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"Unique" and "enigmatic" are words that are easy to throw around. But occasionally a musical work comes along that is truly unique—one of a kind—and manages to remain enigmatic even after nearly two hundred years. Hector Berlioz’s Harold en Italie is one such work: a piece that holds a unique place in the symphonic repertoire because it fits into no known genre and because its meanings remain enigmatic. Furthermore, it is a work that poses challenges different from any other work in the repertoire, challenges that invite some new solutions that I will lay out in the course of this study.

Throughout Berlioz’s career, his fascination with opera and musical drama heavily influenced his symphonic output and inspired him to employ new ideas that blurred the once clear delineation between symphonic, stage, and solo works. Berlioz was clearly influenced by Beethoven’s final symphony, with its pioneering inclusion of chorus and soloists and operatic recitative written for both instrumentalists and singers. In Harold en Italie, Berlioz pays homage to his great predecessor while putting his own musical fingerprint on the new direction in symphonic music.

This new musical direction proved to be both a blessing and a curse for Berlioz. While he received great critical acclaim for Symphonie Fantastique, his second symphonic work Harold en Italie never reached the same level of popularity and has so far earned only a peripheral place in the orchestral canon.
I believe Harold’s relative lack of success is caused primarily by the work’s indeterminate genre, which defies immediate classification and remains a programming quandary for conductors.

Is Harold a symphony, a concerto, or something completely different? To this day, there is much debate about how to classify this work. A survey of the audience at my doctoral recital of this piece with the Eastman Philharmonia on February 22, 2010, revealed almost a 50%-50% split, in which half the audience experienced Harold as a symphony and half heard it as a viola concerto.

In addition to the confusion created for audience members, Harold’s enigmatic format creates a multitude of problems specifically for the conductor. How does one go about programming it into a concert season? How does the conductor reach the decision to treat it as a concerto or a symphony, and how might a conductor work with a soloist who has the opposite view? How should the conductor integrate the logistical and musical challenges of staging the soloist, the harpist, and offstage musicians?
**ORIGINS**

*Harold in Italie* was ostensibly composed because the incomparable virtuoso Niccolo Paganini commissioned it. According to Berlioz’s *Memoirs*, Paganini was so moved by a performance of *Symphonie fantastique* that he “stopped me in the passage and seizing my hand uttered such glowing eulogies that my heart and brain were set on fire.”¹ A few weeks later Paganini asked Berlioz to write a piece for his “Stradivarius viola, a marvelous instrument, which he wanted to play in public; but he lacked the right music.”²

Unfortunately, it quickly became clear that the two parties would be at odds over the conception of the work. Paganini apparently wanted a virtuoso piece to showcase his skills and his new instrument. If his *Memoirs* are accurate, Berlioz had doubts from the first, equivocating that perhaps Paganini would be better off writing his own concerto because Berlioz lacked the skills. Whether that sentiment was just rank flattery, a disinclination to write a concerto to order, or some combination thereof, it was certainly prophetic. Berlioz never composed to the constraints of patrons and seems to have been rather proud of that fact. He was only interested in his own ideas. As Julian Rushton asserts, Berlioz’s

---

² Ibid.
“musical conceptions fitted no patterns of genre or patronage,” and that certainly held true for Harold.

Instead, Harold en Italie is, like so many of Berlioz’s works, an unusual pairing of circumstance and experimentation, of ingenuity and theater. Although the direct catalyst for the piece was certainly Paganini’s commission and encouragement, the musical ideas for Harold seem to have arisen from several different sources and inspirations. Only a few days after Paganini met with Berlioz, Berlioz wrote an article in the Gazette musicale stating that Paganini had commissioned a work from him “in the genre of the Fantastic Symphonie” and that Paganini himself would premiere the viola solo. Berlioz announced its title, “The Last Moments of Mary Stuart [Queen of Scots],” and most importantly, that it would not be a concerto but a “dramatic fantasy for orchestra chorus and solo viola.”

Although on the surface none of those statements ended up to be true about Harold, they contain the seeds of many of Harold’s inspirations.

Despite many compositional changes along the way, David Cairns believes that Harold—“which was first planned as a work in only two movements – sounds more like a dramatic fantasy than a symphony.” Also, perhaps it was Berlioz’s original plan to base his new viola “fantasy” on a

5 Ibid.
Scottish narrative that gave him the idea to revisit material from the *Rob Roy* overture. Many scholars have pointed out that motives and even entire themes from *Rob Roy* are re-used in *Harold en Italie*. Even though *Harold’s* final instrumentation did not include chorus but only an offstage string trio, David Cairns still describes it as a precursor to Berlioz’s choral-orchestral works *Romeo et Juliette, La Damnation de Faust, and L’enfance du Christ*. Berlioz’s initial concept of the work must have contributed something to the final enigma of *Harold’s* classification.

Thus we know by Berlioz’s own public admission that he never had the intention to write a traditional viola concerto for Paganini, even though in his *Memoirs* he expressed his willingness “to please the great man” and claimed to have “attempted to write a solo for the viola”. That viola solo very quickly became instead “a happy scheme” to merge the solo part “with orchestral accompaniment in such a way as to leave the orchestra full of freedom of action”. In its current form the solo viola is given very few virtuosic passages, and its part is largely woven deep into the fabric of the piece. Berlioz asserted he “was confident that, by the incomparable power of his playing, Paganini would be able to maintain the supremacy of the soloist” but whether that is a serious statement of Berlioz’s intent for *Harold* to remain a viola solo at heart, or whether

---

6 Ibid.
7 Berlioz, *The Memoirs of Hector Berlioz, Member of the French Institute: Including His travels in Italy, Germany, Russia, and England, 1803-1865*: 225.
8 Ibid., 224-25.
9 Ibid.
it is a self-justification to Paganini after the fact, is not clear. Indeed, from Paganini’s reaction and Harold’s equivocal reputation among viola soloists to this day, it is just so much wishful thinking. Paganini and Berlioz’s partnership was quickly dissolved.

No sooner was the first movement written than Paganini wanted to see it. At the sight of so many rests in the viola part at the allegro he exclaimed: “That’s no good. There’s not enough for me to do here. I should be playing all the time.” “That’s exactly what I said,” I replied. “What you want is a viola concerto, and in this case only you can write it.” He did not answer; he looked disappointed and went away without referring to my symphonic fragment again.10

Amidst the many sources of inspiration for Harold, the most famous is probably its association with Lord Byron’s Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage (1818). Yet according to Peter Bloom Harold was only associated with Byron’s work upon completion: “An association was made–but only after the work was fully drafted–with the melancholic persona that Lord Byron had constructed for himself.”11

Berlioz made it clear that the viola is not intended to represent Byron’s Harold, but instead plays the role of an autobiographical character presented in a

10 Ibid., 225.
romanticized light, as Harold was in *Childe Harold*. His inventive utilization of the solo viola to personify this character necessarily limits its virtuosity. He wrote that he had set the viola part in the midst of “poetic impressions recollected from my wandering in the Abruzzi” and had made the viola “a kind of melancholy dreamer in the style of Byron’s *Childe Harold.*”¹² Donald Tovey, the famous English musicologist wrote as quoted in Clarson-Leach’s book *Berlioz: His Life and Times*:

> There are excellent reasons for reading *Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage.*
> But among them I cannot find any that concern Berlioz and this symphony, except for the jejune value of the discovery that no definite elements of Byron’s poem have penetrated the impregnable fortress of Berlioz’s encyclopedic inattention.¹³

The viola part presents the *idée fixe* and that theme recurs reflectively throughout. Moreover, as the work unfolds the solo viola line is continuously reduced. For instance, in the last movement, the viola is predominant at the beginning of the movement but almost silent towards the end, when traditional concerti usually reach their peak of intensity. Perhaps it is a good thing that Paganini was only shown the first movement or he would have been truly horrified!

¹² Berlioz, *The Memoirs of Hector Berlioz, Member of the French Institute: Including His travels in Italy, Germany, Russia, and England, 1803-1865* : 225.
*Harold* was completed in Montmartre, Paris on June 22, 1834. The work received its first performance later that year on November 23 in the Salle du Conservatoire in Paris. The original personnel for the first performance featured the conductor Narcisse Girard (1797-1860) and Chrétien Urhan (1790-1845) as the viola soloist. According to Macdonald, Urhan was “a principal violinist in the Opéra orchestra and a devoted exponent of both the viola and the viola d’amore.” Berlioz may have performed the cymbal part on the first performance of the work.

The work received unfavorable first reviews in the press. In his memoirs Berlioz bemoans one of them published in a Parisian musical journal. He writes:

> The article began, in the wittiest fashion: “Ha! ha! ha! – haro! haro! Harold!” [“haro” is a term or shout of denunciation] A day after it appeared I got an anonymous letter which, after a stream of even cruder insults, accused me of “not having the courage to blow my brains out.”


15 Berlioz, *The Memoirs of Hector Berlioz, Member of the French Institute : Including His travels in Italy, Germany, Russia, and England*, 1803-1865: 226.
Throughout his career Berlioz consistently explored questions of orchestration, instrumental placement and physical performance space. He formed firm — some might say dictatorial — opinions on musician placement and its effect on acoustics. He experimented with these elements to heighten the dramatic impact of his symphonic music. In each of his major orchestral works he composed for different offstage combinations, and, as with so many elements of his more outsize compositions, his ideas got larger and more elaborate with time. In the third movement of his *Symphonie fantastique*, he calls for the principal oboe to play its first solo “*derrière la scene*” (offstage) as an echo to the onstage English horn, and then to rejoin the orchestra. Instruments playing offstage were common in operatic literature but rare in the orchestral sphere, and their use was primarily restricted to oratorios (Gossec’s 1774 *La Nativité*) and opera overtures (Beethoven’s *Leonore Overtures*). In his *Requiem Op. 5*, only eight years later, Berlioz calls for four separate brass choirs positioned at the cardinal points in the performance space (North, South, East and West).

It’s easy to forget that Haydn was fond of using musical topoi for dramatic effect — there are numerous instances of tone-painting in *Die

---

Schöpfung— but rarely used purely extra-musical elements in his symphonies.

One notable early exception is Symphony No. 45 “Farewell” in which his gradual banishment of the orchestra, two by two, during the final movement was motivated by specific political factors and targeted only the Prince of Esterhazy.

Haydn’s use of topoi helped to develop the form of the symphony from light background music to concert works. In Symphony No. 103 ("Drumroll") the dramatic timpani roll and Gregorian chant-like melody in the first movement draw on both martial and sacred sounds and experiences that were already familiar to the audiences of his day. In the finale of Symphony No. 104 (London), the pastoral drone at the beginning and the violins’ contra-dance melody at m. 23 introduce visual elements to the audience’s imagination by evoking a rural scene. Haydn’s endlessly inventive symphonic output encompasses a large variety of these musical themes.

Like Haydn, Beethoven incorporated evocative extra-musical elements in his symphonic works, such as the use of cannons in Wellington’s Victory and the Janissary band in the middle of his ninth symphony. Although there are offstage trumpet calls in the Leonore overtures, the pieces were intended for performance in an opera theatre and not a concert hall. There is no evidence that Beethoven conceptualized the symphonic performance space for original programmatic purposes as Berlioz does. Many of Haydn’s more obvious musical effects were jokes, meant to lighten the mood or set a specific (imagined) scene. Beethoven’s effects were directly related to specific events in his orchestral works. Berlioz
used his offstage techniques to further the programmatic aspects of his symphonic works and deepen the drama. Berlioz is the first composer to use this strategy consistently and with sophisticated dramatic forethought.

Berlioz believed that concert venue and instrumental placement within that venue were of critical importance to making music. This kind of specificity was characteristic of Berlioz, who believed that detailed attention to practical considerations were an essential element in any successful performance. Berlioz’s jumble of experiences as an impoverished impresario undoubtedly forced him to learn the serious consequences of many small logistical details.

Berlioz argued that the performance hall was practically an equal partner to the orchestra performing there. He describes his ideal hall, citing that the venue must have hard, resonant surfaces behind and surrounding the musicians so that that every instrument could project clearly and unobstructed to the audience:

The best way to arrange the performers in a hall of a size appropriate to their number is to build them up one behind the other on a series of risers, set out in such a way that each row can project its sound to the audience without any obstacle in the way...

Every well-organized concert orchestra should be terraced in this
Berlioz did acknowledge the individuality of each venue and the necessity of adjusting to the space at hand:

The best grouping of performers in a theatre or a concert hall cannot be definitively fixed, since the shape and layout of the hall’s interior has an obvious bearing on deciding what to do. It depends on the number of performers involved and sometimes on the type of composition they are performing.\textsuperscript{18}

Berlioz also itemized the kinds of decisions that he felt fell under the conductor’s purview. Berlioz was a pioneer in the relatively young field of conducting and his writing on its practice very thorough. When he revised his \textit{Orchestration Treatise} for publication in 1855, he added an entire chapter on the role of the conductor. The chapter included an in-depth discussion of conducting philosophy, technique, and practical issues that affect music making. Berlioz discusses his thoughts on platform placement of the orchestra, which he states “fall within the


\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
conductor’s province, especially in the concert hall.”¹⁹

Berlioz also described his ideal of orchestral seating:

If it is wide enough to contain the whole orchestra the full body of players can be set out at different levels with the first violins at the front on the right; the seconds at the front on the left; the violas in the middle between the two sets of violins; the flutes, oboes, clarinets, horns and bassoons behind the first violins; a double row of cellos and basses behind the second violins; the trumpets; cornets; trombones and tuba behind the violas; the rest of the cellos and basses behind the woodwinds; the harps at the front close to the conductor; the timpani and other percussion behind the brass; and the conductor near the front desks of first and second violins with his back to the audience at the bottom of the amphitheatre.²⁰

Berlioz agreed that the 1st and 2nd violins should be arrayed on opposite sides of the conductor. This seating arrangement was standard for orchestras in the 1830’s and for many decades beyond. It allows the audience to hear a clear separation between the two violin choirs and is ideal for music that features independence between the two parts. As detailed counterpoint became a less common feature in symphonic music, the necessity for the violin sections to be

¹⁹ Ibid., 358.
²⁰ Ibid., 359.
separated diminished. The downside of continuing this practice with contemporary orchestras for Berlioz’s music is that many second violinists have gotten used to being aligned with the first violin section. Also, some would argue that separating the two sections diminishes the total amount of volume from the combined violin sections.

Berlioz also advocated separating the celli and basses and placing them next to the winds on opposite sides of the orchestra, as was fairly common during that time. This eventually fell out of favor, although some orchestras still range the basses at the back of the orchestra, somewhat separate from the rest of the string section. Lower frequencies produce sounds that are less directional than higher frequency sounds, so perhaps this is why Berlioz advocated the separation. By seating the celli and basses further back with the winds, this creates more cohesion between the two major sections.

It could be the very concept of this “point of origin” that Daniel Koury mentions in his book that indeed influenced this decision of Berlioz with regards to seating an orchestra on stage. Koury considers this as what Berlioz believed to be “a basic principle of orchestral scoring.” However, it seems evident that Berlioz saw the first step in orchestral scoring what players would be required and how they were to be arranged on stage as part of his compositional process.

Koury, too, advocates in his book for the separation of first and second violins in staging considerations. He states:

But one fact stands out with clarity: the nearly universal separation of the two violin sections is the most important illustration of this principle, since the scores of the time are replete with dialogue between these two groups.\(^\text{22}\)

Berlioz’s direction on the placement of the first and second violins is nebulous as to which side of the conductor these sections are actually positioned. Koury remarks about this discrepancy by stating:

The question of which is placed to the left and which to the right of the conductor, however basic appear to us now, must remain in doubt as a universal principle, since the Mendelssohn and Berlioz specifications are quite definite at placing the seconds to the left, a situation also encountered at Bayreuth…It seems quite probable at this time that a particular score as well as particular historical data will be needed to determine a given case, rather than reliance on a static disposition.\(^\text{23}\)

Although the ambiguity of knowing the precise placement of violins with regard to left or right is intriguing, what is of greater interest is Berlioz’s adamant

\(^{22}\) Ibid.  
\(^{23}\) Ibid.
feelings about the antiphonal separation and that concept as the normal seating for concert orchestra.

Berlioz was keenly aware of this concept of instrumental placement throughout his composition of *Harold en Italie*. When one simply examines the first page of the current urtext score – New Berlioz Edition (Bärenreiter 2001), it is hard for the reader to ignore Berlioz’s explicit instructions concerning placement of the harp and the viola. He wrote clearly above the solo viola part in the very first measure, “*L’exécutant doit être placé sur l’avant-scène, près du public, et isolé de l’orchestre.*” – in other words, “the soloist must be placed at the front of the stage, close to the public, and separate from the orchestra.” 24 In addition, Berlioz wrote a separate direction above the first measure of the harp line in the score that “*La harpe doit être placée près de l’alto solo.*” or, “the harp must be placed close to the viola soloist”.

While both of these indications are not marked on the first page of the original autograph score, as stated in the variant reading section of the new Bärenreiter urtext score, they clearly appear in the latest scholarship. 25 The printed orchestral parts contain the indication for the placement of the viola solo but do not provide an indication for the harp soloist. The harp indication must have been inserted from another source into this score.

25 Ibid., 207.
It was extremely unusual for a composer at that time to be so specific about the physical placement of soloists. This raises the question of why Berlioz felt that this indication should be included in the score. Did Berlioz feel that he had to justify this genre of this work? What did he want to emphasize? Would it have been preferable to him, given one or the other, to have the viola be isolated, or in front? Was it more important to Berlioz to emphasize the emotional isolation of Harold the viola’s being a visitor in a strange land than it was for the viola to be better heard at the front of the orchestra? Most concert halls can easily accommodate a soloist in front, but not all can have the harp placed next to the viola. Many fewer can sustain some way of isolating the soloist and harp from the orchestra, while keeping them in the front.

For the performance that I conducted of *Harold en Italie* on February 22, 2010 at Eastman School, I followed Berlioz’s marking with regard to placement of the harp and the viola soloist during the bulk of the work. I will discuss the end of the last movement separately below. Fortunately at the Eastman Theatre there is enough room to fit both the viola and the harp in front of the orchestra just as Berlioz suggests. This seemed to work well in terms of co-ordination.

In the renowned scholar and conductor Norman Del Mar’s book entitled *Conducting Berlioz*, Mr. Del Mar tackles this issue. Del Mar acknowledges the challenges of the “sheer geography of the work” and continues: “Berlioz states that the solo viola should be ‘isolated from the orchestra,’ and with the harp close
Del Mar’s approach is completely misguided. Berlioz was clear in his treatise on orchestration that soloists should be placed in front and center of the orchestra. Keeping the soloist towards the center of the platform in the front is also the typical performance practice for almost any orchestral work involving soloists. I am not sure how Mr. Del Mar arrived at this conclusion but perhaps it is related to an acoustical problem.

The Rochester Philharmonic Orchestra also performed this work in the same hall several months later on May 6th and 8th. For these performances with guest conductor Andreas Delfs and violist Melissa Matson, the Rochester Philharmonic like most orchestras, did not follow Berlioz’s directions. The harp was positioned towards the back of the first and second violins (stage right). Matson’s staging position changed throughout the work. She played the majority of the solo lines at the side of the stage right proscenium in front of the wall there. I thought there was actually great benefit to this positioning because having a hard reflecting surface behind Matson enabled the solo viola line to project clearly. Furthermore, in a certain way, it corresponds with Berlioz’s own ideas on concert acoustics. Specifically, it supports his idea of placing musicians

in front of resonant surface to provide more amplification and clarity.\textsuperscript{27} Perhaps Ms. Matson felt as if she would project her sound better in this location.

As the ambiguity of the placement of these two instruments continues in modern performing practice of the work, conductors either by knowing Berlioz’s concepts on orchestral placement or through complete ignorance of these matters continue to experiment with how to reconcile performance of this work. In January of 2010, the Boston Symphony Orchestra performed \textit{Harold} on the 28\textsuperscript{th}, 29\textsuperscript{th} and 30\textsuperscript{th} in Symphony Hall, Boston. For these performances, the music director, James Levine—who conducted the concerts—placed the solo viola within the orchestra (not at the front of the stage) between the first and second violins, standing the entire time, and placed the harp further back but still between the violin sections.\textsuperscript{28} Perhaps a performance consideration for this approach is simply that there was not enough room to place the viola and harp in front of the orchestra without the stage extension. This extension would remove available seats for patrons. Surely Berlioz would be the last person to argue with reducing ticket sales for any performance.

Another interesting case is the noted Berlioz scholar D. Kern Holoman’s March 8, 2003 performance of \textit{Harold en Italie} as conductor with the University of California at Davis Symphony Orchestra in the Mondavi Center. Since Dr. Holoman is one of the main contributor to the \textit{New Berlioz Edition}, I was most

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{27} Macdonald, \textit{Berlioz’s Orchestration Treatise: A Translation and Commentary}: 319.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Boston Symphony, ”Boston Symphony Interview with Steven Ansell,” YouTube, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CRCc5LvYDhs.
\end{itemize}
interested to learn of his commentary regarding this performance and how he
dealt with the placement of both the viola and harp. In my conversation with Dr.
Holoman, I learned that he had placed the viola on a high platform that he had
constructed and placed this platform at the back of the orchestra. He mentioned
that his reasoning for this was that he wanted to create a dramatic atmosphere
where the violist, or Harold, could be seen as an observer to the orchestra—just as
Harold is an observer in the Byron poem, which depicts Berlioz’s experience.²⁹

As my conversation progressed with Dr. Holoman, I enquired whether or
not this proved to be successful. He commented that originally the viola was the
only person on the platform and the harp was positioned at stage level toward
the side and the back of the orchestra. As I probed him further, he stated that, “I
realized later as the rehearsal process progressed, that it was nearly impossible to
coordinate the viola and the harp when they were separated and then put the
harp on the platform with the viola.”³⁰ This of course is completely contrary to
Berlioz’s indications in the score. While I can appreciate the dramatic foundation
of this idea and think that it certainly does add an element to the work that
would perhaps better help listeners understand it, I feel as if the compromise of
placing both the harp and the viola on the platform together lessens the dramatic
effect. Still, I believe that Berlioz would most likely have been pleased to have

²⁹ D. Kern Holoman, Phone Interview, February 9, 2010.
³⁰ Ibid.
seen Dr. Holoman’s idea of stage positioning and would have marveled at its creativity.

The other point in this work where Berlioz’s specifically gives staging directions is in the final movement of *Harold en Italie*. Here, Berlioz requires an off-stage string trio of two violins and one cello, which enter at measure 473. In the third movement Berlioz’s *Symphonie fantastique, Scène aux champs*, Berlioz calls for the oboist to leave the stage and play the first entrance from “*Derrière la scène*” or “behind the scene.” That work was written in 1830 and this was surely a marvel at the time of its creation. Four years later, in *Harold*, Berlioz employs a similar tactic. However, this time he used three instruments simultaneously. Just as the positioning of an offstage musician in *Fantastique* adds an element to the dramatic musical space, so does this trio, which combines with the solo viola in the final movement of *Harold* to create, in a way, a string quartet that spans both on-stage and off-stage areas.

In *Symphonie fantastique*, the offstage oboe provides a musical echo to the original statement of the onstage English horn. While this musical gesture gives the audience an immediate sensation of musical space, it does not contain the sophistication or subtlety that Berlioz later employs in *Harold*.

The inclusion of the offstage trio in *Harold* raises the musical sophistication of off-stage music in the history of the symphonic idiom thus far. Here Berlioz incorporates the Pilgrim’s March into the final movement and places it directly in this offstage string trio. The onstage musical depiction of an
orgy momentarily subsides while the sounds of this trio emerge softly from hidden location behind the scenes. The mere idea of a reprise of this music that is juxtaposed against the musically depicted orgy of brigands, which it interrupts, serves to create spatial musical drama in a whole new way.

I believe that the reintroduction of the Pilgrim’s Chorus from the second movement serves as a display of musical conscience. Here, Berlioz paints a picture where Harold, who is portrayed by the solo viola, has a moment of reflection where he is contemplating the conflict of which party to join. It almost comes across as the stereotyped portrayal of the angel who appears near a character’s shoulder and gives that character advice while the devil appears on the other side and advocates against the angel. Berlioz himself describes the Brigands’ orgy:

In this brigands’ orgy, where wine, blood, joy and range mingle in mutual intoxication and make music together, and the rhythm seems now to stumble, now to rush furiously forward, and the mouths of the brass to spew forth curses, answering prayer with blasphemy, and they laugh and swill and strike, smash, kill rape and generally enjoyed themselves, the orchestra played as though a devil possessed them.31

31 Berlioz, The Memoirs of Hector Berlioz, Member of the French Institute : Including His travels in Italy, Germany, Russia, and England, 1803-1865: 311.
Through the usage of placement of players combined with highly charged themes, Berlioz has in effect created an internal conflict within the character of Harold. Berlioz has expertly used the combination of both musical space and theme to create an expectation of the audience to simultaneously perceive two worlds and then to witness the transcendence of those two worlds by Harold as he has to make a conscious decision of which party he will join.

However, this drama was arranged far before this moment in the music. Berlioz gives the audience musical clues as to the outcome of this event. For instance, at the very outset of this movement, Berlioz quickly recalls the themes of the previous movements much in the style that Beethoven employed in the final movement of his Symphony No. 9. This similarity has been documented by countless musicologists who acknowledge the similarities between these two works.

Unlike in the Beethoven, the inclusion of the solo viola creates an added musical element to the entire unfolding of the drama that makes it more than a mere recapitulation. Berlioz is able to create a moral dilemma between these two worlds of the Brigands’ orgy (onstage) and the Pilgrim’s chorus (offstage). The viola, which has functioned previously in the work as an observer, now has to make a musical decision as to which party to join the Brigand’s orgy or the Pilgrims. The complexity of this musical dilemma completely eclipses any previous attempts for stage directions in musical works.
With the stage set for some type of dramatic outcome, it is most curious that Berlioz makes the viola silent from the point of the conclusion. It makes the audience wonder whether the solo viola has left with the pilgrims off in the distance or in fact has joined the Brigand’s orgy. With the many performances of this work that have occurred over the years there have been instances where the viola has walked off stage at this point (since their musical material is finished). Even if the violist stays on stage but sits down at the side, as was the case in the performance I conducted in 2008 at Eastman, that alone constitutes dramatic action in a concerto setting and raises the question of whether the Harold has succumbed to worldly pressures and joined the Brigands.

There are no indications in any of the known sources about the harpist and violist changing positions during the piece. The harp is tacet throughout the fourth movement and the viola part is moderate, many performers have chosen to transition away from the soloists’ place in the front. For our performance of Harold at Eastman the harpist, whose part is tacet in the fourth movement, and the violist moved to the side of the stage in the middle of the movement, so that the violist could join more closely in the music of the offstage trio.

At the time, I used this change in staging merely for practical reasons. It was far easier to coordinate the solo viola onstage with the offstage string trio by having her near the closed door, through which the offstage sounds would come. Furthermore, it simplified the issue of what both the viola and the harpist were going to do in the last movement. Although I did not realize this at the time, I
now understand that by leaving the viola onstage for the end of the final movement, it might be misconstrued as a commentary that the viola, or Harold, was not going to venture off with the pilgrims but rather succumb to joining the Brigands. While the conductor and the violist may feel as if Harold has wandered away with the Pilgrims chorus, the choice to stay on stage has the possibility of suggesting to the audience that in fact that Harold has stayed on with the Brigands, despite the musical silence. After further contemplation, I have come to the conclusion that any decision about stage blocking may result in some sort of judgment by the audience about the dramatic outcome.

Berlioz, in his second large-scale symphonic work has created an intriguing level of detail here with the combination of both stage direction and musical material. The development of musical staging in his composition since his last major symphonic work, Symphonie fantastique, has clearly evolved to a much more sophisticated level of solely depicting a musical landscape spatially through the placement of musicians.
FORMAL ANALYSIS OF HAROLD EN ITALIE

*Harold en Italie* has four movements:

I. *Harold aux Montagnes. Scènes de mélancholie, de bonheur et de joie*

II. *Marche de pèlerins*

III. *Sérenade d’un Montagnard des Abruzzes à sa maîtresse*

IV. *Orgie de Brigands*.

Each movement roughly adheres to traditional symphonic form. The first movement is in a kind of sonata form; the second movement is a slow march, the third movement is a type of dance, and the fourth is a raucous finale that contains elements of both sonata and rondo form, while incorporating the echo of themes from each previous movement. The concept of bVI remains an important tonal goal throughout the piece and is especially prevalent in the second movement. Each movement depicts a symphonic landscape in which the solo viola mostly observes and occasionally participates. The viola part sometimes has the role of a concerto solo, but more often becomes a unifying, unique melodic line within a larger symphonic context. In keeping with *Harold’s* extra-musical tropes the concepts of travel, vivid environments, and dramatic space are embedded in much of its form and structure. The outer movements utilize the largest complement of musicians and are generally more robust in temperament. The inner movements are more reflective and give an intimate portrait of Italian country life at the time. Berlioz interrelates each movement in...
a variety of ways that eventually climax in grand symphonic style at the end of
the fourth movement. Following one of the innovations in Beethoven’s ninth
symphony, Berlioz pulls themes from the first three movements and references
them in the fourth movement in order to draw the work together. Berlioz is able
to make a compelling musical argument with Harold. Perhaps unexpected
itineraries and uncharted journeys do yield the greatest rewards.

I. Harold aux Montagnes. Scènes de mélancolie, de bonheur et de joie.

The first movement has a large orchestration and conforms to the
traditional sonata form, with two notable departures: first, the introduction is a
double fugue, and second, mm. 95–130 comprise an unusual subsection, a second
or independent introduction to the exposition.

Similar to Berlioz’s Romeo and Juliette Symphony, Harold en Italie begins
with a fugue. Berlioz is often criticized for his lack of skill in counterpoint, yet
begins this movement with a brooding, if brief, double fugue in g minor. The
first subject is placed in the strings and is highly chromatic, wanders mostly by
step, and features stresses of the Neapolitan degree.
Example I.1:

\[\text{Adagio} \quad \frac{\text{d}}{\text{e}} = 76\]

The double fugue juxtaposes the winds against the strings. The next fugal subject entrance occurs in the woodwinds at m. 3, starting with bassoons.

Example I.2:

The fugue ends with the first occurrence of the *idée fixe* at m. 14. It is interesting to note that the theme debuts in minor, but is only restated in the major mode, as it becomes the viola’s hallmark throughout the piece.

This introductory section is characterized by deceptive harmonies. The g minor tonal center is rudely interrupted by sustained chords in bVI (Eb Major) at m. 22, scored for brass and woodwinds. It is further disrupted by the fact that there is no V-I motion before the entrance of the viola. In addition, from m. 36 – m. 38, Berlioz abruptly creates a modal shift from g minor to the parallel major. From mm. 38 - 45, Berlioz reintroduces the theme (heard originally at m. 14) in major, with the viola accompanied by the harp (theme A).
Example I.3 (Theme A):

At m. 46 this theme is repeated with the same instrumentation, but the musicians are instructed to play *aussi doux que possible, presque rien*. This creates the notion that the mountains among which Harold is singing are so vast, that the echo is delayed the full eight measures of the theme. I posit that m. 46 is the first instance in which we can observe a musical landscape forming through Berlioz’s orchestration and dynamics.

At m. 73, an orchestral tutti occurs with the cornet and cello serving as the principal voice, while the solo viola and upper woodwinds echo them by the delay of one quarter note (rather than the eight bars we previously heard). Previous scholars seem not to have noticed that the delay of the theme by one quarter-note is a clever way to signify that Harold has changed positions from within the mountains, the reflective echo is no longer so far away and perhaps there is even now a sense that the vista is not as dramatic as it was originally. Throughout this work, Berlioz continues to use the technique of rhythmical displacement to demonstrate physical space in his music.

The slow double fugue that begins *Harold en Italie* is so unusual in form and different in temperament from the exposition that a clearer, more traditional introduction to the exposition seems necessary. This second introduction begins at m. 94, and serves to set up the viola’s fragmented “discovery” of the main
theme that eventually opens the true exposition at m. 131. Berlioz had a knack for subtly orchestrating even the simplest line. The concept of quickly dividing the phrase between two instrument groups, as happens at m. 94 – 97, is clever because it allows for a wonderful splash of color and at the same time punctuates the phrase and enhances its shape throughout the process.

As far as I can determine, it seems as if previous Berlioz scholars have not noticed that in m. 125-130 Berlioz pays homage to Beethoven by using a compositional device that Beethoven employs in the last movement of his first symphony. Beethoven scores for the first violins in which they “discover” the melody over the time of 8 bars. Below is the example from the last movement of Beethoven’s Symphony No. 1, starting with the pickups to m. 2.

Example I.4:

Berlioz uses this idea to create an effect not of discovery, I think, but of naïveté and clumsiness on Harold’s part (Theme B).
Example I.5 (Theme B):

At m. 145 Berlioz divides up the theme in a constant back-and-forth dialogue between soloist and orchestra – the kind of alternation that one would expect in a concerto, but only a few measures at a time. Clearly this too was probably an element of the composition that did not appeal to Paganini when he first viewed this movement. Who had heard of a soloist’s line being interrupted by the orchestra with such rapidity?

Berlioz again creates musical space when he uses rhythmic displacement at m. 171. Here the solo viola and cornet have the theme, which is displaced by one eighth-note in the clarinets and bassoons. Berlioz, always shifting the orchestral color, eventually removes the cornet from the pairing with solo viola at m. 177. The bassoons continue to echo the solo viola even at m. 188 when they both shift to an accompanying figure and their two voices alternate between the pitches C# and Bb. Berlioz uses cross-articulations here that add to the chaos. C# and Bb occur simultaneously between the two voices because of the rhythmic displacement, and merge to create the outer pitches of a C# diminished chord.
which is fully realized in the subsequent measures. Berlioz includes a repeat of
the exposition, which is standard practice in traditional sonata form.

The second ending at m. 192(b) begins the developmental section of this
movement with an abrupt explosion of ascending scales in the viola. As one
would expect, it is harmonically turbulent and quickly cycles through myriad
keys. bVI arrives at m. 275 and is emphasized by the same measure repeating
three times from mm. 281-283. The grand pause in m. 284 allows Berlioz to finish
his deceptive harmony and return to G major as if nothing had happened. The
development section concludes after the allegro theme occurs again, followed by
a series of diminished chords that end with fermatas.

The basses begin the quasi-recapitulation at m. 323 with another double
fugue using, as the first subject, the original theme with an altered rhythm. The
fugue answer occurs at m. 329 where the celli play quadruplets against the
basses’ triplet rhythm and the oboe simultaneously introduces the second
subject. This fugue is sustained until m. 352 where the allegro theme from the
exposition is reintroduced in the strings, against the idée fixe that was already the
subject of the double fugue. The harmony moves up stepwise, which heightens
the drama. Eventually at m. 372, Berlioz scores a full-out orchestral tutti.

An example of Berlioz’s superb orchestration occurs at m. 445, at which
point Berlioz augments the viola’s solo theme a hocket on that theme in the
winds.
Example I.F (Theme C):

Berlioz takes advantage of the ascension in register of the theme to reassign it to appropriate voices throughout the orchestra. This gives the impression that in addition to the size of the landscape the scenery is varied and wonderful.

To conclude the movement, Berlioz dramatically returns to bVI when it is used to begin the coda at m. 466. The coda is similar in many ways to the end of standard concerti because the soloist plays the melody simultaneous to the tutti from m. 475 to the end.

II. Marche de pélerins

More than a half-century before Charles Ives wrote his *Country Band March*, Berlioz had come up with the idea of writing music about a parade. The two works represent different moods – Berlioz writes about a solemn religious procession, whereas Ives is evoking marching bands passing by a exuberant crowd – but they have a similar hypothesis: the depiction of music and people moving through space.

True to symphonic form, the second movement is slow, but it is also a march, reminiscent of the second movement of Beethoven’s 5th Symphony. The
most interesting elements of this movement are Berlioz’s use of a terraced relationship between keys and dynamics, his introduction of religious elements by extensive use of the hymn like “canto” theme, plagal cadences and perfect 4ths, and the tonal struggle between B and C that characterizes the second half of the movement.

The larger structure of the movement is in ternary form, which includes a trio and a coda. The first A section includes a smaller ternary subset (sections 1-3). After a brief 15-measure introduction with harp and string pizzicati that, coupled with the sustained celli, create a bell-like sound, the first theme is heard in the violins at m. 16 (theme A). The A section (m. 16 - m. 168) begins with four of these 10-measure melodies, each with the indication canto, which clearly refers to the singing pilgrims.

Example II.1 (Theme A):

In the last three bars of this melody, while the final note is sustained, other groups of instruments blur the lines with competing rhythms. For example, the second violin part at m. 23 (below)
Example II.2:

is juxtaposed by the flute II, clarinets, and bassoons playing the opposite rhythms: eighth-note triplets over the second violin’s sixteenth notes and sixteenth notes over the second-violin’s triplets in the first bar of this phrase.

Example II.3:

The result sounds chaotic. One can only imagine what Berlioz was trying to depict here. Perhaps he was trying to show the crowd mumbling or gossiping about the pilgrims. Maybe these are quick personal prayers being spoken by some of the pilgrims who are not singing. It is clear that this is not intended to sound like anyone singing because of the stasis of the pitches of this figure. The orchestration and dynamics increase at the beginning of each iteration of the theme, thus giving the listener the sense that the pilgrims are marching toward them. This first tonal area, from mm. 16-56, is centered in E major and travels through the following: m. 16 – b minor, m. 26 – E major, m. 36 – f# minor. Below is a table outlining the terracing of dynamics, keys, and instruments playing the canto line in this section:
The last *canto* phrase is in E Major (m. 46), which sets up a plagal cadence that allows the transition into the second part of the A section, beginning at m. 56. This is marked by the dissipation of the rhythmic confusion and the introduction of theme B, which is subtly different than theme A (Example II.1).

Example II.4 (Theme B):

These themes are closely related. They share an extensive use of intervals of a fourth. In the first theme the final interval is a leap up by a fourth, and the second theme features a final interval leap down by a fourth. Both contain stepwise motion with the compass of a fourth, which is evident in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} measure of the first theme. In the second theme, the stepwise motion begins in m. 5 with the E down to the B in m. 6. These details accentuate the plagal motion in this movement.

The second part of the A section (Section II), which begins at m. 56, is marked by the fact that the dynamics stay constant at *mf* throughout (mm.
56-114). Perhaps Harold is walking with the pilgrims during these measures, but however, Berlioz’s use of the *idée fixe* at this point in combination with the B theme makes this a less likely idea than that the pilgrims are winding around the mountain below Harold.

Example II.5:

![Thème de l'Adagio]

Section III of the larger A features a swell in dynamics as well as a stepwise ascent in key signature up to C major (the bVI of E major) at the start of the Trio at m. 169. Here is a brief list of the keys Berlioz utilizes in Section III:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure #</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Dynamic</th>
<th>Canto Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>d# minor</td>
<td><em>mf</em></td>
<td>Violin I/Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>E Major</td>
<td><em>poco piu f</em></td>
<td>Viola/Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>f# minor</td>
<td><em>cresc.</em></td>
<td>Violin II/Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>g# minor</td>
<td><em>f</em></td>
<td>Viola/Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>a minor</td>
<td><em>poco meno</em></td>
<td>Violin II/Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>b minor</td>
<td><em>mf</em></td>
<td>Violin II/Viola</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ascension of keys indicates to me that the pilgrims are ascending above Harold in some way, whether spiritually or physically. Notice too that the dynamics peak in the g# minor section.
The arrival of C major (bVI) that marks the beginning of the trio has a slightly less deceptive quality Berlioz’s previous use of bVI; thus he uses a harmonic tonal center that would normally feel deceptive to the audience but makes it sound like a logical arrival. This seems like a mystical or spiritual moment in the work—perhaps where Harold has started to examine his own spirituality and inner self after viewing the pilgrims. The repeating sixteenth notes played *sul ponticello* produces a hypnotic effect. Violists sometimes complain that the part here resembles a practice-room étude; it will sound less so if the violist has the courage to adhere to the written *p* dynamic, even at risk of being “covered” by the orchestra. Indeed, perhaps the desired effect here is as much visual as musical.

Example II.6:

![Example II.6](image)

It removes all focus from Harold and places it on the harmonic progression. Below is a reduction of the first part of this section with the solo viola part.
Example II.7:

Berlioz works through a plethora of keys until reaching the final section of the overall ternary structure at m. 248 where he then presents the A theme again, now in C Major.

The final part of the larger ternary section contains three iterations of theme A. In Section III, Berlioz uses woodwind instruments to play the theme for the first time and the dynamics gradually decrease. This signifies that the pilgrims have passed by Harold and are disappearing out of Harold’s view. The tonal center of this section seems to have settled now clearly in E Major.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure #</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Dynamic</th>
<th>Canto Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>C Major – b</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Flute/Oboe/Clarinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>E Major</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>Violin II/Bassoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>E Major</td>
<td>ppp</td>
<td>Violin I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a coda occurs at m. 279. Berlioz creates a harmonic struggle between two pitches (B and C) that seem to be vying to overtake the harmonic settlement of the movement. Berlioz repetitively places each of these within close proximity to one another. Horns III and IV as well as the harp play C,
which represents the spiritual/ethereal and flute and oboe I play B, which seems
to represent Harold’s earthly existence. These pitches are only one semi-tone
away from each other, but Berlioz manages to make them sound like completely
different worlds by separating them by an octave or more. The only instrument
that plays both pitches is the harp, and never simultaneously.

Berlioz controls which pitch is dominant not by volume, but by length and spacing between the pitches. First, the C lasts for two full bars and the B for one bar. Then at m. 297, Berlioz extends the length of the B and places it in the middle of m. 297 instead of at the beginning of the bar. In the next instance of the B, Berlioz makes its length a half note tied to a single eighth note, entirely different from any other length so far given. This new duration occurs after the syncopated entrance emphasizes a longer note value.

In addition to the struggle between C and B, there is a related, if less obvious, harmonic struggle between C major and B major in the lower strings. Just a quick look at the accidentals in the bass line shows that Berlioz is alternating between these two keys. When there is a sustained C, Berlioz uses C natural, G natural, D natural, and F natural. When there is a sustained B, Berlioz employs the accidentals that are already being used in the key signature (4 sharps). Ultimately the B pitch wins and there is a final chord of E major in the strings in the final bar.
III. Sérenade d’un Montagnard des Abruzzes à sa maîtresse.

This pastoral movement is the most harmonically uneventful and simplistic of the four. It serves as a chance for Berlioz to showcase his infatuation for local Italian musical conventions. Its emphasis on rhythm rather than complicated melodies is in keeping with the simplicity of the folk music it references. It has the simple ternary form of allegro-allegretto-allegro, but ends in a more substantial coda in which Berlioz takes the previous themes in the movement and combines them together. He maintains the previous rhythmic motive in the violas and cellos, but doubles the lengths of the measures in every other instrument.

The movement begins with a drone of fifths in the 2nd bassoon, clarinets, and 2nd oboe, which together represent the sound of a bagpipe or piffero and become the bass voice of the ensemble.\(^{32}\) To this static element, Berlioz adds both piccolo and oboe playing in octaves, to evoke the sound of a pifferi or pastoral oboe, often played by children.\(^{33}\)

This combined group of pifferari play a type of quick and lively dance called a saltarello, which has connections to both Italian and Spanish culture. This dance is in triple meter and is often characterized by dancers’ leaps which are

\(^{32}\) Ibid., 159.

\(^{33}\) Ibid.
part of the choreography.\textsuperscript{34} Below is the saltarello tune played by the oboe and piccolo:

Example III.1 (Theme A):

\begin{center}
\begin{music}
\begin{notation}
\relative {\step 8\clef {\clef bass}}
\beat {\maxbeamwidth 100}
\bar #1
deg{1} \Midi d4-e4-f4-g4-h4-i4-j4-k4-l4-m4-n4-o4-p4
\end{notation}
\end{music}
\end{center}

The tune emphasizes rhythm rather than pitch. The entire pitch compass of the tune is only a perfect fifth. In mm. 4, 5 and 8 there are leaps of a third where the dancers would jump, but the rest of the melody moves stepwise.

The form of this movement is ternary and can be represented as ABA with a coda. The A sections are proportionally quite small compared to the B section. The B section is a trio and contains a serenade played by the English horn:

Example III.2 (Theme B):

\begin{center}
\begin{music}
\begin{notation}
\relative {\step 8\clef {\clef bass}}
\beat {\maxbeamwidth 100}
\bar #1
deg{1} \Midi d4-e4-f4-g4-h4-i4-j4-k4-l4-m4-n4-o4-p4
\end{notation}
\end{music}
\end{center}

There is a marked contrast between these two themes especially given the interval range of the serenade theme compared to the *pifferari* theme and the *legato* of the serenade theme compared to the abrupt articulations of the *pifferari* theme. As the serenade continues Berlioz tonicizes other keys until he eventually reintroduces the *idée fixe* in the solo viola by combining it with serenade theme beginning at m. 65.

The return of A at m. 136 is identical to its first iteration. Berlioz elides the final part of this section into the coda, which begins at m. 166. This coda remains in C major but simultaneously features all three elements that Berlioz introduced in the preceding sections: The drone in the violin I, II and celli; the *saltarello* rhythm in the violas; the serenade theme in the solo viola, and very subtly, the *idée fixe* in the flute and the harp using harmonics.

**IV. Orgie de Brigands**

It seems only fitting that the way Berlioz chooses to end this largely peaceful and bucolic work is with the introduction of some thugs. In this final movement, Berlioz pulls together *Harold’s* diverse structure by restating themes from previous movements within the context of a brigands’ orgy.

This movement incorporates elements of both sonata and rondo forms, but is essentially in sonata form without a formal development section. The introduction is 117 measures, during which Berlioz quotes the major themes from the three previous movements, one after another. At m. 118 there is a
quasi-exposition, with the first complete and uninterrupted statement of the
brigands’ theme (A). The next major signpost is at m. 280, a quasi-recapitulation
because it is a complete quote of the theme at m. 118. There is then an extended,
172-measure coda that begins at m. 411 and primarily utilizes rhythmic
displacement to change the movement’s motivic character and increase the
energy of the finale to the end.

This movement’s aggressive, forte beginning is startling when compared
to the utopian pastoral ending of the previous movement. It is gruff, abrupt, and
unsettled, and characteristic of rough brigands! Berlioz is explicit with his use of
dynamics here and when performers are able to adhere to his instructions, the
true “sound of the brigands” is able to come forth. This theme (A) also serves as
a quasi rondo throughout the movement.

Example IV.1 (Theme A):

The last movement of Harold continues with similarities to the finale of
Beethoven’s Symphony No. 9, with “souvenirs” of previous movements where
Berlioz reminisces about Harold’s travels in the mountains that begin at m. 12.
Almost immediately after the rough and tough beginning, Berlioz presents the
original theme used in the fugue of the first movement (Theme B).
Example IV.2 (Theme B):

Almost as someone might view photos from a journey – but out of order, Berlioz first quotes themes from the first, second and third movements, but then returns to two more themes from the first movement after another instance of the main fourth-movement “brigands” theme (theme A). Theme B (the double fugue motif) does not fully develop and very soon, Berlioz interrupts this motive with crashing Brigands in m. 18 (Theme A again).

Berlioz then brings back the the pilgrims march theme (Theme C) at m. 34 in the bassoon and the solo viola. Each subsequent recollection gets shorter and shorter. There is an interruption by a derivative of the Brigands’ theme.

Example IV.3 (Theme C):

In a matter of a few measures, Berlioz switches quickly to the next souvenir, the serenade from the third movement (D).
Example IV.4 (Theme D):

After this instance of the Serenade, Berlioz then uses a full version of the brigands’ theme again (A). This offsets the next two scenes that Berlioz is about to recall, which are from the first movement. Berlioz uses the allegro theme (E) from the first movement at m. 64.

Example IV.5 (Theme E):

Then Berlioz introduces the *adagio* theme (F), with a few rhythmic embellishments in the 3rd and 7th bars, also from the first movement.

Example IV.6 (Theme F):

At m. 118 Berlioz begins a quasi-recapitulation that features a complete statement of the Brigands theme (A) still in g minor. This section of the work features harmonic development of this motive through the use of sequence and repetition of rhythm. This theme is eventually presented in Bb major at m. 163,
which sets up the first occurrence of the other major theme (G) of this movement at m. 177. Theme G is also in Bb major, and is heroic in quality.

Example IV.7 (Theme G):

As the work proceeds, Berlioz creates a struggle between these two themes that takes place in grand style at m. 541 of the coda.

Much of the musical excitement that Berlioz creates in this boisterous movement comes from rhythmic transformation. Berlioz uses the next theme as the work progresses and manipulates it in various ways to add rhythmic drama to the musical language. The first instance of this theme (H) occurs at m. 200 in the brass.

Example IV.8 (Theme H):

Berlioz sets this theme so that each subsequent entrance is displaced. In the second instance (pickup to m. 202), Berlioz begins this theme again, now on the fourth beat in the woodwinds. This technique preserves the integrity of theme but alters it in a way that skews the listener’s perception of rhythm. The next entrance of this motive is on the second beat of m. 203 to continue this trend.
At m. 213, Berlioz employs a rather ominous theme (I) in the low brass where he actually writes the musical instruction *lourdement*, or “ponderous”.

Example IV.9 (Theme I):

Berlioz’s use of triplets at this point in the movement twists the listener’s perception of rhythmic stability and continues the rhythmic transformation he began in m. 200 with theme (H).

The last major motive of the quasi-exposition section is similar to the quotation of the first movement adagio theme (F) that Berlioz recalls in m. 80. Now, this theme (J) is in minor mode contains more chromatic stepwise motion, this time with a downward trajectory.

Example IV.10 (Theme J):

The quasi-recapitulation that Berlioz constructs beginning at m. 280 is thematically identical to the quasi-exposition but at m. 411, he introduces a thrilling coda. The coda begins after a fermata at m. 410 and features the triplet
material that Berlioz uses in the continuation of theme G. At m. 428 Berlioz begins what seems to be a fugue with this same motive, but the fugue never fully develops and is interrupted by the syncopated motive (H) at m. 441.

The struggle between Theme G and Theme A intensifies. Berlioz at m. 449 now presents motive (G) in G major (previously heard in Bb). This is significant because it is the key in which most of Harold’s themes occur. This is followed by the offstage string trio, which plays a recollection of the pilgrim’s march. The solo viola joins the offstage trio by playing on-stage thus completing a string quartet. A *tutti* orchestra passage occurs at m. 505, also notable as the final measure in which the viola plays. Berlioz continues to develop and intensify the dynamics and rapidity of keys by sequencing motives up to the point where he combines fragments of the G and A motives at m. 541. This seems to signify that the G, or heroic theme, has overtaken the Brigands’ theme (A) and Harold has not been led astray after all. In m. 561, Berlioz harks back to bVI, with the low brass playing on the off-beats. This feature of bVI continues all the way to the end where the final few bars contain alternation I to iv (which also contains bVI) before the three final cadential bars.
FORMAL GRAPHS

Harold en Italie - I. Scènes de mélancholie, de bonheur et de joie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Adagio</th>
<th>Allegro</th>
<th>Intro. of Exposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eb(b/vi)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solo Viola w/ melody</th>
<th>Solo Viola</th>
<th>Orchestral call and response</th>
<th>Rhythmic Displacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orchestra plays syncopated version of theme</th>
<th>Orchestra Tutt.</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Solo Viola Vr. arr.</th>
<th>Orchestra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eb(b/vi)</td>
<td>Vr. arr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recapitulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant in basses</th>
<th>Fragmented in clarinet</th>
<th>A in Solo Vl and Vr.</th>
<th>G in Viol I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coda

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Harold en Italie - II. Marche de pèlerins

**Introduction**

**Part A**

**Section I**

pppp  |  ppp  |  PP  |  p  |  p/mf  |  mf

m. 1  
E:   
df:  
Vla I

26  
E:   
Vla

36  
E:   
Vla I

46  
B:   
Vla /
Bar.

56  
B:   
Vla II

60  
B:   
Vla /
Bar.

**Moto fxo (Adagio)**

**Theme**

**Solo Violin**

**Section II**

A

B

**Part B/Trio**

**Section III**

mf  |  poco più f  |  cresc.  |  f  |  (poco meno)  |  mf  |  p  |  sal ponticello solo viola

104  
E:   
Vla I /
Vol.

114  
E:   
Vla /
Vol.

124  
E:   
Vla II

134  
E:   
Vla /
Vol.

144  
A:   
Vla I /
Vol.

154  
B:   
Vla II /
Vla.

168  
C:   
(VI of E)

177  
D:   
E:   
C:   
A:

**Part A**

**Coda**

mf  |  poco più f  |  cresc.  |  f  |  (poco meno)  |  mf  |  p  |  pp  |  ppp

205  
F:   
C:   
A:   
B:   
Bb:

209  
F:   
C:   
A:   
B:   
Bb:

211  
F:   
C:   
A:   
B:   
Bb:

215  
F:   
C:   
A:   
B:   
Bb:

218  
F:   
C:   
A:   
B:   
Bb:

229  
F:   
C:   
A:   
B:   
Bb:

248  
F:   
C:   
A:   
Bb:

258  
E:   
Vla II /
Vol.

268  
Vla I

279  
struggle B vs. C
disappearing of pilgrims

334

51
Harold en Italie - III. Sérénade d'un Montagnard des Abruzzes à sa maîtresse.

### Allegro
- A
  - Tiempo: Moderato
  - Tempo: Allegro
  - Time: 4

### Allegretto
- B
  - Tiempo: Moderato
  - Tempo: Allegretto
  - Time: 52

### Coda
- A
  - Tiempo: Moderato
  - Tempo: Allegretto
  - Time: 112

Berlioz here combines all previous themes with superimposed time signatures.
Harold en Italie - IV. Orgie de Brigands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>III - Allegro Theme</th>
<th>Allegro</th>
<th>Allegro Theme</th>
<th>Allegro</th>
<th>Allegro</th>
<th>Allegro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. 1.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Quasi-Exposition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>harmonic devel. of motive</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Quasi-Recapitulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>J1</th>
<th>transition</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Coda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J1</th>
<th>Now in G Major</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Solo viola part now tacet

| 505 | 541 | 583 |
Harold en Italie suffered almost immediately in Berlioz’s own opinion from the first performance of this work. Berlioz bemoaned the fact that the conductor of the premiere, Narcisse Girard, was never able to achieve the accelerando in the first movement. He stated in his memoirs, in a passage whose first words never fail to give me a bit of a chill:

The fault was Girard’s. He could never work it up sufficiently in the coda, where the tempo should gradually increase until it is twice as fast. Without this progressive animation the end of the movement sounds feeble and uninteresting. It was torture to me to hear it dragged in this way.35

Apparently the first performance suffered not only in this first movement with Girard, but also in the famous second movement. Berlioz continued his rant stating:

...in the latter half of the [second] movement where the sound of the monastery bells...is heard again after a short interruption, the harpist miscounted his bars and got lost. Instead of putting him right, as I have had to do a dozen times (three

35 Berlioz, The Memoirs of Hector Berlioz, Member of the French Institute: Including His travels in Italy, Germany, Russia, and England, 1803-1865: 225.
players out of four go wrong at this point), Girard shouted out

“Last chord!” which the orchestra accordingly gave, skipping the
intervening fifty-odd bars. It was a massacre.\(^{36}\)

Berlioz’s own recollections of the conducting failures of this work clearly illustrate that, in addition to Girard’s incompetence, Berlioz had created a work that was unusually difficult to conduct. Indeed, rhythmic intricacies make many of Berlioz’s works tricky. Girard’s failures eventually led Berlioz to start conducting all of his own music. When I conducted this work in April of 2010, I felt this might be an opportunity to redeem my family name—though whether I am actually related to Narcisse or not is unclear—and contribute a successful performance of this work.

Setting tempi for the orchestra is the most fundamental task that the conductor that must execute. In many ways this guides all other musical decisions. While conductors must adhere closely to the composer’s instructions, sometimes the specified tempi simply do not work and need to be adjusted in order to achieve the best musical result. There are moments of this in this work.

Berlioz also employs some new techniques such as the structuring of tempo relationships to create simultaneous but different meters and tempi. For instance, the final portion of the third movement incorporates groups of players in one meter/tempo while other players remain in another tempo/meter. The end result is a superimposition of bars, which requires a musical awareness and

\(^{36}\) Ibid., 226.
precision from the conductor in order to make the “seams” between these tempi work and to make sure that the proper metric relations are maintained.

Although there are some ambiguities in this work, for the most part, Berlioz is explicit in his instructions to the conductor. Throughout the score, Berlioz left notes to this effect about the execution of certain passages. Berlioz also included specific instructions about how to beat certain bars. His advocacy of his own works as a conductor did wonders for the growth of symphonic music. It is fortunate that Berlioz was as committed to the craft of conducting as he was because his skill was certainly vital at a time where the musical world had not yet experienced symphonic music of this complexity.

**I. Harold aux montagnes**

This movement presents right from the outset a decision in which the conductor must make a decision about tempo. Berlioz indicates at the beginning of the work a tempo marking of *Adagio* (eighth-note = 76). He also marks the meter of the work somewhat ambiguously by merely indicating a “3” not “3/4”.

It seems obvious that the conductor is required here to conduct the eighth note pulse in order to maintain a good ensemble of balance in this contrapuntal section. Noted English conductor Norman DelMar, states that “this is conducted in 6 quavers”\(^{37}\), but I believe that it is more effective to conduct the beginning section in a legato subdivided three pattern rather than approaching it with six

\(^{37}\) Del Mar, *Conducting Berlioz*: 53.
distinct beats at the same time showing care to shape the phrase exactly as
Berlioz indicates in punctilious detail. There is an example of Leonard Bernstein
available online that clearly shows this and the result is quite good. It is also
interesting to see where Bernstein pushes the tempo to make up for his slow initial tempo.\(^{38}\) The dynamic detail appears to be symbiotically linked to the rise and fall in register of the motive.

While some may disagree, I find this tempo to be a bit hurried for the brooding quality of the work and think that \(\text{eighth-note} = 66\) works better in terms of truly capturing all of the details in the cello line in terms of phrasing, shaping, and dynamics. Regardless of the conductors tempo decision, whether it is true to Berlioz’\(\)s indicated tempo or not, the one thing remains the same, this initial tempo is too slow for the music that occurs when the viola enters at m. 37. Also at this moment, it is crucial for the harp to play the first arpeggio perhaps louder than the prescribed \(f\) dynamic in order to be heard.

The reason that Berlioz’\(\)s tempo does not work at this moment is that it needs to be faster in order to make the phrase flow well and for the solo violist not to run out of bow. If the conductor beats a tempo of \(\text{quarter note} = 38\), he or she will also have difficulty in accommodating the ensemble in keeping the triplet figures that occur at m. 64.

I found that quarter note equals 48 accommodates this and at the same time is a tempo that is not so slow where it would necessitate subdivision.

As a matter of fact, Del Mar comments on this subject:

Berlioz says nothing about any change of tempo, but it becomes increasingly evident that the equivalent dotted quarter=38 will be uncomfortably slow for all that is to come, and with the change to a beat a quicker pulse of 50 is surreptitiously adopted in association with the soloist.39

This adjusted tempo should also be resumed after the un peu retenu at m. 68 where Berlioz indicates 1° tempo. It is best to think of the tempo necessary for the viola to play the two-note quarter-note octave slurs to get enough sound in one bow (which is often covered by the orchestra at m. 73).

There is a tricky spot too at m. 71. Here there is frequently a problem of coordination between the solo violist and the horns. It is best for the soloist to listen to the sound of the horns, who are usually seated far away, and coordinate his or her double stops with the sounding of the horns rather than the other way around. Also an ensemble problem tends to occur on the downbeat of m. 72 where the horns release their tied note and begin to play sextuplet sixteenth notes against the thirty-second notes in a twelve-note grouping. The key to coordinating these voices is making sure that the horns do not hold on to the tied note too long. They should

39 Del Mar, Conducting Berlioz: 54.
release on the downbeat of m. 72 in order to play with the viola. The conductor at this point must also “shade” triple subdivision to help the coordination.

Measure 73 presents a balance challenge for the conductor. Here the cornet part has the melody and is marked \textit{mf}. The solo viola is marked \textit{mf} as well and is in canon with the cornet playing simultaneous octaves. The solo violist here is often concerned about being overpowered by the cornet. It is important to remember that the viola does not function here as a concerto soloist and is at this point a textural voice within the symphony.

Of interest are Berlioz’s dealings with the cornet throughout the history of this work. Berlioz was always at the cutting edge of orchestral possibility. At the time of composition, the work was originally written for a single-valve trumpet.\footnote{Berlioz and Macdonald, \textit{Harold en Italie : symphonie en 4 parties avec un alto principal}: 233.} As technology improved and instruments became further developed, this trumpet was later replaced by a two-valve cornet and then after 1840 but before the publication of the parts in 1847 by two cornets in A.\footnote{Ibid.} The addition of valves allowed for a greater use of chromatic notes.

Curiously in this cornet part, Berlioz places the indication of \textit{canto} above the solo line at m. 73. One can only wonder if this unusual marking

\footnote{Berlioz and Macdonald, \textit{Harold en Italie : symphonie en 4 parties avec un alto principal}: 233.}
\footnote{Ibid.}
comes from Berlioz’s own outré earlier idea of the inclusion of voices in this work. He certainly had not marked any previous scores in this fashion prior to this. Or, perhaps, this is a direct reference to Byron’s narrative poem which divides into four cantos (which is the principal form of division of a long poem)

After the lugubrious introduction, at the outset of the Allegro at m. 95, it is critical that the conductor establish a proper tempo immediately. When the viola then enters in m. 100, due to the slow response time of the repeated C’s played on the lowest string, there will be a tendency for this material to drag. I have found it helpful to remind the string players to play a true pp here so the violist does not have to force and therefore sacrifice tempo by using too much bow so that they can be heard.

There are certainly Beethovenian elements in Berlioz’s music. One of these is an explicit attention to dynamic detail. Berlioz was absolutely precise in how he wrote dynamic changes for the orchestra. His clear attention to detail, if followed by the conductor, allows the orchestra to make dramatic changes in color, mood, and character, but most importantly provides the soloist opportunities to be heard over the orchestra. It is imperative that the conductor follows Berlioz’s markings as clearly as possible to ensure that the soloist is clearly heard. This holds especially true at the extremes of dynamics. The conductor must be sure
that \textit{ppp} is softer than \textit{pp} and that there are marked differences between \textit{f}, \textit{ff}, and \textit{fff}.

Berlioz’s next tempo indication at m. 94 \textit{Allegro} (dotted quarter-note = 104) needs no adjustment from the conductor and generally is not controversial. But, the conductor’s work is hardly over. The challenge of this movement, and the one where Narcisse Girard had failed, is to achieve the final accelerando of the movement.

Berlioz awkwardly writes scores the beginning of this accelerando after a fermata and with the entrance of the strings with a dynamic marked \textit{pp}. It is difficult to move the tempo forward here because the soft dynamics in the strings generally produce a hesitation in terms of tempo. Also at this moment, if the tempo goes too fast, it is hard to maintain the crescendo. It is best for the conductor to push tempo at m. 311 once the strings get started. At the \textit{un peu plus vite} at m. 314, the conductor must insist upon the faster tempo because the woodwinds will want to drag here at their specified dynamic too.

It is easier to move the tempo forward where Berlioz indicates \textit{animez un peu} at m. 323 but it becomes more difficult at m. 352 where he writes \textit{animez encore} due to the fact that the lower strings will want to drag their entrance at m. 353 and hold the quarter note too long. By the time the conductor reaches m. 372, the tempo should be settled and have reached the first plateau of the accelerando.
The final push of tempo occurs at m. 438 where Berlioz indicates *ici* le mouvement doit être devenu, peu à peu, presque du double plus animé qu’au commencement de l’Allegro. Again, the conductor is challenged by the softness of dynamics inhibiting tempo. It is advisable to press tempo by showing fast 2nd beats where the orchestra has the quarter-note then rests. Berlioz is also helpful with his indication of *sans presser* at m. 457, showing where not to push tempo and then his later indication of *serrez* at m. 466 showing where to move nudge the orchestra helpful. My guess is that these indications were added after the Narcisse Girard debacle.

II. Marche de pèlerins

After a frenetic first movement, there are not nearly the strenuous conducting demands in this movement. But there are some deceptively tricky moments and important considerations for the conductor. The first of which is getting the first chord in the horns and bassoons to be played in-tune and not to loudly. This moment sets the mood for the entire movement and this spot is critical to get the right balance and color from these instruments. Also while keeping a flowing tempo of quarter-note = 96 is important in this movement, the most crucial thing at the beginning of the movement is establishing the atmosphere for the pilgrims who appear at m. 16. To that effect, the conductor can treat these entrances as almost quasi-fermatas in order to concentrate on getting that color from the orchestra.
Throughout this movement, Berlioz is helpful by indicating clearly in the score the word *canto* over the most important line. This concept almost has notions of *Hauptstimme* as later seen in the works of Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern. It is crucial that this line is heard predominantly while balancing the orchestra.

As the movement progresses, it is paramount that the conductor carefully control dynamics as Berlioz indicates in order to show the spatial relationship of the pilgrims as they journey in front of the audience. Berlioz is meticulous in these markings and they should be carefully observed.

At m. 23 and where this rhythmic motive recurs, the rhythm should not sound exacting and discrepancies between the simultaneous eighth-note triplets and sixteenth notes should be enjoyed. DelMar writes, “the conflicting rhythms of the prayers should not be too clearly articulated, as they should only be heard as the orchestral equivalent of stage ‘rhubarb, rhubarb’.”

The viola takes on a most curious role at m. 169 where Berlioz scores it to play arpeggios with an indication of *sul ponticello*. The focus at this moment must be on the chords in the woodwinds. The violist must play this passage with great care and attention to color. It should add to the atmosphere and not stick out in the texture.

__________________

42 Del Mar, *Conducting Berlioz*: 64. (Del Mar refers to words that an onstage crowd mumble in order to make an audible but not intelligible noise: American equivalents include “nuts and bolts.”)
At the end of this movement there is a common problem that is encountered by performers. In the anti-penultimate bar the harp is contains an indication of a frequently controversial harmonic indication. Current scholarship shows that Berlioz scores a B above middle C (B4) at this point with the harmonic mark above it. The sounding pitch should sound one octave higher (B5). The most widely available version of the score erroneously contains the marking of B3 written as a harmonic and thus sounding B4. The latest critical edition of the score published in 2001 by Barenreiter fixes this to the correct version printed B4 sounding B5. The conductor may need to correct parts so that the correct sounding note is a B5.

III. Sérénade d’un montagnard des Abbruzes à sa maîtresse

Tempo again is a major factor in this third movement. There are direct tempo relationships that Berlioz requires in the transitions of each of the sections of this movement and it is essential that the conductor establish Berlioz’s printed tempo of Allegro assai dotted quarter-note = 138 from the outset. DelMar states, “the tempo he prescribes… is undeniably brisk and apt to cause trouble to the divided tutti violas before the movement is over.” He is correct in that it is “undeniably brisk” but is certainly a feasible tempo and when executed, makes the serenade section, which begins at m. 32, flow at the perfect speed. An initial challenge is the tendency of the piccolo and oboe to drag at m. 4 behind the

43 Ibid., 66.
violas. The conductor must help by flowing through the beat and keeping the
two players at tempo by slightly anticipating their entrance.

The allegretto tempo is easy to find at m. 32 provided that the original
tempo was set correctly. It is exactly twice as slow. It should be noted that there
is a tendency for this section to lose tempo as the English horn plays this
beautiful but long phrase and the others that follow. The conductor needs to
lead through the phrase and discourage any sense of stagnation.

Berlioz is helpful at m. 135 by providing a fermata before setting the next
tempo that needs to be set (twice as fast, dotted quarter-note = 168). If for some
reason the tempo was lost in the previous serenade section, it is imperative that a
correction be made at this allegro assai tempo in order to avert disaster at m.166.
Here, Berlioz writes two bars within one using the same tempo relationship that
he had set up between the two sections as he combines both themes. If the
tempo is not correct, everything will sound really strange.

At this point the conductor needs to conduct in a subdivided 2 (4 total
beats) to establish the new slower tempo. Berlioz instruction only specifies 4
beats but this could cause a problem if done in a way that distorts the overall
flow. Del Mar states, “[his instructions] translate in present-day terminology into
two bas of a subdivided two…”44 It is best here to show light subdivisions on the
2nd beat of each of the inner bars in order to not disrupt the flow. A marked
subdivision may startle the orchestra and confuse them about the tempo change.

44 Ibid., 68.
The conductor also needs to pay the most attention to the violas at this instance whereas they have the pertinent rhythmic passages and need the most guidance. Once the rhythm and tempo have been established the conductor can take a more passive role and gently guide the orchestra until the next needed point. It seems dangerous to follow Berlioz’s instruction of switching into beating only two beats at m. 168. Stay in subdivided two with gentle stops on the macro beats.

The violas at m. 193 could be in danger of being lulled by the beautiful serenade that happens before this critical measure. Here, the conductor must show clearly their entrance and perhaps “click” a bit more in the subdivisions. Berlioz also advises beating in four here as well. Once the viola enters at m. 202 it is no longer to beat in any subdivisions the conductor can stay in two.

IV. Orgie de brigands

This movement begins a precise attack from the full orchestra, which can be achieved by the conductor showing a clear ictus in the preparation for the downbeat. The next sections simply recall motives from previous movements and therefore need to be executed in the same was as before. At m. 46 since the viola is playing in triplets and the flute follows at m. 51 with the same figure, I found it quite helpful to beat in a quasi one/three “shading” the triplet motion not so much for coordination but to help with maintaining tempo. Measure 54 needs a clear two pattern like the very beginning of the movement.
The brigands theme, which starts from the outset of the movement, needs to be played with careful attention to dynamics, and articulation. Berlioz’s specific indications add much to the level of raucousness of the theme. A lax reading of this theme will not be effective. Conductors may wish to consider breaking the divisi in the strings in order to get a shorter attack on the first chord.

At the recurrence of this theme beginning in m. 118, it is necessary for the conductor to be adamant the strings play the accents on the anacrusis to m. 129 and in each of the parallel sections. I have found that the orchestra will want to rush the rhythms at m. 163, which is probably due to the fact that rhythm is both syncopated and sounds anxious. Perhaps this is why Berlioz wrote sans presser at m. 168 and at other points in the scoring where there is a potential for the orchestra to push the tempo ahead.

Another detail that is often neglected is the meno f that Berlioz writes for the percussion at m. 183 which follows a ff attack. If ignored, it prevents the upper strings from sounding and distorts the overall tutti balance. Although not indicated, the quarter notes in m. 187 should be played non-legato and the separation should be audible, especially in the winds.

The tubas, trombones, clarinets and bassoons at m. 215 will have a tendency to want to drag this passage due to the delay of attack in the lower instruments. The conductor should flow right through these bars and show the slightest bit of forward motion so this line does not drag.
The rhythmic displacement that occurs starting in m. 270 can sound a bit daunting when standing in front of the orchestra and trying to make sense of the rhythm. It is imperative that the conductor gives a clear beat and maintains tempo through this section because one can easily get “turned around in the syncopation”. The same holds true starting in m. 363. It is difficult to coordinate the strings on the last beat of m. 378 with the percussion, this entire section will most likely need to be rehearsed carefully and slowly.

After the *un peu retenu* that begins at m. 408, it is difficult to resume tempo with the strings at m. 411. Immediately after this is a tricky spot for ensemble coordination. At m. 415 the conductor must advise the strings to listen carefully to the woodwinds. I have found it useful to rehearse just the strings alone and then put the two groups together.

The dilemma of coordinating the on-stage viola soloist with an off-stage trio is no small feat and proved difficult even with the modern technology of video monitors. The trio needed to play almost one half beat ahead of me to coordinate the ensemble. It was easier to coordinate the on-stage orchestra with the off-stage trio rather than the other way around. Furthermore, to minimize the disturbing the music with musicians leaving the stage, I used three players who were not in the orchestra to play in the off-stage trio. For the performance, the viola also moved to the side of the stage, which assisted in ensemble coordination.
Berlioz provides instructions on beating bars beginning at m. 524. These are generally helpful but I have found that where he indicates beating in three, it is almost impossible to do that at the specified tempo which should not be altered. Instead conductors might consider thinking of this in one and slightly shade the triplets in the bar. This will remove contact points for the ensemble and not encourage the low brass to drag. It is however imperative that the conductor beat very clearly in two at the places the Berlioz specifies.
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