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INTRODUCTION

The 1950s were a decade of great change for the American wind band. When Frederick Fennell created the Eastman Wind Ensemble in the fall of 1952, he changed the course of the wind band movement by refusing to imitate the symphony orchestra in both size and repertoire any longer. Using the orchestral wind section as a guide, Fennell utilized only one player per part, with the exception of a fortified soprano clarinet section, which yielded an ensemble size significantly smaller than the wind ensemble’s predecessors. This diminished instrumentation allowed conductors the flexibility to break away from the tradition of programming orchestral transcriptions and begin to explore new, original band music as well as revisiting some older original works. Bands were now free to play more artistically and less functionally. While many directors were slow to convert and even resisted this new concept of a band, others embraced the change, and began to utilize the new instrumentation and commissioned new original works for band by major contemporary composers, thus changing the path of the American wind band.

AMERICAN BANDS BEFORE 1950

Prior to the 1950s, the concept of the American “symphony band” was largely a reflection of the desire to imitate the symphony orchestra, both in the size and sound of the ensemble. In his book *The Winds of Change*, Frank Battisti conducted a survey of the number of personnel for three of the more famous bands of the 1940s: the Goldman Band, Edwin Franko Goldman, conductor; the United States Air Force Band, George S. Howard, commander and conductor; and the University of Michigan Concert Band, William D. Revelli, conductor (Appendix A).
Aside from the Goldman Band, a professional ensemble that was comprised of sixty musicians, the other two bands numbered between eighty-one to one hundred musicians. The sheer size of these bands greatly limited the repertoire that could be selected, ruling out many selections of great merit that featured limited instrumentation.\(^1\) Observing programs performed by the three bands mentioned previously, it is clear that much of the repertoire performed was borrowed directly from the orchestral tradition (Appendix B).

In addition to the large number of transcriptions, there were also numerous marches and popular selections as well. Due to the shortness of many of these works, and the lack of high-quality original repertoire of length, band concerts of the mid-1940s averaged more than eleven works per concert.\(^2\) A survey of over six hundred concert selections compiled by Bryce Jordan for CBDNA in 1950 summarizes the following breakdown of the surveyed repertoire: 61% quickstep marches, 16% serious music (including any work designated as an overture, suite, or tone poem), 6% patriotic music, 5% concert marches, 4% folk music, 3% novelties, and 5% waltzes.\(^3\)

Two great conductors of the day, Frederick Fennell and Richard Franko Goldman, expressed their concerns over this lack of high-quality repertoire from major composers. Fennell states, “The reaction of the significant composer to the development of the concert band in America has been cautious indeed. Those who have not ignored it altogether have been few in number, and the music which the do contribute is not always their best,”\(^4\) while Richard Frank Goldman believes, “that the future importance of bands as concert organizations depends of the cultivation of special repertory, embracing the

\(^2\) Ibid., 46.
\(^3\) Ibid., 51-52.
few traditional forms, such as the march, and the new special literature which alone can give musical meaning to band programs.\textsuperscript{5}

**BAND ADVOCACY ORGANIZATIONS**

The 1940s brought about the formation of two organizations whose primary purpose would be the advancement of American bands: the College Band Directors National Association and the Mid-West National Band Clinic (now known as the Mid-West International Band and Orchestra Clinic). William D. Revelli, director of bands at the University of Michigan, founded the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA) in 1941. Revelli felt strongly about the need for an organization to address the concerns of the college band director.\textsuperscript{6} Primary among those concerns was the need for new original repertoire, which Revelli addressed at the 1946 CBDNA convention, when he urged “band leaders in colleges and universities to devise ways and means of motivating our better composers to give us masterpieces of original music.”\textsuperscript{7}

In 1946, Neil Kjos, Sr., Howard Lyons, and H. E. Nutt founded and held the first Mid-West National Band Clinic in Chicago, Illinois. Their vision was for the clinic to be a place for music educators to gather for counsel, support, and inspiration, and a way to strengthen the relationship between the music industry and bands.\textsuperscript{8} The early clinics were focused on the performance of newly published works by visiting school bands, and eventually expanded into a program of performances, clinics, and exhibitions.\textsuperscript{9}

\textsuperscript{7} David Whitwell and Acton Ostling, Jr., *The College and University Band* (Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference, 1977), 7.
\textsuperscript{9} Frank L. Battisti, *The Winds of Change*, 47.
The advocacy of the band as a serious performance medium by organizations such as CBDNA and individuals such as Revelli and Goldman inspired some prominent composers who had not been previously associated with bands to compose for winds in the 1940s. Morton Gould (*Ballad for Band*), H. Owen Reed (*La Fiesta Mexicana*), Paul Hindemith (*Septett für Blasinstrumente*), Leonard Bernstein (*Prelude, Fugue, and Riffs*), Ingolf Dahl (*Concerto for Alto Saxophone and Wind Orchestra*), Darius Milhaud (*Suite Francaise*), and Gunther Schuller (*Symphony for Brass and Percussion*) all composed music for ensembles composed of winds in during the latter part of the decade.\(^{10}\)

On January 3, 1948, the Goldman Band, in conjunction with The League of Composers, performed a concert in honor of Edwin Franko Goldman’s seventieth birthday. The works on the program represented a style of repertoire for wind band that Goldman had spent thirty years of his life advocating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toccata Marziale</td>
<td>Ralph Vaughan Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite Francaise</td>
<td>Darius Milhaud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme and Variations for Band</td>
<td>Arnold Schoenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Power of Rome and the Christian Heart</td>
<td>Percy Grainger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoonthree</td>
<td>Henry Cowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canto Yoruba</td>
<td>Pedro Sanjuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Pieces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Le Marche sur la Bastille</td>
<td>Arthur Honegger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Prelude</td>
<td>Albert Roussel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Le Palais Royal</td>
<td>Georges Auric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 19 for Band</td>
<td>Nicholas Miaskovsky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grainger had been commissioned two years earlier to compose *The Power of Rome and the Christian Heart*. That, in combination with Schoenberg’s *Theme and Variations*,

\(^{10}\) Ibid., 50-51.
created a concert that was both cerebral and reflective. This concert was a significant step marking a new era of band music.¹¹

THE FOUNDING OF THE EASTMAN WIND ENSEMBLE

The same year as the previously mentioned concert by the Goldman Band, Frederick Fennell created the Instrumental Ensemble Department at the Eastman School of Music in Rochester, New York. Says Fennell, “Before anybody stopped to notice, I had created a *Department* simply by creating a form. This was 1948, the blind alley of the Symphony Band was really starting to bother me, with the old hype running thin as the repertory.”¹² As World War II ended, musicians returned to Eastman from military bands. The female instrumentalists who had filled the orchestral spots during the war were allowed to stay in the ensembles to perform with the men. In the fall of 1951 Fennell organized rehearsals of the orchestral wind players with the purpose playing “time-honored wind music.” These rehearsals led to the following concert at the Eastman School of Music on February 5, 1951¹³:

- *Ricercare for Wind Instruments* Willaert
- *Canzon XVI Bergamesca for 5 Instruments* Scheidt
- *Motet: Tui Sunt Coeli for Brass Choir* Di Lasso
- *Sonata pian e Forte* Gabrieli
- *Canzon Noni Toni a 12* Gabrieli
- *Suite No. 2 for Brass Instruments* Pezel
- *Three Equali for Four Trombones* Beethoven
- *Serenade No. 10 in B-flat major* Mozart
- *Serenade in E-Flat Major, Op. 7* Strauss
- *“Angels” from *Men and Angels* Ruggles
- *Symphonies of Wind Instruments* Stravinsky

After the concert, Fennell wrote to Grainger, “The concert is one of the best I have had among all that I both heard and conducted here, and as an event of practical music value and a glimpse into the future, it was without parallel.”

In November of 1951 Fennell contracted hepatitis, confining him to the hospital for nearly the entire winter. While in the hospital, he spent his time reexamining the role of the wind band. Using the instrumentation he used during the February concert as a model, Fennell’s idea on instrumentation was to, “cut it to the bone, no doubling, begin with a concept that grew from the reed, brass, percussion, keyboard resource required for The Ring [Wagner’s Ring of the Nibelung] and The Rite [Stravinsky’s Rite of Spring]. Add a section of saxophones, keep all doors open and eyes and ears pointed straight ahead.” A comparison of the wind section Wagner utilizes in his Ring of Nibelung and the first Eastman Wind Ensemble can be found in Appendix C.

The instrumentation of the ensemble was not as important to Fennell as the reason he selected it. His goal was to create a resource of musicians available to composers who wished to write music. He believed that, “no composer should be told for what instruments he must write, or for how many he must write, or to what extent it is necessary that he include interesting parts for all of them in his score.” With only one player per part, Fennell also desired that each musician would be the soloist that their teacher hoped they would be. The decision on what instruments to use and how many to

---

16 Frederick Fennell, The Wind Ensemble, 22.
17 Frederick Fennell, Time In the Winds, 52.
place on each part was left to the composer.\textsuperscript{18} Donald Hunsberger, conductor of the Eastman Wind Ensemble from 1965-2002, speaks about Fennell’s concept of instrumentation for the composer:

Fennell began a process that was in opposition to the standardized practices at the time by placing a primary emphasis on the development and support of composers on behalf of the wind band. Since the early days of the century, with the highly successful Sousa Band as a model, the quality and quantity of original works, other than occasional pieces, suites, solos, and marches, was sparse, compared to the vast amount of music for band transcribed from orchestral, operatic, and keyboard resources.\textsuperscript{19}

On September 20, 1952, having recovered from hepatitis, Fennell conducted the first rehearsal of the newly formed Eastman Wind Ensemble. Naming the new group “wind ensemble” was a choice that composer W. Francis McBeth found to be very important:

When Frederick Fennell created the wind ensemble and chose the name, he performed one of the ingenious acts of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Fennell saw into the future. He saw a coming repertory for winds. He was well aware that the name band was a four-letter word to many musicians. He wanted to present serious wind literature to audiences, but realized that the term wind band was an albatross around the neck of many people because of the past.\textsuperscript{20}

Richard Franko Goldman believes that the wind ensemble, “becomes, in effect, the realization of what a concert band aims for in its most musically serious moments, and its appeal should be very great for those who feel that the wind band can exist on a somewhat more sophisticated level than is commonly attained.”\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{18} Frank L. Battisti, \textit{The Winds of Change}, 54.
\textsuperscript{21} Richard Franko Goldman, \textit{The Wind Band: Its Literature and Technique} (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1961), 144.
The first performance of the Eastman Wind Ensemble took place on February 8, 1953 at Eastman’s Kilbourn Hall. The repertoire performed that evening was:

- Serenade No. 10 in B-flat, K. 370a by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart
- Nonet for Brass by Wallingford Reigger
- Symphony in B-flat by Paul Hindemith

Fennell’s programming for the new ensemble was innovative, as it divided the program into music for woodwinds, music for brass, and music for the full ensemble.

**OPPOSITION AND ALTERNATIVE IDEAS**

Fennell’s ideas on instrumentation stood in stark contrast to those of Revelli and the CDBNA, and even contradicted Fennell’s original instrumentation for the Eastman Symphony Band, which was modeled after A. A. Harding’s Symphony Band at the University of Illinois. The CBDNA had tried on numerous occasions to create an “ideal” standardized instrumentation, which would serve as a guideline for composers when writing new works for bands. While Fennell was attempting to diminish the size of his ensemble, other bandleaders were attempting to increase the size of their own groups. While many looked on Fennell’s concepts of instrumentation with curiosity, he also drew the scorn of many of his colleagues as well. CBDNA’s proposed “ideal” instrumentation is as follows:

- 1 piccolo
- 6 flutes
- 2 oboes
- 1 English horn
- 2 bassoons
- 1 E-flat clarinet
- 18 B-flat clarinets
two or three parts
first and second parts
first and second parts
first and second parts
first and second parts

---

24 Ibid., 97-98.
6 alto clarinets
3 bass clarinets
2 contrabass clarinets
1 soprano saxophone
1 alto saxophone
1 tenor saxophone
1 baritone saxophone
1 bass saxophone
1 E-flat cornet
3 B-flat cornets two parts, three voices
3 B-flat trumpets two parts, three voices
4 horns
3 trombones
1 bass trombone
3 euphonium
3 tubas
5 percussion

Despite efforts to convince publishers to utilize this instrumentation, it was never adopted as anything more than a compositional guideline. Further attempts were made to revise the list and revive the concept, but it was never well-received.\textsuperscript{26}

Fennell’s style of programming was also quite different from the standard contemporary programming of the time. The University of Michigan Symphony Band, then the model for contemporary band concert programming, played the following concert on February 26, 1952:\textsuperscript{27}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
Homage March & Wagner \\
Symphonic Poem-\textit{The Universal Judgement} & DeNardis \\
“Meditation” from \textit{Thais} & Massanet \\
Concert March-\textit{A Step Ahead} & Alford \\
Aria from \textit{Bachianas Brasilieras No. 2} & Villa Lobos \\
“Carnival” from \textit{La Fiesta Mexican} & Reed \\
Toccata and Fugue in D Minor & Bach \\
Introduction and Samba & Whitney \\
Overture to the Opera \textit{Colas Breugnon} & Kabalevsky \\
Trumpet and Drum & Land
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{26} Frank L. Battisti, \textit{The Winds of Change}, 76.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 96-97.
“Rag” from *Suite of Old American Dances* Bennett
Michigan Rhapsody arr. Werle

During this period, Revelli was still balancing his program with half original works for band and half transcriptions, and also featured soloists in the style of the golden age of virtuosi.\(^{28}\) Studying the repertoire of Mark Hindsley and the University of Illinois bands reveals an even more conservative approach to programming than Revelli’s; one concert program from March 1951 contained only two original works for band (one of those a Sousa march).\(^{29}\)

**CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE EASTMAN WIND ENSEMBLE**

One of the great contributions that Fennell and the Eastman Wind Ensemble made to the music world and the band medium is the twenty-four recordings on the Mercury record label, which represent the high-quality repertoire available to wind bands at the time.\(^{30}\) The first record was released in 1953 and was titled “American Concert Band Masterpieces.” The repertoire included Vincent Persichetti’s *Divertimento for Band*, Morton Gould’s *Ballad for Band*, William Schuman’s *George Washington Bridge*, Robert Russell Bennett’s *Suite of Old American Dances*, Walter Piston’s *Tunbridge Fair*, and Samuel Barber’s *Commando March*. Fennell suggested these works from a list he kept in his wallet, just in case the opportunity to record ever presented itself.\(^{31}\) Following albums find Fennell recording the great British band works including both of the suites for band by Gustav Holst, Ralph Vaughan Williams’ *Folk Song Suite*, and other masterworks such as Grainger’s *Lincolnshire Posy*, Hindemith’s *Symphony in B-flat*, and

\(^{28}\) Ibid., 97.
\(^{29}\) Ibid.
Arnold Schoenberg’s *Theme and Variations for Band*. These recordings quickly influenced band directors throughout the United States, and the music recorded by the Eastman Wind Ensemble began to appear on numerous concert programs throughout the country.\(^{32}\)

Another benefit of the early Eastman Wind Ensemble recordings was the impact it had on erasing the line between music for “band” and music for “wind ensemble.” The introduction of the wind ensemble caused some concern and raised confusion in the band society. Musicians were confused as to what specifically constituted a band compared to what constituted a wind ensemble. The point they failed to grasp was that Fennell was not concerned about the name or size of the ensemble, but the flexibility the ensemble afforded a conductor, who could now select a more broad selection of quality literature for bands without the limitations of a specific number of personnel. Says Fennell, “I sincerely wish that my colleagues would give the wind ensemble a whirl. I know it will be a success here and it could be so in any city in American. I must also be frank to say that I am banking quite heavily on the simple terminology. The word band is death to too many people. So they are blind and stupid and narrow and prejudiced.”\(^{33}\) The technology of the recordings allowed conductors all over the world to experience the sounds of Fennell’s new concept of the wind ensemble.\(^{34}\)

Perhaps the greatest contribution that Fennell and the Eastman Wind Ensemble made to the wind band world was in their procurement of new repertoire. In the summer of 1952, Fennell wrote letters to nearly four hundred composers describing his concept of

\(^{32}\) Ibid.


the wind ensemble and asked them to consider composing works for the new group.

Fennell says:

> My letter stated in part that it was our hope that composers would look upon this instrumental establishment as the basic instrumentation from which they could deviate should a particular score require more or less instruments than were listed. It was further stated that they might consider this in the same manner as one does the tutti orchestra, the full organ, or the complete seven-plus octave range of the piano keyboard – a sonority to be utilized only when desired. My correspondents were informed that the Eastman School would have one annual symposium for the reading of all new music written for the Wind Ensemble, and that there would be no “commissions” save those of a performance that was prepared with skill and devotion.  

Among the first composers to reply to Fennell’s requests for new repertoire were Grainger, Persichetti, and Vaughan Williams. Oddly, Grainger’s reply only listed four of his wind works, *Lincolnshire Posy* not being among the list, though he states, “I have always loved the band and wind ensemble... and have composed steadily for the band since 1905.”

Vaughan Williams responded by telling Fennell that he would keep the wind band in mind, should he ever write music for that combination of players. Fennell was very encouraged by the response he received from composers. He wrote to Grainger, “The daily mail brings response that is amazing. Much of it simply confirms the existence of already known material, but does so in the composer’s hand.”

**NEW REPERTOIRE**

The latter half of the 1950s saw a great rise in the number of compositions from serious composers for winds, both for full wind band and smaller groups varying in size and instrumentation. In addition to Fennell’s call for serious repertoire, Frank Battisti’s

---

35 Frederick Fennell, *The Wind Ensemble*, 16-17.
commissions of twenty-two new works for wind band for his Ithica High School bands, the United States Army Band’s commissioning project in honor of their sesquicentennial anniversary, the establishment of an annual composition contest by the American Bandmasters Association and the Ostwald Band Uniform Company, and the National Music Council beginning the Young Composers Project all had a great impact on composers utilizing their time and talents to write works for wind bands. Some of the more influential works for full ensemble were Howard Hanson’s *Chorale and Alleluia*, Clifton William’s *Fanfare and Allegro* and *Symphonic Suite*, Vittorio Giannini’s *Symphony No. 3*, Vincent Perichetti’s *Symphony No. 6*, and Joseph Wilcox Jenkins’ *American Overture for Band*, while Edgar Varèse’s *Déserts*, Oliver Messiaen’s *Oiseaux Exotiques*, Robert Kurka’s *Good Soldier Schweik Suite*, and Walter Hartley’s *Concerto for 23 Winds* served as important works for winds in a smaller setting.

In 1957 William Tarwater conducted a survey of the CBDNA membership inquiring their opinion of the ten greatest original works for band. The top ten were identified as:

1. Holst- *First Suite in E-flat*
2. Hanson- *Chorale and Alleluia*
3. Holst- *Second Suite in F*
4. Jacob- *Music for a Festival*
5. Persichetti- *Divertimento for Band*
6. H. Owen Reed- *La Fiesta Mexicana*
7. Milhaud- *Suite Française*
8. Vaughan Williams- *Folk Song Suite*
9. Hindemith- *Symphony in B-flat*
10. Jacob- *An Original Suite*

41 Ibid., 62-63.
It is noteworthy that four of these works were composed between 1909 and 1928, while the remaining six were written between 1949 and 1954 (which falls within eight years of the survey). Inexplicably, many landmark works composed between 1929 and 1948 were left off this list, such as Grainger’s *Lincolnshire Posy*, Holst’s *Hammersmith*, Schoenberg’s *Theme and Variations*, and Milhaud’s *Suite Française*. Despite the growth of original compositions for band, in an August 1958 survey conducted by *The Instrumentalist* magazine, when asked to select the “finest selections available for performance by band”, thirty-one band directors choose over one hundred pieces, over half of which are orchestral transcriptions (and very few were marches). Although it should be noted that six of the top ten works were original compositions for band.\(^{(42)}\)

**CONCLUSION**

Though the American wind band had acquired a small library of original works by notable composers prior to the 1950s, the sheer size of the ensemble, as it emulated the symphony orchestra, limited the repertoire to transcriptions, marches, and miscellaneous popular fare. Though the late 1940s saw a small rise in the development of original repertoire, mostly due to the efforts of Edwin Franko Goldman and the founding of band advocacy organizations, it was not until Frederick Fennell’s concepts of instrumentation and programming, which he applied to the Eastman Wind Ensemble, helped the band evolve into its own singular entity, distancing itself from the imitation of the orchestra in both size and repertoire. Though many conductors were reluctant and resistant to abandon tradition and attempt the new concepts Fennell lauded, others

\(^{(42)}\) Ibid., 62-63.
embraced them head-on. The result was a brand new world for the American wind band, with the cultivation of a great number of new and original works, and the freedom to program artistic works from the past without the chains of a static instrumentation.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


**The Goldman Band**
- 1 piccolo
- 3 flutes
- 2 oboes (one doubling English horn)
- 1 E-flat clarinet
- 19 B-flat clarinets
- 1 bass clarinet
- 2 bassoons
- 3 saxophones (alto/tenor/baritone)
- 4 cornets
- 3 trumpets
- 4 F horns
- 6 trombones
- 2 euphoniums
- 4 tubas
- 1 string bass
- 1 harp
- 3 percussion

**University of Michigan Band**
- 8 to 10 flutes
- 2 to 4 oboes (English horn)
- 24 to 28 B-flat clarinets
- 3 alto clarinets
- 3 bass clarinets
- 3 to 4 bassoons
- 5 to 6 saxophones
- 6 to 8 cornets
- 2 trumpets
- 6 to 8 F horns
- 4 baritones/euphoniums
- 6 trombones
- 6 tubas
- 2 string basses
- 1 to 2 harps
- 4 to 6 percussion
- E-flat clarinet/flugelhorns as needed

**United States Air Force Band**
- 6 flutes (all doubling picolo)
- 3 oboes (one doubling English horn)
- 1 E-flat clarinet
- 14 B-flat clarinets
- 1 alto clarinet
- 1 bass clarinet
- 4 bassoons
- 5 saxophones (2 alto, 2 tenor, baritone)
- 11 cornets/trumpets
- 8 F horns
- 6 trombones
- 3 baritones
- 4 tubas
- 4 celli
- 4 string basses
- 6 percussion
APPENDIX B- Representative concert programs from the Goldman, United States Air Force, and University of Michigan bands, circa 1945.

**Goldman Band, Edwin Franko Goldman, conductor**
- Grand March, “America”
- Suite from “Water Music”
- An Outdoor Overture
- First Suite for Band, in E-flat
- Finale, “The New World Symphony”
- Festal March
- Fantasie for Cornet Solo
- Russian Dance from “Petrouchka”
- “Lads of Wamphray”
- March, “Anniversary”
- Waltz, “Liebeslieder”

Edward Franko Goldman
George Frideric Handel
Aaron Copland
Gustav Holst
Anton Dvořák
Philip James
Del Staigers
Igor Stravinsky
Percy Grainger
Edwin Franko Goldman
Johann Strauss

**United States Air Force Band, Captain George S. Howard, conductor**
- Overture, “II Guarany”
- Pavane
- Trombone Solo
- Dance of the Amazons
- Horn and Flute Duet: Serenade
- Finale from Symphony No. 4
- Polka from “Golden Age”
- Russian Sailors Dance
- Saxophone Solo
- Waltz, “Voices of Spring”
- Vocal Solo, “Danny Deever”
- Rhapsody in Blue

Antonio Carlos Gomez
Morton Gould
Arthur Pryor
Anatoli Liadov
Anton Titl
Piotr Tschaikowsky
Dmitri Shostakovich
Reinhold Glière
Eric Coates
Johann Strauss
Walter Damrosch
George Gershwin

**University of Michigan Concert Band, Dr. William D. Revelli, conductor**
- Overture, “Il Matrimonio Segreto”
- Prelude to Act I, “Lohengrin”
- Bravada, Paso Doble
- Trombone Solo
- Frühlingsstimmen Waltzes
- Rhythms of Rio
- Capriccio Italien
- Three Chorales
- March, “Varsity”
- Mannin Veen
- The Yellow and Blue

Domenico Cimarosa
Richard Wagner
Frederick Curzon
Arthur Pryor
Johann Strauss
David Bennett
Piotr Tschaikowsky
J. S. Bach
Earl Vincent Moore
Haydn Wood
University Song
**APPENDIX C** - Comparison of instrumentation used by Wagner in the *Ring of Nibelung* and the first Eastman Wind Ensemble.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Wagner</th>
<th>Eastman Wind Ensemble</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flutes</td>
<td>3 flutes/1 piccolo</td>
<td>2 flutes (one doubling piccolo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboes</td>
<td>3 oboes/1 English horn</td>
<td>2 oboes (one doubling English horn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassoons</td>
<td>3 bassoons/1 contrabassoon</td>
<td>2 bassoons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinets</td>
<td>3 clarinets (one doubles E-flat)</td>
<td>9 clarinets (one doubles E-flat/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass clarinet</td>
<td>1 bass clarinet</td>
<td>1 bass clarinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxophones</td>
<td>0 saxophones</td>
<td>4 saxophones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpets</td>
<td>3 trumpets</td>
<td>5 trumpets (3 cornets/2 trumpets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F horns (doubled)</td>
<td>8 F horns (doubled)</td>
<td>4 F horns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trombones</td>
<td>5 trombones</td>
<td>3 trombones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphoniums</td>
<td>0 euphoniums</td>
<td>2 euphoniums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuba</td>
<td>1 tuba</td>
<td>2 tubas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each ensemble utilizes percussion, harp, and piano as needed.