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ABSTRACT

Música de Feria (1932) is the fourth and last string quartet written by the Mexican composer Silvestre Revueltas Sánchez (1899-1940). The descriptive title of the piece, given by the composer himself, suggests the depiction of a Mexican “Fair” or “Festival” with its implied chaos, crowds, noises, dances, and of course, music. The single movement piece takes the listeners into a high energized journey with its sudden changes of tempo, color, and texture, all of this achieved in just under ten minutes of music. This quartet is by far the most popular, performed, and recorded of all four. Nevertheless, Música de Feria, along with the other quartets, remains largely unknown outside of the reduced, but enthusiastic, circle of Revueltas followers around the world, with the expected exception of his home country Mexico and some Latin American countries. In order to help us understand this work better, as well as to make a case for its inclusion to the twentieth-century string quartet canon, this dissertation provides a comprehensive research based on three different perspectives: An Overview of Revueltas’ life and Musical Style, a General Description of the Quartets with a particular emphasis on the String Quartet No. 4, and a Critical Commentary on the Published Edition and the Manuscript. This last part, a Critical Commentary, closely examines and identifies errors in the Published Edition when compare to the Manuscript. It also focuses on ambiguous markings made by Revueltas himself, highlights possible mistakes in the Manuscript, and finally proposes informed solutions to performers.
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Among the small but enthusiastic group of current scholars (most of them based in Mexico and the US) that have made Silvestre Revueltas their focus of research, there is a clear consensus that the earliest writings about Revueltas’ life typically included plenty of legendary observations. For decades after his death, the myth of Revueltas overshadowed a more objective look at his life and compositions. Silvestre Revueltas’ life was, however, full of curious facts that help to enhance the aura of mysticism that surrounded the last years of his life.

Silvestre Revueltas: The Famous Unknown Composer

Revueltas was born on December 31, 1899, in Santiago Papasquiaro, Durango, Mexico.¹

His parents were merchants of modest means that had the merit of cultivating a love for culture and the arts among their children, of which Sylvester was their first born. Three of his younger siblings also had remarkable careers in the arts. Fermín, who went to study abroad with Silvestre in Austin and Chicago, became a celebrated painter that identified mainly with the Stridentist movement.² José, named after the father, is considered one of the most important writers in recent Mexican history. Rosaura, an actress that enjoyed a respectable international career, was one the earliest advocates for the dissemination of Revueltas’ oeuvre after the death of the composer.³ Due to the nature of his parents’ profession, the Revueltas family relocated several times during Silvestre’s childhood. It was around this time when the 6 year old Silvestre started


² Carla Zurián, Fermín Revueltas: Constructor de Espacios (Mexico City: Editorial RM, INBA, 2002), 128. The tragic early death of Silvestre Revueltas was surpassed by the one of his younger brother Fermín, who died in 1935 at the age of 34. Zurián describes Fermin as a committed “teacher, ideological dissident, and advocate of regional artistic manifestations.”

taking violin lessons and his lifelong relationship with music began. In 1913, Revueltas was sent to Mexico City where his musical instruction was expanded to music theory and perhaps even composition. During this time, the still young Revueltas produced his earliest and largely unknown compositions which have been recently compiled, edited, and published as an academic research project in Mexico.

Perhaps due to the seemingly never ending Mexican Revolution (1910-1920?), Silvestre, along with his brother Fermin, was sent to the St. Edward’s College in Austin, Texas to continue his academic studies, although his time in Austin seemed to have been focused on his violin studies. Very few, if any, compositions were made during his barely year long stay in that city.

By 1919, Silvestre and Fermin were now in Chicago, a city that would deeply influence the Revueltas brothers. Silvestre was enrolled in the Chicago Musical College and Fermín took courses at the Art Institute of Chicago. Revueltas was finally in a much more challenging and culturally rich environment. Although he continued to pursue serious violin instruction, he also resumed working on compositions. From his first year in Chicago, Revueltas was part of Leon Sametini’s violin studio and it is believed that he took composition lessons from Felix Borowsky. In the following years, Revueltas’ life would become very restless: spending long periods of time in Chicago (1919-1920, 1921-1923, and 1924-1925) first as a student and later as

---


a freelance musician, frequent trips to Mexico (1920-1921, 1923-1924, and 1925-1926) where he cultivated new friendships that would become meaningful influences in the next decade of his life, as well as more attempts to have a musical career in the US after finding some work in San Antonio, Texas and Mobile, Alabama (1926-1928).

In one of his trips to Mexico, Revueltas met Carlos Chávez, a young Mexican pianist, composer and savvy musician that would change the course of Revueltas’ life. In 1928, Carlos Chávez was appointed Principal Conductor of the *Orquesta Sinfónica Mexicana* and Dean of the *Conservatorio Nacional de Música de México*. Chávez, who held Revueltas in high regard, especially in the early years of their friendship, quickly offered Revueltas a faculty position as violin professor and Principal Conductor of the *Orquesta Sinfónica del Conservatorio Nacional de Música* as well as the Assistant Conductorship of the *Orquesta Sinfónica Mexicana*. Revueltas accepted, and by 1929 he was back in Mexico only this time to stay. The years that he spent in the US were clearly a time for searching, exploring, and learning that had a lasting impact in Revueltas’ later years, in addition to his musical career. In the 1920s alone, Revueltas lived in several cities, traveled extensively, was married twice, and eventually divorced, had a child, held several jobs, and concertized in the US and Mexico. These years also saw the production of some of his earlier, lesser known compositions that paved the road for his more mature works by which he is better known today.

It is important to stress that, in spite the fact of Revueltas being hired as a violin professor and conductor, his return to Mexico also represented a drastic shift on his career priorities. His engagements as a teacher, soloist, and conductor were done with the pure purpose of making a living. His compositions, on the other hand, took the center stage of his life till the end of his
days. According to the Catalog of Revueltas’ Works compiled by Robert Kolb, from 1929 to 1940, Revueltas embarked into a compositional spree of over 50 original works that shaped the “central corpus” of his oeuvre.

The 1930s also brought a certain amount of success and recognition to Revueltas, the composer. Several of his works were performed not only in Mexico but also abroad. He made an, arguably favorable, impression on his American contemporary counterparts such as Aaron Copland, Nikolas Slonimsky, Henry Cowell, Paul Bowles, and Virgil Thomson. Nevertheless, his private, shy, and fragile persona combined with his very well-documented alcoholism, kept him always at the margins of a more fulfilling life. Revueltas did, however, find a certain level of happiness with his third and last wife, Angela Acevedo, with whom he had three children, Eugenia, Natalia and Alejandra (Natalia and Alejandra passed away in their early childhood; Eugenia was the only one that survived and, in the years after his death, along with Revueltas’ sister Rosaura, became a prominent advocate of Revueltas’ works and the guardian of several of his manuscripts, notes, and letters). As for his other musical activities, Revueltas stopped performing as a violinist in 1929 and his conducting career became less relevant despite his efforts to promote a new local professional orchestra around 1935. This last episode was

---

8 Revueltas, Revueltas por él mismo, 29-31.


10 “… this common quest [for ‘American music,’ ‘musical independence,’ and ‘more national conscience’] was characterized by a search for a local singularity, a modernity… and this expectation… was bestowed on Revueltas’s music… though, [they] had to somehow deal with Revueltas’s… heteroglossia. Cowell criticizes it as a kind of amateurism… Copland… mostly prefers to interpret it in terms of the ‘coloristic richness’ of the South. Bowles… adheres to this latter interpretation [coloristic richness]… Thomson appropriates Revueltas for his own universalist agenda… hearing what is in fact not there: a modern new order.” Roberto Kolb-Neuhaus, “Silvestre Revueltas’s Colorines vis-à-vis US Musical Modernisms: A Dialogue of the Deaf?” Latin American Music Review 36, no. 2 (Fall-Winter 2015): 199, accessed March 6, 2016, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/lat/summary/v036/36.2kolb-neuhaus.html.

11 Contreras Soto, Silvestre Revueltas, 37, 46-47.
considered to have played a part in the consequent falling-out between Revueltas and Carlos Chavez, his former friend and in some ways his mentor.

Revueltas never tried to hide his political and artistic affiliations. He sympathized with the Stridentist movement where his brother Fermín played a relevant role. Although he never enrolled in the Communist Party, Revueltas identified with leftist ideologies. These well-known political and artistic inclinations took Revueltas to the presidency of the newly formed Liga de Escritores y Artistas Revolucionarios (LEAR), a pacifist group of intellectuals and artists that focus their efforts in the dissemination of the arts to the working class in Mexico. In 1937, in an attempt to show support to the left leaning Republic during the Spanish Civil War, LEAR sent an envoy of its members to participate in an Anti-Fascist gathering of writers. Revueltas was part of this delegation, and he tried to take advantage of the opportunity by arranging meetings to promote his works in the several cities that the group visited. While the trip appeared to have been a success by fulfilling Revueltas’ expectations of an armed struggle based on an honest cause to fight for, it also seemed to have taken the worst out of him as depicted in several of his letters where he complains about his lack of money, his reluctance to socialize, and his ever-growing homesickness. The trip itself was heavily documented by Revueltas himself, as shown in the letters he would often and consistently send to his wife Angela.

Revueltas returned to Mexico in the last days of 1937 and continued to actively produce more works with a special emphasis in vocal, drama, and cinematic music. In his last years,

---

12 “The Stridentist movement challenged political and intellectual complacency; it rejected academic conservatism, celebrated modernity and technological novelties such as the radio, cinema and the airplane, and sought to transform not only written and visual language but also everyday life, through the creation of new aesthetic spaces and new approaches to the urban environment.” Elissa J. Rashkin, *The Stridentist Movement in Mexico: The Avant-Garde and Cultural Change in the 1920s* (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2009), 1.

13 Roughly translated as the “League of Revolutionary Writers and Artists.”

although keeping a fairly busy teaching and composing career, Revueltas’ morale changed and he became a more obscure and pessimistic character. His addiction to alcohol did not cease and it was after one of his alcoholic crises that Revueltas became fatally ill of bronchopneumonia and died on October 5, 1940. He was only 40 years old.

Revueltas’ death was indeed a hard blow to the Mexican musical scene of the time. Intellectuals, writers, and artist alike lamented the early departure of one the cultural leaders of the last few years. Famed writers such as Pablo Neruda, Octavio Paz, and Rafael Alberti dedicated beautiful homages to the memory of Revueltas. Regarding the musical scene in the immediate years following his death, after distancing from Revueltas in the last few years, Carlos Chavez began programming again some of Revueltas’ works with the Orquesta Sinfónica Mexicana. As early as 1941, musicologist Otto Mayer-Serra published the first extensive scholarly analysis of Revueltas’ musical language and set the tone for the typical association of Revueltas’ works with a Mexican nationalistic movement.15

In theory, these series of events, right after Revueltas’ death, should have propelled his home country for a more enthusiastic promotion of his oeuvre, but none of this happened. In fact, Revueltas’ music became trapped for several decades, in the limbo of the forgotten, especially outside of Mexico. Some of the causes for this unfortunate neglect are the lack of published works, a subject that would be expanded in the last chapter of this dissertation, and the appearance of new musical tendencies around the world, the aftermath of a vicious and catastrophic World War II. The American composer and musicologist, Peter Garland, was perhaps precise on labeling Revueltas as the “famous unknown composer,” who succeeded in

creating a respectable reputation among circles of connoisseurs, but failed to be a regular presence in the mainstream musical scene.\textsuperscript{16}

The resurgence of Revueltas as a leading Mexican and Latin American figure of the twentieth century did not begin until the eighties and nineties, when the first recordings of some of his works came to light and a new wave of Mexican and American musicologists and instrumentalist began to produce a more specialized and in-depth analysis of Revueltas’ life and oeuvre. This so-called resurgence, however, still has a long road ahead. The ultimate place of Revueltas in the music history of the twentieth century greatly depends on a more consistent and established presence of his works in the concert halls not only of Mexico and Latin America but around the world.

**Musical Nationalism and Modernism**

For the most part of the twentieth century, Silvestre Revueltas’ music was long considered as rooted in nationalistic language and style that was full of folkloric references and \textit{mexicanisms}. This argument remained undisputed for several decades until, in the last 25 years, a new wave of Mexican and American musicologists began a debate on how many of these characterizations truly belong to the intentions of a composer that during his lifetime, remained hesitant to fully embrace the so called Mexican nationalist movement of the time. Instead, he seemed to be enticed to explore modernist tendencies, but always through works that were rich in satire, humor, and sometimes aggressive references, while rejecting traditional European music models. Thus partially explaining Revueltas’ refusal, unlike Chavez, to compose in habitual genres such as Symphony and Concerti, and his reluctance to adhere to customary structures such as the Sonata Form. The String Quartet seemed to be the only established genre that

Revueltas could not resist to explore. Yet, it is important to notice that the last of his quartets was written in 1932, barely three years into his mature period of compositions and he would never return to the genre.

Yolanda Moreno Rivas was one of the first people to dispute the notion of an entirely nationalist Revueltas. As she saw it, Revueltas’ musical language indeed originated within the Mexican nationalistic ideologies of the epoch with its fair amount of folkloric quotations and ethnic elements, but this narrow minded approach was the product of confused critics that could only identify the superficial nuances inherent in Revueltas’ music.17 The consequence of these limited attitudes was a misunderstanding of his works that early on defined Revueltas as a talented composer who created decent material but did not know how to elaborate, never came to terms with traditional forms, and the result of all these shortcomings was the creation of compositions of small proportions.

On the other hand, Moreno Rivas proposed a deeper understanding of Revueltas’ use of folkloric and ethnic elements. First, she believed that Revueltas did not try to merely reproduce verbatim these folkloric elements but rather found ways to manipulate, reenergize, and frequently parody them. This personalized approach to motivic materials, was carefully crafted and prepared to fit within thoroughly planned unconventional forms or systems. In other words, Revueltas’ disdain for European models was deliberate in an attempt to free his compositions of formalisms and traditionalism. This methodology, at the core of his music, could be better

associated with modernist tendencies rather than nationalist.\textsuperscript{18} Several additional scholars followed Moreno Rivas’ lead and expanded on this new line of thought.

In more recent writings by Roberto Kolb, he concurs with the idea of individuality in Revueltas’ works, but he also warns of the dangers of marginalizing some of the compositions that do not fit in the modernist agenda. In these works, Revueltas would find the identity that differentiated him from his colleagues. Kolb suggests looking at some of these works of the early oeuvre as a product of his internal search to combine his modernist and innovative character with a semantic or nationalist meaning.\textsuperscript{19}

As for characteristics of Revueltas’ music, there are three elements that would unequivocally seize the listeners’ attention: rhythm, sound/texture, and harmony.

Revueltas’ complex rhythmical and superimposed metrical structures are characteristic in his works. Peter Garland came to the conclusion that rhythm was the driving force behind Revueltas’ music. Even in the long melodic and expressive sections of his music, rhythm not only serves as a supporting part of the structure but in some ways it represents the structure itself.\textsuperscript{20} It is rhythm that perhaps contributes to amplify the variety of textures in his music, either by intercalating and overlapping rhythmical motives or by the extended use of ostinato phrases that somehow produces textures of actually contradicting nature: calm and tension.

Harmonically, most of Revueltas’ compositions can be analyzed fairly well with tonal methods. In fact, this facet of his work could perhaps be considered the most traditional he would ever get. Nonetheless, he craftily managed to enrich his music by a consistent and systematic use

\begin{enumerate}
\item[\textsuperscript{18}] Moreno Rivas, “Silvestre Revueltas,” in Kolb and Wolffer, \textit{Sonidos en Rebelión}, 59.
\item[\textsuperscript{19}] Roberto Kolb Neuhaus, \textit{Contracanto: Una Perspectiva Semiótica de la Obra Temprana de Silvestre Revueltas} (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2012), 15-23.
\item[\textsuperscript{20}] Garland, \textit{In Search of Revueltas}, 155.
\end{enumerate}
of dissonances, bitonality, and the suggestion of polytonality. Then again, the harmonic characteristics of his works seem to also serve a textural purpose that is directly correlated to the rhythmical structures.

In Revueltas’ musical language, harmony and rhythm appeared to be combined unceasingly to produce unique textures. In this regard, Revueltas’ compositions featured a notable diversity of ensembles, and his instrumentation choices can be considered unorthodox and in some cases even radical. He never hid is predilection to the use of brass instruments and in several orchestrations the strings seemed to be under-scored. This style of writing tells us a lot about Revueltas’ priorities. Sound and texture occupy a primordial place in his music, and his melodic lines and motivic cells, either folklore-inspire or not, are no more than mere elements of his musical collage.
CHAPTER II: REVUELTAS AND HIS STRING QUARTETS

The Four String Quartets by Silvestre Revueltas are part of his earliest mature compositions. They all were written within the first three years of his definitive return to Mexico. As mentioned before, the String Quartet was the only conventional genre that Revueltas ever visited. Nonetheless, the Revueltas String Quartets’ swift conception was only matched by the abrupt and decisive retreat from the genre, as Revueltas never returned to it. They are, however, substantial pieces of music that are worthy of consideration for a place within the twentieth-century string quartet canon.21

String Quartets: An Overview

Composed in 1930 and dedicated to Carlos Chavez, the String Quartet No. 1 is an unorthodox two movement work of a somehow unexpected musical language, although the piece never stops having tonal qualities, the extensive use of chromaticism, dissonances, imitations, and unconventional forms would surprise the listener that only knows Revueltas through his later works. The general structure of the first movement seems to evolve around the initial motivic materials in the Allegro Energico, consistently interrupted by episodes of lower energy that produce a sense of a continuous dialogue. An Adagio in the middle of the movement of Debussian breath quickly evaporates when the initial Allegro Energico makes a comeback to close the movement. The second movement, Vivo, of obvious contrapuntal characteristics is briefly interrupted for an Andante that features one of the earliest examples of the Revueltas’ ostinato that he would constantly use in his later works.

21 Tully Porter, “The Concert Explosion and the Age of Recording,” in The Cambridge Companion to the String Quartet, ed. Robin Stowell (Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 91. It is unfortunate that within the 347 pages of essays in the celebrated Cambridge Companion series, the only mentioned of Revueltas’ String Quartets is done as a secondary comment. The author of the article rather highlights the importance of the Cuarteto Latinoamericano and the relevance of their recordings of works by Latin-American composers (Revueltas, Ginastera, and Villa-lobos).
Revueltas generated a little bit of confusion and debate, perhaps out of humor or tease, by naming his String Quartet No. 2 “Magueyes”. Written in 1931, the piece is divided in three movements. Its nickname, *Magueyes*, suggests a popular, perhaps nationalist, narrative within the quartet. Although, the quotation of some folkloric elements, as he does in the very first tune played by the violin, can barely justified this narrative. The composer tried to avoid any further descriptive characterization, which he definitely had created by adding the nickname, of the piece with a note placed in one of the existing manuscripts:

You could call it a ‘Mexican Sketch’ (it would be stylish). It could look like that, if you want it. But it does not have [the quartet] anything folkloric, serious, or transcendent. (This must delight my peers) in spite of its theme, taken from an excerpt of a popular song. It is simply the expression of a mood…

The first two movements are the most substantial and are based on the development and variations of the initial melody/motive played by the violin. The episodic character of the two movements with its fair amount of tempo and texture changes make the second quartet closer to the abstract language of the first quartet and less so to the modernist style of folkloric breeze of his later works. The last movement, *Allegro Molto Sostenuto*, seems to serve more the function of a coda where the initial jovial color and texture of the first two movements is exchanged for a more rustic and sometimes vulgar one.

As explained earlier, the healthy and still current debate within Revueltas’ scholars of modernist vs nationalist has produced a differentiation on how to categorize his music. Roberto Kolb suggests that the String Quartet No. 3 is a clear example of the formalist Revueltas that

---

22 Also known as a type of *agave*, *maguey* is plant typical of Mexico and commonly associated with the production of alcoholic drinks such as *tequila* and *pulque*.

avoided semantic and nationalistic schemes in an exploration of a more abstract language.\textsuperscript{24} If there was any doubt on the abstract aesthetics of his first two quartets, in the Third Quartet, composed in 1931, there is no place for such debate. In this quartet, arguably his most interesting and progressive of the set, Revueltas explored a musical language that will rarely be seen in any other of his compositions. The three movements are well balanced not only in length but in amount of motivic structures and its functionality as a whole. In the outer movements Revueltas presented, as he did in the previous two quartets, motivic cells of deep structural implications. He would then build upon those motives for the rest of the movements but this time the results are movements of richer density, color, and a more complex rhythmical texture. But the most relevant, significant, and in a way intriguing section of the quartet is found in the second movement, \textit{Lento Misterioso-Fantastico}. In this movement, Revueltas’ musical language can be compared to the one used by Bartok in his “night music” slow movements. A palate of different colors and textures, musical effects, dissonances, and contrasting dynamics are deployed to create an atmosphere of mystery only interrupted by the ever sorrowful melodies. To achieve this, Revueltas asked the strings to make use of almost every extended technique available: double stops, chords, \textit{sul ponticello}, \textit{sordino}, harmonics, and pizzicato. The second movement becomes the central part of the quartet and perhaps the most successful moment of a strange beauty ever composed by the formalist Revueltas.

Just as with most of his works, none of the String Quartets were published during his lifetime, although there are accounts of all four pieces been premiered and performed. The String Quartets no. 1, 2, and 4 were published several years later, in 1952, 1953, and 1967 respectively, by Southern Music Publishing Company, now known as Peermusic Classical. In 1984, while

\textsuperscript{24} Kolb Neuhaus, \textit{Contracanto}, 15-23.
preparing the first recording ever made of Silvestre Revueltas’ Complete String Quartets, the Cuarteto Latinoamericano rescued the manuscript of a fourth string quartet which eventually was classified as number three. The first edition of this piece was published in 1995 by Ediciones Mexicanas de Música.25

**Música de Feria**

With Música de Feria, written in 1932, Revueltas’ compositional language falls into his more traditional style shown in his later orchestral pieces from which he is better known today. The piece itself seems to fit the customary view of Revueltas as a “colorist” or “landscaper” nationalist composer, which could be one of the reasons why his String Quartet no. 4 is the best known and the most performed to this day.26 There are conflicting reports as to when it premiered. Roberto Kolb, in the Catalog of Revueltas’ Works, dates the premier as October 7, 1933.27 Both Julio Estrada and Talía Jiménez Ramírez cite a paragraph on Carla Zurián’s book where she mentions Música de Feria being performed at the opening of Fermín’s gallery exhibition sometime in July 1932.28 In any case, the piece was barely mentioned by Revueltas in his later writings and correspondences. Unlike some of his later works, it is very likely that Revueltas never revisited or revised the score nor did he try to promote it. This attitude, however,
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27 Kolb, *Silvestre Revueltas: Catálogo de sus Obras*, 41.

28 Julio Estrada, *Canto Roto: Silvestre Revueltas* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2012), 83-84; Talía Jiménez Ramírez, “From the Reception to a Theory of Musical Communication, with a Case Study of Mexican Composer Silvestre Revueltas (1899-1940).” (PhD diss., New York University, 2006), 180; Zurián, *Fermín Revueltas*, 25; “Vida Mexicana, Nuestro México,” *Revistas Literarias Mexicanas Modernas* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1981), 376. The aforementioned passage by Estrada and Jimenez Ramirez makes a specific mention of Música de Feria been performed as part of the opening activities at the Gallery. The citation provided by Zurián, however, is confusing to say the least. She seems to direct the reader to a review of the exhibition published in the magazine ‘Nuestro México’. This magazine, now out-of-print, was republished as part of an anthology. The article does in fact review Fermín’s exhibition but any mention of Música de Feria and/or Silvestre is nowhere to be found.
does not come as a surprise. As already mentioned, with the completion of Música de Feria, Revueltas’ creative interests shifted significantly and as early as 1932, this quartet would become his last one.

The descriptive title of the piece, given by the composer himself, suggests the depiction of a Mexican “Fair” or “Festival”, with its implied chaos, crowds, noises, dances, and of course, music. The single-movement piece takes the listeners into a highly energized journey with its sudden changes of tempo, color, and texture, all of it achieved in just under ten minutes of music.

Its festive character and popular breath is balance with its clearly defined sections. Although the appearance of these sections is very clear, there are some discrepancies among scholars regarding how to divide the sections. Julio Estrada makes a case for an A-A’-B-A-A’ structure without giving much explanation beyond mentioning the constant tempo markings changes.29 Talía Jiménez Ramírez bases her A-B-A’ structure in harmonic events, especially with the arrival of what she identifies as the most important poly-chord in the piece at three different places that, according to her, mark the conclusion of each one of the sections.30 Charmaine Françoise Leclair at first seemed to join the three large sections theory but without a clear definition on where they start or finish. He does show, however, a more comprehensive table of the “Formal Scheme”, where he introduces several other sections, mostly based on tempo markings by Revueltas, forming a final A-B-C-D-E-F-A-B-C structure.31 Based on his
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29 Estrada, Canto Roto, 82.


performance expertise, Cuarteto Latinoamericano’s first violinist, Saúl Bitrán, considers that the single movement piece is divided into four sections: A-B-C-A’. 32 Lastly, Peter Garland’s comments on the quartet only highlight tempo markings, meter, and mood changes but he never ventures into giving labels to the sections. Without rejecting any of these analyses, as they all have certain merits, this research uses Saúl Bitrán’s version for practical purposes (Table 2.1).

Table 2.1. Summary of Proposed Sections for Música de Feria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Allegro 1-28</th>
<th>Vivo 29-96</th>
<th>Lento 97-133</th>
<th>Allegro 134-175</th>
<th>Giocoso 176-222</th>
<th>Tempo I 223-257</th>
<th>Presto 258-296</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estrada</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A’</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiménez</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A’</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leclair</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B&amp;C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A&amp;B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitrán</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A’</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the arrangement of the sections, the listener will clearly identify two main characters within the piece: The chaotic but festive Allegros and Vivos, at the outer parts of the work, versus the lethargic and passive beauty of the melody in the Lento at the middle of the piece. Although the harmonic shifts in this piece are not as progressive as in his other quartets, Revueltas used a fairly complex and consistent superimposition of chords in the fast sections of the piece. The Lento section features a more conservative harmonic layer of Debussian qualities. Several of these harmonic structures are built upon prolonged ostinato sections of intensive rhythmic motion where the folkloric elements of the work are highlighted through effective rhythmbical manipulations. And rhythm in this quartet, as Peter Garland suggested for the rest of Revueltas’ oeuvre, is the driving force that makes this piece feel so alive. 33 The amount of rhythmbical layers in almost every single bar of the fast sections successfully creates an impression of an unstoppable chaos. There are several instances in the Allegro from Section C
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32 Saúl Bitrán, “Música de Feria,” 77.
33 Garland, In Search of Revueltas, 164-65.
(m. 134) where all four instruments are confronted with rhythmical passages that are in fact difficult: the meter centers are purposely different among them (mm. 164-170). As if this rhythmic complexity alone was not sufficient, Revueltas’ score leaves room for uncertainty, as his metrical markings often incorporate ambiguity. Therefore, it is not a surprise that every ensemble that has performed this quartet has come up with their own distinctive version and in some cases the liberties taken seem to be the result of a lack of information. In the next chapter, all of these issues will be addressed in hopes to provide informed commentary and suggestions.
CHAPTER III: IN SEARCH OF A CRITICAL EDITION

Under the current standards within the music editing and publishing community and with the rising popularity and interest in Revueltas’ oeuvre, the time has come to have a closer look into his published works, especially since concerns have been raised regarding the quality of the editions of Revueltas’ published works and Música de Feria can clearly, as we will see, be part of this discussion. One of the first people to question the reliability of the published editions of the string quartets was Saul Bitran, first violinist of the Cuarteto Latinoamericano. In an article published in 2002, Bitrán explains:

The full score and parts of Música de Feria, as well as the Quartets [numbers] 1 and 2, were edited by Southern Music Publishing in 1967. I should say that, in spite of the value that resulted from these chamber music jewels being published by that prestigious American publishing house, these editions are filled with mistakes and discrepancies in comparison to the manuscripts by Revueltas, to which we [Cuarteto Latinoamericano] had access. 34

On the other hand, others have suggested that perhaps Revueltas himself contributed to the publication of these inaccuracies or ambiguous markings by providing scores with “inconsistencies and errors”. 35 When it comes to Música de Feria, not only all these questions were valid, but also in several other elements were found inconsistent and unmatched time signatures among the four instruments. This is clearly problematic to anyone that attempts to perform the piece. When confronted with these anomalies, instrumentalists would have to come up with a quick solution, most likely without access to the manuscript and other valuable sources. This research aims to facilitate and provide new generations of Revueltas’ followers


with the Critical Commentary that his works deserve by addressing all the aforementioned issues and proposing solutions. The research supports its findings in the use of the following sources.\textsuperscript{36}

*Autograph Manuscript* (AMS) is a complete score housed at the Biblioteca “Candelario Huizar” of the Conservatorio Nacional de Música de Mexico (CNM).\textsuperscript{37} It is the only known surviving autograph manuscript of the work (Figures 3.1. and 3.2). AMS is in good condition and it does seem to be the last version of the piece, however, it contains a few alterations by foreign hands that were most likely made after Revueltas’ death and before the CNM acquired AMS. Such alterations include a phone number with blue ink on the cover page, bar numbers (which are incorrect), a metronome marking (quarter note = 96), a few time signature suggestions in blue ink, and possibly the use of an eraser. On the other hand, all other sources seem to be based on AMS and the following critical commentary largely considered it the main source. AMS also provides important information such as dedicatee (Dr. Manuel Guevara Oropeza), original title (Música de Feria for String Quartet), length (10 minutes), and date and place of composition (Mexico [City] March 25, 1932).

![Figure 3. 1. Front page of the Autograph Manuscript (AMS).](image)

\textsuperscript{36} A special note of appreciation to Dr. Eugenia Revueltas. To this date, she manages her father’s historical archives. The Sketch used in this research is part of this historical archive which is administrated by the UNAM.

\textsuperscript{37} Silvestre Revueltas, “Música de Feria para Cuarteto de Cuerda” Manuscript, March 25, 1932, Archivo Histórico-Fondo de Música Mexicana/132-2911, Conservatorio Nacional de Música, México.
Figure 3. 2. Excerpt from the Handwritten Manuscript (AMS), mm. 1-2.

*S Sketch (SK) is part of the soon to be released *Biblioteca Digital Silvestre Revueltas* (BDSR) compiled and preserved by the *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México* (UNAM). SK is an incomplete set of thirteen pages that covers only certain sections of the quartet. Notable absences in SK are the initial bars of the piece in Section A (mm. 1-16), material that Revueltas would use again in the Section A’ (mm. 223-296). However, SK includes the most problematic section of the quartet on which the final commentary in this research has supported its claims. Since there are no known Drafts of the quartet, SK becomes, along with AMS, a valuable source to help clarify other controversies regarding notes, slurs, dynamics, and articulations (Figures 3.3 and 3.4).
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38 Silvestre Revueltas, “Música de Feria” Sketches, Acervo Musical e Histórico de Silvestre Revueltas, Biblioteca Digital Silvestre Revueltas (forthcoming), Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
Photocopy of a Handwritten Copyist Score (HC1) is also part of the historical collection at CNM and shares the same file location as AMS.\textsuperscript{39} Given the fact that this is a photocopy, the original HC’s location is not known. HC’s last page reproduced the same date from AMS, March 25, 1932, but with fair certainty we can assume that HC was made at a much later date, which

\textsuperscript{39} Revueltas, “Música de Feria” Manuscript, March 25, 1932, Archivo Histórico.
remains unknown and its author anonymous. This research reports the existence of this photocopy but its relevance is minimal due to the extreme amount of errors found in it. Nevertheless, if the original HC is ever found, it could potentially have a more valuable role (Figure 3.5).

![Figure 3.5. Excerpt from the Photocopy of a Handwritten Copyist Score (HC1), mm. 1-2.](image)

Handwritten Copyist Score (HC2) currently in possession of the Saloma family, who kindly provided access to this research. In a recent conversation with the current heir of the Saloma family affairs, Luis Samuel Saloma commented that his father, David Saloma, and Revueltas did not enjoy of a close relationship. His father, however, did perform and in some cases premier Revueltas’ music during the thirties. After the passing of the former, David Saloma hired an unknown copyist to create a handwritten copy of the AMS, already in possession of the CNM. The result is a full score copy that includes individual parts for each instrument. In Revueltas’ Catalog of Works, this set of parts is wrongly describe as a “manuscript”. Therefore, the ultimate value of HC2 is equal to the value of HC1: both sources were product of foreign hands and it is evident at this point that Revueltas had no role in the

---


41 Kolb, Silvestre Revueltas: Catálogo de sus Obras, 41.
creation of these sources. Nonetheless, HC2 has virtually reproduced every single detail found in AMS and there are considerably less errors than in HC1 (Figure 3.6).

Figure 3.6. Excerpt from the Handwritten Copyist Score (HC2), m. 1.

The Published Edition (PE) was first released in 1967 by Southern Music Publishing Company (SMPC) in 1967 and later reprinted by its new parent company, Peermusic Classical (PC) in 1995, PE remains the sole public edition of the piece. As already pointed out, PE has inconsistencies and errors when compared to AMS. To PE’s credit, the most ambiguous section of the quartet is a clean replica from AMS. The Critical Commentary to follow was motivated from this unfortunate paradox: AMS and PE agree on the ambiguous sections, which puts Revueltas’ own autograph manuscript to scrutiny. Other parts of the Critical Commentary also examine the discrepancies and mistakes found in PE.

Secondary Sources (SS) are a series of works used for comparison purposes that consist of manuscripts from the first and second string quartets; drafts from the second string quartet; and sketches from the first, second, and third quartets. This research had also the opportunity to look at manuscripts of Revueltas’ works written around the same time, such as Ventanas (1931), Colorines (1932), and Parián (1932). All of these SS are also part of the upcoming BDSR hosted
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by the UNAM. Although the final critical commentary is a product of a detailed comparison among AMS, SK, HC, and PE, secondary sources have proven to be very valuable in order to identify and recognize Revueltas’ writing techniques and practices, as well as inconsistencies and, in some cases, even mistakes by the composer himself. It was also taken into consideration performance practices established by some ensembles, including the influential Cuarteto Latinoamericano.

As a last comment on sources, it is important to underscore the lack of more primary sources in Música de Feria. It is very plausible that more sketches, drafts, individual parts, and maybe even other manuscripts may have not been located yet or, sadly, have become lost or destroyed through the years. Roberto Kolb explains this reality in the introduction to the Catalog of Revueltas’ Works, published in 1995:

His [Revueltas’] anti-solemn persona – the one of a composer little worried for his place in posterity- probably drove him to not classify his compositions by opus numbers, or to catalog and keep his manuscripts with more carefulness. The high cost and difficulty [in Revueltas’ time] to publish manuscripts pushed Revueltas’ quick and shrewd hand to make several copies of a same score; these materials, without being edited, were used for performances. Without the reverence that today one of his manuscripts would cause, these documents were then handled among musicians, composers, and conductors. Without a doubt more than one [manuscript] was lost this way. It is suspected that some of these [manuscripts] were sold after his [Revueltas’] death and their whereabouts remain unknown.
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43 Revueltas, Acervo Musical e Histórico, Biblioteca Digital (forthcoming).

44 Silvestre Revueltas, String Quartets 1-4, Cuarteto Latinoamericano, recorded April 9-10, 1993, New Albion NA062CD, 1993. CD; Silvestre Revueltas, String Quartet no. 4, ‘Musica de Feria,’ in Candybox, Matangi Quartet, released April 2, 2010, Challenge Classics CC72353, 2010. CD; Silvestre Revueltas, String Quartets 1-3 and Música de Feria, Martinez Bourguet String Quartet, recorded summer 2006, MB Producciones, 2007. CD. Although the Cuarteto Latinoamericano has recorded Revueltas String Quartets several other times, their last recording for New Albion has become the most popular and influential one in the last two decades. The other two commercial recordings (Matangi and Martinez Bourguet String Quartets) are the only known available to this date.

45 Kolb, Silvestre Revueltas: Catálogo de sus Obras, 13.
Lastly, the methodology used in the Critical Commentary is modeled after the work of Jonathan del Mar in his Critical Edition of Beethoven’s Nine Symphonies. A detailed explanation of the conventions used in the Critical Commentary, that are mostly based on del Mar’s work, is shown in Table 3.1.46

Table 3.1. Nomenclature, Abbreviations, and Observations used in the Critical Commentary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomenclature</th>
<th>Abbreviations</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle c (pitch notation)</td>
<td>c₄</td>
<td>All pitch notation is in lower case with a subscript indicating the register. For example: pitch middle-c = c₄. Not to be confused with capital letters which are used to identify specific Sections of the piece (see below in this table)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note(s)</td>
<td>n. &amp; nn.</td>
<td>n. 1 = note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nn. 2-5 = notes 2 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nn. 3,4 = notes 3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every note is counted including tied notes (e.g. n.2 may be tied to n.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>m. &amp; mm.</td>
<td>m. 81 = measure 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mm. 81-84 = measures 81 to 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mm. 81,84 = measures 81 and 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Signatures</td>
<td>2/8 or (2/8)</td>
<td>It should be assumed that time signatures in parenthesis are a verbatim representation of AMF and PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section A</td>
<td>Section A</td>
<td>Lower case letters are used for pitch notation only (see above in this table)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Violin</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>Vns (Violins) = Vn1+Vn2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Violin</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>Vns (Violins) = Vn1+Vn2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola</td>
<td>Vla</td>
<td>Lower Strings (voices) = Vla+Vc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violoncello</td>
<td>Vc</td>
<td>Lower Strings (voices) = Vla+Vc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The Critical Commentary to follow has been divided in five parts. The first part features an extended analysis of the most problematic issue of the quartet: time signature discrepancies. The last four parts are focused on Sections A-B-C-A’ respectively.\textsuperscript{47}

Part 1. Time Signature Discrepancies

To be fair to PE, this research believes that time signature discrepancies are a product of a very ambiguous AMS that was marked or saturated with unnecessary information by Revueltas himself. As discussed in Chapter II, Silvestre Revueltas’ musical language is rich in changes of tempo, meter, and the use polyrhythm and superimposition of metric structures. All of these qualities are already present from the very beginning of Música de Feria, where quintuples in the Vns and Vla are superimposed on triplets and duplets in the Vc (Figure 3.7).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.7\textwidth]{Figure3_7.png}
\caption{Música de Feria, m. 1. © Copyright 1967 by Southern Music Publishing. Reprinted by Permission.}
\end{figure}

As chaotic as these rhythms could sound, there is nothing subjective to the overall rhythmic structure and, even though in the first 28 bars of the piece there are a total of 18

\textsuperscript{47} Saúl Bitrán, “Música de Feria,” 77-80. As mentioned in Chapter II, this Critical Commentary uses Bitrán’s suggested sections.
changes of time signature, the score reads fairly clearly throughout the *Allegro* at Section A. However, it is in this section, at m.13, where the first hint of confusion appears (Figure 3.8).

![Figure 3.8. Música de Feria, m. 13. © Copyright 1967 by Southern Music Publishing. Reprinted by Permission.](image)

Although common sense will most likely prevail in the understanding of this bar, it is important to notice how in the AMS, Revueltas notated a change to 4/4 but added a (6/8) mark in the Vn1 and Vc parts which can easily be assumed to be merely a suggestion for a certain type of phrasing. Of course, this time signature suggestion of (6/8) is clearly incorrect, as it should have been marked as (12/8), an easy finding that nevertheless can help us in later conflicts by suggesting patterns in Revueltas' writing practices. In a final comment, this bar could have easily been written in 4/4 by adding eighth note triplets without the need for extra information. As we will see in later examples, PE reproduced the event in m. 13 verbatim from the AMS and made no changes, suggestions, or comments. SK does not cover this section of the quartet.

We then arrive at the most ambiguous area of the piece. In the *Vivo* at Section A, mm. 29-85, there are 27 time signature changes in the Vns whereas the Vla and Vc parts have only 17.

---

48 The same applies for mm. 18, 20, 21, and 24. In these bars, however, the time signatures are a more accurate match: 2/4 with 6/8 and 3/4 with 9/8.
Revueltas added more uncertainty by marking different time signatures between Vns and the lower strings. For example, in an extended sequence between mm. 56-75 the Vns alternate several times from 3/8 bars to 2/8 bars, while the Vla and Vc are consistently steady in 2/8 bars.

When such series of misunderstandings arise, the performers are expected to make difficult decisions that include changes to the written score in order to get through this passage. Saul Bitran, although recognizing the ambiguity of these time signatures, suggests a planned “carelessness” from Revueltas where the composer gives freedom to the performers to come up with their own solution in “an act of spontaneity and freshness”.49 This thought is very benevolent on Revueltas’ writing, but as years pass by and the profile of the composer steadily grows, some critical and analytical solutions are due. Specific examples of the area in question start at m. 56 (Figure 3.9).

![Figure 3.9. Música de Feria, m. 56. © Copyright 1967 by Southern Music Publishing. Reprinted by Permission.](image)

The bar before, m. 55, is written as 2/4 in all four voices, nonetheless, by m. 56, the score splits into two truly different groups: the Vns are marked 3/8 and Vla and Vc 2/8. The rhythms in

49 Saúl Bitrán, “Música de Feria,” 74-75.
the Vns transition from a quarter note per beat to an eighth note per beat, whereas ♩=♩ is not marked but implied. On the other hand, Vla and Vc parts are marked 2/8, which is open to different interpretations. If we follow the same concept of ♩=♩, as in the Vns, then we would have an incomplete bar in the Vla and Vc parts, since it would be missing a full eighth note. To add more to the confusion, Revueltas grouped the sixteenth notes in that bar as two sets of triplets which, if the Vns are ignored, would mean a faster series of triplets in the lower two voices.

The explanation suggested in this research, implies the saturation of performance instructions by the composer. Revueltas had a tendency to be very thorough with his Tempo markings in this quartet. If at m. 56 the main beats were established by the lower voices, it would mean the Vns would have to perform their rhythm considerably faster. A new tempo marking would then be expected (as he actually did mark later, in m. 176, *Giocosso* at Section C) but there is nothing of that sort in this part of the score. That leaves us with the other more viable and practical option of keeping the main beats as marked in the Vns, then having the Vla and Vc play those sixteenth notes in a slower fashion, disregarding the triplet markings, thereby ignoring their own 2/8 time signature. In order not to dismiss the triplet markings and the time signature of 2/8 in the lower voices as plain “mistakes”, we could perhaps guess that Revueltas’ intentions were merely stylistic (remember our example from m. 13 where everyone would consider the 6/8 marking as a suggestion of phrasing).

In other words, with the addition of a 2/8 marking Revueltas indicated that, in an extreme and most likely unnecessary way, the bar should be felt or phrased as two beats by the Vla and Vc, although the actual time signature is the one employed in the Vns (3/8).
SK seems to support this theory. The SK’s version of m. 56 is missing the triplet markings in the Vla and Vc (Figure 3.10). These triplet markings were most likely added in the preparation of AMS. However, the time signature discrepancies are already present in SK as Revueltas wrote them out in the Vn1 and Vc. Coming back to the AMS and PE, variations of the same problem, as in m. 56, appear five more times: in mm. 67, 69, 72, 75, as well as in m. 76, where the roles are reversed (Vns go into 2/8, with triplets markings, and the lower voices go into 3/8).

![Figure 3.10. Música de Feria, m. 56 as notated in the Sketch.](image)

To further support this theory, let us compare m. 56 to the almost identical passage at Section A’ towards the end of the piece (Figure 3.11). This time marked as Presto, in m. 258 the Vns have a double time signature of 3/8 (6/16), whereas the Vla and Vc are marked 3/8 (2/8). If we ignore the time signature in parenthesis (especially in the lower voices) at m. 258, we would then arrive at the same solution proposed for m. 56 and, to make the case stronger, this time there are no triplet markings in the Vla nor Vc. Once again, the (2/8) time signature in the lower voices would have to be considered merely stylistic suggestions. In Section A’, however, variations of the same problem do not come back in the following bars as they do in the beginning of the piece.
at Section A. Section A’ perhaps becomes the most valuable evidence in the search of a solution.

In an attempt to keep this reasoning consistent, we now make a case to apply the same concepts to similar events in mm. 68, 71, and 74 (Figure 3.12). Confusion could arise if we pay attention to the new 2/8 time signature given to the Vns. On the other hand, Revueltas made no changes to the 2/8 time signature in the Vla and Vc, which by now we should unequivocally consider to be 3/8. Our options are only two: to perform these three measures suddenly faster, which seems somewhat inappropriate, or to assume that those three measures are in fact saturated with performance instructions on how to “feel” the bar.

---

50 See Appendix A for two more examples of time signature discrepancies.
As we have done with the previous example, when we look at the reciprocate passage in mm. 270, 273, and 276 at Section A’, our proposed solution becomes stronger, given the fact that Revueltas did not mark any new time signatures for any instrument (Figure 3.13). The last time signature change was notated several bars before, in m. 258.

Let us look at another example of ambiguous time signatures, only this time at Section C. This section of the quartet is the richest in tempo changes, high energy, and texture. In multiple instances, Section C demands an extreme amount of rhythmic savviness from the performers.
However, most of the technically difficult passages are not subject to the ambiguity present in Section A. For example in mm. 147-148, the Vn1, Vla, and Vc are clearly marked 3/8, but Vn2 has been assigned 3/8 (4/8), creating an elevated sense of metric complexity by purposely placing quadruplets in a ternary bar (Figure 3.14).

![Figure 3.14. Música de Feria, mm. 147-148. © Copyright 1967 by Southern Music Publishing. Reprinted by Permission.](image)

Similar events appear at mm. 159 and 164 in the Vla and Vc respectively (Figures 3.15 and 3.16).

![Figure 3.15. Música de Feria, mm. 159-160. © Copyright 1967 by Southern Music Publishing. Reprinted by Permission.](image)
Revueltas’ time signatures ambiguities present in Section A become less prominent in Section C due to the fact of a limited set of options to the players. A close examination of m. 159 can prove this (Figure 3.15). There are no tempo changes anywhere near this bar and the time signature of 3/8 in Vn1 and Vc stays the same. First, Vla has the same 4/8 marking suggested to Vn2 in m. 147 and there is no reason to believe that the Vla should play this bar any differently. Second, based on our previous analysis at Section A and the lack of data to suggest anything different at Section C, the 2/8 time signature in Vn2 should be ignored, as well as the triplet markings in the sixteenth notes. Nonetheless, in the following m. 160, Vn2 should in fact be playing faster sixteenth note triplets in order to fit the increasing amount of notes within the “new” 3/8 marking. Variations of this pattern happen at mm. 161 and 170 also in Vn2, as well as m. 175 in Vc.

In Música de Feria alone, Revueltas himself was much clearer when his intentions were to change tempo, speed up the triplets, or completely alter the metric structure of the bar. The best example of this is found at m. 176 where the composer indicates a lighter style by marking *Giocoso*. Time signature adjustments are clearly marked as 2/8 (6/16) for all instruments.
Therefore, the triplet markings in the Vla and Vc should be considered correct, creating a metric dissonance with the Vns’ duplets (Figure 3.17). If all of the previous cases in this analysis were somehow *saturated* with *unnecessary* information, then this last example ironically becomes *over-saturated* with information that is now *necessary* due to the ambiguity of the previous passages.

![Figure 3.17. Música de Feria, mm. 176-177. © Copyright 1967 by Southern Music Publishing. Reprinted by Permission.](image)

It is also in this *Giocosso* section where a peculiar event takes place. Having established an undisputable 2/8 (6/16) time signature for all instruments several measures earlier, Revueltas introduced the last twist in this saga of ever-changing time signatures at mm. 198-201 (Figure 3.18). For fours bars, Vn1 will be playing the fastest version of 3/8 in the entire piece. And that is exactly what makes this case peculiar, since it requires what we have continuously tried to avoid in all the other examples: deliberately increasing the tempo in 3/8 bars to adjust to the rest of the ensemble. Conveniently, the momentum accumulated at Section C seems to lead to a climax in those four bars that adds a sense of improvisatory and soloistic character to Vn1.

Furthermore, it makes more sense to adjust Vn1’s meter to the rest of the instruments and not the other way around.
The reasons for Revueltas to write such confusing time signature markings will never be known. The level of ambiguity created by these markings is greater than the perhaps “stylistic” intentions of the composer. After having looked at SS written around the same time as Música de Feria, it is even more puzzling to find almost nothing of this sort in any of the SS which, by the way, includes the other three quartets written barely one or two years before. The closest example appears in the manuscript from Colorines written in 1932 (page 50, two bars after rehearsal 47).  

**Part 2. Critical Commentary on Section A**

The following Table 3.2, summarizes the critical commentary and edition suggestions for Section A, mm. 1-96.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Critical Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vla: AMS marks accents only at nn. 1-3 while PE erroneously marks accents for all the notes. However, AMS also shows considerable inconsistency in the articulation and slurs every time this motive appears. See Appendix A for a performance suggestion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

51 Revueltas, Acervo Musical e Histórico, Biblioteca Digital (forthcoming).
(Table 3.2 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Critical Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vla: as in m. 2, AMS has accents only in nn. 1-3 while PE wrongly adds extra accents. Vn2: AMS most likely overlooks the lack of bowings while PE makes the right assumption on keeping the consistency by adding the missing bowings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vn2: PE and AMS mark nn. 2,8 as a\textsubscript{3}. Although in every other instance (mm. 3, 225,228) appears as b\textsubscript{3}, not enough data can suggest that the note should be changed in this bar. Therefore a\textsubscript{3} should be kept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vns: see Appendix A; Vc: AMS clearly has sf in n. 8 that PE misprinted as f. Vla and Vc: AMS and PE have the same rhythm but only Vla has accents raising the question as to if AMS missed the accents in the Vc since the same passage at Section A’ in m. 229 has accents on all notes in both instruments. This in fact seems to be the case and accents should be added to Vc. That would imply the addition of an accent at n. 6 in the Vla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>Vc: AMF and PE are missing accents throughout this passage when compare to the reciprocate passage at Section A’ in mm. 231-234.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vn2: PE is missing a staccato in n. 4 based on AMS. Vla: AMF and PE are most likely missing accents on nn. 4-6 when compare to Section A’ at m. 233.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vc: AMS and PE have no accent on n. 4; however Vn1 has accent on n.4 and since both Vn1 and Vc are in unison the accent should be added in Vc. This is still problematic since at Section A’ in mm. 236,237, AMS omits all accents in Vn1. Since our main objective is consistency, it is suggested to keep the accent on n. 4 on both instruments at mm. 14, 236,237.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,21,22</td>
<td>Vn2: To keep consistency with mm. 19, IV---- (sul G) should be added at mm. 21,22. SK seems to suggest this, even though both AMS and PE are missing this instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>Vn2: AMS and PE are not consistent in the accentuation of nn. 1,3. Based on m. 18, as well as the consistent marking in Vn1, n. 1,3 should have an accent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Vn2: While in unison with Vn1, AMS and PE seem to have miss the dynamic marking of f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Vc: AMS has the wrong rhythm in the cello which has been corrected in PE. All notes should be eighth notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Vla and Vc: While all four instruments are marked ff in n. 3 it seems obvious that the Vla and Vc are missing a dynamic marking for nn. 1,2. The passage from mm. 24-28 is suspected to be an insert done by Revueltas somewhere between SK and AMS (SK has no signs of mm.24-28). Perhaps Revueltas while preparing AMS forgot that the last dynamic marking in the Vla and Vc was in fact a diminuendo. That been said, most recordings naturally add a subito dynamic marking of either f or ff, matching the accents in nn. 1,2. This seems to be the best solution while the alternative is weak: nn. 1,2 performed in an awkward soft dynamic marking with an accent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Vla: SK has n. 6 as an e\textsubscript{5} while in AMS and PE is an f#\textsubscript{5}. However, there is not enough evidence to suggest that SK is correct then AMS and PE should be observed. Vla: PE is missing triplet mark in nn. 1-3. AMS is correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Critical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Vn2: Staccato markings surprisingly and randomly appear in AMS, PE, and SK. Performers should take note of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Vla and Vc: AMS and PE are most likely missing the accents and downbows clearly marked in the previous three bars. An even more inconsistent version of this is found at Section A’ mm. 251-257 where only the Vla has accents and downbows. It is suggested to mark both passages with accents and downbows in both instruments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-78</td>
<td>See Part 1 for a detailed analysis of time signature discrepancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-78</td>
<td>Vla and Vc: This passage most likely should be staccato throughout. There is nothing to suggest that the articulation should change after AMS and PE mark staccato in m. 56. The passage at Section A’ in mm. 258-280 should follow this convention to secure consistency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Vn2: AMS is missing a slur between nn. 1,2. PE makes the right choice by connecting them since there is no apparent reason for it to be different than the rest of the passage. Also, AMS and PE are consistent when then same passage arrives at Section A’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-84</td>
<td>Vc: AMS is not consistent in the use of accent. PE perhaps rightly so, added the accents in the context of what the other three instruments are playing. However, mm. 280-290 are marked differently (see Part 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-92</td>
<td>Vc: AMS and PE add an extra # to n. 4 except in m. 86. To avoid confusion: all n. 4 from these measures should always be #. SK confirms this event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93,97</td>
<td>HC has already been described as an unreliable source. The perfect example is in these bars where in AMS the strings are marked con sord. HC changed this marking to candor (Spanish for “warm”). PE and AMS are correct. For a suggestion as to where the mutes should be released, see Part 3 at mm. 133.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>AMS Lento is clearly marked in this bar and not in m. 94 as in PE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Vn2 and Vla: AMS and PE are obviously missing the return-to-arco instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Vns: AMS marks II---- (sul A) in Vn1. The marking was misplaced in PE an appears erroneously in Vn2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 3. Critical Commentary on Section B**

The following Table 3.3, summarizes the critical commentary and edition suggestions for Section B, mm. 97-133.
Table 3.3. Critical Commentary on Section B, mm. 97-133.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Critical Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97-129</td>
<td>The pick-up to the first and main melody in Section B has a severe problem of articulation/slurs inconsistencies among all instruments: SK all without slurs; AMS without slurs in mm. 97,121; AMS with slurs in mm. 101,109,116,118,120; PE with extended slurs in mm. 97,118; PE with slurs in mm. 101,109,116,120,121. See Appendix A for a performance suggestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Vn1: n.3 should be a half dotted as marked in SK and AMS. PE is missing the dot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-133</td>
<td>Vla and Vc: Inconsistent use of staccato marking in the pizzicatos: SK all without staccato; AMF with staccato in parts of mm. 102, 133, 131, 13; AMF without staccato in mm. 98,99,103,110,111 and parts of mm. 130, 131, 132; PE with staccato only in mm. 102, 130-133. The evidence is so scattered that it is almost impossible to suggest a solution. The best that can be done is to point out the differences and leave it to the performer to make an informed decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Vc: AMS and PE are perhaps missing the ppp dynamic in order to match the top voices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114-115</td>
<td>Vla and Vc: Dynamics are not clear in AMS and PE. Given the texture of the passage, the most logical outcome would be to match the Vns and change to pp and ppp in mm. 114,115 respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Vn2: n.3 is evidently a major mistake from PE as it should be an a₄ as clearly marked in AMS and SK. Most of the recordings available play the wrong note.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Vn2: n.6 is also another misprint from PE as AMS and SK have a b₅. Also, SK slurs n.4-6 buy they are separated in AMS and PE which seems to be more fitting given the dynamics which are not present yet in SK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-128</td>
<td>Vla: PE and AMS are marked in treble clef. However, there are reasons to believe that these bars are written in the wrong clef. First, if the Vla changes to alto clef then all instruments would be mimicking the chords and intervals from mm. 114-115 (with the exception of a couple of notes in Vn2 and Vla). Second, SK does not include mm. 127-129 but it does include all measures before m. 126 and then jumps to m. 130. These missing bars in SK could provide some insights into what could have happened: Revueltas added mm. 127-129 while preparing AMS and he did not notice that the Vla was still in treble clef. A similar circumstance had been discussed before (see Part I at m. 27). Third, if the treble clef is kept, it seems unconventional that the Vla’s pitches are higher than those from the Vns, not to mention the unexpected and unfitting amount of dissonance by the end of the phrase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 3.3 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Critical Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Vn2 and Vla: There is not enough evidence to suggest that n. 5 should be different for any of these instruments. AMS and PE coincide and SK does not have this bar. Nevertheless, there is a slim possibility that the notes should be the same as in m. 115. Given the lack of more evidence, it is suggested to keep the AMS and PE’s version. As for an alternative version: n. 5 in Vn2 as a b₃ and Vla as an f♯₃ (the Vla would then avoid been the only instrument to change pitches in the following m. 129).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Vla and Vc: Diminuendo at AMS seems to be applied to both instruments. PE printed only diminuendo in the Vla. In this context, AMS has a stronger case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>AMS and PE do not provide any information as to when to release the sordino (mute) for all instruments. Given the intensity and volume required in the following Section C, not to mention that there are virtually no rests for several bars, the end of this bar seems to be the best option to release for that purpose. Other alternatives seem unnecessary and unfitting: i.e. releasing the mutes somewhere before the end of Section B or keeping the mutes till the end of the piece.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 4. Critical Commentary on Section C**

The following Table 3.4, summarizes the critical commentary and edition suggestions for Section C, mm. 134-222.

Table 3.4. Critical Commentary on Section C, mm. 134-222.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Critical Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134-135</td>
<td>Vc: AMF marks staccato only in nn. 1-4 of m. 134 and nn. 1-6 of m. 135. PE marks staccato in every note from mm. 134-135. None of the other instruments have staccato. This issue is never really clarified by Revueltas. In Section A there are several instances where the articulation of the sixteenth notes is open to interpretation. One thing we know for sure, if Revueltas marked staccato it should then be observed. The rest of the cases is open to the performers’ preferences due to the lack of more information in this score. It is also encourage to study and review other scores. The ones that have been reviewed and compared for this research only confirms the lack of consistency in Revueltas’ articulations or to say it in a more fitting way: the abundance of no articulations. The Cuarteto Latinoamericano has been a relevant and decisive force in the promotion of Revueltas’ works for the string quartet genre and their recordings of these pieces remain relevant to this date. For the future generations of quartets interested in these compositions, listening to the Cuarteto Latinoamericano’s recordings would be a good and safe way to start.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Vla and Vc: PE is most likely missing the dynamic markings from AMS that have both instruments as f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Critical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141,145</td>
<td>Vn1 and Vc: Due to the intensity, energy, and volume in these bars, accents are probably missing from AMS and PE in nn. 1,5 just as written in Vn2 and Vla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147-202</td>
<td>See Critical Commentary Part 1 for a discussion on time signature discrepancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Vn1: AMS and PE have nn. 1,2 separated. SK has them slurred which suggests that perhaps Revueltas missed this detail in the preparation of AMS. Also, this motive is repeated in m. 158 with a slur between nn.1,2 which suggests that m. 152 should be tied together as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Vn1: Several solutions had been proposed in order to solve the enigmatic bis marked in this bar, but none of them are satisfactory. AMS and PE share this confusing marking (only on top of the Vn1 line) and SK provides no further details. The most common decision among performers is to bluntly ignore it. Another bis marking, at mm. 170, is also ignored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154-155</td>
<td>Vla: According to AMS these two measures should be tied together. PE missed this slur forcing the Vla to rearticulate the note at m. 155. AMS should be observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Vla: It is possible that AMS is missing the slurs between nn. 4-5. In an attempt to be consistent with the Vns, PE’s version seems to be more congruent by slurring nn. 4,5 in the Vla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Vla: n. 1 is most definitely a misprint in PE since this motive is in unison with Vn1. AMS provides the correct version: n. 1 should be a d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168-169</td>
<td>Vn1 and Vla: In this unison motive, PE is very clear on separating n. 4 at m. 168 from n.1 at m. 169 in the Vn1, but then slurring the same two notes in the Vla. This discrepancy is perhaps due to the markings at AMS, where it is clear that Vn1 has no slurs between those notes but the Vla has a very tiny line that could possibly signify a slur or not. Due to the way this motive is written before and after (i.e. mm. 142,172) it would then make sense for both instruments to rearticulate n. 1 at m. 169.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Vn1: n. 6 should be an eight note as in AMS and not the erroneous quarter note in PE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Vc: PE is missing a closing hairpin (diminuendo) that is clearly marked in AMS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172-173</td>
<td>Vla: AMS is probably missing a slur between mm. 172,173 just as it is written in Vn1. Since both instruments are playing the same motive, the slur should be added to Vla as marked in PE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Vla: n. 6 should be a b₄ as marked in AMS; although PE suggestion of n. 6 as a c♯₃ is tempting, there is not enough evidence to change it. Also, m. 156 in Vc supports AMS’s version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176-179</td>
<td>Vns: The call and response sequence that begins in m. 176 is inconsistently marked in both AMS and PE. Due to the density of the texture it is suggested to keep in both voices Vn2’s original marking: nn. 1,2 in m. 176 are ff and n. 1 in m. 177 is sf plus accent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Critical Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Vn2 and Vla: PE misses the dynamic change. Both instruments should be mf as marked in AMS. Also, AMS marks staccato in both instruments while PE is missing the staccatos in Vn2. AMS markings are more complete and should be observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221-222</td>
<td>Vla: PE is missing the slurs that appear in AMS and connect n.2 in m. 221 to n.1 in m. 222. AMS consistently keeps the slurs in all instruments avoiding any intentional re-articulation of m. 222. The misprint in PE should be avoided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 5. Critical Commentary on Section A’

The following Table 3.5, summarizes the critical commentary and edition suggestions for Section A’, mm. 223-296.

**Table 3.5. Critical Commentary on Section A’, mm. 223-296.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Critical Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Only places in Section A’ with new discrepancies or misunderstandings will be discussed. Refer to Part 2 for commentary on related and similar passages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Vns: Somehow PE inexplicably marks fff. In AMS there is nothing of this sort. The PE’s dynamic marking should be ignored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Vns: n. 5 should have an accent just as marked in m. 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236-237</td>
<td>Vn2 and Vla: n. 7 in viola and n.8 in Vn2 should be accentuated in both bars as marked in Section A at m. 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-256</td>
<td>Vn1: Marked for only two bars in AMS and PE IV---- (sul G) should be extended till m. 256 based on Section A mm. 52-54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Vn2: It could be argue that n. 6 b(b_3) is a mistake in AMS and PE since in the reciprocate passage in Section A at m. 55 is marked as a b(b_3) (natural). However, this time around at Section A’ several things are happening that support the change: accelerando, crescendo, and also a new pattern in the viola not present in Section A. The new b(b_3) note in Vn2 would only contribute to create more tension that clearly the passage demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Vn2: PE erroneously extends the 8va----- marking it one bar too many. This bar should already be played loco as shown in AMS and matching the reciprocate passage at Section A in m. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280-290</td>
<td>AMS and PE’s accents are matched. However, the choice and use of accents in this passage at Section A’ clearly defers with Section A, but there are no enough reasons to try to match these similar passages. Therefore, AMS and PE are correct in this case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Vla and Vc: AMS seems to have missed the last sff and accents markings that are in Vns. PE assumed so and added them to the score. In this case, PE has a strong case in order to match articulations for all instruments at the last chord of the piece</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

This research’s opportunity to compare the published edition with the original manuscript and sketches, cannot be understated. In some cases, misprints and mistakes in the published edition were identified and corrected. In other cases, however, the ambiguity displayed in the manuscript and sketches has forced this dissertation to analyze and criticize Revueltas’ writing and copying practices. Several instances were identified where his inattention created: transposition mistakes (i.e. the Viola is missing the return to alto clef in mm. 127-128), lack of performance instructions (i.e. the use and release of mutes in mm. 93, 97, 133), and of course the apparently enigmatic over-saturation of time signatures in multiple places of the piece. This research has addressed all these cases, expecting to provide performers with informed suggestions, editions, and corrections.

This document also hopes to benefit the current effort to promote Revueltas’ life and works by some scholars and institutions in Mexico, led by Roberto Kolb and the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. In fact, five works have already been published as Critical Editions in Mexico with historical commentary by Kolb. A fine and remarkable effort indeed, but with the overwhelming amount of pieces yet to be revised and edited, this dissertation makes its contribution to the cause by visiting Revueltas most famous quartet and one of his most performed works.

In the last 25 years, Mexican scholars, instrumentalist, and conductors alike have praised the work of their beloved Revueltas, and they have become his greatest advocates by consistently programming his music. The ultimate goal in this research is to join this movement and help to

bring Revueltas music to the hands of musicians outside of Mexico and eventually create a more established presence of his works in the concert halls around the world.
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APPENDIX A: PERFORMANCE SUGGESTIONS AND ADDITIONAL EXAMPLES

Example 1. Performance suggestion (articulation/accents) of the main motive at mm. 2 and 224. Similar articulation/accents should be observed in the variations of the main motive at mm. 5, 7, 227, and 229.

Example 2. Performance suggestion (slurs) of the main melody in the Lento in Section B at mm. 97, 101, 109, 116, 118, 120, and 121.

Example 3. Time signature discrepancies in mm. 65. Lower voices’ eighth notes are missing the triplet marking.
Example 4. Time signature discrepancies in mm. 267. Lower voices should ignore the 3/8 marking and instead perform eighth note triplets within the 2/8 of the Vns.
# APPENDIX B:
## REVUELTAS’ CHAMBER MUSIC WORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
<th>Publishing Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>El Afilador</td>
<td>violin and piano</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924?</td>
<td>Tierra pa’ las Macetas (Soil for the flowerpot)</td>
<td>violin and piano</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Batik</td>
<td>flute, two clarinets, two violins, viola, and cello</td>
<td>SMPC 1956. UNAM Edición Crítica 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>El Afilador (The Knife Sharpener)</td>
<td>flute (piccolo), English horn, clarinet, bass clarinet, bassoon, and two French horns</td>
<td>UNAM Edición Crítica 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Piece for Violin and Piano</td>
<td>violin and piano</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Four Little Pieces for String Trio</td>
<td>two violins and cello</td>
<td>SMPC 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>String Quartet no. 1</td>
<td>two violins, viola, and cello</td>
<td>SMPC 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>String Quartet no. 2 “Magueyes”</td>
<td>two violins, viola, and cello</td>
<td>SMPC 1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Madrigal</td>
<td>violin and cello</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>String Quartet no. 3</td>
<td>two violins, viola, and cello</td>
<td>SMPC 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>String Quartet no. 4: Música de Feria (Music of the Fair)</td>
<td>two violins, viola, and cello</td>
<td>SMPC 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Three Pieces for Violin and Piano</td>
<td>violin and piano</td>
<td>SMPC 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Ocho por Radio (8 x Radio)</td>
<td>clarinet, bassoon, trumpet, percussion, two violins, cello, and bass</td>
<td>SMPC 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940?</td>
<td>Three Little Serious Pieces</td>
<td>piccolo, oboe, clarinet, saxophone, and trumpet</td>
<td>First and Second Little Serious Pieces by SMPC 1957. Third Little Serious Piece is unpublished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C:
PERMISSION LETTERS

Dr. David Rodríguez de la Peña
Director
Conservatorio Nacional de Música

Baton Rouge, LA, a 26 de febrero de 2016

Por este medio, le manifiesto mi compromiso de dar crédito al Conservatorio Nacional de Música en el (la)
Artículo ( ) Capítulo de libro ( ) Monografía ( )
Producción de: Radio ( ) TV ( ) Cine ( ) Video ( ) Internet ( )
Otro: Cualquier uso

desa el (la) cual utilizaré el documento siguiente que me facilitaron:

Autor: Revueltas, Silvestre.

Título: Cuarteto no. 4 Música de Fariña.


Atentamente

Rafael Galván Herrera
Louisiana State University - Doctoral Candidate
Recibió Original 29/Feb/2016

Fuera recibido por Ana María Chávez
Excelente Servicio y Atención.
29 de Febrero del 2016
10 am.

Tel: 8647-5930. Correo electrónico: cmn@onba.gob.mex / www.conservatorio.bellasartes.gob.mx
Reprint Permission for Theses/Dissertations

To:
Rafael Galvan-Herrera
Doctoral Candidate at
Louisiana State University (LSU)

In Reference To The Following Work(s):
Silvreste Renwetias:
String Quartet No. 4, Musica de Feir
©Copyright 1967 by Southern Music Publishing Company

Thank you for your request dated 3/1/16. Permission to reprint the above mentioned work(s) or excerpt(s) in your thesis/dissertation will be granted under the terms noted below.

1. ☐ The full copyright notice as it appears in our printed publication of the work(s), together with the words "Reprinted by Permission," must be inserted under the music of our work(s) in all copies of your thesis/dissertation.
☐ The following copyright notice must appear under the music of our work(s) in all copies of your thesis/dissertation.

© Copyright 1967 by Southern Music Publishing Company
International Copyright Secured. Reprinted by Permission.

2. ☐ Upon completion of your thesis/dissertation, you will send one copy of it to us free of charge.
3. ☑ A service fee of $ is payable to us. Please make your check payable to:
Brazilian Music Inc.

4. ☐ Your thesis/dissertation containing our work(s) or excerpt(s) thereof may not be sold or further duplicated without our prior written permission, although you may deposit a copy in an inter-library system or with University Microfilms at Ann Arbor, Michigan.

5. ☐ If your thesis/dissertation is accepted for commercial publication in any form whatever, you must make a new application for permission to reprint our work(s).

6. ☑ (Other:)
Measures to be cited:
1, 13, 56, 67, 68, 147, 148, 159, 160, 164, 165, 176, 177, 198, 201, 202, 270

Your signature below will constitute acceptance of the terms noted above. Please return this form, together with any service fee due, to us at the above address.
This permission will become effective when you receive a copy countersigned by us.

Accepted and agreed: _______________________________ Date: 03/09/2016

Signature of Applicant

Permission granted: _______________________________ Date: 04/11/16
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Born in Xalapa, Mexico, violinist Rafael Galvan-Herrera earned his Bachelor in Music from Universidad Veracruzana where he studied with Emmanuel Arias; a Master of Music from Florida International University studying with Marcia Littley; a Master of Arts-Music and an Artist’s Diploma from Montclair State University where he studied with Yi-Wen Jiang. He has participated in masterclasses with the Vermeer, Shanghai, Latinoamericano, and Amernet Quartets, as well as violinists Arnold Steinhardt, Zvi Zeitlin, Shmuel Ashkenazi, Weigang Li, Teo Arias, Ning Feng, and Eric Shumsky. In 2011, Rafael was awarded full fellowships to attend the National Orchestra Institute 2011 and the Youth Orchestra of the Americas “Mexico Tour 2011”. In the summer of 2015, he attended the Aspen Music Festival and School thanks to a full scholarship awarded by the Allen and Kelli Questrom Foundation. An avid chamber musician, he has performed in different cities of Spain, Austria, the US, and Mexico. Currently, Rafael is a Doctor of Musical Arts candidate at Louisiana State University, where he is part of Espen Lilleslatten’s violin studio. He is a member of the Baton Rouge Symphony Orchestra as well as a regular guest with the Louisiana Philharmonic Orchestra. Rafael was an artist sponsored by the Mexican Government’s Fondo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes (FONCA) in 2010.