

PERSONNEL

VIOLIN I

*Miya Saito-Beckman
Teagan Roberts
Bashar Matti
Gillian Frederick
Anika Hirai
Ellie Van Hattem
Mary Evans
Cilka Daniels
Valerie Nelson
Chris Ives

VIOLIN II

*Melanie Haskins
Elliot Bliss
Michelle Brunader
Kelsey Hollenbaugh
Camille Barnisin
Madeline Chu
Elizabeth Thornton
Madeline Howard
Megan Hermansen
Izabel Austin

VIOLA

*Kasey Calebaugh
Nicole Mowry
Kalie DeBolt
Ricky Waterman
Lauren Culver
Rubi Yan
Ziyun Wei

CELLO

*Elizabeth Gergel
Hendrik Mobley
Clair Dietz
Nicole Long
Connor Balderson
Eleanor Rochester
Kevin Hendrix

BASS

*Yixao Pan
Aaron Green
Richie Garceau
Mario Rodriguez

FLUTE

*Linda Jenkins
Audrey Dutra
Annabel MacDonald

OBOE

*Emily Foltz
*Megan Anderson

CLARINET

*Esther Kwak
Jackson Tu

BASSOON

*Bronson York
*Daniel Yim

HORN

*Andrea Kennard
*Shae Wirth
Amrit Gupta
Sean Brennan

TRUMPET

*Casey Riley
Joseph Vranas

TROMBONE

*Talon Smith
Nick Ivers
Jon Caponetto

TUBA

*Juan Valdez

PERCUSSION

Aaron Howard
Matt Gley
Kelsey Molinari
Daniel Suprenant

* = Principal

Recording of UO concerts and events without prior permission is prohibited.

Performances sponsored by the UO School of Music and Dance are sometimes video recorded and photographed for a variety of uses, including both live simulcast and digital archive on the UO website, or for publicity and publications. Images of audience members may be included in these recordings and photos. By attending this event, audience members imply approval for the use of their image by the UO and the School of Music and Dance.

Season 116, Program 59



UNIVERSITY OF
OREGON

SCHOOL OF MUSIC AND DANCE

University of Oregon **Symphony Orchestra**

Dr. David Jacobs, Conductor
Evan Harger, Graduate Conductor

*Concerto Competition Winner
Eduardo Moreira*

Beall Concert Hall
Thursday, April 27 | 7:30 p.m.



Piano Concerto No. 2 in G Minor Sergei Prokofiev (1891 - 1953)

Evan Harger, Conductor
Eduardo Moreira, Concerto Competition Winner

INTERMISSION

Symphony No. 5 in E Minor Pyotr Illyich Tchaikovsky (1840 - 1893)



Eduardo Moreira was born and raised in Porto Alegre (south Brazil), where he started having piano lessons at the age of 6. He graduated in music from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul and has his Master of Music degree from the University of Strasbourg, France, where he lived for 6 years. He also has a Diploma of Specialization in Piano Performance (with the highest honors) and Chamber Music from the Conservatory of Music and Dance of Strasbourg. His recitals include several cities in France and Brazil. He has also played as a soloist with the Orchestras of Porto Alegre and Bahia. He won several prizes in national piano competitions (Brazil). He is a third year doctoral student at the University of Oregon under the direction of Dr. Alexandre Dossin.

The idea of an “unspoken program” was certainly in the composer’s mind as he sat down to compose this symphony; in the spring of 1888 he noted a possible approach: “Intr[oduction]. Complete resignation before Fate – or, what is the same thing, the inscrutable designs of Providence.” Although he eventually dropped the specific programmatic references, it is clear that this symphony projects some kind of dramatic significance. The broad outlines are made clear by a recurring idea that has over the years adopted the composer’s nomenclature and become known as the “fate” motive; its original ominous character undergoes various metamorphoses, emerging triumphant in the score’s concluding pages.

Low strings and woodwinds introduce the fate motive at the opening; it is followed by a theme reminiscent of a Slavic folk tune. The movement presents a wealth of themes, and even the development presents material not previously introduced.

The second movement’s luscious main theme was adapted for a popular love song; Tchaikovsky’s skillful orchestration, however, lifts the mood from sentimentality to high Romanticism. The movement’s principal melody is presented in a memorable solo by the horn, followed by other appealing woodwind solos.

The third movement is the most distinctive, a graceful waltz in which Tchaikovsky again exploits a wide range of instrumental color. The finale brings the emotional drama of the symphony to a climax. After opening with the fate motive, Tchaikovsky turns to the movement’s militant main subject; the tension mounts (one New York critic referred to “slaughter, dire and bloody... across the storm-driven score”) until a newly affirmative version of the fate motive bursts forth in the magnificent final moments.

— *Program Notes by Susan Key*

Piano Concerto No. 2 in G Minor Sergei Prokofiev (1891 - 1953)

Prokofiev wrote his first two piano concertos while he was still a student at the Saint Petersburg Conservatory. He was an unusually precocious young musician—he composed his first piano piece at the age of five and at nine he was playing Beethoven sonatas. By the time he was admitted to the conservatory in 1904, at the age of thirteen, he had already written two operas, a symphony, a violin sonata, and several piano pieces. Prokofiev quickly grew bored and disillusioned with the stodgy school atmosphere; he was an unusually rebellious student, and he did poorly in his classes with Rimsky-Korsakov and Liadov, the two most distinguished teachers at the conservatory. With his first two piano concertos, Prokofiev began to assert his musical personality and to distance himself from the prevailing reactionary tastes.

Prokofiev’s first piano concerto, completed in 1912, helped to establish his reputation as an enfant terrible; it was discussed by the leading critics in both Saint Petersburg and Moscow, who carped about its superficial bravura and exhibitionistic, “acrobatic” technique. The second piano concerto Prokofiev began the following year was, in part, an attempt to compose a work of greater depth, although it requires even greater virtuosity. (Prokofiev had become a pianist of exceptional brilliance and power during his conservatory days, and he wrote both works to perform himself.)

When Prokofiev came to this country in 1918, he left the score of his Second Piano Concerto in his Petrograd apartment, where it eventually was used by the new tenants as fuel “to cook an omelet,” as the composer’s friends later informed him. In 1923, then living in Paris, Prokofiev decided to reconstruct the score from memory. “I have so completely rewritten the Second Concerto that it might almost be considered the Fourth,” he wrote to a friend that year. But in his autobiography he claimed that he had merely made “the contrapuntal development slightly more complicated, the form more graceful—less square,” and that he “improved” both the piano and orchestral parts. We’ll never know how different the original 1913 concerto is from the one he introduced in Paris in May 1924.

But then, in a city used to being at the center of the avant-garde, it caused little stir.

The Second Piano Concerto has four movements, unconventionally arranged—the last three offer little variety of tempo and there's no “slow movement” at all. The first movement begins with a delicate, expansive lyrical theme in the piano; it's the only one of its kind in the work. Prokofiev ingeniously transforms much of the standard development and recapitulation sections into a monumental, unabashedly virtuosic cadenza for solo piano (he marks the climax “colossale”). By the time the orchestra reenters, the movement is practically over.

The scherzo is a fleet perpetuum mobile for the pianist, playing nonstop sixteenth notes in unison octaves throughout. (The orchestra adds terse, colorful comments, but stays out of the soloist's way.) The subsequent Intermezzo, which doesn't offer the relief its title traditionally suggests, is a fierce and sometimes grotesque march over a repeating bass line. The finale is more of a battle between piano and orchestra, the former resorting to full-fisted chords to gain the upper hand. Prokofiev makes room for a leisurely interlude with a simple folklike melody and another florid cadenza before the “relentlessly discordant” chords that left the Pavlovsk audience, apparently unaccustomed to healthy harmonic daring, frozen with fright.

— *Program Notes by the Chicago Symphony Orchestra*

Symphony No. 5 in E Minor Pyotr Illyich Tchaikovsky (1840 - 1893)

Tchaikovsky's deeply felt nationalistic sentiments bound him closely to his contemporaries in the twilight of Czarist Russia. Yet – ironically – his musical expression of the “national element” placed him at the center of a bitter debate. While the central European musical world in the late 19th century argued over the relative merits of Wagner and Brahms, Russian musical society was marked by hostility between an amateur group of nationalists, the “Mighty Handful,”

and conservatives such as Anton and Nicholas Rubinstein, who wanted Russian music to reflect European techniques and standards. Though he drew inspiration from Russia's rich vein of folk music, Tchaikovsky embraced his European training and rejected the attitudes of the nationalists as simplistic: “The young Petersburg composers are very gifted but they are all impregnated with the most horrible presumptuousness and a purely amateur conviction of their superiority over all other musicians in the universe,” he once grumbled. But shortly after the premiere of his Fifth Symphony in November of 1888, he wrote to his brother: “On Saturday I took part in a Russian Symphony concert. I am very glad that I could prove, in public, that I do not belong to any particular party.”

The public dimension was one to which Tchaikovsky was very sensitive; as the country's foremost composer, and as a conductor with an international reputation, Tchaikovsky was closely scrutinized. In an 1882 letter to a Russian critic he argued: “It is not important that European audiences applauded me but that all Russian music and Russian art were received with enthusiasm in my person. The Russians ought to know that a Russian musician has held the banner of our art high in the big European centers.”

Composed shortly after a long European tour, the Fifth Symphony is typical of the artistic balance Tchaikovsky struck; it is not explicitly nationalistic, but a distinctively Russian flavor pervades many of the themes.

There is also a related, but deeper, artistic issue in the work. As Leon Plantinga points out, Tchaikovsky's personal approach to musical meaning often conflicted with the strictures of his formal training: “He struggled ceaselessly with the opposed demands of formal traditions he had learned in the conservatory and his own predilection for an emotional and expressive progression of events corresponding to an unspoken program.”