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ABSTRACT

Despite its obscurity, *Sinfonietta*, Op. 188 by Joachim Raff (1822-1882) is an important chamber work for winds and should find its place more frequently on the concert programs of university wind ensembles. In order to test this hypothesis, I investigate Raff’s biography for evidence that might explain its obscurity while leaving the door open to question that status. Furthermore, I investigate the *Sinfonietta* from a conductor’s perspective and apply a critique of its artistic merit.

Several factors explain Raff’s fall from acclaim; none of them relegate his music to permanent obscurity. Based on the composer’s historical significance, analytical results, and the work’s artistic merit, the *Sinfonietta* should occupy a more prominent place in the wind ensemble canon.
CHAPTER 1
JOSEPH JOACHIM RAFF: A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Despite its obscurity, *Sinfonietta*, Op. 188 by Joachim Raff (1822-1882) is an important chamber work for winds and should find its place more frequently on the concert programs of university wind ensembles. In order to test this hypothesis, I investigate Raff’s biography for evidence that might explain its obscurity while leaving the door open to question that status. Furthermore, I investigate the *Sinfonietta* from a conductor’s perspective and apply a critique of its artistic merit.

**Overview**

The development of literature for the wind band medium underwent a drastic shift in 1952 with the advent of the Eastman Wind Ensemble, directed by Frederick Fennell. Before that date, the majority of concerts offered a steady diet of marches, concerti, and transcriptions of orchestral works, similar to concerts led by John Philip Sousa. Large symphonic ensembles, some upwards of 100 performers, dominated the landscape until Fennell decided to steer the medium in a new direction.¹

Fennell’s wind ensemble concept created an opportunity for chamber works to be performed.² This development led conductors to look into the past in order to rediscover works that could provide musicians and audiences with a new sound palette. As chamber works from previous centuries were located, the wind band medium began to attach itself to composers that had strong reputations, including Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Ludwig

---

² Ibid, 53.
Van Beethoven, and Richard Strauss. While each of these composers had at one point written music specifically for winds, there were several other composers who wrote quality works for winds that seemingly had been forgotten. One such composer was Joseph Joachim Raff.

In addition to a retrospective look into our musical heritage, the flexible instrumentation of a wind ensemble allowed various color combinations to be explored as composers no longer had to write for a specific group of instruments. Prior to this shift in approach, the University of Michigan employed a very large ensemble in the 1940s, which aimed at “imitating the large symphony orchestra in sound and size.”

Instrumentation of this ensemble was: 8-10 Flutes; 2-4 Oboes (English Horn); 24-28 B-flat Clarinets; 3 Alto Clarinets; 3 Bass Clarinets; 3-4 Bassoons, 5-6 Saxophones (Alto, Tenor, and Baritone); 6-8 Cornets; 2 Trumpets; 6-8 French Horns; 4 Baritones or Euphoniums; 6 Trombones; 6 Tubas; 2 String Basses; 1-2 Harps; 4-6 Percussion; and occasionally Eb Clarinet and 2 Flugelhorns were added. Composers assumed the freedom to compose for whatever would fit the need of their work. This freedom allowed for new commissioning possibilities, such as the birth of the West Point Band Commissioning Series in 1957 and the American Wind Symphony Orchestra by Robert

---

3 Fennell, 53.


6 Fennell, 52.
Austin Boudreaux. These opportunities allowed the medium to look forward and shape the future of the wind band.

As the scope of music available to wind groups was increasing, Acton Eric Ostling attempted to evaluate works of “serious artistic merit” in a 1978 research study that used ten criteria to rate each work considered.\(^7\) While the study tried to identify the strongest works for winds available, it neglected to include Raff’s chamber work, *Sinfonietta*. Even in the late 1970s, wind ensemble directors were unaware of this composition. Just as Raff’s place in music history has been lost over time, so has his laudable work for winds. A detailed look into Raff’s life will help us understand possible reasons he could have been lost over time.

**Early Years**

Josef Joachim Raff was born on May 27, 1822, in Lachen, Switzerland.\(^8\) He was the first-born child of Franz Josef Raff and Katharina Schmid, arriving three years into their marriage. It has been suggested that Joachim, as he was called, became a musician because church bells were ringing when he entered the world.\(^9\)

Franz Josef, originally from Württemburg, Germany, was a driven man and had escaped being drafted into the French army during the Revolution by fleeing to Switzerland.\(^10\) His discipline came from settling with the Cistercian monks until the fall


\(^8\) For the rest of his life, he would use the name Joachim.


\(^10\) Württemburg is 40 miles south of Stuttgart, Germany.
of Napoleon in 1815.\textsuperscript{11} Franz instilled this strong discipline in young Joachim. At age six, the precocious Joachim could read fluently, and by age eight, he could translate Latin. He also played the violin, the organ, and sang in the choir.\textsuperscript{12}

Unfortunately this push for Joachim to achieve success at such a young age took a serious toll on both him and his father. If Joachim made a mistake while performing, he would receive a cane lash across the hand. These beatings continued until Joachim made a conscious decision to starve himself to death rather than endure one more beating from his father.\textsuperscript{13} While his attempt at starvation put young Raff on the verge of death, it shocked his father into realizing what he was doing to his son, who never laid another hand on Joachim again.\textsuperscript{14}

In 1834 at age twelve, Joachim’s father took him to Rottenburg in Württemburg to attend the local grammar school under the tutelage of his uncle, Mattäus Raff. After four years, Joachim moved to a Jesuit college where the only language allowed was Latin. His school report from 1839 indicates that Joachim was an excellent student, receiving top marks in public speaking, poetry, and history.\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{11} Raff, 2.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{13} Raff, 2.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{15} Raff, 15.
\end{flushleft}
Joachim’s family pressured him to finish his schooling so that he could begin supporting himself financially. In 1840 on a visit to St. Gallen, he was appointed to a teaching post at an upper primary school in Rapperswil\textsuperscript{16} with an annual salary of 470 florins.\textsuperscript{17}

**On a Musical Path**

Joachim was now on his own for the first time in his life, but was still unsure whether he wanted to be a teacher or a clergyman. It was at this time that Raff became friends with Franz Curti, Anton Curti, and G. H. Diethelm, all who encouraged Raff’s musical output. However, since Raff was worried about being critiqued by music scholars, he had destroyed most of his early compositions. In Raff’s words: “Ever since my earliest years I’ve fooled around with musical compositions, but only a few friends at most have ever got to hear these offspring of my imagination and then I laid them to rest because I was afraid that they might be judged to be worthless creations.”\textsuperscript{18}

In 1841, Franz Abt introduced Raff to the contemporary music scene.\textsuperscript{19} It was at this time when the nineteen year-old knew he wanted to pursue music as a full-time career.\textsuperscript{20} Raff took a big step towards this new pursuit when he wrote a letter to Felix


\textsuperscript{17} St. Gallen is a city in northeast Switzerland. Also, 470 florins was a lot of money in those days, but now translates to about $260 per year.

\textsuperscript{18} Raff, 17.

\textsuperscript{19} Franz Abt (1819-1885) was a German composer and choral conductor.

\textsuperscript{20} Raff, 18.
Mendelssohn asking for an assessment of the compositions he included in the mailing.\textsuperscript{21}

Much to Raff’s surprise, Mendelssohn told him to pursue his musical career because he saw real talent. In addition, Mendelssohn sent Raff’s compositions to the publishing company Breitkopf and Härtel, who eventually would become Raff’s full-time publisher.\textsuperscript{22} Mendelssohn’s letter to Breitkopf and Härtel stated:

\begin{quote}
Most Respected Sirs, - I have received the enclosed letter and compositions, and cannot refrain from submitting them to you, in the hope that you may be enabled to indulge both the writer and myself with a favourable answer. Were the pieces only signed by some well-known name I am persuaded they would have a very large sale, for the contents are such that it would be difficult to believe that many of them are not by Liszt, Döhler, and other eminent players. The composition is elegant and faultless throughout, and in the most modern style; but now comes the fact that no one knows the name of the composer, which entirely alters the case. Perhaps a single piece might be taken out of each set, or possibly you may find that one or two of those for which I personally care least (e.g. the gallops) are more suited for the public taste: in a word, perhaps you may somehow be induced to print something out of the collection. If my hearty recommendation will have any weight, I most willingly add it to the request of my young friend. In any case I must ask you to try the pieces over, and refer them to those friends who usually advise you in such cases, and then let me know the result, returning the letter at the same time – I trust with only a little of the music. Such is my hope, which I beg you to pardon and excuse. – Yours faithfully, F.M.B.\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

In order to ease the burden of pursuing two careers at once, both teaching and composing music, Raff turned in his resignation notice to the primary school in August

\textsuperscript{21} Felix Mendelssohn (1809-1847).

\textsuperscript{22} www.raff.org/life/bio/swiss.htm.

\textsuperscript{23} Unknown, “Joseph Joachim Raff [Obituary],” \textit{The Monthly Musical Record} 12 (August 1, 1882): 175.
1844. Raff declared bankruptcy in December. Raff then left Rapperswil for Zurich and began teaching music lessons and copying music. Unfortunately, the musical scene in Zurich was slow and Raff struggled to survive, even becoming homeless for a brief period.

The Development of Two Influential Relationships

In the summer of 1845, another life-changing event happened to Raff. The Zurich newspaper announced that Franz Liszt, who was at the height of his fame, would be performing in Basel on June 18. With no funds for travel, Raff walked to Basel in terrible weather, causing him to be late to the concert. When Raff finally arrived, there were no more tickets available. While he bemoaned his predicament, Liszt’s secretary, Belloni, overheard Raff’s story and took him to Liszt’s dressing room. When Liszt took the stage, he was joined by Raff, who sat next to the famous artist. After the concert, Raff and Liszt spoke of their mutual passion for music. It was at this point that Liszt made the decision to mentor Raff as they headed to Germany together.

---


25 Raff, 24.

26 Ibid.

27 Franz Liszt (1811-1886).

28 Zurich and Basel are separated by 53 miles.

29 Thompson, 1768.
As their friendship grew, Raff shared his compositions with Liszt. Those that did not meet Liszt’s approval were immediately destroyed.\textsuperscript{30} The professional contacts he made during his time with Liszt were invaluable. His friendship with Liszt provided Raff an entrance into the music scene, and he was able to find a new job at a music and piano dealer in Cologne, while Liszt continued his performance tour in Hungary.

Raff’s new job paid very little and forced him to work up to ten hours a day.\textsuperscript{31} Some of his duties included cleaning manuscripts and performing on new pianos in hopes of enticing local buyers to make a purchase. However, his disdain for his new position was due to his boss, Josef Lefebvre, who seemed to demean all his employees as if they were “factory folk.”\textsuperscript{32} Raff complained, “Even if I am to be reprimanded for clumsy work or pitied because I am poor, I am nevertheless entitled to be treated properly and humanely; after all, I am a person from a decent family background, I have acquired knowledge, however deficient it might be, and I have striven honestly to achieve something worthy of recognition in my chosen field.”\textsuperscript{33} The harsh treatment he received made Raff regret ever accepting the position.

Amidst all the turmoil Raff was experiencing since parting company with Liszt, one moment of joy came in June 1846 when he met with Mendelssohn while working as a music critic at the Male Choirs Festival in Cologne.\textsuperscript{34} Their conversation revolved

\textsuperscript{30} Raff, 30.

\textsuperscript{31} Raff’s annual salary at the music and piano dealer was only 300 talers (or thalers).

\textsuperscript{32} Raff, 32.

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid, 34.
around Raff’s new compositions, with Mendelssohn “praising their melodic invention, but also pointing out their shortcomings in terms of musical structure.” In order to help Raff with his theory deficiencies, Mendelssohn agreed to take him on as a student. This generous offer was the first bit of good news for Raff in quite some time.

The gravity of his financial crisis prompted Raff to hastily produce several musical works during 1846. This increase production worried Liszt, who sent Raff a letter in October warning him of the dangers of over-producing his music. By saturating the market with his music, Liszt feared that people would grow tired of Raff’s works. Raff took this criticism to heart and destroyed several of these works as he deeply respected the opinion of his mentor.

In addition to his composing and his job in Cologne, Raff served as a music critic for the Allgemeine Wiener Musikalische Zeitung. Raff’s editor, Dr. August Schmidt, respected Joachim for the articles he wrote even saying, “You are tough and go your own way regardless, which I like.” Unfortunately Raff’s strong critiques were not tempered when it came to reviews of those associated with the journal. In issues 116-117 of the journal, Raff’s harsh reviews were directed towards two men from Cologne who were viewed “as VIPs in the world of musical criticism.” These two men were associated

35 Raff, 34.

36 By all documentation, these theory lessons never occurred, as Raff and Mendelssohn never found themselves in the same city ever again.


38 Raff, 38-39.

39 Ibid, 39.
with the journal that Raff wrote for, an affiliation of which Raff did not know at the time. They demanded Raff’s termination and Raff was left without a means of support once again.40

In the spring of 1847, Raff left Cologne for the prospect of working with a popular publisher, Karl Mechetti, in Vienna.41 However, before he arrived in Vienna to begin his new job, Karl passed away, leaving Raff scrambling once again.42 This set of circumstances left Raff to make the decision of whether to visit Liszt in Weimar or Mendelssohn in Leipzig. Once again, tragedy followed Raff as he learned of Mendelssohn’s passing after a series of strokes.

Raff’s constant struggles led him to question the relationships he had developed through the years, including the one most important to him in Liszt. Raff’s speculation that he was being ‘used’ led him to write Liszt in early 1848 questioning his mentor’s instructional practices. Liszt’s response was direct saying, “Despite having been patient and gentle with you, I am simply not going to put up with such rudeness any more.”43

**Move to Stuttgart**

With Mendelssohn’s passing and the damaged relationship with Liszt, Raff decided to settle in Stuttgart. Still struggling to survive, Raff met two individuals, Frau Kunigunde Heinrich and Hans von Bülow, who would influence him the rest of his life.


42 Karl Mechetti (1811-1847).

43 Raff, 45.
Heinrich, a widowed music teacher, accepted Raff into her studio. However, Heinrich did more than instruct him in music. She provided him with a warm home and open line of communication, realizing that his life was in turmoil. It was during this time that Raff wrote arrangements of popular operatic melodies, one of which was for von Bülow, who was just eighteen at the time.\(^{44}\) Raff’s arrangement of a “Fantasy on Themes” from Kücken’s opera *Der Prätendent* was then performed at a New Year’s Day concert in 1848.\(^{45}\) Von Bülow’s performance drew rave reviews and Raff at last had his first public success.

At this point Raff began working on his four-act heroic opera entitled *König Alfred*.\(^{46}\) For Raff this was something entirely different, given his limited experience with the stage and the interaction of voices with instruments. Once he had completed the original version, he made several revisions, with each progressively allowing him to gain confidence in writing large-scale works. Unfortunately for Raff, it took almost two years before the first public performance was staged in Weimar.\(^{47}\) While Liszt praised the performance, the opera never caught on and went unpublished.

**Brief Stay in Hamburg**

With multiple other compositions failing to become published, Raff felt it was time to leave Stuttgart. Raff walked out of the city not only with debts, but without saying goodbye to his closest friends, including Heinrich who later scolded him, “Don’t you

\(^{44}\) Hans von Bülow (1830-1894).

\(^{45}\) Friedrich Wilhelm Kücken (1810-1882).

\(^{46}\) This piece was begun in September 1848 and was eventually completed in April 1849.

\(^{47}\) The first public performance took place on March 9, 1851.
ever leave a city like that again.”  

He headed for Hamburg in September 1849, with the hope of finding a job with the publisher, Julius Schuberth. Just after he arrived in Hamburg, Liszt surfaced in the city as well, and they met to attempt to resolve their differences. After one of Liszt’s performances, Raff noted, “He plays like a god, as always,” seeming to recognize the importance of being a colleague of such a master.

Under his new employer Schuberth, Raff continued to excel at arranging, even noting for one piece, “I'll be getting seven thaler for doing this, which is too much for a copyist, but too little for a composer.” The strain of Raff’s thirteen-hour workdays were tempered somewhat by frequent invitations to play duets with Schuberth, an accomplished violinist. Due to their budding friendship and Hamburg’s high rent, Schuberth offered Raff a room at his house.

**Life at a Crossroads**

It was at this point that Raff had a major decision to make. Liszt had proceeded to Weimar where he asked Raff to spend the winter months with him. On the other hand, Schuberth told Raff that if he stayed in Hamburg, a more permanent position with the publishing company was in his future. Realizing that Liszt was his route to prominence, Raff left Hamburg on November 24, with the assurance that he could rejoin Schuberth after his winter stay in Weimar. Schuberth agreed with Raff’s plan to join Liszt and even

---

48 Raff, 57.

49 Julius Schuberth (1804-1875).


51 Ibid.
accompanied him on the trip. Although Raff’s time in Hamburg was brief, he left in far better spirits and in a much stronger financial state.\textsuperscript{52}

His arrival in Weimar, one of the major literary centers at this time, led Raff to one of the higher points of his life. Cultural opportunities offered in Weimar included free tickets to the theater and musical matinees at the Altenburg, the house where Liszt lived.\textsuperscript{53} Due to his early fortunes in Weimar, Raff decided to forgo any further opportunities with Schuberth.\textsuperscript{54} The connections he had made in his short time in Weimar and his restored relationship with Liszt made this a fairly easy choice. With this decision behind him, their relationship seemed to flourish, with the two seeing each other almost every day.

During his first few months in Weimar, Raff’s main projects were a revision of the score of \textit{König Alfred} and the creation of his first symphony.\textsuperscript{55} Between working on his own music and doing orchestrations for various composers, including Liszt, Raff had never been busier.\textsuperscript{56} Amid all of his compositional duties, Raff found some time in April 1850 to join Liszt for a few performances. Several of Raff’s works were performed, including his \textit{Eclogue Fantastique}, which had been composed during his time in

\textsuperscript{52} Raff’s stay in Hamburg was approximately two months.

\textsuperscript{53} Raff, 72.

\textsuperscript{54} This decision was made in January 1850.

\textsuperscript{55} This symphony was not completed until 1854.

The response to these works was excellent, with Liszt proudly recognizing Raff from the stage.

In the fall of 1850, Liszt left to help care for the child of his lover, Princess Carolyne, who had been stricken with typhoid fever. Liszt’s prolonged absence in Weimar allowed Raff to spend Christmas with Eduard Genast’s family. On Christmas Eve, one of Genast’s daughters, Doris, decorated a tree just for Raff. It was at this point that Raff fell in love with Doris. Raff even enjoyed the playful ‘teasing’ by Liszt once he found out the news.

Liszt finally returned to Weimar on January 21, 1851, to begin preparations for the debut of the opera, König Alfred. The debut performance had been scheduled for February 16 with Liszt conducting, but two separate incidents pushed back opening night. First, the star soprano, Fraulen Agthe, lost her voice on the day of the performance. Then the very next day, Princess Carolyne became seriously ill and Liszt had to hurry to Bad Eilsen to attend to her. After several weeks caring for the Princess, Liszt wrote Raff and asked him to conduct the opera himself.

---

57 [www.raff.org/music/brief/chamber2.htm](http://www.raff.org/music/brief/chamber2.htm).

58 Eduard Genast (1797-1866) was a German vocalist.

59 Doris was an accomplished actress and would continue her career until they relocated to Frankfurt in 1877.

60 Raff, 86.

61 [www.raff.org/music/detail/vocal/alfred.htm](http://www.raff.org/music/detail/vocal/alfred.htm).

62 Raff, 90.
On March 9, the opera *König Alford* was performed at the Weimar Court Theatre. The opera was so well received that, by the third act, Raff was taking a curtain call. Raff was now a public figure, with people on the street congratulating him. However, Raff’s dream of having this opera widely performed never materialized, as most theatres decided not to stage it.

In late May of 1852, the thirty year-old traveled to Ballenstedt, a town north of Weimar, to help Liszt coordinate a music festival. The organizational skills of Raff were on full display as he helped Liszt orchestrate a festival that received tremendous praise. This success motivated these two to arrange ‘Berlioz Week’ in November that same year, with Hector Berlioz himself making an appearance.

Despite some mild success in Weimar, Raff was ready to leave. He had grown tired of working on arrangements and sought to compose his own music. His limited salary in Weimar was still not enough to cover his cost of living. To add to his frustrations, Raff had a job opportunity surface in Munich, but at the same time, was served an arrest warrant due to debts he accrued while living in Switzerland in 1845. Liszt offered to help pay off the debt, but Raff would not allow it on a matter of principle.

---

63 [www.raff.org/music/detail/vocal/alfred.htm](http://www.raff.org/music/detail/vocal/alfred.htm).

64 The decision why theatres chose not to pick up this opera is still a debate. Some scholars believe that it was due to the high demand placed on the musicians, while others feel that it went against more conservative composers such as Johannes Brahms and Clara Schumann.

65 Hector Berlioz (1803-1869).

66 Raff, 103.

67 Johnson, “Maria Stuart, Opus 172: A Song Cycle by Joseph Joachim Raff Based on the Poetry of Mary Queen of Scots,” 12.
Raff was put under house arrest until the fall of 1853, but by that time, the position in Munich was already filled.

Coming off his house arrest, Raff decided to write a book. Raff had always been a devoted fan of Richard Wagner and, after seeing the premiere of *Lohengrin*, wrote a book in late 1853 entitled *Die Wagnerfrage.*\(^{68}\) The 300-page publication sought to analyze Wagner’s opera and “find a rational explanation for every experience.”\(^{69}\) Despite receiving some praise, critics of the book took offense to the tone used by Raff. Even Liszt, who was never asked to preview the manuscript, reprimanded Raff for his work.\(^{70}\) The harsh criticism Raff received from those he considered friends led to his becoming very paranoid that many wanted to see him fail.

Following Raff’s book, his next major project came in the summer of 1854 when he composed the music for the tragedy *Bernhard von Weimar.*\(^{71}\) While the play was not a success, critics called Raff a “master of orchestration.”\(^{72}\) Three of the pieces, two marches and the overture, would eventually be published.

The remainder of 1854 was spent working on his first symphony, which was first performed on April 20, 1855, alongside three other works. The reviews were mixed, but

---

\(^{68}\) *Die Wagnerfrage* means *The Wagner Question*, and was published by Vieweg’s of Brunswick in the summer of 1854.

\(^{69}\) Raff, 114.


\(^{71}\) The play debuted on January 2, 1855, and only had a few performances.

that was nothing new for Raff. Unfortunately, none of those works were published, which Raff considered more a backlash from his book than about the quality of the pieces.

About this time that his beloved fiancée, Doris, began encouraging Raff to leave Weimar and separate himself from Liszt, whom she felt used Raff more than he should have. Raff’s last piece composed in Weimar was Dornröschen, a musical fairy-tale with text by Wilhelm Genast. In addition to the rave reviews from the performers, Liszt even said that it was the strongest piece Raff had composed to date. In an essay about the composition, Liszt described Raff’s artistic personality as “reliant upon Mendelssohn, most of all Wagner, sometimes Berlioz, and in some instances Italian composers.” After these comments, Raff’s decision to leave Weimar became even tougher as Liszt felt it was not prudent to abandon the strong core of musicians in the city. In the end, Raff felt that the more he did for Liszt, the more he owed his mentor.

Wiesbaden

Raff moved to Wiesbaden, where Doris had been living for a few years, in 1856. While Raff was concerned about his mentor’s reaction to his departure, the next letter from Liszt to Raff began “Respected sir and friend.” This new chapter for Raff had him not only composing, but also teaching both piano and counterpoint lessons.

Most of Raff’s compositional time was spent working on Samson; in September of 1857, Raff asked Liszt to review the first three acts of this new opera. Liszt’s response

73 Wilhelm was the son of Eduard Genast and brother to Doris.

74 Raff, 128.

75 Ibid.

76 Previous letters from Liszt always began with “Dear Raff” or “Dear friend.”
to the opera was very positive and he even helped arrange the premiere, which was to take place at the Weimar Theatre. However, Liszt became upset while presiding over another performance in that theatre and scolded the audience for their disrespectful behavior. As Liszt was banned from the theatre, so ended Raff’s chance of having *Samson* premiered there.

Following this disappointment, Raff and Doris married in Wiesbaden on March 15, 1859. Shortly after the marriage, Raff began teaching harmony and piano classes at two female-only schools in Wiesbaden, while also serving as a theatre and music critic. His salary, when combined with what Doris earned at the Ducal Court Theatre, afforded the Raffs a comfortable lifestyle. After paying off all their debts, the Raffs had another reason to celebrate when Doris became pregnant. However, all of this joy turned to despair when Doris lost the child. It would be several years before the Raffs would celebrate the birth of their first child.

In addition to piano pieces composed for his students, Raff began work on *An das Vaterland*, a symphony that attempts to “depict German life and what it means to be German.” The work was entered into a compositional contest, and out of the thirty-two symphonies entered, Raff’s piece was chosen as the winner. The symphony premiered on

77 Raff, 139.


79 Johnson, “Maria Stuart, Opus 172: A Song Cycle by Joseph Joachim Raff Based on the Poetry of Mary Queen of Scots,” 12.

80 Helene Raff was born in 1865 and was their only child.

81 Raff, 147.
February 22, 1863, in Vienna with Josef Hellmesberger conducting.\textsuperscript{82} The work received tremendous amounts of praise by those who heard both the rehearsals and the performances. The good news for Raff continued to pour in as his cantata, \textit{Deutschlands Auferstehung}, won first prize in a contest sponsored by the music publisher E. F. Kahnt of Leipzig. At forty years old, Raff was finally realizing his dream of being a successful musician and composer.

In addition to some overtures and marches written for various festivals, Raff’s next major composition was the 1867 opera, \textit{Die Parole}.\textsuperscript{83} (Its libretto was written by Raff, but was published under the pseudonym Arnold Börner.\textsuperscript{84}) Despite all his efforts, this opera, based on a comedy by Countess Ahlimb-Saldern, was neither performed nor published.

The other major work that Raff undertook in 1867 was \textit{De Profundis}, written for eight-part chorus and full orchestra.\textsuperscript{85} By dedicating the work to Liszt, Raff proclaimed the high regard with which he held his mentor. The composition was first performed at the \textit{Allgemeine Musikfeste} and later at other various locations.\textsuperscript{86}

The following year saw Raff complete two major works. His third symphony, \textit{Im Walde}, Op. 153, was centered on Raff’s love of nature.\textsuperscript{87} Raff’s other work, \textit{Dame

\textsuperscript{82} www.raff.org/resource/krueck/symphony/symph_01.htm.

\textsuperscript{83} www.raff.org/music/detail/vocal/parole.htm.

\textsuperscript{84} Arnold Börner was a good friend of Raff in his youth.

\textsuperscript{85} www.raff.org/music/detail/vocal/profund.htm.

\textsuperscript{86} Schuberth’s would publish \textit{De Profundis} in 1868.

\textsuperscript{87} www.raff.org/music/detail/symphony/symph_03.htm.
*Kobold*, was a light, comic opera with a libretto written by his friend Paul Reber. Both of these works were premiered in Weimar in April 1870.

All of this success led to Raff’s recognition as the most important musical resident of Wiesbaden. Both musical venues in town, the Court Theatre Orchestra and the Spa Orchestra, competed to perform his works. Between 1871 and 1876, Raff was extremely productive, writing at least five symphonies at this peak of his creative life. One of his most popular works, *Symphony No. 4*, was given high praise by von Bülow who said the work was “tremendously fresh, spontaneous, clever and charming.” Josef Rheinberger, a German composer himself, said it was a “…magnificent work which I admire not only for all its merits, but for its noble melodiousness which, unfortunately, is rare these days.”

Word quickly spread that Raff’s music was gaining popularity. German conductor Leopold Damrosch emigrated to the United States in 1873 and sent a letter to Raff letting him know that his symphonies and chamber music were being performed as much as those of Beethoven. In 1876 the acclaimed Philharmonic Society of London invited

---

88 [www.raff.org/music/detail/vocal/kobold.htm](http://www.raff.org/music/detail/vocal/kobold.htm).

89 Raff, 178.

90 Ibid, 182.

91 Ibid, 179. *Symphony No. 4* is also known as the G minor symphony.

92 Ibid.

93 Leopold Damrosch (1832-1885).
Raff to conduct one of his symphonies in person as his name “enjoy[ed] a glowing reputation here.”\(^{94}\)

In addition to receiving several tributes from adoring fans, Raff was inducted into prestigious musical organizations such as the *Reale Istituto Musicale* in Florence, the Philharmonic Society of New York, the *Societa del Quartetto* in Milan, the *Cäcilien-Verein* in Wiesbaden, and the *Societa International d’Incoraggiamento delle Arti* in Naples.\(^ {95}\) All of this fame was a far cry from where Raff had been just ten years earlier.

**Popularity Decline**

After one reaches his peak, a decline often follows. Earlier in Raff’s life, Liszt had warned him about over-saturating the market with his compositions. Raff countered that Mozart lived only a few years, but even in his short life, published several hundred works. Also, in response to his critics, Raff said, “What these gentlemen should do is show me any piece of mine that isn’t up to scratch, compositionally speaking.”\(^ {96}\) Raff always felt inspired and thought that postponing work on a new composition was “nothing more than a lack of self-discipline.”\(^ {97}\)

As pressure mounted to prove his critics wrong, Raff completed his Seventh Symphony, *In den Alpen*. This symphony was premiered on December 30, 1875, and was intended to pay homage to his native Switzerland.\(^ {98}\) However, the audience expected

\(^{94}\) Even though an invitation was extended, Raff did not make the trip.

\(^{95}\) Raff, 187-189.

\(^{96}\) Ibid, 198.

\(^{97}\) Ibid.

something more. Raff was very disappointed in the reception, but nonetheless continued on his fast-paced compositional style, beginning his symphonic cycle Die Jahreszeiten.\footnote{Raff, 199.}

The first symphony in this cycle, Frühlingsklänge, was fairly popular, but the second, Der Winter, did not garner as much success. One of Raff’s strongest supporters, Louis Lüstner, felt that Raff’s works were suffering due to his high output.\footnote{Raff, 200.}

Even on days or trips that were taken for relaxing, Raff could not refrain from working on his music. While Raff was considered an innovator of program music, he was also drawn to classical forms. This style placed him between the two main compositional groups of the time.\footnote{Liszt/Wagner (programmatic) vs. Brahms/Schumann (classical style).}

In the middle of the nineteenth century the “War of the Romantics” generated a debate about the development of form.\footnote{Alan Walker, et al, “Liszt, Franz,” Oxford Music Online, Oxford University Press, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/48265p12 (accessed June 8, 2013).} The classical camp felt that current musical structure was solid and needed no change. However, the programmatic camp felt that it was time to modify these existing forms.\footnote{Ibid.} For Raff, his two mentors were on opposite sides of the debate. While Mendelssohn sided with the classical approach, Liszt urged composers to explore new structural boundaries. Even in his Sinfonietta, one can see the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item Die Jahreszeiten means The Seasons.
  \item Raff, 199.
  \item Raff, 200.
  \item Liszt/Wagner (programmatic) vs. Brahms/Schumann (classical style).
  \item Ibid.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
influence of this debate. Within classical forms, Raff chooses to employ unbalanced phrasing. Ultimately, this decision not to align himself with either camp could be one of the reasons why Raff and his music was lost.

**Move to Frankfort and the Hoch Conservatory**

In 1877 Dr. Johann Peter Hoch, a music lover, left his fortune to the city of Frankfurt to establish a conservatory. Raff was asked to be the director, and he gladly accepted. After taking a two-week vacation in Switzerland, Raff moved to Frankfurt to begin setting up the Hoch Conservatory, which was to be located in one of the city’s oldest buildings, the *Saalhof*. After a year of hiring professors and designing the curriculum, the conservatory opened on September 25, 1878.

In his opening speech, Raff, now fifty-six, said that the first goal of the conservatory was to “conserve the aspects of musical technique involved in producing a work of art and also the elements which ensure that it is recorded in such a way that it can be performed.” The second goal was in reference to musical style. Raff said, “Like any other work of art, a piece of music is determined by its personality, location and time.”

Raff went on to talk about the importance of an educational institution to understand and
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107 Raff, 209.

108 Ibid.
respect the past, but to look forward and “run ahead of the times rather than lagging behind.”

In keeping with Raff’s rigorous work ethic, he chose not to employ a secretary or librarian. Instead he was determined to do all of that work himself. Raff even set his own salary lower than that of his top professor, Julius Stockhausen. In defense of this decision, Raff offered, “A theatre director often gets less than the star of the show. And Stockhausen’s the star of my show, isn’t he?” To emphasize that the conservatory was not designed to promote his own music, Raff forbade both students and professors from performing his compositions. These gestures continued to reveal his unselfish nature.

The conservatory opened with 60 students, but by the end of the first year, there were 123. Even though Raff had opportunities to teach privately, he always turned these requests down, stressing the need to become students at the school first. He even offered a compositional class for women, which was counter to the thinking of the time. One of his female compositional students, Mary Wurm, would eventually gain notoriety throughout Germany and England. Several of Raff’s male students gained fame, including a famous American composer, Edward MacDowell.
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The conservatory though was not without controversy. Since Raff was highly involved in his students’ progress, he attended their lessons and rehearsals. The studio teachers did not welcome this level of oversight as they felt Raff was often questioning the instruction being given. Another situation that came up was Stockhausen’s professional relationship with his fellow professors. Raff addressed this issue in a letter to Stockhausen, but to no avail. Stockhausen resigned and started his own vocal academy.

All of this strife took its toll on Raff. In the summer of 1881 Raff took a vacation to try to relieve some of the stress in his life. While in Weimar, he met up with Liszt, who had planned a concert in Raff’s honor. The overwhelming gratitude he felt towards his mentor for organizing such an event humbled him.

**Last Days**

As he began work on a new oratorio, Raff began having pains in his chest and a persistent cough. In the spring of 1882, Raff suffered cardiac arrest. Though he survived the incident, it was discovered that he had a serious heart problem. The patient was put on a strict diet, resulting in substantial weight loss. In addition to a visit by Johannes Brahms, the conservatory staff brought Raff a bouquet of flowers and a picture album. However, Raff realized that those persons in Germany’s cultural elite were not sending their regards. This stark acknowledgement greatly disappointed Raff, who knew that the days of his being among those at the top of the music world had passed.

Worried that the conservatory would move on without him, Raff insisted that he return to his post as director. His days at the office were shorter, but he was there trying
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115 Raff suffered from both an enlarged heart and clogged arteries.

116 Johannes Brahms (1833-1897).
to serve the students. On June 24, 1882, Raff went to bed and never again awoke, suffering another heart attack that evening. ¹¹⁷ Raff’s student, MacDowell remembers, “Only the day before the terribly sudden event I had walked part of the way home with him from the Conservatorium. As I bade him good-bye I noticed that his hand was very hot and dry and that his eyes seemed unusually bright. The next morning I was greatly shocked when I heard that he had been found dead in his bed by the barber who went every morning to shave him.”¹¹⁸ The funeral took place on June 27 with his remains being placed in the Frankfurt cemetery.

Just after his death, the Raff Memorial Society was formed in Frankfurt, with von Bülow serving as president, Max Fleisch as chairman, and Richard Strauss as one of the many members.¹¹⁹ The society’s goal was to construct a monument in honor of Raff by organizing concerts and accepting donations. This dream was realized as the Raff Memorial was erected and his remains placed beneath it. To this day, the city of Frankfurt is the caretaker of Raff’s final resting place.

**Summary**

Joachim Raff’s relationships with Mendelssohn and Liszt ultimately influenced the shape of his future compositions. While his time with Liszt was especially important, Raff did not achieve success until he broke free from the shadow of the great Hungarian. Never one to conform, Raff utilized musical ideas from both classical and programmatic

---

¹¹⁷* It is believed that the time of death was 11:00pm.


camps to create a unique voice that made him one of the most performed composers of his generation. Unfortunately for Raff, his financial status required him to produce music at high volumes, ultimately leading to him oversaturating the market. By the end of his life, audiences had heard so much Raff that they were yearning for a new voice. Despite Raff’s large musical output, one cannot ignore the important contributions he made to music in the nineteenth century. In addition to his numerous operas and symphonies, Raff’s other contributions came as the Director of the Hoch Conservatory, where he educated future musicians at one of Europe’s finest musical institutions. It is time for us to recognize one of the most performed composers of the nineteenth century and understand his place in music history.
CHAPTER 2
SINFONIETTA, OP. 188: A CONDUCTOR’S ANALYSIS

Analytical Process

Having examined Raff’s life and noted some of his influential compositions, it is time to look at his most important work for winds and investigate its worthiness in the wind band medium. I will approach this in two ways—a conductor’s analysis and an artistic merit critique.

The process of learning a score is one that is very personal, as a conductor must utilize all aspects of his or her musical knowledge to bring the composer’s ideas to life. While many conducting textbooks differ on the process of analysis, they all agree a conductor must analyze every aspect of the score. From a work’s formal structure to its orchestration, every detail must be addressed and understood before ever stepping onto the podium, as attention to these details will directly influence a conductor’s gestures.

I have chosen to analyze the Sinfonietta using a three-step method, one similar to the approach used by Donald Hunsberger and Roy Ernst in their textbook The Art of Conducting. The first step focuses on contextual information on the composition, where the conductor is asked to gather as much information about the composer, instrumentation, and historical context in which the piece was written. The second step analyzes the work’s form, its melodic and harmonic content, and its texture with regards to orchestration. The final aspect of the analytical process involves interpretive decisions.

conductors must make only after researching background information and having a complete grasp of the composition’s structure.

Regarding interpretation, Hunsberger and Ernst say the conductor should make decisions regarding the feel a tempo should create, how timbral changes should be embraced, and how the emotional content of the work can be developed throughout a work’s structure. Following background information on the composition, I have chosen to analyze each movement individually with regard to structural features and interpretation.

**Contextual Information**

Composed in 1873 during the high point of Joachim Raff’s artistic life and published by Siegel the following year, the *Sinfonietta*, Op. 188 was actually his second work for winds. Raff wrote his first work for winds, *Fest-Ouvertüre (für Blasinstrumente) über vier beliebte Burschenlieder*, Op. 124, eight years earlier in 1865. While the wind version to *Fest-Ouvertüre* existed only in manuscript form, Praeger and Meier published a four-hand piano edition in 1865.  

---


122 *Sinfonietta* means “little” or “light” symphony.

123 The *Fest-Ouvertüre* had been lost for many years, but as of March 1, 2014, has been located in the Stuttgart Landesmuseum. The version located in Stuttgart is the four-hand piano arrangement originally published in 1865, which the author of this monograph now has in his possession. It is very likely that the original wind work will never be located.
In the sequence of Raff’s musical output, the *Sinfonietta*, written during the composer’s time in Wiesbaden,\(^{124}\) falls just after a piano work and just before his sixth symphony.\(^{125}\) It is important to note that the term ‘sinfonietta’ was apparently invented by Raff.\(^{126}\) Sergei Prokofiev, Paul Hindemith, Darius Milhaud, and Ingolf Dahl are more recent examples of composers who have also composed sinfoniettas.\(^{127}\)

The *Sinfonietta*, now published by Edwin F. Kalmus and Whirlwind Music Publications, is for double woodwind quintet and is in four movements, lasting approximately twenty-five minutes. It is not known if the *Sinfonietta* was a commission or if it was composed for a particular individual, ensemble, or event.\(^{128}\)

In the Kalmus Publishing edition of the piece, a foreword written in Zurich in 1976 by Hans Steinbeck has been included.\(^{129}\) The translation from German to English follows:


\(^{125}\) The piano work was entitled *Erinnerung an Venedig: Sechs Stücke* (Memories of Venice: Six Pieces). Raff’s sixth symphony was composed in the summer of 1873 and was entitled *Symphonie: Gelebt: Gestrebt, Gelitten, Gestritten-Gestorben-Umworben* (“Symphony: Lived: Struggled, Suffered, Fought-Died-Glorified”). Raff’s strong work ethic is on display as the *Sinfonietta* was the tenth composition he completed in 1873.


\(^{127}\) Ibid.


\(^{129}\) Hans Steinbeck was the Director of the Swiss Music Archives at the Swiss Royalty Collection Society and was also a member of the Swiss National Sound Archives Establishment Association.
Though famous and successful in his day but now almost forgotten, composer Joseph Joachim Raff was born on May 27, 1822, in Lachen (Switzerland), the son of a Swiss mother and southern German father, who had fled to Switzerland as a consequence of the French Revolution. Even at a young age, Raff showed his teachers, Franz Abt in Zurich and Mendelssohn, a strong musical inclination, apparently inherited from his father. From 1845 on he was connected to Liszt and Hans von Bülow and, after stays in Weimar, Cologne, Hamburg, and Stuttgart, settled in Wiesbaden in 1856. In addition to his work as a composer and student, Raff helped with the instrumentation of various works by Franz Liszt. In 1877 he was appointed director of the Hoch Conservatory in Frankfurt, where he worked until his death on June 25, 1882.\(^{130}\)

In connection with the program of the anthology of Swiss music on records, which was produced from 1964 to 1971, Raff was rediscovered as a composer born in Switzerland. The author of these lines selected this rich, creative work, the *Sinfonietta* Op. 188, from a collection of more than 200 printed works. Composed in the late seventies based on the harmony of classical music (Serenades and Divertimenti), this composition proved to be very rewarding.\(^{131}\) Raff has provided us with a supremely delightful concert work in pairs of wind instruments (which is rarely found in the Romantic period), whose four varied, formally concise sentences are characterized by flourishing melody, ingenuity and a masterfully handled horn section, which sometimes requires virtuosic playing.

The 1969 recording of the *Sinfonietta* (plate CTS-34 Association for the promotion of Swiss music) was to our knowledge the first gramophone recording of a work by Raff, so to speak, a harbinger of an increasingly discernible, and certainly legitimate Raff-Renaissance.

We have no doubt that the *Sinfonietta*, Op. 188, in addition to the *Petite Symphonie* of Charles Gounod and the *Serenade*, Op. 44 of Dvorak, will find the entrance to the concert repertoire, as several noted concerts and radio and television broadcasts occurred in the wake of record production.

For practical reasons, the publisher and editor decided to reissue the out-of-print work using a new facsimile of the first edition. The instrumental parts were kindly loaned by the Bavarian State Library in Munich, while the score was provided by the University of Music and Performing Arts in Frankfurt.

If the performance of the *Sinfonietta* should prove one way or another to be too long, the editor suggests the following:

I. Movement: B-C, J-L
II. Movement: halfway before G-halfway after J
III. Movement: C-I

---

\(^{130}\) Sources differ on Raff’s date of death. Some sources indicate June 24, while others say June 25.

\(^{131}\) Why Steinbeck says this composition is from the late seventies when the exact date is 1873 is unknown.
This foreword clearly identifies that Raff, though well-known in his lifetime, is now overlooked. His rediscovery began when a project on Swiss music took place in the middle to late 1960s. Out of his entire collection of works, Steinbeck chose Raff’s Sinfonietta as the piece that deserved more attention.

Based on Mozart’s chamber works, Raff chose an instrumentation (ten winds) that is not usually seen in the Romantic period. Although Steinbeck mentions a 1969 recording of the Sinfonietta as the rebirth of Raff, the recording was actually published in 1971.\textsuperscript{132} The Orchestra della Radio Svizzera Italiana, under the direction of Leopoldo Casella, performed the work. It is my contention, in addition to Mr. Steinbeck’s, that the Sinfonietta is of similar quality to Dvorak’s Serenade and Gounod’s Petite Symphonie.

\textbf{Wind Band Literature in the 19th Century}

There were a few pieces in particular that Raff could have been exposed to that might have encouraged him to write this work. In 1824, Felix Mendelssohn, who Raff was in contact with for quite some time, wrote his Overture for Winds, Op. 24. The work was originally composed for eleven players, but the score was lost and rewritten for twenty-four performers.\textsuperscript{133} It is in one movement, but has two contrasting sections.

Two large works for winds composed during the 1840s could also have had an influence on Raff. In 1840 Hector Berlioz composed his Grand Symphonie Funebre et Triomphale, Op. 15 for a large concert ensemble. The work is in three movements and lasts approximately thirty minutes.

\textsuperscript{132} This recording is on LP by the Swiss CTS label (CTS 34).

\textsuperscript{133} Battisti, 5.
Just three years later, in 1843, Berlioz wrote a treatise on orchestration entitled *Grand Traité d’Instrumentation et d’Orchestration Modernes* that “provided composers with important mechanical and technical information on the instruments of the orchestra, especially wind instruments.”¹³⁴ Raff’s connection to Berlioz lies in the fact that Liszt and Berlioz were very close, both personally and professionally, with Berlioz making several trips to Weimar to visit Liszt. Raff and Liszt eventually would collaborate in hosting a ‘Berlioz Week’ festival in both 1852 and 1855.¹³⁵

One year after Berlioz’s treatise, Richard Wagner, whose relationship with Raff would best be described as contentious¹³⁶, wrote his only work solely for winds, *Trauersinfonie*, for “ceremonies marking the reinterment of Carl Maria von Weber’s body in Dresden after its return from London.”¹³⁷ While there is no proof that Raff heard this music or read Berlioz’s treatise, these resources were available and could have provided some background for his *Sinfonietta*.

Music written solely for wind instruments was very sparse during this time, but just after the *Sinfonietta*, the wind band medium saw an increase in compositions. In the twenty years leading up to the *Sinfonietta*, only eight compositions were completed. However during the twenty years following Raff’s piece, twenty-eight compositions for
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¹³⁴ Battisti, 5.


¹³⁷ Battisti, 5.
chamber winds were finished. Table 1 shows the list of additional chamber works for winds composed during this period. An * denotes those works that are transcriptions.

Table 1: Wind Chamber Compositions 1853-1893

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPOSER</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahms, Johannes</td>
<td>Begräbnisgesang, op. 13</td>
<td>1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahms, Johannes</td>
<td>Hungarian Dances Nos. 3, 5, 11, 16*</td>
<td>1858-1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahms, Johannes</td>
<td>Variations and Fugue on a Theme</td>
<td>1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruckner, Anton</td>
<td>Mass No. 2 in E minor</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounod, Charles</td>
<td>Hymne a Sainte Cecile</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cianchi, Emilio</td>
<td>Nonetto</td>
<td>1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizet, Georges</td>
<td>Jeux d'enfants*</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert, Franz</td>
<td>Ellens zweiter Gesang</td>
<td>1873 (approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizet, Georges</td>
<td>Carmen Suite*</td>
<td>1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubois, Theodore</td>
<td>Deuxième Suite</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry, Hubert Charles</td>
<td>Nonet, op. 70</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvorak, Antonin</td>
<td>Slavonic Dance, op. 46, no. 8</td>
<td>1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvorak, Antonin</td>
<td>Serenade in D minor</td>
<td>1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvorak, Antonin</td>
<td>Slavonic Dance, op. 72, no. 2*</td>
<td>1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Röntgen, Julius</td>
<td>Serenade in A, op. 14</td>
<td>1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvorak, Antonin</td>
<td>Czech Suite, op. 39*</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strauss, Richard</td>
<td>Serenade in E flat, op. 7</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouvy, Louis Theodore</td>
<td>Octet in E flat, op. 71</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faure, Gabriel</td>
<td>Premiere Nocturne, op. 33/1</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strauss, Richard</td>
<td>Suite in B flat, op. 4</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounod, Charles</td>
<td>Petite Symphonie, op. 90</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvorak, Antonin</td>
<td>Slavonic Dance, op. 72, no. 1</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvorak, Antonin</td>
<td>Slavonic Dance, op. 72, no. 7</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird, Arthur</td>
<td>Nonet (Marche Miniature)</td>
<td>1886-1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuille, Ludwig</td>
<td>Sextet in B flat, op. 6</td>
<td>1886-1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Saëns, Camille</td>
<td>Feuillets d'album, op. 81</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novacek, Rudolf</td>
<td>Sinfonietta in D minor</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird, Arthur</td>
<td>Suite in D</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazarri, Sylvio</td>
<td>Octuor, op. 20</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf, Hugo</td>
<td>Auf ein altes Bild</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janacek, Leos</td>
<td>Lachian Dances*</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard, Emile</td>
<td>Divertissement in F, op. 36</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartmann, Emil</td>
<td>Serenade in B flat, op. 43</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jadassohn, Salomon</td>
<td>Serenade, op. 104c</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinecke, Carl</td>
<td>Octet, op. 216</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheinberger, Josef</td>
<td>Messe in B flat, op. 172</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Five years after Raff’s piece, Antonin Dvorak composed his *Serenade in D minor* in 1878. This four-movement work lasts approximately twenty-five minutes and is for eleven performers, including adding a third French horn, a cello, and double bass to the traditional wind octet instrumentation.

Fellow German composer Richard Strauss composed two works for winds in the 1880s. His *Serenade in E flat*, Op. 7 was a single-movement work written in 1881, while his *Suite in B flat*, Op. 4, was completed in 1884. While both works were for thirteen players, the *Suite* was commissioned by Hans von Bülow, consisted of four movements, and lasted approximately twenty-three minutes.

Another standard wind work written shortly after Raff’s *Sinfonietta* was Charles Gounod’s *Petite Symphonie*. The work was completed in 1885 and was for standard wind octet, plus one flute. Paul Taffanel, flute professor at the Paris Conservatory, commissioned the work that is in four movements with a length of almost twenty minutes.

There is no evidence that these works were a direct result of Raff’s *Sinfonietta*, but due to gatherings called *Schubertiades*, composers maintained a tight circle and were cognizant of each other’s works.139 With Raff’s popularity at its peak during this time, there is little doubt that each of these composers knew of Raff and his many works, including the *Sinfonietta*.

---

Sound Elements and Interpretation

The second approach to my analysis is understanding a composition’s construction. This section will focus on the composition’s form, melodic and harmonic content, texture, and orchestration. Only after these details have been examined can one progress to making informed interpretive decisions.

Movement I (Allegro)

Form

The first movement of the Sinfonietta is the longest of the four, with 406 measures lasting approximately eight and a half minutes. As is standard practice with most classical symphonies, the first movement is in sonata form. The structure of the first movement is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Formal Structure of First Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>EXPOSITION</th>
<th>Key Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-36</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-70</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-74</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-98</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-124</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125-132</td>
<td>Closing Theme</td>
<td>G-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133-185</td>
<td>Introduction/Theme 2</td>
<td>F-Bb-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RECAPITULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186-221</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222-255</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256-259</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260-283</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284-309</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310-322</td>
<td>Closing Theme</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323-387</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CODA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388-406</td>
<td>Introduction Fragments</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first movement is in common time and marked allegro, although no exact tempo marking is indicated.

**Melodic Content**

Melodically, this movement contains a first theme, second theme, and closing theme. The first theme is introduced by flute 1 in measure 37 and can be seen in Figure 1.

![Figure 1 - Theme 1 (mm. 37-44)](image1)

Two leaps a major sixth apart can be seen in the antecedent of the phrase, while a leap of an octave and another major sixth can be seen in the consequent. However after each leap, the phrase takes on a downward motion. When the first theme reappears in measure 222 of the recapitulation, it is once again performed by flute in identical fashion.

The second theme, which is twice as long as the first theme, is presented in measure 73 by oboe 1 with support by the horns and bassoons, creating a homophonic texture. Theme two can be seen in Figure 2.

![Figure 2 - Theme 2 (mm. 75-90)](image2)

Theme two is a welcome change as the romantic tone of this passage is in stark contrast to the material found in the opening 72 measures. While theme one contained
several intervallic leaps, theme two moves largely in a step-wise motion, with its range staying within a major seventh. Just as theme one is restated in the recapitulation, theme two reappears in measure 260, but this time oboe 2 has joined the homophonic texture. One unique aspect of this theme is that its sub-phrasing could be interpreted as two 4-measure sections or it could be heard as one 3-measure and 5-measure sub-phrase. This ambiguity shows Raff’s foothold in both camps.

Finally, the closing theme occurs at measure 125, when both flute 1 and clarinet 1 play in octaves. This theme is shown in Figure 3.

![Figure 3 - Closing Theme (mm. 125-133)](image)

While the first two themes of this movement have a similar feel, this new theme, with a range of an octave and a half, stretches the technique of both performers. The movement of this theme is generally in a step-wise motion either ascending or descending. When the closing theme returns in recapitulation in measure 310, the pattern has moved up a fourth, beginning on an F instead of a C. In addition, Raff chooses to extend this theme by five measures, further showcasing the technique of the two soloists.

**Harmonic Content**

Harmonically the first movement begins in F major, before an A major chord at measure 26 provides the initial movement toward D minor. However a return to F major
can be heard once again with the introduction of the first theme at measure 37. One chord that could be quite striking for both the performers and listeners can be heard at measure 57. Raff is able to achieve this new tonality, D-flat major, by moving step-wise in both the soprano and bass voices. The movement remains in this tonality until a move to G is felt at measure 67. The introduction of theme two, as well as the closing theme, is centered on C, the dominant of the original F major.

As the development section begins with a restatement of the introduction first heard in measure 1, so does a return to F major. Similar to most development sections, key centers come and go quickly, before a return to F major is felt at the recapitulation. Where the recapitulation truly differs is in measure 238 when our half note passage, originally heard in measure 53, now returns in minor. Instead of the shocking D-flat heard at the conclusion of these four measures, we now hear G-flat major, which is sustained until a C⁷ chord leads us back into F major as the second theme returns once again. The transition into the closing theme at measure 310 utilizes the same progression as before, but this time the theme is in F major instead of the original G major, where the movement remains until its conclusion at measure 406.

**Texture, Orchestration, and Rhythmic Development**

Regarding texture, Raff was considered an orchestrator of the highest caliber. The majority of the first movement is homophonic, but where Raff shows his creativity is in instrument pairings and rhythmic shifts. A long introduction begins very softly and builds by adding both crescendos and voices. Octave F’s in the horn provide a foundation for a rhythmic pattern in contrary motion played by both the clarinets and bassoons.
Measure 7 adds a new color (oboes) and a new rhythmic figure (dotted eighth and sixteenth) has replaced the pattern found in measures 1 to 6. The horns continue to operate in their own fashion until the entrance of the flutes in measure 11, which serves as a small climax within the introduction. Flute 1 and oboe 1 operate collectively as they play a motive that builds until the main climax at measure 26, where we hear the first dramatic shift in key.

The initial rhythmic pattern heard in measures 1 through 6 returns in measure 27, but this time all voices, minus the horns, play this idea. This section clearly acts as a transition into the first theme performed by flute 1 from measures 37 to 44. Careful attention must be paid to balance as the lone flute plays against eight other voices.

Canonic entrances can be heard first in oboe 1, but then exchanged between clarinet 1 and flute 1 through measure 52. The second theme has a more relaxed personality, but an ascending passage built in thirds interrupts the music. The character has clearly shifted back to a more aggressive but lighter style, one quite similar to the beginning of the movement.

One of the more technically challenging moments of this movement begins at measure 98 where an ascending eighth note figure is passed canonically downward through most of the ensemble. The restatement of the second theme at measure 105 can be heard in both the horns and bassoons. However, what makes this section unique is that we now hear a virtuosic oboe part layered above this restatement. Eventually the oboe gives way to flute 1 at measure 113. This section provides a wonderful contrast between the calm temperaments of theme two and the virtuosic line of oboe 1 and flute 1. All of

---

140 Bassoon 1 is tacet during this section.
this brewing intensity manifests itself in the closing theme, where an energetic triplet passage in octaves is performed by flute 1 and clarinet 1.

The beginning of the development has a similar feel to the introduction of the movement. One difference is that this introduction utilizes the second theme of the exposition as it continues to be interrupted by the contrasting eighth note motion originally heard in measure 1. A four-note ascending and descending motive, prominent from measure 155 to 161, is passed between clarinet 1, oboe 1, and flute 1.

An alternating whole note and half note pattern, complete with lengthy decrescendo, brings the development section to a close. This decrescendo helps to resurrect the solemnity of the introduction of the movement when the recapitulation surfaces in measure 186.

While the overall idea of the recapitulation is consistent with the exposition, Raff uses different colors of instruments to pique the listener’s interest. A virtuosic statement once played by oboe at measure 105 is now played by flute 1, with the second statement of theme 2 underneath it. The original pairing of flute 1 and clarinet 1 returns for the closing theme, but Raff’s small shifts in those accompanying keep the music fresh.

Another new addition to the music is the extension of the closing theme that occurs from measure 318 to 322. Measures 324 through 331 are similar in construction to measures 230 to 237, but instead of concluding with half notes, Raff chooses to let the bassoons have their technical moment for a few measures before bringing us back to C major at measure 344. Raff once again repeats material from the introduction of the movement, but this time it is intended to deceive the listener. Raff fools us by placing a D minor triad at measure 350.
While the material found at measure 351 is new, it still hints at the second theme while asking certain performers to display their technique once again. The conversation between clarinet 1 and flute 1 is very evident and adds to the progression back to F major in measure 372, where the bassoons are featured once again.

The beginning of the coda at measure 388 is characterized by a *Poco piu moto*. While this music is very similar to the introduction, Raff’s subtle changes such as utilizing the flute in tandem with the clarinets and bassoons keep the listener engaged. The ending of the movement is fairly traditional as he employs silence to build intensity before ending on an F major triad.

**Interpretation**

With regards to tempo, Raff only indicated ‘allegro’ and did not specify an exact tempo marking. Robert Donington’s interpretation of music during this time period was that time-words “related strictly to mood, not to tempo.”¹⁴¹ Wagner’s interpretation of tempo during this time was “the idea of appropriate and phrasing and expression will induce the conception of the true tempo.”¹⁴² Based on my conducting experiences and the technical demands placed on the performers, I suggest a half note equaling 96-100. The first movement is in common time, but the conductor should strongly consider placing the movement in cut time as it would give the players more freedom. It is important that the conductor not slow down at the end, as it is only the conclusion of the first movement.


From my conducting perspective, the overall character of the opening movement should be energetic and full of conversation between each voice. Since the majority of the first movement is homophonic, careful attention must be placed towards balance, as melodic figures could be overshadowed. Raff’s creativity in terms of timbre and rhythmic alterations should always be brought to the forefront. Whether it is a change in feel from duple to triple or an added voice in support of a theme, Raff’s small shifts are what keep the music fresh.

**Movement II (Allegro Molto)**

**Form**

The second movement, a 6/8 scherzo, lasts approximately five minutes and, similar to the first movement, has no defined tempo other than Allegro Molto. The structure of the second movement, ABA\(^1\) with a Coda, can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3: Formal Structure of Second Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>A SECTION</th>
<th>Key Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-85</td>
<td>First Theme</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-130</td>
<td>Second Theme</td>
<td>Db</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131-144</td>
<td>First Theme(^1)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145-168</td>
<td>Third Theme</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168-188</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188-248</td>
<td>Third Theme(^1)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248-256</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257-304</td>
<td>First Theme(^2)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305-339</td>
<td>CODA</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Melodic Content

Similar to the first movement, three themes dominate this movement. Instead of a long introduction, Raff introduces the first theme in the clarinets in measure 3. This theme can be seen in Figure 4.

![Figure 4 - First Theme (mm. 3-10)](image)

Step-wise motion dominates this one octave theme. While clarinet 2 does play the same pattern in harmony, clarinet 1 should be treated as the lead voice. Similar to the first theme of movement one, this theme is 8 measures long, with the last 4 measures being a repeat of the first four.

Just as the second theme in the first movement was 16 measures long, so is the one found in the second movement. This theme, introduced simultaneously with a key change, can be seen in Figure 5.

![Figure 5 - Second Theme (mm. 86-101)](image)
While the overall shape of this line is 16 total measures, strong antecedent and consequent phrases are present with this theme that spans just over an octave. Within each 8-measure sub-phrase, the shape of the line is evident with the first 4 measures moving upwards and the proceeding 4 measures moving downwards. In the second sub-phrase, the direction only moves upward toward the final F. Raff also chooses to clearly define desired articulations, both slurs and staccatos within this theme. It is the first time that we have seen staccatos utilized within a theme.

Similar to the key shift found at the first statement of theme two, we find another key shift, this time moving to F major. The third theme can be seen in Figure 6.

![Figure 6 - Third Theme (mm. 144-168)](image)

Raff has unveiled his longest theme of the first two movements and clearly identifies the desired phrasing. There are six sub-phrases within these 25 measures, with the first 4 sub-phrases each containing 8 notes. However the fifth and sixth sub-phrases contain 10 and 5 notes respectively. The overall shape of each sub-phrase is ascending with the proceeding sub-phrase starting lower than the previous note. The only exception to this pattern is the last sub-phrase. This unbalanced theme is another example of Raff’s compositional style being influenced by both musical camps.
**Harmonic Content**

The first 18 measures are rooted in F minor and feature both the clarinets and bassoons, with the clarinet first playing theme one before the roles are reversed in measure 11. A shift to the dominant can be found when the horns take over the motor rhythm at measure 19. The restatement of the first theme by the flutes in measure 48 brings a return to F minor.

Brief hints of E and A-flat eventually lead us to D-flat major with the introduction of the second theme. The restatement of the first theme at measure 131 is now in C, instead of the F minor heard in measure 3. The third theme makes its appearance at measure 101, with Raff positioning the movement back in its original F minor where we stay until the A\(^1\) section appears at measure 257. At this point Raff utilizes a pedal C in the clarinets, while clearly placing the bassoons in F minor where we remain until the end of the movement.

**Texture, Orchestration, and Rhythmic Development**

Overall this movement is homophonic, with a motor rhythm driving the movement. While the bassoons begin this motor rhythm of a quarter note and eighth note at measure 1, it is eventually passed to the horns at measure 19 by playing octave Cs.

Raff’s addition of the oboes and flutes helps propel the music forward before the restatement of the first theme at measure 43. This restatement builds in intensity towards measure 53 where the apex of the musical line is heard. The flutes and clarinets, performing in pairs, are providing all melodic content throughout this section.

A four-bar unison line shifts us out of the aggressive nature of the first 59 measures. The character of this movement has clearly shifted as a more romantic second
theme from flute 1 and oboe 1 takes over. The clarinets should strive to sound like one, as they must consistently hand off a four-note ostinato.

Oboe 1 takes over the second theme at measure 102, but careful attention must be placed on balance as the remaining nine members of the ensemble play a supportive role. This section continues to build in intensity through increased motion and dynamics. Raff has positioned the listener for a strong climax at measure 188, but frustrates the listener’s expectations by offering offers a subito piano back in D-flat major, an element not heard in either of the first two movements.

Just before the key change at measure 131, Raff hints at the aggressive nature of the first theme before it makes its return in the flutes. The original statement of the first theme was in F minor, but now we hear it in C. The clarinets eventually join the flutes as this section builds to measure 146, where we hear a third theme played by the horns that introduces the B section now firmly in F. The only accompaniment to the horns is the clarinet 1 in which they play a birdcall-like motive, another distinct sound not previously heard.

The third theme eventually gives way to a transition at measure 168 that displays the technique of flute 1 and bassoon 1 on top of a lyrical melody. The return of the third theme by the oboes at measure 188 is now supported by this technical passage in bassoon 1 and clarinet 1. This third theme continues for several measures before the original statement of the theme is heard in the horns. However, Raff chooses to employ the flute 1 in a supportive role, instead of the clarinet birdcall we heard earlier at measure 145 in the clarinet.
This third theme stretches all the way to measure 248 where a transition that hints at the return of the first theme can be recognized in the bassoons. Eventually the first theme does return, but this time the first statement is in the bassoons instead of the clarinets. The build in this section is similar, with the downbeat of measure 289 being identical to measure 43. The music from this point is exactly as before, until the appearance of the coda in measure 305.

Raff uses chromatic movement in the flutes to build intensity, and just as another climax is imminent, hints of theme one reappear in the clarinets and bassoons. An ascending five-note theme in the flutes leads us back to F minor while horn 1 sustains a C, F, C over short rhythmic figures before the movement culminates on an F minor chord.

**Interpretation**

While no tempo marking actually exists, I recommend a metronome marking of dotted quarter note equaling 124-128. The overall feel of this movement is aggressive, but sections of relaxation do exist. I feel it is important that the character shifts within this movement are brought to the forefront.

The motor rhythm of quarter and eighth note is passed throughout the ensemble and must be performed consistently by each voice. When Raff requires the performers to play consecutives eighth notes, he often asks them to slur the first two and tongue the third. The performers must lift off the sound on the second eighth in order to hear the articulation of the third eighth.
Movement III (Larghetto)

Form

While the third movement is the shortest in length in terms of measures, it often takes the longest to perform, lasting approximately eight minutes. The structure of the third movement can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4: Formal Structure of Third Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>A SECTION</th>
<th>Key Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-30</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-33</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>f#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-49</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-57</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-104</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105-120</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-156</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>C-G-C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Melodic Content

Unlike the first two movements, only two themes are heard in these 156 measures. Utilizing an ABABA form, Raff uses each theme to begin a new section. Theme one, first performed by the clarinets, can be seen in Figure 7.
Raff introduces this 14-measure theme right on measure 1. This theme is unique in that it is not properly balanced, with 8 measures forming the antecedent and 6 measures forming the consequent. The range spans the interval of a tenth. Unlike the second movement, Raff does not ask the performer to rearticulate the third note of the three-note grouping.

The second theme opens the B section of the movement and begins in measure 34. This theme, first performed by oboe 1, can be seen in Figure 8.

In the first two movements, Raff’s second themes have always been greater in length than the first. However in this movement, this second theme is only 8 measures long. While its range spans less than an octave, it does contain several accidentals, something not often seen within Raff’s themes.

**Harmonic Content**

Theme one, harmonically centered in C major, is heard immediately in the clarinets, where subtle crescendos and decrescendos provide intriguing shaping. This movement is the only one of the four that does not start in either F major or minor. While
F major does appear during the first theme, the majority of the A section is in C major, with a few hints of G major, the eventual key of the second theme.

The second theme alternates between G and D, but the return of theme one at measure 58 brings us back to C. Raff does not repeat everything from the previous A section, choosing to employ several modulations ranging from C minor, F minor, A major, and B major. The restatement of theme two at measure 105 moves the work back to C major, the original key of the movement. A move to the pre-dominant carries the music through this section until theme one reappears at measure 121. From this point Raff uses C, F, and G before ending on a C major triad.

**Texture, Orchestration, and Rhythmic Development**

Within the first theme, Raff uses triplets, the first appearance of that rhythm since the opening movement. After the first theme comes to a conclusion at measure 14, we hear a sixteenth note pattern that seems to project a sense of forward motion. Raff is able to achieve a change of rhythm without interrupting the overall lyrical quality of the movement.

The transition from measures 50-57 leads us back into the first theme at measure 58 and is unique in that it is the first time we hear sixteenth note triplets in the work. The performers must be able to shift their rhythmic focus between triple and duple throughout this section.

Theme one is back in C major, but the flutes and oboes, whose parts are constructed in intervals of thirds, perform it this time. The second statement of theme one begins again at measure 66, but is played by the oboes in thirds. Raff chooses to use a different accompaniment figure as well. Whereas the first time we heard this concept in
measure 9 when it utilized only legato quarter notes in support, this variation adds an eighth note triplet pattern in the clarinets. A sixteenth note pattern heard in measure 71 moves us to C minor, interjecting a sense of unrest in the movement. However this unrest subsides after five measures, at which the oboes and horn 1 reintroduce a sense of tranquility.

Consecutive entrances moving downward through the ensemble provide a nice change of pace in measures 81 to 84, but attention must be given to how each voice enters the sound. This section acts as another transition as motives from theme one are heard beginning in measure 88. One voice seems to initiate an idea, only to have another voice finish the statement.

Measure 94 begins a push forward, both in tempo and volume. Although a change of tempo is not dictated, one can feel it in the music so that time can be pulled back before the restatement of theme two by oboe 1 at measure 105. The music has returned to C major and, while the oboe is once again the primary voice, the accompaniment has shifted slightly to provide the listener with some variety. In addition, the oboe is joined this time by horn 1, instead of bassoon 1, in measure 113.

A two-measure transition beginning at measure 119 brings us back to the first theme at 121. On this occasion the horn has the melody, while flute 1 provides a virtuosic line that appears to soar over the main material, taking us all the way through measure 134 where we hear a restatement of the first theme in thirds played by the flutes and clarinets. The strengthening intensity is aided by ascending sixteenth note passages in oboe 1 and flute 1, before a descending triplet pattern brings the piece back under control.
at measure 143. Fragments of the first theme are heard in the final measures before Raff settles on a C major triad at the end.

**Interpretation**

This movement carries with it a stronger emotional content than either of the two previous movements. Although a suggested tempo marking of quarter note equaling 60 is appropriate, the conductor should feel free to show more elasticity between the bar lines. Rhythmically, the performers must negotiate between duple and triple within a slower tempo. It is important that this shift not disrupt the gentle character of this movement.

The accidentals found in theme two create several minor second intervals. Performers should embrace these accidentals to create a tension and release effect. Special attention must be given to how the performers release their sound, as concrete note endings are not essential. Tenuto markings are very apparent throughout the first 30 measures of this movement, an articulation not offered by Raff in the first two movements.

**Movement IV (Vivace)**

**Form**

The fourth movement, while similar in length to the first movement in terms of number of measures, is actually the shortest in duration, lasting approximately four and one half minutes. The movement is labeled Vivace, but as is the case with the other movements, no actual tempo marking is provided. The structure of the fourth movement can be seen in Table 5.
Table 5: Formal Structure of Fourth Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>A SECTION</th>
<th>Key Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-55</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-109</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>C-G-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-225</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>(Various)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-283</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284-302</td>
<td>Theme 1/Theme 2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Melodic Content**

Similar to the third movement, Raff utilizes only two major themes in this movement. Raff introduces the first theme in measure 1, just as he did in the previous two movements. The flutes, playing in thirds, perform this opening theme, with only the clarinets accompanying. This theme can be seen in Figure 9.

![Flute First Theme (mm. 1-16)](image)

**Figure 9 - First Theme (mm. 1-16)**

Sixteen measures long with a range of less than an octave, the final movement opens with an aggressive theme, complete with articulations on every note. The first four measures and proceeding four measures are almost completely identical. Measures 9-12
are similar in construction to the first eight measures, but Raff employs ascending legato quarter notes over the last four measures to prepare the listener for what is to come later in the movement.

Theme two appears in both oboe 1 and bassoon 1 playing in octaves. It is the first time in the entire *Sinfonietta* that Raff presents a new theme played by instruments of different timbres. This second theme can be seen in Figure 10.

![Figure 10 - Second Theme (mm. 55-71)](image)

This theme is sixteen bars long, same as the first theme of this movement. With a range of a ninth, Raff has chosen an evenly balanced theme. One point of note about theme two is that when it reappears at measures 225-226, the first three eighth notes are stated by the horns. However, this time Raff delays the sound of the quarter notes for two full beats.

Finally for the first time in this entire composition, Raff closes out the movement by combining fragments of both theme one and two. While the flutes and clarinets hint at theme one in measure 284, the horns perform theme two. However, theme two originally began on beat two of the measure, but Raff starts it on beat one.

**Harmonic Content**

Similar to the first movement, the fourth movement begins in F major, where Raff maintains this tonality until the introduction of theme two at measure 56. This new theme
is now in C major, with small motions toward the dominant, G major. Toward the end of
the B section, Raff introduces F minor in measures 103 and 105 before taking us back to
F major with the restatement of theme one at measure 110. Throughout this restatement,
Raff transports the listener through several modulations, including A-flat, E-flat, G-flat,
and finally C major at measure 210.

When theme two returns at measure 225, we are now back in our original F major
center. Brief modulations to A-flat in measure 241 and Bb at measure 245 finally lead us
to the dominant of C major at measure 258. As expected in the final movement, Raff
moves us back to F major at measure 276, where we remain until a final F major triad
completes the Sinfonietta.

**Texture, Orchestration, and Rhythmic Development**

Raff continues the homophonic texture by asking the flutes, playing in thirds, to
perform the opening theme with only the clarinets accompanying. A brief transition from
measures 16 to 20 gives way to a restatement of the first theme. However, Raff now asks
the oboes and bassoons to accompany the flutes.

The second theme, rooted in C major, is played in octaves by oboe 1 and bassoon
1, with the accompanying figure playing in hocket. This new theme continues to measure
72 where a rather lengthy transition takes us back and forth between G major and C
major before resting on F major at measure 110 with the restatement of the first theme.
This restatement from measure 110 to 155 is identical to the material in measures 1
through 46, which should facilitate the preparation of this movement for both the
conductor and performers.
Measures 156 to 160 offer a short transition before we hear fragments of the first theme split between the flutes and bassoons. The four accented quarter notes from earlier in the movement return, but this time they are followed by a descending sixteenth note pattern in clarinet 1. These four accented notes continue to recur throughout the next few bars, with hints of the first theme appearing in conjunction at measure 206.

This trend continues until the return of the second theme in oboe 1 and bassoon 1 in measure 226. However, unlike the first statement of second theme at measure 56, horn 1 takes over the theme from bassoon 1 at measure 230.

Following a short four-bar transition from 241 to 244, fragments of the second theme emerge amidst sixteenth note flourishes. These moments carry the music to measure 268 where we hear a unison rhythm that appears to displace the beat by an eighth note. This compositional device is used by Raff to add further tension to the music.

As the music builds, fragments of the first theme reappear. Finally, the music is back in F major as the coda begins at measure 284. The music rises to an exciting conclusion where we find an ending similar to the first movement. A final F major triad is performed, with both flutes, oboe 1, clarinet 2, horn 2, and bassoon 2 playing the root.

**Interpretation**

A metronome marking of quarter note equaling 148 seems appropriate. The character of this movement is very lively, generated both by tempo and style. Although not marked, a slight ritard over the last few measures is acceptable.

Articulations for both the first theme and second theme must be clearly addressed. For the first theme, Raff has placed a slur and staccato over the same notes. It is this
conductor’s opinion that the performers should break the slur and rearticulate the staccato eighth note. In the second theme, Raff has placed an accent in the middle of the slur. The approach to this accent should be one of weight, not an emphasis on the tongue.

The ascending technical passage in the flutes in measures 29 and 30 brings us to a repetitious pattern of the ensemble playing four accented quarter notes and eight eighth notes. The conductor must pay close attention to how the performers handle the weight of each quarter note versus the light staccato eighth notes.

**Work of Serious Artistic Merit**

Once each movement is dissected in terms of form, texture, and orchestration, it is imperative to show why this is a quality work in the canon. In 1978, Acton Eric Ostling, Jr., a doctoral student in music education at the University of Iowa, completed a research project that developed criteria used to determine works of “serious artistic merit.” As new compositions were being commissioned in the 1960s, it became imperative that conductors determine works of artistic merit.

The wind ensemble concept that developed in the middle twentieth century was in stark contrast to the symphonic band concept that ruled earlier. This new concept had its roots in Mozart, Beethoven, and Mendelssohn and it was important that newer compositions have similar quality. Ostling also felt that the “development in the repertoire for the wind band during the last twenty-five years of the current century has occurred in three general areas of activity: (1) a revival of interest in dormant compositions, (2) discoveries through musicological research, and (3) the stimulation of new compositions through commissions, contests, and the encouragement of young

---

Ostling, 1.
composers to contribute to the wind band literature.” With an increase of compositions now available, it became apparent that meritorious works needed to be identified so that composers and conductors alike had a template for choosing and creating quality literature.

Compositions chosen for Ostling’s study had to fall into one of four categories:“(1) Original compositions for the ensemble, as defined; (2) transcriptions completed by the composer, or personally approved by the composer; (3) transcriptions by person other than the composer which were selected from music written prior to 1750; and (4) transcriptions of twentieth-century compositions.” Raff’s Sinfonietta clearly falls under Ostling’s first category of being an original composition for winds.

In determining which actual compositions were to be reviewed, Ostling started with works he had “conducted in concert performance and/or rehearsal…heard in concert performance and/or observed rehearsal…heard through recorded performance.” From that point, Ostling asked Frederick Fennell to review the list and add compositions he felt warranted review. The final list of pieces totaled near 400, but Raff’s Sinfonietta was not included. Compositions included in this study that fall within twenty years of 1873 were Johannes Brahms’ Begrabnisgesang (1858), Anton Bruckner’s Mass No. 2 in E minor (1866/1882), Antonin Dvorak’s Serenade in D minor, Op. 44 (1878), Charles Gounod’s

144 Ostling, 3.
146 Ibid, 31.
Petite Symphonie (1885), Richard Strauss’ Serenade, Op. 7 (1882) and Suite in Bb, Op. 4 (1884), and Richard Wagner’s Huldigungsmarsch (1864).\textsuperscript{147}

Noted Raff scholar, Mark Thomas, feels that Raff was relatively unknown until the release of a 1970 LP recording of his Fifth Symphony (Lenore) by Bernard Hermann and the London Philharmonic Orchestra. It is possible that even though this recording was released eight years prior to his dissertation, Ostling might not have been aware of Raff’s work for winds. If Ostling was unaware of the work, then he would not have conducted it in a performance or rehearsal, nor would he have rehearsed it at any point prior to 1978.

After the rediscovery of Raff in 1970, a 1971 recording of the Sinfonietta on a Swiss record label became available. This somewhat obscure album shed light on Raff’s work for winds, but the availability of the album was most likely limited as it contained two other relatively unknown composers.\textsuperscript{148} It is unknown if Ostling ever heard this recording. However as he stated earlier, if Ostling had heard a recording it would have most likely made the list of 400 compositions to be reviewed.

Finally, only two other known recordings of the Sinfonietta exist and both were completed after 1978. The first recording was made in 1993 by Radio-Sinfonieorchester Basel, a professional ensemble in Switzerland. Two years later, the Catholic University of America Chamber Winds, conducted by Robert Garofalo, recorded the Sinfonietta.

\textsuperscript{147} Wagner’s Huldigungsmarsch was arranged by Raff, one year before Raff wrote his first work for winds, Fest-Ouvertüre, Op. 124.

\textsuperscript{148} In addition to the Sinfonietta, this album included the opera La Rappressaglia by Joseph Hartmann Stunz and the Double Clarinet Concerto for Orchestra by Schnyder van Wartensee.
While both of these recordings have supported the promotion of Raff and his music, they both came well after Ostling’s dissertation.

Even though Raff’s work was omitted from Ostling’s study, it is important to recognize how it measures against the ten criteria he established to determine a work’s merit. The first criterion used for judgment was that “the composition has form – not a form, but form – and reflects a proper balance between repetition and contrast.”\(^{149}\) If there was one thing that Raff understood when it came to music, it was form. Raff’s *Sinfonietta* demonstrates not only form within a larger framework, but clear structure within each movement, both in phrase design and balance of themes versus transitional passages.

Ostling’s second criterion was that “the composition reflects shape and design, and creates the impression of conscious choice and judicious arrangements on the part of the composer.”\(^{150}\) While these first two criteria deal with form, this criterion refers directly to organization related to “phrasing and cadencing.”\(^{151}\) Once again, Raff’s control of phrasing is very evident as thematic material is clearly separated by transitional phrases. Classical themes are often very simplistic, and Raff’s ideas follow this trend, with several of the *Sinfonietta*’s themes having strong antecedent and consequent structure. Where Raff is creative is in his use of combining contrasting articulations, both slurs and staccatos, within one theme and by constructing unbalanced themes. In his approach to cadences, Raff typically uses traditional harmonic movement. Occasionally,

\(^{149}\) Ostling, 23.

\(^{150}\) Ibid, 24.

\(^{151}\) Ibid, 25.
however, such as at measure 57 of the first movement, Raff moves the listener to an unexpected new tonality.

The third criterion was that “the composition reflects craftsmanship in orchestration, demonstrating a proper balance between transparent and tutti scoring, and also between solo and group colors.”\(^{152}\) This criterion seeks to judge the composer’s control of texture and color. Raff was known as a master orchestrator and was employed by several composers, including Liszt and Wagner, to transform their compositions into works of art. Even within the *Sinfonietta*, one can see how Raff shifts colors not only between those playing melodic content, but also by those who are accompanying. In addition, Raff is judicious in allowing each voice to carry melodic material at some point. He chooses to employ traditional support instruments of horn and bassoon into melodic vehicles throughout the entire composition.

Following control of texture and color, Ostling’s fourth criterion was that “the composition is sufficiently unpredictable to preclude an immediate grasp of its musical meaning.”\(^{153}\) With regards to texture and color, wind instruments offer more possibilities due to a variety of timbres and combinations possible. Raff used his orchestrational skills to add variety and unpredictability to his music. While Raff had a strong grasp of form, it did not preclude him from creating unpredictable moments in his music. Whether it was an atypical shift of key center, the use of canonic entrances, or the use of an instrument in a virtuosic role layered about thematic material, Raff knew the optimum amount of

\(^{152}\) Ostling, 25.

\(^{153}\) Ibid.
creativity to insert in his *Sinfonietta*, without disrupting the overall flow of the composition.

The next criterion used by Ostling was “the route through which the composition travels in initiating its musical tendencies and probable musical goals is not completely direct and obvious.”\(^{154}\) This statement refers to how the composition moves through what a listener would expect, while not being too direct. Raff certainly does use standard classical forms that are easy for the listener to understand. However just as in Ostling’s fourth criterion, the *Sinfonietta* takes enough liberties, both in its use of transitional passages and its orchestration, that the music remains fresh to the audience. As stated earlier, his melodies are clear, but at times, can be asymmetrical in their construction. Also, when Raff restates a theme, it is often supported by a different voice or played by an entirely different instrument.

The sixth criterion was that “the composition is consistent in its quality throughout its length and in its various sections.”\(^{155}\) The *Sinfonietta* is very consistent both in its overall structure and its use of melodic and harmonic content. Over the course of its four movements, Raff demonstrates his creativity without interrupting the overall flow of the work. Raff’s themes are cleverly constructed and are not overused. Once he has stated a theme, he positions the listener for creative interplay between the voices.

“The composition is consistent in its style, reflecting a complete grasp of technical details, clearly conceived ideas, and avoids lapses into trivial, futile, or unsuitable passages” was the seventh criterion utilized by Ostling. Raff had a complete

\(^{154}\) Ostling, 26.

\(^{155}\) Ibid, 27.
understanding of how a piece of music was constructed. From its form to its melodic content, Raff knew how to stay on task and evade any passages that did not contribute to the overall shape of the piece. His melodies have clear shape and accompanimental figures are there to support each theme. When a theme is not being stated, Raff uses compositional devices such as canonic entrances and hockets to keep the music fresh before moving on to a new theme.

Ostling’s eighth criterion was that “the composition reflects ingenuity in its development, given the stylistic context in which it exists,” referring to the ability to hold one’s attention, the ability to remember its content, and the presence of technical invention. While the Sinfonietta is twenty-five minutes in length, Raff’s creativity in orchestration and melodic development attempts to keep the listener engaged throughout. The presence of technical invention can be found in how he introduces themes, how he utilizes transitional passages, and how he shifts accompanying figures during the course of each movement.

The ninth criterion used to determine a work’s merit was that “the composition is genuine in idiom, and is not pretentious,” which seeks to find that “the composition is true to its concept implied by its title.” As stated earlier in this chapter, a Sinfonietta is a short symphony. Raff uses the four movements to paint a picture on a smaller canvas than one used in a traditional orchestral setting. Pretentious music attempts to make comments about something other than their original intent. From making a political statement or displaying extreme technical ability, Raff is able to avoid these pitfalls.
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While his music does require accomplished players, this virtuosity does not drive the piece, relying instead on a variety of themes and his orchestrational abilities to create a work of merit.

Finally, Ostling’s last criterion was that “the composition reflects a musical validity which transcends factors of historical importance, or factors of pedagogical usefulness.”\textsuperscript{158} Raff was able to create a piece that appeared to reinvigorate composers’ interest in the wind band medium. While music for the wind band was limited prior to 1873, a spike in production occurred immediately following the completion of this work. This piece could be regarded as the catalyst for future wind works such as the Dvorak \textit{Serenade} and Gounod \textit{Petite Symphonie}.

Two additional research projects based on Ostling’s dissertation have come about in the past twenty years. In 1993, Jay Warren Gilbert, a doctoral student at Northwestern University, produced a literal replication of Ostling’s work.\textsuperscript{159} Unlike Ostling’s version, however, Raff’s \textit{Sinfonietta} was included in the study. Out of the twenty evaluators who rated the work, ten of them were familiar with the \textit{Sinfonietta}.\textsuperscript{160} The work also received a 3.1 average rating out of 5, with 5 being the highest.

\textsuperscript{158} Ostling, 30.

\textsuperscript{159} Jay Warren Gilbert, “An Evaluation of Compositions for Wind Band According to Specific Criteria of Serious Artistic Merit; A Replication and Update” (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1993), i.

\textsuperscript{160} Gilbert, 117.
In 2011, Clifford Neil Towner, a doctoral student at the University of Nebraska, undertook a second update to Ostling’s original study.\(^1\) Twenty evaluators were once again asked to rate each piece on a scale of 1 to 5. For this study, twelve evaluators, two more than in Gilbert’s study, were familiar with Raff’s Sinfonietta. The composition also received an average rating of 3.5, .4 points higher than the previous study.

Based on the Gilbert and Towner studies, it is evident the Sinfonietta has slightly strengthened its position in the wind band canon. This trend could be due to recordings that have been recently released and to “lists” that have been compiled by musicians such as David Wallace, Eugene Corporon, David Whitwell, Rodney Winther, Cate Gerhart, and Tim Reynish.

Winther’s text, *An Annotated Guide to Wind Chamber Music*, presents a list of chamber compositions categorized by the number of performers needed. Raff’s work has been included and includes a brief synopsis of the work.\(^2\) Gerhart also offers an annotated bibliography, but her version is online and only contains works for double wind quintets.\(^3\) The website offers a summary of the composition’s form and publishing information.

---


Tim Reynish’s website offers a variety of information on both old and new compositions, available recordings, and additional reference information.\textsuperscript{164} Reynish mentions the importance of the Winther book before recommending a list of nineteen chamber works, one of which is Raff’s \textit{Sinfonietta}.\textsuperscript{165} Reynish also offers a specific recommendation for Raff, stating, “Many players in Europe will be unfamiliar with the music of Arthur Bird (1856-1923), the American romantic composer, a pupil of Liszt. His music with that of Emile Bernard, Joachim Raff, Enescu, Caplet and Casadesus creates a little oasis of original romantic repertoire for smaller ensemble, great to change the pace and style of a concert.”\textsuperscript{166}

\textbf{Conclusion}

While the music of Joseph Joachim Raff was widely performed throughout the nineteenth century, most have forgotten his contributions. This lack of awareness can be attributed to several factors, including Raff’s choice to oversaturate the market with his music, which Liszt warned Raff about early in his career. Additional reasons include his decision not to allow any staff member or student at the Hoch Conservatory to perform his music and his unwillingness to side with either the New German School or those who supported absolute music. According to Lott, “His symphonies and his chamber music evince the struggle between deference to tradition and progressive idealism, a struggle


that makes them sometimes difficult to assess objectively and that played a part in Raff’s rapid decline from public favor after his death.”

While Raff’s efforts appear obscure in music history, his contributions cannot be denied. Before breaking away from his long-time mentor Liszt, Raff had developed a strong reputation as a master orchestrator. At the urging of his wife, Raff broke free from Liszt’s shadow and developed his own music, one that suggested both programmatic and classical ideas.

An analysis of the Sinfonietta revealed that Raff made conscientious decisions regarding form and texture. Regarding form, one can see both the classical approach and New German approach as Raff utilized both balanced and unbalanced themes throughout. While his themes were fairly simplistic, Raff chose to vary texture either through changing a melodic instrument or by varying accompanimental figures.

As recordings of his music were released in 1969 and 1970, Raff’s reputation experienced resurgence. Though his most significant work for winds, the Sinfonietta, was omitted from Ostling’s 1978 research study, it can now be found in the subsequent two studies by Gilbert and Towner. The Sinfonietta now can be found on several lists that identify quality music. In the late 1990s, Raff scholar, Mark Thomas, started a website (www.raff.org) to further promote this lost artist. Even Raff’s daughter, Helene’s, book that was completed in German has now been translated into English. All of this evidence suggests that Raff is gaining traction in this musical world.

One of the most significant discoveries of this project was the rediscovery of Raff’s first work for winds, the Fest-Ouvertüre, Op. 124, which had been stored in a
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museum in Stuttgart. Only the four-hand piano edition was published, meaning it is possible that the original wind version has been permanently lost. However, an arranger has been contracted to bring this new work back to life using the instrumentation employed in the *Sinfonietta*. 
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Joachim Raff
Sinfonietta
für 2 Flöten, 2 Oboen,
2 Klarinetten, 2 Fagotte
und 2 Hörner
op. 188
Vorwort


Wir zweifeln nicht daran, daß die Sinfonietta op. 188 neben der Petite Symphonie eines Charles Gounod und der Serenade op. 44 eines Dvorak wieder Eingang ins Konzertrepertoire finden wird, sind doch im Gefolge der Plattenproduktion bereits verschiedene konzertante Aufführungen sowie Rundfunk- und Fernsehaufzeichnungen zu vermerken.

Aus praktischen Erwägungen entschlossen sich Verlag und Herausgeber, das seit vielen Jahren vergriffene Werk in einer Faksimile-Ausgabe des Erstdruckes neu aufzulegen. Während die Instrumentalstimmen freundlicherweise von der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München ausgeliehen wurden, stellte die Hochschule für Musik und darstellende Kunst in Frankfurt die Partitur zur Verfügung.

Falls sich die Sinfonietta für die eine oder andere Aufführung als zu lang erweisen sollte, schlägt der Herausgeber folgende Sprünge vor:

I. Satz: B–C, J–L
II. Satz: halber Takt vor G — halber Takt nach J
III. Satz: C–L

Zürich, November 1976
Hans Steinbeck
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