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Selection of repertoire is an important task for any conductor. One of the ways to approach this challenge is to look at the works of composers whose compositions have proven to be durable over the years. There are certain composers who consistently provide quality literature without becoming repetitious or predictable. One such composer is Dr. Frank Ticheli.

The quality of Ticheli’s work has already risen to a level where many of his wind-band compositions are now referred to as core literature. Eleven of his fifteen compositions for wind band or wind ensemble are on state contest lists. Seven of his compositions are included in the prestigious series *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band*, Volumes 1, 2, and 3. *Cajun Folk Songs*, *Fortress*, *Gaian Visions*, and *Postcard* are included in *Best Music For High School Band*.

The purpose of this study is to identify what distinguishes Ticheli’s music as quality literature by means of an analysis of three of his compositions for band. Each piece has been selected from a different time frame and represents different technical performance levels: *Fortress*, *Postcard* and *Vesuvius*. Two of these compositions are recognized as exceptional works of Ticheli: *Fortress* and *Postcard*, while the third work, *Vesuvius*, is one of his more recent releases. Each of the pieces chosen is appropriate for
either high school or college programming. Each piece has unique elements incorporated into the structure that can be used as the basis for comprehensive teaching.

To gain a better understanding of each work, and to provide a common analytical basis of examining Ticheli's compositional language, the author analyzed each piece using an abridged "Step 3 Score Analysis" as outlined by Frank Battisti and Robert Garofalo in *Guide to Score Study for the Wind Band Conductor*. For the purposes of this study, only the areas of melody, form, rhythm, and orchestration were examined in detail. Harmony, texture, dynamics, and stylistic articulations & expressive terms have been included as elements of the flow chart.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURES

BACKGROUND

Selection of repertoire is an important task for any conductor. As a band conductor, this author is constantly evaluating the educational and musical needs of the musicians performing. Finding appropriate repertoire that meets the needs of the performers, the conductor, and the audience can prove difficult. One of the ways this author approaches this challenge is to look at the works of composers whose compositions have proven to be durable over the years. One could assume that other works by these same composers would be of similar caliber. There are certain composers who consistently provide quality literature without becoming repetitious or predictable. For this author, one such composer is Dr. Frank Ticheli.

The quality of Ticheli's work has already risen to a level where many of his wind-band compositions are now referred to as core literature.¹ Eleven of his fifteen


Thomas L. Dvorak et al., Best Music For High School Band (Brooklyn: Manhattan Beach Music, 1993) 70-72.
compositions for wind band or wind ensemble are on state contest lists. Six have received "Highly Recommended" ratings for new music from *The Instrumentalist* magazine. Three have received "Highest Rating, 'Reviewers Choice'" from *The Instrumentalist* magazine.²

In a detailed review of Ticheli's *Cajun Folk Songs* for *The Instrumentalist* magazine, William Kenny likened this composition to the works of Vaughan Williams and Grainger.³

Three of Ticheli's compositions have received "Highest Rating" from *Band Directors Guide* magazine.⁴ Seven of his compositions are included in the prestigious series *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band, Volumes 1, 2, and 3.*⁵ *Cajun Folk Songs, Fortress, Gaian Visions,* and *Postcard* are included in *Best Music For High School Band.*⁶

It is rare to find a contemporary composer whose compositions receive consistently high marks and laudatory reviews for originality, programmability and teachability. Even more rare is a composer who has proven his craftsmanship at all levels of technical difficulty. This author feels Ticheli's compositional language is remarkably consistent in its originality and application. Each of his pieces is an individual entity designed within its own parameters, not merely a carbon copy of a previous piece with minor alternations.

---


⁴ Margolis, on-line posting.


⁶ Dvorak, 70-72.
Table 1.1 shows a complete list of Ticheli’s works for band and wind ensemble.

Included in this list are two of his less familiar pieces: Concertino for Trombone and Band and Music for Winds and Percussion, both available only through rental with Manhattan Beach Music. Sun Dance has probably been overshadowed by the practically simultaneous releases of Blue Shades and Cajun Folksongs II. The three most recent compositions, Shenandoah, Vesuvius, and An American Elegy, are still making their appearances onto state lists. The middle section of this list is very impressive: Portrait of a Clown, Fortress, Cajun Folk Songs, Cajun Folksongs II, Amazing Grace, Gaian Visions, Postcard, Pacific Fanfare, and Blue Shades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>YEAR COMPOSED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STATE LISTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An American Elegy</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesuvius</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Shades</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Dance</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folksongs II</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Fanfare</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaian Visions</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazing Grace</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folk Songs</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortress</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of a Clown</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music for Winds and Percussion</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concertino for Trombone and Band</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1.1: List of works for band by Ticheli²

² As of this writing, Pacific Fanfare is still in publication, which explains the lack of appearance on any state list.

³ Margolis, on-line posting.
The purpose of this study is to identify what distinguishes Ticheli's music as quality literature by means of an analysis of three of his compositions for band. Each piece has been selected from a different time frame and represents different technical performance levels: Fortress, Postcard and Vesuvius. As discussed above, two of these compositions are recognized as exceptional works of Ticheli: Fortress and Postcard, while the third work, Vesuvius, is one of his more recent releases. Fortress is listed as a grade 3 piece; Postcard is listed as a grade 5 piece; Vesuvius is listed as a grade 4 piece. Each of the pieces chosen is appropriate for either high school or college programming. Each piece has unique elements incorporated into the structure that can be used as the basis for comprehensive teaching. Fortress is an example of Ticheli's early work; Postcard appeared four years later; and Vesuvius is an example of Ticheli's most recent wind band compositions.

BIography

Frank Ticheli was born on January 21, 1958, in Monroe, Louisiana. Having been raised in the shadow of New Orleans, he grew up listening to New Orleans style Dixieland music. Louis Armstrong was his idol, a fact that prompted him to start playing the trumpet. His high school musical experience could be viewed as typical. He performed with the school's concert band, marching band, jazz band, and orchestra. The music

---

9 Frank Ticheli, e-mail to the author, 29 Sep. 2000.
program at Berkner High School in Richardson, Texas, however, was by no means typical. Ticheli describes this program as “one of the truly great school programs in the country.”

After graduating from Southern Methodist University with a Bachelor of Music degree in 1980, Ticheli taught high school in Garland, Texas. This experience, although brief, was very beneficial. It was during this short duration of teaching high school band when Ticheli gained valuable introductory information about musical perception and cognitive learning. This insight helped shape his early compositional approach to writing music for winds, especially for young performers. It is his unique approach to composition, especially at the easier grade levels, that sets his music apart from the standard wind band composer. Ticheli’s compositional technique also manifests itself at the more difficult levels as highly artistic construction and not just extreme technical difficulty.

Realizing that composition was a calling and not just a hobby, Ticheli moved on to the University of Michigan for his graduate studies. He received his Masters in Music in 1983 and his Doctor of Musical Arts in Composition in 1987. During his five years at Michigan, Ticheli was a graduate assistant working with nationally recognized Pulitzer

---

10 Frank Ticheli, personal correspondence to the author, 20 Apr. 2001.


12 Ticheli, e-mail, 29 Sep. 2000.


Prize winners Leslie Bassett and William Bolcom.\textsuperscript{15} While at Michigan, Ticheli had the opportunity to study with and observe one of this country’s finest band conductors, H. Robert Reynolds. Years later, their enduring friendship inspired the composition Postcard, which is a musical memorial to Reynolds’ mother.\textsuperscript{16}

Following his graduation from Michigan, Ticheli taught music at Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas. While in San Antonio, Ticheli had the opportunity to expand his work in the orchestra genre. It was also during this time that Ticheli’s critically acclaimed wind band compositions Portrait of a Clown, Fortress, and Cajun Folk Songs were composed and published.

In 1991, Ticheli joined the faculty of the University of Southern California’s Thornton School Music, where he is currently a professor of composition. As composer-in-residence with the Pacific Symphony Orchestra from 1991 to 1998, Ticheli gained a national and international reputation.\textsuperscript{17} National awards for his orchestral, vocal, and wind band compositions are listed in detail in Appendix A.

Ticheli credits his success as a composer to the fact that he does not limit himself to only one genre. He feels that his work with orchestras and voices as well as the experiences he has had with wind bands provides a broader, more comprehensive

\textsuperscript{15} Ticheli, e-mail, 29 Sep. 2000.

\textsuperscript{16} Frank Ticheli, “Program Notes,” Postcard.

approach to writing music and to the process of creating meaningful musical moments for all of the various genres with which he works.\textsuperscript{18}

**RELEVANT RESEARCH**

Research about and analysis of Ticheli's music is scarce. Thomas Stone makes a brief mention of *Postcard* in his thesis “Symmetrical Set Voicings.”\textsuperscript{19} Stone describes and illustrates the palindromic nature of the opening theme, and references the octatonic scale upon which the opening theme is constructed. Stone includes an annotation of the name “Harrah” relating to the pitches B-A-D-D-A-B (where B=H from the German system, and D=R or “re” from solefege) in the middle of the forty-two-note palindrome.

Jerome Markoch examines *Postcard* in detail in his thesis “An Approach to the Musical Analysis of Wind-Band Literature Based on Analytical Modes Used By Wind-Band Specialists and Theorists.”\textsuperscript{20} Markoch’s examination includes detailed set theory analysis of the melody, an examination of Ticheli’s use of rhythm, an additional section dedicated to motivic analysis, a Schenker-based reduction analysis, and a concluding section in which Markoch mentions some possible teaching strategies based on his examination. Markoch includes a “Form Chart” in his Appendix E and a “Précis” in his


Appendix F. Specific details of agreement and critique of Markoch’s findings will be addressed in Chapter 3.

There are several articles and citations about Ticheli’s band compositions. One of the three pieces chosen for this study appears in the celebrated three volume series Teaching Music Through Band Performance: Amazing Grace, Postcard, Portrait of a Clown, and Cajun Folk Songs appear in Volume 1;\textsuperscript{21} Blue Shades appears in Volume 2;\textsuperscript{22} Sun Dance and Cajun Folk Songs II appear in Volume 3.\textsuperscript{23} Each entry is presented in the following format: Unit 1: Composer; Unit 2: Composition; Unit 3: Historical Perspective; Unit 4: Technical Considerations; Unit 5: Musical Considerations; Unit 6: Musical Elements; Unit 7: Form and Structure; Unit 8: Suggested Listening; and Unit 9: Additional References and Resources. These individual units normally consist of one or two paragraphs of general observations and pertinent information. Unit 7: Formal Structure is normally presented as a concise précis. Although Postcard receives more attention than the standard entry, there is very little new information beyond what is given by the composer in his program notes. One important aspect pointed out by the author of the entry is the extensive use and development of the tritone E-A\# throughout the composition.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{21} Miles, Vol. 1, 132-135, 166-169, 222-224, 450-455.

\textsuperscript{22} Miles, Vol. 2, 547-551.

\textsuperscript{23} Miles, Vol. 3, 285-287, 304-308.

\textsuperscript{24} Miles, Vol. 1, 452-454.
Both Postcard and Fortress appear in Best Music for High School Band.²⁵

Annotations for the compositions that appear in this compendium are designed to provide conductors who are not familiar with these pieces enough critical information to make educated programming choices. It is clear that the purpose of this publication was not to include an in-depth analysis of each piece. Although the publication is useful as a resource for identifying quality band literature, the information it included regarding Fortress and Postcard could not be utilized for this study.

Patrick Dunnigan includes Postcard in his article "Reverse Transcriptions from Band to Orchestra" for the February 1997 edition of The Instrumentalist magazine.²⁶ Other reviews and articles that focus on compositions of Ticheli appear in The Instrumentalist, but none specifically addresses the three compositions chosen for this study.

PROCEDURES

This author has conducted both Fortress and Postcard, and observed the preparations for two different performances of Vesuvius. Having studied these pieces and perused other band compositions of Ticheli, the author thinks it is clear there are common elements in all of Ticheli's compositions that are manifested in different ways appropriate to each piece. Some of the initial characteristics this author has identified in Ticheli's music are: 1) the development and manipulation of short melodic/motivic ideas, sometimes

²⁵ Dvorak, 71-72.

reduced to only a simple interval, 2) layered rhythmic schemes involving written and implied metrical stress or polymeters, 3) a distinct form, separate and unique unto each piece, and 4) the use of atypical orchestration, particularly at the easier grade levels. To gain a better understanding of each work, and to provide a common analytical basis of examining Ticheli's compositional language, the author analyzed each piece using an abridged “Step 3 Score Analysis” as outlined by Frank Battisti and Robert Garofalo in Guide to Score Study for the Wind Band Conductor. Battisti and Garofalo’s “Score Analysis” includes a detailed examination of melody, harmony, form, rhythm, orchestration, texture, dynamics, and stylistic articulations & expressive terms. See Appendix B for a complete breakdown of Battisti and Garofalo’s “Score Analysis.” For the purposes of this study, only the areas of melody, form, rhythm, and orchestration will be examined in detail. Harmony, texture, dynamics, and stylistic articulations & expressive terms will be included as elements of the flow chart. This method of score study is the same method that Markoch criticizes in his thesis. Markoch finds this method inadequate and he advocates several other methods of score study. His conclusions, however, fail to demonstrate how these other methods are more useful or superior.

One of the unique aspects of Ticheli's music is his atypical approach to band orchestration. In addition to the prescribed method outlined above, an orchestration

---


28 Markoch, 85-88.

29 Kenny, 26.
chart will be included in the analysis of each composition. An orchestration chart of Frank Ericson's *Toccata for Band* is included in Appendix C, to provide a basis for comparison. *Toccata for Band* is similar in grade level and technical demands as *Fortress*. Both pieces appear on many state contest lists. Both pieces are excellent examples of quality literature for younger, developing musicians. The purpose of the orchestration charts is to illustrate the diversity of Ticheli's technique in comparison to other composers. Themes and motifs are assigned geometric patterns or shadings, then indicated as such on the chart according to the instruments chosen by Ticheli. Other information pertinent to each composition (e.g., ostinato, transitional material, and unique instrumental effects) is also assigned a geometric pattern or shading and illustrated in the same manner. A legend for each composition's orchestration chart will be included in the chapter assigned.

Chapter II, Chapter III and Chapter IV will examine *Fortress*, *Postcard*, and *Vesuvius* respectively. Included with each examination will be a brief discussion of certain salient teaching points unique to each piece and an explanation of conducting problems and possible solutions encountered while this author was preparing each piece for performance.

An important aspect of this study is the involvement of Ticheli. He has already agreed to assist with this study and has been instrumental in assisting with the research of some biographical and background information.\footnote{Ticheli, e-mail, 16 May 2000.} He has agreed to read each chapter and provide comments with regard to the accuracy of the analysis and any conclusions. Russell
Mikkelson makes the following observation in his thesis "A Study of Sounds, Shapes and Symbols" by Leslie Bassett: A Contemporary Composition for Band."

"It is difficult to over-estimate the value of the relationship between conductor and composer. These personal contacts provide a dialogue between the two; a sharing of ideas between the performer and a living composer."

Like Mikkelson, I intend to use fully all opportunities to have the composer evaluate, corroborate, and when necessary, bring to my attention any erroneous conclusions or errant statements.

Chapter V will address the conclusions drawn from the analysis of the composition. Specifically, what are the common elements found in each piece? Does Ticheli use the same "language" in each piece? Are there similarities in his formal designs? Does there appear to be a certain technique that seems to be favored by Ticheli? Can any conclusions be drawn as to why Ticheli's music stands out as consistently better than most other music of comparable difficulty and genre?

**APPENDICES**

Appendix A contains biographical information of Ticheli's education and compositional output. This listing includes professional honors and awards, academic awards, a selected discography, commissions and grants, and a complete catalogue of works. This information was compiled from Ticheli's vita. Appendix B contains

---


32 Ticheli, Resume.
complete description of Battisti and Garofalo's "Score Analysis." Appendix C contains the orchestration chart base model of Frank Erickson's Toccata for Band.
CHAPTER 2

ANALYSIS OF FORTRESS

Ticheli describes **Fortress** as his first major composition for concert band.\(^1\)

Composed in 1988, **Fortress** was premiered by the Batawagama Youth Camp Band in Iron County Michigan on June 25, 1988, with David Schleicher as the conductor.\(^2\)

The following information is extracted from the composer's introductory notes:

The tritone (TT) is the most important structural interval in the piece. Alteration between major triads a tritone apart occurs throughout the piece. For example:\(^3\)

```
\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{trombones.png}
\caption{Example of tritone motion in **Fortress** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music}
\end{figure}
```

---

\(^1\) Rombach.

\(^2\) Frank Ticheli, "Acknowledgments" **Fortress**

\(^3\) Frank Ticheli, "Composer's Notes" **Fortress**
There are three important ideas that occur throughout the piece, each receiving emphasis at different times:

1. **Main Idea**
   - Low brass
   - \[ \text{nf} \]

2. "Call Motif"
   - Trumpet
   - Straight snare
   - \[ \text{nfp} \to \text{nf} \]

3. **Legato theme**
   - Oboe
   - \[ \text{nfp} \]

**Figure 2.2: Thematic ideas** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music

An additional unifying device used throughout the piece is a staccato pattern of eighth-notes employed as background and harmonic accompaniment. This idea is first presented at measure 7 by the bassoons.

**Figure 2.3: Staccato pattern** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music

Other examples of this rhythmic accompaniment can be found at measures 14, 18, 22, 34, 66 (variation), 71-86 (as an ostinato), 156, 143, and 147.

---

4 Ibid.
FORM

The composer indicates that the composition is segmented into five different sections. Section 1 presents the main idea, call motif, legato theme, tritone motion, and staccato pattern, all within the first twenty measures. An examination of the flow chart (Chart 2.1) illustrates that these ideas are presented in short two- and three-measure phrases, with the exception of the tritone motion, which is sometimes presented in longer segments for harmonic purposes. These motivic ideas become the compositional building blocks of the piece; these themes are constantly developed, augmented, and rearranged.

\[5\] Ibid.
Section 1:

Form: 6 - 7 - 3 - 8 - 10 (26)
2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 4
Melody: Percussion Staccato Call motif
Orchestration: Percussion Bssus Muted Ft
Harmony: Bb - E Tritone
Texture: Exposed soloistic
Dynamics: pp mp
Stac.

Section 2:

Form: 2 + 4 (2) - 8 - 10 (5)
Orchestration: Perc. Trp+Hn Cb/Euph Ft+Ob(Tamb)
Harmony: Bb - E Tritone
Texture: Section Combinations
Dynamics: p mf mp f mf ff f mp

Chart 2.1: **Fortress flow chart** continued
A continued examination of the Chart 2.1 shows that within Section 1, no thematic idea extends beyond four measures. Many times, one theme concludes with a sustained note while a second theme is presented on top of the sustained extension of the first theme.

![Chord progression and melody](image)

**Figure 2.4: Thematic overlap** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music

Other examples of this technique can be seen at measures 26, 34, and 38.

The manner in which Ticheli utilizes the tritone throughout this piece allows him to blend one thematic idea into another without a formal break in continuity.

![Chord progression and melody](image)

**Figure 2.5: Thematic blending** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music

Section 2 is dedicated to the development of the call motif. It is in Section 2 that phrase lengths of longer than four measures can first be clearly identified. These longer
phrase lengths are still not standard four- or eight-measure blocks, however, but rather five and seven.

In Section 3, the legato theme is presented and developed. Phrase lengths within this section conform to standard lengths of four and eight measures. Throughout this section, thematic snippets of the main idea provide rhythmic contrast as aural reminders of the main thematic material. The continued development of the legato theme, mostly in diminution, leads to Section 4.

Section 4 begins with an eight-measure phrase. These eight measures are the most turbulent and rhythmically active measures of the entire piece. A four-bar phrase of thematic material of main idea provides the final push into the ultimate climax of the composition at measure 120. This climax lasts for only two measures. A dramatic four second caesura is followed by a brief two-measure restatement of the legato theme in a new tempo.

Section 5, which is parenthetically labeled “Coda” by the composer, begins with a very long B-flat pedal point. The ascending E major triads provide the contrasting tritone harmonic motion. Another four-bar phrase similar to measure 116 leads to the penultimate climax at measure 153 of a two-measure statement of the main idea. This beginning of the “Coda” section is very reminiscent of classical composition practices of extended cadences and pedal points leading to recapitulations of the main theme.6 Ticheli concludes the piece quickly after the climax at measure 153.

---

MELODIC ANALYSIS

It is difficult to separate this piece into individual elements; many of the elements are interrelated and interdependent. By the very nature of the tritone harmonic scheme, the main idea, the call motif, and the legato theme all include the interval of a tritone in their construction. See Figure 2.2 for examples of this construction. As was mentioned above, a unique characteristic of the melodies in this piece is the short two-measure phrase lengths. Each thematic idea and its development will be examined individually. Although some extracted musical examples are included, it might be helpful for the reader to refer to a full score.

Main Idea

One characteristic of this piece is Ticelj’s use of percussion instruments. He does not relegate the percussion section to standard block scoring techniques and utilizes certain instruments of the percussion family to introduce thematic and rhythmic material. This is not unique for band literature, but it is not commonly found at this grade level. As labeled by the composer, the main idea is first introduced by the snare drum beginning in measure 1.

![Snare Drum Notation]

Figure 2.6: Main Idea Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music
After an early climactic moment, the snare drum restates the introduction at measure 30. Just before the presentation and development of the legato theme, which begins in section 3, Ticheli uses the tambourine to present the main idea at measure 69.

![Tambourine notation]

**Figure 2.7: Main Idea presented by the tambourine Used by Permission Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music**

At measure 124, the snare drum is used again to present the main idea following the dramatic 4-second caesura and two-measure interlude. The constant repetition of this theme with its invariable rhythmic scheme provides continuity and familiarity for the listener.

An examination of the flow chart shows that the main idea or portions of the main idea appear eighteen times throughout the course of this piece. The first melodic presentation of the idea begins at measure 12 and then again at measure 16.

![Low Brass notation]

**Figure 2.8: Melodic statement of the Main Idea Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music**
Sometimes the idea is only two measures long, but, as pointed out above, there are moments when the idea is extended to four measures. Almost every time this idea is stated, however, beats one and two of the first two measures are rhythmically identical.

![Musical notation](image)

**Figure 2.9: Four-measure Main Idea** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music

Notice that all of the examples of this main idea have the consistent rhythmic scheme, while the melodic presentation is never the same. Ticheli has kept this idea fresh by subtle changes in the rhythmic scheme and melodic development. Otherwise, eighteen presentations of the same idea might become monotonous in less creative hands.

A four-measure call and response between the brass and woodwinds utilizing rhythmic elements of the main idea leads to yet another altered presentation of the main idea at measure 44.
Figure 2.10: First climactic moment Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989

Manhattan Beach Music

Notice how the rhythmic identity of the main idea is used following the now familiar two-measure statement starting in measure 46.

Using the rhythmic identity of the main idea to enhance the development is not restricted to the climactic moment mentioned above. During the presentation and development of the legato theme, the trombones make a veiled reference to the main idea beginning in measure 83, and then the high brass do the same beginning at measure 96.
Figure 2.11: Rhythmic reference to the Main Idea Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music

In this example, notice that the snare drum is used to reinforce the familiarity of this idea. Also notice the use of the tom-toms to answer the later statement. The importance of the tom-toms will be addressed later during the examination of the legato theme.

A four-measure rhythmic reference is used to lead to the climactic moment at measure 120 where a two-measure statement of the main idea is presented with a new melodic and rhythmic scheme.

Figure 2.12: Main Idea at the climactic moment Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music
There is one moment when the main idea appears to be presented identically to a previous statement. The melodic material at measure 141 is identical to that at measure 12.

![Brass notation]

**Figure 2.13: Main Idea at measure 141** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989

*Manhattan Beach Music*

The orchestration and texture are different, however, and more importantly, the harmonic presentation is altered. At measure 12, open fourths and fifths are used; at measure 141, Ticheli uses full triads.

Another four-measure call and response episode beginning at measure 149 is similar to the previous episode at measure 116. This episode leads to the final statement of the main idea and the penultimate climax at measure 153.

![Brass notation]

**Figure 2.14: Final statement of the Main Idea** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989

*Manhattan Beach Music*
Call Motif

In his program notes, the composer provides a snippet of the call motif. The complete motif, as introduced by the trumpet in measure 8, can be seen in Figure 2.15.

![Muted Trumpet](image)

**Figure 2.15: Call Motif Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music**

Similar to the main idea, the call motif has its own rhythmic identity and melodic structure. The role of the TT in the melodic construction of the Call Motif is easily seen, but the function of TT harmonic motion is less obvious. The first three notes outline the major triad, in this case B-flat. The top note of the motif, B-natural, outlines the TT (F to B). The B-natural implies the contrasting E major triad, completing the TT harmonic motion.

The TT relationship takes a slightly different shape when presented at measure 38. Keeping the rhythmic identity of the motif, two major arpeggios a TT apart are used to provide the harmonic structure.
Figure 2.16: Call Motif harmonic variation  Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989

Manhattan Beach Music

An important rhythmic development occurs with this variation; the oboe and alto saxophone present their motif in eighth-notes (and half-notes) without using the triplet rhythm. This augmentation development is further exploited at measure 50, and even more so with an abbreviated presentation by the trumpet at measure 67.

Figure 2.17: Call Motif augmentation  Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989

Manhattan Beach Music

Starting at measure 143, the motif is heard for the last time. In keeping with his treatment of this motif, it is augmented one final time. In this form, it resembles the original rhythmic identity, but the harmonic structure is altered.
Figure 2.18: Call Motif final statement Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989

Manhattan Beach Music

The first melodic development of this motif happens at measure 24 with descending fourths and chromatic melodic motion.

Figure 2.19: Call Motif development Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989

Manhattan Beach Music

The beginning of Section 2 sees these same elements presented in a slightly altered state.

Figure 2.20: Section 2 Call Motif variation Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989

Manhattan Beach Music
The descending fourths are now harmonized with a tritone in measure 55. In measure 57, ascending fourths are harmonized with perfect fourths. The chromatic nature and structure of the melody in measure 56 becomes an important element in the next section: the seven-measure canon.

Figure 2.21: Call Motif canon Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan

Beach Music
All of the elements used during the development of the call motif appear in this unique seven-measure canon, although the structure of this canon is not always exact: the four-voiced canon alternates at the tritone; descending fourths provide continuity with previous development; and the chromaticism generates a unique harmonic tension.

**Legato Theme**

Ticheli uses the crash cymbals to establish the rhythmic identity of the legato theme much in the same way as he identifies the snare drum and the main idea.

![Crash Cymbal](image)

**Figure 2.22: Rhythmic identity of the Legato Theme** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music

The salient feature of the legato theme is the rhythmic emphasis of the weak beats: two and four. The cymbals are used to emphasis this characteristic at measures 12-14 and 18-20.

![Flutes](image)

**Figure 2.23: Weak beat emphasis** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music
The first melodic presentation of the legato theme, which in this instance is only a foreshadowing of the legato theme, is a two-measure phrase at measure 22, and then as a three-measure phrase at measure 34, with the ever present cymbals emphasizing the weak beats.

![Musical notation]

Figure 2.24: Melodic presentation of the Legato Theme Used by Permission.

Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music

Notice the stability of the intervalic relationship in the construction of this theme: the same melodic construction (or intervallic relationship) at a different pitch level. The crash cymbal's emphasis of the weak beat disappears after a solo presentation of the theme in measures 38-39.

Section 3 is dedicated to the presentation and development of the legato theme. Having firmly established the rhythmic identity of this theme, the crash cymbals are no longer incorporated into the structure.

---

7 Frank Ticheli, personal interview, 12 Jan. 2001
Beginning with Section 3, phrase lengths stabilize to standard four-bar lengths, antecedent and consequence phrases can clearly be identified, and the melodic construction follows deliberate patterns.

To keep this theme fresh, minor changes in the melody are used in the last measure of each phrase. The trumpet presentation at measure 83 folds into five-beat episode of tritone motion, extending the phrase by one measure. This one-measure extension incorporates a shift from beat two to beat four as the starting beat of the legato theme.
**Figure 2.27: Legato Theme shift to beat four** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989

*Manhattan Beach Music*

After the theme is reestablished starting on beat two, an inversion of the theme appears in measure 96. Notice that this inversion is not a simple diatonic inversion, rather the theme maintains the intervalic relationship of previous statements.

**Figure 2.28: Legato Theme inversion** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989

*Manhattan Beach Music*

Starting in measure 100, the stability of the legato theme begins to unravel as the theme is passed from one section to another in shorter statements. This helps to build the tension and accelerates the momentum towards Section 4.
Figure 2.29: Legato Theme segmentation Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989

*Manhattan Beach Music*

The rhythmic diminution is foreshadowed by the tom-toms’ acceleration of the underlying rhythmic pacing in measures 96-106. (See Figure 2.11 or refer to the score.) All of this rhythmic acceleration and instability establishes the character of Section 4.

As mentioned above, Section 4 is the most rhythmically active and unstable section of the piece. Coincidentally, this shift follows the most stable section of the piece. On the flow chart, this section is diagrammed as an eight-measure phrase. It could be further segmented into two-measure phrases.
Figure 2.30: Section 4 Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music

This author feels, however, that in order to maintain the intensity, continuity, and pacing of this section, it is better to approach these eight measures as one continuous thought. This interpretation becomes clear when one examines the full score and sees the connection of the bass line across the bar lines every other measure, and the relationship of the trumpet to the bass line in measures 114-115.

The last melodic statement of the legato theme follows the dramatic 4-second caesura at measure 122.

Figure 2.31: Legato Theme last melodic statement Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music
The rhythmic identity of the legato theme is used two more times: first as ascending triads on beats two and four at measures 128-135, and then in measures 143-148.

![Musical notation](image)

**Figure 2.32: Legato Theme rhythmic identity** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music

Notice that in measure 147-148 there are no crash cymbals emphasizing the weak beats.

**HARMONIC ANALYSIS**

Ticheli establishes the importance of the tritone in his introductory notes. As mentioned above, the percussion, in this case the timpani, play an important role in the presentation of this aspect of the piece. In measure 5, the timpani presents the basic three-beat/one-beat relationship of the harmonic structure and pacing.

---

[8] Due to the uncommon structure of the harmonic language used in *Fortress*, an extended analysis of the harmony is presented here.
During the presentation and development of the legato theme, the harmonic pacing is augmented from 3/1 to 6/2 relationship. Keeping in character with Ticheli’s treatment of other themes, the composer slightly alters this pacing to avoid predictability.

Figure 2.34: TT harmonic pacing augmentation Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music

There are times when the harmonic pacing shifts to an equal two-beat structure, as illustrated in the composer’s notes. (See Figure 2.1) Again, to avoid predictability, Ticheli anticipated the harmonic progression by moving the bass line one beat early creating a unique phasing effect in the harmonic pacing.

Figure 2.35: Phasing effect in the TT motion Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music
He also creates this phasing effect by delaying the resolution of the bass line.

Figure 2.36: Phasing effect delayed resolution Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music

Ticheli utilizes an inverted form of this structure by placing the anticipated note above the harmonic structure in measures 48-49, and placing the delayed resolution above the harmonic structure in measures 99-101.

Figure 2.37: Inverted phasing effect Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music

Ticheli makes another variation in this effect by incorporating a delay in the harmonic structure while the bass line keeps the harmonic pacing.
Figure 2.38: Phasing effect variation Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989

Manhattan Beach Music

In many instances, the alternating tritone harmonic structure is obvious from chord to chord.

Figure 2.39: TT motion from chord to chord Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989

Manhattan Beach Music

At other times, the tritone motion is often implied. The bass line will not always be the obvious indicator of tritone motion, sometimes the melody or accompanying counter melody needs to be analyzed against the entire harmonic structure in order to fully appreciate when this harmonic motion present.
Figure 2.40: Implied TT motion Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music

To create a different form of tension utilizing the same tritone harmonic scheme, Ticheli has chords that are a tritone apart play against each other.

Figure 2.41: Simultaneous TT chords Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music
RHYTHM ELEMENTS

Other than the rhythmic issues that have been discussed concurrently with the other issues above, there is only one item concerning rhythm to be examined further at this time: tempo. From the score, Ticheli indicates the tempo should be quarter-note = 126-132. This tempo is consistent throughout most of the piece providing constant forward momentum to the pacing. There is a complete caesura between measures 121 and 122. This caesura follows an important climactic moment in the piece. By measure 121, the main idea has reasserted its dominance as the prime thematic material. If Ticheli were to follow the established patterns of this piece, the main idea would fold into tritone motion before moving on to other material or development. Instead, Ticheli places a complete halt of the forward motion right at the moment it is least expected. It is important not to let the tempo subside or telecast the upcoming caesura. It is incumbent upon the conductor to keep the ensemble pushing ahead as if there were a downbeat in measure 122. Ticheli indicates that the caesura should be four seconds long. The next two measures are indicated as quarter-note = 60 with a *poco rit.* and fermata (on beat four) in measure 123. *Tempo I* is indicated for the downbeat of measure 124. The tempo stays constant until measure 155 where Ticheli has a *poco rit.* through measure 157. A *tempo* is indicated on the downbeat of measure 158 through the end of the piece. From his “Composer Notes,” Ticheli warns that the conductor should not take too dramatic a ritardando between measure 155 and 157. The first trumpets must display good rhythmic memory by assisting the conductor in re-establishing *Tempo I* on the downbeat of measure 158.
ORCHESTRATION

There is an issue regarding the texture of this piece that deals with the instrumentation, which will be addressed before the discussion of orchestration. It is essential that the scored instrumentation be complete. The introduction of the staccato pattern by two bassoons at measure 7 is cross-cued in the clarinets. The clarinet sonority is an effective alternative, but it cannot replace the timbre of the bassoons. The bassoon timbre is as important as the rhythmic aspects of the passage. Although there is no indication of character or expression marking provided by the composer, the beginning of this piece should be light and semi-sariric in character. The humoresque quality of the bassoon timbre playing staccato eighth-notes matches the thin, transparent texture of the opening statement. The cues indicated for clarinets could be used if two bassoons are not available, but the timbre of the clarinets in the indicated register may be too thick for the proper texture.

There are times during the staccato pattern where the second oboe is vital to the texture (i.e. measure 34). The second flutes need the support of the second oboe in providing a crisp and audible staccato at the indicated dynamic. There are similar challenges at measures 136 and 143. One oboe is an absolute must, but in order to achieve an effective representation of the composer's intent, two oboes are required to accomplish the desired texture.

Although not as critical, a complete clarinet section is required in order to achieve the "warm" sonority indicated at measure 122, which for this moment in the piece includes an alto clarinet, a B-flat bass clarinet, and an E-flat contra-bass clarinet. Other instruments could easily double the lower notes, but nothing can replace the texture that a
complete clarinet choir can produce as scored. It is interesting that Ticheli has chosen not to cross-cue any of the notes to other instruments, leaving a clear indication that he wants the clarinet timbre at this dramatic moment in the development.

The E-flat soprano clarinet is scored sparingly and within a reasonable range throughout most of the piece. There is one moment when the E-flat clarinet is called for that could prove problematic to the texture. In measures 143-147, the E-flat doubles the first flutes. The written D sharp in measures 143 and 147 needs careful attention and tuning in order that the timbre of the clarinet does not dominate the texture. The piccolo and the first flutes are written in a good range to accomplish the legato nature of this passage. If a mature player is not available, the E-flat clarinet's part can be omitted.

As stated in Chapter One, this author feels that Ticheli's orchestration choices are a defining characteristic of his compositional language. In order to help illustrate the significance of this proposal, orchestration charts have been included in the analysis. Included in the flow chart (Chart 2.1) is the basic orchestration of each section. A complete verbal description of the orchestration would prove tedious and lengthy. Therefore, the inclusion of the orchestration charts provides an alternative to prose descriptions.

For each orchestration chart, the basic elements will be the same: 1) instrumentation will be derived from the score\(^9\), 2) rehearsal numbers will be extracted from the score, with additional numbers indicated parenthetically to assist in defining the

---

\(^9\) The arrangement of the instruments will be similar to the indicated score order, but not always exact. Based on the analysis of each piece, certain instruments will be grouped together in order to achieve a clearer picture of the orchestration, particularly in the low woodwinds.
subsections, 3) motivic or thematic material will be designated by a specific geometric pattern or shading, and 4) any additional information the author feels will help clarify important aspects and elements unique to each piece will be explained in a prose introduction.

The orchestration of *Fortress* is illustrated in Chart 2.2. The main idea, call motif, legato theme, and tritone motion are the important elements highlighted by Ticheli in his introductory notes. The “staccato pattern” element has been included by the author. Basic harmonic figures, sustained chords, and rhythmic elements that do not have a clear relation to the other categories are designated as “accompaniment.” Included in this category are all non-melodic percussion parts that do not have rhythmic identification with other elements.
Chart 2.2: **Fortress** orchestration chart

continued
As was discussed in Chapter 1, Frank Erickson’s *Toccata for Band* has been illustrated in the same manner and is included in Appendix C. It is this author’s opinion that one of the reasons Ticheli’s music is comparatively better than that of his contemporaries is his orchestration technique. In order to visually see the difference between Ticheli’s orchestration approach and that of another leading composer, *Toccata for Band* has been included as a comparison of style and substance.

One of the striking contrasts between *Fortress* and *Toccata for Band* is the complexity of the orchestration. Tutti and block scoring are standard choices by Erickson. This technique of orchestration is a common element found in many band pieces at this grade level. Ticheli uses tutti and block scoring in a limited manner in *Fortress*. He presents his thematic material in short statements of varying timbres. He also layers the themes on top of one another. At a critical moment in the development, measures 145-148, the main idea, call motif, tritone motion, and staccato pattern are all presented at the same time.

![Figure 2.42: Thematic overlay](Used by Permission. Copyright © 1989 Manhattan Beach Music)

48
Notice that the B-flat pedal point in the timpani and low instruments becomes tritone motion at varied intervals. When compared to Toccata for Band, there is only one moment when two contrasting themes are played at the same time: measure 171.

An important characteristic that both Toccata for Band and Fortress have in common is the lack of exact repetition. It is not uncommon at this grade level to find note for note repetition of sections. As discussed in the melodic analysis above, the main idea of Fortress is never presented the same way twice. There is only one short section in Toccata for Band that is repeated exactly: measures 35-55 are presented verbatim as measures 123-148. There are no sections, subsections, or any two measures exactly the same in Fortress. The implications of this fact will be discussed later.

Another contrast between these two compositions is how each composer uses the percussion section. Erickson’s employment of the percussion could be seen as standard for this grade level. There are no important solo or soli passages, nor any significant or unusual characteristic techniques required of the performers. The percussion parts mimic thematic ideas presented by other instruments and a minimal number of players are required to successfully accomplish a proper performance.

In Fortress, there are no insignificant percussion parts. There are only a few instances where the percussion are used strictly as “accompaniment” or double a thematic moment, but these are rare: the occasional suspended cymbal roll to carry a crescendo to its conclusion; very limited employment of the bass drum; crash cymbals used to emphasize dynamic contrasts; and judicious use of auxiliary percussion parts (slapstick, tambourine, i.e.). As seen above, Ticheli uses the snare drum, crash cymbals, and timpani to introduce key elements of the rhythmic structure and, in the case of the timpani, the
harmonic language. The crash cymbal statement of the legato theme’s rhythmic structure at measure 38 must not be underplayed; it is the only instrument with that rhythmic identity at that moment.

Mallet instruments are used in a limited capacity in *Fortress* as well. The glockenspiel and xylophone are used to emphasize critical moments and add an occasional burst of color. Instead of using the snare drum to present the main idea at measure 69, Ticheli’s uses the tambourine. This succeeds in reminding the listener of the importance of the theme, as if from a distance, without having to use the same texture. Limited use of the tom-toms and slapstick serve to heighten the pacing, texture, and color of their given moments.

**REHEARSAL SUGGESTIONS**

Although many observations have been interspersed above, the following section is meant to provide additional suggestions that might prove helpful to conductors in preparing this piece for performance. Conductors will have individual issues depending on their particular situation. The following comments are based on this author’s own preparation and performance.

It seems obvious to this author that the orchestration and melodic development of *Fortress* should play an important role in any conductor’s interpretation. Balance of the texture will be critical in order that each element of the orchestration and statements of thematic material be presented properly and according to the intent of the composer.
As Kinny points out in his discussion of *Cajun Folk Songs*, many conductors will shy away from thinly scored pieces at this grade level. Ticheli has carefully orchestrated *Fortress* to take advantage of strong section leaders during the soloistic moments. The opportunities to introduce and develop new styles and techniques with this piece are numerous: thematic development, TT based harmonic progressions, canon, rhythmic displacement, augmentation and diminution, and open scoring requiring greater development of aural skills.

A conductor who decides to program *Fortress* needs to keep in mind that the form of this piece is not standard. Recall that virtually every aspect of this piece is constantly being developed and presented differently every time. Rehearsal planning of this piece must be done with care because it is 160 measures of new material from beginning to end. Nuances, soloistic playing, and technical concepts might be new for younger bands, but they are well worth the time and effort. This work can be a centerpiece of programming for younger bands. More experienced bands will also find this piece challenging and enjoyable. Conductors of mature bands, however, need to be just as cautious about being too casual with rehearsal time. The composer’s intent is very detailed for a piece at this grade level.

Ticheli has indicated in the score that the percussion at the beginning should play “*pp* (distant).” A piccolo snare played lightly at the edge of the head will assist greatly in this effect. Have the player move to a standard concert snare at measure 14. Using the piccolo snare again at measure 124 could prove effective as well.

---

10 Kinny, 26.
Ticheli suggests using a small pair of crash cymbals at the beginning. Even small
marching cymbals, however, may be too cumbersome to produce the desired effect in
inexperienced hands. A suspended cymbal with a drum stick or hard yarn mallet might
serve the ambiance of the introduction better, especially for young performers who have
not mastered the delicate technique of *pp* crash cymbals. Moving to regular concert crash
cymbals by measure 14 could be an option.

The timpani player needs to have the time to set the pitches properly before the
conductor starts this piece. Programming issues might play in the decision of where to
place this piece in the concert order. The timpani player could play more towards the rim
at the beginning. This technique provides more of a “ping” and allows the player to take a
larger stroke, which might provide more control for younger players. At measure 143, the
timpani is the first instrument to break the B-flat pedal point and reestablish the tritone
harmonic pacing seen earlier in the piece. This moment should not be lost in the texture.
The timpani player might need to instructed to play a dynamic level higher. The low
brass and reeds may be tempted to jump the dynamics as well, so a careful explanation of
the situation might be prudent.

Dynamics on the whole are indicated clearly. There are times when this author
has the ensemble play slightly less or more than the indicated dynamics. For instance, the
first written *f* at measure 25 should not be as forceful as the climax at measure 44, which
is also indicated as *f*. With the accents written on beats two, three, and four in measure
25, the author was able to get the desired effect by having the ensemble think of measure
25 as *mf*+ and save the true *f* for later.
Another important issue this author had to deal with in regards to the dynamics occurs at measure 122. The clarinet choir entrance is marked \textit{mp}. This entrance follows the biggest moment of the piece in measure 121. A very dramatic four-second caesura is indicated between measures 121 and 122. It took some encouragement by this author to get the clarinets to push the correct amount of air to get the instruments to speak properly. The problem seemed to be that the clarinets knew they were the only instruments playing on the downbeat of measure 122, they saw the \textit{mp}, and consequently pulled back too much. Explaining to the clarinets that starting their notes a little louder than indicated can always be tapered back and that the alto saxophone is in good register to project the sound, seemed to help stabilize the clarinet chord.

Another issue arose regarding the four-second pause when this author prepared this work for performance. The drama of this moment is as much visual as it is aural. As the ensemble approached the performance date, this author made sure that nobody moved or started to put down his/her instrument after the cut off in measure 121. After the clarinets had started playing, then this author had everyone slowly put their instruments down.

Each of the melodic themes has its own rhythmic identity and articulation. The main idea often has an accented half note in the second measure (see Figure 2.6). This accent should be a stress accent and not an over-zealous tongue attack. This author suggests that the players save the aggressive interpretation for measures 86-87 and Section 4. Similarly, the call motif has an accent on the top note (see Figure 2.13) that should not be exaggerated.
When the thematic ideas are layered, as in measures 20-26, each theme should maintain its character. The staccato pattern should be as crisp as possible while the contrasting legato theme is performed as smoothly as possible. The aggressive nature of the call motif should rise out of the staccato pattern and lead the music into measure 25. The accents in measure 25-26 should dissipate gradually as the development of the call motif folds itself into the tritone motion and diminuendo. There are similar moments throughout the piece that need this amount of attention.

The trombones and euphonium parts are marked “crisp and distinct” at measure 83, as are the trumpets and horns starting at measure 96. This is in contrast to the legato theme, which should maintain the smooth, flowing quality of its character. Further into section 3, the legato theme should become more agitated as Ticheli starts to break the legato theme into shorter segments, but the length of the notes still has to be maintained.

The transformation of the legato theme at measures 106-107 is an important moment. This author suggests that the eighth-notes in measure 106 be played full value, then in measure 107 and throughout section 4, the eighth-notes should be played with a slight separation unless marked with a slur. Pay special attention to the octave pyramids in measure 107. Make sure the piccolo and xylophone can be heard adding the last octave to the pyramid.

Careful balance of the chords starting in measure 128 is a must. The clarinets must not overpower the bassoon. Likewise, the alto saxophone needs to understand the placement of its note in relation to the triad.

Work with the horns to achieve good intonation at measure 157. “Bells up” can cause some embouchure issues, which will affect the pitch as well as the timbre.
CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS OF POSTCARD

Postcard is one of Ticheli's most advanced works for winds. Only ensembles of superior musicianship and complete instrumentation should attempt this work. It takes a considerable amount of rehearsal time and knowledgeable musicians, both performer and conductor, to realize the composer's intent in this five-minute whirlwind of emotional contrasts and styles. Ticheli refers to Postcard as his most compact composition.\(^1\) As such, there is very little about this composition that can be called "fat." As we will see, Ticheli has not constructed this piece around one section or favorite group of instruments. Every line in the score has to be played in the proper balance and proportion to the rest of the instruments performing at the time. It is a challenge to make this piece come to life as the composer intended, but one well worth the effort.

From the "Program Notes" provided in the score, Ticheli describes the circumstances that led to the commission of Postcard. H. Robert Reynolds asked Ticheli to compose a musical memorial to his late mother. Reynolds didn’t want a solemn elegy;

\(^1\) Frank Ticheli, personal interview, 12 Jan. 2001
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he wanted a piece that celebrated his mother’s life. *Postcard* was designed “as a musical reflection of her character - vibrant, whimsical, succinct.”

**PROGRAM NOTES**

*Postcard* was commissioned by my friend, colleague, and former mentor, H. Robert Reynolds, in memory of his mother, Ethel Virginia Curry. He requested that I compose not an elegy commemorating her death, but a short energetic piece celebrating her life. In response, I have composed this brief “postcard” as a musical reflection of her character — vibrant, whimsical, succinct.

It is cast in an ABA’ form. The primary theme, first heard in the flute and clarinet and used in the outer sections, is a palindrome — that is, it sounds the same played forwards or backwards. This theme honors a long-standing tradition in the Reynolds family of giving palindromic names (such as Hannah and Anna) to their children. H. Robert Reynolds’ first name is Harrah. The theme’s symmetry is often broken, sometimes being elongated, other times being abruptly cut off by unexpected events.

The B section is based on a five-note series derived from the name Ethel: E (E natural) T (T in the solfeggio system, B flat) H (in the German system, B natural) E (E-flat this time) T (T in the solfeggio system, A natural). The development of this motive can be likened to a journey through a series of constantly changing landscapes.

The A’ section is articulated by the return of the main melody. This section is not identical to the A section, but is close enough in spirit to it to give the effect of a large-scale palindrome surrounding the smaller ones.

*Postcard* was completed in the summer of 1991. Its first performance was on April 17, 1992, at Hill Auditorium in Ann Arbor, Michigan, by the University of Michigan Symphony Band conducted by H. Robert Reynolds.

Frank Ticheli
Pasadena, California
June 24, 1993

**Chart 3.1: “Program Notes” from Postcard** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1993

**Manhattan Beach Music**

---

2 Frank Ticheli, “Program Notes” *Postcard*. 56
The program notes provided for Postcard are atypically brief for Ticheli. The conductor must analyze and understand the score completely before attempting to present this work to an ensemble. Ticheli does not provide a detailed analysis that would truncate the conductor's score study process.

FORM

Ticheli provides the basic form in his program notes: ABA1. The B section starts at measure 111 and the A1 section starts at measure 195. As was demonstrated in the examination of Fortress, many of the elements in Ticheli's compositional style are interrelated and Postcard is no different. The palindromic nature of the opening theme is carried over to the form: ABA1, "close enough in spirit to...give the effect of a large-scale palindrome surrounding the smaller ones."³

Portions of the A section are repeated in the A1 sections. Measures 77-102 are repeated as measure 234-259 with just a few exceptions: measures 234 and 238 have added notes for the low brass and reeds, baritone saxophone is added in measures 236-238, the horns have pick-up notes added on measure 238, and the vibraslap in measure 91 is changed to bass drum and cymbal in measure 248. Ticheli uses portions of measures 30-52 as repeated material in measures 211-228 transposed at a minor 3rd (m3) relationship. The interval of m3 will be explored later in the discussion concerning melodic development.

³ ibid.
Chart 3.2: Postcard flow chart
Chart 3.2 continued

Form: 121 | 126 | 132 | 138 | 144 | 148 | 155 | 162 | 169 | 171
5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 3 + 4 | 3 + 4 | 4 | 5
3 + 2 | Ethel | Ethel VAR | Ethel | Ethel 3 | Ethel | Theme 3 | Ethel var.

Melody: Dev. Ethel | Ethel VAR

Rhythmic elements: 345 4 444 4

Orchestration: Ob+2Cl 1C1 Pic+Fl+Vibes C/Muted Trp Ob+6 Saxs+Bar T
Extreme Cl Range

Brass WW Sax Horn

Harmony: B-flat 84 E G E-flat G-flat

Texture: Polyphonic Solistic Sectional polyphonic contrapuntal

Texture: 6 part contrapuntal polyphonic

Texture: 3 part contrapuntal

Texture: contrapuntal

Texture: continuo

Dynamics: mf f mp mf f

Dynamics: f mf< f>

Dynamics: mp< f

Dynamics: mf< f>

Dynamics: mp f

Texture: 7 voice polyphonic

Texture: 6 voice polyphonic

Texture: Hybrid 2 voice imitation

Texture: High/Low mixed

Texture: Legato vs. Staccato

Form: 171 176 180 186 AI: 195 201 207 211 217 222 228
5 5 4 4 6 6 4 6 5 6

Melody: Ethel T3 var. T1 var. 6

Rhythmic elements: 4 3 4 26548 833837 844844 848 847 3

Orchestration: High/Low Sax TT High Cl Arp Pyramid Hn rips Vitrateap Tr+Hn High/Low Cl ASax Pic+Cl Legato vs. Staccato

Harmony: G-flat 84 D min F min G-flat

Harmony: 84 - min 3 - TT

Texture: Hocket poly.

Texture: 5 voice polyphonic

Texture: 6 voice polyphonic

Texture: Hybrid 2 voice imitation

Texture: High/Low mixed

Texture: mf mp f mp< f

Texture: mf< f>

Texture: mp< f

continued
Some of the issues that will be explored based on the flow chart are: 1) the elaborate multi-layer rhythmic scheme, 2) the non-standard harmonic structure, 3) an intricate dynamic scheme, and 4) melodic development and fragmentation. In addition, orchestration charts similar to those prepared for Fortress will be included and examined.

There are two specific issues that should be addressed based on the information presented in the flow chart. One is the manner in which the dynamics are indicated on this version of the flow chart. Ticheli’s compositional language for Postcard is very complex and elaborate, and this includes his treatment of dynamics. There are times when multiple levels of dynamics occur simultaneously making the standard graphing of dynamics inadequate or inappropriate. The other issue is the harmonic progression portion of this flow chart. As will be seen, Ticheli’s harmonic language cannot be analyzed using
standard tertian harmonic progressions. The “harmonic progression” indicated on the flow chart does not represent either major or minor keys, or even modes, but rather a generic tonal area at the indicated time. More about these two issues will be discussed in context later.

MELODY

The primary theme of Postcard is a forty-two note palindrome. As pointed out by both Stone and Markoch, the middle six notes of the palindrome represent the name “Harrah.” (See Figure 3.1: Theme 1 and subsequent variations of Postcard) Except for a chromatic passing tone of A-sharp (or its enharmonic B-flat), Theme 1 is based on an A octatonic scale, whose whole-step, half-step relationship is 2-1-2-1-2-1-2-1.

---

4 Markoch, 75; Stone, 3.
Figure 3.1: Theme 1 and subsequent variations of Postcard

Used by permission. Copyright © 1993 Manhattan Beach Music
Markoch points out that after the initial statement of Theme 1, the palindromic nature of the structure is not kept intact. Notice that in Variation 1 of Figure 3.1 that there are subtle changes in the melody (circled). As in Fortress, Ticheli develops his thematic material by presenting it differently every time. The importance of this technique in relation to Postcard could be a reference to the human development of character or personality, inasmuch as a person's character or personality is constantly changing with every new experience. There are certain features that seem constant, but in some way, everyone (every theme) develops. The composer confirms this analogy and adds that he attempts to manipulate most of his compositional process in this way in order to keep the music fresh.

There are several important compositional features of Theme 1 that Ticheli uses as unifying material later in the work. Markoch points out the importance of the opening four notes and identifies them as set 0235. This author found it easier to identify this feature as a minor tetrachord, without having to revert to time-consuming set theory. The composer confirmed that he did not use set theory in the development of this piece. "I chose my notes based on what I thought sounded best at the moment I was composing it. The fact that a certain combination of notes fall into the category of a set are coincidental and not structurally intentional. It makes more sense to view these notes as a minor

---

5 Markoch, 64.


7 Markoch, 75.
Thomas Dvorak makes an interesting observation that the whole-step, half-step relationship of the minor tetrachord, 2-1-2, is also palindromic in nature. This adds unity to the structure and form of this piece.

In addition to the minor tetrachord, Ticheli uses the interval of m3, which is derived from the opening theme, as material for accompaniment, usually in the form of two staccato eighth-notes. This gesture can be seen throughout the score, but they are too numerous to list all of the occurrences here. Ticheli highlights this interval in the second measure of Theme 1 by adding an accent and a slur. The importance of this gesture is not immediately seen, but the m3 interval becomes another unifying element throughout the piece. In measure 111, Ticheli scores the clarinets in mostly parallel m3’s as the accompaniment.

There are other elements in Theme 1 that take more time to manifest themselves: 1) the chromatic element, and 2) the importance of the TT interval. The chromatic element is easier to identify after the statement of Var. i. The bassoon accompanies the oboe with a chromatic line that cannot be derived from the octatonic scale. (See Figure 3.1, Chromatic element) Accompanying chromatic lines of dissimilar construction can be found throughout the work: measures 53-57, measures 63-66 in the bass line, measures 73-80 in trumpets 2/3 and horns, and measure 92-97 in the saxophones. The chromatic element also finds its way into the melodic development. The melodic line that starts in the bass voices at measure 162 begins with the “Ethel” theme, but then spins off into an undulating

---

8 Ticheli, personal interview, 12 Jan. 2001.

9 Dvorak, 71.
undulating chromatic line. (The “Ethel” theme is discussed below.) At measure 171, ascending chromatic lines interact with descending chromatic lines in a short hocket interlude.

The TT is used in the melodic construction of the three primary themes. (Refer to Figure 3.1, Figure 3.8, and Figure 3.13.)

Ticheli includes the TT in the climactic moment of the B section.

Figure 3.2: TT at measure 186 Used by Permission. Copyright © 1993 Manhattan Beach Music

The final melodic figure of the piece incorporates the TT twice in its construction. Ticheli uses mirror image construction in this final figure. [As will be seen later, this figure is an intervallic transposition of the “Ethel” theme.]

Figure 3.3: Final melodic figure Used by Permission. Copyright © 1993 Manhattan Beach Music

---

9 Dvorak, 71.
The TT is also used in the construction of ornamental figures. Figure 3.3 shows some of the various runs that Ticheli constructed using the TT, often as super-imposed intervals.

Figure 3.4: Construction of ornamental figures using the TT Used by Permission.

Copyright © 1993 Manhattan Beach Music
Many of these figures are transposed a m3 in the repeated sections later. The TT can be found in the accompanying figures in the trumpets from measure 22-26, and in the Horns starting in measure 30.

The lydian or #4 element noted in the flow chart (Chart 3.1), and later in the orchestration charts, is clearly stated by the Horns at measure 61.

![Figure 3.5: Lydian influence](image)

Another example of this #4 element can be seen in the G-natural against the D-flat triad in measures 77-83. The composer describes his use of the TT or the lydian element as “added note” technique. “It’s not that I consciously used modal harmony, but rather that I like that sound, that #4 flavor in my music.”

The trombone and saxophones provide this element during the climactic sections at measures 98 and 255. The saxophone ostinato starting measure 162, which is then passed to the Horns in measure 166, uses this added note technique as well. The accompanying figures starting at measure 195 have the added #4 note.
The trombones have one of the last gestures in the composition, which also includes the lydian element.

The interrelated aspects of the elements require that certain characteristics of rhythm be included in the following discussion of the development of Theme 1. Variation 2 is an exact inversion of Theme 1. Up to this point, the rhythmic scheme of Theme 1 has remained constant. Variation 3 is a modified form of the inversion, but the rhythmic

---

10 Ticheli, personal interview, 12 Jan. 2001.
identity of Theme 1 begins to lose its structure. Variation 4 maintains similarities of the rhythmic identity, but the palindromic nature of the theme by this point is clearly not an issue.

By the time Ticheli gets to Variation 5, Theme 1 is restored to the original notes and rhythm, but the meters are altered to accommodate the accompanying figures. The chromatic element, originally presented by the bassoon in Variation 1, has been transposed. Variation 6 follows this pattern except that Ticheli changes the middle 2/4 measures to 4/4, and shortens the palindrome "to break up the predictability."\(^{11}\)

The other major theme of Postcard is the “Ethel” theme.\(^{12}\) Like Theme 1, the first statement of the “Ethel” theme is melodically a palindrome.

![Figure 3.8: “Ethel” theme](image)

**Figure 3.8: “Ethel” theme** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1993 Manhattan Beach Music

As he treated Theme 1, Ticheli develops the “Ethel” theme immediately. By displacing the D-sharp up an octave, Ticheli establishes an intervallic relationship of pitches that becomes the basis of further continuity: up a TT, up a m2, up a M3, down a TT. The first full statement of this intervallic relationship occurs in the Piccolo and Flutes in measure

---

\(^{11}\) Ibid.
116. The interval of the M3 becomes a unifying factor in the presentation of Theme 3 and will be discussed later.

Figure 3.9: “Ethel” intervallic relationship Used by Permission. Copyright © 1993

Manhattan Beach Music

The alto saxophone and the 1st clarinet subsequently present more obvious variations of the “Ethel” theme.

Figure 3.10: “Ethel” theme variations Used by Permission. Copyright © 1993

Manhattan Beach Music

At this point, Ticheli begins a series of variations of the “Ethel” theme, both linear and horizontal. At measure 126, Ticheli partitions the theme by alternating every note

---

12 Ticheli, “Program Notes” Postcard.
between piccolo and 2nd clarinets, which are supported by the vibraphone. This section is foreshadowed in measures 104-110. More importantly, the “Ethel” theme is hinted at in this earlier passage as well.

Figure 3.11: “Ethel” theme, measure 126 Used by Permission. Copyright © 1993 Manhattan Beach Music

Markoch identifies the next section (measures 132-137) as the “Ethel Motive [sic][which] is imitated in varying degrees of augmentation and diminution proportional to register: the higher the part the more the Ethel motive is diminuted.”\(^{13}\) Although this is generally true, there are a few exceptions worth noting.

\(^{13}\) Markoch, 73.
Figure 3.12: “Ethel” variations, measure 132 Used by Permission. Copyright © 1993

Manhattan Beach Music

Notice that in measure 137 the oboes, saxophones, and bassoons trill the “Ethel” theme horizontally. In measure 138, the flutes and clarinets are playing quarter notes, accompanied by repeated sixteenth-notes in the trumpets. In measure 140, the flutes and clarinets revert to playing eighth-notes again. Lastly, the timpani presents the “Ethel” theme in the same register as the tubas but at a faster rhythmic tempo.
At measure 148, Markoch identifies this new theme as a variation of “Ethel.”

This author has decided to label this new melodic development as Theme 3. Although the thematic material seems similar to Ethel, it also contains rhythmic traits and intervallic identities (TT, m3, chromatic accompaniment) that can be identified with Theme 1. In addition, Ticheli sets this section apart by providing the only interpretive marking in the score, “Expressive.” Therefore, this section could be seen as a new material and given its own label. The composer has confirmed that this new material is Theme 3.

![Figure 3.13: Theme 3 Used by Permission. Copyright © 1993 Manhattan Beach Music](image)

Theme 3 is initially presented as two equal phrases. In regards to the melody, the second phrase is repeated exactly up a M3; the accompaniment is altered. This M3 relationship, rather than a m3 relationship, is derived from the intervallic scheme created by the “Ethel” theme.

**RHYTHM**

Several aspects of the rhythmic scheme of *Postcard* have already been included in the discussion above. Refer to Figure 3.12. Starting with the pick-up to measure 144 in

---

14 Markoch, 76.

the euphonium part, Ticheli spins out a six-voice contrapuntal episode that utilizes the “Ethel” pitches. He extends the melodic figure and uses a crescendo to build the tension and forward momentum into measure 148 where Theme 3 begins. At the climaxes in measure 98 and 255, similar construction of implied polymeters and multi-voice polyphony are incorporated.

![Figure 3.14: Climax at measure 255](Used by Permission. Copyright © 1993 Manhattan Beach Music)

By examining the score, one can see that several other layers are added by the saxophones, trumpets, and trombones, although they not included in Figure 3.14. In Figure 3.14, the implied meters have been written in.

Another example of the implied polymeters can be seen in measures 81-83 and 238-240. Figure 3.15 shows the relationship of these layered meters.
Figure 3.15: Implied polymeters Used by Permission. Copyright © 1993 Manhattan Beach Music

The “Ethel” theme starts in a 5/4 meter that can be analyzed in several ways because of the rhythmic construction. The original notation is 5/4, but the rhythmic pulse can be seen as either mixed or asymmetrical meters.

Figure 3.16: “Ethel” rhythmic analysis Used by Permission. Copyright © 1993 Manhattan Beach Music
This section, however, must be conducted in 5/4 due to the accompanying figures. The clarinet and bassoon figures in measures 113-116 clearly do not support mixed or asymmetrical interpretation, nor do the piccolo and flutes figures in measure 116. Look at the bassoon line included in Figure 3.4. The implied meter of this accompaniment is clearly not 5/4, but rather some form of triple meter.

Except for the fermata in measure 110, the tempo of Postcard never changes. There are several moments where implied tempo changes occur, but the divided beat pulse is never altered. In measure 104, the notation provides the allusion of a tempo change, especially when put into the context of the piece. All the elements, including the abrupt mood change of the character, clarinet sustained chord, the implied 6/8 meter in the flute and piccolo, and the implied aleatoric trumpet passage, help to create the allusion of a tempo change.

**ORCHESTRATION**

As he does in Fortress, Ticheli employs instruments and instrument combinations throughout Postcard with precision and deliberate intent. As mentioned earlier, there simply is no “fat” in the scoring. To accomplish the composer’s intent, full instrumentation is an absolute necessity. Two oboes and two bassoons, along with a good bass clarinet player are needed to achieve all the color combinations Ticheli employs. The soprano clarinets need to be of sufficient numbers to balance against the brass and to accomplish certain accompaniment figures. The players assigned to the 2nd and 3rd parts must be strong, confident performers because they often get the important melodic or
rhythmic figures. There is one particular run in the 2nd clarinets that could be doubled by adding the 1st clarinets so that the notes can be heard: measures 175-176.

**Chart 3.3** is the orchestration chart for *Postcard*. As with *Fortress*, the main melodic elements of *Postcard* have been given their own geometric shapes. The tetrachord and staccato elements have been identified and included by the author. Also included with this version of the orchestration chart are the moments where Ticheli employs the tritone or superimposed double-tritone runs, the #4 (lydian) element, and *sf*\(^{16}\) attacks. Indication of these moments are superimposed over the other identifications whenever possible.

\(^{16}\) There are two moments where Ticheli turns the *sf* gesture around: measures 33 and 212. Instead of having the performers crescendo into the *sf*, as he normally does throughout this piece, Ticheli has them start with the *sf* followed by a rapid diminuendo.
Chart 3.3: Postcard orchestration chart  
continued
Several identifying characteristics of Ticheli's compositional style, similar to those used in *Fortress*, can be noted: 1) the limited use of percussion, 2) the constant shifting of textures, and 3) the restrained use of tutti scoring. In this series of orchestration charts,
orchestration charts, the technique of segmenting, fragmenting, and/or partitioning of the melodies is not as readable identifiable as it was with the Fortress charts because of Ticheli’s evolved orchestration skills. This underscores the necessity of being able to analyze with more than one approach. Although charting out the orchestration, as in the manner used in this study, is very helpful with learning and understanding the score, it is not a complete analysis by itself. Other methods and approaches, as used earlier, are required when undertaking an involved and complex score such Postcard.

REHEARSAL SUGGESTIONS

The complexities involved with Postcard require varied rehearsal strategies, particularly for ensembles with less experienced musicians. The players need to become acquainted with their particular part over a long period of time. This is not the type of piece that should be attempted with limited rehearsal time available. The simple fact that only twenty-two measures are repeated in the entire composition means that two hundred and forty-three different measures need to be rehearsed and understood. The proper execution of the subtleties and nuances, in addition to balance and proper inflection, should be one of the constant rehearsal objectives. The accents and phrasing of Theme 1 and its subsequent variations will require constant vigilance from the conductor.

As an example of the process that this author used when approaching this piece, examine the different entrances of the instruments between measures 19 and 21. Every player needs to understand which entrance is an individual line and which line is doubled for color and texture reasons. Behind Variation 2, which starts in measure 22, all of the non-melodic figures will have to be checked for balance and consistent articulation. A
continued measure-by-measure description would prove tedious for this paper, but the conductor who attempts this piece will have to continue along a similar approach for any chance to realize Ticheli's intent.

One of the rehearsal strategies this author used when preparing this piece was to inform the players about the unique palindromic structures within the piece. Each player received a copy of the program notes, Theme 1 and its subsequent variations, and the "Ethel" theme and its subsequent manifestations. Providing the players with some of the constructional ideas that Ticheli used in the design of the piece seemed to help them understand the concept and sound Ticheli was aiming for. Short of giving everyone a score, this approach proved beneficial. In addition, a recording was made available for the players to listen to while they followed along with their part.

To help achieve the proper character, the players had to be reminded and coached to exaggerate the dynamics, especially during crescendos and decrescendos that occur in the matter of only a few beats. Those crescendos that ended in sf (i.e. measures 33-48) required special attention to keep the sound of the sf from becoming too spread and unmusical. The graphic below might prove useful in explaining to players how interpret the sudden burst of energy into the sf at the end of the crescendo.
Figure 3.17: Interpretation of \textit{sf} markings

There are numerous instances where Tichefit adds a second player to the crescendo. These added players should enter below the dynamic level of the first player, then quickly crescendo to add their weight to the sound and timber.

Dynamic and character changes happen quickly and frequently. The players have to be able to shift style, dynamics, mood, and articulations often from one beat to the next. It becomes incumbent on the conductor to modify beats, body language, ictus, and stick dynamics accordingly. The preparatory gestures of these changes will require considerable practice on the conductor’s part. The tendency to slow down during softer, more lyrical passages will probably be one of the more difficult issues to control. Locking in on the tempo where the divided beat never changes requires practice with a tempo device that can sound a pulse at 320 beats per minute. Standard metronomes only go as high as 208 beats per minute. There are, however, numerous machines available where the divided beat can be programmed to sound. By setting the quarter-note to 160 beats per
minute and allowing the divided beat to sound, the conductor will benefit greatly from individual practice sessions conducting the score with this type of machine running in the background. Needless to say, players will benefit from practice sessions like this as well. Particular attention should be paid to transitions from louder dynamics to softer dynamics. This author found that the transitions from measure 29 to 30, measure 103 to 104, and measure 147 to 148 required focused rehearsal concentration and repetition.

Outlined below is a possible rehearsal plan for Postcard. An individual conductor’s situation will probably require modification to this plan, but the general approach to learning this piece could prove useful. This plan is designed with the expectation that at least thirty minutes of rehearsal time is available (after the warm up, tuning, announcements, etc.). In addition, rehearsals should be separated by at least one day to give the players time to internalize the rehearsal and prepare the material for the next rehearsal. For rehearsal purposes, thematic material and similar ideas have been grouped together on the same day. After the technical issues have been mastered, larger portions of the piece are grouped and rehearsed together for continuity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rehearsal 1: Introduction to the piece and Ticheli’s language used in Postcard</th>
<th>Read m. 1-end</th>
<th>Try to avoid stopping. A slightly slower tempo may be required for this reading.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal 2: Theme 1 and variation sections</td>
<td>m. 1-30 m. 52-61 m. 73-77 m. 84-93 m. 195-201 m. 241-251</td>
<td>Insist on accents and phrasing from the melody. Pay particular attention to the background material. It might prove helpful to run sections without the melody.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal 3: Fragmentation of Theme 1 sections</td>
<td>m. 30-52 m. 37-52 m. 61-73 m. 77-84 m. 211-228</td>
<td>exaggerated dynamic and execution of the sf sixteenth-note and triplet patterns accents and doublings balance of all parts same issues as above, different instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal 4: Climax sections; run first A section</td>
<td>m. 94-104 m. 251-261 m. 1-104</td>
<td>exaggerated dynamics, timpani must be heard, 2nd trumpet might need extra players second climax should have more weight try not to stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal 5: “Ethel” and Theme 3 sections</td>
<td>m. 104-132 m. 148-162 m. 176-195</td>
<td>style and tempo; bassoons and bs. cl. at m. 117 style and tempo balance of the cl. lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal 6: “Ethel” variations; run through of the B section</td>
<td>m. 132-148 m. 162-176 m. 104-195</td>
<td>clean execution and note placement rhythm; balance at m. 168 tempo and character changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal 7: Fragmentation sections: A1</td>
<td>m. 201-211 m. 228-234 m. 261-265 m. 194-end</td>
<td>consistent dynamics same as above balance of the melodic line in m. 264 try not to stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal 8- (?) Continuity</td>
<td>m. 1-end as needed m. 1-end</td>
<td>spot check problem areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Rehearsal plan for Postcard
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF VESUVIUS

_Vesuvius_ is one of Ticheli's later works. In this composition, one will find that Ticheli's compositional language has matured and developed, which is to be expected of those who continue to study and teach their craft. Ticheli's maturation process is evident in the complexities of the formal structure and the melodic design, the expanded harmonic language of modes and altered modes, the continued development of the rhythmic variations, and the increased demand on the conductor and performer to properly execute the composer's intent. Although it is not as technically difficult as _Postcard, Blues Shades, or Gaian Visions_, _Vesuvius_ does demand the most of musicians at this grade level, which in many ways makes the proper execution of this piece comparatively more difficult. College and professional wind ensembles will have some of the same musical difficulties with this piece as any grade 4 ensemble attempting it.

Like many of Ticheli's scores, _Vesuvius_ is furnished with extensive program notes, form analysis, and rehearsal notes. A conductor might assume that his/her own analysis of the score is complete by simply reading the introductory information from Ticheli. In fact, nothing could be further from the truth. Although Ticheli provides the
basic melodic, form, and harmonic breakdown, these are only the bare essentials. Chart 4.1 is the introductory material provided in the front of the score.

PROGRAM NOTES

Background

Mr. Vesuvius, the volcano that destroyed Pompeii in A.D. 79, is an icon of power and energy in this work. Originally I had in mind a wild and passionate dance such as might have been performed at an ancient Roman Bacchanalia. During the compositional process, I began to envision something more explosive and fiery. With its driving rhythms, exotic modes, and quotations from the Dies Irae from the medieval Requiem Mass, it became evident that the Bacchanalia I was writing would represent a dance from the final days of the doomed city of Pompeii.

The Work's Themes

Vesuvius contains four main themes. The main theme (Theme 1) introduces two important features: the D Aeolian mode (colored by Ab), and the irregular subdivision of 9/8 meter (2+3+2+2):

Quiet, but with urgent energy

(2+3+2+2)

Theme 2, which is more aggressive and rhythmically active, is actually a loose variation of Theme 1. Both themes share the same primary pitches and melodic contours:

Theme 3, sinuous and seductive in quality, is first stated by the solo oboe. Each time the theme is repeated, one of its notes is chromatically altered, which creates a constant series of subtle modal shifts, from A Phrygian (measures 146-153), to A Aeolian (measures 154-160), to A Dorian (measures 161-179):

Poco rubato

Like the prior theme, Theme 4 is constantly evolving. In its initial, and simplest form, it is a menacing four-note horn call, but it immediately restates itself as a five-note motive, and continually changes:

Chart 4.1: Vesuvius introductory material Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999

Manhattan Beach Music

continued
## Chart 4.1 continued

### Rondo Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tonality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pedal point; phrygian mode established</td>
<td>A Phrygian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Theme 4 foreshadowed (trombone)</td>
<td>A Phrygian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Theme 3 foreshadowed (flutes, clar. 2)</td>
<td>A Phrygian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Transition theme foreshadowed (low brass, low w.w.)</td>
<td>A Phrygian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Theme 1 (alto sax solo)</td>
<td>D Aeolian (colored by flat 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>D Aeolian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>D Aeolian (colored by flat 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>D Aeolian (A Aeolian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulating</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>New texture established</td>
<td>D Aeolian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>episode</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Quote of Dies Irae fragment (ob. 1, hn. 1)</td>
<td>D Aeolian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Continued elaboration of texture</td>
<td>A Aeolian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Continued elaboration of texture.</td>
<td>B (chromatic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Continued elaboration of texture</td>
<td>E Phrygian with occasional chromatic inflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Cadence to A</td>
<td>A (open 5ths)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Theme 3 (oboe)</td>
<td>A Phrygian—A Aeolian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Theme 3 (w.w.)</td>
<td>A Dorian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Bridge (brass)</td>
<td>A Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Theme 3 (w.w.)</td>
<td>A Dorian—D Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Canonic episode moving to reprise of A section</td>
<td>A Phrygian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>Theme 1 (brass) against w.w. flourishes</td>
<td>D Aeolian (colored by flat 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>Bb Lydian (colored by flat 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>259</td>
<td>Theme 1 (w.w.) against Theme 2 (brass)</td>
<td>D Aeolian (A Aeolian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Theme 4 (horns)</td>
<td>A Phrygian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
<td>Theme 4 (muted tpts., trbs.)</td>
<td>A Phrygian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Theme 4 (flutes, obs., alto saxes)</td>
<td>C# Major/minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>Theme 4 (low brass) against</td>
<td>F Phrygian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 3 (alto saxes, tpt. 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311</td>
<td>Theme 4 against Theme 1</td>
<td>A Phrygian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>Theme 4 against Theme 3</td>
<td>A Phrygian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>327</td>
<td>Cadence to D minor</td>
<td>D Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>Canonic variation on Theme 1</td>
<td>D Aeolian (colored by flat 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>346</td>
<td>Canonic variation extended</td>
<td>A Aeolian (colored by flat 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>363</td>
<td>Theme 1 (brass) against w.w. flourishes</td>
<td>D Aeolian (colored by flat 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>369</td>
<td>Coda based on fragment of Theme 1</td>
<td>D Aeolian (colored by flat 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music*
Chart 4.1 continued

REHEARSAL NOTES

General Remarks

Vesuvius is, above all, a furious dance. In order to preserve the work's fiery energy, the players must clearly communicate all indications of stress (e.g., accents, fż markings). In addition, the tempo must not drag! In the premiere performance, we found that the energy could be effectively heightened by playing at an even faster tempo than is marked in the score. The players should keep in mind at all times that this is a dramatic work, both in the loud and quiet passages.

Detailed Remarks

Introduction (measures 1–46): The work begins with an explosion of energy in the Phrygian mode on A. Percussion 3 must use a large slapstick at the beginning for maximum sound. In measures 32–39, the saxophones and clarinets may stress slightly the first note of each paired slur for purposes of clarity.

Section A (measures 47–103): The main theme (in alto saxophone at measure 47) is marked only mp, but should sizzle with energy and urgency. The vocalizations of "Z" (measures 59–62, and 70–73) are meant to enhance the sense of ritual and mystery that is so important in the work. In both occurrences of the vocalizations, I recommend that the performers exaggerate the staccato and dynamic markings. In measure 63, make sure that flute 1 and oboe 1 sound in the foreground.

Modulating episode (measures 104–139): This episode serves as a transition between the A and B sections of the work. The texture is active, but make sure that all parts marked mp or softer remain in the background so that foreground events can be heard clearly. For example, in measures 107–113 the dialogue among the tubas, first clarinets and first flutes must project clearly. In measures 114–118, a fragment of the "Dies Irae" melody is quoted by the oboes and muted horn 1 as a symbol of the death and destruction caused by Vesuvius. In measures 118–126, the special effect played by the timpanist is a subtle one, and it should remain in the background.

Section B (measures 140–216): The tempo relaxes slightly, establishing a quiet oasis. Theme 3, which is introduced by the oboe, must not be overshadowed by its accompaniment. The bowed vibraphone passages that occur throughout this section may be played by one or two players, and are in effect somewhat subliminal, adding only a hint of an ethereal quality. In measures 161–179, make sure that the melody (flute 1) sounds in the foreground. Do not overstate the crescendo in the brasses in measures 184–188. (Their dynamic peak is only mf)

Transition (measures 217–240): The change of mood and mode is abrupt and dramatic as a furious canon interrupts without warning, and recalls the fiery energy from the beginning of the work. The passage builds in intensity, punctuated by occasional tutti shouts (measures 223 and 232), and explodes into a climactic return of the main theme.

Section A' (measures 241–279): The main theme, now roaring in the brasses, engages in furious battle against a series of rushing scales, played by the woodwinds. The ratcheting passages are crucial to the overall frenzy and must be played as loudly as possible on a good instrument. At measure 259, Theme 1 (woodwinds) is pitted against Theme 2 (brasses). At first they are equal in importance, but as the repetitions continue, Theme 2 wins the struggle and builds to another passionate tutti shout (in measure 275), and then recedes.

Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music
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Chart 4.1 continued

Section C (measures 280-335) — the struggle intensifies. Another battle begins in
measure 303 as Theme 4 (horns, trombones, euphoniums) is pitted against Theme 3 (alto
saxophones, trumpet 2). The texture grows increasingly complex as other instruments join
the struggle (e.g., the machine-gun-like trumpets of measure 312). The conductor should
ensure that all these textural elements are heard distinctly.

Section A" (measures 336-369): The main theme, slightly altered, is used as the basis for
an extended canon, led by the alto saxophone, and followed by, in succession: clarinet 1
(measure 339), bassoons (measure 342), alto saxophone and horn 1&2 (measure 345), trum-
pet 1 (measure 346), horn 3, 4, trombones 1&2, one euphonium (measure 349), low
woodwinds, trombone 3, tuba (measure 352). The canon builds to a massive explosion of
sound in measure 357; it is followed by a repeat of the battle that sounded earlier in
measures 241-246. The Codzi begins at measure 369 — first quietly, then building to a state
of extreme agitation. The players seem to be on the verge of losing control as the tempo
accelerates to a point of near chaos. A violent slam! on the bass drum signals the return of
the main tempo and one final shout.

PERCUSSION INSTRUMENTATION

Timpani (phas large suspended cymbal to be placed on timpani head)

Note: All percussion parts require only one player each. Percussion 1 could be more easily
managed by two players. All instruments listed in order of appearance:

Percussion 1

Xylophone
Vibraslap (motor off) needs two double bass bows for bowed vibraphone
Bongos (2)
Suspended Cymbal (large)
Triangle (medium)
Tambourine
Ratchet

Percussion 2

Marimba
Tom Toms (3)
Snare Drum
Crotale (1)
Suspended Cymbal (medium)

Percussion 3

Slapstick (very large)
Temple Blocks (3)
Suspended Cymbal (medium large)
Bass Drum (large)
Tam-Tam (large)

FRANK TICHELISH

Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music
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There are important interpretive issues addressed in the “Detailed Remarks” portion of the “Rehearsal Notes.” More about interpretation will be discussed below. As will be seen, the information provided above is only a skeletal outline from which a conductor can start a detailed analysis of this piece.

**FORM**

Ticheli relates that this piece started with the concept of a *Bacchanalia*. Ticheli eventually chose the “rondo form” for the structure of this piece. There are no written histories that relate the form of a Roman *Bacchanalia*, therefore, a rondo provides Ticheli with a recognizable form and the ability to bring back themes without loosing the integrity of the composition or his concept of the flow. The *Harvard Dictionary of Music* describes the rondo form as:

> A form frequently used in classical sonatas, symphonies, and concertos for the final movement. It was developed from the rondeau of the French clavecinists...The term “rondo form” is also used, particularly by English writers, for two alternation schemes shorter than the true rondo, the ternary form A B A and the five-part form A B A B A (or A B A C A).¹

When composers use this form, typically the “A” material is normally presented the in the home key every time. Even in the contemporary application of this form, the repeated “A” material is usually an exact repeat, but may often be shortened. Ticheli has modified this form to be analyzed as A B A’ C A”. He uses the same thematic material in the “A” sections to identify the form, but each “A” section has its own treatment and character.

Ticheli explains that”[o]ften the role of the C-section in rondo form resembles the

---

Chart 4.2 is the flow chart for Vesuvius.

Chart 4.2: Vesuvius flow chart

continued
Chart 4.2 continued

A1:

Form: 154 201 106 180 106 8 204 217 224 233 241
Melody: 7 8 3 + 4 16 4 13 14 + 6 2 2 + 2 2 + 1 8 10 2 + 3 1 + 4
Rhythmic elements: 33 32 + 4 33 42 4 32 4 + 1 4 4 3 + 2 2 + 1 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4
Orchestration: Oboe Soli Brass WW Mix Brass WW Mixed
Harmony: A Phrygian A Dorian A Major A Dorian D Major A Phrygian D Aeolian (b5)
Texture: Homophonic Hybrid Multi-voiced Contrapuntal Homophonic
Dynamics: p f p < mf > mf < f > mp f ff f ff ff ff

C:

Form: 251 259 267 276 280 287 295 303 311 319 327 336
Melody: 8 8 9 4 7 8 8 8 8 8 8 4 + 5
Rhythmic elements: 9 8 19 48 4 3 4 3 4 6 2 3 6 2 8 2 4
Orchestration: Sax WW WW Tutti WW Horns Brass Low WW Mixed sf sf Tutti
Harmony: Bb Lyd. D Aeolian A Phrygian C# Major/ Minor A Phrygian D Aeolian
Texture: Homophonic Polyphonic Homophonic Mixed 2 Voice imitation Polyrhythmic
Dynamics: mf < ff f f f f f mf f sf f mf mp < sf
As was seen in Postcard, there exists a second or even third layer of implied rhythmic meter beyond the printed meter. These areas are indicated by a second (or third) time signature below the indicated meter. In addition, the intricate design of the dynamics make traditional graphing unfeasible. Themes that appear in parenthesis (i.e. measure 9, measure 18) are foreshadow statements of these themes.

Extra material used only once, with generally no relation to other thematic material, is one of the unique elements of Vesuvius: expanding sustained pyramids based on the phrygian mode (measures 18-47); vocal effects used to create atmosphere (measures 59-74); bridge material with rhythmic allusions, but no direct connection, to melodic development (measures 62-69); Dies Irae quote (measures 104-114); and a Theme 3 gesture based loosely on Theme 2 and Theme 3 melodic structures (measures 119-136, 175-180, 212-216). It could be argued that all of these issues are related either
through melodic development, harmonic relationships, or rhythmic identities, or any combination of these techniques. Unlike the other compositions in this study, however, Ticheli never brings this material back directly, with the exception of the Theme 3 gesture.

MELODY

There are four main themes used in Vesuvius. Those themes are presented in the program notes above. Themes 1 and 2 are closely related and are associated with the “A” sections. Theme 3 is the contrasting statement to Themes 1 and 2, and is associated with the “B” section. Theme 4 is new material and is associated with the “C” section.

Contrary to how he treated the melodies in the other works presented in this study, Ticheli rarely develops the Vesuvius themes beyond their initial statements. An exception to this is Theme 3, as stated in the program notes. Although some extension of certain themes can be seen, there is little of what is traditionally referred to as “development.”

Figure 4.1: Extension of Theme 1 Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music

Figure 4.2: Extension of Theme 2 Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music
Ticheli describes Theme 4 as constantly evolving. In the context of the program notes, this is a true statement. Beyond the eight-bar evolution of the four-note horn call, however, there is only one change to the structure of the theme in its subsequent presentations. The trumpets present an altered form of the theme up a perfect fourth.

Figure 4.3: Trumpet alteration of Theme 4 Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music

The piccolo, saxophones, and horns play this version of Theme 4 at measure 311. All other presentations of this theme retain the intervallic structure, rhythmic identity, and phrasing (with slight modification for modulations and transitions) of the initial eight-bar statement.

The presentation of themes without alteration is another example of Ticheli’s maturation process. One might normally expect the presentation of themes in exact duplication to become predictable and musically unrewarding. But it is the strength of Ticheli’s craft as a composer and an orchestrator that keeps the total structure from becoming stagnant by presenting these themes in constantly changing situations. Ticheli

---

3 Ticheli, “Program Notes” Vesuvius
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achieves variety through tonal, contrapuntal, and coloristic means. It is through these various devices that Ticheli achieves an advanced style of development. The reprise of the A’ section sees Theme 1 interrupted by converging woodwind runs, but the basic structure of the theme, played by the brass, is unchanged. For the reprise of the A” section, Ticheli uses a favorite technique of canon and imitation to present an abbreviated version of Theme 1.

Another familiar element in the melodic and harmonic construction is the use of the TT. Theme 1, for example, is “colored by flat 5” creating the tonic to dominant interval of the TT: D to A-flat. At measure 54, the TT is created by the inclusion of the chromatic alteration of E-flat.

\[5\] Ticheli, personal correspondence, 20 Apr. 2001

\[6\] Ticheli, “Program Notes” *Vesuvius*
Figure 4.4: Vesuvius TT at measure 50 Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music

The trumpet figure at measure 54 is first presented at measure 10 where the familiar B-flat to E TT makes its first appearance. The gesture at measure 86 uses this same interval, and later in a similar manner at measures 223, 232, and 324.

Figure 4.5: B-flat-E TT Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music

Music
A decorative figure using this interval is passed from the euphonium to the trumpets, to the clarinets, and finally to the oboe, flutes, and piccolo from measures 227-230. The antecedent phrase of the first statement of Theme 3 begins on E and ends on B-flat.

[Refer to the program notes.] Other alterations of Theme 3 find the inclusion of the TT as well.

![Figure 4.6: Theme 3 TT variation Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music](image)

Although Ticheli uses the TT to “flavor” the music, the most important interval used in the melodic and harmonic construction is the Perfect 5th (P5), often scored in the bass voices.
The P5 can be found in all voices, though, and in various manifestations.
Figure 4.9: P5 in arpeggio form Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music

Ticheli employs the P5 (and the inversion, P4) using similar orchestrations in the “B” section starting at measure 140. A close examination of the clarinets and bassoons show both arpeggio and sustained open fifths. The arpeggio motion is augmented at measure 102.
218 in the bassoons and saxophones. Throughout the “C” section, the P5 can be seen in the accompaniment figures.

![Musical notation image]

**Figure 4.10: P5 accompaniment figures**  
*Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music*

**RHYTHM**

As in the other compositions in this study, Ticheli’s rhythmic scheme is interrelated with the melodic structure. Rhythmic identity of the themes is one way Ticheli manages to establish continuity throughout the piece: the “A” section themes (Theme 1 and 2) have an unfettered dance-like quality, the “B” section theme (Theme 3) sounds longer and more flowing, and the “C” section theme (Theme 4) is a short motivic cell with a menacing, driving character. With each repetition of the “A” section, the “dance” quality of Themes 1 and 2 becomes more frantic and mesmerizing, as the *Bacchanalia* pushes ahead to a dazzling conclusion.

---

8 In **Figure 4.10**, the score order has been adjusted in order to show the P5 interval more clearly.
Themes 1 and 2 are written in the complex quadruple meter of 9/8, where the divided beat is interpreted as 2+3+2+2.

\[ \text{Figure 4.11: Vesuvius 9/8 interpretation Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999} \]

\[ \text{Manhattan Beach Music} \]

There is only one 9/8 measure in the composition where this interpretation is different; measure 273 is broken down as 2+2+3+2.

A short complex triple meter 8/8 section between measures 63-69 is interpreted as 3+3+2.

\[ \text{Figure 4.12: Vesuvius 8/8 interpretation Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999} \]

\[ \text{Manhattan Beach Music} \]

Again, this meter is consistent throughout this section. As mentioned above, one interesting feature of Vesuvius are the one-time appearances of certain motives. This rhythmic motive appears only once in actual notation. There are hints or foreshadowing of 8/8 meters elsewhere, however, below the written surface meter of 4/4.
Figure 4.13: *Vesuvius* 8/8 implied meter *Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music*

An earlier example of this technique can be seen at measure 15. The proper execution of the difficult cross rhythm created by the tuba should be one rehearsal objective.

Figure 4.14: *Vesuvius* 8/8 implied meter at measure 15 *Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music*
This last example of 8/8 implied meter is interesting due to the shifting interpretation of the meter, making this passage one of the more difficult passages to accomplish. In measure 18, the trombone and 2nd trumpet start their 8/8 pattern on beat one, and the 1st & 3rd trumpets start their pattern on beat three. The rest of the "shifting" can be followed by observing the phrase markings across the eight-notes.

Figure 4.15: Vesuvius 8/8 implied, measures 18-19 Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music
As in Postcard, Vesuvius has numerous other instances where Ticheli implies polymeters. It starts almost from the very beginning of the piece. Although the written meter is 4/4, Ticheli implies a 3/4 feel starting in the third bar.

![Figure 4.16: 3/4 implied meter at measure 3](Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music)

Another instance occurs when the written meter is 3/4, but a 6/8 and a 4/4 meter are clearly evident.

![Figure 4.17: Polymetric interpretation](Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music)
The vocal effect employed at measures 59-62 and 70-73 has an implied compound meter interpretation, which can be seen in the score.

Beneath the 3/4 written meter of Theme 4, there are occasional insertions of 6/8 and 2/4 implied meters.

![Musical Notation]

**Figure 4.18: Theme 4 implied meters** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music

When Theme 3 is layered over Theme 4, the implied meters become more complex. Ticheli remarks that this layering of thematic material “is a developmental technique. Rather than alter themes a lot, this time I develop by placing them in new contexts.”

---

9 Ticheli, personal correspondence, 20 Apr. 2001.
Theme 3 presents a unique situation. Theme 3, as written in the score, is in simple triple meter and is to be conducted in one. (Refer to the score marking at measure 140.) The melody, however, is actually constructed in 3/2.

Figure 4.20: Theme 3 implied meter Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music
Certain accompanying figures strengthen this illusion.

![Musical notation](image)

**Figure 4.21: Theme 3 accompanying figures** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music

Why didn’t Ticheli simply complete the metric modulation and write this melody in 3/2? The answer lies in the bass clarinet and timpani (when it joins at measure 153). The bass line stays in 3/4 and switches to 3/2 only when Ticheli has all the parts change to 3/2.

![Musical notation](image)

**Figure 4.22: Theme 3 bass line** Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music

Ticheli wants the feeling of one to the bar to remain the dominating pulse with only an occasional shift to the hemiola quality of the 3/2 metric modulation.

Refer to the score and examine the timpani part throughout the “B” section.

Notice that the A₃ is not written. In order to play this note in context, the 23” timpani
being used to play the E₃ would have to be re-tuned every time. This necessity to retune
would not only be very difficult, but it would be impractical. The only option would be to
have another 23” timpani available. Most high schools would be hard-pressed to field this
extra drum. To avoid the confusion, Ticheli simply leaves the top note of the bass line
pattern out.

ORCHESTRATION

The orchestration of Vesuvius is very similar to the other pieces in this study; it is
very elaborate, involving numerous combinations of textures and colors. Added to the
orchestration of Vesuvius, however, are some new techniques, some of which were
previously mentioned. Ticheli employs a vocal effect in Vesuvius. Although this
technique is not uncommon in contemporary pieces, this is a new element for Ticheli.
The Dies Irae quote, the bridge material used at measure 63, and the vocal effect¹⁰ all
make only one appearance in the composition. The Theme 3 gesture is restricted to the
“B” section. Ticheli has used sfz effects in other compositions, but the character of this
piece lends itself to the aggressive quality of the sfz and Ticheli employs it liberally, as
opposed to his normal conservative approach for this effect.

Besides the four main themes, Vesuvius utilizes more elements in the texture than
any other piece in this study. Unlike the previous orchestration charts, the legends for the
Vesuvius orchestration charts vary according to the needs of the individual chart The
construction of the “sustained pyramids,” “rips/runs/glissandos,” and the “sixteenth-note
runs” are related and, therefore, have been assigned the same pattern. Likewise, “Theme
4” and “Theme 4 transition material” use the same melodic elements and have been assigned similar patterns. The “timpani effect” at measure 118 employs the timpani in an unusual manner [refer to the introductory material], however, the effect is remarkably appropriate for the character of this piece. The scoring at this point is light, but this effect will be lost in the texture if the proper balance is not maintained. The “Dies Irae,” Theme 3 gesture, and “bridge material” elements have all been assigned their own unique pattern. In the previous pieces of this study, Ticheli has used the “staccato,” “accompaniment,” and “greg” elements.

---

10 Although the vocal effect is used at two different times, this effect encloses the eight-measure appearance of the 8/8 meter, and is never used again.
Chart 4.3: Vesuvius orchestration chart
Chart 4.3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piccolo</th>
<th>Flutes</th>
<th>Oboes</th>
<th>Clarinets</th>
<th>Alto Sax</th>
<th>Tenor Sax</th>
<th>Barit Sax</th>
<th>Bass Clar.</th>
<th>Bassoons</th>
<th>Trumpets</th>
<th>Horns</th>
<th>Trombones</th>
<th>Euphoniums</th>
<th>Tuba</th>
<th>Timpani</th>
<th>Perc. 1</th>
<th>Perc. 2</th>
<th>Perc. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Canonic episode)

114 118 128 132 140 146 154 161 169 180 196 204 217 224 233

Legend:
- T3
- T4
- Staccato
- Accompaniment
- Dés
- Iris
- Theme 4
- Transition
- Material
- Theme 3
- Gesture
- Timpani
- Effect

continued
One feature that should stand out from the orchestration charts is the frequency of tutti scoring, particularly for loud dynamic moments. These moments are highlighted on the charts by a solid black line from top to bottom: measure 1, 9, 18, 99, 276, 357, and the last note.
Another feature that Ticheli utilizes throughout this piece is juxtaposition of descending and ascending sustained pyramids and sixteenth-note runs. After separate statements of ascending sustained pyramids, the clarinets (supported by vibraphone) and the saxophones perform opposite lines simultaneously at measure 38, culminating with all seven pitches of the mode sustained at the same time.

Figure 4.23: Juxtaposed sustained pyramids Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music

Later in the composition, these figures are shortened to sixteenth-note figures without the sustained effect.
Figure 4.24: Juxtaposed sixteenth-note runs Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999

Manhattan Beach Music
This gesture is very effective when Ticheli alternates the brass and woodwinds at the reprise of the A’ section. Notice that these runs start and end as (reduced) P5 intervals.

Figure 4.25: Woodwind sixteenth-note runs Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999

Manhattan Beach Music

119
A similar technique is employed starting at measure 377, this time using brass and woodwinds together during the *molto accelerando*.

*Figure 4.26: Accelerando figures* Used by Permission. Copyright © 1999 Manhattan Beach Music
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A related figure comprises the four- to five-octave descending patterns following dramatic **ff** tutti statements. These moments are normally accompanied with a decrescendo and a thinning of the texture. Although not always clear from the orchestration charts, several of these moments can be seen at measures 9, 27, 99, 276, and 327.

**REHEARSAL SUGGESTIONS**

Like the previous pieces in this study, *Vesuvius* will require more rehearsal time than normal to prepare properly. The technical demands placed on the performers by this grade 4 composition are at the extreme range. Depending on the maturity of the players, conductors may want to consider this a grade 5 composition and program accordingly. It takes approximately nine minutes to complete the piece. *Vesuvius* will be one of the highlighted works on any concert program, be it high school or professional. As mentioned earlier, in keeping with Ticheli’s normal approach to orchestration, only six measures are repeated exactly, leaving 382 measures for rehearsal. *Vesuvius* is a big piece in every aspect: time, teachability, emotional impact, and audience appeal.

This author had the opportunity to observe the rehearsal of this piece by the composer. The following suggestions and comments have been distilled from two days of rehearsals of a high school honors band under the composer’s direction.¹¹

Ticheli started the rehearsal at measure 47 to establish the complex 9/8 interpretation of the meter. He was very adamant that the accent on beat two be purposefully stressed and that note be the focal point of each measure. When it became

---

clear that some of the players were having difficulty with the interpretation of the quadruple 9/8 meter, Ticheli taught them the following "drinking song."

Figure 4.27: Mnemonic device used to teach Vesuvius Theme 1

He had the entire ensemble learn all the lines separately. Then he divided the band into thirds and assigned a line to each section. Throughout the teaching of this device, Ticheli emphasized the importance of the accent on beat two. The desired effect was achieved; the pulse of the meter stabilized and the vertical alignment was much improved.

In a related issue, both Theme 1 and Theme 2 need to have a dance-like quality. He wanted the themes to have a bouncy character without getting too aggressive. He wanted the aggressive interpretation saved for Theme 4. The proper stress (not hard attack) of the accent on beat two will help convey the dance character of Themes 1 and 2.

The vocal effect was an area that Ticheli wanted the ensemble to exaggerate the dynamics; he wanted the starting dynamic softer and more crescendo than the players were comfortable performing. Ticheli had the players add an accent to the downbeat of measure 60 and measure 71 to help emphasize the of the peak of the crescendo.
After ensuring the meter was stable for Theme 1 and 2, Ticheli jumped ahead to measure 146. Although he indicates in the score that this section should be conducted in one, he started the rehearsal of this section in three. This seemed to help the oboe and the 1st clarinets stabilize their rhythmic patterns. Once it became clear that the players were not going to have major difficulties with the rhythms, he slipped into one.

For the transitional material at measure 217, Ticheli again focused on the accent at the beginning of the eighth-note run. He wanted the note aggressive but not played long. Although not written, he stressed that everyone should emulate the style of the trombone entrance. Unless marked by a slur, the eighth-notes should be performed as a punctuated marcato, not a short staccato.

For the accents in measure 223, Ticheli wanted the second note pulled back, so that the emphasis was on the downbeat. Percussion can improve this effect by using aggressive strokes on the downbeats and almost “ghosting” the upbeats.

At measure 303, Ticheli focused his attention on two things: 1) the $f_{p}$ in the woodwinds really should be interpreted as $f_{pp}$ with the change in the dynamic occurring immediately, not as a quick diminuendo, and 2) with the return of Theme 3, the interpretation of that theme still needs to be flowing and gentle, juxtaposed with a fiery and aggressive interpretation of Theme 4.
At measures 242 and 364, Ticheli wanted as much sound as he could get from the ratchet. Even with two players performing, the sound still did not meet with his expectations.\textsuperscript{12}

For the \textit{molto accellerando} that starts at measure 377, Ticheli wanted this passage performed with as much acceleration as possible. He suggests that by measure 381, conductors should be in one and continue to accelerate to the fermata. The bass drum solo on the downbeat of measure 386 should be as loud as possible without doing damage to the drum. The horns could start their rip to the last note on beat three of measure 387.

\textsuperscript{12} Oversized ratchets would be a better choice for this piece than the standard eight-inch variety.
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS OF THIS STUDY

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING PERCEIVED COMMON ELEMENTS

In the first chapter of this study, some generic observations were presented about the compositional language of Ticheli, and it was assumed that many of these “common elements” might be found in every Ticheli composition. As a reminder, these characteristics are listed again: 1) the development and manipulation of short melodic/motivic ideas, 2) layered rhythmic schemes involving written and implied metrical stress, 3) a distinct form, separate and unique unto each piece, and 4) the use of atypical orchestration. Based on the analytical information extracted from this study, the following conclusions can be made regarding these assumed common elements:

1) Each piece in this study included and incorporated short melodic and/or motivic ideas as a characteristic in the compositional language. The analysis of Fortress detailed the development, diminution, and augmentation of the “Main Idea,” “Call Motif,” and the “Legato Theme.” The TT was the main melodic and harmonic construction interval. In Chapter 3, both Theme 1 and the “Ethel” motif from Postcard were the subject of examination which demonstrated fragmentation technique, and linear and intervallic manipulation. The m3 assumed the role as the
most important melodic and harmonic interval. Chapter 4 demonstrated how the
rhythmic identity of the “A” section themes and the fragmentation of Theme 4
were used as transitional material in Vesuvius. The interval of the P5 is used as a
unifying device throughout the piece.

2) Two of the compositions, Postcard and Vesuvius, used layered rhythmic schemes
or polymeters. Although Fortress does have rhythmic issues, which include
layered schemes, polymeters were not involved.

3) Each piece was cast in a separate and distinct form. A review of the flow charts
shows that Fortress has five sections, an almost through-composed configuration,
Postcard has an A-B-A1 ternary form, and Vesuvius utilizes a modified rondo
form.

4) Ticheli’s orchestration is atypical, regardless of grade level. His common
characteristics include: using tutti scoring sparingly; he deliberately scores the
melody in second and third parts¹; his employment of percussion is designed for
maximum effect²; he rarely, if ever, repeats a section of music using the same
orchestration or texture. A possible continuation of this study might be the
comparison of Ticheli’s orchestration to the top twenty-five core repertoire pieces
for bands and wind ensembles.

¹ “I always try to score the melody or an important fragment in the second and
third parts, even if it’s only for two beats as in [An American] Elegy. This lets the players
on those parts know that they are important and encourages them to rise to the occasion.”
Ticheli, personal interview, 12 Jan. 2001.

² “I think that if you overscore the percussion, they lose their effectiveness and
It would be careless to make the assumption that all of Ticheli’s compositions incorporate these four basic elements or characteristics. It has already been demonstrated that the use of polymeters doesn’t hold true for one of the pieces in this study.

Throughout the course of this study, it became evident that the questions posed at the end of Chapter 1 could not be completely answered with an analysis of only three Ticheli compositions. This author had the opportunity to program and conduct two other Ticheli compositions not used in this study: *Cajun Folk Songs* and *Sun Dance*. In addition to observing Ticheli prepare *Vesuvius*, this author had the privilege of observing Ticheli rehearse and conduct *An American Elegy*.\(^3\) The knowledge and insight gained from these additional experiences almost negates the premise of a “three composition” Ticheli study; there would be too many instances of false assumptions and lack of proper application of methodology.

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS POSED IN CHAPTER 1**

The purpose of Chapter 5 of this study is to draw conclusions based on the analysis of the three pieces chosen. The five questions posed at the end of Chapter 1 were:

1) What common elements are found in each piece?

2) Does Ticheli use the same “language” in each piece?

3) Are there similarities in his formal designs?

4) Are there certain techniques that are favored by Ticheli?

5) Can any conclusions be drawn as to why Ticheli’s music stands out as consistently better than most other music of comparable difficulty and genre?

---

\(^3\) High School Honor Band Weekend, The Ohio State University, 12-14 Jan. 2001
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There are commonalities among all of the pieces of this study, however, none that can be identified without an in-depth analysis as used in this study. All of Ticheli's pieces, regardless of grade level, require more rehearsal time than comparative literature of most other composers. The unique approach to orchestration, the infrequent cross-cueing, the non-standard harmonic language, and Ticheli’s desire to challenge the lower parts with important melodic passages all combine, obligating the conductor to design rehearsal plans which require more time.

Ticheli’s approach to melodic construction and his harmonic language seems to incorporate a specific interval for each piece. The interval of the tritone, however, is used in all three, albeit in a lesser capacity in Postcard and Vesuvius. This reference to the tritone does not mean the obvious structural inclusion of the tritone in a dominant-seventh or diminished-seventh chord; this observation of Ticheli’s use of the tritone addresses the deliberate use of the tritone in the melodic construction and accompaniment figures, and occasionally the harmonic framework. Fortress uses both harmonic tritone motion and a canonic passage with entrances at the tritone. The “main idea,” the “call motif,” and the “legato theme” in Fortress use the tritone in the melody. Postcard includes added note technique that favors the lydian (#4) element and super-imposed tritone runs as unifying devices. All three of the melodies in Postcard include at least one tritone leap. Altered modes that use a lowered-fifth scale degree and melodic leaps of a tritone can be seen throughout Vesuvius. The tritone of B flat-E seems to be a favored interval with Ticheli. Often this tritone is linked in some fashion to the E flat-A tritone.

Canonic or imitative passages also appear in all three pieces. Fortress has the unique canon at the tritone; Postcard has several passages that use imitation that resemble
a canon; *Vesuvius* has one distinct canonic passage and several shorter imitative sequences.

Ticheli’s application of the bassoon texture in his orchestration technique is unusual. Each piece in this study requires two bassoons to accomplish the intended texture. Used as a unifying element throughout the *Fortress*, the staccato pattern is first introduced by two bassoons in measure 7. Section 5 of *Fortress* begins with triadic chords voiced in two bassoons and one alto sax. Long continuous dovetailed lines that are important accompaniment figures can be found in both *Postcard* and *Vesuvius*.

The similarities shared among Ticheli’s endings are worth mentioning. All three pieces end with a flourish of sound. Part of the texture of all three pieces includes trombone glissandos and French horn rips in the concluding measures. The horns are highlighted at the end of *Fortress* with glissandos in measures 155-156, “bells up” performance instructions, and a final glissando [rip] in the 1-2 horn part. The trombones have a glissando from a major triad up to a major triad. The end of *Postcard* features the horns on a “ff” soli trill, and the trombones glissando down with added note harmonic structure. Horn rips and trombone glissandos are used from measure 377 to 384 as part of the penultimate statement in *Vesuvius*. The horns are also scored with a rip to the final chord.

There is another feature about the endings of *Postcard* and *Fortress* that should be observed. *Postcard*, although not written in a major key, has a general harmonic structure that can be seen as “major.” *Vesuvius* can be seen as generally “minor” in its harmonic language. The final chord of both pieces are major and minor triads respectively, whose
third is deliberately underscored.\(^4\) In Postcard, the tenor saxophone and the horn 2 parts have the C# of the A major final chord. In Vesuvius, only the tenor saxophone has the F of the D minor final chord. The composer's intent is to ensure that the quality of the chord is present, but to have only a hint of that quality in the texture.\(^5\)

Ticheli uses many different techniques and conventions in each of the pieces of this study. There is no consistent harmonic language: Fortress is certainly in a major key, but doesn’t use conventional harmonic progression; Postcard utilizes several harmonic conventions to include the octatonic scale, chromatic construction, and added note technique; Vesuvius uses generally minor modes and altered modes.

Ticheli doesn’t seem to favor any one particular twentieth-century technique. All three pieces have melodic fragmentation, augmentation, and diminution. Fortress has tone clusters, chromatic construction, polytonal moments, and tritone based harmonic motion. Postcard utilizes added note technique, chromatic construction, implied polymetric episodes, tone clusters, and octatonic scale based melodic construction. Vesuvius features many of the same issues as Postcard, but relies heavily on modes and altered modes for its harmonic and melodic foundation.

The questions concerning form and technique have already been addressed in the discussion of the common elements. Question 5 will be discussed addressed later.

\(^4\) Ticheli, personal interview, 12 Jan. 2001.

\(^5\) Ibid.
BREAKDOWN OF FINDINGS

At this point, the author has included a series of tables showing some of general observations made before this study began of Ticheli's wind compositions as they apply to most of Ticheli's wind compositions. A continuation of the series shows the observations and conclusions made in Chapter 5 as they apply to these same works.

---

6 Pacific Fanfare and Concertino for Trombone and Band were not available to the author for this study and therefore, not included in these tables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>USE OF POLYMETERS</th>
<th>MEASURE NUMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An American Elegy</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesuvius</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Shades</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>3/4 + 2/4 m. 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:3 + 2/4 m. 96, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/4 + 6/8 m. 116, 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:3 during clarinet solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Dance</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>(see program note) m. 26, m. 42-44, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folksongs II</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaian Visions</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>All three movements have some form of polymeters, generally 6/8: 2/4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazing Grace</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>During the flute canonic episode, the 1st clarinet is playing an augmented variation of the melody.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folk Songs</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2nd Movement: 5/4, 3/4 against 6/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortress</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of a Clown</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music for Winds and Percussion</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Movement I is extremely complicated rhythmically. At other times throughout the other movements 6:5/4, 3:2/4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5.1: Use of polymeters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An American Elegy</td>
<td>Through-composed: A-B-A'-C-D-A''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesuvius</td>
<td>A B A' C A''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>Theme and Variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Shades</td>
<td>Through-composed: Section I, II, III, IV, V, VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folksongs II</td>
<td>Two Movement: Theme and Variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard</td>
<td>A B A'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaian Visions</td>
<td>Three Movement structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folk Songs</td>
<td>Two Movement: Theme and variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortress</td>
<td>Through-composed: Section I, II, III, IV, V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of a Clown</td>
<td>A B A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music for Winds and Percussion</td>
<td>Three Movement structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5.2: Form**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>MELODY IN LOWER PARTS</th>
<th>PARTS AND MEASURE NUMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An American Elegy</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; clarinet m. 47-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; clarinet m. 90, beats 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesuvius</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; trumpet m. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; trumpet and 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; trombone m. 53-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Shades</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Dance</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; and 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; trumpet m. 21-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; trumpet m. 31-36, 71-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tenor saxophone m. 26-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; clarinet m. 45-48, 56-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; alto saxophone m. 121-124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folksongs II</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Movement 1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2ns alto saxophone m. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; trumpet m. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaian Visions</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazing Grace</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; clarinet and 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; trumpet m. 25-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; clarinet and 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; flute m. 57-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; trumpet and 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Horn m. 64-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; alto saxophone and 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; trumpet m. 83-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folk Songs</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; clarinet/trumpet/ofoe m. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortress</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>tenor saxophone m. 49-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; flute m. 71-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; and 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; clarinets m. 128-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of a Clown</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; clarinet at letter G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music for Winds and Percussion</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to the nature of the writing and the difficulty level, all parts are solcistic at one point or another.

**TABLE 5.3: Melody in lower parts**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>INCLUSION OF THE TRITONE</th>
<th>NOMENT CLATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An American Elegy</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesuvius</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>A-E flat as part of a Cmin6 chord; not heard as a dissonant tritone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Shades</td>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>Horns m. 97, 99, 101. Due to the preponderance of dominant-seventh chords, there are tritones everywhere, but not in the context of this observation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Dance</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folksongs II</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaian Visions</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Movement II: melody: m. 11: G (B) C#, E-B flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m. 20 B flat-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m. 45 C-F#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Movement III: m. 152 F-C flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m. 196 C-G flat, E flat-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m. 211 diminished triad in the trumpets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazing Grace</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1st Movement: m. 75 E flat-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m. 78 F# against a C pedal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folk Songs</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2nd Movement: m. 82-87 D flat-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m. 107 E flat-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m. 109 G flat-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortress</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of a Clown</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>B flat-E, B flat lydian scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music for Winds and Percussion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5.4: Inclusion of the tritone
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>USE OF CANONIC PASSAGES</th>
<th>MEASURE NUMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An American Elegy</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>m. 97-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesuvius</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>m. 41-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Shades</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>m. 249-264, m. 388-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Dance</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folksongs II</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Throughout Mvt. II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaian Visions</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Movement II, m. 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazing Grace</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>m. 47-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folk Songs</td>
<td>NO*</td>
<td>*the coda of Mvt. II has imitative elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortress</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of a Clown</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music for Winds and Percussion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5.5: Use of canonic passages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>UNIQUE BASSOON TREATMENT</th>
<th>MEASURE NUMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An American Elegy</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>m. 1 opening statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesuvius</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Shades</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>m. 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Dance</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>m. 9-10, m. 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folksongs II</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaian Visions</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazing Grace</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folk Songs</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2nd Movement, m 92-100 (with muted trombone and marimba)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortress</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of a Clown</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music for Winds and Percussion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5.6: Unique bassoon treatment**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TROMBONE GLISSANDOS AND HORN RIPS</th>
<th>MEASURE NUMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An American Elegy</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>See Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesuvius</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Shades</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Horns, m. 265-271, 417-423 Trombone glissandi throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Dance</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Horns, m. 172 Trombones, m. 173 (175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folksongs II</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Chapter 3 Trombone glissandi everywhere, but not as part of the final gestures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazing Grace</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folk Songs</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2nd Movement: trombone gliss m. 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortress</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of a Clown</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music for Winds and Percussion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5.7: Trombone glissandos and horn rips**

Table 5.1 reveals another conclusion: most of Ticheli’s fast pieces or movements utilize polymeters; none of his slow pieces or movements do. Table 2.1 reveals that Ticheli does not favor a particular form or convention in his compositional approach. It would appear from the information gleaned from Table 5.3 that Ticheli makes a deliberate effort to include melodic passages or fragments in the lower parts. Although initial assumptions regarding the interval of the tritone seemed valid, Table 5.4 demonstrates that it was mostly coincidence the three pieces chosen for this study featured the tritone. Canonic technique and imitative passages are present in many of Ticheli’s works as shown in Table 5.5, however, there are some compositions that don’t utilize this convention. Table 5.6 reveals that it was circumstance that led to the

---

7 Ticheli, personal correspondence, 20 Apr. 2001.
assumption regarding unique bassoon treatment. Although trombone glissandi and horn
rips are part of Ticheli’s language, Table 5.7 shows clearly that he restricts the use of
these effects.

ANSWER TO QUESTION 5

The final question posed at the end of Chapter 1 was this: Can any conclusions be
drawn as to why Ticheli’s music stands out as consistently better than most other music
of comparable difficulty and genre? It has been the focus of this study to attempt to
answer that question through a series of detailed analysis of three diverse Ticheli
compositions. This author had hoped that by analyzing these works, an understanding of
Ticheli’s compositional process might be partially revealed. With a better understanding
of how Ticheli approaches the craft of composing, a conductor can shape a better
interpretation of the work, and therefore, realize the composer’s intent more authentically
and musically. Although many facts can be drawn from the information gleaned from the
analysis of Fortress, Postcard, and Vesuvius, any conclusions about these facts can
obviously be very subjective. In his book “Materials and Techniques of Twentieth-
Century Music,” Stefan Kostka mentions that “[t]he task of the composer is to create a
work that is consistent, that is stylistically unified within its own self-defined universe.
The task of the student [ed. note conductor] is to try to understand what that universe is
and how the different aspects of the composition fit into it.”8 The difficulty with this
statement is the fact that not everyone will “understand” the universe in the same way;
what will be senseless “noise” to one person could be marvelous “technique” to another.

8 Stefan Kostka, Materials and Techniques of Twentieth-Century Music (Upper
In a lecture given at The Ohio State University on January 13, 2001, Ticheli addressed the issue of what it takes to make good music. His audience consisted of local band directors and university music students. When he asked his audience to tell him what they look for in a “good” piece of music, as could be expected, there were a wide variety of answers. Ticheli offered his own perspective. What he listens and looks for in any piece of music, to include his own compositions, are these four elements: 1) aspects of singing and dancing, with well constructed melodic and rhythmic schemes that don’t get predictable or boring, 2) authenticity with consistency in approach and application [much along the same line as the Kostka quote above], 3) textures that sparkle and that are transparent, and 4) good counterpoint.9

When these four elements are applied to the three pieces in this study, it is the opinion of this author that these “subjective” elements do exists in Ticheli’s compositional approach and language. Too often, new compositions of leading wind composers resemble their previous works. The forms and structures are designed to be learned quickly and to make the ensemble sound good with a minimum of effort, which normally means the quality and substance of these compositions are lacking meaningful content. The textures are predictably full of block scoring and simplistic repetitive rhythms. The counterpoint is uninspired and superficial. For this author, there are only a few composers whose compositions are eagerly anticipated. Frank Ticheli is one such composer whose music will continue to inspire and teach student and audience alike, along with such names as Vaughan Williams, Holst, Grainger, Persichetti, and Sousa.

9 Frank Ticheli, lecture given at the Ohio State University, 13 Jan. 2001.
A possible continuation of this study might include the analysis of works by other composers of wind-band pieces whose approach and techniques are comparable to those of Ticheli. For this author, some of the composers whose works merit this kind of study are Anthony Iannaccone, Daniel Buckwich, Steve Melillo, Bob Margolis, Timothy Broege, David Maslanka, Mark Camphouse, Ron Nelson, and Joseph Schwantner. Each of these composers continues to contribute significant pieces to the wind-band genre. Any of these composers could be studied separately at various grade levels or in combination at comparatively similar grade levels.

This author will often attend concerts where works by some of these composers are programmed, to include Ticheli, to find the interpretation lacking. While discussing the concert with the conductor or the performers, it becomes apparent that many of the issues regarding the interpretation of the piece have been overlooked or never revealed. Although there are numerous texts and guidelines about the process of analysis, such as the Battisti/Garofalo text used in this study, it is this author's opinion that many musicians, conductor and performer alike, lack the experience to apply the numerous analytical techniques available.

Continued studies such as this one, might provide two valuable resources:

1) A template of various score study techniques that musicians can use to hone their own analytical skills: The process of analysis is a skill that all musicians should continue to develop. As the composer's advocate, one of the conductor's roles, and in many ways, the instrumentalists who play for them, is to realize the composer's intent. It is not always possible to call composers to ask for their help in this area, therefore, it is left to the musician's prowess in research and analysis.
to shape the interpretation. Not all analytical processes will be appropriate for
every piece, and not every musician will be skilled at all of the various
conventions of analysis. Quality in-depth, step-by-step procedures, such as the
one used in this study, will help guide less experienced musicians in discovering
new approaches to understanding music and the processes that composers go
through to create their works.

2) Valuable source information about contemporary composers and their works,
particularly of composers who are still alive: It has been this author’s experience
that composers are normally very willing and eager to share their thoughts and
insights with people who are genuinely interested. As primarily a wind-band
conductor, this author finds it very frustrating to do research about a wind-band
composer only to find a one-paragraph entry about their life and music. There
have been positive steps taken in the past few years to correct this deficiency,
however, there is still much to be done and written. Having Dr. Frank Ticheli
collaborate on this study has proven invaluable. His input, insight, guidance, and
corrections and/or corroboration of the findings have helped develop a resource
that this author hopes other musicians will find useful. If such a resource were
available on all of the composers mentioned above, the performances of their
works will extend vast credibility to the wind-band genre as a whole through
superior interpretations and realizations of oft-overlooked masterpieces.
APPENDIX A

BIOGRAPHY

Frank Ticheli was born in Monroe, Louisiana on January 21, 1958. His musical studies began at the age of nine as a trumpeter. Throughout high school he played in concert band, orchestra, jazz band, and marching band. His early passion was for New Orleans jazz, and Louis Armstrong was his idol.

He received his Bachelor of Music degree in 1980 from Southern Methodist University, where he studied composition with Donald Erb. At the same time, he took private lessons in counterpoint and orchestration with Robert X. Rodriguez. After a brief period as a music teacher at Lakeview Centennial High School in Garland, Texas, he entered the University of Michigan, where he received his Master of Music in 1983 and Doctor of Musical Arts in Composition in 1987. He received the Rackham Pre-Doctoral Fellowship during his final year of graduate studies. While attending the University of Michigan he studied with William Albright, George B. Wilson, and Pulitzer Prize winners Leslie Bassett and William Bolcom.
Ticheli was an Assistant Professor of Music at Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas from 1988 to 1991. In 1991 he joined the faculty of the University of Southern California’s Thornton School of Music, where he is currently a professor of composition.

Ticheli was composer-in-residence with the Pacific Symphony Orchestra from 1991 to 1998. His orchestral works have been performed by the American Composers Orchestra at Carnegie Hall, Austrian Radio Orchestra, Frankfurt Opera Orchestra, Frankfurt Radio Orchestra, Saarbrücken Radio Orchestra, and the orchestras of Atlanta, Colorado, Hong Kong, Jacksonville, Long Island, Lubbock, Memphis, Nashville, Phoenix, Philadelphia, Portland, San Antonio, San Jose, and others.

Awards for Ticheli’s music include the prestigious Charles Ives Scholarship and Goddard Lieberson Fellowship, both from the American Academy of Arts and Letters, First Prize in the Texas Sesquicentennial Orchestra Composition Competition, the Frances and William Schuman Fellowship, the Rose Lee Finney Award, and frequent summer residencies at the MacDowell Colony and Yaddo. The Pacific Symphony Orchestra’s Koch label recording featuring Ticheli’s Radiant Voices and Postcard received an honorable mention at the 1994 National Association of Independent Record Distributors (NAIRD). In 1999, he was selected as a recipient of a Chamber Music America Grant to compose a work for the Philadelphia-based saxophone quartet Prism. In 1999 he received first prize in the Britten-on-the-Bay Composition Contest for his choral work, There Will Be Rest.

Ticheli’s fourteen compositions for wind ensemble and concert band have been performed all over the world and have been awarded several prizes, including the 1989
Walter Beeler Prize for *Music for Winds and Percussion*, and First Prize at the eleventh annual “Symposium for New Music” held in Virginia for *Concertino for Trombone and Band*. His most recent work for band, *An American Elegy*, was commissioned by Kappa Kappa Psi for the Columbine High School Band in memory of the victims of the Columbine shooting tragedy. He conducted the Columbine High School Band in the premiere performance on Easter Sunday, 2000, marking the one-year anniversary of the tragedy.

Other commissions and grants have come from the American Music Center, Pacific Symphony Orchestra, Pacific Chorale, Worldwide Concurrent Premieres, Inc., University of Miami, Prince George’s Philharmonic Orchestra, Adrian Symphony, City of San Antonio, Stephen F. Austin State University, University of Michigan, Trinity University, Indiana Bandmasters Association, and others.

Ticheli’s works are published by Manhattan Beach Music, Helicon Music (of European America, Inc.), Hindon Music (Hinshaw), and Encore Music Publishers, and are recorded on the labels of Koch International Classics, Klavier, Albany, and Mark Records.
SELECTED DISCOGRAPHY

Blue Shades, University of North Texas Wind Ensemble, Klavier label (1998).
Radiant Voices, Pacific Symphony Orchestra, KOCH label (1994)

COMMISSIONS AND GRANTS

Symphony for Band, commissioned by a consortium of 25 university wind ensembles and concert bands, to be premiered in Fall 2002.
Symphony for Orchestra, commissioned by the University of Miami, to be premiered in October, 2001.
Out of the Blue, funded by a grant from Chamber Music America, for the saxophone quartet, Prism (2000).
An American Elegy, commissioned by Kappa Kappa Psi for the Columbine High School Concert Band in memory of those who were killed at Columbine on April 20, 1999.
There Will Be Rest, commissioned by the Pacific Chorale, 1999.
Vesuvius, commissioned by the Revelli Foundation for the National Honor Band of America, 1999.
An American Dream, commissioned by the Pacific Symphony Orchestra, 1998.
Blue Shades, commissioned by a consortium of 30 university and high school bands under the auspices of Worldwide Concurrent Premières, Inc., 1996.
On Time's Stream, commissioned by the Pacific Symphony Orchestra, 1995.
Cajun Folk Songs II, commissioned by the Indiana All-State Association, 1996.
Radiant Voices, commissioned by the Pacific Symphony Orchestra, 1993.
Playing with Fire, commissioned for the Jim Cullum Jazz Band and San Antonio Symphony, funded in part by a grant from the American Music Center, 1992.
Gaian Visions, commissioned by the Stephen F. Austin State University chapter of Pi Kappa Lambda, 1990.
Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra, funded by a grant from Trinity University, 1990.
Here We Stand, commissioned by Prince George's Philharmonic Orchestra, 1989.
String Quartet, commissioned by the Adrian Symphony Orchestra, 1984.
Concerto for Trombone and Band, commissioned jointly by H. Dennis Smith and The University of Michigan School of Music, 1984.

CATALOGUE OF WORKS

Orchestra:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Shades</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiant Voices</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Time’s Stream</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Fanfare</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images of a Storm</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solo with Orchestra:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An American Dream</td>
<td>Soprano voice</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing with Fire</td>
<td>7-piece Jazz Band</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra</td>
<td>Trumpet</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Band and Wind Ensemble:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An American Elegy</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesuvius</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Shades</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Dance</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folk Songs II</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Fanfare</td>
<td>antiphonal band</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaian Visions</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazing Grace</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cajun Folk Songs</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortress</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of a Clown</td>
<td>band</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music For Winds and Percussion</td>
<td>wind ensemble</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto for Trombone and Band</td>
<td>solo and band</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choral:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There Will Be Rest</td>
<td>SATB, a cappella</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chamber:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of the Blue</td>
<td>saxophone quartet</td>
<td>2000 Encore Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songs of Tagore</td>
<td>soprano, alto sax, piano</td>
<td>1992 Encore Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Burner</td>
<td>saxophone quartet</td>
<td>1989 Encore Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here We Stand</td>
<td>12 brass and percussion</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto for Trombone</td>
<td>solo, 2 pianos, percussion</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The First Voice</td>
<td>solo trumpet</td>
<td>1987 PP Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sting Quartet</td>
<td>string quartet</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td>electronic tape</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Songs of Loss</td>
<td>baritone voice, clarinet, piano</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humouresque</td>
<td>brass septet</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poltergeists</td>
<td>alto fl, bass cl, horn, cello, 2 percussion</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Time</td>
<td>trumpet, piano</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Movements</td>
<td>flute, bassoon, trumpet, piano</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio for Brass</td>
<td>trumpet, horn, trombone</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

SCORE ANALYSIS GUIDE
2. Analyze the internal harmonic movement:
- cadences:
  - conventional — perfect, half, plagal, deceptive
  - nonconventional — modal, others
- modulations:
  - fifth, third or second relationship types
  - others
- progressions:
  - intervals of root movement
  - sequence
  - parallelism — chord streams, elisions, others

3. Analyze individual chord structures:
- tertian: built in thirds (triads — major, minor, diminished, augmented; seventh, ninth, eleventh, thirteenth)
- nontertian: built in fourths (quartal), fifths (quintal), seconds (secondal)
- chord inversions
- chord alterations (expanded chord tones, added nonchord tones)
- bichords and polychords
- tone clusters and other dissonant chord structures
- additional considerations:
  - prominent harmonic intervals
    - harmonic rhythm
    - harmonic tension (consonance versus dissonance)
  - use of nonharmonic tones and added tones to create tension
  - relationship of harmony to melody

Form:
1. Analyze the overall form of the composition to determine if the work follows a standard formal design:
- compound or multinmovement forms:
  - instrumental — concerto, suite, symphony, sonata, divertimento, serenade, others
  - instrumental and vocal — cantata, oratorio, mass, others
- sectional forms:
  - binary (AB)
  - ternary (ABA)
  - rondo (ABACA)
  - archi (ABCBA)
  - combinations or variations of the foregoing
- variational forms:
  - theme and variations
  - passacaglia, chaconne

---

“Guide to Score Study for the Wind Band Conductor: Chapter 3, Score Analysis Guide”

Used with permission, Meredith Music Publications
3. Identify specific rhythmic techniques employed:
- augmentation or diminution
- polyrhythms
- thematic or motive rhythms (nonmelodic)
- ostinato rhythms
- juxtaposition of diverse rhythm groups
- rhythmic patterns that give energy and drive to the music
- techniques that shift, obscure, or destroy the pulse or meter:
  - hemiola (3:2 relationship)
  - syncopation
  - displaced accents
  - distant rhythmic figures
  - omission of bar lines
  - free rhythms (ala-proportional notation)
- use of silence (rests)

Orchestration:
1. Reexamine the score requirements in terms of atypical instruments or unusual musical resources employed.
2. Study the orchestration carefully by examining:
   - each family of instruments: woodwinds, brass, percussion
   - each instrument choir, subchoir, or section:
     - flutes, double reeds, clarinets, saxophones
     - conical brass, cylindrical brass
     - membrane percussion, mallet keyboard, accessories
     - others (piano, harp, organ, etc.)
   - each individual instrument line
3. Notice the composer's use of:
   - special effects: muting, flutter tongue, trills, tremolo, glissando, pitch bending, bells in the air, multiphonics
   - extreme register scoring (high or low tessituras)
   - unusual union or octave doublings
   - composite tone colors (instrument timbre mixing)
   - imaginative instrumental scoring combinations (e.g., stopped horn and natural horn flutter tongue)
   - contrasting tone colors:
     - vertical (melody to accompaniment)
     - horizontal (section to section, phrase to phrase)
   - percussion instruments for coloristic effects

"Guide to Score Study for the Wind Band Conductor: Chapter 3, Score Analysis"

Guide" cont. Used with permission, Meredith Music Publications
Texture:
1. Identify and compare the musical textures employed in the work (movements, sections, subsections):
   - monophonic (unison playing – one line)
   - homophonic:
     - chordal ("familiar style" – note against note)
     - melody with accompaniment
     - sustained chord accompaniment
     - repeated chord accompaniment
     - arpeggiated accompaniment (Alberré bass)
   - polyphonic:
     - number of parts
     - relative importance of each part
     - degree of melodic independence of each line
     - spacing and crossing of parts
     - contrapuntal techniques employed:
       - imitation (note strictness and distance), stretto, augmentation, inversion, retrograde, others
       - parallel, oblique, and contrary motion
       - freistimmig (free voice writing)
   - hybrid textures (combinations of homophonic and polyphonic):
     - prominent melody with polyphonic accompaniment
     - quasi-contrapuntal style
     - figuration
   - special texture related effects:
     - antiphonal
     - responsorial

2. Examine the density (thickness or thinness) of each movement, section, and subsection. Notice how the orchestration (and the harmony) contribute to the textural sound of the musical fabric.

Dynamics:

1. Examine the overall dynamic scheme of the composition (horizontal dynamics):
   - perimeters (lowest and softest dynamics)
   - climaxes, subclimaxes, and low points

2. Examine the dynamic curve of large sections, subsections, periods, phrases.

3. Study the balances within each phrase (vertical dynamics):
   - melody vs. accompaniment
   - primary to secondary (subordinate) material
   - instrument tessituras (register strength or weakness)

4. Notice the composer’s use of dynamic effects:
   - terrace dynamics
   - extremely loud or soft dynamics
   - polydynamics (simultaneous use of contrasting dynamics)
   - dynamic accent (fpp, pp, sfz, sfp)
   - orchestrated crescendo or diminuendo
   - suble dynamic nuances
   - subtle changes of dynamics
   - extremely quick or slow crescendos or diminuendos

5. Notice the specificity (or lack thereof) with which the composer indicates dynamic crescendos and decrescendos. Observe whether or not specific dynamic markings are indicated at the beginning and ending of crescendos and decrescendos.

Stylistic Articulations & Expressive Terms:

1. Examine the composer’s expressive use of stylistic articulations (symbols and words) – legato, staccato, marcato, tenuto, polysarticulations.

2. Study all musical terms used by the composer to indicate expression (for example, leggiero, cantabile, dolce, expressivo, and so on).

3. Consider the performance practices of the historical style period represented by the composition:
   - instrumentation and orchestration
   - tempi and rhythms
   - dynamics
   - ornaments and embellishments
   - articulations and vibrato

“Guide to Score Study for the Wind Band Conductor: Chapter 3, Score Analysis

Guide” cont. Used with permission, Meredith Music Publications
APPENDIX C

TOCCATA FOR BAND ORCHESTRATION CHART
Chart C.1: Toccata for Band orchestration chart
Chart C.1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>148</th>
<th>154</th>
<th>171</th>
<th>(179)</th>
<th>184</th>
<th>188</th>
<th>196</th>
<th>(200)</th>
<th>203</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flutes</td>
<td>Oboe</td>
<td>Sop. Clarinets</td>
<td>Alto Saxophone</td>
<td>Tenor Saxophone</td>
<td>Bass Clarinet</td>
<td>Bar Saxophone</td>
<td>Bassoons</td>
<td>Trumpets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horns</td>
<td>Trombones</td>
<td>Euphonium</td>
<td>Tubes</td>
<td>String Bass</td>
<td>Timpani</td>
<td>Snare Drum</td>
<td>Bass Drum</td>
<td>Cymbals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theme 1 | Theme 2 | Theme 3 | Accompaniment | Transitional material
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