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ABSTRACT

Leoš Janáček’s sextet for winds, *Mládí* (“Youth”), was written four years before the composer’s death in 1928, in the year of his seventieth birthday. The piece was prepared for first performances nearly simultaneously in two locations. In Brno, Janáček led the rehearsals and worked with the Brno sextet; in Prague, the flutist of the Prague sextet, Gustav Nespory, led their rehearsals.

Otakar Nebuška was the editor from Hudební Matice, Prague, responsible for delivering the final manuscripts to be used as a basis for publication of the first edition of the score and parts. He believed that the published score should be as close as possible to the composer’s manuscript, but that the individual parts should include additional details and nuances of performance. The first edition of the score was thus published according to the first Brno performance, with one notable difference: the tempo (i.e., metronome marking) and expression (e.g. Allegro) markings of the Prague performance were adopted into the final copy of the score used for the first edition. The parts used for publication, however, with all the additional details of dynamics, phrasing and articulation were those of the Prague ensemble. Janáček heard the Prague premiere of *Mládí* but did not have a hand in preparing the Prague sextet’s parts.
Though not added by Janáček, these additional markings in the parts have merit as an interpretative source, being very early, contemporary, of Czech extraction, and heard by the composer. The only score currently in print and available for purchase is the 1990 Supraphon Bärenreiter Praha “Critical Edition.” Though claiming the title, “critical,” the editors assert that the parts were not published with the Prague markings, but were corrected based on the score. This cannot be the case, however, as the first edition of the parts clearly shows numerous details that are not in the first edition of the score. The editors of the 1990 Supraphon edition of Mládí removed the Prague markings from the parts; moreover, numerous details of articulation and dynamics of their own were added without noting the vast majority of their additions in the critical notes. Since the Supraphon score is now the only one readily available, a valuable interpretative source is being denied to new performers of the work.
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I remember clearly my first encounter with the music of Leoš Janáček. During my days as an undergraduate, I played piccolo with the local semi-professional orchestra. Our parts for the next concert had been handed to us beforehand as usual and I immediately noticed something about one of the pieces: in a pencil scrawl above the words “I – TACET” there was written “ear plugs in.” Usually such a reminder is written on the music of the person(s) sitting next to the piccolo player, and typically when the piccolo player actually has notes to play. I was intrigued.

The piece was Janáček’s Sinfonietta, and it was unlike anything I had ever heard before. It seemed like there were two- and three-bar repeats every five measures, much to the chagrin of the conductor while rehearsing. There were transitions everywhere, asymmetrical phrases, and small angular motives repeated over and over—but it was never boring. The string parts were extremely awkward. I had never heard horn rips descend before, let alone a great number of them for measures on end. And there was a spine-tingling section beautifully set for the piccolo, clarinet in the highest register—and four trombones. I couldn’t get over the scoring; so transparent and polar, so sharp-edged and concentrated it almost hurt. And the ear plugs? Well, what other piece uses eight trumpets and two sets of timpani?
In graduate school a few years later, I was delighted to find that Janáček had written a piece for wind quintet plus bass clarinet entitled, *Mládí*. I called *Flute World*. “We have one set of parts on the shelf by International,” they said, “but no score. It’s out of print.” I called other likely music sources, but the answer was the same everywhere. I was lucky to get any set of parts and would have to make do with a library score.

Though new to the graduate program I hunted for likely candidates to play the piece with me and soon we were sitting down to a “reading session.” We were in for a shock—Janáček’s pieces do not “read”. What in the heck is 6/16, anyway? Wait a minute—*seventeen/sixteen*? What tempo does this *meno mosso* refer to? Why are there two sets of tempo indications in the score? We trudged our way through *Mládí*, and it began to shine, but there were still many puzzling details we never quite figured out.

About this time I was assigned a short project from my woodwind literature professor; compare a score and parts and see what you find—it will save you much rehearsal time if you know where the errors are beforehand. It was a little too late for the “beforehand” part, but we had come across some curious discrepancies in our rehearsals, and I decided to compare the two in greater detail. I was in for another surprise.

I found that the parts had a great number of details that simply didn’t exist in the score. We had performed the piece more than once by then, and I knew that the markings “worked”; they were intuitive, obviously done by performers. At the time, I assumed that the score and parts didn’t match simply
because we were playing from International edition parts, and the only score in the library was by some obscure Czech publisher I couldn’t pronounce.

The quirky little piece took up residence in my head and didn’t show any inclination to move out. I wrote a short paper about it for another class and always vaguely wondered where those markings came from (little did I know then that they were practically identical to the details put in by the very first performers of the premiere; probably the best Czech performers at the time). I had grand notions of preparing my own edition of Mládí, only to find it had “already been done” as part of a new edition of Janáček’s complete works. But when I looked at the new edition, it didn’t look anything like my old part. Once I understood how Janáček used the metric marking of 6/16 it made perfect sense. Now in its place was “modern” notation. And where were all those helpful performing details?

The following document is an investigation of the answer.
INTRODUCTION

The works of Leoš Janáček have become increasingly popular over the last twenty years. For a long time only a handful of his pieces were familiar to audiences outside Central Europe; now an increasing number of his operas and other works are being performed regularly. While Janáček was once obscured by the shadows of Antonin Dvorak and Bedrich Smetana, now he is considered second only to Dvorak in the ranks of Czech composers. Where once there were relatively few articles and books devoted to Janáček, now he is a regular topic in scholarly music periodicals and new books about him and his work surface every year. The first international Janáček conference was held in 1988; new recordings are released regularly by reputable performers.

Janáček’s late chamber music—being a cache of works written at the height of his compositional confidence and ease—has also attracted increasing interest, and the wind sextet, Mládí (“Youth”) is no exception within the trend. Whereas the piece used to be performed occasionally by only firmly established professional groups as a sort of nod toward the eccentric, now it is becoming a well-known work with which most woodwind quintet ensembles are likely to be familiar.

As performers are (justly) being granted entrance into the hitherto hallowed “scholarly” realm, the demand for reasonable access to the proper information has grown. There have been thirteen editions of Mládí, most with
peculiar advantages and weaknesses. *Mládí* is a curious work with a curious history; the scores and parts which have been published over the years reveal a surprising number of significant discrepancies. Until about 1980, essentially one version of the parts and one version of the score was in circulation which did not match each other; the parts contained many nuances of dynamics and articulation absent from the score, done by performers (not the composer). The subsequent publications of the C. F. Peters edition (1979 score, 1982 parts), and the 1990 Supraphon “Critical Edition” (1990 score and parts), did present matching sets of scores and parts, but both excluded the additional markings found in the early parts.

To publish an edition closer to the composer’s original final manuscript is generally a laudable practice; however, in this case the additional markings were done by Czech performers for the true premiere of the work, and the composer was present at the performance. In addition, since these “Prague markings” were printed in the only parts available for over fifty years, a performance tradition based on them has been established.

A thorough and detailed scholarly edition, which is the truly “performer-friendly” one, is beyond the scope of this document. The aim here is rather to provide a map to the performer interested in this work for the purpose of navigating the maze of available sources, and to clarify some of the issues surrounding it.
CHAPTER 1

A PORTRAIT OF THE COMPOSER

*I maintain that a pure musical note means nothing unless it is pinned down in life, blood, locale. Otherwise it is a worthless toy.* –Leoš Janáček

In a hospital room in Ostrava, (then) Czechoslovakia, a stocky, energetic man with keen blue eyes and thick white bristling hair complains to the doctor—“forbid these young doctors to keep pricking me with their injections. It disturbs me in my work.”¹ His bed is covered with manuscript paper, and he will be dead within twenty-four hours. His wife, upon seeing his face shortly after he died, thought, “you hated dying, you have been wrestling with death.”²

Leoš Janáček (1854-1928) lived as he died: eager—at times almost frantically so—to wring every last drop of energy, emotion, and meaning from his surroundings and then distill and present it in his music. His was not an easy life, but he lived up to his creed, what he wanted to be read “in the book of my life”:

Grow out of your innermost selves
Never renounce your beliefs
Do not toil for recognition
But always do all you can
So that the field allotted to you may prosper.³

¹Vogel, Leoš Janáček, 378.
²Zemanová, Janáček, 256.
³Štědroň, Leoš Janáček, 174.
His harvest was a long time in maturing, but he never stopped composing
nor did he change his style to suit the critics. The field allotted to him for a long
time was that of teacher and musician in Moravian city of Brno, and he threw
himself headlong into the work to be done. He was choirmaster and organist at
the Augustinian monastery; he taught at the Teacher’s Training Institute; he
founded an organ school with three teachers and nine students. ⁴ He led two
community choirs; he brought in extra musicians in order to perform large scale
works like Mozart’s Requiem and Beethoven’s Missa Solemnis. By managing to
have the Opera House include purely symphonic concerts during the season, the
quality of orchestral playing rose and local composers had a medium for their
compositions. He founded a Russian Circle in town and a journal to review
activities of the Provisional Czech Theater. Though many of these activities were
tapered off over time, it is immediately apparent that he worked very hard and
selflessly.

He loved his country, and felt that the soul of his nation—or any nation,
for that matter—was in the sound of its language and its folksong. He was an
incredibly keen observer of both. He traveled with the famous Czech philologist
František Bartoš to collect folksongs and dances, co-publishing two volumes: one
of 174 songs in 1890, and one of 2,057 songs and dances (1899-1901). ⁵ And he
was always collecting speech patterns and inflections, notating them into
roughly equivalent musical notation with amazing speed. His jottings weren’t
restricted to human speech; Janáček kept track of the change in his dog’s bark as

⁴ Thirty-six years later in 1918 he would still be the director, with 186 pupils and a new name—the Brno Conservatory:
Janáček, Leaves from His Life, 9.

⁵ Simeone, Tyrrell, and Němcová, Janáček’s Works, 770.
he matured from a puppy and he watched his pet chickens for hours, noting their different sounds and putting words to them. He noted the sounds of the ocean on his voyage back home from England and even found a way to notate the tiny, high sound of complete silence (Fig. 1).⁶

![Musical notation]

I picked them in the vineyard

Fig 1. Janáček’s dictation: Left to right: a young girl’s speech melody, a sound of the sea (“this one yells”), silence.

With such a conviction of the importance of language, it is not surprising that though Janáček composed in many genres, his passion was for opera. It was the long delay in gaining important performances of them, notably Jenůfa, that most caused him to doubt himself and his abilities. When at last Jenůfa was performed in Prague in 1916—twelve years after the wildly successful Brno premiere and twenty-two years since he began its composition—Janáček was sixty-two, and the most compositionally fruitful period of his life was just beginning.

When fame did thus finally find him, those in the musical scene were surprised and perplexed. Where did this composer come from?

Who was the white-haired gentleman with the funny name, born in the same decade as Elgar, Puccini, and Mahler (in fact, before all of them), who had forsaken the musical idiom of his coevals for that of composers thirty years his juniors, such as Stravinsky and Alban Berg?⁷

---

⁶ Janáček, Letters, 111, 116, 73.

⁷ Susskind, Janáček and Brod, 79.
Leoš Janáček came from Hukvaldy, a small village in Moravia, born on July 3, 1854. His father and grandfather were both musicians and teachers, and his mother was also a fine musician who took her husband’s place to some degree in the musical community when he died in 1866. With ten children in the household the family was poor, and his parents were quick to take advantage of the opportunity to send eleven-year-old Leoš to the “Queen’s” Monastery in Old Brno as a chorister in 1865. The choristers, or “blue-boys” (so named by the blue robes they wore), were a talented and well-trained ensemble that performed at all kinds of occasions in the community from theater productions to funerals; music of Mozart, Cherubini, Rossini, Haydn, Beethoven, Weber.\(^8\) It was his four-year tenure here that instilled in Janáček the work ethic and discipline which were to stand him in good stead for the rest of his life; the boys had a very rigorous schedule of schoolwork and musical training. They also found time for occasional pranks like stealing apples:

> We are crawling under a little bridge—you couldn’t get into the monastery garden by the path. Under the bridge all is cobwebs and darkness....”Thieves!” shouted Father Alip from his window on the first floor. We leapt over fences and through the cloister to escape! In the doorway with a lighted candle held high stood our Director Pavel Křižkovský!\(^9\) As reluctantly, one after the other we had to pass him, a minor scale was played on us...a minor scale in every octave. I got a slap in the highest octave.\(^10\)

After his training at the monastery, and subsequently at the Brno Imperial and Royal Teachers’ Training Institute, Janáček took up the mandatory two-year (and unpaid) post at one of the Institute’s schools; the equivalent of student teaching. It was during this time (1872-1874) that he began making inroads in

\(^8\) Vogel, *Leoš Janáček*, 41-42.

\(^9\) Moravia’s leading choral composer at the time, who took an interest in Janáček’s training.

the musical life of Brno, and was able to try out early choral compositions with
the Svatopluk Choral Society. His teaching certificate did not include a license to
teach music, however; for that he needed additional training in order to pass the
state exam. Consequently, he sought leave to study with František Skuherský\textsuperscript{11}
at the Prague Organ School and subjected himself to the task of completing two
years of study there in one year (1874-1875). He made the acquaintance of
Antonín Dvořák during that time; a composer he whole-heartedly admired, later
striving to get his works performed in Brno whenever he could. Though he did
have a few persons looking after him on occasion, his time there was chiefly one
of Spartan existence—scribbling exercises and practicing for a time with no more
help than a piano keyboard of chalk; “stealing” heat from the tenant across the
hall by leaving his door open. He returned to Brno and fought to improve the
musical scene with renewed zeal, increasing his influence and augmenting the
variety and quality of performances—not without some degree of conflict. After
four years he asked yet again (in 1879) for leave to study—this time at the
Leipzig Conservatory. There he spent five months of intense work primarily
with Leo Grill, and then three months of study at the Vienna Conservatory with
Franz Krenn, colleague of Anton Bruckner and teacher of Gustav Mahler.\textsuperscript{12}
Janáček did find time for one other occupation besides study during this time
that was to be characteristic of him for the rest of his life: letter writing. In this
case the recipient was his fourteen-year-old fiancée and former piano pupil
Zdenka Schulzová, whom he would marry upon his return to Brno in 1880.

\textsuperscript{11} Director of the school, he taught modulation, counterpoint, and polyphonic forms: Vogel, \textit{Leoš Janáček}, 50.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 72
Though his skills were undoubtedly improved by his extended training, it also appeared to have initiated an eight-year “crisis” during which Janáček was faced with a choice: follow the zeitgeist of romantic trends, or turn toward folk influences. By 1888, Janáček had decisively chosen a more folk-based foundation for his works, largely due to the influence of the previously mentioned František Bartoš and their ethnomusicological excursions together that year. In about 1879 he had already begun notating the rhythms and inflections of speech; he called them nápěvky mluvy: a term hard to translate but generally understood as “speech melodies” or “speech rhythms”:

I don’t need to understand the words….I can tell by the tempo and modulation of speech how a man feels; if he lies, or if it is just a conventional conversation. …These are my windows into the soul of man, and when I need to find a dramatic expression I have recourse to my library.14

Janáček did not literally quote specific speech melodies in his music; rather, his constant study of them provided a kind of creative ethos out of which his works grew. His compositions often rest on a truss-like foundation of speech-based gestures; oft-repeated yet seldom dull, characteristically angular and short yet mysteriously cohesive: “When he gets into being himself the lengths remain brief and the units become tiny, but the shapes are large, and the powers of driving continuity inexhaustible.”15 Janáček’s style thus does not lend itself particularly well to analysis:

That he remains resistant to analysis one discovers when banging one’s head against his music in vain. He lays his materials and his processes, however eccentric, so squarely and clearly that there is nothing that cannot be followed, and description or unknitting seems more than usually futile.16

---

13 Ibid., 94.
14 Janáček, Leses, 21.
16 Ibid., 11.
Janáček’s writing is economical and almost sparse, partly in defiance of the Wagnerian style which he disliked, and perhaps partly due to his practice of often drawing his own staff lines. His wife claimed that the habit started because she would deny him staff paper in an effort to keep him from composing while on holiday, but Janáček maintained that a wilderness of empty staves encouraged superfluous notes.\(^{17}\) He came to prefer a polarized texture, using extremes of register to effect a distilled and powerful sound, keen and transparent.

[Janáček’s] nature was one of slow development, and his deep researches into the spring of human expression through natural speech, in and by which song lives, had contributed to his present consummate command of style. The result was a fused language, capable of expressing the most varied emotions, and an orchestration with a colour and tang of its own, owing nothing to others, its chief object being to heighten and illustrate the psychological situation and having little superfluous tissue.\(^{18}\)

Janáček gained success and notoriety in Brno, and occasionally pieces of his were performed in Prague, but for over thirty years he spent his life in teaching, writing, and composing in relative obscurity. The first fifteen years or so of his full-fledged teaching career were especially busy and emotionally difficult; his son had died in 1890 as an infant and his firstborn beloved daughter, Olga, died at the age of twenty-one in 1903. He finished the piano score of his opera *Jenůfa* (later he wrote operas straight into full score) in time to play it for his daughter before her death, at which his hair turned grey “almost overnight.”\(^{19}\) His married life was not much better; Zdenka was from a staid

---

\(^{17}\) Vogel, *Leoš Janáček*, 27.


\(^{19}\) Stüsskind, *Janáček and Brod*, 25.
German household and living with the fiery and fiercely Czech Janáček was bound to cause tension without the added distress of losing their children. Janáček had little time for grief. He was teaching at two schools including his fledgling organ school, for a time directing three choirs, writing reviews of local and outside concerts, and in general doing everything he could to raise the musical standard in the area. Though he succeeded in improving the musical culture around him, Janáček often doubted his skills and could be very despondent at times:

I wouldn’t wish anyone to endure the mood into which he sank when he suffered these doubts. He felt that he was only a little man, with a soul filled with terror. He, who had such inborn dramatic vision, doubted, and waited for public approval.20

Nothing tried his faith in himself more than the struggle to get one of his operas produced in Prague; one of the hardest battles in his professional career was the fight for Jenůfa.

It was a review from 1887 that caused his predicament. Janáček had chosen some rather uncomplimentary words to describe exactly what he thought of Karel Kovařovic’s youthful opera, The Bridegrooms, and was also critical of his conducting skills. Unfortunately, Kovařovic was the conductor of the Prague National Theater and by 1900 practically controlled what was staged there. Thus in 1903 when Janáček was pleading for a Prague performance of Jenůfa his words fell on deaf ears.21 Jenůfa would not be performed in Prague for thirteen years (despite enthusiastic reception in Brno), and then only with fairly extensive revisions by Kovařovic. The performance in 1916 was a successful one, and at last Janáček’s name and music began to creep into the outside world. The

20 V. Tausky quoting Oswald Chlubna, close associate and colleague of Janáček’s at the Brno Conservatory: Tausky, intro. to Janáček—Leaves, 15–16.

21 Vogel, Leoš Janáček, 147.
acceptance and recognition of Jenůfa did a great deal to encourage Janáček, as did
two other events largely responsible for inspiring his compositional confidence:
Czecho-slovakia’s independence (1918), and a passionate, unattainable
love—Kamila Stůsslová, nearly thirty-six years his junior.

Janáček met the Stůssls in 1917 while on a holiday in Luhačovice; Janáček
was 62, Kamila almost 27. David Stůssl was interested in becoming acquainted
with the composer of Jenůfa and a friendship soon formed. Janáček was
completely enamored with the “gypsy” (she had a dark complexion, curly black
hair and dark eyes) and began to write her letters—eventually over 600\(^{22}\). She
accepted his worship, but never reciprocated his love, and because of the vast
age difference and geographical distance, Kamila’s husband tolerated the
friendship (Zdenka was less amenable). Many of the female leads in Janáček’s
operas after that were created with Kamila in mind; she was also the inspiration
for his string quartet, Intimate Letters—directly associated with their
correspondence. It is certainly true that without her inspiration, there would not
have been so many works written with such speed and passion, and it is largely
due to Kamila that Janáček’s last decade was one of his most fruitful. Ironically,
she was also the indirect cause of his death. Sources differ regarding the exact
nature of the circumstances, but most agree that it was on a search for her son
while they were visiting him in Hukvaldy that he caught a chill and later
pneumonia; he died soon after in the hospital at Ostrava on August 12, 1928.

\(^{22}\) Ibid., 254-55.
CHAPTER 2

MLÁDÍ: GENESIS, PREMIERES, AND EARLY EDITIONS

*A perfect work falls from the tree like a ripe apple. . . . even a scientist cannot do without fantasy.*  –Leoš Janáček

**Janáček in 1924**

Due to the success of *Jenůfa*, Janáček’s other operas were accepted much more easily and his other works began to penetrate abroad as well. By the time Janáček was approaching his seventieth year he had gained a large measure of fame in his own country and was decidedly attracting the notice of the outside world. 1924 was an auspicious year in that regard; *Jenůfa* would receive premiere performances in Berlin (conducted by Erich Kleiber) and New York, and Janáček would be a presence at the festival of the International Society of Contemporary Music (ISCM) for the second time. Nearer home, there were at least nine concerts solely devoted to his music over the span of only three months in Brno and Prague, and the Brno theater produced three of his operas that season—including the premiere of *Příhody Lišky Bystroušky* (*the Cunning Little Vixen*). Unlike most composers’ seventieth birthday festivities that tend to be retrospectives, Janáček was actively composing at a tremendous rate. In addition to the new opera, two other works premiered that year: his *First String Quartet* and *Mládí*. 
Inspiration and Influences

In 1923, Max Brod—an admirer and champion of Janáček—was finishing up his biography, published before the composer’s seventieth birthday on July 3, 1924. The mental forays into childhood memories during the interviews with Brod are probably what prompted Janáček to write a short piece for piccolo, glockenspiel, and drum (or piccolo and piano) which he named March of the Bluebirds, recalling his days as a Queen’s chorister: “Whistling go the little songsters from the Queen’s Monastery—blue like bluebirds.” The scoring was also influenced by his remembrance of the Prussian army band, with its “little tin drums. . .and the strident tunes of the high piccolos” which he had heard during his chorister days.23 He dated the autograph May 19, 1924 and dedicated the piece to his primary copyist (and a flutist), Václav Sedláček. The thematic material of the short piece became the basis for the third movement of Mládí. The theme of the first movement is thought to be derived from the speech melody, “mládí, zlaté mládí!” (youth, golden youth!). According to the program notes for an early performance the second movement depicts “a tearful scene of farewell from his mother at the railway station” in Brno (there was no railway station in Brno!) and the fourth movement “a rigorous entry into life.”24

Janáček’s decision to write for chamber winds was probably influenced by his attendance at 1923 International Society of Contemporary Music (ISCM) festival in Salzburg, which was Janáček’s “debut before the mighty mandarins of modern music.”25 In addition to hearing his own Violin Sonata, some of the

23 Vogel, Leoš Janáček, 299.
24 Přibáňová, intro. to Mládí, xvi.
25 Susskind, Janáček and Brod, 79.
chamber works of the concerts given there on August 4 and 5 included woodwinds, such as Prokofiev’s *Overture on Hebrew Themes* for clarinet, string quartet and piano; a sonata for flute and harp by Sem Dresden; and Arthur Bliss’s *Rhapsody* for flute, english horn, string quartet and two voices. He was most impressed with Igor Stravinsky’s *Trois pieces* for clarinet and *Concertino* for string quartet. Most significantly as far as *Mládí* is concerned, Albert Roussel’s *Divertimento* for woodwind quintet and piano was performed by none other than the fine Parisian ensemble *Société moderne des instruments à vent*. Janáček was to hear this same ensemble perform again less than a year later on April 10, 1924 in Brno as part of the ensemble’s tour; this time the program included J. B. Foerster’s *Wind Quintet* op. 95 as well as Roussel’s *Divertimento*.

Such exposure to fine wind playing no doubt intrigued Janáček, who had never written for chamber winds before.

**Early performances and sources for the first printed edition**

*Autograph and first authorized copy*

Janáček wrote out the first draft of *Mládí* during a three-week stay at his small house in Hukvaldy, the village where he spent his childhood days. On July 24 he wrote to his Beatrice, Kamila Stösslová, “I’ve composed here a sort of memoir of youth.” He returned to Brno on July 27 and revised the first draft, dating the autograph August 10. Janáček left the autograph with his faithful copyist, Sedláček, before leaving on August 15 for a two-week holiday. Sedláček

---

26 Přibáňová, intro. to *Mládí*, xv, xvii.
finished the authorized copy before Janáček returned, dating it August 28
(presumably about this time he also wrote out the first parts). Janáček seems to
have been very eager to have the work performed and published as soon as
possible. Two letters, one from the head of the Prague Conservatory (agreeing to
perform the work) and another from the director of the Hudební Matice
publishing house (expressing interest in its publication), were sent to Janáček
before the first copy of the score had even been completed.

Rehearsals in Brno and Prague; the Prague score

Though Janáček had alerted the Prague Conservatory of his new
composition, he first worked with musicians closer to home—professors of the
Brno conservatory. As he had never written for this medium before, the
rehearsals prompted considerable changes in the score; he had written “many
things that were found difficult to play or didn’t during performance fully
correspond to his sound or tempo intentions. . .” Janáček was very pleased
with their work and wanted them to play the Prague premiere in addition to the
Brno premiere; but members of the Czech Philharmonic were already
rehearsing for that event. Thus two different ensembles were preparing the
work nearly simultaneously. In Prague Otakar Nebuška, an editor from

---

28 Simeone, Tyrrell, and Němcová, Janáček's Works, 230.
29 Přibáňová, intro. to Mladí, xv-xvi.
30 Josef Bok, flute and piccolo; Matěj Wagner, oboe; Stanislav Krtička, clarinet; František Janský, horn; František Bříza, bassoon; Karel Pavelka, bass clarinet.
31 Šourek, intro. to Mladí, 5. See also Appendix A.
32 Officially, the “Woodwind Chamber Association of the Czech Philharmonic Orchestra.” Seven members performed (as they decided to have the piccolo part played by an additional member, Josef Dreschler): Gustav Nesporý, flute; Alois Stancl, oboe; Artur Holas, clarinet; Oldřich Seliger, horn; Eduard Anderle, bassoon; Josef Pech, bass clarinet.
33 Přibáňová, intro. to Mladí, xv.
Hudební Matice (HM) and a friend of Janáček’s, had a second copy of the score (done by Sedláček); Janáček sent two letters in early October containing changes to be made to this score.34 On October 14, Janáček also wrote to the conductor of the Czech Philharmonic, Václav Talich, requesting him to supervise the rehearsals. However, the flutist of the group, Gustav Nesporý, assumed the responsibility, perhaps even before Janáček requested Talich.35

Premieres and the third copy of the score

On October 21, 1924 the Brno sextet performed the Brno premiere, but just before the performance the fates frowned on the occasion; both the oboist and clarinetist had last-minute trouble with their instruments, probably due to a considerable temperature change between the artists’ room and the concert hall. The oboist managed to jury-rig a temporary fix, but the clarinetist mostly mimed his part.36 Though the piece garnered healthy applause, poor Janáček ran onto the stage afterward, saying, “ladies and gentlemen, this was not my composition! Mr. K. was pretending to play but in fact did not.” The Prague performance on November 23 must therefore be considered the true premiere, at which Janáček was also present.37

Earlier that month on November 6—the day of The Cunning Little Vixen’s premiere—Janáček gave Nebuška a third copy of the score (also by Sedláček). Janáček intended it to be the authoritative copy and the basis for the print edition

34 Simeone, Tyrrell, and Nemcová, Janáček’s Works, 230.
35 See note 31.
36 Přibáňová, intro. to Mládí, xvi.
37 Vogel, Leoš Janáček, 303. See also note 33 and 34.
of the score; final changes were added in pencil by Janáček on November 21 and by Nesporý on November 25, just before and after the Prague premiere.  

*Divergence of source material: score and parts*

The first edition of the score differs considerably from the first edition of the parts. According to Otakar Šourek, it was Nebuška’s publishing philosophy that was responsible for these discrepancies; he believed that the published score should represent the composer’s exact conception, but that the parts should contain additional, detailed performance markings. It was not the Brno ensemble’s set of parts that was used as the basis for the first edition of the parts, but Prague’s, and the Prague rehearsals were led by flutist Gustav Nesporý. As most musicians tend to do, the Prague ensemble added subtleties of dynamics, articulation and dynamics in preparation for musical and thoughtful performance. They also made not-so-subtle changes in the tempi of the movements, and these two categories are important to keep in mind as separate entities. In one category are the metronome and tempo markings of the Prague performance, which were adopted (with Janáček’s permission) into the third and final score which was based on the Brno rehearsals and performance. In another category are the detailed performance markings (dynamics, articulation) in the Prague parts which were *not* adopted into the score, but remained only in the parts (fig. 2):

---

38 Dolezal and Faltus, “Critical Commentary,” 43. See also Appendix B.

39 Šourek, intro. to *Mladi*, 6. See also Appendix A.
Fig. 2. Flow chart of primary sources resulting in the first publication of the score and parts

Given that Janáček made changes to the final score two days before the Prague premiere, it is possible that he made the tempo changes himself, but there is no record of his being present at any of the Prague rehearsals. There is very little information regarding what he thought of their performance (see below), but the fact that he allowed the publisher to use the changed tempo markings assumes some degree of approval.
Janáček was present for one other performance of *Mládí*, this time in England, having received a gracious invitation by Rosa Newmarch (another Janáček champion) on behalf of Britain’s musical dignitaries of the time.\(^40\) On May 6, 1926, a concert of his chamber music was given in Wigmore Hall in London, and *Mládí* was performed by the London Wind Quintet.\(^41\) Janáček attended rehearsals with the ensemble, and at first it appears he was very impressed with their technical mastery. In a letter to Zdenka on May 3, he wrote: “I had a rehearsal at 8:30 a.m. … The Youth is interpreted excellently. Brno and Prague should go and hide.”\(^42\) But their musicality did not seem to be emotional enough for him. In a feuilleton titled, “Sea, Land” Janáček described how he thought the vastness and coldness of the sea influenced English tastes and emotions:

> The wide planes of space bring into the mind great planes of time, and wide, diluted planes of emotion. By this I explain to myself the clinging to musical works of the past—the conservatism of the English musical mind… In my *Youth* and the *Quartet on Tolstoy’s Kreutzer Sonata*
> the smile languished,
> the joke turned serious;
> the horror did not frighten,
> the passion did not explode.\(^43\)

Later he wrote to Max Brod, “[t]hose London string and wind players have hearts of ice! They are content with half measures. They sit in front of their fireplaces—and can’t stand the heat of the sun!”\(^44\) Whatever his appraisal of their emotional capacity, however, he couldn’t fault them for laziness. A general strike happened on the day of the concert crippling all transportation; the oboist,

\(^{40}\) Susskind, *Janáček and Brod*, 110.

\(^{41}\) Robert Murchie, flute/piccolo; Leon Goossens, oboe; Haydn Draper, clarinet; Aubrey Brain, horn; Paul Draper, bassoon; Richard Newton, bass clarinet: Simeone, Tyrrell, Nemcova, 231.


\(^{43}\) Ibid., 130

\(^{44}\) Susskind, *Janáček and Brod*, 112.
Leon Goosens, walked for three hours to get to the performance, and many others arrived on foot as well.\textsuperscript{45} The concert was well-received, and Janáček was very pleased to have been invited to London, though he did not like their brand of musicality. The London quintet did probably play off of parts containing the Prague markings, as the published edition would have been in print nearly a year by then.

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., 110.
CHAPTER 3

PUBLICATIONS OF MLÁDI: DESCRIPTION AND APPRAISAL

In their zeal for consistency, editors must guard against making interpretive decisions that are properly within the province of the individual performer.

—Colin Lawson and Robin Stowell

Editions: a roster

There have been thirteen publications of Mládí to date including the first Hudební Matice editions (fig. 3)^46:

---

^46 Chart adapted from: Simeone, Tyrrell, and Nemcova, Janáček’s Works, 230.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLICATION TYPE</th>
<th>PUBLISHER, CITY</th>
<th>DATE PUBLISHED</th>
<th>PLATE NUMBER</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pocket score</td>
<td>Hudební Matice (HM), Prague</td>
<td>April 20, 1925</td>
<td>HM 341</td>
<td>First edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts</td>
<td>HM, Prague</td>
<td>June 16, 1925</td>
<td>HM 347</td>
<td>First edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano arrangement (two-hands)</td>
<td>HM, Prague</td>
<td>Early 1925</td>
<td>HM 348</td>
<td>Arranged by Bretislav Bakala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket score</td>
<td>HM, Prague</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>HM 341</td>
<td>ed. and intro. Otakar Šourek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts</td>
<td>Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury, hudby a umění (SNKLHU)</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>H 2609</td>
<td>renewal of 1925 HM; very slight change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket score</td>
<td>International Music Company (IMC), New York</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3111</td>
<td>from HM 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts</td>
<td>IMC, New York</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3104</td>
<td>from SNKLHU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts</td>
<td>Editio Supraphon (ES), Prague</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Reprint of SNKLHU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket score</td>
<td>ES, Prague</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>H 6514</td>
<td>ed. and intro. by Šourek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts</td>
<td>Peters, Leipzig</td>
<td>1982 (ed. no. 9864)</td>
<td>13184</td>
<td>ed. Barvík and Zimmermann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score and Parts</td>
<td>ES, Prague, Bärenreiter, Kassel</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7388 and 7388p</td>
<td>ed. Jan Doležal and Leoš Faltus; intro. by Sváta Přibáňová; (7388p omits critical notes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score and Parts</td>
<td>Editio Bärenreiter Praha</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7388</td>
<td>from ES, 1990, with some minor changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. Chart of published editions

A “family tree” of the editions shows that there are essentially four versions of the score and three versions of the parts (fig. 4):
Fig. 4. Publications of Mládí and their sources

Note that this chart does not show which manuscripts or authorized copies were used for the preparation of various editions, but only printed sources. Such considerations are most pertinent to the middle column, which incidentally includes those editions claiming the title, “critical.” The Peters edition, while not claiming to be critical, exhibits critical attributes; the autograph and early copy were consulted and an attempt made to publish an edition as close to the composer’s intention as possible. What exactly is a critical edition, however? Before an appraisal of the editions can be made, it is helpful to have a working definition of the different types of editions.
Types of editions: a short orientation

The New Grove article on editions and editing discusses four types of editions: photographic facsimile, edited print that replicates the original notation, interpretative, and critical.\(^4\) Of the four, the first is generally not suited for performers, as the text is usually not legible enough to be read accurately at any kind of speed; this is certainly true of Janáček’s hand. The second does not apply in this case, as it refers to very early music where old notation is replicated via typeset. An interpretative edition is one that has been prepared by a performer who has added his own details of articulation, dynamics, phrasing, etc. While this type is often interesting and useful as a kind of documentation of particular performance styles, it has the disadvantage of (usually) being unclear as to what the composer wrote and what the performer added. The piece may even be re-written to some extent. These three types of editions are each for a rather narrow purpose: the facsimile for a scholarly, leisurely appraisal; the edited print for the performing specialist; and the interpretative for a performer who wishes to follow a certain tradition, or a student/amateur in need of performing suggestions.

A critical edition has a broader audience in mind—“the general musically literate public: performer, student, scholar, and the informed amateur.”\(^5\) Its aim is to present a clearly legible text based on the editor’s study of all credible sources which often includes an autograph manuscript, fair copy, first printed edition, and possibly performer’s parts. Of course the number and type of

---


\(^5\) Ibid., 892.
sources varies depending on the piece, composer’s habits, preservation of sources, and other factors. Many editors choose to base their edition primarily on one good source rather than treating all sources equally and ending up with a patchwork version that resembles nothing that previously existed⁴⁹ (but, of course, in other circumstances such an approach is warranted). Where deviation from the chosen “best source” is deemed necessary based on comparison to other sources the conscientious editors of a critical edition will make clear that one reading was chosen over another and why, and show the alternative reading—usually in a commentary in an appendix or forward, as too many in-text emendations are visually distracting. Also, it is increasingly expected that a critical edition include some discussion of the source materials and the principles behind the decisions made by the editor(s). A critical edition is expected to serve the purposes of academic study and practical performance; “Different editions strike different balances, and one function usually predominates, but the other is never lost sight of.” ⁵⁰

**Editions: description and appraisal**

**1947 Hudební Matice**

The second score of *Mládí* was published in 1947, edited by the previously mentioned Otakar Šourek.⁵¹ In it the original tempo markings are included along with the Prague markings, which are in parentheses. In addition, “everything

---


⁵⁰ Grier, “editions, historical and critical,” 400.

⁵¹ “Otakar Šourek (1883-1956), Czech musicologist, and the most important biographer and editor of Dvorak’s works...he compiled the original Dvorak thematic catalogue and was first general editor of the Dvorak edition.” From: Beckerman, “Janáček’s Notation Revisited,” 250.
that was different or added in the first edition is in parentheses”; “in places where it was shown to be necessary, some dynamic markings were added; these are also marked by parentheses.” Redundant accidentals were omitted, as well as a few errors corrected. All in all, the 1947 score does not radically depart from the first edition. None of the changes are especially significant other than the addition of the original tempo markings—indeed, the same plates were used for the production—and the use of parentheses to indicate where changes were made is laudable. As mentioned, the Prague ensemble played the movements at quite different tempi than Janáček had marked in the score, and they changed the expressive indications to suit the new metronome markings (fig. 5):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Brno “Premiere”</th>
<th>Prague Premiere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Andante ( \frac{4}{4} = 128 )</td>
<td>Allegro ( \frac{4}{4} = 144 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Moderato ( \frac{3}{4} = 92 )</td>
<td>Andante sostenuto ( \frac{3}{4} = 72 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Allegro ( \frac{3}{4} = 120 )</td>
<td>Vivace ( \frac{3}{4} = 160 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Con moto ( \frac{2}{4} = 104 )</td>
<td>Allegro animato ( \frac{3}{4} = 132 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5. Movement titles and metronome markings, Brno and Prague premieres

The 1947 parts are identical to the 1925 parts; indeed, there are no 1947 parts per se. An item worthy of mention, however, is that in the parts all the repeats are written out; therefore the parts have a different number of measures per movement than the score.

---

52 Šourek, intro. to Mladí. 6. See also Appendix A.
**1958 SNKLHU Parts**

These parts, “renewed” from the HM 1925 edition, have a few slight changes; some of the dynamic markings are placed in brackets and a very few articulation markings have been slightly changed. The HM 1925 plates were obviously used for this edition.

**1970 International Music Company**

This score is an identical copy of the HM 1947 score. The only changes are in the naming of the instruments and the title style and font. Likewise, the parts are identical to the 1958 SNKLHU parts.

**1979/1982 C.F. Peters edition**

The first score showing significant change from the first edition is the 1979 C. F. Peters edition. The editors include brief “concluding remarks” in German, Czech and English on the genesis of the work and comment on the dual tempo indications (Brno vs. Prague). In a separate “editor’s note” sources for *Mládí* are described as well as the principles for the edition, and finally there are about 100 annotations acknowledging alternate readings and occasional references to the autograph “in order to illustrate the compositional process.”\(^\text{53}\) Unfortunately, the annotations are somewhat haphazard. Some added articulation markings (i.e. slurs, staccatos) are not accounted for, even under caveat of “[a]nalagous

---

\(^{53}\) Barvík and Zimmermann, “Editor’s Note,” 98.
additions. . . in connection with parallel part-writing.” Borrowed divisions usually shed one ligature line (fig. 6), but the change in notation is not mentioned.

![Notation of borrowed division: Left, HM; right, Peters](image)

“[C]onsistent continuation of the chains of trills up to the end of the last tied note in each case” is weakly justified under the rubric of analogous additions, but to one used to their absence these additions sound quite strange. There are errors, but they are few and of slight effect. All in all, the Peters edition is quite consistent and most of the variants from their chosen source materials are accounted for. The greatest fault of the editors is their failure to include the second authorized score—which Janáček expressly intended to be the authoritative one—as part of their comparative study. Either they were not aware of the second copy or did not choose to include it. Whatever the reason, it is a serious shortcoming for a critical edition. Exclusion of the Prague score is to be expected, as it did not come to light until about 1992.

---

54 Ibid., 99.
55 Ibid.
56 Dolezal and Faltus, “Critical Commentary,” 43.
57 Barvík and Zimmermann’s editorial technique has been called, “amateur”: Wingfield, “Unauthorised Recomposition,” 210.
58 Šťfan, “Retuše Janáčkova Mladí.”
The parts, published a few years later (1982), were intended to match the score—the first edition to do so. Aside from a few errors, the parts do follow the score; therefore, almost all of the Prague interpretative markings are removed from this edition, aside from a very few references in the annotations where the editors used the parts as an auxiliary source.

A curious quality of this edition is the system used to number the measures. Whenever there is a repeat with a first and second ending, the endings are not exclusively numbered; e.g., if the first five measures of a movement are repeated, with a first ending of two measures and a second ending of two measures, each ending would be numbered m. 6 and m. 7. Thus first and second endings share the same numbers. This is annoying at times, especially when attempting to locate particular measures quickly.

1980/1975 Editio Supraphon

I have been unable at this time to find any information on how to obtain this score; three facts are known, however. First, Otakar Šourek, who edited the 1947 edition, was listed as this edition’s editor and wrote the introduction. Second, Šourek died in 1956. It seems unlikely that he edited a new edition that sat on a shelf for fifteen years before being published. Third, by 1990 when the Supraphon score was published the reviewer of the edition, Janáček scholar, Zdeněk Skoumal, made the comment that users of the Supraphon score should compare it with the Peters score; no mention of the earlier Supraphon score was

---

59 Simeone, Tyrrell, and Němcová, Janáček’s Works, 230.
made.\(^{60}\) This seems to imply that the Peters score was evidently more reliable, or at least was based on more sources and therefore more “critical.” Given these facts, it is likely that the 1980 score is merely a reprint of the Hudební Matice score which Supraphon wanted to republish under its own name. That there is no detailed description or mention of the score through reasonably accessible scholarly resources supports this conjecture. The parts are a reproduction of the 1958 SNKLHU publication.\(^{61}\)


There has been much controversy over the Complete Critical Edition of Janáček’s works (hereafter referred to as “CE”), the first volume of which was published in 1978 (*Mládí* is series E, volume 6). Although it has gained some positive reviews, the reaction in the United States by top Janáček scholars has been unequivocally negative. There is a fitting consideration to bear in mind at the outset, however, when evaluating the battlefield:

> There is no point trying to blame anyone for this impasse. To my mind the problem has always been a political one: the editorial board was set up by Czechs and for Czechs, and consisted only of Czechs. Despite the fact that there were many scholars and musicians who ought to have been consulted in the process of designing an edition, political conditions made this at best inconvenient, and at worst, impossible.\(^{62}\)

This is a welcome attitude amidst the many rather uncharitable reviews published, but however sympathetic one may be to the predicament of the editors, it remains that many criticisms of the edition are virtually unanswerable while the majority deserve sober consideration at the least. We may put these

---

\(^{60}\) Skoumal, “Music Reviews,” 1136.

\(^{61}\) See note 59.

criticisms into four categories, applicable to the CE in general and specifically to Mládí: first, the CE’s orthography; second, the lack of consideration of international scholarship; third, selective omissions in the annotations; and fourth, errors, including a failure to acknowledge an early interpretative source—the 1925 HM parts.

Orthographic principles of the CE

The majority of the discussion concerning the CE has centered on the editors’ attitude toward orthography—especially their decisions to enharmonically respell notes when the “inner logic” of the music so dictates—and to use non-traditional notation for the meter. Their reasoning is that orthography is progressive, and that editors should support and encourage progression rather than attach too much importance to the musical symbols. In a summary of the Editorial Principles and Guidelines, the editors state:

If someone had told [Janáček] that his notation of musical pitch suggested something more than musical pitch, he would have rejected the idea out of hand. The inconsistency with which he uses accidentals and key signatures in musically analogous places shows clearly that he pursued no special intention with his unusual manner of notation. The Complete Edition of Janáček’s works seeks to proceed in such a way that the use of accidentals reflects the inner logic of the music, something which is easier to grasp when the proper orthographical notation is employed.  

Jarmil Burghauser, a highly esteemed Czech musicologist, composer, and conductor and an important member of the editorial committee, also stated:

The poetic saying that we must have our composer “warts and all” is wrong exactly in its principal point—where the warts are. If they are in the work itself, then well, nobody is entitled to remove them. But if they are only in the notation distorting the means by which the work is conveyed to the interpreter, then the duty of the editor is to remove such static.

---


*Enharmonic respelling*

However, there are times when there may be found very important meaning in the “static” of the particular spelling that Janáček uses, as a joint review by Roland J. Wiley and the esteemed pianist and pupil of Janáček, Rudolf Firkušný, elucidates:

The principles employed [by the CE] disregard a delicate but fundamental aspect of notation: the spelling of notes conveys a particular meaning....A brief example will illustrate. Janáček described No. 10 of *On an Overgrown Path*, “The Barn Owl Has Not Flown Away!” in graphic terms: the two pitches in the right hand in measure 3—C-sharp and A-sharp—he called “fate”. These were, within the program of the piece, a foil to the flourish of measure 1, which represented an attempt to scare the bird away....Later, when writing, *In the Mist*...he states this fate motive again...pointing up the similarity with the earlier composition in the spelling of the notes: C-sharp and A-sharp are presented within a key signature of five flats. This quotation is entirely obscured in the Critical Edition (p. 106)—and with it an important insight into the meaning of the piece—when the notes are spelled, in accordance with the *Ediční zásady* [editorial principles], as D-flat – B-flat.⁶⁵

It goes without saying that theoretical music analyses and insight into Janáček’s compositional procedure will be hampered by the CE’s practice of “cleaning up” the score and conforming incongruous accidentals into a self-designated enharmonic key center. It is misguided to assume that while no rhyme or reason can always be found in Janáček’s use of notation that none ever will be; to standardize the notational procedure to the point of respellings in the name of progression and “performer-friendliness” is unmerited—the traditional notation that has been in use in available editions since the work was published in 1925 is perfectly legible. The more difficult aspects of the piece, technical and rhythmic, will not become any easier by changing the style of notation.

---

*Metric notation*

The second orthographic issue is that of the meter indications and rhythmic notation. The editors have again chosen the “progressive” route and thus have notated meters not in the traditional manner, with vertical Arabic numerals in the staff, but rather above the staff horizontally (fig. 7).

![Fig. 7. Metric notations: Left Traditional (HM); Right CE](image1)

This “scientific” notation causes the most visual distraction in its conversion of isolated 17/16 measures (fig. 8):

![Fig. 8. Notation of 17/16: Left Traditional (HM); Right CE](image2)

17/16 is bound to be confusing at first glance no matter how it is translated, but at least traditional notation takes up considerably less space.

Janáček was a progressive thinker in many ways; not only in his use of speech melody as a basis for composition—a major innovation in itself—but also in his theoretical writings and philosophy. It is thus not surprising that he described this kind of notation in his theoretical studies, though he did not use it in his own compositions.\(^{66}\) Janáček’s progressive orientation, so to speak, is

---

therefore some justification for the decision of the editors to use non-traditional notation. But the fact remains that Janáček did *not* use this kind of notation. However noble the editors’ intentions may be, this reasoning seems in the name of science rather than to the purpose of practicality or fidelity to the original, which surely should take precedence in a critical edition. On the practical side, the large Arabic numerals can be easily mistaken for rehearsal numbers (in consequence of which the CE has been obliged to remove this useful rehearsal tool) and the note values mistaken for actual notes on the staff (see again fig. 8). On the side of fidelity to the original, some time signatures have not merely been converted to a different notation but changed altogether; the very first signature, in fact, should be 6/16, not 2/4. True, this is a value seldom seen by musicians, but it happened to be a favorite of Janáček’s, as Jaroslav Vogel points out in his definitive biography:

> One must not be confused also by Janáček’s habit of giving a 6/16 time signature instead of a clear 3/8. He likes to switch the rhythm from three times two to two times three and back again, and the use of the signature 6/16 is a convenient way of leaving the metre open to either interpretation.67

By imposing 2/4, the option of two times three is obscured, and an insight into Janáček’s “habit” is missed. The signature at the beginning of the fourth movement is completely changed to 2/4 (2/4) from 6/8 (fig. 9):

---
Fig. 9. Mvt. IV m. 1-2: Left HM (1947); Right CE

This may avoid the visual clutter of brackets when borrowed division is employed, but it draws perilously close to unacceptable tampering.

Less annoying, but deserving of mention is the “rhythmic respelling”, a subset of the orthography issue. In most cases, the CE’s rendering can certainly be justified logically, but for the performer many of the notations seem unnecessarily fussy; fig. 8 is already one example. Another example is a comparison of measure 35 in the first movement, where a seemingly innocuous rhythm takes on an impressive appearance (fig. 10):

Fig. 10. Mvt. I, m. 35: Left HM; right CE
Yet others are arguably cleaner, i.e.

![Musical notation image]

Fig. 11. Mvt. I, m. 20-21: Left HM; right CE

The CE also chose to use ratios to show borrowed division, e.g.

![Musical notation image]

Fig. 12. Mvt. I, m. 4: Left HM; right CE

Michael Beckerman refers here to the CE’s edition of a choral piece, but the sentiment is just as applicable to *Mládí*:

For new students of Janáček’s work such manipulation is a travesty, as they may never see the work in its original form; for those of us who know the composition it is merely annoying, as if some mad Shavian disciple had spelled the composer’s name “Layosh Yanacheck.” 68

**Lack of consideration of international scholarship**

The second area of criticism concerning the CE is its lack of international considerations. The full book of Editorial Principles and Guidelines (*Ediční zásady a směrnice k notační problematice klasiků 20. století*), which gives at length the

---

68 Beckerman, “Music Reviews,” p. 638
arguments and reasoning of the editorial board, was published only in Czech\(^{69}\) (although a summary essay of the main points was translated into German, and further into English for the 1988 Janáček Conference).\(^{70}\) The editorial board no doubt put a tremendous amount of thought and research into their principles, but few will have reasonable access to their findings or an explanation of their practices.

Included in each volume of the series is an essay containing general information—the specific work’s genesis, archival information regarding primary sources, and a description of the premiere(s)—in Czech, German, English, French and Russian; well and good. But the critical notes that describe the sources used for the edition, the discussion of which sources were primarily used and why, and the annotations describing alternate readings are only in Czech and German. Thus a large contingent of performers is presented with an unnecessary obstacle to an understanding of the listed variants, and the busy or less determined performer is likely to pass over them altogether.

**Omissions**

Whatever one’s appraisal of the editors’ philosophy or views on progressive orthography, the greatest fault of the CE is its selective omissions in the annotations. The editors have forced the composition into a more standardized, conformed mold, obscuring subtle quirks in the work, and these editorial intrusions are not acknowledged in the critical commentary. Indeed,

---

\(^{69}\) Jarmil Burghauser admitted that this was an error and planned to add additional translations: Beckerman, “Janáček’s Notation Revisited,” 252, 258.

\(^{70}\) Bärenreiter and Supraphon, Publishers, “Editorial Guidelines.”
the argument over enharmonic respellings and the addition of key signatures
would be more evenly weighted if not for the failure of the CE to acknowledge
where these changes were made. In the notes preceding the annotations (only in
Czech and German) the editors do reference the fact that they have inserted key
signatures and conformed the accidentals to the “inner logic” of the piece, but
they do not tell us where. Nor do the notes specify where respellings occur save
a general comment that “more extensive such respellings can be found in the
fourth movement bars 115-138 and 161-169.” If there were only one or two
instances, this might be more forgivable, but in Mládí there are some thirteen
imposed key signatures in the piece and numerous instances of enharmonic
respelling outside the measures mentioned.

Many articulation and dynamic markings are also added or omitted
without notice. In the opening gesture in the oboe, for instance, dots under slurs
have been added in the fifth bar to the dotted-eighths. As part of an oft-repeated
phrase (being the primary theme) this two-note gesture occurs some sixteen
times in the printed score, but in the first published edition—which the editors
used as a primary source—not a single occurrence includes this marking. There
is no explanation offered in the notes or acknowledgement that an alternative
exists. A visual example gives an idea of the extent of these markings; fig. 13-
15 are typical sample pages from the 1990 Supraphon score. The blue markings
indicate editorial changes from the first printed copy of the score that are noted
and accounted for. The red markings show omissions and additions that are not.

71 Dolezal and Faltus, “Critical Commentary,” 44. See also Appendix B.
72 This particular marking may possibly be justified under the rubric of “ex. trad.” (according to traditional Czech
performance practice). This designation is explained and used in other volumes of the CE, but for some reason is not
mentioned in Mládí.
Fig. 13. Page 7 of CE score (mvt. I): Blue, variants from HM (1947) acknowledged; Red, variants unacknowledged
Fig. 14. Page 8 of CE score (mvt. I): Blue, variants from HM (1947) acknowledged; Red, variants unacknowledged
Fig. 15. Page 15 of CE score (mvt. II): Blue, variants from HM (1947) acknowledged; Red, variants unacknowledged
It is immediately apparent that 1) there are many changes; 2) most can be defended logically; 3) many are very slight; 4) some are not slight, but create a noticeable auditory difference. M. 117, for example, of pg. 7 (fig. 13) shows that the editors have changed the flute slur’s meaning from a phrase marking to a change of articulation; the change in placement now dictates that the second note of the measure be unarticulated, rather than the five notes being one gesture. Though arguably slight in themselves, the presence of so many changes must collectively change the piece. The only explanation offered for changes not indicated is this:

The editors corrected slips of pen or misprints appearing in the sources, completed [sic] the missing minor interpretation marks according to analogous sections. In cases where there was no doubt whatsoever they did this tacitly, in all other instances they commented on it in the annotations.23

Based on the overwhelming number of added “minor interpretation marks” it is clear that their definition of “no doubt whatsoever” does not agree with that of the generally accepted standard. And marking analogous sections in the same way is an especially dangerous line of reasoning to take in Janáček’s music, since “[c]ontinual variations of themes is a major element of Janáček’s style.”24 Given that he consistently repeats small melodic fragments influenced by his speech melody practice of composition, it makes sense that he would vary these small units slightly in terms of articulation or dynamics, and his body of works bears this out. Obviously the editors have taken many matters into their own hands in an effort to simplify the variants and make the text more “performer-friendly”. This approach might be warranted for an easy work prepared for young,

23 Dolezal and Faltus, preface to Mládí, iii.
inexperienced players, but the demands of *Mládí* are far above that level. “If some works play themselves, Janáček’s never do.”75 Any ensemble capable of giving a good performance of the work will contain members fully able to negotiate Janáček’s original orthography, and those performers who seek to do honor to the style and the composer will want to know what their interpretive options are, rather than have an editor make the decisions for them.

Errors

In addition there are a few outright errors. In the English introduction, the date of the Prague premiere is wrong as well as the publication year of Janáček’s preliminary sketch of *The March of the Blue-boys* which appeared in his feuilleton titled, “Berlin” (the other translations are correct). More importantly, Přibáňová asserts that the director of Hudební Matice, Václav Mikota, did not accept the Prague markings in the parts but conformed them to the score. This cannot be the case, however, as the 1925 parts show a vast number of additional markings clearly made by performers that are not in the 1925 score. Fig. 16 shows a page of the 1947 HM score with markings indicating the additions and changes from the 1925 HM parts:

---

Fig. 16. Page of 1947 HM score (mvt. III): Red markings indicate additions from 1925 HM parts
There are some features of the CE that prove helpful, such as the information concerning exactly where and how the many tempo markings were changed. If one is interested in studying the evolution of the piece from its earliest form, this is the edition that includes the most examples from the autograph. The key signatures do simplify the graphic picture a good deal, and having the bass clarinet part printed in treble clef removes one of the barriers to the piece. Many of the editor’s decisions and approaches are explained if one has the time to translate the notes, and might be justifiable (if time and skill permit reading, in Czech, the 200-page book of principles). However, the lack of acknowledging numerous changes undermines the degree to which the rest of the notes can be trusted. And the “heavy-handed standardisation,” 76 lack of consideration of international scholarship, and outright errors must defeat the CE’s claim of “critical,” and the editorial board’s decision not to even acknowledge that the Prague markings had been in circulation right up to the time of their new edition is inexcusable.

---

76 Wingfield, “Unauthorized Recomposition,” 209.
CHAPTER 4

THE PRAGUE INTERPRETIVE MARKINGS AND
NOTES ON PERFORMING MLÁDÍ

A true work deserves true understanding and true success. – Jaroslav Vogel

The case for the Prague markings

What is the value of these interpretative markings that have been in the parts since 1925? What role have they played in the performing tradition of the work? And finally, do they deserve to be summarily deleted from existence?

Objective value

The highest value of the Prague markings is in their balance adjustments and dynamic shaping. The very beginning of Mládí is a good example of the former: Janáček marked all the voices mf, but the Prague parts have only the solo oboe at mf; the accompanying figure in the horn is marked down to mp and the sustained notes in the bassoon and bass clarinet marked p – common sense.

The latter (dynamic shaping) makes up the majority of the markings. Often Janáček marked diminuendos or crescendos without specifying their goal; the Prague ensemble simply made many decisions about the destination dynamic level, and for the most part these dynamics are consistent throughout the parts. More effective on the interpretive level are their dynamic maps that
give definition to the larger shapes – for example the Piu mosso section of the first movement, (m. 62) up to the arrival at the Meno mosso (m. 103). This section is quite repetitive, and their markings fill out Janáček’s dynamic skeleton a bit and add interest. The section starts with all parts marked pp; seventeen bars later there is no further direction from Janáček except “dim.”, then mf for the melody and p for the accompaniment. The Prague parts very sensibly have the voices come up a level so that there is somewhere to dimuendo to; then in the long crescendo (over about 30 measures) to a high point at the Meno mosso (m. 103) the dynamic comes down to grow again, adding interest and aiding the pacing of the crescendo.

One of the best examples of this shaping is in the third movement. Fig. 16 shows the first page of the movement in score with the Prague markings in red. First, the balance has been adjusted at the beginning; the bassoon is marked up a level because it has the nearest semblance of a melody. In m. 7, the accompaniment is marked up a level so that the second phrase can come down to pp, effecting an echo. In m. 15 ff., the voices are “trying to outdo one another” and give “a graphic illustration of the musical pranks of the blue-boys.”77 The bass clarinet imitates the flute in alternating measures; mf then down to p to come up again to mf and f. Meanwhile the oboe and bassoon are fighting their own little battle a measure apart, and the clarinet trill has been marked from f to fp so that it doesn’t obscure the subtleties of the other voices. By adding the variety of dynamics, the aural picture is clarified; it is easier to hear that the bass clarinet is imitating the flute, for instance, and the variety simply makes the section more interesting.

77 Vogel, Leoš Janáček, 301.
In other instances it appears the Prague performers noticed one detail in a part and added it to analogous places. In the first movement, for example, there is a crescendo that appears in a three-note motive in the bass clarinet (fig. 17):

![Motive](image)

Fig. 17. Motive in mvt. I, m. 67

This idea becomes almost an ostinato from m. 86–97 in the oboe and horn but without the crescendo; the Prague parts have added a crescendo to every one. It may not be what Janáček would have preferred, but it is an idea worth considering. While not perfect and certainly only one way to shape the piece, it is obvious from their markings that the Prague ensemble was musically sophisticated and that they rehearsed with care and thought.

**Historical value**

It is also surely of no mean value that these markings were done by some of the best Czech musicians in preparation for an actual performance that was heard by the composer, and in the year of the work’s composition. Their value as a specimen of performance practice of the time cannot be denied. Up until the 1982 Peters’ parts, these markings have been published and distributed the world over, with essentially little or no change. Ever since the Prague premiere wind sextets have learned and played from these parts. Thurston Dart writes,

> The written text must never be regarded as a dead laboratory specimen; it is only sleeping, though both love and time will be needed to awaken it. But love and time will be wasted without a sense of tradition and of historical continuity.  

---

It is obvious, by both common sense (the IMC parts were available up until the mid 1990’s), and an investigation of recordings from the first in 1938 to those at the turn of the 21st century, that the vast majority of musicians performing this piece do use or have used these parts. However many good and worthy arguments one may make in favor of the composer’s original score, it remains that a performing tradition was started that has endured right up to the present. To deny its existence is to deny the “sense of tradition” and “historical continuity.” This is not to say that the markings should be regarded as equal to the composer or that they should never be challenged, but that as a record of contemporary performance they should receive consideration.

Taking these considerations into account, it is regrettable that the two remaining editions of the parts available for purchase (Peters and Supraphon CE) have for all practical purposes completely purged any traces of the Prague markings. One hopes in the future that they will resurface in a new edition.

Notes on performing Mládí

In the course of listening to many recordings, studying scores and parts, and meditating on Jaroslav Vogel’s venerable appendix, “On the Interpretation of Janáček’s Works” (from his biography of the composer)79, I would like to offer a few suggestions for performing Mládí. As a preface, the reminder that Janáček’s works never play themselves is in order. His works are usually difficult and quirky (Mládí is no exception), and there is no getting around their idiosyncrasies; “the right way to the proper rendering of his works lies not in

---

79 Vogel, Leoš Janáček, 385-395.
detours and compromises, but in directly overcoming the difficulties. Thus it is often a case of sheer and repeated drudgery before a score begins to shine.\textsuperscript{80}

The following suggestions are the current fruit of careful consideration and study, but I reserve the right to change my opinions in the future on certain aspects of performing \textit{Mládí}. Of primary influence have been Vogel’s Janáček biography (from which all the following quotes are taken)\textsuperscript{81} and the 1938 (and first) recording of \textit{Mládí} by the Prague Wind Quintet.\textsuperscript{82}

\textit{Sound concept}

One of Janáček’s signature characteristics is his use of texture; “it should not be forgotten that a certain thinness of sound, a certain lack of stuffing in the middle parts, is the distinguishing feature of his style (387).” Though less of an issue in \textit{Mládí}, this concept of texture should inform the style of playing to some degree. One of the more interesting features of the first recording of \textit{Mládí} is the very judicious use of vibrato and a certain lightness to the tone. Therefore, an overly dark tone and constant vibrato should be avoided, especially when playing accompanying material. \textit{Mládí} is meant to be (for the most part) light-hearted and humorous, not epic.

\textit{Articulation and phrasing}

\textsuperscript{80} Vogel, Leoš Janáček, 392.

\textsuperscript{81} Jaroslav Vogel’s biography of Janáček (first published in 1958) is still considered the standard by which all others—and there are many—are judged. Not only does his work lay out Janáček’s activities and development, but everything he wrote is described and discussed. He knew Janáček and conducted his works for many years; his biography contains an excellent chapter on performing Janáček’s works. In the forward to the first English translation of the book in 1981, Charles Mackerras, one of the premiere conductors of Janáček, calls the book his “Janáček Bible” and specifically mentions the section on interpretation as a great help to him. We may trust Vogel’s suggestions, therefore, as they have stood the test of time and proven their practical usefulness.

\textsuperscript{82} Rudolf Hertl, flute, piccolo; Václav Smetteček, oboe; Vladimír Říha, clarinet; Otakar Procházka, horn; Karel Bidlo, bassoon and Václav Kotas, bass clarinet.
Likewise the articulation should be generally light and at times almost brittle. The staccatos especially should be quite short. When a group of staccato notes is under a slur, the slur should be interpreted more as a phrase marking than softening the staccato too much; a good example is the 17/16 bars with the descending string of staccato sixteenth notes under one long slur. Often when the last note of a short slur is a smaller note value, one should come off the slur almost clipping the last note. This is closely related to Janáček’s typical phrase structure:

He almost always ends on an unaccented beat and even stops abruptly just before reaching an accented one. This avoidance of the safe port of heavy beats even at the beginning of a phrase…gives Janáček’s music its own peculiar atmosphere of unfulfilled, choking emotion. It does sound disjointed to those unaccustomed to his music, but it is also the secret of his disturbing and exciting impact even on those who find him irritating. Janáček’s music sometimes produces conflicting emotions in one and the same listener – but it never produces indifference (143).

Vogel is speaking here of Janáček’s operatic writing, which tends to be more somber in nature than Mladi, but the concept of avoiding heavy beats in his phrasing is certainly applicable; “one simply has to get used to the missing heavy beats without getting bogged down or irritated by the novelty of their absence (387).” Though “Janáček’s realism makes it imperative to perform his works, where necessary, in all their roughly hewn truthfulness and elemental wildness,” it is important to remember “another quality…essential to interpreting Janáček: mere simplicity (391).” Taking simplicity and metric unity (see below) into account generally rules out overly romantic tendencies in Janáček’s phrasing. This does not mean that the phrasing should be obscured, only that the performer should not take much too much license. A good example is in the fourth movement, m. 67 – 84. Some performers make this entire section seasick with a kind of constant rubato, choosing a lugubrious
tempo and making a simple contrasting section into an unnecessarily pompous statement.

In contrast to the dry staccatos, the *legato* phrases and *tenuto* markings should be very smooth and connected. The 1938 recording was again unusual in this regard, especially in the second movement; articulation was barely discernable at all. Consequently, small swells on individual tenuto notes there are not suited to the style. Notes without any marking should generally be played for their full value, e.g. the quarter notes at the end of the first movement and the very last note of the piece.

*Tempi and metric relationships*

It is known that Janáček was constantly changing his ideas about any given piece—in rehearsals he would often “drive the performers to despair, changing, up till the very last minute, not only the instrumentation and dynamics, but even the tempi (27).” Depending on his mood, he might choose one tempo one day and another tempo a different day. Rather than to view the metronome markings as immovable, it is much more important to keep the metric relationships consistent. This is arguably the most difficult aspect of *Mládí*, since Janáček’s works tend to be sectionalized with many transitions of meter and tempo. The sometimes fragmentary nature of his music, however, should not cause the interpreter to divorce the sections from one another but rather to seek out the metric tie that relates them:

The rhapsodic character of some portions of Janáček’s music and their supposed naturalism was long the cause of the entirely misleading idea that his musical language was a string of characteristic fragments and that the right interpretative approach was to concentrate on detail—in a word, continuous rubato. The unification of tempi was thought to be not only alien to his style, but well nigh
impossible. The temptation to reach for this conclusion was supplied mainly by
Janáček’s typical rubato interjections which seemed, at first sight, to break up all
unity of tempo. In reality, these interjections do not break up the tempo at all, they
merely suspend it....Thus, unity of tempo in Janáček’s music is not only possible but
is in fact one of the secrets of the relative tectonic unity of his works (390-91).

A sense of metric unity is therefore the primary frame on which to build one’s
metric picture of the movements and to some degree, the entire piece. There are
four principles to keep in mind which help achieve this unity (in no particular
order): First, as mentioned, have proper understanding of Janáček’s rubato
indications. The meno mosso sections in the third movement are a classic
elementary example, with their numerous ritard’s and a tempo’s in the space of two measures.
If these are taken too literally, the section becomes queasy, inhibiting forward
motion. Second, keep the smallest time value constant in transitions: “As a
general rule, when Janáček changes the time signature, the unit of time that
remains constant is not the bar but the small time-value (389).” The 1938 Prague
recording frequently exhibits this conception of many of the transitions, and it
makes much musical sense. Third, augmentation and diminution are to be
expected:

One should also not be confused when deciding on a new tempo, if one finds that
while one part may continue evenly, another will have its rhythm doubled or
halved. ...augmentation and, in particular, diminution of motives are part and parcel
of Janáček’s technique of composition (391).

Fourth, some expression markings should be taken with a grain of salt: “one
should also bear in mind that Janáček’s ‘presto’ is evidently not so fast, and his
‘adagio’ not so slow as they often are with other composers (391).” Taken
together, these four guidelines go a long way toward solving many of the
puzzling transitions in Mládí.
The charts in figures 18 – 23 elaborate how I believe these principles apply to *Mládí*. As excellent as the Prague markings are in many respects, their weakness is in some of the metronome markings added and some of the tempo indications that were changed from Janáček’s original markings. It is helpful to know which tempo markings are Janáček’s, which ones are theirs, and if indications were changed, what the original marking was. In addition to the principles described by Vogel, the suggestions in the charts are naturally influenced by my own experience as a performer of this work and by the many recordings to which I have listened (in that order). They are not meant to be mandates, but a picture of my conception of the piece as informed by research and experience.
### MOVEMENT I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>JANÁČEK’S MARKING</th>
<th>PRAGUE MARKING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Title)</td>
<td>Andante $\frac{3}{8} = 128$</td>
<td>Allegro $\frac{3}{8} = 144$</td>
<td>$\frac{3}{8} = 144$ is more common, or a little faster. Again, whatever tempo is chosen, it is the metric continuity that is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Meno mosso</td>
<td>Meno mosso $\frac{3}{8} = 72$</td>
<td>The eighth note should equal half of the starting tempo. If the Prague beginning tempo is used, $\frac{3}{8}$ should $= 72$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>(6/16)</td>
<td>Tempo I $\frac{6}{16} = 144$</td>
<td>This should be the opening tempo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59, 62</td>
<td>Piu mosso</td>
<td>Un poco piu mosso $\frac{3}{8} = 160$</td>
<td>This tempo is more open to the performer’s discretion, but it does have to <em>ritard</em> in order to modulate metrically into the next tempo (see below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103, 106</td>
<td>Meno mosso</td>
<td>Meno mosso $\frac{6}{16} = 60$</td>
<td>The <em>meno mosso</em> should be less than 72, whatever is chosen; and the sixteenths in the <em>meno mosso</em> should equal the previous eighths in the horn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111, 114</td>
<td>Tempo I</td>
<td>Meno mosso $\frac{3}{8} = 72$</td>
<td>This tempo should match that of m. 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115, 118</td>
<td>Allegro $\frac{2}{4} = 128$</td>
<td>Allegro $\frac{2}{4} = 168$</td>
<td>Depending on how much one wants to accelerate to achieve the desired tempo in m. 133, 136 (see below); either use a metric modulation and double the previous tempo (which will yield the beginning tempo) or take a quicker tempo such as $\frac{2}{4} = 168$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133, 136</td>
<td>(no marking)</td>
<td>Poco piu mosso $\frac{2}{4} = 176$</td>
<td>An error; should be $\frac{2}{4} = 176$. The Prague ensemble obviously wanted to pace an extended <em>accelerando</em> up to m. 155, 158.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164, 167</td>
<td>Presto</td>
<td>Presto $\frac{2}{4} = 192$ (á una battuta)</td>
<td>This tempo should not be too fast or frantic in nature; remember Janacek’s <em>Prestos</em> are not so fast.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold** type = measure numbers from *Hudební Matic* score (measure numbers do not match the HM/SNKLHU/IMC parts, whose repeats are written out).  
*Italic* type (where different from HM) = measure numbers from *Supraphon Critical Edition* (measure numbers do match the CE parts).  

---

Fig. 18. Chart of information and suggestions for movement I
### MOVEMENT
#### II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>JANÁČEK’S MARKING</th>
<th>PRAGUE MARKING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Title)</td>
<td>Moderato $\frac{\ddagger}{\ddagger} = 92$</td>
<td>Andante sostenuto $\frac{\ddagger}{\ddagger} = 72$</td>
<td>Most ensembles start the movement around 62-66. This theme returns and tends to get a bit slower each time, however, so it should not be too slow right away. (72 is exactly twice as slow as the Prague marking for the first movement.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Piu mosso</td>
<td>Piu mosso $\frac{}{\ddagger} = 132$</td>
<td>$\ddagger = 132$ is a bit difficult; most ensembles choose somewhere around 120 – 126; although the first recording done in 1938 by a Prague ensemble is close to 138 and a 1998 recording by the Brno Wind Quintet is right at 132. Whatever one’s decision, there is one measure of ritard available to get back to the opening tempo in m. 44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>accel.</td>
<td>accel</td>
<td>The eighth notes in the oboe should accelerate to match the eighth note of the triplet in the flute at the a tempo in m. 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Tempo I</td>
<td>Tempo I $\frac{}{\ddagger} = 72$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold** type = measure numbers from **Hudebni Maticce** score (measure numbers do not match the HM/SNKLU/IMC parts, whose repeats are written out).

Fig. 19. Chart of information and suggestions for mvt. II, m. 1 - 44
**MOVEMENT**

**II** (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>JANAČEK'S MARKING</th>
<th>PRAGUE MARKING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49 (cut time)</td>
<td><em>Piu mosso</em> $\frac{1}{4} = 84$</td>
<td><em>Piu mosso</em> $\frac{1}{4} = 126$</td>
<td>The <em>accel.</em> preceding the <em>Piu mosso</em> should serve the function of matching the sixteenth notes in the lower voices to the quarter-note triplets at the <em>Piu mosso</em>. $\frac{1}{4} = 84$ is a bit slow, but one should remember that this section is a fairly short episode, and if it is too fast the “re-entry” to the Tempo I in m. 74 will be too abrupt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 (cut time)</td>
<td><em>Piu mosso</em></td>
<td><em>Piu mosso</em> $\frac{1}{4} = 120$</td>
<td>Ensembles play this section anywhere from 76 to 112. I propose that the preceding sixteenths in the clarinet should roughly match the quarter-note triplets, which puts it around 96 if the tempo of the theme is about 72.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 (reh. 6)</td>
<td><em>Meno mosso</em></td>
<td><em>Meno mosso</em> $\frac{1}{4} = 80$</td>
<td>This <em>meno mosso</em> refers to the previous tempo; there should not be a drastic drop in tempo here. Janacek is setting up the transition back to the Tempo I in m. 100. From here to the end the piece slows down in gentle terraces; first step down, m. 100; second step m. 105; third step, m. 110; last step, m. 116. It is a long road home so it can’t start too slow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bold* type = measure numbers from *Hudební Matice* score (measure numbers do not match the HM/SNKLHU/IMC parts, whose repeats are written out).

Fig. 20. Chart of information and suggestions for movement II, m. 49 - 90
This movement was inspired by memories of young choristers whistling on their way to classes at the Queen’s Monastery, and by the sound of a Prussian military band. Thus whatever the tempo, it should not be frantic in nature. It should not speed up when the melody enters.

The tempo chosen here must take into account the ritard bars containing thirty-second notes; the ritards should be slight so that the section doesn’t become seasick.

Probably a mistake that the marking was not added in the Prague parts.

The Prague marking correctly reflects what the composer intended; the marking meno mosso refers to the tempo at m. 103, not a further slowing.

See note on m. 107, 108

**Bold** type = measure numbers from Hudebni Matice score (measure numbers do not match the HM/SNKLHU/IMC parts, whose repeats are written out).

Fig. 21. Chart of information and suggestions for movement III
### MOVEMENT

#### IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>JANÁČEK’S MARKING</th>
<th>PRAGUE MARKING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Title)</td>
<td><em>Con moto</em> † = 104</td>
<td><em>Allegro animato</em> † = 132</td>
<td>This movement is performed anywhere from about 120 to 144.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong> (reh. 1)</td>
<td><em>Un poco meno mosso</em></td>
<td><em>Meno mosso</em> † = 88</td>
<td>(Some sources have a <em>caesura</em> marked before this bar in the horn part.) The phrasing here should not be elaborate, but quite simple; avoid pausing every three bars and keep the forward motion. Most ensembles choose a tempo slower than 88 (see analogous section m. 67), but anything less than about 70 makes the section too heavy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><em>Piu mosso</em></td>
<td><em>Piu mosso</em> † = 126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><em>Meno mosso</em></td>
<td><em>Meno mosso</em> † = 76</td>
<td>See notes for m. 23. † = 76 seems to be a more appropriate tempo than 88.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>93</strong> (3/4)</td>
<td><em>Allegro</em> † = 104</td>
<td><em>Vivace</em> † = 132 á una battuta</td>
<td>There are two options for gaining this <em>Tempo primo.</em> Either accelerate quite a lot in order to make the † = † (difficult for the bassoonist) or accelerate less and then double the tempo, making † = †. The latter matches the similar section at m. 35.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold** type = measure numbers from *Hudebni Matice* score (measure numbers do not match the HM/SNK/LHU/IMC parts, whose repeats are written out).
**MOVEMENT**

**IV (cont.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moment</th>
<th>Tempo</th>
<th>注释</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123 (6/16)</td>
<td><em>Meno mosso</em></td>
<td>The most puzzling transitions of the piece are at this complicated section. Janáček is quoting the first and second themes of the first movement; the first theme is quoted at m. 125 and second theme at m. 142. The two quotes should be the same tempo, but at what relationship? If one follows the Prague markings, the quote of the first theme is twice as slow as the original. The quote of the second theme is three times as fast as the original, which does not seem to make musical sense; but given the &quot;augmentation/diminution&quot; principle, it could be exactly what he wanted. There is no great solution here, but I would suggest either starting with a slower tempo, perhaps 64 (half of 128, Janacek’s original movement I M.M.) or switching the note values that get the beat; thus m. 123 should read, <em>d = 72</em>, and at m. 142, <em>d = 72</em>. The dotted quarter should still get the beat from m. 139 – 141.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 (6/8)</td>
<td><em>Tempo I</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 (3/8)</td>
<td><em>Tempo I meno mosso</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 (reh. 6)</td>
<td><em>Tempo I</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td><em>Piu mosso a tempo</em></td>
<td>The Prague marking is treating this as a <em>tempo primo</em>, but Janacek’s original marking is probably referring to the Tempo I at m. 142. If one is using 72 as the tempo there, then <em>d = 72</em> should be the tempo here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td><em>Un poco piu mosso</em></td>
<td>If <em>d = 72</em> at m. 157 (see note), then <em>d = 84</em> is <em>un poco piu mosso</em>. 84 is also a better tempo for this section than 120. Most ensembles play it about 104 – 116. This is the base tempo on which is built a terraced <em>accelerando</em> to the end.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 200, 204 (3/4) | *Presto* | 152 is too fast; ensembles play this anywhere from 124 – 146. The *accel*.

six bars earlier (accounting for the repeat) functions to make the *d = d*; it should be a smooth transition. |
| 228, 236 | (no marking) | The same metric modulation applies here as m. 200 (see note); whatever tempo is chosen for the *Prestissimo*, the *d = d*. |
| 249, 257 (no marking) | *Prestissimo* | |

*Italic* type (where different from HM) = measure numbers from *Supraphon Critical Edition* (measure numbers do match the CE parts).

Fig 23. Chart of information and suggestions for mvt. IV, m. 123 - 249
Miscellaneous notes

There are a few other spots that merit attention, as I have noticed many performances either in error due to a mistake in the parts, or demonstrating confusion about Janáček’s notation.

First, in the horn solo of the first movement (m. 55, reh. 3) the last six notes should have another ligature line, making them sixteenths. All the sources have sixteenths except for the Prague parts.

Second, in the fourth movement a measure before rehearsal number one (m. 23 in HM and CE) the last note in the horn part should probably be a D (written). The first and second authorized copies of the score show a D as well as the Prague parts. Only the HM scores show a C.

Third, two bars later (m. 24, one after reh. 1) in the bass clarinet part is an instance of a motive where there is no tie to the second beat of the measure in the Prague parts and the HM score; it is rearticulated. This does not match other occurrences of this motive, where there is a tie (the Peters and, of course, the CE edition include the tie, no doubt according to their license of marking according to “analogous” sections). The first recording follows the HM score/Prague parts, as well as a later (and excellent) recording by the Prague Quintet (1990). I think either interpretation is justifiable.

Fourth, also in the fourth movement, Janáček used shorthand notation at rehearsal 7 (Piu mosso, 6/8); dotted half notes with three hatch marks on the stem in the horn and bassoon parts. I have heard three different interpretations of this marking: flutter tongue, sextuplets (i.e., twelve notes per bar), and borrowed subdivision (eight notes per bar). It is probable that a flutter was not what
Janáček had in mind. He rarely, if ever, called for flutter tongue, and none of the Czech recordings I listened to use flutter here. Sextuplets, on the other hand, require truly Herculean effort to achieve if the tempo is to be what it should (though the Philadelphia Woodwind Quintet carries it off with complete nonchalance). The first recording uses borrowed time; two beats of four notes each. This last option is justifiable, based on the opening and other numerous sections using eight repeated notes per bar.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Due to its peculiar history of early preparation and publication, the first edition of the parts for Mládí contained performance details as added by members of the Czech Philharmonic Orchestra in Prague that never appeared in the first edition of the score. These Prague markings should not be considered equal to Janáček’s original notation, yet his presence at the first performance that used these markings, and his consent to have the Prague tempi used in the first edition of the score must denote some measure of approval. These details include logical adjustments for balance and exhibit sophisticated dynamic shaping. Their chief weakness is in some of the tempo indications and metronome markings.

Not only do these Prague markings have inherent merit, they are valuable as a record of Czech performance practice at the time Mládí was written in 1924. They have remained in available, published editions up until the mid 1990’s. A survey of recordings shows that the performing tradition of Mládí has been largely shaped by the Prague version of the parts.

The editors of editions currently in print, namely the 1990 Supraphon Critical Edition, did not include the Prague markings as a source in their critical evaluation and preparation of the parts, nor did they acknowledge their appearance in the first published edition of 1925. Neither the Supraphon edition,
nor the Peters edition (nearly out of print) include the Prague markings in the parts or give more than a few passing references to them in their critical notes.

Therefore, musicians today choosing to perform Mládí should be aware that these markings exist when deciding on an edition to use. Those desiring a “clean slate” from which to build their interpretations may be better served by the Peters edition parts. Ensembles desirous of continuing in the performing tradition of the piece should attempt to find the SNKLHU parts or (in the United States) IMC parts or the Artia export of the SNKLHU. Persons interested in the evolution of the work from the autograph to the copy used for the first edition will find the most abundant and detailed information in the Supraphon edition; however one should be aware that this edition is often vague and inconsistent when acknowledging editorial decisions and additions. Comparison of the 1947 HM or 1970 IMC score (they are identical) with the parts mentioned above clearly shows which markings were added or changed by the Prague ensemble. Consultation of the CE critical notes provides further insight into which tempo and metronomic indications were used in the Brno score throughout the movements in addition to the beginning tempi, and of their evolution.

Jaroslav Vogel’s suggestions on performing Janáček, and an evaluation of the first recording done by Czech artists, reveals that the most important guidelines to keep in mind are consistent metric relationships, avoidance of overly romantic phrasing, and a lighter approach to timbre, vibrato and articulation. Difficult sections should not be solved at the expense of these principles, especially metric cohesion. Lastly, some familiarity with Janáček’s
personality and character informs the performer’s emotional approach to Mládí; a work full of energy, abrupt phrases, and “brimming over with humour.”
APPENDIX A

TRANSLATION OF OTAKAR SOUREK’S INTRODUCTION TO THE 1947
HUDEBNI MATICE SCORE
The genesis of the sextet *Mládí* is interesting in the fact that Leoš Janáček wrote it during the month of his seventieth birthday—in July 1924—expressing his memories of a distant period he spent as a young chorister in the “Queen’s” Monastery in Old Brno (1865 – 1874). He was vividly engaged by these memories when he collected the data for his biographers during the spring of 1924. The charming memories of those years were revived, when he as one of the “blue boys” —as the choristers of the Old Brno monastery were called because of their light blue uniforms with white trim—was causing various mischiefs and musical jokes that often annoyed even the beloved director of the monastery choir.

The mood of this exuberant, young carefree youth first gave rise—on May 19, 1924—to a bizarrely entertaining *March of the Blue-Boys* (under the title of the manuscript, Janáček wrote: “The singers from Králová Monastery are shouting with joy. They are blue as blue-birds”) and then in July to the sextet *Mládí*. Not only is the thematic core of the third movement from *March of the Blue-Boys*, but it is also in other ways filled with those memories and moods—the music is either an exuberant frolic or—especially in the second movement—pensively reflective. (*March of the Blue-Boys* was printed in Brno’s magazine, *Hudební besídka*, IV, pp. 121-127. Janáček dedicated the manuscript to his permanent and trustworthy copyist Václav Sedláček, flautist in the orchestra of the National Theater in Brno.)

The score of *Mládí* originally looked different from the first performed version. Janáček, absorbed by an unusual task of a piece for wind instruments only, wrote many things that were found difficult to play or didn’t during
performance fully correspond to his sound or tempo intentions. He realized this during the rehearsal for the first performance of his piece in Brno. Based on what he heard and taking into account player’s notes, he changed many things in player’s parts (the end of the third movement was changed even in composition). This is how the sextet got its final form, as it was performed on the first concert, organized for the occasion of Janáček’s 70th birthday by the Musical Conservatory in Brno on October 21, 1924 in the Besední Hall in Brno.

It was performed by professors of the conservatory (they were also members of the National Theatre orchestra): Josef Bok—(flute and piccolo), Matěj Wagner (oboe), Stanislav Krčička (clarinet), František Janský (horn), František Bříza (bassoon), and Karel Pavelka (bass clarinet).

In Prague, the piece was performed for the first time on November 23, 1924 at a new music concert by Hudební Matice—dedicated exclusively to Janáček—in the Vinohrady Theatre. This time it was played by members of the Czech Philharmonic Orchestra: Gustav Nesperý (flute), Josef Dreschler (piccolo), Alois Štancl (oboe), Artur Holas (clarinet), Oldřich Seliger (horn), Eduard Anderle (bassoon), and Josef Pech (bass clarinet). Very soon the sextet became popular abroad as well.

Hudební Matice in Prague published the score and parts of Mládí, including the two-hands piano version by Bretislav Bakala, for the first time in 1925. There was quite a difference between the score and parts. This stemmed from the principle held by the publisher, Otakar Nebuška, that the score should reflect the final composer’s idea, while parts used for practical reproduction should be as much as possible detailed in respect of performance, especially
concerning tempo and dynamics. The score was therefore printed after Václav Sedláček’s copy which was following Janáček’s intentions after the first performance in Brno (the original form of Janáček’s score is not known). However, the publisher decided to make some changes in tempo based on the first performance in Prague—some verbal and all numeric (metronomic) markings were replaced by new ones and metronome markings were added to all the places where not present. The parts were published with the same tempo markings (the same is true of the piano version), but with new and very detailed performance markings, based on the first Prague performance as recorded in pencil by flautist Nesporý, who was directing the rehearsals for the performance.

The new edition in this collection of pocket scores follows the same principle as the first edition. However, the tempo markings follow Janáček’s original values from Sedláček’s copy, and everything that was different or added in the first edition is in parentheses. The first value reflects the composer’s original ideas, interesting but not always very precisely expressed (although the Moderato indication at the beginning of the second movement, for example, seems to reflect the composer’s idea better than Andante sostenuto). The second value is preserved, because it was printed during the composer’s lifetime and therefore probably with his approval.\footnote{The fact that these values are not invariable is proven by the later performance by the Prague Wind Quintet, quite established and even recorded to (vinyl) record (Esta number 7125-b; players: Rudolf Hertl, Dr. Václav Smetacek, Vladimir Riha, Otakar Prochazka and Karel Bidlo, together with bass clarinetist V. Kotas). For a comparison, I am providing those metronomic numbers, where the Prague Wind Quintet performance is different from those in the first score edition.} In addition, in places where it was shown
to be necessary, some dynamic markings were added; these are also marked by parentheses. Typos are corrected as well as redundant accidentals, very common in Janáček’s original version and typical of him.

Some of the explanations regarding the development of the work were provided to me by professor Josef Bok and professor Stanislav Kritčka. I thank them, and similarly thanks to my friend Dr. Václav Smetáček for help in the score revision.

Prague, January 1945.

O. Š.

Movement I:
- m. 34 and 111 (Meno mosso) \( \updownarrow = 80 \)
- m. 59 (Un poco piu mosso) \( \updownarrow = 184 \)
- m. 103 (Meno mosso) \( \updownarrow = 76 \)
- m. 115 (Allegro) \( \updownarrow = 184 \)
- m. 133 (Poco piu mosso) \( \updownarrow = 192 \)
- m. 163 (Presto) \( \updownarrow = 100 \)

Movement II:
- m. 1, 44, 74 and 100 \( \updownarrow = 60 \)
- m. 49 (Piu mosso) \( \updownarrow = 104 \)
- m. 90 (Meno mosso) \( \updownarrow = 92 \)

Movement III:
- m. 1 and 82 (Allegro – Tempo I) \( \updownarrow = 176 \)
- m. 58 and 103 (Meno mosso) \( \updownarrow = 96 \)
- m. 127 (Piu mosso) \( \updownarrow = 144 \)

Movement IV:
- m. 1 (Con moto) \( \updownarrow = 144 \)
- m. 23 (Un poco meno mosso) \( \updownarrow = 76 \)
- m. 93 (Allegro) \( \updownarrow = 120 \)
- m. 123 (Meno mosso) \( \updownarrow = 84 \)
- m. 142 (Tempo I) \( \updownarrow = 66 \)
- m. 175 (Un poco meno mosso) \( \updownarrow = 92 \)
- m. 200 (Presto) \( \updownarrow = 120 \)
- m. 228 (Prestissimo) \( \updownarrow = 144 \)
APPENDIX B

TRANSLATION OF “SOURCES” AND “EDITION PRINCIPLES” FROM THE 1990 SUPRAPHON CRITICAL NOTES
**SOURCES:** a/ An autograph of the score, deposited in the Musical History department of the Moravian Museum in Brno (hereafter JA) under the signature 23.515. It is written using brown ink on single sheets that were lined by hand on one side, usually in two columns. The autograph consists of a title-page with the following text: Mládí / Suite / for flute, oboe, clarinet / horn, bassoon and bass clarinet / Leoš Janáček / and further sheets paginated separately for each movement. The first movement has 13 pages, the second movement 14, the third movement 12 numbered to 13, because one of the sheets is numbered 5-6. The fourth movement is paginated to 18 – sheet 4 has been lost and there are three sheets with number 14: 14a, 14b, 14c, 19 sheets altogether. The well-preserved, sometimes poorly legible autograph is dated 10. VIII. 1924 - on the last sheet. The dimension of all the sheets is 289 x 231 mm; the total number of sheets including the title sheet is 59.

b/ The approved transcription of the score, deposited under the signature A 23.456 in JA, is written on 31 sheets of music paper with dimensions 333 x 255 mm with 14 staves. Each sheet is written on both sides, two columns on each side. The title page has following information on it: //”Mládí”/Suite//for flute, oboe, clarinet/horn, bassoon, bass clarinet/ Leoš Janáček/; the page is completed by a pencil annotation et Picc. above the third line and a red pencil annotation July 1924 on the right bottom side. The transcription is signed V.Sedl. (= Václav Sedláček) and dated 28. VIII. 1924 on the last page; it has a lot of interlinear notes
in black and red pencil, furthermore there are interlinear notes done with a
different brownish ink, which has the same color as the autograph. Most of them
are easily identifiable as Janáček’s handwriting.

Along with the authorized transcription of the score, there is an unauthorized,
undated but contemporary collection of parts under the same number. It is
signed Václav Sedl., on music paper with 10 staves and with the dimension 218 x
235 mm. In the parts, most corrections (not all of them!) were registered, so they
correspond with the authorized transcription of the score.

c/ An authorized transcription of the score, which was given to the Archive of
Janáček as a present in July 1985 from Jarmil Burghauser (from Otakar Šourek’s
estate), is deposited under signature A 48.559 in JA. This transcription served as
a print template for the first publication and has 32 sheets with 14 staves and the
dimension 257 x 335 mm. The title-page says: /Mládi/Suite/Flute, (Picc.), Oboe,
Clarinet B, /Horn F, Bassoon and Bass clarinet B/ Leoš Janáček/. Added in writing
(pencil) is 1924 in brackets. In addition to printing notes, the title-page has the
following statement written in pencil: “The authentic version/
which the composer Janáček gave me for print production/and as a model for corrections
of other scores and parts/ in Brno November 6, 1924 on the day of the premiere of
Bystrouska./Otakar Nebuška.”/ Under this, in another hand in violet pencil: „
Janáček corrected it on Nov. 21, before the first Prague / (and the first public)
performance on Sunday Nov. 23, 1924/ on the new music concert sponsored by Hudební
Matice, played by seven Winds of the Czech philharmonic. On Nov. 25, 1924, the final revision was done by a flutist of the Czech philharmonic/ Nesporý (who directed the rehearsals)/ in cooperation with Nebuška."

This copy of the score has indeed a series of corrections done with a pencil. Their authenticity is proved by the statements listed above.


The principles of the edition: The source for our edition is the print edition of the score (source d/), which we compared with the authorized transcription of the score (source b/) in detail. The authorized transcription of the score probably bears even later interventions of the author than the 1925 Hudební Matice edition (compare bars 105-109 in the flute part and bar 112 for flute and clarinet in the second movement). We compared this with source c/ as well. We also used the autograph as a resource, which is an unfinished version of the work in comparison to source c/ in many aspects. At the same time, we corrected obvious typos and print errors included in the basic sources, and added missing performance markings according to other parallel places. We united different musical notations into the one with the most appropriate sound where needed and omitted unnecessary accidentals. Except for cases where were no doubts
about those corrections, we list all the other cases in editor’s notes (Annotazioni), as well as variations of the basic sources. In correspondence with the principles of the edition, we changed the notation of the bass clarinet from bass to treble clef and left it in the last place in the score because it corresponds with the location of its true function. In a similar way, we replaced the tenor clef, which is used here and there in bassoon.

Some bars are not listed in the sources, but only highlighted as repetitions of the previous identical bars. In one case, the third movement bars 172-177, the repeat is not written out in sources A and C, but are written out in the authorized copy C1, and the printed HM edition. All other cases, first written out in our edition, are in the fourth movement, bars 196-199 and 228-231 (thus bars 200-203 and 232-235 originated in our edition). This explains why our edition has different number of bars than the previous edition. It is the same as in the first movement, where we chose a reading of sources separating bar 58 (in the HM score) into bars 58-61 (see the relevant explanation below and examples in the notes).

In bars 141-142 in the first movement, that have the repeat sign in between, the autograph does not have a first and second ending marked. They are first marked in copy C.

In order to simplify the graphic picture, we introduced a key signature in places that are evident in our edition: all sources have local accidentals only. According to it and in correspondence with our editorial principles, we also realized
enharmonic respellings of single notes tacitly at other places. More extensive such respellings can be found in the fourth movement in bars 115-138 and 161-169. Further, the fourth movement is in bars 1-92, 128-138 and 157-204 notated in all sources as 6/8, where the horn part at the beginning and later other instruments’ parts are notated as eighth notes, while surrounding parts move in dotted quarter notes. Because ternary division (compound division) of the beat, which is used in the original, is in the absolute minority, we chose the marking 2/|l for the virtually binary division (simple division) meter; eighth notes are changed to sixteenths and dotted eighths to simple quarter notes.

Similarly, bars 123-127 are changed from 6/16 to 2/8, although it is the primary theme of the first movement. However, a reason for using this marking is the 3/16 accompanying motion [?]. Janáček used this metric marking in a similar place in the first movement, bars 124-129.

Bars 58-61 are merged into one bar in the Hudební Matic edition, because in the printed template (source c/), bar lines were scraped out according to an instruction of unknown origin. We are coming back to the reading of the autograph and of the first transcription, because as our experience showed, transcription in the form of „cadenza” tempts interpreters to a wrong understanding. Only the annotation „ad lib.” written in Janáček’s hand in source b/ is safely authentic.
APPENDIX C

DISCOGRAPHY
Entries are arranged chronologically by recording date, then recording release date, then alphabetically. Entries in parentheses are not published, but are of some interest and so are included. Some entries taken or modified from William Curtis’s 1978 discography (see bibliography) and are identified as such. Quotes are taken from the RLG Union Catalog. Details of recording and release dates, recording numbers, personnel, movement titles used, and approximate beginning tempi are included whenever possible. Recording medium is listed in reverse chronological order according to the logic of easiest attainability.

1 **Prague Wind Quintet, 1938**
Rudolf Hertl, fl; Václav Smetáček, ob; Vladimír Říha, cl; Otakar Procházka, hn; Karel Bidlo, bsn. Václav Kotáš, bs cl

*Curtis, 87*
10’’ record: *Mercury* MG 15009 (1950)
78 rpm: *Esta* E 7125-6; *Ultraphon* E 23092-3 (1938)

I. Allegro MM = 140
II. Andante sostenuto MM = 60
III. Vivace MM = 184+
IV. Allegro animato MM = 144

2 **Radio-Berlin Orchestra Wind Sextet, 194?**

*Curtis, 88*
12’’ LP: *Chant du Monde* LDX 8017 (c. 1951)
10’’ record: *Chant du Monde* LDM or LDP 8152

3 **Philadelphia Woodwind Quintet, 1954**
William Kincaid, fl; John de Lancie, ob; Anthony Gigliotti, cl; Mason Jones, hn; Sol Schoenbach, bsn. Leon Lester, bs cl

*Curtis, 89*
12’’ LP: *Columbia* ML 4995 (1955)
*Philips* ABR 4057; A 01642

I. Andante MM = 146
II. Moderato MM = 66
III. Allegro MM = 160
IV. Con moto MM = 124

4 **Prague Wind Quintet, 195?**
Rudolf Hertl, fl; Václav Smetáček, ob; Vladimír Říha, cl; Josef Schwarz, hn; Karel Bidlo, bsn. Alois Rybín, bs cl

*Curtis, 90*
12’’ LP: *Supraphon* LPM 400 or *SUF* 20347 (new number assigned)
*Supraphon* DM 5302
5  Leningrad Philharmonic Wind Quintet, 1968
Lev Perepyolkin, fl; Vladimir Kurlin, ob; Mikhail Izmailov, cl; Vitali Buyanovksy, hn; Lev Pechersky, bsn. Yuri Michurin, bs cl

Curtis, 91
12” LP: Melodiya D 10611-2/5 359-60 (c. 1962)

(6)  Library of Congress Festival Winds, 1964

7  Southwest German Radio Wind Quintet of Baden-Baden, 1969
Kraft Thorwald Ditlo, fl; Horst Schneider, ob; Hans Lemser, cl; Karl Arnold, hn; Helmut Müller, bsn and unnamed bs cl

Curtis, 92
12” LP: Mace M/SM 9034 (1966)
   Saba SB 15011; MPS SM 15011
   BASF MPS 20 20762—5

8  Caramoor Festival Orchestra (members), 1966
Claude Monteux, fl; Henry Schumann, ob; George Silfies, cl; Brooks Tillotson, hn; Reohey Nakagawa, bsn; Aldo Simonelli, bs cl


Curtis, 93
12” LP: Desto D 428/DST 6428 (1966)
   I. Allegro MM = 152
   II. Andante sostenuto MM = 66+
   III. Vivace MM = 168
   IV. Allegro animato; Presto MM = 126

9  Melos Ensemble, 1967
Richard Adeney, fl; Peter Graeme, ob; Gervase de Peyer, cl; Neill Sanders, hn; William Waterhouse, bsn; Stephen Trier, bs cl

CD: EMI Classics 7243 5 65304 2 3 (1994)
(Capitol 1995?)

Curtis, 94
12” LP: Angel S 36455 (1968)
   Vanguard Cardinal VCS 10123 (1977)
   H.M.V. ASD 2344; CVB 2067
   Seraphim SLJ 6061 (second mvt. only, 1970)
   I. Andante MM = 144+
   II. Moderato MM = 56
   III. Allegro MM = 166
   IV. Con moto MM = 134
10  **Foerster Wind Quintet, 1970**  
Radomír Pivoda, fl; Vítězslav Winkler, ob; Bohumil Opat, cl; Otto Kopecký, hn; František Svoboda, bsn. Josef Horák, bs cl  
CD: *Panton* 81 1203-2111 or 710376 (1990)  
Curtis, 95  
12” LP: *Panton* 01 0214/11 0214

11  **Prague Wind Quintet, 197?**  
Jan Hecl, fl; Miloslav Hašek, ob; Jiří Štengl, cl; Miloš Petr, hn; Josef Slanicka, bsn. Adolf Nechvátal, bs cl  
12” LP: *Supraphon* 1 SUPD 011 (2 LP set)  
Curtis, 96  
12” LP: *Supraphon* 111 1177

12  **Danzi Wind Quintet, 197?**  
*Curtis*, 97  
12” LP: *BASF* MPS 25 21809—0 (1973)

13  **Chamber Music Society of Lincoln Center, 1973**  
Paula Robison, fl; Leonard Arner, ob; Gervase de Peyer, cl; Robert Routh, hn; Loren Glickman, bsn; Allen Blustine, bs cl  
“Recorded Nov. 6, 1973, at Alice Tully Hall, Lincoln Center, New York”  
10” reel-to-reel: *New York Public Library* (1973)

14  **Vienna Wind Soloists, 1976**  
Wolfgang Schulz, fl; Gerhard Turetschek, ob; Peter Schmidl, cl; Volker Altman, hn; Fritz Faltl, bsn. Horst Hajek, bs cl  
12” LP: *Ace of Diamonds* SDD 523  
*Curtis*, 98  
12” LP: *London* STS 15419 (1978)  
*Decca* SDD 523
(15) **Philadelphia Woodwind Quintet, 1976**
Ronald Reuben, bs cl


“Version edited for broadcast: LWO 9208”

16 **Brno Wind Quintet, 1978**

12” LP: *Panton 81 11 0048*

(17) **Chamber Music Society of Lincoln Center, 1978**
Paula Robison, fl; Leonard Arner, ob; Michael Webster, cl; Barry Tuckwell, hn; Loren Glickman, bsn; Virgil Blackwell, bs cl

“Recorded March 26, 1978 at Alice Tully Hall, Lincoln Center, New York”

10” reel-to-reel: *New York Public Library* (1978)

18 **London Sinfonietta (members), 1978**
Sebastian Bell, fl; Janet Craxton, ob; Anthony Pay, cl; Philip Eastop, hn; Martin Gatt, bsn; Michael Harris, bs cl


    *Decca* D223D5 (1981)

    I. *Andante* MM = 158
    II. *Moderato* MM = 62
    III. *Allegro* MM = 166
    IV. *Con moto* MM = 138+

19 **König Ensemble, 1980**

12” LP: *Bedivere* BVR 304 (1981)
20 Wingra Quintet Plus One, 1981
Robert Cole, fl; Marc Fink, ob; Glenn Bowen, cl; Douglas Hill, hn; Richard Lottridge, bsn;
Les Thimmig, bs cl
12” LP: Spectrum SR-142 (1981)
   I. Andante MM = 150
   II. Moderato MM = 72
   III. Allegro MM = 172+
   IV. Con moto MM = 128

21 Los Angeles Chamber Orchestra (members), 1981
David Shostak, fl; Allan Vogel, ob; David Shifrin, cl; Robin Graham, hn; Kenneth
Munday, bsn; Gary Gray, bs cl
(Warner Apex ?)
12” LP:
   I. Allegro MM = 144+
   II. Andante sostenuto MM = 68
   III. Vivace MM = 166
   IV. Allegro animato MM = 132

22 Orpheus Chamber Orchestra (members), 1985
Susan Palma, fl; Randall Wolfgang, ob; Charles Neidich, cl; William Purvis, hn; Frank
Morelli, bsn; Dennis Smylie, bs cl
CD: Deutsche Grammophon 415 668-2 (1986)
Cassette: Deutsche Grammophon 415 668-4 (1986)
12” LP: Deutsche Grammophon 415 668-1 (1986)
   I. Allegro MM = 140
   II. Andante sostenuto MM = 66
   III. Vivace MM = 184
   IV. Allegro animato MM = 130

(23) Marlboro Music Festival, 1986
Judith Mendenhall, fl; Rudolph Vrbsky, ob; Theresa Tunnicliff, cl; David Jolley, hn;
Michael Finn, bsn; David Krakauer, bs cl. Unclear which clarinetist played which type of
clarinet.
“Recorded in the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.,
Feb. 1, 1986”
24 Marlboro Music Festival, 1986
Laura Gilbert, fl; Rudolph Vrbsky, ob; Shannon Scott, cl; Julie Landsman, hn; Alexander Heller, bsn; David Krakauer, bs cl


25 Basel Ensemble, 1986
CD: Denon 33CO-1474 or CM 1474 (1987)

26 Wind Soloists of the Chamber Orchestra of Europe, 1989
Thierry Fischer, fl; Douglas Boyd, ob; Richard Hosford, cl; Jonathan Williams, hn; Matthew Wilkie, bsn, Nicholas Rodwell, bs cl. Unclear which clarinetist played which type of clarinet.

CD: ASV CD COE 812 (1989)
   ASV PLT 8509 (2002)
   I. Allegro MM = 152+
   II. Andante sostenuto MM = 57
   III. Vivace MM = 176
   IV. Allegro animato MM = 138

27 Aulos Bläserquintett, 1989
Peter Rijks, fl; Diethelm Jonas, ob; Karl-Theo Adler, cl; Dietmar Ullrich, hn; Ralph Sabow, bsn. Kurt Berger, bs cl

CD: Koch Schwann Musica Mundi CD 310 051 (1990)

28 Prague Wind Quintet, 1990
Jan Hecl, fl; Jiří Krejčí, ob; Ludmila Peterková, cl; Vladimíra Klánská, hn; Lumír Vaněk, bsn; Petr Čáp, bs cl

CD: Supraphon 11 1354–2 131 or LC 0358 (1991)
   I. Allegro MM = 152
   II. Andante MM = 70-
   III. Vivace MM = 172
   IV. Allegro animato MM = 132

29 Fodor Quintet, 1990
Marieke Schneemann, fl; Bart Schneemann, ob; Harmen de Boer, cl; Jacob Slagter, hn; Ronald Karten, bsn. Harry Spathaan, bs cl

CD: Ottava OTR C69031 or OTR C69021 (1992)
30 **Ensemble Walter Boeykens, 1991**
Dirk de Caluwe, fl; Joris van Den Hauwe or Jan Maebe, ob; Walter Boeykens or Hans Vanneste, cl; Jacob Slagter, André Pichal, Nico Demarchi or Jan van Duffel, hn; Brian Pollard or Dirk Noyen, bsn. Jan Guns, bs cl

CD: *Harmonia Mundi France* HMC 901399; *HMA* 1901399 (new number assigned) (1997)

Musique D’Abord 1901399 (1997)

I. *Andante* MM = 152  
II. *Moderato* MM = 64  
III. *Allegro* MM = 166  
IV. *Con moto* MM = 128

31 **Ensemble Villa Musica, 1992**

CD: *Musikproduktion Dabringhaus und Grimm* MD+G L 3439 (1993)

32 **Camas Quintett, 1994**
Andreas Noack, fl; Andreas Vogel ob; Matthias Ritter, cl; Carla Goldberg, hn; Stephan Hüfner, bsn. Rudolf König, bs cl

CD: *EigenArt* 10100 (1994)

I. *Andante-Allegro* MM = 144  
II. *Moderato-Andante sostenuto* MM = 63  
III. *Allegro-Vivace* MM = 166+  
IV. *Con moto-Allegro con animato* MM = 126+

33 **Linos Ensemble, 1994**
Philippe Bouchy, fl; Klaus Becker, ob; Rainer Müller-van Recum, cl; Will Sanders, hn; Eberhard Marschall, bsn; Albert Osterhammer, bs cl

CD: *Capriccio* 10 576

I. *Allegro* MM = 148  
II. *Moderato* MM = 66-  
III. *Allegro* MM = 166  
IV. *Con moto* MM = 140

34 **Chamber Music Society of Lincoln Center, 1994**
Ransom Wilson, fl; Stephen Taylor or Allan Vogel, ob; Charles Neidich, cl; Robert Rouch, hn; Julie Feves, bsn; Dennis Smylie, bs cl

“Recorded Alice Tully Hall, Lincoln Center, NY”

10” reel-to-reel: *New York Public Library* (1994)
35  **Netherlands Wind Ensemble** (members), 1995
Marieke Schneemann, fl; Bart Schneemann, ob; Harmen de Boer, cl; Paul van Zelm, hn; Ronald Karten, bsn; Romke Jan Wymenga bs cl

CD: *Chandos Chan* 9399 (1995)

I. Allegro MM = 146  
II. *Andante sostenuto* MM = 66  
III. Vivace MM = 170  
IV. Allegro animato MM = 140

36  **Michael Thompson Wind Quintet, 1995**
Jonathan Snowden, fl; Derek Wickens, ob; Robert Hill, cl; Michael Thompson, hn; John Price, bsn. Michael Harris, bs cl


I. Allegro MM = 144  
II. *Andante sostenuto* MM = 66-  
III. Vivace MM = 152  
IV. Allegro animato MM = 124

37  **Claude Debussy Wind Quintet, 1996**
Céline Nessi, fl; Eric Cassen, ob; Romain Guyot, cl; Laurent Ollé, hn; Laurent Lefèvre, bsn. Bruno Martinez, bs cl

CD: *Harmonia Mundi France* HMN 911624 (1997)

I. *Andante* MM = 144  
II. *Moderato* MM = 66  
III. Allegro MM = 160- 
IV. *Con moto* MM = 140+

38  **Swiss Wind Quintet, 1996**
Michael Hartmann, fl; Tilmann Zahn, ob; Urs Brügger, cl; Henryk Kalinski, hn; Tomasz Sosnowski, bsn. Nikita Cardinaux, bs cl

CD: *Koch DICD* 920395 (1997)

I. Allegro MM = 158  
II. *Andante sostenuto* MM = 64  
III. Vivace MM = 162  
IV. Allegro animato MM = 136
Oslo Philharmonic Wind Soloists, 1996


I. *Allegro* MM = 156
II. *Andante sostenuto* MM = 68
III. *Vivace* MM = 166
IV. *Allegro animato* MM = 132

Marlboro Festival Wind Ensemble, 1997

Paula Robison, fl; Jennifer Kuhns, ob; Igor Begelman, cl; Radovan Vlatkovic, hn; Daniel Matsukawa, bsn; Michael Rusinek, bs cl


I. *Allegro* MM = 148
II. *Andante sostenuto* MM = 56+
III. *Vivace* MM = 172
IV. *Allegro animato* MM = 134

London Festival Orchestra (members), 199?

Edward Beckett, Malcolm Messiter, Anthony Pike, Richard Skinner, Derek Taylor, Anthony Jennings (don’t know who is playing what. CD supposedly coming)


Brno Wind Quintet, 1998

Peter Pomkla, fl; Libor Bartonik, ob; Vít Spilka, cl; Tomáš Kopecký, hn; Roman Novozámský, bsn. Jiří Sedláček, bs cl

CD: *Artimus* ARMU 007-2 (1999)

I. *Allegro* MM = 152
II. *Andante sostenuto* MM = 64
III. *Vivace* MM = 176
IV. *Allegro animato* MM = 132+

Prague Wind Quintet, 199?

CD: *Praga* PRD250134 or PRD350005 (1999)

(44) Marlboro Music Festival, 2000

Demarre McGill, fl; Katherine Needleman, ob; Richie Hawley, cl; Jennifer Montone, hn; Willliam Winstead, bsn; Anthony McGill, bs cl

INDEX TO APPENDIX C (DISCOGRAPHY)

by Performers and Ensembles

(Bold numbers refer to discography entry numbers)

Adeney, Richard: 9
Adler, Karl-Theo: 27
Altmann, Volker: 14
Arner, Leonard: 13, 17
Arnold, Karl: 7
Aulos Bläserquintett: 27
Bartonik, Libor: 42
Basel Ensemble: 25
Becker, Klaus: 33
Beckett, Edward: 41
Begelman, Igor: 40
Bell, Sebastian: 18
Berger, Kurt: 27
Berlin Radio Wind Sextet: see Radio-
Berlin Orchestra Wind Sextet
Bidlo, Karel: 1, 4
Blackwell, Virgil: 17
Blustine, Allen: 13
Boer, Harmen de: 29, 35
Boekens, Walter: 30
Boucly, Philippe: 33
Bowen, Glenn: 20
Boyd, Douglas: 26
Brno Wind Quintet: 16, 42
Brügger, Urs: 38
Buyanovsky, Vitali: 5
Caluwe, Dirk de: 30
Camas Quintett: 32
Câp, Petr: 28
Caramoor Festival Orchestra: 8
Cardinaux, Nikita: 38
Cassen, Eric: 37
Chamber Music Society of Lincoln
Center: see Lincoln Center, Chamber
Music Society of
Chamber Orchestra of Europe: see
Wind Soloists of the Chamber
Orchestra of Europe
Claude Debussy Wind Quintet: 37
Cole, Robert: 20
Craxton, Janet: 18

Danzi Wind Quintet: 12
Debussy Wind Quintet: see Claude
Debussy Wind Quintet
Demarchi, Nico: 30
Den Hauwe, Joris van: 30
Diloo, Kraft Thorwald: 7
Eastop, Phillip: 18
Ensemble Villa Musica: 31
Ensemble Walter Boeykens: 30
Fal, Fritz: 14
Feves, Julie: 34
Filharmonické kvinteto Brno: see Brno
Wind Quintet
Fink, Marc: 20
Finn, Michael: 23
Fischer, Thierry: 26
Fodor Quintet: 29
Foerster Wind Quintet: 10
Gatt, Martin: 18
German Radio Wind Quintet: see
Southwest German Radio Wind
Quintet of Baden-Baden
Gigliotti, Anthony: 3
Gilbert, Laura: 24
Glickman, Loren: 13, 17
Goldberg, Carla: 32
Graeme, Peter: 9
Graham, Robin: 21
Gray, Gary: 21
Guns, Jan: 30
Guyot, Romain: 37
Hajek, Horst: 14
Harris, Michael: 18, 36
Hartmann, Michael: 38
Hašek, Miloslav: 11
Hawley, Richie: 44
Hecl, Jan: 11, 28
Heller, Alexander: 24
Hertl, Rudolf: 1, 4
Hill, Douglas: 20
Hill, Robert: 36
Hosford, Richard: 26
Hüfner, Stephan: 32
Izmailov, Mikhail: 5
Jennings, Anthony: 41
Jolley, David: 23
Jonas, Diethelm: 27
Jones, Mason: 3
Kalinski, Henryk: 38
Karten, Ronald: 29, 35
Kincaid, William: 3
Klanska, Vladimir: 28
König Ensemble: 19
König, Rudolf: 32
Kopecký, Otto: 10
Kopecký, Tomáš: 42
Kotas, Václav: 1
Krakauer, David: 23, 24
Kuhns, Jennifer: 40
Kurlin, Vladimir: 5
Lancie, John de: 3
Landsman, Julie: 24
Lefèvre, Laurent: 37
Lemser, Hans: 7
Leningrad Philharmonic Wind Quintet: 5
Lester, Leon: 3
Library of Congress: 6, 15
Lincoln Center, Chamber Music Society of: 13, 17, 34
Linos Ensemble: 33
London Festival Orchestra: 41
London Sinfonietta: 18
Los Angeles Chamber Orchestra: 21
Lottridge, Richard: 20
Maebe, Jan: 30
Marlboro Festival: 23, 24, 44, 40
Marshall, Eberhard: 33
Martinez, Bruno: 37
Matsukawa, Daniel: 40
McGill, Anthony: 44
McGill, Demarre: 44
Melos Ensemble: 9
Mendenhall, Judith: 23
Messiter, Malcolm: 41
Michael Thompson Wind Quintet: 36
Michurin, Yuri: 5
Miloš, Petr: 11
Monteux, Claude: 8
Montone, Jennifer: 44
Morelli, Frank: 22
Müller, Helmut: 7
Müller-van Recum, Rainer: 33
Munday, Kenneth: 21
Nakagawa, Reohey: 8
Nechvátal, Adolf: 11
Needleman, Katherine: 44
Neidich, Charles: 22, 34
Nessi, Céline: 37
Netherlands Wind Ensemble: 35
Noack, Andreas: 32
Novozámský, Roman: 42
Noyen, Dirk: 30
Ollé, Laurent: 37
Opat, Bohumil: 10
Orpheus Chamber Orchestra: 22
Oslo Philharmonic Wind Soloists: 39
Osterhammer, Albert: 33
Palma, Susan: 22
Pay, Anthony: 18
Pechersky, Lev: 5
Perepyolkin, Lev: 5
Peterkova, Ludmilla: 28
Peyer, Gervase de: 9, 13
Philadelphia Woodwind Quintet: 3, 15
Pichal, André: 30
Pike, Anthony: 41
Pivoda, Radomir: 10
Pollard, Brian: 30
Pokmala, Peter: 42
Prague Wind Quintet: 1, 4, 11, 28, 43
Pražské dechové kvinteto: see Prague Wind Quintet
Price, John: 36
Procházka, Otakar: 1
Purvis, William: 22
Quintette à vent Claude Debussy: see Claude Debussy Wind Quintet
Radio-Berlin Orchestra Wind Sextet: 2
Reuben, Ronald: 15
říha, Vladimir: 1, 4
Rijks, Peter: 27
Ritter, Matthias: 32
Robison, Paula: 13, 17, 40
Rodwell, Nicholas: 26
Routch, Robert: 13, 34
Rusinek, Michael: 40
Rybin, Alois: 4
Sabow, Ralph: 27
Sanders, Neill: 9
Sanders, Will: 33
Schmidl, Peter: 14
Schneemann, Marieke: 29, 35
Schneemann, Bart: 29, 35
Schneider, Horst: 7
Schoenbach, Sol: 3
Schulz, Wolfgang: 14
Schuman, Henry: 8
Schwarz, Josef: 4
Scott, Shannon: 24
Sedláček, Jiří: 42
Shifrin, David: 21
Shostak, David: 21
Silfies, George: 8
Simonelli, Aldo: 8
Skinner, Richard: 41
Slagter, Jacob: 29, 30
Slanicka, Josef: 11
Smetáček, Václav: 1, 4
Smylie, Dennis: 22, 34
Snowden, Jonathan: 36
Sosnowski, Tomasz: 38
Southwest German Radio Wind
Quintet of Baden-Baden, 7
Sparnaay, Harry: 29
Spilka, Vit: 42
Stengl, Jiří: 11
Svoboda, František: 10
Swiss Wind Quintet: 38
Taylor, Derek: 41
Taylor, Stephen: 34
Thimmig, Les: 20
Thompson, Michael: 36
Tillotson, Brooks: 8
Trier, Stephan: 9
Tuckwell, Barry: 17
Tunnicliff, Theresa: 23
Turetschek, Gerhard: 14
Ullrich, Dietmar: 27
Van Duffel, Jan: 30
Vanek, Lumír
Vanneste, Hans: 30
Vienna Wind Soloists: 14
Villa Musica Ensemble: see Ensemble
Villa Musica
Vlatkovic, Radovan: 40
Vogel, Allan: 21, 34
Vogel, Andreas: 32
Vrbovský, Rudolph: 23, 24
Walter Boeykens Ensemble: see
Ensemble Walter Boeykens
Waterhouse, William: 9
Webster, Michael: 17
Wickens, Derek: 36
Wiener Bläseristen: see Vienna Wind
Soloists
Wilkie, Matthew: 26
Williams, Jonathan: 26
Wilson, Ransom: 34
Wind Soloists of the Chamber
Orchestra of Europe: 26
Wingra Wind Quintet Plus One: 20
Winkler, Vítězslav: 10
Winstead, William: 44
Wolfgang, Randall: 22
Wymenga, Romke Jan: 35
Zahn, Tilmann: 38
Zelm, Paul van: 35
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