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MUSIC TRANSCRIPTIONS FOR EUPHONIUM

Music transcriptions are an important part of the euphonium repertoire. The euphonium is a relatively young instrument when compared to others in the band and orchestra family, with its first concerto being composed in 1972. While there are numerous pieces of music that have been written for euphonium, the euphonium also has music transcribed from other instruments and different composers who would not have been able to write for the instrument during their time. One example of this would be the works of Robert Schumann.

The purpose of this paper is to look at two pieces of literature composed by Robert Schumann that have been transcribed for euphonium. There are many challenges and things to consider when preparing to perform these pieces. These works, originally written for different instruments, can be difficult to play on the euphonium due to the differences in the transcription. Reasons for this include the style of the instrument they were composed for and how those instruments differ from the style of the euphonium, as well as different techniques that those instruments use. The works that will be looked at are Fantasy Pieces Op. 73 for Piano and Clarinet, which can also be called Fantasiestücke, and Five Pieces in Folk Style, which was originally written for cello and piano.

These works will be analyzed and comparisons will be made between how they were originally performed and how a euphonium player may perform them. To do this, the author will look at different copies of the music, from originals to the transcriptions for euphonium, as well as listen to multiple recordings by professionals on the original instruments to see how they compare to recordings done by euphonium artists. Finally, the author will look at specific sections that could give someone trouble when performing and offer advice to avoid that problem. Specific questions that will be asked are:
1. What was the original meaning of the piece?

2. What techniques would be used by the original instrument that cannot be performed by euphonium?

3. What are some things that the euphonium soloist needs to do differently and where are those located in the score?

4. How should a euphonium player prepare these pieces?

To study these pieces, I will look at the overall piece for the first question. For the second and third question, I will take a look at different techniques and markings that are in the score, and then discuss the differences between the original and the transcription. Finally, I will discuss the steps I took to learn the *Five Pieces in Folk Style* and prepare it for a performance, as well as look at ways that would be good for preparing *Fantasiestücke*.

**BACKGROUND**

Both *Five Pieces in Folk Style* and *Fantasiestücke* were written in 1849 during Schumann’s time in Dresden. This was his most prolific period of composing as he wrote close to forty works, and more than quadrupled his income (Daverio, Sams 2014). He not only wrote *Five Pieces in Folk Style*, but also *Fantasiestücke* for clarinet, the settings to three scenes of Goethe’s *Faust*, and *Three Romances* for oboe and piano (Black, 2010). While extremely productive, this year was also very difficult and disruptive. Beginning in May there was a political revolt in Dresden. Schumann, who had liberal political ties, was forced to leave the area overnight with his wife, leaving their children behind. His wife was later able to retrieve them, but the period was stressful (Daverio, and Sams 2014). While both of these works were written before the actual war took place, it is still important to note the effect that year had on Schumann.
Five Pieces in Folk Style has some interesting context. In an article by Leo Black, the writer tries to examine what folk style Schumann is trying to display. Schumann’s works during the year covered a variety of styles and instruments. However, the title, *Five Pieces in Folk Style*, is a unique title and there is a mystery as to which country the folk style belongs. Translated as “the tone of the people,” Black desires to figure out what the title exactly means and whom Schumann refers to in his phrase, “the people.”

While the name of the work is a little confusing, the work is not technically challenging. *Five Pieces in Folk Style* does not contain a difficult key signature. The original work starts and ends in A minor, which was a key that Schumann favored during the year (Black, 2008). The dances occur in movements I, III, and V, and all are in A minor. The piano part for this work has interesting and tricky rhythms throughout and adds a nice compliment to the soloist. It could be that the piano was being used to imitate a different instrument, such as the accordion or the hurdy-gurdy. While the key was not adventurous, the phrase lengths that were used were much more interesting. For instance, as can be seen in Figure 1, in the first movement, there are four 2/4 measures that make up a phrase, but the cello part plays notes in groups of three, three, and two against the piano who plays four groups of two notes. Black notes that German dances are normally in 4/4, so these dances were not native to the country in which they were written. It is possible that this dance was written to resemble a ‘cuckoo polka,’ which came from Eastern Hungary, but the style does not remain the same throughout (Black, 2008).
The piece has many different rhythms, and in some movements there is a very complex setting between the piano and cello while in others it is simpler but effective. The third movement’s accompaniment could possibly be meant to resemble a choral response to the instrument. The piano often responds to the cello’s rhythm with staccato quarter notes, which lead the cello into the next note. This could be meant to play the part of a dancer lifting up someone in a dance. Throughout the movement, the cello and piano work together. In mm. 46 the main theme returns and the piano plays the same line as the cello, performing in a “canon” style, but a beat behind. Traditionally, Black notes, the canon style would not be composed this way (Black, 2008).

The fourth movement has a tempo marking that is translated “not too fast.” The movement is in D, which is the subdominant of the key of the first movement. Black states that this key is normally used for more exciting or powerful pieces, such as how Bach used trumpets to imitate the Christian soul showing joy. However, this movement is not joyful, and instead
could be thought to resemble a steamboat that was in Dresden called the “Weisse Flotte,” which was the first steamboat of its kind in Europe. Schumann is possibly imitating this with the opening line acting as the engine propelling the ship.

The fifth movement continues the excitement of the fourth movement. There is a combination of three bars plus four bars as far as measure groupings. The tempo markings originally written by Schumann were removed in a later edition. However, these markings are still common to many performers and are used in the euphonium transcription. Something to observe is that, when listening to artists perform the piece, the tempo markings are not always in place. This will be looked at in more detail later on in the performance section (Black, 2008).

Through studying the work’s context, Black is unable to determine a specific people that the piece is representing. The word “Volkston,” which is found in the original title of the piece, is a mystery to him, and according to Black, it is not in the German dictionary. There are a number of possibilities for its meaning. It is possible that it could be political, i.e., the creation of a united Germany, though Black states that Schumann’s diaries do not show much political involvement. Black concludes that the tone could also be related to the concept of family. It relates to the fact that the family lives and acts in society and ultimately dances (Black, 2008). However, while Black thinks it is about family and society, after studying Fantasiestücke I wonder if there were any specific characters in mind.

*Fantasiestücke* was originally written for clarinet and has three movements with titles, which translated to English, read “Tender and with expression,” “Lively, Light,” and “Quick and with fire.” While originally for clarinet, the work has been transcribed for many instruments. The transcription that I used for euphonium is actually a transcription for cello, which was published in 1887, nearly forty years after it was originally composed. However, this version has
a copyright date of 2006, and may exhibit differences from the original. Also known as *Fantasy Pieces Op. 73*, the work was originally written in February of 1849.

There is a slight mystery to this title as well. Before the piece was published, it was originally titled *Soiréestücke*. *Soirée* means an evening party or gathering, and *stücke* means pieces or parts. The change in title could be referencing the change in how one might originally hear this in a social gathering, which is probably how it was originally heard, enforcing the imagination and fantasies of the mind that the piece may evoke (Franke, 2007). According to an article by Chernaik, the work was based on the writings of E.T.A. Hoffman. Schumann often used characters and codes in his music, and the two characters that Chernaik believes to be found in this work are Eusebius and Florestan (Chernaik, 2011).

In an article by Eric Sams, the author discusses Schumann’s affinity with using names and characters in his music, and searches out who Eusebious and Florestan were. Sams argues that the characters in this piece are actually names for Schumann and his wife Clara. He had other names for Clara and often referred to her as Ambrosia and Beda. He also used the name Cilia, from St. Cecilia. He decided that he could create his own “communion of the saints” by using two names. In the Carnival calendar that Schumann viewed, St. Cilia and St. Eusebius were honored a day apart, so it made sense to Schumann to replace Clara with Eusebius. Sams does not have an answer for why one character is shy and the other outgoing, but he believes that it is likely to be found in Schumann’s love for codes, leitmotifs, the marriage to Clara, and other interests he had to be part of the puzzle. Sams also notes that in the calendar of the saints, the day that is in between Clara and Eusebius was, in the year 1837, August 13th, which is when he and Clara reunited after getting separated (Sams, 2007).
There are differing opinions as to why these characters are named and their origins. In an article by Judith Chernaik, the author goes into more details about the Florestan and Eusebius. According to Schumann himself, these characters were formed in his head as “more than a secret society,” because it belonged only to him. Eusebius and Florestan were two characters that Schumann often used in his music. Named after saints in the works Carnaval, they are also openly portrayed in Schumann’s work Davidsbündlertänze (Chernaik, 2011).

In Carnaval, the characters are revealed and have a specific tone, rhythm, and harmony, but they also have a specific key. According to Chernaik, Eusebius is more melodic and reflective, comes in the key of Eb, and moves “stepwise over a rising and falling bass.” Florestan is the opposite, with jumps over a diminished seventh chord, and regularly have sforzando accents on F# or F. Chernaik states that Florestan acts as Schumann’s “spokesman.” He is not shy, he is a commanding figure who is outgoing. There is also the chance that he is named after the main hero in Beethoven’s opera Fidelo (Chernaik, 2011).

Eusebius is a more obscure character. According to Chernaik, Schumann had asked Clara to think of saints that are honored near her birthday, and they included either Aurora or Eusebius. Eusebius was a bishop who stood against the Arian heresy of denying Christ. Chernaik denies that Schumann had any interest in the actual bishop or what he stood for, but he may have liked his name. He also may have found a coincidence in the way letters, when put into musical notes, matched those of him and his friend Schubert. He also suggests that the key signatures that Eusebius was drawn to, E and Eb, influenced his interest in the name. It is also possible that these characters represent Schumann’s primary influences, Schubert and Beethoven, and possibly other musical styles. These characters helped Schumann create his own romantic style. Chernaik argues that these characters helped Schumann, who early in his career
did not have the confidence he had later on, to share his inner feelings and his dreams in his music and to discover his potential (Chernaik, 2011).

It is with this knowledge that I wonder what impact these characters had on *Five Pieces in Folk Style*. The work definitely has contrasting styles. The first one has humor and is more outgoing, and the fourth and fifth movements are even more so. At the same time, the second and third movement is soft and could be a good example of Eusebius. While I was unable to find any research to support this, and the key signatures do not really match these characters, I think the idea that each movement has a character or style is a critical part in understanding the work and could help the performer have more fun with the work as well.

**DIFFERENCES**

There can be difficulty playing a transcription because the instrument it was originally intended for may require different styles or techniques than the euphonium. The arranger may be responsible for making the work playable. By looking at the score, we are able to see what changes Paul Droste, the arranger of *Five Pieces in Folk Style*, made. There are a number of changes in each movement that I will look at. These changes are important to know for a couple of reasons. First, when studying a transcription, it is often helpful to listen to the piece on its original instrument. Knowing the differences in the original from the transcription can be very helpful. The second reason is that seeing these types of changes can help a student if they ever decide to make a transcription of their own.

The arranger takes some liberties in making changes to the piece, and it is important to make changes while still keeping the integrity of the work. The biggest change that was done for the entire piece is that everything is taken down a whole step. The first movement, for instance, is originally written in A minor, but is written in G minor for the euphonium; movement 2 was
originally in F major but rewritten in Eb major, and so forth. One of the reasons this could have been done is to help with range and certain notes, as well as to put the instrument in a more familiar key. This helps the work as a whole avoid keys with multiple sharps and it also limits the highest note to a high C.

The basic structure of the piece is kept the same, but there are a variety of differences and each movement has a different number of changes. In the first movement alone there are many changes that needed to be made. In the first four lines of the movement for the cello, the work is written in treble clef instead of bass clef due to the range, which is not an issue in the transcription as the arranger keeps it all in bass clef. One minor change is that, in measure four in the cello part, the cello plays a marcato on only the first note, whereas the euphonium part has three normal accents on that part. This is a pattern that continues through the piece, and takes place possibly due to the need for the euphonium to articulate each note strongly to get the effect.

An example of a larger change that needed to be addressed is the use of double stops. It is not practical for euphonium players to use double stops. To play two notes together, a brass performer has to use multiphonics and the sound would be different than two actual notes being played simultaneously. There are multiple cases of this happening throughout the piece especially in the first movement. In m. 57 there is a sixteen-measure rest in the euphonium section, followed by an eight-bar phrase that is very different from the rest of the euphonium part, followed by another eight-bar rest. This section is an example where the arranger took some liberties in order to make the piece fit better on the euphonium. In the cello part, during the time of the rests, there is a sixteen-measure and eight-measure part that is mostly double stops. In the euphonium part, the piano plays first, then the euphonium part comes in and takes over as the parts switch, and then after eight measures, they switch again and the euphonium
rests. The piano and cello do the same thing during the eight-measure rest in the euphonium line. While there is no reason given for the euphonium playing nothing during these rests, it gives the piano a chance to shine and it gives the euphonium player a nice break.

There are a couple other notable differences in the first movement. In mm. 113 and 115 the cello part plays a sforzando piano, where the euphonium part is written as piano. In m. 124 there is a section of double stops in the cello, which also happens in the last measure. Finally, in the second-to-last measure in the cello part, there are thirty-second note septuplet runs where the euphonium part has sixteenth-note sextuplet runs. While there is no written reason for the change, it allows the euphonium part to be a chromatic run, which flows very well on the instrument.

In the second movement, there are not many changes. The only major change is in the last two measures. In the cello part, the first quarter note is an octave below the half note it is tied to, before going to a pizzicato quadruple stop. The euphonium player stays on the same Eb for the first quarter note in the last measure, then jumps an octave before coming back down. However, the euphonium soloist does not use any quadruple stops.

In movement three there are many differences between the two parts. During the first sixteen measures in the cello part there are seven fortепiano marks and multiple crescendos. The euphonium part starts at a mezzo forte and does not have any written changes. As a whole, the euphonium part is lacking dynamic markings compared to the cello part. There are few instances of crescendos or dynamic markings louder than mezzo forte in the euphonium part, while the cello part has an abundance of fortепianos, crescendos, and other stylistic markings.

Measures 18-28 in the cello part are vastly different than the transcribed euphonium part. The cello part contains double stops throughout the entire section, playing major sixths the whole
time. The euphonium part takes the bottom note of the double stop, and as stated above, has no dynamic markings. These markings in the cello part allow for an emphasis on the sound of the major sixth, as there is a forte on key parts of the section where the cello leaps up in range. There is no way for the euphonium player to know that he needs to make an emphasis on the part unless he listens to the piece performed by a cello player. In this movement, the first section returns, and the changes that were made as far as dynamic markings are the same. The other change is fourteen measures before the end, where the euphonium part is an octave lower for nine measures. For the arranger to put this part in the range of the cello would make a piece that is currently accessible to players of a wide variety of levels only accessible to the elite players who could reach the very top range of the euphonium. It makes sense to lower it an octave to make the piece more playable.

The fourth movement does not have many changes from the cello part to the euphonium part. The main differences are in dynamics and the ending. As in the third movement, there are many dynamic markings left out in the euphonium part. There are multiple sforzando markings in the cello part, such as in mm. 2, 7, 8, 13, 14 as well as others later. There are also sforzando-piano markings missing in mm. 31 and 38. The ending of the movement appears to have been changed to make it more playable on the euphonium. While the last four measures are the same, the four previous ones have been altered. As can be seen in Figure 2, in the cello part, the soloist has an eighth-note phrase that starts on an A and has leaps of different intervals, up to a tenth, but after every leap there is a return to A. In the euphonium part, the eighth notes have no bass note to fall back to and are played in an arpeggio-like style. This cello part would be playable on the euphonium, but it probably is more idiomatic this way.
The final movement exhibits more changes. The first major difference occurs in m. 16. The cello part jumps up to an E, while the euphonium part jumps down an octave. While the note is playable on euphonium, it is still high and would be the highest note of the whole piece. It could also be that this section may not be intended by Schumann to be the climax of the piece, so taking it down an octave prevents this. It also helps to not strain euphonium players by making them play in an easier range. The euphonium part stays down an octave for about the next ten measures.

There are only a couple other changes. One is that the repeat is written out in the cello part, whereas in the euphonium part there is a coda. There is also a twenty-measure rest in the euphonium part, and the cello part has an accompaniment to the piano. The cello line during this section has a lot of long notes and no real sense of melody. This piece does not have any other breaks, so this section probably worked well as a chance to give the performer a break. Another difference is sixteen measures after the rest. As can be seen in Figure 3, starting in the fifth measure of the cello part, and the second measure of the euphonium part, the pattern is slightly different. The pattern consists of leaps of an octave, a fourth, and a twelfth. The cello pattern
starts with the leap of an octave down and up a fourth, while the euphonium part leaps down an octave but up a twelfth. While many of the notes, once transposed, are accurate, they are just in a different place. The only other major differences are again the lack of dynamics markings and the fact that the cello part ends with a triple stop that is a full chord and the euphonium ends on one note.

FIGURE 3 – Differences in mm. 102-105.

Cello Part – Mm. 102-105.

Euphonium Part – Mm. 101-105, difference begins in 102.

The last thing to observe is the varied techniques used for cello and for euphonium. For example, places the cello might emphasize with a bow and breathe mark are important. There are not a lot of bow markings used in the original cello score. It is therefore important to listen to recordings and see how a downbeat is perceived. It is also important to look at breath marks in the euphonium part. Cello players do not need to breathe air to perform their works and can play more continuously, so it is important to find good places to breathe without disrupting the piece.

The transcription of Fantasiestücke has some differences than the original, but not as many. What is interesting is that the transcription used for euphonium is actually the cello part, not the original clarinet part. While I am not certain of the reason for this, it makes sense in the
fact that euphonium and cello are in the same key, making the transcription easier. The original part was written for clarinet in A, but because the cello part is mostly already in bass clef, the hard part has already been done.

The first movement only has a couple alterations. The biggest difference, as mentioned above, is the clefs. The cello part uses both bass clef and tenor clef to make the notation clearer. It is important for the soloist then to know how to read both clefs. Other than that, the only other real difference is that there is an *attacca* after the last note. The piece is much more true to the original than the previously discussed work. The dynamic markings are identical and the tempo markings are correct as well.

The second movement has similar differences but a few more than the previous movement. There is a note under the tempo marking by the coda that indicates when translated to gradually get quieter, and the *attacca* returns at the end of the movement in the cello part. However, most of the differences in this movement are related to dynamics. In m. 15, the cello has no decrescendo into the next measure; it just has a piano marking at the start of m. 16, as opposed to the clarinet part that has the decrescendo. In mm. 44-45 the crescendo and decrescendo marks are put farther apart in the clarinet part, so that the decrescendo is on the last two beats of m. 45 whereas the cello part has both markings on m. 44. The markings missing in the cello part are minor, and the soloist just needs to be aware because fast dynamic changes do not necessarily fit the character of the work. Finally, in m. 49 there is a slight difference in the parts. The cello part has four eighth notes for the first two beats, and the clarinet part has a dotted quarter and an eight note. Other than those issues, the movement is rather similar.

The third movement is the movement that has the biggest change from the original. Right at the start of the movement, the cello part has slashes through the eighth notes, indicating
to play them as sixteenth notes. In the cello part that is freely available on IMSLP, the movement even starts with two sixteenth notes. While the contour of the line remains the same, the lengths of the notes change. As can be seen in Figure 4, there is a strong difference between these two starts. The same rhythm returns in the piece multiple times. What is also interesting is that, when the clarinet part finally does have sixteenth notes written, the cello part uses them as well. Another difference is in m. 39, where there are grace notes before the G#. In the clarinet part, the measure before that has a whole note tied to the quarter note, and there are no grace notes. In mm. 43-46, the articulations are much different as well. The clarinet has the notes grouped into slurred sections, whereas the cello part has staccatos and slurred parts, and m. 46 has three marcato markings instead of being slurred. The dynamic markings and tempo markings are similar between the original and the transcription. However, those major differences are an interesting change.

FIGURE 4 – Measure 1 Differences.

Cello part – Sixteenth-notes to start, then slashed eighth notes, m. 1.

Clarinet part – Straight eighth notes, m. 1-2.
PERFORMANCE

*Five Pieces in Folk Style*

The Guide to the Euphonium Repertoire indicates that this solo is one of the more popular ones and that it is a standard of the repertoire, in part due to the number of emotions and musical expressions that are required to perform it (Bone, 2007). It is important to make sure that when performing this work, the performer attempts to stand out amongst the other people who have played it, while not losing the character of the actual work.

Listening to a good recording is always a good step in learning a piece. For the *Five Pieces in Folk Style* there are many good examples because this piece is very popular. The two main recordings I listened to were those by Paul Droste and Pat Stuckmeyer who perform on euphonium, and a recording by Yo-Yo Ma on cello. Through these recordings, I was able to get an idea of how this piece had been performed by professionals but also to gain an understanding of differences in style. This enabled me to take techniques and styles that I heard and put into my rendition of the work.

One of the main issues that I came across was tempo. There are a few specific spots where the euphonium player and the cello player vary. The second movement, is notated to be at quarter note equaling 74 on the cello score and 60-72 for the euphonium. Yo-Yo Ma plays this piece much slower, around quarter note equaling 50. However, he takes the fourth movement much faster. It is written to be quarter note at 152. He takes this movement faster, whereas Droste takes the movement around quarter note at 120. The tempo of the movement is stated “Not Too Fast.” I am unsure why the euphonium score suggests the movement be played that slow. It is not much easier to play, and when compared to the cello playing it with the quarter note at 180 or 190, it sounds extremely slow. The difficulty is finding a happy medium. In
movements I, III, and V, the tempo can be difficult to find because of how a performer may embellish the tempo, but there is not the written difference between the scores.

Technically speaking, the whole piece is not overly taxing. The range goes up to a high C (C2), which is high, but playable. The low range is not very taxing either. However, each movement offers its own challenges. The first movement is labeled “With Humor,” which is personified through the character of the piece. The humor is one of the parts that make the movement difficult. In mm. four, eight, and elsewhere, as is seen in Figure 5, there is a part where are two eighth notes are followed by a leap down an octave with a pattern of two sixteenths and an eighth. This part is difficult because not only is there a jump down an octave after playing in the higher range for a few measures, but there is also the difficulty of the dynamic effect. To create the humor effect, it is necessary to play the preceding measures softly and then on beat two when the part leaps down, play loud and add a ritardando.


The combination of the humor and leap create difficulty, and it is important to practice buzzing the jump to get the embouchure used to playing it. The other two sections that are difficult are the slurred section starting at m. 25 and the section starting at m. 74 right after the long rest. In m. 25, the part needs to be performed by buzzing and making sure the intervals can be heard. Slurring a passage at that tempo can be difficult, especially with two different dynamics. The section at m. 74 is difficult because while marked with two notes slurred and two notes staccato, the section needs to resemble the piano part because it is taking over the melody from the piano. When I performed this, the accompanist played the part much smoother, and it
was important to make sure the notes were in character, but still smooth. The final three measures, which look intimidating, are merely a chromatic scale, and if the performer is proficient in this technical area, it is not as difficult as it looks.

The second movement is slow, but offers difficulties of its own. While intonation and tone are always important, it is especially important in this movement to be in tune and have the best possible sound that one can produce because the notes are more exposed. Another challenge is keeping the flow of the music and knowing when to add musical elements like a ritardando. The tempo is also difficult because neither of the recordings I chose went with the suggested tempo. When playing slow, it is tempting to not keep a steady tempo, and that needs to be avoided. While not marked in the score, there are places that allow for a ritardando or accelerando. An example of a place where this is possible would be around mm. 22-26. In the recordings, Yo-Yo Ma allows there be a little leeway with the tempo, where Droste pushes it faster.

Another difficulty with this movement is dynamics. The dynamics are soft, and to have a solid tone while playing quiet is difficult. In mm. 36 and 39, the lines are the same but the dynamic is mezzo piano the first time and pianissimo the second time. There are other times throughout the movement as well where the artist may use contrasts. Yo-Yo Ma does a masterful job of emphasizing these contrasts. While not overly difficult, it is important to listen to recordings to hear the piece played professionally and discover places to put the dynamics.

In m. 64, there is a high G (G3) that is played pianissimo. This part takes careful practice to make sure that the performer is confident playing the note and coming in softly. As the piece ends, there are a series of long notes. They are soft, and need a good tone that is in tune. The movement is very beautiful, but tone and intonation can make or ruin the movement.
One tool that is essential in preparing this piece is a drone and tuning device. I had trouble tuning notes in the high range, and in particular the high Eb (Eb3). I was able to use the tuning device to play a chord and work on getting a good sound and working to play in tune. The phone app Tonal Energy is a great partner for this because it lets you play a whole chord, not just one note, for a drone. This allows the performer to play a section of a piece to make sure they are in tune, and lets them hear their intonation. For a movement that uses a lot of long tones, it is very beneficial.

The third movement was the most difficult movement that I encountered. It is the slowest of the movements, and the tempo marking is “not fast, but freely.” This makes it very hard at times to hear the beat, especially with the accompanist. While not hard to play on its own, putting it together with an accompanist is difficult because the instruments must be together. In m. 18, where the part originally contains double stops, the piano and instrumentalist are together. This part is in C, and there are a number of B naturals in the movement that must be addressed. In m. 27, the rhythm on the second half of the measure, as seen in Figure 6, can trip the performer if they are not expecting it. This piece, note wise, is relatively straightforward, but it is important to pay attention to the details.

FIGURE 6 – Difficult Rhythm, mm. 27-28.

The fourth movement is the fastest movement of the piece depending on which recording I listened to. The opening two measures, which appear twice during the movement, are challenging to slur at that speed. It was helpful to buzz to make sure that the air is continuous. The goal when buzzing these passages is not to play each note individually and clearly, but to make a smooth sound throughout.
There are a few other places that are important to work on. In mm. 7-8 and 13-14 it is important to make sure the first note sounds like a strong down bow of a cello. In m. 17 the piece is supposed to be very quiet. This part starts on an E3 and goes up to a C2. It is important to make sure that this part is played with excellent intonation while being played softly. As mentioned earlier, in mm. 29 and 31 there is a *sfp* on beat one written in the original cello part, but not the euphonium part. In mm. 64 and 67 it is important not to hold the dotted half note for too long and to make sure that the sixteenth notes that follow are in time and not slowed down. This is a part that if played wrong can get the soloist and the accompanist off track.

One last thing that needs attention is finding appropriate spots to breathe and to breathe when the score indicates to do so. Right before the pickup to the last two measures, the euphonium part has a breath mark. This is a good time to take a good breath because it allows the accompanist and soloist to end together, and it also is right at the end of a ritardando. It also separates the end from the jumps in the previous measures allowing it to close more fluidly. For the most part, Droste has done a good job marking important breath marks throughout the piece, but when they are not marked, it is important to seek out appropriate instances that do not ruin the work.

The final movement does not contain as many challenges as the previous movement. This movement, written in 2/4 time, is more straight forward than previous movements. The movement is not trying to use humor or drama. The euphonium part is labeled “intense and marked.” One of the main issues in this movement is to make sure to distinguish between the slurred sections and the tongued or staccato sections. There is a pattern that is written often that has a group of eighth notes and they are slurred-two then tongued-two. It is important to make sure that the articulation is used properly for this movement. There are many triplet rhythms
written in this movement. While the triplets themselves do not cause much concern, it is when the pattern diverts from them that the performer needs to pay attention. The last couple of measures can offer a challenge due to the range, the large leaps, and accurately hitting the last note. While the last note is staccato, it leaps down over an octave from a Bb 3, and needs to have a good solid sound for the last note. Overall this movement does not have any tempo fluctuations written in to adjust the time, though depending on the artist doing the performance, there may be some fluctuations performed. Yo-Yo Ma in particular adjusts the tempo often. However, this movement is a dance, so it is important to keep the flow of the movement happening as well.

Performing this piece is difficult more because of the style than because of technique. This piece is very popular, but also allows the soloist to be expressive in many styles. This is a good opportunity for students to learn different styles. Today’s technology permits people the opportunity to listen to multiple recordings for free on either Spotify or YouTube. It is important to listen to get an idea of how different people perform it. The goal is not to hear a recording and duplicate it, but to hear a recording and be inspired by parts of it to make the rest of the work special.

_Fantasiestücke_

While I have had the chance to work extensively on _Five Pieces in Folk Style_, I have not had the same opportunity to practice or perform _Fantasiestücke_. Therefore, in preparation, I looked at reviews of people who have performed this piece and will also offer insight into strategies I would take when I do learn the work.

As with the previous piece, it is important to listen to a good performance of this work. While I was not able to find a good recording of it by a euphonium player, there are many cello
and clarinet recordings online to listen to, as well as a good performance by tuba player Floyd Cooley. The tuba is similar to the euphonium in terms of the need for air and good sound quality, and this is an excellent recording to study.

It is also important to view Fantasiestücke as a contrast between the two characters mentioned above. Florestan is more outgoing, willing to put himself out there, whereas Eusebius is shyer and not confident. In an article by Stan Stanford, the author gives a good review of important things to look at for this piece. All movements have the same form of ABA plus a coda, though the final movement has a brief introduction as well. The first movement is in A minor and then the last two are in A major. There is a common melodic theme of the notes creating the shape of an arch. Rhythmically, the whole work has a contrast between duple and triple note figures that drive the work. As for the character, Stanford argues the first two movements have the character of Eusebius (though the second one has some parts that act like Florestan trying to come out as well), and the last movement resembles Florestan (Stanford, 1987).

In the first movement, the line’s pattern is a half-step down, then a jump of a minor sixth which then descends as a scale down. This theme is important to the entire movement and the performer should look for chances to bring it out. Section A is mm. 1-26, section B is mm. 26-37, the second A is mm. 37-5, and the coda is mm. 57- the end. The piano is with the soloist the whole time except for at m. 36, which offers a good time for the soloist to slow down. In both the first and second movement Schumann writes the music in a way that allows the music to slow down without writing any special notes, simply by removing the triplets in the piano and having the soloist decrescendo.
The second movement is faster, and in a way shows the character of Eusebius, but possibly with Florestan coming out a little. The work is in A major, but the B section goes to F major. The duplet and triplet forms are here, and the melodic line represents an arch. The A section is mm. 1-26 and introduces the character and then goes on to work at elaborating the arch motive. Schumann uses many motives and each one is in some form of an arch. In the B section, mm. 27-50, there are no duple rhythms, only triplets, until halfway through the section. The second A section returns to A major in m. 51 and goes through m. 64. According to Stanford, mm. 16-17 is repeated three times. In m. 48, the triple meter part is gone and a leap in the piano moves to the clarinet, which Stanford states is a good time to use rubato (Stanford, 1987).

In the final movement, which is again in A major, Stanford states that Florestan finally comes into full character. The arch pattern is used, but there are more accent markings for expression. There also becomes a dotted eighth to sixteenth pattern used to help add fire, which is part of the title of the last piece (“quick with fire”). According to Stanford, fire, which in German is called “feuer,” is represented by dotted eighth to sixteenth pattern. The A section is mm. 11-24. The B section, mm. 24-45, is in A minor to change the mood. Schumann changes the dynamics to piano and changes the “fire” rhythm to dotted quarter note-eighth-quarter. However, to keep the character of the fire alive, there are many dynamic markings. The second A section is mm. 45-68, when the coda starts. The coda begins similarly to the B section; there is an addition of sixteenth notes for the first time that replaces the triplets in the piano. Schumann indicates twice for the performer to speed up during this time as well, and finally the soloist has his or her first opportunity to play a sixteenth-note section at m. 86. The coda in this
movement is longer than the previous ones, which serves to indicate not only the end of the movement, but also the work (Sanford, 1987).

When looking at the score, there are a few things that would be important to notice before deciding to perform the work. The range is not overly difficult, but it does get a D2, which can be out of the range of students. The articulation of this work is also very important. The character can almost be found in the different styles of articulation. Slurs are also very important as there are many smooth passages. It is important to work on slur exercises to make sure the phrase can be played smooth. It would also be beneficial to take the notes and buzz the slur line to help get an idea of the notes and ensure a smooth performance.

The first and second movements do not contain much that is overly difficult technically. The second movement has a lot of chromatic lines along with the slurred passages, but the majority of the part plays smoothly through the fingers. The key could offer some difficulty to those not accustomed to playing in a wide variety of keys. There are also a lot of jumps in the piece. Many of them are an octave or more. In the first movement, in mm. 29-30 there is a two-octave jump. However, aside from these, the first two movements, while not easy, are playable. It is just important to pay attention to style and detail.

The third movement is where some of the difficulty comes. First, the slashed eighth notes offer a challenge. The biggest concern is that this is a total change from the original. My concern with this would be that it adds a faster passage before it is called upon originally. In the clarinet version, the sixteenth notes do not arrive until closer to the end in the clarinet part. Although adding this pattern throughout the piece would add a much more frantic style resembling Florestan, I would be interested in playing those normally to see how it sounds.
The other difficult part of the movement is that there are a lot of accidentals and dynamic and articulation markings. The piece requires considerable attention to detail. Finally, at different times throughout the piece, there is a battle with the accompanist playing triplets when the soloist is playing duplets. Knowing this, as well as knowing the difficulties found in *Five Pieces in Folk Style*, it would be important to have ample time to work on the piece with the accompanist. This piece is an intriguing work, and it is one that I look forward to playing in the future.

**Conclusion**

Transcriptions are a valuable part of the euphonium repertoire. Much euphonium music is relatively new. The addition of transcriptions allows performers the opportunity to play music from many different eras when composers knew nothing about the instrument.

The euphonium is a great instrument for which to write transcriptions for because of its sound. It has a similar range to the cello and it also is capable of mimicking the human voice. The transcriptions by Schumann are good examples of works that have been transcribed for euphonium, but they are only just the beginning. These works are a challenge to play, technically and stylistically, but they are very much worth the time spent working on them.
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