

## **Daydreams**

**by Noah Brode**

### **1. Clear and inventive deviation from the shared material between movements, all with an obviously repeated introduction. /20**

The deviation is clear, though I did hope for a little bit more transitional material between the shared material and the resulting movement. It was most clear in No. 2 and predicated slightly in No. 3 (with a sustained rhythm turning into a short one), but No. 4 seems to come out of nowhere despite the chordal sustaining of the material before it. Each movement offered a lot in terms of developing the motive in very different ways in and of themselves. My favorite I think was No. 4, with a wonderful uneven fifths transition in m. 147 leaving the Cmb9 chord signifying the uncertainly calm nature of the rest of the movement. Transitions like that were super welcome and if they were a little more overt throughout it would have made the connection even clearer. Overall though, the transitions were handled well, despite the start and stop nature of some of them.

I was a little confused by the formal structure of some of them, most notably No. 3, which sometimes had parallel periods, sometimes double periods, and sometimes single periods (like in the end, which really threw me off). More could have been with the structure to highlight these changes; for example, the end of No. 3 could have ended super bright and fast to really make that change in-your-face and brutal. As a whole, the sound world of this work is delightfully varied both within movements and between movements, creating an interesting arc that takes tidbits of the main melody and bends them situationally, an interesting take on the subject of development. **16.5/20**

### **2. A conclusive and satisfying, yet creatively combined final movement. /10**

It was a little hard to hear a mazurka in the last movement beside a potential augmentation of the reference in m. 186. In addition, some transitional stuff seems a little empty, though the ideas are certainly there. From m. 191 to m. 192, for example, the augmented second in the latter could be filled in with a much more overtly different chord to play up the half diminished tonality of the previous measure, as if leveling into a new place; the idea is solid. The end of the movement is, while pleasant, a bit too plain for my taste, as though it was starting something again in its repetition as opposed to ending it. The 3-2-1 scale descent in the violin helps with a good idea of really being final in a Schenkerian sense, but ends up sounding too neutered, so to speak. Perhaps slightly more motion in the piano or a slower roll might help. The transitions from mm. 179-191 were great, there just enough to catch attention, before moving on. A nice take on the instructions of the competition. **7.5/10**

### **3. A good, semi-professional score and audio rendition of the work. /10**

Some elements clash in the score, like dims, dynamics, and especially pedal markings. Overall, though, it's pretty nice albeit slightly plain-looking. Rhythms are parsed out as they should be and the elements between the instruments line up well. There are a couple places where there are inconsistent fermatas between the parts (i.e. m. 148), and strings of half notes like in No. 2 could have been supplemented, especially since the piano doesn't have the same transformational context as the violin does with its part. The sound file is nicely representational, though I was missing some inner voice stuff, or at least I thought I was. m. 166 has a wrong note in the violin? My other big complaint was the lack of much shifting dynamics without it sounding awkward or hugely bursting. The moments that were wanted to be brought out were, thankfully. Definitely a pleasant listen generally. **7/10**

### **4. Sound and realistic instrumentation and orchestration. /10**

Bowings would have been really great, but overall I'm very pleased looking at the composer's intentions. There are some great range interplays audible and a good mix of homophonic and contrapuntal material, though I could have used a bit more motion variation in No. 4 perhaps. Slurs used in the violin complement the leaps it makes later (i.e. m. 203) and the piano is well-balanced as a supporting role. Good job. **8/10**

**TOTAL: 39/50**