

is the revolutionary aspect of the violin writing. This abounds in new combinations of stopped tones and arrangements of harmonics. Aside from the obvious freshness of the material of *Jeu de Cartes* and the tightness of its detailed harmonic technique, the wonder here lies in the use of the subtlest formal devices: anticipated and overlapped phrases, carefully organized cyclical returns, and in the great variety of rhythmic pace.

Hindemith's *Konzertmusik* for strings and brass is his most inspired work before *Mathis*. Though imperfect in many technical respects, it moves from one beautiful, soaring theme to another, irresistibly sustained by the personal force of its melodic material. In the post-*Mathis* *Symphonic Dances* the technical smoothness attained somewhat dilutes the personal substance of his melos, but none of his characteristic robustness is lost.

The relaxed grace of Copland's more recent compositions has made the difficult, uncompromising pieces which followed the *Piano Variations* seem even more remote. The *Short Symphony*, if well played, however, would clearly reveal its great originality, extraordinary compression and salient motives. Though Piston's *Violin Concerto* does not contain his deepest expression, it is perhaps his most successfully integrated work. There is a mastery of classical formal procedure and the finely curving phrases speak easily a variety of sentiments. The compositional virtuosity of the last movement is unmatched by any American.

If I include in a list of neglected modern compositions a work by Mozart, it is because to my ear he is a most modern composer. The *Divertimento in B \flat* for two horns and strings is great especially for its incredible Adagio, a bel canto movement in sonata form, in which almost every note is compounded of inspirational stuff.

. . . PAUL ROSENFELD

THERE are few pieces in the "modern" repertory that are neglected. The current repertory as I see it (far from the madding crowd's ignoble strums) is composed almost entirely of pieces shamelessly being worked to death—as the *Miserere* in *Il Trovatore* was worked to death on the old street-organs—by the majority of managers of radio stations and concert rooms, assisted by the massy family of violinists. I am using the word in Wagner's sense. Of a certain instrumentalist he said, "He is more a musician than a violinist, more an artist than a musician." By this it can be seen that by "violinists" I might easily be meaning vast numbers of instrumentalists, including orchestra conductors. Should the community wish to save music, it will, I suspect, have to find other employment for all these individuals. This naturally will have to be as easy and secure against

the necessity of risk, as tender of the intellect, as conspicuous and well-paid.

The number of neglected modern compositions must be immense. Certain are known; many must be unknown; none is by Shostakovitch or Morton Gould. To mention ten orchestral ones: they are Bartok's *Violin Concerto*, Berg's *Three Pieces for Orchestra*, Elliott Carter's *First Symphony*, Copland's *Short Symphony*, *Three Places in New England* by Ives, Charles Mills's *Second Symphony*, Schönberg's *Five Pieces for Orchestra*, *Les Noces* by Stravinsky, *Arcanes* by Varese and the *Passacaglia* by Stefan Wolpe. I regret that the form of your question, which limits me to ten pieces, prevents my mentioning Bartok's *Music for Strings, Percussion and Celesta*, Berg's *Concerto for Piano, Violin and Brass*, Bloch's *Three Jewish Poems* and *Three Psalms*, Chavez' *Piano Concerto*, Harris's *Symphony 1933*, Hindemith's *Concerto for Orchestra*, Milhaud's *La Création du Monde*, Schönberg's *Variations for Orchestra*, Scriabin's *Piano Concerto*, Sessions' *Symphony*, *Intégrales* by Varese, *Five Pieces for Orchestra* by Webern, *Three Dances for Orchestra* by Wolpe, etc., etc. . . .

. . . LEONARD BERNSTEIN

I BELIEVE there are three major general reasons for the continued neglect of a particular musical work: first, exceeding difficulty of execution; second, complexity of presentation, which may include both the aspect of enormous numbers of performers and that of great financial outlay; and third, lack of audience appeal. All three of these motivations possibly originate in the managerial department, with its eye to budget and box office, since even difficulty of execution is a problem that can be met by extra rehearsal, which, after all, costs money.

Under the first two headings I should place works like Stravinsky's *Perséphone*, and *Les Noces*, both of which require intensive choral preparation, and soloists of top rank who still have time and inclination to learn these roles. One cannot expect a soprano or tenor in the prime of Metropolitan Opera stardom to forego the glamor and financial return of constant *Aida* performances for the dubious honor (conventionally speaking) of learning and singing the parts in *Les Noces*. This notwithstanding the fact that a spirited performance of either of these works would no doubt make a strong, favorable impression on a New York audience. These generalities would also be true of the operas *Lulu* and *Wozzeck* by Berg, or almost any symphonic work of Charles Ives, although the latter composer is not by any means a model of popular appeal.

This question of audience appeal is a rather stale one now, since it has been proved many times that works formerly thought "duds" can, when played with clarity, intelligence and devotion, be communicated to