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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The aim of this document is two-fold. First and foremost, it aims to provide as exhaustive a list as possible of available performance materials written for stringed instruments that have been arranged for the euphonium, including both existing arrangements and commercial recordings featuring these works. Second, it seeks to provide valuable information intended to aid euphoniumists with their preparation and performance of string music. Included are specific ideas concerning both the importance of string arrangements within the euphonium repertoire and how to approach their performance from a pedagogical standpoint.

HISTORY

Although the history of the euphonium can be traced all the way back to the aptly-titled serpent in the late 16th century, its modern history really began in a fifteen year period between 1829 and 1844. Within that relatively-short span of time, no fewer than six different instruments were created that are now considered to be predecessors of the modern euphonium.\(^1\) These instruments include, but are not limited to, Wieprecht’s *Tenorbasshorn* (1829), Moritz’s four-valve instrument in B♭ based on Wieprecht’s bass tuba (1838), Sommer and Bock’s *Sommerophone or Euphonion* (1843), Hell’s *Hellhorn* (1843), Pelitti’s *Bombardino* (circa 1835), and Sax’s baritone-voiced member of his family of *Saxhorns* (1844).

\(^1\) These instruments include, but are not limited to, Wieprecht’s *Tenorbasshorn* (1829), Moritz’s four-valve instrument in B♭ based on Wieprecht’s bass tuba (1838), Sommer and Bock’s *Sommerophone or Euphonion* (1843), Hell’s *Hellhorn* (1843), Pelitti’s *Bombardino* (circa 1835), and Sax’s baritone-voiced member of his family of *Saxhorns* (1844).
instruments quickly found a home in the military bands of Europe, mostly as a replacement for the ophecleide. However, despite the availability of so many new baritone-voiced brass instruments, no specific solo literature was written until 1872 with Ponchielli’s *Concerto per flicorno basso*. Reasons for this lack of writing are speculative at best, but possibly include a relative designation to the military band medium, a shortage of early virtuosic performers, or perhaps even a lack of willingness from composers to write serious solo works for these new instruments.

Two years after Ponchielli’s staple of the repertoire was premiered, David J. Blaikley of the Boosey Company in England developed the modern automatic compensating system (patented in 1878), in which he solved the problem of sharpening pitch inherent with 3-valve euphoniums. With Blaikley’s invention, the euphonium reached the pinnacle of innovation in its basic design. The system’s allowance to play the entire range of the instrument in tune provided the euphonium with a world of possibilities as a serious vehicle for solo performance. Unfortunately, much of music’s vast history had already come and gone by the time the euphonium became such a vehicle.

THE PROBLEM

Faced with a complete lack of literature from most of music’s earlier stylistic periods, euphoniumists must find materials written for other instruments in order to satisfy the need for baroque, classical, and romantic music, and even to supplement the original body of modern

---


3 Pierre Louis Gautrot patented a similar invention which he called the *système equitonique* in 1864, but Blaikley’s more-successful system remains the basis of all modern designs.
repertoire. Logically, much of the literature written for other brass instruments transfers well to the euphonium, but even absorbing that body of works into the repertoire cannot adequately bridge the gap. The problem is one of technological development, and it is a shared problem throughout the entire brass family. Although the older brass instruments had been around for many years prior to the euphonium’s invention, the technology allowing them to play chromatically was not readily available until the 1820s. This late development in the design of the brass family of instruments prevented composers before the first half of the 19th-century from writing music that was not hindered by technological limitations. As a result, the entire brass family has little solo music written before the invention of the valve.

String instruments, however, were a chromatic family of instruments from their inception. As a result, the great majority of solo literature from the earlier stylistic periods written for single-voiced instruments was written for strings. Thankfully, many of these works have become available to euphoniumists via arrangements, providing euphonium students with the necessary materials to become well-rounded performers in a variety of styles.

NEED FOR STUDY

The problem facing euphoniumists today is not one of available performance materials. It is in the available literature’s lack of specificity concerning items that would benefit an aspiring performer the most. A common example of this problem is the frequent omission of the original instrument written for on an arrangement for the euphonium. Another problem is the

---

4 Heinrich Stölzel invented the first valve that became widely used in 1814. The most successful valve, made by François Périnet in Paris in 1839, has become the standard basic design and is known as the “piston” valve.

5 Notable solo compositions for the brasses from before the invention of the valve include the four horn concerti by W.A. Mozart, trumpet concertos by F.J. Haydn and J.N. Hummel, and the trombone concerto by Leopold Mozart.
complete lack of a substantive, euphonium-specific resource addressing the body of available string literature and its applicability to the areas of euphonium pedagogy and performance.

Preparing music written for a stringed instrument on the euphonium quickly presents a host of problems. The simple difference of relying on breath to create sound instead of drawing a bow across a string quickly becomes a hurdle to effective performance. How do we deal with this issue, and other inherent differences between the instruments which would prevent us from giving a representative performance of this music? The real problem is that we have no resource, no textbook, and no reference to call upon when making these crucial musical decisions.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The euphonium world was recently given a much needed research tool with the publication of the *Guide to the Euphonium Repertoire*, and while it does provide the aspiring performer with available arrangements of some string music, it is far from exhaustive, and contains no section addressing the literature’s place in the euphonium’s repertoire or approaches to its performance. In fact, despite the fact that the performance of string music on brass instruments has become common, surprisingly little has been written addressing the problems inherent in preparing performances of this music. As small a collection as those works are, scholarly materials written addressing the pedagogical value and necessity of performing this music are smaller still.

---

Among the available materials, perhaps the most pertinent to this document is the DMA dissertation written by trombonist Stephen Wampler, which is a performance study on Bach’s famous *Six Suites for Violoncello Solo.* While it centers on performance applicability to brass players, it also features considerations in the areas of performance editions, structural analysis, and 18th-century performance practice. Another applicable document is the DMA treatise by Yutaka Kono, current professor of tuba and euphonium at Texas A&M University at Kingsville. While it focuses on arrangements for tuba and the process of arranging the music itself, it also contains a chapter solely devoted to discussing the validity of adapting music written for other instruments for tuba performance. Perhaps the most interesting document written on this subject comes from Paul Stevens, professor of horn at Kansas University. His DMA dissertation, entitled “Bowings for Brass”, presents concepts intended to enable brass players to incorporate the string player’s ideas of bowing into their own airstreams. Also available is the DMA dissertation by Robert Conger, which like Wampler’s dissertation discusses playing the *Six Suites* on the trombone. In addition to these dissertations, a few general audience articles addressing the *Six Suites’* performance on brass instruments have also been written.

Just over a decade ago, trombonist Mark Lusk, professor of trombone at Pennsylvania State University, published a multi-faceted study of the *Six Suites*, which is by far the best

---


8 Yutaka Kono, “Discussion of Transcribing Music for Tuba and a Transcription of Sergei Rachmaninoff’s *Sonata for Cello and Piano,* in G Minor, Op. 19,” (DMA diss., The University of Texas at Austin, 2002).


10 Robert Brian Conger, “J.S. Bach’s *Six Suites for Solo Violoncello,* BWV 1007-1012; Their History and Problems of Transcription and Performance on the Trombone, A Lecture Recital, Together with Three Recitals of Selected Works by Paul Hindemith, George Christoph Wagenseil, Richard Monaco, Darius Milhaud, Nino Rota, Giovanni B. Pergolesi and Others,” (DMA diss., North Texas State University, 1983).

reference available on this topic. It contains both unedited or “blank” editions for the addition of the performer’s markings and Lusk’s own edition of the second suite. His guide also addresses performance practice in some detail, and while he focuses mainly on slide technique for the trombonist, many ideas are still applicable to the valved performer. The guide begins with a history of the Six Suites along with a small discussion of theoretical and pedagogical considerations, and it concludes with a suggested order of study and a selected discography of available recordings.

Finally, this document would be remiss without the mention of the DMA dissertation of Paul Droste, which was written almost 40 years ago at the University of Arizona. Much like Kono’s treatise, it focuses mainly on the specific process of arranging string music for euphonium and the arranging techniques used. It also reflects the desperate need for literature for the instrument that was present at the time. Additionally, it contains five arrangements of string pieces for euphonium, one each from the Baroque, Classical, and Romantic periods and two from the Contemporary era. Most importantly, it helped Droste attain the first DMA in Euphonium Performance that was awarded from an American college or university.

DELIMITATIONS

For the purposes of this study, the literature to be considered is published solo works originally written for any stringed instrument that have been arranged for performance on the euphonium or trombone. Works arranged for tuba have not been considered. The study

---

14 The exclusion of works arranged for tuba is due to the disparity of range between it and the euphonium. Pieces arranged for trombone can be played on euphonium as they are, with no changes.
includes pieces written for an instrument alone or with accompaniment. In the interest of availability and applicability, works and recordings that have not been published were not considered within the scope of this study, with one exception. Recordings of unpublished arrangements have been included if other arrangements were available because of their potential value as a reference and study tool.

In conclusion, this document intends to be an inclusive resource for euphoniumists of all ages who are looking for music outside of the body of original works for the instrument, be they professional performers, collegiate professors, private instructors, secondary band directors, or just young players with a school-owned horn. It is the author’s sincere hope that the research obtained in the writing of this document provides performers and teachers alike with a variety of tools designed and presented to assist them in producing the finest possible performances of this music.
CHAPTER 2

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF STRING LITERATURE ARRANGED FOR EUPHONIUM

This chapter is an annotated bibliography of published performance materials originally written for stringed instruments that have been arranged for the euphonium. The information included with each entry is intended to provide the student and teacher alike with enough information to determine whether or not an arrangement is appropriate for the selected performer’s skill level. Included in each entry is the following information: composer, title, arranger, publisher, and date of publication.

Each annotation provides the total range, duration, original instrumentation, arranged instrumentation, and selected information about the piece’s demands in regards to potential study and performance. Range designations are as follows:

Figure 2.1 – Range designations

\[ CC - BB \quad \text{C - B} \quad \text{c - b} \quad \text{c' - b'} \quad \text{c'' - b''} \]
Durations are all approximate and will vary depending upon tempo. Several of the arrangements have altered tempo markings from the original score in an attempt to make the part more accessible to younger players. Information provided in the annotations in this chapter is the result of personal examination by the author.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


Range: G – a¹. Duration: 3’ (mvt. 1), 4’40” (mvt. 2), 1’50” (mvt. 3), 3’10” (mvt. 4).

Originally written for violin, bass, and continuo. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. From the baroque composer Albinoni’s twelve sonatas for violin and bass (Op. 6 – 1711), this arrangement features four movements arranged slow-fast-slow-fast. While the range poses little difficulty and the embellishments have been removed, the fast movements of this sonata are still very challenging. Both require good technique and intervallic facility to perform the continuous 16th note and triplet passages with little to no rest. Many of the technical passages are poorly spaced and difficult to read.


Range: B♭ – c² (optional f³). Duration: 4’. Originally written for violin. Arranged for euphonium and piano. This flashy showpiece written by Norwegian composer, conductor, and violinist Alfvén was arranged by Rydland for the great Norwegian euphonium soloist Tormod Flaten with brass band accompaniment. Its consistent double-tonguing and high range demands make it one of the most difficult arrangements in the entire repertoire.

Range: $e_b^1 - g_b^1$. Duration: 4’20”. Originally written for orchestra. Arranged for euphonium and piano. Wyss’ arrangement of Bach’s familiar tune, transposed to the key of $A_b$, is very simple and accessible to players of most skill levels. This would be a good exercise in intonation, as many of the longer notes lie in the flat 5th and sharp 6th harmonics.


Range: $c - d^1$. Duration: 3’15”. Originally written for orchestra. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. This arrangement of Bach’s well-known classic is accessible to euphoniumists of any age or skill level. Its narrow range of a major 9th, familiar key (F major), simple rhythms, and familiarity make it one of the most playable arrangements available.


Range: $A - f^1$. Duration: 1’30”. Originally written for orchestra. Arranged for euphonium and piano. This short arrangement of the finale to J.S. Bach’s second orchestral suite lies within a very narrow and attainable range. However, it does require a high level of technical facility within the context of a light baroque style including ornamentations.


Range: $c - b_b^1$. Duration: 3’20”. Originally written for cello. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. This arrangement actually contains both *bourrees* from Bach’s third cello suite. Also, the original key has been transposed up a 4th, making the original C major-minor relationship between the two dances now an F major-minor relationship. The demand for facility
in relation to both technique and intervals is formidable in the original key. This arrangement compounds that difficulty by scoring those demands mostly above the bass clef staff.


Range: F – b♭¹. Duration: 4’25” (mvt. 1), 7’45” (mvt. 2), 4’30” (mvt. 3). Originally written for violin and orchestra. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. Part of the Dishinger Conductor’s Series, this arrangement of the BWV 1041 concerto is incredibly difficult, most especially in the finale. While it is not overly demanding from a range standpoint, the endurance, technical facility, and intervallic agility required are all considerable.


Range: E♭ – f¹. Duration: 8’30”. Originally written for cello. Arranged for euphonium. This arrangement (containing only the *bourrees* and the *gigue* from the fourth suite) was inspired when Flaten heard cellist Yo-Yo Ma’s performance of this particular suite in his “Inspired by Bach” series. This arrangement does not venture into the higher tessitura of the euphonium. The continuous triplet texture in the *gigue* is demanding in both technique and breath control.


Range: B♭ – e♭¹. Duration: 3’45”. Originally written for voices with trumpet, oboes, strings, and continuo. Arranged for baritone and piano. This short and simple arrangement is very approachable for players of any skill level. It requires neither great range nor technique and provides many rests for such a short piece.

Range: F – g¹. Duration: 2’55”. Originally written for orchestra. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. This short arrangement in D minor does not tax the range, but it very demanding in the areas of technique and intervallic facility. Interestingly, there is no polonaise movement of the five in Bach’s third orchestral suite. This movement is the fifth movement (of seven) from his second suite for orchestra.


Range: F – f¹. Duration: 3’30”. Originally written for violin. Arranged for trombone, cello, bassoon, or French tuba. This brief arrangement is very accessible for players of all ability levels as it does not require a great range, fast technique, or advanced breath control over long phrases. There are some octave leaps written, but within the slow tempo and the middle range of the instrument, they are very playable.


Range: (optional C) E – g¹ (Suites 1 – 4), (optional C) E – f¹, (Suite 5), (optional C) D – c² (Suite 6). Duration: 17’ (Suite 1), 19’ (Suite 2), 19’30” (Suite 3), 25’ (Suite 4), 24’ (Suite 5), 27’ (Suite 6). Originally written for cello. Arranged for trombone solo. Brown’s transcription of Bach’s famous cello suites are an attempt (as noted in the editor’s note in the score) “to make them practical for use on the trombone as a valuable addition to the trombonist’s study repertoire.” They are equally (if not more) practical for performance on the euphonium. The majority of the suites lie within a very playable range on the euphonium, with the notable exception of the sixth. The sixth is also the only suite of the six to utilize the tenor clef. All of the suites provide significant challenges from the standpoints of breath control, flexibility, and intervallic facility.

Range: F – c² (Suites 1, 3, & 4), E – B♭¹ (Suite 2), Duration: 17’ (Suite 1), 19’ (Suite 2), 19’30” (Suite 3), 25’ (Suite 4). Originally written for cello. Arranged for tenor trombone. This older arrangement of the suites was done by the trombone legend LaFosse, who taught at the Paris Conservatory for many years in the middle of the 20th century. It contains complete arrangements of the first four suites plus the *Sarabande* and *Gigue* of the fifth suite and the *Courante* from the sixth suite. All of the suites utilize tenor clef almost exclusively. Also, each suite has been transposed up from where they were originally written (first suite from G major to C major, second suite from D minor to F minor, third suite from C major to F major, fourth suite from E♭ major to A♭ major). This higher tessitura, together with breath control and intervallic facility already required, make this a very difficult arrangement to perform.


Range: E – a♭¹. Originally written for cello. Arranged for tenor tuba, baritone, or euphonium. This arrangement contains the *sarabandes*, *gigues*, and paired dances (*minuets*, *bourrees*, or *gavottes*) from each of the six suites, with the exception of the sixth suite, for which there is no *gigue*. Many of the movements have been transposed to more euphonium-friendly keys. For example, the dances from the first suite have been transposed up a third from G to B♭. Of all the arrangements of Bach’s suites, this is the most accessible to players of lower skill levels.


Range: c – d². Duration: 14’. Originally written for viola de gamba and keyboard. Arranged for trombone and piano. This arrangement by the great trombonist and pedagogue Marsteller is very taxing on the performer from the standpoints of range, endurance, and breath control. Arranged for euphonium or trombone, it also utilizes the tenor clef quite often, many times in the
middles of measures. The passage containing the uppermost notes has the option of being played down an octave. This arrangement is in Bach’s original key of G major.


Range: G – c². Duration: 15’. Originally written for viola de gamba and keyboard. Arranged for trombone and piano. Much like the previous entry, this arrangement is very difficult, requiring a wide range, good endurance, and tenor clef skills. It also demands greater intervallic facility and is pitched in the original key of D major.


Range: G – d². Duration: 5’45” (I), 5’30” (II), 4’ (III). Originally written for viola de gamba and keyboard. Arranged for trombone and piano. Similar to its two predecessors, the final arrangement of Bach’s three sonatas for viola de gamba is in the original key of G minor. It also demands the greatest range of the three, is written mostly in the tenor clef, and is extremely technically demanding in extended scalar and arpeggiated passages.


Range: G – b₁. Duration: 15’. Originally written for violin and harpsichord. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. This arrangement from Bach’s six violin sonatas has been transposed by a tritone into E♭. It presents challenges not only in the areas of technique and range, but also in endurance. At over 15 minutes in total length, there are only two instances where the performer is given more than a measure of rest. This arrangement is also demanding from an ornamentation standpoint, requiring the performer to possess a working knowledge of baroque trills and mordents.

Range: F – b♭1. Duration: 16’. Originally written for violin and harpsichord. Arranged for baritone and harpsichord. One of the more difficult pieces in the Dishinger Conductor’s Series, this arrangement requires a great amount of technique, even in the slower 1st and 3rd movements. There is also a problem in its arranging. In the solo part, only the first movement is written in bass clef (in the piano score, the solo part remains in bass clef throughout). The final three movements shift to B♭ treble clef and are written one octave higher than they should be. This creates a difficult clutter of ledger lines to decipher and makes an already difficult piece nearly impossible to read.


Range: (optional C♯) E – g¹ (Suites 1 & 2), (optional C) E – g¹ (Suite 3), (optional FF) F – g¹ (Suite 4), (optional C) E – f¹, (Suite 5), E – d² (optional C – e²) (Suite 6). Duration: 17’ (Suite 1), 19’ (Suite 2), 19’30” (Suite 3), 25’ (Suite 4), 24’ (Suite 5), 27’ (Suite 6). Originally written for cello. Arranged for trombone, baritone, or bassoon. Marsteller’s arrangements are a valuable addition to the rest of the arrangements of Bach’s famous suites for cello because of the extra information provided in the score. Throughout his arrangements are tempo, dynamic, and interpretive markings, and alternate notes/ossia passages that provide great insight into the suites’ performance. With the exception of the final suite, these arrangements are very playable from a range standpoint, but do require great endurance, breath control, and intervallic facility. The sixth suite, by far the most demanding, demands a thorough knowledge of tenor clef and stretches into the upper tessitura of the euphonium.

Range: $A_b - f^1$. Duration: 4’05”. Originally written for organ (often played by two violins and continuo). Arranged for baritone horn and piano. This arrangement of the finale of Bach’s penultimate trio sonata for organ does not push the envelope in terms of range or endurance. It does however, like many of Dishinger’s arrangements, provide little in the way of rests for the soloist.


Range: $B_b - g^1$. Duration: 3’25”. Originally written for organ (often played by two violins and continuo). Arranged for baritone horn and piano. This short piece requires good breath control from the performer. It is very rhythmically active and has very few rests for breathing.


Range: (optional C#) $E - g^1$ (Suites 1 & 2), (optional C) $E - g^1$ (Suite 3), (optional FF) $F - g^1$ (Suite 4), (optional C) $E - f^1$ (Suite 5), $E - d^2$ (optional C – $e^2$) (Suite 6). Duration: 17’ (Suite 1), 19’ (Suite 2), 19’30” (Suite 3), 25’ (Suite 4), 24’ (Suite 5), 27’ (Suite 6). Originally written for cello. Arranged for trombone. This entry is both a performing edition and a performance practice study. In it, he provides valuable resources such as transcription and performance problems, phrasing, and even available recordings, both of trombonists and of cellists. The only suite that has actually been altered for performance is the second suite in D minor.


Range: $G - a^1$. Duration: 9’10”. Originally written for violin and orchestra. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. One of Beethoven’s more popular works for violin, this arrangement is
in the original key and retains much of its florid writing. The technique required is formidable, most especially when trying to keep it within the singing style of the tempo marking *adagio cantabile*.


Range: G – b♭1. Duration: 4’20”. Originally written for violin and piano. Arranged for euphonium or tuba and piano. This arrangement by former Army Band euphoniumist Madeson requires great technique and intervallic facility, especially if taken at the marked tempo of *allegro molto*.


Range: d – f♯. Duration: 2’. Originally for string orchestra. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. Another of Medici’s simple publications, this arrangement from the 18th century English composer Boyce is the finale of his 4th symphony. Especially simple in the lower tessitura of the horn, this arrangement never ventures below the bass clef’s middle-line d.


Range: B♭ – e2. Duration: 12’. Originally written for double bass and string orchestra. Arranged for euphonium and piano. The former Coast Guard Band euphoniumist Werden’s arrangement is actually the first movement of Capuzzi’s *Concerto for Double Bass* (although it does not indicate this fact on the score). More difficult than the available arrangements of the other two movements, the *Allegro Moderato* contains an extended cadenza and stretches the range. Arranged in the key of Eb, the aspiring performer can play the entire concerto by combining this piece with the Catalinet arrangement.

Range: F – g¹. Duration: 13’25”.

Originally written for double bass and string orchestra. Arranged for tuba, euphonium, trombone, bass Eᵇ and Bᵇ, and piano. Catalinet’s popular arrangement carries with it the distinction on the score “freely arranged and adapted.” Included along with the score are solo parts for each of the instruments listed (trombone/euphonium B.C. and euphonium T.C./Bass Bᵇ are combined parts). It features only the middle and final movements of the original concerto. This arrangement is very playable, as it does not push the range and stays almost entirely in the key of Eᵇ. The Rondo does contain some extended passages of continuous 16th notes, but the passages are almost exclusively scalar.


Duration: 15’. Originally written for double bass and string orchestra. Arranged for euphonium and piano. Accompaniment parts for brass band, fanfare band, and wind band also available. Better known as the *Concerto for Double Bass*, this arrangement in the “Euphonium Virtuoso Series” for Steven Mead features more demanding technique and articulation than the Catalinet version, plus a very virtuosic opening movement.


Range: d – g¹. Duration: 3’45”. Originally written for violin and piano. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. Another in the Dishinger Conductor’s Series, this short arrangement contains three of the dance movements from Corelli’s suite. While not challenging from a range standpoint, the outer movements do require good distinction between staccato and legato articulations.

---

15 The fanfare band, especially popular in Belgium, is an ensemble comprised of a standard brass choir instrumentation combined with a family of saxophones.

Range: G – c². Duration: 6’. Originally for violin and continuo. This older arrangement comes from the twelve sonatas that comprise Corelli’s Op. 5. It begins with a prelude and contains four dance movements labeled *Allemanda, Sarabanda, Gavotta, and Giga.*


Range: G – d². Duration: 5’40”. Originally for violin and orchestra. Arranged for euphonium and piano. Accompaniment parts for brass band, fanfare band, and wind band also available. Vertommen’s transcription of de Sarasate’s violin showpiece retains much of its difficulty, with high demands of extended range, multiple tonguing, and rapid technical passages with wide intervallic leaps. Available with brass band, wind band, and piano accompaniment.


Range: E – f². Duration: 7’10”. Originally for violin and orchestra. Arranged for euphonium and piano. Frey’s take of this fiery showpiece is fiendishly difficult. It requires the utmost from the soloist, ranging from passionately lyrical playing to blazing-fast technique. While the slower opening demands a wide range within its cadenza-like texture, the *allegro* requires both double tonguing and wide intervallic leaps.


Range: A♭ – c². Duration: 5’05”. Originally written for violin and piano. Arranged for euphonium and piano. This arrangement of the finale from Dvorak’s Op. 57 for violin is challenging and well-transcribed. The *allegro molto* passages are technically demanding, but the lyrical sections lie very well on the horn and there is ample rest available throughout.

Range: E – a\(^1\). Duration: 3'40” (mvt. 1), 3’ (mvt. 2). Originally written for violin and piano. Arranged for euphonium and piano. This arrangement by Winter is the first two movements of Dvorak’s *Romantische Stücke*. While the *allegro moderato* is very straightforward and accessible, the *allegro maestoso* is a bit more difficult, requiring good technique in both extremes of register. There is not a single measure of rest for the performer in either movement.


Range: F – b\(^\frac{1}{2}\). Duration: 3’†. Originally written for violin and piano, later orchestrated by the composer for full orchestra. Arranged for euphonium and piano. The second of Elgar’s Op. 15 (No. 1 being the *Chanson de nuit*), this arrangement is beautiful, brief, and very accessible.


Range: GG – e\(^1\). Duration: 3’15”. Originally written for violin and piano, later orchestrated by the composer for full orchestra. Arranged for tuba or bass trombone and piano. The first half of Elgar’s Op. 15, this arrangement was done for tuba or bass trombone, but lies well within the playable register for the euphonium. The pedal GG occurs only once in the short coda, and no other part of the arrangement ventures below G an octave higher.


Range: F – a\(^1\). Duration: 2’30”. Originally written for violin or cello and piano. Arranged for euphonium and piano. A short and very lyrical arrangement, Elgar’s Op. 4 No. 1 requires a consistently-lyrical style from the performer across a wide range of the instrument via many leaps in the melody.

Range: A – a\textsuperscript{b}. Duration: 3’. Originally written in three versions for solo violin, violin and piano, and for orchestra. Arranged for euphonium and piano. Elgar’s first published work is the third of four pieces featured in this Rosehill publication of selected pieces from performances of the famous British euphonium soloists Robert and Nicholas Childs, better known as the Childs Brothers. Very lovely and playable, it is rather short and only features two measures that lie above g\textsuperscript{1}.


Range: A\textsubscript{b} – b\textsubscript{b}. Duration: 3’. Originally written in three versions for solo violin, violin and piano, and for orchestra. Arranged for euphonium and piano. Very similar to the previous arrangement except that it is pitched in A\textsubscript{b} instead of F. The modulation in the second phrase is written with accidentals instead of a key change in this arrangement.


Range: F – e\textsuperscript{b}. Duration: 3’. Originally written in three versions for solo violin, violin and piano, and for orchestra. Arranged for euphonium and piano. Werden’s arrangement of Elgar’s popular work is pitched in B\textsubscript{b}, and stretches the euphoniumist’s range to the utmost, its tessitura remaining above the bass clef staff for most of its duration. It concludes with a b\textsubscript{b} that is held for eight measures with rallentando.


Range: FF – d\textsuperscript{2}. Duration: 6’35”. Originally written for cello and orchestra. Arranged for euphonium and band. Howey’s arrangement of Faure’s beautiful Op. 24 pushes both extremes of tessitura for the instrument, from pedal F at the end of the first cadenza to d\textsuperscript{2} less than ten
measures later. This arrangement also requires great technical proficiency from the performer within the delicate texture in the middle *poco piu animato*.


Range: E♭ – c² (optional C – e♭²). Duration: 6’. Originally written for cello and piano. Arranged for euphonium and piano. This arrangement by Yamaha Euphonium Artist Adam Frey is much more committed to making this piece more playable for the aspiring euphoniumist. Unlike the previous entry, many of the extreme range problems have been avoided and it contains several *ossia* passages so that the piece can be adjusted to different playing levels.


Range: G – b♭⁴. Duration: 3’55”. Originally written for cello and piano. Arranged for trombone and piano. This beautiful cello work by Faure was originally written as part of the incidental music for the Maeterlink play *Pelleas et Melisande*. Brown’s arrangement is scored in the middle and upper registers of the instrument and is mostly scalar with a few ascending arpeggiated passages.


Range: D – b♭⁴. Duration: 3’55”. Originally written for cello and piano. Arranged for euphonium and piano. This arrangement is very accessible although it is scored mostly above the bass clef staff. It requires smooth slurring at both extremes of the range, many times over wide intervals.

Range: F – g₁ (optional C – c²) (No. 1), E – g₁ (Nos. 2, 4, & 5), F – g₁ (No. 3), (FF♯) E – g₁ (No. 6). Duration: 5’30” (No.1), 9’25” (No. 2), 8’ (No. 3), 7’15” (No. 4), 7’10″ (No. 5), 7’30” (No. 6). Originally written for bassoon or cello. Arranged for euphonium and piano. The newer of the two available arrangements of these six baroque sonatas, Mortimer’s version is very similar to Keith Brown’s older arrangement. Though most of the range is very accessible, it is stretched on both ends of the instrument in the first and last sonatas. Having been arranged for euphonium instead of trombone, much of the ornamentation is still present in this version.


Range: F – g₁ (Nos. 1 & 3), E – g₁ (Nos. 2, 4, & 5), (C) G – g₁ (No. 6). Duration: 5’30” (No.1), 9’25” (No. 2), 8’ (No. 3), 7’15” (No. 4), 7’10″ (No. 5), 7’30” (No. 6). Originally written for bassoon or cello. Arranged for trombone and piano. Brown’s arrangements of the sonatas come in two volumes. Although range and endurance should not pose much of a problem in performance, these arrangements do require fluency in tenor clef and can be difficult from a rhythm standpoint, especially in the slower dance movements. Much of the ornamentation has been removed from this version.


Duration: 20’. Originally written for cello and wind band. Arranged for euphonium and piano. Accompaniment parts for brass band, fanfare band, and wind band also available from the publisher. This extremely challenging new work was transcribed for euphonium by Vertommen is unique in that much of the double-stopping was left in the transcription and left up to the performer to choose how to perform it (much of the double-stopping is octave doubling). This
arrangement is also unique within the repertoire in that it is heavily influenced by popular music. Requiring a wide range, fast technique, and good endurance, this is one of the more difficult arrangements in Band Press’ “Euphonium Virtuoso” collection.


Range: B♭ – f\. Duration: 2’45”. Originally written for string orchestra. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. Another Dishinger arrangement, this piece stays within the normal register of the euphonium. Very simple, short, and playable by performers of any skill level.


Range: F – e♭\(^{1}\) (No. 1), A♭ – g♭\(^{1}\) (No. 2). Duration: 6’30” (No. 1), 9’ (No. 2). Originally written for orchestra. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. The titles of Dishinger’s arrangements are a bit misleading, as both pieces are mix-and-matches from the first and third of Handel’s suites. Dishinger’s No. 1 contains the Bourree and Hornpipe from the first suite and the Rigaudon from the third suite. His No. 2 is all from Handel’s third suite, including both Minuets and the Gigue. Both are very accessible arrangements. The most challenging dance is the final Gigue, whose middle section is in E♭ minor and contains the widest range of both pieces.


Range: F – g♭\(^{1}\). Duration: 6’. Originally written for orchestra. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. This arrangement comes from one of Haydn’s most famous works, his 104\(^{th}\)
symphony which was entitled, “London.” Neither the range nor the technique required presents a problem, but it does contain a modulation from D minor into D½ major and back.


Duration: 6’30”. Originally written for viola and orchestra. Arranged for euphonium and piano. These two arrangements of Hummel’s *Potpourri for Viola and Orchestra “Fantasie”* Op. 94 differ only in the accompaniment. The piece is very difficult and contains extensive sections of both extended lyrical and extremely technical passages.


Range: F – c². Duration: 7’30”. Originally written for cello and piano. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. One of the staple arrangements in the euphonium repertoire, the Klengel *Concertino* was originally written in C, but was lowered a whole step by Falcone in the arranging process to avoid range problems. Quite difficult, this arrangement is demanding from both technical and lyrical standpoints, as well as requiring good articulation and intervallic facility. A wind band accompaniment is available through Belwin-Mills Publishing.


Originally written for cello. Arranged for euphonium and piano or organ. This collection of arrangements by the British composer and arranger Mortimer is one of several collections for many different instruments (including tuba, trombone, and bass trombone). The individual sonatas themselves are also available for purchase individually from the publisher. They are virtually identical to the Brown/Ostrander arrangements in terms of range and duration.
However, they differ greatly in respect to the inclusion of stylistic embellishments. Mortimer has included trill indications prominently in his version, something that is completely absent from the more trombone-friendly Brown/Ostrander arrangements. There are also many *ossia* passages throughout the sonatas that can help the performer with breath control in the faster, more technical movements.


Range: A – a₁. Duration: 6’. Originally written for cello. Arranged for euphonium and piano. Featured on Flaten’s album *Flight*, this arrangement of the A minor suite is geared towards the more seasoned euphoniumist, with more aspiring tempo markings and much more in the realm of stylistic embellishments than the Ostrander arrangement.


Range: A – a₁. Duration: 6’. Originally written for cello. Arranged for trombone and piano. This popular arrangement from the baroque composer Marcello requires good technique but remains almost entirely scalar throughout. Like all of the Ostrander/Brown string arrangements, it is completely devoid of embellishments, presumably because it was arranged primarily for performance on trombone. The sonata features four short movements (adagio – allegro – largo – allegro).


Range: (optional C) G – a₁. Duration: 5’15”. Originally written for cello. Arranged for trombone and piano. Like the previous entry, this arrangement is cast in a slow-fast-slow-fast four movement structure. The technique required is also very similar, although this sonata is more demanding in the realm of intervallic facility.

Range: d–c\(^2\). Duration: 8’. Originally written for cello. Arranged for trombone and piano. By far the most difficult of the seven Marcello sonatas available, this arrangement is very taxing from both the range and breath control standpoints. It is also entirely written in the tenor clef. Eliminating the repeats written in both fast movements cuts approximately two minutes off the total performance time, making this arrangement considerably easier to perform.


Range: E–a\(^{1}\). Duration: 6’15”. Originally written for cello. Arranged for trombone and piano. One of the more accessible of the Brown/Ostrander arrangements, this sonata lies within a very comfortable range for the instrument and rarely ventures into the upper tessitura. It also includes optional omissions in the second movement in order to alleviate breath control issues.


Range: A–a\(^{1}\). Duration: 8’30”. Originally written for cello. Arranged for trombone and piano. Much like the previous entry, this arrangement stays within a comfortable range throughout. Its length combined with extended passages that require both good breath control and excellent technique make this one of the more challenging in the series.


Range: G–a\(^{1}\). Duration: 8’. Originally written for cello. Arranged for euphonium and piano. A wonderful addition to the literature, Frey’s arrangement differs from others in that it contains within the solo part a composer biography and, most importantly, a short explanation of the baroque ornamentations required within the arrangement. This explanation, complete with examples, was written by Frey and the late David Randolph, former professor of tuba and
euphonium at the University of Georgia. The solo part is unornamented, but the ornamented solo part is available online via Frey’s website at www.euphonium.com/examplemusic.html.


Range: G – a\(^1\). Duration: 8’. Originally written for cello. Mead’s version of the F-major sonata is strikingly similar to Frey’s. Its only differences are in the interpretation of ornamentations. Mead also provides instances in the *presto* movement where he suggests small alterations to be taken on the second time through repeated sections.


Range: G – g\(^1\). Duration: 7’30”. Originally written for cello. Arranged for trombone and piano. This arrangement is very similar to the C major sonata in that it requires much more in the realm of technical arpeggiation and intervallic leaps than the other Marcello sonatas. It also includes passages in the final *allegro* that allow for the omission of certain notes to assist with breath control.


Range: G – a\(^b\)\(^1\). Duration: 7’. Originally written for cello. Arranged for trombone and piano. This arrangement, like the D major sonata, utilizes the tenor clef. Despite that, it is probably the most accessible of the sonatas from the technical aspect. This would be an excellent piece for a student learning the tenor clef.

Range: c – g\(^1\). Duration: 3’50”. Originally written for orchestra. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. This arrangement occupies the narrow range of an octave and half and is not demanding in regards to technique or agility. It is accessible without being overly simplified.


Range: F – b\(^1\). Duration: 4’55”. Originally written for violin and piano. Arranged for euphonium and piano. The finale of Mendelssohn’s F minor sonata, this arrangement requires technical and intervallic facility in a very light style at a very quick pace. It also contains sustained playing in the upper register and frequent figures of descending arpeggios.


Range: F – b\(^1\). Duration: 6’45”. Originally written for violin. Arranged for euphonium and piano. Monti’s traditional showpiece for violin is very difficult, requiring the performer to double tongue continually for much of the piece. The arranger’s choice of the key of B\(^b\) to avoid putting the demanding technical passages in the highest tessitura of the instrument places the opening lyrical statement in the low range of the euphonium.


Range: G – c\(^2\). Duration: 6’45”. Originally written for violin. Arranged for euphonium and piano. This arrangement of the popular *Csardas* is pitched in a very high key (C minor), requiring not only the endurance to maintain passages in the upper register, but demanding a high technical proficiency within it.

Range: F – b♭. Duration: 6'45". Originally written for violin. This arrangement of Monti’s showpiece is the headline work in a collection that contains three other pieces for euphonium and piano: the “Largo al Factotum” from Rossini’s opera *The Barber of Seville*, Elgar’s *Salut d’Amour* (written for cello and listed again in this chapter), and John Hughes’ *Calon Lan*, which is a euphonium duet with piano. This arrangement is also in the more register-friendly key of B♭.


Range: F – d. Duration: 4’15”. Originally written for orchestra. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. Taken from Mozart’s 39th symphony, this short arrangement taxes neither the range nor the technical facility. It is, however, transposed up a whole step to the key of F, presumably to make it playable on three valve euphoniums and baritones that cannot play an E♭ below the bass clef staff.


Range: G – b♭. Duration: 4’30”. Originally written for violin and piano. Arranged for euphonium and piano. This arrangement from Mozart’s *Sonata No. 28 in E♭* demands a very light articulation style throughout. It frequents the upper register of the euphonium and requires the performance of many ornamentation figures within its quick pace.

Range: B♭ – a♭. Duration: 4’40”. Originally written for three violins and continuo. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. Very accessible, this arrangement includes some of the more rhythmically active variations which require fast technique within the fluid style.


Range: F – g. Duration: 4’40”. Originally written for three violins and continuo. Arranged for euphonium and piano. A simple arrangement of the baroque classic. The fourth variation requires facility in the lower register of the horn and the sixth includes some registral displacement. Comes with parts for both treble and bass clef euphonium.


Range: C – c². Duration: 3’ (No. 13), 4’42” (No. 24), 3’30” (No. 17), 4’ (No. 20). Originally written for violin. Arranged for unaccompanied euphonium. These caprices are fiendishly difficult, requiring not only great technical facility, but rapid leaps of register throughout. Werden has helped out the aspiring performer in these arrangements, removing all multiple stops and suggesting breath marks to alleviate the need for impossible breath control. All four have been transposed to make the range manageable.


Range: G – a♭. Duration: 1’30”. Originally written for orchestra. Arranged for Euphonium, Tuba or Trumpet and CD Accompaniment. Corwell’s arrangement of the famous orchestral showpiece, although not terribly taxing range-wise, requires the utmost in chromatic
technique from the performer. It also demands a very quick and clean double-tongue throughout wide and rapid dynamic shifts.


Range: A – b♭. Duration: 1’30”. Originally written for orchestra. Arranged for solo instrument and piano. This arrangement form the Ludwig Artist Solo Series requires the utmost in technical facility from the performer. The classic orchestral showpiece is marked vivace and is comprised mostly of continuous chromatic 16th-note passages. A wind band accompaniment is also available through Ludwig.


Duration: 3’50”. Originally written for cello and orchestra. Arranged for euphonium and piano. From Band Press’ “Euphonium Virtuoso Collection,” this arrangement requires very good technique within its romantic style. There are only a few short sections of calm and lyricism. It is available with brass band, wind band, and piano accompaniments.


Range: D – c² (optional d²). Duration: 9’. Originally written for violin. Arranged for euphonium and piano. Accompaniment parts for brass band, fanfare band, and wind band are also available. Arranged for euphonium virtuoso Steven Mead, this arrangement is incredibly difficult. It demands great technique in both its slower opening and the faster allegro. Especially challenging from a multiple tonguing standpoint, this arrangement requires extended triple tonguing from the performer throughout the entire range of the instrument in both scalar and arpeggiated passages.

Range: B⁰ – f¹. Duration: 3’. Originally written for orchestral cello solo. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. This short, simple arrangement does not require an extensive range and is very accessible to players of all skill levels.


Range: Aᵇ – g¹. Duration: 3’. Originally written for orchestral cello solo. Arranged for euphonium and piano. Arranged for and featured on Mead’s *World of the Euphonium* series, this arrangement, much like the previous entry, works very well on the euphonium.


Range: GG – c². Duration: 13’ (I), 4’30” (II), 10’ (III). Originally written for arpeggione and piano. Arranged for euphonium and piano. Transposed to C minor from its original key of A minor, this arrangement is very demanding from the performer in every aspect of playing. Its long duration requires great endurance and the wide range and frequent use of the 2ⁿd harmonic requires consistency of tone in the lower tessitura of the instrument. The technical aspects of the outer movements are also very demanding in both scalar and arpeggiated passages.


Range: d – a¹. Duration: 2’25”. Originally written for violin and piano. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. This arrangement of the third movement from Schubert’s sonata has

---

¹⁶ The arpeggione is a 19ᵗʰ century guitar-like instrument with six strings and frets that is bowed in the same manner as the cello.
been transposed down a whole step into the key of G minor. It also bears a tempo marking of 120 bpm, although violinists traditionally take it 40 to 50 beats faster.


Range: F♯ – b♭₁, Duration: 3’35” (I), 3’15” (II), 3’30” (III), 2’25” (IV), 2’30” (V). Originally written for cello. Arranged for euphonium and piano. A challenging, well-arranged cello transcription from one of the great euphoniumists of the 20th century, this arrangement works in whole or in part. The five pieces together cover a wide variety of styles and contain passages that are technical, lyrical, and even comical. The outer movements are especially demanding in terms of articulation and intervocalic facility.


Range: B♭ – a♭₁. Duration: 2’45”. Originally written for violin. Arranged for baritone and piano. Falcone’s arrangement of this popular classic is short, yet requires a good deal of technique and baroque embellishments from the performer. It was originally written as a finale to one of Senaille’s violin sonatas.


Range: A♭ – g♭₁. Duration: 3’45”. Originally written for violin. A popular transcription for intermediate to advanced players, this arrangement contains several different parts for different low instruments of the brass family, to include the trombone, euphonium, tuba, and B♭ and E♭ basses. This arrangement is the same piece as the previous entry with a short introduction. The only difference between the allegros is that Catalinet’s arrangement is pitched a whole step lower than Falcone’s.
Shostakovich, Dmitri.  *Concerto No. 1 for Cello and Orchestra.*  Arranged by Nikk Pilato.  

Range: C – d\(^2\).  Duration: 6’45”.  Originally written for cello.  Arranged for euphonium and piano.  This arrangement by current UGA Assistant Band Director Nikk Pilato is virtually an exact copy of the original cello part.  Incredibly difficult, it requires facility in the extended ranges, near-impossible breath control, and consistent registral leaps.  The publication only comes with the solo part.


Duration: 7’.  Originally for string quartet, later arranged by the composer for cello and string orchestra.  Arranged for euphonium.  One of Tchaikovsky’s most popular short pieces, the *Andante cantabile* was originally the slow movement of his first string quartet (Op. 11).  Lovely and very romantic, this is a very playable arrangement.  Available with brass band, wind band, and piano accompaniment.


Range: D – g\(^2\).  Duration: 9’15”.  Originally for violin and orchestra.  Arranged for euphonium and brass quintet.  Howey’s arrangement of the concerto’s blazing finale is fiendishly difficult, requiring the utmost from the euphoniumist in terms of technique, intervallic facility, and especially range.  While it doesn’t push into the pedal range, it regularly ventures well into the upper tessitura of the instrument, including a stratospheric g\(^2\) in the cadenza.


Range: C\# – c\(^1\).  Duration: 6’30”.  Originally for violin and orchestra.  Arranged for baritone horn and piano.  This arrangement of the beautiful middle movement from Tchaikovsky’s
famous concerto requires a cantabile style in the lower tessitura of the euphonium. While Dishinger did keep this arrangement in the original key, it might work better in the present range for bass trombone or tuba.


Range: F – g¹. Duration: 4’ (mvt. 1), 3’15” (mvt. 2), 4’05” (mvt. 3), 4’10” (mvt. 4). Originally written for viola, strings, and continuo. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. The slow movements of this concerto (mvts. 1 & 3) are very accessible. The *allegro* and *presto* movements, however, are very difficult from the standpoints of technique, flexibility, and agility.


Range: (optional BB♭)E – b♭¹. Duration: 9’45””. Originally written for cello and piano. Arranged for solo instrument and piano. This piece has a long history of being played by other instruments. Solo parts in the original keys are available for cello, violin, viola, clarinet, english horn, alto saxophone, bassoon, and tuba. Droste’s arrangement, available for euphonium, baritone, tenor saxophone, or bass clarinet, features all movements transposed down a whole step with the lone exception of the second, which has been transposed down a fourth. While the first five songs are very lyrical, the *allegro vivace* finale is quite technical in both its light and lyrical sections.


Range: G – a¹. Duration: 7’30”. Originally written for violin and orchestra. Arranged for baritone horn and piano. This arrangement of Vivaldi’s concerto op. 3 no. 6 has been transposed down a 4th from the original D minor. Typical of the baroque arrangements, it requires great technique, breath control, and intervallic facility throughout the outer movements.

Range: F – d. Duration: 2’20”. Originally written for violin and orchestra. Arranged for euphonium and piano. This arrangement of the middle movement of Vivaldi’s “Winter” concerto from *The Four Seasons* is short, simple, and very playable. Its only challenge lies in its slow tempo, which is traditionally felt in 8.


Range: F – g¹. Duration: 12’. Originally written for cello and continuo. Arranged for trombone and piano. Utilizing both the bass and tenor clefs, this arrangement does not tax the extremes of range on euphonium but is still very challenging in the areas of technique and breath control. The piano score should be consulted for this arrangement (and for the subsequent Vivaldi arrangements), as it contains embellishments that do not appear in the solo part. As noted in the score, the revision and realization of the figured bass (for all the Vivaldi sonatas listed here) was done by Italian composer Luigi Dallapiccola.


Range: E – g¹. Duration: 11’30”. Originally written for cello and continuo. Arranged for trombone and piano. Similar to the previous entry, this arrangement requires a thorough knowledge of tenor clef. While there are no extended technical passages that require extensive breath control, it is much more demanding in terms of arpeggiation and intervallic facility that the first sonata. Like all the Vivaldi sonatas in listed here, it is presented in a four movement slow-fast-slow-fast structure.

Range: F – g\(^1\). Duration: 14’. Originally written for cello and continuo. Arranged for trombone and piano. One of the more challenging of Ostrander’s arrangements, this sonata requires excellent breath control and good technique and contains many wide leaps within technical passages.


Range: F – a\(^1\). Duration: 13’. Originally written for cello and continuo. Arranged for trombone and piano. This arrangement is very challenging in terms of technique, even in the slower first and third movements. The final *allegro* is especially difficult, requiring wide intervallic leaps within the technical texture throughout.
CHAPTER 3

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECORDINGS CONTAINING LITERATURE ARRANGED FOR EUPHONIUM

This chapter features an annotated discography of solo euphonium repertoire originally written for a stringed instrument. As much information as was available for each recording has been included. In some cases, information such as the date of release was not listed on the recording or present in any currently available reference, resource, or website.

Similarly, several artists have not provided the arranger of the works originally for strings featured on their recordings or have recorded arrangements that are unpublished. In those instances, such albums were included in this discography if the value of their inclusion as a reference or study tool outweighed their complete exclusion.

The entries in this discography contain the following information: artist, album title, label, serial number, date of release, and medium (LP, cassette, or CD). Annotations list only the pieces recorded on the recording that are arrangements of string literature, composer, and (where possible) arranger.
DISCOGRAPHY

Araki, Tamao. *Vivid Colors!* Blue Lights BLCD-0125, n.d. CD.

Japanese euphoniumist Araki’s debut recording with the brass band Vivid Brass of Tokyo includes an arrangement of Benedetto Marcello’s Sonata in F major, originally for cello.


This recording from the British euphoniumist and conductor Baglin features arrangements of William Henry Squire’s *Tarantella, Op. 23* and Saint-Saëns’ *Le Cygne* from his orchestral work *Le Carnaval des Animaux*, both originally for cello.


The US Navy Band’s former euphonium soloist, Behrend’s recording includes the popular cello work *Allegro Spiritoso* by Jean Baptiste Senaille.


The first euphonium recital to ever be heard in New York’s Carnegie Hall featured the Andante and Rondo from Antonio Capuzzi’s *Concerto for Double Bass*.

———. *The Sacred Euphonium.* Mark Custom Records 37883, 1985. CD.

Bowman’s recording with organ accompaniment that includes an arrangement of J.S. Bach’s “Air” from *Suite No. 3*.


Contains the Philip Catalinet arrangement of the *Concerto for Double Bass* by Antonio Capuzzi (all movements).

This recording by David Childs (son and nephew of the famous Childs Brothers euphonium soloists) includes his own arrangements of the violin showpieces *Vallflickans dans* by Hugo Alfven, *Czardas* by Vittorio Monti, and *The Flight of the Bumblebee* by Nicolai Rimsky-Korsakov.


Childs’ debut recording includes his own arrangements of Saint-Saëns’ *The Swan* and Bach’s *Air from “Suite in D,”* along with his father Robert’s arrangement of Squire’s *Tarantella.* His father was also the conductor on the recording.


The famous Childs Brothers’ recording with Dutch brass band De Bazuin Oenkerk features as its finale Rimsky-Korsakov’s *Flight of the Bumblebee,* arranged by the band’s conductor, Klaas van der Woude.

———. *British Bandsmen Centenary Concert.* Chandos CHAN 8571, 1987. CD.

This recording, recorded in celebration of the 100th anniversary of the brass band, features two pieces with the Childs Brothers, one of which is Roy Newsome’s arrangement of Paganini’s *Moto Perpetuo.*

———. *Child’s Play*. Doyen Recordings DOY 001, 1986. CD.

Another classic Childs Brothers recording with brass band accompaniment, *Child’s Play* contains Howard Snell’s arrangement of Paganini’s famous *Moto Perpetuo.*
———. *The Song of the Brother*. Salvationist Publishing & Supplies SPSLCB 18, 1993. CD.

This recording with the London Citadel Band of the Salvation Army includes Ray Steadman-Allen’s arrangement of Saint-Saëns’ *The Swan*.


This recording (again with brass band) by the Childs brothers includes arrangements of Edward Elgar’s violin & piano/orchestral love song *Salut d’Amour*, Rimsky-Korsakov’s orchestral showpiece *Flight of the Bumblebee*, and Vittorio Monti’s ever-popular virtuosic showpiece *Czardas*.


This recording with the Black Dyke Mills Brass Band includes the Andante and Rondo movements from Antonio Capuzzi’s *Concerto for Double Bass* (arr. Catalinet) and Child’s own arrangement of the *Fantasy* for viola and orchestra in G minor Op. 94 by Johann Nepomuk Hummel.


———. *Euphonium Favorites for Recital and Contest*. Coronet Recording 3203, 1984. LP.


These entries have been grouped together because the recently released *Complete Recordings* is a double CD re-mastering of Droste’s two previous recordings. Included are Droste’s own arrangements of Schumann’s *Five Pieces in Folk Style, Op. 102*, Vaughan-Williams’ *Six Studies in English Folk Song*, and Haydn’s *Divertimento No. 70*, all originally written for cello.

From the father of modern euphonium playing, Falcone’s first album includes the Boureecs from J.S. Bach’s third cello suite and also the *Piece en forme de habanera* by Maurice Ravel.


The late Falcone’s second album features Camille Saint-Saëns’ *Le Cygne* from the orchestral suite *Le Carnaval des Animaux* and Squire’s *Tarantella*.


The third recording in the four-album series contains the Shuman arrangement of the *Adagio* movement from Franz Joseph Haydn’s *Concerto for Cello*.


The Norwegian euphoniumist’s debut recording contains Frode Rydland’s arrangement of Hugo Alfven’s *Vallflickans Dans* plus his own arrangements of Benedetto Marcello’s *Sonata in A minor* for cello, J.S. Bach’s *Suite No. 4 in E♭* for violoncello, and Massanet’s *Meditation from “Thais.”*


This recording features Denton’s arrangement of Saint-Saëns’ cello solo *The Swan* from his orchestral suite *Le Carnaval des Animaux*.


Frey’s debut recording includes Faure’s beautiful *Elegié in C Minor* for cello and jazz trumpeter Harry James’ arrangement of Rimsky-Korsakov’s *Flight of the Bumblebee.*
Frey’s second collaboration with the New Zealand Symphony Orchestra contains his own arrangements of Alfven’s *Vallflickans Dans* and Massanet’s violin interlude *Meditation from Thais*.


Japanese soloist Fukaishi’s second recording includes the *Suite for Violoncello No. 1 in G* by J.S. Bach.


This recording features the first movement from Klengel’s *Concertino No. 1* and the andante and rondo movements from Capuzzi’s *Concerto for Doublebass*.


This live recording is comprised mostly of original works, but also includes David Werden’s arrangement of Niccolo Paganini’s *Caprice No. 17 for Solo Violin*.


Swiss euphoniumist Gagnaux’s second effort includes Gert Buitenhuis’ arrangement of Sarasate’s *Gypsy Airs*.


This recording from the famous Japanese euphonium soloist Hokazono features an arrangement of Monti’s *Czardas* by Kanai.

British euphonium legend Kane’s recording with the International Staff Band of the Salvation Army includes Ray Steadman-Allen’s arrangement of Saint-Saëns’ *The Swan*.


Kipfer’s debut recording as a solo artist features Antonio Vivaldi’s *Sonata VI*, arranged by John Mortimer (originally for cello). It also includes an arrangement by Beni Wüthrich of the finale from Niccolò Paganini’s *Violin Concerto No.2*, which carries the nickname *La Campanella* (the little bell).


Israeli euphonium/trombone artist Levi’s recording with the brass band Ensemble de Cuivres Melodia features an arrangement of Paganini’s *Moto Perpetuo* that was prepared by the ensemble’s conductor, Olivier Chabloz.


The second recording by the now-retired Professor of Euphonium at Morehouse College contains a lovely setting (Louder’s own) of W.A. Mozart’s *Melodie for Violin*.

———. *Live!* Mark Custom 6103-MCD, 2006. CD.

Dr. Louder’s third recording includes the entire *Concerto for Double Bass* by Antonio Capuzzi. (Compilation album)


Canadian Salvation Army euphoniumist Mallet’s first recording includes the Williams Himes arrangement of Senaille’s *Allegro Spiritoso*. 

From the most recorded euphoniumist in history, Mead’s collaboration with the trombone quartet *Trombonisti Italia* includes Debussy’s *The Girl with the Flaxen Hair* and Rimsky-Korsakov’s *The Flight of the Bumblebee*, both arranged by Maurice Bale.

———. *Audacious*. Polyphonic Records BOCC110, 2008. CD.

Living up to its title, this “intrepidly daring” two CD set features numerous new recordings of both original and arranged music, concluding with a Luc Vertommen arrangement of Tchaikovsky’s violin showpiece *Valse Scherzo*, Op. 23.


Mead’s collaboration with the Desford Colliery Caterpillar Brass Band contains conductor Howard Snell’s arrangement of Saint-Saëns’ *The Swan*.


Mead’s collaboration with the Spanish Brass Luurs Metalls Quintet concludes with Henry Howey’s arrangement of the finale from Tchaikovsky’s famous violin concerto.


One of Mead’s most recent recordings contains several arrangements of Mozart’s string pieces, including the overture from *The Marriage of Figaro* (arr. Hubert Gurtner) and the theme and variations from *Andantino con Variazioni (Sinfonia Concertante)* K.297B (arr. Maurice Bale).

This recording includes Derek Bourgeois’ arrangement of the Adagio movement of Edward Elgar’s *Concerto for Cello* and a Howard Snell arrangement of Paganini’s *Moto Perpetuo* for two euphoniums and brass band.

———. *Classic Quintet + Steven Mead*. Polyphonic Records QPRM 118D, n.d. CD.

This recording is the result of a collaboration with the European chamber group the Classic (woodwind) Quintet. It includes Gottfried Veit’s arrangement of Monti’s *Csardas*.

———. *Colours of the World*. Steven Mead SM02, 2007. CD.

Mead’s second collaboration with Italian trombone quartet ‘Trombonisti Italiani’ is a collection, mostly of folksongs, from many countries around the globe. Included from Norwegian composer Hugo Alfven is his popular *Vallflickans Dans*.

———. *Euphonium Fantasy*. Bocchino Music 107, 2008. CD.

This new recording accompanied by the Whitburn Band includes Luc Vertommen’s arrangement of Saint-Saëns’ *Allegro Apassionata* and euphoniumist Thomas Ruedi’s arrangement of Tchaikovsky’s *Rococo Variations*, both originally for cello.


An interesting recording from the prolific Mead, this features all music for multiple euphoniums, all played by Mead via the technique of multi-tracking. Included are Dukas’ *The Sorceror’s Apprentice*, the ‘Scherzo’ from Mendelssohn’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, and Wagner’s *The Ride of the Valkyries*. 

A sequel born from the popularity of the previous effort, this recording features another all-Mead euphonium ensemble playing, among others, Maurice Bale’s arrangement of the finale from Beethoven’s fifth symphony and ‘The Death of Ase’ from Edvard Grieg’s *Peer Gynt Suite Op. 23* (arr. Harris).


The third in Mead’s multi-tracking series features Pat Stuckemeyer’s arrangement of Smetana’s *Dance of the Comedians* from his opera *The Bartered Bride*. It also contains an arrangement of John Williams’ theme from the movie *Schindler’s List*.


This recording contains two Luc Vertommen arrangements: Friedrich Gulda’s *Concerto for Cello and Wind Orchestra* and Pablo de Sarasate’s *Introduction and Tarantella*.


The second solo recording from Mead with the Rigid Containers Group Band includes de Sarasate’s *Gypsy Airs* and Mark Freeh’s adaptation for brass band of Harry James’ arrangement of *Flight of the Bumblebee*.

———. *Mead In(n) Brass*. Weinburg Music 10183, 2002. CD.

This recording features Mead with the great Austrian brass ensemble Sound Inn Brass. Included on the album are arrangements of Dvorak’s *Slavonic Dance No. 8* and Borodin’s *Polovtsian Dances* (arr. Howarth & Gurtner).

As the title suggests, this recording was done as a tribute to two of the pillars of the euphonium world: Simone Mantia and Leonard Falcone. Included on the disc is Falcone’s own arrangement of the Klengel *Concertino.* This album was recorded with the Michigan State Wind Symphony in the very room in which Falcone taught for many years.


The first of five recordings in Mead’s *World of the Euphonium* series opens with Mead’s own arrangement of Marcello’s *Sonata in F* for cello.


This recording includes Mead’s own arrangement of Saint-Saens’ “Le cygne” from *Le carnaval des animaux* and an arrangement of the popular showpiece for violin, *Hora Staccato.*


The fourth of five recordings in the “world of” series includes Hugo Alfven’s *Vallflickans Dans.*


The most recent in the “world of” recordings features as its finale Spanish composer Gaspard Cassadó’s *Danse du diable vert* (Dance of the Green Devil) for violin or cello. The arrangement was done by Swiss euphoniumist Thomas Rüedi and was adapted by Roy Newsome.


This debut recording from French euphoniumist Milhiet is unique in that it features all pieces accompanied by the accordion. Included are Vittorio Monti’s traditional showpiece *Czardas* and Vivaldi’s *Sonata No. 1 en Si b majeur* for violin.
Pierce, Benjamin. *Cheers.* © Benjamin Pierce and Jun Okada (837101342094), 2007. CD.

Pierce’s second recording features his own arrangements of Antonio Bazzini’s *Dance of the Goblins, Scherzo Fantastique, Op. 25* for violin, Brahms’ *Hungarian Dance No. 5*, and Rimsky-Korsakov’s *Flight of the Bumblebee*. It also includes Donald Hunsberger’s arrangement of Paganini’s *Moto Perpetuo* for violin.


This recording by the Swiss euphoniumist Ruedi contains his own arrangement of Tchaikovsky’s famous *Rococo Variations* for cello and orchestra. This version (as well as the entire CD) is accompanied by traditional European brass band.

Stuckemeyer, Patrick. *Just for Fun*. Potenza PM 1001. CD.

Stuckemeyer’s debut recording features Paul Droste’s arrangement of all five movements from Robert Schumann’s *Five Pieces in a Folk Style*, originally for cello.


This recording includes Philip Catalinet’s arrangement of Antonio Capuzzi’s *Concerto for Double Bass* (Andante and Rondo).

Thompson, Kevin. *Euphonic Bach*. Private label (© Kevin Thompson), 1998. CD.

The debut recording by the Canadian Thompson features his own arrangements of Bach’s 1st (BWV 1007) and 5th (BWV 1011) cello suites.


Tropman’s first recording includes Hugo Alfven’s *Vallflickans dans* (Dance of the Shepherd Girl) and two pieces for cello and piano by Gabriel Faure: *Papillon, Op. 77 & Sicilienne, Op. 78*. 

VanderWeele’s first solo recording, accompanied by the New York Staff Band of the Salvation Army (of which he is principal euphoniumist), includes staff bandswoman Dorothy Gates’ arrangement of the violin showpiece *Hora Staccato*.


This recording from Dutch conductor and euphoniumist Verweij includes Eric Wilson’s arrangement of Monti’s *Czardas*.
CHAPTER 4

IMPORTANCE AND PEDAGOGICAL BENEFITS

Chapter One of this document delineated the void present in the body of original euphonium repertoire and the need to fill it via arrangements of music for other instruments. In Chapters Two and Three the literature and recordings of arrangements from the repertoire of the strings for euphonium were presented in an attempt to supplement that gap in the original materials, effectively “filling the void.” This concluding chapter now ties the results of this study together with the following question: Why are these arrangements important within the euphonium repertoire? To assist in answering this question, the author turned to a selected panel of professional teachers and performers from the United States and Great Britain.\(^\text{17}\) Their inclusion in this study served the purpose of generating the ideas presented in this chapter via their years of experience performing and teaching these arrangements within their own studios.

Overwhelmingly, the most frequent answer to the question posed above pertained to the vast amount of benefits and opportunities that the aspiring performer stands to gain from studying and performing string literature. Not only do these arrangements provide invaluable opportunities to study the style of the earlier musical periods, they give euphoniumists access to history’s greatest composers. Studying and performing this music provides an important foundation of stylistic knowledge, similar perhaps to that of an aspiring composer who studies

\(^{17}\) The list of participants along with their responses to the discussion questions can be found in Appendix C.
the compositional styles of the great composers on the journey to finding their own. It further provides specific pedagogical benefits that can assist performer and teacher alike in preparation and performance.

A satisfactory performance for both the performer and the audience is only possible when the musician combines a mastery of the techniques required with an intelligent interpretation of phrasing and form. That kind of mastery and interpretation can only be discovered as the result of the musician’s “decision-making processes” in dealing with all the intricate details that a piece of music provides. Modern composers of solo euphonium literature tend to be very specific with their extra-musical markings. Dynamics, velocity, articulation, phrase length, and rubato are often specified to the point where many student performers are satisfied simply to play what appears on the page. Their interpretations subsequently run the risk of becoming a paint-by-numbers kind of bland, a pretty picture with little depth and personal thought behind it. Performing arrangements of string music, however, forces musicians to make these decisions on their own. And while arrangers have added some extra-musical markings into their arrangements, the vast majority of it is still left to the performer to decide. The process of having to make these crucial decisions is the single greatest benefit a performer can glean from studying and performing an arrangement of string literature.

Take for instance the following excerpt from the third movement of J.S. Bach’s Sonata No. 3 for violin (Figure 4.1). While the arranger has provided some articulation markings and a couple of dynamic suggestions, there are many decisions that still must be made in order to play this phrase. Most important among these decisions is where to breathe. With a metronome marking of 48 beats per minute, performers will need more than just a single breath to complete

---

18 Dennis AsKew, questionnaire by author. See Appendix C for full responses.
the passage. Where do they break the line to breathe? Do they utilize rubato and alter the tempo in order to make the breath less jarring on the phrase? Should they leave out a note to keep the line moving? And if they do choose to omit a note, which one do they sacrifice? Regarding dynamics, there is a half-bar crescendo to begin the phrase, but no other direction until the forte designation four and a half measures later. Should this be played as one consistent build to forte, or do they look to identify sub-phrases within the line that can help guide the dynamics within the larger framework? Questions like these force performers to look deeper inside the music to the form and the harmony to find answers that will help create a truly musical phrase.

Figure 4.1 – J.S. Bach, *Sonata No. 3 in E Major*, BWV 1016, arranged by Ronald C. Dishinger (Owensboro, KY: Medici Music Press, 1998), Movement III, mm. 7-13

Another example of music that requires such decision-making is the famous conclusion to the Prelude from Bach’s G-major cello suite (Figure 4.2). With just a very few indications on the page, it is left up to the performer to decide how to shape and pace the line as well as how to design the dynamics to create an effective closing to this opening prelude. In addition, this excerpt demonstrates another great benefit that studying arrangements of string literature provides: stretching the performer’s capabilities beyond the norm of standard expectations. The
excerpt is the very definition of unidiomatic, requiring the utmost in intervalllic facility. Put simply, this passage is incredibly difficult to execute on the euphonium with the necessary smoothness and connectivity that the style requires, certainly much more so than the vast majority of the euphonium’s original repertoire. For this reason, spending the time to develop the necessary skills to play the passage correctly stretches the euphoniumist’s abilities, effectively broadening their skill set.

Figure 4.2 – J.S. Bach, *Suites 1, 2, and 3 for Violoncello Alone*, arranged by Robert L. Marsteller (San Antonio: Southern Music Company, 1963), Prelude, mm. 39-42

An important consideration must be made here. Knowing that many composers of the earlier stylistic periods provided very little in the way of extra-musical markings, the performer can come across an interesting dilemma when faced with an arranger’s particular markings: how many of these are purely editorial in nature? Many times, the answer to that question can be found via the consultation of performance and urtext editions for the intended instrument. Discovering which markings are from the composer and which are from the arranger provides valuable insight that can assist the aspiring performer with their music-making decisions.
Consulting recordings of the works to be studied or performed can also help unearth possibilities to add to this decisional process. As euphonium soloist Adam Frey states:

I use original and urtext editions when possible, but also consult other editions and recordings to see how others have made efforts to make the works as viable as possible. Performance editions offer a great chance to see each performer’s specific vision and adjustment to make the music viable for performance.19

Ideally, the greatest value here may be found not in the actual musical decisions made while working on a particular arrangement, but in the active process of being forced to make them.20

Developing a sense of line and pacing within one’s phrasing is a valuable skill that the study of string literature affords. This idea of line is best expressed as a constant feeling of forward motion in one’s playing, a persistent propelling of the music from note to note, figure to figure, and phrase to phrase. Consider the following quotation from David McGill, principal bassoonist of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra:

To be understood, an idea must be communicated in a clear and logical way. Marcel Tabuteau hit upon the root of musical communication through the development of his ideas about note grouping . . . Understanding note grouping unleashes the forward motion, the expression, the music within each note. Changing pitches alone is not enough to create motion in music. The power to communicate resides in forward motion thoughtfully applied to the notes.

Music is not the notes. Music is what the notes do.21

The study and performance of arrangements of string music provides the perfect opportunity for euphoniumists to work on developing this necessary skill within a readily accessible musical context. With the arrangements that are available, euphonium students can learn how to instill

---

19 Adam Frey, questionnaire by author. See Appendix C for complete responses.


21 David McGill, Sound in Motion: A Performer’s Guide to Greater Musical Expression (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2007), p. 29. Marcel Tabuteau, long time Principal Oboist of the Philadelphia Orchestra and Professor at the Curtis Institute, is widely regarded as one of the greatest pedagogues of the 20th-century, specifically on matters of musicianship and phrasing.
this forward motion in their playing by utilizing the same melodies that other classical musicians of the more traditional instruments do.

Applicability to the student musician is another great benefit that string literature affords. With the vast majority of the euphonium’s original literature being from the 20th-century, the difficulty of learning repertoire is many times compounded due to the tonal language that modern composers utilize. The following excerpt from Donald White’s *Lyric Suite* illustrates this problem (Figure 4.3). The figures in this passage are composed of no discernable key structure or scale. They also contain a vast amount of chromaticism, large intervallic leaps, and a prominent use of dissonant intervals. Furthermore, the performer is directed to play this passage freely with a wide dynamic range and very specific articulations, a task that becomes increasingly difficult when put in the context of the composer’s modern style of writing.

![Figure 4.3](image)

Figure 4.3 – Donald White, *Lyric Suite* (Milwaukee, WI: G. Schirmer, 1972), mvt. 1, mm. 21-31

Identifying scalar passages, hearing chord changes underneath melodic lines, and discovering form can all become difficulties in modern literature, whereas these same features are more readily identifiable in music from the earlier stylistic periods. The following excerpt
from Beethoven’s *Violin Sonata in E♭ Major* demonstrates this applicability very well (Figure 4.4). Much like the excerpt from Bach, this portion from the concerto’s second movement features wide intervals and arpeggiated passages, all within a consistent 16th-note rhythmic texture. It also contains some scalar passages that, combined with the previous devices, make it an excellent teaching tool for using the music’s structure to simplify the line.

![Sheet music image]

**Figure 4.4** – Ludwig van Beethoven, *Rondo from Violin Sonata in E♭ Major Op. 12, No. 3*, arranged by Robert Madeson (Baltimore, MD: Tuba-Euphonium Press, 1994), mm. 202-211

While at first glance this excerpt looks very daunting in terms of technique, breath control, and intervallic facility, it can be made to feel much easier by breaking down each measure by its figures and what chords or scales make up its structure (Figure 4.5). Discovering the building blocks that compose a technical passage such as this serves two purposes. First, it helps make the excerpt easier to play by giving the performer a view of the music that is more than just consecutive notes and the fingerings necessary to play them. Second, it reinforces the basic music theory that college students learn during their undergraduate careers, giving them a tangible example outside of their academic classes to help make their theory skills more practical.
Figure 4.5 – Beethoven’s *Rondo From Violin Sonata in E♭ Major Op. 12, No. 3* (analyzed)

Another benefit to be gained from performing this literature can be found in the idea of modeling the sound of the euphonium after that of a stringed instrument. As University of Georgia Tuba/Euphonium Professor David Zerkel states:

Wind players can think of the exhale as having the same qualities of the bow of a violinist. If the air (or bow) is not moving, no sound will be produced. The consistency and speed of the air has everything to do with the quality of the sound produced. By studying literature composed for strings, we can examine the relationship of breath and bow.²²

This concept is especially effective when applied not necessarily to the actual timbre of the instrument, but the characteristics that sound demonstrates when playing passages that are more difficult to execute on the euphonium. The old adage “make it sound easy” is significantly more difficult to achieve with string music because the technical requirements are compounded with unidiomatic writing. However, if aspiring performers adequately model their product after what they hear from the strings, they can mimic the versatility of the bow and develop a wide array of

²² David Zerkel, questionnaire by author. For complete responses, please see Appendix C.
valuable performance skills. These skills include evenness of tone, ease of total range, variety of color changes, and clarity of articulations.

Finally, studying and performing music from the repertoire of the strings can help further legitimize the euphonium as a serious instrument in the classical world. Due perhaps to the euphonium’s near exclusion from the orchestral medium and its lack of solo works from the great composers, the euphonium remains an outsider to many in the realm of serious classical music. Obtaining the skills necessary to perform string arrangements and giving representative performances of those arrangements is not only a great way to “broaden [the] stylistic palette,” it is a solid opportunity to gain the respect of our peers and help push the euphonium to increased recognition and popularity. Students and teachers of the euphonium who add this literature to their repertoire will find it an increasingly valuable and renewable resource that helps create well-rounded, marketable musicians.

CONCLUSION

It is necessary to know the history of the euphonium in order to understand the repertoire problems that players of this instrument face. The comparatively recent invention and development of the euphonium has had an effect on both the quality and the quantity of original euphonium literature. Many of the early brass instrument virtuosos wrote their own solos, but their pioneering efforts have not led to a full-fledged literature. The euphonium player must rely on arrangements in order to perform music of a variety of styles and from different historical periods.

The quotation above was penned in 1975 when Paul Droste released his first LP, *Euphonium Solos*. While the euphonium’s body of original repertoire has grown significantly in the 35 years since that time thanks to two generations of proactive soloists, euphoniumists today

---

23 Patrick Sheridan, questionnaire by author. Please see Appendix C for complete responses.
still must seek out and create arrangements in order to supplement that repertoire. As can be seen from the literature and recordings presented in Chapters Two and Three, the efforts of those musicians have not been limited to new works for the instrument. The body of available arrangements from the literature of the strings is a welcome and necessary complement to the euphonium repertoire. Studying and performing string music not only ensures a well-balanced performance education, but also contributes to the necessary progression and development of the euphonium student. It is the hope of the author that euphoniumists will utilize the body of string arrangements available and contribute new arrangements from that (and other instruments’) literature to the ever-expanding repertoire of this instrument.
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APPENDIX A
SHOWPIECES AND HIGHLY SIMPLIFIED ARRANGEMENTS

In the process of compiling the information presented in the previous two chapters, a dichotomy in the literature became apparent. While most of the available literature was arranged in order to give euphoniumists access to the music of great composers from earlier stylistic periods, there is a significant portion that falls into the category of what are commonly called showpieces. The defining characteristic of pieces belonging to the showpiece category is their demand of the very highest level of technical proficiency. This is nothing new to euphoniumists. Since its inception, the euphonium has been exploited by composers for its technical capabilities, from the Simone Mantia theme-and-variations solos to modern repertoire such as the Greek dance Zeibekikos from Philip Wilby’s Concerto for Euphonium. Tapping into music of the past, it seems, is no different. Of the sixty recordings featured in Chapter 3, twenty-four of them feature at least one arrangement that falls into this category. Pieces included in this study that can be classified as showpieces are the following:

Hugo Alfven’s Vallflickans Dans (arranged by Frode Rydland)

Pablo de Sarasate’s Zigeunerweisen (arranged by Adam Frey)

Vittorio Monti’s Czardas (arrangements by Marc Reift and Eric Wilson)

Nicolai Rimsky-Korsakov’s Flight of the Bumblebee (arrangements by Neal Corwell and Albert O. Davis)
Peter Tchaikovsky’s *Finale from “Concerto for Violin”* (arranged by Henry Howey)

Among the remaining arrangements, there are several that have been made more accessible to younger students and players of lower skill levels due to a high amount of simplification on the arranger’s part. This “watering down” has been achieved through the usage of one of more of the following devices: cutting significant portions of the original piece, scoring the more difficult passages in the accompaniment instead of the solo, significant octave displacement and range alterations, significant or complete removal of ornamentations and embellishments, slower tempo markings, and transposition to more friendly and familiar keys.

The following arrangements have undergone such a process:

Bach’s *Air on a G String* from the Third Orchestral Suite (arranged by Ronald C. Dishinger)

Bach’s *Jesu, Joy of Man’s Desiring* (arranged by Lloyd Conley)

Corelli’s *Prelude and Minuet* (arranged by Richard E. Powell)

Handel’s “Allegro” from *Concerto Grosso Op. 3, No. 4* (arranged by Ronald C. Dishinger)

Handel’s *Water Music Suite No. 2* (arranged by Ronald C. Dishinger)

Pachelbel’s *Canon* (arranged by Daniel Dorff)
APPENDIX B

CATEGORIZATION OF FEATURED ARRANGEMENTS INTO STYLISTIC PERIODS

This appendix contains all arrangements from Chapter 2 categorized into the appropriate stylistic period from when the original piece was composed. It is intended as a reference tool for teachers and performers looking for a piece from a specific stylistic period for their students or themselves. All arrangements in this appendix include the following information: composer, title, arranger, instrument originally written for, and page number from its corresponding listing in Chapter 2.

BAROQUE:


Bach, Johann Sebastian. *Cello Suite No. 4*. Tormod Flaten. Cello. 11.


———. *Sonata No. 3 in E Major, BWV 1016*. Ronald C. Dishinger. Violin. 15.

———. *Suites 1, 2, and 3 for Violoncello Alone*. Robert Marsteller. Cello. 15.


———. *Trio Sonata No. 5, Movement III*. Ronald C. Dishinger. Two violins. 16.

———. *Trio Sonata No. 6, Movement III*. Ronald C. Dishinger. Two violins. 16.


———. *Sonata in D Major.* Keith Brown. Cello. 27.

———. *Sonata in E Minor.* Keith Brown. Cello. 27.

———. *Sonata in F Major.* Allen Ostrander. Cello. 27.

———. *Sonata in F Major.* Adam Frey. Cello. 27.

———. *Sonata in F Major.* Steven Mead. Cello. 28.


———. *Sonata No. 2 in F Major*. Allen Ostrander. Cello, 38.


———. *Sonata No. 4 in B♭ Major*. Allen Ostrander. Cello, 38.

CLASSICAL:


**ROMANTIC:**


Mascagni, Pietro. *Intermezzo from the Opera ‘Cavalleria Rusticana.’* Ronald C. Dishinger. Orchestra. 29.


———. *“The Swan” from The Carnival of the Animals*. Steven Mead. Orchestral cello solo, 33.


CONTEMPORARY:


———. *Zigeunerweisen (Gypsy Airs)*. Adam Frey. Violin. 19.


APPENDIX C

ITEMIZED PANEL RESPONSES TO PEDAGOGICAL QUESTIONS

As a part of this study, the following musicians provided information regarding the importance, potential benefits, and pedagogical applicability of string arrangements to the euphonium repertoire:

Dennis Askew, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Brian Bowman, University of North Texas

Charley Brighton, Great Britain (Willson performing artist)

Paul Droste, The Ohio State University (retired)

Adam Frey, Emory and Georgia State Universities

Patrick Sheridan, Arizona State University and University of California – Los Angeles

Kelly Thomas, University of Arizona

Demondrae Thurman, University of Alabama

David Zerke, University of Georgia

The data presented in this appendix are the combined responses of these participants, which have been itemized by question.
In your opinion, is string music important for euphoniumists to perform? Why?

(Askew) Yes. Primarily it offers the performers opportunities to learn different styles of music. Secondarily, it provides the performer with the opportunity to work through decision making processes in terms of breathing points, phrasing points, etc. that would not necessarily be an issue found in works originally composed for euphonium, thus stretching the performer, in many good ways.

(Bowman) Many periods of music are not represented in the original euphonium literature while all have great music written for strings. This is a source a large body and variety of important literature that can be studied and performed.

(Brighton) Yes indeed, although around since 1853, the Euphonium had to wait until 1972 for its first ‘real’ Concerto (Horovitz).

(Droste) Yes!! If euphoniumists are to perform music from earlier in music history (Baroque, Classical, or even Romantic Eras), they must resort to transcriptions. Baroque cello sonatas (Vivaldi) are a good place to start. Beethoven and Brahms allowed violins and clarinets to play their cello music.

(Frey) This is most certainly an important aspect of repertoire and study because of the youthful age of the instrument and not having original repertoire from the Baroque, Classical, Romantic time periods. The transcriptions help fill out overall musical genres for students.

(Sheridan) To develop a broad musical sense and a varied musical intuition it is vital to be exposed to a variety of styles of music from around the world throughout musical history for every instrument/ensemble. The ‘string music’ of ‘classical’ composers is a wealthy resource for solo exploration as is the ‘string music’ from American fiddling, jazz and world music.
(Thomas) Yes. I feel that string music is some of the highest quality music available. It is also important due to the fact that the euphonium wasn’t invented when many of the greatest composers were alive and composing.

(Thurman) Yes it is important. The most noted composers wrote for strings and for euphonium players to have access to them, we have to play their music. I also feel that composers notate phrasing better for strings than for brass and that gives us insight to better phrasing in general.

(Zerkel) String music is important for euphonium players to study! The vast amount of quality literature that has been composed for strings is too rich to ignore. Since quality solo literature for the euphonium was not composed until the mid/late 20th century, playing string music allows the student to explore music from the baroque, classical and romantic period. Adapting string transcriptions is very important toward the development of the players that I teach.

From a pedagogical standpoint, what benefits can a performer obtain by performing string music?

(Askew) Learning musical line, working on breathing, and developing alternate/additional articulation concepts.

(Brighton) To be able to perform the works of the great masters (Beethoven/Mozart etc.) is rare in the brass world, so it gives a valuable insight to the classical realm of music.

(Bowman) Learning styles and literature from a large variety of musical periods.

(Droste) The pedagogical benefits are making a string piece work on euphonium, either by playing it “as is” and learning how to interpret string markings (and challenges), or by making
alterations or full arrangements of significant literature. At Eastman I was in the advanced orchestral conducting class. As the class was “the orchestra” and we had no cellist in the class, I covered the cello parts on euphonium. It was a blast coping with string crossings, etc. I really enjoyed this challenge. When it was my turn to conduct, the famous tubist Roger Bobo played the cello parts on his tuba - and even better than I played them.

(Frey) There are many benefits, such as the significant phrasing demands in regards to breathing locations. String players do not have to breathe, but bow. So many times we think of phrases differently. Players can also think and become aware of various string idiosyncrasies, such as bowing and how that translates audibly to articulation and nuance on brass instruments. The tone color of string instruments can be altered based on the various different gut sizes of the strings and their inherent character. This helps the euphonium player gain a more coherent sense of color. The evenness of tone that string players can achieve and that remains a standard across ranges can serve as a model and goal for brass players. Brass players do not have the same ease of range as string players and therefore most work to try to achieve the same fluidity.

(Sheridan) ‘String music’ provides a historical perspective. Music of the Baroque, Classical and Romantic eras can be studied via performance of ‘string music’ from composers of this era. Most of the literature for euphonium is not old enough to encompass much of musical history. World music is becoming more a part of performance opportunities for engaging musicians. Euphonium players that understand, perform and compose music from this broad category have more options in terms of ‘job power.’ String performers in this genre of music, again, are far more developed than what euphoniumists have developed in terms of non-classical musical styles, so ‘string music’ in this area provides another place for euphonium players to broaden their stylistic palette. Creativity is the job currency of current business era. Improvisation is a window into
daily creative connection. Exposure to jazz music and, more importantly, improvisation is vital for a euphonium player. Opportunities in the job market are far more varied for euphonium players that can play/teach jazz styles and improvise on their instrument. Transcribing string performers in jazz provides an incredibly varied palette of musical phrasings, color and style (rhythmic, articulative, etc).

(Thomas) The opportunity to become more familiar with many of the greatest composers is one obvious benefit. Also, the necessity to interpret the music to make it work on our instruments is a challenge, not only from a breathing standpoint, but also having the ability to convey string articulations (downbow vs. upbow). When there are chords the student must also decide whether to play a single note or to roll the chord. There are a lot of interpretation benefits for the student.

(Thurman) Again, the idea of learning natural phrasing is huge. Playing string music also can stretch the perceived limitations of brass instruments relative to playing large intervals and fast technical passages.

(Zerkel) There are many benefits. Wind players can think of the exhale as having the same qualities of the bow of a violinist. If the air (or bow) is not moving, no sound will be produced. The consistency and speed of the air has everything to do with the quality of sound produced. By studying literature composed for strings, we can examine the relationship of breath and bow. Another aspect is that of pace. Since string players do not ever have to “come up for air,” the study of this material forces the student to think about alternative phrasing considerations and how quickly or slowly one must pace the exhale. String repertoire forces this issue more so than wind repertoire, because composers considered the length of the phrase when writing for winds. Having to make these decisions aids in the development of good musicianship. As mentioned
before, the wealth of quality repertoire written for strings is another attractive component of studying this music.

*When is it appropriate to assign string music to a euphonium student in their collegiate education?*

(Askew) Freshman year forward.

(Brighton) As soon as they start to master Concerto/Sonata style works, the comparisons can be beneficial.

(Bowman) At any time. Often easier string pieces have been transcribed and can be used for less accomplished students until they learn to read the appropriate clefs and transpositions.

(Droste) Players with a good high school background should have been exposed to string literature. In college it is absolutely necessary. One purpose of applied music is to learn interpretation and performance practices. Studying string music is necessary to meet this goal. Playing string music is also a great technical challenge (like playing in a circus or rodeo band).

(Frey) This of course depends on the level of the student as well as the level of the repertoire selected. There are certainly easier string works, such as Marcello, that can be functional for early high school students. On the other side of the difficulty spectrum can be works like Bach Violin Concerti and works such as the Franck Violin Sonata and show pieces by Sarasate that require extreme dexterity and facility across ranges.
(Sheridan) It is appropriate to introduce a wide style palette as soon as one engages in music. I don’t feel as if there is a timeframe that should dictate when euphonium players should play euphonium music and when they should perform other music.

(Thomas) I assign the music at all levels. If it is a younger student I will give them a version that has already been edited for a wind player. Sometimes, this is one of the first works they have played by Bach. If it is a mature performer, I will have them work from the original part and then they are responsible for making the decisions on what to play.

(Thurman) I usually will assign a baroque sonata very early (first year). It enables me to talk about harmony as they learn it in music theory. We can also talk about phrasing because in that music, the phrases are fairly easy to define.

(Zerke) I use string arrangements immediately in the first semester.

Are there any specific pieces of string music that you find yourself consistently assigning to members of your studio? What are they and what is it about them that you think is beneficial to your students?

(Askew) Capuzzi Concerto, Bach Cello Suites, Corelli Sonatas, Marcello Sonatas. Each gives a variety of challenges and provides the students with opportunities to develop insight into an earlier style of performance.

(Bowman) Bach Cello Suites of course are a standard, but other cello works such as the Squires Tarantella work very well. Again learning music of great composers is valuable.
(Brighton) The Mozart Violin Sonata K303 works well, transposed to Concert F, the detail in the writing is a real work-out for the brain! The more recent works of Joe Miserendino (PA, USA) ‘Four Nightsongs’, Terry Treherne (UK) Concertante and Ken Friedrich’s works show the instrument is no longer a fish-out-of-water.

(Droste) Aria con Variazioni, Handel/Fitzgerald (harpsichord to cornet); a great piece in a musical sense, and the arrangement really works. I’ve used it often as a recital opener. Five Pieces in Folk Style, Op. 102, Robert Schumann/arr. Droste. Five major sections in a truly romantic idiom. Music of a master. Individual movements can stand alone or be combined (fast, slow, fast). I would not play all five at once. At one recital I had five of my students each play a movement, back-to-back. Six Studies in English Folk Song, Vaughan Williams/Droste. Six short gems. Tuba Concerto by Vaughan Williams; the second movement works very well.

(Frey) Marcello Sonata in F offers good diatonic work with some single tonguing challenges without any overly demanding high range moments that can limit it use to other players. This can be used by high school through to college to adult players and provides great opportunities. Sarasate’s Gypsy Airs is great violin showpiece that allows some great scope of interpretation as well as giving students the chance to musically figure out how to negotiate non-idiomatic writing for the instrument. Bach Cello Suites provide great musical and phrasing challenges as well as non-idiomatic writing, but primarily a vehicle for developing interpretation because there are so many different options and editions. Kol Nidrei is a wonderful melody that highlights some new ethnic music and something different. Rachmaninov’s Sonata in G for cello is a wonderful work that provides a lot of challenges for players and insight into the true concept of a sonata with piano, versus a solo piece with piano accompaniment.
(Sheridan) I encourage euphonium performers to seek out string music from a variety of musical eras. The only consistent string assignments are the Bach Cello Suites and the Telemann Fantasies. The reason for the consistent inclusion of this repertoire is simple - these are perfect pieces written by the very best of the greatest composers. Rather than require specific repertoire, I do require euphonium players to have an extensive knowledge of string performers. There is much to be learned about all aspects of music making by listening to greatest string performers in a variety of styles - Heifetz, Perlman, Zukerman, Stern, Ma, Kreisler, Karr, Rabin, Menuhin, Casals, Milstein, Kogan, Szeryng, Galamian, Ricci, Gingold, Oistrakh, Grappelli, Starker, O’Connor, Meyer, Venuti, Brown, and Zabach are a short list of examples. Usually after an extensive listening tour through performers like the ones listed above, the euphonium player often finds repertoire that speaks to them.


(Thurman) I often assign the Marcello F-Major cello Sonata. It works well because it doesn’t go very high in the euphonium register but has much substance musically. It also teaches breath control and dynamic discipline. I also teach from the Galliard Sonatas for the same reasons.

(Zerkel) J.S. Bach: The Suites for Violoncello, specifically #2 and the Gamba Sonatas, specifically #3. Bach is simply great music. I use these works not only as a good technical and musical stretch, but also as an ear training vehicle. It all makes sense. The study of these works will help to instill good musical intuition in young players.
Antonio Capuzzi: Andante and Rondo from the Double Bass Concerto. This is a nice study in the classical period. Writing is pretty idiomatic for wind players. This may be one of the first string transcriptions my students will see.

Julius Klengel: Concertino #1 for Cello. This is a late classical work that poses challenges in the area of flexibility and nimbleness. I usually assign an arrangement that has been transposed to Bb.

Benedetto Marcello: The Sonatas for Violoncello, specifically F Major, a minor, C Major. Solid Baroque repertoire that poses fewer technical problems than the music of J.S. Bach.

Robert Schumann: Five Pieces in Folksong Style for Cello - Great romantic rep that challenges students in phrase construction.

Ralph Vaughan-Williams: Six Studies in English Folksong. Great lyrical studies with huge range of the Violoncello.


What are the most consistent problems you find in your students’ performance of string music?

(Askew) Breathing, articulation, and ornamentation.

(Bowman) Breathing, large leaps, and how to handle double stops and other string techniques not usually familiar to brass players.

(Brighton) Tempo and style. Trying not to make scalar passages sound like something from the Arban tutor, and lack of control when playing very slow Adagio movements (at 8 beats in the bar, for example).
(Droste) Not understanding the “lightness” of the string sound and articulation. I performed one of the Vivaldi Cello Sonatas with harpsichord once and really had to learn how to “suck it in” sound wise. Normal brass articulation sounds “thuddy” on string pieces. One of my greatest music lessons was at Eastman when I took a lesson from the cello professor on Vivaldi, then he played it for me. What an eye opener!

(Frey) Not being able to determine phrases because they last too long as well as breathing locations in long technical passages. Range and intervals that are easy to navigate on string instruments (this also is true with woodwind transcriptions as well). Lack of rests to assist with endurance in general, but also particularly with high passages, especially in cello repertoire.

(Sheridan) Unless there are situations in the music that address double-stops (or more), the performance of string music isn’t any different than the study of other music. There are some situations in which air management is an issue as string phrasing doesn’t need to provide space for actual breathing. But beyond these situations, the developmental work addresses the same performance issues - TIME, PITCH, TONE, ARTICULATIONS and PHRASING - as any other music.

(Thomas) Breathing, maintaining string articulations/dynamics, and endurance.

(Thurman) Most students can’t make long phrases. Also, students have problems connecting large intervals in melodic passages.

(Zerker) Lack of planning for breaths and/or consideration of subphrases within musical lines. Also, lack of consideration for the way that pieces would sound like on the instrument for which they were originally composed.
How do you assist your students in overcoming these problems?

(Askew) Working on “lightening up” the entire process.

(Bowman) Demonstration, marking the music, and learning how to adapt bowing techniques to breathing and articulation.

(Brighton) Obtaining original recordings by great violinists/cellists and running the piece under tempo to spread the musical line.

(Droste) First of all, they need to hear Yo-Yo Ma or some other fine cellist play the piece that they are studying. This is for musical interpretation. Our euphonium lessons then deal with what techniques are necessary to honor the interpretation and bring it to life. This is another reason why students should attend recitals and performances of string performers. Incidentally, not all string music is playable on euphonium.

(Frey) We take time to determine safe breathing locations and often times will have to leave out a few notes to add a breath so that the overall rhythm and flow of a technical section does not lose its momentum. We will often change octaves of passages to make them sound as effortless on the euphonium as they sound on the original instruments. We may also simplify a technical passage that might be running 16\textsuperscript{th} notes into an 8\textsuperscript{th} and two 16\textsuperscript{th} notes or perhaps a slur 2, tongue 2 pattern that makes the technique more fluid. For this, we might provide a tutti in the piano or band parts so the soloist can rest for a phrase or two and for the high range, taking passages one octave lower or higher to facilitate making the final sound to be as pure as possible.

(Sheridan) Threat of failure. Physical abuse works as a last resort.

(Thomas) Demonstrating for students, having them find original source recordings, and trying to sound like the original instrument.
(Thurman) We work on breath control via long tones and lip slurs. We also talk about tempo and dynamics as possible aids with the phrases. With regard to intervals, I believe in playing as connected as possible as opposed to “slurring”. With that, we work on using a fast airstream over big intervals in addition to practicing a smooth legato tongue.

(Zerkel) I encourage them (and sometimes drag them) to visit the library to hear several recordings of the works on original instruments. I ask them to consider the historical context of the period of the work that they are performing. I ask students to plan the phrasing in a way that makes sense for their personal lung capacity and ability. I encourage students to be creative in solving the problems that long lines or extreme range considerations may pose.

Do you use the original part when preparing a performance of an arrangement? Do you consult performance editions?


(Bowman) Whenever possible. At times.

(Brighton) Where possible, from the library or Internet as bowing marks have different stresses on various notes.

(Droste) Most of my arrangements (Vaughan Williams, Schumann) were done at universities where I had access to complete editions. I would recommend using an original to start with, then consulting other editions/arrangements. I also found that the string teachers who were my teachers (string pedagogy classes, etc.) were willing to act as consultants and took interest in my attempts to arrange and perform “their music.” on my instrument.
(Frey) I use original and urtext editions when possible, but also consult other editions and recordings to see how others have made efforts to make the works as viable as possible. Performance editions offer a great chance to see each performer’s specific vision and adjustment to make the music viable for performance. Some provide editions that make works accessible to players of many different levels and I think this is very important as great music should be performed by players of many different skill levels.

(Sheridan) I prefer to have students use the original part. Or, in the case of an arrangement in a different key, to have the original solo part as a reference. I am apt to consult performance editions from the great string teachers/writers like Galamian, Heifetz, and Kreisler.

(Thomas) It depends on maturity of student. Younger students generally work from performance editions. Older students work from the original source material. They may consult several performance editions if they need help with interpretation/phrasing ideas.

(Thurman) No. Only because from academic study, you can figure out what the original may have been. However, I will try to find recordings on the original instrument to aid in musical choices and ornamentation.

(Zerke) Rarely. I should more frequently.

*Can a performance edition intended for strings be helpful to a wind player? How so?*

(Askew) Yes. Primarily in developing articulation and breathing schematics.
(Bowman) Learning to utilize the musical effects so naturally done with the bow and imitating musical stress and articulation styles that can be done easily with the bow and also adapted for the euphonium player.

(Brighton) Simply because they don’t breathe, working out musical phrases is important, combined with a study of the piano accompaniment or orchestral score.

(Droste) The same question could be asked of band directors who perform orchestral transcriptions. One must learn how to match the sound and style (mostly articulations) of a string player to do this. Good band directors are sensitive to this and teach it from the podium. Example: study The William Tell Overture in its original orchestral setting before trying to play it with a band. Technically, phrasing and breathing are major problems, as string players never have to breathe. Sometimes it is necessary to leave out a note or two to get a breath.

(Frey) Performance editions can be extremely helpful. In the specific case of the Bach Cello suites (and other works as well), a motivated student can really dig deeply into the intricacies of each player’s interpretation. They can make a decision concerning what composite musical picture they want to create in regards to phrasing locations, articulation choices. In the case of performance editions by other brass players, these can guide students in the choices they can or have to make as well as present them with options that have been successfully utilized by other players.

(Sheridan) I believe so. String markings (bowings and articulations) have a more developed usage of these types of markings to instruct the performer about either the ‘beginning’ or the ‘end’ of notes than most brass editions. If the performer is familiar with these types of markings, there is more performance information on a string part than a brass edition. More helpful though
is the score of the entire work. Information about necessary performance edits that are brass centric are usually found by looking at the accompaniment rather than the solo part.

(Thomas) Generally I will use either the original source material or a performance edition done for a wind instrument (usually trombone). I don’t generally use performance editions intended for string instruments. I would rather just use the original source material.

(Thurman) I’m sure it could. It would liberate the student from the stronghold of the editions in the score that they are reading from.

(Zerke) Yes, in that many times, wind arrangements are “dumbed down.” Also, there will be times that the editor may make a decision on how to adapt a double stop passage that might not always be the best choice. Part of the value in assigning this material is to have the students make these decisions on their own. In this case, playing off (or at least studying) the manuscript makes a lot of sense.
APPENDIX D

CONTACT INFORMATION FOR FEATURED PUBLISHERS

This chapter contains the contact information for all publishers listed in chapters 2 and 3 of this document. Its inclusion is intended for the convenience of readers interested in obtaining the arrangements or recordings featured in this document. As much information as was available has been provided, including mailing address, website address, email contact, phone number, and fax number.

Alphonse Leduc: Alphonse Leduc Robert King, Inc.
140 Main St.
North Easton, MA 02356
www.rkingmusic.com
commerce@rkingmusic.com
508-238-8118
508-238-2571 (fax)

Band Press VOF: Watertorenlaan 13B-1930 Zavantem
www.bandpress.be
band.press@telenet.be
+32 2 759 54 08 (phone & fax)

Bocchino Music: Euphonium.net
2A Beaumont Rd.
Chorlton-cum-Hardy, Manchester M21 8BR
www.euphoniumstore.net
euphoniumstore@googlemail.com
+44 (0) 161 2830362
Chandos Records: Chandos House, 1 Commerce Park
            Commerce Way, Colchester. Essex CO2 8HX
            www.chandos.net
dmartin@chandos.net
            +44 1206 225200
            +44 1206 225201 (fax)

Cimarron Music Press: 15 Corrina Lane
            Salem, CT 06420
            www.cimarronmusic.com
            sales@cimarronmusic.com
            860-536-2185
            888-235-1772 (fax)

Crystal Records: 28818 NE Hancock Rd.
            Camas, WA 98607
            www.crystalrecords.com
            order@crystalrecords.com
            360-834-7022
            360-834-9680 (fax)

Doyen Recordings: PO Box 42
            Denshaw, Oldham, Lancashire OL3 5WQ
            www.doyenmobile.com
doyen@doyenmobile.com
            +44 (0) 1457 820138

Editions Marc Reift: Case Postale 308
            Route du Golf 350
            CH-3963 Crans-Montana, Switzerland
            www.reift.ch
            info@reift.ch
            +41 (0) 27 483 12 00
            +41 (0) 27 483 42 43 (fax)

Ensemble Publications: PO Box 32
            Ithaca, NY 14851-0032
            www.enspub.com
            enspub@aol.com
            607-592-1667
            607-273-4655 (fax)

Euphonium Enterprises: see Euphonium.com
Euphonium.com  
Adam Frey  
www.euphonium.com/store  
adam@euphonium.com

Fundamental Music:  
Tormod Flaten  
www.tormodflaten.com  
tormodflaten@gmail.com  
+47 9337 4848

Galaxy Music Corporation:  
ECS Publishing  
138 Ipswich St.  
Boston, MA 02215  
www.ecspub.com  
office@ecspub.com  
617-236-1935  
617-236-0261 (fax)

Hinrichsen Edition:  
C.F. Peters Corporation  
70-30 80th St.  
Glendale, NY 11385  
www.edition-peters.com  
718-416-7800  
718-416-7805 (fax)

International Music:  
5 West 37th St.  
New York, NY 10018  
www.internationalmusicco.com  
info@internationalmusicco.com  
212-391-4200  
212-391-4206 (fax)

JRB Music:  
JRB Music Productions  
PO Box 117  
Cold Spring Harbor, NY 11724  
www.jrbumusicproductions.com  
info@jerbil.biz  
888-572-2322

Kendor Music:  
21 Grove Street  
PO Box 278  
Delevan, New York 14042-0278  
www.kendormusic.com  
716-492-1254  
716-492-5124 (fax)
Ludwig Music Publishing: Ludwig Masters Publications
6403 West Rogers Circle
Boca Raton, FL 33487
www.masters-music.com
info@masters-music.com
800-434-6430
561-241-6347 (fax)

Mark Custom: 10815 Bodine Rd.
Clarence, NY 14031
www.markcustom.com
info@markcustom.com
716-759-2600
716-759-2329 (fax)

Medici Music Press: 5017 Veach Rd.
Owensboro, KY 42303
www.medicimusic.com
270-684-9233

Mirasound: Ariane 6, 3824 MB
Amersfoort, Nederland
www.mirasound.nl
info@mirasound.nl
+31 033 4555004
+31 033 4552730 (fax)

MSR Classics: MSR Music LLC
Newtown, CT 06470
www.msrccd.com
info@msrcd.com
203-304-2486
203-304-2491 (fax)

150-0002 Azuma Ken International Building 6F
2-12-19 Shibuya
Shibuya-ku, Tokyo
www.crownrecord.co.jp
web@crownrecord.co.jp
Obrasso Music: Obrasso-Verlag AG
Baselstrasse 23c CH-4537
Wiedlisbach, Switzerland
www.obrasso.ch
obrasso@bluewin.ch
+41 (0)32 636 37 27
+41 (0)32 63626 44 (fax)

Polyphonic Records: see Studio Music
polyphonic@studio-music.co.uk

Potenza Music: Just for Brass
6115 S. Kyrene Rd., Suite 201
Tempe, AZ 85283
www.justforbrass.com
sales@justforbrass.com
480-652-4532
480-456-8826 (fax)

Rosehill Music Publishing: see Winwood Music

Sacem: www.sacem.fr
Contact via webpage only

Salvationist Publishing & Supplies: 1 Tiverton St.
London 6E1 SNT
www.sps-shop.com
01933 445 445
01933 445 415 (fax)

Saydisc Records The Barton, Inglestone Common
Badminton, S. Glos. GL9 1BX, England
www.saydisc.com

Southern Music Company: 1248 Austin Hwy. Suite 212
San Antonio, TX 78209
www.southernmusic.com
info@southernmusic.com
210-226-8167
210-223-4537 (fax)
Studio Music Company: Cadence House
Eaton Green Road
Luton, Bedfordshire
LU2 9LD
www.studio-music.co.uk
sales@studio-music.co.uk
+44 (0) 1582 432139
+44 (0) 1582 731989 (fax)

Summit Records: PO Box 26850
Tempe, AZ 85285-6850
www.summitrecords.com
sales@summitrecords.com
800-808-4449

Theodore Presser Company: 588 North Gulph Rd.
King of Prussia, PA 19406
www.presser.com
sales@presser.com
610-592-1222
610-592-1229 (fax)

Triumphant Productions: see Salvationist Publishing & Supplies

Tuba-Euphonium Press: PO Box 326
Baltimore, MD 21203
store.iteaonline.org
888-331-4832 (phone & fax)

Walking Frog Records: PO Box 680
Oskaloosa, IA 52577
www.walkingfrog.com
877-673-8397
888-673-4718 (fax)

Western International Music: 3707 65th Ave.
Greeley, CO 80634-9626
www.wiminc.com
wimbo@wiminc.com
970-330-6901
970-330-7738 (fax)
Winwood Music: Unit 7 Fieldside Farm
Quainton, Buckingham, UK
HP22 4DQ
www.winwoodmusic.com
sales@winwoodmusic.com
01296 655777
01296 655778 (fax)