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Abstract

Aaron Copland completed the orchestral score to *El Salón México* in 1936 marking a turning point in his career. The piece received more performances in the year following its completion than any of his previous orchestral works. It was well received by both critics and audiences due to his focus on melody and shift in thinking towards using the “simplest possible means” to make the music more accessible to the listener.

Mark Hindsley completed a band arrangement of *El Salón México* in 1966 that included numerous changes to the meter and rhythmic notation found in Copland’s orchestral score. The author conducted a comparative analysis of Copland’s published orchestral score, the *El Salón México* manuscript materials, Bernstein’s arrangements for piano, and Hindsley’s transcription for band. This investigation sought to determine why Hindsley chose to include metric alterations that differ from the orchestral score, and how he decided what meters would be appropriate.

The study of Copland’s manuscript materials of *El Salón México* revealed that Copland simplified the meter and rhythmic notation after the composition was complete. These rhythmic alterations were completed during the orchestration process in an effort to make the piece more performable. Much of Copland’s original conception of rhythmic notation, that appears in his manuscript sketches, also appear in Bernstein’s piano arrangements. In addition, many of the alterations Hindsley utilized were similar to the
metric and rhythmic notation in Bernstein’s arrangements. In some sections of the music, Bernstein’s and Hindsley’s notation more closely match Copland’s original conception of rhythmic notation than the orchestral score.

The comparative analysis also revealed Hindsley’s scoring techniques, including heavy doubling, unnecessary changing of wind instrument timbres and numerous changes to meter and beaming. The author created a new arrangement for band that restores all the orchestral meters and modernizes the instrumentation and orchestration. The intent was to provide today’s conductors the option of using a transcription more closely related to the published orchestral score.
Dedicated to my husband and closest friend Erik Evensen.
Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my teachers at the Ohio State University for their help and guidance in completing this project, including my committee members Hilary Apfelstadt, Daryl Kinney, Richard Blatti, and especially my advisor Russel Mikkelson who proposed the idea for project and guided the work throughout the process. I would also like to thank him and the Ohio State University Wind Symphony for their preparation of my arrangement that resulted in a wonderful performance.

Thank you to Philip McCarthy from Boosey & Hawkes, and James Kendrick and Jessica Rauch from the Aaron Copland Fund for Music for assisting with the various permissions needed to complete this project.

I would also like to thank the librarians at the Library of Congress for their assistance, particularly Loras Schissel for mailing a copy of a necessary manuscript.

Finally, I’d like to thank my family for all of their support the past three years. I need to give a special thank you to my husband Erik Evensen, who has been my greatest supporter.
Vita

January 26, 1976................. Born, Janesville, WI, USA

1999........................................ B.M.E. University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire

1999-2001................................. Music Educator, Mukwonago, WI

2001-2003................................. Graduate Assistant, Oklahoma State University

2003.......................................... M.M. Wind Conducting, Oklahoma State University

2003-2006................................. Lecturer, University of New Hampshire

2006-2009................................. Doctoral Conducting Associate, Ohio State University

2009-present ......................... Director of Bands, Bemidji State University

Field of Study

Major Field: Music
# Table of Contents

Abstract ..............................................................................................................................................ii

Dedication ..........................................................................................................................................iv

Acknowledgements ...............................................................................................................................v

Vita ........................................................................................................................................................vi

List of Figures .....................................................................................................................................viii

List of Photos .....................................................................................................................................xii

List of Tables ......................................................................................................................................xiii

Chapter 1: Introduction and Procedures ............................................................................................1

Chapter 2: *El Salón México* for Orchestra ......................................................................................17

Chapter 3: The Mark Hindsley Arrangement for Band ..................................................................45

Chapter 4: The Erika Svanoe Arrangement for Band ......................................................................82

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Suggestions for further Research ....................................................92

Bibliography ......................................................................................................................................100

Appendix A: Copland’s “Suggested revisions on band arrangement” ...........................................103

Appendix B: *El Salón México* for Band arranged by Erika Svanoe ............................................105
List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Folksong material used in *El Salón México* ........................................... 23
Figure 2.2: Copland, *El Salón México*, melodic material, mm. 8-13 ......................... 23
Figure 2.3: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 23-26, Trumpet .................................. 24
Figure 2.4: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 39-44, Bassoon 1 ................................. 24
Figure 2.5: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 61-64, Violin 1, 2, Viola (compressed)..... 25
Figure 2.6: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm.76-81, Violin 1.................................... 25
Figure 2.7: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm.106-110, Clarinet 1 ............................. 26
Figure 2.8: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 135-139, Violin 1 ............................... 26
Figure 2.9: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 185-190, Clarinet 1 ............................. 27
Figure 2.10: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 256-260, English Horn ....................... 27
Figure 2.11: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm.211-214, Clarinet 1 ............................. 28
Figure 2.12: Copland, ARCO 28-A (Piano Sketch), Rhythmic notation, mm.1-3........ 32
Figure 2.13: Copland/Bernstein, *El Salón México* for Two Pianos, Rhythmic notation,
mm. 1-3 ......................................................................................................................... 32
Figure 2.14: Copland, *El Salón México*, Rhythmic notation, mm. 1-5....................... 32
Figure 2.15: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 124-128, Violin 1 ............................... 33
Figure 2.16: Copland, ARCO 28-A (Piano Sketch), Corresponding music to Figure 2.15
................................................................................................................................. 33
Figure 2.17: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 160-168 (compressed) ..................34

Figure 2.18: Copland, ARCO 28-A (Piano Sketch), Corresponding music to Figure 2.17 ...........................................................................................................34

Figure 2.19: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm.130-135, Strings..........................35

Figure 2.20: Example of revised rhythmic notation in *Symphonic Ode* ..................37

Figure 3.1: Hindsley Orchestration Chart ...............................................................51

Figure 3.2: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 40-44. Bassoons,
Contrabassoon, Alto and Tenor Saxophones .......................................................53

Figure 3.3: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 247-251, Strings ..............................54

Figure 3.4: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 247-251, Clarinets .....54

Figure 3.5: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 61-64, Strings .................................55

Figure 3.6: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 61-64, Clarinets,
Cornets ..................................................................................................................55

Figure 3.7: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 73-80, Strings .................................56

Figure 3.8: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 73-80, Flutes, Clarinets,
Cornets ..................................................................................................................56

Figure 3.9: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 1-4, Trumpets ..................................57

Figure 3.10: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 1-4, Cornets,
Trumpets ..............................................................................................................57

Figure 3.11: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 20-25, Bass Clarinet, Bassoons,
Trombone 1 ...........................................................................................................59
Figure 3.12: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 20-25, Bassoons, Saxophones ........................................................................................................................................59

Figure 3.13: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 221-226 ........................................................................61

Figure 3.14: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 221-226 ..........................62

Figure 3.15: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, 1st Version Manuscript (ARCO 28-D) mm. 73-80 ........................................................................................................................................63

Figure 3.16: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 73-80 .................................................................65

Figure 3.17: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 73-80 .......................66

Figure 3.18: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 372-375, Viola .......................................................69

Figure 3.19: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 373-377, Clarinet 2, 3 ........................................................................................................................................69

Figure 3.20: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 377-379, Violin 2, Viola ..........................70

Figure 3.21: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 380-382, Clarinet 2, 3 ........................................................................................................................................70

Figure 3.22: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 14-15, Trumpets ........................................71

Figure 3.23: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 14-15, Cornets, Trumpets ........................................................................................................................................71

Figure 3.24: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 316-319, Trumpet 1, 2 ...............................72

Figure 3.25: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 316-319, Trumpet 1 ..........................72

Figure 3.26: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 324-326, Horns ........................................73

Figure 3.27: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 324-326, Horns ........73

Figure 3.28: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 252-256, Violins ........................................75
Figure 3.29: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 252-256, Clarinets 1, 2

Figure 3.30: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 257-258, Viola

Figure 3.31: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 257-258, Clarinet 1

Figure 3.32: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 10, melodic material

Figure 3.33: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, m. 10, melodic material

Figure 3.34: Comparison of rhythmic notation for music corresponding with orchestral mm. 156-172 in the Piano Sketch (ARCO 28-A), Bernstein arrangement for solo piano, and Hindsley’s arrangement for band

Figure 3.35: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 59, Bassoon

Figure 3.36: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, m. 59, Bassoon

Figure 3.37: Copland, *El Salón México*, m.313, Trumpet 1 in C

Figure 3.38: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, m. 313, Trumpet (displayed in concert pitch)

Figure 3.39: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 160-161, melodic material in Trombone 1, 2, Violin 1, Viola

Figure 3.40: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 160-161, melodic material in Horn 2, 4, Trombone 1, 2
List of Photos

Photo 2.1: ARCO 28.1, Music corresponding to published orchestral score m. 321......40
Photo 2.2: ARCO 28-A, Music corresponding to published orchestral score m. 321.....41
Photo 2.3: ARCO 28, Music corresponding to published orchestral score m. 378........42
Photo 2.4: ARCO 28a copy 2, mm. 24-25, Bass Clarinet, Bassoons, Trumpet in C,
Trombone ........................................................................................................................................43
Photo 2.5: ARCO 28-A, Music corresponding to published orchestral score
mm. 24-25 ........................................................................................................................................44
List of Tables

Table 2.1: Summary of published scores and manuscripts ........................................31
Table 3.1: Comparison of Instrumentation between Copland Orchestral Score and
Hindsley Band Score ......................................................................................................49
Table 4.1: Comparison of Instrumentation between Copland Orchestral Score, Hindsley
Band Score, and Svanoe Band Score ........................................................................85
Chapter 1: Introduction and Procedures

Background

Transcriptions and arrangements of works from other mediums hold an important place in the literature of the wind band. For much of the band’s history, a large part of the available literature included orchestral transcriptions. While there has been an enormous increase in the percentage of original compositions for band in the past several decades, quality transcriptions of significant works from other mediums continue to add depth and variety to the literature as a whole.

When a conductor is faced with the task of performing an arrangement or transcription, it is important to refer to the original version during score study and preparation. If the arranger of the new version has made changes that may affect the performance of the piece, it is vital to know what these alterations are, and if they are appropriate. In some cases, changes in an arrangement may not accurately reflect the original composer’s intentions, while other changes are appropriate due to the difference in medium.

One such band transcription that deserves a thorough comparative analysis and evaluation is Mark Hindsley’s arrangement of Aaron Copland’s *El Salón México*. While it is considered to be one of Copland’s lighter orchestral works, it is an important piece because of its place in his compositional output as a whole. It was one of the first works that represented a conscious shift in Copland’s compositional style towards using what he
called the “simplest possible terms.” Copland’s perception that the majority of concert audiences were apathetic towards any music but the established classics was responsible for this shift in thinking. As the audience for new music continued to decrease, Copland experimented with music he thought would appeal to a wider audience.¹ *El Salón México* was the first successful piece in this new style and helped Copland gain widespread popularity.²

Hindsley’s band arrangement is significant not only because of Copland’s status as one of America’s premiere composers, but because of its widespread use by bands. It has appeared on several state high school contest lists including Texas, Florida, Arkansas, and Virginia and was recorded by both the University of Illinois and the Cincinnati Conservatory.³ It also appears regularly on collegiate band programs.⁴

However, Hindsley made several editorial decisions, particularly regarding meter, which differ significantly from the score of the orchestral work. One purpose of this study is to compare Aaron Copland’s *El Salón México* for orchestra with Mark Hindsley’s transcription for band and to evaluate the editorial changes made in the band version. Finally, a new arrangement of *El Salón México* for band was created in which all of Copland’s orchestral meters were restored.

**Aaron Copland**

Aaron Copland (1900-1990) is one of the most significant American composers of the 20th century. He won the Pulitzer Prize and the New York Music Critics’ Circle

---

¹ Copland, “Composer from Brooklyn,” xxvi.
³ Shattingermusic.com
⁴ CBDNA Report
Award for *Appalachian Spring* and his film scores earned him four Academy Award nominations and one win for *The Heiress* in 1949. He was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Letters in 1954, received the Academy’s Gold Medal in 1956, and served as the Academy’s president in 1971. Other awards included a MacDowell Medal in 1961, a Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1964, a Kennedy Center Honor in 1979, a Medal of the Arts in 1986, and a Congressional Gold Medal in 1986, as well as several honorary doctorates.⁵

While Copland’s music has been acknowledged by prestigious awards, it is also recognized by much of the American populous because of its infiltration into popular culture. His music has been used to promote the Olympics, the armed forces and the United States beef industry, because “when it comes to music that summons up images of America in the minds of American listeners, Copland is unique… in each case the promoters have wanted to tap into deep-seated feelings that, somehow, this music evokes like almost nothing else.”⁶

The youngest of five children, Aaron Copland was born on November 14, 1900 in Brooklyn, New York to his parents Harris and Sarah Copland. Throughout his youth Copland studied piano, theory, and composition with various teachers and supplemented his education by attending recitals and concerts. In 1921 he traveled to Paris where he studied composition with Nadia Boulanger, his most influential teacher. While studying with Boulanger Copland produced his first orchestral score, *Grohg*, which he completed upon his return to the United States in 1924. In addition, Boulanger arranged for two

---

⁵ Howard Pollack. "Copland, Aaron." In *Grove Music Online.*
⁶ Burr, “Copland, the West and American Identity,” 22.
performances of Copland’s organ concerto to be performed by both the New York and Boston Symphony Orchestras with herself as soloist. The performance of the *Organ Symphony* under the baton of Sergey Koussevitzky initiated an important relationship for Copland. Koussevitzky became one of Copland’s greatest collaborators and champions.⁷

Upon Copland’s return the United States, he felt the need to compose modern music that was identifiably American. He began to incorporate jazz into his symphonic works such as *Music for Theatre* (1925) and the Piano Concerto (1926).⁸ While Copland had the support of Koussevitzky and several other musicians, critics, and artists, much of the press regarded his music with skepticism. His Piano Concerto, performed by the Boston Symphony Orchestra with himself as pianist, had a particularly unfavorable reception.⁹ Olin Downs of the New York Times wrote “It progresses by fits and starts…confirming [the listener’s] suspicions that Mr. Copland needs a firmer hold of principles of musical structure… Here is a young man who can surely not remain content with the praise of partisans or knowledge of his own artistic shortcomings.”⁴⁰ Public audiences had similar reactions. At a performance of the Piano Concerto in Mexico there were so many hisses from the audience during the performance that Copland looked to the conductor, Carlos Chávez, for a sign of whether to continue the performance.¹¹

Copland’s compositional activity decreased in the late 1920s. He entered a self-reflective period in which he considered his own compositional path, as well as the path of American music. In his 1939 essay “Composer from Brooklyn” he stated:

---

⁷ Howard Pollack. "Copland, Aaron." In *Grove Music Online*.
⁹ Pollack, “Copland, Aaron." In *Grove Music Online*.
¹¹ Copland and Perlis, *Copland*, 216.
I began to feel an increasing dissatisfaction with the relations of the music-loving public and the living composer. The old “special” public of the modern-music concerts had fallen away, and the conventional concert public continued apathetic of indifferent to anything but the established classics. It seemed to me that we composers were in danger of working in a vacuum. Moreover, an entirely new public for music had grown up around the radio and phonograph. It made no sense to ignore them and to continue writing as if they did not exist. I felt that it was worth the effort to see if I couldn’t say what I had to say in the simplest possible terms.\footnote{Copland “Composer from Brooklyn,” xxvi.}

It was \textit{El Salón México} that “developed and heralded his new style.”\footnote{Berger, \textit{Aaron Copland}, 30.} It embodied Copland’s new tendency toward “imposed simplicity.”\footnote{Copland, “Composer from Brooklyn”, xxvi.} For the untrained listener the use of folksongs and programmatic title helped bridge the gap from absolute music. It was accessible for audiences who did not have musical training or the ability to perceive formal structures. The piece was immediately popular receiving more performances than any of his other orchestral works and brought Copland’s new compositional style to the attention of the public. \textit{El Salón México} established Copland as a “successful” composer and was directly responsible for his publishing contract with Boosey & Hawkes. Impressive honors would soon follow, including a commission from the Columbia Broadcasting System for \textit{Music for Radio} (1937), election to the National Institute of Arts and Letters in 1942, and the 1945 Pulitzer Prize in music for \textit{Appalachian Spring}.\footnote{Berger, \textit{Aaron Copland}, 30-31.}

In the decade that followed 1935, Copland did not entirely abandon writing in his more abstract style, though most of his efforts had some element of functionality, such as \textit{An Outdoor Overture} (1939), composed for students, or included external matter that
gave the piece an element of being programmatic, such as *Appalachian Spring* (1944).

Many of Copland’s most popular and well-known works are from this time span, including *Fanfare for the Common Man* (1942) and *Rodeo* (1942). Pieces such as his Piano Sonata (1941) and Sonata for Violin and Piano (1943) are representative of his more abstract style during this time period. However, it was not until he composed his Third Symphony (1946) that he composed for the orchestra without programmatic elements.\(^{16}\)

Copland commented on what was perceived as an abandonment of his more complex music in his 1967 addition to “Composer from Brooklyn.”

The assertion that I wished “to see if I couldn’t say what I had to say in the simplest possible terms” and the mention of “an imposed simplicity” were taken to mean that I had renounced my more complex and “difficult” music… these remarks of mine emphasized a point of view which, although appropriate at the time of writing…seems to me to constitute an oversimplification of my aims and intentions, especially when applied to a consideration of my subsequent work and of my work as a whole.\(^{17}\)

While the ten years that followed *El Salón México* seemed to focus on Copland’s new accessible style, he later felt that there was no disparity between his two compositional styles, the simple and the complex. Rather, he adapted his technique to the materials with which he chose to work.

[There is] a continuing discussion concerning the apparent dichotomy between my “serious” and my “popular” works. I can only say that those commentators who would like to split me down the middle into two because I take into account with each new piece the purpose for which it is intended and the nature of the musical materials with which I begin to work. Musical ideas engender pieces, and the ideas by their character dictate the nature of the composition to be written.\(^{18}\)

---

\(^{16}\) Berger, *Aaron Copland*, 32.
\(^{17}\) Copland, “Composer from Brooklyn,” xxvi-xxvii.
\(^{18}\) Ibid., xxxii.
By the late 1940s Copland was widely regarded as the leading American composer of his time. While he had lived in Manhattan for many years, he moved to Ossining, New York in 1952. Through the 1950s he continued to lecture, teach and write and in 1958 began a 20-year international conducting career, presenting both his own works and the music of over 80 other composers. In 1961 Copland moved into a larger home located near Peekskill, New York where he lived until his death. He did not compose much after 1972 and began to suffer short-term memory lapses in the mid-1970s. After being diagnosed with Alzheimer’s he was under medical supervision by the mid-1980s. He died of respiratory failure on December 2, 1990.¹⁹

*El Salón México*

During a visit to Mexico in the autumn of 1932, Copland conceived of writing a piece based on Mexican themes. From the beginning, he connected the piece with a popular dance hall in Mexico City called Salón México. He realized he did not want to attempt to reflect the profound, historical side of Mexico since he felt he did not truly know the country. Instead he wanted to reflect this tourist “hot spot” where he also felt a close connection with the Mexican people.

While the work references several Mexican folk songs, Copland transforms the melodies into his own musical language. He said “It wasn’t the music that I heard, but the spirit that I felt there, which attracted me. Something of that spirit is what I hope to have put into my music.” The work was completed in 1936 and premiered by Carlos Chávez and the Orquesta Sinfónica de México the summer of the following year.

¹⁹ Pollack, “Copland, Aaron.” In *Grove Music Online*.
El Salón México is a significant work in Copland’s compositional output for several reasons. First, this piece came at a time when Copland was beginning a shift in thinking toward trying to say things in the “simplest possible terms.” The works that followed the Symphonic Ode (1929), the composition that marks the culmination of Copland’s austere writing up to that point, gradually evolved towards a generally more accessible aesthetic. Copland’s focus on melody and the use of Mexican folksongs in El Salón México were important elements that helped Copland write in a more accessible style, as well as attain wider audience appeal of his music.

Second, this was Copland’s first work to utilize borrowed folk tunes, a tool he would use throughout his career. While some of the material he borrowed is a direct quotation, his treatment of folksongs more often employs a transformation of the materials, making them a part of Copland’s compositional language, deftly retaining the spirit and character of the tunes. Copland’s motive for turning to these melodies was “an aspect of his campaign to achieve a simple style and a content that would engage the interest of a wider audience.”

Third, due to greater interest in his music, Copland became enormously successful. El Salón México introduced the composer to a larger audience and earned him popular acclaim. Compared to Statements and the Short Symphony, which received hardly any performances, by 1938 El Salón México had been performed by 21 orchestras. Also, it was at the 1938 European premier of this work that Copland met Benjamin Britten, who in turn introduced Copland to his publisher Boosey & Hawkes. El Salón

---

20 Berger, Aaron Copland, 57.
México, along with Music for Radio, were the first works to be published by the London firm.

*El Salón México* clearly marks a compositional turning point for Copland in several ways. His conscious efforts to appeal to a wider audience, use of folksong materials, and the success that followed the premiere all contribute to the fact that this work was an important milestone in Copland’s compositional output. Several arrangements of the piece were created. Leonard Bernstein arranged both the solo piano and two piano versions in 1941 and 1943 respectively. A truncated version titled “Fantasia Mexicana” dated 1952 was adapted and orchestrated by Johnny Green for the MGM motion picture *Fiesta*. Arturo Toscanini wrote an unpublished arrangement for piano, possibly for his own study of the orchestral score.  

Mark Hindsley completed his arrangement for concert band in 1966.

While Copland created several band arrangements of his own works, as well as composing *Emblems* (1964) for band, he did not create a band version of *El Salón México*. His first transcription for band was *An Outdoor Overture* (1938), originally composed for high school orchestra. The band transcription was completed at the request of Edwin Franko Goldman and was premiered by the Goldman Band in 1942. The other transcriptions Copland completed for band include *Variations on a Shaker Melody* (1956), *Preamble for a Solemn Occasion* (1949), *Inaugural Fanfare* (1977), and *Red Pony Suite* (1948).

---

21 Since the Toscanini is an unpublished reduction of the published orchestral score and the Green is a truncated version of the orchestral score, these two versions did not factor into this study.

Mark Hindsley (1905-1999) created the band arrangement of *El Salón México* in 1966. Hindlsey was the Director of Bands at the University of Illinois from 1948 until he retired in 1970. He completed dozens of arrangements for band, most of which are self-published and still available from his son, Roger Hindsley, who currently distributes his music.\(^{23}\) The only band arrangement of Hindsley’s that is not currently self-published is *El Salón México*, published by Boosey & Hawkes. According to a 1982 survey by Earle Gregory, it was (and likely still is) one of Hindsley’s most often played transcriptions. The distribution capabilities of Boosey & Hawkes certainly contribute to its availability and popularity.\(^{24}\)

**Review of Related Research**

The majority of literature regarding *El Salón México* relates to the background story of the composition or how the work fits into Copland’s compositional output as a whole. There is no in-depth analysis of the work to date. This lack of analytical research is also noted by Leo Philip Fishman in his recent dissertation “Theoretical Issues and Presumptions in the Early Music of Aaron Copland” (2007). Fishman states that “there has been a dearth of useful research concentrating on theoretical aspects of his music while there has been a great deal of work on contextualizing Copland as a way to explain his oeuvre.”\(^{25}\) Fishman’s study concentrates on four early works of Copland’s, none of which is *El Salón México*.

---

\(^{23}\) www.hindsleytranscriptions.com  
The most relevant literature that addresses questions posed by this study is either limited in scope or tangential to the topic. Only two limited analyses of the orchestral *El Salón México* were discovered. No literature could be found regarding Hindsley’s band transcription. Topics that were considered tangential but supportive to the study include studies of the piano arrangements of *El Salón México* by Leonard Bernstein, Mark Hindsley’s other arrangements for band, and Copland’s use of metric and rhythmic notation in other works. The most relevant literature within these topics is summarized here.

The best information that could be considered an analysis of *El Salón México* is by Gerald Abraham. When Boosey & Hawkes published the miniature score of *El Salón*, it was traditional for analytical notes to be included. The four-page insert gives a brief summary of the story of the Mexican dance hall and Copland’s inspiration for writing the piece. Most of the information outlines Copland’s use and alteration of Mexican folksongs and where they appear in various guises throughout the piece. Abraham outlines his interpretation of the form, which is debatable but certainly workable version of the formal structure. The notes are of high quality and give an excellent summary of the work, but are very limited in scope.26

“A Comparison and Analysis of Aaron Copland's *El Salón México* for Orchestra, Piano Solo, and Two Piano Four Hands” by Richard Glazier gives a brief analysis of the orchestral version and documents some of the differences between it and the piano arrangements by Leonard Bernstein. Most of the analysis is drawn from Gerald Abraham’s notes published in the miniature score, though Glazier additionally illustrates

---

26 Abraham, “Aaron Copland: *El Salón México*.”
Copland’s use of polyrhythm and polytonality. In comparing the rhythmic notation of the orchestral and piano versions and reading Copland’s essay “On the notation of rhythm,” Glazier recognizes that Copland simplified the meter in the orchestral version. Some of the other rhythmic notation that appears in the piano versions he credits to Bernstein, but in some cases this notation originally appears in Copland’s hand in the manuscript materials. It is clear that Copland’s manuscripts of *El Salón México* were not examined as part of this study. Glazier’s purpose is to document some of the differences in the piano versions and defend them as artistic additions to piano literature.27

Research regarding Copland’s practice of rewriting rhythmic notation in his orchestral works includes “The Compositional History of Aaron Copland’s Symphonic Ode” by Elizabeth Bergman Crist. She constructs the history of the composition through existing manuscript materials and correspondence. Crist demonstrates the process and circumstances that led to Copland’s rebarring of the *Symphonic Ode*, and substantiates that Koussevitzky was largely responsible for initiating these changes. The article also provides evidence that Copland preferred his original rhythmic notation. This was discovered through his restoration of the original notation in the revised 1955 edition.28

Research regarding Mark Hindsley’s band transcriptions was done by Earle Suydam Gregory and documented in his dissertation “Mark H. Hindsley: The Illinois Years.” It documents the professional activities of Hindsley with emphasis on his research into the construction of instruments, his contributions to the University of Illinois band building, and his contributions to band literature through transcriptions.
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27 Glazier, “A Comparison and Analysis of Aaron Copland's El Salon Mexico.”
28 Crist, “The Compositional History of Aaron Copland’s *Symphonic Ode.*”
This includes a study of the scoring practices of Hindsley by examining a sample of his orchestral transcriptions for band and an analysis of how each instrument was utilized. The research confirms and expands much of Hindsley’s own writings in *Hindsley On Bands.*

**Procedures and Purpose of the Study**

I first became familiar with *El Salón México* when I was playing clarinet on *Suite from Billy the Kid* with a youth orchestra. It was at this time I became interested in Copland’s other works for orchestra. I did not formally study the piece until I was asked to conduct Mark Hindsley’s band transcription for an audition at the Ohio State University. During the course of my study, I learned that there were several places in Hindsley’s score where the meters published in the band arrangement differ from the meters in Copland’s original orchestral score. These discrepancies led me to several questions. What is happening in the original orchestral score that may have initiated the meter changes in the band score? What are all of the meter changes that Hindsley utilized? Why did the arranger choose to use different meters and how were the meters chosen? Do other arrangements of *El Salón México* also alter the meter? Did Copland approve of the changes Hindsley made? Is a new band arrangement of *El Salón México* with the orchestral meters restored warranted? These are the questions that led me to develop this study in the manner that follows.

At the start of this process, I determined that a new band arrangement of *El Salón México* was warranted and could be an important addition to band literature. The changing of meters and beaming in arrangements, such as the Hindsley arrangement, can
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pose difficulties for musicians. In the case of *El Salón México*, many college wind
players learn the piece in the band arrangement, but then must relearn the different meters
when called upon to play the original orchestral version. Regardless of whether changing
the original meters for an arrangement is an improvement or not, the relearning of music
in different meters is a difficult task for both conductors and players. Since it is highly
unlikely that a different edition of the orchestral version of *El Salón México* will be
available, I felt it was important that band directors have an arrangement in which the
meters of the orchestral version were maintained.

In addition, Hindsley’s arrangement was conceived for a large band with over 90
musicians. College bands of this size were much more common in the 1960s than they
are today. Today’s collegiate bands use a smaller number of musicians, more in line with
a wind ensemble instrumentation. This trend gained acceptance at many colleges and
universities in the 1970s. Even the majority of today’s large concert bands are
significantly smaller than Hindsley’s model. The new band arrangement of *El Salón
México* was created both to restore the orchestral meters and modernize the
instrumentation.

I felt many of the questions posed could be answered by doing a comparative
analysis between Copland’s orchestral score and Hindsley’s band arrangement. This was
completed in two stages. First, I completed an overall study of the orchestral work, with
special consideration for rhythm and meter. Second, I compared several aspects of the
Hindsley band arrangement to the orchestral score. These aspects included
instrumentation, meter, beaming, key signatures, and overall scoring.

---

30 Battisti, *Winds of Change*, 68.
Since a dialogue with either the composer or arranger was impossible, I decided to review all of the relevant sketches, manuscripts, and correspondence between Copland and Hindsley. To accomplish this I visited the Library of Congress and examined all of the materials relating to *El Salón México*. It was my premise that an examination of Copland’s sketches and original manuscripts would lead to a deeper understanding of the work and its compositional process, as well as confirm possible errata found during the analysis. To discover any possible contact between Hindsley and Copland, I also searched for and examined correspondence relating to the band arrangement.

Chapter Two examines Copland’s orchestral score of *El Salón México*. This includes a background of its creation and how it fits into a shift in thinking at this point in Copland’s compositional output. It includes a brief formal analysis noting thematic development and use of folksong. The use of meter, beaming, and rhythm is also examined in depth.

Chapter Three discusses Hindsley’s arrangement of *El Salón México* for band. This will include changes made by Hindsley in the band arrangement pertaining to instrumentation, meter, beaming, key signatures, and overall scoring. All metric alterations in the Hindsley are documented and cataloged according to the type of alteration made, and the origins of these alterations are explored. The publication history, relevant correspondence, revisions to the original band manuscript and errata are also be examined.

Chapter Four compares the new arrangement for band, created by myself, to the Mark Hindsley band arrangement and Copland’s original orchestral score. It includes a discussion of the decision making process regarding instrumentation, use of key
signatures, overall scoring, meters, and beaming. It also documents changes made due to errata found in both the Hindsley band arrangement, as well as the original orchestral score.

Chapter Five presents a summary of the findings of the study and provides suggestions for further research.

**Description of Appendices**

Appendix A: Copland, “Suggested Revisions on band arrangement of *El Salón México*”

Appendix B: Full score of *El Salón México* for band arranged by Erika Svaneo
CHAPTER 2: El Salón México for Orchestra

In 1935 Copland organized a series of “one-man concerts” featuring the works of one living composer on each program. In observing the audiences at this series Copland stated “As I looked around at the all-too-familiar small group at these concerts, I knew that I wanted to see a larger and more varied audience for contemporary music.”\(^{31}\) At this time Copland was finishing El Salón México in which he said he was experimenting with a different style of writing. He was not rejecting one kind of music for another, but felt it was time to try something new.\(^{32}\)

Copland considered the first version of the Symphonic Ode from 1929 to be the piece that marked the end of his most austere and complex compositions. The move toward a simpler style was a gradual transition in the works that followed.

In retrospect it seems to me that the Ode marks the end of a certain period in my development as a composer. The works that follow it are no longer so grandly conceived. The Piano Variations (1930), the Short Symphony (1933), the Statements for Orchestra (1935) are more spare in sonority, more lean in texture. They are still comparatively difficult to perform and difficult for an audience to comprehend.\(^{33}\)

El Salón México was first conceived while Copland was simultaneously working on two other works in the fall of 1932 in Mexico: Short Symphony and Statements.

“These three works and their combined compositional histories document Copland’s

---

\(^{31}\) Copland and Perlis, Copland, 244.

\(^{32}\) Copland and Perlis, Copland, 245.
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refinement of a simplified musical idiom that emphasizes aural accessibility and draws on
the melodic resources of traditional tunes.” It is El Salón México and its position in
Copland’s compositional output as one of the first of several works to simplify his
musical language that makes it particularly significant.

Short Symphony is composed in a similar vein as Copland’s earlier works, such as
the Piano Variations, which focuses on structural unity and uses a dissonant avant-guard
style. Statements still utilizes this type of style, but focuses less on formal structure and is
more episodic. Copland also hoped that the suggestive movement titles, such as
“Militant” and “Cryptic,” would make the piece more palatable to the listening audience.
El Salón México also uses an episodic form, but focuses more on melody than these other
works. The reason for this shift toward melody comes primarily from the materials
Copland chose to work with, which were inspired by the music he heard during his trip to
Mexico in 1932.

For several years prior to his trip, Copland had promised Carlos Chávez that he
would visit Mexico. When Chávez promised him an all-Copland program by the
Conservatorio Nacional de México, he felt the time had come. He left New York on
August 24, accompanied by Victor Kraft, and arrived in Laredo September 2, the
morning of the concert. Copland remained in Mexico for five months.

During Copland’s visit, Chávez took him to a dance hall in Mexico City called El
Salón México, known to the locals as “El Marro” or the policeman’s nightstick. It was a
popular place for tourists who wanted a taste of how the local lower class sought

34 Crist, Music for the Common Man, 43.
35 Crist, Music for the Common Man, 43-4.
entertainment.\textsuperscript{36} The atmosphere of the place made an impression on Copland and he came away with the idea to create \textit{El Salón México}.

\textit{El Salón México} had been ‘in the works’ since my first trip to Mexico in 1932 when I came away from that colorful dance hall in Mexico City with Chávez. I had read about the hall for the first time in a guidebook about tourist entertainment: ‘Harlem type night-club for the peepul, grand Cuban orchestra, Salón México. Three halls: one for people dressed in your way, one for people dressed in overalls but shod, and one for the barefoot.’ A sign on a wall of the dance hall read: ‘Please don’t throw lighted cigarette butts on the floor so the ladies don’t burn their feet.’ A guard, stationed at the bottom of the steps leading to the three halls, would nonchalantly frisk you as you started up the stairs to be sure you had checked all your ‘artillery’ at the door and to collect the 1 peso charged for admittance to any of the three halls. When the dance hall closed at 5:00 A.M., it hardly seemed worthwhile to some of the overalled patrons to travel all the way home, so they curled themselves up on the chair around the walls for a quick two-hour snooze before going to a seven o’clock job in the morning.\textsuperscript{37}

Copland did not want to try to translate the profound side of Mexico into a musical work. He felt he did not know the country well enough to attempt this. Rather he wanted to reflect the spirit of the dance hall and his experiences he had there with the Mexican people as a tourist. The “people” were reflected in Copland’s use of traditional folksongs. Copland stated “I began (as I often did) by collecting musical themes or tunes out of which a composition might eventually emerge. It seemed natural to use popular Mexican melodies for thematic material…My purpose was not merely to quote literally but to heighten without in any way falsifying the natural simplicity of Mexican tunes.”\textsuperscript{38}

Having the piece sound “Mexican” was a concern of Copland’s. He wrote to Chávez expressing his concern “I am terribly afraid of what you will say of the ‘Salón México’-perhaps it is not Mexican at all, and I would feel so foolish. But in America del

\textsuperscript{36} Crist, \textit{Music for the Common Man}, 51.
\textsuperscript{37} Copland and Perlis, \textit{Copland}, 245.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 245.
Norte it may sound Mexican!” He wrote again to Chávez in 1935: “What it would 
sound like in Mexico I can’t imagine, but everyone here for whom I have played it seems 
to think it is very gay and amusing.” Once Chávez heard Copland perform the piano 
version, he agreed to conduct it once the orchestration was complete. The premiere took 
place on August 27, 1937 in Mexico City with Orquesta Sinfónica de México at the 
Palacio de Bellas Artes. The music was well received by the musicians and public with 
newspapers stating the piece could be taken as Mexican music.

The piece was immediately popular. Twenty-one orchestras had performed the 
piece by 1938. The first American performance was conducted by Koussevitzky with 
the Boston Symphony Orchestra on October 14, 1938. Another significant performance 
was at the 1938 International Society for Contemporary Music concert in London where 
Copland met Benjamin Britten, who was responsible for introducing Copland to the 
publishing firm Boosey & Hawkes. In a letter to Ralph Hawkes Britten wrote “I’m 
fearfully anxious for you to cash in on Aaron Copland – the American composer – now 
without a publisher since Cos Cob Press gave up. His El Salón México was the brightest 
thing of the festival…. I feel he’s a winner somehow.”

Ralph Hawkes wrote to Copland August 12, 1938 expressing an interest in 
publishing El Salón México. Negotiations by written correspondence ensued and 
Copland eventually convinced the firm to publish Music for Radio as well. It was

39 Ibid., 246.
40 Ibid., 246.
41 Crist, Music for the Common Man, 43-4.
42 Mitchell and Reed, eds., Letters from a Life, 566.
43 Ralph Hawkes to Aaron Copland, 12 August 1938, Aaron Copland Collection, Library of Congress.
Hawkes who suggested that more performances of El Salón México would be possible if
the instrumentation was slightly reduced and suggested that having a second version of
the piece available with smaller instrumentation.44

**Instrumentation:**

The full instrumentation for El Salón México is as follows:

- Piccolo
- 2 Flutes
- 2 Oboes
- English horn
- Clarinet in E-flat
- 2 Clarinets in B-flat
- Bass Clarinet in B-flat
- 2 Bassoons
- Contrabassoon
- 4 Horns in F
- 3 Trumpets in C
- 3 Trombones
- Tuba
- Timpani
- Percussion
- Piano
- Strings (Violins, Violas, Cellos, Contrabasses)

The percussion part calls for multiple instruments: xylophone, suspended cymbal,
gourd, temple blocks, wood block, bass drum, snare drum, and tambour de Provence,
which Copland describes as a long drum with a dull sound. The gourd was the only
Mexican percussion instrument that he included in the piece. This may have been for the
best, since several orchestras of the time had a difficulty acquiring a proper gourd for
performances.

Some of the wind instruments were marked in the score as “not essential to
performance.” At the request of Ralph Hawkes, and likely seeing the opportunity for

44 Ralph Hawkes to Aaron Copland, 20 September 1938, Copland Collection.
more performances with a reduced instrumentation, Copland created an alternate scoring
to accommodate this request, eliminating the need for the English Horn, Clarinet in E-flat, Bass Clarinet, Contrabassoon, and Trumpet 3.

**Folksong Materials and Form**

Copland used several Mexican folk songs, found in published collections, as the basis for many of the melodies in *El Salón México*. Two of the songs, “El Palo Verde” and “La Jesuita” were found in *Cancionero Mexicano* edited by Frances Toor. “El Mosco” and “La Malacate,” an indigenous dance tune, were found in *El Folklore y la Música Mexicana* by Rubén M. Campos. These melodies are not usually used in their original form, but rather Copland derived new melodic material from them.  

An excellent summary of Copland’s use of these folk songs comes from musicologist Gerald Abraham. When Boosey & Hawkes published the miniature score, it was customary to provide analytical notes about the music. The publisher asked Abraham to write the notes for *El Salón México*. The four-page insert includes excerpts of the original folksong material and documents Copland’s alteration of these melodies into the thematic material used in the piece.

Abraham notes the three most utilized melodies as “El Palo Verde,” La Jesusita,” and “El Mosco.” He describes the form of the piece as a “subtilised and elaborated ternary from, with a long introduction.” Abraham illustrates Copland’s alteration of each of the folksongs, as well as documents where material derived from each folksong appears in the piece.

---

47 Abraham, “Aaron Copland: *El Salón México.*”
The melodic material from the opening is derived from the first strain of “El Palo Verde”

Figure 2.1: Folksong material used in *El Salón México* \(^{48}\)


**Figure 2.2: Copland, *El Salón México*, melodic material, mm. 8-13**


\(^{48}\) Abraham, “Aaron Copland: *El Salón México.*”
Beginning in measure 23, the trumpet solo is based on “La Jesusita”

The duet between bassoon and bass clarinet starting at measure 39 is a rhythmically altered version of “El Mosco.”
At measure 61, the strings have material modified from the second strain of “El Palo Verde.” This same material also appears twice more during the piece beginning at measures 145 and 353.

Figure 2.5: Copland, El Salón México, mm. 61-64, Violin 1, 2, Viola (compressed)

The melody in the strings beginning at measure 76 is derived partly from the second strain of “El Mosco.” This theme concludes the section that Abraham labels as the introduction.

Figure 2.6: Copland, El Salón México, mm.76-81, Violin 1

The Allegro Vivace begins at measure 103 and marks the start of what Abraham calls the first section of the ternary form. It begins with material related to the opening measures illustrated above in Figure 2.2. This is followed by a theme derived from both
the altered material from “El Palo Verde” at the beginning of the piece, and the second strain of “El Mosco.”

Figure 2.7: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm.106-110, Clarinet 1


New material is added to the beginning of the previous theme at measure 135 but is very similar.

Figure 2.8: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 135-139, Violin 1

The material from Figure 2.5 returns at measure 145 and is followed by a variant of Figure 2.2 from measures 175-182. This concludes the Allegro Vivace section and what Abraham labels the first large section of a ternary form. The second section of this form begins at measure 183 at the tempo change marked “Moderato molto (rubato).” The clarinet solo that follows (Fig. 2.9) is a version of Figure 2.7. Abraham states this version “recurs several times in the section as a species of refrain, holding it together.” One such reiteration is a rhythmic variant in the English horn at measure 256. (Fig. 2.10)

![Figure 2.9: Copland, El Salón México, mm. 185-190, Clarinet 1](image)

![Figure 2.10: Copland, El Salón México, mm. 256-260, English horn](image)

At measure 211, melodic material in the solo clarinet is derived from “La Jesusita” and is then restated in the strings.

![Figure 2.11: Copland, El Salón México, mm.211-214, Clarinet 1](image)


Abraham describes the remainder of the middle section consisting of rhythmic development of this tune and material from the first section. Copland writes of the section “before the final climax I present the folk tunes simultaneously in their original keys and rhythms. The result is a kind of polytonality that achieves the frenetic whirl I had in mind before the end, when all is resolved with a plain unadorned triad.”

The return of the main section occurs at measure 324. The material is very similar to what had been heard previously but with slightly altered keys. The piece ends with the fanfare-like material from the opening measures.

**Manuscript materials and changes in rhythmic notation**

Copland himself noted that orchestras had a difficult time performing *El Salón México*. “*El Salón* was not easy to perform; it presented rhythmic intricacies for the
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conductor and the players.” There are many places in the orchestral version where eighth notes are beamed over a barline, dotted barlines and brackets are used to indicate an alteration of normal rhythmic stress, and more than one time signature is often indicated or simply implied by the placement of accents. The need for this kind of rhythmic notation can be observed upon examination of the manuscript materials in the Aaron Copland Collection cataloged at the Library of Congress.

**Description of the manuscript materials**

The initial “Sketches” of *El Salón México* are cataloged at the Library of Congress in the Aaron Copland Collection as ARCO 28.2. It appears that Copland began his initial sketches of in March of 1933, which is the earliest date noted on the manuscript. These sketches are in pencil, do not always follow the progression of the piece, and have large sections crossed out. They illustrate a working out of melodic material and experimentation with different meters.

The “Piano Sketch” (ARCO 28-A) is dated 1934 on the front cover. The date at the end of the manuscript notes it was completed in July, 1934. The Piano Sketch is a 21-page manuscript that uses between two and four staves and progresses through the piece from beginning to end. Revisions were still being made as some sections are crossed out, but then continue on sequentially with revised material. Copland wrote most of the Piano Sketch initially in pen and his original, more complex concept of the meter and beaming appear in pen. Many of the meters and beaming that appear in Leonard Bernstein’s piano arrangements appear in the Piano Sketch. There are also marks in lead and blue pencil throughout this manuscript. Many of the pencil markings indicate instruments for
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orchestration or possible changes to the choice in meter. While the pencil indications of meter do not match the meters of the final published orchestral version exactly, they are certainly less complicated than the original metric indications that appear in pen and are a step closer to what was published in the orchestral score.

There are three orchestral manuscript scores cataloged at the Library of Congress. One is cataloged as the “Rough Orchestral Score” (ARCO 28.3) and notes “began Aug. 9, 1934.” The manuscript is in pencil, but is incomplete and only four pages in length. The second “Full Score (Draft)” (ARCO 28.1) is a complete draft in pencil, but has no date indicated. The final “Full Score” (ARCO 28) is complete and mostly completed in ink with some red and blue pencil marks indicating rehearsal numbers and time signatures respectively. The date on the front cover is 1936.52

There are several arrangements and other works that are significant to the study of changes in rhythmic notation in *El Salón México* beyond the manuscript materials. These include Bernstein’s and Hindsley’s various arrangements of the work, as well as Copland’s 1929 and 1955 versions of the *Symphonic Ode* for orchestra, which is discussed later in this chapter. The table below summarizes all relevant documents in chronological order.

---

Table 2.1: Summary of published scores and manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Document name</th>
<th>Composer/Arranger</th>
<th>Other information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Symphonic Ode (for orchestra)</td>
<td>Copland</td>
<td>withdrawn, revised in 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>&quot;Sketches&quot; El Salón México</td>
<td>Copland ARCO 28.2</td>
<td>manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>&quot;Piano Sketch&quot; El Salón México</td>
<td>Copland ARCO 28-A</td>
<td>manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>&quot;Rough Orchestral Score&quot; El Salón México</td>
<td>Copland ARCO 28.3 manuscript</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1934</td>
<td>&quot;Full Score (Dra)&quot; El Salón México</td>
<td>Copland ARCO 28.1</td>
<td>manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>&quot;Full Score&quot; El Salón México</td>
<td>Copland ARCO 28</td>
<td>manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>El Salón México (for orchestra)</td>
<td>Copland</td>
<td>published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>El Salón México (for piano solo)</td>
<td>Copland/Bernstein</td>
<td>published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>El Salón México (for two pianos)</td>
<td>Copland/Bernstein</td>
<td>published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Revised Symphonic Ode (for orchestra)</td>
<td>Copland</td>
<td>published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>&quot;1st Version manuscript&quot; El Salón México (for band)</td>
<td>Copland/Hindsley</td>
<td>ARCO 28-D manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>El Salón México (for band)</td>
<td>Copland/Hindsley</td>
<td>published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes in Rhythmic Notation

One of the reasons for the “rhythmic intricacies” that Copland mentioned is that he originally conceived of groupings of eighth notes in groups of twos and threes that would call for shifting irregular time signatures.\(^{53}\) In the Piano Sketch these groupings occur starting on the beat. While time signatures do not appear in ink on the Piano Sketch manuscript for the measures in the figure below, the groupings and barlines appear to be the same as Leonard Bernstein’s arrangement for two pianos with the appropriate time signatures added. The one change in rhythm between the two examples is the eighth rest that appears at the end of the third measure. However, this rest does appear in the orchestral version.

\(^{53}\) “Irregular” time signatures are defined for the purposes of this study as meters that have uneven groupings of eighth notes. For example, a time signature of 7/8 could have an eighth note grouping of 2+2+3. This would be defined as “irregular.” Other meters that would be included in this definition would be 5/8, 8/8, and 10/8. These irregular meters are considered “shifting” when the time signatures rapidly change from measure to measure. If a regular meter (3/4, 4/4) appears during a string of irregular meters, the term “shifting irregular meters” still applies because the effect as a whole is a succession of changes between groups of 2 and 3 eighth notes.
As the previous examples illustrate, there were drastic changes in meter between the Piano Sketch and the final orchestral version. These kinds of alterations to meter occur throughout the orchestral version and are particularly prevalent during sections with faster tempi, which tend to be more rhythmic. In most cases, the meters are changed from shifting irregular meters to a more constant regular meter of 3/4 or 4/4. This forces rhythms that originally occurred on the beat to be played as syncopations.
Figure 2.15: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 124-128, Violin 1

Figure 2.16: Copland, ARCO 28-A (Piano Sketch), Corresponding music to Figure 2.15

Copland would sometimes indicate what the original eighth-note groupings were in the orchestral score by beaming those notes together. Sometimes these groups are beamed over the barline. Copland also used dashed barlines to imply the feel of a downbeat that occurred in the Piano Sketch, but was no longer there when the orchestral meter had been altered.

Figure 2.17: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 160-168 (compressed)

Figure 2.18: Copland, ARCO 28-A (Piano Sketch), Corresponding music to Figure 2.17

Perhaps the most extreme case of simplification of meter occurs at measure 133 where Copland inserts a dotted barline and a key signature change in the middle of a measure. This accommodation allows the music to remain in common time.

Figure 2.19: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm.130-135, Strings


The previous examples illustrate the typical changes to meter that Copland made between the Piano Sketch and the final orchestral score. Generally the meter is simplified while the rhythmic value of notes remains the same. This was not the first time that Copland made these types of metric alterations when creating an orchestral score. Evidence provided by Elizabeth Crist in “The Compositional History of Aaron Copland’s *Symphonic Ode*” reveals the rhythmic revisions of that work were done for the purpose of making the music more performable by orchestral conductors and musicians at the time of the premiere.
In her article, Crist outlines the compositional history of the *Symphonic Ode* beginning with the initial sketches, through Copland’s final revisions from 1955. This history includes the manuscript materials as well as correspondence regarding the piece. The manuscript sketch of the *Symphonic Ode* included many sections with shifting irregular meters, as did the initial orchestral score. Koussevitzky was to conduct the premiere on February 22, 1930 but in rehearsal both he and the musicians had difficulty with the rhythms. He informed Copland that the *Ode* could not be performed as written. Copland scoffed at this idea but at Koussevitzky’s invitation, conducted the piece at a rehearsal himself. In a letter to Israel Citkowitz Copland described the experience:

> I finally heard the “Ode!” I conducted it myself one morning at a rehearsal in Boston while Koussevitzky listened from the auditorium. I only really heard the slow parts, the fast parts were ruined by being played too slow. The end sounds gloriously. It was a revealing experience. The upshot was that I have for all time given up trying to make music look on paper what it actually sounds like. Applied to the “Ode” this means that I must completely rewrite the barring of the fast parts throughout.\(^{54}\)

To revise the *Symphonic Ode*, Copland returned to his original ink score and altered the rhythmic notation in several sections of the music creating a new score for Koussevitzky. Most of the changes “rewrite unusual meters (7/8, 9/8, 10/8) in smaller units (3/4 or 4/4), which suggests that Copland was concerned with making the score easier for Koussevitzky to conduct, not necessarily for the player to read.”\(^{55}\) Crist gives the following examples of the kind of revised notation Copland used.

---

\(^{54}\) Copland to Israel Citkowitz, 29 May 1930, Copland Collection, as quoted in Crist, “The Compositional History of the *Symphonic Ode*,” 261.

\(^{55}\) Crist, “The Compositional History of the *Symphonic Ode*,” 262.
The parallels in compositional process between the *Symphonic Ode* and *El Salón México* regarding rhythmic notation are numerous. In both cases, the rhythmic notation was conceived with shifting irregular meters, but later changed to more simple meters. In the manuscript materials of both works, the revision of meter was notated in blue pencil over the original meters. The alterations that Copland made in the *Ode* as documented by Crist in Figure 2.20 bear a striking resemblance to alterations made to *El Salón*. Evidence provided by the *El Salón* manuscript materials, the previous alteration of metric notation in the *Symphonic Ode*, along with the fact that Copland allowed the Bernstein piano arrangements to be published with the irregular meters in tact, suggests that the metric changes in *El Salón* were made during the process of orchestration and were for a practical, not necessarily musical, purpose.

This is further evidenced by the timeline of these two compositions. The experience with Koussevitzky and the reworking of the *Symphonic Ode* were likely still fresh in Copland’s mind at the time he was working on *El Salón*. Copland worked on the rhythmic revisions to the *Ode* during the summer of 1930, and a set of parts soon after. The premier took place with the Boston Symphony Orchestra on February 19, 1932, with

---
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a repeat performance on March 3 in New York. Copland heard the work again during his 1932 visit to Mexico in a performance conducted by Chávez on November 18 with the Orquesta Sinfónica. He began work on the Sketches for *El Salón* a few months later in 1933.

Finally, Copland confirms the rebarring of *El Salón México* in his essay “Shop Talk: On the Notation of Rhythm” from his book *Copland on Music* (1960). He discusses the practicality of rewriting rhythms to more simple meters, in particular for conductors and orchestras. After showing an example of shifting irregular meters he writes “Here you have the by-now-familiar groups of unequal metrical units that strike terror in the hearts of performers, particularly conductors—who know in advance the struggles in store for them when these rhythmic complexes are brought to rehearsal.” At the time the essay was written in 1960, he implies that more modern, progressive conductors and musicians are more capable or willing to negotiate the complex rhythmic notation and in some cases prefer it. He also states his opinion that “composers would do well to notate their music so that, as far as possible, it looks the way it sounds. If however, more than one player is involved, and especially in the case of orchestral works, a rearrangement of rhythmic barring may be necessary. The more rhythmically sophisticated conductors will not think so, but performances are more likely to materialize.” In the final footnote he cites *El Salón México* as an example of such a rearrangement of barring.

---

57 Copland, *Copland on Music*, 274.
Errata

One of the initial reasons the manuscript materials were examined was to confirm possible errata that appear in the published orchestral score. Two significant suspected errata were discovered during the process of studying the orchestral score. A third error was discovered due to a pencil indication in one of Copland’s personal copies of the published orchestral score. While other minor discrepancies of beaming or articulations appear between the score and manuscripts, these three pitch discrepancies were most significant. Investigation into these errata turned up varying degrees of evidence in favor of changing the pitches that appear in the published orchestral score. It should be noted that this is not a comprehensive list of errata.

The first suspected error appears in the orchestral score at measure 321 in the cello. The second eighth note in the measure is published as an E. However, this pitch changes a well established ostinato figure that has been occurring for the previous eleven measures. The E is also dissonant with the D written in the upper strings. Changing the cello’s E to a D solves both of these issues.
The evidence supporting the change to a D is somewhat mixed. An E clearly appears in the Full Score manuscript (ARCO 28). In the Full Score-Draft manuscript (ARCO 28.1) this pitch also appears as an E but it looks like this passage was hastily written in by Copland in pen after completing his pencil indications. (Photo 2.1) Most of the ostinato figure was indicated by a shorthand “c” mark in previous measures.

Photo 2.1: ARCO 28.1 (Full Score-Draft), Music corresponding to published orchestral score m. 321

However, clearer evidence that the note in question should be a D appears in the Piano Sketch (ARCO 28-A). (See Photo 2.2) It is likely that Copland miscopied this passage in both orchestral manuscripts. This note is also published as a D in the Bernstein piano arrangements. It is likely that D is the correct pitch in this passage and the published E in the orchestral score is incorrect.

Photo 2.2: ARCO 28-A (Piano Sketch), Music corresponding to published orchestral score m. 321

The second significant errata discovered in the orchestral score occurs at measure 378 in the cello and double bass. The third note in the measure appears as a G-sharp in the published score, but should clearly be a B as indicated in the Full Score manuscript.

(Photo 2.3)

Photo 2.3: ARCO 28 (Full Score), Music corresponding to published orchestral score m. 378

The third errata was discovered because of a pencil indication in one of Copland’s personal copies of the published orchestral score. (Photo 2.4)

Photo 2.4: ARCO 28a copy 2 (Published Score), mm. 24-25, Bass Clarinet, Bassoons, Trumpet in C, Trombone

After comparing the chords that appear in the Piano Sketch (ARCO 28-A) with the published orchestral score, it is clear the penciled indication of A-sharp in Bassoon 2 shown above is correct. When the chords were broken into the separate voices, the A-sharp was not carried through the measure and was also changed earlier in the measure to the enharmonic B-flat, which also complicated the transfer of pitches to the orchestral score. The correct pitches appear in the Piano Sketch (Photo 2.5) and the Bernstein piano arrangements.

Photo 2.5: ARCO 28-A (Piano Sketch), Music corresponding to published orchestral score mm. 24-25

Chapter 3: The Mark Hindsley Arrangement for Band

Mark Hindsley completed his arrangement of *El Salón México* for concert band on May 11, 1966 as noted at the bottom of his manuscript score. Below that is written “Chapala, Jalisco, Mexico” which is located approximately 30 miles south of Guadalajara on Lake Chapala.\textsuperscript{58} It is unclear if the manuscript was actually completed in Mexico since classes were in session at the University of Illinois until Saturday, May 28\textsuperscript{th}.\textsuperscript{59}

The premier performance of the arrangement was likely on Thursday, March 16, 1967 with Hindsley conducting the 121-member University of Illinois Concert Band. A second performance of the program, which included *Pictures at an Exhibition*, *Music for the Royal Fireworks*, and *The Sorecer’s Apprentice*, took place the following evening.

Regarding the performance of *El Salón México*, Diana Henry, who wrote a review of the performance for the *News Gazette*, noted “Only Mark Hindsley’s superb baton could lead the 121 band members through the intricate tempo changes and off-beat accents. In the number’s slightly over 400 bars, the meter changes 150 times, in addition to 64 changes from or to double or triple figures.”\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{58} Copland, “*El Salón México* for band,” arr. Mark Hindsley, MS score, 1966, Aaron Copland Collection, Library of Congress.

\textsuperscript{59} Linda Stahnke Stepp (Archival Operations and Reference Specialist University Archives, UIL) to Erika Svanoe, email, 4 March 2009. Referring to University of Illinois Staff Directory for 1965-66.

It appears that Hindsley mailed his manuscript score along with a recording of a performance to Boosey & Hawkes in late August of 1967. A note on the cover of the manuscript reads “To Aaron Copland and Boosey-Hawkes with admiration and thanks. Mark Hindsley 8-26-67.” Stuart Pope, who was a managing director at Boosey & Hawkes and one of Copland’s contacts, mailed the score and recording to Copland from Boosey & Hawkes on December 7, 1967. He included a note mentioning it was done with permission, and described Hindsley’s status as an “important man in the field.”

Copland appears to have had a positive first impression of the arrangement as he noted in the margin of the letter “[arrangement] good – I would not object to publication.” This is echoed in a letter from Stuart Pope two weeks later stating “I am glad you like the Mark Hindsley arrangement of El Salón México. I would think publication of it to be commercially sensible.”

While Copland approved of the arrangement and Boosey & Hawkes decided to publish it, it took several years for the project to be completed. Hindsley had prepared a score and set of parts with Copland’s suggested revisions by June 18th, 1969. The revised score was sent to Copland on June 24, 1969 with a note from Stuart Pope regarding the date of publication stating “I am sure you have a mental, if not a written note, of the date of the assignment and will be knocking on my door in 12 months if this band

---

61 Hindsley to Copland and Boosey & Hawkes, note on presumed cover of manuscript score, Box 99, Copland Collection.
62 Stuart Pope to Aaron Copland, 7 December 1967, Copland Collection.
63 MS note by Copland, written in margin of Pope to Copland, 7 December 1967, Copland Collection.
64 Stuart Pope to Aaron Copland, 20 December 1967, Copland Collection.
transcription is not in print." It appears, however, that a twelve-month estimate was optimistic since the copyright date of the band arrangement is 1972 and Copland did not receive his published copies until December of that year.

Copland recommended minor revisions to Hindsley’s manuscript. His initial concerns were that the accompaniment from rehearsal eight to eleven was too consistently the same and that the use of cup mutes at rehearsal 19 in the cornets was “too sentimental.” Copland presumably mailed the manuscript back to Pope and passed along these two concerns. Hindsley responded in a letter to Stuart Pope that he would be “glad to accede to Mr. Copland’s wishes in the two instances you mention, and would particularly welcome specific solutions.” Hindsley continued by suggesting minor changes to these sections including straight mutes in the cornet or use of saxophones at rehearsal 19 and asked Copland to advise further.

Pope mailed the manuscript and recording back to Copland along with a copy of Hindsley’s letter asking for Copland’s suggestions. Copland presumably listened to the arrangement a second time and replied with a more detailed list of suggested revisions as well as suggested solutions to the scoring on his previous comments, all of which Hindsley incorporated into the final version of the band arrangement. Copland also
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65 Stuart Pope to Aaron Copland, 24 June 1969, Copland Collection.
66 John Owen Ward to Aaron Copland, 22 December 1972, Copland Collection.
67 Copland, MS note cataloged with Pope to Copland, 20 December 1967, Copland Collection.
68 Mark Hindsley to Stuart Pope, 21 November 1968, Copland Collection.
69 Stuart Pope to Aaron Copland, 26 November 1968, Copland Collection.
cleared up his intentions with the use of the “Tambour de Provence” which should be a “long drum with a dullish sound.” Hindsley had initially mistaken this for tambourine.

What is notably missing from these suggested revisions is any mention of the numerous changes of meter and beaming that Hindsley utilized. While the Hindsley transcription incorporated changes from the orchestral score in meter, beaming, key signatures, and instrumentation, Copland approved of publishing the arrangement after listening to it for the first time. Subsequently, he had only minor suggestions for revisions after hearing the arrangement for the second time, with no mention of the changes of meter. He also had a copy of Hindsley’s manuscript while listening to the arrangement. From this it can be inferred that Copland was content to send the piece to be published with the meters as they were.71

Instrumentation

While the change in medium from orchestra to band demands changes to the instrumentation, Hindsley retained as many instruments as possible from the original version, even when these instruments were less common in the typical band instrumentation of the time. These include the English horn, contrabassoon, piano, and contrabasses as seen in the table below.

---

70 Copland, TS “Suggested revisions on band arrangement of El Salon Mexico by Mark Hindsley,” initialed A.C., undated, Copland Collection.
71 It is interesting to note that it appears from markings in one of Copland’s published copies of the Hindsley that he may have also conducted the band arrangement at some point. It seems that he questioned the 6+2/8 meter marking, and ultimately decided to conduct those measures in four. At rehearsal 16 where major changes in the meter appear Copland noted “Watch out! Changed” in the margin and clearly marked all of Hindsley’s meters in red throughout the score.
Table 3.1: Comparison of Instrumentation between Copland Orchestral Score and Hindsley Band Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copland Orchestral Score</th>
<th>Hindsley Band Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piccolo</td>
<td>Piccolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Flutes</td>
<td>Flutes 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oboes</td>
<td>Oboes 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Horn</td>
<td>English Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinet in Eb</td>
<td>Clarinet in Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Clarinets in Bb</td>
<td>Clarinets in Bb 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass Clarinet</td>
<td>Bass Clarinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eb Contrabass Clarinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bassoons</td>
<td>Bassoons 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrabassoon</td>
<td>Contrabassoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alto Saxophone 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenor Saxophone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baritone Saxophone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bb Cornets 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Trumpets in C</td>
<td>Bb Trumpets 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Horns in F</td>
<td>Horns in F 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Trombones</td>
<td>Trombones 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baritones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuba</td>
<td>Tubas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timpani</td>
<td>Timpani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percussion</td>
<td>Percussion 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violins 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrabasses</td>
<td>Contrabasses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The timpani, percussion, and piano parts are exactly the same in the Hindsley as they are in the orchestral original, except for the changes in meter and beaming that occur throughout the piece. No additional percussion instruments are added that do not appear
in the orchestral version. The contrabasses are scored almost identically to their orchestral part, but sometimes also cover a cello line, particularly in places where pizzicato is needed.

Hindsley maintains the same number of parts for many of the winds, such as two parts for flute, oboe, and bassoon, four horn parts, and three trombone parts. As is common in concert bands, however, the intention is that there would be multiple players on almost every wind part. The band size that Hindsley typically had in mind when creating an orchestral transcription had a total of 92 musicians. This correlated to what he considered to be a basic symphony orchestra of 90 musicians. He also made a distinction of the roles of instruments whether they were part of a “homogenous choir” or a “color instrument.”
Figure 3.1: Hindsley Orchestration Chart

This example illustrates the amount of doubling that Hindsley had in mind while creating his arrangement of *El Salón México*. It should also be noted that the size of the band that played the arrangement at the premiere had 121 members or what Hindsley refers to as the “large” or “maximum” band. While Hindsley’s arrangements are playable by smaller groups, they were conceived for a band that is considerably larger than most modern college bands that currently exist.

---

72 Hindsley, *Hindsley on Bands*, 146.
Overall Scoring

During the process of scoring an arrangement for band from an orchestral score, many of an arranger’s decisions will fall into two categories: timbre and doubling. Decisions that fall into the timbre category include whether to retain or change instruments during solos when the orchestral instrument is available in the band instrumentation. Decisions that fall into the doubling category include when to double wind lines that were originally intended for one player, and how thickly the music should be scored. Sometimes considerations for timbre and doubling will overlap. Timbre is an important consideration when making a substitution for the string section. However, since these parts were usually written for a large body of players performing the same line, the amount of doubling to employ should also be considered.
Timbre Considerations

Throughout the score Hindsley usually chose to maintain solo wind instrument timbres where possible from the orchestral score. For example, the trumpet solo at measure 23 is retained in the trumpet part (not cornet). Important solo lines in flute, oboe, English horn, bassoon, Eb clarinet, and Bb clarinet are all maintained in the band arrangement. The one major exception occurs at measure 40. This duet, originally for bassoon and bass clarinet, is scored by Hindsley for bassoon and tenor saxophone.

Figure 3.2: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 40-44. Bassoons, Contrabassoon, Alto and Tenor Saxophones


Many of the decisions Hindsley made concerned the re-orchestration of the string parts. The violin and viola parts are usually transferred to clarinets, cornets, flutes, or a combination of the three depending on musical context. In passages requiring musical agility the clarinets are often used. Cornets are often used in combination with clarinets, and flutes are used when the range of the line was too high to be comfortably played by other instruments.
Figure 3.3: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 247-251, Strings

Figure 3.4: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 247-251, Clarinets

Figure 3.5: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 61-64, Strings

Figure 3.6: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 61-64, Clarinets, Cornets

The low strings are also scored depending on musical context. The horns and low brass are utilized in sections where either the dynamic is loud or the scoring is thick, or where a change in timbre is appropriate. Two examples in which the brass are used to accommodate a change in timbre begin at measure 73 and again at measure 268. In more thinly scored sections the saxophones, bass clarinet and contrabass clarinet are often
assigned to play the middle or low string parts. The low clarinets often double the double bass when playing pizzicato.

Hindsley is also specific regarding the use of trumpets versus cornets. In most cases the orchestral C trumpet parts are written for Bb trumpet and the cornets are used to cover the string parts, demonstrating a choice to utilize the contrast between cylindrical and conical bores. Third cornet is used to cover the orchestral third trumpet part when necessary.

Figure 3.9: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 1-4, Trumpets

Figure 3.10: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 1-4, Cornets, Trumpets

Doubling considerations

The comparison of thickness of scoring between the Copland orchestral score and the Hindsley band score was categorized by the author into three areas: thin instrument scoring, moderate scoring, and full scoring. Categories were defined by the number of players utilized in Copland’s orchestral score. Thin scoring was defined as areas where one player per part scoring is used. In these sections Hindsley often retained one player per part in the band arrangement. Full scoring is defined as where all or most instruments are being utilized. Moderate scoring was defined as sections of music that use more than one player per part but a significant portion of the ensemble is not playing. It is most often in these moderately scored sections that Hindsley utilizes more doubling of parts and the scoring seems to be thicker in the band score than in the orchestral score. The rescoring of the strings in particular seems to be where much of this doubling occurs.

There are a several places in the orchestral score where a thin texture is utilized. In these situations, Hindsley generally maintains the thin texture. For example between measures 103 and 112, the band arrangement sounds identical to the original orchestral score since the writing is exclusively for winds and piano. Here Hindsley is careful to write “solo” on all of the wind parts to match the one on a part playing in the orchestra. The thin texture of the orchestral version is maintained and the instrumentation is basically identical.
Hindsley uses a slightly different approach from measures 20 through 32. He also marks all instruments as “solo,” but substitutes tenor and baritone saxophones for Copland’s original choice of trombone and bass clarinet. Here the thin scoring is maintained, but Hindsley chose to change the timbre of this section from the original since trombone and bass clarinet were available in his instrumentation.

Figure 3.11: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 20-25, Bass Clarinet, Bassoons, Trombone 1

Figure 3.12: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 20-25, Bassoons, Saxophones

There are only a few places in the orchestral score where Copland uses full scoring. The two large sections in the orchestral version that are scored the thickest are from measures 134-182 and 353-402. Hindsley does conserve the use of full scoring in the band arrangement to coincide with the corresponding measures of the orchestral score. This helps preserve the architecture and pacing of dynamics in the original orchestral score.

The areas of the orchestral score that are defined as moderate scoring seem to be where more doubling of parts occurs. In most cases it is an issue when transferring the string parts to the winds. Often Hindsley would use a timbre of a combination of brass and clarinets as a substitute for the strings. While this combination helps to differentiate the string parts, the fact that it is scored for many wind players creates a feeling of heaviness in stark contrast to the transparent sound of a string section.
A section where moderate scoring is used and considerations involving both doubling and timbre intersect is from measures 221-226. Here Copland uses moderate scoring that utilizes only first violins, violas, cellos, and a few winds. Hindsley scored these bars more thickly using first and second clarinets, muted first cornets, and muted first trombones to cover the violin and viola lines. The cellos are covered by low clarinets, third trombones, and string bass. This is an example of how Hindsley uses doubling of brass and clarinets to substitute for the strings. As a result, the scoring in the band version is significantly thicker than in the orchestral. However, using a brass and clarinet timbre as a substitute for strings does allow Hindsley to maintain the timbre of clarinet interjection in measure 226.

Figure 3.13: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 221-226

Another section of the orchestral score that uses moderate scoring is from measures 73-99. This is another place where the band score is scored more thickly than the orchestral score due to doubling. This is also a section about which Copland expressed concern when listening to Hindsley’s first version of the arrangement. In Copland’s first hand written notes regarding this section he stated “the [accompaniment] in [clarinets, saxophones, and horns] is too consistently the same.”
Figure 3.15: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, 1st Version Manuscript (ARCO 28-D) mm. 73-80
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Hindsley responded by suggesting “the trombones take over the rhythmic movement in the accompaniment with the horns sustaining throughout as in the orchestral score.”\textsuperscript{74} Copland replied with a list of suggested revisions.\textsuperscript{75} (See Appendix A) He addressed this section of the arrangement by stating “Perhaps one could lighten the accompaniment by alternating the [horns and trombones] in both the notes that are repeated and notes that are held for possibly 4 to 6 measures at a time.” Hindsley did incorporate this suggestion into the final draft. However, Copland seems to be responding, at least partially, to the thickness of the scoring in this section suggesting it needed to be “lightened.” Hindsley did not decrease the number of players between versions. He actually needed to add a third trombone part in order to facilitate Copland’s suggestions. It is also interesting that Copland’s first thought about this section was that it was “too consistently the same” since the orchestral scoring of the accompaniment is very consistent though this section.

\textsuperscript{74} Mark Hindsley to Stuart Pope, 21 November 1968, Copland Collection

\textsuperscript{75} Copland, TS “Suggested revisions on band arrangement of El Salon Mexico by Mark Hindsley,” initialed A.C., undated, Copland Collection.
Figure 3.16: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 73-80

Figure 3.17: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 73-80

Copland made another comment in his list of suggested revisions regarding the sound being too “weighty”. At both measure 26 and measure 33 he suggested “some substitute for the two [trombones] which seem rather weighty to me at that spot. (perhaps sax?)” Hindsley had originally scored the *pizzicato* string chords for flutes, clarinets and trombones. In the published band arrangement the chord has been redistributed to only flutes and clarinets. This is another example of Copland’s responding to scoring that sounded too heavy, in this case due to instrument choice.

Some of Hindsley’s thinking behind the amount of doubling used in these sections that use moderate scoring can be gleaned from his own writings. In his essay “Scoring for the Concert Band” he lays out a general set of principles for creating a band arrangement from an orchestral score. In writing about omitting instruments to secure a proper dynamic balance he wrote “in doing so we are again sacrificing body and texture of tone and moving toward a chamber sound, which is undesirable yet sometimes necessary to approach the ultimate dynamic delicacy of the strings.” The number of players covering the string parts was also a concern for Hindsley; “For the sake of body and texture it is almost axiomatic that the same number of players should be utilized as are playing the string parts, but often this goal cannot quite be reached.”

From these two statements and the evidence provided by the band score, it is clear that Hindsley was concerned about having a texture of many instruments playing when substituting for the string section. Using a “chamber sound” where the numbers of
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76 Copland, TS “Suggested revisions on band arrangement of El Salon Mexico by Mark Hindsley,” initialed A.C., undated, Copland Collection.
77 Hindsley, *Hindsley on Bands*, 147.
78 Ibid.
players is smaller was “undesirable” because it did not have the texture of many instruments playing the same line. In these instances, Hindsley generally seems to be more concerned with texture of multiple players rather than trying to best replicate the timbre of the string section.

**Alteration of music for playability**

Besides the necessary changes in instrumentation and scoring that Hindsley incorporated into his arrangement for band, there are several other alterations that he undertook. These changes include the use of accidentals as opposed to key signatures, the alteration of meters and beaming, and the rewriting or rescoring of certain passages. Unlike the changes in instrumentation and scoring which are necessary when creating an arrangement for band from an orchestral score, these kinds changes were not strictly needed. In these situations, Hindsley made a decision to alter a component that could have been left as it appears in the orchestral score. Based on the kinds of alterations he made, it can be surmised that these changes were made for ease of reading and performing.

**Key Signatures**

Hindsley maintained pitch level/key of the orchestral version and did not transpose the band arrangement up or down by any interval. Though the Hindsley arrangement and the Copland orchestral score are both transposed, there is a significant difference between the two in their use of key signatures. Copland uses several traditional key signatures, in which transposing instruments use a transposed key signature. In addition, at times he cancels all key signatures to C major using an “open” or “pseudo C” key. In addition, horns, and timpani are always written with a key signature of no sharps.
and no flats. Accidentals are utilized throughout the piece in those instruments, a typical means of writing in orchestral works. Hindsley uses an “open” key for all instruments, utilizing accidentals throughout the score. This is likely done for readability. The key signatures that appear in the orchestral score include G major, A major, and F-sharp major. Sharp key signatures can often pose difficulties for bands. Hindsley likely thought the parts would be more easily played by using accidentals throughout the band score.

Rewriting

There are two kinds of rewriting that Hindsley incorporated into his arrangement for band. The first occurs when the string parts are so idiomatic for the instrument it is nearly impossible for those parts to be played on a wind instrument. An example of this kind of string writing occurs in the violins and violas in measures 364-379. Hindsley dealt with this using two different techniques. First, he split the part among two instruments.

![Figure 3.18: Copland, El Salón México, mm. 372-375, Viola](image)

![Figure 3.19: Copland/Hindsley, El Salón México for Band, mm. 373-377, Clarinet 2, 3](image)

The second option was to rewrite the part to be more playable on a wind instrument, while still keeping the spirit of the original line.

![Figure 3.20: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 377-379, Violin 2, Viola](image)

**Figure 3.20:** Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 377-379, Violin 2, Viola

![Figure 3.21: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México for Band*, mm. 380-382, Clarinet 2, 3](image)

**Figure 3.21:** Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México for Band*, mm. 380-382, Clarinet 2, 3

The second kind of rewriting or rescoring occurs when an orchestral wind part is sufficiently difficult or high in the range that Hindsley reworked the passage. One example occurs at measure 14 where Hindsley covers the orchestral first trumpet part in the upper woodwinds.

Figure 3.22: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 14-15, Trumpets

Figure 3.23: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 14-15, Cornets, Trumpets

Another example of eliminating a part from the trumpet occurs at measure 316. In the orchestral score the second trumpet accentuates certain pitches in the first trumpet solo by doubling some the notes. Hindsley eliminates this orchestral second trumpet part entirely.

Figure 3.24: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 316-319, Trumpet 1, 2

Figure 3.25: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México for Band*, mm. 316-319, Trumpet 1

Hindsley also rescores portions of lines if they become high in an instrument’s tessitura. For example, the horn parts in Hindsley’s arrangement at measures 324-326 have the highest notes eliminated. This line, which also occurs in the upper strings, is scored by Hindsley in the clarinet, alto saxophones, and first cornet. Only these instruments cover the highest pitches of the motive.

![Figure 3.26: Copland, El Salón México, mm. 324-326, Horns](image1)

**Figure 3.26: Copland, El Salón México, mm. 324-326, Horns**

![Figure 3.27: Copland/Hindsley, El Salón México for Band, mm. 324-326, Horns](image2)

**Figure 3.27: Copland/Hindsley, El Salón México for Band, mm. 324-326, Horns**


In all of the examples above, Hindsley made an effort to make the parts more playable or reduce the chances of missed pitches in the brass.

**Meters and Beaming**

Hindsley made some significant changes to both the meter and beaming in the band arrangement when compared to Copland’s orchestral score. Many of the rhythmic complexities inherent to the orchestral work stem from the re-beaming and changing of meters that Copland himself undertook during the compositional process from the early
piano sketch to the full orchestral score as discussed in Chapter 2. There are several
places in the orchestral score that have eighth note beaming across barlines, use an
extraordinary amount of syncopation, or appear to have two implied meters sounding
simultaneously. Hindsley chose to alter some of the meters and beaming in what was
likely an effort to clarify the rhythmic groupings and make the piece easier to read and
perform. These alterations can be categorized into one of three groups: a change of
beaming to match the meter, a change of meter to match the beaming, or a combination
of changing both meter and beaming.
Changing beaming to match the meter

When two meters are implied simultaneously, Hindsley often alters the beaming to a more typical grouping that fits with the meter. For example, at measure 247 the violins are playing an eighth note pattern and several beams go across the barline.

Hindsley edited the beaming to reflect more traditional groups of three eighth notes in 6/8 time.

Figure 3.28: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 252-256, Violins

Figure 3.29: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 252-256, Clarinets 1, 2

A second example occurs at measure 257 where the meter is 4/4. (Copland does notate (6+2/8) as a secondary meter in the orchestral score.) Hindsley retains the 4/4 meter but alters the beaming in all parts to four groups of 2 eighth notes. However, he attempts to show the groupings from the orchestral score through the use of broken barlines. It is also important to note that Hindsley used only the 4/4 meter marking and chose to leave out the (6+2/8) marking entirely, likely for the sake of clarity.

Figure 3.30: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 257-258, Viola

Figure 3.31: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 257-258, Clarinet 1

Changing of meter to match the beaming

There are several instances in which Hindsley edited the meter. In each case, the beaming in the orchestral score implies a different meter. Some of these changes are minor and isolated. For example, there are places where Hindsley changes a 3/4 meter from the orchestral score to a 6/8 meter in the band score due to eighth note groupings. These changes occur in the band score at measures 10, 180, 186, 189, 194, and 394.

![Figure 3.32: Copland, El Salón México, mm. 10, melodic material](image)

In comparison with the orchestral score, there are major changes to the meter in Hindsley’s arrangement. These occur in two large, related sections. The first occurs from measure 156 through 172, and the second from 364 through 390.

![Figure 3.33: Copland/Hindsley, El Salón México for Band, m. 10, melodic material](image)
It is unclear exactly why Hindsley chose to alter the meters in these sections, though the prevalence of syncopation and non-traditional beaming may have been a contributing factor. It is also unclear how the decision to change these meters was made. The beaming suggests specific eighth note groupings, but the number of macrobeats in each measure would most certainly be alterable. The meters Hindsley chooses, however, bear a striking resemblance to the meters Bernstein utilized in his piano arrangements, which in turn are very similar to Copland’s manuscript Piano Sketch.

Figure 3.34: Comparison of rhythmic notation for music corresponding with orchestral mm. 156-172 in the Piano Sketch (ARCO 28-A), Bernstein arrangement for solo piano, and Hindsley’s arrangement for band
With the exception of the sections listed above, Hindsley utilizes Copland’s orchestral meters for the majority of the remainder of the piece. In general, it appears that Hindsley used the orchestral meters for the majority of the piece and made changes only in the most syncopated sections. There are two potential reasons for these alterations. First, Hindsley may have thought the shifting irregular meters were easier to read than the syncopated rhythmic notation. In Earl Gregory’s dissertation about Hindsley he writes “Selection of the proper meter signature for a composition, Hindsley notes, is related to the notation which is most likely to be error free.”79 The second reason could be Hindsley’s preference for music to “…LOOK as close to what it is going to sound like as [it] possibly can.”80 The changes he made to the meter certainly reflect this preference as well.

**Combination of alterations to beaming and meter**

Hindsley was also confronted with choosing one meter over another. There are several places in the orchestral score in which Copland utilizes multiple time signatures. One example occurs at measure 305 where Copland writes C (6+2/8). Another is found at measure 274, where several instruments are marked in 3/4 but others stay in 6/8. In these situations Hindsley chose one meter and made the beaming match the chosen meter. This was likely done to increase clarity and readability.

**Errata**

Three significant errata were discovered through discrepancies between the published orchestral score of *El Salón México* and Hindsley’s band arrangement. All of

80 Ibid.
these items appear as errors in Hindsley’s manuscript as well. The first is an incorrect rhythm at measure 59 in Bassoon 1.

Figure 3.35: Copland, El Salón México, mm. 59, Bassoon

The second errata is in the trumpet part at measure 313. The pitches at the beginning of the measure are incorrect.

Figure 3.37: Copland, El Salón México, m.313, Trumpet 1 in C

Figure 3.38: Copland/Hindsley, El Salón México for Band, m. 313, Trumpet (displayed in concert pitch)
The third discrepancy found between the orchestral score and the Hindsley arrangement is from measure 160-161. The pitches F, A, E that appear in first violin do not appear in the proper octave in the band score.

Figure 3.39: Copland, *El Salón México*, mm. 160-161, melodic material in Trombone 1, 2, Violin 1, Viola

Figure 3.40: Copland/Hindsley, *El Salón México* for Band, mm. 160-161, melodic material in Horn 2, 4, Trombone 1, 2

Chapter 4: The Erika Svanoe Arrangement for Band

Early in the process of comparing the Hindsley band arrangement to the Copland orchestral score of *El Salón México*, I determined that a new band arrangement of the work was warranted for a number of reasons. The primary justification for the new arrangement was the restoration of the orchestral meters. I thought it was important to give wind conductors an option that would allow them and their musicians an opportunity to perform the piece with the orchestral meters in tact. Often wind players learn *El Salón México* by playing the Hindsley arrangement, but then need to relearn different meters if they perform the orchestral version.

The meters Hindsley chose to alter are very close to the meters that Copland himself used in his Piano Sketch. We also know that Copland personally approved of the Hindsley arrangement and contributed to editorial process from Hindsley’s initial draft to the published band arrangement. These two factors validate and legitimate Hindsley’s decision to alter the meter from the orchestral score.

As discussed in Chapter 2, it is clear that Copland changed the notation of the rhythm in the orchestral version to make the piece more performable by orchestral conductors and musicians. In some sections of Hindsley’s band arrangement the meters could be considered a closer representation of Copland’s original rhythmic intent than the orchestral score. In other sections of the band arrangement, however, it is clear that Hindsley eliminated some of the eighth note beaming that indicates these irregular
groupings of eighth notes giving the conductor no indications of Copland’s rhythmic intentions. One purpose of the new arrangement was to restore all rhythmic indications of the orchestral score.

A second justification of the new arrangement was the modernization of scoring practices and instrumentation. This work is of sufficient difficulty that it is generally performed by bands at colleges and universities. However, the size of many of these bands has decreased as a result of moving to a wind ensemble or wind symphony format. The average size of college bands has certainly decreased since 1966 when the Hindsley arrangement was first written. Additionally, more modern trends of orchestration for band typically utilize thinner scoring than earlier transcriptions. This new arrangement attempts to reflect these modern scoring practices, as well as provide an instrumentation that is playable by more modern collegiate ensembles.

**Instrumentation**

There were several specific changes to the instrumentation of the Hindsley and Copland that were incorporated in the new arrangement. First, the number of double reed players was decreased. Copland calls for two oboes, English horn, two bassoons, and contrabassoon. I decided to decrease this to two oboes with 2\textsuperscript{nd} doubling English horn and two bassoons with 2\textsuperscript{nd} doubling contrabassoon. I did this to make the arrangement more playable by smaller schools that may not have as many double reed players. While Copland does have the three oboe/English horn players or the three bassoonists playing at the same time in the orchestral score, these moments are during thickly scored sections where an instrument substitute in an arrangement for winds would not affect the color adversely. The English horn and contrabassoon could not be eliminated entirely,
however, because of important solo moments in the orchestral score. In this case, Hindsley also utilized doubling of English horn and contrabassoon in the 2nd oboe and 2nd bassoon parts so that bands with fewer double reed players could successfully perform his arrangement.

I decided to eliminate the Eb Contrabass Clarinet that Hindsley utilized for practical reasons. In the Hindsley arrangement this part is used to bolster the sound of the double bass and perhaps to blend with the clarinet section when they cover the upper string parts. I felt this was unnecessary and it does not appear in Copland’s orchestral score.

I also decreased the number of cornet and trumpet parts utilized by Hindsley. The practice of scoring of both cornet and trumpet parts in band scores has become outdated. Most modern bands perform both cornet and trumpet parts on trumpet. Considering that Hindsley specifically wanted a conical brass sound for the strings that contrasts with the cylindrical color of the trumpet, modern practice dilutes the effectiveness of Hindsley’s scoring. I also wanted to maintain the integrity of the original trumpet parts as much as possible, which included having them play fewer string parts than in the Hindsley. The new arrangement is scored with three trumpets in B-flat. I considered scoring for trumpets in C, as in the orchestral score, but decided against it for practical purposes since more bands will likely have musicians comfortable playing on B-flat trumpets.

The timpani, percussion, piano, and double bass were all retained and treated in much the same manner as the Hindsley. No additional percussion were added to the new arrangement, and these parts appear exactly the same as they do in the orchestral score. The division of instruments in Percussion 1 and 2 works well in the Hindsley and was
retained. The double bass does cover cello lines when the range is appropriate, especially when *pizzicato* is utilized. A summary of the instrumentation of the three pieces is in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copland Orchestral Score</th>
<th>Svanoe Band Score</th>
<th>Hindsley Band Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piccolo</td>
<td>Piccolo</td>
<td>Piccolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Flutes</td>
<td>Flutes 1, 2</td>
<td>Flutes 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oboes</td>
<td>Oboes 1, 2 (2nd doubles English horn)</td>
<td>Oboes 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Horn</td>
<td>English Horn (doubled by 2nd Oboe)</td>
<td>English Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinet in Eb</td>
<td>Clarinet in Eb</td>
<td>Clarinet in Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Clarinets in Bb</td>
<td>Clarinets in Bb 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Clarinets in Bb 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass Clarinet</td>
<td>Bass Clarinet</td>
<td>Bass Clarinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eb Contrabass Clarinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bassoons</td>
<td>Bassoons 1, 2 (2nd doubles Contrabassoon)</td>
<td>Bassoons 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrabassoon</td>
<td>Contrabassoon (doubled by 2nd bassoon)</td>
<td>Contrabassoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alto Saxophone 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenor Saxophone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baritone Saxophone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bb Cornets 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Trumpets in C</td>
<td>Bb Trumpets 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Bb Trumpets 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Horns in F</td>
<td>Horns in F 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Horns in F 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Trombones</td>
<td>Trombones 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Trombones 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euphoniums</td>
<td>Baritones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuba</td>
<td>Tubas</td>
<td>Tubas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timpani</td>
<td>Timpani</td>
<td>Timpani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percussion</td>
<td>Percussion 1, 2</td>
<td>Percussion 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violins 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrabasses</td>
<td>Contrabasses</td>
<td>Contrabasses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Comparison of Instrumentation between Copland Orchestral Score, Hindsley Band Score, and Svanoe Band Score

**Overall Scoring**

Many of my own decisions regarding scoring are in line with Hindsley’s decisions. As mentioned, the percussion, piano and double bass are treated in similar
ways and are very close to what appears in the orchestral score. In addition, the thickness of scoring that appears in the orchestral score from thin to moderate to full is generally reflected in both arrangements. Hindsley’s use of brass for significant changes in timbre at measure 73 and measure 268 are so effective in the overall scope of the work that this concept was borrowed in the new arrangement for band.

There are some significant differences, however, between the new arrangement for band and Hindsley’s arrangement with regards to scoring. These differences typically fall into two categories: timbre and doubling. Often the considerations for these two areas overlap, particularly when rescoring the string parts. In general, I attempted to make the new arrangement sound more like the orchestral version.

**Timbre and Doubling Considerations**

There are two places in the Hindsley arrangement where saxophone is used as a replacement for an orchestral wind instrument and the change in timbre is significant. The first is from measures 20-25 and the second is from measures 40-44 (Figures 3.11 and 3.2 respectively). In the new arrangement the original orchestral wind instruments were maintained keeping the timbre as close to the orchestral version as possible. (See Appendix B pages 109 and 112)

The new arrangement does not have cornets available in the instrumentation because today’s bands typically do not use them in modern practice. Since the color contrast between cornet and trumpet that Hindsley intends as part of his arrangement is often negated by modern performances, I had to utilize the contrast between woodwinds and brass more often. As a general rule, the trumpets and other brass instruments usually covered the orchestral brass parts, and were only given material from the strings when a
overall change in timbre is called for, when full scoring is utilized in the orchestral score, or no other workable substitution is evident.

One reason for the reduction of the use of brass in the new arrangement was to use the brass section more sparingly as Copland did in the orchestral version. Furthermore, while Hindsley’s practice of using both cornets and clarinets as a substitute for the string section creates the texture of a large number of string players, the timbre of this combination has a weight and heaviness to it that is uncharacteristic of stringed instruments. Copland made comments in his suggested revisions that imply he felt this way as well. I relied more on the woodwind timbres of the clarinet, saxophone, flute, and bassoon sections as substitutes for the strings. This maintained some of the texture of a section of instruments, while also maintaining a lighter, more transparent timbre. This concept is also in line with more modern practices of thinner scoring.

One example of thinner scoring occurs from measures 73-99. In the Hindsley arrangement there is a large amount of doubling of the string parts, some of which is assigned to the brass. (See Figures 3.7 and 3.8) In the new arrangement, fewer players are used to cover the string parts creating a more transparent sound. The violin melody is covered by flutes, clarinets, and alto saxophone instead of flutes, clarinets, and cornets. The intention is to create a lighter, more transparent sound more reflective of the timbre of a violin section. I did decide to use brass instruments to cover the lower string parts because the overall change in timbre at this point in the piece is effective in the Hindsley. However, instead of using the full section of both trombones and horns that appears in the Hindsley arrangement, I only used two horns and euphonium to cover the chords in the
lower strings. Two trombones cover the two orchestral horn parts. The overall scoring is significantly thinner in the new arrangement. (See Appendix B p.116-119)

A second example of thinner scoring in the new arrangement occurs at measures 221-226. In the Hindsley, the string parts are covered by a combination of clarinets and brass. (See Figures 3.13 and 3.14) In the new arrangement only clarinets and baritone saxophone are used as substitutes for the string section, and the double bass part is retained from the original orchestral score. This decision makes the interjection of the clarinets in the orchestral score at measure 226 ineffective, however, since a change in timbre is no longer possible. As a solution, two solo trumpets were used to cover the clarinet interjection that occurs in the orchestral score. In this case, the change in timbre and thinner scoring were prioritized over the retention of the exact timbre of the orchestral score. (Appendix B p.135-136)

Both of the above examples were places in the orchestral score that I categorized as Copland using “moderate scoring.” As discussed in Chapter 3, it is in these areas of the Hindsley transcription that I felt the amount of doubling and use of brass was the most excessive. The use of less doubling and more woodwind timbres in the new arrangement as illustrated above was very typical in these moderately scored portions of the orchestral score.

**Restoration or Retention of Other Alterations by Hindsley**

Beyond the necessary changes in instrumentation and scoring that Hindsley utilized, there are several other alterations that Hindsley incorporated to make the music more accessible for performance. These changes include the use of accidentals instead of key signatures, the alteration of meters and beaming, and the rewriting of some passages.
I evaluated the necessity of each of these alterations and in most cases restored what appears in the orchestral score. In these situations, Hindsley’s priorities seem to reflect accessibility of performance, while my priorities were to retain as much of the orchestral writing as possible.

**Key Signatures**

As discussed in Chapter 3, Hindsley approached key signatures differently than Copland by utilizing a transposed score with no key signatures (or open score) throughout the entire work. Copland combined that approach in some sections with the use of transposed key signatures in other sections. I was unsure how to proceed since I was not sure why Copland decided to switch back and forth. I wondered if this was a convention that he utilized in just his orchestral music, or if this was something he discontinued later in his career. I decided to refer to Copland’s one original work for band, *Emblems* (1964), to see how he treated key signatures in that work. I discovered that key signatures in *Emblems* are treated in the same way as they are in the orchestral *El Salón México*. Therefore, I retained all of the key changes and use of accidentals that appear in the orchestral score.

**Rewriting**

Hindsley utilized two kinds of rewriting in his arrangement. The first is the alteration of string parts that are so idiomatic to the instrument they are nearly impossible to play on any wind instrument. This type of writing appears in the orchestral score from measures 372-379. (See Figures 3.18 and 3.20) In this case, I thought the alterations that Hindsley utilized were necessary due to the impossibility of accurate performance. I borrowed Hindsley’s rewritten parts and incorporated them into the new arrangement.
The second kind of rewriting Hindsley used occurs when an orchestral wind part is sufficiently difficult or high in the range that the passage was reworked. (See Figures 3.22 through 3.27) I felt that all of these alterations were unnecessary and without exception sought to retain the integrity of the orchestral wind parts. This makes the new arrangement more difficult to perform but more accurately maintains Copland’s original scoring and the integrity of the melodic line.

**Meters and Beaming**

The primary reason for doing a new arrangement of *El Salón México* was to restore the orchestral meters into an arrangement for band. As I examined the use of beaming and eighth note grouping in the orchestral score, I discovered that this was an integral part of how the piece works rhythmically. This is logical considering that Copland originally conceived of the music using mixed meters and then reworked the meter for the orchestral score. I felt it was necessary to duplicate the meters and the eighth note beaming to provide the conductor as much information as possible about the orchestral score. While some beaming of eighth notes across bar lines makes the music less readable, the retention of beaming is meant to inform conductors and players of Copland’s original rhythmic intent and increase the feeling of the original grouping during performance. Additionally, Copland also occasionally utilized brackets and dotted bar lines in the orchestral score to show a rhythmic stress that was outside the confines of the meter. (See Figures 2.9 and 2.17) All of these brackets and dotted bar lines were retained in the new arrangement.
Corrected Errata

As detailed in the previous chapter, there are three significant errata which were discovered as discrepancies between the published orchestral score of *El Salón México* and Hindsley’s band arrangement: the rhythm of Bassoon 1 at measure 59, the pitches of Trumpet 1 at measure 113, and the missing pitches from violin 1 in measures 160-161. All of these were corrected in the new arrangement to match the orchestral score.

Additionally, as discussed at the end of Chapter 2, there are three significant pitch errors that were discovered in the published orchestral score. These errors occur in the second bassoon at measure 24, the cello at measure 321, and the cello and double bass at measure 378. These errors are corrected in the new arrangement for band based on evidence provided by the manuscript materials and the Bernstein piano arrangements.
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Research

El Salón México is an important piece in Copland’s compositional output because it represents a significant shift in thinking at this point in his career. Copland wanted to expand the audience for modern music and was experimenting with musical composition using the simplest possible means. El Salón México is the first of several works that appealed to a much wider audience and gained Copland popular and critical acclaim. One reason for this was his use of borrowed Mexican folksongs and the shift of focus towards melody and away from absolute music and formal structures.

El Salón brought Copland widespread recognition. In terms of numbers of performances this was easily Copland’s most successful orchestral work up to this point. While the appeal of piece based on melody and its use of Mexican folksongs certainly contributed to its popularity, it is likely the practical steps Copland took to make the work more performable for conductors and orchestral musicians also contributed to the greater number of performances. The changes in rhythmic notation from shifting irregular meters to regular simple meters, as well as the option for using a reduced instrumentation made the work much more accessible for orchestras of the time.

The changes in rhythmic notation lead to a new question: if Copland had orchestrated El Salón México later in his career, would he have reworked the rhythmic notation so extensively? It is the opinion of the author that it is likely Copland would have made fewer changes to the metric notation in this scenario. First, the Symphonic
Ode was revised in 1955 with many of the original meters restored that Copland had changed for Koussevitzky in 1930. Copland eventually withdrew the 1929 version completely from his list of repertoire replacing it with the 1955 version. Second, Copland notes his preference for the music to “look like it sounds” in his essay “On the Notation of Rhythm.” Finally, Copland approved of Hindsley’s meter decisions in the band arrangement of El Salón México. While it is impossible to form a definitive answer to this question, evidence suggests that Copland would have preferred fewer changes to his original rhythmic notation.

At first glance, when comparing Hindsley’s band arrangement of El Salón México to the orchestral score, it originally appeared to have many changes in meter that might be questionable since they did not reflect the composer’s intentions. However, evidence discussed in the previous chapters suggests that in terms of rhythmic notation, in some sections, the Hindsley arrangement could be considered a better representation of Copland’s original rhythmic conception than the orchestral score. Ironically, much like Copland’s own rhythmic revisions, this was likely done for practical purposes. Musicians in the 1960s were more adept at dealing with shifting irregular meters than musicians in the 1930s. From the time of the 1929 Symphonic Ode, musicians would have had thirty-five more years of exposure to music that included this kind of writing by composers such as Stravinsky. Even collegiate musicians (or perhaps especially) would have been more familiar and open to reading this kind of rhythmic notation. In fact, it is very possible that Hindsley thought using shifting irregular meters that matched the rhythmic stress of the music would be easier for his musicians to perform than the complicated syncopations of the orchestral version.
This seems to be congruent with the fact that many of Hindsley’s decisions in creating the band arrangement seem to be practical in nature. The reduction of double reed players needed, the grouping of eighth notes to match the meter through the score, the thicker scoring in many sections, and the use of accidentals instead of key signatures all point to Hindsley’s desire for a playable and readable arrangement. It is unknown how much Hindsley knew about Copland’s own revisions to rhythmic notation, but it would seem that Hindsley at the very least referred to the published Bernstein piano arrangements. It is the author’s opinion that in some rhythmically complex sections, Hindsley referred to the piano arrangements and used those metric and rhythmic notations instead. His justification of these changes were likely practical, but also had a musical impetus. In an interview with Hindsley he said music should “…LOOK as close to what it is going to sound like as [it] possibly can.” This particular quotation suggests that Hindsley may have read Copland’s “On the Notation of Rhythm.” Regardless of whether this was Hindsley’s informed intention or simply coincidence, this notation is closer to Copland’s original conception of the meter and is one of the strengths of Hindsley’s arrangement.

One purpose of this project was to create a second band arrangement of El Salón México that would provide conductors a second choice of what version to program with their band. Both band arrangements have different strengths and intentions that conductors should consider when making this decision. In the case of rhythmic notation, both the Hindsley arrangement and the Svanoe arrangement have relative strengths and weaknesses. While Hindsley did use Copland’s original intentions of rhythmic notation

---

for certain sections of his arrangement, he also simplified several indications that would inform a conductor or players about these intentions in other sections of the piece. Much of the beaming and irregular grouping of eighth notes that occurs in the orchestral score is simplified by Hindsley to match the meter. Musicians looking at these sections of the music would have no idea what these irregular groupings are, and their intended effect would be lost. The author’s arrangement restores these groupings to the way they appear in the orchestral score. It should also be noted that Hindsley’s simplified beaming is easier to read than the author’s.

It is the author’s opinion that the other relative weakness of the Hindsley is its heavy scoring during some sections of the piece. Some of Hindsley’s choices for scoring may reflect a desire to keep more members of the band involved in playing the piece more of the time. This was particularly evident when replacing orchestral wind parts into the saxophones, or using a combination of brass and clarinets to play string parts. The original orchestral version has a certain transparency, however, that comes with the use of the string section in particular. The use of brass often makes these string parts heavy or more prominent than they sound when played by strings in the orchestral version. The author’s arrangement attempts to keep more of this transparency in tact by using more woodwind timbres and less doubling when transferring the string parts to the band arrangement.

Regarding the relative difficulty of the arrangements, the author’s is likely more difficult. Both arrangements are certainly challenging because of the rhythmic intricacies inherent in the music, as well as the need for strong soloists on several parts. Yet the slightly thicker scoring, simplification of eighth note grouping, and use of shifting
irregular meters as opposed to syncopated simple meters make the Hindsley slightly more performable by bands today.

The idea that more complex meters are easier to perform by modern bands may be counterintuitive. Performance of shifting irregular meters was very difficult for musicians in the 1930s. There is so much of this type of rhythmic writing in modern band literature that it is the author’s opinion that these kinds of rhythms are easier to perform by modern bands. Because of Hindsley’s modifications, his arrangement would be a good choice for conductors with larger or relatively less experienced bands. Advanced high school or young collegiate bands would likely have more success performing Hindsley’s arrangement.

However, the author’s use of replicating the meters and beaming in the orchestral score has two benefits. First, musicians who may play or conduct the orchestral version during their careers will not need to relearn different meters. Second, replication of eighth note groupings that appear in the orchestral score provide the conductor and players an idea of what Copland’s original intentions were throughout the entire score, not just in selected sections of the music. The author’s arrangement is a good choice for conductors who have musicians who may play in orchestras, or are able to apply the rhythmic subtleties the beaming implies. It also replicates the transparency of the orchestral version more successfully. It is likely a better choice for smaller, more advanced bands such as advanced college wind ensembles.

Finally, the Hindsley arrangement has the advantage of being approved by the composer. Copland listened to a recording of the arrangement with a score in hand on at least two occasions. He also made minor corrections and suggestions for scoring in some
sections. While the composer cannot approve the author’s arrangement, it was completed with the intention of restoring his rhythmic intricacies and modernizing the instrumentation for both artistic and practical purposes.

**Suggestions for further research**

Evidence provided by Copland’s reworking of the *Symphonic Ode* in 1955 and statements regarding the notation of rhythm suggest that he was less willing to alter the rhythmic notation in his orchestral works later in his career. While *El Salón México* includes many of these rhythmic alterations, it is a relatively early work. It would be interesting to note how Copland’s rhythmic notation evolved throughout his career with regard for pieces written for large ensembles. It would be interesting to compare the manuscript sketches to published scores for selected works at different points in Copland’s career to see if he became less inclined to change metric notation or if his sketches or if his writing evolved to include more writing directly as syncopated rhythms.

Another topic of interest would be if Copland’s rhythmic notation for large ensemble requiring a conductor was significantly different than his writing for chamber ensembles or soloists. Did Copland’s experience with Koussevitzky and *Symphonic Ode* also shape his rhythmic notation for groups that had no need for a conductor? Or did he make these kinds of adjustments for chamber ensembles as well?

Another area of research could include the perception of differences in rhythmic notation to the listener. Copland wanted to make music look like it sounds on the page. Does the music actually sound different if it looks different? With some or all visual cues removed, including score, conductor, or the movement of musicians, can a trained listener perceive the changes rhythmic notation? Does isolating some of the visual cues,
such as watching a score, or watching a conductor change a listener’s perspective on how the music sounds?

Another question that arises is if orchestral conductors make adjustments in how they conduct *El Salón México*. Has anyone altered the meter back to Copland’s original intentions? An interesting project would be to compile all the available information from the manuscript materials and various piano arrangements and create a new orchestral score of *El Salón México* that would change the rhythmic notation back to what Copland’s original intentions were. Modern conductors and orchestras are much more capable of performing complex rhythms, and the change in the sound of the performance could be significantly different.

This study found that Copland made significant changes to the meter and rhythmic notation of *El Salón México* during the process of orchestration. Evidence suggests that these changes, along with the option for reduced instrumentation, made the work playable by more orchestras. This, along with the use of folk songs, contributed both to Copland’s popularity with audiences and critics, and to the rise of his stature as one of America’s foremost composers.

While Hindsley altered the meters and rhythmic notation in his transcription for band, he likely did so by referring to Bernstein’s arrangements for piano. This restored some of the rhythmic notation, as Copland originally conceived it, from his early sketches. While both Hindsley’s and the author’s transcriptions have relative strengths, the author’s arrangement was completed with the intention of providing today’s band conductor the option of choosing another version for performance. Having a second version is valuable because it is the work of one of America’s most important composers
and makes an important contribution to the repertoire of both the orchestra and the band. While the piece was born from humble folk materials, the work itself is of high artistic quality. Regarding *El Salón México* Copland stated, “As I see it, music that is born complex is not inherently better or worse than music that is born simple.”

---

82 Copland and Perlis, *Copland*, 248.
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Appendix A

List of suggested revisions to the band arrangement of *El Salón México* by Mark Hindsley. Typescript by Aaron Copland. Initial A.C.
Suggested revisions on band arrangement of EL SALON MEXICO.

Would suggest some substitute for the two trbs. which seem rather weighty to me at that spot. (perhaps sax?)

Same as above is true.

Perhaps one could lighten the accompaniment by alternating the hns. and trbs. in both the notes that are repeated and notes that are held for possibly 4 to 6 measures at a time.

I suggest that the orchestration be left as it is.

I prefer the cornets with straight mutes rather than cup mutes.

There is probably a confusion in nomenclature here. My original asks for a tambour de Provence, which is a long drum with a dullish sound. Mr. Hindsley seems to have thought that I was indicating a tambourine. If the name tambour de Provence is unknown in band literature, then I suggest that he ask for a long drum with, in parenthesis, dull sound.
Appendix B

*El Salón México* by Aaron Copland, transcribed for band by Erika Svanoe.

Fl. 1,2
Bsn. 1,2
Cl. 1,2
Ob. 1,2
Picc.
Pno.
Euph.
Timp.
T. Sx.
B. Sx.
Tbt.
T. Bn.
R. Bn.
Db.
B.B.
Tuba

Tbn. 1,2
Tpt. 2
Hn. 1,2
Hn. 3,4
Fl. 1,2

Bsn. 2
Cl. 1
Cl. 2
Cl. 3
Ob. 1
Ob. 2
Fl.
B. Tbn.

Fl. mem (i = 138)
Fl. mem (i = 138)
Fl. mem (i = 138)
Fl. mem (i = 138)

Piu mosso
Piu mosso
Piu mosso
Piu mosso

simply
simply
simply
simply

4
4
4
4

214
215
216
217

134
con tutta forza (with 2 hard sticks) secco