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The selection of high-quality music should be a primary goal for all music directors. It is appealing to select music that has been composed in a purely functional way to assist the performers, particularly at the beginning level; however, much of this music has been composed at the expense of craftsmanship. The purpose of this study was to complete performance analyses of two works for wind band by Steven Bryant that are of different levels of difficulty. *Interruption Overture* is a beginning wind band piece while *Suite Dreams* was written for advanced wind band. Score analyses considered characteristic compositional techniques of the composer, including orchestration, form, harmonic structure, transitions, melodic and rhythmic gesture, and the use of motivic development. In an effort to compare the level of compositional craft of these pieces, each performance analysis included program notes, historical or programmatic influences, a harmonic reduction analysis, considerations for rehearsal and performance, and conducting issues. Through these analyses, a comparison of *Interruption Overture* and *Suite Dreams* was completed, and based on these findings a determination was made regarding the similarities and differences in the level of craftsmanship.

The analyses of *Interruption Overture* and *Suite Dreams* indicate that Bryant has created two works of high quality despite the differences in the level of difficulty. He has written interesting melodic, rhythmic, and harmonic elements that interact with each other. Characteristics present in both pieces, which indicate the quality of literature for young bands include: theme manipulation, imaginative use of rhythm and harmony, distinct formal structure, and creative extended techniques.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The philosophy of a music director is gleaned through the music that is selected for performance. The selection of high-quality music should therefore be a primary goal for all directors. It is appealing for directors to select music that has been composed in a purely functional way to assist the performers, particularly at the beginning level; however, much of this music has been composed at the expense of craftsmanship. There is evidence that composers writing for beginning performers do not have to sacrifice craft in order to accommodate lower levels of ability. Michael Colgrass (2004) states that music does not have to be complicated if it is going to be composed in an intellectually interesting way and still have aesthetic elements. When music is “stripped down to its bare essentials” it should withstand scrutiny, regardless of the level of the performers (p. 21). He also suggests that “…the goal of too many composers who write for children is primarily pragmatic, placing function ahead of aesthetics” (p. 22). Reynolds (2000) agrees, stating that this places a heavy emphasis on compositional characteristics that will make the ensemble sound good often to the detriment of musical integrity.

According to Ray Cramer (1997), several components comprise the music that has artistic merit, or is of high quality. He offers that a high-quality work has a clear formal structure, creative melodies and countermelodies, interesting harmonies and rhythm, contrast, effective scoring, and lastly, yields an emotional response. If the repertoire selected for performance is of high quality, the framework is set for a rehearsal atmosphere that will provide students opportunities for significant musical growth. Directors can then nurture an awareness of the natural elements of music in their students. Furthermore, the potential for musical experiences of breadth and depth are made possible when music of high quality is selected for performance
(Reynolds, 2000). High-quality music yields much for students because the craft is such that the elements of the music are inherent and can easily be transferred to other music. Persellin (2000) also promotes high quality music and suggests that when directors provide students with opportunities to learn music of high quality, they learn more about themselves in addition to having a clearer and more in-depth understanding of the music.

Selecting repertoire is only the first step in preparing to give students opportunities for musical growth. Battisti and Garafalo (1990) state that in order to effectively express the composer’s intent within a composition there must first be an understanding of the score. Once that has been accomplished, it is then permissible, and necessary, for the conductor to make interpretations about the music to relay to the performers. Having a clear and detailed understanding of the score creates the potential for teaching quality music and the potential for optimum student growth as musicians. Additionally, Townsend (2011) states, “In order for a band director to implement a comprehensive music education for her students, it is imperative to consistently apply appropriate processes of score study to ensure that each piece has artistic and, consequently, educational value” (p. 2). Unfortunately, there is a scant amount of practical research in the form of score analyses that aid directors with selecting quality repertoire. Townsend (2011) proposes, there is an abundance of music that has been poorly written but gets performed anyway, which hinders the possibility for students to “participate in a higher quality musical experience” (p. 2). This reaffirms the necessity of the band director to assess, through in-depth score study, any music that is being considered for performance. Score study is not only imperative for assessing the quality of a work. When information acquired about a piece is communicated to the performers, it helps them develop a thorough understanding of the music, which in turn makes the potential for musical growth a reality.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine musical characteristics present in quality literature for young bands through a comparative performance analysis. As previously stated, music can be composed in an uncomplicated way yet still be interesting and aesthetically pleasing; therefore, beginning band music should be composed and held to the same standards of quality as advanced wind band music. In an effort to determine the characteristics present in quality literature, this study consisted of performance analyses of two works for wind band by Steven Bryant: *Interruption Overture* for beginning wind band and *Suite Dreams* for advanced wind band. Steven Bryant is a prolific and an award-winning composer of works for wind ensemble, orchestra, and chamber ensembles, as well as electronic and electro-acoustic music.

Summary of the Procedures

For this project, I analyzed two works for wind band by Steven Bryant; *Interruption Overture*, written for beginning wind band, and *Suite Dreams*, written for advanced wind band. Both analyses considered compositional techniques of the composer, including orchestration, form, harmonic structure, transitions, melodic and rhythmic gesture, and the use of motivic development. Through the analyses of these works, a comparison of *Interruption Overture* and *Suite Dreams* was completed. Based on these findings a determination was made regarding the similarities and differences in the level of craftsmanship.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Selecting the appropriate literature for performance is one of the most involved responsibilities of a music director. The significance of this task may be the motive behind the abundance of research on the subject. Directors are fortunate to have many resources to assist them in their search for quality music. A director should have a broad knowledge of music that is composed for all levels of band, but since * Interruption Overture* and *Suite Dreams* are compositions intended for amateur ensembles, information about music composed for young bands is more relevant. For these reasons, the review of literature has been separated into three parts: (a) Resources for Band Directors, (b) Music Composed for Young Bands, and (c) Selecting Quality Literature for Band.

Resources for Band Directors

There is an abundance of information available to directors intended to aid in the selection of repertoire. The majority of repertoire for the wind band has been composed since the middle of the twentieth century and in the last quarter century there has been considerable effort made to identify a core repertoire for the wind band. Research completed in both theses and dissertations represent many efforts to define a core repertoire for the wind band at different levels. Repertoire lists and contest lists published by various U.S. state music organizations are also examples of this effort.

Additional resources for directors include several well-known composition contests: the Ticheli Composition Contest, Ostwald Award-American Bandmasters Association, William D. Revelli Composition Contest, Beeler Memorial Prize, and the Merrill Jones Memorial Contest. Composition contests provide opportunities for composers to create new works and promote
quality literature for beginning and intermediate wind bands. The Ticheli Composition Contest publishes works each year that directors can use to supplement their curriculum and repertoire (Baumgartner, 2009). The William D. Revelli Composition Contest, organized by The National Band Association, continues to support the creation of quality literature for bands in America (McCutchen, 2009). In 2008, Steven Bryant received this award for *Suite Dreams*. Additionally, in response to music educators’ demand for new and creative works for young bands, the American Composers Forum created the *BandQuest* project, through which twenty-one pieces have been composed for young bands by renowned American composers. Renowned American composers including Michael Colgrass, Michael Daugherty, Libby Larsen, Dana Wilson, and Chen Yi have contributed to this project. Furthermore, there have been numerous articles and books published that provide information about repertoire and analyses of repertoire. *The Journal of Band Research, The Instrumentalist, The National Band Association Journal,* and *The Journal of the World Association of Symphonic Bands and Ensembles* offer information to aid the search for quality literature.

While, these resources are useful, Carney (2005), states that using them solely to make decisions about repertoire does not give the director adequate knowledge of a piece. McCutchen (2009) suggests that after the necessary research has been completed, the best way to decide whether a piece is of high quality is to study the work yourself. Completing a performance analysis is one way to determine the quality of a piece (Baumgartner, 2009; Townsend, 2011). A performance analysis includes more than just studying the score; it is a comprehensive representation of a piece of music. When completing a performance analysis, one gathers program notes and historical information that pertain to a piece, and determines considerations for performance, rehearsal, and conducting, in addition to studying the score. Completing a
performance analysis and general score study are both involved processes. One or the other must be employed to become acquainted with a piece in order to make an assessment of the quality.

Music Composed for Young Bands

Band directors rely on the music selected for performance to help improve their ensembles. Much of the music composed for young bands is structured specifically to help young students learn the fundamentals of music and performance on their instrument in a deliberate way. Pulitzer prize-winning composer, Michael Colgrass (2004) believes that too often when composers are writing for young bands, their priority is to create a piece that focuses on fundamentals of performance in an outright manner, and creativity and invention are overlooked. Music composed this way sounds “formulaic, clichéd, undistinguished, and undistinguishable” (Budiansky & Foley, 2005, p. 10). Compositions like this make the band sound good even though the music sounds artificial (Battisti, 1995).

Frank Ticheli, a prolific composer of music for band, choral, and orchestral works, mentions that many pieces written for young bands are full of doublings to help students feel more comfortable when in reality it perpetuates feelings of insecurity during more exposed passages. He also compares music which lacks craft to junk food: students may enjoy the music at the time, but that does not mean they should experience it or that it will aid in their music education beyond the surface (Sheldon, 2003). Frank Byrne (2001), who spent twenty-seven years with the United States Marine Band and is now the executive director of the Kansas City Symphony, notes that music of this nature is deficient in skill and creativity and does nothing to further improve the band music literature.

Some directors and music professionals find it difficult to understand why quality music is overlooked because of its potential impracticality for teaching young musicians. Music does
not have to be basic to reach this audience or for them to improve on their instruments (Brashier, 2000). There are still options for aesthetic content despite the limitations of a young band. Some of the great composers of western art music composed uncomplicated music for students and they are considered high-quality works (Rizzo, 1985). Furthermore, with increased exposure, quality music continues to be interesting regardless of the level of difficulty, which means there will always be something for students to learn (Del Borgo, 1988).

When commissioned by the American Composers Forum BandQuest project to write a piece for eighth grade band, Colgrass (2004), “was reminded that music can have intellectual interest and convey emotion without being complicated. Stripping down my music to the bare essentials…challenged my imagination and sense of fantasy” (p. 21). John Mackey, a renowned composer of works for band, orchestra, chamber ensembles, and theater, thinks that if he were to take into account all the range, intonation, and rhythmic limitations of a young ensemble, composing for this group would become an exercise and the focus on creating music would be lost. When Mackey composes, his goal is not to create a piece that will teach the musicians a certain fundamental of music. His ultimate aim is to compose high quality, challenging music that consequently young players can perform (Townsend, 2011).

Selecting Quality Band Literature

It is a common philosophy among music educators that one of the greatest responsibilities of a band director, or any musical director, is the selection of repertoire for the ensemble. This notion is agreed upon, but the subjective nature of music as an art makes it difficult to follow through. Despite this, music can be objectively studied; artistic and inventive characteristics of a composition can be revealed, however, it must be acknowledged that not all music is good (Byrne, 2001). Therefore, not every piece of music will benefit, impact, or be
practical for students to learn (Apfelstadt, 2000). Conversely, a quality piece of music will always have educational qualities and it is the director’s responsibility to help students understand those (Brashier, 2000). If directors inform students about the process and reasons for selecting certain music, they can become more discerning about the music they play, which will further their development as independent musicians (Apfelstadt, 2000).

The potential for educational value should be assessed during the process of selecting music. When directors select music of lasting quality, they prepare their students for a versatile and balanced music education (Reynolds, 2000). Stephen Budiansky and Tim Foley (2005) insist:

Many of the best music teachers reiterate this point, that a development of musical imagination and taste, a feel for style and phrasing, and an ability to pursue independent music making and appreciation can only be attained by playing the best music, and not through the performance of artistically limited didactic works. (p. 7).

Quality repertoire challenges students and gives them the opportunity to learn more about music in general, and about themselves as they grow as musicians (Persellin, 2000). Once repertoire has been selected, the director’s philosophy of music education is exposed (Apfelstadt, 2000). This philosophy is noticeable by parents, administrators, and colleagues, as well as students, and is a reflection of the director’s musical integrity (Williamson, 1981). In similar support, Dello Joio (1962) states, “The standards of a school’s music department are reflected to a large extent by the quality of the music performed and by the background and dedication of the teachers involved” (p. 33). Excellent repertoire allows a band program to stand on its own as a curricular subject, which is imperative for students, parents, other teachers, and administrators to comprehend (Cooper, 2001).
The majority of students in a band program will not continue to study music at the professional level after high school. Consequently for these students, the repertoire embodies their complete music education as that is what they will spend the most time learning (Budiansky, 2005). The subject matter of music is the literature the director teaches and the students learn; this is the core of the program (Adams, 1994, as cited in Budiansky & Foley, 2005), therefore, the literature selected for performance is the foundation of the students’ music education (Carney, 2005). The literature is the deciding factor of the progression of the curriculum as there are specific musical aspects learned through each composition (Budiansky & Foley, 2005). Waskiak (2010) states that the repertoire “should foster the development of a variety of music skills, appreciations, and understandings” (p. 90). If these characteristics are found in the music to be selected, they create a potential resource for teaching and learning and therefore, the music should be considered a representation of the curriculum (Sindberg, 2001).
CHAPTER III. PROCEDURES

The majority of this study was to complete performance analyses of two works for wind band by Steven Bryant that are of different levels of difficulty. *Interruption Overture* is a beginning wind band piece while *Suite Dreams* was written for advanced wind band. In an effort to compare the level of compositional craft of these pieces, each performance analysis included program notes, historical or programmatic influences, a harmonic reduction analysis, considerations for rehearsal and performance, and conducting issues. The comparison is shared in the discussion chapter.

Selection of Works

*Interruption Overture* and *Suite Dreams* were selected based on the status of their composer as well as their level of difficulty. Steven Bryant is a prolific composer of music for wind ensemble, orchestra, and chamber ensembles in addition to electronic and electro-acoustic music. He has received the National Band Association’s William D. Revelli Composition Award three times, and his works have been performed by ensembles such as the Julliard Symphony and the United States Air Force Band. These two pieces were written for groups of differing abilities, forming the basis for comparison. While *Suite Dreams* has been recognized as an award-winning composition, both pieces were analyzed to determine characteristics present in quality literature for young wind bands.

Performance Analysis

The first component of completing the performance analysis was to find information specifically about each piece. The program notes in each score, Steven Bryant’s website, *stevenbryant.com*, and any publications that contained information regarding either of the pieces
provided helpful information. I also searched for any historical or programmatic details that would influence the conception of each piece. Next, I spent a considerable amount of time analyzing each piece. For the analyses, I studied both musical scores to determine the formal and harmonic structure, transitional material, melodic and rhythmic gesture, unifying motives, orchestration, and thematic development. I also made analysis charts of each piece that helped me view the music in a linear fashion. Through this analysis, I was able to determine considerations for rehearsal, performance, and conducting, as well as compositional traits of the composer.

The performance analysis of each work included the following: (a) program notes; (b) historical/programmatic influences; (c) theoretical analysis; (d) considerations for rehearsal and performance; and (e) conducting issues.
CHAPTER IV. PERFORMANCE ANALYSES

Analysis of *Interruption Overture*

*Program Notes*

*Interruption Overture* is a deceptively creative piece for beginning wind band. Bryant develops one theme throughout the piece while interrupting that idea on both a macro and micro level. The theme is simple yet written with several metric changes between 4/4, 3/4, and 2/4. Each time the theme gains momentum, it is interrupted by a tone cluster constructed of every note in the chromatic series except B-flat, F, and E. The piece is loosely constructed in ternary form, determined by key center, with an introduction and coda. The A sections are complete statements of the original theme in B-flat major and the B section can be considered a large-scale interruption with emphasis on dissonance.

*Historical/Programmatic Influence*

*Interruption Overture* was commissioned by Bill Kellerman and the sixth grade band at the Bartle School in Highland Park, NJ. Bryant conceived this piece as an inversion of *Chester Leaps In*, which he composed the year before *Interruption Overture*. Bryant (1998) states in the score’s performance notes, “The music should catch listeners off-guard, giving no hint of the explosive dissonance and chaos around every corner.” For Bryant, this piece was a chance to introduce young musicians to chaos and dissonance in an organized way.

*Theoretical Analysis*

*Interruption Overture* opens with a statement of the primary theme which serves as the basis for the entire piece. The first interruption is presented in measure 14 as a tone cluster constructed of every note in the chromatic series except B-flat, F, and E. Throughout the piece,
this interruption “chord” serves as the functional dominant. Nearly every occurrence of the interruption is after, or in the middle of a statement of the theme, and consequently followed by the theme again. Bryant has cleverly disguised this considering there are very few dominant chords throughout the piece and when modulations occur, the key center does not move to the dominant. Each time the interruption is performed, the entire band plays accented and *staccato* eighth notes. In measure 14, it is played exactly this way and is embellished at the end by the triangle player.

The theme begins again in measure 16 in B-flat major this time accompanied by the low brass and low woodwinds in a *staccato* eighth note *ostinato* that is almost entirely constant throughout the piece. The theme continues for eleven measures and is concluded with the interruption in measure 26. Next, the flutes introduce a variant of the primary theme in B-flat major, which is similar to the primary theme, but rhythmically altered. In this instance, it is accompanied by an augmented fragment of the primary theme in the clarinets while the xylophone performs the *ostinato* accompaniment. The xylophone is joined six measures later by the low brass and low woodwinds in measure 33. Following the variant theme, the primary theme is stated in B-flat again. The trumpets interject with a fragment of the variant theme in E-flat major, until measure 41, when the primary theme ends with another occurrence of the interruption. Next, fragments of the primary theme, the augmented theme, and the rhythmic *ostinato* are passed between the woodwinds and the brass. From measure 47 to 54, there are two full statements of the second half of the augmented theme with rhythmic *ostinato* accompaniment. This section is completed in measure 55 with yet another interruption. The accented and *staccato* eighth notes are played for two and a half beats and then extended in the
low brass with whole note dissonances of G against A and a trill from G to A-flat in the low woodwinds.

Measure 58 begins the first transition section in E-flat major. The alto and tenor saxophones, trumpets, and horns perform an augmented extension of the theme in C major while the low brass and low woodwinds perform a descending series of notes from G to A-flat. In measure 63, the trumpets continue with a primary theme fragment in A-flat. The bassoons, trombones, and baritones then play an augmented version of the theme extension, which brings us to a tutti theme fragment in E-flat. The flutes, clarinets, and alto and tenor saxophones supplement these statements with the *ostinato* rhythmic accompaniment.

The second major section of the work, from measure 71 to 104, is the interruption section. It contains the majority of dissonance in the piece, excluding the interruptions that frequent the other sections. It begins with six beats of *tutti* aleatory followed by a measure of 2/4, which includes a *fortissimo* quarter note by the bass drum and a half note by the vibraslap. Then there is a measure of 4/4 in which the clarinets play the *ostinato* rhythmic accompaniment. These three things occur again, but the aleatory is four seconds this time and the flutes have the *ostinato*. This is followed by two and half beats of aleatory and a tritone juxtaposition of a primary theme fragment in the low brass and low woodwinds. In measure 80, the interruption is performed again to conclude this section.

Measure 82 begins the main part of the interruption section. It starts with a *ritardando* to quarter note=84. The flutes, oboes, second clarinets, and tenor saxophones descend in triplets while the first clarinets and alto saxophones descend in sixteenth notes. This is accompanied by a four beat trombone *glissando*. This descending effect ends on a whole note of one of four pitches: B, F, E, and B-flat. In measure 85, the clarinets improvise for eight measures in a *legato*
manner on the pitches G, A, A-flat, and B-flat while solo baritone, horn, and trumpet play a second variant of the original theme one at a time. This variant theme is again similar to the primary theme, but the rhythm is slightly altered. As the variant theme is passed from baritone to horn, the trombones join the baritone to play a tritone (F and B) on beats one and three. As each solo instrument finishes the variant theme, they join the tritone played on beats one and three. Once the trumpet finishes the variant theme, the full band without the flutes and oboes continue this dissonance on beats one and three for two measures. This idea ends with a fermata and then solo flute plays the second half of the primary theme at measure 96. After two measures, the flutes are joined in a pyramid of tritone entrances that are played on beats one and three until the full band is playing this idea. This accelerates until it becomes the accented and *staccato* interruption. The percussion extends the interruption through imitation for a measure.

The second transition section in A-flat major begins in measure 105 with a rhythmic *ostinato* identical to the accompaniment in the earlier sections. The low brass and low woodwinds without the tubas rotate through the pitches A-flat, B-flat, and B-natural, and is constant throughout the sixteen measures of this transition. The kick drum joins the accompaniment in measure 107 on quarter notes on every beat giving the music more forward motion. In addition to these two layers, the clarinets have four chromatic eighth notes that are constructed in an overlapping pattern. The clarinets begin this in measure 109 and continue while the trumpets present the primary theme in D-flat major from measure 110-121.

Measure 122 begins the recapitulation of the “A” section with the primary theme in B-flat major accompanied by the rhythmic *ostinato* in the low brass and woodwinds. This rhythmic *ostinato* remains persistent throughout the recapitulation until measure 147. The primary theme in B-flat major continues until measure 132 where it is interrupted. It is then immediately
followed by a fragment of the augmented theme in B-flat major stated by the upper woodwinds and the horns. In measure 138, another statement of the augmented theme fragment is performed, this time in E-flat major, with the trumpets replacing the horns. It is concluded by a descending glissando in the trombones and a chromatic triplet descent by the other low brass and low woodwinds from B-flat to E. In measure 143, the second half of the B-flat theme returns for four measures to complete the recapitulation in measure 146.

Beginning in measure 147, a twelve measure interruption, which can be considered the beginning of the coda, occurs until measure 158. It begins with a call and response between the winds and percussion. The entire band performs accented and staccato eighth notes for a full measure and the percussion responds identically. The band then plays the interruption for two beats of eighth notes and the percussion responds identically again. Lastly, each plays for one beat back and forth for a full measure. Following this call and response, all the winds and the xylophone simultaneously play a theme fragment for two measures on their respective pitch of the interruption. This is then followed by six beats of aleatory and a pyramid of entrances on the rhythmic ostinato to build the interruption and conclude with a full measure of marcato eighth notes. In measure 159, there is a brief restatement of the second half of the primary theme in B-flat major by the alto and tenor saxophones, trumpets, and horns with rhythmic ostinato accompaniment in the low brass, low woodwinds, and snare drum. Bringing the piece to its conclusion, Bryant merges the interruption and the tonality of the primary theme. The upper woodwinds and the xylophone play one measure of an ascending B-flat major scale in eighth notes and then are joined by the full band playing a non-dissonant B-flat major chord in marcato eighth notes in the style of the interruption.
Technical Considerations for Rehearsal and Performance

Each interruption is a series of eighth notes that are both accented and loud. Bryant (1998) states in his program notes that the controlled chaos of the dissonance forces [the students] to learn to quickly shift their mental focus, from “wild and crazy,” to “focused and melodic….” Because of the nature of the interruptions, it will be important to stress that the students perform with good tone as it is easy to get excited when playing loud. It is also common to compress the eighth notes in an idea that is repetitive and loud. The shifting between time signatures may also present some difficulties for students. When performing the primary theme, students may try to add extra beats to measures without four.

In measure 82, the flutes, oboes, 2nd clarinets, and tenor saxophones have descending triplets against descending sixteenth notes in the 1st clarinets and alto saxophones. Students will need to be mindful of their specific subdivision as it relates to the larger beats so each rhythm sounds distinct. At the same time, there is a glissando written in the first and second trombone parts. For the firsts, it begins on F3 and descends to B-flat2, and in the seconds it begins on F3 and descends to F2. Both of these are not natural glissandi so there will be a break somewhere. For the firsts, they will need to start in first position at F3 and slide down to sixth position C3 and quickly back to first position to land on the B-flat2. The seconds will begin the same way, but when they get to C3 they will drop a fourth to F2. This will be a challenge for them, and F2 might not be possible for this ability level. Another difficulty for the brass is the frequency of the tritone interval. Bryant did not write tritones in a linear way, but instead stacked them in instruments. For example, starting in measure 98, the second horns enter on B3 and the first horns enter on F4. Likewise, the second trombones enter on E3 and the firsts enter on B-flat3 in
measure 99. Students will need to internalize this interval in order to be successful at playing these parts.

Additionally, there are sections of aleatory and improvisation. It will be important here to make sure that there is constant sound. The clarinets from measure 85 to 92 will need to be confident as they are the only instruments with this improvisation. This is particularly important for the baritone soloist since it is uncommon that composers write for the baritone as a solo instrument in beginning wind band music. Furthermore, Bryant has written in specific articulations meant to accentuate contrast and students should be held accountable for the correct performance of these articulations. For example, in measure 102, the legato quarter notes help set apart the accented and staccato eighth notes of the interruption.

Conducting Issues

The majority of Interruption Overture is in 4/4, however, there are several sections that shift between 4/4, 3/4, and 2/4 that the director will need to conduct with a steady pulse. The aleatoric measures require varying numbers of beats. The director will need to decide whether to conduct these measures or to start them and prep for the next measure after the correct number of beats. If the director decides the latter, she will need to keep an accurate count of the number of beats so as to portray the composer’s intent. The director will also need to decide how long the fermata rest should be in measure 95. The length should briefly pause the building of harmonic tension as it continues in measure 96. If the fermata is too long, the momentum will be lost. Lastly, there are long sections where most of the percussion does not play. It will be necessary to make sure they are ready to play before their entrance after a large number of rests. This is particularly crucial in measure 132, when the only percussion instrument that has been playing since measure 105 is the kick drum.
Analysis of *Suite Dreams*

*Program Notes*

*Suite Dreams* is a “dream-like fantasia” based on one primary theme (Bryant, 2008). Form is fairly irrelevant in this piece, as it is mostly a development of this theme. Bryant manipulates the primary theme in many ways that disguises the original material. The piece is constructed of several large sections that are delineated by harmony and thematic development. The first section is measure 1-31 in E-flat major, which quickly moves to C minor for measures 32-75. These two sections are linked in their development of the primary theme almost exclusively. The next section is an extended transition toward E-flat Major, about 30 measures. This transition has additional themes sporadically introduced with E-flat Major tonality; however, there is a constant sustained G, which serves a dual purpose. It is the dominant of C Minor as well as the third of E-flat Major, the note that gives E-flat its major tonality. The G roots us to C Minor, but also leads us toward E-flat Major. Finally, by measure 105, we are officially in E-flat Major for the rest of the piece during which, four major sections are set apart by their thematic emphasis.

*Historical/Programmatic Influence*

*Suite Dreams* is the fourth piece of Bryant’s *Parody Suite. Chester Leaps In,* *ImPercynations,* and *MetaMarch,* the others in his *Parody Suite,* were all based on melodic fragments of standard works for wind band and have a humorous quality to them. *Suite Dreams* is not meant to be witty, but is it does, however, use as its source material fragments from a standard piece of wind band repertoire. It is almost exclusively based on the inverted chaconne melody from *First Suite in Eb* by Gustav Holst. Three additional melodic themes are present in the work but are not developed as extensively as the inverted chaconne melody.
Theoretical Analysis

*Suite Dreams* begins with a sustained G in the vibraphone and clarinets. The vibraphone fades into the clarinet sound and is followed by the first instance of humming by the majority of the band. The humming is commenced by an ascending sextuplet in the glockenspiel and crotales, and a quintuplet in the vibraphone on the notes of the inverted chaconne melody. This is a precursor of the rhythmic complexity that Bryant has included in this piece. The humming, which started in measure 5, consistently oscillates between G and A-flat until measure 31. After the humming is well established for three measures, the flutes, bassoon, clarinets, and bass clarinet present a melody constructed of a combination of the march theme and the inverted chaconne theme. These instruments share in the presentation: each has one to three notes of the melody to offer at a time, the last of which is sustained after the initial attack. A second phrase of this is performed until measure 31. The E-flat major tonality of this section is revealed by the melody and the intermittent vibraphone accompaniment that emphasizes the major third of the tonic chord.

Beginning in measure 32, there is an extensive development of the inverted chaconne theme with some interjections of other themes. The tonality changes almost immediately to C minor as the flutes are set in an *ostinato* of over-lapping eighth notes based on the inverted chaconne until measure 43. At the same time, the vibraphone is playing dotted quarter notes on the inverted chaconne melody to accomplish a *hemiola*. Two measures of this introduction and the horns and euphoniums begin presenting the march/inverted chaconne theme through shared monody. Each note is sustained after the initial attack and this leads to the first presentation of the cornet theme in major mode by the oboes, clarinets, and trumpets. In the middle of this theme, the saxophones enter on a C minor chord with an added F. Bryant (2008) instructs the
saxophones to perform this chord by “Medium-fast pulsing (< >), Don’t synchronize.” The pulsing is accomplished by alternating a crescendo and decrescendo from piano to forte at different times. This pulsing is completed by a descent of sextuplets and 32\textsuperscript{nd} notes. The rhythmically conflicting parts are common for Bryant; he consistently writes irregular subdivisions of the beat to be played simultaneously. In this case, for each beat of the fast descent, it is six notes against eight. Additionally during the saxophone descent, the trombones perform a slow descending glissando from D to A-flat.

From measure 44 to 62, Bryant develops the inverted chaconne theme further through creative rhythmic complexity. In fragments, he staggers each entrance as he presents the theme in the tubas, bassoons, clarinets, and bass clarinets, later to be joined by the baritone saxophone, trombones, and euphoniums toward the middle and end. During this development, Bryant also wrote a line of constant eighth notes that oscillate from G to A-flat. This line is passed back and forth between the alto and tenor saxophone and it creates a level of rhythmic stability to accompany the other lines. The other lines are set against each other in contrasting rhythms of irregular subdivisions, which is dependent on the stability of the constant eighth notes. The rhythmic complexity present in this section includes hemiola, implied duple and triple meters, and multiple subdivisions of the beat performed simultaneously. For example, on a given beat, there could be a quarter note triplet, eighth notes, a dotted eighth note, an eighth note triplet, or a dotted quarter note in a random combination. It is very seldom that the rhythms line up on the beat. Also, entrances are often on subdivisions of the beat and do not coincide with others. Bryant also creates an illusion of acceleration in this section by off-setting the entrances of instruments, decreasing the length of rests between statements, and steadily diminishing the subdivisions that are played. Additionally, to continue the emphasis of the C minor tonality, he
frequently adds B-naturals into the thematic fragments. These are more noticeable because the original inverted chaconne theme has B-flats. Bryant signals the completion of this thematic development in measure 59, with a sustained E-flat, played by the trumpets and horns, which resolves down a minor second to a *tutti* D in measure 62.

Measure 62 to 75 is one complete statement of the inverted chaconne theme shared by the oboes, trumpets, trombones, and euphoniums. The section begins with the flutes improvising on the pitches D, E-flat, F, G, and A-flat until measure 68. Bryant also has the mallet percussion improvising on pitches from the inverted chaconne melody in random order of two to four notes. His directions to the percussionists are to “keep it sparse and dreamlike” (Bryant, 2008). Soon after the improvising has started the rest of the woodwinds, trumpets, horns, tuba, and timpani hum from E-flat to D, slowly oscillating between the two notes. Next, the euphoniums begin the inverted chaconne theme that is rhythmically altered. The first four pitches are embellished by the trombones as they slowly perform two consecutive *glissandi* between the first and second pairs of notes. The trumpets and euphoniums together play the next three notes of the theme and are then joined by the oboes on the following three. At the same time, Bryant writes the 1st and 2nd flutes against the 3rd and 4th flutes in subdivisions of 6:8, 5:6, and 4:8. The euphoniums continue the melody with the trumpets for another note and then the trumpets are left to finish the theme. The last note that is played by each instrument is sustained to create an E-flat 12th chord that is pulsed and finally left to *crescendo* to a *sfz* by measure 76.

Measure 76 to 104 is a lengthy transition to the final sections in E-flat Major. Bryant wrote a sustained G throughout this entire section that is disguised by its frequent movement throughout the band. There is also a sustained B-flat in the timpani that enters in measure 92 and is constant until measure 104. The G presents a duality of tonalities. While the G is the dominant
of C Minor, which is the current tonality, it is also the third scale degree of E-flat Major, the note that denotes its major tonality. The B-flat presents still another layer of movement toward the E-flat Major tonality, as it is the dominant. The presence of the B-flat foreshadows a dominant to tonic resolution into measure 104.

Beginning in measure 77, there are three statements of the cornet theme over the next nineteen measures. In addition to this, different instruments improvise legato chromatic figures between D and A-flat. Bryant uses complex layers of rhythm to transition the second statement of the cornet theme into the third. There are three layers of different rhythms that occur simultaneously which carry the line into measure 92: quarter note triplets, the eighth-two-sixteenth note rhythm, and the two-sixteenth-eighth note rhythm in diminution. After the third statement of the cornet theme, there is a brief development of the inverted chaconne theme in measure 95. The clarinets move from eighth notes to eighth note triplets while the trumpets play quarter note triplets. The inverted chaconne theme is transformed once again in measure 98. It is presented by the low brass in parts: the horns play the first four notes, the trombones play the following four, the euphoniums play the next two, and the tubas finish with the last note. By measure 103, every note of the melody has been sustained since its initial attack and the performers are instructed to pulse their sustained note from piano to forte with a final crescendo from piano to sfz in measure 104.

From measure 105 to the end of the piece the tonality is E-flat major. In the first section, from measure 105 to 124, there are two statements of the chaconne melody, which is rhythmically altered. This is accompanied by two statements of the march theme set as a countermelody. As these two themes are played, there are minimal additions. Bryant, sporadically, has the upper woodwinds present the notes of the inverted chaconne theme in 32nd
notes, eighth note triplets, and quarter note triplets adding yet another layer of rhythmic complexity. Another example is from measures 116 to 119. Bryant presents the inverted chaconne theme in *hemiola*; the flutes and oboes play eighth notes against the clarinets and vibraphone playing quarter note triplets.

From measure 122 to 144, the march theme is performed twice, once as the primary melody, and once as the countermelody to a statement of the chaconne theme, both of which are rhythmically altered. This is accompanied by variations of two secondary themes from *First Suite*. The first is the rising eighth-two-sixteenth note theme that Bryant has the woodwinds play in quarter note triplets, and the second is the running sixteenth note passage in which he changes the tonality. Beginning in measure 141, Bryant introduces a sustained B-flat in the low brass and timpani to create a dominant to tonic resolution. This movement toward resolution, the sixteenth note motion, the ascending melodic notes, and the overall rise in dynamics all converge to create an intense *crescendo* toward the climax in measure 145.

Beginning in measure 145, the climax of the entire piece is met with the first and only original statement of the chaconne melody played by the low brass and low woodwinds. Accompanying this is the cornet theme as a countermelody. As these two themes are presented, fragments of the inverted chaconne theme and the eighth-two-sixteenth note theme in diminution are both played until measure 156. Here, the tempo has been reduced, the last notes of the cornet and chaconne themes are being completed as the oboes, clarinets, and alto and tenor saxophones are pulsing a twelfth chord constructed of the pitches D, F, A-flat, C, E-flat, and G. The cornet theme is restarted immediately in measure 156 in the trombones, euphoniums, and tubas. The previous eighth-two-sixteenth note theme is played rhythmically accurate by the 1st flutes, 2nd
flutes and vibraphone, and the 3rd and 4th flutes play a variation of this theme in triplets until measure 160.

The oscillation humming that was present in the beginning of the piece begins again in measure 158. This continues until measure 174, with instruments pausing their humming to present a fragment of one of the main themes and then to return to the humming. After the first part of the cornet theme is finished, the bassoons play one melody that is constructed of the march, inverted chaconne, and chaconne themes. The bass clarinet accompanies the bassoons with a melody that is constructed from the inverted chaconne and ends with the first four notes of the original chaconne theme. In measure 174, the oscillation humming ceases, and the performers hum on one pitch of an E-flat major chord. Also in this measure, the bassoons, 3rd and 4th trombones, euphoniums, and tubas, sustain an E-flat for one measure. This E-flat is the beginning of six measures of shared monody by the entire brass section accompanied by the vibraphone. The melody that is shared is the first half of the chaconne theme. Each note of the melody is passed to a different part of the brass section. This in addition to the octave displacement that Bryant writes effectively disguises the melody. It finally resolves to an E-flat major chord first played by the euphoniums and tubas, and followed by the clarinets. In measure 180, the clarinets remain playing the E-flat major chord while the rest of the band hums the E-flat major chord. The clarinets are instructed to fade this into the voices for the conclusion of the piece.

_Bechnical Considerations for Rehearsal and Performance_

Steven Bryant has written several parts for each instrument. There are four parts for flute, clarinet, trumpet, trombone, and horn, which is standard, and two parts for euphonium and tuba. An average high school band will not have sufficient numbers in all sections to have a significant
number of players on each part. As a result, students will need to be confident when playing their parts. This is also important because Bryant wrote the parts independent of each other; there are many instances when all four parts of one section are each playing something different. Additionally, humming happens frequently throughout the piece. The director will need to judge the dynamic of this action in order for the audience to hear it. The audience must have an awareness of the sound the humming produces to get the full effect of the piece in these instances.

Bryant also uses shared monody and octave displacement to disguise themes within the music. Because of this, the director must make students aware of how their part relates to the entire theme. Each note is not random and is more likely to be part of a larger idea. This also means that the director needs to make sure the theme comes through as one phrase or a series of phrases. The rhythms are also challenging. There are runs with many accidentals, triplets moving to eighth notes or sixteenth notes, dotted figures tied to other notes, syncopation, and the lines are independent of each other. Students will need to be very secure of their performance given that there will not be very many people on a part. There are many instances of hemiola as well, which means students will need to be aware of their specific subdivision and how it relates to the larger beats. Lastly, there are several non-standard notations that the director will have to make clear before beginning: humming, pulsing, pitch oscillation, suspended time, aleatory.

Conducting Issues

This piece poses several conducting challenges. There are irregular metric changes that do not follow a specific pattern. This will take some practice to make effortless and the students will need time to internalize how each set of changes works. There are also five tempo changes ranging from quarter note equals 48 to quarter note equals 84. The range seems drastic, but how
Bryant has organized them in the piece makes them seamless. It is important that the director learns these tempos in order to establish and maintain the mood of the piece. If a tempo change is too drastic the flow of the piece will be interrupted.

Cues will be more important in a piece like this given that the parts are independent. Students will be looking to the conductor for reassurance of their part. Similarly, the nature of some of the sections is that the entrances are offset (mm. 44-61). The conductor does not have to show every entrance, but will need to make sure students are engaged and ready to play before their respective entrances. The measures of suspended time will need practice. Deciding on a consistent action that will demonstrate the beginning of suspended time will combat confusion. It will also be necessary to make the preparatory beat very clear when moving on to real time again. Eye contact with those students playing in the next measure will be very helpful.

Furthermore, much of this piece is meant to be performed in a dream-like character. In contrast, there are several sections that are angular, accented, rousing, or heroic. It is important that the director make this contrast apparent in her conducting. The dream-like character should not be over-conducted, but understated. Students will still be able to follow a small and inconspicuous pattern.
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION

Bryant’s Compositional Techniques

The analyses of *Interruption Overture* and *Suite Dreams* have shown that Bryant has created two works of high quality despite the differences in the level of difficulty. In *Interruption Overture*, there are few rhythms and melodies that challenge young musicians, but this does not limit Bryant’s creativity in organizing the piece. It is complete in formal and harmonic structure, and has interesting melodic elements. This is also applicable to *Suite Dreams* although it is much more technically demanding of the musicians. Bryant writes melodic, rhythmic, and harmonic elements that interact with each other. Characteristics present in both works, which indicate the quality of this literature for young wind bands include: theme manipulation, imaginative use of rhythm and harmony, distinct formal structure, and creative extended techniques.

Melodically, Bryant effectively manipulates the themes that are presented in both pieces. The most basic yet artful way that he manages this is through the development of one primary theme throughout each piece. *Suite Dreams* is mainly a development of the inverted chaconne theme from Holst’s *First Suite in E-flat*, and *Interruption Overture* is a development of the primary theme presented in the first few measures. Bryant manipulates melody throughout these pieces in several ways. He augments, diminishes, and fragments ideas, all of which may be presented alone or as accompaniment to another theme. Often, a quick interjection, that is seemingly random, is a fragment of a previously stated theme. Bryant is also clever to give themes different roles. In *Suite Dreams* in measure 124, Bryant gives the march theme the role of countermelody as it is presented with the chaconne theme. In *Interruption Overture*, he creates variant themes by slightly changing the rhythm of the primary theme. The changes are enough to
produce a variant theme, but not enough to create a secondary theme. Lastly, in *Suite Dreams*, he presents themes using shared monody. Although Bryant uses this technique frequently to disguise the themes throughout the piece, it is particularly evident in the final measures. Beginning in measure 174, each instrument of the brass section contributes one note of the first eight of the chaconne theme before the last E-flat Major chord. Through in-depth study one can recognize that the majority of this piece is constructed of the themes manipulated and presented in the ways just discussed. It is rare for any one of them to occur alone; often they occur simultaneously with other manipulations of the melody.

Another important component of Bryant’s compositional style is his creative use of rhythm. In *Interruption Overture*, he uses ostinato, acceleration, and frequent metric changes. In *Suite Dreams*, he also uses ostinato and frequent metric changes but in addition he uses hemiola, implied meters, and the illusion of acceleration. The ostinato prevalent in *Interruption Overture* is frequently used as a unifying element. The rhythmic ostinato performed mostly by the low brass and low woodwinds is consistent throughout the piece as accompaniment to the primary theme. In *Suite Dreams*, Bryant writes straightforward hemiola of 2:3, but he also creates rhythmic layers where instruments are playing contrasting subdivisions of the beat against one another. For example, frequently there are contrasting subdivisions of 3:4, 4:5, 5:6, 5:8, and 6:8. Additionally, the first extended development of the inverted chaconne from measure 43 to 62 is a prime example of Bryant’s complex rhythms, implied meter, and the illusion of acceleration. Rarely do the different layers line up on a downbeat and there could be any combination of these rhythms played simultaneously: quarter note triplet, eighth notes, a dotted eighth note, an eighth note triplet, or a dotted quarter note. The implied meters are suggested through the groupings of the fragments. For example, when the fragment is presented in dotted quarter notes, the meter 6/8
is implied although it is not actually written. Bryant also creates the illusion of acceleration by off-setting the entrances of fragments, decreasing the length of rests between statements, and steadily diminishing the subdivisions that are played. In *Interruption Overture*, he writes an actual *accelerando* in the music, which is appropriate for the age group. This gives more responsibility to the director instead of the students. Lastly, it is also a common compositional trait of Bryant’s to write frequent metric changes. This is another way that Bryant can develop an idea differently each time. In *Interruption Overture*, the metric changes seem random at first but a pattern is recognizable the further you continue into the piece. In *Suite Dreams*, the metric changes are almost as convoluted as the rhythms he writes. Again, these differences are age appropriate.

Bryant’s use of harmony is imaginative and always serves a purpose. The form of each piece is revealed by the main changes in the harmonic structure. As *Suite Dreams* is a fantasia, the form is not as concrete as *Interruption Overture*, but it can be separated into larger sections based on harmony and thematic material. Bryant uses the melody to present the key center in *Interruption Overture* which consequently exposes its ternary form. The truly artistic harmonic development in *Interruption Overture* is Bryant’s use of dissonance. The interruption “chord,” constructed of every pitch except B-flat, F, and E, can be considered a functional dominant in this piece. There are very few true dominant chords throughout the piece and none of the modulations that occur are to the key of F Major. In addition, the interruption is almost always followed by the theme. Bryant also uses the interval of the tritone frequently to separate interruption material from the sections of functional harmony when presenting the primary theme. This interval is present in how Bryant constructed the interruption and also how he relates theme fragments. In *Suite Dreams*, he presents a duality of key centers during the transition from
C minor to E-flat major. Throughout this entire section, Bryant writes a sustained G that gets passed between several instruments. This keeps the music rooted to C minor but at the same time leads it toward E-flat major. The final push toward E-flat major comes when Bryant writes a sustained B-flat in the timpani, which creates a dominant to tonic motion as the music moves to E-flat major in measure 105.

Bryant is also resourceful about extended techniques he requests of the musicians. Performers in *Interruption Overture* have the opportunity to play aleatoric passages, improvised parts, suspended time, and *glissandi*. In *Suite Dreams*, performers have the same opportunities listed previously but Bryant adds pulsed dynamics, singing and humming. The purpose of these techniques is to create effects to accompany the themes presented. All of these effects contribute to the full realization of each piece. In *Interruption Overture*, Bryant uses aleatory, improvisation, and *glissandi*, as part of the interruption material, which is a large component of the piece. In this case, the techniques have a more central purpose. In *Suite Dreams*, however, the techniques are all complimentary to melodic and rhythmic development. In some instances, they also serve as transitional material. For example, Bryant writes a glissando in the trombone part in *Interruption Overture* in measure 82 as part of a transition to a new key area, and another in measure 142 just before the return of the primary theme. Similarly, in *Suite Dreams*, Bryant uses the pulsed dynamics often to transition the music to new thematic material.

**Implications for Music Education**

*Quality Music for Beginning Wind Band*

The results of this comparative analysis show that Steven Bryant has written a quality piece of music for beginning wind band. It is apparent that despite performance limitations of the students, it is still possible to create music that is both playable and artistic. *Interruption*
Overture has a formal and harmonic structure that is logical and provides the foundation for a quality piece of music. It also has original characteristics that give it a unique sound. This is one piece for beginning wind band that does not compromise creativity and artful expression for functionality. The potential for quality beginning wind band music is high as is demonstrated by Interruption Overture.

Score Analysis as an Educational Tool

The in-depth score analyses which resulted from this performance analysis are models of the type of foundation one can create for teaching music in a band rehearsal. The director may use all the materials to write lesson plans which will optimize her time with the ensemble. More specifically, the considerations for rehearsal and performance offer prime information that can make the entire rehearsal period leading to the concert more efficient. Completing in-depth score analyses also helps the director to become intimately acquainted with the characteristics present in a piece of quality literature. Learning these characteristics should result in a broad knowledge for the students to acquire, and should act as a supplement to their physical knowledge of the music (performing it on one’s instrument).

Suggestions for Further Research

It would benefit the band community to encourage more composers to write for young bands. There are a vast number of composers who write exclusively for band, but I am suggesting that composers who are more varied in their musical composition background be sought. Composers new or less experienced with this genre might explore innovative possibilities of the ensemble and its instruments, and this could potentially change the sound of the ensemble. This could contribute to band music moving away from the trite, formulaic standard that has been set. Composers who write outside the band world may have more to offer
because they may focus their attention on creating quality music instead of the perceived limitations of the ensemble.

The band community could also benefit if more research was completed through performance analyses. Performance analyses offer a comprehensive representation of a piece of music. Completing a performance analysis essentially involves learning as much about a piece as possible. The score must be studied in-depth, the learning difficulties for students must be assessed, and one must think critically about the composer’s intent. This type of analysis is purely scholarly, which means the primary focus is to gain a thorough understanding of the piece, not just learn to conduct it. Completing a performance analysis is practical experience for any person entering or already in the music education profession. Furthermore, each analysis is a potential resource for directors as this process can be applied to any piece of music. Each one can be used to guide a director’s study of a piece or help when considering it for programming.
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