal*

Tab. 8

Ex. 49 (cont.)

74

The musical score consists of three systems, each with two staves (1 and 2). The first system (measures 74-77) features a treble staff with a melodic line and a bass staff with a rhythmic accompaniment. The second system (measures 78-81) includes a box labeled 'B2' in the bass staff and a 'C minor 7' chord marking below it. The third system (measures 82-85) continues the piece with various dynamics and articulations. The score includes dynamic markings such as *f*, *p*, *crec.*, *pp*, and *ppp*, as well as articulation marks like accents and slurs. The piece concludes with a 'rit.' marking at the end of the third system.

Ex. 49 (cont.)

75

The musical score consists of three systems, each with two staves (1 and 2). The first system includes a *ff* dynamic marking and a *marcato* instruction. A handwritten note 'tonic' is written below the first staff of the first system. The second system continues the piece. The third system concludes with a double bar line and a *ff* dynamic marking. The score is written in a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a 2/4 time signature.

Imp. Edouard-Dupré - Paris-Lyon  
4 N. de Arènes de la Seine - 137111

T. 112

GRAND ÉCRAN

Ex. 50 Third Movement, 1941, [69] -1

67

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 50, Third Movement, 1941, measures 69-71. The score is written for two staves (1 and 2) and includes performance instructions such as *ff*, *mf*, *cresc.*, and *L'istesso tempo*. The score is divided into three systems. The first system covers measures 69-70, the second system covers measures 70-71, and the third system covers measures 71-72. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings. The tempo instruction *L'istesso tempo* is repeated at the beginning of the third system. The score is annotated with "common to all versions" and "opening tutti".

68 Ex. 50 (cont.)

The musical score consists of three systems, each with two staves labeled 1 and 2. The first system shows a piano introduction with a melodic line in staff 2 and a bass line in staff 1. The second system features a complex texture with a melodic line in staff 1, a dense rhythmic accompaniment in staff 2, and a bass line in staff 1. The third system concludes with a melodic line in staff 1 and a bass line in staff 2, marked with dynamics like *ff*, *trem.*, and *din.*



Ex. 50 (cont.)

72 Coda

1. *pp*

2. *p*

rising scale

1. *ppp*

2. *p*

73

78

79

1. *cresc.*

2. *mf*

*cresc.*

*mf*

70 Ex. 50 (cont.)

1

2

74

*mf cresc.*

*cresc.*

74

1

2

*pp*

*p*

75

*poco cresc.*

75

*p*

Ex. 50 (cont.)

The first system of musical notation consists of two staves. The upper staff is in treble clef and the lower staff is in bass clef. Both staves are in a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a 3/4 time signature. The music features a continuous eighth-note pattern in the upper staff and a more complex rhythmic pattern in the lower staff. Dynamic markings include *mf* (mezzo-forte) in both staves.

The second system of musical notation consists of two staves. The upper staff is in treble clef and the lower staff is in bass clef. Both staves are in a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a 3/4 time signature. The music continues with eighth-note patterns. A *dim.* (diminuendo) marking is present in the lower staff towards the end of the system.

The third system of musical notation consists of two staves. The upper staff is in treble clef and the lower staff is in bass clef. Both staves are in a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a 3/4 time signature. The upper staff is marked *73 scherzando* and *p* (piano). The lower staff is marked *76 dolce* and *p*. The music features triplet patterns in the upper staff and sustained chords in the lower staff.

hint at second subject

72 Ex. 50 (cont.)

1

*cresc.* *sf* *p*

2

77

*mf*

1

77

*mf*

2

*dim.* *f* *mf*

Ex. 50 (cont.)

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 50 (cont.) on page 73. The score is written on four systems of staves. The first system includes a 'first subject' annotation and a 'p' dynamic marking. The second system includes a 'cresc.' marking. The third system includes first and second endings. The score features complex rhythmic patterns and various musical notations.

74 Ex. 50 (cont.)

First system of musical notation, measures 79-80. It consists of two staves, 1 and 2. Measure 79 is marked with a box containing the number 79. The music is in a key with one sharp (F#) and a 3/4 time signature. The first staff (1) features a melodic line with slurs and accents, starting with a forte (*f*) dynamic. The second staff (2) provides a harmonic accompaniment with chords and some melodic fragments.

Second system of musical notation, measures 81-84. It consists of two staves, 1 and 2. Measure 81 is marked with a box containing the number 81. The music continues in the same key and time signature. The first staff (1) has a melodic line with slurs and accents, marked with a fortissimo (*ff*) dynamic. The second staff (2) features a rhythmic accompaniment with triplets and chords, also marked with a fortissimo (*ff*) dynamic.

Third system of musical notation, measures 85-86. It consists of two staves, 1 and 2. Measure 85 is marked with a box containing the number 85. The music is in a key with one sharp (F#) and a 3/4 time signature. The first staff (1) has a melodic line with slurs and accents, marked with a fortissimo (*ff*) dynamic and the instruction *presente e ritmato*. The second staff (2) has a rhythmic accompaniment with chords, marked with a fortissimo (*ff*) dynamic and the instruction *rit.* (ritardando). Measure 86 is marked with a box containing the number 86 and the instruction *A tempo rubato*.

recapitulation of First Movement material.

Ex. 50 (cont.)

75

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 50 (cont.), consisting of six systems of music. The notation is arranged in three pairs of staves (treble and bass clef). The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings. Key markings include *ritando*, *A tempo (♩ = ♩)*, *ff*, and *ff marc.*. The score is divided into measures by vertical bar lines, with some measures containing repeat signs. The handwriting is clear and legible.

76 Ex. 50 (cont.)

The musical score is divided into three systems, each with two staves (1 and 2).  
System 1: Starts with a boxed measure number 52. Staff 1 has a dynamic marking of *ff*. Staff 2 has a dynamic marking of *mf*. Below the staves, the text "B major 7" is written.  
System 2: Staff 1 has a dynamic marking of *ff*. Staff 2 has a dynamic marking of *mf*.  
System 3: Starts with a boxed measure number 53. Staff 1 has dynamic markings of *ff*, *mf*, and *cresc.*. Staff 2 has dynamic markings of *ff*, *p*, and *cresc.*



Ex. 50 (cont.)

Handwritten musical score for Ex. 50 (cont.) on page 77. The score is written for piano and consists of four systems of music. Each system has a grand staff with a treble and bass clef. The first system shows a complex melodic line in the treble and a rhythmic accompaniment in the bass. The second system includes dynamic markings *ff* and *mf* and a measure number **84** in a box. The third system includes *cresc.*, *f*, and *pp* markings, and a handwritten note "C minor 7 (90)". The fourth system continues the melodic and harmonic development.

Ex. 50 (cont.)

78

Musical score for measures 78-80. The score is in two systems, labeled 1 and 2. System 1 (top) has a treble clef and a key signature of one flat. System 2 (bottom) has a bass clef and a key signature of one flat. The music features complex chordal textures and melodic lines. A dynamic marking of *ff* is present at the end of measure 80.

Musical score for measures 81-84. The score is in two systems, labeled 1 and 2. System 1 (top) has a treble clef and a key signature of one flat. System 2 (bottom) has a bass clef and a key signature of one flat. The music features complex chordal textures and melodic lines. Dynamic markings include *ff* and *marcato*. A *tonic* marking is present below the bass staff in measure 82.

Musical score for measures 85-88. The score is in two systems, labeled 1 and 2. System 1 (top) has a treble clef and a key signature of one flat. System 2 (bottom) has a bass clef and a key signature of one flat. The music features complex chordal textures and melodic lines. Dynamic markings include *f* and *p*. Measure numbers 85 and 85 are boxed in the first and second staves respectively.

Ex. 50 (cont.)

The musical score is written for piano and consists of three systems of four staves each. The first system features a melodic line in the upper right staff with a sixteenth-note triplet marked with a dashed box and the number '6'. The second system includes dynamic markings of *ff* in the upper right and lower left staves. The third system also features a sixteenth-note triplet in the upper right staff, marked with a dashed box and the number '6', and *ff* markings in the lower left and lower right staves. The notation includes various note values, rests, and articulation marks.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

Rachmaninoff, Sergei. *Concert pour Piano (No.4) Op.40* (1926) [unpublished], Library of Congress, Washington DC; ML 30.55a R3 [11a]

Rachmaninoff, Sergei. *4me Concerto pour Piano et Orchestre Op.40, (Partition d'Orchestre)*, Paris: Edition "TAIR", 1928.

Rachmaninoff, Sergei. *4me Concerto pour Piano Op.40, (Reduction pour 2 Piano a 4 mains par l'auteur)*, Paris: Edition "TAIR", 1928

Rachmaninoff, Sergei. *4<sup>th</sup> Concerto for Piano Op.40*, New York: Charles Foley, 1944. [Full score]

Rachmaninoff, Sergei. *Fourth Concerto Op.40, (Two Pianos - Four Hands)*, New York: Charles Foley, 1946.

### Secondary Sources

Belaiev, Victor. 'Sergei Rakhmaninov', *Musical Quarterly* 13 (July 1927), pp. 359-76.

Bertensson, Sergei. 'Rachmaninoff As I Knew Him', *Etude* 66 (March 1948), p. 138.

Bertensson, Sergei and Leyda, Jay. *Sergei Rachmaninoff: A Lifetime in Music*. New York: New York University Press, 1956.

Briantseva, V N. *S.V.Rakhmaninov*. Moscow: Sovetskii Kompozitor, 1976, pp. 514-25 [trans. Phillip Shovk (unpublished)].

Campbell, Stuart (ed.). *Russians on Russian Music, 1830-1880*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Cannata, David Butler. *Rachmaninoff's Changing View of Symphonic Structure*. Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1992. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms International, 1993.

- Cannata, David Butler. 'Rachmaninoff's Concept of Genre'. *Studies in Music* 15 (1995). London (Canada): Department of Music History, Faculty of Music, University of Western Ontario, pp. 59-74.
- Chassins, Abram. *Speaking of Pianists*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1957.
- Coolidge, Richard. 'Architectonic Technique and Innovations in the Rakhmaninov Piano Concertos', *Music Review* 40 (August 1979), pp. 170-216.
- Culshaw, John. *Sergei Rachmaninov*. London: Dennis Dobson Limited, 1949.
- Grove, Sir George. *Dictionary of Music and Musicians* 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Eric Blom (ed). London: Macmillan, 1954.
- Grove, Sir George. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Stanley Sadie (ed.). London: Macmillan, 1980.
- Hershberger, Jay. *Rachmaninoff on Rachmaninoff: an Interpretive Analysis of his Piano/Orchestra Recordings*. DMA diss. Arizona State University, 1995. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms International, 1995.
- Leonard, Richard. *A History of Russian Music*. New York: Macmillan, 1957.
- Lyle, Watson. *Rachmaninoff*. London: W. Reeves, 1939.
- Martyn, Barrie. *Nicholas Medtner: His Life and Music*. London: Scholar Press, 1995.
- Martyn, Barrie. *Rachmaninoff: Composer, Pianist, Conductor*. London: Scholar Press, 1990.
- Martyn, Barrie. 'Rachmaninoff and Medtner', *Studies in Music* 15 (1995). London (Canada): Department of Music History, Faculty of Music, University of Western Ontario, pp. 87-94.
- McLean, Hugh J. 'Introduction to the Proceedings of the International Rachmaninoff Symposium', *Studies in Music* 15 (1995) London (Canada): Department of Music History, Faculty of Music, University of Western Ontario, pp. 21-2.
- Norris, Geoffrey. *Rakhmaninov*. London: J.M.Dent, 1976.
- Norris, Geoffrey. 'Rackhmaninov's Apprenticeship', *Musical Times* 124 (October 1983), pp. 602-05.
- Norris, Geoffrey. 'Rakhmaninov's Second Thoughts', *Musical Times* 114 (April 1973), pp. 364-68.

- Palmieri, Robert. *Sergei Vasil'evich Rachmaninoff: A Guide to Research*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1985.
- Piggott, Patrick. *Rachmaninov*. London: Faber and Faber, 1978.
- Rachmaninoff, Sergei. 'Music Should Speak From the Heart', (Interview with David Ewen) *Etude* 59 (December 1941), pp. 804, 849.
- Riesemann, Oskar von. *Rachmaninoff's Recollections*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1934.
- Ruud, Charles A. 'Fin de Siecle Culture and the Shaping of Rachmaninoff', *Studies in Music*. 15 (1995) Department of Music History, Faculty of Music, University of Western Ontario, pp. 23-38.
- Sabaneyeff, Leonid. *Modern Russian Composers*. New York: International Publishers, 1927.
- Seaman, Gerald. *History of Russian Music, vol 1*. Oxford: Alden and Mowbray, 1967.
- Schonberg, Harold C. *The Great Pianists*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963.
- Seroff, Victor. *Rachmaninoff*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950.
- Swan, Alfred and Swan, Katherine. 'Rachmaninoff: Personal Reminiscences', *Musical Quarterly* 30 (January 1944), pp. 1-19, and (April 1944), pp. 174-91.
- Threlfall, Robert. 'Rachmaninoff's Revisions and an Unknown Version of his Fourth Concerto', *Musical Opinion* 96 (February 1973), pp. 235-37.
- Threlfall, Robert. *Sergei Rachmaninoff: His Life and Music*. London: Boosey and Hawkes, 1973.
- Threlfall, Robert and Norris, Geoffrey. *A Catalogue of the Compositions of S. Rachmaninoff*. London: Scolar Press, 1982.
- Walker, Robert. *Rachmaninoff: His Life and Times*. Tunbridge, Kent (Eng.): Midas Books, 1980.
- Yasser, Joseph. 'The Opening Theme of Rachmaninoff's Third Piano Concerto and its Liturgical Prototype', *Musical Quarterly* 55 (July 1969), pp. 312-28.