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The early history of the wind band is rooted in the practical uses for wind instruments. The early “wind instruments were often associated with military, courtly, and civic activities.”¹ Then during the Renaissance era (1400-1600), composers like Giovanni Gabrieli, who according to Frank Battisti was the “father of orchestration,” began to orchestrate for specified instrumentation within the church.² When writing Sonata pian’e forte, c. 1597, Gabrieli took “a great step forward in the establishment of purely instrumental ensembles” as artistic purposes rather than for solely functional purposes, by notating specific dynamics for the instruments.³

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a new wind group emerged, coinciding with the development of the clarinet, called the Harmonie ensemble.⁴ Consisting of pairs of oboes, clarinets, bassoons, and horns, many great composers of the time, such as Mozart, Haydn, Krommer, and Beethoven contributed repertoire for this ensemble, and thus the body of work that developed as a result of this ensemble has come to be known as Harmoniemusik. Unfortunately, due to the economic conditions caused by increasing military conflicts with the French

⁴ Cipolla and Hunsbeerbe, 59.
Revolution, the American Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, many of the Viennese aristocratic Harmoniemusik ensembles began to disappear toward the end of the eighteenth century.\(^5\) However, after its disappearance, ongoing developments in the technology of instrument design and manufacture (development of piston valve in 1813 by Blumel, conical-bore flute by Boehm in 1832, the invention of the saxophone in 1840 by Adolphe Sax, and the application of Boehm’s ring system to the clarinet in 1843) allowed composers such as Hector Berlioz, Felix Mendelssohn, Richard Wagner, and Richard Strauss the opportunity to integrate wind instruments into their compositions, which eventually included new works for the wind band.

By the early 1900s, the wind band began developing into an artistic medium that attracted new composers with its unique sonorities. Composers such as Gustav Holst, Ralph Vaughan Williams, Percy Grainger, Igor Stravinsky, and Florent Schmitt began writing specifically for winds, which further promoted the wind band’s status as an artistic ensemble. Over the years, such Pulitzer Prize-winning composers as Karel Husa, Joseph Schwantner, and John Corigliano used the wind ensemble as a medium for artistic purposes. The two composers on which this document focuses, Paul Hindemith and Frank Ticheli, also wrote music specifically for wind band, by adapting and manipulating the music before them to create artistic masterworks for this medium. In doing so, Hindemith integrated characteristics similar to Stravinsky’s neo-classical techniques, but manipulated the harmonic language to fit his compositional style while Ticheli used diverse sonorities and textures to create music that highlights the wind ensemble’s potential. There is little doubt that

Hindemith and Ticheli contributed greatly to the development of the wind band and its repertoire.
PAUL HINDEMITH

Born on 16 November 1895 in Hanau, Germany, Paul Hindemith began violin lessons at age nine and later studied with Adolf Rebner at the Hoch Conservatory in Frankfurt, Germany. Hindemith later attended the Hoch Conservatory as a student in 1908 to continue his studies on violin, but during this time he also explored composition. Rebner noticed Hindemith’s interest and encouraged him to write a piece for violin, so that he could play it on the “end-of-term concert.” In 1912, Hindemith began studying composition and counterpoint with Arnold Mendelssohn and later studied with Bernhard Sekles. According to Geoffrey Skelton, “Mendelssohn concentrated primarily on musical forms” with Hindemith, and Sekles focused on composition techniques including “fugues and chorales in strict four-part counterpoint.”

As a performer, in June of 1915, Hindemith accepted his first paid position as a member of the first-violin section within the Frankfurt Opera, which allowed him

---

7 Skelton, 34.
9 Skelton, 35.
to support his family and continue his schooling.\(^{10}\) In addition to performing with the Frankfurt Opera, Hindemith also was a member of the Rebner Quartet until 1921 (a string quartet founded by his violin professor); he played bass drum in a military band in 1918; and he eventually founded the Amar Quartet, in which he played viola, in 1921 at the Donaueschingen Music Festival.\(^{11}\) The Amar Quartet was very important for performing and premiering new works during the 1920s. As a result, it became one of the most influential quartets advocating for contemporary music until it disbanded in 1933.\(^{12}\)

Though his reputation was growing as a performer, Hindemith continued to compose, and his breakthrough came with his String Quartet No. 2 op. 10 (1921). In 1921, a new music festival under the Sponsorship of Prince Max Egon Furst von Furstenberg, emerged in Donaueschingen specifically dedicated to the development of music for contemporary chamber ensembles, and it eventually became referred to as a *Kamermusikfeste* (chamber music festival).\(^{13}\) “In its promotion of open experimentation and cooperation, the Donaueschingen Music Festival also presented works by composers such as Maurice Ravel, Bela Bartok, Darius Milhaud, 

\(^{10}\) Skelton, 40-41. Hindemith’s father volunteered for the German army in and was a casualty of war, which left Hindemith the responsibility to support his family.

\(^{11}\) Skelton, 41, 48, 65.


Igor Stravinsky, and Arnold Schoenberg.”\textsuperscript{14} Hindemith’s String Quartet No. 2 was featured at the first festival in Donaueschingen. This successful performance allowed Hindemith to remain active as a performer in the festival and more importantly provided him an opportunity to premiere many contemporary chamber works.

By 1926, Hindemith became the head of the music selection committee for the Donaueschingen Music Festival. Hindemith decided that the festival was going to feature “a concert of ‘military band’ music.”\textsuperscript{15} Because the wind band was an emerging artistic medium, the Donaueschingen Music Festival of 1926 was one of the first that featured works specifically written for band. Hindemith wrote \textit{Konzertmusik für Blasorchester}, Op. 41 for this festival; it was premiered on 24 July 1926.

Throughout the 1920s, Hindemith wrote several chamber wind works in addition to \textit{Konzertmusik für Blasorchester}, Op. 41. His dedication to writing for wind instruments is evident in his \textit{Kamermusik} (Chamber Music) series that he composed between 1922 and 1927: each piece within the series features a wind ensemble accompaniment. The first of seven works in the series was written in 1922-1923.\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Kammermusik} Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 (written between 1924 and 1925), consist of four concertos for pianoforte, violoncello, violin, and viola, respectively, and each accompanied by a chamber orchestra. \textit{Kammermusik No. 6 Op 46}, no. 1 (1927) is a concerto for viola d’amore. The final \textit{Kamermusik} work, \textit{Kamermusik}

\textsuperscript{14} Skelton, 72.
\textsuperscript{15} Battisti, \textit{Winds of Change}, 4.
No. 7 Op. 46, no. 2 (1927), is a concerto for organ. Though written for fewer instruments, his *Klein Kammermusik* Op. 24, no. 2 in 1922 is also written for winds. Because Hindemith wrote so many works for wind instruments during the 1920s, it is evident that he had an affection for wind instruments during this time period of his career. According to Arthur Browne, the *Konzertmusik für Blasorchester* Op. 41 and the seven chamber music pieces in the *Kammermusik* series are perhaps the best works that Hindemith wrote during this period.\(^\text{17}\)

Before writing his last installment in the *Kammermusik* series in 1927, Hindemith accepted a position at the Staatliche Hochschule für Musik. In his role as professor, he developed a philosophy that summarized his output before 1927 and would become a common thread with his compositions throughout the rest of his life. In a letter dated 12 February 1927 that he wrote to Willy Strecker, his publisher and friend with Schott Music, Hindemith stated, “Music [needs to] be designed, according the degree of difficulty, to be not only of use for teaching purposes, but also to provide material for amateurs interested in modern music.”\(^\text{18}\) This statement represents Hindemith’s philosophy of music, which coincides with his fondness to write *Sing-und Spielmusik*, music to sing and play. Later, though opposed by Hindemith, this genre was referred to as *Gebrauchsmusik*, music for everyday use, or functional music, a term coined by Heinrich Besseler.

Johann Sebastian Buis writes, “*Gebrauchsmusik*, more often than not associated with Hindemith’s compositions from 1927 through 1932, is connected with the use, function, or purpose for which music is composed and performed,” but

\(^{17}\) Browne, 51.

\(^{18}\) Skelton, 86.
also refers to music that features folk songs and/or written for period
instruments.\textsuperscript{19} Within \textit{Gebrauchsmusik}, “Hindemith tried to prevent alienation
between the modern composer and his audience.”\textsuperscript{20} This genre of music was
intended to bridge the gap between the professional and the amateur musician –
one who practices music seriously – and serves as the connection between the
unfamiliar modern music and the traditional music.\textsuperscript{21} As evident by his letter to
Strecker, Hindemith believed that music, especially modern music, should be made
accessible to the people and to the average musician. Thus, he wrote music for
specific events and period instruments that often integrated traditional folk songs
but were intended to be accessible for average musicians.

Hindemith’s philosophy of \textit{Gebrauchsmusik} is evident in his compositions
beginning as early as the works composed for the Donaueschingen Festival, because
the music was written for a specific purpose and specific early instruments
\textit{(Kammermusik No. 7 Op. 46 no. 1 for viola d’amore).} In 1925 and 1926, according to
Kemp, Hindemith contributed \textit{Lieder nach alten Texten}, Op. 33, and the
\textit{Konzertmusik für Blasorchester}, Op. 41, for unaccompanied chorus and military band
respectively, as an attempt to prevent the festivals from becoming limited to a
specific clique.\textsuperscript{22} Furthermore, because Hindemith suggested writing music
specifically for wind instruments in 1926, he and the other members of the

\textsuperscript{19} Johann Sebastian Buis, “Hindemith and Early European Music in the United States
(1940-1953)” (DMA Diss. Ball State University, 1991), 7, 12, 15.
\textsuperscript{20} Buis, 3.
\textsuperscript{21} Buis, 3.
Donauerschingen music selection committee “aimed to introduce *Gebrauchsmusik* [specifically] for military band.”

In 1932, Hindemith stopped composing *Gebrauchsmusik*, because the National Socialists’ rise to power limited the output of this genre of music. As the National Socialists gained authority, Hindemith eventually was “elected to the Leadership Council of the *Reichsmusikkammer* – an institution for the promotion of good German music.” However, after the premier performance of Hindemith’s controversial *Mathis der Maler Symphony*, Hindemith’s music was in jeopardy of being banned by the National Socialists. Through much debate and conversation, he eventually took an extended leave of absence from the Hoch Conservatory in November 1934 and *Mathis der Maler* was banned in December of 1934.

Amidst the turmoil caused by the performance of *Mathis der Maler* in 1935, Hindemith was invited by the Turkish government to help build a “thriving musical life” that reestablished connections to their native tradition. At first, Hindemith observed rehearsals, concerts, and “inspected whatever music there [was]” in Ankara, Turkey. After suggesting improvements to the music scene in Turkey and serving as a German ambassador by improving relations between the two countries, Hindemith returned to Berlin. He then reported to the new *Reichsmusikkammer*

---

25 Ibid.
27 Skelton, 128.
director Gustav Havemann about his trip to Turkey. According to Skelton, it is not clear if “this report persuaded the Nazi bosses to regard Hindemith with a more favourable eye,” but a few weeks after its submission, one of Adolf Hitler’s biggest supporters and the Reich Minister of Propaganda in Berlin, Joseph Goebbels, made it clear that “he had no objection to a production of *Mathis der Maler* in Frankfurt.”

By Goebbels indicating that he had no objections, Hindemith’s music was no longer “officially banned,” but it also did not mean that his music could be performed either. As a result, conductors in Germany did not want to risk performing his works.

In the autumn of 1936, while visiting Turkey yet again, two performances of Hindemith’s music were scheduled to be performed in Berlin in hopes of rebuilding Hindemith’s reputation in Germany, which was still shaded despite his continued efforts for building relations between Germany and Turkey. After the first performance, the conductor was “admonished,” and the second performance never took place. In a letter to Strecker on 1 November 1936, the composer wrote, “Either things will move in the opposite direction in the near future, which I do not expect, nor (to be honest) really want, or the existing tension will mount even further.” Because his music was removed from the second program and the conductor was reprimanded for programming his music, which led to Hindemith’s fame “spreading abroad, [as] he became a symbol for those still resisting the

---

28 Skelton, 129.  
29 Skelton, 131.  
30 Skelton, 134.  
31 Skelton, 135.
Nazis.” He officially resigned from the Hochschule in Berlin on 30 September 1937, and then toured the United States and other countries, such as England, promoting his music in early 1938. He returned to Berlin to finalize his and his wife Gertrude’s affairs after his tours. Together they emigrated from Germany to Switzerland in September 1938.

Prior to and during his residency in Bluche, Switzerland, Hindemith not only continued to expand his compositional output, he developed an alternative music theory textbook, which according to James Paulding is “perhaps the most important theoretical work on music since Jean-Philippe Rameau’s *Traité de l’harmonie Réduite à Ses Principes Naturels* of 1722 and certainly one of the last important statements on the theory of tonal music by a major composer.” The origins of his textbook *The Craft of Musical Composition*, emerged while he was teaching music theory in Germany and Turkey, though some allude to the theories first emerging in 1927 in Germany. He published two volumes in Germany entitled *Uterwiesung im Tonsatz*, the first book in 1937 and the second in 1939. The English translation of these two texts, *The Craft of Musical Composition*, emerged in 1942. The third volume of this textbook series was not published until after his death in 1970. The first book introduces the theory of Hindemith’s new approach to music composition, and the second text consists of exercises in two-part writing. He initially developed

---

32 Paulding, 202.
34 Paulding, 205.
this system in an attempt to accommodate the twelve-tone system of Arnold
Schoenberg. Though it did not fulfill its goal, *The Craft of Musical Composition* has
emerged as an analytical tool for Hindemith’s music and become a useful resource
when teaching twentieth century music.\textsuperscript{36}

“The basis for Hindemith’s new theory was acoustics, specifically the
harmonic series.”\textsuperscript{37} Paulding summarizes that “he formulates a new theory
regarding scale formation, in which all semitones are equally important. The
traditional view of major and minor tonality is disregarded but classifies the order
in which the twelve tones of the chromatic scale make their appearance, in
diminishing degree of relationship to the given tone as Series 1 (Figure 2.1).”\textsuperscript{38}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2.1.png}
\caption{Series 1}
\end{figure}

\textit{Source:} Paul Hindemith, *The Craft of Musical Composition Book 1: Theory* (New York:

Series 1 is a continuum that classifies specific notes and their intonation tendencies
within the harmonic series to fundamental tone (tonic). After analyzing each pitch’s
intonation tendency related to a fundamental tone, Hindemith then ordered these
pitches based on their degree of separation from the fundamental tone. The closely-
related pitches appear on the left side of the spectrum and those less related appear

\textsuperscript{36} Paulding, 214.
\textsuperscript{37} Paulding, 207.
\textsuperscript{38} Paul Hindemith, *The Craft of Musical Composition Book 1: Theory* (New York:
on the right side. This theory then led Hindemith to expand his thoughts regarding the harmonic system, and argue there is a natural order to intervals as well. Therefore, every interval has specific harmonic and melodic characteristics ranging from consonant to dissonant, which he labels Series 2 (Figure 2.2).  

Figure 2.2. Paul Hindemith Series 2.  

When analyzing The Craft of Musical Composition Book 2, Kevin O'Connell elaborates on the two series in Hindemith’s theories:

Both Series operate on the principle of increasing tension the further to the right one reads. The ordering of the 12 tones in Series 1 has nothing to do with a 12-tone row. On the contrary, the first note is a tonic or 'source tone' and the subsequent notes are defined by their level of tension in relation to it (and not to each other). In the interval chart that forms Series 2, divided into sub-groups A and B, the tension level also increases from left to right. Hindemith describes the intervals on the left as having the greatest harmonic value while those on the right have the greatest melodic value. The tritone stands outside both of these categories, for according to Hindemith its status is neutral until a third pitch is added.  

---

39 Paulding, 207.  
According to Hindemith, the significance in this theory is that,

The key [center of a piece of music] and its body of chords is not the natural basis of tonal activity [within the work]. What nature provides are the intervals. The juxtaposition of intervals, or of chords, which are the extensions of intervals, gives rise to the key. We are no longer the prisoners of the key. Rather, we now have a free hand to give the tonal relations whatever aspect we deem fitting. The different harmonic tensions, which we need for this purpose, are indicated by the ranking of interval-values.  

In other words, the tonal center emerges from the intervals because the intervals between the notes imply harmonic function. Meaning that intervals of perfect fourths and perfect fifths are consonant intervals that create harmonic motion, even if used in succession. In addition, dissonant intervals are often the framework for melodic purposes. As a result, Hindemith’s music is often very difficult to analyze in terms of tonal music theory because the accidentals are introduced not as a result of specific modulations or tonal balances, but as the result of the immediate demands of voice leading, such as avoidance of awkward intervals both vertically and horizontally. Therefore, Hindemith’s harmonic language often does not resemble that of Baroque music because pitches frequently do not appear in clearly defined major-minor tonalities. His melodic material often integrates chromatic and step-wise motion, which is “the main carrier for propulsion and musical expressivity” and “larger intervals to establish harmonic motion.”  

Prior to Hindemith and his contemporaries, composers often thought within the limitations

---

41 Hindemith, *Craft Book 1*, 107.
42 O’Connell, 6
43 O’Connell, 7.
of tonality. Thus, Hindemith’s philosophy that the intervals are actually the building blocks of music and that they are grouped according to their relationship to each other, allowed composers of any style to no longer be confined to major and/or minor tonalities.44

After living in Switzerland for two years, Hindemith immigrated to the United States of America in January 1940 in search of employment. He arrived in New York on 16 February 1940 and became a professor at the University of Buffalo. To earn enough for a decent living, Hindemith also taught one day a week at Wells College and lectured at Cornell University and Yale University.45 In April 1940, after several successful lectures at Yale, the School of Music there offered him a permanent position as Visiting Professor of Music Theory; by January 1941, to ensure Hindemith would remain on faculty, Yale offered him full professorship.46 47 He and his wife settled in New Haven, Connecticut, where they eventually obtained citizenship in 1946. When World War II ended in 1945, Hindemith wanted to return to Europe to give concerts and lectures. In 1947, the first European tour took place and he eventually returned to Europe a second time in August 1948 during which he traveled through Switzerland to Germany, and spent the New Year in Italy and Sicily. Collectively, these two tours allowed Hindemith time to compose new works and give countless concerts all across Europe, now that the land was not under the Nazi party’s rule.

44 O’Connell, 16.
45 Skelton, 173-174.
46 Skelton, 175.
In early 1949, after his European tours, Hindemith received an offer from the University of Zurich to teach music theory and composition. Arriving at an agreement between Yale and the University of Zurich, in 1951 he began teaching at both schools. It was also in 1951 that he wrote his masterwork for band, Symphony in B-flat. Two years later, he retired from teaching and focused on composing and conducting. Living the remainder of his life in Switzerland, but maintaining an active conducting and teaching schedule, Hindemith became ill in the fall of 1963 and died on 28 December 1963. Throughout his life Hindemith’s compositional style evolved to incorporate many characteristics similar to those of eighteenth and nineteenth century music. However, though he looked back to the music characteristics of those before him, he often manipulated and developed these borrowed techniques to inform to his own writing style.

The first major compositional change emerged in Hindemith’s writing in the early 1920s. After World War I, many composers, like Hindemith, had “a new interest in reestablishing ties with the distant past while avoiding the excesses of the immediate past,” specifically impressionism and expressionism. Thus, artists often felt the need to “reject the inflated pretensions of the post-Romantic individualism” and consequently developed a renewed respect for “clarity, objectivity, and order.” During the years between World War I and World War II, composers began writing music that incorporated neoclassical techniques: syncopated rhythms; lyrical melodies; clear, transparent, and sometimes sparse
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instrumental textures; the use of forms developed in the eighteenth century; and more than one tonal center within a composition.\textsuperscript{50} One of the first composers to integrate and develop the use of neoclassical techniques was Igor Stravinsky.

At the beginning of Stravinsky’s compositional career, he was highly influenced by Rimsky-Korsakov and Russian theatre.\textsuperscript{51} These early years are referred to as his Russian period and are characterized by his incorporation of folk music and nationalism.\textsuperscript{52} During this time, Stravinsky composed his three most important ballets for Serge Diaghilev’s Ballets Russes: *The Firebird* (1910), *Petrushka* (1911), and *The Rite of Spring* (1913).\textsuperscript{53} Unfortunately, after World War I and the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, Stravinsky was forced to leave Russia.\textsuperscript{54} Scott Lubaroff writes that Stravinsky’s “separation from his homeland and Russian publishers, as well as from Diaghilev and the temporarily disbanded Russian Ballet, necessitated some changes in the mediums for which Stravinsky wrote.”\textsuperscript{55}

These changes led to Stravinsky’s incorporation of neoclassical characteristics of clearer instrumental textures, eighteenth-century forms, and classical tendencies. According to Lubaroff, “at first, the change [in Stravinsky’s style] was due to limited resources, but ... these adaptations began to manifest themselves in the form of a professed preference for the sounds of wind
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instruments and piano, as opposed to strings.” In *Histoire du Soldat*, Stravinsky continued his allegiance to the stage while simultaneously shrinking the performing forces by writing for seven instrumentalists (clarinet, bassoon, trumpet, trombone, percussion, violin, and string bass). Lubaroff notes that this instrumentation marked a change to Stravinsky’s *concertante* style, in which a thinner texture results from one instrument representing a family of instruments, and to his developing preference for wind instruments. Stravinsky’s preference for wind instruments also manifested itself in his *Symphonies of Wind Instruments* (1920), composed for twenty-three wind instruments.

In his other compositions completed during the early 1920s, Stravinsky further developed his incorporation of neoclassical techniques. The next major composition that manifested the transition in Stravinsky’s compositional style was *Mavra* (1922). As a one-act opera buffa, *Mavra* shows a tendency to “look back” to forms, structures, harmonies and textures of the past. The final component of Stravinsky’s compositional transformation is evident in *Pulcinella* (1919-1920). Though not originally written by Stravinsky, he revealed that his work on *Pulcinella* led him to a new appreciation of eighteenth-century classicism and to “a new style of composition distinguished by classical features.”
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stylistic changes – writing for smaller wind ensembles, looking back to forms of the past, and incorporating classical features – coalesced collectively in his *Octet for Wind Instruments* (1923).

At the same time that Stravinsky was integrating his neoclassical characteristics, a related movement called *Neue Sachlichkeit* (New Objectivity) emerged in Germany.61 *Neue Sachlichkeit*’s specific purpose within music was its accessibility to the masses, reversion to harmonic tonality, and structural simplification.62 In her history text, Marie Stolba writes “*Neue Sachlichkeit* is characterized by a preference for absolute music, a greater emphasis on counterpoint, an economy of performing resources, and a revival of eighteenth-century traditional forms, with thematic material subject to techniques and compositional processes then favored.”63 Therefore, similarly to Stravinsky, “German artists and writers, in reaction to the intense emotion aesthetics and psychological attitudes of [post-Romantic expressionism and impressionism], established a movement known as the *Neue Sachlichkeit*, or ‘New Objectivity,’ which advocated a return to simplicity, austerity, and a directness of expression devoid of

the superfluous elaborations that had been acquired in the arts throughout the preceding eras.”

With the emergence of Neue Sachlichkeit in 1923, the same year Stravinsky wrote his Octet, Hindemith began changing his writing style, as is evident in the song cycle Das Marienleben Op. 27 (1922-1923), which according to musicologist Stephen Hinton, is considered a pivotal work for Hindemith because it incorporates the use of a falling semitone sigh (chromaticism) and it implies that the accented passing tones and/or suspensions resolve on a weak beat.” In addition, at the same time as Das Marienleben, Hindemith began work on the Kammermusik series. Because Das Marienleben and the Kammermusik have been labeled by scholars as pivotal compositions in which Hindemith’s true compositional style emerged, one can infer that Hindemith welcomed and integrated the new, objective compositional approaches of the time, as opposed to Stravinsky, who changed his compositional style out of necessity.

Hindemith’s gravitation towards Neue Sachlichkeit characteristics, advocating for Gebrauchsmusik, and integration of his new compositional theories within his compositions define his writing style during a two-decade span of his middle career. Two works for chamber winds that use these three compositional devices are Kammermusik No. 7 Op. 46 no. 2 (1927) and Septett für Blasinstrumente (1948). However, his compositional style developed and evolved between these two

---

works. By comparing two works of Hindemith’s mature writing, the Kammermusik No. 7 Op. 46 no. 2, an early composition and Septett für Blasinstrumente, a late composition, the evolution of his writing for winds is explored in this document, so that his importance in the development of the wind band repertoire can be observed.

KAMMERMUSIK NO. 7

The Kammermusik series (1922-1927) consists of seven pieces highlighting Hindemith’s adoption of Neue Sachlichkeit. According to Stephen Hinton, the Kammermusik compositions use “relatively small instrumental forces” and the writing is much leaner than music of the Romantic era. The traditional sense of intimacy and dialogue associated with chamber music part writing is absent in these works. Rather, this series displays virtuosic technique by all players, soloists and the chamber ensemble. Kammermusik No. 2 and 7 highlight the characteristics of both Neue Sachlichkeit and Gebrauchsmusik, because Kammermusik pieces were composed for the Donaueschingen Music Festival and the inauguration of a new organ in the Frankfurt’s broadcasting service.

The Kammermusik series integrates two distinguished changes from the Romantic period and Hindemith’s earlier compositions, before 1922. First, these works consist of a departure from an “opulent, sonorous, blended orchestral sound, a romantic virtuosity, and a harmonically-backed sound technique,” which provide a

---
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contrast from the symphony orchestra so prominent in the Romantic Era.\textsuperscript{68}

Secondly, these works revive pre-classical music, which features a new emphasis on melody without harmonic support, integrates linear-counterpoint, employs fewer instruments, and incorporates traditional forms.\textsuperscript{69} Because these characteristics are very similar to those exploited by Stravinsky and his neoclassical techniques, it should be noted that the characteristics associated with \textit{Neue Sachlichkeit} and neoclassical techniques are the same, except for the region in which these movements occurred. Therefore, the concept of incorporating and manipulating traditional forms, integrating linear-counterpoint, employing fewer instruments, and developing clear objective textures will henceforth be labeled as neoclassical characteristics.

\textit{Kamermusik Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 (opus 36)} were written between 1924 and 1927 and consist of four concertos for pianoforte, violoncello, violin, and viola, respectively, each accompanied by a chamber orchestra. \textit{Kamermusik No. 6} Op. 46, no. 1 is a concerto for viola d'amore, a viola popular during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and \textit{Kamermusik No. 7} Op. 46 no. 2 is a concerto for organ.\textsuperscript{70} As mentioned by Browne, these seven chamber works are perhaps the best, because they are the most representative works of Hindemith's compositional style and they are a fine contribution to neoclassical music.\textsuperscript{71}

\textsuperscript{71} Browne, 51.
The orchestra parts within each work are often as important as the soloist. The traditional accompanimental roles of the orchestra are enhanced within these works, and the supporting lines feature virtuosic playing similar to those in the solo part. The chamber instruments often introduce and develop the thematic material and motives similar to that of a soloist in the classical era. Hindemith created the interaction between the accompaniment and the solo to acknowledge the traditional solo concerto but also seemed to recognize a change in the role of the accompanying parts in chamber music.\textsuperscript{72}

The final piece in the Kammermusik series was written in 1927-1928 for organ solo and chamber ensemble. The world premier of Kammermusik No. 7 Op. 46 no. 2 took place on 8 January 1928 as part of a private concert to mark the inauguration of the organ at the broadcast studio of the Frankfurt Radio Broadcasting Station. The Frankfurt Radio Orchestra was under the direction of Ludwig Rottenberg, Hindemith’s father-in-law. Reinhold Merten played the organ solo during the premiere, and Hindemith traveled from Berlin to Frankfurt to attend the performance in the broadcasting studio.\textsuperscript{73}

Hindemith’s Kammermusik No. 7 Op. 46 no. 2 is set for a chamber ensemble consisting of piccolo, flute, oboe, clarinet, bass clarinet, two bassoons, contrabassoon, French horn, trumpet (in C), trombone, cello, and contrabass. With the exception of bassoon, there is only one member of each instrument family used in the work. As a result of this reduced instrumentation, the orchestration used

\textsuperscript{72} Schubert, IV.
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represents that of a symphony orchestra, just as Stravinsky did when he integrated his *concertante* style.

The form of the first movement of Hindemith’s *Kammermusik No. 7* is a derivative of sonata form used in a Classical concerto. There are two distinct differences between the typical sonata form and that which is used in a Classical concerto sonata form. The traditional concerto sonata form’s exposition is usually stated twice, first by the orchestra, and the second by the orchestra and soloist.74 Therefore, the orchestra introduces both the main theme and second theme before the soloist enters. Secondly, the concerto sonata form adds a cadenza directly before the coda, if one is present.75 As expected when integrating neoclassical techniques, Hindemith adopts the traditional form, but alters these two major characteristics of the standard concerto sonata form and others in the first movement’s formal structure.

Just as in sonata form, the exposition (ms. 1-64) has two themes. The chamber ensemble introduces the main theme (ms. 1-20) in A (Figure 2.3).

![Figure 2.3: Kammermusik No. 7 Op. 46 no. 2, Theme 1, mm. 1-20. Source: Paul Hindemith Kammermusik No. 7 Op. 46 no. 2.](image)
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The first alteration of the typical form occurs when Hindemith chooses not to introduce the second theme in the orchestra’s initial statement of the exposition. Instead, he immediately rescores the main theme in the organ solo (ms. 21-38).

Furthermore, unlike conventional sonata form where a transition exists between the main theme and the first subordinate theme, to create a tonal conflict, a transition between the first and second theme is omitted from Kammermusik No. 7’s exposition. In its place, to create the tonal conflict necessary within the exposition, he superimposes Theme 1 (transposed down a minor 6th) in the chamber orchestra with that of Theme 2 in the organ (ms. 39-54)(Figure 2.4).

By doing so, he disguises Theme 2’s entrance and masks the use of the traditional concerto sonata form.

Furthermore, the harmonic relationship between the first tonal area (A) and the second tonal area (D) does not follow the standard sonata form. Typically, the first tonal area is presented in one key (in this case, it is A). Then, after a transition, the second tonal area is stated on the dominant of the first tonality (what would be
E). However, the interval of a perfect fourth is very constant according to Hindemith’s theories presented in the *Craft of Musical Composition*. Therefore, Hindemith’s presentation of the two tonal areas separated by a perfect fourth instead of a perfect fifth supports his belief that the perfect fourth and the perfect fifth function similarly in a harmonic role.

After the organ’s statement of the subordinate theme in m. 55, the clarinet emerges from the texture with material based on Theme 2 and is accompanied by the bassoons, contrabassoon, strings, and organ (mm. 55-64). Though this section is based on Theme 2 material, it is not a complete statement of the second theme, and it functions to reinforce the tonal area of the subordinant theme. Therefore, this section functions not as a restatement of Theme 2, but as the closing section of the exposition, with a codetta (mm. 62-64).

The development begins in m. 65, which highlights material from Theme 1. Initially beginning with the full chamber ensemble playing two measures in unison (mm. 65-66), Hindemith quickly thins the texture of the development. Between the oboe and clarinet, Theme 1 is developed and is supported by a continuo-like figure in the strings; meanwhile, the organ provides virtuosic counterpoint to the first theme. The instrumental roles, though, change in m. 74 between the organ and winds; the organ takes over playing material derived from Theme 1 while the orchestra, still reduced instrumentation, plays similar virtuosic contrapuntal material, as if taking over the role of the soloist. According to Jeffery Brankes, “the organ and orchestra share equal importance [in this section] because of the contrapuntal texture that emphasizes individual parts, and the use of instruments
other than the organ as soloists.” That is to say, while the organ is the soloist, every ensemble part in this work also serves as a soloistic instrument and is treated as such throughout this composition. For the first time in this work, the instrumentalists in m. 74 become the “virtuosic soloist” and the organ supports them.

Hindemith returns to the original tonal center in the recapitulation in m. 111, thus following a traditional sonata form. However, he deviates from the original form because he does not restate the second theme in the recapitulation. Despite this departure from the norm, according to Glenn Spring and Jere Hutcheson, “the sense of return may not be affected if a theme is omitted altogether.” Furthermore, within a concerto sonata form, the soloist often plays a cadenza before the coda section. Because the return of Theme 1 in the recapitulation also features a drastic textural change to an organ solo, this section resembles that of a cadenza. After the brief organ solo establishes the sense of return, a coda ensues in m. 118. The presence of both C-naturals and C-sharps in the section serves to divorce major and minor tonality, and instead settles on the most resonant pitch, A. By disguising the entrance of the second theme, eliminating the transition, shortening the orchestra’s statement of the exposition, and eliminating the traditional cadenza before the coda, this movement is evidence of Hindemith’s manipulation of traditional forms to accommodate his writing style.

---
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The monothematic second movement has an eleven-measure theme that can be divided into four different phrases (Figure 2.5).
Figure 2.5: Paul Hindemith, *Kamermusik No. 7* Op. 46 no. 2 movement 2, mm. 1-13.

Introduced first by the organ in canon, displaced by one measure, and at the interval of an augmented octave, the theme is accompanied by a descending ostinato bass line. This theme sounds very dissonant because of the augmented octave separation. However, the theme itself contains mostly stepwise motion. Based on his Series 2, the intervals of seconds suggest more of a melodic role than a harmonic role. There
are many nonharmonic tones and notes with more harmonic function than melodic function. Because the notes of the second phrase consist of mostly seconds, the overall motion of this melody can be interpreted as a quality musical line, according to Hindemith’s theories.

The movement is composed in ternary form, A B A’ (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1: Kammermusik No. 7 Op. 46 no. 2 – Formal Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Tonality</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Organ Solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 1-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canon: Displaced by one measure at the interval of an augmented octave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Organ and Chamber Ensemble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 12-26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fugato section: Various entrances of the original theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Organ and Clarinets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 27-33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canon in Organ displaced by one beat; Clarinets play theme displaced by one measure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the organ’s first statement of the theme, stretto-like entrances throughout the chamber ensemble characterize the B section, and build to the climax of the movement in m. 21. Each entrance in the chamber ensemble (flute m. 12; oboe m. 14; clarinets and bassoon 1 m. 17; and bassoon 2, French horn, and cello m. 18) is based on the first phrase of the main theme, but is transposed to a different starting pitch. Meanwhile the organ develops motives from the first phrase. In m. 22 the brass and low voices in the chamber ensemble diminuendo until the return of the A section in organ. The return of A is different in two ways. First instead of the organ
playing the theme in a canon, displaced by one measure and at the interval of an augmented-octave, it is performed in canon displaced by an eighth-note at the interval of an octave. The second change to the return of the A section is the addition of another statement of the theme in the clarinets in m. 28. As the clarinets concluded their statement, the organ proceeds to the coda in m. 36. As outlined, there are many different combinations of instruments throughout this movement. This movement highlights the diverse textures within the chamber orchestra and its use in both supportive and soloistic roles.

The third movement exemplifies Hindemith’s contrapuntal techniques and is labeled as a triple-fugue. To classify a composition as a triple fugue, the definition of a double fugue must first be understood. According to Kent Kennan, “a double fugue [has] two subjects that appear together at some point in the work.” Consequently, if one applies the definition provided by Kennan to a triple fugue, the resulting definition is characterized by three subjects that appear simultaneously at some point in the musical composition.

The exposition of Kammermusik No. 7’s third movement follows the structure of a five-voice fugue and it begins with a six-measure subject, which is recognizable by the rhythmic nature of the ascending augmented triad in the first measure (Figure 2.6).

---

After this identifiable motive of the subject, its remaining material is very rhythmic and features much chromaticism. A real answer follows the subject in m. 7 that is written one whole-step below the original subject. Complementing the answer, in the trumpet voice, Hindemith wrote a line that could be labeled as a countersubject, which is less rhythmic than the subject. According to Kennan, the countersubject must have “melodic interest, individuality, and enough rhythmic contrast to make it a good foil for the subject.”\textsuperscript{79} When applying Hindemith Series 2 principles to the countersubject, it can be determined that the overall structure consists primarily of stepwise motion. Hence, the countersubject compliments the character of the subject, and contains the rhythmic contrast necessary. However, it fails to recur frequently enough throughout the exposition to provide enough evidence to classify this material as a countersubject and therefore should be labeled as free counterpoint to the subject. It is important to note that the organ does not present a complete statement of the first subject; rather, the organ continues to develop the thematic ideas presented in the subject, which is further evidence that Hindemith treated the solo and chamber ensemble parts as equals.

This second subject in m. 84 is identified primarily by its intervallic structure

\textsuperscript{79} Kennan, 207.
and is unique because the voices are not presented in an imitative fashion (Figure 2.7).\textsuperscript{80}

![Subject and Countersubject]

Figure 2.7: Kammermusik No. 7 Op. 46 no. 2 movement 3, mm 84-88

However, imitative entrances of this subject do occur in m. 102, and the subject serves as the framework from which free material is derived in the organ and winds throughout this fugue’s section. Therefore, even though this particular subject does not conform to the traditional fugue, it certainly intended to function as one.

In addition to the identifiable intervalllic characteristic of this subject, the important component of this fugal section is the orchestration technique. The organ first introduces the subject in the bass voice, and the countersubject is presented in the soprano voice beginning in m. 85. After four statements of the subject and countersubject, the lowest voice of the organ is removed from the texture in m. 102 and is then replaced with a unison line for oboe, clarinet, bass clarinet, and bassoons in m. 102. The chamber ensemble interjects with rhythmic punches in mm. 115-119 while the organ develops the second fugue’s subject. This interaction between
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soloist and ensemble differs from any to this point. Eleven measures later, this same material returns, but now with roles reversed. The role-exchange between organ and chamber ensemble continues throughout the remainder of this section, highlighting drastic texture and timbre changes, until the third and final theme is presented in the organ in m. 152.

Considerably different from either of the other two subjects, the third subject is characterized by a smoother and less rhythmic motive (Figure 2.8).

Figure 2.8: Kammermusik No. 7 Op. 46 no. 2 movement 3, mm 152-154.

Like the second subject though, the third subject is not introduced in a typical imitative manner. Instead, Hindemith simultaneously inverts the subject and transposes the motive as if this subject existed in the middle of a fugue as an entry. After a brief statement from the organ, the first subject motive returns in the chamber orchestra, which serves to retransition to the first subject.

A recapitulation in a fugue is very similar to that of sonata form, except that
“it does not mean a literal repetition of the exposition, but rather a similar section in which the subject[s] and countersubject[s], if any, are stated again.”\textsuperscript{81} Therefore, similarly to the beginning of the movement, the textures in the recapitulation consist of a statement of the subject by the trumpet, followed by a statement of the answer by the clarinet. The return of the first subject also reestablishes the chamber ensemble’s role in this work. Because the first fugue subject is only presented by the chamber orchestra without organ, it can be implied that Hindemith wrote this section to highlight the chamber ensemble’s colors, timbres, and textures, which could affirm his desire for clarity in his music.

Within the recapitulation, Hindemith layers the themes. After a statement of the second subject in m. 261 and the third subject in m. 283, the fugue’s construction begins to evolve m. 293, in which the first and second subjects are superimposed. Hindemith further manipulates the form by combining the second and third subjects in m. 293. In m. 307 the organ combines all three subjects, so that this movement satisfies all the requirements for a triple fugue. The organ solo merges motives from all three themes to create what seems to be a new theme. However, each subject’s identifiable characteristics are masterfully fused together so that each subject compliments the other themes. Since the organ theme has three independent and contrasting themes that are developed throughout the entire work and are presented simultaneously within the movement, this movement, according to Kennan’s definition, can justifiably be classified as a triple fugue.

\textit{Kammermusik No. 7} utilizes many of the characteristics that have come to
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define Hindemith’s compositional style. He incorporated transparent textures
(especially those used in the second subject of the third movement); manipulated
traditional forms (as evident in the sonata form in movement one and the triple
fugue in the third movement); wrote for smaller wind instrument ensembles
(similar to Stravinsky), but integrated the chamber orchestra and organ equally
throughout the piece; and utilized his complex harmonic language throughout the
entire piece. Furthermore, because this composition was written for the
inauguration of the organ at the broadcast studio of the Frankfurt Radio
Broadcasting Station, Hindemith affirmed his affection for *Gebrauchsmusik* (music
for everyday use, or functional music) while integrating neoclassical techniques into
one composition, *Kammermusik No. 7.*
CHAPTER 3
AN ANALYSIS OF PAUL HINDEMITH’S
SEPTET FOR WIND INSTRUMENTS

During the fall of 1948, Hindemith traveled throughout Europe giving lectures, teaching classes, meeting with old friends, and conducting various ensembles.\footnote{Giselher Schubert, trans. Richard Deveson, Preface: \textit{Septet for Wind Instruments}, (Mainz: B. Schott’s Sohne, 1949), III.} After nearly three months of travel, he “arrived in Taormina in Sicily on 21 November 1948 and planned to rest after the stresses and strains of his travels,” but by 22 November, he began working on a new composition: \textit{Septet for Wind Instruments}. He began writing the \textit{Septet} on 29 November and completed the fifth and final movement on 7 December.\footnote{Schubert, \textit{Septet}, IV.} “It is not known what prompted him to compose a septet (the work was certainly not commissioned) nor what led him to use the \textit{Alter Berner Marsch} (Old Bernese March) in the finale”; however, it is remarkable that he created the entire composition in eight days.\footnote{Ibid., IV.}

The Orchestra Sinfonia Stabile da Camera gave the premiere performance of Hindemith’s \textit{Septet} on 30 December 1948 in Milan, Italy, with Hindemith conducting.\footnote{Ibid., V.} “Also on the concert was his own arrangement of a suite of French dances from the \textit{Livres de Danceriers} published by Claude Gervaise and Etienne du Tertre, the \textit{3 Stücke für 5 Instrumente} (1925), the suite from the ballet \textit{Der Däman}
(1923), and *Kammermusik No. 4* (Violin Concerto, Op. 36, No. 4, 1925).” Nearly four years after its premier performance on 7 December 1952, Hindemith’s *Septet* was performed in New York, and after the performance, the work received the New York Critics’ Circle award as the best chamber work of the season.

The *Septet* is a multi-movement work that incorporates Baroque counterpoint, Classical forms, a small ensemble (flute, oboe, clarinet, trumpet, French horn, bass clarinet, and bassoon), unique timbre combinations, and tuneful melodies. Though written twenty years after the *Kammermusik No. 7*, the *Septet* returns to a style that characterized many of his early works in the 1920s, which integrate a clearly defined structure. According to Giselher Schubert, “the *Septet* also influenced other composers, such as Stravinsky, who clearly took a lead from Hindemith in his own *Septet* of 1953.” Like Stravinsky, Hindemith experimented with writing for smaller instrumental ensembles. However, unlike Stravinsky, Hindemith wrote for fewer instrumentalists because the clearer, transparent textures were “ideally suited to display the music’s linear style,” rather than writing for smaller forces because of limited resources. Furthermore, according to Ralph Wahl, the *Septet* contains contrapuntal textures, soloistic lines for all winds, and individual parts characterized by a high degree of rhythmic independence. though this piece was composed in 1948, all of these characteristics suggest, Hindemith’s
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writing continued to gravitate toward the integration of neoclassical techniques late into his career.

The overall formal design of the Septet is a palindrome. The movements are organized in fast-slow-fast-slow-fast order, in which the slow fourth movement is a retrograde of the slow second movement. In addition, in the first, third, and fifth movements, Hindemith deploys the three basic methods of motivic and thematic manipulation: development, variation, and fugue.\textsuperscript{91} To further support the palindrome structure of this piece, the tonal scheme is outlined in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tonality</td>
<td>E-flat</td>
<td>E-flat - E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E – E-flat</td>
<td>E-flat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Giselher Schubert, trans. Richard Deveson, Preface: Septet for Wind Instruments. (Mainz: B. Schott’s Sohne, 1949), VII.

According to Schaffer, Hindemith used this compositional technique in other works, such as Sonata for Trombone and Piano (1941), Hin und zurück, op. 45a (1927), and the Quintet for Clarinet and String Quartet, Op. 30 (1923, rev. 1954).\textsuperscript{92} According to Colin Mason, Hindemith’s retrograde structure of the Quintet for Clarinet and String Quartet (1923) “may have influenced Bartok in his use of inverted recapitulations.”\textsuperscript{93}
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The first movement of the *Septet* is in sonata form, though like the *Kammermusik No. 7*, it departs from the conventions of the Classical era. As mentioned, Hindemith’s harmonic language does not follow conventional music theory practices, although if his melodies are analyzed in harmonic and melodic contexts, as represented by his Series 1 and 2, the melodies contain both harmonic and melodic cells. An excellent example is presented when the clarinet introduces the main theme in mm. 1-6 (Figure 3.1) in which the defining characteristic is the trill in m. 1.

![Figure 3.1: Septett für Blasinstrumente movement 1, mm. 1-6.](image)

Analyzed using Series 2, the melody’s harmonic implication is strongest on the first beat of measures 2, 3, 4 and since each down beat is approached by either a minor-sixth interval or a perfect fourth interval. Within each measure, the perfect fourth interval, which primarily has harmonic value, is scattered throughout the melody. The other intervals have primarily melodic values and provide more tension and direction for the melodic figure. Though it is difficult to identify a specific tonality at no. 2 (April 1960): 153.
the beginning of the piece, by m. 12 the piece is functioning in E-flat, with a restatement of Theme 1. Because this piece was composed in 1948, Hindemith’s mature period, though he used the framework of sonata form, he manipulated the Classical form. The restatement of Theme 1 in m. 12 is very unusual, but to create variety Hindemith then develops the theme in m. 15-23. This technique of developing the first theme will manifest itself again in the recapitulation.

Following a dependent transition in mm. 24-26, the second theme, m. 27, (Figure 3.2) integrates both harmonic and melodic-based intervals in the thematic line.94

![Figure 3.2: Septett für Blasinstrumente movement 1, mm. 27-36.](image)

However, unlike the main theme, Theme 2 is less rhythmically active and features grace notes, which change the overall character of Theme 2 from that of the main

---

94 A dependent transition is a section that borrows material present in the main theme and “destabilize[s] the home key so that the subordinate key can emerge as a competing tonality in the exposition.” See William E Caplin, Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 125.
theme. In Theme 2, the accompaniment is rhythmically repetitive, where as in the main theme, the rhythms are independent in each voice.

The third and final theme in the sonata form exposition is introduced in m. 58 (Figure 3.3).

Figure 3.3: Septett für Blasinstrumente movement 1, mm. 58-61.

The defining characteristic of this melody is the rhythmic motion and light character associated with the theme. As a second subordinate theme, its character is closely related to that of the first subordinate theme, but the grace notes are no longer integrated into the theme and the textures are more transparent, which allows specific instruments to be heard. The closing section begins at m. 74 and leads directly to a development section that features motives from all three themes. The development section is unique because the trumpet restates Theme 2 while the accompaniment figures derive from Theme 1 material. Further, Hindemith juxtaposes Theme 2 with Theme 1 material beginning in m. 89. The Theme 1 motives are dispersed throughout the ensemble, which drastically changes its
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95 Benjamin Shaffer, “Paul Hindemith’s Septet (1948): A Look Back to Neue Sachlichkeit” (DMA diss.: University of North Texas, Denton TX. 2010), 27.
timbre. After augmenting the second theme in mm. 99-108, Hindemith transitions into a false recapitulation in m. 114.\textsuperscript{96}

A false recapitulation, according to Caplin, is “a retransition that starts with reference to the opening material from the main theme, usually in the development key just confirmed by a prior half cadence.”\textsuperscript{97} Caplin continues, “Eventually, the music returns to the home key for the true recapitulation.”\textsuperscript{98} Even though there is a false recapitulation with highly developed material, the material present in the false recapitulation also suggests a return of the original tonality, E-flat, during the second half of the theme, with a pedal E-flat in the bass clarinet. Therefore, the two subsequent statements of Theme 1 material imply a return to the original tonality in mm. 124-151.

The original tonality (E-flat) does not return in m.124; instead the tonal center E is implied. However, six measures earlier in mm. 118-123, the tonal implication is that of a B\textsuperscript{7}. Based on Hindemith’s compositional theories, the root progression from B to E is that of either a perfect fifth or a perfect fourth, which are the two intervals with the most harmonic implications. According to William Thomson, Hindemith’s major contribution to music theory is that the fundamental unit for music is not necessarily a major triad but instead the fundamental relationship between the notes.\textsuperscript{99} Therefore, the clear dominant to tonic

\textsuperscript{96} Peter Hoyt, “The ‘False Recapitulation’ and the Conventions of Sonata Form,” PhD. Diss.: University of Pennsylvania, 1999), 17-19.
\textsuperscript{97} Caplin, 159.
\textsuperscript{98} Ibid.
relationship between the end of the false recapitulation and the next section is clearly understood.

If the exposition’s duel statements of the main theme and the dominant-to-tonic relationship between the false recapitulation and m. 124 are taken into consideration, one can suggest that the recapitulation actually begins in m. 124 in which the oboe and bass clarinet each present the main theme. According to Caplin, “the recapitulation is a large section that brings back, usually in modified form, an earlier exposition.”\textsuperscript{100} He continues, “[within the recapitulation] change [may] involve harmonic-tonal organization, melodic-motive material, grouping structure, and formal functions.”\textsuperscript{101} Because both instrumental lines repeat the same melodic material, though different from the original main theme, one can infer that Hindemith not only implied the main theme function, but he also reinforced and solidified this material as the return of the main theme’s by writing the melody twice. The repetition to the Theme 1 motive gives the listener a sense of “return” and thus fulfilling one of the requirements of a recapitulation.\textsuperscript{102} 

The one factor that is unaccounted for is the return to the first tonal center. The dominant-to-tonic relationship at the end of the false recapitulation to m. 124 certainly suggests a structural landmark at m. 124. Though a typical sonata form movement returns to the first tonal area in the recapitulation, Hindemith modifies the formal outline. If one were to analyze a C chord in Hindemith’s music, it may contain the pitches C, E, and G, or C, E-flat, and G within the same measure. The

\textsuperscript{100} Caplin, 161.
\textsuperscript{101} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{102} Spring and Hutcheson, 213.
important factor is not that the chord sounds in a major or minor tonality, but rather its relationship between the chords around it. Additionally, Hindemith applies this same principle to the root movement between the false recapitulation and m. 124. His theory suggests that the important fact of this section is not whether the return of Theme 1 material is in the “traditional” home key, but rather its relationship to the material around it. Since the tonal center is a dominant-to-tonic relationship, the material presented in m. 124 is certainly derived from Theme 1, and the overall function of this section gives the listener a sense of return, m. 124 should be labeled as the beginning of the recapitulation.

The first theme is presented twice in the recapitulation, first by the oboe in m. 124 and second by the bass clarinet in m. 137. Even though the recapitulation does not begin in the first tonal area, the music returns officially to the first tonal area in m. 152 with the statement of the third theme, and the remainder of the movement remains in E-flat. This sonata form movement is an example of Hindemith’s integration of neoclassical techniques because he manipulates the sonata form movement to meet his compositional techniques. Not only does he make use of his complex harmonic language, he incorporates a false recapitulation that leads to a nontraditional recapitulation.

The second movement Intermezzo begins in the same tonality in which the first ended, except in the second movement the key is written in its enharmonic spelling, D-sharp. As its name implies, this movement is predominately lyrical in style and functions as connective material between movements one and three. Scored for wind quintet and bass clarinet (trumpet is tacet in this movement), the
movement resembles that of a rounded binary form. The A section, characterized by double-dotted rhythms, is then composed in “a-b-a” form itself. Though only lasting 11 measures, the primary material (Figure 3.4) begins in the clarinet voice.

Figure 3.4: Septett für Blasinstrumente movement 2, mm. 1-11.

The “b” section develops the material from the primary material into cadenza-like material, in which the rhythmic motive changes from double-dotted rhythms to a triple-based rhythm. The A section concludes with a return of the “a” material, except the orchestration has changed from the clarinet to the flute.

The B section begins in m. 12 with the oboe and creates an sense of forward momentum through an accelerando (vorangehen). As the texture thickens in m. 13,
imitative entrances occur in the flute, clarinet and bass clarinet at a different pitch class, but each entrance retains the same intervallic structure. The B section retransitions back to A in m. 20. To return to the primary motive, Hindemith wrote contrasting material that incorporated both duple- and triple-based rhythms in mm. 17-19, which creates an unsettled nature within the music.

The return of the A’ section also marks a change in orchestration. Instead of the clarinet being featured, the cadenza-like material is scored for flute. In addition to the change in orchestration, the formal structure of the A’ section is shortened. In the A section at the beginning of the movement, the “a” material was 3 measures long, and the “b” material was 4 measures long. The return of A retains the “a-b-a” formal structure but “a” lasts 2 measures and “b” lasts 3 measures, of which the melodic lines make use of rhythmic diminution. Since the material from A returns, but material is compressed, the movement is composed in a rounded binary from. A three-measure coda follows the A material. Harmonically, the tonal center shifts from D-sharp to E, thus giving the entire movement the harmonic relationship of 7 to 8 (Ti – Do) and it provides justification for the enharmonic spelling of E-flat (D-sharp) at the beginning of the movement.

*Variationen* (theme and variation), movement three, includes five statements of a theme. Instead of varying and developing the theme, Hindemith changes the accompanimental material and supporting lines of the theme to establish different characters between each of the statements. The first appearance of the theme (mm. 1-25) is introduced by solo trumpet (Figure 3.5).
The intevallic relationship of this theme is strongly based on the harmonic values of Series 2, especially the opening interval of a perfect fourth. This interval establishes the tonality of F even though there are many non-harmonic tones within the melody. Because Hindemith manipulates the accompanimental figures, the accompaniment of this variation is the least rhythmically active of all the variations.

The second statement (mm. 26-50) is rooted in the tonality of E and has a descending bass line in bassoon and sixteenth-note triplets in the clarinet and bass clarinet. A murmuring character is created in the accompanimental figures while the theme floats above the troubled waters. Though the rhythms are more active in the accompaniment, the material is still beat centered and simplistic. The oboe is scored
to play the third statement of the theme (mm. 51-76) in the tonal center of A, but the accompanimental figures are written in a 9/8 time signature while the melody is written in a ¾ time signature. The differentiation between time signatures naturally implies a duple versus triple feel in this variation. This variation marks the middle of the entire composition. It is also the most rhythmically complex variation within the movement because of the combined duple and triple-based rhythms. As a result, the subsequent variations begin to retransition back to less complicated rhythms.

Returning to the original time signatures in the fourth variation (mm. 77-102), the French horn establishes a B-flat tonal center with the melody. The drastic dynamic shifts and syncopation in the fourth variation accompaniment figures contrast with those in other movements where the material is primarily beat-oriented and reserved. The fifth and final variation (mm. 103-127) reestablishes the home key of F and combines several of the variations’ accompanimental figures. This variation features syncopated rhythms and a combination of duple and triple rhythmic motives to support the original theme, presented in the bassoon and later reinforced by the trumpet. To further enhance the palindrome relationship of this piece, the third movement begins the first statement with trumpet and concludes the final statement with trumpet. In addition, the movement concludes with a six-measure coda in F, which highlights the opening intervallic structure of the theme.

In the fourth movement the palindrome nature of this piece is highlighted. The fourth movement is another Intermezzo and this movement is an exact retrograde of the second movement. For instance, because the second movement concluded with a flute solo, the fourth begins with a flute solo. Hindemith retains the
same formal and harmonic relationships within the fourth movement that are initially presented in the second movement, which transition directly into the fifth movement.

Combining multiple neoclassical characteristics, Hindemith’s fifth movement incorporates earlier forms, lyrical melodies, and more than one tonal area. The final movement, like that of the Kammermusik No. 7, is written using a fugue, specifically a triple-fugue. However, unlike the Kammermusik No. 7, the fifth movement adds an additional layer of complexity. Underneath each fugue, the trumpet performs the Alter Berner Marsch (Old Berese March) (Figure 3.6) as “a kind of cantus firmus.”

Figure 3.6: Septett für Blasinstrumente movement 5, mm. 1-16.

To separate the trumpet even further from the rest of the ensemble, Hindemith writes the march in 2/2, while every other instrument is in a meter equivalent to 12/8. Embodying the Baroque fugue, this movement is characterized by counterpoint, complex polyphony, and driving rhythms. According to O’Connell, Hindemith’s integration of a traditional tune or hymn (the Alter Berner Marsch) is
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103 Schubert, Septet, X.
104 Shaffer, 32.
not uncommon.\textsuperscript{105} In his \textit{Craft of Musical Composition: Book 3}, Hindemith encourages students to explore hymn tunes and folk materials from a variety of sources when writing counterpoint. Furthermore, O’Connell deduces that young composers often struggle to relate to the foreign language that is counterpoint. Integrating familiar tunes gives the student a chance of developing a personal idiom based more on understanding of the material (contrapuntal techniques) than on stylistic mannerisms.\textsuperscript{106}

The first subject (Figure 3.7) establishes its tonal center with the interval of a perfect fourth and then consists of step-wise motion (melodic value-based notes), which begins with the clarinet and is followed by entrances in the flute (m. 7), bassoon (m.11), and bass clarinet (m. 16).

![Figure: 3.7: Septett für Blasinstrumente movement 5, mm. 1-6.](image)

Within the second fugue subject (Figure 3.8), the texture is thinned drastically and much more sparse, rhythmically.

\textsuperscript{105} O’Connell, 13.
\textsuperscript{106} Ibid.
Because the rhythms are neither angular nor unsteady, when the second entry of the subject enters in m. 42, the character of the piece resembles that of a conversation between the instruments. The interaction between the entries significantly alters the character and texture from those of the first fugue subject. This compositional technique is a strong example of the neoclassical characteristic, a desire for clear transparent textures.

The third and final subject (Figure 3.9), presented by the bassoon, begins in m. 73 and contrary to the two earlier fugue subjects, the third subject is written in a legato style.

The final subject resembles the main theme of the first movement because Hindemith integrates a trill, similar to the defining characteristic of the main theme.

Figure 3.8: *Septett für Blasinstrumente* movement 5, mm. 38-42.

Figure 3.9: *Septett für Blasinstrumente* movement 5, mm. 73-75.
in the first movement, which provides the final piece of evidence needed to label this entire composition a palindrome. Similar to the Kammermusik No. 7, in order for the fifth movement of the Septet to be labeled a triple-fugue, all subjects must occur simultaneously at some point within the fugue. In m. 103, a closing section incorporates all three subjects, and the Alter Berner Marsch. With all four styles occurring simultaneously, it is no wonder that music critic Donald Mitchell said, “it was difficult to hear all the parts [in the fifth movement] and impossible to reconcile such widely contrasted musical materials.” As a result, from a technical perspective, the fifth movement is Hindemith’s most complex movement in the Septet. Hindemith combines four different themes, which means four different styles as well. Also, each of the themes has highly contrapuntal lines, so that when they occur simultaneously, the overall texture is extremely thick. This requires complete independence from the players and presents challenges when balancing the ensemble.

Like the Kammermusik No. 7, the Septet exemplifies Hindemith’s unique harmonic technique, the use of fewer instrumentalists, and with a “look-back” to earlier forms, this work should also be classified as a work that integrates neoclassical techniques. These two works differ, however, in one major aspect of neoclassical writing: the clarity of textures. Within the Kammermusik No. 7, though there are moments in which the chamber orchestra integrates independent writing and sparse textures (movement 3, ms. 168-205), the Kammermusik No. 7 features homophonic writing and doublings to create richer textures to compliment the

---

organ. However, the Septet features completely independent writing for each instrument while integrating complex rhythmic and harmonic figures. While both works clearly incorporate neoclassical techniques, the Septet features a greater refinement of his compositional style.

Hindemith explored neoclassical techniques beginning in the early 1920s and continued to refine them throughout the remainder of his compositional career. As a result, his compositions primarily integrate clear, objective lines; complex harmony that incorporate chromatic counterpoint and form a tonal center devoid of major and/or minor tonalities; reduced instrumentation to provide clear, transparent textures; and a manipulation of traditional forms to fit his compositional style. Using neo-classical techniques throughout much of his compositional career, Hindemith wrote many chamber works during his life. Two of these works that warrant a permanent place in the wind band repertoire are his Kammermusik No. 7 Op. 46 no. 2 (1927) and his Septet for Winds (1948).

---


CHAPTER 4
THE LIFE OF FRANK TICHELI
AND AN ANALYSIS OF ANGELS IN THE ARCHITECTURE

Frank Ticheli:

“Dr. Frank Ticheli has established himself as one of the most performed, recognized, and successful composers in the wind band world over the past twenty years.”¹¹⁰ He served as composer in residence with the Pacific Symphony (1991-1998) and has won numerous prestigious awards.¹¹¹ Born on 21 January 1958 in Monroe, Louisiana, Ticheli began his music career at age nine. Having significant exposure to jazz music because his father took him into jazz clubs in New Orleans, Ticheli wanted to play the clarinet. “The local pawn shop had both a clarinet ($80)” and an “old beat-up trumpet ($45).”¹¹² However, since the trumpet was 35 dollars less expensive, his father bought him the trumpet, and thus he began his musical career.¹¹³

¹¹⁰ Linda Moorhouse, “A Study of the Wind Band Writing of Two Contemporary Composers: Libby Larson and Frank Ticheli” (DMA diss.: University of Washington, 2006), 129.
¹¹¹ “His many prestigious awards include a first round ‘Best Classical Album’ Grammy Award nomination in 2001; Honorable Mention at the National Association of Independent Record Distributors (NAIRD) Indie Awards (1995); MacDowell Colony ‘Frances and William Schuman Fellow’ (1994); both the American Academy of Arts and Letters ‘Goddard Lieberson Fellowship’ (1990) and ‘Charles Ives Scholarship’ (1986); a grant from Chamber Music America (2000); the Ithaca College Walter Beeler Memorial Composition Prize (1989); and First Prize awards in the Delius Composition Contest (2000), Britten-on-the-Bay Choral Composition Contest (1999), Texas Sesquicentennial Orchestra Composition Contest (1986), and the Virginia CBDNA Symposium for New Band Music (1986).” See Moorhouse, 131.
¹¹³ Sussman, 10.
During his experience at Berkner High School, in Richardson, Texas, Ticheli’s band director encouraged the young musician’s pursuit of composition. Ticheli was offered opportunities to transcribe pop tunes and arrange music for various ensembles in his high school program. In an interview conducted by Eliahu Sussman, he speculated that these opportunities initiated his career as a composer.\textsuperscript{114}

Upon graduation from Berkner High School, Ticheli stayed in Dallas and attended Southern Methodist University (SMU), where he doubled majored in music education and theory/composition. He studied music education with William Lively and Howard Dunn, and his composition teachers included Bruce Faulconer, Jack Waldenmaier, and Donald Erb.\textsuperscript{115} In her dissertation, Linda Moorhouse spoke with Ticheli regarding his early successes and failures as a composer. Though the faculty as SMU were very supportive, Ticheli said the following regarding his first affirmation that he was in the correct field:

In my junior year I wrote a work called *Poltergeist* under the tutelage of Jack Waldenmaier. Joseph Schwantner was a guest composer at SMU at the time, and he wanted to hear the works of the student composers. He heard *Poltergeist* and was particularly intrigued by it. He was very encouraging to me publicly in front of a whole audience. That really turned me on because he singled me out and said, ‘I like this particular work,’ and urged me to apply to Eastman and so forth. Also around this same time I met Leslie Bassett, when he visited as a guest composer as well. That really fired me up, as he was one of the first persons of any authority to say, ‘You have some talent as a composer.’\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{114} Sussman, 10.
\textsuperscript{115} Moorhouse, 137-138.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., 139.
Ticheli received the Bachelor of Music degree in December 1980 and immediately began teaching at Lakeview Centennial High School in Garland, Texas, as the assistant band director. According to Moorhouse, while still employed, Ticheli applied to the graduate composition programs at the University of Michigan, the University of Illinois, North Texas State University (now the University of North Texas), Indiana University, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Rochester’s Eastman School of Music. Ticheli chose the University of Michigan to pursue his graduate work.

Receiving his Masters in Music in 1983 and his Doctor of Musical Arts in Composition in 1987, Ticheli was a graduate assistant working with the nationally recognized Pulitzer Prize winners Leslie Bassett, William Bolcom, William Albright, and George B. Wilson. Following his graduation, Ticheli taught composition as a faculty member at Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas. While in San Antonio, he explored compositions for orchestra and “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 by Manhattan Beach Music.”

After teaching at Trinity University for three years, he moved to California in
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117 Moorhouse, 140-141.
118 Ibid.
119 John Darling, “A Study of the Wind-Band Music of Frank Ticheli with an Analysis of Fortress, Postcard, and Vesuvius” (DMA diss.: The Ohio State University, 2001), 4-5.
120 Jody Besse, “An Analysis and An Historical Contextualization of Frank Ticheli’s Cajun Folk Songs” (DMA diss.: The University of Southern Mississippi, 2012), 39.
121 Darling, 6; While still a graduate student at the University of Michigan and with the help of the Director of Bands, at the time, H. Robert Reynolds, Ticheli nurtured a strong relationship with Manhattan Beach Music publisher Robert (Bob) Margolis. Subsequently, all of Ticheli’s concert band works are published or rented exclusively by Manhattan Beach Music. See Moorhouse, 133.
1991 and assumed teaching responsibilities at the University of Southern California and served as the composer in residence for the Pacific Symphony.\textsuperscript{122} He remains a professor at the USC Thornton School of Music in the composition department.\textsuperscript{123}

Ticheli has written music for wind band, orchestra, and choir, but he is most popular for his wind band compositions. He tries to write music for all age groups without sacrificing the quality of his writing. According to Moorhouse, “In defining his own compositional style, Ticheli admits there is nothing unique about what he does, and freely confesses he borrows form, structure and ideas from the past.”\textsuperscript{124} He often borrows from the masters before him, but he said, “The challenge is to make borrowed techniques work in a new context.”\textsuperscript{125} As a result, Ticheli acknowledges similarities among all his pieces, including “certain rhythms, harmonies, colors, and certain ways I use accents, percussion instruments, silence, etc.”\textsuperscript{126} He continues:

I’ve certainly developed my own [compositional voice] over time. I love reinforcing accents by doubling the attack point with a string pizzicato or a muted trumpet bite, then removing the doubling during the sustained portion of the note. This keeps the texture translucent and light, while zzing life into the accents… I sometimes enjoy superimposing several layers of activity to make a complex texture. The trick is to strive for maximum activity without sacrificing transparency. If things get too complex, the individual layers combine to form one amalgam, and then I’ve defeated my purpose... The secret, for me, is to keep airspace within

\textsuperscript{122} Besse, 40.
\textsuperscript{123} Frank Ticheli Biography. https://music.usc.edu/frank-ticheli/
\textsuperscript{124} Moorhouse, 157.
\textsuperscript{126} Moorhouse, 159.
and between the actual layers. I use rests within each layer so that a brief window is opened for another layer to come through. Also, I tend to assign each layer its own register and rhythmic identity to maintain its individuality... My [compositional voice] may not be terribly unique, but I've found that those who are aware of them tend to give more powerful performances of my music.\textsuperscript{127}

Knowing that Ticheli is fond of “clear defined forms, removing the doublings during sustained notes, biting muted-brass attacks, layering textures, and transparency in his music,” I will analyze \textit{Angels in the Architecture} and \textit{Wild Nights!} from this frame of reference.

\textbf{Angels in the Architecture:}

Nearly fourteen and a half minutes long, \textit{Angels in the Architecture} takes the listener on a musical journey representing life by portraying “a dramatic conflict between the two extremes of human existence – one divine, the other evil.”\textsuperscript{128} According to an interview published in \textit{The Instrumentalist}, Ticheli said while composing the work, “I'm pulling out all the stops” to create a great piece of music.\textsuperscript{129} When asked, “How did the composition [\textit{Angels in the Architecture}] unfold in your mind?” Ticheli replied:

\begin{quote}
At first I had only a general concept of using hymns from various religions. The premiere will coincide with World Youth Day, for which the Pope will visit Sydney.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{128} Frank Ticheli, \textit{Angels in the Architecture} (Brooklyn, NY: Manhattan Beach Music, 2008), 3.
This got me thinking about faith, spiritual renewal as well as spiritual doubt, angels of darkness and light.¹³⁰

Ticheli’s program note, found in Appendix C, highlights the formal structure of *Angels in the Architecture*. Like much of Ticheli’s work, this piece contains a clearly defined form. While Ticheli’s label of a “five-part rondo form (light – darkness – light – darkness – light)” is effective, he offers a more thorough formal analysis within the score. Table 4.1 outlines the overall formal structure of *Angels in the Architecture*.

Table 4.1 *Angels in the Architecture* Formal Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Tonality</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E-flat Major</td>
<td>Solo Vocalist representing an angel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 148</td>
<td>Darkness</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A Pedal: C, E, and G Minor</td>
<td>Disjunct, angular, repeated short notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149 – 207</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E-flat Major vs. C Minor</td>
<td>“Chorale of Light” and “Hevenu Shalom Aleichem”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208 – 313</td>
<td>Darkness</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>E-flat and C Minor</td>
<td>Similar characteristics to first statement of the darkness music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314 – 340</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D-flat/B-flat Major</td>
<td>“Chorale of Light” and “Old Hundredth Statement”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341 – 362</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E-flat Major</td>
<td>Solo Vocalist representing an angel; Addition of the tritone in the penultimate measure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note the characteristic differences between the light and dark music. The light music features lyrical lines with open intervals, where as the darkness music is angular, disjunct, rhythmic and often dissonant sounding.

The opening vocal solo, provided below in Figure 4.1, utilizes the notes found in an E-flat major pentatonic scale.

¹³⁰ Blaufuss, 20.
Figure 4.1: *Angels in the Architecture* m. 2

The text, according to Ticheli, is taken from the nineteenth-century Shaker song (Figure 4.2).
Comparing Ticheli’s setting and the original, the significant differences are that Ticheli extends the end of the phrases; the song is transposed up on chromatic half step; and the phrase structure is manipulated. Instead of repeating the B section, he returns to the A section. Within his setting, Ticheli accompanies the song with tuned-crystal wine glasses and whirlies to establish an ethereal mood, as if an angel were protecting the world.\textsuperscript{131} As the Shaker song concludes in \textit{Angels in the Architecture}, the “darkness music” envelops the light and establishes an A minor tonality. This change in tonality is significant because the distance between these

\\[131\text{ Whirlies, as Ticheli wrote in the score, are, Tuned flexible, corrugated rubber or plastic tubes or hoses approximately three to four feet long. “They are to be held by the hand at one end and twirled above the head to achieve the desired pitch.” See \textit{Angels in the Architecture} score, 3.}
two tonal areas is a tritone. According to Oxford Music Online, until the end of the Renaissance, the tritone was the “diabolus in musica,” (the devil in music), because there are six half steps between the two tonal areas – six representing the Devil’s number.132 Therefore, Ticheli not only changes the tonality between light and dark music, he utilizes the Devil’s interval to enhance the character change between the two sections. Once the minor tonality is established, Ticheli gradually thickens the texture by layering voices, first sustained tones in low reeds (mm. 6-14), then articulated sequence of minor-thirds in the upper woodwinds (mm. 15-19), and finally sustained notes in the low brass, which feature French horn glissandi (mm. 18-22). In this introduction section, the first non-harmonic tone of A minor is introduced in the French horn (m. 10), which is an E-flat – yet another tritone.

The darkness section begins in m. 23, with a tutti statement of “Darkness Music.” This unison motive (Figure 4.3), which is followed by “dramatic silences,” affirms that the darkness has taken over the peace.133

Compared to the transparent music of the light section before it, this music is much more agitated and fragmented. The darkness music also features disjunct motion that is characterized by intervals of minor thirds, syncopated rhythm aggressive articulations, and ever-changing timbres.\textsuperscript{134}

After the darkness’ main theme in m. 30, the texture thins and begins to develop forward momentum as a result of the steady eighth notes in clarinets and marimba. Once the eighth-note mummer is established, the first biting accents in the brass occur in m. 33. Ticheli writes these sporadic, agitated figures scored in brass and low reeds to explode through the texture. The biting attacks in the brass, combined with constantly changing dynamics throughout the orchestration, provide an opportunity for individual voices to emerge then fade back into the overall texture. This compositional technique supports Ticheli’s desire for both clear, transparent textures and layering within his pieces, and musically its purpose is to drastically and dramatically alter the timbre, creating an unsettled sensation.

Additionally, the incorporation of these brass interjections in an unpredictable

\textsuperscript{134} Blatti, 33.
manner is found in other pieces of his music. In his Symphony No. 2 (2004) Movement III “Apollo Unleashed,” Ticheli employs a similar compositional device. Instead of scoring the motor rhythm in clarinets and marimba, in “Apollo Unleashed” he writes the motor rhythms specifically for percussion instruments. Then muted brass and low reeds interject with biting accented figures to change the texture of the opening section. Though the instrumentation and character is different in “Apollo Unleashed,” the same compositional techniques are used in the darkness music of Angels in the Architecture and have become a significant technique within his writing.

When discussing colors and textures of an ensemble, Moorhouse wrote, “Ticheli is fascinated with pure colors of instruments” and will write music for everything from solo instruments to full ensemble sounds featuring new and varied sounds, especially in the percussion section. According to Blaufuss’ interview, Ticheli gave the following response when asked to elaborate on his approach to building the unique textures for the different sections used in Angels in the Architecture.

The piece I am writing now for the Sydney Opera House [Angels in the Architecture] starts very low and dark but with bright sounds on top. I want to create the effect of darkness for a very bright light to breach through, as the music shines a spotlight on the audience. It burst out with major thirds in octaves and then the woodwinds come screeching on as though they are screaming about something. My goal is to express a crisis of faith and a feeling of desperation.

135 Moorhouse, 158.
136 Blaufuss, 21.
Furthermore, in mm. 57-59, 65-66, 75, and 112-113, he writes non-traditional sounds for the trombones that incorporate flutter-tongue and plunger mute. To give this unique timbre a programmatic context, this sound almost represents a “roar” of a demon. In addition to the trombones having atypical sounds, the flute players also are instructed to make a sound similar to a “jet whistle” in m. 65.\textsuperscript{137} As the character of this section grows more agitated with various rhythmic layers, the music builds to m. 84, where the “Darkness Theme” (Figure 4.4), scored in the upper woodwinds and alto saxophone, emerges. Defined by the quarter-note triplets, this lyrical theme is written in E-minor.

![Figure 4.3: Angels in the Architecture mm. 84-94.](image)

The phrase structure of this theme is presented similar to that of a period because it integrates an antecedent/consequent phrase relationship. The antecedent phrase

\textsuperscript{137} Ticheli gives instruction regarding the technique required to produce such as sound in the score. See Ticheli, \textit{Angels}, 13.
consists of a basic idea represented by the quarter-note triplet theme in the upper woodwinds. Then the syncopated figure in the French horn and trumpet in m. 89 represents the contrasting idea of the antecedent phrase. A consequent phrase typically resembles that of the antecedent marked by a return of both the basic idea and contrasting idea, which occurs in m. 90.

After the “Darkness Theme” is introduced, the piece becomes more agitated rhythmically through the use of layering. One rhythmic motive (Figure 4.5) in m. 97 appears frequently in Ticheli’s writing to build intensity and momentum.

Figure 4.5: Angels in the Architecture m. 97.

For instance, in Postcard (1993), mm. 96-97 build to m. 98. Here Ticheli uses this same rhythmic figure to propel the music forward and thus creates a major arrival at m. 98. Within Angels in the Architecture, the same rhythm enters the texture in m. 97, and creates momentum to anticipate the return of the “Darkness Music” in m. 107, which makes use of rhythmic augmentation. The character of this section remains the same until the return of the light music in m. 140, which is foreshadowed by the trumpets’ (Figure 4.6) fanfare-like, inverted, major chords in m. 124.
The trumpet figure conflicts with the minor tonality of the surrounding music and figuratively represents the battle between good and evil.

Characterized by less rhythmic motion, open intervals, and transparent scoring, the “Chorale of Light” – an original melody (Figure 4.7) – emerges in m. 149 and is scored for the low brass voices.
This suggests a reverent and comforting sensation, and it implies that the good will prevail. A second statement of the chorale is scored in the upper woodwinds, representing the angelic voices of the heavens. Then the third and final statement of this theme at m. 162, combines the scoring of the first and second statement, which then transitions to a more jovial character in m. 175.

Quoting the traditional Hebrew song “Hevenu Shalom Aleichem” in C-minor, Ticheli presents a lighter section of music. Traditionally sung upon returning from the synagogue, it wishes peace to all the ministering angels. When singing this song, the two angels who have graced their home and presence are welcomed, asked for a blessing, and then respectfully bid farewell. Translated as “We brought peace unto you,” this song captures the optimism of the light section of Ticheli’s piece.

After the first statement, the darkness returns once again overtaking the second phrase of the melody in m. 193. Similar to the introduction, in mm. 2-22, Ticheli adds layers to thicken the texture and create tone clusters causing tonal conflicts. The “Darkness Music” returns in m. 208, and though there are slight orchestration differences, the return of the darkness section is reiterated until the transition material in m. 255. After a trumpet solo in which the “Darkness Theme” is heard for the last time (mm. 263-267), a celesta, with harmonic planing, accompanies two solos, incorporating bassoon and clarinet.

---

Before the light section returns for the third time, the texture of the piece thins and gradually rebuilds. First introduced by the French horns in m. 283, a chorale-like figure (Figure 4.8) serves to anticipate the light section.

![Figure 4.8: Angels in the Architecture mm. 283-290.](image)

Characteristic of the light music, this melody has less rhythmic motion and more open intervals. The melody transitions to the trumpets (m. 291), clarinets (m. 298) and returns to the French horn (m. 306). Each statement adds accompaniment layers to build to a dramatic, tutti restatement of the “Chorale of Light” in m. 314. To increase the thickness of the overall sonority, Ticheli suggests doubling the brass parts in an organ. In an essay, Ticheli discussed the impact tutti sections have on music: “Tutti scoring is of course more effective when used sparingly; well-mixed colors are usually a necessity during a strong climax.”

Therefore, it is understandable that the return of the “Chorale of Light” is written for the entire ensemble because it is the “strong climax” of the piece.

Maintaining the intensity throughout two statements of the “Chorale of Light,” the music eventually begins to relax and become more contemplative. Ticheli then quotes the sixteenth-century Genevan Psalter, “Old Hundredth” in m. 352.

---

139 Ticheli, *Composers on Composing for Band*, 356.
According to W. H. Havergal, “There is probably no musical composition with the exception of the ancient Ambrosian and Gregorian tones, that has been so universally sung by worshiping assemblies, as the Old Hundredth Psalm Tune, and certainly none so familiar to the ear of Protestant communities.”

In 1563, John Day of London published a four-volume collection of church-tunes and within this collection, Day maintains the original melody but alters the second and third notes of the last phrase to the now standard form of the tune (Figure 4.9).

![Figure 4.9: Old Hundredth Hymn](image)

Figure 4.9: Old Hundredth Hymn

Many prominent composers have used this tune as a basis for compositions, most notably Johann Sebastian Bach’s chorale cantata BWV 130, and chorales BWV 326 and BWV 327, Paul Hindemith’s *Trauermusik*, and Ralph Vaughan Williams’ *The Old Hundredth Psalm Tune*. David Maslanka also used this tune as the foundation for his monumental *Symphony No. 4* for wind ensemble. Though Ticheli uses the “Old

---


141 Havergal, 15-16.
“Hundredth” hymn tune, he modifies it to better fit this work. Most notably he alters its rhythm. Scored for a small chamber ensemble of piccolo, two flutes and celesta, the hymn creates an ethereal atmosphere from which the angelic voice reappears.

According to Richard Blatti, “The idea of a guardian angel protecting the imperfect side of humankind is an age-old and multi-cultural belief.” Not only does Ticheli reference the idea of a guardian angel, he also alludes to the meaning of life by referencing Charles Ives' *The Unanswered Question* in the program note for *Angels in the Architecture*. Originally drafted in 1908, Ives penned his work to capture “the perennial question of existence” by scoring it for string quartet (representing the silence of the druids – who know, see, and hear nothing), flute quartet (representing humans searching for the answer to life’s question), and solo trumpet (representing the perennial question of existence). Matthew McDonald, in his article “Silent Narration? Elements of Narrative in Ives’s The Unanswered Question,” gives a narrative of Ives' composition as follows:

> Conceptualizing *The Unanswered Question* as a discursive representation of the flutes’ story outlined [as] the Fighting Answerers searching for the Invisible Answer by engaging in civilized discussion and by building on hypotheses in an orderly fashion. Since the Answer is ultimately unobtainable, this discussion is futile, circular. At some point the Answerers lose patience, abandon their discussions, and begin to mock the Question, [which is represented seven times by solo trumpet] (hence chromatic meandering of the earlier Answers gives way to pointed elaborations on the trumpet’s motive). As the flutes begin to give up on their quest, they no longer follow a logical

---

142 Blatti, 30.
argumentative thread; instead, the Answers become disassociated from one another, as the flutes become preoccupied with ridiculing the Question (hence the absence of the same degree of linear coherence as in the initial three Answers). The mocking proves just as futile as the more genuine attempts made before it, likewise going nowhere (hence, the final Answer loops back to the first, as the eternal process of answering continues).\textsuperscript{144}

Ticheli poses a similar question at the end of his \textit{Angels in the Architecture}. After the final statement of “Light” (mm. 341-360), in which the angel figure reappears, the listener is certain that “Light” has concurred “Darkness.” However, in the penultimate measure, he reintroduces one final tritone in the bass voices, which represents the never-ending battle between good and evil. Like Ives, Ticheli insinuates that as soon as one thinks the world is a good place and that there is a purpose for life, unexpected obstacles and/or unfortunate circumstances emerge, which cause doubt and disbelief.

\textit{Angels in the Architecture} highlights many of Ticheli’s compositional techniques. Its use of layering, rhythmic brass accents, and transparency of textures create a work that is characteristic of his compositional style. In addition, he incorporates hymns and songs from a wide range of sources for influence on this piece, the Shaker hymn “I am an Angel of Light,” the Hebrew song “Hevenu Shalom Aleichem,” the sixteenth-century Genevan Psalter “Old Hundredth,” and Charles Ives’ \textit{The Unanswered Question}. Collectively, all of these characteristics and

influences have culminated into a meaningful and influential piece in the wind band repertoire.
CHAPTER 5
AN ANALYSIS OF FRANK TICHELI’S WILD NIGHTS!

Commissioned by the California Band Directors Association in celebration of their 50th anniversary, Frank Ticheli’s *Wild Nights!* was premiered at the Saroyan Theater on 18 February 2007 with Timothy Salzman conducting the California All-State Symphonic Honor Band in Fresno, California. The composition is inspired by Emily Dickinson’s poem, *Wild Nights!*

Wild Nights! Wild Nights!
Were I with thee,
Wild Nights should be
Our Luxury!

Futile the winds
To a heart in port,
Done with the compass
Done with the chart.

Rowing in Eden
Ah! the sea!
Might I but moor
To-night in Thee!

Emily Dickinson (1830-1886), an American poet, wrote *Wild Nights!* in 1861, and it was later published in 1891. The meaning of this poem is often the subject of debate amongst English scholars. Most believe that it suggests “bold eroticism.”

---

According to Paul Faris, the subject of this poem is not erotic, but rather depicting a
stormy night on the sea. His analysis follows:

Stormy nights on the sea of life are buffeting me, and I
need thee desperately. If I could only be safe in harbor
with thee, the winds howling outside would lose their
futile efforts to get at us would only give us a luxurious
sense of our sufficiency in each other. I would be rowing
peacefully with thee in paradise, no longer depending
desperately on compass and chart. But ah, I do not have
thee, and the sea does buffet me. O that I might have thy
protective presence!\footnote{Faris, 274.}

Based on Ticheli’s program note, “I focused most heavily on the lines [of the original
text] ‘Done with the compass, / Done with the chart’ and ‘Rowing in Eden! / Ah! the
sea!’”, it is plausible that like Faris, Ticheli believed this poem depicted a stormy
night on the unsettled sea.\footnote{Ticheli, Wild Nights!, 3} He also states “to my knowledge no one has used this
wonderfully sensuous poem as the basis for a purely instrumental tone poem.”\footnote{Ticheli, Wild Nights!, 3}

The tone poem – “a programmatic composition, usually in one movement for
orchestra [or large instrumental ensemble]” – was first introduced to music during
the Romantic era (1800-1910).\footnote{David Poultney, Studying Music History: Learning, Reasoning, and Writing About
Music History and Literature, 2nd ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1996), 149.} Franz Liszt began writing instrumental pieces
inspired by plays, novels, poetry, paintings, legends, and historical events that
incorporated “thematic transformations, enharmonicism, and the use of augmented
triads, diminished intervals, the whole-tone scale, parallel harmonic motion, and
delayed resolutions.”

This compositional style “culminated in the tone poems (including Don Juan and Also Sprach Zarathustra) of Richard Strauss, who expanded the range of extramusical subjects to philosophy and even to autobiography (Ein Heldenleben).” By labeling this composition as a “tone poem” Ticheli implies there is a programmatic context for this work.

Regarding this work, he includes the following in the program note:

Throughout the piece, even during its darker middle section, the music is mercurial, impetuous, and optimistic. A jazzy syncopated rhythmic motive permeates the journey. Unexpected events come and go, lending spontaneity and a sense of freedom. The work is composed in five distinct sections, but contained within each section are numerous surprises and a devil-may-care swagger. Surprises are found at every turn, and continue right through to the final cadence.

Similarly to Angels in the Architecture, the analysis that follows will identify clearly defined forms, the removal of doublings during sustained notes, biting, muted-brass attacks, layering textures, and transparency within Wild Nights! As mentioned in Chapter 4, Ticheli often composes music within a clear form. Wild Nights! form is outlined in Table 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1: Wild Nights! Formal Outline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151 Poultney, 149-150.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 Ticheli, Wild Nights!, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With an explosive introduction, the first measure of *Wild Nights!* provides an excellent example of one of Ticheli’s compositional characteristics. To create a dramatic entrance but still allow the supporting lines to be heard, he removes doublings on the sustained notes. Following the impact of the opening measure, mm. 2-3 feature chromatic planing of major triads alternating between trumpets and low brass. According to Ralph Turek, “planing refers to the parallel melodic motion of to or more musical lines.” Furthermore, chromatic planing provides parallel motion of “precisely the same size interval, yielding a chromatic series of identical harmonic

---

structures that conform to no particular key.”\textsuperscript{155} Therefore the alternating, descending brass line serves to destabilize the tonal center of the piece.\textsuperscript{156}

The first theme (Figure 5.1) is a syncopated melody that is centered on F, which sounds improvised and alludes to the jazz influence of this piece.

![Figure 5.1: Wild Nights! mm. 6-15.](image)

This theme is eight-measures long and resembles the antecedent-consequent phrase relationship of a period. The antecedent phrase (mm. 6-10) contains, as William Caplin describes it, the basic idea (BI) (mm. 6-8), characterized by syncopated

\textsuperscript{155} Ibid., 667.
\textsuperscript{156} Ibid., 666.
ascending scalar figure in the clarinets and euphonium, and the contrasting idea (CI) (mm. 8-9), characterized by a syncopated, disjunct, and articulate motive in the upper woodwinds and xylophone. Furthermore, the consequent phrase (mm. 10-15) contains material that is similar to the BI (mm. 10-12) and to the CI (mm. 13-15).

After a brief transition (mm. 16-19), Theme 1 repeats (mm. 20-28), but is embellished and scored entirely in the euphonium voice. However, surrounding the melody, Ticheli layers the music with woodwind flourishes, brass accented notes, and motives of the CI throughout the ensemble (Figure 5.2).

Figure 5.2: Wild Nights! m. 23.

157 “The contrasting idea achieves its ‘contrast’ with the basic idea most obviously by means of melodic-motivic content. In addition, secondary features such as texture, dynamics and articulation may achieve the contrast. The basic idea and contrasting idea differ most significantly with their harmonic organization. The basic idea is usually supported by a tonic prolongational progression and the contrasting idea must close with a cadential progression.” See Caplin, 49.
Concluding the restatement of Theme 1, Ticheli develops the rhythmic nature of the CI while presenting a new theme in the French horns (mm. 31-37) (Figure 5.3).

Figure 5.3: *Wild Nights!* mm. 31-37.

While the melodic material is different, Theme 2 is rhythmically similar to the BI in Theme 1. Since no new melodic material is present for the remainder of Section A, it can be determined that the entire A section is based on the Theme 1’s melodic and rhythmic components. Ticheli adds variety to this section by developing motives, layering themes and/or compositional devices, and using compositional techniques, such as chromatic planing to destabilize the harmonic structure of the section.

The B section (mm. 66-151) highlights the “jazzy” nature of this piece. The section has a jazz feel because the melody and accompaniment figures are using a different harmonic language. At the beginning of the A section, Ticheli highlights an ostinato figure in the clarinets, and this ostinato is repeated in the B section except it is articulated differently. The change in articulation provides a drastic character change from the A section, which is then further enhanced because the harmonic language is modified to resemble that of an octatonic or diminished scale.
According to Bruce Benward and Marilyn Saker “the octatonic scale is an eight note scale composed of alternating whole and half steps.” Because this scale is symmetrical there are only three forms the octatonic scale possible before the scale repeats itself (Figure 5.4).

Figure 5.4: Octatonic Scale Forms

Benward writes, “Jazz musicians refer to this scale as diminished because the chords resulting from this scales pitches is diminished.” The diminished triads, and more specifically diminished-seventh chords are essential to a jazz improviser, because “each of [the diminished-seventh chord’s] notes may be used as either the leading tone or as the tonic of a new key.” Therefore, the diminished-seventh chord is the ideal pivot chord, has predominant function, and can help facilitate harmonic

---

160 Benward and Saker, 39.
substitutions such as the tritone substitution, which helps to create more suspenseful improvised lines and chord progressions.\textsuperscript{162}

The beginning of the B section features the use of the octatonic scale. In Figure 5.5 the bass line is noted.

![Figure 5.5: Wild Nights! mm. 66-68. It can be seen that the notes of this bass line are contained in the third form of the octatonic scale. Furthermore this five-note bass line repeats itself until m. 85, which suggests that this is a vamp section to feature a soloist. Ticheli fulfills this expectation with an alto saxophone solo (mm. 69-85). The saxophone solo (Figure 5.6) also makes use of the third form of the octatonic scale, as represented in the pitch collection in Figure 5.7.

\textsuperscript{162} A tritone substitution is the principle of replacing a dominant-seventh chord with "another dominant seventh chord whose root is a tritone away from the original root." In addition, "This substitution encourages a chromatic bass line that creates interest, chromaticism, and melodic integrity in the bass." See Richard Lawn and Jeffrey Hellmer, \textit{Jazz Theory and Practice} (Belmont, CA: Alfred Publishing, 1996), 114.
Figure 5.6: *Wild Nights!* mm. 69-85.

Figure 5.7: Third form of the octatonic scale.

Though the flutes and second-trumpet, support the alto saxophone, the solo line (Theme 2) resembles that of an improvised solo.

In jazz, the soloist improvises over chord progressions. According to Poulter, a great jazz solo exhibits several essential characteristics in order for it to be labeled as a great solo. Several of the characteristics include the integration of special effects (grace-notes), creating a contour to the solo, and interacting with the rhythm section.\(^{163}\) Ticheli incorporates all three of these characteristics in the saxophone

\(^{163}\) Poulter, 27-32.
solo (see. ex. 7). He uses grace-notes to smoothly transition from one note to another (mm. 69, 71-74), which creates a free feeling for the soloist. Also, the shape of the solo begins and ends on the same two notes (F-sharp, G), and the middle the climax of the line coincides with the highest note of the phrase. Collectively the shape of this solo resembles one that increases tension only to resolve at the end. Finally, the solo becomes less rhythmically active at times when the accompaniment figures become more active. This resembles the interaction a soloist would have in a jazz setting.

Measures 85-96 feature another soloist, a trumpet, but this solo section accentuates accompaniment figures that are more active. This second solo section builds to a shout section of the piece in which the woodwind section plays the second thematic material in mm. 96-118. After a groove is established by the bass line in m. 118, which is characterized by harmonic planing of major-tenths, the entire woodwind section and low brass section layer Theme 2 and the new bass line which leads directly into a retransition (mm. 130-151) back to the A section in m. 152.

The return of the A section, according to Ticheli, is shorter, but otherwise similar to that of the first statement of A. However, there are differences that lead this section to be labeled as A’ rather than a shorter restatement of A. The biggest differences between the two statements of the A material are that Ticheli removes the material present in mm. 54-66 in the restatement; he takes less time to transition between developments of Theme 1 (for example the crescendo in mm. 164 Ticheli, Wild Nights! Program Note, 3.
51-53 in the first statement of A is only two measures long in the return of A, mm. 193-194); and the instrumentation is manipulated in mm. 167-177 from the original in mm. 18-28.

The final section begins in m. 195 with an unpredicted change in character and style. The overall effect of mm. 195-199 is the calm before the storm and reflects the ninth line of the poem, “Rowing in Eden.” The bell-like figures in the vibraphone and clarinets signify that the intensity of traveling without a compass or map is over because “Eden” has arrived. However, in m. 200 Ticheli depicts the tension of the waves approaching with sixteenth notes in the trumpets and then in m. 201 in the French horns and trombones/euphonium (Figure 5.8).

Figure 5.8: Wild Nights! mm. 200-201.

This “wave-like” effect becomes the basis for the remainder of this section and I assert that this section of music depicts the text of Dickenson’s poem. To capture the energy of the storm and the sea becoming unsettled and more fierce, Ticheli
increases the rhythmic momentum and thickens the orchestration. Just as the sea becomes unpredictable, so do the “wave-like” motives throughout this section. This character of the piece builds to one that represents a sailor’s desire to triumph over the sea in m. 229. He then thickens the orchestration to represent that of the last major swell in the coda mm. 240-248. Dramatically representing the text of Emily Dickinson’s *Wild Nights!*, Ticheli’s tone poem features several compositional characteristics that have become defining traits of his writing. First, *Wild Nights!* is programmatic, a common thread for all of his band works. Second, he uses brass instruments, sometimes muted, to articulate short rhythmic motives, eliminates doublings of sustained notes to create a thinner texture, and layers musical ideas to create a complex sonority. Finally he often uses transparency of textures to allow individual textures to emerge within a clearly defined formal structure.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

Paul Hindemith and Frank Ticheli both contributed many pieces to the wind band repertoire and a list of their works for wind band is included in Appendix A and Appendix B respectively. Both composers’ specific voices can be identified and heard in the works analyzed in this document. However, without understanding a composer’s tendencies and compositional characteristics, one cannot acquire a deep understanding of any piece of his or her music.

As a conductor, having a complete understanding of the music before rehearsals is essential to being successful when in front of an ensemble. Having a working knowledge of any piece that one is conducting is important to any conductor. When one takes the time to learn the details surrounding a piece of music (when was it written, why was it written, to whom it was dedicated, how the piece fits within the composer’s overall output, etc), the preparation, rehearsal, and performance of that piece of music is much more rewarding for the conductor and musicians involved.

Understanding the context in which any piece of music is written is vital for a conductor, and knowing where a composer fits within the scope of music history is equally important. The evolution of the wind band has taken many years to develop into an artistic performing ensemble. From Gabrieli, Mozart, and Beethoven, to Stravinsky, Hindemith, and Ticheli, the wind band has changed drastically.
Therefore, it is important to know from where the wind band emerged so that the conductor can better be informed of what is happening currently with this ever-changing medium.
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APPENDIX A
PAUL HINDEMITH WORKS FOR WINDS

Kammermusik No. 1 Op. 24 No. 1, for chamber orchestra (1921) 14 minutes
Kleine Kammermusik Op. 24 No. 2, for wind quintet (1922)
Kammermusik No. 2 for Piano and Orchestra, Op. 36, No. 1 (1924) 19 minutes
Kammermusik No. 3 for Cello and Orchestra, Op. 36, No. 2 (1925) 16.5 minutes
Kammermusik No. 4 for Violin and Orchestra, Op. 36, No. 3 (1925) 21 minutes
Kammermusik No. 5 for Viola and Orchestra, Op. 36, No. 4 (1927) 19 minutes
Kammermusik No. 6 for Viola d’Amore and Orchestra, Op. 46, No. 1 (1927) 16 minutes
Kammermusik No. 7 for Organ and Orchestra, Op. 46 No. 2 (1927) 16 minutes
Symphonic Metamorphosis of Themes of Carl Maria von Weber (tr. Wilson) (1943) 20 minutes
March from “Symphonic Metamorphosis” (tr. Wilson) (1945/1972) 5 minutes
Symphonia Serena 2. Geschwindmarsch by Beethoven (1946) 4 minutes
Septett für Blasinstrumente (1948) 16 minutes
Symphony in B-flat (1951) 17 minutes
APPENDIX B
FRANK TICHELI WORKS FOR BAND

Dancing on Water (2015) 8 minutes
December Snow (2015) 2.5 minutes
Korean Folksong From Jeju Island (2015) 11.5 minutes
Peace (2015) 3 minutes
Earth Song (2012) 3.5 minutes
San Antonio Dances (2011) 9.5 minutes
Concerto for Clarinet and Concert Band (2011) 21 minutes
Symphony No. 1 (2011) 30 minutes
San Antonio Dances (2011) 9.5 minutes
Rest (2011) 8 minutes
Amen! (2009) 2.5 minutes
Angels in the Architecture (2009) 14.5 minutes
The Tyger (2008) 5.5 minutes
Wild Nights (2007) 6.5 minutes
Nitro (2006) 3 minutes
Sanctuary (2006) 12 minutes
Joy Revisited (2005) 3.5 minutes
Joy (2005) 2.5 minutes
Abracadabra (2004) 5 minutes
Symphony No. 2 (2004) 21 minutes
Ave Maria (2004) 4 minutes
A Shaker Gift Song (2004) 2 minutes
Pacific Fanfare (2003) 6 minutes
Loch Lomond (2002) 6 minutes
Simple Gifts Four Shaker Songs (2002) 9 minutes
An American Elegy (2000) 11 minutes
Vesuvius (1999) 9 minutes
Shenandoah (1999) 6 minutes
Blue Shades (1997) 11 minutes
Sun Dance (1997) 5 minutes
Cajun Folk Songs II (1997) 11 minutes
Postcard (1994) 5 minutes
Gaian Visions (1994) 10 minutes
Amazing Grace (1994) 5 minutes
Cajun Folk Songs (1990) 7 minutes
Fortress (1989) 5 minutes
Portrait of a Clown (1988) 3 minutes
Music for Winds and Percussion (1988) 16 minutes
Concertino for Trombone and Band (1987) 13 minutes
APPENDIX C
PROGRAM NOTES FROM TICHELI’S ANGLES IN THE ARCHITECTURE

“Angels in the Architecture was commissioned by Kingsway International, and received its premiere performance at the Sydney Opera House on July 6, 2008 by a massed band of young musicians from Australia and the United States, conducted by Matthew George. The work unfolds as a dramatic conflict between the two extremes of human existence – one divine, the other evil.

The work’s title is inspired by the Sydney Opera House itself, with its halo-shaped acoustical ornaments hanging directly above the performance stage.

*Angels in the Architecture* begins with a single voice singing the 19th century Shaker Song:

> I am an angel of Light  
> I have soared from above  
> I am cloth’d with Mother’s love  
> I have come, I have come  
> To protect my chosen band  
> And lead them to the promised land.

This “angel” – represented by the singer – frames the work surrounding it with a protective wall of light and establishing the divine. Other representation of light – played by instruments rather than sung – included a traditional Hebrew song of peace (“Hevenu Shalom Aleichem”) and the well-known 16th-century Genevan Psalter, “Old Hundredth.” These three borrowed songs, despite their varied religious origins, are meant to transcend any one religion, representing the more universal human ideals of peace, hope, and love. An original chorale, appearing twice in the work, represents my own personal expression of these aspirations.

In opposition, turbulent, fast-paced music appears as a symbol of darkness, death, and spiritual doubt. Twice during the musical drama, these shadows sneak in almost unnoticeably, slowly obscuring, and eventually obliterating the light altogether. The darkness prevails for long stretches of time, but the light always returns, inextinguishable, more powerful than before. The alternation of these opposing forces creates, in effect, a kind of five-part rondo form (light – darkness – light – darkness – light).

Just as Charles Ives did more than a century ago, *Angels in the Architecture* poses the unanswered question of existence. It ends as it began: the angle reappears singing the same comforting words. But deep below, a final shadow reappears – distantly, ominously.”

---
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