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I’ve long thought it a real disaster for the music world – especially that part of it populated by concert bands and wind ensembles – that John Barnes Chance died so young. Our experience of the music of composers who lived to a ripe old age suggests that only in rare cases did such composers – even very talented ones – find their “fully mature” voice before the age of forty. The great range of types and modes of expression in Chance’s published music suggests that he hadn’t yet found his – the indisputable excellence of many of his extant compositions notwithstanding.

Had he enjoyed just another twenty years of life (he still would have died young), I wonder how different the repertoire landscape for the concert band might be from the one we do in fact know.

Incantation and Dance – written in 1960 under the working title Nocturne and Dance – is a standout. If ever a composition for wind band begged for choreographic treatment, this is the one. (Perhaps it’s been done, and I just don’t know about it. If that’s the case, I applaud whoever was willing to take on the challenge.) Even I – certainly no dancer – can imagine such a choreography, at least in its broad outlines. The key to such a treatment – and, for that matter, for a completely convincing musical performance of the piece – lies in the work’s title. Although Incantation and Dance suggests (like Saint-Saëns’ Introduction and Rondo Capriccioso, for instance) a bipartite composition – a suggestion that seems superficially confirmed by the tempo and meter contrasts between the music up to measure 33 and that which lies beyond – the truth of the matter is that the Incantation already contains the intervallic seeds of the Dance, and the two exist in an interpenetrating relationship, like the Taoists’ yin and yang (in which the former cannot meaningfully be thought of as somehow prior to the latter). Howard Hanson’s Chorale and Alleluia furnishes a comparable case in point.

The interpenetration of these two facets of Chance’s composition is handled in such an artful way that its subtleties are likely to go both unnoticed to a casual listener and unrealized in a superficial performance. Perhaps my meaning will become clear in the course of the following account.

Incantation and Dance: A Conductor’s Synopsis

Incantation and Dance is laid out in three large “cycles,” each of which moves the composition from a posture of “conjuring” through a “percussion concerto” to and through a full-blown and finally frenzied dance (in the third cycle, all three happen
simultaneously not serially). Cycle 1 runs from the opening measure to the cadence on E♭ at measure 100. Cycle 2 begins at the anacrusis to measure 115 and concludes at the parallel cadence in 205. Cycle 3, which functions as a coda to the entire work, begins with the compound anacrusis to measure 217 and concludes with the final G major cadence. As the work’s grounding tonality is G minor – often expressed in its Aeolian form – this last constitutes a Tierce de Picardie.

My sketch above omits two stretches of music: the one that begins at measure 100 and yields to the second cycle at 115, and the passage between measures 205 and 217. These are both bridge passages, the second a harmonized and otherwise elaborated augmentation of the first. Barry Kopetz (The Instrumentalist, October 1992) identifies this material as a “third theme,” but I can’t buy it. It is by almost no stretch of the imagination “thematic,” its bridging function is clear enough, and developmental references to it are otherwise completely absent from the composition.

The first of the cycles functions as an exposition of the three primary elements (Incantation, “percussion concerto,” Dance) identified above. In that exposition, the Incantation puts in three appearances in the opening 32 measures; the “percussion concerto” that begins with the entrance of the claves in measure 35 lasts until the two whip cracks in measure 70; and the Dance proper, beginning with the compound anacrusis to measure 71, continues in force to its deceptive cadence on E♭ (the flat submediant) at measure 100. Successive cycles of this material are temporally compressed, with the final cycle’s palimpsest presentation occupying just 19 measures.

**Cycle I: measures 1-100**

Contra Kopetz, the opening passage is Chance’s Incantation, cast not in the Phrygian mode on D, but in G minor (the work’s primary key), hovering around the dominant level. This is the only understanding of the work’s opening tonality that will make sense in the long run. In this first Incantation (mm. 1-17) we are immediately confronted with a phrasing conundrum. If the first subphrase is understood to begin on the opening D, then the second subphrase must just as surely begin on the second D, and the third on the third. Clearly, this cannot be, for it deprives all three subphrases (down to, say, the chromatic surprise in measure 9) of their arrival notes. If, on the other hand, the first subphrase is calculated beginning with the low C – where the dynamic nuance begins – we have a succession of phraselets that makes sense on at least three counts:

- The first two subphrases now end on a held D, confirming the “timeless” inaugural pitch and extending the dominant of G minor (the passage is, in other words, a dominant prolongation, and can now be heard as such); the third subphrase likewise almost does, but the line plunges past the concluding pitch and continues to the chromatic “surprise,” somewhat in the manner of the first theme of Beethoven’s Eroica Symphony.
- The hairpin nuances now reflect the actual phrasing by underpinning actual phraselets.
• The entrance of low clarinets is thus heard for what it actually is: in each case, a response to a phrase not a strange and unaccountable interruption of one.

In case the foregoing argument is not sufficiently compelling for any particular reader, I invite that reader to turn to page 41 in the score and notice how the final Incantation phrase – in trumpets and trombones – begins.

The first three subphrases of the Incantation exhibit a “growth device” that foreshadows other such approaches, to be seen later in the composition. The first subphrase, for instance, proceeds from C up to F and falls to D; the second makes it farther, to G (skipping F), before falling through F (now recovered) to D; the third rises all the way to B♭ and falls by decorated (filled-in) degrees – managing, moreover, to push past the “floor of D” to a member of a new diatonic collection based on D♭ (I would describe that collection as D♭ minor complete with raised leading tone – i.e. C; be it noted, however, that once the contrabass clarinet moves off the A onto A♭, the pitch class collection is purely octatonic – an important facet of the composition’s harmonic vocabulary). This last stage is important: it sets forth one of the basic dichotomies of the composition – in this case, the tritone dichotomy of G (the foundational tonality) and D♭, which will resurface at important structural points.

The fourth subphrase – from the C in measure 10 to the tied D♭ in 12-13 – is partly a response to the ending of the third subphrase, mirroring its fall with a rise exhibiting comparable features, only in retrograde. The E♭-D♭ of measure 13 returns the music to G minor, and the first Incantation is brought to a close by its fifth subphrase, a great *senza crescendo* arch in the flutes, who finally cadence on the tonic – without assistance from any harmonizing instruments – in measure 17.

Before discussing the thematic substance of the Incantation further, let us explore the harmonies that are offered by the low clarinets.

Their first entrance gives us a tonic chord, sounded only very briefly before archly “sidestepping” onto the flat submediant in first inversion (the held D in the flutes makes this a VI♭7 for the moment). The second entrance repeats that formula exactly. (Incidentally, this functional analysis corroborates my observation, above, that what we have here is a dominant prolongation in G minor; any attempted reading of these chords in D Phrygian is woefully weak and inconclusive).

The third entrance of those instruments (from measure 10) – now *pianissimo* on account of the flutes’ reduced dynamic – gives us new harmonic material to “conjure” with (pun intended). The first sound, coupled with the flutes’ tied D♭, is a quartal stack. In the tonal context created thus far, this is nonsensical. But the collection makes perfect sense if that tied D♭ is recognized for the suspension that it truly is, and then resolved to the C that follows it – in which case we have a V♭7 of D♭. The only way, incidentally, that a band will be able to realize this in practice, is for the flutes to “divvy up” the breathing so that each others’ momentary silences are covered.
Two of the low clarinets change their pitches in measure 11, yielding what is surely heard as an $f_{b}^{7}$ – provided, that is, that the flutes also treat their tied $E_{b}$ as a suspension and resolve it as before. Needless to say, the chord just described functions as a leading-tone seventh chord to the Dorian version of G minor – which is to say that the music even at this point, after so brief an excursion to “there,” is trying to come back “here” (by an octatonic route, as mentioned above).

At the point where *Poco più mosso* is indicated, the final subphrase of the Incantation proceeds. This is the long one – the one that reaches its tonic goal in a most unlikely way. The underpinning held sonority is once again the submediant chord we heard before, but this time approached from a whole-tone cluster marked *mezzo forte* (the bassoon cue here, by the way, is completely meaningless, representing *nothing* in the instruments printed above it; this score is lousy with such errors, which will all be accounted for in a lengthy errata list later in this article).

Before proceeding to the second statement of the Incantation, I have some comments to offer about this opening section. The first concerns phrasing (and breathing). I have hinted above that the structural relationship of the first three subphrases is like the advancing of a multi-faceted argument. Were it not for the accompanying voices, it might make sense for the flute players to breathe after each long $D$, before presenting the next subphrase. The accompanying chords, however, make a suspension after-the-fact of each of those $D$s, which must therefore be resolved into the following $C$s – so unanimous breaths in those places are excluded. In any case, overt sectionality ceases to be true of the theme itself once measure 9 is reached: from there to the cadence at measure 17 the line must unfold continuously and uninterruptedly.

Furthermore, the dynamics of the flutes and clarinets vis-à-vis each other are unambiguously notated and must be religiously observed. Only in measure 13, with their whole-tone cluster, are the clarinets allowed to engulf the flute sound – and then only momentarily. Although an arrival dynamic is not given in the score, I believe the *diminuendo* in measure 14 should fall back to *pianissimo*, restoring the established dynamic relationship between flutes and harmonizing instruments.

With the flute and clarinet writing in Chance’s introductory paragraph we come face to face with a serious acoustical issue. The problem is, under-supported low notes on flutes and clarinets exhibit precisely the opposite tendencies: the flutes will go flat and the clarinets sharp. I believe it is due to that fact more than any other that some listeners imagine the opening of John Barnes Chance’s *Incantation and Dance* to be atonal! I cannot recall ever hearing it played in tune. (Consider for a moment the structure of a G Aeolian scale. Its most expressive note is its downward-pressing $E_{b}$. In the 4th measure of this composition, that note is given to the bass clarinet, *piano*. That pitch must be lower than usual not higher.) The best solution I know for this passage is for the flautists to play in a slightly rolled-out position, biasing the pitch upwards, and have the clarinet players pull whatever’s available to make the tube longer, not forgetting to shorten the tube after they finish in measure 15. (The flautists must likewise remember to revert to a normal playing position when heading up toward the high $E_{b}$.)
I have yet to hear the G in measure 17 played in such a way as to represent what it actually is: the end of the first Incantation not a member of some ongoing project. Part of the problem may be the placement of a rehearsal mark at measure 16 – which makes absolutely no musical sense. I would advise anyone who wants to conduct this work, to number the entire score from beginning to end, using the editor’s identified measure numbers to check one’s numbering. Then be prepared to ignore the editor’s rehearsal marks – which are often placed incoherently. In any event, the flutes must noticeably cadence on this G: what comes next is something new.

Finally, the Italian tempo indications are exactly defined by Chance’s metronome markings, which must be scrupulously observed. One of the distortions I’ve heard most often where this piece is concerned is a tempo that is much too fast from measure 33 on – occasionally up in the 160 bpm range. It is true that Chance writes Presto there, but he also gives a precise metronomic indication, almost exactly twice as fast as the Poco più mosso that we find at measure 13 (and that thus foreshadows the Presto tempo).

With the re-entry of a single stand of first clarinets at measure 17 we begin a polyphonic setup to the second statement of the Incantation. Their material, sung an octave lower than the flutes, is spun off the flutes’ cadence figure in measures 16 f., plus a three-8th-note anacrusis that foreshadows an upbeat figure soon to become prominent in the Dance (cf. Mm. 71, 82, 94, etc.). Chance provides a curious “constructivist” counterpoint immediately, by bringing in a second rank of clarinets a fifth/twelfth lower and one beat later, and a third rank an octave lower halfway through bar 19 (because by this point the flutes have dropped the project, leaving the first clarinets stranded in a single octave). This attractive material – an offset parallel organum in fifths – is treated as a wave-like ostinato, rolling along unchanged and unimpeded for the next six measures as the flutes trill softly on the supertonic pitch and lower-pitched instruments sound the second Incantation. There are a couple of things that should be noticed. First, this statement of the Incantation is temporally compressed compared with the first statement (the arrival notes are not held so long); furthermore, the reeds of that group really are to play forte, with the tuba offering an understated reinforcement. No other dynamic arrangement will do. These instruments, like the flutes before them, should overlap their breathing.

The tempo suddenly slackens to its original pace in measure 26 and a beautiful new tonal landscape opens up. The bass instruments – with the reeds still forte and now joined by reinforcements – are denied a cadence of their tune, “hanging up” on their D5 instead. At the same time, the flutes – now joined by the piccolo – move their trill a half step higher, producing – together with the bass instruments – a “frame” of Bb minor in first inversion. What that frame surrounds is a harmonized statement of the first part of the Incantation in E major – roughly. “Roughly,” because as the tune moves, all its supporting harmonies move with it, resulting in a wide brush of parallel major triads in second inversion (the effect is a little like the opening verse of Lincolnshire Posy). This Bb minor/”E major” dichotomy is very much like that between G and D5, mentioned above. It will not escape our notice that all four of these pitch classes together constitute a fully diminished seventh chord on E. That chord is one of the structural underpinnings of
the octatonic scale built on the same pitch – a scale that Chance will have much occasion to use come dancing time.

It is to be noticed and strictly observed that this statement of the Incantation is to be played in the piano-pianissimo range, while low reeds hang onto a D pedal forte. If this seems counterintuitive, try it. Barney Chance has called this tune – let’s by all means respect his unambiguously-expressed wishes. Let’s take a chance on Chance.

A gorgeous skein of rising parallel major triads over a bass line now moving in the opposite direction arrives at the sonority that will underlie the first instance of the “percussion concerto.” That sonority – attained on the third beat of measure 32 and then held forever – is an E major 6-4 chord against an A pedal (this is yet another transposition of the tritone dichotomy noted above). Incantation and Dance is by no means an atonal work, but its occasional bitonal and octatonic features greatly enrich its otherwise common-practice diatonic vocabulary.

With the entrance of the maracas and the dropping of many of the sustained pitches at measure 33, the conductor has two measures to get this tempo exactly right. From the entrance of the claves, the beat must be securely established at 138 bpm.

The “percussion concerto” that begins here sets forth most of the important rhythmic motives that will permeate the Dance proper – and, in the case of the temple blocks, part of its melodic profile. In this presentation, entrances of different instruments are four measures apart, so a sense of “four-bar phrasing,” integral to dance music generally, is finally in evidence. The entrance, however, of loud interjections in irregular rhythms and temporal intervals beginning in measure 53 undercuts that phrase regularity considerably. The purpose of these interjections is to move the harmony – by means of parallel second-inversion major chords as before – to an A major/D pedal tritone dichotomy in measure 55. Against that unsettled sonority trumpets, trombones and baritones play a ferocious declamation whose intervallic contours owe something to the Incantation; their triplet quarter notes and fast dactylic finish echoed by the woodwinds will also play notable roles later in the piece. That declamation occurs three times, expanded at each subsequent sounding and moved upward in pitch. The final dactylic “shout,” is “grown” into a compound anacrusis to the Dance proper in measure 70: two sharp whip cracks set it in motion. (Forgive the digression, but I’ve started thinking about choreography again. I cannot dismiss the ubiquitous image in those low-budget TV Westerns from the 60s, where the “bad guy” shoots the ground next to someone’s feet and orders him to dance. Here, the dancing master holds a whip not a six-shooter.)

The Dance is now joined in earnest. Its material is set forth twice in its entirety, with a third statement broken off prematurely. Statement 1 runs from measure 71 through 82, statement 2 from 83 through 94, and statement 3 from 95 to the deceptive cadence at 100, thus deprived of its consequent phrase.

Kopetz indicates that the form of the dance is ABABA. There is some merit to this analysis (final cadences, for instance, are avoided at the ends of phrases, lending an
“ongoing” quality to the entire section). I am more inclined, however, to think of it as being structured in a periodic form exhibiting antecedent and consequent phrases. On account of being denied satisfactory closure in the first two statements, the music simply abandons the attempt in the third statement, in favor of something different.

The antecedent phrase is five measures in length, with a phrase structure of 2+2+1. The “tune,” set forth in the first and second trumpets and reinforced by other instruments, is in G Aeolian. Its harmonized countermelody, played by the horns in parallel major triads (we’ve seen these before), explores both darker and brighter modes on account of their chromatic alterations. Rhythmically, one could generalize that the Dance tune is pretty much an “on-the-beat” melody, played against a highly syncopated countermelody, whose rhythm is identical to that of the tambourine from its entrance at measure 43.

It’s important to notice what the third and fourth trumpets are doing in these measures. They have a “skeleton” of the dance tune, consisting of a few selected notes. Later, this skeleton will be used in the manner of a bass line – however, it is not a true bass line but a distillation of the tune itself. (Heinrich Schenker might have written it.)

The “extra” measure at the end of the antecedent phrase is an 8/8 bar divided in a manner is often heard in eastern European folk music: 3+2+3 (I recommend conducting it that way). Its sequential triadic fall turns the music toward a consequent phrase on D, the dominant.

The consequent phrase is seven measures long, constructed entirely of pitches drawn from the octatonic scale on D (this is an important point that Kopetz misses, rendering his discussion of this passage incoherent and useless). It was Chance’s great stroke of genius to turn the music to the dominant – a perfectly classical gesture – and then present the “dominant” alternative in octatonic language. Understood this way, everything about the passage makes sense, including the countermelody (I hesitate to call it a bass line) in the low reeds: in the octatonic scale begun with a half step, you can construct the primary triad with either a major third or a minor third, and Chance does both here in alternation (hence the F♭s and F♯s). It’s very much like the opening bars of Ravel’s *Alborado del gracioso* in that respect; Stravinsky often resorted to the same device. The continuation of the material from measure 80 does not represent a restatement at the “E♭ level” (as in Kopetz) but a simple stepwise commencing along octatonic lines already established.

The second statement, whose structural downbeat lies at measure 83, is of course swept into by the same anacrusis as before – an anacrusis that seems to grow naturally out of the consequent phrase that preceded it. This is a mark of true compositional craftsmanship: the work’s seams are artfully covered by material that is equally at home in two contexts. That second statement is structurally identical to the first: only the orchestrational details have changed. The second presentation of the consequent phrase affords some real challenges for the low brass players (mm. 88-94).
The third statement – the incomplete one – proceeds like the others, but with its orchestration amplified and its volume ratcheted up a notch. The sounds of cymbals and whip lend a special kind of vicious urgency to this passage. And it is the “extra” measure at the end of the five-bar phrase that sends the music unexpectedly onto a cadence on E♭ (the flat submediant; see my discussion of the initial Incantation, above).

The bridge passage initiated by that deceptive cadence is engaging on many levels. For one, the sound of the full ensemble immediately dissipates, leaving only the low clarinets playing a fragment of the Dance tune, but set up in a way that recalls the flutes’ surprising gesture in measure 9. Their fortississimo is probably the most ominous, threatening sound available the entire ensemble. And by arriving on A♯, they immediately depose the ensemble’s just-gained E♭ in favor of its polar (tritone) opposite. Note: their A in measure 101 absolutely must begin fortississimo, and then be carried through a plunging diminuendo to mezzo piano. Again, I cannot recall ever hearing this passage played as Chance wrote it. No technical difficulty can account for this (as there is none): only carelessness explains it.

The music that begins in measure 101 is apparently “new;” however, a voice leading (i.e. “Schenkerian”) analysis will reveal the Incantation’s basic contours embedded in its notes. Despite its rhythmic complexity, this passage is noticeably “organic” in shape: its phrasing is informed throughout by “growth” (recall the discussion above of the first part of the Incantation), primarily in lengths of subphrases. Its apparent complexity is due to two factors: the 3/8 sound of many of the small melodic cells (in both bass and treble lines), and the way the lower voice of this two-part counterpoint interacts with the upper. This accounts for the fact that the notorious difficulty of measures 101-107 completely disappears as the lower voices abandon their previous activity and proceed to reiterate their arrival note as a kind of obstinate pedal.

**Cycle II: measures 115-205**

In measure 113 the “breaking-in” of A♭s against the prevailing Gs sets the stage for the onset of the Cycle 2. In this hair-raising, dissonant moment we have an overt expression of the ultimate conflict and dichotomy: the G pedal that might not unreasonably be said to stand for the Dance (for its tonality at least), and an A♭ that serves as dominant to the tritone-related D♭ that grounds this new statement of the Incantation.

In this statement, Chance harmonizes the Incantation as he had done earlier, from measure 26 (the Dance’s countermelody in 71 ff. is also related). Parallel major chords in second inversion provide a primitive-sounding enhancement of a tune already stretched to the breaking point: its grounding pitch held over-long, its melodic profile almost obliterated by casting it in the rapid, biting dactylic rhythms first heard at bar 59 in an entirely different (but as we now see, related) context. And against this swirl harmonized woodwind scales, beginning on D♭, Mixolydian but turning octatonic at the third beat of measure 115. Here is an important point: if you want your woodwinds to play this passage accurately instead of stabbing at it or faking it, get them to practice their
octatonic scales, just as they do their diatonic scales. There are, after all, only three of
them: the one that begins on E (that’s the same as the one that begins on D♯), the one that
begins on F and the one that begins on F♯. In this passage we have two of them: the one
that begins on E in measure 115, and the one that begins on F in the following measure.
These are alternated with some regularity. In measures 212 f., the three-note rising
passage first heard in measures 30-32 recurs, setting the stage for a second statement of
the Incantation.

This last is cast in the lowest voices of the band, and its melodic profile is partly
borrowed from the flute statement in measure 10. It affords an unambiguously B♭ minor
“foil” to the earlier statement, against now consistent measured trills in upper woodwinds
falling away in carefully-marked stages (observe and honor them!). Their version of the
three-note rising figure (mm. 126 ff.) sets the stage for this cycle’s presentation of the
“percussion concerto.”

This time the percussionists enter at two-bar intervals rather than the previous
four, and the harmonic underpinning is very different: a B major triad against a bass A
(this could be understood as a V7 of E in third inversion). A low-reed crescendo and
simultaneous flute scale in measure 140 usher in a change of tonality: the chord is now
one of G♯ (or A♭) minor, and another harmonized rising passage in horns, handed off to
the trumpets in the most careful way, yields a D major chord against the held A♭ – the
ubiquitous tritone dichotomy once again established. Against this new sonority – and
with the “percussion concerto” throbbing away – the first clarinets (or perhaps this should
be a clarinet solo?) play a kind of meditation on the Dance, as though to wish it back into
existence. And another rising flute scale – completed with the same notes in the upsweep
in measure 70 and corroborated by a cadencing of all the other voices – does just that –
sort of.

For what we are offered is not the full-fledged Dance, but its skeleton as
described above: even its countermelody is missing. This passage is a classic danse
macabre, with the Dance skeleton due to be reiterated continuously over the course of 28
measures, more or less unchanged except for six measures suddenly jacked up a minor
third and played fortissimo. And from the fourth measure of this presentation the horns
set forth a particularly beautiful version of the Incantation, while one stand of first
clarinets offer some kind of murmured, barely audible magic ritual with the flutes taking
up the “meditation” formerly tendered by clarinets (cf. mm. 142 ff.) – now offered as a
sort of Greek chorus.

The six fortissimo measures set at the B♭ level constitute a structural parenthesis
to the proceedings, but their effect is anything but “parenthetical.” The choreographic
possibilities are mind-boggling. Their structure is simple: two-bar units exhibiting
increments of materials we have heard before. So the Dance’s harmonized countermelody
joins the fray in measure 168, and the flute comments from the preceding section are
added two bars later, in all of the woodwinds but the very lowest, plus a strategically
placed cymbal crash.
In the final four measures of the *danse macabre* the change of timbre from muted horns to clarinets is strikingly beautiful.

A reduced upsweep in measure 175 – this one based on measure 17 – ushers in the reprise of the Dance proper, following almost exactly the same plan as before. The only differences are in details of orchestration, an “extra” beat in measure 187 to give the dancing master a chance to shoot at someone’s feet, a succession of great chromatically-enhanced waves of woodwind sixteenth notes, and the notable omission of the first part of the “Dance skeleton” in the bass instruments in measures 188 and 190. In measure 205 the music suddenly cadences, as before, on E♭.

What the composer has done, of course, is to set up another bridge passage as he had at measure 100. This time the music is handled very differently. Instead of low clarinets conveying us by means of melody into the new territory, the participants in the “percussion concerto” break in full-fledged and offer two measures of unrelenting *fortissimo*. The bridge’s melodic material begins in 207, now played in splendid augmentation by the brass instruments and partly harmonized by thirds. Even the triplet quarter notes in measure 209 have their predecessors: both in the same interjected rhythm that, beginning in measure 57, had set up the first appearance of the Dance, and in the apparent 3/8 setting – i.e. “grouping by threes” – of the same material in 101 ff. The most likely explanation of the harmony in this passage is “dominant prolongation in G♭ minor” – which means that the cadence on E♭ a few bars earlier is now recognized in retrospect as a cadence on the dominant of this new key. We have, of course, seen this key hinted at before (m. 140). The woodwind scales that accompany this bridge statement are G♭ minor scales with an occasional chromatic passing tone F♯ spelled as G♭.

The rubric established by the first few measures of this bridge passage is followed faithfully – even through a rather forced cadence on a curious sonority grounded on D at measure 215 (the chord is D–A♭–C, or whole-tone set 026 – loosely construed, I suppose, as a kind of “Phrygian dominant seventh” of G minor) – until it is forced to yield to Cycle 3 in the big scheme of things.

**Cycle III: measures 217-235**

This cycle, which begins with a fully orchestrated upsweep to measure 217, serves the entire composition as a coda. Several of its features call for notice and comment. The first is its simultaneous – or “palimpsest” – presentation. The “percussion concerto,” always fully-fledged – is present through a large part of this section. The Dance undergoes some striking alterations, and only its antecedent phrase is presented – being denied any semblance of completion until the very end of the piece. Those alterations including a “paring-down” as in measure 217 where the former sixteenth notes – now present only in the temple blocks – are replaced by more pedestrian eighths, a reiterated upward, partly chromatic “thrusting” as in measures 218, a harmonized descent by whole tones in horns and trombones in measures 219 f. and 224 f., and the replacement of the former “extra” measure – the one that had previously led to the (now missing) consequent phrase – by two contrasting and equally powerful gestures: a “focusing of the camera” by upper woodwinds gradually amplified in measures 220 f.,
and a “stuck record” presentation of the Dance’s most prominent motive, formerly heard as a sort of “meditation” in measures 142 ff. It is to be especially noted that both of these gestures include at least some apparent 3/8 time elements, and a strong argument can be made for conducting them that way. In the case of the first, measure 221 is conducted as an 8/8 measure, this time grouped as 3+3+2. As for the second, measures 226 could be conducted as a 2/4 measure followed by one in 12/8 time.

The final statement of the Incantation, from measure 228 on, duplicates the very first phrase of its initial presentation, from the low C in measure 2. The harmonization is handled as before, and the answering two measures of dancing are shorn of their primary tune – perhaps to drive home the principle that the tune in question was always embedded in the Incantation to begin with. If the composer’s intentions are to be fully realized, the dynamic scheme from measure 228 on must be adhered to rigorously.

Despite the chromatic content of the Dance’s harmonized countermelody and the reiterated E♭s in the high woodwinds’ measured trill, the ending is unambiguously G major, owing to the trumpets’ long-held final chord. The emphatic eighth-note chord that punctuates that ending like a G-major exclamation point contains major thirds in the oboes, second and third clarinets, and – if the score is to be believed (for this may be a misprint comparable to many such errors in this badly-printed score) – the first trombone!

Errata

The score of Chance’s Incantation and Dance is lousy with errors. Some of them are arguably “minor,” but many would have a profound effect on the sound of the piece were they allowed to stand, not merely cluttering it with “wrong” notes, but in at least a couple of cases, altering its basic tonal argument. My errata list proceeds by measure numbers. Information in parentheses is not technically errata, but I feel it is either necessary or very desirable in order to clarify the composer’s intent and help players avoid performance errors.

1 In the left margin, identify Tenor Sax. (You may want to note that the contrabass clarinet part is in B♭.)
4 Add a slur to the bass clarinet cue in the bassoon part.
8 In the bassoon part, add the completion of a tie from the previous measure.
13 Add a ♯ to the D in the bassoon’s bass clarinet cue. (Bring the low reeds down to pp at the end of their diminuendo.)
18 (Mark the 1st clarinet part (p).)
19 Mark the 3rd clarinet entrance p.
17-25 (Since the 1st clarinets are pared back to a single stand in this passage, it might be wise to duplicate that approach in the 2nds and 3rds as well.)
54 The ff is printed too soon in the clarinet parts – it applies not to the tied note but to the passage that begins with an accented dotted quarter.
55 Add an accent mark to the 2nd and 3rd clarinets.
57-60 The bass clarinet part is printed a third too high.
64 The second trumpets should have B♭ not B♭.
Add a marcato accent to the baritones’ last note.
Mark the horn cue in the alto and tenor saxophones f.
Remove the staccato dot from the last note in the alto saxophones; replace the first staccato dot in that measure with an accent mark – do this last in the tenor sax part also.
In the tenor saxophone part (horn cue), complete the slur from the previous measure. Mark the bassoon part mf. (Add a z to the second horn’s E.)
Mark the bassoon part f.
The second clarinets’ third note should be A♭ not B♭. Add a slur for the last three notes in the alto clarinet part.
The last note in the 2nd alto saxophone – a horn cue – should be C not A. (Add z signs to the third notes in the alto and third clarinet parts.)
Complete the slur from the previous measure in the saxophones.
(Add a z to the second horn’s E.)
Excise the inexplicable floating f in the (1st?) trombone.
Mark the 3rd and 4th trumpets f.
Add a slur across the barline in the bassoon part.
Add an accent mark to the first note in the tuba part.
The sixteenth notes in the bassoon part – a bass clarinet cue – are printed a third too high.
Add the missing accent mark in the alto clarinet – next to last note.
Add a hairpin crescendo mark in the oboes as in the horns; mark its ending ff.

Based on the time-honored (but never very practical) principle that accidentals in one octave carry through to different octaves, there are many natural signs that will need to be imposed on the scales in mm. 115-120. The following is a complete list:

Oboes: mm. 115 & 117, add signs to the D, E and G in the fourth beat of both bars.
1st Clarinets: mm. 115 & 117, add signs to the final As in both bars.
3rd Clarinets: mm. 117 & 120, add signs to the final Ds in both bars.
Bass Clarinet: mm. 115, 117 & 120, mark the final D in each bar.
2nd Alto Saxophone: mm. 115, 117 & 120, mark the final A in each bar.
Baritone Saxophone: mm. 115 & 117, mark the final A in each bar.

There are other errors in these measures as well:

The seventh note in the bass clarinet should be a G♭.
Remove the sharp signs from the Cs in third and bass clarinet parts.
The first sixteenth note in the alto saxophones should be an E♭.
In the first clarinet part, mark the third last note as a B♭. (Add a z to the trumpets’ first note.)
Add sharp signs to the first note in the alto clarinet and alto and tenor saxophones.
The second and third trumpets are printed a third too high.
Add a hairpin diminuendo sign in 2nd and 3rd clarinets.
Add a trill sign to the maracas.
Mark the maracas p.
Identify this percussion entrance as *timbales* not *bongos*.

Add slur to alto saxophone horn cue, and dynamics to alto and tenor saxophones.

After correcting all the other low woodwind parts, reconcile the cues in the bassoon parts with them. Do the same in 171-175.

Change (Hats) to (Horns) in the trombone/bass trombone parts (!!!). Mark the second note in the 3rd horn as an $E\flat$, and reconcile the 2nd trombone cue to it by marking it as an $A\flat$.

In the 3rd horn part, the first note on the third beat should be an $E\flat$. The second trombone cue in the same spot should be an $A\flat$.

Remove the final staccato dot in bass and contrabass clarinet parts.

It appears the flutes should have something in this measure (cf. previous measure) – a half note tied to an eighth, maybe?

Mark the second note in the 3rd trombone as an $A\flat$, as before.

Mark the first note in the 2nd trombone as an $A\flat$.

Mark dynamics in the trombones’ horn cues, as in the actual horn parts.

The last slur in the 1st clarinet part is printed one note too early (it should begin from A not G).

Mark the $A\flat$ in the 2nd trombone as before.

In the bassoon part, where the bass clarinet cue begins again, the first note should be an $A\flat$. It should also, of course, be marked $p$ (see above).

Mark the alto and tenor saxophones’ horn cues $p$.

Reconcile the cues in the bassoon part with the actual bass clarinet part, as before.

In the left hand margin, identify the 12th staff from the top as *baritone saxophone* not *bass clarinet*. Do the same on page 33.

In the passage from 188 through 192 we encounter the same “carried accidentals” problem as in 115-120. Here’s the list:

Piccolo: In the second half of measures 188 & 190, mark G and D naturals.
Flutes: Same corrections as in the piccolo part.
Oboes: G naturals in those same two measures. In 192, mark the final B and C with natural signs.
1st, 2nd & 3rd Clarinets: Same corrections – to As and Es. In 2nd & 3rd clarinets, mark the high D in measure 192 with a natural sign.
Alto Clarinet: Same corrections – to Es and Bs.
Bassoons: Same corrections, in the same two measures (Gs and Ds).
Alto Saxophones: Same corrections, applied to Es and Bs.
Tenor Saxophone: Same corrections, applied to As and Es.
Baritone Saxophone: Mark the B in the final beat of both bars.

There are other mistakes in these measures, as well:

The last note in the 3rd & 4th horns should be a $B\flat$ and a $G\flat$.
Remove the impossible slur from the timpani part.
Excise the sharp sign from the last note in the 1st clarinet part.
Move the sharp sign from the first to the second trombone (resulting in A♯/F♯).

**In 200-204 there are more such cases as earlier:**

Piccolo: In the second half of measures 200 & 202, mark G and D naturals.
Flutes: Same corrections as in the piccolo part.
Oboes: G naturals in those same two measures. In 204, mark the final B, C and D with natural signs.
1st, 2nd & 3rd Clarinets: Same corrections – to As and Es. In 2nd & 3rd clarinets, mark the high D in measure 204 with a natural sign.
Alto Clarinet: Same corrections – to Es and Bs.
Bassoons: Same corrections, in the same two measures (Gs and Ds).
Alto Saxophones: Same corrections, applied to Es and Bs.
Tenor Saxophone: Same corrections, applied to As and Es.
Baritone Saxophone: Mark the B in the final beat of both bars.

**There are other errors in these measures as well:**

202 In the 2nd & 3rd clarinet part, the fifth note should be an E not a G.
203 Excise the 8va sign from the alto saxophones, and correct the last note of the third beat, changing it from a D♯ to a C♯.
204 Move the flat sign from the first horn to the 2nd, so that it reads like horns 3 & 4.
208 Continue the scale in the first alto saxophone as in measure 213.
212 Change the B♯ in the first alto saxophone to B♭.
213 The oboes should have an A♭ at the beginning of the fourth beat.
216 The second note in all horn parts should be a B♭.
217 In the 3rd & 4th horn part, remove the dot from the quarter note. The baritones’ fourth note should be a D not a C.
219-221 The tambourine part is printed a “3rd” too low.
222 In the left margin, identify oboes in the plural (not that it matters, I suppose, since they are never divided!). Do the same on page 42.
223 The last note in the oboes should be C♭.
225 In the temple blocks part, move the accent mark to the third note.
235 (Mark an E♭ in first alto saxophone.)

The plethora of errors just identified says volumes about the commitment – or lack thereof – of Boosey & Hawkes to high publishing standards. Sad to say, other publishers have done and are doing even worse.

**Now you must go through all the parts and reconcile them to your corrected score. Good luck!**
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