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Abstract

This study examines Amy Beach's only concerto, the Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in C-sharp Minor, Op. 45. The four-movement, late Romantic work for virtuoso pianist and large orchestra is a significant contribution to the genre, containing well-developed and contrasting themes, interesting and innovative harmonies, and exciting virtuosic display. This monograph explores the concerto from a historical, stylistic, and analytical perspective. The first chapter provides a brief biography of Amy Beach and an overview of her most important compositions. Chapter Two examines the historical significance, the critical reception, and the pianistic style of the concerto. The influences of other late-Romantic composers, such as Chopin, Liszt, Tchaikovsky, Grieg, Brahms, and MacDowell, are discussed. The third chapter provides an analysis of the formal, harmonic, and thematic structures of the work, with an emphasis on the unique aspects of Beach's compositional style that make this concerto significant.
INTRODUCTION

Amy Beach's Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in C-sharp Minor, Op. 45, completed in 1899, was one of the first piano concertos (if not the first) to be written by an American woman. The four-movement, late-Romantic work is also a significant contribution to the genre, containing well-developed and contrasting themes, interesting and innovative harmonies, and exciting virtuosic display. The compositional skill and imagination evident in the concerto are remarkable considering that the composer was an American woman, that she did not study in Europe, and that she was primarily self-taught. Beach performed the concerto with ten different major orchestras in the United States and Europe from 1900 to 1917; these performances helped to establish and secure her international reputation as both a composer and a pianist.

The largest collection of archival sources related to the life and music of Amy Beach is currently housed in the Dimond Library Special Collections Department, University of New Hampshire, Durham. The "Beach Collection" includes personal correspondence, diaries and notebooks, music manuscripts, published scores, clippings, photographs, and ephemera. Access to the Beach Collection at the University of New Hampshire was of invaluable assistance in the preparation of this document, since much of the historical information about the concerto was located in the many newspaper reviews and journal articles that Beach saved in her scrapbooks.

Although Beach and her compositions have been studied extensively, the concerto had not been singled out as a topic for research until recently. Only two journal articles have been written about the concerto: "A 'Veritable Autobiography'?"
Amy Beach’s Piano Concerto in C-sharp Minor, Op. 45,” by Adrienne Fried Block (1994),2 and “Critical Perception and the Woman Composer: The Early Reception of Piano Concertos by Clara Wieck Schumann and Amy Beach” by Claudia Macdonald (1993).3 In May of 1999, after the proposal for the current project was approved, a dissertation about Beach’s concerto was completed. An Analytical Study of the Piano Concerto in C-sharp Minor, Op. 45, by Amy Beach, written by Ching-Lan Yang of the University of Northern Colorado, provides a formal and thematic analysis of the work; however, the dissertation does not cover the critical reception, nor does it include comparisons to other nineteenth century concertos. In addition, the analytical conclusions in this monograph differ substantially from Yang’s findings.

The virtuoso pianistic style and the expressive harmonic language of the concerto are typical of the late nineteenth century. The brilliant piano writing features full, blocked chords, double octaves, alternating hands, chromatic scales in thirds and sixths, wide-ranging arpeggios, and trills. The harmonic language is characterized by chromaticism, imaginative use of augmented sixth chords, modulation by thirds, and a tendency to obscure expected tonal goals and formal divisions. One hundred years after its premiere, Beach’s concerto is being embraced by scholars and performers alike. A performance and recording of the work by the Women’s Philharmonic and pianist Joanne Polk is scheduled for March 2000 in San Francisco.

---


CHAPTER 1

BRIEF BIOGRAPHY AND OVERVIEW OF COMPOSITIONS

Biographer Adrienne Fried Block has called Amy Beach (1867-1944) "the first American woman to succeed as a composer of large-scale art music," and noted that she was "celebrated during her lifetime as the foremost woman composer of the USA."¹

Born in Henniker, New Hampshire as Amy Marcy Cheney, she was the only child of Charles Abbott Cheney, a paper manufacturer and importer, and Clara Imogene Cheney, a talented amateur singer and pianist. Amy’s youthful musical aptitudes, including absolute pitch and an accurate musical memory, were first noticed by her family. In an unpublished biography of her daughter, Clara Cheney wrote extensively of young Amy’s abilities. She reported that when the child was only one year old she could hum forty tunes accurately, each one in the same key in which she had first heard them. Before she was two, she could improvise a “perfectly correct alto to any soprano air” her mother might sing.² Of the songs sung to her, she always remembered the way in which they were first rendered; if her mother or grandmother later sang a song in a different key or changed the intervals, she would order them to “sing it clean.”³ As a toddler, Amy would ask for music by its “color.” Her mother eventually discovered that Amy was not referring to the color on the covers of the music, but to the child’s


² Clara Imogene Cheney, [Biography of her daughter], 26 February 1892 (MacDowell Colony Papers, Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, holograph, quoted in Adrienne Fried Block, Amy Beach, Passionate Victorian (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 4-5.

³ Ibid.
colorful conception of the key (C, white; E, yellow; G, red; A, green; Ab, blue; Db, violet; Eb, pink).  

In spite of Amy’s prodigious musical gifts, Clara Cheney decided that her daughter should be “a musician, not a prodigy,” and consequently did not allow Amy to play the piano until age four. “I was to be as carefully kept from music as later I would be helped to it,” Beach stated in a 1914 interview for *Mother’s Magazine*. Beach recalled her first encounter with the keyboard in the same interview:

> At last, I was allowed to touch the piano. My mother was still opposed, but I can remember my aunt coming to the house, and putting me at the piano. I played at once the melodies I had been collecting, playing in my head, adding full harmonies to the simple, treble melodies. Then my aunt played a new air for me, and I reached up and picked out a harmonized bass accompaniment.  

While spending the summer of 1871 with her grandfather in West Henniker, four-year old Amy composed her first piano pieces without the aid of a piano. “When I reached home I told my mother that I had ‘made’ three waltzes. She did not believe it at first, as there was no piano within miles of the farm. I explained that I had written them in my head, and proved it by playing them on the piano.” In an effort to keep her daughter appropriately modest, Clara Cheney refrained from expressing enthusiasm over her child’s abilities. Later Beach recalled: “It was a part of her theory of education not to discuss before me my precocity; no one was permitted to make my accomplishments appear anything out of the expected, or normal.”

---


When Amy was six, her mother finally agreed to teach her piano, scheduling three lessons a week. Practice was limited to allotted times. Amy mastered the Boston Conservatory Method in less than a year and began performing publicly at the age of seven. However, after a recital in a private home in Boston resulted in a favorable press notice and offers from concert managers, Clara Cheney, in her continued effort to prevent Amy from being exploited as a child “prodigy,” did not allow Amy to perform any more recitals for nine years.

In 1875 the Cheney family moved to Boston, one of the finest musical communities in the country. Even though European study was recommended and often expected for young American musicians, Amy’s parents preferred that their daughter lead a more traditional life. From 1876 to 1882 Amy studied piano with Ernst Perabo (1845-1920), a highly regarded German-trained pianist who taught at the New England Conservatory. Perabo believed that “the development of the mind requires slow growth, assisted by the warm sun of affection, and guided by conservative teachers with honest and ideal conceptions who understand how to so load its precious cargo, that it may not shift during life’s tempestuous vicissitudes.”8 Amy progressed rapidly under his kind encouragement.

In 1882, fifteen-year-old Amy began studying piano with Carl Baermann (1839-1913), a former professor at the Munich Conservatory who had recently moved to Boston. A pupil and friend of Franz Liszt, Baermann provided an important link to Europe’s most famous pianist. Shortly after she began studying with Baermann, her

---

8 Johann Ernst Perabo, Compositions, Arrangements, and Transcriptions (Boston: The Sparrell Print, n.d.).
mother allowed Amy to begin performing publicly. On 24 October 1883, Amy made her Boston debut participating in a variety program typical of the time. She performed two major works, Moscheles’s Concerto in G Minor and Chopin’s Rondo in E-flat, op. 16. The *New York Tribune* and at least nine Boston papers covered the concert; all agreed that the highlight of the evening was Amy Cheney’s debut. A critic for the *Boston Gazette* wrote: “Her natural gifts and her innate artistic intelligence were made apparent in the very first phrases she played. . . . She has a brilliant and remarkably fluent technique, of which the grace and refinement are delightfully conspicuous.”

After her debut, Amy’s life of isolation changed dramatically as she joined the Boston musical circle and became a well-known public figure. She later reported, “Life was beginning!” Amy Cheney continued to perform successfully for two years following her debut, culminating in two prestigious orchestral engagements. In March of 1885, she performed the Chopin Concerto in F Minor, op. 21, with the Boston Symphony Orchestra. The following month she played the Mendelssohn Concerto in D Minor, op. 40, with conductor Theodore Thomas (1835-1905) and his traveling orchestra.

---

9 Block, *Amy Beach*, 30.

10 Block, *Amy Beach*, 30.


12 Thomas was considered one of the most important conductors in America at the time. According to *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, the Theodore Thomas Orchestra gave many tours throughout the United States and Canada over the legendary “Thomas Highway” from 1869-1888. In addition to his traveling orchestra, he conducted the New York Philharmonic Orchestra (1877-1891), and the Chicago Symphony Orchestra (1892-1905). “Thomas did more than any other American musician of the 19th century to popularize music of the great European masters. . . . The popularity of the symphony orchestra in the USA today is due in part to the work of Thomas.”
Amy's formal compositional training was minimal. She studied harmony with Junius Hill, professor at the Boston Conservatory, for only one year (1881-82). Her parents then sought advice about a composition teacher from Wilhelm Gericke, the conductor of the Boston Symphony. He recommended that Amy teach herself composition by studying the great masters. She followed Gericke's advice, and in 1884 began a multi-year process of self-education. She began by translating treatises of Hector Berlioz and Francois-Auguste Gevaert from French to English. She also studied the scores of symphonies and fugues, memorizing many of them, and attended as many rehearsals and concerts as possible. The Boston Symphony Orchestra and other chamber groups in the area performed regularly during the concert season, giving Beach the opportunity to learn most of the great works by European composers.

A manuscript workbook, which she kept from 1887 to 1894, illustrates her determination and resourcefulness. In alphabetically-arranged entries, she defined musical terms, described technical details about rhythmic and pitch notation, and copied extensive passages on how to write for orchestral instruments. The composer recalled those years of self-education in a 1918 interview with Hazel Kinscella:

I taught myself composition, and I think very few people would be willing to work so hard. . . . I had one year's instruction in harmony, and all the rest—fugue, double fugue, counterpoint and orchestration—I taught myself. . . . After I had gone through all the textbooks I could find, I studied—again by myself—the scores of symphonies and overtures. I memorized fugues and similar works, until I could write them from memory, writing each 'voice,' or part, on its own separate staff. Then I copied and memorized whole scores of symphonies in the same way, until I absolutely knew just how they were 'made'. . . . Then I went to concerts, thoroughly studying the symphony to be heard, before I went, and while the orchestra played it, I heard the instruments, learning the distinctive quality of each, until it was like the voice of an old and intimate friend.\(^{13}\)

The regime Amy set for herself demanded intense concentration, motivation, and the ability to carry on without the regular criticism and validation a teacher could offer. Later she said that learning composition independently was not something she would recommend to the average student: “It requires determination and intensive concentration to work alone, and those who are not equipped for it would go seriously afield.”¹⁴ One of her earliest biographers, Percy Goetschius, noted that Beach’s talent for composition had been virtually “unaided, but also unbiased. In consequence of this somewhat unique fact, she has succeeded in preserving her individuality to a rare degree. What she gives is peculiarly herself.”¹⁵ Many writers for journals such as The Musical Courier and Etude proudly point out that her education is entirely American.

In December of 1885, Amy Cheney married Dr. Henry Harris Aubrey Beach, a prominent Boston physician twenty-five years her senior. Dr. Beach, an amateur singer and pianist, appreciated his young wife’s abilities, but believed that a husband should support his wife financially. Out of respect for her husband’s wishes, Amy Beach agreed never to teach piano and to donate any fees that she earned as a performer to charity. More importantly, Dr. Beach encouraged his young wife to devote her time to composition instead of performing. Her performances were limited to one or two annual recitals, presentations of her own works, and occasional performances with the Boston Symphony Orchestra, including performances of the Mozart Piano Concerto in


D Minor, K. 466 (February 1886), the Beethoven Piano Concerto No. 3 in C Minor (April 1888), with Beach's own cadenza (later published as her op. 3), and the Saint-Saëns Piano Concerto No. 2 in G Minor (February 1895).

Without concern for fees and with only the infrequent distraction of a concert date, Beach devoted the majority of her time and efforts to writing music.\textsuperscript{16} She composed in almost every medium, including solo vocal, choral, keyboard, chamber, and orchestral music. More than 200 of her 300 individual works were published within a short time of their completion by Arthur P. Schmidt (Boston), her exclusive publisher from 1885 to 1914, and from 1922 until her death in 1944.\textsuperscript{17} G. Schirmer published Beach's music from 1914 to 1922.\textsuperscript{18}

As a composer, Beach was first known for her art songs and small piano pieces. During the first three years of her marriage, while continuing to study composition independently, Beach wrote and published over a dozen songs. Her first published work, "With Violets," op. 1, no. 1, was completed before her marriage and therefore was signed with her maiden name; however, all subsequent works were signed "Mrs. H. H. A. Beach." These early songs became a storehouse of musical ideas for use as themes in larger instrumental works, including the Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in C-sharp Minor.

\textsuperscript{16} Block, \textit{Amy Beach}, 112.

\textsuperscript{17} Adrienne Fried Block, "Why Amy Beach Succeeded as A Composer: The Early Years," \textit{Current Musicology} 36 (1983): 54.

\textsuperscript{18} "[Beach] was disappointed that Schmidt, despite his Leipzig branch, was not able to keep European dealers supplied with enough works to satisfy the demand that her concerts created. Probably as a result of this dissatisfaction, she contracted with G. Schirmer to publish her future works beginning in 1914." Adrienne Fried Block, "Arthur P. Schmidt, Music Publisher and Champion of American Women Composers," \textit{The Musical Woman: An Interdisciplinary Perspective} 2 (1984-85): 163.
While her early songs and piano pieces were well-received locally, it was through her larger works that she gained wider acceptance and recognition, first by her Boston colleagues, then nationally and internationally. Just a few months after their wedding, Dr. Beach encouraged his young wife to begin composing her first large work for orchestra and chorus, her Mass in E-flat, op. 5 for solo quartet, chorus, organ, and orchestra, which was completed in 1889. The premiere, performed by the Handel and Haydn Society in 1892, was reviewed by no fewer than eighteen Boston papers and nine out-of-town papers and journals; overall, there was praise for her vocal and orchestral writing. After the successful production of the mass, she was commissioned to write works for various occasions, including the dedication of the Woman’s Building at the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago, for which she composed the *Festival Jubilate*, op. 17.

In the last few years of the nineteenth century, Beach composed two of her largest and most important works, the Symphony in E Minor, “Gaelic,” op. 32, and the Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in C-sharp Minor, op. 45. The “Gaelic” Symphony received a first performance on 30 October 1896 with Emil Pauer conducting the Boston Symphony. Philip Hale of the *Boston Journal* praised Beach as a “musician of genuine talent who by the imagination, technical skill, and sense of orchestration displayed in this symphony has brought honor to herself and the city which is her

---

19 The Handel and Haydn Society, a well-known Boston musical organization, began performing in 1815 and is considered the earliest oratorio society in America.

20 Block, *Amy Beach*, 70-71.
dwelling place." Similarly, Benjamin Woolf, critic for the *Herald*, complimented the symphony as "steadily high-reaching, dignified and virile, and of an able musicianship that is beyond all question."22

Four years after the premiere of the "Gaelic" Symphony, Wilhelm Gericke conducted the Boston Symphony in the first performance of Beach’s Piano Concerto in C-sharp Minor with the composer at the piano. Reviews were mixed, but in general were less positive than those for the symphony. It may have been that more than one performance was needed before the correct balance could be established and the texture clarified, because Beach’s frequent performances of the concerto from 1913 to 1917 received much more favorable reviews. Both the symphony and the concerto became important vehicles for launching her international success as a composer-pianist. In addition to the large-scale works (mass, symphony, concerto) composed during the years of her marriage (1885-1910), Beach wrote a Violin Sonata, op. 34, a Piano Quintet, op. 67, and *The Chambered Nautilus*, op. 66 for chorus and orchestra, works which were performed often and received well during her lifetime.

After the deaths of her husband in 1910 and her mother in 1911, Amy Beach was solely responsible for her future for the first time in her life. On her forty-fourth birthday, 5 September 1911, Beach sailed for Europe, first to rest, then to build a reputation as a composer and a concert pianist. Her first performances in Europe included the Violin Sonata, the Piano Quintet, and some of her songs. In the fall of 1913, American violinist and conductor Theodore Spiering helped organize three

---

21 Block, *Amy Beach*, 100.

22 Block, *Amy Beach*, 100.
concerts in which he would conduct the “Gaelic” Symphony and the Piano Concerto, with Beach as soloist. The orchestral programs, which took place in Leipzig, Hamburg, and Berlin, were a huge success. The reviews in all three cities enthusiastically praised Beach’s compositional skill in both works as well as her abilities as a pianist. Dr. Ferdinand Pfohl, critic for the Hamburger Nachrichten, called Beach a “possessor of musical gifts of the highest kind, a musical nature touched with genius. . . . Her symphony is a work that compels the highest respect. . . . The piano concerto was played by Amy Beach herself. . . . in a style which revealed her as an excellent pianist, with brilliant technique and contagious rhythm.”23 The most outstanding reviews from the German newspapers were translated and reprinted in American papers such as The Musical Courier and Musical America.

With the escalation of World War I, Beach’s American manager, M. H. Hanson, advised her to leave Europe in July, 1914. Beach, however, refused to leave until September, when the Germans offered Americans “the last train out,” with all conveniences at government expense.24 Upon her return to the United States in 1914, her manager had already booked thirty concerts across the country for the 1914-15 concert season. She performed her concerto with orchestras in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, St. Louis, Minneapolis, and Boston. In addition, Beach’s songs and chamber music were performed frequently across the country, often with the composer at the piano.


24 Block, Amy Beach, 195-97.
After a very successful year touring America, Amy Beach continued to spend winters on tour and summers practicing and composing. In 1916, Hillsborough, New Hampshire became her official residence between concert commitments. However, Beach considered herself “too enthusiastic a traveler to settle down.” Beginning in 1921, Beach was invited by Edward MacDowell’s wife, Marian, to be a fellow at the MacDowell Colony in Peterborough, New Hampshire, where she spent the months of June and/or September every summer until her death in 1944. The MacDowell Colony became vitally important for Beach’s compositional output; from 1921 on, almost all of her music was composed or at least sketched there. According to Block, “Marian MacDowell, by her invitation to Beach to become a fellow at the colony, had rescued the composer at a time when her creative efforts were languishing, and the renewal of her fellowship each year after 1921 undoubtedly revitalized Beach’s work.” Some of the most notable works Beach composed during her visits to the MacDowell Colony include “A Hermit Thrush at Eve” and “A Hermit Thrush at Morn,” op. 92, for solo piano; String Quartet in one movement, op. 89; Piano Trio, op. 150; the sacred chorus The Canticle of the Sun, op. 123; and an opera, Cabildo, op. 149. In 1928, Beach was awarded an honorary Master of Arts degree by the University of New Hampshire.

In 1930, Beach began spending winters in New York, then dividing the time from May to September between Boston, Hillsborough, and the MacDowell Colony. In New York, she became very active in St. Bartholomew’s Episcopal Church, often composing music for their choir and organist. She continued to perform for women’s

---

25 Block, Amy Beach, 203.
26 Block, Amy Beach, 242.
clubs, various musical organizations, and radio broadcasts. One of the “most beautiful experiences” of her life occurred in 1934, when Beach was invited to perform for Eleanor Roosevelt at the White House. She played “Young Birches” and “Scherzino: A Peterborough Chipmunk” from her Three Pianoforte Pieces, op. 128. In 1936, Beach was invited to the White House again, this time performing all three pieces of the same set.\textsuperscript{27} In 1934 at age sixty-seven, Beach began to decrease her activities, discontinuing extended concert tours, and choosing to play single concerts close to one of her “homes” in New York, Boston, Hillsborough, or the MacDowell Colony.

After a heart attack in 1940, Amy Beach reluctantly admitted that her performing life had come to an end. In a June 1941 letter to music critic and supporter of women’s music, Elena de Sayn, she declared, “I have taken no formal farewell from public performances, nor do I intend to do so. But I face the fact that I shall never again be strong enough for it.”\textsuperscript{28} A high point of her last years was a festival held in honor of her seventy-fifth birthday in Washington, D.C. in 1942, organized by de Sayn. Two programs of Beach’s music were performed at the Phillips Gallery on 27-28 November 1942; unfortunately the composer was not strong enough to attend. Amy Beach died in her New York apartment on 27 December 1944. After the funeral services at St. Bartholomew’s, her ashes were interred next to the graves of her husband and parents at Forest Hills Cemetery in Boston.

\textsuperscript{27} Block, \textit{Amy Beach}, 260-61.  
\textsuperscript{28} Block, \textit{Amy Beach}, 291.
In the study of Amy Beach’s life and works, several important points arise, including 1) her dual role as a pianist and composer; 2) the effect, if any, of her gender on her composition and career; and 3) the format of her name. These subjects are discussed at length in Adrienne Block’s recent biography, *Amy Beach: Passionate Victorian*; however, a few comments on these issues may be of assistance and interest to the reader.

During her lifetime, Amy Beach was respected highly as both a pianist and a composer. Headlines in the leading musical journals of her day referred to her as “Distinguished American Composer-Pianist” (*Etude* and *Musical America*), “America’s Foremost Woman Composer” (*Simmons Magazine*), and “An American Genius of World Renown” (*Etude*). Her reputation as a concert pianist began with her highly acclaimed Boston debut in 1883. During the years of her marriage she became more well-known as a composer, with the completion of several large-scale works such as the mass, symphony, and piano concerto. After her husband’s death, Beach the composer and Beach the pianist became more intertwined. She once stated: “When I am not playing I am composing and *vice versa*. I do them both interchangeably and constantly, but not both at the same time. This keeps me fresh for each one. I am a dual personality and lead a double musical life.”

Amy Beach composed during a time when women were considered to be intellectually inferior to men. The issue of whether women could compose large-scale works was hotly debated at the turn of the century, with statements pro and con appearing frequently in the press. For example, three months after his arrival in this country to become director of the National Conservatory of Music in New York, Antonín Dvořák stated in an interview with the Boston Post that the compositional talent in the United States was male, not female. He believed that women had nothing to contribute to the development of American music due to their intellectual inferiority. Beach herself submitted rebuttals to various Boston papers, citing numerous examples of successful women composers.30 Beach, however, never felt limited in her capabilities and even seemed oblivious to the prejudices that some men had toward women composers:

In regard to the position of women composers I may say that I have personally never felt myself handicapped in any way, nor have I encountered prejudice of any sort on account of my being a woman, and I believe that the field for musical composition in America offers exactly the same prospects to young women as to young men composers.31

Concerning her name, Amy Beach realized that using “Mrs. H. H. A. Beach” marked her as a Victorian holdover at a time when she wished to be viewed as a contemporary composer. While in Europe, she preferred to be billed as “Amy Beach”; however, after someone asked her whether she was the daughter of Mrs. H. H. A. Beach, she decided that rather than build a reputation all over again under a new name, 

30 Amy Beach, “American Music . . . Some Testimony on Woman’s Ability as A Composer,” Boston Daily Traveller, 10 December 1892, Beach Collection, Dimond Library, University of New Hampshire.

31 Amy Beach, “The Outlook for the Young American Composer,” Etude 33 (1915): 14.
she would revert to the name under which her music was published. Evidence that she preferred to be remembered as Amy Beach is in her last will and testament in which she set up a fund for the MacDowell Colony to receive royalties and performance fees earned by her music—she called it the “Amy Beach” Fund.\footnote{32 Block, \textit{Amy Beach}, x.}
CHAPTER 2

CONCERTO FOR PIANO AND ORCHESTRA IN C-SHARP MINOR, OP. 45

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW AND CRITICAL Reception

Amy Beach's Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in C-sharp Minor, op. 45, completed in 1899, was one of the first piano concertos (if not the first) to be written by an American woman. According to *American Piano Concertos: A Bibliography* by William Phemister, the only other woman in America to compose a piano concerto prior to 1899 was Helen Hopekirk (1865-1945),1 practically an exact contemporary of Beach; however, Hopekirk was Scottish by birth. It is also interesting that Beach's concerto was composed during a relatively "dry spell" for piano concertos, as it is one of the few written in the last decade of the nineteenth century. Other piano concertos written in the 1890's include Saint-Saëns' Fifth Piano Concerto (1895), Tchaikovsky's Third Piano Concerto (1893) and Scriabin's Piano Concerto (1896), of which the latter two do not represent the best work of otherwise great composers.2 Stylistically, Beach's four-movement, late Romantic work is more similar to concertos written earlier in the nineteenth century, such as Grieg's Piano Concerto (1868), Tchaikovsky's First Piano Concerto (1875), Brahms' Second Piano Concerto (1881), and MacDowell's Second Piano Concerto (1886). Rachmaninoff's Second and Third Piano Concertos were completed in 1899, was one of the first piano concertos (if not the first) to be written by an American woman. According to *American Piano Concertos: A Bibliography* by William Phemister, the only other woman in America to compose a piano concerto prior to 1899 was Helen Hopekirk (1865-1945),1 practically an exact contemporary of Beach; however, Hopekirk was Scottish by birth. It is also interesting that Beach's concerto was composed during a relatively "dry spell" for piano concertos, as it is one of the few written in the last decade of the nineteenth century. Other piano concertos written in the 1890's include Saint-Saëns' Fifth Piano Concerto (1895), Tchaikovsky's Third Piano Concerto (1893) and Scriabin's Piano Concerto (1896), of which the latter two do not represent the best work of otherwise great composers.2 Stylistically, Beach's four-movement, late Romantic work is more similar to concertos written earlier in the nineteenth century, such as Grieg's Piano Concerto (1868), Tchaikovsky's First Piano Concerto (1875), Brahms' Second Piano Concerto (1881), and MacDowell's Second Piano Concerto (1886). Rachmaninoff's Second and Third Piano Concertos were completed in 1899, was one of the first piano concertos (if not the first) to be written by an American woman. According to *American Piano Concertos: A Bibliography* by William Phemister, the only other woman in America to compose a piano concerto prior to 1899 was Helen Hopekirk (1865-1945),1 practically an exact contemporary of Beach; however, Hopekirk was Scottish by birth. It is also interesting that Beach's concerto was composed during a relatively "dry spell" for piano concertos, as it is one of the few written in the last decade of the nineteenth century. Other piano concertos written in the 1890's include Saint-Saëns' Fifth Piano Concerto (1895), Tchaikovsky's Third Piano Concerto (1893) and Scriabin's Piano Concerto (1896), of which the latter two do not represent the best work of otherwise great composers.2 Stylistically, Beach's four-movement, late Romantic work is more similar to concertos written earlier in the nineteenth century, such as Grieg's Piano Concerto (1868), Tchaikovsky's First Piano Concerto (1875), Brahms' Second Piano Concerto (1881), and MacDowell's Second Piano Concerto (1886). Rachmaninoff's Second and Third Piano Concertos were

---


2 Scriabin's concerto is an early work that is not representative of his mature style.
written after Beach’s, in 1901 and 1909 respectively, and could therefore have had no influence on Beach’s.

In his dissertation *The Solo Piano Works of Mrs. H. H. A. Beach*, Marmaduke Miles classifies Beach’s compositions for solo piano into three distinct style periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style Period</th>
<th>Opus Range</th>
<th>Year Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First style period</td>
<td>opp. 4 - 28</td>
<td>through 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second style period</td>
<td>opp. 54 - 116</td>
<td>1903 - 1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third style period</td>
<td>opp. 128 - 148</td>
<td>1932 - 1936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of Beach’s piano music falls into a particular style period except for op. 36, a set of elementary teaching pieces called *Children’s Album*. According to Miles, the works evolve from the “stylized virtuosic display pieces of the early period, into the tonally experimental works of the middle period, and finally into the simpler, more reflective works of the final period.”

It was between the first and second style periods that Beach composed several of her largest and most important works, including the “Gaelic” Symphony, op. 32 (1896), the Sonata for Violin and Piano, op. 34 (1896), and the Piano Concerto, op. 45. The concerto, a four-movement, late-Romantic virtuoso work for piano and orchestra, is closest in style to her first period, featuring much virtuosic display and a nineteenth-century harmonic language.

Amy Beach dedicated her concerto to the well-known Venezuelan pianist Teresa Carreño (1853-1917). Beach may have hoped that dedicating the concerto to the famous pianist and sending her a manuscript copy of the full score and parts might encourage Carreño to one day perform and promote the work, just as she had

---


5 A copy of the score and parts that Beach sent to its dedicatee, Teresa Carreño, is housed in the Carreño Collection at Vassar College, New York.
championed MacDowell’s Second Piano Concerto, which had also been dedicated to her. Before receiving the concerto, Carreño’s letters to Beach indicated that she intended to learn and perform the work: “I am most eagerly looking forward to the new concerto and let me again express my innermost thanks for the dedication of it. It will indeed be a work of love to learn it.” In addition, after receiving the piece she wrote, “The first movement has caused me the greatest pleasure. . . . I am looking forward to the rest of it with all the greater eagerness and all the more delight. . . . I will try to do all I can not to go too far from your ideas in the rendition of it.” However, Carreño never performed the concerto. She proposed it as part of a concert with the Berlin Philharmonic in 1901, but her manager was opposed, and in the end she played an Anton Rubenstein concerto instead.

The Piano Concerto in C-sharp Minor played a significant role in Beach’s career as a composer-pianist. The work became the primary vehicle for launching her return to the concert stage after the deaths of her husband and mother; this in turn helped secure her international reputation as both a composer and pianist. The following table details Beach’s ten known performances of the concerto; a discussion of the subsequent reviews follows.

---

6 Letter from Carreño to Beach, 17 December 1899, Beach Collection, Dimond Library, University of New Hampshire, Durham (hereafter, UNH).

7 Letter from Teresa Carreño to Beach, 25 May 1900, UNH.

Table 2.1. Amy Beach’s performances of the Concerto for Piano and Orchestra, Op. 45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ORCHESTRA</th>
<th>CONDUCTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 April 1900</td>
<td>Boston Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td>Wilhelm Gericke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 November 1913</td>
<td>Winderstein Orchester, Leipzig</td>
<td>Theodore Spiering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 December 1913</td>
<td>Orchester des Vereins Hamburgischer Musikfreunde, Hamburg</td>
<td>Theodore Spiering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 December 1913</td>
<td>Berlin Philharmonic</td>
<td>Theodore Spiering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 June 1915</td>
<td>Los Angeles Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td>Adolf Tandler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 August 1915</td>
<td>Panama-Pacific International Exposition Orchestra, San Francisco</td>
<td>Richard Hageman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 February 1916</td>
<td>Chicago Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td>Frederick Stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13 January 1917</td>
<td>St. Louis Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td>Max Zach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 March 1917</td>
<td>Boston Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td>Karl Muck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15 December 1917</td>
<td>Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td>Emil Oberhoffer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before Amy Beach finished composing the concerto, she was engaged to perform the premiere with the Boston Symphony on 7 April 1900. Wilhelm Gericke, who had advised Beach sixteen years earlier to teach herself composition, was the conductor. Beach saved eight reviews from the Boston papers in a scrapbook of clippings. In general, the critics were not kind, agreeing that the orchestra was too heavy and that the piano part was sometimes difficult to distinguish. Most of the critics attributed the imbalance to a lack of compositional skill: “The instruments are not combined in the most effective manner; the mixture is not clear, but muddy.” Similarly, “the orchestration is steadily thick and noisy, and too frequently so massive that the solo instrument does not and cannot loom through it. The score would benefit

---

9 The scrapbooks are currently housed in the Amy Beach Collection, Dimond Library, University of New Hampshire, Durham.

10 “The Symphony Concert,” *Boston Gazette*, 8 April, 1900, UNH.
greatly by a severe thinning out.”¹¹ In a recent article, Claudia Macdonald speculates on the possibility that Beach could have made changes to the score after hearing an imbalance between the orchestra and solo at the first performance. The score that Beach sent to Carреño contained “numerous pasted-over corrections” in both the full score and parts;¹² however, according to Macdonald, it is not known whether Beach sent the score before or after the premiere.¹³

In addition to the problem of balance, several critics also considered the formal structure of the concerto unclear and incoherent. According to Louis Elson of the Daily Advertiser, “the whole first movement seemed rather indefinite . . . although there were many individual passages of much charm, there did not seem to be that coherency and clear scheme that one finds in the masterpieces.”¹⁴ While Beach’s compositional skills were criticized in varying degrees, the reviewers had only high praise for her skills as a pianist, stating that she played with “consummate technique” and “great beauty of expression.”¹⁵ This reaction may be due to critics’ views regarding women at that time. While women were commonly accepted as performers at the end of the nineteenth century, critics did not think that women could compose and judged their work accordingly.¹⁶

¹¹ “The Symphony Concert,” Boston Herald, 8 April 1900, UNH.

¹² Mann, “The Carреño Collection at Vassar College,” 1081.


¹⁴ Louis C. Elson, “Musical Matters,” Boston Daily Advertiser, 9 April 1900, UNH.

¹⁵ Boston Transcript, 10 April 1900, UNH.

After her performance with the Boston Symphony in 1900, Beach did not play the concerto with orchestra again until 1913, during her European tour. She performed the two-piano arrangement with the assistance of Carl Faelton in 1909, as part of a solo recital that included works by Handel, Schumann, and Debussy. The four reviews from Boston newspapers pasted in her scrapbook indicate that Beach and Faelton gave a "fine rendition" of the work that "went far to display the qualities of Beach's music," but the performance "inevitably suffered" from lack of orchestra.17

After the deaths of her husband and mother in 1910, Beach decided to resume the performing career she had neglected during the years of her marriage. In 1911 she traveled to Europe, hired a concert manager, changed her professional name from Mrs. H. H. A. Beach to Amy Beach, and gradually resumed performing. In the fall of 1913, American violinist and conductor Theodore Spiering helped organize three concerts in which he conducted the "Gaelic" Symphony and the Piano Concerto in C-sharp Minor, with Beach as soloist. These concerts and the subsequent acclaim of the critics had a significant effect on Beach's career. Unlike the first performance in Boston, all three performances of the concerto in Germany were highly praised by the critics. Five reviews of the Leipzig concert, 22 November 1913, were translated in the Musical Courier. The critics reported that her work showed "much learning," "beauty of ideas," and "well-sounding combinations" of orchestral instruments.18

Before her performance in Hamburg on 2 December 1913, Beach was concerned that the audience would be "cold," the critics "hostile." However, as she stated in an

17 Newspaper clippings from the Boston Times, Transcript, Herald, and Globe, 18-20 February 1909, UNH.

article for *Musical America*, she was "determined to force the audience to like it."

Her resoluteness paid off—the critics were complimentary. Even Dr. Ferdinand Pfohl, considered by Beach to be "the worst bear of them all," wrote glowingly of Beach's skill as a composer and her abilities as a pianist:

> We have before us undeniably a possessor of musical gifts of the highest kind; a musical nature touched with genius. Strong creative power, glowing fancy, instinct for form and color are united in her work with facile and effortless mastery of the entire technical apparatus. To this is added charm of poetic mood, delicacy and grace of melody, and a gift for rich, soulful harmonization. The piano concerto was played by Amy Beach herself... in a style which revealed her as an excellent pianist, with brilliant technique and contagious rhythm. This work finds its highest point in the opening allegro—a surpassing movement, rich in ideas in the romantic element, and marked by its refined treatment not only of the solo instrument, but of the orchestra.

Beach’s third European performance of the concerto, 18 December 1913 in Berlin, received further acclaim. From the *Berlin Volkszeitung*: “Amy Beach played the piano part herself in excellent bravura style, and the hearty applause, which the artist received for the proof she gave of her great talent in compositions of the grand style, was indeed well-merited and justified.” Concerning her compositional skills, a critic for the *Berlin deutsche Reichsanzeiger* wrote: “The artistic manner in which the concerto is worked out undeniably reveals an independence of character and personality, and a remarkably knowledge of the art of instrumentation.”


20 Ibid.


23 Ibid.
correspondent for *Musical America*, O. P. Jacob, was more critical than the German press. He considered the first movement praiseworthy, but the succeeding movements weaker; he also thought Beach to be better as a composer than a pianist.\(^2\) This is just the opposite reaction from the reviews of 1900, when the critics praised her highly as a performer, but criticized her compositional skills.

Beach returned to the United States in 1914 to renewed admiration and esteem for her abilities as a composer and pianist. Critics now heralded her as a celebrity and often prefaced their reviews with a summary of her triumphs in Europe. Between 1914 and 1917, Beach performed her concerto with orchestras in six major cities: Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, St. Louis, Boston, and Minneapolis. Beach was delighted with her first performance upon her return to the states. She described the concert in Los Angeles, 26 June 1915, in a letter to her cousin: “The concerto went grandly Sat. night and I had 4 big recalls & shouts of bravo & waving of h’dk’fs. Loads of flowers. Orchestra stood as I came in! Good notices!”\(^2\)

The most prestigious and widely-covered events were the performances in Chicago and her return engagement in Boston. The reviews in Chicago were almost entirely favorable, but there were several notable contradictions of opinion regarding specific aspects of Beach’s concerto. Edward Moore of the *Evening Journal* and Karleton Hackett of the *Evening Post* had opposite reactions to the construction of the concerto and the quality of the themes. Moore found the construction of the work “entirely praiseworthy,” but did not like the melodic ideas:


\[^{25}\] Letter from Beach to Ethel Clement (cousin), 29 June 1915, UNH.
The composer evidently gave much care and thought to the construction of the work. Its working out is painstaking; its balance between solo instrument and orchestra is excellent. . . . [However,] the musical ideas of the work are not of the notable kind that command attention and stick to the memory. There are very few themes in all four movements that flow, that possess the powerful vitality which every large work ought to set forth.26

Hackett, on the other hand, believed that the concerto “lack[ed] a certain structural strength,” but had memorable melodies:

It was not apparently conceived as an organic whole in which the piano formed but one of the essential elements, but it took form rather as a series of soli for the piano about which the orchestra was written. This gave it a somewhat disjointed effect, with the orchestra appearing and disappearing in a rather confusing manner. But the thematic foundation was strong, good, solid melodies that one could tie to.27

Another interesting contradiction can be seen in two critics’ evaluations of the quality of the individual movements. Felix Borowski of the Chicago Herald thought that the first movement was the strongest, and that the other movements were progressively weaker.28 Conversely, the critic (unidentified) for the Chicago Examiner found the finale to be the best part of the work.29

All the critics had words of praise for Beach’s playing. However, they were always aware of her gender, as the following compliment reveals: “As a pianist Mrs. Beach will satisfy most people who demand that a woman play the piano like a man. The virile force with which she attains to an enormous tone is remarkable. . . . Her

---

27 Karleton Hackett, “Chicago Symphony Orchestra Concert,” Chicago Evening Post, 5 February 1916, UNH.
29 Article from the Chicago Examiner, reprinted in The Musical Courier, UNH.
technic is superb . . ." wrote Stanley Faye of the Chicago Daily News.30 Beach must have liked his comparison—in a letter to the critic she expressed her deep appreciation and requested twenty-five copies of the article.31

Seventeen years after the premiere of her concerto with the Boston Symphony, Beach was again invited to play the work with the prestigious orchestra. Ads that appeared in several newspapers emphasized the immense pride Bostonians felt for their local heroine.32 According to the soprano May Goodbar, a friend of Beach’s, the composer’s “very appearance on stage touched off a long ovation, and at the end the audience would not let her go,” demanding six returns to the stage to bow.33 In contrast to her first performance in Boston in 1900, the critics praised her skill as both pianist and composer following her 1917 performance. All seemed to agree that, as a result of her residence abroad and her appearance in German cities, Beach had “grown in breadth and authority” as a pianist.34 Henry T. Parker wrote that Beach had never before played with “such ready resource and ample range, felicity of touch . . . and freedom of rhythm and progression.” While he did not think the concerto a masterpiece, he did find it “expertly, sensitively and fancifully written . . . at the golden mean that treats a concerto neither as a virtuoso piece for solo instrument with accompanying band or as a symphonic piece that happens to add a piano to the other instruments.”35

---


31 Block, Amy Beach, 207.

32 “Music Lovers Ready to Greet Mrs. Beach,” Boston Advertiser, 1 March 1917, UNH.

33 Letter from May Goodbar to “Dearest Nellie,” 10 March 1917, UNH.

34 “Symphony Concert,” Boston Globe, 3 March 1917, UNH.

35 H. T. P., “The Symphony Concert,” Boston Transcript, 4 March 1917, UNH.
There are at least two possible reasons that Beach's concerto met with such considerable critical success from 1914 to 1917 compared to the first performance in 1900. First, later performances of the concerto were likely cleaner and more well-balanced. Secondly, Beach was more well-known and more highly respected than she had been in 1900. She had become quite famous as a composer due to the publication of almost all of her works up to that point by Arthur P. Schmidt. With glowing European reviews to her credit, Beach was hailed as a celebrity upon her return to America after 1914.

Several critics wrote that they thought the concerto deserved to be played by other pianists. Parker speculated that, because the composer was alive and performing the work, "the silly egotism, envy or etiquette of many a virtuoso will continue to deprive audiences of the pleasure of it." Two other lesser-known pianists did perform the concerto during Beach's lifetime. Dagmar de Corval Ruebner of New York gave a performance of it with the Washington Symphony Orchestra under the direction of Heinrich Hammer on 17 January 1911 at the Columbia Theatre, Washington, D. C. Herbert Putnam of the Library of Congress attended the performance, then wrote Beach two days later to request that a copy of the score be made for the library at the library's expense.

[We are] appalled at the idea that its permanence for the student and the public is conditioned upon the preservation of a single manuscript, subject to all the perils of transportation and use. If you would only let us, we should be but too happy, at our own expense, to have a transcript made for preservation here—not of course available for production or commercial use, but merely for study and for posterity, and to insure against the loss to posterity of a composition so important.

---

36 Ibid.

37 Letter from Herbert Putnam to Beach, 19 January 1911, UNH.
Helen Pugh, a young student of Mrs. Crosby Adams, also played the concerto at the biennial meeting of the National Federation of Music Clubs at Asheville, North Carolina, in 1923 under the direction of Henry Hadley; Beach herself loaned the orchestral parts for this performance. According to an article in the *Etude* by Mrs. Adams, Beach heard Pugh play the concerto in April 1926 and was surprised at the young girl’s ability: “I was never more impressed in my life with such ability and poise as was displayed by this young musician. . . . Through it all I was more than pleased with the interpretation given it by Helen Pugh.”

Following the North Carolina concert, the concerto was not performed for many years. It was re-introduced in 1976 by Mary Louise Boehm through her performances and recording of the work (Vox Turnabout, QTV-S 34665).\(^{39}\) Boehm was very enthusiastic about her “discovery” of the Beach concerto in the Fleisher Collection, Free Library of Philadelphia: “Here it was . . . a magnificent romantic concerto, opening with a bold bravura cadenza and leading into some of the most melting melodies and technical fireworks a pianist could desire—plus a rich orchestra score. How could this work have remained unheard for the last six decades?”\(^{40}\) Apparently, other musicians did not share her enthusiasm; after Boehm’s performance and recording in the 1970’s, the concerto was not performed again until the late 1990’s. One hundred years after its premiere, the concerto seems to be making an effective comeback, as interest in


\(^{39}\) Mary Louise Boehm, “Where was Amy Beach All These Years?” Interview by Dean Elder, *Clavier* 15 (December 1976): 14-17.

\(^{40}\) Mary Louise Boehm, *Beach: Concerto* for Piano and Orchestra, Vox Turnabout QTV-S 34665, liner notes.
unpublished, lesser-known works by women and minorities has increased. On 18 August 1998, Stuart Malina conducted the Chautauqua Symphony Orchestra in a performance with Alan Feinberg as the soloist at the Chautauqua Summer Institute in New York. In addition, the concerto is scheduled to be performed 25 March 2000 in San Francisco by the Women's Philharmonic with Joanne Polk, soloist; a recording is also planned by this group.41

**Pianistic Style, Influences, and Comparisons**

Amy Beach performed six piano concertos before composing her own: the Moscheles Concerto in G Minor, op. 58; the Chopin Concerto in F Minor, op. 21; the Mendelssohn Concerto in D Minor, op. 40; the Mozart Concerto in D Minor, K. 466; the Beethoven Concerto No. 3 in C Minor, op. 37, for which she composed her own cadenza; and the Saint-Saëns Concerto No. 2 in G Minor, op. 22. While these pieces must have had some influence on Beach, the pianistic style in Beach's concerto seems to be most influenced by the concertos of Chopin, Liszt, Tchaikovsky, Grieg, Brahms, and MacDowell. The piano writing in the concerto is noticeably dominated by what Claudia Macdonald has termed "performance-oriented gestures."42 These gestures include virtuoso passages with full, blocked chords, brilliant octaves, alternating hands, chromatic scales in thirds and sixths, wide-ranging arpeggios, tremolos, and trills.

Chromatic passages in thirds, sixths, octaves, or six-three chords appear in every movement. While the use of chromatic passagework is relatively common in late-Romantic piano works, some passages in Beach's concerto are especially reminiscent of

---

Liszt and Grieg. For example, in the first movement of Beach's concerto, an alternation of chromatic scales and arpeggios in sixths is strikingly similar to a passage from Liszt's Piano Concerto No. 2 in A Major (Example 2.1).

Example 2.1a. Beach, I, mm. 248-250

Example 2.1b. Liszt, Piano Concerto in A Major, mm. 320-322

In the exposition of the concerto, Beach includes a passage of descending chromatic thirds near the end of the transition section (mm. 119-122). While many Romantic piano concertos contain passages in chromatic thirds, it is interesting that the Grieg Piano Concerto in A Minor, op. 16, has a passage of descending chromatic thirds in practically the same place that Beach used them.

Passages for alternating hands, another pianistic gesture frequently found in late Romantic piano concertos, are prevalent throughout the Beach concerto, except in the slow movement. These passages often include alternating octaves, which closely resemble those in the Tchaikovsky Piano Concerto in B-flat Minor (Example 2.2). The

---

All musical examples from the two-piano score of Amy Beach's Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in C-sharp Minor, op. 45, are reprinted by permission of Hildegard Publishing Company (Appendix C, p. 79).
alternating octaves are occasionally used to create a chromatic scale, as in m. 284 of Example 2.2a and Example 2.2c.

Example 2.2a. Beach, I, mm. 282-284

Example 2.2b. Tchaikovsky, Piano Concerto in B-flat Minor, I, mm. 164-165

Example 2.2c. Tchaikovsky, III, mm. 298-299

In the first and last movements, passages of alternating hands often culminate with a trill or chordal tremolo for alternating hands, which Beach indicates with "trillo." These passages, marked ff or fff, create an effective climax in the closing group (mm. 188-189) and the coda (mm. 429-432) of the first movement, and just before the coda of the finale (mm. 178-181). The first of these passages is similar to the double-handed trill in the cadenza of the Grieg concerto (Example 2.3).
There are several passages in the Beach concerto that closely resemble Chopin’s pianistic writing, as Example 2.4 illustrates. The opening phrase of the fourth movement is also reminiscent of Chopin (Example 3.18, p. 59).
Beach frequently uses wide-ranging arpeggios in the piano as accompaniment to the orchestra. These arpeggios often include irregular groupings of five, six, or seven notes, producing a somewhat improvisatory feel, as in mm. 93-98 of the first movement. Inverted horn fifths are also used as an accompaniment in mm. 242-246 of the development. This passage closely resembles Liszt’s use of inverted horn fifths in his Piano Concerto in A Major, mm. 480-484.

In addition to the pianistic influences of Chopin, Liszt, Tchaikovsky, and Grieg, a similarity to Brahms can be seen in Beach’s use of the piano as part of the orchestra. In the concertos of both Beach and Brahms, the piano part is often accompanimental, functioning as a member of the ensemble rather than as featured soloist. The influence of Brahms is especially evident in Beach’s formal organization and harmonic language, which are examined in the following chapter.

Beach did not leave many interpretive decisions for the pianist. She indicated her intentions regarding tempo, pedaling, articulation, dynamics, and mood as explicitly as possible. In addition to the specific metronomic markings found at the beginning of important formal sections (see Table 3.2), Beach frequently instructs the orchestra and pianist to ritienuto, rallentando, and accelerando, while in cadenza passages the pianist is often encouraged to play rapidly with instructions such as veloce and velocissimo. Specific pedal indications are included in every movement. She even denotes the use of the sostenuto pedal in the opening solo cadenza (mm. 41-48). Some of her pedal indications are particularly long, as in mm. 69-72, mm. 83-86, and mm. 119-121 during descending thirds. Articulation markings include the usual slurs and staccato markings, as well as more specific instructions such as marcato, legatissimo, leggerissimo,
martellato, ben legato, and brillante. In addition, Beach continuously gives directions regarding interpretation, such as con delicatezza, con tutta forza, con dolore, agitato, dolcissimo, con grazia, appassionato, agitato, con bravura, and con energico.

In view of their geographical and historical proximity, as well as their identical dedications, a study of the Beach concerto would be incomplete without a comparison to the MacDowell Piano Concerto No. 2 in D Minor, op. 23. Like Beach, MacDowell (1861-1908) was a New Englander, but, unlike Beach, he received his training in Europe. As mentioned above, MacDowell dedicated his Second Piano Concerto (1885) to Carreño; perhaps due to the remarkable success of his work, Beach chose the same dedication for her concerto. In a review of Mary Louise Boehm’s recording of the Beach concerto for High Fidelity, Irving Lowens compared Beach’s work to Edward MacDowell’s concertos: “I would say that in many ways her concerto is a finer work than MacDowell’s early A minor concerto . . . and is at least as impressive as his D minor concerto, upon which most of his reputation as the best American composer of his time was based.”

The content and ordering of the movements is quite similar, in spite of the additional movement in Beach’s work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MacDowell: Concerto in D Minor</th>
<th>Beach: Concerto in C-sharp Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Larghetto calmaro – Poco più mosso</td>
<td>I. Allegro moderato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Presto giocoso [a scherzo]</td>
<td>II. Scherzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Largo – Molto allegro</td>
<td>III. Largo – Allegro con scioltezza</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

44 Irving Lowens, [Review of Beach’s Concerto for Piano and Orchestra, Op. 45, Mary Louise Boehm, piano; Westphalian Symphony Orchestra, Siegrfried Landau, conductor], High Fidelity 27 (December 1977): 77-78.

45 The programs from Beach’s earliest performances list the concerto as three movements, with the third and fourth movements combined on one line of text. However, according to Beach’s own written description of the concerto, she considered the work to have four movements (see Chapter 3).
The first movements of both works begin with an orchestral introduction in which the main theme is presented quietly, followed by the entrance of the piano with a fortissimo cadenza-like flourish. Neither work includes a double exposition.

Beach seems to have been particularly influenced by the second movement of MacDowell’s concerto. Instead of the slow movement customarily found in the middle of a three-movement concerto, MacDowell chose a “presto giocoso” scherzo containing many passages of perpetual motion sixteenth notes. Similarly, Beach’s second movement is also a scherzo; subtitled “perpetuum mobile,” it consists entirely of sixteenth notes in the piano.46

While MacDowell’s concerto has the usual three movements, the third movement begins with a Largo introduction, followed by an Allegro. Similarly, the third movement of Beach’s concerto, a Largo, leads attacca to the Allegro finale.

MacDowell uses cyclicism in his concerto by restating thematic material from the first movement in several places in the third movement. The finale of Beach’s concerto is also cyclic, as she recalls a portion of the Largo.

Much of Beach’s virtuoso pianistic style, including the alternating octaves, wide-ranging arpeggios, and double-handed trills, seems to be derived from nineteenth-century composers such as Liszt, Tchaikovsky, Grieg, and MacDowell. However, it should be remembered that, as pianist Mary Louise Boehm said in an interview about Beach’s concerto, “all that stuff was in the wind those days.”47

46 It should also be noted that Saint-Saëns’ Second Piano Concerto, which Beach performed in 1895, has a fast second movement labeled “Allegro scherzando.”

47 Mary Louise Boehm, “Where was Amy Beach All These Years?” Interview by Dean Elder, Clavier 15 (December 1976): 16.
CHAPTER 3

ANALYTICAL OBSERVATIONS

The musical language of Amy Beach's Piano Concerto in C-sharp Minor reflects many stylistic traits typical of late-Romantic music, including the use of chromaticism, unusual resolutions of augmented sixth and diminished seventh chords, modulation by thirds, and mixed modes. However, the overall structure of Beach's concerto is somewhat unusual in that it comprises four movements instead of the usual three. Interestingly, the programs from Beach's earliest performances list the concerto as three movements, with the third and fourth movements combined on one line of text:

Concerto for Pianoforte in C-sharp Minor, op. 45
I. Allegro moderato
II. Scherzo (Perpetuum mobile): Vivace
III. Largo — Allegro con scioltezza

However, Beach herself considered the Largo a separate movement, as evidenced by her own description of the work: "The work is in four movements, the last two being connected." Moreover, the length and complexity of the Largo are quite substantial.

The use of four movements has a clear precedent in another well-known concerto, namely Brahms's Piano Concerto No. 2 in B-flat Major, op. 83. The ordering of the movements, fast — fast (scherzo) — slow — fast, is the same in both works. Brahms's influence is also evident in several formal and harmonic features that will be discussed below.

---

1 Boston Symphony Orchestra program, 7 April 1900, UNH.
The orchestration of Beach’s concerto is slightly expanded compared to that of the typical late nineteenth-century concerto. The concerto is scored for two flutes, piccolo, two oboes, two clarinets, bass clarinet, two bassoons, four horns, two trumpets, three trombones, tuba, percussion, solo piano, and strings. One of the most interesting aspects of Beach’s instrumentation is her inclusion of the piccolo and the bass clarinet, which has an occasional solo part. The trumpets, usually accompanying instruments in the nineteenth-century orchestra, are often used for melodic purposes. The percussion section includes both a triangle and a cymbal. The triangle is prominent in the second and fourth movements, while the cymbals are called for only near the end of the finale.

Amy Beach’s early songs frequently became a source of musical ideas for her otherwise abstract works, such as the Ballade, op. 6, for solo piano; Romance for Violin and Piano, op. 23; “Gaelic” Symphony, op. 32; Theme and Variations for Flute and String Quartet, op. 80; and Piano Trio, op. 150. Much of the melodic material in the first three movements of Beach’s concerto is based on three songs composed shortly after her marriage. Biographer Adrienne Fried Block believes that Beach’s choice of songs points to an extramusical meaning in the concerto, and that the concerto could even be viewed as autobiographical. The songs she selected were dedicated to the two most influential people in her life, her husband and mother; Block asserts that Beach’s particular choice of songs represent her personal struggle for independence from them. While Block’s theory is interesting and credible, there is no concrete evidence that Beach intended the concerto to represent any particular conflict in her personal life. The songs do not represent her best vocal music, and were not as well-known as many

---
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of her later songs. It is possible that she simply liked the thematic material in the songs, and decided to use it more effectively in the concerto.

**MOVEMENT I: ALLEGRO MODERATO**

The first movement of Beach's concerto, in sonata form, features several interesting formal characteristics. As in other concertos of the late nineteenth-century, Beach immediately departs from the concerto-sonata form by not including a double exposition. Another interesting aspect of the form is Beach's use of two distinct themes in the first group of the exposition, as well as new thematic material in the transition (Table 3.1). The first group in the recapitulation is extremely compressed, containing only an abbreviated statement of the first theme.

A considerable amount of the material throughout the first movement is based on the opening theme (Theme 1A), which is stated quietly in octaves by the strings (Example 3.1). This haunting melody is remarkably similar to the opening theme of the finale of Dvořák's "New World" Symphony (1893). Both the intervals and the rhythm of the first five notes are exactly the same, as are the G#, B, and C# that follow, and both themes emphasize the natural form of the minor scale with a lowered seventh.

The variety of ways Theme 1A is developed, reharmonized, inverted, and broken into small motives shows Beach's considerable skill as a composer. Motives based on Theme 1A are presented prominently in every section of the first movement except for the second theme group, including the transition, closing, development, cadenza, and coda. These motives, a and b, are derived from the first four measures of

---

4 First movements of the Schumann, Tchaikovsky, Grieg, Liszt, and MacDowell concertos abandon partially or totally a purely orchestral exposition.
Table 3.1. Formal Outline of Movement I: Sonata form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Formal section</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-215</td>
<td>EXPOSITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-131</td>
<td>FIRST GROUP</td>
<td>c#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-35</td>
<td>Theme 1A, Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-68</td>
<td>Solo cadenza on Theme 1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-86</td>
<td>Theme 1B, piano; 1A, orchestra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-131</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>(V/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-100</td>
<td>Theme 1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-107</td>
<td>Dotted figure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108-131</td>
<td>Motives a and b from 1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132-165</td>
<td>SECOND GROUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132-146</td>
<td>piano</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146-165</td>
<td>violin / orchestra</td>
<td>C# – A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166-215</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166-92</td>
<td>Themes 1B, Dotted figure, 1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192-215</td>
<td>Ritornello – Theme 1A and Theme 2 (g#)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215-285</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215-66</td>
<td>Theme 1A with inversion, Theme 1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267-73</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274-77</td>
<td>Theme 1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278-85</td>
<td>Retransition</td>
<td>V/c#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286-439</td>
<td>RECAPITULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286-303</td>
<td>FIRST GROUP, Theme 1A</td>
<td>c#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304-349</td>
<td>SECOND GROUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304-320</td>
<td>piano / orchestra</td>
<td>Db</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321-349</td>
<td>violin / orchestra</td>
<td>F – Db/C#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350-406</td>
<td>CADENZA (1A, 1B, 2, Dotted figure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407-439</td>
<td>CODA (Dotted figure and 1A)</td>
<td>c#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 3.1. Beach, I, mm. 1-6, Theme 1A
Theme 1A as illustrated in Example 3.1. Following the complete statement of Theme 1A by the orchestra, Beach frequently uses these two motives independently. The piano enters in m. 36 with a virtuosic cadenza based on motive $a$. Then while the piano states Theme 1B (mm. 69-86), the orchestral accompaniment is based on motive $a$. This motive is also prevalent in the closing group, the development, the cadenza, and the coda.

Motive $b$, characterized by its use of a pentatonic collection, is prevalent in the transition of the exposition and the coda. In the transition, Beach uses material based on motive $b$ to frame the transition theme (mm. 93-100, 115-119). Later in the movement, motive $b$ is stated by the timpani at the end of the cadenza as a link to the coda (Example 3.2). The pentatonic sound is highlighted here as the orchestra continues with an arpeggio based on E, G♯, B, and C♯.

Beach uses motive $a$ as the source for rigorous contrapuntal writing in the development and the cadenza, including invertible counterpoint and canon. An inversion of this motive is first stated by a solo horn early in the work (mm. 54-55). In
the development, motive $a$ and its inversion are presented simultaneously in "mirror motion" (m. 216) then in invertible counterpoint (m. 223) as illustrated in Example 3.3.

In the cadenza, motive $a$ is presented as a canon at the sixth (mm. 359-361).

Example 3.3. Beach, I, mm. 216-219, 223-227, motive $a$ in invertible counterpoint

The second theme of the first group, Theme 1B, is first stated in the piano beginning in m. 69. Characterized by horn fifths and a combination of triplets and eighth notes, it appears prominently and frequently enough to validate its status as a theme. Theme 1B is often presented simultaneously with motive $a$, as in its first statement by the piano in mm. 69-86, where it is marked to be played slightly louder than the orchestra's accompanying statement of motive $a$ (Example 3.4). Similarly, as Themes 1A and 1B open the development (m. 215), Theme 1B in the piano is again marked to be played with more projection than Theme 1A and its inversion played by the orchestra. Beach continues to treat Theme 1B in mm. 231-241 of the development, after which a motive based on the horn fifths of 1B becomes the accompaniment in the piano (mm. 242-247).
Example 3.4. Beach, I, mm. 69-72, Theme 1B accompanied by motive a

Beach includes a new figure in mm. 100-107 of the transition that is characterized by descending broken thirds and a dotted rhythm. This “dotted figure” is later used prominently in both the closing group of the exposition and the cadenza, where statements of Theme 1B are immediately followed by brief statements of the transitional material. The transition figure also appears prominently in the coda as it is played by the full orchestra in mm. 411-418.

The thematic material for the lyrical second theme group (Example 3.5a) is based on the third verse of Beach’s song “Jeune fille et jeune fleur,” op. 1, no. 3 (Example 3.5b). The second theme is one of the few places in the first movement where the piano takes the lead and the orchestra has a purely supportive role. The first statement of Theme 2 is by the piano alone; likewise, when Theme 2 is presented in the development (m. 267) and the recapitulation (m. 304), the piano remains prominent while the orchestra has an entirely accompanimental role.
Example 3.5a. Beach, I, mm. 132-135, Theme 2

Example 3.5b. Beach, “Jeune fille et jeune fleur,” op. 1, no. 3, mm. 39-43

Beach’s treatment of harmony features several interesting compositional tendencies, including an avoidance of authentic cadences, a preference for third relationships, a penchant for augmented sixth chords, and frequent application of chromatic bass lines and pedal points. One of the most striking characteristics of the harmony is the lack of dominant-tonic cadences. There are only four authentic cadences in the entire first movement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Formal Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>c#</td>
<td>Exposition, Beginning of Theme 1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>g#</td>
<td>Closing group, Ritornello section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Db</td>
<td>Recapitulation, End of second group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>c#</td>
<td>Final cadence, with suspensions until m. 432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The first, second, and closing groups of the exposition are not tonally closed, nor does Beach resolve the long dominant of the retransition with a tonic chord at the beginning of the recapitulation.

As a substitute for dominant-tonic cadences, Beach often employs cadences with uncommon resolutions of augmented sixth chords. For example, to establish the key of the second theme group, A major, Beach uses a common-tone German sixth chord which resolves directly to the tonic (Example 3.6). One of the most unusual cadences occurs at the end of the second group of the exposition. The second group ends on the dominant of A while the closing group begins in f minor (bvi with an added sixth, D) creating a deceptive cadence with mode mixture (Example 3.7).

Example 3.6. Beach, I, mm. 131-132

Example 3.7. Beach, I, mm. 163-166

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Several large-scale harmonic events in the first movement are particularly noteworthy, including a second theme group that modulates and a recapitulation that begins on the “wrong” chord. The second group of the exposition, in the submediant key of A major instead of the expected relative major,\(^5\) contains two tonal centers—A major and C# major:

SECOND GROUP (mm. 132-165)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm. 132-146: piano</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm. 146-165: violin/orchestra</td>
<td>C# – A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beach repeats this practice in the recapitulation, in which the second theme is presented in Db major and F major. It is interesting that the keys of the second theme group thus create a chain of major thirds: A, C#, F, Db. This use of major-third chains is likely due to the influence of Brahms. For example, in his Third Symphony, op. 90, Brahms composed out a chain of major thirds in the exposition—F, A, C#. Further, in the second movement of his String Quintet in F Major, op. 88, Brahms begins in C# minor, alternates between C# minor and A major, then ends the movement in A major. Beach alternates between these same keys in the second group of the exposition of her concerto.

The way in which Beach blurs the distinction between the end of the development and the beginning of the recapitulation, both harmonically and texturally, also suggests the influence of Brahms. Following a climactic retransition based on the dominant, G#, Theme 1A returns with the “correct” melody notes, but harmonized with the subdominant instead of the expected tonic (Example 3.8). The beginning of the

---

\(^5\) The use of the submediant for the second theme group for minor-mode movements is interesting, but not rare. Examples from the nineteenth century include Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, Schubert’s Unfinished Symphony, and Brahms’s Piano Quintet, Op. 34.
recapitulation is further obscured by the continuation of the same texture through the retransition and the recapitulation—the piano continues to have alternating octaves while the strings and horns play the theme.

Example 3.8. Beach, I, mm. 285-287

Brahms used this technique in his String Sextet in B-flat Major, op. 18, in which the recapitulation begins with the expected melody notes, but is harmonized with the dominant; further, the texture remains constant from the end of the development through the return of the first group. In Brahms’s Piano Quartet in C Minor, op. 60, the beginning of the recapitulation is supported by an Ab in the bass. Similarly, the recapitulation of the Brahms’s Violin Sonata in G Major, op. 78, begins on the V\(^7\) of IV.

Bass lines throughout the concerto often consist of chromatic lines and pedal points. In the transition and in the development, chromatic bass lines precede a more stable tonal area based on a pedal point, as in mm. 107-127 of the transition (Example 3.9). In mm. 107-113, the bass line descends chromatically from d to C\(^\#\),\(^6\) then to an E

\(^6\) Designation of specific octaves: C, C c c\(^1\) c\(^2\) c\(^3\) c\(^4\) (c\(^1\) = middle C)
pedal via an augmented sixth chord. Following the E pedal, which prepares the second
tonal area of A major, the bass line ascends chromatically to A in mm. 123-127.

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
\text{m.} & 104 & 110 & 113 & 115 & 123 & 127 & 132 \\
\end{array}
\]

A: V Ger6 I

Example 3.9. Bass line graph, Beach, I, mm. 104-127

In mm. 271-278 of the development, a very long descending bass line from c to G-♯
sets up the dominant pedal of the retransition; however, this descent is not completely
chromatic as shown in Example 3.10. An ascending chromatic bass line also serves as
the basis of the ritornello at the end of the exposition (mm. 193-213), rising from B to a.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{m.} & 267 & 272 & 278 \\
\end{array}
\]

V/c♯ (retransition)

Example 3.10. Bass line graph, Beach, I, mm. 267-278

The formal demarcations in the first movement are often indicated by changes in
tempo, for which Beach included specific metronome markings (Table 3.2). The range
of tempos is quite wide – from \( \frac{d}{= 80} \) to \( \frac{d}{= 132} \). The tempo for Theme 1A varies from
\( \frac{d}{= 112} \) to \( \frac{d}{= 132} \), while the tempo for Theme 2 ranges from \( \frac{d}{= 80} \) to 100.
Table 3.2. Beach’s tempo markings in the first movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Tempo</th>
<th>MM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theme 1A</td>
<td>Allegro moderato</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Animato</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Ritornello of closing</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Recap., 1A</td>
<td>Animato (132)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Recap., Th. 2, piano</td>
<td>Poco sostenuto</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Recap., Th. 2, violin</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>Animato (m. 411)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MOVEMENT II: SCHERZO (PERPETUUM MOBILE)**

The second movement of Beach’s concerto is unprecedented in the piano concerto repertoire. The use of a scherzo as the second movement of a concerto, while uncommon, can be seen in the Brahms Second Concerto, the Saint-Saëns Second Concerto, and the MacDowell Second Concerto; the role of the piano, however, makes this movement stand alone. The piano part, which consists of perpetual-motion sixteenth notes, plays an accompanimental role throughout the entire movement, while the orchestra carries the melodic material. Moreover, there are no orchestral tuttis in this scherzo, as the piano plays continually throughout.

The second movement is based very closely on Beach’s song “Empress of the Night,” op. 2, no. 3 – the song’s piano accompaniment becomes the solo part, and the vocal line is played by the orchestra (Example 3.11). The form of the movement is also

---

7 The second movement of Prokofiev’s Second Piano Concerto, op. 16 (1923), is a scherzo with perpetual motion sixteenth notes.
closely tied to the song, as the thematic material for the A and B sections is based on different verses of the song (Table 3.3). The first theme, $a$, is based on the first verse of "Empress of the Night"; themes $b'$ and $b^2$ of the B section are derived from the second verse of the song.

Allegretto non troppo.

Voice

Radiant with light. Out of the darkness.

Piano

PP sempre staccato con Pedale

Example 3.11a. Beach, "Empress of the Night," op. 2, no. 3, mm. 1-3

Example 3.11b. Beach, II, mm. 9-14
Table 3.3. Formal Outline of Movement II: Ternary form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Formal section</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>modulatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-71</td>
<td>A (a)</td>
<td>A – C# – A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-100</td>
<td>transition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-157</td>
<td>B (b' and b^2)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157-188</td>
<td>cadenza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189-199</td>
<td>retransition (b^2)</td>
<td>(F^7 becomes Ger6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-260</td>
<td>A' (a - b'- a)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260-292</td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the first movement, formal and harmonic features in the second movement include modulation by thirds, irregular resolutions of augmented sixth chords, highly contrapuntal writing, and pentatonicism. The A section alternates between the keys of A major and C# major, with a statement of a in the key of C# inserted in mm. 30-37; these are the same tonal areas were used in the second group of the first movement. While the mediant key (C#) is used within in the A section, the B section is in the key of C major, the lowered mediant.

The introduction to the second movement is interesting in that it serves as a tonal link from the key of the first movement to the that of the second. Dvořák also included a such tonal link at the beginning of the second movement of his “New World” Symphony to modulate from E minor to Db major; similarly, Chopin used a short tonal link at the beginning of the third movement of his Sonata in B Minor, op. 58. Beach begins the second movement with a French augmented sixth chord on D, and ends with a French-sixth dominant on Bb which resolves directly to the tonic, A major, in m. 10.
In addition to the augmented sixth chords in the introduction, a clever use of an augmented sixth chord can be seen in the retransiion, mm. 189-199. Instead of a dominant pedal, the return of A is preceded by eight measures of F major harmony, ending with an F\(^7\), which is then enharmonically respelled as a German augmented sixth chord in the key of A major (Example 3.12). The resolution is interesting as Beach uses a dominant with an added sixth before resolving to the dominant seventh chord.

![Example 3.12. Beach, II, mm. 197-201](image)

As in the first movement, Beach continues to employ contrapuntal writing in the second movement. The primary theme of the B section, \(b^1\) is based on mm. 23-24 of "Empress"; it is frequently treated as a canon at the octave throughout the B section, as in Example 3.13. There are similar canons beginning in measures 119, 125, 236, and 260. The second theme of the B section, \(b^2\), based on mm. 12-13 of "Empress," appears less frequently, but prominently, in transitional passages and as a countermelody (Example 3.14). It is the only theme used in the retransition, mm. 189-199.
Example 3.13. Beach, II, mm. 101-108, $b'$ as canon

Example 3.14. Beach, II, mm. 189-191, $b^2$

The A' section (mm. 200-259) repeats much of the material from the first A section; however, Beach omits the statement of $a$ in C# major, and inserts a canon statement of $b'$ in mm. 236-243 of A'.

Source of material for A' (mm. 200-260)

- mm. 200-224 A, mm. 11-29, 38-44
- mm. 225-235 transitional, based on A
- mm. 236-243 $b'$ (Canon, clarinet and horn)
- mm. 244-246 $b^2$
- mm. 245-260 A, mm. 61-70

As in the coda of the first movement, Beach makes use of a pentatonic scale near the end of the second movement (mm. 278-285), using the notes A, B, C#, E, and F#.

It is interesting that the published two-piano score, arranged by Beach in 1900, does not have a heavy double bar at the end of the second movement; instead, there is a fermata and a thin double bar immediately followed by the time signature for the next
movement (a new key signature is not necessary). The end of the third movement is even more clearly connected to the fourth, as Beach indicates with the marking *attacca*.

When this is considered in combination with the length of the first movement (seventeen minutes, almost half of the entire concerto), it is possible to conclude that Beach may at some point have thought of the concerto in two parts of almost equal length as follows:

- **Part One:** I. Allegro moderato
- **Part Two:** II. Scherzo — III. Largo — IV. Allegro con scioltezza

Moreover, the tonal link at the beginning of the second movement joins these two halves, indicating that Beach conceived the concerto as one continuous work.

**MOVEMENT III. LARGO**

The slow movement, which Beach described as “a dark, tragic lament,” is based on her song “Twilight,” op. 2, no. 1 (Example 3.15). The movement, only 77 measures long, could be regarded as an introduction to the finale, but Beach herself referred to the Largo as a separate movement; additionally, the complex harmony and well-defined formal organization (Table 3.4) suggest an independent form.

The movement opens with one of the few orchestral tuttis in the entire concerto, providing a much-needed break for the soloist and the audience after the perpetual motion of the second movement. The introduction and first part of the A section (mm. 1-15) are played by the orchestra alone; the piano and orchestra play together for the remainder of the movement as the melody alternates regularly between the two.

Various instruments are featured as soloists throughout this movement, including clarinet, flute, trumpet, violin, horn, and cello.
Example 3.15a. Beach, “Twilight,” mm. 1-7

Example 3.15b. Beach, III, mm. 7-11

Table 3.4. Formal Outline of Movement III: Ternary form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Formal section</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-31</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>f#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Introductory phrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-31</td>
<td>a, a'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-58</td>
<td>B (Poco più mosso)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-77</td>
<td>A' (Tempo I)</td>
<td>f#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Formally, the A section contains two statements of the theme, \( a \) and \( a' \). The orchestra states \( a \) in mm. 7-15, then the piano repeats and embellishes it in mm. 21-30 with orchestral accompaniment.

**Formal organization of A:**

| mm. 7-15 | \( a \) (orchestra tutti) | f\# pedal |
| mm. 15-20 | Bridge (piano solo) | c\# pedal |
| mm. 21-31 | \( a' \) (piano with orchestral accompaniment) | f\# pedal |

The B section, which is based on the same thematic material as the A section, is marked by a clear change of both key and tempo. The section begins with a cadence in A major, but the harmony is mostly modulatory. The end of the B section contains a dominant pedal in preparation for the reprise of \( A' \). However, instead of resolving to the tonic, Beach places a dominant pedal (C\#) underneath the return of \( A' \), making the return of \( A' \) less definitive harmonically. Moreover, there are no more cadences in f\# as the \( A' \) section prepares for the *attacca* entrance of the finale.

The bass line of this highly chromatic movement is especially interesting as it consists entirely of long pedal points and movement by half-steps. Both \( a \) and \( a' \) of the A section are accompanied by an F\# pedal followed by a descending chromatic bass line to a new key area (mm. 7-15, 21-29). In addition, the C\# pedal in the transition (mm. 15-19) is both approached and left by descending chromatic lines (Example 3.16).

---

Example 3.16. Bass line graph, Beach, III, mm. 7-31 (A)
The bass line of the B section begins with a short pedal on A, but mostly ascends chromatically until the dominant pedal on C# in mm. 47-51. The remainder of the third movement (A', mm. 59-75) is supported by a dominant pedal, C#, followed by a series of sequences in which the bass descends from C# to G, ending with an A⁴⁄₂ chord (Example 3.17). Beach then respells the last bass note, G, to an F-double-sharp, creating an inverted German augmented sixth chord in the key of C# minor, which becomes the first chord of the finale. One of the most interesting features of the bass line occurs in mm. 73-75 in which the bass line (B♭, F, E, G) is a transposition of the opening melodic motive of the introduction, a motive that occurs frequently in this movement.

Example 3.17. Bass line graph, Beach, III, m. 59 - IV, m. 4

**MOVEMENT IV. ALLEGRO CON SCIOLTEZZA**

Beach herself referred to the last movement as a “bright vivacious rondo”;
however, the formal organization of the finale is not a straightforward rondo by any means. In addition to the elements of rondo form, the key relationship between the

---

8 con scioltezza = with ease

B and B' sections suggests the sonata principle; therefore, I have chosen to classify this movement as a modified sonata-rondo form with the ordering of B' and A" reversed, as illustrated in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5. Formal Outline of Movement IV: Modified Sonata-Rondo form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-43</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>c#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>A¹</td>
<td>c#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-27</td>
<td>A²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-43</td>
<td>transition (orchestra tutti, A¹ and A²)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-86</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>E – G♯ – E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-94</td>
<td>Cadenza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-123</td>
<td>A'</td>
<td>c#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124-147</td>
<td>C (Lento)</td>
<td>g♯ – B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148-168</td>
<td>B'</td>
<td>Ab – C – Ab (V) – Db</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168-184</td>
<td>A''</td>
<td>Db</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185-205</td>
<td>Coda (A and B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This movement also has a cyclical element in that the C section is based on the third movement. In contrast to the previous movements, the piano plays a less accompanimental role in the finale and is more prominent in the presentation of themes.

The A section, very lively and dance-like, contains two distinctive parts. The first part, A¹ (mm. 1-8), is reminiscent of Chopin (Example 3.18), while the second part, A² (mm. 9-23), recalls an ascending sequential passage from Tchaikovsky’s *Capriccio Italien*, op. 45 (Example 3.19). The B section, also dance-like, is characterized by a quasi-bolero rhythm in the accompaniment (Example 3.20).
Example 3.18. Beach, IV, A¹, mm. 1-4, Chopinesque

Example 3.19a. Beach, IV, A², mm. 9-12

Example 3.19b. Tchaikovsky, Capriccio Italien, mm. 107-111

Example 3.20. Beach, IV, mm. 46-49
The finale, like the preceding movements, is characterized harmonically by third relationships and unusual cadences involving enharmonic shifts. Beach frequently uses modulation by thirds, both between sections and within sections. For example, the keys within the B section are E major, G# major, then back to E major, a major third.

Similarly, the Lento (C) section begins in G# minor and ends in B major. The harmonic shift at the end of the C section into the B' section is especially interesting as Beach moves from the key of B major to the key of Ab major in mm. 147-148, an enharmonic minor third. The vii° chord in B major, A#–C#–E–G, becomes V7 in the key of Ab as the E is lowered to Eb and the other tones are enharmonically respelled as Bb–Db–G (Example 3.21).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{B: vii}^\circ \quad \text{Ab: V7} \\
\text{I}
\end{array}
\]

Example 3.21. Beach, IV, mm. 147-148

Beach enhances the rondo feeling in this movement by recalling the A theme at the end of the B section, and the B theme at the end of the A' section as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m.</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>119</th>
<th>124</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>(A')</td>
<td>Cadenza</td>
<td>A'</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beach creates an exciting effect in the final statement of A" by combining the ascending "Capriccio" motive with its inversion in mm. 172-173 (Example 3.22). The piano states an embellished version of the phrase, while the orchestra plays the descending inversion.

![Example 3.22. Beach, IV, mm. 172-174](image)

The coda of Beach's concerto contains a distinctive chord progression containing the Neapolitan chord that is reminiscent of the coda in the finale of the Grieg Piano Concerto in A Minor. Beach closes her concerto with three varied statements of the following progression: I – V/II – II6 – V – I (Example 3.23a). The varied repetitions of this progression are found beginning in mm. 185, 190, and 194. Grieg similarly uses several repetitions of this progression in the "Quasi presto" coda of the finale (Example 3.23b).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Example 3.23a. Beach, IV, mm. 185-189

Example 3.23b. Grieg, Piano Concerto in A Minor, III, mm. 372-375
Throughout the four-movement concerto, Beach utilizes traditional forms, but always with some modification, as in the use of two themes in the first group of the exposition of the first movement, and the modification of sonata-rondo form in the finale. The most distinctive compositional tendencies are modulation by thirds, unusual resolutions of augmented sixth chords, avoidance of authentic cadences, pentatonicism, bass lines that commonly alternate between chromatic motion and pedal points, and frequent contrapuntal writing. The influence of other composers on Beach's form and harmonic language is unmistakable—particularly that of Brahms, Dvořák, Tchaikovsky, and Grieg.
CONCLUSIONS

The revival of interest in Amy Beach's music is evidenced in the many recent performances, recordings, journal articles, dissertations, and lectures about Beach and her music. In the last few years, virtually every aspect of her life and music has been studied. Adrienne Fried Block's research, particularly her exhaustive and interesting biography, *Amy Beach: Passionate Victorian* (1998), is especially noteworthy. Publications about Beach and her compositions appear frequently in a wide variety of journals, ranging from theoretical and musicological journals to educational and pedagogical journals. Her works are also a popular topic for dissertation research, with papers concerning her symphony, piano concerto, piano music, choral music, and solo vocal music appearing in the past three years. Beach's life and music were the focus of three recent conferences—the Amy Beach Conference and Concert series at the University of New Hampshire in October, 1998; the New England Conservatory Spring Festival, "Musical Boston a Century Ago," March 1999; and a one-day "Beach Conference" at the Mannes School of Music in New York, 6 December 1999. New recordings are also being released quite frequently, such as the recent recording of all the solo piano music by Joanne Polk (1998-1999), as well as a recording of the Piano Concerto in C-sharp Minor by the same soloist with the English Chamber Orchestra released in March 2000. The recent interest in the music of Beach may indicate that her compositions will increasingly become part of the concert repertoire of American music.

The research into the early history of Beach's concerto has raised at least two intriguing questions: 1) When did Beach send a copy of the manuscript score to Teresa
Carreño? and 2) Do the “numerous pasted-over corrections”\(^1\) in Carreño’s score indicate that Beach made changes to the score after the premiere in 1900? Further research could lead to some interesting conclusions about Beach’s compositional process.

As the previous chapters have illustrated, the concerto is skillfully and imaginatively written. Beach effectively combines the virtuoso pianistic style and harmonic conventions of the nineteenth century with her own musical language. The recent interest in this extraordinary work by both scholars and performers is well deserved.

\(^1\) Mann, “The Carreño Collection at Vassar College,” 1081.
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APPENDIX A

BEACH’S NOTES ON THE CONCERTO FOR PIANO AND ORCHESTRA, OP. 45

Amy Beach provided the following description of the Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in C-sharp Minor, op. 45 for the Los Angeles Examiner, 7 June 1915. It was subsequently reprinted in The Musical Courier.

The work is in four movements, the last two being connected.

The first, Allegro, is serious in character, piano and orchestra vying with each other in the development of the two principal themes, of which the second is songlike in character. There is a richly worked out cadenza for the solo instrument near the close of the movement.

The second movement, “Scherzo,” bears the subtitle “perpetuum mobile,” and consists of a piquant etude rhythm unbroken throughout the piano part, set against an orchestral background that sings the melody in the stringed instruments. This is a short movement, with a brief cadenza for the piano before the final resumption of the principal theme.

The slow movement is a dark, tragic lament, which, after working up to an impassioned climax, passes through a very soft transition phase directly into the last movement, a bright vivacious rondo.

Before the close there comes a repetition of the lament theme, with varied development, quickly followed by a renewal of the rondo and then a coda.1

Beach wrote a similar description of the concerto for the program notes of the Chicago and the St Louis performances in 1916-17:

The concerto contains four movements, of which the opening Allegro is much longer than the others. This is built broadly upon the symphonic form, the orchestra and piano sharing in about an equal degree in the development of the two contrasting themes.

The second movement is a ‘Perpetuum mobile’ for the solo instrument, with the melodic and harmonic structure supplied almost entirely by the orchestra.

A short slow movement leads without break into the finale, which is interrupted before the close by a recurrence of the Largo.2

---


2 St. Louis Symphony Orchestra, Program Notes, 12-13 January 1917, UNH.
# APPENDIX B

## CATALOG OF WORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orchestral</th>
<th>Chamber</th>
<th>Keyboard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Opus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Opus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony in E minor, “Gaelic”</td>
<td>Romance, vn, pf</td>
<td>“Mamma’s Waltz”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in C-sharp Minor</td>
<td>Sonata in A minor for Violin and Piano</td>
<td>Air and Variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance, vn, pf</td>
<td>Invocation, vn, pf</td>
<td>Menuetto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata in A minor for Violin and Piano</td>
<td>Quintet for Piano and Strings in F-sharp minor</td>
<td>Romanza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Compositions, vn, pf</td>
<td>Theme and Variations for Flute and String Quartet</td>
<td>Petite valse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invocation, vn, pf</td>
<td>Quartet for Strings in One Movement</td>
<td>“Allegro appassionato,” “Moderato cantabile,” “Allegro con fuoco”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintet for Piano and Strings in F-sharp minor</td>
<td>Pastorale, fl, vc, pf</td>
<td>Cadenza to Beethoven, Piano Concerto No.3, 1st mvt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme and Variations for Flute and String Quartet</td>
<td>Caprice: “The Water Sprites” fl, vc, pf</td>
<td>Valse-Caprice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartet for Strings in One Movement</td>
<td>Lento espressivo, vn, pf</td>
<td>Six Sketches: “In Autumn,” “Phantoms,” “Dreaming,” “Fireflies”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastorale, fl, vc, pf</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Bal masque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprice: “The Water Sprites” fl, vc, pf</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Children’s Carnival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lento espressivo, vn, pf</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Trois morceaux caractéristiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio for Piano, Violin, and Violoncello</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Children’s Album</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastorale, ww qnt</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>“Summer Dreams” pf, 4 hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 This list was compiled from Adrienne Fried Block, *Amy Beach: Passionate Victorian* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 300-309. Unpublished works have been omitted.
Eskimos: Four Characteristic Pieces
Les rêves de Colombine: Suite française
Prelude and Fugue
“From Blackbird Hills”
Fantasia fugata
“The Fair Hills of Éire, O!”
“A Hermit Thrush at Eve,” “A Hermit Thrush at Morn”
From Grandmother’s Garden
“Farewell Summer,” “Dancing Leaves”
Suite for Two Pianos Founded upon Old Irish Melodies
“Old Chapel by Moonlight “
Nocturne
“A Cradle Song of the Lonely Mother”
“From Olden Times: Gavotte”
“By the Still Waters”
“Tyrolean Valse-Fantasie”
“From Six to Twelve”
“A Bit of Cairo”
Three Pianoforte Pieces: “Scherzino: A Peterborough Chipmunk,” “Young Birches,” “A Hummingbird”
“Out of the Depths”
Five Improvisations
Prelude on an Old Folk Tune, organ

Opera

Cabildo

Sacred Choral

Mass in E-flat
“O Praise the Lord, All Ye Nations”
Choral Responses
Festival jubilate
“Bethlehem”
“All Hallelujah, Christ is Risen”
“Te Deum”
“Peace on Earth”
“Help Us, O God”
“Service in A”
“All Hail the Power of Jesus’ Name”
“Thou Knowest Lord”
Canticles
“Te Deum”
“Constant Christmas”
“The Lord is My Shepherd”
“I Will Lift Up Mine Eyes”
“Benedictus es, Domine” “Benedictus”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>“Let This Mind Be in You”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>“Lord of the Worlds Above”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>“Around the Manger”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>“Benedicte omnia opera Comini”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Communion Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td><em>The Canticle of the Sun</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Evening Hymn: “The Shadows of the Evening Hours”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>“Christ in the Universe”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>“God Is Our Stronghold”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>“Hearken Unto Me”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>“O Lord God of Israel”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>“Lord of All Being”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>“I Will Give Thanks”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Pax nobiscum”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Secular Choral**

- 9 “The Little Brown Bee”
- 16 “The Minstrel and the King”
- 30 “The Rose of Avon-town”
- 31 Three Flower Songs
- 39 Three Shakespeare Choruses
- 42 Song of Welcome
- 46 *Sylvania: A Wedding Cantata*
- 49 A Song of Liberty
- 57 “Only a Song” “One Summer Day”
- 59 “The Sea Fairies”
- 66 *The Chambered Nautilus*
- 74 Panama Hymn
- 82 “Dusk in June”
- 86 “May Eve”
- 94 Three School Songs
- 101 *Peter Pan*
- 110 “The Greenwood”
- 118 Two Children’s Choruses
- 126 “Sea Fever” “The Last Prayer”
- 127 “When the Last Sea is Sailed”
- 129 “Drowsy Dreamtown”
- 140 “We Who Sing Have Walked in Glory”
  — “A Bumblebee Passed By My Window”
- 144 “This Morning Very Early”
  — “The Ballad of P.E.O.”

**Songs**

- 1 Four Songs
- 2 Three Songs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Songs of the Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Three Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Three Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>&quot;Hymn of Trust&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Four Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Three Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>&quot;Villanelle: Across the World&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Three Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Four Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Four Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Four Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Three Shakespeare Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Three Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Five Burns Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Three Browning Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Four Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Four Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Four Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>&quot;Give Me Not Love&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>&quot;When Soul Is Joined To Soul&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>&quot;After&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Two Mother Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Three Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Two Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Two Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Four Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Two Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Two Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Three Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>&quot;In the Twilight&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>&quot;Spirit Divine&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>&quot;Message&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Four Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Two Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>&quot;Jesus My Savior&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>&quot;Mine Be the Lips&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>&quot;Around the Manger&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Three Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>&quot;Rendez-vous&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>&quot;Birth&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>&quot;Springtime&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Two Sacred Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>&quot;Dark Garden&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>&quot;To One I Love&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>&quot;Fire and Flame&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>&quot;My Love Came Through the Fields&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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— "A Light That Overflows"
137 Two Mother Songs
— "Evening Song"
— "The Deep Sea Pearl"
142 "I Sought the Lord"
143 "I Shall Be Brave"
145 "April Dreams"
— "Jesus, Tender Shepherd"
152 "Though I Take the Wings of Morning"
— "The Heart That Melts"
— "The Icicle Lesson"
— "If Women Will Not Be Inclined"
— "Time Has Wings and Swiftly Flies"
March 2, 2000

Hildegard Publishing Company
Attn: Sylvia Glickman
Fax: (610) 649-8677

Dear Ms. Glickman,

I am a candidate for the Doctor of Musical Arts degree at Louisiana State University. Having completed work on my dissertation, “Amy Beach’s Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in C-sharp Minor, Op. 45: A Historical, Stylistic, and Analytical Study,” I am requesting your permission to reproduce the following measures from your two-piano edition of the Beach Piano Concerto, Op. 45. In addition, UMI may supply single copies of my dissertation on demand.


Movement II: mm. 9-14, 89-91, 101-108, 197-201

Movement III: mm. 7-11

Movement IV: mm. 1-4, 46-49, 147-148, 172-173, 185-189

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Katrina C. Rushing

Katrina C. Rushing
1763 Briar Oak Drive
Baton Rouge, LA 70810
Fax: (225) 388-2562

March 16, 2000

Permission granted. Please credit Hildegard Publishing Company for these measures.

Sylvia Glickman
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