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Abstract

A Comparative Examination of the Published Editions of Alexander Glazunov’s
Concerto in E-flat Major for Alto Saxophone and String Orchestra, Op. 109

Christopher D. Mickel

Alexander Glazunov’s Concerto in E-flat Major for Alto Saxophone and String Orchestra of 1934, written for virtuoso saxophonist Sigurd M. Rascher, is one of the most significant works within the saxophone literature. This document provides historical details of Glazunov’s work, including a discussion of the circumstances leading to its composition, while comparing the editions currently available to define a clearer understanding of the work and the composer’s intentions.

First published in 1936 by Alphonse Leduc, this French edition has been the sole version available. However, in late 2010, with the aid of Sigurd Rascher’s daughter Carina, the German company Bärenreiter published a scholarly edition of the work. This paper features a comparative analysis of the two editions supported by numerous musical examples. In the time between the initial composition of the concerto and its publication, Glazunov made several revisions to the work which were not included in its first publication. This paper examines the discrepancies between the autographed manuscript and the published editions as well as the correspondence between Glazunov and Rascher in which Glazunov discusses his edits. Citing the Concerto’s pedagogical and performance resources, this paper also considers a Music Minus One edition intended for practice as well as an alternate cadenza composed by Christian Lauba.

This paper contains concise accounts of the composition and publication history of the Concerto by drawing upon the significant scholarly research relating to it. The author concludes that by considering the different editions of the work as well as other performance resources related to the work saxophonists will present new interpretations of the Concerto. This research will assist in reinvigorating this well-established work while providing a single, comprehensive source.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Alexander Glazunov’s *Concerto in E-flat Major for Alto Saxophone and String* Orchestra is one of the most significant works within the saxophone literature. First published in 1936 by Alphonse Leduc, this French edition has been the sole version available. However, in late 2010, the German company Bärenreiter published a new scholarly edition of the work.

German saxophone virtuoso Sigurd M. Rascher (1907 - 2001), for whom the Concerto was composed, gave its premiere in 1934, two years before its publication by Alphonse Leduc. In the premiere performance, Rascher played from Glazunov’s original manuscript. According to Rascher, there are differences between this manuscript and the Alphonse Leduc edition.¹ The new edition by Bärenreiter has been edited by Rascher’s daughter, Carina. Carina, like her father, is a prominent saxophonist and pedagogue. As a result of her work, this new edition makes use of the melodic contours and durations present in Glazunov’s autographed manuscript and the phrasing, articulation, dynamic indications, the styles of note attacks of certain notes, indication of specific fingerings, and breath marks which represents her father’s approach to performing the work.

Comparative examination between these two published editions and the manuscript of Glazunov’s Concerto substantiates the need for this research by addressing four primary concerns: to provide historical background relating to the composition of the work, to identify differences through a comparative analysis of the Alphonse Leduc edition and the new Bärenreiter edition, to provide explanations for the differences between the editions and how

---
they relate to the autographed manuscript, and to discuss and evaluate other musical resources related to this work.

**Discussion of Research Methodology**

The research methodology involves the study of the history of *The Concerto*, and a comparative analysis of the Alphonse Leduc edition and the new Bärenreiter edition. For the discussion of the historical background, the author has surveyed the available literature to provide an accurate account of the circumstances regarding the compositional process of this work. There has been disagreement regarding the circumstances under which it was composed, for whom it was composed, its premiere, and subsequent publication. This document will clarify many of the discrepancies regarding the work’s origin.

After providing an accurate discussion of the historical background of this work, the author includes a comparative analysis of the published editions of this Concerto, the Alphonse Leduc edition and the Bärenreiter edition, in order to determine the differences between them. To propose possible explanations for these variations, the author will addresses the significance of the autographed manuscript followed by a discussion of more recent resources related to Glazunov’s work.
Chapter 2: Historical Background

Initial Composition

The Concerto was composed in 1934. Sigurd Rascher, who was very vocal about promoting the saxophone, was the initial catalyst for the composition of this work. The circumstances relating to the composition of the Concerto are closely related to the premiere performance of Glazunov’s other saxophone work, the Saxophone Quartet, Op. 109. The Quartet was premiered in 1932, the same year of its composition, by Marcel Mule’s saxophone quartet, the Quatuor de le Garde Republicane.

The premiere of the Quartet was a private performance held in Paris between December 9 and 16, 1932; Glazunov invited a few friends and personalities.2 Among those in attendance was Sigurd Rascher whose recollection of the performance is as follows:

As I was just in Paris, I had to hear it. I still remember the homogeneous sound of the four saxophones. So enthusiastic was I that I applauded until my hands were red. Here was a real ovation, in its persistent liveliness obviously not only aimed at the performers, but more so yet at the composer: a tall, lightly stooping gentleman with white hair, who stood quietly in the auditorium. With a benevolent smile he thanked for the applause. In his life he had seen many ovations; this one, however, was different: his friends honored him.3

It was at this performance where the association between Rascher and Glazunov began. The performance was very moving for Rascher, as he recalls: “Overflowing with enthusiasm, eventually even I made it into the artists’ room. I had difficulties expressing myself in common language, so I held the master’s hand an asked simply, ‘May I play for you?’ ”4 Rascher then met with Glazunov and played for him. It was at this meeting that Rascher carefully suggested

---

that Glazunov compose a concerto; Glazunov responded: “Oui, for such a musician I will write one.” Glazunov then suggested that Rascher see him again within the next few weeks.\(^5\)

According to his correspondence with his colleague Maximilian Oseevich Steinberg, Glazunov began work on the *Concerto* early in the spring of 1934. In a letter dated March 17 1934, Glazunov stated that he had begun composing the *Concerto* “...under the influences of attacks rather than requests from the Danish saxophonist Sigurd Rascher.”\(^6\) In a letter dated April 4 1934, Glazunov told Steinberg that the *Conceto* was finished.\(^7\)

Following its completion, Rascher received word that the *Concerto* was finished in sketch form; as Rascher recalls: “Soon thereafter in Copenhagen, where I lived at the time, word reached me that the *Concerto* was completed in sketches. Not long afterward, I received the solo part.”\(^8\) Rascher again visited Glazunov and played the work for him in order to receive the composer’s feedback. Rascher recalls this meeting: “These were unforgettable hours: even today, more than half a century later, not only what was said about the music is clear in my memory, but also the master’s voice, his facial expression, and even the furnishings of the music room.”\(^9\)

Glazunov gave Rascher the completed autographed score. Rascher recalls receiving it: “In order to enable me to perform the *Concerto*, the composer gave me a score of 56 pages...”\(^10\)

It is unclear as to when Rascher received the completed autographed score; however, the

---

\(^7\) Sobchenko, “Letters”, 68.  
\(^8\) Rascher, “Alexander Glazunov,” 16.  
Concerto was completed by early May of 1934. This is supported by the inscription on the final page of the autographed score that reads: “4. May 1934, Boulogne s/S. Alexander Glazunov.”

For whom was the Concerto Written?

There have been misconceptions regarding the composition of Glazunov’s work that can be traced to a letter written by Gilbert Leduc dated January 20, 1960. Leduc’s letter contains inaccuracies regarding the genesis of the work. In this letter, Leduc states “It was the last work written by the great master Glazunov in Paris in 1936.” This is clearly false as Glazunov himself inscribed the date of May 4, 1934 on the final page of the autographed manuscript. Furthermore, Glazunov’s correspondence with Steinberg states that the work was completed by April of 1934.

Leduc goes on to state, “...and it was Mr. Alphonse Leduc who caused the writing of Glazunov’s Concerto...”; again, this is not accurate. Rascher’s recollection of the events which led to the composition of the work, as well as Glazunov’s letters to Steinberg, clearly identifies Rascher as the inspriation for the work. Furthermore, the first page of the autographed manuscript bears the dedication: “A Sigurd M. Rascher.” As Rascher informed his daughter, Carina, Glazunov made these inscriptions in her father’s presence. Lastly, Glazunov discusses his difficulty obtaining a publisher for the Concerto in two letters written to Rascher. In the first letter dated September 2, 1934 Glazunov wrote “As yet I have no publisher for my work” and the

---

12 Gilbert Leduc is the son of Alphonse Leduc who was the founder of the firm which published the Concerto in 1936.
16 Alexander Glazunov, Concerto In E-Flat Major for Alto Saxophone and String Orchestra (Kassel, Germany: Bärenreiter, 2010), XIII.
second dated September 11, 1934 where Glazunov stated “Unfortunately I have as yet not found a publisher.” Alphonse Leduc could not have commissioned or otherwise “caused the writing of” the work since Glazunov stated in the months after he finished composing it that he could not find a publisher.17

This information in Gilbert Leduc's 1960 letter regarding Glazunov’s Concerto is false, as the evidence against it is clear. The work was composed in 1934, not 1936, and Alphonse Leduc was not involved until its publication in 1936.

The Premiere Performance

Rascher and Marcel Mule gave the first performances of the Concerto, both of whom recall giving the premiere performance. Glazunov was very excited that his work was going to be performed, and he acknowledged that Rascher and Mule would give the first performances. In a letter to Steinberg dated June 4, 1934, Glazunov stated: “I completed the Concerto for saxophone, both the score and clavier, and most likely I will hear performances within days by the Frenchmen Mule and the Danish Saxophonist Rascher.”18 These performances would not take place until the following autumn and winter.

Glazunov discussed the premiere performance in a letter to Steinberg dated November 21, 1934: “The Danish Saxophonist Rascher, with very good, indeed tremendous technique, will perform it.”19 Rascher performed the world premiere on November 26, 1934, in the Church of St. Nicholas in Nyköping, Sweden with the Norrköping Symphony Orchestra with Tord Benner conducting. The work was performed again the next day in Norrköping.20 Glazunov supports

20 Glazunov, Concerto in E-Flat Major, XIII.
this in another letter to Steinberg dated December 5, 1934: “The Saxophone Concerto was premiered twice by Sigurd Rascher in the two largest cities of Sweden. Next year I will hear it in Paris.”  

In an interview with the prominent American saxophonist and pedagogue, Eugene Rousseau, Mule recalls giving the premiere performance.

**Mule** – Glazunov had written the *Quartet, Op. 109* for us prior to composing the *Concerto*. At any rate, I read the *Concerto* with Glazunov at the piano; and he must have liked it, for it was a month or two later that I performed the *Concerto* for the French radio.

**Rousseau** – Then your performance of Glazunov’s *Concerto* over French Radio was prior to the first performance given by Sigurd Rascher, for whom it had been composed?

**Mule** – Yes, that is correct.

This performance, which was the French premiere, took place on January 20, 1935, at Radio Colonial in Paris, with Marcel Mule as soloist and Henry Tomasi conducting, two months after Rascher’s world premiere.

Glazunov was well aware of ongoing performances of the *Concerto* as he remained in contact with Rascher. It is unclear as to whether Glazunov ever heard the work. He died on March 21, 1936, and there is no further information indicating if the composer was ever present at a performance.

**André Petiot**

The name André Petiot appears as a co-composer on the saxophone solo part and the piano reduction of Leduc’s edition of Glazunov’s work. It is quite clear that Petiot had no

---

21 Sobchenko, “Letters”, 69
22 Eugene Rousseau is a student of Marcel Mule. Marcel Mule would not have known of Rascher’s performances of the *Concerto*.
23 Charles, “Dossier”, 23
24 Glazunov, *Concerto in E-Flat Major*, XIII
25 Sobchenko, “Letters”, 69
involvement in the compositional process; in all of the archival letters recorded, Glazunov never mentioned working with a colleague.26

Petiot’s name was credited as a co-composer to make it possible for Glazunov to receive French royalties for his work. At the time, the Soviet government had ceased to pay royalties on French works in the Soviet Union and in retaliation the French government had done the same for Russian works.27 Since the French government ceased to pay royalties on Russian works in France, André Petiot accepted the figure of co-author in order to serve as a liaison for the royalty payments by SACEM (Société des auteurs, compositeurs et éditeurs de musique28) to Glazunov.29 Marcel Mule reported that Alphonse Leduc had mentioned that it was a matter of copyright.30 The publisher visited Glazunov many times to make arrangements for the composer to receive royalty payments. However, it is unlikely that Glazunov benefited much from this arrangement because he died in less than a month after the work was published.31

---

28 Société des auteurs, compositeurs et éditeurs de musique (SACEM) is a French professional association collecting payments of artists’ rights and distributing the rights to the original songwriters, composers and music publishers.
Chapter 3: Comparative Analysis

Contrasting the Leduc and Bärenreiter Editions

The Saxophone Solo Part

The most significant differences between the Leduc edition and the Bärenreiter edition of Glazunov’s concerto lie in the saxophone solo part. Of these differences, the most apparent are related to phrasing. The Leduc edition employs phrase markings over smaller groupings of pitches (Figure 3.1), the markings are used to indicate slurs and not the overall phrase. The French edition breaks the phrase into multiple slurs that emphasize the beat and bring clarity to the angularity of the line.


The Bärenreiter edition (Figure 3.2) is simpler in this regard, making clear the large overall phrase and suggesting a more *sostenuto*, lyrical approach.

---

32Two saxophone solo parts are included with the Bärenreiter edition: the part originally published by Leduc and the new edition of the solo part. For the purposes of the comparative analysis, the author is referring to the latter as the Bärenreiter edition.
The Leduc Edition indicates slurs and not phrases where in places an understanding of the phrase is to be assumed. However, the Bärenreiter edition indicates the overall phrases while assuming that the performer will tongue certain note to insure that they respond clearly.

By the second half of the twentieth century many composers began to demand a more specific and detailed indication of musical elements such as articulation, dynamics, fingering, breathing, and, in the case of composers such as Karlheinz Stockhausen and George Crumb, choreography and position on stage. The most significant piece in the saxophone repertoire which incorporates this type of musical notation is Edison Denisov’s *Sonate for Alto Saxophone and Piano* of 1970. Denisov’s work includes a highly specific notation that indicates melodic lines which accelerate or decelerate; effects such as flutter-tonguing; a wide range of textural sounds; and frequent often very abrupt contrasts in dynamics and articulation. Specific fingerings and voicing adjustments are indicated in the music to guide the performer in executing multiphonics and quarter-tones. In an attempt to best communicate the Romantic style of Glazunov’s work, Bärenreiter has applied the same modern practice of notation through specific articulation markings. Since Bärenreiter has included specific articulation markings, the author has listed the different indications for the specific articulations, the proper attacks and releases, and the character of the articulations in Table 3.1.
Table 3.1. Bärenreiter articulations: attacks and releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articulation</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Attack Syllable</th>
<th>Release</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legato/Tenuto</td>
<td>Taa</td>
<td>Taa or Daa</td>
<td>Long air release/articulation of next note</td>
<td>Connected articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staccato</td>
<td>Ta</td>
<td>Ta</td>
<td>Short Air Release or tongue cut-off</td>
<td>Short detached articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached Legato</td>
<td>Taa</td>
<td>Taa or Daa</td>
<td>Air release</td>
<td>Detached full value articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong Ta or Ka</td>
<td>Long air release/articulation of next note</td>
<td>full value articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accented Legato</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong Taa or Kaa</td>
<td>Long air release/articulation of next note</td>
<td>Connected articulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed information on the proper execution of the saxophone articulations listed in Table 3.1 is published in *HELLO! Mr. SAX* by Jean-Marie Londeix.\(^\text{33}\) In addition to articulation markings, Bärenreiter has also included specific fingerings and breath marks.

The *Concerto* was written in 1934 and published by Leduc in 1936, before the modern practice of such musical indication came into common use. As a result, much of the detailed musical indications in the Bärenreiter edition are not present in the Leduc edition.

When comparing these two editions, the cadenza is of particular interest as Bärenreiter has included substantial new material in this section of the work. In the Leduc edition, only one cadenza is present. However, the Bärenreiter edition contains three different cadenzas: Glazunov’s standard cadenza as presented in the Leduc edition; a much shorter cadenza which appears to be a truncated version of the standard cadenza; and a third and very different cadenza composed by Sigurd Rascher.

Although the *Concerto* is in one movement, it comprises three major sections. Sigurd Rascher explains it in the following manner: “...though the work is in one movement, it possesses three independent parts, following the traditional concerto model.”\(^{34}\) These parts are divided as follows: Section one is the first sixty-six measures, Section Two is measures 67 – 164, and Section Three is measures 165 to the end of the work, measure 329.

**The Saxophone Solo Part: Section One**

The saxophone enters at measure 11, measures 11 – 22 (Figure 3.3) show identical dynamic markings with exception of measure 13; the Bärenreiter edition shows a *decrescendo* not present in the Leduc edition.

The most significant differences between the Leduc edition and the Bärenreiter edition become apparent as the phrasing and articulations differ substantially between the two editions. The notable differences are the placement of the slurs. In the Leduc edition, phrases are broken into multiple slurs which aid in emphasizing the harmonic changes.

*Legato* articulations in the Bärenreiter edition are notated in measure 11, the end of measure 14, and measure 21. Bärenreiter also includes detached *legato* indications in measures 13, 14, 19, and 20. These detailed articulation indications are not present in Leduc’s edition.

In addition to the specific articulations, the Bärenreiter edition includes breath marks in measures 15, 17, and 22. These markings allow an adequate supply of air to the performer, while maintaining continuous sense of musical momentum.

---

Figure 3.3. Alexander Glazunov, *Concerto in E-flat Major for Alto Saxophone and String Orchestra, Op. 109*, measures 11 – 26: Articulations and placement of phrase markings.
In contrast to Leduc’s harmonic approach encouraged by multiple small groups of slurs, Bärenreiter presents a horizontal approach with a broader, songlike character. These differences in the placement of the slurs are indicated in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Differences in slur placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Numbers</th>
<th>Leduc Edition</th>
<th>Bärenreiter edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Beats 1, 2, and 3 are tongued.</td>
<td>Beats 1 and 2 are tongued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Beats 1, 2, and 4 are tongued.</td>
<td>Beats 1 and 4 are tongued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Beats 2 and 4 are tongued.</td>
<td>Beats 1, 2, and 4 are tongued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Beats 1, the “&amp;” of 2, and 4 are tongued.</td>
<td>Beats 1 and the “&amp;” of 2 are tongued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Beats 1, 3, and the “&amp;” of 4 are tongued.</td>
<td>Beats 1 and the “&amp;” of 4 are tongued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Beats 1, the “&amp;” of 2, and 4 are tongued.</td>
<td>Beats 1 and the “&amp;” of 2 are tongued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The “&amp;” of 1 and 3 are tongued.</td>
<td>The “&amp;” of 1 is tongued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Beats 1 and 4 are tongued.</td>
<td>Beats 1 and 4 and the “a” of 4 are tongued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Beats 1 and 4 are tongued.</td>
<td>Beats 4 and the “a” of 4 are tongued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Beats 1 and three are tongued.</td>
<td>All notes are slurred.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures 27 – 36 (Figure 3.4) represent the continuation of Section One; the two editions continue to differ in their phrasing and articulation markings. Here, Leduc indicates the slurs; the saxophonist’s understanding of the phrase is assumed. However, Bärenreiter indicates the phrases while assuming that the player may articulate certain notes in order to effectively interpret the melodic line. Although both editions require the player to have a strong
understanding of the piece, the new edition encourages longer lines and promotes greater phrase direction by the use of these articulations.


The dynamic markings in this section are virtually identical in both editions with the exception of the indication on the downbeat of measure 27. In the Bärenreiter edition, the dynamic level is marked *piano* and in the Leduc edition, *mezzo piano*. The Bärenreiter edition continues the same dynamic marking as the opening, while the Leduc edition highlights greater contrast.
Also unique to the Bärenreiter edition are the specific fingerings\textsuperscript{35} in measures 30 and 31. The C – sharps are labeled “5”\textsuperscript{*} or “0”\textsuperscript{+} and the A – sharps are labeled “sk”\textsuperscript{±} over them. This notation, which indicates specific fingerings to be used, is not present in the Leduc edition.

Further differences are present in measures 40 – 52 (Figure 3.5). The variation in phrase indication continues in this section with multiple slurs in the Leduc edition and a more sostenuto approach by Bärenreiter as in measures 11 – 21 and 27 – 36. Indications of staccato attacks in measures 43, 47, 50, and 52, are present in the Leduc edition. However, more articulations are notated in Bärenreiter’s edition: the same staccato markings are indicated as well as detached legato attacks in measures 43, 47 and 50, a legato attack in measure 51, and a staccato attack in measure 46. Other specific indications unique to the Bärenreiter edition are breath marks in measures 44, 48, and 50, and the “sk” fingering for A – sharp marking in measure 49.

\textsuperscript{35} In order to clearly describe the specific fingerings indicated in the Bärenreiter edition, the author has used the key identification chart entitled “Chart of the Saxophone” on page 6 of HELLO! Mr. Sax by Jean-Marie Londeix.
\textsuperscript{*} Fingering for this note: 8va – 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6 – C# (See “Chart of the Saxophone” in Londeix, HELLO! Mr. Sax,6)
\textsuperscript{+} Fingering for this note: no keys are depressed (open C sharp)
\textsuperscript{±} Fingering for this note: 1- 2- Ta (See “Chart of the Saxophone” in Londeix, HELLO! Mr. Sax,6)
The breath marks in measures 44, 48, and 50 of the Bärenreiter edition occur after the first of three repeated notes; the last of the three notes is on the downbeat of the measure. As a
result of this placement of the breath, the second of the three notes becomes the anacrusis for the 
next phrase. This is significant because many saxophonists have learned this work through study 
of the Leduc edition which does not specify where breaths should be taken. Consequently, it has 
become common practice among saxophonists to play this section by taking a breath after the 
third repeated note making it the last note of the preceding phrase. These two interpretations are 
quite different yet they are both effective presentations of the musical lines.

The section spanning from measure 53 – 66 is the final portion of Section One and is 
very similar in both editions. They are virtually identical with the exception of the phrasing in 
measures 59 – 61 (Figure 3.6).

Figure 3.6. Alexander Glazunov, *Concerto in E-flat Major for Alto Saxophone and String Orchestra, Op. 109,* 
measures 59 – 61: Articulations and placement of phrase markings.

These differences in phrase markings between the two editions present Bärenreiter’s most 
significant changes to this section of the work. In the Leduc edition In the Leduc edition, the 
harmonic rhythm is brought out by a more frequent use of slurs. Bärenreiter seeks a more 
horizontal interpretation, where larger groups of notes are slurred, suggestive of a more *sostenuto* 
approach. Further differences in this section are more subtle; there are indications in the 
Bärenreiter edition that are not present in the Leduc edition. They are as follows: the *staccato*
attacks in measures 54 and 56, the “sk” marking in measure 53, and breath marks which have been added in measures 57 and 58.

The Saxophone Solo Part: Section Two

The fourteen measure orchestral interlude beginning at measure 67 marks the beginning of the *tranquillo* second section. The first entrance of the saxophone in this section is at measure 81 (Figure 3.7).

The phrasing between the two editions is quite different. Leduc continues to break the phrases into multiple slurs, contrasted to Bärenreiter’s broader, *sostenuto* approach. Specific markings for the attacks and releases of notes differ between the two editions. In the Leduc edition, the half note in measure 84 is marked with an accent; it is not accented in Bärenreiter’s edition. The detached *legato* notes in measures 87, 91, 94, and 101 of Bärenreiter’s edition are not present in Leduc’s; neither are the *legato* markings in measures 86 and 98.

In this section, Bärenreiter continues to be more specific in its indications of certain musical elements. This is apparent in measure 83 as the D – flat on beat three is marked with the number 5, indicating a specific fingering. Also, measures 88, 91, 96, 98, and 99 contain breath marks. None of these markings are present in the Leduc edition.

Leduc Edition

Bärenreiter Edition
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The differences between the two editions of this work are very significant in measures 104 – 119. Even though measures 116 – 119 are virtually identical, with the exception of a *diminuendo* indicated in the Bärenreiter edition, measures 104 – 115 show two very different presentations of the phrasing (Figure 3.8).
In the Leduc edition, the phrases are broken into several slurs in order to clearly define the harmonic changes and the melodic sequence. However, Bärenreiter has provided a broad
horizontal approach to the phrase structure which implies a broad, singing character. In this section, Leduc has included *accelerando*, *allargando*, and *ritardando* indications which guide the saxophonist through the melodic line. These are not present in the Bärenreiter edition, and as a result, adjustments in tempo are left to the discretion of the performer.

After a three measure orchestral interlude in measures 120 – 122, the saxophone enters in measure 123. Measure 120 marks the beginning of the next section (Figure 3.9) of Section Two which ends at measure 141. In regard to indications of dynamics, the two editions are identical. However, the differences in phrasing are quite apparent: Leduc continues with melodic lines that are sectionalized by multiple slurs and Bärenreiter continues with the a more songlike presentation. Discrepancies in articulation are present in the two editions: the accents in measures 128 and 132 of the Leduc Edition are not notated in the Bärenreiter edition. Furthermore, the detached *legato* indications in measures 124, 128, and 132 of Bärenreiter’s edition are not present in that by Leduc.

Leduc Edition

Bärenreiter Edition
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The fifth part of Section Two, measure 142 – 154, begins with a three-measure interlude by the orchestra; the saxophone enters at measure 145 (Figure 3.10).


As has been the case with the preceding sections of this work, the most significant differences between the two editions pertain to phrasing and slur placement. There are some important differences in articulation in measures 145 and 153: the accent markings present in measure 145
of the Leduc edition are not indicated in the Bärenreiter edition. Further differences are in measure 153, in Bärenreiter’s edition specific articulations (detached legato, accent, and legato) are indicated over the notes on beats two and three. These are not present in the Leduc edition.

Measures 155 – 163 are a transition into the cadenza. Here the two editions of the *Concerto* differ in only two minor places: measures 155 – 156 (Figure 3.11) and 159 – 160 (Figure 3.12).


The phrasing in these two measures differs slightly between the editions. In the Bärenreiter edition, the slur beginning in measure 155 carries through beat two of measure 156, but in the Leduc edition, the slur beginning in measure 155 carries through beat four of the measure with the downbeat of measure 156 articulated. In addition, Bärenreiter has indicated that the quarter note on beat three of measure 156 is to be played with a detached *legato* attack.

The differences in measures 159 – 160 are minimal (Figure 3.12). In the Bärenreiter edition, the A – flat whole note in measure 159 is tied to the G – sharp on the downbeat of measure 160; these notes are not tied in the Leduc edition. The Leduc edition also places a *decrescendo* under measure 159.
The seventh part (Figure 3.13) of Section Two, measures 163 – 164, is the cadenza and contains some of the most significant differences between the two editions of this work.\textsuperscript{36} This cadenza is also present in the Bärenreiter edition as the second of three possible cadenzas; it is identical in both editions. This first cadenza (Figure 3.14) presented by Bärenreiter is a truncated version of the Leduc edition cadenza.

\textsuperscript{36} Though the cadenzas illustrated in Figures 13 and 14 contain several measures, all of the material beginning in measure 164 is considered to be one measure.
There is one slight difference between the first and the second cadenza in regard to phrasing. In the second cadenza (Figure 3.13), the slur beginning on beat three of measure 163 only spans two eighth notes; the downbeat of measure 164 is articulated. However, the same phrase in the first cadenza (Figure 3.14) is slightly different. The slur beginning on beat three of measure 163 is carried over to beat one of measure 164.

The third cadenza (Figure 3.15) in the Bärenreiter edition is completely different than the first two. Cadenzas one and two were composed by Glazunov, but the third is by Sigurd Rascher. Rascher recalls playing his cadenza for Glazunov: “… [I] played my own for him, he listened to it a few times and meant it fit rather well, I should play it. [sic]”

---

37 Alexander Glazunov, *Concerto In E-Flat Major for Alto Saxophone and String Orchestra* (Kassel, Germany: Bärenreiter, 2010), XIV.
The Saxophone Solo Part: Section Three

Section Three begins at measure 165 (rehearsal number 22). Measures 165 – 178, which begins with a four-measure orchestral interlude, prepares the saxophone’s entrance in measure 169 with *staccato* eighth notes in octaves. Measures 165 – 175 are identical in both editions. However, in the last three measures of this section (Figure 3.16) the melodic content differs. This variance in the melodic material is a result of revisions Glazunov made in the two years
between the initial composition of the *Concerto* (1934) and its publication (1936). Rascher discusses these changes: “In the three measures before rehearsal number 24 [measures 176 - 178] in the manuscript are no eighth-rests, but octaves, just as in the previous measures.”


The next part of Section Three, measures 179 - 192 (Figure 3.17 and Appendix), contains discrepancies in the placement and length of slurs. In measure 180 of the Leduc edition, a slur begins on the last eighth note of beat three and extends through the quarter note on beat one of measure 181. In the Bärenreiter edition beat four of measure 180 is tongued, as are the last eighth note of beat four and the downbeat of measure 181. A slur begins on beat four of measure 181 in both editions, but the Bärenreiter in edition it carries over through the quarter note on beat one of measure 182; this pitch is tongued in Leduc’s edition. The last eighth note of beat four of measure 182 is tongued in both editions, but in the Leduc edition it is the beginning of a slur that carries over through the second eighth note of measure 183, while in the Bärenreiter edition beat one of measure 183 is tongued and slurred to the second eight note of the beat. The last eighth

---

note of measure 183 is tongued in both editions but in the Leduc edition it is the beginning of a series of slurred notes which continues through the second eighth note of measure 184. In measure 184 of Leduc’s edition beats two and three are tongued; In the Bärenreiter edition beats one and two are tongued. The dotted quarter note on beat one of measure 187 and the last eighth note of beat three are tongued in the Leduc edition. Bärenreiter indicates that the downbeat of this measure is under a slur which begins on beat four of measure 186; the quarter note and eighth note in beat three are tongued. Further differences in slur placement are present in measure 188. In the Leduc edition beat two and the last eighth note of beat three are tongued; beat two of the Bärenreiter edition is the beginning of a slur that carries through the downbeat of measure 189.

The articulations are very similar; however, in the Bärenreiter edition adds *staccato* markings in measures 182 and 183. In both editions, measures 189 – 192 are an orchestral interlude which brings this section to an end.

The next five subsections are short eight measure sections in which there are several call and response phrases between the orchestra and the saxophone. The first (Figure 3.18) of these begins in measure 193 and continues through the downbeat of measure 201.

In this section, there are many differences in phrasing. As has been the case throughout this work, Leduc has presented multiple slurs which aid in clarifying the harmony where Bärenreiter has indicated larger phrases which convey the flow of the melodic line.

With the exception of the accent on beat four of measure 198, there are no indications regarding articulation in the Leduc Edition. However, in the Bärenreiter edition, there are more detailed indications regarding specific articulations: the detached *legato* articulations in measures 195 and 196, the *staccato* in measure 197, the accent in measure 198, and the *legato* markings in measures 199 and 200.

Figure 3.19 illustrates measures 201 – 208; this section overlaps with the previous one at measure 201.

Again, the phrase and articulation indications in each edition are quite different. In measures 203 – 205 of the Leduc edition, there are six small groups of slurred notes, two *staccato* markings, and an accent. These same measures in the Bärenreiter edition have three larger groupings indicated and only one specified articulation, the *staccato* in measure 203. The same type of phrasing differences are also present in measures 206 – 209. The vertical and horizontal approaches by Leduc and Bärenreiter respectively continue in this section. Bärenreiter has indicated detached *legato* markings in measures 207 – 208 which are not in the Leduc edition. Measure 209 marks the end of this section and the beginning of the next.

Measures 209 – 216 are primarily orchestral passages without the soloist. However, the phrasing and articulation in the limited saxophone passages (Figure 3.20) are quite different.
The articulation markings in the two editions are slightly different: in the Bärenreiter edition the last two eighth notes in measure 210 are marked *staccato*.

The last of the short eight measure subsections begins in measure 217 and ends at measure 224 (Figure 3.21). The same phrasing discrepancies are present in this section. Specific articulations are notated in the Bärenreiter edition, such as the detached *legato* markings in measures 219 and 223 and the *legato* marking in measure 222. There are no specific indications for articulation in the Leduc edition.
The next subsection, measures 225 – 235, begins with the orchestra; the saxophone does not enter until measure 227. The phrase markings differ significantly between the two sections (Figure 3.22).


In measures 227 – 230 Leduc has divides the phrases into multiple slurs in order to bring out the angularity of the line. Bärenreiter indicates longer slurs for a more *sostenuto* character.

The Bärenreiter edition has *staccato* markings in measures 230 and 232 and the *legato* in measure 231 are articulations which are not indicated in the Leduc edition. The trill on the D dotted quarter note in measure 231, that carries over into measure 232 is clearly specified to carry through the end of the quarter note on the downbeat of measure 232 in Bärenreiter’s edition. The trill is not as specific in the Leduc edition; as a result, the exact length of the trill is not consistently interpreted, as some performers trill through the quarter note on beat one of
measure 232 while others end the trill on the downbeat of measure 232. The one dynamic
difference in this section is the *forte* marking in measure 233 of the Leduc edition; this indication
is not present in the Bärenreiter edition.

The section beginning in measure 236 – 253 (Figure 3.23) is a prime example of the two
very different approaches to phrase structure which have been present through the entire work.
In order to clearly define the changes in harmony, the Leduc edition is divided into multiple
slurs. Bärenreiter, however, has clearly indicated the large overall phrase for a broad singing
character. Articulation in this section has substantial disagreement as well. The accent on the
downbeat of measure 239 in the Leduc edition is not present in the Bärenreiter edition.

Bärenreiter has indicated several articulations which are not marked in the Leduc edition: they
include: *staccato* markings in measures 238, 239, 242, and 243; and detached *legato* indications
in measures 240 and 246. The Bärenreiter edition also includes breath marks in measures 244
and 248.
Unlike the first twelve measures of this section, there is very little difference between the two editions in the last five measures of this section; the phrasing and dynamics are identical.
The only difference lies in the *staccato* indications in measures 249 – 251 of the Bärenreiter edition (Figure 3.24).

After a six measure orchestral interlude (measures 253 – 258), the saxophone enters on beat two of measure 259. The section beginning in measure 259 and ending on the downbeat of measure 277 is in two parts, the first part (Figure 3.25) begins at measure 259 and ends at measure 268; the second part (Figure 3.26) begins at measure 269 and ends at measure 277.


The phrasing in this section differs between the two editions. As has been the case throughout the *Concerto*, the phrase indications in the Leduc edition are grouped into very small groups of notes and the phrases in the Bärenreiter edition are longer. The articulation also differs, as the *staccato* indications in measures 260, 262, 265, and 266 of the Bärenreiter edition are not present in the Leduc edition; the same is true for the *legato* marking over the G in measure 264. There is also a slight difference in dynamic markings. The Bärenreiter edition does not include the *forte* marking in measure 263 that is present in the Leduc edition.
The second part of this section spans measures 269 to the downbeat of measure 277. The only difference between the two editions in this part of the work is in the phrase indications; again, these show Leduc’s vertical approach and Bärenreiter’s horizontal approach.


The next subsection begins on beat two of measure 277 and comes to an end at measure 281. This excerpt is virtually identical in both editions, the only difference being the notation regarding articulation of the quarter notes on beat four of measures 278 and 280. In the Leduc edition, these notes are marked with accents and in the Bärenreiter edition these are marked with accented *legato* indications.

Measures 281 through the downbeat of measure 285 make up the next small section (Figure 3.27); as has been the case throughout this work, the difference between the two editions in these measures lies in the slur and phrase markings.
Also, the *mezzo forte* indication under the last eighth note of this section in the Bärenreiter edition is not in the Leduc edition. Following these four measures, the next section (measure 285 beat two through the downbeat of measure 289) contains *staccato* eighth note octaves which descend chromatically. Aside from the *mezzo forte* indication on the downbeat of measure 289 of the Bärenreiter edition, there is no variance between the two editions in these measures.

Beginning on the second half of beat one of measure 289 to the downbeat of measure 293 (Figure 3.28) the difference between the editions is in the dynamic markings.
The major difference regarding dynamics is in the sequence in measures 289 through the downbeat of measure 291. In the Leduc edition, this section begins with a piano indication and crescendos to mezzo forte and decrescendos back to piano. In the Bärenreiter edition, the dynamics are abruptly juxtaposed as the sequence alternates between forte and piano. The last two measures of this section are very similar with the only difference being the mezzo piano indication in the Bärenreiter edition in measure 292.

Beat two of measure 293 through the downbeat of measure 301 marks the next subsection (Figure 3.29). There are many differences in phrasing with Leduc breaking the phrases into multiple slurs and Bärenreiter indicating longer slurs.
In the Bärenreiter edition, specific articulations have been indicated with detached *legato* markings in measures 294, 295, and 296.

In both of the editions, the next three sections of the work are almost identical. The first of the three begins in measure 301 and continues to the downbeat of measure 305, the only difference in this section is that the dotted quarter note on beat three of measure 302 is accented in the Bärenreiter edition and is not in the Leduc edition. The second of the three begins on beat two of measure 305 and ends on the downbeat of measure 309. In this section, *staccato* notes are indicated by Bärenreiter in the following measures: 305, 306, 307, 308; these indications are not present in the Leduc edition. The last of these sections, measures 309 through the downbeat of 314, is very similar in both editions. The only difference is regarding phrasing in measures 311 – 312 (Figure 3.30), reflecting shorter groupings in the Leduc edition and primarily longer in the Bärenreiter edition.
Leduc has again presented smaller groups of slurred notes and Bärenreiter larger ones. This presentation of the vertical and horizontal approaches to phrase structure by Leduc and Bärenreiter has been consistent throughout the work.

The final section of the *Concerto*, measures 313 – 329, contains significant variance between the two editions beginning with measures 316 – 320 (Figure 3.31). Differences in slur placement exist in measures 316 and 319 – 320. Also, the placement of the accents in measure 317 is different: the quarter note on beat three is accented in measure 317 of the Leduc edition while it is not in the Bärenreiter edition. The quarter note on beat four of measure 317 in the Bärenreiter edition is accented; this note is not accented in the Leduc edition.

**Leduc Edition**
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**Bärenreiter Edition**
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Figure 3.32 presents further changes that exist in the final measures (324 – 329).

Beginning with measure 324, beat four is of particular interest: in the Leduc edition, the saxophonist has the choice to play the altissimo G or the lower B to C figure, yet in the Bärenreiter edition indicates only the altissimo G. The two sixteenth notes on beat three of measure 325 are tongued in the Leduc edition; in the Bärenreiter edition these notes are slurred. In measure 326, the sixteenth notes on the “and” of beat one are slurred in the Leduc edition and are marked as tongued with *staccato* notes in the Bärenreiter edition.

The melodic content in the last three measures also differs between the two editions. The first two beats of measure 327 are comprised of an eighth note an eighth rest and a trilled quarter note in the Leduc edition, but in the Bärenreiter edition these beats are composed of a half note which is not trilled. Here, the Bärenreiter edition also indicates *pesante poco*. In measure 328 of the same edition, there is a *piano* marking, which is not in the Leduc edition, under the low C on beat one.
The last figure (Figure 3.33), which starts on beat two of measure 328, is different in each edition. In the Leduc edition it is a short gesture which ends on beat three of measure 328, the saxophone ends this gesture before the orchestra plays the final notes. In the Bärenreiter edition, this figure begins on beat two of measure 328 and ends on beat one of measure 329; the saxophone and orchestra end together. Leduc presents this final gesture with an “8a ad. lib.” indication, Bärenreiter presents this gesture with “8va” indication. In the Leduc edition, the saxophonist has the option to play the final two notes as written or an octave higher in the altissimo register. However, according to the Bärenreiter edition, proficiency in the altissimo register is required.
The difference between the two editions of the solo saxophone part of this *Concerto* is substantial. Extensive variance in phrasing and articulation and the inclusion of multiple cadenzas make up the majority of the differences between these two editions. Other less frequent discrepancies are in dynamic indications, the style of attacks of certain notes, indication of specific fingerings, breath marks, and, in a few cases, actual differences in the melodic material. As a result of these differences, new possibilities for musical interpretation of this standard work of saxophone literature are now available.

**The Orchestra Score and the Piano Reduction**

The Bärenreiter and Leduc editions of the orchestra score are exactly identical. However, there have been some very subtle changes made to the piano reduction. For example, passages have been moved to a different clef in order to make the printed part easier to read, melodic lines which were doubled in octaves in the Leduc edition have been reduced to a single line, many of the chords in the Bärenreiter edition are voiced without the pitch doubling found in the Leduc
edition, and in some cases the melodic lines have been altered. Prior to Bärenreiter’s
publication, and in correspondence with the author, Carina Rascher referred to the piano
reduction: “Since the piano part was extremely ‘unpianistic,’ there will be a revised piano
reduction,” and subsequently, changes were made to make the piano reduction more idiomatic.

---

39Carina Rascher, e-mail message to Christopher D. Mickel, May 28, 2010.
Chapter 4: Conclusions

Summary of Differences between the *Concerto’s Two Editions*

It is clear that the Leduc and Bärenreiter editions of the saxophone solo part differ significantly. The most apparent discrepancies are related to phrasing, articulation, and the cadenza, with other less frequent variance in dynamic indications, the style of note attacks, indication of specific fingerings, breath marks, and, in a few cases, actual differences in the melodic material.

In the period between the work’s completion and its publication, Glazunov made several changes to the melodic content of the work. The Bärenreiter edition presents the melodic content as it was originally presented in the autographed score that Glazunov gave to Rascher upon completing the work in 1934. It was from this score that Rascher initially performed the work’s premiere. The Leduc edition, published in 1936, is the product of Glazunov’s revisions.

According to a previously unpublished note by Rascher, dating from the 1980s, Glazunov made changes to the *Concerto* before the publication process [by Leduc].\(^{40}\) Correspondence between Glazunov and Rascher documents these changes: one of Glazunov’s letters to Rascher dated October 2, 1934, explains a change in the last figure in measures 327 - 329 (Figure 4.1) which is different that the ending gestures in the Leduc edition and the Bärenreiter edition. In this letter Glazunov explains to Rascher that he had “...altered the penultimate bar as follows to avoid interrupting the phrase in the main part of my saxophone concerto: I find it much more logical!”\(^{41}\) Glazunov would again alter this phrase; this final change is noted in the difference between the two editions presented in Figure 3.32. He announced to Rascher on February 28\(^{th}\),

\(^{40}\) Alexander Glazunov, *Concerto In E-Flat Major for Alto Saxophone and String Orchestra* (Kassel, Germany: Bärenreiter, 2010), XIV.

\(^{41}\) Glazunov, *Concerto in E-Flat Major*, (Kassel, Germany: Bärenreiter, 2010), XIV.
1935, that the final gesture had again been changed to the version indicated in the Leduc Edition.\(^{42}\)


Further evidence that changes were made is present in measures 176 – 178 (Figure 3.16). However, it is unclear as to exactly when Glazunov made these changes which, after comparing with his autographed score, Sigurd Rascher addressed as follows:

But it is evident that before the first printing this and that were changed in the solo part. In the three measures before rehearsal number 24 [measures 176 - 178] in the manuscript are no eighth-rests, but octaves, just as in the previous measures.\(^{43}\)

Other discrepancies in the melodic material exist in measures 324 and 328 in the form of optional lower pitches to substitute for the notes written in the altissimo register. Upon noticing these changes, Sigurd Rascher asked Glazunov why he made them. According to Rascher:

Glazunov told me that the ranking local [Paris where Glazunov lived at the time] saxophone player had visited him, and on that occasion learned of the young player from Copenhagen [Rascher] and his excursions into the high register. Whereupon the visitor remarked, “Nous ne faisons d’choses comme ça, nous avons l’ecole Parisienne” [“We wouldn’t do that, we have Parisian Schooling.”] Trans. Sigurd M. Rascher\(^{44}\)

At the time of the composition of this work, Rascher was the only saxophonist who had cultivated the altissimo register, and had refined it to a point suitable for use in classical music. The Parisian saxophonists of the day, including Marcel Mule and his students,

---

\(^{42}\)Glazunov, *Concerto in E-Flat Major*, (Kassel, Germany: Bärenreiter, 2010), XIV.


\(^{44}\)Rascher, “Alexander Glazunov,” 17.
simply did not play in the altissimo register. It is likely that Glazunov added these optional substitute pitches for the altissimo notes to make the piece more easily playable and also concurrent with playing trends of that time.

The Bärenreiter edition includes three different cadenzas. The first cadenza (Figure 3.14) is a truncated version of the cadenza issued in the Leduc edition. This cadenza is essentially the original cadenza present in the autographed score. According to Carina Rascher, it is “…the original cadenza written in the manuscript (much shorter).” Rascher preferred his own cadenza (Figure 3.15), of which Glazunov approved. Sigurd Rascher recalls his first rehearsal of the Concerto with Glazunov:

“Even when I let on that I was none too happy with the cadenza and played my own for him, he listened to it a few times and meant it fit rather well, I should play it. [sic]” On February 28th, 1935, Glazunov notified Rascher that he had expanded his cadenza. This expanded cadenza (Figure 3.13) is the one present in the Leduc edition.

The phrasing, articulation, dynamic indications, the styles of note attacks of certain notes, indication of specific fingerings, and breath marks indicated in the Bärenreiter edition are intended to create a solo saxophone part which represents Rascher’s approach to performing the work. Carina Rascher discusses these changes:

...the saxophone part as SMR [Sigurd M. Rascher] played it, with totally different phrasing, with the missing tones left off by Leduc [the octave passage in measures 176 - 178] and his, by Glazounov himself sanctioned version, of the cadenza [Rascher’s cadenza Figure 3.15] and no AD [referring to the optional substitute pitches for the altissimo notes] for G and C at the end.

Carina Rascher discusses the phrasing, articulation, and slur markings notated in the Bärenreiter edition: “The SMR [Sigurd M. Rascher] solo part is taken from the Urtext [sic]…The phrasing,
articulation, and slur markings were taken from his [Sigurd Rascher’s] performance solo part, and the recollections of his playing, from my memory.”

The variance between the Leduc and the Bärenreiter editions of the solo saxophone part can be clearly explained. The majority of the differences are a result of revisions made by Glazunov in the two years (1934 - 1936) between the composition of the work and its subsequent publication. Other differences are a result of the addition of Rascher’s own cadenza and Bärenreiter’s effort to create a solo saxophone part that reflects Rascher’s interpretation. These changes offer new performance options for saxophonists studying this essential part of the classical saxophone repertoire.

The Orchestra Score

The Leduc and Bärenreiter editions of the orchestra score are identical. However, as he did with the saxophone solo part, Glazunov made some revisions before publication. The changes occur in two small sections of the cello part. The first change, four measures after rehearsal number 22, is in measures 165 through the downbeat of measure 169 (Figure 4.2):


This passage from the cello part, found in the Leduc and the Bärenreiter editions, was indicated in the autographed score as a lead in to be played by the saxophone when the cadenza came to

---
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an end. Glazunov made Rascher aware of these changes on February 28th, 1935; stating: “...the four measures [in the saxophone solo part] after rehearsal number 22 are replaced by muted cellos...”\textsuperscript{51} The autographed score also contains a different cello part (Figure 4.3):

![Figure 4.3](image)

In the autographed score, the passage indicated in Figure 4.2 is crossed through in the saxophone part and written in the cello part over the passage presented in Figure 4.3.

The other change in the cello part begins two beats before rehearsal number 23 on beat three of measure 169 and continues through measure 178. According to the autographed score,\textsuperscript{52} the cellos rest during these measures. However, Glazunov added a pizzicato cello passage (Figure 4.4) before publication:

![Figure 4.4](image)

\textsuperscript{50}Glazunov, \textit{Concerto in E-Flat Major}, (Kassel, Germany: Bärenreiter, 2010), 39
\textsuperscript{51}Glazunov, \textit{Concerto in E-Flat Major}, (Kassel, Germany: Bärenreiter, 2010), XIV
\textsuperscript{52}Glazunov, \textit{Concerto in E-Flat Major}, (Kassel, Germany: Bärenreiter, 2010), 39
This is another revision Glazunov announced to Rascher in the letter of February 28th, 1935. Regarding these changes, Glazunov stated: “…three measures before rehearsal number 24 there are changes in the solo part [see Figure 3.16] and the cellos [Figure 4.4]…”

These are the only revisions made to the orchestra score. All of these changes were made prior to publication and the material presented in the Leduc and the Bärenreiter editions is representative of these revisions. The Bärenreiter edition of the saxophone solo part represents the autographed manuscript and Sigurd Rascher’s performances, while the Leduc edition represents Glazunov’s revisions. However, both editions of the orchestral score represent Glazunov’s revisions.

Other Resources Related to Glazunov’s Concerto

There are other pedagogical and performance resources related to Glazunov’s Concerto: a Music Minus One edition, a new cadenza, and an alternate ending to the new cadenza. The Music Minus One edition includes the solo part for Glazunov’s work (as it is presented in the Leduc edition) as well as the solo part for Earland von Koch’s Concerto for Saxophone and Orchestra in E-Flat Major. Also included are complete recordings of each work and play-along tracks (a performance with the saxophone track removed) which were recorded by Lawrence Gwozdz (a prominent saxophone performer and pedagogue and a student of Rascher) playing the saxophone solo with the Plovdiv Philharmonic Orchestra conducted by Nayden Todorov.

A fourth cadenza has been written by the contemporary French composer Christian Lauba. Lauba is known for writing non-traditional, contemporary saxophone literature which
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utilizes extended techniques: multiphonics, slap-tongue, tone-color trills, vibrato manipulation, flutter-tongue, key clicks, quarter tones, and altissimo; some of his works require the saxophonist to have mastered the technique of circular breathing. A notable example of this style is his Neuf études pour saxophone. However, Lauba has stepped out of the contemporary aesthetic for which he is well known and incorporated a more traditional approach in his cadenza for the Glazunov Concerto:

I composed the cadenza because Leduc thinks that the cadenza which is published is too short and of weak musical quality. Above all, it is not originally written by Glazounov but by Petiot. When I wrote my cadenza, my model was Glazounov's violin concerto, his symphonies, specially the 4th which is a masterpiece, but also the concertos by Tchaikovski the cadenzas of which are so well written. His violin and his piano concertos (also the 2nd which is less famous). I wanted to introduce some genuine virtuosity in this cadenza and also to make it much longer so that the equilibrium of the form is more balanced. It amplifies the concerto. As for the construction, I use most of the main themes as in a "classical" cadenza by Mozart or Beethoven. The style is of course post-romantic but in a more "classical" way; Glazounov is not Tchaikovski!

This cadenza was composed for saxophonist Richard Ducros, and according to Lauba: “will be the 13th Étude ‘de style’ published by Leduc.”

Concert saxophonist Douglas O’Connor has added to Lauba’s cadenza. He has composed an alternate ending (to the cadenza which begins on the penultimate staff line of Lauba’s cadenza. O’Connor has discussed the alternate ending: “I didn’t think the ending worked well for drawing the orchestra back in, so I made my own ending to Lauba’s Glazunov cadenza. . .I had Lauba’s permission!”
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Closing Remarks

Glazunov’s *Concerto for Alto Saxophone and String Orchestra* is one of the most important works in the saxophone repertoire; it is frequently performed and is a standard requirement in saxophone curriculae around the world. The material contained in this research will provide saxophonists with a single source which clearly addresses the following: the circumstances relating to the genesis of Glazunov’s work, a detailed comparative analysis of the published editions of the *Concerto* by Leduc and Bärenreiter, an explanation of the revisions made by Glazunov before the initial publication of the work, and a discussion of other sources related to the *Concerto*. Saxophonists will benefit from this research because it is currently the only single source which provides detailed information regarding these different aspects of this very important saxophone concerto.

The chapter containing the history of the *Concerto* provides an accurate account of the composition of Glazunov’s work. Furthermore, the discrepancies in the accounts which address for whom the *Concerto* was written and who gave the premiere performance are examined and clarified. Lastly, the involvement of André Petiot, whose name appears as co-composer in the Leduc edition, is also examined and resolved.

Comparative analysis of the Leduc edition and the new Bärenreiter edition shows two very different approaches to performing the *Concerto*. With this new edition of this standard work now available, saxophonists can and should begin to explore new possibilities for musical interpretation. The comparative analysis contained provides saxophonists the opportunity to carefully examine both editions and decide how they want to perform the piece, or specific sections of it, based upon which presentation of the *Concerto* makes the most aesthetic and
intellectual sense. As a result of this comparison, the author hopes new interpretations of this work will make their way into concert halls.

In addition to the comparative analysis of the published editions of the *Concerto*, the author discusses the edits made by Glazunov in the time between the composition of the work in 1934 and its publication by Leduc in 1936. This two-year span between composition and publication highlights the relationship between the published editions and the work’s autographed score. Although both published editions include the changes to the orchestra score, the Bärenreiter edition includes Rashcer’s interpretation, evidenced by the editorial markings. The Leduc edition includes Glazunov’s edits which took place during the two years between its composition and publication.

When discussing the Bärenreiter edition of the saxophone solo part, Carina Rascher states, “The SMR [Sigurd M. Rascher] solo part is taken from the Urtext.” Here, she refers to the autographed manuscript as the urtext for which Bärenreiter presents the solo part as Glazunov’s initially envisioned it. The Leduc edition however, does contain Glazunov’s later revisions; the phrasing, articulation, and placement of the slurs are very different than those indicated in the autographed manuscript. These differences in phrasing and articulation make up the vast majority of the differences between the published editions. A large number of the significant works in the saxophone repertoire are published by Leduc, and were influenced by Marcel Mule and his saxophone pedagogy defined at the Paris Conservatory. As a result of this Parisian influence, editing practices have become apparent and can be considered as a style associated with Leduc. Although is unclear as to exactly why these differences exist, it is possible that editors at Leduc applied their approach to notation to Glazunov’s work creating an edition from which saxophonists have now performed since 1936.
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The author does not consider the original score, the Bärenreiter edition, or the Leduc edition to be a definitive edition of this work for the following reasons: the original score and the Bärenreiter edition do not contain Glazunov’s later revisions and the Leduc edition contains numerous changes to phrasing, articulation, and slur placement that were possibly not made by Glazunov. A definitive edition of the work would have Glazunov’s melodic revisions and the articulations identified in the autographed manuscript.

The discussion of other sources related to the *Concerto* provides information regarding pedagogical and performance resources related to the work. The first source is a *Music Minus One*\(^6^1\) edition which includes the saxophone solo part as well as a recording of the concerto and a play along track for study and practice. The second source is a cadenza written by Christian Lauba. This cadenza, which is a separate publication by Leduc, is longer and more virtuosic than those included in the Leduc and Bärenreiter editions. This is significant because saxophonists now have four cadenzas to consider and the author believes that saxophonists will decide based upon their own personal taste. However, some players, especially less experienced students, will not choose Lauba’s cadenza because it is intended to be extremely virtuosic and as a result is very difficult; the author believes that less experienced students who are learning the *Concerto* should first learn Glazunov’s original cadenza, then Rascher’s, and lastly Lauba’s. Lauba’s cadenza can be overwhelming for some less experienced players; the author feels it should not be attempted until the player has attained the facility to effectively perform it. Lauba’s saxophone works, because they push the limits of the performers and the instrument, are very difficult and only the most advanced players perform them; as a result many players do not play them at all. However, most every saxophonist will study Glazunov’s *Concerto* and might

eventually learn all of the cadenzas. By including Lauba’s cadenza in the scope of study of Glazunov’s work, the next generation of saxophonists will be challenged to be more technically advanced.

With the presence of Lauba’s alternate cadenza, the possibility of other composers and saxophonists writing their own cadenzas is not unlikely. Indeed, this process has been documented in this paper: Rascher wrote his own cadenza because he was not satisfied with Glazunov’s and Douglas O’Connor has composed an alternate ending to Lauba’s cadenza because he did not feel Lauba’s most effectively drew in the orchestra. Since the *Concerto* is a standard work which is performed frequently, the composition of another alternate cadenza is a realistic possibility.

There is no doubt that Glazunov’s *Concerto* will continue to be a very important standard in the classical saxophone repertoire; it is a requirement for every serious saxophonist. Since its composition, it has been one of the most frequently performed saxophone pieces. With the new performance possibilities that have recently become available, the author expects that performances of the work will increase as saxophonists begin to look again at the *Concerto* and program it in order to incorporate these new resources. In addition, there will be more variance in the many performances of the work as saxophonists reconsider their approaches to it and subsequently teach the piece to their students.

For the past seventy-five years, the Leduc edition of Glazunov’s *Concerto* has been the sole version that saxophonists have used. However, with the new scholarly edition by Bärenreiter, the French edition by Leduc, and the Christian Lauba alternate cadenza, new possibilities for performance and interpretation can now be readily explored. These resources aid saxophonists in obtaining a firm understanding of the work and its development. In addition
to performance practice, Bärenreiter’s edition provides a clear account of the historical background relating to Glazunov’s work. It is the hope of the author that this research, which addresses many important aspects of the *Concerto*, will assist in reinvigorating this well-established work by providing a single, comprehensive source.
Appendix

Variance in Slur Placement in Measures 179 through the Downbeat of measure 189

Measure 180 the last eighth note of beat three - quarter note on beat one of measure 181
Leduc Edition:

[Music notation image]

Bärenreiter Edition:
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Measure 181 beat four - quarter note on beat one of measure 182
Leduc Edition:

[Music notation image]

Bärenreiter Edition:
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Measure 182 last eighth note of beat four - measure 183 the second eighth note
Leduc Edition:

![MUSIC DIAGRAM]

Bärenreiter Edition:
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Measure 183 the last eighth note - measure 184 the second eighth note
Leduc Edition:
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Bärenreiter Edition:
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Measure 184 beats two and three
Leduc Edition:

Bärenreiter Edition:

Measure 186 beat four - measure 187 beat one
Leduc Edition:

Bärenreiter Edition:
Measure 188 – the downbeat of measure 189

Leduc Edition:

Bärenreiter Edition:
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