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INTRODUCTION

The primary goals of this project were to assemble, rehearse, and conduct an ensemble in two performances of Lukas Foss’s cantata *The Prairie*; to publish a document detailing the numerous inconsistencies that exist between the score and parts (thus facilitating future performances); and to create and sustain a new project-based community that performed an important choral-orchestral work at a high artistic level. This piece was selected because it is representative of mid-century American compositional aesthetics (an interest of the author) and because its neglect over the past seventy years suggests that it needs a champion.

*The Prairie* (composed in 1942, published in 1944) dates from Lukas Foss’s early period, when his writing was tonal and conservative in harmonic language. The accessible but sophisticated music—similar in style to Aaron Copland’s works of the same time—is capable of bringing together the novice concertgoer and the seasoned classical music aficionado in a shared, effective listening experience. The imagery of the text—a poem by Pulitzer Prize-winning writer Carl Sandburg—can easily connect listeners to America’s natural beauty, to the joys and struggles of our American history, and to the promises of tomorrow. *The Prairie* was hailed at its premiere, but research into the work’s performance history shows only a handful of performances in its seventy years of existence.

Of immediate and enduring use to the choral community is the compilation of inconsistencies between the score and parts, plus revised parts (including re-written sections of movement IV drafted by Andrew Clark, presently the director of choral activities at Harvard University) that may be copied and distributed to orchestra members in future
performances. It is hoped that these resources will expedite the rehearsal process and encourage choral conductors to program this work.

Through this project, we formed a new community made up of adult members of the Maryland tri-state area (including Washington, D.C. and Virginia) and students at the University of Maryland, plus myriad logistical supporters whose assistance brought the project to life. We chose to rehearse and perform the work in two locations—on campus at the University of Maryland and in the Capitol Hill neighborhood of Washington, D.C.—to honor and invest in the “home turfs” of both geographical segments of the artistic community.

Specific to this project, a significant challenge was to create community among chorus members who do not usually sing with each other and who are likely to sing together only for this project. A guiding premise stated that the sense of community one feels—especially in a choral ensemble—contributes positively to an individual singer’s willingness to be vulnerable, to explore new ideas and skills in music-making, to listen around him or her, and to connect meaningfully with others for the greater good of the music being learned.

In the exploration of community, we endeavored to welcome, nurture, and sustain the new group of singers that constituted the chorus. A shortage of time and insufficient sociological training prevented the full realization of community-building, but the experiences documented in this project can provide the choral community with a template that may be revised and expanded to facilitate community-building in other project-based choruses in other communities. The project-based chorus may be an increasingly attractive vehicle for the performance of large-scale choral works, especially as a performance
opportunity for singers who do not have time to rehearse for an entire season with an established ensemble.

This paper does not delve into the biographies of Lukas Foss or Carl Sandburg, as the scholarly research on both men is considerable and beyond the scope of this project. The author directs readers to the bibliography, which includes several valuable biographical resources that were consulted as part of the score study and rehearsal preparations for this project.
CHAPTER 1

THE PRAIRIE

*The Prairie* is a choral-orchestral cantata written in 1942 by Lukas Foss (1922–2009) to a poem by Carl Sandburg (1878–1967). The work is approximately fifty-three minutes in length, and is scored for SATB soli, mixed chorus, and orchestra. G. Schirmer is the original and current publisher of the work: *The Prairie* was first published in 1944 and was revised in 1976. The orchestral score and parts are available for rent from G. Schirmer. The piano-vocal score (octavo) is now out of print, although it, too, is available for rent from G. Schirmer.

*The Prairie* was premiered May 14–15, 1944, at Town Hall in New York City, in a program that also included one of Brahms’s Op. 29 motets and the *Six Chansons* of Paul Hindemith (one of Foss’s composition teachers).¹ The performance, conducted by Robert Shaw, featured Shaw’s Collegiate Chorale and soloists Patricia Neway (soprano), Alice Howland (alto), Lucius Metz (tenor), and Elwyn Carter (bass).² The 35-member orchestra³ was comprised of instrumentalists from the NBC and CBS Concert Orchestras.⁴ The *New York Times* review of the premiere hailed the work as the “pièce de résistance” of the program,⁵ and praised Foss for the sensitivity of his melodic line and text setting (noting that the “meter and Whitmanesque irregularity of meter [in Sandburg’s

⁴ Perone, *loc. cit.*
⁵ Downes, *loc. cit.*
poem] is not easy to give a vocal setting”), “harmonic flexibility,” ability to “suggest atmosphere by a few notes on a solo instrument,” driving rhythms, and the sincerity, earnestness, and “dramatic impulse” of his writing.6

Foss’s cantata was awarded the New York Music Critics’ Circle Citation for most important new American choral work of 1944, and was hailed for its “musicianship, imagination, and direct expressive powers of no mean order.”7 When Artur Rodzinski conducted the work eight months later (on January 18, 1945) with the New York Philharmonic, the Westminster Choir, and soloists Dorothy Kirsten (soprano), Nan Merriman (alto), William Harris (tenor), and Todd Duncan (bass), the $4000 cost of producing The Prairie was compared in scope to Beethoven’s Choral Symphony and hailed as “the most ambitious American work ever to be put on at Carnegie Hall.”8 The Columbia Broadcasting System’s subsequent broadcast of The Prairie (on January 21, 1945) brought Foss nationwide attention,9 and reviews of Rodzinski’s performance suggest that this work put Foss on the map, pronouncing “Composer Foss a promising young man”10 and noting the twenty-three-year-old already possessed the technique and fluency of a modern composer.11 Unfortunately, the work has enjoyed only occasional performances over the past seventy years: far fewer than reviewers of the mid-1940s might have expected, and scarcer than this beautiful and well-crafted work deserves.

---
6 Downes, loc. cit.
10 “Champagne & Cornbread,” Time (29 January 1945), 75.
The poem

The textual basis of Foss’s cantata is the poem of the same name from Sandburg’s collection *Cornhuskers*, published by Henry Holt in 1918. Sandburg intended for this second book of poems to sound “very American,”

12 drawing inspirations for *Cornhuskers* from his boyhood home of Galesburg, Illinois, a “microcosm of nineteenth-century American life,” recalled for its “robust dependence on the burgeoning railroads, its avid attention to politics, its reverence for the powers of education and religion, and its population of pioneers and immigrants.”

13 Foss called Sandburg’s poem “a new expression of an old faith drawn from the native soil. The protagonist, simply, is the prairie, but through this poem the prairie grows until it becomes the symbol for the all-embracing principle of growth itself.”

14 The poem captures not only the spirit of place, but of time, both geological (e.g., “Here the water went down, the icebergs slid with gravel”) and anthropological (e.g., “in the years when the red and the white men met”).

15 The prairie personified by Sandburg is “timeless,” “history’s ultimate witness,” and “the great philosopher of war, removed from human pain, able to grandly transform the ugly into the beautiful.”

16 In references to battles from the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, and World War I, Sandburg sets up the “abiding peace of the prairie as a welcome antithesis to the man-made clamor of war.”

13 Niven, *op. cit.*, 5.
14 Cited in Goss, *op. cit.*, 493.
16 Yannella, *loc. cit.*
17 Niven, *op. cit.*, 306.
Sandburg’s place among great American poets has invited contrasts and comparisons to Walt Whitman (1819–1892). Sandburg’s contemporary and fellow poet Alfred Kreymborg (1883–1966) contrasts the two men in this way:

Whitman rose at the birth of the nation; Sandburg grew up in the midst of its vast development and vaster braggadocio, and saw that much of the vastness was hollow, many of the claims superficial. His view of the nation is fully as patriotic as Walt’s. No land is in need of skepticism more than successful America.¹⁸

Philip Yannella, past Director of American Studies at Temple University and author of The Other Carl Sandburg, characterizes “The Prairie” as Sandburg’s “most Whitmanesque poem to date,” referring to poetic devices common to both writers. These include cataloguing scenes and people, recasting the ugly or mundane as objects of beauty, and directly addressing the reader.¹⁹

“The Prairie” also continues the use of constructs seen/heard in Chicago Poems, the collection that preceded Cornhuskers by two years (also published by Henry Holt). Some of the words found in both “The Prairie” and in multiple entries of the earlier Chicago Poems are “prairie,” “dust,” and “tomorrow” (presented not only as a point in time, but as an ideal, as in the poem “A Fence”). Chicago Poems’ “Mill Doors” presages lines 129 of “The Prairie” in its poignant use of the phrase “never come back.” “Child of the Romans” is a beautiful example of the type of contrasting images heard throughout “The Prairie.” The poem “Mamie” provides a description of small town life similar to the scenes in “The Prairie” (heard in movement III of the Foss). A sympathetic interest in the history and lives of Native Americans is heard in lines 53–56 of “The Prairie,” as well as in the short poem “A Coin,” from Chicago Poems. The idea of communication across the

¹⁸ Cited in Niven, op. cit., 362.
¹⁹ Yannella, op. cit., 103.
centuries features prominently in the poem “Two Neighbors” as well as in lines 58–70 of “The Prairie” (heard in movement V of the Foss).20

Sandburg’s free-verse style and realistic subject matter, as presented in Chicago Poems and Cornhuskers, established him as “a poet of national stature,”21 and he was recognized with half of the second annual Poetry Society of America’s award for best American book of poetry (the predecessor to the Pulitzer Prize) in 1919.22

The cantata

Foss wrote the cantata The Prairie a year after reading Sandburg’s “The Prairie.” Although he had never seen the western prairies, he felt spiritually connected to the vast open country depicted in Sandburg’s poem.23 He intended the work to represent “something ‘native’ to the United States,” but he also wanted it to “transcend a narrowly geographical understanding of the prairie.”24 The “earthy and almost religious approach” of Sandburg’s epic poem provided Foss the perfect text to create a large choral-orchestral work “based on the American soil and spirit.”25

As a newly naturalized American citizen, the Berlin-born Foss intended the work to be an expression of love for his new homeland. In explaining the overtly “American” sound of his cantata, Foss explained: “I was in love. I had discovered America.”26

20 Carl Sandburg, Selected Poems (New York: Gramercy Books, 1992). The specific Chicago Poems quoted here—as well as other poems by Sandburg—are contained in this volume.
21 Niven, op. cit., 334.
22 Niven, loc. cit. The award was shared with Margaret Widdemer (1884–1978), author of Old Road to Paradise.
23 Goss, loc. cit.
25 Goss, loc. cit.
musical vocabulary of the “American sound”—shared by 1940s-era compositions of such contemporaries as Aaron Copland (1900–1990), David Diamond (1915–2005), Ross Lee Finney (1906–1997), and Roy Harris (1898–1979)—is made up of “broad, sweeping melodies,” angular ostinati, and open sonorities such as fourths, fifths, and octaves that are “suggestive of vast open spaces.” While allusions to Copland are heard throughout The Prairie (notably the brass fanfares which open and conclude the cantata), folk song parodies—a feature of Copland’s expressive language—are not. (It is notable that Foss did not include line 24 of Sandburg’s poem—with its references to “Yankee Doodle,” “Old Dan Tucker,” and “Turkey in the Straw”—in his cantata text.)

Foss set a little over half of the 143 lines of the original poem: the composer omitted certain lines and entire sections, he combined and divided others, and he exchanged the order of paragraphs and verses. Examining these alterations, Beth Levy, in Frontier Figures: American Music and the Mythology of the American West, suggests:

No doubt some of Foss’s omissions were necessary for economy: omitting the thirty lines after the text for movement V, and the thirty lines between those that end movement III and those of movement VIc allowed Foss to keep his cantata under one hour in length. But aspects of these long cuts, and other, shorter deletions, suggest that Foss was also interested in modifying Sandburg’s prairie to fit his own vision.28

Levy’s last assertion is supported by an essay Foss wrote in 1963, in which he described his approach to setting texts:

[M]y finding a text beautiful is not enough. It has to be something I can live with, day in, day out. Nor do I seem able to set a text in a straight manner, the way the poet wrote it. I like to ‘play’ with a text... This seemingly highhanded manner of dealing with the text has always been my way of working with words. Perhaps I am a frustrated poet at heart, or perhaps it is just the feeling that a composer does

---

27 Perone, op. cit., 3.
28 Levy, op. cit., 171.
not merely add music to a text, he must ‘use’ the text. He must have the courage to alter, even at the risk of spoiling. The poem will continue to exist in the form the poet gave it; in the new musical form it will serve a purpose—in short, it will serve.29

When Foss wrote the above statement, the premiere of *The Prairie* was twenty years behind him, and he was flush with the confidence befitting a well-established composer and conductor. However, as a twenty-year-old unknown composer, Foss could not take for granted the use of—let alone the reconstruction of—Sandburg’s copyrighted poem. The composer had already begun composing *The Prairie* when he wrote to Sandburg, imploring him for permission to use the poem in its adapted format.30 Sandburg supported Foss’s interpretation, writing back: “You have revitalized the old poem.”31 He then left the matter up to the publisher, but advocated for the young composer, writing: “Give the young man a break. It seems he has approached the music in the same sporting way in which I wrote the poem.”32

*The Prairie* is representative of Foss’s self-described early period, extending to the late 1950s. As such, the work demonstrates these five characteristics: (1) traditional/neo-classical forms and textures comprise the structure; (2) motives are carefully developed; (3) energetic rhythms are consistently used; (4) melodies emphasize the text; and (5) harmonies are tonal.33 Foss constructed his cantata in seven movements, the sixth in three parts, for a total of nine sections. The first and last movements are reserved for the human storyteller and the inner movements are for the voice of the prairie.34 The tenor soloist takes the part of the poet, speaking; the chorus is “the Prairie, the earth, which

---

30 Goss, *loc. cit.*  
31 Levy, *loc. cit.*  
32 Cited in Levy, *loc. cit.*  
34 Levy, *op. cit.*, 173.
buries the dead, which sees cities growing.”

The composer’s own notes on the themes and structures are reproduced below:

The opening movement [Movement I “I was born on the Prairie”], which has the nature of a prologue, speaks of the prairie as we are accustomed to visualize it. The author, in a pastoral tenor solo, sings of open valleys and far horizons, and the music breathes fresh air.

After this pastoral introduction, a fugue is heard in the orchestra [Movement II “Dust of men”], above which the chorus takes up a new theme in the manner of a chorale. This is the voice of the prairie: “I am here when the cities are gone. I am here before the cities come... I am dust of men... I who have seen the red births and the red deaths of sons and daughters, I take peace or war, I say nothing and wait.”

As a complete contrast, a folk-like movement [Movement III “They are mine”] follows, but the melodies remain original throughout the work, no native tunes having been used. With the re-entry of the chorus, the prairie becomes “mother of men, waiting.” Then [in Movement IV “When the red and the white men met,”] the author reaches far back into the past and we see the cities rising on the prairie, out of the prairie, while the chorus chants of the years when the red and the white man met. [In Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years,” the bass soloist] calls out: “To a man across a thousand years I offer a handshake; I say to him: ‘Brother, make the story short, for the stretch of a thousand years is short.’” In rugged 5/4 and 7/4 rhythms follows what may be styled the industrial section, ending with a fugue for male voices on the words: “What brothers these in the dark of a thousand years.”

A lyrical intermezzo brings us back to the prairie. This consists of a short a cappella chorus [Movement VIa “Cool prayers”], a soprano song [Movement VIb “O prairie girl”], and a scherzando duet [Movement VIc “Songs Hidden in Eggs”]. These are held together by a dreamy little shepherd’s lay, a nostalgic woodwind refrain of the prairie.

The tenor’s voice introduces the seventh and last section [Movement VII “To-morrow”], and everyone joins in the final hymn to the future, expressing the healthy and sunny optimism unique to this country: “I speak of new cities and new people. I tell you the past is a bucket of ashes... I tell you there is nothing in the world, only an ocean of tomorrows.”

Thus, having opened to us the past and the present, the prairie announces the future, “Tomorrow is a day.”

For in-depth structural analyses of The Prairie, the author recommends Bruce Sparrow Browne’s 1976 dissertation on Foss’s choral music, Eldonna May’s 2005 paper

---

35 Foss, op. cit., 7.

The poem and the cantata text side-by-side

Below is the complete text of Sandburg’s poem, shown side-by-side with the corresponding measure numbers where each line of text is found in Foss’s cantata. Omitted sections of the poem are indicated in italics and within brackets. Of special note is Foss’s amalgamation of two distinct sections of the poem (lines 38–46 and 95–99)—and the reordering of those lines—to form the text for movement III “They are mine.”

“The Prairie” by Carl Sandburg

1 I was born on the prairie and the milk of its wheat, the red of its clover, the eyes of its women, gave me a song and a slogan.

2 Here the water went down, the icebergs slid with gravel, the gaps and the valleys hissed, and the black loam came, and the yellow sandy loam . . .

3 [Here between the sheds of the Rocky Mountains and the Appalachians,] here now a morning star fixes a fire sign over the timber claims and cow pastures, the corn belt, the cotton belt, the cattle ranches.

4 Here the gray geese go five hundred miles and back with a wind under their wings honking the cry for a new home.

5 Here I know I will hanker after nothing so much as one more sunrise or a sky moon of fire doubled to a river moon of water.

The Prairie by Lukas Foss

Movement I “I was born on the Prairie” (tenor solo)

mm. 8–25

mm. 37–48, 96–117

mm. 49–60, 127–151

mm. 60–83

mm. 156–169
6 The prairie sings to me in the forenoon
and I know in the night I rest easy in the
prairie arms, on the prairie heart.

* * *

7 After the sunburn of the day
8 handling a pitchfork at a hayrack,
9 after the eggs and biscuit and coffee,
10 the pearl-gray haystacks
11 in the gloaming
12 are cool prayers
13 to the harvest hands.

[In the city among the walls the overland
passenger train is choked and the pistons
hiss and the wheels curse.
On the prairie the overland flits on phan-
tom wheels and the sky and the soil be-
tween them muffle the pistons and cheer the
wheels.]

* * *

14 I am here when the cities are gone.
15 I am here before the cities come.
16 I nourished the lonely men on horses.
17 I will keep the laughing men who ride
iron.
18 I am dust of men.

[The running water babbled to the deer,
the cottontail, the gopher.
You came in wagons, making the streets
and schools,
Kin of the ax and rifle, kin of the plow
and horse,
Singing Yankee Doodle, Old Dan Tucker,
Turkey in the Straw,
You in the coonskin cap at the log house
door hearing a lone wolf howl,
You at a sod house door reading the bliz-
zards and chinooks let loose from Medicine

mm. 172–187

Movement VIa “Cool prayers”
(SATB chorus)
mm. 14–16, 20–22
mm. 16–18
mm. 18–20
mm. 22–24
mm. 24–28
mm. 28–29, 30–31, 33–34
mm. 29–30, 31–32, 34–35

Movement II “Dust of men”
(solo quartet, SATB chorus)
mm. 88–92, 115–19
mm. 93–97, 119–23
mm. 98–101, 124–27
mm. 102–06, 128–32
mm. 147–48, 151–53, 155–57, 167–70, 176–79
Hat,]
27 I am dust of your dust, as I am brother
and mother
28 To [the copper faces,] the worker in flint
and clay.
29 The singing women and their sons a
thousand years ago
30 Marching single file the timber and the
plain.
31 I hold the dust of these amid changing
stars.
32 I last while old wars are fought, while
peace broods mother-like,
33 While new wars arise and the fresh kill-
ings of young men.
34 I fed the boys who went to France in the
great dark days.
35 [Appomattox is a beautiful word to me
and so is Valley Forge and the Marne and
Verdun,]
36 I who have seen the red births and the
red deaths
37 Of sons and daughters, I take peace or
war, I say nothing and wait.

* * *

38 Have you seen the red sunset drip over
one of my cornfields, the shore of night
stars, the wave lines of dawn up a wheat
valley?
39 Have you heard my threshing crews yell-
ing in the chaff of a strawpile and the run-
ning wheat of the wagonboards, my corn-
huskers, my harvest hands hauling crops,
singing dreams of women, worlds, hori-
zons?

Movement III “They are mine”
(soprano/alto solos,
SATB chorus)

40 Rivers cut a path on flat lands.
41 The mountains stand up.
42 The salt oceans press in
43 And push on the coast lines.
The sun, the wind, bring rain

And I know what the rainbow writes across the east or west in a half-circle:
A love-letter pledge to come again.

* * *

[Towns on the Soo Line,
Towns on the Big Muddy,
Laugh at each other for cubs
And tease as children.

Omaha and Kansas City, Minneapolis and St. Paul, sisters in a house together, throwing slang, growing up.

Towns in the Ozarks, Dakota wheat towns, Wichita, Peoria, Buffalo, sisters throwing slang, growing up.]

* * *

Out of prairie-brown grass crossed with a streamer of wigwam smoke—out of a smoke pillar, a blue promise—out of wild ducks woven in greens and purples—

Here I saw a city rise and say to the peoples round the world: Listen, I am strong, I know what I want.

Out of log houses and stumps—canoes stripped from tree sides—flatboats coaxed with an ax from the timber claims—in the years when the red and the white men met—the houses and streets rose.

A thousand red men cried and went away to new places for corn and women: a million white men came and put up skyscrapers, threw out rails and wires, feelers to the salt sea: now the smokestacks bite the skyline with stub teeth.

[In an early year the call of the wild duck woven in greens and purples: now the riveter’s chatter, the police patrol, the song-whistle of the steam-boat.]
To a man across a thousand years I offer a handshake.  
I say to him: Brother, make the story short, for the stretch of a thousand years is short.

* * *

What brothers these in the dark?  
What eaves of skyscrapers against a smoke moon?  
These chimneys shaking on the lumber shanties  
When the coal boats plow by on the river—  
The hunched shoulders of the grain elevators—  
The flame sprockets of the sheet steel mills  
And the men in the rolling mills with their shirts off  
Playing their flesh arms against the twisting wrists of steel:

* * *

[A headlight searches a snowstorm.  
A funnel of white light shoots from over the pilot of the Pioneer Limited crossing Wisconsin.

In the morning hours, in the dawn,  
The sun puts out the stars of the sky  
And the headlight of the Limited train.

The fireman waves his hand to a country school teacher on a bobsled.  
A boy, yellow hair, red scarf and mittens, on the bobsled, in his lunch box a pork chop sandwich and a V of gooseberry pie.

Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years” (bass solo, ATB chorus)  
mm. 1–2

mm. 2–18

mm. 20–25, 38–41

mm. 26–29

mm. 29–32

mm. 32–34

mm. 42–44/45 (cond. score vs. octavo)

mm. 45–48

mm. 48–52

mm. 54–57

mm. 59–62

mm. 62–63

(entire phrase: mm. 64–112, 136–150)
The horses fathom a snow to their knees. 
Snow hats are on the rolling prairie hills. 
The Mississippi bluffs wear snow hats.

* * *

Keep your hogs on changing corn and mashes of grain,
O farmerman.
Cram their insides till they waddle on short legs
Under the drums of bellies, hams of fat.
Kill your hogs with a knife slit under the ear.
Hack them with cleavers.
Hang them with hooks in the hind legs.

* * *

A wagonload of radishes on a summer morning,
Sprinkles of dew on the crimson-purple balls.
The farmer on the seat dangles the reins on the rumps of dapple-gray horses.
The farmer’s daughter with a basket of eggs dreams of a new hat to wear to the county fair.

On the left- and right-hand side of the road,
Marching corn—
I saw it knee high weeks ago—now it is head high—tassels of red silk creep at the ends of the ears.]

* * *

I am the prairie, mother of men, waiting.
They are mine, the threshing crews eating beefsteak, the farmboys driving steers to the railroad cattle pens.
They are mine, the crowds of people at a Fourth of July basket-picnic, listening to a lawyer read the Declaration of Independ-

Movement III “They are mine” (soprano/alto solos, SATB chorus)
mm. 129–53, 157–69, 184–229, 266–94
mm. 33–40 (“they are mine” repeated throughout this movement, notably:
mm. 117–207, 268–82, 318–38)
mm. 42–77
ence, watching the pinwheels and Roman candles at night, the young men and women two by two hunting the bypaths and kissing bridges.

98 They are mine, the horses looking over a fence in the frost of late October saying good-morning to the horses hauling wagons of rutabaga [to market].

99 They are mine, the old zig-zag rail fences, the new barb wire.

* * *

100 [The cornhuskers wear leather on their hands.

101 There is no let-up to the wind.

102 Blue bandanas are knotted at the ruddy chins.

103 Falltime and winter apples take on the smolder of the five-o’clock November sunset: falltime, leaves, bonfires, stubble, the old things go, and the earth is grizzled.

104 The land and the people hold memories, even among the anthills and the angleworms, among the toads and the woodroaches—among gravestone writings rubbed out by the rain—they keep old things that never grow old.

105 The frost loosens corn husks.

106 The Sun, the rain, the wind loosen corn husks.

107 The men and women are helpers.

108 They are all cornhuskers together.

109 I see them late in the evening in the western evening

110 in a smoke-red dust.

* * *

112 The phantom of a yellow rooster flaunting a scarlet comb, on top of a dung pile crying hallelujah to the streaks of daylight,

113 The phantom of an old hunting dog nosing in the underbrush for muskrats, barking
at a coon in a treetop at midnight, chewing on a bone, chasing his tail round a corn-crib,

114 The phantom of an old workhorse taking the steel point of a plow across a forty-acre field in spring, hitched to a harrow in summer, hitched to a wagon among cornshocks in fall,

115 These phantoms come into the talk and wonder of people on the front porch of a farmhouse late summer nights.

116 “The shapes that are gone are here,” said an old man with a cob pipe in his teeth one night in Kansas with a hot wind on the alfalfa.]

* * *

117 Look at six eggs
118 In a mockingbird’s nest.

119 Listen to six mockingbirds
120 Flinging follies of O-be-joyful
121 Over the marshes and uplands.

122 Look at songs
123 Hidden in eggs.

* * *

124 [When the morning sun is on the trumpet-vine blossoms, sing at the kitchen pans: Shout All Over God’s Heaven.
125 When the rain slants on the potato hills and the sun plays a silver shaft on the last shower, sing to the bush at the backyard fence: Mighty Lak a Rose.
126 When the icy sleet pounds on the storm windows and the house lifts to a great breath, sing for the outside hills: The Old Sheep Done Know the Road, the Young Lambs Must Find the Way.]
Spring slips back with a girl face calling always: “Any new songs for me? Any new songs?”

O prairie girl, be lonely, singing, dreaming, waiting—your lover comes—your child comes—the years creep with toes of April rain on new-turned sod.

O prairie girl, whoever leaves you only crimson poppies to talk with, whoever puts a good-bye kiss on your lips and never comes back—

There is a song deep as the falltime redhaws, long as the layer of black loam we go to, the shine of the morning star over the corn belt, the wave line of dawn up a wheat valley.

* * *

O prairie mother, I am one of your boys.

I have loved the prairie as a man with a heart shot full of pain over love.

Here I know I will hanker after nothing so much as one more sunrise or a sky moon of fire doubled to a river moon of water.

* * *

I speak of new cities and new people.
I tell you the past is a bucket of ashes.
I tell you yesterday is a wind gone down, a sun dropped in the west.
I tell you there is nothing in the world only an ocean of to-morrows, a sky of to-morrows.

I am a brother of the cornhuskers who say at sundown:
To-morrow is a day.

Movement VIb “O prairie girl”
(soprano solo)

mm. 58–62

mm. 65–88

mm. 95–110

mm. 127–46

Movement VII “To-morrow”
(tenor solo, solo quartet, SATB chorus)

mm. 29–33

mm. 36–42

mm. 54–68

mm. 79–84, 181–88, 204–33

mm. 84–100

mm. 103–12, 116–69

mm. 112–23, 169–72

mm. 188–91, 231–37, 247–50

mm. 192–94, 236–56, 290–332, 345–400

mm. 194–99, 280–87, 290–332, 345–400

(lines 141–42: mm. 400–12)

mm. 413–18
Since *The Prairie*’s lauded premiere, the cantata has enjoyed only a limited number of performances. As of this writing, publisher G. Schirmer has not responded to repeated requests for a complete performance history, drawn from rental records. However, even an incomplete record of performances, drawn from a variety of sources, shows that the work is not commonly performed, except in the past decade, when interest in the work shows a resurgence, perhaps renewed in part by Andrew Clark’s 2007 recording and Foss’s death in 2009.

In addition to the 1944 premiere, only two notable performances are listed in Karen Perone’s 1991 bio-bibliography of Lukas Foss: on January 18, 1945 (the previously discussed performance conducted by Artur Rodzinski) and March 13, 1961, in which excerpts of solo movements were performed by Enid Clement (soprano), Teresa Racz (alto), and the UCLA Symphony, under the direction of the composer. Foss also conducted the work in the vinyl recording produced on February 28, 1976, with soloists from the Gregg Smith Singers: Jeanne Distell (soprano), Ani Yervanian (alto), Jerold Norman (tenor), and Harlan Foss (bass); the Long Island Symphonic Choral Association; and the Brooklyn Philharmonia Orchestra. On that album cover, Foss noted the length of time that had passed between the work’s premiere and the first recording: “I had to wait some thirty years to hear my *jugendwerk* on records.” It took another thirty for a second

---

37 Perone, *op. cit.*, 27.
38 Not believed to be a relative of Lukas Foss.
39 Lukas Foss, album cover notes to *The Prairie*; Long Island Symphonic Choral Association; Gregg Smith Singers; Brooklyn Philharmonia Orchestra; Lukas Foss, cond.; Vox Productions, 1976.
commercial recording to be made, this time by Andrew Clark, who recorded the work on compact disc in 2007 with soloists Elizabeth Weigle (soprano), Gigi Mitchell-Velasco (alto), Frank Kelly (tenor), and Aaron Engebreth (bass); the 100-voice Providence Singers; and the 46-member Boston Modern Orchestra Project. Clark’s ensemble made the recording shortly after publicly performing the work on March 3, 2007, as part of the NEA-sponsored American Masterpieces Choral Festival, presented at the VMA (Veterans Memorial Auditorium) Arts and Cultural Center in Providence, Rhode Island.40

On June 28 and July 7 of that same year, Mark Mangini conducted two performances of The Prairie (at Lincoln Center in New York City and at the Channing Sculpture Garden in Bridgehampton, New York) with soloists Elizabeth Farnham (soprano), Julia Spanja (alto), Gerard Powers (tenor), Robert Osborne (bass); a chorus made up of 100 singers from the Choral Society of the Hamptons and the Greenwich Village Singers; and a chamber ensemble from the Brooklyn Philharmonic. The cantata was the centerpiece of a program entitled “American Awakening,” which also featured Copland’s Old American Songs and Foss’s Renaissance Concerto (written in 1985), performed by flutist Carol Wincenc.41 Advance press for Mangini’s performances suggested that the two performances were “bound to popularize [The Prairie] among new music aficionados,” although a resurgence of public interest in the cantata was not preordained: “Classical music is not the cynosure of all American eyes.”42

40 The Providence Singers, loc. cit.
Schirmer records available online indicate that the cantata has been performed four times since Mangini’s performances, all of them in 2010 (although it is not clear whether these records are complete): on March 2 and April 9 at the Boston University College of Fine Arts, on April 1 by the Edmond Community Chorale in Edmond, Oklahoma (Karl Nelson, conductor), and on October 24 at the University of Victoria in Victoria, British Columbia (Brian Wismath, conductor). The author posted several queries to the American Choral Directors Association’s ChoralNet daily digest, requesting information from choral conductors and singers who had previously performed the work, but no responses were received.

Why did interest in The Prairie fall off so precipitously after its acclaimed first performance? Certainly the orchestral, choral, and solo writing reflected the 1940s compositional mainstream, joining such works of “Americana” as Aaron Copland’s Appalachian Spring (1944), David Diamond’s Rounds (1944), Ross Lee Finney’s Pilgrim Psalms (1945), and Roy Harris’ Symphony No. 6 “Gettysburg Address” (1944). The specific subject matter of the prairie and Western life was a popular one among concert works written after the outbreak of World War II: Foss’s cantata joined the likes of Copland’s ballet Rodeo (1942), Norman Dello Joio’s ballet Prairie (1942), Eugene Goossens’s film score Cowboy Fantasy (1942–44), and Elie Siegmeister’s orchestral works Western Suite (1945) and Prairie Legend (1947). The selection of the popular poetry of Sandburg as a textual basis to the cantata also augured well for the success of the work: Foss was among many composers whose works were settings of or were based on Sand-

---

burg’s poetry, and the second of three to draw inspiration specifically from “The Prairie,” joining Leo Sowerby (whose orchestral tone poem The Prairie appeared in 1929)\textsuperscript{45} and Norman Lockwood (whose choral work The Prairie appeared in 1953). Publishing giant G. Schirmer published the work the same year as its premiere, along with a separate printing of movement VIa “Cool prayers,” which has enjoyed greater exposure than the large-scale work. The work was available and accessible.

One potential factor may be worth further examination in a future paper: the rise of new poetic and musical voices, displacing Sandburg and Foss (even by Foss himself, whose shift to an avant-garde aesthetic coincided with his appointment to the composition faculty at UCLA in 1953), rendering The Prairie old-fashioned. Another factor, confirmed in this project, is the considerable expense to rent the orchestral materials from G. Schirmer, placing this cantata out of reach for many ensembles. A third factor—perhaps the most likely—could be the whispered rumors about the inconsistencies that exist between the orchestral parts (revised in 1976, presumably for Foss’s LP recording) and the conductor’s score. Sadly, these rumors are true, and while some of the inconsistencies seem to be traced to the 1976 revision, still others appear to be the result of careless copying when the parts and score were drafted by the publisher. It is the hope of this author that the appended documents, pointing out the inconsistencies, will facilitate future performances and perhaps inspire G. Schirmer to issue a corrected score and updated parts.

\textit{Orchestra}

Foss’s The Prairie is accessible in its traditional orchestral scoring. The ensemble calls for flute/piccolo (one player), oboe/English horn (one player), clarinet in B-flat/bass

\textsuperscript{45} Levy, \textit{op. cit.}, 161.
clarinet (one player), bassoon/contrabassoon (one player), horn in F, three trumpets in C, trombone, percussion (one player), piano, and strings. For this project, the author used a complement of twenty-two players in each performance, including three players each on Violins I and II, two players each on Viola and Cello, and one Bass (i.e., 3.3.2.2.1). Mark Mangini’s 2007 performance with the Brooklyn Philharmonic used a similar string count. In the 2007 recording of The Prairie with the hundred-voice Providence Singers and the Boston Modern Orchestra Project, Andrew Clark’s string count was more than double, at 8.8.6.5.2. With adequate rehearsal, the chamber-sized count of 3.3.2.2.1 can work well, especially with a chorus of 35–40 singers. A string count of 5.5.4.3.1 might provide better balance with a larger chorus.

When determining the size of the string section, the conductor should be aware of several divisi sections, listed below:

**Movement I** “I was born on the Prairie”
mm. 11–12: Viola part divided into three notes

**Movement II** “Dust of men”
mm. 64–70: Bass part divided; playable as double stops by one bassist, or divided into lower notes (bass) and upper notes (2nd cello, played down one octave)

**Movement VIb** “O prairie girl”
mm. 82, 84: Bass part divided; playable as double stops by one bassist

**Movement VII** “To-morrow”
mm. 224–27: Violin I part divided into 4; can be rescored to include Violin 2
mm. 287–98: Violin I part scored for “2 desks”

For this project, I chose to open movement II “Dust of men” with one player per part until m. 48, to improve intonation and clarity. For future performances, I would be inclined to experiment with the scoring and/or playing in mm. 10, 12, 24–25, 44, and 46 of movement VII. In these measures, the string rhythms end one subdivision (a sixteenth
or a division of a triplet) before the winds. The resulting perception is of one or more parts playing incorrectly.

Of note for budgeting and logistics is the considerable battery of large instruments which comprise the percussion part: three timpani (sizes not specified in the part; we used 32”, 29”, and 26”), bass drum, and xylophone, in addition to snare drum, suspended cymbal, triangle, and slapstick. The conductor’s score does not indicate which percussion instruments are used in each movement; the chart below provides this information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mvmt</th>
<th>Timpani</th>
<th>Triangle</th>
<th>Snare</th>
<th>Bass</th>
<th>Susp. Cymb.</th>
<th>Xylophone</th>
<th>Slapstick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(tacet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIb</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, the score calls for four auxiliary instruments, three of which (piccolo, English horn, and bass clarinet) are indispensable; the fourth (contrabassoon) is optional. The piccolo is featured in movements III (mm. 45–62 and 87–109), IV (mm. 78–82), and VII (mm. 277–90). The English horn is scored in movements IV (mm. 1–2), V (mm. 24–29), and VII (mm. 86–152). The bass clarinet is found only in movement VII (mm. 86–193 and 260–345). The contrabassoon is featured primarily in movement VII (mm. 86–199), plus three measures in IV (mm. 14–16). In both movements, the contrabassoon is doubled by the bass in every measure (except m. 169 in movement VII). Foss includes an optional second bassoon part which would presumably be played only when no contrabassoon is available. The second bassoon part appears in movement VII, mm.
116-152. This optional part is indicated only in the conductor’s score, not in the bassoon part. (It has been excerpted and included with the Bassoon revised parts in Appendix 2.)

**Chorus**

This work is for standard SSAATTBB chorus. Perhaps for coloristic reasons, Foss divides some sections in more than two parts; however, for performance by a chorus of 35–40 singers (as in this project), it is conceivable to redistribute parts so that there are no more than two divisions in almost all sections. Below are some of the redistributions used in this project:

**Movement III** “They are mine”

m. 129 divisions:
- Sop. line: top = S1 mid. (when 3) = S2 btm. = S2 + A1
- Alto line: top = A2 btm. (when 2) = T1
- Tenor line: top = T + B1 btm. (when 2) = T2 + B1

mm. 175–80 divisions:
- S/A line: Sopranos
- Tenor line: top (when 2) = A + T1 btm. (when 2) = T2
- top (when 3) = A mid. (when 3) = T1 btm. (when 3) = T2
- Bass line: top (when 2) = B1 btm. (when 2) = B2

3-part Bass division determined in rehearsal

mm. 284–95 divisions:
- Sop. line: S1
- Alto line: S2
- Tenor line: top (when 2) = Altos bottom (when 2) = Tenors
- Bass line: Basses

**Movement VIa** “Cool prayers”

mm. 14-22 divisions:
- Sop. 1 line: S1
- Sop. 2 line: top (when 2) = S2 bottom (when 2) = A1
- Alto line: A1 (except when singing lower S2 notes) + A2

mm. 30–31 & 33–34 divisions:
- Sop. 1 line: top (when 2) = S1 bottom (when 2) = S2
- Sop. 2 line: S2 (except when singing lower S1 notes) + A1 (when S1 line divided)
- Alto line: A1 (except when singing lower S2 notes) + A2
- Tenor line: T1 + T2 (except when singing B1 notes)
- Bari. line: B1 (except when singing upper B2 notes) + T2 (only when B1 sings lower B2 no
- Bass line: top (when 2) = B1 bottom (when 2) = B2
**Movement VII** “To-morrow”  
mm. 133–44 divisions:  
- Sop. line: S1  
- Alto line: S2 + A1  
- Tenor line: Tenors + A2 (rejoining Alto line at m. 138, third quarter)  
- Bass line: Basses

Additionally, in movement VII, m. 314 (third quarter) through 322 (second quarter), we switched the soprano and alto parts to place these sections in more comfortable ranges.

**Solo quartet**

The SATB soloists take a prominent role in *The Prairie*, sometimes serving as storytellers, often in the anthropomorphized voice of the prairie itself. Soloists are featured in movements I (tenor), II (SATB quartet), III (soprano/alto duet), V (bass), VIb (soprano), VIc (soprano/alto duet), and VII (SATB quartet). In this project, soloists were also added in two areas not scored by Foss; these two additions enriched the sound and enhanced the visual and musical drama of climactic moments.

The first section where soloists were added is mm. 209–13 of movement II “Dust of men.” The previous section is a 46-measure textural crescendo—beginning with the tenor soloist at m. 162 and adding in turn each soloist, choral part, and orchestral instrument—culminating in the unison, recitative-like text “I who have seen the red births and the red deaths / Of sons and daughters, / I take peace or war.” In Foss’s scoring, the soloists are silent at this culminating section, from m. 209 until the end of m. 213, when they re-join the ensemble at the end of the text: “I say nothing and wait.” The omission of the soloists at this dramatic section is problematic in orchestration and text setting. The music calls for all voices (players and singers) to unite in rhythm and melody, following the in-
tense forty-six-measure build-up. Textually, the soloists are part of the corporate “I” that is speaking at the end, and are presumably part of the corporate “I” that is speaking at m. 209. For these reasons, I chose to add the soloists in mm. 209–13, singing in unison with the chorus; the result was a more powerful conclusion to this movement.

“To-morrow” also finds the soloists silent at the end of the movement. Generally, this omission is problematic in terms of the cantata’s dramatic conclusion. Specifically to this project, the omission of the soloists’ voices negatively impacted the strength and richness we needed in the final sustained “day,” mm. 415–18. In the score, Foss last utilizes the solo quartet in the middle of movement VII, mm. 206–97, leaving them out of the continued repetitions of “an ocean of tomorrows / a sky of tomorrows” as well as the concluding statement “I am a brother of the cornhuskers who say at sundown: / To-morrow is a day.” In this project, I brought back the soloists in m. 400, where the tenors begin the overlapping sequence of “I am a brother of the cornhuskers” statements. Soloists entered with their corresponding voice parts (tenor in m. 400, bass in m. 402, alto in m. 404, soprano in m. 405) and sang through the end of the choral writing (m. 418). As anticipated, this addition enhanced the volume and timbre of the final text, and—as with movement II—the inclusion of the soloists considerably heightened the drama of the movement’s (and the cantata’s) conclusion.

The tenor is the most prominent of the four soloists: opening the first and last movements, identifying these as a structural pillars in orchestration and text. The tenor is also featured prominently in the middle of movement II “Dust of men,” mm. 162–167, where the solo quartet is accompanied by a driving ostinato in the orchestra—a diminu-
tion of the rhythmic and melodic figures from the opening of the movement—and commentary by the chorus.

The bass soloist’s aria in movement V “In the dark of a thousand years” is the most rhythmically challenging solo, and the part is made more difficult—and unnecessarily so—by the indication of time signatures and bar lengths in one way in the octavo and another way in the orchestral parts and conductor’s score. In the orchestral parts and score, m. 22–23 are indicated as one measure of 7/4 followed by one measure of 9/4. In the octavo, the bass solo in this section is comprised of three measures: two in 3/2 and one in 4/4. A similar section is found at mm. 26–28 (three measures shown as 7/4 + 4/4 + 5/4 in the score and parts), indicated in the octavo as three measures: one in 3/2 and two in 5/4. (This section is further complicated by a mis-numbering of measures in the octavo, beginning with m. 30. The total number of measures in this movement should be 154, not 153.)

If allowances can be made for the accidental mis-numbering, the inconsistencies in barring cannot. Logistically, these variances present problems in rehearsal (i.e., determining precise rehearsal segments), but more importantly, this discrepancy can result in time-keeping challenges in performance (i.e., seeing a downbeat from the conductor when the part shows the middle of the bar) that can negatively impact the soloist’s confidence. To avoid these problems, the author recommends re-writing the bass solo for these sections in the octavo, following the time signatures of the score and parts.

In movement V, the soloist and conductor should be aware that the setting of “grain elevators” is rhythmically different in the octavo compared to the conductor’s
score. In the octavo, “grain elevators” is contained within (re-numbered) m. 44; in the conductor’s score, the final syllable of “elevators” is on the downbeat of m. 45.

Unless the conductor provides the bass soloist with a fresh pitch, it is important to begin movement V as quickly as possible after the conclusion of movement IV. The soloist’s first pitch (B) is the leading-tone of the final chord (C) in “When the red and the white men met.” The instability of that tone—combined with the anxiety of performance—can cause the soloist to sing the opening unaccompanied measure of the movement in the wrong key.

The alto solo in movement III “They are mine” is the most varied of the solo parts: opening with a recitative (shared with the soprano soloist), followed by an intensely rhythmic catalogue of prairie events, continuing with a lyrical solo over a rough ostinato and choral commentary, and concluding (before a D.S. return to the catalogue of prairie events) in an introspective lament accompanied by solo instruments. Movement III presents an additional challenge in the mis-numbering of measures in the octavo. In order to match the conductor’s score and parts, choristers and soloists should renumber their measures from m. 118 (which should be renumbered as m. 117) through 340 (which should be renumbered as m. 339).

The alto soloist also shares a duet with the soprano in movement VIc “Songs hidden in eggs.” The brevity of this movement and simplicity of the text (a mere seven lines of poetry, comprised of only 27 words) belies the complexity of the writing: mixed meter favoring asymmetry that can challenge the best musicians, and the sparse orchestration that can make vocal entries challenging. This movement contains significant discrepan-
cies between the conductor’s score and parts and the octavo. These should be clarified before rehearsing:

**Movement VIc “Songs hidden in eggs”**

Measure numbers in piano/vocal score start over at m. 1, but conductor’s score and orchestral parts continue with m. 147. Soloists should renumber their measures for this movement, mm. 147–236, in the method described below. Page numbers refer to the pages of the octavo.

- Pg. 89 = new mm. 147–160
- Pg. 90
  - m. 15 = new m. 161
  - mm. 16–17 = new combined measure 162
  - mm. 18–19 = new combined measure 163
  - m. 20 = new m. 164
  - mm. 21–22 = new combined measure 165
  - mm. 23–24 = new combined measure 166
  - m. 25 = new m. 167
  - rest of page = new mm. 168–174
- Pg. 91 = new mm. 175–182
- Pg. 92 = new mm. 183–193
- Pg. 93
  - mm. 52–57 = new mm. 194–199
  - mm. 58–59 in vocal line = new mm. 200–201
  - m. 60 = new m. 202
  - mm. 61–62 in vocal line = new mm. 203–204
  - mm. 63–65 = new mm. 205–207
- Pg. 94
  - mm. 66–67 = new mm. 208–209
  - mm. 68–69 in vocal line = new mm. 210–211
  - m. 70 = new m. 212
  - rest of page = new mm. 213–236

The most lyrical solo is assigned to the soprano, in movement VIb “O prairie girl.” This movement is one of the most accessible to assemble, with its consistent scoring and (mostly) regular time signatures. In the opening five measures, the soloist and orchestra should be aware that the singer outlines A major while the strings play F# major. This movement also contains inconsistencies between the barring and measure numbers of the conductor’s score and parts and the octavo. In this movement, measure num-
bers in octavo start over at m. 1, but the conductor’s score and orchestral parts continue with m. 58. The soloist should renumber her measures for this movement, mm. 58–146.

Investing in the text

The primary way in which singers are distinguished from instrumentalists is in the expression of text, and the artistic sophistication of that expression is strengthened by the depth of understanding each singer has in the words he or she is singing. In the case of Sandburg’s “The Prairie,” singers in this project had the advantage of working with readily understandable concepts presented in plain-spoken English. Where the poem rouses thoughtful discussion—such as movement IV’s depictions of settler encounters with Native Americans and the transformation of the idyllic countryside into polluting cities—the arguments are obvious (e.g., who would argue in favor of Native American slaughter?) and easily embraced by most participants.

Perhaps because “The Prairie” invites us so effortlessly, choristers may require encouragement to think about the text and capitalize on its images. With this in mind, we opened ourselves to discovering the poem’s imagery through an initial exercise that identified the geological and anthropological elements and histories of the prairie.46 Choristers were asked to consider the words “The Prairie,” and were tasked to write down questions that were elicited from those two words. Responses included:

- Where is the prairie?
- How was it formed?
- What does it look like?
- What is the weather like?

---

46 This exercise was posted by Scott Dorsey in the January 7, 2014 edition of the ChoralNet daily digest: <www.choralnet.org/429795> (last accessed 23 March 2014). It was reprinted from Randel Wagner’s article “Taming the Text” (Washington ACDA’s Unison, Vo. 14, No. 3).
Who lives and works there?  
Who has lived there in the past?  
What do houses look like on the prairie?  
What plants and animals are found there?  
What industry is found there?  
How is the prairie different from other places?  
What human and animal sounds are heard on the prairie?

Throughout the project, we returned to these questions, uncovering the answers as revealed in the poetry. In addition to the texts found in the octavos, choristers also had access to omitted texts via copies of the complete poem, distributed at the December 14, 2013 project open house / interest session. Below are a few of the answers uncovered throughout the project:

**Where is the prairie?** “between the sheds of the Rocky Mountains and the Appalachians” (line 3 of the poem; omitted from the cantata)

**How was it formed?** “Here the water came down, the icebergs slid with gravel, the gaps and the valleys hissed, and the black loam came, and the yellow sandy loam” (line 2 of the poem; movement I, mm. 37–48)

**What does it look like?** “Have you seen a red sunset drip over one of my cornfields, the shore of night stars, the wave lines of dawn up a wheat valley?” (line 38 of the poem; movement III, mm. 1–9)

**What is the weather like?** “The sun, the wind, bring rain” (line 44 of the poem; movement III, mm. 250–65)

**Who lives and works there?** “the lonely men on horses” (line 18 of the poem; movement II, mm. 99–101); “the threshing crews eating beefsteak, the farmboys driving steers to the railroad cattle pens” (line 96 of the poem; movement III, mm. 33–40); “young men and women” (line 97 of the poem; movement III, mm. 71–72); “a million white men” (line 56 of the poem; movement IV, mm. 80–82); “the men in the rolling mills with their shirts off” (line 66 of the poem; movement V, mm. 47–51)

**Who has lived there in the past?** “The singing women and their sons a thousand years ago” (line 29 of the poem; movement II, mm. 169–72); “A thousand red men” (line 56 of the poem; movement IV, mm. 64–65)

**What do houses look like on the prairie?** “Out of prairie-brown grass crossed with a streamer of wigwam smoke” (line 53 of the poem; movement IV, mm. 9–12)

**What plants and animals are found there?** red clover (line 1 of the poem; movement I, mm. 14–15); wild ducks (line 53 of the poem; movement IV, m. 15); crimson poppies, redhaws, corn, wheat (lines 129–30 of the poem; movement VIb, mm. 102, 132, 141, 145); mockingbirds (line 118 of the poem; movement VIc, m. 148)
What industry is found there? Lumber mills, coal-mining, grain processing, steel mills: “These chimneys shaking on the lumber shanties / When the coalboats plow by on the river— / The hunched shoulders of the grain elevators— / The flame sprockets of the sheet steel mills” (lines 62–65 of the poem; movement V, mm. 28–47)

How is the prairie different from other places? “I am here when the cities are gone. / I am here before the cities come. . . I am dust of men” (lines 16–17 and 20 of the poem; movement II, mm. 88–97, 147–48); “new cities and new people” (line 134 of the poem; movement VII, mm. 80–82)

What human and animal sounds are heard on the prairie? “Have you heard my threshing crews yelling in the chaff of a strawpile and the running wheat of the wagonboards, my cornhuskers, my harvest hands hauling crops, singing dreams of women, worlds, horizons?” (line 39 of the poem; movement III, mm. 10–29); “listening to a lawyer read the Declaration of Independence” (line 97 of the poem; movement III, mm. 57–62); “Listen to six mockingbirds” (line 119 of the poem; movement VIc, mm. 151–52)

Rehearsal process

The two-month rehearsal schedule for this project was dictated by several factors, including the availability of rehearsal and performance spaces, the contractual limitations of the rental agreement with G. Schirmer, and the availability of personnel (notably, we avoided the middle and end of the semester, when university participants would be busy with other concerts, recitals, and projects). The community chorus of twenty-five singers rehearsed weekly from January 7 through February 25, at the Capitol Hill Arts Workshop (CHAW) in southeast Washington, D.C. Each rehearsal at CHAW was two hours in length and included a fifteen-minute warm-up. The university chorus of twelve singers began rehearsing upon the conclusion of winter break: we rehearsed in the School of Music’s choral rehearsal hall in two Saturday sessions (each lasting three hours) on February 1 and 15. The orchestra received parts and errata in late January and early February, and rehearsed twice: on February 22 (at Memorial Chapel) and 25 (in the choral rehearsal hall). Each performance was preceded by a 75–90-minute rehearsal, focusing on trouble
spots and transitions. The two performances were scheduled to take place February 28 (at Memorial Chapel) and March 3 (at Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church); however, a snowstorm on March 3 delayed the second concert until the following week (March 10).

At the first chorus rehearsal, we introduced big-picture guidelines, along with a number of “rules,” all of which focused our efforts and increased the efficiency of our learning throughout the project. These rules included music-reading guidelines and principles of good singing. Our big-picture guidelines were:

- Number one goal: to create a unified, beautiful ensemble sound.
- Number two goal: to communicate the text clearly and expressively.
- Singing text is not the same as talking text.
- Progress is achieved when everyone practices a little every day and comes to rehearsal with knowledge, skill, and openness.
- Every voice is unique. (But remember the number one goal. . .)

Our “rules,” designed to help us arrive at the “big picture,” included:

- Always sing on the breath.
- Sustain on pure vowels.
- Sing through the end of every phrase.
- Resonate on closing consonants (“mih,” “dih,” and the like); when the consonant is followed by a rest, resonate on the rest.
- Engage your core with strength when singing softly.
- Never sing louder than your unique voice can sing with a beautiful, supported sound.

Choristers received a “rehearsal re-cap” via e-mail after every rehearsal. These e-mails were designed to review what we accomplished; orient singers to guidelines, rules, and goals; prepare the chorus for the next rehearsal; and connect singers to the project community between rehearsals. Each “re-cap” was concisely written to fill only piece of standard paper when printed.

As can be expected in chorus rehearsal planning, we focused on accessible, homophonic sections of the cantata first, prioritizing the creation of a unified sound and de-
veloping a comfort with each other and with the process, then built toward increasingly
complicated sections with greater refinement throughout. Highlights of the two-month
community chorus rehearsal schedule are indicated below (segments are shown in the
order rehearsed):

Rehearsal 1
1. Movement IV: mm. 56–95 – rehearsed in depth
2. Movement II: mm. 115–32 – rehearsed in depth
3. Movement II: mm. 139–59 – introduced
4. Movement II: mm. 188–219 – rehearsed in depth
5. Movement III: mm. 117–79 – introduced
6. Movement VII: mm. 414–18 – introduced

Rehearsal 2
1. Movement VIa: mm. 14–35 – rehearsed in depth
2. Movement III:
   • mm. 117–79 – reviewed and refined
   • mm. 180–229 – rehearsed in depth
3. Movement IV: mm. 9–27 – introduced
4. Movement VII: mm. 400–19 – rehearsed in depth

Rehearsal 3 (cancelled due to snowstorm; intended focus was half of Movement VII)

Rehearsal 4 – focus on Movement VII
1. mm. 164–72 – reviewed (from Open House)
2. mm. 79–164 – rehearsed in depth
3. mm. 181–233 – rehearsed in depth
4. mm. 290–332 – rehearsed in depth
5. mm. 345–74 – introduced
6. mm. 375–400 – introduced
7. mm. 400–end – reviewed and refined

Rehearsal 5
1. Movement II: entire – reviewed and refined
2. Movement III: mm. 256–339 – introduced and rehearsed in depth
3. Movement IV: mm. 31–46 – introduced
4. Movement VIa: mm. 28–35 – reviewed and refined
5. Movement VII: mm. 155–72 – reviewed and refined
6. Movement V: entire – introduced
Rehearsal 6
1. Movement IV: mm. 48–56 – choral alto and tenor solos introduced to all singers
2. Movement VII: mm. 79–154 – reviewed and refined
3. Movement VIa: mm. 14–35 – reviewed and refined
4. Movement III: mm. 117–79 – reviewed and refined
5. Movement VII: mm. 207–33 – reviewed as preparation for soloist integration
6. Movement III: mm. 249–94 – reviewed as preparation for soloist integration
7. Movement II: mm. 162–208 – reviewed with the Clark recording, as preparation for soloist integration
8. Movement VII:
   - mm. 290–332 – reviewed and refined
   - mm. 100–45 – reviewed and refined

Rehearsal 7
1. Movement II:
   - mm. 108–32 – spot checked, with lead–in and accompaniment
   - mm. 162–79 – spot checked, with lead–in and accompaniment
   - mm. 188–208 – spot checked, with accompaniment
2. Movement III:
   - mm. 117–79 – reviewed and refined
   - mm. 180–229 – spot checked, with accompaniment
   - mm. 249–94 – spot checked, with lead–in and accompaniment
   - mm. 315–39 – spot checked, with lead–in and accompaniment
3. Movement IV: entire – reviewed and refined, after spot check of mm. 75–95
4. Movement V:
   - mm. 87–112 – reviewed and refined
   - mm. 136–50 – reviewed and refined
5. Movement VIa: entire – reviewed and refined, after spot check of mm. 23–28
6. Movement VII:
   - mm. 124–72 – reviewed and refined
   - mm. 345–419 – reviewed and refined

Rehearsal 8 – with soloists and orchestra (2.5 hours)
1. Movement VII:
   - mm. 1–49 – reinforced tempo transitions
   - mm. 105–72 – reviewed chorus entrances
   - mm. 173–208 – refined accelerando, chorus accuracy
   - mm. 224–27 – checked Vn I/II divisis
   - mm. 270–81 – reviewed 5/4 groupings
   - mm. 323–49 – reinforced tempo transitions, refined col legno section
   - mm. 345–400 – refined to bring out eighth notes in every part
   - mm. 400–419 – reviewed for conductor confidence
2. Movement VIc:
   • mm. 159–70 – reinforced tempo transitions
   • mm. 210–16 – reinforced tempo transitions
3. Movement VIb:
   • mm. 112–26 – refined dynamic contrasts
   • mm. 143–46 – reinforced rit.
4. Movement VIa:
   • mm. 14–35 – refined a cappella chorus intonation with Cb entrance at m. 30
5. Movement IV:
   • mm. 27–46 – refined chorus entrances
   • mm. 47–56 – reviewed for integration of alto and tenor choral solos
   • mm. 83–86 – refined sustain and crescendo in dotted-quarter parts
6. Movement II:
   • mm. 1–88 – refined to one instrument per part (mm. 1–47), reviewed for conductor confidence
   • mm. 162–219 – refined lightness and balance in orchestral parts
7. Movement I:
   • mm. 1–25 – refined balance and timing with soloist
   • mm. 54–82 – refined mixed meter
   • mm. 92–115 – refined tempo transitions, dynamic contrasts
   • mm. 186–88 – refined fanfare rhythms
8. Movement III:
   • mm. 1–40 – refined tempo transitions
   • mm. 53–90 – refined mixed meter
   • mm. 286–88 – refined conducting gesture
   • mm. 290–339 – refined tempo transitions, chorus entries
9. Movement V:
   • mm. 1–18 – reviewed for chorus confidence
   • mm. 36–46 – reinforced tempo transitions
   • mm. 98–154 – reviewed for tempo transitions, confidence of instrumental entries

The three-hour rehearsals for university singers were structured to introduce almost all of the cantata at the first session and review and refine at the second. The condensed rehearsal schedule was intended to encourage participation (among an already-overextended population) and it presumed a faster pace of instruction facilitated by choristers’ musical training (i.e., most university singers were music majors and/or members of UMD choirs). Community choristers were invited to attend both of the university ses-
sessions, and many did. Because the community singers had many more weeks of rehearsal experience with the music, their participation in the university sessions created a more robust sound and confident environment into which the university singers could integrate themselves.

The first rehearsal with the orchestra took place between the seventh and eighth community chorus rehearsals and lasted 3.5 hours. The session was timed to rehearse every movement within 2.5 hours, then run the entire piece in the remaining hour. As the rehearsal progressed, we encountered enough challenges to necessitate the revision of the plan, to exclude the run. With the luxury of one or two additional orchestra rehearsals—especially one with orchestra alone—we would have had time for a run of the piece, and the run and extra rehearsal time would have resulted in a significant improvement in the confidence and accuracy of the first performance.
CHAPTER 3

THE PRAIRIE AS A VEHICLE FOR BUILDING COMMUNITY

A central premise of this project is a correlation between community and vulnerability; that is, when a choral singer feels comfortably connected to fellow singers, he or she is more likely to open up to new ways of making sounds for the ultimate service of the music. A lack of sociological expertise, plus the project’s compressed time frame (further abbreviated by weather cancellations), did not allow extensive exploration of vulnerability, but survey responses and anecdotal information point to the perceived formation of an affirming new community and to positive results of intentional community-building. Furthermore, performance feedback from participants and audience members suggests that this community created an aesthetically pleasing musical experience.

The musical community for this project

The artistic community created for the musical portion of this project was comprised of a chorus of adult community members (from the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area) and University of Maryland (UMD) students, UMD instrumentalists, soloists from the Maryland Opera Studio and UMD Voice Division, and a third-year doctoral candidate in choral conducting serving as conductor. The total number of musical participants was sixty-five: including twenty-five community singers, twelve university singers, twenty-four instrumentalists (including two alternate players), and four soloists. Each of the community members of the chorus paid $25 to participate in the ensemble: these fees were applied to production costs, including score rental and space reservations. Universi-
ty singers did not pay to participate. Instrumentalists were paid a very modest honorarium ($50 per player) as a token of appreciation and to encourage serious participation. Soloists were not paid.

*The larger community for this project*

Supporting the musical community was a larger community of logistical and financial backers. Institutional support included the Capitol Hill Arts Workshop (rehearsal space, promotion, registration services, document production, stage management, and financial support), UMD’s College of Arts and Humanities (grant award), the School of Music’s Office of Choral Activities (rehearsal space, promotion, document production, paperwork processing, financial support), UMD Bands (percussion for first performance and transportation of equipment), the Clarice Smith Performing Arts Center (equipment), the University of Maryland’s Memorial Chapel (rehearsal and performance space), the Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church (performance space), OpusRite (recording services), Craig Teer (percussion rental for second performance), and G. Schirmer (rental of score and parts). Individual support came in the forms of monetary contributions, event promotion, equipment transportation, stage set-up and restoration, document review, and ushering, to name just a few of the numerous project components.

It is important to note that the musical and larger communities created for this project were built over time. Community-building is a long-term, ongoing process. By nurturing relationships with people and organizations over many years, we ensured enough musicians to play and sing in the ensemble, enlisted enough helpers to accom-
plish everything behind the scenes, solicited adequate funding, and assured two audiences comprised of interested, encouraging people from around the metropolitan area.

Survey #1

Early in the rehearsal schedule, community and university choristers responded to a short survey focusing on perceptions of community and vulnerability. At the end of the project, choristers responded to a second survey on these same topics. Survey questions were designed by the author. Responses are collected in the appendices to this document.

The first survey was initially distributed at the fifth community chorus rehearsal and the second university chorus rehearsal. Of the thirty-seven singers in the chorus, twenty-eight responded to the survey (76%), of whom twenty-three were community singers (92% of total number of community singers) and five were university singers (42% of total number of university singers). In the first survey, choristers were provided a chorus roster and asked to approximate the number of Prairie choristers they knew before this project. Around 93% of respondents knew either none of or only around a third (about twelve) of their fellow singers. Although the question was flawed in failing to offer numerical ranges, the results still pointed to a real opportunity in this project to create community among people who did not know each other.

Choristers were next asked to define community and vulnerability, generally and specific to a choral experience. The respondents’ definitions for community included four constructs that appeared multiple times: togetherness (four responses), unity (five responses), sharing (eight responses), and commonality (fifteen responses). These constructs align with sociological definitions of community as “sharing the same origin and
the same destiny,” and a sense of belonging, “something that we create, rather than somewhere we just are, or are ‘inside.’” Most respondents defined community as a group of people (nineteen responses); a smaller number defined community abstractly (seven responses); and two respondents defined community as a place. The responses defining community abstractly are the most interesting to this author, because they most closely relate to the project goal of creating and sustaining community: the emphasis is on the action, not just the resulting product. The conceptual responses included “togetherness and collaboration,” “a comfort level with similar-minded people,” “a sense of mutual support,” “finding unity in difference,” “being open to opportunity,” and “a sense of belonging.”

Not surprisingly, when respondents defined vulnerability, 29% (eight of the twenty-eight) focused on such negative constructs as damage, being hurt or wounded, lack of control, and lack of safety. Another 32% (nine of the twenty-eight) defined vulnerability using a combination of positive and negative constructs; for example: “open to damage,” “ability to be hurt or wounded,” and “open… to risk or injury.” What was surprising was the percentage of respondents—39% (eleven of the twenty-eight)—who focused primarily on positive constructs in their definitions. These included “opening my soul to challenges: …new situations, new people,” “moving away from our comfort zone,” and “combining individual talent and effort of many people into a single creative product.” Of note in both the definitions of community and vulnerability were the variances in personalization: most respondents defined the terms scientifically, without attaching themselves

---

to the concepts; however, a few personalized the definitions. Two examples of this personalization are: “the environment where I live, work and worship” (for community) and “opening myself up to be real, honest, or unguarded” (for vulnerability).

The survey also asked respondents to define community and vulnerability in a choral experience. When defining community in this framework, respondents were about equally divided between community as a noun and community as a verb, although the degree of individualization was higher when describing community as a verb. Of the fifteen verb-focused definitions, “sharing,” “singing,” and “being a part of…” were each used twice; the remaining nine were unique, and included “blending,” “combining,” “coming together,” “contributing,” “helping each other,” “listening,” and “working together.” One verb-focused definition consisted solely of behavior examples: “greeting each other, being glad to see each other, remembering and asking about each other from week to week,” and another included a list of behaviors as part of the verb-focused definition: “Community in a choral experience means being a part of something bigger than myself. It’s knowing the cultural norms—bringing a pencil, being quiet while others are learning their part.” Thirteen definitions focused on nouns: five respondents referred to groups of “singers,” three referred to “people,” two referred to an “atmosphere,” and the remainder used the words “chorus,” “interest,” and “result” (i.e., the “result of voices in harmony and rhythm”). Only one definition included the director as part of the community, and only one included the audience. Also of note: only two definitions of community referred specifically to socializing or “having fun;” instead, most definitions described an environment in which music-making is the primary focus.
Definitions of vulnerability in a choral experience did not vary significantly from the definitions provided for vulnerability in a general sense. Seven respondents described vulnerability in solely negative terms; eight described it in solely positive terms; and ten described it with a mixture of positive and negative terms. Two respondents contextualized choral vulnerability in personal situations. One of these remarked: “Singing 2nd soprano—it is not easy for me. I can’t always hear the right note and the part is not intuitive to me.”

The final question in the initial survey asked singers to recall and rate the sense of community they felt among the participants in this project at their first rehearsal. Respondents selected a number from one to ten, with one representing a minimal sense of community and ten representing a strong sense of community. The largest cluster of responses was between four and six (58% total). In the second survey, conducted at the end of the project, this same question was asked, and the largest cluster of responses was between eight and ten (65%).

Survey #2

The second survey was initially distributed via e-mail after the first performance. Of the thirty-seven singers in the chorus, twenty-six responded to the survey (70%), of whom twenty-two were community singers (88% of total number of community singers) and four were university singers (33% of total number of university singers).

In this survey, choristers were asked to share their memories of feeling most and least vulnerable and least and most connected to the community created for the project. The top four responses for “most vulnerable” moments were: singing alone or with few
people on one’s voice part (eight responses), at or just before the first performance (seven responses), at difficult sections in the music or when there were problems in performance (six responses), and at the beginning of the project (five responses). Two additional responses, indicated by two choristers each, were: at the rehearsal with the orchestra on February 22, and when the community choristers joined the university choristers. We may reasonably assume that these last two responses, plus the response “at or just before the first performance” refer to activities (i.e., singing at the rehearsal with the orchestra on February 22, singing at the rehearsal when the two groups of choristers joined, and singing at or just before the last performance), rather than referring to places (i.e., at the rehearsal location with the orchestra on February 22, at the rehearsal location when the two groups joined, and in the location at or just before the last performance), although new locations and new people can certainly be stressors. Given this assumption, and considering the recurring themes of other responses, the “take-away” can be that choral singers are most vulnerable when they are not able to sing their parts accurately and confidently. Choristers understand and accept that they must rehearse and perform in different times and spaces, and with different people, as part of most ensemble experiences. The stresses related to changing venues and personnel can be made more manageable when not augmented by anxiety over the music. When conductors invest choristers with the skills they need to sing their parts securely, the overall anxiety level can diminish, and as that anxiety level decreases, each singer’s voice, mind, and heart are freer to make beautiful music.

Responses to the “least vulnerable” moments also mesh with the goal of prioritizing accurate, confident singing. Phrases used more than once included: [singing] at the

49 One respondent indicated that he or she never felt “vulnerable,” instead using the term “uncomfortable.”
dress rehearsal or concerts (six responses), singing specific sections in the music (four responses), singing / singing confidently (three responses), and performing in sync with other musicians (three responses). The importance of comfort within one’s environment also appeared in several responses. Some responses sharing this theme included: at rehearsals / at CHAW (three responses), at the beginning of the rehearsal process (three responses), and knowing others in the group (two responses).

Knowing each person in the group by name was a goal of mine in this project: one that did not succeed fully, but which remains a priority for future collaborations. There is a visceral reaction to hearing one’s name called: an acknowledgment that the other is connected specifically to you, not just generally to the alto section, the university singers, the woodwinds, etc. My greatest vulnerability was exposed whenever I could not remember a chorister’s name: forgetting a singer’s name revealed that I was not remembering a specific component of the ensemble sound in my planning and shaping.

Not knowing others was the most significant reason given in response to Survey #2’s question asking when choristers felt “least connected to the community.” Both community and university singers expressed disconnection to the community when the ensemble rehearsed at UMD on February 1 and 15 (seven community responses; two university responses): at both rehearsals, new singers were integrated with minimal success in establishing rapport with the rest of the ensemble. Ten choristers indicated that they were least connected to the community at the beginning of the project; it is reasonable to assume this reflects a lack of familiarity with members of the ensemble, in addition to uncertainties about the music and the scope of the project. Choristers felt most connected to the community at one or both performances (seventeen responses), not coinci-
dentally the point at which choristers had the most time to get acquainted with fellow collaborators and the music.

To contextualize the community perceptions with the vulnerability findings, choristers felt more vulnerable and less connected to the community when individual responsibility outweighed corporate responsibility; they felt least vulnerable and most connected to the community when corporate responsibility outweighed individual responsibility. In choral terms, the most positive moments occurred when singers could join their voices accurately and confidently with others whom they knew and trusted to also sing accurately and confidently.

According to survey responses, the sense of community perceived by individual choristers had a positive effect on focusing efforts in rehearsal (on a scale of 1–10, with 1 representing “not at all” and 10 representing “a great deal,” a cluster of 50% indicated 9–10), practicing parts outside of rehearsal (31% indicated 9), and focusing efforts in performance (a cluster of 70% indicated 9–10). Responses suggest that the sense of perceived community had no significant effect on an individual’s motivation to “take new chances and try new things in rehearsal.”

All survey respondents indicated that the ensemble sound changed over the course of the project. Identifying how the sound changed revealed several themes: blend/cohesion/trust/unity (thirteen responses); confidence (eleven responses); improved execution of elements like diction, dynamics, and phrasing (six responses); generally “better” or positive (three responses); and increased volume (two responses). These perceptions of the change in sound complement post-concert, anecdotal feedback provided to the director about the sound, including:
The sound had a lot of energy and excitement—and that excitement filled the room. (audience member from the first performance)

The orchestra and soloists were excellent…and the chorus was superb—nicely blended, well prepared and expressive. You put together a lovely program for us in the audience as well as the performers who took part—a true community-building event. (audience member from the second performance)

Choristers were also asked to describe the links between “community connectedness” and choral sound, as perceived in this project. Responses included these repeated themes: better sound (six responses), intensified cohesion (five responses), increased motivation (four responses), and improved confidence (two responses). One respondent suggested a circular relationship: “more connectedness ⇒ better ensemble ⇒ more connectedness ⇒ etc.” Another respondent proposed that the link is actually in the opposite direction: “I think ‘community connectedness,’ if any, comes as a result of focusing on performing the music well, rather than the other way around.”

*Efforts to build community in this project*

Social philosopher Martin Buber suggests that you cannot plan for community; that it is the physical result of people listening to each other. In contrasting the collective and the communal, Buber writes: “Collectivity is not a binding but a bundling together: individuals packed together. . . But community, growing community. . . is the being no longer side by side but *with* one another…”

In this project, we attempted to engage choristers with each other meaningfully through group warm-ups that included duets and small groups (intended to encourage vulnerability and focus listening), through short discussions related to the poetry (refer to the section in Chapter 2 on “Investing in the text”), and through feedback-sharing exer-
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50 Cited in Ansdell, *op. cit.*, 53.
cises. In the feedback-sharing exercises, each chorister was asked to write down three expectations he or she had of fellow chorus members. At the end of rehearsal, choristers were invited to identify specific choristers who had met those expectations, and to share the expectations with them in the form of positive verbal feedback. A few of the shared expectations were: “look up / watch the conductor,” “be willing to help,” and “speak up when you don’t get your part.” Additionally, weekly “rehearsal re-cap” e-mails—discussed in Chapter 2—were designed to foster community by maintaining a connection with singers between rehearsals.

Challenges and questions

The most significant (and obvious) challenge to creating community in a short-term project is the time-limited nature of the experience, and this proved true in our Prairie collaboration. Most social practices require some period of time in order to become established as conventions, so while guidelines and “rules” for ensemble music-making were established early on and enforced consistently and a variety of exercises were facilitated to engage choristers meaningfully with each other, the two-month project was not enough time to establish a community in which togetherness, unity, sharing, and commonality were experienced among all members. Specifically, responses to Survey #2 suggest that while this project affirmed and nurtured community among people who already knew each other, it did not create a strong sense of community among people who knew none or few of their fellow choristers when they joined the project. This fact was hidden from the conductor until after the project concluded and survey responses were

Responses made it clear that the conductor sought out weekly, informal feedback only from choristers he already knew; there was little or no effort to solicit the same regular, informal feedback from singers new to him. Thus, problems in community-building went unnoticed. The very “newness” of these singers made communication with them all the more important: to establish conventions (in this case, vocal skills that create a consistently beautiful and blended sound) requires cooperation, which in turn requires communication. Interestingly, solicitation of feedback from new singers would also have been an excellent opportunity for the conductor to demonstrate vulnerability: to engage with choristers unknown to him, without the empathy veteran choristers would have stored up, whose honesty about “how things are going” might have been critical of the conductor’s plans. Brown notes: “When we seek to change and improve a situation, there is always the possibility that we won’t—not because of a failure to get others’ cooperation, but because that cooperation leads to problems that we did not foresee. Feedback can produce its own mischief.”

Although the conductor has considerable discretion in establishing an environment where community can be facilitated, the relationship is also reliant on choristers being receptive to and engaging in opportunities to connect with fellow collaborators. In this project, conductor-led efforts to learn everyone’s names occurred at the start of several rehearsal sessions. Late arrivals—notably by “new” choristers—negatively impacted the success of these efforts, and one opportunity to build community with fellow singers and the conductor was not as effective as it could have been.

52 Brown, op. cit., 106.
53 Brown, op. cit., 128.
Considering the results of the two surveys, the author wonders if we increased the sense of community through the very act of studying it (\(i.e.,\) the Hawthorne effect)? After all, choristers were aware of the community-building goals from the beginning and were involved in the efforts to nurture and sustain community throughout the project. Also, without having standard definitions of “community” and “vulnerability,” survey participants responded to questions about these concepts using their own meanings. The variations in definitions provided in the first survey suggest that responses in the second survey were probably built on disparate understandings. Finally, while the two surveys point to an increase in the perception of community from the first rehearsal to the end of the project, the author questions if the intentional efforts to build community were any more effective than would have been achieved simply by virtue of the shared experience?
CONCLUSION

When he heard the *The Prairie* at its premiere in 1944, Lukas Foss had many reasons to believe his cantata would take a high-ranking place among the canon of choral-orchestral repertoire: it was performable by a standard choral-orchestral ensemble; it had a clear-cut, inspiring text by a beloved poet; it was structurally cohesive, tuneful, and harmonically accessible; and it was introduced to the world by an outstanding ensemble led by one of the world’s preeminent choral conductors. What it did not have, however, was an accurate score and corresponding parts. The inconsistencies between these resources have—until now—created hours of extra work for any conductor who has chosen to program the work.

Reconciling the orchestral parts with the conductor’s score required about five hours per part (for sixteen parts, plus the octavo). The time-consuming nature of this endeavor elevated it to an equal footing with the project’s original, single goal of creating and sustaining a new project-based community that performed an important choral-orchestral work at a high artistic level. The resulting project is somewhat bifurcated, but the product is of immediate and lasting use to the choral community.

With the resources assembled here, future performances of *The Prairie* may be considered with less trepidation, and conductors can plan on a reasonable time in preparation. For the reasons outlined above, this is a fine work that has been unfairly neglected over the past seventy years. It is also an ideal vehicle for a project-based chorus: intriguing, challenging, but very feasible given the musical and nonmusical communities needed to present and support it.
This project provides a glimpse into the connections between community and choral music-making. Questions remain about what community means to the choral experience, if it can be created and how, what the best practices are to create and measure it, and even if having it makes a difference in the sound. The strategies outlined in this paper may be helpful as a starting-point for future explorations in building communities through music.

An important question remains: What did Foss write in 1944 and what are the revisions he made in 1976? This paper reconciles the score and parts as they are available from the publisher, but they do not reconcile the score and parts to the holograph score, available for study at the Library of Congress. In addition to confirming the original intent of pitches and rhythms, the holograph score may provide insights into such disputed sections as the col legno section in movement VII (mm. 333–39), the elimination of which seems to be a later edit.\(^\text{54}\)

---

\(^{54}\) Other disputed sections include: Vc/Cb pitches, movement I (m. 135); Cb articulation, movement III (m. 26); Tpt I/Xylo pitches, movement III (m. 100); Vn I/II and Viola pitches and articulations, movement IV (m. 53); Hn pitches, movement IV (m. 71–72); Perc instrumentation (Timp vs BD), movement IV (m. 95); Snare hits, movement VIc (m. 162–66); and Xylo pitches, movement VII (m. 287–90).
APPENDIX 1

INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN THE CONDUCTING SCORE OF THE PRAIRIE AND THE REVISED ORCHESTRAL PARTS

The following instructions were provided to instrumentalists for performances of The Prairie at the University of Maryland’s Memorial Chapel (College Park, MD) on February 28, 2014 and Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church (Washington, D.C.) on March 10, 2014. The instructions facilitate consistency between the parts, revised in 1976, and the conductor’s score, which was presumably not revised. The piano-vocal score (octavo) was also reviewed for inconsistencies, and was a helpful resource in determining some questionable pitches in the score and parts.

The orchestral parts, available for rent from G. Schirmer, Inc., include numerous handwritten markings from previous performances. The set rented for these performances was Set. No. 1; presumably other sets would have different handwritten markings. Some handwritten markings are likely to be remnants from previous interpretations; however, without a definitive score and set of parts, it is difficult to distinguish between interpretive and corrective markings. Clarifications regarding these handwritten markings and printed markings, provided in this appendix, attempt to reconcile the score, parts, and octavo.

Also included in this appendix are a few instructions which were specific to the instrumentation used in this project’s performances (in most cases, to facilitate divisi in which there were not enough players). The indication “???” is used for instructions that are not definitively justifiable by comparing the score, parts, and octavo. Revised parts are found in Appendices 2 and 3.

GENERAL NOTES

Movement I “I was born on the Prairie”
m. 169 most parts indicate poco rit. (instead of molto rit.)

Movement II “Dust of men”
m. 131 parts not playing this bar show a rest with a fermata; this bar is divided rhythmically as 2/4 + 3/8 + 2/4 (no fermata)

Movement III “They are mine”
m. 31 in most parts, the $\Phi$ sign is missing from the beginning of this bar; this is the symbol the publisher chose, rather than the more common $*$ (Segno) sign
m. 117 in most parts, Fine is missing from the end of this bar
m. 339 in most parts, the instruction “Da capo del $\Phi$al Fine” is missing from the end of this bar; this instruction is more commonly indicated as “D.S. al Fine” (interpreted here as “go back to m. 31 and play through m. 117”)
Movement IV “When the red and the white men met”
m. 31    most parts indicate *alla marcia* (without the continuation *ma l’istesso tempo*).

Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years”
m. 17    most parts are missing *maestoso*
m. 19    most parts are missing *Moderato*
m. 25    some parts are missing *Con moto*; some parts indicate *Con moto* one bar late (in m. 26)
m. 39    in most parts, *rit. molto* is preceded by *poco rit.* in m. 38; some parts indicate *molto* only (instead of *rit. molto*); some parts indicate *rit. molto* in m. 40
m. 112   most parts are missing *Vivace*

Movement VIb: “O prairie girl”
m. 62    this bar is indicated in some parts as 3/2; there are four quarter beats of music followed by two quarter beats of rest

Movement VIc “Songs hidden in eggs”
The following bars are shown in some parts as 4/4 and some as 8/8; all are divided as 5/8 + 3/8 (2+3+3):
- mm. 162–63
- mm. 165–66
- mm. 200–01
- m. 204
- m. 207
- mm. 210–11
m. 204 is shown as 8/8, but is most clearly conducted as 4/4

Movement VII “To-morrow”
m. 19    most parts are missing *Agitato*
m. 43    most parts are missing *Agitato*
m. 68    most parts are missing *molto rit.* (like Tempo I of No. I)
m. 70    most parts are missing *sempre rit.*
m. 100   most parts are missing *Tempo*
m. 125   most parts are missing *Con moto*
mm. 155, 157, 159 – these three bars are 3 + 2 (not 2 + 3 as shown in sustained parts’ tied notes)
mm. 162, 164 these two bars are correct as 2 + 3
mm. 166   most parts are missing *a tempo*
mm. 333–39 string parts are missing *col legno*; this may be a significant revision from 1976 (???)
m. 345    most parts have time signature indicated incorrectly or crossed out; the time signature is 4/4; *un poco piú meno mosso*; parts play downbeat as half note (not a quarter)
CONDUCTOR’S SCORE

Movement I “I was born on the Prairie”
mm. 0–1, 4–5 Clarinet line missing
mm. 0–3 Horn line missing
mm. 4–6 Horn line missing from last eighth note of m. 4
m. 6 Cl: omit tied half note
m. 13 Vn I: last pitch should be B4
m. 49 Tenor solo: text should be “Here now a”
mm. 59 Cb: F#2 (tied from previous bar) missing
mm. 76–77 Tenor solo: tie (from m. 76 to 77) missing
m. 78 Cb: should be 6/8 (not 7/8)
mm. 80–81 Tenor solo: tie (from m. 80 to 81) missing
m. 92 Fl: pp missing
m. 117 Timpani E shown on Piano line
m. 132 Pno: bt. 2.5 should be G#3 + C4 (not F#3 + C4)
m. 135 Should Vc change to B2 + E3 in this bar (???); should Cb change to B2 (???)
m. 150 Hn: end of diminuendo is p
m. 156 Note that the fermatas in the Tenor solo are not included in the octavo
m. 167 Tenor solo: text should be “river moon”
m. 171 Hn: downbeat is B4 (not A4)
m. 186 Hn: fp cresc. (to bt. 2) missing; dim. to p is incorrect
mm. 187–88 Horn line missing
m. 187 Note that the final tied quarter in the Tenor solo is missing in the octavo

Movement II “Dust of men”
mm. 29–30 Cl: tie (from m. 29 to 30) missing
m. 70 Pno: RH should be C-flat 4 + E-flat 4
m. 123 Cl: mf missing
mm. 139–40 Cb: RH should be C-flat 4 + E-flat 4
mm. 168–70 Choral tenor part: ties missing for sustained word “men”
mm. 187–88 Hn, Tpts: tie (from m. 187 to 188) missing
mm. 192–207 Fl: 8va missing
m. 204 Snare: eighth note missing from end of bar
m. 205 Cl: ff missing
mm. 209–13 Fl: 8va missing
mm. 217–19 Percussion: last three bars are Timpani roll (C#3); compare to sustained pitch and dynamics of Tbn line

Movement III “They are mine”
m. 4 Soprano solo: “one of my” should be contained within an eighth note triplet figure
m. 19 Tpt I: first pitch should be B4
m. 22 Tpts: decrescendo missing
mm. 45–52 Fl: to be played on piccolo
mm. 45–50  Oboe line missing
m. 52    Cb: half rest, quarter note B-flat 3, quarter rest
mm. 68–70 Perc: play on Snare, not Bass Drum
m. 99    Cl: mf missing
m. 100   Should Tpt I and Xylo. play same pitch on last quarter (???)
mm. 102  Ob, Cl: decrescendo missing
mm. 117–339 Corresponds to mm. 118–340 in the octavo
m. 198   Cb: quarter D-flat 3 on bt. 1
m. 201   Vc: 3/4 missing
m. 240   Cb: bt. 3 should be an octave: A-flat 1 + A-flat 2
m. 248   Fl: pp on bt. 2
m. 248   Ob. Cb: pp on bt. 3
m. 248   Bsn: tenor clef missing (tenor clef through m. 250)
m. 252   Cl: p missing

Movement IV “When the red and the white men met”
m. 13    Contrabsn: should be bass clef
mm. 31–38 Bass Drum line missing
m. 44    Cb: F3 on last quarter missing
m. 46    Snare: bts. 2–3 missing
m. 52    Cl: quarter rest at end of bar
m. 57    Vn I: bt. 4 is G4 (not F4)
m. 58    Fl: first pitch should be C5 (not A4)
mm. 75–78 Percussion: play on Timpani/Bass Drum
mm. 78–82 Fl: play 8va if played on flute; loco if on piccolo
m. 85    Cb: whole rest missing
mm. 87–90 Timpani line is not the same as the part (pitches and rhythms)
m. 92    Percussion: Susp. Cymbal on downbeat
m. 94    Hn: single pitch on bt. 4 should be E5; dynamic level should be f
m. 94    Pno: D major chord (in 4th and 5th octaves) missing from bt. 4
mm. 94–95 Percussion: Slapstick in m. 94, Timpani C3 (or Bass Drum) in m. 95

Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years”
m. 5     Vn II: double stop: upper pitch is A4
mm. 31–154 Corresponds to mm. 30–153 in the octavo
m. 36    Tbn: last note is dynamic level f
m. 38    Hn, Tbn: decrescendo to p
m. 44    Note that the Bass solo rhythm for “elevators” is different in the octavo
m. 53    Perc: last beat is Snare (not Bass Drum)
m. 62    Fl, Cl: più rit. missing
m. 84    Cb: mf missing
m. 91    Tpt I: f missing
mm. 96–97 Percussion line missing from bt. 2 of m. 96
m. 109   Tpts I, II: tie missing between last subdivision of bt. 2 and first subdivi-
sion of bt. 3
mm. 116, 120, 121 – Pno: sf missing
m. 120 Tbn: downbeat should be B3 (not D3)
m. 150 Vc: rhythm should match rest of strings (half note then whole note); pitches are correct
m. 154 Cl: should be 8vb

Movement VIa “Cool prayers”
* This movement is erroneously called “Cool prayer” (singular) in the conductor’s score.

Movement VIb “O prairie girl”
mm. 58–146 Corresponds to mm. 1–89 in the octavo
m. 59 Note that the Tpt I rhythm is indicated incorrectly in the octavo
m. 59 Vn I, II, Vla: should be dotted half followed by quarter rest
m. 69 Vc: should be dotted half followed by quarter note C2
m. 84 Vc: top pitch should be D3 (not F#3)
m. 109 Vc: both pitches should be flattened
mm. 138–41 Contrabass line missing

Movement VIc “Songs hidden in eggs”
* Note that in the octavo, the bars in this movement are of different lengths and are not numbered. See Chapter 2 for clarification.
mm. 162–66 Snare Drum line missing
m. 204 Cl: diminuendo missing

Movement VII “To-morrow”
m. 27 Marked as ⌣ in conductor’s score only
m. 41 Note that the Tenor solo does not have any fermatas in the octavo
m. 56 Note that this bar is mis-numbered as 55 in the octavo
mm. 73–74 Vn I: gli altri indicated in Vn II line with stems up
mm. 88–89 B. Cl: omit the tie over the barline
m. 90 Vc: pitches should be G2, A2; rhythm is correct
m. 91 Vc: last pitch should be G2
m. 92 Vc: first pitch should be A2
mm. 96–97 Tbn: tie (from m. 96 to 97) missing
m. 99 Trombone line missing
m. 100 Tpt III: f missing
m. 141 B. Cl: diminuendo missing
m. 165 Hn: ff missing
m. 180 Pno: should be sff (not ff)
m. 182 Tbn: first pitch should be A2 (not B-flat 2)
m. 203 Timp: both notes should be marked sf
mm. 206–07 Timp: last bt. of m. 206 and first bt. of m. 207 should both be marked sf
m. 215 Solo vocal parts: text should be “new people” (not “new cities”)
m. 220 Tpt II, III: p missing
m. 221 Solo vocal parts: text should be “new people” (not “new cities”)
m. 223 Choral vocal parts: text should be “new people” (not “new cities”)
m. 262 Hn: *decrescendo* missing
m. 276 Mis-numbered as m. 275 in conductor’s score
mm. 277–90 Picc: should be 8va
mm. 287–90 Should Xylo. play M2s as in previous section (???)
mm. 298–302 Picc: should be 8va through bt. 3 of m. 302
m. 310 Vn II: A4 half note in second half of bar missing
m. 314 Vn II: half note in second half of bar should be D5
mm. 326–27 B. Cl: tie (from m. 326 to 327) missing
m. 340 Snare: accent missing from last eighth note
m. 345 Snare: downbeat missing
m. 347 Vn I: first pitch in bt. 2 is E4
m. 371 Vn II, Vla, Vc: *p* should be *p sub.*
m. 391 Hn: *crescendo* missing
m. 401 Tbn: last pitch should be B2
m. 405 Vn II: last three pitches should be B3, C4, D4
m. 406 Tbn: first pitch is F3
m. 411 Suspended Cymbal roll begins on bt. 4 of m. 411
mm. 412–13 Tpt II, III: tie (from m. 412 to 413) missing
m. 413 Tbn: *p* missing at end of *decrecendo*
m. 414 Hn, Tpts: rests missing at end of bar
m. 415 Cl: should be G-flat 4 (not G4); G-flat 4 is tied through m. 417
m. 417 Cl: should be G-flat 4 (not G4); G-flat 4 is tied into m. 418
m. 418 Hn: *decrecendo* to *p* missing

**FLUTE/PICCOLO**

**Movement I** “I was born on the Prairie”
m. 35 DO NOT PLAY; the F#4 in m. 34 should be one bar only; m. 35 should be one bar of rest
m. 54 *poco più mosso*
m. 84 *mp* (not *p*) and *espressivo*
m. 150 no *rit.*
m. 155 *crescendo*
m. 156 *colla voce*

**Movement II** “Dust of men”
mm. 14–15 no *rit.*
mm. 30–31 no *rit.*
mm. 114–15 play handwritten notes
m. 127 *marcato*
mm. 132–33 follow revised part
m. 172 play; *p* (not *mp*)

**Movement III** “They are mine”
mm. 31–34 four bars of rest
m. 191 \textit{mp}
m. 248 \textit{pp} (not \textit{p})
mm. 289–94 NO CUT
mm. 295–97 DO NOT follow handwritten notes; follow revised part instead
mm. 334–39 follow handwritten notes or revised part

Movement IV “When the red and the white men met”
mm. 5–8 NO CUT
m. 58 second pitch is A-flat 4 (not A4)
m. 59 third pitch is correct as A4
mm. 64–end follow revised part from bt. 4 of m. 64, with the following corrections:
  • mm. 67–68 – slur from bt. 2 in m. 67 to bt. 1 in m. 68
  • mm. 78–82 – play on piccolo; return to flute at m. 87
  • m. 78 \textit{ff} and \textit{marcato} on bt. 4
  • m. 88 slur from bt. 1 to bt. 2

Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years”
m. 2 \textit{Andante}
m. 21 \textit{mp} (not \textit{mf})
mm. 119–125 \textit{loco} (not 8va)

Movement VIa “Cool prayers”
m. 15 handwritten note of 6/8 and chorus entry is correct
mm. 44–47 flute solo is missing; follow revised part

Movement VIb “O prairie girl”
m. 62 this bar is comprised of the two measures (combined) before the 3/4 (\textit{Andante}); \textit{Andante} begins in m. 63

Movement VIc “Songs hidden in eggs”
pg. 13, line 9 this line begins with m. 205
mm. 235–36 no tie between these two bars; breathe between the bars

Movement VII “To-morrow”
m. 165 hold back
mm. 212–14 oboe cue (DO NOT PLAY)
mm. 335–39 five bars of rest (not two)
m. 357 clarinet cue begins here (the indication of “Cl. in B\textsuperscript{b}” at m. 335 is not correct)
m. 379 NO CUT
m. 383 NO CUT
**OOBE/ENGLISH HORN**

**Movement II** “Dust of men”
m. 14  no *rit*.  
m. 88  *pp* (not *p*)  
m. 127  *marcato*  
m. 171  *p* (not *mp*)  
m. 174  *p* (not *mp*)

**Movement III** “They are mine”
m. 191  *mp*  
mm. 289–94  **NO CUT**  
m. 295  *Tempo*  
mm. 304–06  wrong notes in these bars; follow revised part  
m. 309  *calando* (begins here)

**Movement IV** “When the red and the white men met”
mm. 1–2  play on English horn; ignore small, handwritten notes above the part  
mm. 5–8  **NO CUT**  
m. 38  *pp* (not *p*)  
m. 64–end  follow revised part from bt. 4 of m. 64, with the following corrections:  
  • m. 69  A5 (not G5) on bt. 2  
  • mm. 71–72 – in both bars, slur the quarters in groups of 2 (ref: bts. 1–2 in m. 71)  
  • m. 75  *ff*  
  • m. 78  *ff* and *marcato* on bt. 4

**Movement V** “In the dark of a thousand years”
m. 5  ten bars of rest  
mm. 45–56  **NO CUT**  
mm. 151–152  play 8va (E5, not E4)  
m. 154 (last bar) – play 8va (E5, not E4)

**Movement VIa** “Cool prayers”
m. 13  *rit.*  
mm. 44–47  **DO NOT PLAY**; this is a flute cue; return to playing at m. 48

**Movement VIb** “O prairie girl”
m. 100  play

**Movement VIc** “Songs hidden in eggs”
m. 178  *p* (not *pp*)

**Movement VII** “To-morrow”
m. 55  this bar is the first measure on pg. 14, line 9  
m. 165  hold back  
m. 246  *p* (not *pp*)
mm. 258–60  follow handwritten notes or revised part
mm. 277–79  piccolo cue should be indicated an octave higher
mm. 335–39  five bars of rest (not two)
m. 379       NO CUT
m. 383       NO CUT

CLARINET in B-FLAT/BASS CLARINET

Movement I  “I was born on the Prairie”
mm. 1–6     follow revised part
m. 54       poco più mosso
mm. 93–94   bassoon cue (DO NOT PLAY)

Movement II “Dust of men”
  m. 14       no rit.
  m. 131      this bar erroneously crossed out
  m. 127      mp and marcato
  m. 171      p (not mp)
  m. 174      p (not mp)
  mm. 179–81  follow handwritten notes
  mm. 185–89  DO NOT follow handwritten notes; follow revised part

Movement III “They are mine”
  m. 191      mp
  mm. 289–94  NO CUT; play at m. 294

Movement IV “When the red and the white men met”
  mm. 5–8     NO CUT
  m. 43       pp
  m. 60       play four quarters: D4 / B3 / A3 / G#3
  mm. 65–end  follow revised part, with this correction:
               • m. 78   ff and marcato on bt. 4
               • m. 95   Note that only the clarinet part has the third of the chord; is this a mistake?

Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years”
  m. 2        Andante
  m. 21       mp (not mf)
  mm. 45–56   NO CUT
  pg. 13, line 8:
               • first bar on this line is m. 137
               • third bar on this line, printed as 140 (but crossed out) is m. 139
               • fourth bar on this line, written in by hand, is m. 140
               • the handwritten extra bar of repeat at the end of the line is correct: this is m. 142
  m. 146      mf (not f)
  mm. 151–52  loco
  m. 154 (last bar) – 8vb
Movement VIb “O prairie girl”
m. 126 DO NOT PLAY this tied-over note; stop playing the sustained E5 at the 
end of m. 125; this measure should be a bar of rest

Movement VIc “Songs hidden in eggs”
m. 208 pp on bt. 2

Movement VII “To-morrow”
m. 100 f (not ff)
mm. 133–34 these bars are both 3+2 (not 2+3)
m. 165 hold back
mm. 208–09, 212–13 – these bars are added parts; remove the slur on the two eighths that 
end each of these phrases
mm. 258–59 oboe cue (DO NOT PLAY)
mm. 337–39 NO CUT
m. 379 NO CUT
m. 383 NO CUT
mm. 415–end follow revised part

BASSOON/CONTRABASSOON

Movement I “I was born on the Prairie”
m. 54 poco più mosso
m. 79 missing from part; follow revised part
mm. 80–93 follow handwritten notes

Movement II “Dust of men”
m. 14 no rit.
mm. 135–49 missing from part; follow revised part
mm. 162–66 missing from part; follow revised part
mm. 174–75 missing from part; follow revised part
mm. 179–81 missing from part; follow revised part
mm. 185–88 missing from part; follow revised part
m. 199 G#2 on bt. 2

Movement III “They are mine”
mm. 9–10 follow handwritten notes or revised part; p dynamic level
mm. 25–26 missing from part; follow revised part
mm. 33–35 follow handwritten notes (three bars of sustained F2)
m. 42 missing quarter note G3 on bt 2
m. 76 p
m. 220 missing from part; follow revised part
mm. 225–26 missing from part from bt. 3 of m. 225; follow revised part
mm. 289–94 NO CUT
Movement IV “When the red and the white men met”

mm. 5–8 NO CUT

mm. 65–end follow revised part, with this correction:
  • m. 71 bt. 3 is B3 (not A3)

Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years”

m. 19 last 3 beats: each quarter should have a staccato marking; all three beats should be connected with a slur

mm. 45–56 NO CUT

m. 146 \( mf \) (not \( f \))

m. 152 play tied note for half note value (one beat in 3/2), then rest for two beats

Movement VIc “Songs hidden in eggs”

m. 208 \( pp \) on bt. 2

Movement VII “To-morrow”

mm. 41–42 two bars of rest

mm. 89–92 missing from part; follow revised part

mm. 103–06 missing from part; follow revised part

mm. 116–25 optional bassoon 2 part indicated on revised part

mm. 133–34 these bars are both 3+2 (not 2+3)

mm. 146–47 optional bassoon 2 part indicated on revised part

mm. 151–52 optional bassoon 2 part indicated on revised part

m. 165 hold back

m. 192 \( fp \) (not \( p \))

mm. 208–09, 212–13 – these bars are added parts; remove the slur on the two eighths that end each of these phrases

mm. 277–80 piccolo cue should be indicated an octave higher

mm. 300–02 three bars of rest

mm. 337–39 NO CUT

m. 365 first pitch is A3

m. 379 NO CUT

m. 383 NO CUT

m. 397 \( f \)

mm. 415–end follow revised part

HORN in F

Movement I “I was born on the Prairie”

m. 54 \( poco più mosso \)

m. 96 \( fp \) (not \( p \))

m. 164 \( mp \) (not \( p \))

Movement II “Dust of men”

m. 14 no \( rit. \)

m. 16 \( a \) \( tempo \) is irrelevant
m. 31 no rit.
m. 33 a tempo is irrelevant
m. 105 p (not pp)
mm. 114–15 handwritten notes are added (not in the score); the score indicates that the horn plays two bars of sustained G#4 (two tied whole notes)
m. 151 espressivo at bt. 3
m. 181 cross out handwritten “marcato”
m. 197 fp
mm. 200–01 crescendo to downbeat of m. 201; fp on downbeat of m. 201
m. 214 rit. applies to this bar, not the bar above

Movement III “They are mine”
m. 15 p (not pp)
mm. 33–35 follow handwritten notes in bass clef (sustained G2 after quarter rest on downbeat of m. 33)
m. 187 play A4 (ignore the crossed-out accidental)
m. 220 follow handwritten notes (two half note B3s)
mm. 225 (bt. 3) through 226 – follow handwritten notes (half note E4, whole note E4)
m. 244 mp
mm. 284–88 follow revised part
mm. 289–94 NO CUT

Movement IV “When the red and the white men met”
mm. 5–8 NO CUT
m. 16 poco rit.
m. 17 a tempo
m. 44 start p; crescendo through the bar to arrive at mf in m. 45
m. 51 note the change in pitch to E4
m. 52 crescendo into downbeat of m. 53
m. 53 p on bt. 2
m. 54 p on bt. 2
m. 60 follow handwritten notes: B-flat 4 / A4 / G4 / F#4 / E4, in the rhythm quarter / quarter / quarter / eighth / eighth
m. 69 note the change in pitch to G4
m. 71 original part shows two quarters on bts. 2 and 3 (G4 / B-flat 4); play revised note (half note G4) (???)
m. 72 original part shows two quarters on bts. 2 and 3 (G4 / C5); play revised note (half note G4) (???)
mm. 75–86 NO CUT
mm. 86–end follow handwritten notes or revised part

Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years”
m. 2 Andante
m. 32 mf
m. 36 ff
mm. 49–51 oboe cue (DO NOT PLAY)
m. 52 \( f \)
m. 114 \( mf \)
mm. 114, 116, 120, 121, 122 – cross out the handwritten \( sfz \) markings
m. 134 bt. 3: two eighths on F#4 (rather than one quarter)
m. 146 \( mf \) (not \( f \))
m. 154 (last bar) – \( ppp \) (not \( pp \))

**Movement VIb “O prairie girl”**

mm. 104–05 \( tenuto \) on both half notes
mm. 135–39 five bars of rest

**Movement VII “To-morrow”**

mm. 69–71 slur this phrase
mm. 151–52 no tie between these two bars; breathe between the bars
m. 165 hold back
m. 168 no \( rit. \)
mm. 277–79 piccolo cue should be indicated an octave higher
m. 280 \( p \) (not \( mf \)); \( legato \)
mm. 280–89 all half notes and dotted half notes in this section are \( tenuto \) (also the whole note in m. 287); all three tied quarters are accented on initial quarter
mm. 335–39 five bars of rest
mm. 375–79 five bars of rest
mm. 383–84 two bars of rest
m. 397 \( fp, crescendo \) through m. 398
m. 402 cross out this tied note; sustained G#5 concludes at the end of m. 401
mm. 411–14 follow handwritten notes or revised part
m. 415 last pitch in this bar (pick-up to m. 416) is B4
m. 417 last pitch in this bar (pick-up to m. 418) is \( ff \) in dynamic level

---

**TRUMPETS I, II, III**

**Movement I “I was born on the Prairie”**

m. 1 II \( mp \) (not \( p \))
m. 169 tutti \( molto rit. \) (instead of \( poco rit. \))
m. 185 II cross out handwritten tied note; Tpt II note stops at the end of m. 184
m. 186 II replace \( fp \) cresc. with \( mf \) \( dim. p \)

m. 186 III replace handwritten \( crescendo \) with \( dimuendo \) to \( p \)

**Movement II “Dust of men”**

m. 78 I \( mp \) (not \( p \))
m. 81 I \( mp \) (not \( mf \))
m. 167 III \( p \) at start of this bar (cross out \( decrescendo \) to \( p \))
m. 197 I, II \( fp \)
m. 200 tutti \( crescendo \)
m. 201 tutti \( fp \)
Movement III “They are mine”
m. 16 I 4/4
mm. 71–74 I four bars of rest
mm. 87–89 II piccolo cue should be indicated an octave higher
m. 99 I, II piccolo cue should be indicated an octave higher
m. 107 II mp
m. 192 I ppp (not pp)
mm. 285–86 III tied pitch from m. 285 into 286 should be G4 (not C4)
mm. 289–94 tutti NO CUT

Movement IV “When the red and the white men met”
mm. 5–8 I NO CUT
mm. 5–9 II, III five bars of rest
m. 13 I p
m. 16 tutti poco rit.
m. 17 tutti a tempo
mm. 64–end tutti follow revised parts from bt. 4 of m. 64, with the following corrections:
  • m. 64 I revised part begins at f dynamic level
  • m. 73 I accent (in addition to sfp)
  • m. 77 (tutti) ff
  • m. 95 I play C4 (not C5)

Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years”
m. 2 tutti Andante
m. 49 II oboe cue (DO NOT PLAY)
m. 52 I mf (not mp)
m. 54 II play
m. 56 II last pitch is quarter note A4
m. 91 II follow handwritten notes (note that the bar begins with a quarter rest)
m. 96 III mp
m. 106 II f (not ff); marcato
m. 109 II tie last note in second triplet to first note in third triplet
m. 112 tutti Vivace
m. 114 I, III mf (not sf)
m. 116 I, III cross out handwritten sf
m. 120 I, III cross out handwritten sf
m. 121 I, III cross out handwritten sf
m. 144 I half note at end of bar is a cue note (DO NOT PLAY)
m. 148 tutti replace “crescendo to mp” with a swell (cresc.-dim.) on the whole note
m. 149 tutti begin this bar p
m. 154 I DO NOT PLAY this last bar
Movement VIb “O prairie girl”

m. 59  I  add eighth rest before two sixteenths; the sixteenths sound on the & of 3
m. 59  II  add eighth rest in Tpt I cue, as indicated in the comment directly above

mm. 59–62  I  pp
m. 62  I, II  rhythm is correct; unlike m. 59, this stmt. begins on bt. 3 (not the & of 3)

m. 100  I  mf
m. 101  I  cross out handwritten f

Movement VII “To-morrow”

m. 96  I  crescendo from the first note to the second
m. 100  II  play F4 as a dotted half on the downbeat
m. 104  III  sustain A4 for two more quarters (instead of resting)
m. 165  tutti  hold back
m. 209  I  pp
m. 213  I  pp
m. 232  I  before m. 235, count three bars of rest in cut time (not four)
m. 235  I  beginning here, count fifteen bars of rest through m. 249
m. 258  I  oboe cue (DO NOT PLAY)
m. 265  I  pp
m. 266  III  pp (not mp)
m. 335–39  tutti  five bars of rest
m. 344  III  second note should be on the & of 2 (not directly on 2)
m. 350  I  one bar of rest
m. 351  I  play this bar two times (= m. 351 and 352)
m. 379  tutti  NO CUT
m. 383  tutti  NO CUT
m. 415  tutti  follow handwritten instructions/notes; after repeat of mm. 416–17, sustain into last bar

TROMBONE

Movement I “I was born on the Prairie”

mm. 118–25  cross out slurs on last two notes of each bar in this section
mm. 118–21  play B3 quarter note on downbeat of each of these four bars
mm. 122–23  play A#3 quarter note on downbeat of each of these two bars
mm. 124–25  play A3 quarter note on downbeat of each of these two bars
mm. 142–48  cross out slurs on last two notes of each bar in this section

Movement II “Dust of men”

m. 201  fp (not mf)
m. 212  no rit.
### Movement III “They are mine”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm. 284–94</td>
<td>NO CUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 317</td>
<td>( p ) (not ( mp ))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Movement IV “When the red and the white men met”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm. 5–14</td>
<td>ten bars of rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 59</td>
<td>follow handwritten triplet pattern on beat 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 60</td>
<td>follow handwritten notes (three quarters, two eighths: ( E_{\text{flat}} - 3 / D3 / C3 / B2 / A2 ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 64–end</td>
<td>follow revised part from bt. 4 of m. 64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. 2</td>
<td>( \text{Andante} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 25</td>
<td>( \text{Con moto} ) (begins here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 28</td>
<td>DO NOT PLAY handwritten notes in this 5/4 bar; rest for the full bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 32</td>
<td>DO NOT PLAY handwritten notes in this 5/4 bar unless asked to do so (they double another part); rest for the full bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 33</td>
<td>double bass cue (DO NOT PLAY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 34</td>
<td>play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 64</td>
<td>cross out handwritten “in 4”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 151–52</td>
<td>DO NOT PLAY these bars; stop at the end of m. 150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Movement VII “To–morrow”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. 104</td>
<td>cross out handwritten ( f ) at end of bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 165</td>
<td>hold back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 170</td>
<td>cross out handwritten ( fff )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 192</td>
<td>( fp ) (not ( p ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 277–80</td>
<td>piccolo cue should be indicated an octave higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 335–39</td>
<td>five bars of rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 365–84</td>
<td>twenty bars of rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 398–99</td>
<td>follow handwritten notes, then skip immediately to end of line where handwritten m. 400 appears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 400</td>
<td>this bar begins with a quarter rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pg. 14, last bar – cross out this bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 404</td>
<td>play this first bar of pg. 15 (even though it is crossed out in the part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 417–18</td>
<td>follow handwritten notes, dynamics; last note (tied-over note in m. 418) is a quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pg. 15, last line – DO NOT PLAY the crossed-out bar; no trombone in final bar (m. 419)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERCUSSION

**Movement I “I was born on the Prairie”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm. 126–27</td>
<td>follow revised part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 128</td>
<td>SD is ( pp )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
m. 128 this bar is played 22 times (mm. 128–49); add an extra bar at the end of the top line on pg. 3 (that extra bar will be the fifteenth time m. 128 is played)

pg. 3, line 2:
- begins with the sixteenth time m. 128 is played
- the third bar (not the fourth) on this line is m. 145
- the last played bar (BD by itself on bt. 1) is m. 150
- cross out the bar printed as 150; do not count this one bar of rest
- count the four bars of rest toward the end of the line; these are mm. 151–54
- follow the part as written from here on

Movement II “Dust of men”
m. 189 both SD and BD are p; this bar is played four times (mm. 189–92)

Movement III “They are mine”
m. 80 piccolo solo (cue) begins on eighth bar of 10-bar rest (m. 87)
m. 214 accent both notes
mm. 289–94 NO CUT; play the cymbal part in m. 290
mm. 335–39 five bars of rest (not four)

Movement IV “When the red and the white men met”
m. 45 ignore extraneous handwritten note after this bar
m. 46 play this bar
mm. 50–53 four bars of rest
m. 60 rhythm is quarter rest / quarter note C3 / quarter note C3 / quarter rest
m. 64 accent all three notes
mm. 65–72 follow revised part
mm. 75–86 NO CUT
m. 87 (where timpani plays) – the five notes in this bar should be C3 / C3 / G2 / C3 / G2; follow the rhythm as written
m. 89 first pitch is C3; rest of bar is all G2; follow the rhythm as written
m. 90 marked incorrectly; it is the last bar on the second-to-last line of pg. 8; the first bar on the last line is m. 91
m. 95 possibly for timpani (on C3) or bass drum (???)

Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years”
mm. 112–22 all rim-shots

Movement VIc “Songs hidden in eggs”
mm. 162, 163, 165, 166 – SD hits are probably crossed out because they are not indicated in conductor’s score; however, they work well to define the 8/8 meter (???)

Movement VII “To–morrow”
m. 41 violin cue note is tied over from the previous bar
mm. 287–90 – although indicated as single notes, it is likely these should be two notes (E5 + F#5), as indicated in mm. 275–280 (???)

mm. 337–39 NO CUT
m. 341 accent on first note
m. 343 no cresc.

mm. 375–85 NO CUTS in this section (m. 375 is played 9 times total; change to new pattern at m. 384)

mm. 395–400 two bars of rest, then play timpani, mm. 397–99 (note the line above the timpani notes in mm. 397–98: play each of these bars as a whole bar of steady eighth notes)

mm. 415–end follow revised part

PIANO

Movement I “I was born on the Prairie”
m. 11 RH upper notes should be A4 / E5 / C#5; rhythm is eighth / eighth / dotted half
mm. 128–48 follow revised part
m. 149 rit.
m. 173 RH upper notes should be D4 / B3; rhythm is sixteenth / dotted eighth tied to half

Movement II “Dust of men”
m. 31 no rit.
m. 64 NO CUT
m. 162 follow revised part
m. 162 no 5–bar rest
mm. 163–206 NO CUT
m. 207 follow handwritten notes for LH, beats 1–2: F#3 / F#3 / D#2 / F#2; rhythm is eighth / eighth / eighth / eighth

Movement III “They are mine”
m. 25 cello cue (DO NOT PLAY)

Movement IV “When the red and the white men met”
m. 38 no 9-bar rest
m. 38 piano part begins here with last two eighth notes in octaves: first eighth is E4/E5, second is F#4/F#5
m. 39 p (not mp)
mm. 39–46 NO CUT
mm. 61–95 follow revised part

Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years”
m. 26 sempre staccato
mm. 30, 35 these bars are correctly numbered; ignore handwritten changes
m. 114 sf
Movement VII “To–morrow”
m. 26 \( \text{poco rit.} \) indicated above this bar applies to this bar
m. 72 follow handwritten notes for RH: D4 (sixteenth) / B3 (dotted eighth tied to half)
m. 184 no E3 in LH
m. 260 \( pp \)
m. 334 LH first eighth note of bt. 4 is B1 (not D2)
m. 336 LH second eighth note of bt. 4 is B1 (not D2)
mm. 337–39 NO CUT
mm. 375–87 follow revised part
mm. 415–end follow revised part

VIOLIN I

Movement II “Dust of men”
m. 161 \( \text{dim.} \)
m. 200 \( \text{crescendo} \) over bts. 3–4
m. 201 \( \text{sfz} \) on downbeat

Movement III “They are mine”
m. 32 third quarter is A-flat 5
m. 41 \( \text{crescendo} \) from last half of bar into next downbeat
m. 110 third quarter is A-flat 4
m. 202 \( \text{crescendo} \) from last eighth into next downbeat
m. 203 \( \text{crescendo} \) from second to third eighth
mm. 289–94 NO CUT

Movement IV “When the red and the white men met”
mm. 5–8 NO CUT
m. 29 \( pp \) on bt. 4
m. 47 \( \text{decrescendo} \) bts. 1–2 and bts. 3–4 (\textit{simile} through m. 54)
mm. 47–54 \( \text{tenuto/staccato} \) on each quarter
m. 53 bt. 1 is E-flat 4 (???)
mm. 64–end follow revised part from bt. 4 of m. 64, with the following correction:
\begin{itemize}
  \item m. 70 slur bt. 1 to 2
\end{itemize}

Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years”
m. 3 add E4 grace note
mm. 146–50 NO CUTS

Movement VIc “Songs hidden in eggs”
m. 176 two eighths on bt. 4 are C5, C5

Movement VII “To–morrow”
m. 216 flute cue (DO NOT PLAY)
mm. 224–27 follow revised part (if needed)
m. 332  \textit{Meno mosso} (begins here, not in m. 333)
mm. 337–39 NO CUT
mm. 340–44 \textit{staccato} throughout
mm. 368–69 follow revised part
mm. 375–79 five bars of rest (not four)
m. 383 NO CUT
m. 397 add another repetition of repeated bar; repeated bar is played three times total
mm. 415–end follow revised part

\textbf{VIOLIN II}

\textbf{Movement II “Dust of men”}
m. 161 \textit{dim.}
m. 200 \textit{crescendo} over bts. 3–4
m. 201 \textit{sfz} on downbeat

\textbf{Movement III “They are mine”}
m. 41 \textit{crescendo} from last half of bar into next downbeat
m. 202 \textit{crescendo} from last eighth into next downbeat
m. 203 \textit{crescendo} from second to third eighth
mm. 289–94 NO CUT

\textbf{Movement IV “When the red and the white men met”}
mm. 5–8 NO CUT
m. 53 play B3 on bt. 3; slur together the three quarters in this bar (? ? ?)
mm. 60–61 follow revised part
mm. 64–end follow revised part from bt. 4 of m. 64, with the following correction:
\begin{itemize}
  \item m. 70 slur bt. 1 to 2
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years”}
m. 3 add A3 grace note
mm. 146–end follow revised part

\textbf{Movement VII “To–morrow”}
m. 42 one bar of rest
m. 78 one bar of rest (DO NOT PLAY printed note)
mm. 224–27 follow revised part (if needed)
m. 258 oboe cue (DO NOT PLAY)
m. 332 \textit{Meno mosso} (begins at downbeat)
mm. 337–39 NO CUT
mm. 342–44 \textit{staccato} throughout
m. 368 quarter rest on bt. 3
mm. 375–79 five bars of rest (not four)
m. 383 NO CUT
m. 402  one bar of rest (DO NOT PLAY printed note)
mm. 415–end  follow revised part

VIOLA

Movement I  “I was born on the Prairie”
m. 41  mp
m. 57  F#3 (not F3)
m. 111  piano subito
mm. 118–35  staccato throughout

Movement II  “Dust of men”
m. 161  dim.

Movement III  “They are mine”
m. 38  violin II cue is in treble clef
m. 41  crescendo from last half of bar into next downbeat
m. 244  arco
mm. 289–94  NO CUT

Movement IV  “When the red and the white men met”
mm. 5–8  NO CUT
m. 53  play A-flat 3 on bt. 3 (???)
m. 62  in bts. 3–4, lower part slur last two quarters
mm. 64–end  follow revised part from bt. 4 of m. 64, with the following correction:
  •  m. 70  slur bt. 1 to 2

Movement V  “In the dark of a thousand years”
m. 3  add E3 grace note
m. 5  mp
m. 7  play E3 and E4 (double) on bt. 3

Movement VIa  “Cool prayers”
m. 53  5th note should be G4 (not another F#4)

Movement VIc  “Songs hidden in eggs”
m. 201  play B-flat 3 for half note, then half rest

Movement VII  “To–morrow”
m. 63  no slur between the notes
m. 78  one bar of rest (DO NOT PLAY printed note)
m. 106  lower note on bt. 3 is F#, tied to previous half note
mm. 230–31  NO CUT: oboe cue is correct except for erroneous C5 on bt. 3 (should be quarter rest)
mm. 337–39  NO CUT
mm. 341–44  staccato throughout
m. 351   bt. 4 is F3 (not A3)
m. 383   NO CUT
m. 402   bt. 1 is quarter rest (DO NOT PLAY printed note)
mm. 415-end   follow revised part

---

**CELLO**

**Movement I** “I was born on the Prairie”
m. 11   *decrescendo* into next downbeat
mm. 34–36   follow revised part
m. 42   *mp*
m. 48   *dim.*
m. 50   marked incorrectly as m. 55
mm. 82–94   follow revised part
m. 111   *piano subito*
m. 135   follow revised part
m. 158   tenderly

**Movement II** “Dust of men”
m. 71   *f* (not *ff*); *arco*
mm. 64–70   follow revised part (if needed)
m. 105   *legg.; crescendo* over bts. 3–4
m. 149   *arco*
m. 161   *dim.*

**Movement III** “They are mine”
m. 41   *crescendo* from last half of bar into next downbeat
m. 201   3/4 beginning this bar
m. 256   *mp*
mm. 289–94   NO CUT
m. 309   *calando* (here, not m. 310)

**Movement IV** “When the red and the white men met”
mm. 5–8   NO CUT
m. 60   follow revised part
mm. 64–end   follow revised part from bt. 4 of m. 64

**Movement V** “In the dark of a thousand years”
m. 59   *decrescendo* to *p* in first half of bar; continue to *decrescendo* to *pp* in second half of bar
m. 88   erroneous flat sign on C3
m. 99   *f* for last two eighths
m. 146   *mf* (instead of *f*)
Movement VIa “Cool prayers”
* Note that the only Vc note in this entire movement is the last bar (m. 57).

Movement VIb “O prairie girl”
m. 80 downbeat should be three pitches: E2, B2, D3
m. 112 dolce

Movement VII “To–morrow”
m. 78 one bar of rest (DO NOT PLAY printed note)
m. 138 dim.
mm. 337–39 NO CUT
mm. 340–41 arco; staccato throughout
mm. 343–45 viola cue (DO NOT PLAY)
m. 379 NO CUT
m. 383 NO CUT
mm. 415–end follow revised part

BASS

Movement I “I was born on the Prairie”
m. 42 mp
m. 135 play: B2 quarter / quarter rest / quarter rest (this bar should look like m. 136)
m. 149 rit. (here, not m. 151)
m. 158 tenderly

Movement II “Dust of men”
m. 25 the oboe solo (cue shown in this bar) begins at the pick-up to m. 17; this
cue shows the continuation of the solo
mm. 64–70 follow revised part (if needed)
m. 71 arco
m. 105 legg.; crescendo over bts. 3–4
m. 115 mp on bt. 3
mm. 153–54 poco crescendo applies to these two bars, not to the bar below (m. 159) as
it looks in the part
m. 161 dim.
m. 162 no f; continue dim. from m. 161; dim. to p on bt. 3 of m. 162

Movement III “They are mine”
m. 26 left hand pizz. on downbeat (???)
m. 41 crescendo from last half of bar into next downbeat
m. 111 legg. at third quarter
m. 115 dim.at third quarter
m. 116 pp at third quarter
m. 244 arco
m. 252 pizz.
Movement IV “When the red and the white men met”
mm. 5–8 NO CUT
m. 9 p
m. 16 no mf
m. 17 p
mm. 31–33, 35–36 – articulation marking is staccato with slurs connecting bts. 1–2 and 3–4
mm. 64–end follow revised part from bt. 4 of m. 64, with the following corrections:
  • m. 65 arco
  • m. 73 A2 (not A-flat 2) on bt. 2

Movement V “In the dark of a thousand years”
m. 59 decrescendo to p in first half of bar; continue to decrescendo to pp in second half of bar
m. 99 f for last two eighths
m. 110 tied note on downbeat should be the same E-flat 2 from bt. 4 of m. 109
m. 122 sempre ff
m. 123 last two eighths are F#3 and B2
m. 148 mf

Movement VIa “Cool prayers”
m. 34 ritard.

Movement VIb “O prairie girl”
m. 59 the trumpet cue should begin with two sixteenth notes (not eighth notes), preceded by an eighth rest on bt. 3
m. 62 the trumpet cue should begin with two sixteenth notes (not eighth notes), beginning on bt. 3 (NOT preceded by an eighth rest as in m. 59)
m. 96 arco (not pizz.)
m. 120 mp

Movement VIc “Songs hidden in eggs”
m. 188 same as m. 187, except both pitches are accented

Movement VII “To–morrow”
m. 78 one bar of rest (DO NOT PLAY printed note)
mm. 133–34 these bars are both 3 + 2 (not 2 + 3)
m. 192 fp (not p) on downbeat
m. 196 fcrescendo on downbeat
mm. 337–39 NO CUT
m. 379 NO CUT
m. 383 NO CUT
mm. 415–end follow revised part
APPENDIX 2

REVISED PARTS THAT RECONCILE INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN
THE CONDUCTING SCORE OF THE PRAIRIE AND
THE 1976 REVISED ORCHESTRAL PARTS
(EXCLUDING MOVEMENT IV: MM. 64–95)

The following are revised parts that reconcile the conducting score and the 1976 revised orchestral parts. Excluded from this appendix are the revised parts created by Andrew Clark for movement IV: mm. 64–95; these appear in Appendix 3.

FLUTE

Movement I: mm. 132–33

\[\text{\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{flute_mov1}}\]

Movement III: mm. 295–97

\[\text{\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{flute_mov3}}\]

Movement III: mm. 334–39

\[\text{\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{flute_mov3}}\]

Movement VIa, mm. 44–47

\[\text{\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{flutemov6a}}\]
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OBOE

Movement III: mm. 304–06

Movement VII: mm. 258–60

CLARINET

Movement I: mm. 1–6

Movement II: mm. 185–89

Movement VII: mm. 415–end
BASSOON (page 1 of 3)

Movement I: m. 79

Movement II: mm. 135–89
BASSOON (page 2 of 3)

Movement III: mm. 9–10

Movement III: mm. 25–26

Movement III: mm. 220–26

Movement VII: mm. 89–92

Movement VII: mm. 103–06
BASSOON (page 3 of 3)

Movement VII: mm. 116–52 [optional Bassoon 2 part]

Movement VII: mm. 415–end
HORN

Movement III: mm. 284–288

Movement IV: mm. 86–end

Movement VII: mm. 411–14
PERCUSSION

Movement I: mm. 126–27

Movement IV: mm. 65–72

Movement VII: mm. 415–end
PIANO (page 1 of 3)

Movement I: mm. 128–48

Movement II: m. 162
PIANO (page 2 of 3)

Movement IV: mm. 61–end
PIANO (page 3 of 3)

Movement VII: mm. 375–87

Movement VII: mm. 415–end
VIOLIN I, VIOLIN II, VIOLA (page 1 of 2)

Movement IV: mm. 60–61 (Violin II)

Movement V: mm. 146–end (Violin II)

Movement VII: mm. 224–27 (Violin I, Violin II)
* Suggested revision for ensembles with fewer than four players on Violin I.

Movement VII: mm. 368–69 (Violin I)
VIOLIN I, VIOLIN II, VIOLA (page 2 of 2)

Movement VII: mm. 415–end (Violin I, Violin II, Viola)
CELLO, BASS (page 1 of 2)

Movement I: mm. 34–36 (Cello)

Movement I: mm. 82–94 (Cello)

Movement I: m. 135 (Cello)

Movement II: mm. 64–70 (Cello, Bass)
*Suggested revision for ensembles with one player on Bass and two players on Cello: divisi Bass may be played as double stops, or Bass may play low notes while second Cello plays upper Bass notes (down an octave).
CELLO, BASS (page 2 of 2)

Movement IV: mm. 60 (Cello)

Movement VII: mm. 415–end (Cello, Bass)
APPENDIX 3

ANDREW CLARK’S REVISED PARTS THAT RECONCILE INCONSISTENCIES
BETWEEN THE CONDUCTING SCORE OF *THE PRAIRIE* AND
THE 1976 REVISED ORCHESTRAL PARTS: MOVEMENT IV: MM. 64–95

The following are revised parts that reconcile the conducting score and the 1976 revised orchestral parts for Movement IV: mm. 64–95. These were created by Andrew Clark for use in his 2007 performances and recording. They are included by permission.

**FLUTE** (Movement IV: mm. 64–95)
The following corrections should be integrated when using this revised part:
- mm. 67–68 slur from bt. 2 in m. 67 to bt. 1 in m. 68
- mm. 78–82 play on piccolo; return to flute at m. 87
- m. 78 *ff* and *marcato* on bt. 4
- m. 88 slur from bt. 1 to bt. 2
OBOE (Movement IV: mm. 64–95)

The following corrections should be integrated when using this revised part:

- m. 69  A5 (not G5) on bt. 2
- mm. 71–72  in both bars, slur the quarters in groups of 2 (ref: bts. 1–2 in m. 71)
- m. 75  ff
- m. 78  ff and marcato on bt. 4

\[ \text{Music notation image} \]
CLARINET (Movement IV: mm. 64–95)
The following correction should be integrated when using this revised part:

- m. 78  ff and marcato on bt. 4
- m. 95  Note that only the clarinet part has the third of the chord; is this a mistake?
BASSOON (Movement IV: mm. 64–95)
The following correction should be integrated when using this revised part:

- m. 71 bt. 3 is B3 (not A3)
TRUMPET I (Movement IV: mm. 64–95)
The following corrections should be integrated when using this revised part:

- m. 64 revised part begins at $f$ dynamic level
- m. 73 accent (in addition to sfp)
- m. 77 dynamic level is $ff$
- m. 95 play C4 (not C5)
TRUMPET II (Movement IV: mm. 64–95)
The following correction should be integrated when using this revised part:
• m. 77 dynamic level is ff

[Music notation image]
TRUMPET III (Movement IV: mm. 64–95)
The following correction should be integrated when using this revised part:

- m. 77 dynamic level is **ff**
TROMBONE (Movement IV: mm. 64-95)
VIOLIN I (Movement IV: mm. 64–95)
The following correction should be integrated when using this revised part:

- m. 70 slur bt. 1 to 2
VIOLIN II (Movement IV: mm. 64–95)
The following correction should be integrated when using this revised part:
- m. 70  slur bt. 1 to 2
VIOLA (Movement IV: mm. 64–95)
The following correction should be integrated when using this revised part:

- m. 70          slur bt. 1 to 2

![Musical notation image]
CELLO (Movement IV: mm. 64–95)
BASS (Movement IV: mm. 64–95)
The following corrections should be integrated when using this revised part:

- m. 65  \textit{arco}
- m. 73  A2 (not A-flat 2) on bt. 2
APPENDIX 4

COMPILATION OF RESPONSES TO SURVEY #1
OF CHORISTERS SINGING IN THE PRAIRIE

Initially distributed at community chorus rehearsal #5 (Feb. 11, 2014) and university chorus rehearsal #2 (Feb. 15, 2014)

28 respondents of 37 choristers (76% response rate)

1. Are you a community singer or a university singer?
   **Responses:**
   - “community singers” = 23 (of 25; 92% response rate)
   - “university singers” = 5 (of 12; 42% response rate)

2. Approximately how many *Prairie* choristers did you know before this project? (See the attached roster.)
   **Responses:**
   - “none of them” = 9 (32% of respondents)
   - “around a third” = 17 (61% of respondents)
   - “around half” = 2 (7% of respondents)
   - “around two-thirds” = 0
   - “all of them” = 0

   Note: Response choices should have offered ranges. “None of them” includes respondents who indicated they knew 1-3 singers.

3. In reference to # 2, how many of the previously-acquainted choristers were singers with whom you sang in a previous choir?
   **Responses:**
   - “none of them” = 11 (39% of respondents)
   - “around a third” = 6 (21% of respondents)
   - “around half” = 0
   - “around two-thirds” = 4 (14% of respondents)
   - “all of them” = 7 (25% of respondents)

   Note: Percentages do not add up to 100 due to rounding.

4. What does “community” mean to you, generally?
   **Responses:**
   - a. A group with shared proximity and interests. (C)
   - b. A group of individuals doing something together. (C)
   - c. A collection of people who have significant values in common. (C)
   - d. A collection of people with different backgrounds. (C)
   - e. A group of people, united by either geography, shared identity, or common interest. Generally, communities succeed when the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.
   - f. Togetherness and collaboration, united either through voluntary commonality (shared interest) or involuntary [commonality] (geography). (C)
   - g. It implies a comfort level with similar-minded people. (C)
h. A sense of mutual support, with goals in common.  (C)
i. People with shared aspect of life.  (C)
j. A group of people who live near each other and/or have common goals and work with each other to achieve said goals.  (C)
k. Finding unity in difference.  (C)
l. Being open to opportunity.  (C)
m. A group of people who share your values, honor your differences, and strive for a common goal of respecting the dignity of every human being.  (C)
n. Being a part of a group of people with a shared interest.  (C)
o. People with shared values who care about each other and make time for each other.  (C)
p. Non-professional, perhaps non-audition, perhaps lacking in training, etc. of professional singers.  (C)
q. A group of people, working toward a common goal.  (C)
r. A group of people.  (C)
s. “Community” means the environment where I live, work and worship.  (C)
t. Group of people from a certain area (the size of which may vary) working together on a common project.  (U)
u. Community is a group of people who have something in common.  (C)
v. Positive quality – sense of belonging to a group with shared visions/goals.  (U)
w. A place where people of different backgrounds come together with a common goal.  (U)
x. A group of people connected through common interests or location.  (C)
y. A group of people with a common interest, geographically, socially or some other bond.  (C)
z. A gathering of people united by a common interest, pleasure, demographic and/or purpose.  (C)
aa. People working separately and together for the common good.  (U)
bb. A group of people that is united by a common idea, goal, purpose, location, or characteristic.  (U)

5. What does “vulnerability” mean to you, generally?

**Responses:**  Note: Responses labeled (C) for community singer, (U) for university singer.

a. Open to damage.  (C)
b. Ability to be hurt or wounded.  (C)
c. Opening my soul to challenges. Those could be new situations, new people.  (C)
d. Moving away from our comfort zone.  (C)
e. Vulnerability is opening yourself to feedback from another person without any sense of their response.  (C)
f. Openness of oneself to others beyond an initial comfort point.  (C)
g. Feeling uncomfortable about what will be happening.  (C)
h. Combining individual talent and effort of many people into a single creative product.  (C)
i. Making yourself open to being hurt or making mistakes.  (C)
j. Being open or unprotected from criticism or attack. (C)
k. Risk taking. (C)
l. Open to mistakes. (C)
m. “Cherish Your Doubt” – learning that what we think are our weaknesses may be your strengths. Being open and trusting, overcoming fear of rejection. (C)
   Note: The respondent opens his comment with the title of a work for mixed chorus; music and poetry by Elizabeth Alexander (published in 2005 by Seafarer Press).
n. Being at risk of being hurt. (C)
o. Leaving yourself open to the potential of risk or injury. (C)
p. Open to possible “errors” or possible problems (i.e., in my case, I’m not professionally trained, so I take longer to learn music). (C)
q. Opening myself up to be real, honest, or unguarded. (C)
r. Showing myself risking disapproval from others. (C)
s. “Vulnerability” to me means doing something out of my comfort zone. (C)
t. Being helpless. Usually occurs when I’m home by my lonesome. (U)
u. Vulnerability is to make oneself open to experiencing a more deep connection or experience. There is often a perceived or real risk of being hurt. (C)
v. Not usually a positive quality – exposure, insecurity. (U)
w. Allowing yourself to be open to experience new things, even if [they are] scary or unpleasant. (U)
x. Open to try new things, express personal feelings in front of others. (C)
y. Subject to undue or uncontrollable influence. (C)
z. Feeling exposed, unsafe. (C)
   aa. Susceptible to changes in a bad way. (U)
   bb. Feeling that you’ll be judged by others about an imperfection. (U)

6. What does “community” mean to you, in a choral experience?
   **Responses:**
   Note: Responses labeled (C) for community singer, (U) for university singer.
   a. Good atmosphere – mutually supportive. (C)
   b. Singing for a common goal. (C)
   c. Understanding my voice contributes to the sound but is not the sound. (C)
   d. It means there are singers with various levels of training, voice types and physical abilities. (C)
   e. A community chorus is one (usually with open participation) where residents of a specific region gather to sing, usually in free or charity concerns. (C)
   f. Group of people with shared interest working together to produce art. (C)
   g. A positive atmosphere working with choral members and director. (C)
   h. Combining individual talent and effort of many people into a single creative product. (C)
   i. Amateur singers. (C)
   j. A friendly group of people who are working toward the goal of performance. This also implies support and encouragement to me. (C)
   k. Listening. (C)
   l. Coming together. (C)
   m. “Lift Every Voice” – singers of various abilities committed to bring a composer’s musical vision to life with passion and excellence. (C)
   Note: The respondent opens his comment with the title of a hymn; music by John Rosamond
Johnson and poetry by his brother James Weldon Johnson. The hymn is also called “The Negro National Hymn” and “The Black National Anthem.”

n. Being part of a group with a shared musical purpose. (C)
o. Greeting each other, being glad to see each other, remembering and asking about each other from week to week. (C)
p. Singing together, non-professional singers (mostly). (C)
q. Sharing the joy and challenge of learning/performing a choral piece together. (C)
r. The chorus is the community, but in concert we’re part of a broader community including the audience. (C)
s. In choral experience, “community” means the singers are from a varied background, e.g., age, ethnicity, musical experience, musical training, gender, sexual orientation, physical ability. (C)
t. All the singers work together and support each other’s voices. All notes should sound in perfect unison; everyone sings with one voice. (U)
u. Community in a choral experience means being a part of something bigger than myself. It’s knowing the cultural norms—bringing a pencil, being quiet while others are learning their part. (C)
v. Feeling welcomed and accepted; sharing a journey. (U)
w. A group of singers that sing and socialize together. (U)
x. The blending of many voices to create a sound not possible any other way. (C)
y. A shared cultural interest, specifically music. (C)
z. The wondrous result of voices in harmony and rhythm. (C)
aa. Help each other improve the singing. Meet each other and have a nice time during rehearsals. (U)
bb. A group that shares musical goals and a desire to express something greater than any individual. (U)

7. What does “vulnerability” mean to you, in a choral experience?

Responses: Note: Responses labeled (C) for community singer, (U) for university singer.
a. Liable to make a noticeable error. (C)
b. Ability to be hurt or wounded. (C)
c. Singing 2nd soprano—it is not easy for me. I can’t always hear the right note and the part is not intuitive to me. (C)
d. It means you have to sing out of your comfort zone. (C)
e. The possibility that you will be distinguishable from the choral whole. (C)
f. Being open to criticism and direction; being emotionally involved with the piece. (C)
g. Feeling unsure about and yet open to performing the music and singing with others. (C)
h. Singing boldly, risking making mistakes. (C)
i. Not sure what this would mean in a choral context. (C)
j. Being open to constructive criticism, aimed at improving the performance quality. (C)
k. Risk taking. (C)
l. Learning from mistakes. (C)
m. Openness to instruction from the director and fellow singers. Finding a way to blend individual voices into a whole—give up in some way personal preference—“It should be FORTE dammit!” (C)

n. Being willing to join others in a shared musical endeavor, hoping I will be able to contribute adequately, and trusting in the ensemble to lift the individual singers. (C)

o. In rehearsal, singing loud enough for the director to hear your mistakes, even when you are uncertain. Committing to strong consonants even when others are not. (C)

p. One “vulnerable” singer can make his/her section more “vulnerable” if there are problems of blending, or learning the music, etc. (C)

q. Bringing my real self to the choral group and being OK with all that comes from taking that leap. (C)

r. Singing out, risking making mistakes that might be heard. (C)

s. In a choral setting, “vulnerability” refers to being asked to sing something that I am less comfortable singing, e.g., tonal structure, text that I am not comfortable singing, a vocal range that is not my strongest, rhythmic patterns that are difficult, music that changes meter often. (C)

t. When one voice can be heard out of the chorus. In my case, when I can hear my own voice or when my voice doesn’t blend with those around me. Also when my voice sounds strange, or conditions prevent me from singing my best/clearly. (U)

u. Vulnerability in a choral experience means singing the high notes by myself in rehearsal before being confident with the rhythm and pitch. (C)

v. Not usually a positive quality—exposure, insecurity. (U)

w. Allowing the music to speak through your [comment not finished]. (U)

x. Willing to sing out loud, possibly make a mistake, also willing to lead. (C)

y. Being critically judged by peers and/or by an audience. (C)

z. Fear of making an error which damages the whole group. (C)

aa. Singing solos, performing for the audience. (U)

bb. Feeling associated with criticism, failure, displays of weakness, compromise, which are regular occurrences in choral rehearsals and performances. (U)
8. How would you rate the sense of community you felt among the participants in this project at your first rehearsal? (Use the scale below, 1-10, with 1 being a minimal sense of community and 10 being a strong sense of community. Circle the number that best fits your memory of the first rehearsal.)

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses:**
- “1” = 0
- “2” = 0
- “3” = 2 (7%)
- “4” = 7 (25%)
- “4 to 5” = 1 (4%)
- “5” = 3 (11%)
- “6” = 5 (18%)
- “7” = 2 (7%)
- “8” = 4 (14%)
- “9” = 2 (7%)
- “10” = 1 (4%)
- No response = 1 (4%)

*Note: Percentages do not add up to 100 due to rounding.*
APPENDIX 5

COMPILATION OF RESPONSES TO SURVEY #2
OF CHORISTERS SINGING IN THE PRAIRIE

Initially distributed via e-mail following performance # 1 (Feb. 28, 2014)

26 respondents of 37 choristers (70% response rate)

9. Are you a community singer or a university singer?
   **Responses:** “community singers” = 22 (of 25; 88% response rate)
   “university singers” = 4 (of 12; 33% response rate)

10. When did you feel **most vulnerable** in this project?
    **Responses:** Note: Responses labeled (C) for community singer, (U) for university singer.
    a. At the first concert [Feb. 28] when we were worn down and unsure how it would go. (C)
    b. Being in the front row and unable to hear the notes (happened occasionally). I felt embarrassed that everyone would see. (U)
    c. Rehearsals at UMD when no UMD singers showed up (in my section). (C)
    d. Saturday rehearsal [Feb. 15] with very few singers. (C)
    e. When we had a UMD rehearsal [Feb. 15] with very few sopranos. (C)
    f. During the performance in the Chapel [Feb. 28]. (U)
    g. By vulnerable do you mean “exposed”? If so, I would say on the men’s division section [in movement V] “In the dark of a thousand years.” (U)
    h. Just before the first performance [Feb. 28] and at the UMD rehearsal on Feb. 22 with orchestra. (C)
    i. When we were messing up during the UMD performance [Feb. 28]. (C)
    j. During the performance, in the complicated parts. (C)
    k. The dress rehearsal before the first concert [Feb. 22]. It would have helped [me] to have sectional practice in the weeks prior, but time and space were not available. (C)
    l. Never really vulnerable. Uncomfortable in first performance [Feb. 28]. (C)
    m. First rehearsal. (C)
    n. In the beginning, and after the UMD choral students joined. (C)
    o. At the second UMD rehearsal [Feb. 15], when I was the only active singer in my section. (C)
    p. The beginning, when I knew no one, and also any time I was the only person singing. (C)
    q. Performance # 1 [Feb. 28], rehearsal before performance. (C)
    r. First UMD rehearsal [Feb. 1]. (C)
    s. When I didn’t feel like I knew my part well. (C)
    t. Most vulnerable at the beginning of the project, and just before the first concert [Feb. 28]. (C)
    u. When there were few people singing my part, leaving me increasingly responsible for knowing my part well. (C)
v. Most vulnerable during the first rehearsal in January 2014 [Jan. 7]. (C)
w. Performing at Memorial Chapel at UMD [Feb. 28]. (C)
x. (1) In the section where the tenors, baritones and basses overlap in canons [in movement V, m. 7-18 and 63-111]. (2) When we started to switch the baritones to singing with the tenors [for the Mar. 10 performance, when we needed reinforcement on a few tenor lines due to anticipated low turnout in the tenor section]. (3) When we had a lot of mixed meter. (4) When the choral entrances were different than those of the orchestra. (C)
y. For me, movement V was the most difficult. Even though I practiced a lot at home with the recording, I never could quite master some of the rhythms, especially in the middle. Fortunately, a couple of the university singers in my section were more confident and we managed to get through it without a train wreck. (C)
z. Any time I felt like I was the only one singing in my section. (U)

Note: The question should have referred to the definition of “vulnerability” as explored by respondents in Survey #1; i.e., “Thinking back to your definition of ‘vulnerability’ from the first survey, . . .”

11. When did you feel least vulnerable in this project?

Responses: Note: Responses labeled (C) for community singer, (U) for university singer.

a. Some of the last rehearsals when I knew a few of the other choristers. (C)
b. When I was in sync with everyone! It felt fantastic! (U)
c. Community singers’ rehearsals at CHAW. (C)
d. Friday concert [Feb. 28]. (C)
e. When I recovered from laryngitis and could sing. (C)
f. At rehearsals. (U)
g. I felt least vulnerable on the large and confident homophonic sections. (U)
h. Early on in rehearsal process—felt we had good musical leadership. Only realized later as other components were layered in how challenging The Prairie would be to perform. (C)
i. Being congratulated by friends after the concerts. (C)
j. Early on in the rehearsal schedule, and whenever the music was melodic in nature, i.e., singable, rather than percussive. (C)
k. The first few rehearsals. (C)
l. Rehearsals. (C)
m. In the final UMD rehearsal. (C)
n. After warm-ups, getting to know the group. (C)
o. When I stood in front of strong singers and later in the process as I gained confidence. (C)
p. The concerts; the really awesome/long dress rehearsal [Feb. 22]. (C)
q. Rehearsing with university [singers] and orchestra and soloists for the first time [Feb. 22]. They were so much better [in] quality than I expected! (C)
r. At Monday’s performance [Mar. 10]. (C)
s. When I was able to sing with confidence. (C)
t. About a week before the concert—the music really clicked and then I felt so much less vulnerable. (C)
u. During sections of the music that were most familiar. (C)
v. Least vulnerable during the March 10, 2014 performance. (C)
w. Performing at Capitol Hill Presbyterian [Mar. 10]. (C)
x. While singing in unison. (C)
y. At the first performance at the Chapel. For the first time it felt wonderful to be a part of a whole and I could see/hear the soloists, orchestra, and chorus together for the first time. I was thunderstruck how [Paul] calmly worked through it with encouragement, skill, and musical panache. (C)
z. When all of the performers (conductor, orchestra members, and singers) were completely involved in the act of music making and were not hindered by technical shortcomings, musical errors, or lack of confidence. For me, this occurred several times throughout the final performance on March 10. (U)

12. When did you feel **least connected** to the community that was created for this project?

**Responses:** Note: Responses labeled (C) for community singer, (U) for university singer.

a. First rehearsal when I didn’t know them. (C)
b. Learning my part independently, which was necessary since we had so little time together. (U)
c. At UMD rehearsals (at Memorial Chapel or at Clarice Smith Center). (C)
d. The first few rehearsals. (C)
e. At UMD rehearsals at Clarice Smith Center. (C)
f. During the second rehearsal maybe, or [as we entered] the stage at the performance. (U)
g. I felt least connected during the first few Saturday morning rehearsals at UMD [Feb. 1 and 15]. (U)
h. At the beginning. (C)
i. The way we went our separate ways after the rehearsals/concerts. (C)
j. In the joint rehearsals with the university singers. (C)
k. Did not feel connected to the university singers. (C)
l. Breaks at the Clarice Smith Center—where were restrooms, whom to ask, .... (C)
m. First rehearsal. (C)
n. At the beginning, before speaking with some people. (C)
o. When Paul thought my name was another singer’s name. (C)
p. The beginning. (C)
q. At the first rehearsal. (C)
r. First time we met university students. (C)
s. When the orchestra joined us [Feb. 22]. (C)
t. There was a direct relationship between feeling vulnerable and feeling unconnected—once the vulnerability lessened, the community connectedness increased. (C)
u. Never. (C)
v. Least connected during the first rehearsal. (C)
w. During the first few rehearsals. (C)
x. I felt least connected when we sang on the risers [in the choral rehearsal room on Feb. 25] and there were not enough risers to fit [all of the singers]. I ended up standing behind a singer who wandered back and forth, making it difficult to see the director. (C)
y. Sadly, [when] I had to miss the second performance [originally scheduled for Mar. 3] due to Mother Nature! I would have truly enjoyed being able to be with everyone to perform this beautiful music in public a second time. (C)
z. Any time I felt like I was the only one singing in my section. (U)

13. When did you feel most connected to the community that was created for this project?

Responses: Note: Responses labeled (C) for community singer, (U) for university singer.

a. Hanging out in the time between the final rehearsal and the final performance later that evening [Mar. 10]. (C)
b. Interacting with the other choir members during rehearsal breaks and before/after the first concert [Feb. 28]. (U)
c. At the community rehearsals at CHAW. (C)
d. [No response] (C)
e. At UMD performance [Feb. 28] and rehearsal there also. (C)
f. During the rehearsal before the concert. (U)
g. I felt most connected during both performances [Feb. 28, Mar. 10]. (U)
h. At first performance and afterwards when discussing impending snow with other singers. We were all sorry that we might not have a second chance to sing. (C)
i. During rehearsals. (C)
j. Setting up for [the] concert, and in the [West] Chapel after the performance [Feb. 28]. (C)
k. Before the first concert [Feb. 28] began. (C)
l. Singing together with the orchestra and soloists – when it all finally came together. (C)
m. During the Capitol Hill [performance, on Mar. 10]. (C)
n. During the final performance [Mar. 10]. (C)
o. Before the last performance [Mar. 10]. (C)
p. Right now: the concerts. (C)
q. At the end of the first performance [Feb. 28]. (C)
r. At Monday’s performance [Mar. 10]. (C)
s. At our final party [Mar. 11]. (C)
t. There was a direct relationship between feeling vulnerable and feeling unconnected—once the vulnerability lessened, the community connectedness increased. Because of my lack of knowledge to read music, I had to push myself incredibly hard for rehearsals and for practicing outside of rehearsal times. I joked with [my coworkers] that it was a good thing I had recently reduced my work time, because I filled most of that free time with trying to learn this piece! Taking chances came toward the end of the project—more when the music began to click. (C)
u. I always felt connected—[Paul] did a nice job creating a sense of community among this disparate group of singers. (C)
v. Most connected during the March 10, 2014 performance. (C)
w. Gradually at each CHAW rehearsal and ultimately during the UMD rehearsals and at both performances. (C)
x. I felt most connected to the community when we did a communal warm-up. (C)
y. At the first performance [Feb. 28]! I think we brought all our skills together, trusting [Paul] to get us from movement I to movement VII with artistry and confidence. Strong communities have to have strong leaders people trust—how very fortunate we were to have [Paul] “steering the mother ship!” (C)
z. When all of the performers (conductor, orchestra members, and singers) were completely involved in the act of music making and were not hindered by technical shortcomings, musical errors, or lack of confidence. For me, this occurred several times throughout the final performance on March 10. (U)

14. Regarding the degree to which you experienced a feeling of community in this project, to what extent did that feeling motivate you to… (1 = not at all; 10 = a great deal)

...focus your efforts in rehearsal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses:</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>6 (23%)</td>
<td>7 (27%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...take chances and try new things in rehearsal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses:</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...practice your part outside of rehearsal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses:</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (31%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...focus your efforts in performance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>9 (35%)</td>
<td>9 (35%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages do not add up to 100 due to rounding.

15. Do you believe the quality of the sound created by the Foss Prairie chorus changed over the course of this project? Responses: “Yes” = 26 (100%) “No” = 0

If yes, how would you describe the change? If no, in what ways did it remain the same?

Responses: Note: Responses labeled (C) for community singer, (U) for university singer.

a. Among the community choristers, the sound did blend better as we learned the music and were able to listen to each other more. However, that was thrown
off quite a bit when we were joined by the university singers, who sang at very different levels of talent, volume, and interest in blending. (C)
b. The quality improved. We were listening to each other for cues and pitches. Everyone focused on how the parts overlapped and intertwined. (U)
c. More UMD singers started showing up, which changed [the] sound. (C)
d. It has gotten stronger and more focused. Having both full groups rehearse together near the end made a big difference. (C)
e. Blended better, more confident and on key. (C)
f. It got better, although I wasn’t there for all the rehearsals. (U)
g. We became more alive and present as we got more comfortable with the music. And on the final performance [Mar. 10], even though we had fewer singers, I believe we sang the best we had ever sung. Part of that, I think, is that we, yes, had one more performance under our belts, but also that we enjoyed it more because we could hear the orchestra and soloists much better at Capitol Hill Presbyterian. (U)
h. As a group, we worked to create a unified sound and approach to the music. This unification resulted in a similar mindset that improved the quality of sound. Only possible with good technical guidance. (C)
i. Better blend; more decisive, assured entries. (C)
j. More confident, especially with the orchestra. (C)
k. Over the weeks, everyone felt more confident with practice. (C)
l. Better blend; more consistent diction; unified in effects. (C)
m. It became more beautiful and blended as the weeks passed. (C)
n. It was positive change; we grew more confident. (C)
o. More confident. (C)
p. Well, we were not great at the beginning, and we’re not bad now. There were moments in [the] concert [when] I got chills, but there are still areas we need to work on. (C)
q. Grew more confident in the parts and trusting of conductor to unify choir and orchestra and soloists. (C)
r. Better sound after blending with section. (C)
s. Technical things improved with increased comfort singing the music. I think trust also built among singers and in relation to the conductor which enabled him greater freedom of expression from first to last concert. (C)
t. Quality of sound changed substantially—perhaps as we all gained confidence (and felt less vulnerable!). (C)
u. The degree of detail in [Paul’s] suggestions and markings led to a more focused, cohesive performance. (C)
v. Yes, the quality of sound changed. We were more “cohesive” (together) in the final performance on March 10. (C)
w. Within the community singer rehearsals it was a gradual yet continual learning process that began to gel over the weeks as we learned and became more comfortable with the challenge of the difficult music and peculiar time changes. As time went on and the community singers eventually combined with the university singers—and particularly the orchestra—it became infinitely more comfortable. I believe we were emboldened by the additional support of the
university singers and the ultimate challenge of joining forces with the orchestra. (C)

x. The sound became more an ensemble sound, with more texture, range in dynamics, observation of entrances and cutoffs and the group trusting the director in what vowel sounds he wanted. (C)
y. From our individual community chorus rehearsals (which were wonderful) to our joint rehearsals and performance with the university singers, I think we grew in sensitivity to dynamics, blend, tempo, and, most importantly, achieving a unified choral sound [that] this work demands. (C)
z. The confidence level of the group was much higher by the time we reached the final performance. Chorus members were more secure with their musical responsibilities. They were more prepared and willing to sing sensitively. The singing was more unified when each member was fully engaged with the conductor, fellow performers, and the audience. (U)

16. What connections can you make between “community connectedness” and choral sound in this project?

Responses: Note: Responses labeled (C) for community singer, (U) for university singer.
a. I think if the choir had had more time together, we would have sounded much better for several reasons. I’m not sure what effect our friendships with each other would have had on the quality of the music we produced. I didn’t spend any time outside of the very beginning and end of the rehearsals with the members of the choir I didn’t know already, and if we had had more time together, or were working on a less challenging/technical, more uplifting piece, I might have felt like I had more time and energy to develop those relationships. (C)
b. The more comfortable everyone was with each other, the better the sound. (U)
c. In this case, none. The “community” never had a chance to develop. Rehearsals had no social time and UMD singers participated in very few rehearsals. (C)
d. There is a magic that happens, possibly the physical vibration of so many voices singing together. (C)
e. The two go hand in hand and the group’s sound reflects this. Singing in community knits people together in many cultures and communities. Political and religious groups use music to intensify cohesion and celebrate and to motivate. (C)
f. The more connected the community of the singers, the better the sound is. (U)
g. We became more connected as we learned to sing together with more precision. Breathing with the person next to me, and singing in unison or in parts with him/her, someone who has had different life and musical experiences, was refreshing. Singing with UMD students almost exclusively these days, I was refreshed to make “real world” music with amateur musicians (not meant pejoratively). (U)
h. If people feel connected, they pull together. This quality can enhance good technical training. (C)
i. Mutual reliance among singers and between sections helped improve the sound. (C)
j. I think “community connectedness,” if any, comes as a result of focusing on performing the music well, rather than the other way around. (C)
k. Difficult to answer—I feel the sound was created not by “community connectedness,” but by leadership of Paul. (C)
l. More connectedness → better ensemble → more connectedness → etc. (C)
m. Being comfortable brings out more confidence in people’s voices. (C)
n. Connectedness discourages vulnerability, instead encouraging confidence, reflected in sound. (C)
o. This feels like a stretch. (C)
p. Choir is community, and builds community. (C)
q. I think being a great chorus is being a trusting chorus—in yourself, in your fellow performers, and in [the] conductor. You believe more in the collective ability to bring a piece to fruition, and realize it doesn’t solely depend on you, but on your ability to work with everyone’s sound, under the conductor’s guidance. And that is a very unifying feeling. (C)
r. Essential—every voice contributes to [a] healthy, balanced sound. (C)
s. I’m not certain I understand the question, although I do think there is a connection between unity among people and cohesiveness in sound (in general). (C)
t. Big connections between community connectedness and the choral sound. (C)
u. Community connectedness has never been very important to me in the various choral projects I’ve participated in. It has existed at times and not at all at others, and the degree of fulfillment I have felt has not always correlated with the community connectedness. That said, I recognize that the sound might be better when the community is more connected, and for that reason I admire [Paul’s] efforts to pull together some sense of community in such a short span of time. At the wrap-up party, it was certainly nice to connect on a personal level with many of the singers I hadn’t had a chance to really get to know throughout the rehearsal process. (C)
v. If you feel you’re a part of a community, and you belong, you’ll work more to produce a better sound (singing, etc.). (C)
w. Continuing as described in question 7, ultimately in the end we were not really combined choirs with an orchestra, but truly one voice. (C)
x. I found it nice to have a person in charge with a point of view of the musical work. That allowed [each] singer to commit to whatever level of involvement he or she wanted [in order] to make the final project more artistically sound. (C)
y. A chorus, while composed of individual voices, succeeds only when no one individual voice can be identified. We are connected by our history together, our ability to ask for and receive help from other singers, and communally look to a leader to guide us. This blend of personalities (with all their talents and quirks) is fundamental to a beautiful choral sound. We can laugh together,
commiserate together over the hard parts, and feel like we are part of something that is far bigger than the sum of our individual contributions. (C)

z. As the chorus’ sense of community strengthened, the choral sound became more cohesive. By the end of the project, singers were more aware of each other’s strengths and weaknesses. It seemed that many singers formed stronger friendships and the sense of teamwork was at its highest during the final performance. As the chorus deepened their understanding of the cantata, the choral sound became richer in color. The singers were more intent on expressing specific ideas based on the text. They were more responsive to the conductor’s gestures, and more flexible with their vocal production. (U)

17. How would you rate the sense of community you feel among the participants in this project now, at the final performance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td>9 (35%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional comments:**

Note: Responses labeled (C) for community singer, (U) for university singer.

a. –
b. –
c. –
d. I still know very few people in the chorus. (C)
e. Performing together last week gave me a much greater appreciation for and sense of connection with the instrumentalists and the soloists. (C)
f. –
g. –
h. I didn’t participate in [the] final performance. Because the UMD and community singers didn’t come together until later in the project, the development of community was slower and hadn’t really happened by [the] first performance [Feb. 28]. Also, the rehearsal schedule cut into community time. (C)
i. –
j. A real positive has been the director’s unfailingly positive and supportive approach to whatever happened in rehearsal or performance. He has an amazing ear. (C)
k. Singing under Paul’s direction was the highlight of this project. His skill, humor, [and] even-keel approach to the highs and lows produced dedication and commitment. (C)
l. –
m. –
n. –
o. –
p. –
q. –
r. –
s. [“10” qualified as “among the choir.”] I didn’t feel like there was an opportunity to build rapport with UMD singers and orchestra members. (C)
t. You have awakened a love of music in me that had been buried under many life messes for almost 30 years. That is a gift that I will never forget! I need to learn what options are out there in our area for [continued] singing…. (C)
u. –
w. –
x. –
y. For the one performance I was able to do, I really felt like the community of both community and university choristers, the soloists, and the orchestra was very strong. There was a palpable sense of excitement and anticipation in the “green room” before we went on. I really felt like “we’re all in this together” and “let’s go out and give it 110%....” (C)
z. –
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