Despite its obvious physical nature, a musical score may seem to lack the permanence or gravity of a work of visual art, as the printed notes are incomplete without the final added dimension of performance. While paintings and statuary can retain their basic appearance for years, sometimes even for centuries, a musical score undergoes countless virtual variations each time it is presented, even while its physical form remains the same. As listeners we not only expect these variations, we recognize and value them as the essence of each unique musical experience. Even so, these small deviations are usually limited to tempo and dynamics while the pitches in the score remain constant from performance to performance.

In the visual arts, the term “permanence” may also negatively describe the artist’s ability, or lack thereof, to alter a piece once it leaves his or her hands. After a painting or sculpture is sold or displayed, it is almost unheard of for an artist to retouch the work, regardless of their ultimate satisfaction with its final form. Yet if a composer decides to change a musical detail after a work is heard in concert, he or she might revise the piece via an addendum to the published score, notes on the rental parts, through recordings or by other means. So the question arises: is there a point when a musical work, like a painting, is no longer open to revisions by its creator? And further: after such a change has been made, has the work been corrected, or has it been compromised?

There are two extremes of opinion that have developed with respect to the score: one that holds the score as sacrosanct, as evidenced by the rise in popularity of “critical” and urtext editions, and another that treats each musical composition as a work in progress, one whose process of evolution continues even after the composer’s death through each successive performer’s presentation of the piece.

Somewhere between these two extremes stood the attitude taken by Igor Stravinsky, especially as regards his right to alter his own music. Whether returning to a piece in order to fix some details he had discovered after hearing the work in concert, or, as in the case of his ballets Firebird and Petrushka, to recast the works for smaller ensembles, his revisions frequently led to confusion among performers, as the original versions were never entirely removed from the public eye, taken down from library shelves or banished from the concert hall.
An especially confusing case for bassoonists is found in the famous solo in the Berceuse from *Firebird*, one of the ballet’s most popular movements, and the first to receive a formal revision by its composer. As will be demonstrated in this article, what most likely started as a simple misprint was soon to undergo a series of intentional revisions by Stravinsky. Yet thanks to the popularity of the many existing versions of the work, from the original ballet through three suites, the composer’s own piano reductions, two arrangements for violin and piano, and even one for solo organ, bassoonists to this day continue to wonder exactly what note they are supposed to play in the solo’s recapitulation: d natural or d flat?

One might assume that the story of a simple half-step note change might be equally simple and concise. Such is not the case in this instance. If the reader will follow this rather lengthy investigation through to its conclusion, he or she will find that this is not just the story of a single note, but is more about the process of composition, the rights of the composer to retouch a work, and even about the responsibilities of the performer. It will call into question whether or not a work is truly “finished” upon publication, which elements in a score remain open to interpretation, and how we performers might reconcile different versions of the same work.

That being said, this article is actually shorter than it could be. Despite the decades of debate and the many anecdotes that have developed around this solo, some having appeared in print in this very journal, the author has decided to limit this article to an investigation of primary source materials and supporting evidence that come directly from, and only from, Igor Stravinsky. The versions of the Berceuse examined in this article were all composed and/or arranged by Stravinsky, except for the organ transcription, which was prepared by his publisher and can be assumed to have received his tacit authorization. The composer conducts all the recordings cited, and the letters and quotations come either directly from Stravinsky or from his longtime assistant and biographer Robert Craft. The one footnote in which bassoonists’ opinions are cited recalls an actual quote by the composer heard at a rehearsal in which the Berceuse was being performed. It is hoped that with this collection of score excerpts, correspondence and recordings, the composer’s own opinions about the solo might finally be made clear.

The worldwide celebrity of *Firebird* was both a boon and a burden for Stravinsky. Robert Craft characterized the situation in these words:

> From the most popular work that Stravinsky ever wrote, *Firebird*, he received the least income. Even worse, he was forced to spend a fortune on litigation in which the composition, and his and others’ arrangements from it, involved him.²

Both the first and last commercial recordings the composer made were of suites from this ballet. It launched his international career, and as one of the most frequently performed works on his conducting tours, it followed him all the way to the close of that career. His frustration with it was already clear by 1931, when Stravinsky sent a letter to Willy Strecker at Schott complaining of having to conduct it so often: “See if you can find a way for me to conduct something other than *Firebird* and *Petrushka*, which I do all the time everywhere. You would be an angel!”³ By 1950, he had distanced himself even further, claiming, “I wrote *Firebird* and *Petrushka* so long ago they no longer seem to be particularly mine. When I conduct them, they seem like standard general repertory—as if
I were conducting Shéhérazade or Till Eulenspiegel... As frustrated with the work as he may have been, the public would always want its regular dose of Firebird, so it is no surprise to find so many variants of the original within his catalog. In order to keep track of all these versions through the course of this article, the author has chosen to tell the story of the Berceuse solo in the form of a chronology.

L’OISEAU DE FEU (Composed 1909-1910; published 1910 by Jurgenson, Moscow)

Perhaps the only detail of this entire article that will be accepted by all readers is the fact that between 1909 and 1910, Stravinsky composed the complete ballet score to L’Oiseau de Feu, and in that ballet at four measures after rehearsal number 186 in the Berceuse, the bassoonist is instructed to play a d natural as the first note of the triplet that appears on beat 2 of that bar. As the composer never made a formal revision of the full ballet score, the original solo appears today as it did then:

![Figure 2 Reprise of the Berceuse bassoon solo, Reh. 186, 1910 version.](image)

L’OISEAU DE FEU. CONTE DANSÉ EN DEUX TABLEAUX. RÉDUTION POUR PIANO À DEUX MAINS PAR L’AUTEUR. (1910, 1918; pub. Jurgenson 1911)

As with almost all of his stage works, as well as many chamber and orchestral pieces, Stravinsky usually prepared the piano reductions of his music himself, both for rehearsal purposes and for extra income, and such is the case with Firebird. In both of the Firebird piano reductions, one finds that the reprise of the bassoon melody reflects exactly what is found in the original score, above. This adds to the evidence that at these early dates (March 1910 for the first reduction, and December 1918 for the second) Stravinsky had no intentions of making any changes to this solo.

SUITE TIRÉE DU CONTE-DANSÉ “L’OISEAU DE FEU” (1911; pub. Jurgenson 1912)

The rarely performed first suite, employing the original orchestration, did not include the Berceuse. Its five movements were: I. Introduction – Kashchei’s Enchanted Garden – Dance of the Firebird, II. Supplication of the Firebird, III. The Princesses’ Game with the Golden Apples, IV. The Princesses’ Khorovod, V. Infernal Dance. Performances of this suite must certainly have inspired Stravinsky to consider creating a new version for smaller orchestra, as the ensemble required to perform these movements was monstrous, including quadruple winds and horns, triple brass, a full battery of percussion, celesta, piano, three harps and a suggested minimum of sixty strings.

BERCEUSE TIRÉE DU CONTE-DANSÉ “L’OISEAU DE FEU.” (1912; pub. Jurgenson 1912; version for reduced orchestra with concert ending)
The question of a misprint or revision in the bassoon solo actually begins with this publication, not with the 1919 suite. Stravinsky completed and separately published revisions of the Berceuse and Finale first, and appended them to the other movements he reworked in 1918 and 1919 to complete the new suite. As few musicians living today have ever performed the Berceuse and Finale as printed by Jurgenson, and as so many have played them in their “second home,” it is natural to assume that the missing accidental in the triplet originated with the 1919 suite.

Stravinsky was wise to arrange the Berceuse first, as it hardly needed any adjustments to be accommodated by a smaller orchestra. Besides some very subtle changes in the high woodwind parts and the reduction of two harp parts into one, the only obvious audible difference to be found in this first arrangement (besides the bassoon note) is its ending, which closes on a simple tonic e flat minor chord. Upon the completion of the reduced orchestration of the Finale, this would later be replaced by the famous tremolando transition.⁶

![Figure 3 Excerpt from the Bassoon 1 orchestra part, 1912 version. © 1912 P. Jurgenson, Moscow.](image)

In both the orchestral score and the separate bassoon part (shown in Figure 3 above), at 1 bar before rehearsal 7 the bassoon solo has NO cautionary d natural sign at the start of the triplet on beat two. Neither does it have a cautionary flat sign, so how can anyone be certain whether this was an omission or a commission by the composer? The only way to know for sure would be to compare the printed version with the manuscript, which unfortunately has not been located by this author.

While Stravinsky somehow found time to finish the Berceuse reduction and have it published by 1912, he did not get around to completing the new orchestration of the Finale until 31 March 1915, three years later.⁷ It should be no surprise that it took him so long to do this, as he was busy changing the course of music in the meantime, composing not only Le Sacre du Printemps, but also the cantata Zvezdoliki, the Three Japanese Lyrics, the later sections of Le Rossignol, and the orchestrations of his song set Recollections of My Childhood! Still, a cash cow like Firebird was worth a bit of his precious time, and Stravinsky is perfectly clear about his reasons for undertaking the task: “Thus excerpts from Firebird will be accessible to orchestras that do not have the necessary instruments to present the work in full.”⁸ With this punishing schedule of
composition, is it any wonder he might have overlooked a missing accidental in the bassoon solo?

Proof that during the first decade after its publication Stravinsky probably still considered the alteration of the bassoon part a misprint comes from an examination of the first two recorded performances listed in the table at the end of this article, as well as the 1918 piano reduction, which all held to the d natural. In his recording with the “Orchestre Symphonique de Paris” and in the playing of the hand-punched Duo-Art piano roll, the bassoonist (in the first instance) and the composer-as-hole-puncher (in the second) both play d natural. Despite being made nine years after the 1919 suite’s completion, the music performed in the recording of 1928 is an amalgam of the original orchestration (movements 1-4) and the 1919 suite (5-8). At the time of this recording, Stravinsky clearly considered it necessary to correct the lowered note and restore it to d natural.9

SUITE DE L’OISEAU DE FEU POUR ORCHESTRE MOYEN (1919; pub. J. & W. Chester 1920)

Stravinsky finished his suite for “medium” or “regular” orchestra in April 1919.10 The title is misleading, as completing this suite involved more than simply reducing the orchestra size. During his legal battles for his rights to Firebird, he indignantly asserted the differences between the 1919 and the 1911 suites in a letter to Schott:

…he [Schott’s lawyer] has only to ask any conductor who has conducted both suites to know that this is not a simple reorchestration but a veritable recomposition.11

As soon as the 1919 suite began to receive performances, problems became apparent with the new edition. After a few years of conducting the suite and constantly correcting the many misprints, Stravinsky sent a frustrated letter to Henry Kling at J. & W. Chester lamenting that their version “is full of errors. It is my duty to tell you so.”12

It was hoped that examining the composer’s manuscript of the 1919 suite at the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris would finally bring the question of d or d flat to an end, proving once and for all whether the change was in the composer’s hand or simply one of the many errors mentioned by Stravinsky. This was not to be. On page 63, during the final moments of the Infernal Dance, one finds the words “Selon ancienne partition” (“According to the old score”) and on the next page there is no Berceuse and no Finale. This emphasizes the importance of the 1912 manuscript in our quest to find the definitive answer to the present question. That manuscript, however, cannot answer yet another question that poses itself from this point: what if the change was in fact a misprint, and rather than correct it, the composer chose to adopt it? Subsequent arrangements of the Berceuse begin to lend credence to that theory.
BERCEUSE AND FINALE FROM “L’OISEAU DE FEU” arranged for organ by Maurice Besly. (1922; pub. J. & W. Chester)

An item of particular relevance to this article is found in the Nadia Boulanger collection at the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris: an autographed copy of an arrangement of the Berceuse for organ solo, made not by Stravinsky but by Maurice Besly. In it, the transcription of the bassoon solo appears exactly as it does in the 1912/1919 versions, but with an added cautionary flat mark in parentheses in front of the triplet! This is the first time that a transcriber had entered the game, and Mr. Besly must have deemed the missing natural from the 1912 revision to be intentional on Stravinsky’s part, and confirmed it by adding an accidental to his arrangement. The only justification for including in this chronology an arrangement that was not made by the composer is to propose that Stravinsky might have corrected the note in question (if he was even aware of it) when he signed this copy:

Igor Stravinsky à Nadia Boulanger avec tous mes meilleurs compliments
Paris Sept/24

It may be appropriate at this point in the article, at the risk of adding even more confusion, to draw the reader’s attention to a second misprint/alteration that appears two bars earlier in the same solo. (See Figure 4, measure 2 above.) For some reason, the second beat of this bar appears in the 1919 suite, the 1945 suite and the 1922 organ
version as a quarter note d natural, not as two eighth notes d and b flat as in the original ballet. Could it be that the quarter note d natural was a misreading of the composer’s autograph? See Figure 1 at the opening of this article and notice how the eighth note d natural in the second measure seems separated from the beam that should join it to the second eighth note b flat. In the case of the organ arrangement, it may be that Maurice Besly copied both the quarter note mistake and the missing natural sign from the 1912/1919 versions, but why Stravinsky did not correct it in 1945 cannot be explained.\footnote{14}

BERCEUSE TIRÉE DU BALLET “L’OISEAU DE FEU” Transcription pour Violon et Piano par l’auteur (1926; pub. B. Schott’s Söhne 1929)

The first non-orchestral arrangement of the Berceuse made by the composer is in the original key of e flat minor, and in the equivalent measure of this work as that of the bassoon solo discussed in this article (measure 28 in the arrangement), the melody matches the original ballet version, and reads d natural at the triplet in question. A second parallel between this arrangement and the original is that the piano treble mirrors the high violin parts from the ballet, and a d natural appears in the piano on the second beat of the measure at hand, at the same time as the natural appears in the melody. Many people use this coordination of pitches as proof that the bassoon pitch MUST remain d natural or it would cause a clash, despite the frequency of dissonance in Stravinsky’s music in general. The second version for violin and piano, discussed below, will supply the composer’s response to that argument. Another important reason to quote this version in this article is to establish for the record that this is the last time the melody appears with the original pitch in a published version by the composer himself.

BERCEUSE FROM THE BALLET “THE FIREBIRD” Transcribed for Violin and Piano by the composer and Samuel Dushkin (1932; pub. B. Schott’s Söhne 1932)

In the early 1930’s, Stravinsky worked with the violinist Samuel Dushkin on his new Violin Concerto, as well as the Duo Concertante and a set of transcriptions of earlier works, which the two musicians planned to perform on upcoming tours. In the course of these work sessions, Dushkin presented his own transcription of the Berceuse to Stravinsky and recorded the composer’s reaction:

Once I thought I would surprise him by making an arrangement of the berceuse from “The Fire Bird.” After I had played it for him, he looked unhappy. I felt slightly hurt. “Don’t you like it?” I asked. “It sounds like
Kreisler’s arrangement of Rimsky-Korsakov’s ‘Chant Hindou,’” he said. “Well,” I said, “it is rather Oriental, isn’t it?” Stravinsky lowered his head and said sadly, “Yes, I’m afraid that’s the trouble with it.”

Dushkin’s story provides another glimpse into the love/hate relationship that had developed between the composer and this piece. Could it be that one of the contributing factors toward what Stravinsky wincingly acknowledged as “Oriental” was the augmented interval at just this moment in the Berceuse melody? It may very well have been the case, as in this arrangement the composer makes some important changes. First, he transposes it to a more violin-friendly key, e minor instead of the original e flat minor, and at the triplet which has been the focus of this article, Stravinsky adopts the new version from the suite, writing a d natural at the start of the triplet (the transposed equivalent of the bassoon’s d flat). He then retains the dissonant clash with the upper chromatics, writing a cautionary d sharp in both violin and piano treble on beat two, the parts that would have been played by the violins in the original. In other words, what is printed as d flat in the bassoon and d natural in the violins in the suite, here appears transposed as a d natural in the piano clashing against a d sharp in the violin and the piano treble.

Figure 6 1932 vln/pno transcription, mm. 25-28. © 1932 by B. Schott’s Söhne.

Stravinsky affirms this change at the end of the arrangement with a reprise of the melody with the lowered pitch, this time in the violin.

Figure 7 1932 vln/pno transcription, mm. 37-41. © 1932 B. Schott’s Söhne.
THE FIREBIRD Ballet Suite 1945 for Orchestra (1945; pub. Leeds Music Corporation, New York for USA and B. Schott’s Söhne, London for all other countries 1946)

What was speculation in the 1912 and 1919 versions can now be stated with fact: by the time of the 1945 suite, Stravinsky had not only adopted the new version using d flat, but he also inserted a cautionary flat sign in front of the note in question, something that would be otherwise unnecessary thanks to the e flat minor key signature. The d naturals in the first and second violins remain, proving that this clash did not in and of itself necessitate a corresponding d natural in the bassoon melody. As in the original 1912 reduction, this change in the bassoon solo is the ONLY alteration Stravinsky makes in the entire orchestra in this movement of the suite, other than to reassign the second flute part back to the first flute as in the ballet, which was changed in 1919, and to replace the original slurs in the violin parts at Rehearsal 155 that went missing in the 1919 suite.

![Reh. 155, 1945 suite. © renewed 1974 MCA, Inc. MCA Music, New York for USA, B. Schott’s Söhne, Mainz and Schott & Co Ltd, London for all other countries.](image)

In what seems like a little joke between the composer and all those bassoonists who ever questioned this note change, Stravinsky adds an optional concert ending for the Berceuse with a return of the bassoon solo (158bis in the 1945 score). The bassoon enters
one last time with the melody, hesitates with a rest in the third bar, and in the fourth finally brings the melody and the piece to a close via the d natural, using it as the leading tone to finish the work in its tonic key of e flat minor. It seems as if the composer is saying to bassoonists everywhere: “You want your d natural? Here’s your d natural!”

Figure 9 Concert ending of Berceuse, 1945 suite. © renewed 1974 MCA, Inc. MCA Music, New York for USA, B. Schott’s Söhne, Mainz and Schott & Co Ltd, London for all other countries.

CHRONOLOGY OF STRAVINSKY’S RECORDED PERFORMANCES

Arguments about the printed pitch can be won or lost only on the strength of corroborating evidence from recorded performances by the composer. The tables below list the known recordings that Stravinsky made either as conductor, pianist, or in the case of the piano rolls, as technician.17 These include studio recordings from 1928 through 1967 and several live recordings that are now commercially available or that are available through archive services. The version performed is listed in the first column, the performers in the second, and the recording information in the third. When known, the original recording information is followed by label and catalog numbers from modern reissues. Finally, the fourth column lists the pitch played at the moment corresponding with the original triplet, in whichever version is performed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Orchestra or performers (all conducted by Stravinsky unless otherwise noted)</th>
<th>Original recording company, recording dates, and current release information</th>
<th>Note played in Berceuse, m. 27, beat 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911 Suite plus Berceuse and Finale</td>
<td>Orchestre Symphonique (de Paris)/Orchestre des Concerts Straram</td>
<td>Columbia 8-10 Nov 1928&lt;br&gt;Pearl GEMM CD 9334; EMI 54607</td>
<td>d natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Performers</td>
<td>Recordings</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Ballet, player piano version</td>
<td>Stravinsky’s hand-punched Duo-Art/Pianola piano roll</td>
<td>Created ca. 1923-1928. Klavier Records KCD-11038; Dal Segno 2001 DSPRCD007; Christopherus Verlag SCGLV LP</td>
<td>d natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berceuse, 2nd version for violin and piano</td>
<td>Samuel Dushkin, violin; Igor Stravinsky, piano</td>
<td>Columbia, Studio Albert, Paris 6 June or 6 April (?) 1933 EMI CDS 7 54607 2</td>
<td>Transposed equivalent of d flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 1945</td>
<td>Philharmonic-Symphony Society of New York</td>
<td>Columbia 28 Jan 1946 Pearl GEMM CDS 9292, LYS 271-273</td>
<td>d flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 1945</td>
<td>Philharmonic-Symphony Society of New York</td>
<td>CBS “Invitation to Music Series” 30 Jan 1946</td>
<td>Not located by NY Philharmonic archivists, but most likely the same as the Columbia recording, made two days earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 1945</td>
<td>Boston Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td>BSO broadcast 23 Feb 1946, Symphony Hall Boston</td>
<td>d flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 1945</td>
<td>French National Radio Orchestra</td>
<td>Live broadcast on Swiss Radio 25 Sept 1956</td>
<td>Not received in time for inclusion in this article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 1945</td>
<td>BBC Philharmonic, Royal Festival Hall,</td>
<td>10 Dec 1958 BBC Transcription Service discs - 98562-66</td>
<td>d flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Ballet</td>
<td>Columbia Symphony</td>
<td>Columbia Records, Hollywood 23-25 Jan 1961 Sony Classical SM3K 46291</td>
<td>d flat (the composer retroactively changed the note, even in the complete ballet score)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 1965 concert in Warsaw is the only known recorded performance conducted or performed by the composer since 1928 in which a d natural can be heard at the triplet. The concert included the Variations and *The Rite of Spring*, conducted by Robert Craft, plus the Symphony of Psalms and the Berceuse and Finale from *Firebird*, conducted by Stravinsky, but the author could not confirm with Robert Craft which version of the Berceuse was used in that performance. Other than that live concert in Warsaw, every single recorded performance by Stravinsky of the Berceuse from 1933 through 1967, either for orchestra or in arrangement for violin and piano, contains the altered version of the original solo. Can there be any clearer demonstration which version the composer preferred?

In an interview published in Mina Lederman’s journal *Modern Music*, Stravinsky admitted to a quirk of his personality that must be acknowledged if anyone, bassoonist or not, is to make sense of the above chronology:

> People always expect the wrong thing of me. They think they have pinned me down. Then all of a sudden—au revoir…It is not up to me to explain or to judge my music. That is not my role. I have to write it—that is all…¹⁸

Stravinsky lived and composed in a constant state of forward evolution. Like the Soldier in *Histoire du soldat*, he seems to have had a phobia about moving backward or heading back home, even figuratively. The meticulous changes he felt obligated to apply to so many of his works will always frustrate those who preferred the earlier versions. But if one of our tasks as musicians is to bring to life the text handed to us by a composer, should we not respect the elder composer as much as the younger? Be it a revised Octet, a corrected *Sacre*, or a fourth-generation *Firebird*, our charge as performers is, as always, to recreate what the composer has entrusted to us. In the case of the *Firebird* Berceuse, what Stravinsky left us with was not textual confusion, but two versions of the same beautiful solo. We bassoonists can live with that.

¹ Reprinted with permission, University of British Columbia Library, Rare Books and Special Collections, H. Colin Slim Collection, item #48.


The manuscript of the first piano reduction was completed 21 March 1910 and published by Jurgenson in July 1911. A second, much revised version was completed 6 December 1918 and dedicated to Vladimir Vasilievich Yuzhin. The manuscript of the first version and an annotated proof of the second are held in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York. See *Correspondence II*. 219n.

The same chordal ending appeared first in the 1910 piano reduction of the ballet, and in that version Stravinsky included an optional continuation if using the reduction for ballet rehearsals. *Stravinsky in Pictures and Documents*. 59.

Stravinsky to Jurgenson, 24 July 1914. *Correspondence II*. 225.

See Louis Cyr, notes to the Pearl GEMM compact disc *Igor Stravinsky: The Rite of Spring/The Firebird*. GEMM CD 9334.

Letter from Stravinsky to N. G. Struve, 6 April 1919. *Correspondence II*. 226.


Bibliothèque nationale de France code Vmg. 22926 (2)

That is, unless Stravinsky consciously adopted the same mistake as Besly. Robert Craft confirms that Stravinsky worked on the 1945 suite by consulting not his own manuscript, but rather the pirated Kalmus score available in the US at the time. *Stravinsky in Pictures and Documents* 378.


This is not the last time the composer would go on record stating his dissatisfaction with the sound of this particular interval. In a copy of Ciro Stadio’s *Studi d’Orchestra per Fagotto* (Edizioni Ricordi 1932, reprinted 1951) that belonged to Lewis Hugh Cooper and which was donated to the University of Michigan, there is a note in Cooper’s hand on page 77, where the Berceuse solo appears. There is an arrow pointing to the first note of the triplet and a flat sign marked over that note. The note reads: “Natural in original score, changed to flat by Strawinsky [sic] shouting ‘Too Exotic’ at Philly rehearsal (according to Sol Schoenbach ‘Too Bad’)”

The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Jerry Young of Austin, Texas in supplying some of the archival broadcasts and live recordings. Thanks are also due to Richard Wandel, archivist for the New York Philharmonic, for information on the 1946 concerts and recordings. For a complete annotated list of live and studio recordings, see Philip Stuart, *Igor Stravinsky—The Composer in the Recording Studio: A Comprehensive Discography*. (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991).

*Stravinsky in Pictures and Documents*. 378.