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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In recent years, notable composers have written trumpet concertos that are seldom performed but merit greater recognition and more frequent performances. The primary objective of this document is to evaluate and analyze two of them, one by Lowell Liebermann and one by John Williams. The trumpet concertos will be analyzed from a historical, theoretical, pedagogical, and performance perspective. This document will also strive to provide insight about the history of these works, the process involved in their creation, and how the works compare with Liebermann’s and Williams’ concertos for other solo instruments. To provide information and perspective regarding the context of these concertos in the history of musical repertoire, this document will first discuss the history of the concerto form and the use of the trumpet within that form.

Background

The solo concerto has developed from its Baroque period roots in seventeenth-century Italy to become one of the richest and preeminent forms of musical expression, on an even playing field with the symphony and the string quartet. The word “concerto” is thought to have come from the Latin concertare, which means to compete, dispute, or debate, and also is related to the same word in Italian, which means to reach agreement.¹ This duality of conflict and collaboration between the soloist and the ensemble “lies at

the heart of the concerto principle.”² Indeed, the qualities that have helped to sustain the concerto’s enduring popularity are spectacle and virtuosity, but most especially, the assimilation of contrasting and, at times, antagonistic forces within a logical framework.³

Before the eighteenth century, the word “concerto” was used to describe many different kinds of works and was not consistently employed in the fashion that it would be in the future. The term was first used not for purely instrumental music, but for choral compositions, accompanied by instruments or organ, and mixed vocal and instrumental forms.⁴ The earliest recorded publication to use the word “concerto” in its title was a collection of motets, mass movements, and madrigals called *Concerti per voci, & stromenti Musicali*.⁵ They were composed by Andrea Gabrieli and his nephew, Giovanni. The title indicates performance by mixtures of voices and instruments; the writing includes pieces for as many as three contrasting groups. The motets written by Giovanni Gabrieli in this collection are very similar to those in his *Sacre symphoniae* of 1597, which accentuates the point that, in this period, there was no clear distinction of characteristic style between the use of the word “concerto,” “sinfonia,” “canzona,” or “sonata.”⁶

---


⁴ Hutchings, 240.


One of the most important elements of the nascent concerto that eventually drew it apart from its parent genre, the sonata, was a strong sense of contrast. Composers attained contrast through *basso continuo* accompaniment, which led to the highlighting of the outermost components of the texture, the treble and bass, at the expense of the middle parts. This polarity brought a strong sense of tonality, but stood diverged from earlier approaches, which tended to be polyphonic. Contrast was also achieved through a type of composition called *stile concertato*. Music written in this design featured mixed groups or choirs of voices and/or instruments. In addition, a small ensemble could be contrasted against a larger one. The varying groups or individuals were closely associated, but there were also elements of rivalry between the factions. The goal was to create contrast in sonority, and the primary procedure of showcasing this simply involved presenting the differing groups in alternation. The development of *stile concertato* was unmistakably linked with the development of the concerto genre.

Another distinguishing element of the evolution of concerto composition was soloistic virtuosity. While the sonata genre had a tradition of equality, the concerto highlighted differences in status and ability. The solo parts to concertos were written in a style meant to display the soloist’s equality or superiority not to another individual, but to the full orchestral ensemble. As a result, the concerto served to foster the development of instrumental technique, reshape the nature of orchestral texture and sound, bring new instruments and performers to the public’s attention, and offer immeasurable

---


8 Anderson, 2.

9 Roeder, 17.

10 Hutchings, 242.
opportunities for further creative development among composers, all while raising “the profile and reputation of instrumental music in general.”

Around 1700, the term concerto began to be consistently applied to works for orchestra alone (the orchestral concerto), for two or more soloists and orchestra (the concerto grosso), and for solo instrument and orchestra (the solo concerto). It came to be typically composed in three movements (fast-slow-fast), a development which was standardized by Antonio Vivaldi. Over time, the solo concerto became the most prominent subsection of the genre. Because so much music of this period was written on highly perishable materials, it is not practical to identify a specific composer as being the inventor of the form as it is known today. However, it is reasonably clear that Giuseppe Torelli, a prominent figure in the Bologna school, was the first to popularize the form. Over sixty years later, the influential theorist, Johann Joachim Quantz, named him as its inventor in his famous treatise on performance practice and flute technique, Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen. Torelli was also an important individual among composers of trumpet music. His music marked the beginning of solo trumpet repertoire; the musicologist Edward Tarr believes that he wrote at least thirty-six works for one, two, or four trumpets.

While Torelli was the first important composer to create repertoire for the solo trumpet, the use of trumpet as a musical instrument is documented at least as far back as

---

11 Ibid., 246.
12 Wood, 17.
the fifteenth century BCE, as evidenced by Egyptian art in the Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Trumpets of this era were used as signaling instruments for ceremonial and military purposes, and as a symbol of power and status. They did not appear in events that featured art music; the famous philosopher, Plutarch, “compared the sound of the Egyptian trumpet with the braying of an ass.” The trumpet disappeared after the fall of Rome and did not re-emerge until the age of the crusades. During the early Middle Ages, trumpeters played in only the low part of the registers, “puffed out their cheeks while blowing”, “produced a tone that was described as airy and trembling,” and basically lived as vagrants.

Trumpet players came to be employed by royal courts or cities between the twelfth and the fourteenth centuries, and, over time, this led to a change in what had been the traditional role of the trumpet in society. During this period, all trumpets were natural trumpets; they did not have any extra mechanism to change pitch except for minute adjustments of lip tension, which produced the natural harmonic series. However, trumpet players enjoyed an exalted position in the royal courts, and over time a number of them developed the ability to play into the higher register, where the intervals of the harmonic series become closer. This led to the court players being separated into two classes: musical and non-musical trumpeters. For the trumpet to become well-received in art music, the player had to develop exceptional technique, including the ability to play

16 Tarr, 17.
17 Sarkissian and Tarr, 829.
18 Tarr, 10.
19 Ibid., 52-53.
softly and to play the impure partials of the harmonic series in tune. Eventually, the best trumpet players of this era were able to play pieces that went up to the sixteenth and eighteenth partial of the harmonic series, and several works went all the way to the twenty-fourth partial. By contrast, as a result of technological innovations to the instrument, today’s classical trumpet player rarely goes above the eighth or ninth partial.

The trumpet played a significant role in the development of the concerto genre. Many musicologists agree that the “cradle” of the concerto was the collegiate church of San Petronio in Bologna. The church boasted a large permanent orchestra of accomplished musicians, which was augmented by additional musicians of modest ability for special occasions. In such cases, the appropriate music for the situation would provide different parts for each group within a single composition, giving the more difficult parts to solo instruments. The church’s enormous size and its two opposing galleries for musicians encouraged a shift towards independent instrumental music and an antiphonal style of writing. These conditions called for music that was vibrant, vigorous, expansive, and deliberate in harmonic rhythm.

To meet this need, the church’s maestro di cappella, Maurizio Cazzati strengthened the church’s musical forces by hiring the highly skilled trumpet players from the Concerto Palatino, a group that often performed at the university and for

---

20 Ibid., 60.
21 Ibid, 12.
22 Talbot, 36.
24 Roeder, 36.
city’s public functions. Cazzati and his successors Giuseppe Maria Jacchini and Giuseppe Torelli composed sonatas for one or more trumpets and large string orchestra to exploit their differing timbres. The imitative interaction of the traditional sonata was supplanted by homophonic textures, recurring themes, and concertato dialogue between the trumpet and the strings, as a substitute for contrapuntal elaboration.

The material available to be played by the valveless trumpet was much more restricted than that of the string players; the overtone series typically limited the trumpet to triadic and scalar passages. In order to create concertato dialogue, the violin needed to mimic the trumpet style in these sonatas. As a result, violinists learned and incorporated certain features of trumpet style that soon became a part of violin style itself: “string broken-chord figures,” “rapid note repetitions,” “scale-passages in the second octave above Middle C,” and great use of the violin’s open strings for a vigorous sound, which often corresponded to the important notes in the trumpet’s overtone series. As Torelli’s interest shifted in his later works to the violin as a solo instrument, he adapted these elements to the string concerto. Hutchings asserts that these first concertos could really be called “trumpet sonatas without a trumpet,” which underscores the trumpet’s notable contribution to the development of the concerto genre.

As the Baroque period progressed, other notable composers also wrote excellent and difficult concertos for the trumpet, including Johann Melchior Molter, Georg Philipp

25 Ibid., 36.
26 Hutchings, 242.
27 Talbot, 36.
28 Roeder, 37.
29 Hutchings, 242.
Telemann, Leopold Mozart, Johann Wilhelm Hertel, and Michael Haydn. Even one of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart’s early works was a trumpet concerto (1768), but it has subsequently been lost. While the Classical period saw the triumph of the solo concerto genre as a significant art form, especially in the works of Joseph Haydn, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, and Ludwig van Beethoven, these Classical composers and their contemporaries wrote music in which the trumpet had a very different role. Music of this era required the expression of a variety of emotions within each movement of a work, which diverged from the Baroque practice of presenting only a single emotion in each movement. The trumpet epitomized the “old courtly culture and expressed one-sidedly an old-fashioned heroic Affekt.” In fact, Quantz admitted in 1754 that he had been offered the opportunity to become a trumpeter, but turned it down “because ‘good taste’ was ‘not to be cultivated’ on the trumpet.”

Because the strings and winds were more adept at providing a range of expression, the trumpet became a tutti instrument, never leading the melody unless provided with a short fanfare at climactic moments. Composers reduced the trumpet register to the twelfth partial and, eventually, the ability to play in the high clarino register became obsolete and was largely forgotten.

During the Classical era, players, composers, and instrument makers tried to make the trumpet more chromatic in its lower register through various means and mechanisms. These experiments led to several transitory instruments, such as the stopped trumpet and keyed trumpet, eventually culminating in the creation of the valve mechanism around
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1815, and the beginning of modern technique.\textsuperscript{32} During this period of experimental trumpet designs, Joseph Haydn and Johann Nepomuk Hummel wrote two of the most celebrated trumpet concertos in today’s repertoire. In fact, not only is Haydn’s trumpet concerto the last concerto that he wrote, but many also consider it to be his finest concerto.\textsuperscript{33}

Haydn and Hummel wrote their works for Anton Weidinger, a trumpeter in the Vienna court orchestra. Weidinger used a keyed trumpet to perform the concertos. The keyed trumpet was pierced by a number of holes near the bell which were covered by closed keys. When opened in succession, they were calculated to raise the pitch of the instrument, one semitone at a time.\textsuperscript{34} This new flexibility came at a price: the holes lessened the trumpet’s formerly brilliant sound. According to the musician C.F.D. Schubart, the keyed trumpet had a sound that lay somewhere between a trumpet and an oboe.\textsuperscript{35} The valve system for the trumpet had several advantages over its competitors: it was more agile than the previous mechanisms and it had a fully chromatic scheme with a homogenous sound.\textsuperscript{36} Unfortunately, both Haydn and Hummel’s concertos were forgotten and lost after their premieres, and did not surface again until 1929 and 1957,

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 95.

\textsuperscript{33} Roeder, 175.

\textsuperscript{34} Philip Bate, \textit{The Trumpet and Trombone: An Outline of their History, Development, and Construction} (New York: W.W. Norton, 1978), 127.

\textsuperscript{35} Tarr, 97.

\textsuperscript{36} Sarkissian and Tarr, 835.
respectively. As a result, neither piece had any influence on composition for trumpet in the nineteenth century.

Due to technological innovations in the nineteenth century, the trumpet became a much more versatile instrument. However, the trumpet was used predominantly as an orchestral instrument, and this writer cannot find evidence of any concertos composed for trumpet during this period. The emergence of the cornet in the mid-1800’s supplanted the trumpet for a time as the soloistic instrument of choice. Even though its tone was less “noble” and “carrying,” it was more agile because of its more conical shape, dangers in the high register were lower, and it had a beautiful and gentle tone. The great cornet soloists of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries displayed dazzlingly virtuosic technique in numerous pieces written in the same form: theme and variations. The trumpet re-emerged in the United States as a popular solo instrument during the mid-twentieth century due to the rise of jazz. Some of the most influential jazz soloists include Louis Armstrong, Bix Beiderbecke, Dizzy Gillespie, Harry James, and Roy Eldridge.

Nevertheless, there was not a rapid growth in the composition of classical trumpet concertos until after World War II. Some of the most important pieces of this period were written by Henri Tomasi (1948), Alexander Arutiunian (1950), André Jolivet (1948 and 1955), Charles Chaynes (1956), William Lovelock (1970), Edward Gregson (1983), Karel Husa (1973 and 1987), and Peter Maxwell Davies (1988). Several of these works
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are among the most played concertos in the trumpet solo performance repertoire, next to the Haydn and Hummel concertos of the Classical era.

Although the twentieth-century trumpet concertos listed above are considered to be exceptionally well written, many believe that the quality is not as high as it is for other instruments. Critics also point out that very few of the works were written by composers who were well-known by people other than brass musicians.\footnote{Ibid., 30.} While the trumpet concertos written between the end of the Second World War and the 1980’s deserve attention and praise, there have also been numerous concertos written for trumpet in recent decades, most of which are neglected and underperformed. The dearth of research and information about more recently written trumpet concertos points to a need for further study.

**Justification of the Study**

Thomas Stevens, the former Principal Trumpet of the Los Angeles Philharmonic, who is well-known for his activities in the promotion, performance, and recording of contemporary music, has pointed out that even though the trumpet had basically completed its technological advances by the beginning of the twentieth century, “two generations of trumpeters have somehow managed to avoid having major works written for them by the leading composers of the times.”\footnote{Thomas Stevens, “New Trumpet Music: Basic Performance Elements,” *International Trumpet Guild Journal* 1 (October 1976): 24.} He continues by pointing out that composers such as Barber, Bartok, Berg, Copland, Poulenc, Prokofiev, Schoenberg, Shostakovich, Stravinsky, Walton, and Webern all were able to write well for the trumpet.
in their orchestral works, and that while they composed solo works for other instruments, all neglected the trumpet as a solo instrument. Stevens later states in his article that while the trumpet has enough literature in early music to play a recital in a fabulous hall for a sophisticated audience “the day after a flutist, and a day before a violinist,” the only way to keep pace with our brethren in today’s musical world as a solo instrument is to develop a more thorough knowledge of new works.43

With Stevens’ opinions in mind, this writer believes that the study of recent significant concertos for the trumpet would encourage greater development of instrumental technique, broaden the horizons of aspiring trumpet soloists, and help the trumpet stay relevant as a soloistic instrument in the twenty-first century. Two accomplished contemporary American composers whose concertos for trumpet merit detailed study and research are Lowell Liebermann and John Williams. Both are highly acclaimed contributors to contemporary music.

Called both a “traditionalist” and an “innovator” by the New York Times, Lowell Liebermann is one of America’s most noteworthy living composers.44 He is also an active conductor. Many well-known artists have performed his works, including Sir James Galway, Stephen Hough, Susan Graham, and Joshua Bell. His music is also well represented on CD, with over sixty releases to date. He has written over one hundred compositions in all genres and his works have been played by many orchestras, including the New York Philharmonic, the Philadelphia Orchestra, and L'Orchestre Symphonique
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de Montréal.\textsuperscript{45} Liebermann’s \textit{Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra} was premiered by the New York Philharmonic on May 25, 2000. It was conducted by Kurt Masur, with Philip Smith as the soloist.

John Williams is one of the most renowned composers in the history of American music. Known mostly for his film scores, he is a five-time Academy Award winner, and also has won four Golden Globe awards and ten Grammy awards. He served as conductor of the Boston Pops for fourteen years. To date, he has written eleven concertos, premiered by artists such as Yo-Yo Ma, Dale Clevenger, and Judith LeClair, and orchestras including the Boston Symphony Orchestra, the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, and the New York Philharmonic.\textsuperscript{46} Williams’ \textit{Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra} was first performed by Michael Sachs and the Cleveland Orchestra on September 26, 1996. The performance was conducted by Christoph von Dohnányi.

Currently, while there is scholarly research that examines the music of Liebermann and Williams, a study has not been completed on their concertos for trumpet. Given the facts that Lowell Liebermann and John Williams are highly acclaimed contemporary composers and that their trumpet concertos were premiered by elite American orchestras and outstanding trumpet soloists, it is evident they are worthy of extensive study and research. Through this research, I intend to reveal the merits of the concertos written by these composers and to promote these works as valid and convincing additions to the solo trumpet repertoire for both study and performance.

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this essay is to examine and analyze the concertos for trumpet written by Lowell Liebermann and John Williams from a historical, theoretical, pedagogical, and performance perspective.

Research Questions

1) What is the history of and the inspiration for these two works? How did they come to be commissioned and what processes were involved in their production?
2) How do these works compare to Liebermann’s and Williams’s other compositions for solo instruments?
3) How are the works organized, and what are their significant features regarding structure, style, harmonic language, and rhythmic character?
4) What strategies exist to achieve the proper performance practice of these works and overcome the technical issues presented by these compositions?
5) What is the historical significance of these works? What are their significant contributions to the trumpet concerto repertoire?
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter will outline previous research of contemporary trumpet concertos in general and the concertos of Lowell Liebermann and John Williams, in particular. The chapter will first review studies that discuss the development and significance of the concerto as a genre of musical performance. Subsequently, it will investigate literature that recounts the development of the trumpet and its function as a solo instrument before the twentieth century. A summary of the most noteworthy research related to the trumpet concerto in the twentieth century will follow. Finally, this chapter will examine the research concerning the music, personal history, and importance of the two composers chosen for the current study (Liebermann and Williams).

The Concerto as a Musical Genre

A large amount of published information exists regarding the history and development of the concerto genre. Using the WorldCat database, this author discovered three esteemed resources relevant to this study.

According to WorldCat, Michael Thomas Roeder’s *A History of the Concerto* is owned by more libraries around the world than any other book dealing with this subject matter. In his introduction, Roeder writes that he intends for the book to be thorough in its treatment of the concerto from its beginnings up to the present day, but that the book would focus upon the works and composers whose involvements were of greatest
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significance in the timeline.  The book is presented in four parts: the Baroque Concerto, the Classical Concerto, The Romantic Concerto, and the Twentieth-Century Concerto. Each part is broken into chapters that discuss stylistic advancements, trends in different countries or regions, composers, and individual works of consequence.

Even though Roeder’s book introduces a great quantity of information spanning over three centuries of music, he is successful at providing many helpful and specific details. The book is especially effective in analyzing how composers influenced each other, identifying changes in style of composition over time, and distinguishing the most important contributions of each composer and time period. The author’s attention to biographical detail and his specific analyses of works are also very informative. This book is a very well organized and valuable resource for musicians of widely varying backgrounds, from the enthusiastic amateur to the serious musical scholar.

Robert Layton’s *A Guide to the Concerto* offers a survey of the genre from its seventeenth century origins to the present day. Unlike Roeder’s book, it is not intended to be a history; however, reading this book from cover to cover would give the reader a general concept about the historical evolution of the concerto. The book contains a collection of essays written by thirteen authors. The authors come from a variety of backgrounds including musicology, conducting, performance, and composition.

For this study, the most useful parts of the book are Nicholas Anderson’s chapter on the Baroque concerto, H.C. Robbins Landon’s chapter on the Classical concerto, and Peter Dickinson’s chapter on the concerto in the United States. Anderson describes the concerto’s ancestry and the characteristics of the Baroque concerto. He also compares
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and contrasts the works of the period’s most important composers, showing how compositional style changed over time. Landon outlines the concerto during the Classical period. He includes background information about Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto, but defers information regarding Mozart’s work to the following chapter due to his singularly outstanding contributions to the concerto genre. Moreover, approximately ninety percent of Europe was unaware of Mozart’s achievements in 1795. Dickinson summarizes the development of the concerto in the United States and reveals how America’s wide variety of cultural traditions helped create unique compositions.

_The Cambridge Companion to the Concerto_ is another prominent book concerned with the concerto as a musical form. Published in 2005, it contains chapters written by leading musicologists and music theorists. This book presents a detailed account of the concerto repertoire, significant composers, and the evolution of compositional style, similar to what was in Roeder’s and Layton’s studies. It also contains an impressive concerto chronology that highlights important compositions from concerto history. However, unlike the other two works, this book also contains sections that discuss performance practice trends over the concerto’s history and analyze the role of the concerto in musical culture. The chapter dealing with the early history of the concerto and the trumpet’s role in the creation of the concerto genre is the most pertinent part of the book to this study.
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The Development of the Trumpet and its Role as a Solo Instrument

In the wide realm of scholarly literature on the trumpet, one book stands out as an exceptional source for information regarding the trumpet as a solo instrument. Edward H. Tarr’s book, *The Trumpet*, describes the history of the trumpet dating from its earliest recorded history in roughly 1415 B.C.E. to the date of the book’s publishing.\(^{52}\) Tarr is a world-renowned trumpet player, a respected musicologist, and has been instrumental in the revival of Baroque and Romantic era trumpet performance practice. This book was originally written in German in 1977, and was later translated to English by S.E. Plank and Tarr. The book contains many photographs and charts that compare historical instruments with contemporary trumpets. It also describes trumpet making procedures, the different areas of employment for trumpet players, and various organizations and brotherhoods of trumpeters that existed during the Medieval, Renaissance, and Baroque periods.

Tarr includes a detailed account of Baroque trumpet technique and style and describes the process through which the trumpet became accepted in art music and solo playing. He also gives details about the great trumpet solos of this era and explains the decline of the trumpet during the Classical period. He later discusses the invention of the valve trumpet, the use of the cornet as a solo instrument, the various orchestral trumpets of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and important soloists.

The Trumpet Concerto in the Twentieth Century

Two studies and a published annotated bibliography were found that dealt with concertos for trumpet written in the Twentieth Century and related specifically to this
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study. Stephen Craig Garrett’s D.M.A Thesis,\textsuperscript{53} written in 1984, is devoted to an examination of Arutiunian’s and Tomasi’s trumpet concertos, along with Chaynes’ first concerto for trumpet and Jolivet’s second concerto for trumpet. Garrett provides only a scant amount of musical analysis of the works, because his primary focus is on trumpet technique and performance issues involved in the preparation and performance of these works. He illustrates these concerns through the presentation of numerous musical examples from the concertos.

The first section contains a discussion of perceptions and viewpoints regarding performance concerns and the overall state of the trumpet concerto genre in 1984. This segment was augmented by interviews with several highly respected trumpet players, including David Hickman, Vincent DiMartino, and Gordon Mathie.

The study concludes with the results of a survey that he sent to ninety-two members of the International Trumpet Guild. The participants were asked to list what works they considered to be the ten most important trumpet concertos of the twentieth century. The results are found in a list of 153 concertos for trumpet and orchestra, all of which were written between 1904 and 1983. He chose to focus upon the Arutiunian, Tomasi, Chaynes, and Jolivet concertos because they received the most votes in the survey.

Garrett’s thesis contains an extensive amount of information. The segment that discusses perspectives on the twentieth-century trumpet concerto and the list of twentieth-century trumpet works are particularly interesting and useful. These sections

\textsuperscript{53} Stephen Craig Garrett, “A Comprehensive Performance Project in Trumpet Repertoire; A Discussion of the Twentieth-Century Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra; An Investigative Study of Concertos by Alexander Arutiunian, Henri Tomasi, Charles Chaynes, and Andre Jolivet; And a Bibliography of Concertos for Trumpet and Orchestra Written and Published from 1904 to 1983” (DMA thesis, University of Southern Mississippi, 1984).
add perspective regarding the direction of the trumpet concerto genre in the years that lead up to the period the current study will examine.

Peter J. Wood’s Doctoral Thesis analyzes Gunther Schuller’s *Concerto for Trumpet and Chamber Orchestra* from both a theorist’s and a performer’s perspective. It also contains transcripts of interviews with Schuller and with two of the major performers of the work, Gerard Schwartz and Stephen Burns. Wood notes that this work is technically demanding and at the time of study had been performed only five times in its twenty-one year existence. Prior to his analysis of Schuller’s concerto, Wood provides a biographical sketch of the composer, and a short history of the concerto form and the trumpet concerto. He proceeds to describe the historical contribution Schuller’s concerto makes to the trumpet concerto genre. Wood argues that Schuller’s “eclecticism” is reminiscent of both Handel and Stravinsky, that his emphasis on tone color is similar to that of Ravel, Debussy and Milhaud, and that this particular work helps “bridge that gap in the trumpet concerto repertoire from the great composers of the Baroque era to those of the late twentieth-century.”

Wood’s study of the concerto is thoroughly researched and very well written. His theoretical analysis and performance analysis is very meticulous. The concentration of his analysis is on overall form, “energy levels,” texture, rhythmic styles, and the twelve-tone system. His performance analysis focuses on dynamics, awareness of the
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orchestral parts, practice techniques for difficult intervallic leaps, and suggestions for efficient practice of technically difficult passages.

Wood’s interviews of Schuller, Burns, and Schwartz are informative and insightful. Among the topics Schuller discussed were his compositional techniques, the process of commissioning the concerto, and his expression of concerto tradition through this piece. Topics mentioned in the interviews with Schwartz and Burns were the commissioning process, their view of Schuller’s impact on the musical world, and performance and practice techniques.

In 1994, Norbert Carnovale published the second edition of his annotated bibliography about music written for trumpet and orchestra in the twentieth century.58 The first edition of this book was published in 1975. This annotated bibliography was also used by the International Trumpet Guild as a special supplement to their journal in February 1994. The bibliography was a large portion of Carnovale’s doctoral thesis, written in 1973.

This work serves as a reference guide for music composed for trumpet and orchestra in the twentieth-century. It includes information about 179 compositions, all of which are easily available as piano reductions. The list of solos also includes a few works for trumpet in combination with another solo instrument. Each listing in the bibliography includes the following basic information: the type of trumpet required for playing the work, the name of the publisher, the date of publication, the pitch range, a graded level of difficulty, and a short description of the work’s distinguishing characteristics. He concludes with a list of forty compositions from the book that he

would recommend for performance and the addresses of the publishers listed in the bibliography. This study is well organized and presents a useful overview of each work that it profiles.

**Study of the Composers**

**Lowell Liebermann**

Being a relatively new composer, there is not a great deal of written information available about Lowell Liebermann. Biographical information was taken from Liebermann’s personal website. The existing scholarly works written about Liebermann deal with his music for piano and flute. In 1999, Jeannine Dennis wrote a thesis that concentrates on his music for flute and piccolo.\(^{59}\) The thesis provides a broad guide for the performance of Liebermann’s *Concerto for Piccolo and Orchestra*, and his *Sonata for Flute and Piano*. It also contains sections describing Liebermann’s personal history and musical style. She includes two appendixes containing a listing of Liebermann’s works and a discography.

Dennis outlines Liebermann’s general style, stating that while Liebermann’s music displays allusions to the music of Shostakovich, Liszt, and Frank Martin, he has a style that is full of contrasts, flexible, and diverse.\(^ {60}\) She praises Liebermann as a composer who composes technically challenging and properly idiomatic music for flute and piccolo, while managing to compose music that does not repeat stereotypical showpieces of the past. Her musical analysis of the concerto and sonata emphasizes form


\(^{60}\) Ibid., 9.
and thematic development. The author also includes a performance guide. It contains musical suggestions for a convincing performance and efficient practice methods of the technically difficult areas.

Written in the same year as Dennis’s thesis, Lisa R. McArthur completed a study entitled “Lowell Liebermann: His Compositional Style as Derived from Three Flute Works and Applied to Other Selected Instrumental Works.”61 McArthur compares Liebermann’s \textit{Sonata for Flute and Piano}, \textit{Concerto for Flute and Orchestra}, and \textit{Concerto for Flute, Harp, and Orchestra} with some of Liebermann’s works in other genres including solo piano, chamber ensemble, violin concerto, and orchestra.

This thesis provides insight into Liebermann’s compositional techniques. It also highlights similarities in his compositional style. McArthur’s analysis examines the following aspects of Liebermann’s music: form, sound, harmony, melody, rhythm, and growth.62 She follows this methodology for each movement of the various profiled compositions. This document is extremely well organized and clearly written. McArthur’s thesis is a valuable resource for the comparison of Liebermann’s \textit{Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra} to his other solo works.

In 2000, Dean Alan Nichols completed his scholarly survey of Liebermann’s works for solo piano.63 Nichols studies seven of Liebermann’s solo piano compositions written between the years of 1977 and 1996. The author includes a short biographical
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Nichols demonstrates that Liebermann’s works combine contemporary styles regarding harmony and thematic development, while also writing music that is “Neo-Romantic” or “Neo-Tonalist” in its regard for tonality and lyricism.64 He believes that Liebermann’s music contains stylistic elements reminiscent of Scriabin, Rachmaninoff, and Ravel.

John Williams

Many writers have studied John Williams’ music for films but little research exists regarding his works for the concert stage. Only one of Williams’ concertos has been studied in a scholarly thesis. In 2004, John Michael Lopinto wrote a dissertation on Williams’ concerto for bassoon, The Five Sacred Trees.65 The author provides a movement-by-movement analysis. He then argues that selected technical components from the work can be used to develop a progressive curriculum that would allow a student to expand their base of repertoire with pieces from the orchestral realm that contain similar techniques. He contends that, as a result, this piece could provide a student with continual growth from their freshman year of college through their senior year. Lopinto writes that he is not seeking to create “a replacement for, or negate any established teaching techniques,” but is trying to use a piece of literature as a source of

64 Ibid., 150.

inspiration for “multiple tangents of study.” His investigation of the concerto focuses on performance issues and largely eschews a formal analysis of the work.

One journal article was found that directly discusses John Williams’ *Trumpet Concerto*. Written by Mary Thornton, the article was published in the *International Trumpet Guild Journal* in 1997. The article consists of two short interviews. The first interview is with Michael Sachs and the other is with John Williams.

Sachs discusses his involvement in the composition process and the techniques he used to prepare the work for performance. Williams describes the concerto in terms of form, harmony, and style. Williams says that his compositional intent was to exhibit the trumpet’s full range of idiomatic expression; the first movement shows traditional “military and ceremonial” aspects of trumpet style, the second movement showcases the trumpet’s lyrical and singing qualities, and the third movement displays the trumpet’s athleticism. Williams also states that a performer’s input is very important to him when he is composing. As background information, Thornton’s article about Williams’ *Concerto for Trumpet* is insightful and informative. The article provides an excellent starting point for musical analysis of John Williams’ *Trumpet Concerto*.

**Summary**

Having reviewed the existing literature regarding the concerto, the trumpet as a solo instrument, and the works, personal history, and musical significance of Lowell
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Liebermann and John Williams, it is clear that research and analysis of the Liebermann and Williams trumpet concerto is justified. A substantial volume of thoughtful and insightful documents currently exists regarding these composers and their compositions. My research has shown that they are outstanding contemporary composers. They have received prestigious commissions and have had their works performed by world-renowned orchestras and soloists. However, no comprehensive study has been published regarding their trumpet concertos. As a result, this study is justified and should fill this void.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

The Selection of Works for Study

After deciding to investigate contemporary concerto literature for trumpet and orchestra, it became necessary to compile a list of available pieces. Through the research process, it was discovered that while Norbert Carnovale published an annotated bibliography of music written in the twentieth century for trumpet and orchestra in 1994, no similar work had been created since that time.

To be considered worthy of further examination, it was desirable that the work demonstrate a high degree of significance in the musical world. For the purposes of this study, the level of significance was evaluated using two criteria: the reputation of the composer of the work and of the soloists who have performed the work. While a considerable number of contemporary works were found to be worthy of extensive study, Lowell Liebermann’s *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* and John Williams’ *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* proved to be outstanding choices for further research.

Concise biographies that outline Lowell Liebermann’s and John Williams’ accomplishments and significance can be found later in this essay, at the beginning of Chapters 4 and 5, respectively.

Both concertos have been premiered by two of the most acclaimed and accomplished trumpet players of our day. Philip Smith, the soloist for the premiere of Lowell Liebermann’s *Trumpet Concerto*, has been Principal Trumpet of the New York
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Philharmonic since 1978 and his playing has been described as showcasing “brilliant technique, elegant lyricism, and [a] wide range of colors.”\(^\text{70}\) He has also been mentioned as one of the best trumpet players of our generation\(^\text{71}\) and as an aesthetic and philosophical model for all musicians.\(^\text{72}\) Michael Sachs, the soloist for the premiere of John Williams’ \textit{Trumpet Concerto}, has been Principal Trumpet of the Cleveland Orchestra since 1988, and also is currently the Chairman of the Brass Division and Head of the Trumpet Department at the Cleveland Institute of Music. His sound has been depicted as “gleaming” and “golden.”\(^\text{73}\) His playing has also been described as having “intensity, power, and an enormous presence that is beyond words.”\(^\text{74}\)

The trumpet concertos have also been recorded by well-known and widely respected trumpet players. Arturo Sandoval recorded the Williams \textit{Concerto} in 2002, and the Liebermann \textit{Concerto} was recorded by Ryan Anthony in January 2011. Known foremost as a musician whose style displays a unique blend of jazz and Latin music, Arturo Sandoval has been awarded four Grammy Awards and six Billboard Awards. He also received an Emmy Award for his composition of the underscore to the HBO movie
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based on his own life, *For Love or Country: The Arturo Sandoval Story.* Currently a Yamaha artist, Ryan Anthony is presently the Principal Trumpet of the Dallas Symphony Orchestra, and has previously been celebrated for his successful career as a soloist and chamber musician, most notably as a member of the Canadian Brass, and as an educator at institutions such as Oberlin College Conservatory of Music and the North Carolina School of the Arts.

**Procedures for Studying the History of the Selected Compositions**

The historical information researched and studied will include details about the commissioning process, collaboration between the composers and the soloists during the compositional process (if any), and insight regarding Liebermann’s and Williams’ musical goals pertaining to these works. The above information will be gathered through interviews, music reviews, performance reviews, CD liner notes, and journal articles. A general comparison of these works to Liebermann’s and Williams’ other compositional output will be made. The purpose of this will be to determine how characteristic these concertos are of Liebermann’s and Williams’ other compositions.

**Procedures for Analyzing the Selected Compositions**

Musical analysis will first examine the overall form of each movement and identify important themes and motives. Each movement will have a detailed diagram that outlines the organization, themes, and tonal centers (if important). The diagram will be
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used for the purpose of clarity and to highlight similarities and differences within the music.

There will be extended discussion of each composer’s harmonic language. In general, Liebermann’s concerto tends to employ traditional tonality and musical form, but uses non-traditional progressions and dissonances for dramatic purposes. On the other hand, Williams’ *Trumpet Concerto* uses tonal centers that are effectively and virtually disguised. Therefore, the harmonic analysis of Williams’ *Concerto* will investigate how he manages this harmonic camouflage.

Musical examples will be presented within the text for illustration and comprehensibility. To simplify this endeavor, most musical examples will be derived directly from the piano reduction and given a label of “piano score.” However, all references to the accompaniment will refer to the orchestral score. As a result, prospective pianists will be aware of the orchestral colors from which the piano reduction is derived. Musical examples will, at times, be modified to include elements of the orchestral score not present in the piano reduction. This will be clearly marked in the title of the musical example. The purpose of this will be to illustrate significant musical features that clarify and enhance the musical analysis. It is apparent that some musical features of the orchestral score had to be omitted from the piano reduction for reasons of performance feasibility. In most cases, the omissions do not affect the musical analysis. The essay will make note of differences between the piano reduction and the orchestral score when they are substantial.
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Pitches will be classified in the following manner:

Example 3.1. Pitch Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Procedures for Creating Practice and Performance Suggestions**

The section examining the pedagogical issues and advisable performance practice of the concertos will contain suggestions for efficient practice techniques to master the technically difficult areas. Some of the difficulties performers may encounter include range, wide intervals, quick articulations, and dynamic extremes. It will also advise prospective performers about musical issues regarding character, tone color, knowledge of the orchestration, blending, phrase structure, dynamics, arrival points, and pacing of lines. When applicable, the performance guide will include pedagogical suggestions for dealing with specific difficult passages. This will include exercises suggested by the author and the subjects of interviews, either as original ideas or from well-known and easily acquired method books.

Performance suggestions will generally pertain to performances of the concerto that use the piano reduction, rather than the original orchestral version. The reason for this is that most performers of these works will, regretfully, not have the opportunity to perform with an orchestra, but this should by no means be a barrier to the successful performance of the concertos.
Biographical Sketch of Lowell Liebermann

Considered by many to be a leader of the neo-Romantics or the neo-tonalists,78 Lowell Liebermann’s music is among the most extensively performed in his generation of American composers.79 Liebermann’s compositions have a unique style that combines traditional forms and tonal writing with an original approach to harmony, melody, and texture. His emerging influence as a composer is evidenced by his lengthy list of commissions, increasing number of compositional awards and honors, and his high reputation among prominent soloists and conductors.

Lowell Liebermann was born on February 22, 1961, in New York City. He has long had a fervent passion for music, commenting that he couldn’t “remember a time when my mind was not filled with music, with a desire to turn even my earliest notions of life into sound.”80 He began his piano studies at the age of eight, and his composition studies at fourteen.81 A highly accomplished pianist and a Steinway Artist, he made his performing debut at Carnegie Recital Hall at the age of sixteen, in a program that

---


included his own Piano Sonata, Op. 1, which was composed a year earlier and later won the Music Teachers National Association first prize in 1978.82

Liebermann entered the Juilliard School of Music as the only accepted composition major of the 1979 freshman class. He completed his Bachelor of Music, Master of Music, and Doctor of Musical Arts degrees at the school, studying composition with David Diamond and Vincent Persichetti. During his time at Juilliard, he composed many works including War Songs for Bass Voice and Piano, opus 6, which won the Grand Prize of the Delius International Competition and his Symphony No. 1, opus 9, which won first prize in the Juilliard Orchestral Competition and a BMI Award in 1987.83

According to Richard Freed, a noted music critic, Liebermann’s earliest works were “chromatic and contrapuntal in texture, often verging on atonality.”84 Liebermann has called his early works “self-consciously modern”85 and mentioned that, when starting out at Juilliard, he “felt pressure to stick wrong notes into a passage to make it sound modern, or otherwise be accused of being old-fashioned.”86 The composition of his Piano Sonata No. 2, “Sonata Notturna” in 1983 marked a repositioning to a more tonal
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language, bringing “clearer harmonic direction, with an emphasis on . . . thematic unity.”

Liebermann received a momentous opportunity during his final year of doctoral studies. The successful performance in 1987 of his Variations on a Theme by Bruckner for solo piano at the Spoleto Festival in Charleston, South Carolina led the festival to commission him to write a sonata for flute and piano for its 1988 season. The Sonata for Flute and Piano, op. 23, was embraced by performers and audiences alike. The sonata, Liebermann said, “fulfilled a need in the flute repertoire . . . it allows the flute to do things which it often doesn’t get a chance to do – namely, big, expansive, virtuosic playing.” To date, it has been recorded more than twenty times and has become part of the standard repertoire for flutists. The success of this work contributed greatly to Liebermann’s reputation as an outstanding contemporary composer.

The excitement created by the Sonata for Flute and Piano produced a wave of new commissions. Some of his most popular works since include: Gargoyles for solo piano (1989), which has been recorded fifteen times; Concerto for Flute and Orchestra, op. 39 (1992), which was commissioned by James Galway, premiered by the St. Louis Symphony, and crowned as the “Best Newly Published Flute Work” by the National Flute Association in 1994; Piano Concerto No. 2 (1992), which was commissioned by

---
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the Steinway Foundation, was lauded as “perhaps the best piece in the genre since Samuel Barber’s concerto”\textsuperscript{92} by the \textit{Baltimore Sun}; and \textit{Concerto for Piccolo and Orchestra} (1996), which “allowed the piccolo to play as beautifully as any violin” and was only the seventh (and longest) concerto written for the instrument.\textsuperscript{93}

Liebermann has also served as composer-in-residence of the Dallas Symphony Orchestra for four years, and has worked in the same role for other organizations including the Pacific Music Festival and the Saratoga Performing Arts Center. He has written compositions in virtually all genres: he was the first American to have an opera \textit{(The Picture of Dorian Gray)} commissioned by the Opera de Monte-Carlo and his \textit{Symphony No. 2} was declared to be “radiantly visionary” and the work of a composer unafraid of grand gestures and openhearted lyricism.\textsuperscript{94} His works have been performed by many major orchestras, including the New York Philharmonic, the Philadelphia Orchestra, and L’Orchestre Symphonique de Montréal.\textsuperscript{95}

Even though accomplished musicians such as Stephen Hough, Garrick Ohlsson, Charles Dutoit, Sir James Galway, Van Cliburn, and Joshua Bell have championed Liebermann’s music, some critics have labeled his music as excessively conservative. Liebermann disputes such charges, saying, “To criticize a composer for writing ‘conservatively’ is equivalent to criticizing an author for writing in standard grammatical

\textsuperscript{92} Lowell Liebermann, “Biography.”

\textsuperscript{93} Kevles.

\textsuperscript{94} Terry Teachout, “Back to the Future,” \textit{Time} 155, No. 9 (March 6, 2000): 73.

\textsuperscript{95} Liebermann, “Biography.”
English. It’s not the language that counts; it’s what the author does with it.”96 Pianist David Korevaar has observed that Liebermann’s “harmonies leave our ear with the impression that he has used traditional chord progressions, but they move from triad to triad without following the textbook rules on harmonic progressions.”97 While he uses traditional forms that allow for considerable reprise of previously stated material, such as arch form or rondo form, he also has a remarkably diverse style, ranging from memorable and beautiful lyrical tunes that are tonal to violent and unsettled motives with no tonal center.

### Overview of the Concerto

The *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra*, opus 64, was composed in May 1999. While he composed the work, Liebermann was doing a residency in Bellagio, Italy on a fellowship from the Rockefeller Foundation. The concerto was commissioned by John Marsteller and his sister, Helen, in memory of her husband, Edward Frazier Treutel. Edward Treutel was a trumpet instructor at the Juilliard School for fifty-eight years. He started teaching in the Juilliard preparatory division in 1937, began teaching college-level students in 1945, and retired in 1995. John Marsteller wrote that “the concerto was conceived as a tribute to a specific teacher . . . and as a commemoration to the entire teaching profession – a profession often forgotten in the glory of performing fame.”98

Because one of Treutel’s many successful students was Philip Smith, Principal Trumpet

---
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of the New York Philharmonic, the idea from the very beginning was for Mr. Smith to premiere the new concerto.99

Liebermann’s *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* was premiered at Avery Fisher Hall in New York City on May 25, 2000 by the New York Philharmonic, conducted by Kurt Masur. The concerto was generally well-received by critics; Barrymore Laurence Scherer of the *Wall Street Journal* wrote that “Mr. Liebermann has succeeded in . . . balancing bravura and a wealth of attractive musical ideas to create a score that invites repeated listening”100 and well-known critic Terry Teachout reported that “the audience ate it up, as did I, and my guess is that it will enter the standard repertoire very quickly.”101

Recently, Liebermann’s *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* was performed and recorded in January 2011 by the Dayton Philharmonic, conducted by their music director, Neal Gittleman. Ryan Anthony, a renowned solo artist, Principal Trumpet of the Dallas Symphony Orchestra, and former member of the Canadian Brass, performed as the soloist. The recording will be released on a CD of Liebermann works for orchestra, including his recently composed *Clarinet Concerto* (2010).102

As with most of his mature works, Liebermann’s *Concerto for Trumpet* contains many acknowledgements of tradition, while still maintaining a progressive originality.

---

99 Lowell Liebermann, interview by author, recording, Coral Gables, FL, December 17, 2010; See Appendix A, p. 177.

100 Scherer.


102 Liebermann, interview; See Appendix A, p. 189.
The *Concerto* is written in a standard three-movement scheme: as Liebermann has said, “it’s a formula whose contrast has proven effective over time; if it’s not broken, don’t fix it.”\(^{103}\) Although Liebermann does not employ sonata form or rondo form in this work, he uses forms that give ample room for revisiting previous themes. While the third movement of the *Trumpet Concerto* does not fit any classic formal design, the first two movements are essentially written in arch form. Many of Liebermann’s solo works, including the sonatas for flute and violin, the *Flute Concerto*, and the *Concerto for Flute and Harp*, use arch forms. As a result, the formal design of Liebermann’s *Concerto for Trumpet* is a factor that helps make the work seem like a logical addition to Liebermann’s output.

Another element of the concerto that is consistent with his previous compositions is the harmonic idiom. Overall, Liebermann’s harmonic language is tonal and his music most often uses consonant sonorities, but he often avoids using traditional harmonic progressions. Liebermann also utilizes combinations of harmonies, such as the combination of major and augmented tonalities. However, his writing includes some dissonances, which he uses for specific purposes, such as during movement towards a cadence or for the creation of accents. Liebermann also furthers his reputation as a “masterful orchestrator” with the *Trumpet Concerto*. For example, Scherer describes a “scintillating background” at the opening of the concerto’s first movement;\(^{104}\) the sparkling effect is created by the combination of a gently rolling harp accompaniment, harmonics in the violins, and a motive similar to a bird call in the flute.

\(^{103}\) Keller, 21.

\(^{104}\) Scherer.
The melodic material of the *Concerto for Trumpet* is characterized by its lyricism. Liebermann stated that before beginning work on the concerto, he thought about “what [was] lacking in the trumpet repertoire.” He said he found that “once you get past the Haydn and Hummel concertos, you have a handful of truly mediocre pieces. There is no substantial trumpet concerto, either romantic or modern.” So he decided that the trumpet needed a concerto that “not only allows it to be virtuosic but also exploits its lyrical side.”105

While the concerto is best typified by its usage of sweeping and expressive melodic lines, Liebermann provides balance with use of recurring motives, pulsing and repeating accompanimental figures, unexpected harmonic twists, and melodic transformations. Additionally, the third movement is largely devoted to the revisiting and development of thematic material originally found in the two earlier movements. These factors give the concerto a sense of unity not only within its individual movements, but also as a complete whole. Liebermann has said that he usually doesn’t compose movements as separate standing objects. Instead, he likes to compose his works as completely planned-out progressions, developing and transforming themes from one movement to another. This is a technique he uses in many of his compositions.106

---
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Musical Analysis

First Movement

The first movement of Lowell Liebermann’s *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra*, opus 64 is best described as a hybrid of two musical structures: simple ternary form and arch form. The structure is spelled out as ABCB′A′. Each separate section of the architecture is clearly demarcated by a change in time signature, rhythm, and the presence or absence of traditional tertian harmony. Both Section B and Section B′ are harmonically unsettled and can be viewed as extended transitions to the more harmonically stable A and C Sections. So in a larger sense, the form of the first movement may also be classified as a modified simple ternary form, with transitions.

Each of these five major sections can be further broken down into subsections. As has been previously discussed, this work has a plethora of extended melodic themes that, as expected, are reiterated in the first movement, but some of the themes also make appearances in the second and third movements as well. The sequence in which the themes are introduced is important: the main themes of Section A and B are repeated in reverse order in Sections B′ and A′. This particular arrangement of themes gives the impression of an arch form. The following table provides a more specific sketch of the structure of the first movement, its themes, and its most significant tonal centers.
In addition to the many broad themes found in this work, Liebermann also employs a persistent background motive which can be found in various forms throughout the work. The motive is characterized as a rising perfect fourth. It is often presented as a sort of bird call; four thirty-second notes on the first pitch are followed by an eighth note at the new pitch level. When Liebermann uses this motive, it is often done in a continuous descending stream. In general, each proceeding interval set is lower than the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Significant Tonal Center(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-17</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>F♯ Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17-33</td>
<td>a'</td>
<td>F♯ Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33-38</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>F♯ Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (trans.)</td>
<td>39-43</td>
<td></td>
<td>unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (bridge 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44-50</td>
<td>c, d</td>
<td>D minor, unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51-59</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60-71</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>F minor (unstable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72-83</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>E minor/major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84-95</td>
<td>g'</td>
<td>E, minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96-107</td>
<td>f'</td>
<td>D minor (unstable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>108-119</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>C♯ minor (unstable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120-131</td>
<td>h'</td>
<td>C minor (unstable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B' (bridge 2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>132-144</td>
<td>e'</td>
<td>unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>145-170</td>
<td>c', d'</td>
<td>D♯ minor, unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (trans.)</td>
<td>171-184</td>
<td>b', i</td>
<td>F major, F♯ major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>185-198</td>
<td>a''</td>
<td>F♯ Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>198-203</td>
<td>(codetta)</td>
<td>F♯ Major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
previous set by a third, but that is not always the case. The motive is meant to supplement the overall structure of the work and to serve as a unifying principle.

The first movement starts with a two measure introduction that establishes Section A’s atmosphere. Liebermann combines a rolling accompanimental ostinato (played by the harp), with the rising fourth motive (played by the flute), and sustained violin harmonics. The ostinato firmly establishes the key of F♯ major, though it does include a passing tone. In fact, the ostinato includes at least one non-chord tone in nearly every measure of its usage.

Example 4.1. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, accompaniment, mvt. 1, mm. 1-3

Theme a is introduced by the solo trumpet, beginning in measure 3. With long and lilting groups of notes slurred together, most of the time it proceeds in step-wise motion:

---

107 The sustained violin harmonics (very high, flute-like notes produced by lightly touching the string at a specific point instead of pressing it down in the ordinary manner) are, for obvious reasons, not written in the piano score.
Example 4.2. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, solo trumpet, mvt. 1, mm. 3-10

The theme emphasizes the key of F♯, especially at its cadential points in measures 6 and 10. However, it also creates a mixture of two modes: Ionian and Phrygian. This is clearly seen in measures 4 and 5, where the entire F♯ Phrygian scale is outlined. While the harmonic line is largely reserved during this statement of the theme, this Ionian-Phrygian mixture creates the avenue for inventive harmonic progressions in subsequent recurrences of the theme. During this first statement of the theme, Liebermann twice shifts harmonically from F♯ to its Neapolitan chord of G Major, though it does not function as a Neapolitan chord in the traditional sense; instead, it functions as a dominant chord. As Liebermann often either changes chords or moves important tones by half-step throughout the concerto, this first chord change is already hinting at Liebermann’s harmonic style throughout the piece. Liebermann also often balances the non-traditional progressions with conventional progressions. For example, the second phrase of this theme concludes with a C♯ chord in a traditional half cadence, preceded by its secondary dominant.

Example 4.2 shows Theme a’s first two phrases. The third phrase of Theme a, however, sounds harmonically out of place: measure 11 clearly moves to D major, or ♭VI of the home key of F♯. The impression is confirmed as this phrase is interrupted by a
rising sequential pattern (shown in Example 4.3) written in Lydian mode. This forms a transition that leads back to an orchestral restatement of Theme a in measure 17.

Each rendition of the melodic pattern at the top of the treble line (seen in Example 4.3) is transposed upwards through the keys of A♭, C, D♭, and D Lydian. The solo trumpet line mirrors the key presented in each of the measures with a string of rising scalar figures. The harmonies presented in the still-present ostinato become more ambiguous as the transition progresses; the harmony that it supplies increasingly does not agree with the Lydian scale presented above it. The growing dissonance culminates in the final measure of the transition (measure 16) where the ostinato presents D# diminished underneath a D Lydian scale. The upwardly moving lines, the rising harmonic tension, and ever-present crescendo create an effective transition to the new subsection.
Section A₂ presents the same melodic material that was heard starting in measure 3, but this subsection presents Theme a without a harmonic interruption. The first two phrases of this subsection are identical to the previous one, but new harmonies are introduced, further enhancing the theme. When the solo trumpet re-enters with the melody’s third phrase at the upbeat to measure 25, the musical line has been transposed
down a minor second to D↓, an expected tonality in the key of F↓.\textsuperscript{108} This time, the theme is not disrupted: the theme’s third phrase ends in measure 28 and its fourth phrase in measure 33, with a perfect authentic cadence in F↓ major. It is therefore apparent that Theme a is constructed as a parallel double period, but is only presented in full form when it is repeated.

Section A\textsubscript{3} ushers in Theme b at measure 33. Theme b is extremely similar to Theme a: they have the same lilting, mostly step-wise motion, and the rhythmic pattern of the melody in measures 33 and 35 is analogous to the corresponding melody in measures 3 and 5. Most importantly, the important notes of each theme are the same: each starts with a C↓, F↓ is the high point of both opening phrases, D↓ has a prominent place in both opening phrases, an A↓ completes both opening phrases, and a C↓ and E open both of the themes’ second phrases.\textsuperscript{109} But despite the notable resemblances to Theme a, Theme b will later be presented in several ways that display its importance and allow it to stand on its own.

Example 4.4. Liebermann, \textit{Concerto for Trumpet}, Theme b, mvt. 1, mm. 33-38

\textsuperscript{108} D↓, enharmonically respelled as C↓ is the dominant in the key of F↓. Liebermann often writes in enharmonic spellings that are not necessarily correct in a theoretical sense; he does this in order to create the most readable spelling for the performer (See Appendix A, p. 183).

\textsuperscript{109} Compare Example 4.2 (p. 43) and Example 4.4.
After measure 38, Theme b dissolves as Liebermann takes the melodic idea from this measure and spins it into something new. A driving triplet figure replaces the ostinato, and while the *stringendo* marking indicates an increase in tempo, this effect is furthered by constantly decreasing note values in the highest voices, which naturally increases the pace.\footnote{110} This transition is made more dramatic by an ascending melodic line and long crescendo to *ff*. As the tension builds, the harmonies become more complicated. For example, Liebermann introduces a mixture of major and minor modalities in measure 38, a minor and diminished mixture in measure 39, and a major and augmented chord mixture in measure 41. Nevertheless, the section ends traditionally, to an extent; there is clearly a French augmented sixth chord of D minor in measure 42, followed by the dominant of D minor (with an A\# present to add a dissonant flavor) in measure 43, leading to the tonic for the start of Section B.

Section B is the shortest section of the first movement. As is the case throughout this movement, Liebermann will expand upon it when it is repeated. The melodic material consists of an aggressive bass voice employing curt and abrupt statements, working in counterpoint with a driving line of sixteenth notes in the treble voice, which are grouped by two or four and accented at harmonic changes:

\footnote{110} The progression of this decreasing note value is dotted quarter notes in measure 38, a dotted quarter note quintuplet in measure 39, quarter notes in measure 41, and a quarter note septuplet in measure 42.
Example 4.5. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 44-45

This mutates into a winding, mostly chromatic line of sixteenth notes in measure 48:

Example 4.6. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 48-49

Harmonic rhythm increases considerably; in Section A, any single harmony stays constant for at least half a measure, but harmonies change four to six times per measure in Section B. Liebermann makes liberal use of dissonant sonorities between the bass and treble, including minor ninths, major sevenths, and minor seconds. As the winding figure draws to its conclusion, the two voices move apart to their extreme high and low registers, ending at a distance of more than six octaves.
The solo trumpet, tacet since measure 33, now returns to the fray, introducing a new theme in 4/4. The new melodic idea seems familiar: the rhythm of the theme (seen in Example 4.7) bears a strong resemblance to the rhythm of the rising fourth motive. 

Example 4.7. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 51-55

Example 4.7 shows that the trumpet line consists of mostly chromatic movement. As a result, the harmonic quality is ambiguous. The caustic accompaniment consists of two tone clusters (C♯, D♯, E, F and C♯, D♯, F♯, G). The orchestral retort to Theme e (heard in the solo trumpet) is placed in measures 52, 54, and 56. While the retort is forceful, it outlines an augmented triad and resolves to notes unrelated to the passage which precedes it, therefore doing nothing to help identify a tonal center. As a result, this section is harmonically indistinct but creates a biting and ominous mood. The solo

---

111 See Example 4.1, p. 42.
trumpet’s descending line of thirty-second notes (beginning with the upbeat to measure 57) outlines two augmented chords, a sonority that Liebermann has previously used several times. The augmented sequence breaks on F♯, and the accompaniment responds with a scalar run that resolves downwards by half-step, a familiar device in this work.

Section C, the largest of the first movement, is unified by a new ostinato found in the bass line, which is shown in Example 4.8. Each subsection of C has this same ground bass, but it is transposed downwards by a half-step on each repetition. It is a gruff and severe mixture of quarter notes and quarter rests. It begins around the tonal center of F in measure 60, but the twisting path of the line defies any overall harmonic classification.

Example 4.8 also introduces a melody of running triplets on top of the ground bass, played by the solo trumpet. This melody receives an imitative response of triplets from the horn and trumpet sections of the orchestra. Even though the time signature is 4/4, the triplets give a 12/8 impression and cause this section to stand in contrast to the previous one, which was clearly duple in nature. The triplets, at the forefront of the thematic material in Section C₁, become a continuous motor rhythm and a background layer imposed behind a new sweeping and expansive melody in Section C₂.
Example 4.8. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 60-71
The melody of Section C₂ is centered on the key of E minor, though it momentarily flirts with E major in measure 79. The background triplets constantly alternate back and forth between G and G♯, further emphasizing the combining of major and minor modalities. The trumpet restates this theme in Section C₃ (shown in Example 4.9), transposed down a half step to the key of E♭ minor. The accompaniment is much less ambiguous about the key in this second rendition of Theme g; the major third is not present.

Example 4.9. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 84-88

Harmonically speaking, Sections C₂ and C₃ have melodies that remain essentially situated around one tonal center but, in general, this is not typical of Section C’s other
subsections. For example, Section C₄ sees a return to prominence of the triplets\textsuperscript{112} as the lyrical melodic line disappears. As before, however, the line follows a harmonically shifting pattern and even the harmonies that are implied are tenuous. Liebermann introduces a new duple meter fanfare-like motive in the trombone, which is then taken up more insistently by the entire orchestral brass section.\textsuperscript{113} The second incarnation of the fanfare motive also incorporates quintuplets, thirty-second notes, and sixteenth notes. The dissimilarity of the triplets and fanfare ideas, along with a swelling crescendo, the inclusion of woodwinds to the texture, and an increasing usage of minor second intervals between orchestral voices, creates a cacophony of sound, leading directly to the most dramatic moment of the first movement.

Example 4.10. Liebermann, \textit{Concerto for Trumpet}, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 108-111

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example4_10.png}
\end{center}

Section C₅, which begins in measure 108, pits an anguished melody in the solo trumpet line against the full orchestra (minus the percussion), that presents the ground

\textsuperscript{112} This triplet idea was at the forefront in Section C₁, and is presented in the same general contour as the earlier theme, but with melodic changes; as a result, it was labeled as Theme f'.

\textsuperscript{113} While the fanfare motive is an important counter-motive in this section, it only appears in measure 104 of the piano score, due to the complexity of the triplet passage.
bass in unison, with no other accompanimental line (seen in Example 4.10). The starkness of this arrival and the \textit{ff} dynamic at which the juxtaposition is presented across the entire orchestra makes an intense effect on the listener, as this section is as uncomplicated as the buildup was complicated.\textsuperscript{114} The \textit{ff} dynamic begins to recede after two measures, as more orchestral voices drop out of the texture. In Section C\textsubscript{5}, the anguished melody is repeated note for note (transposed downwards by a half-step) in the bass clarinet and viola while the solo trumpet plays a decorative countermelody above (seen in Example 4.11).

Example 4.11. Liebermann, \textit{Concerto for Trumpet}, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 120-124

![Example 4.11](image)

The orchestra’s primary melody starts at a \textit{f} dynamic and gradually recedes while the trumpet countermelody starts quietly but gradually gains prominence with a crescendo buffeting a nearly two octave ascent over measures 127-132. The animated solo line helps to create an emphatic ending to Section C and dramatic return to the Section B material.

\textsuperscript{114} The \textit{ff} dynamic is presented across the orchestra except in the orchestral brass, which is marked at forte, most likely to achieve a proper balance of sound across the orchestra.
Section B′₁ contains the same melodic ideas (Theme e′), contour, and nebulous harmony earlier seen in Section B₂. This displays the thematic arch form employed by Liebermann in this movement. However, Theme e′ contains several new rhythmic variations and resolves differently. This time, Theme e′ alternates between orchestra and trumpet, respectively, instead of being exclusive to the solo line. The theme is presented in sixteenth and eighth notes (seen in Example 4.12), but the effect is the same as before because the tempo is twice as fast. The trumpet response is more virtuosic, as it presents the theme in sextuplets and sixteenths. The orchestral retort from Section B is again present and still outlines an augmented triad. The retort is written in quarter notes; thus, no irregular time signatures are necessary, as they were before.¹¹⁵

Example 4.12. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 132-137

¹¹⁵ The differences listed in this paragraph can be viewed through a comparison of Example 4.7 (p. 49) and Example 4.12.
The descent of the arch is continued in Section B’\textsuperscript{2} which as expected, derives its material from Section B’\textsuperscript{1}. The thematic material is quoted verbatim from the first six measures, including all of Theme c’ and the beginning of Theme d’, except that it is now transposed up a half-step. In the seventh measure (seen in Example 4.13), the solo trumpet enters and extends Theme d’ for two measures. It then introduces a new half-step trill motive, which is traded in imitation between various individual members of the woodwind section and the solo trumpet. This terse motive, which lasts for half a measure, is accompanied by an equally brusque and pointed motive in the lower strings and piano, which repeats its own individual pattern every three measures, up a half-step. Due to this melodic fragmentation, any traditional harmony is either not present or well-disguised.

Example 4.13. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 151-156

Shortly after the solo trumpet drops out of the texture, the trill motive moves permanently into the piccolo and flute, while the bass ostinato pattern continues, and a chorale-like melody appears in the horn. The trill motive in the piccolo and flute effectively reminds a listener of the bird call and prepares a return of the rising fourth
motive, presented when the solo trumpet returns with the upbeat to measure 166. The rising fourth motive begins to dominate the texture, as the bass ostinato comes to a halt on an extended C2, which functions as a traditional dominant pedal and prepares for a cadence in F major in measure 171 as the rising fourth motive cascades downwards through the orchestra.

Section B’3 heralds the return of Section A material, presenting Theme b in a new fashion: Liebermann prescribes a “wah-wah mute”\textsuperscript{116} to the solo trumpet line and the melody is presented over a tremolo in the vibraphone and viola:

Example 4.14. Liebermann, \textit{Concerto for Trumpet}, solo trumpet, mvt. 1, mm. 171-174

While the effect of the harmon mute conveys a sense of nostalgia, one cannot listen to the “wah-wah” effect without feeling that Liebermann is showing a sense of irony and humor towards his own melodic material. Although Theme b was previously in Section A, Liebermann clearly intends for the material to be part of the bridge structure, for the characteristic ostinato is not in the texture, and the arrival is in the key of F major, a half-step away from the expected tonality. Theme b is extended in a rising and modulating sequence that swells with a crescendo, arriving back in the key of F\# at a sudden $p$ dynamic. This arrival brings a completely new theme, presented in the manner

\textsuperscript{116} The mute is called a “wah-wah mute” in the piano score, but is called a harmon mute in the orchestral score.
of a cadenza (Theme i). The short cadenza provides a gentle retransition to Theme a, now complete with the expected background texture and tonality of Section A.

Example 4.15. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 181-184

The restatement of Theme a'' that starts in measure 185 is more closely aligned with the complete statement of the theme heard in measure 17, rather than the incomplete statement heard in measure 3. The solo trumpet enters with the melodic material after the theme’s midpoint in measure 193, which is the same place that it entered in the earlier statement of the theme (m. 24). The trumpet part has the same notes as before, but Liebermann uses different enharmonic spellings. Liebermann omits thematic material that had been heard in measures 25-29, but this is balanced by the more lengthy motivic extension that completes the phrase. The codetta reaffirms the key as the trumpet rises up into its higher register. The cascading rising fourths motive concludes the movement, washing downwards as it did in the opening of the movement and completing the arc.
Second Movement

Given the heading of “Elegy,” the second movement of Lowell Liebermann’s *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* is the only titled movement of the work. The composer said that the movement is not necessarily an elegy to Edward Treutel, but it could appropriately be viewed as such. Liebermann says the title is meant to give “a character indication to the music” and to indicate “how [the 2nd movement] should be interpreted.”

Like the opening movement, the second movement has elements of arch form; the ideas from measures 1-30 are clearly restated in reverse order in the final measures of the movement (mm. 100-123). The middle part of the movement comprises the main body of thematic material; in length alone, it makes up approximately sixty percent of the overall movement. As a result, it would be an exaggeration to call this movement a classic arch form. It is more accurately described as a through-composed movement in which the middle section is consistently following an arc of mounting intensity and the smaller outer sections are repeated in reverse order, and function as both an introduction and a coda, respectively.

---

117 Liebermann, interview; See Appendix A, p. 182.
Table 4.2. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, mvt. 2, outline of form and other significant features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Significant Tonal Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1-13</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>starts unclear; ends in B major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>14-30</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>B minor, E minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31-58</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>F minor, E♭ minor, E major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59-81</td>
<td>d, e</td>
<td>E♭ major, C major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81-99</td>
<td>f, e, I (mvt. I)</td>
<td>G major, F major, F♯ major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'</td>
<td>100-114</td>
<td>b'</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'</td>
<td>115-123</td>
<td>a'</td>
<td>F♯ major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second movement starts in a homorhythmic texture with a solemn hymn-like chorale setting, which establishes a “twilight mood.”

Above the chorale (Theme a) an E♭ is intoned by the tubular bells of the percussion section in measures 2, 4, 6, 9, 11, and 13. This effect was inspired by the hourly chimes heard at a church nearby the studio overlooking Lake Como in Bellagio, Italy, where Liebermann composed the Trumpet Concerto. Their presence in the work adds to the somber atmosphere and serves “as a reminder of that sonic landscape.”

The second movement begins with two F♯ major chords, the same harmony heard at the end of the first movement. However, it quickly becomes clear that the tonic key is not F♯. Indeed, the tonal center is not immediately evident as Liebermann uses a common-tone harmonic progression (F♯ major, B♭ major, F, A♭ major/augmented, A major, E minor).

---

118 Scherer.

119 Keller, 21.
Example 4.16. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 2, mm. 1-6

![Molto adagio \(J = \text{c. 60}\) (Theme a)](image)

The unconventional harmonic sequences continue through the introduction, which concludes with a tritone cadence (an F major chord to a B major chord).

The solo trumpet enters for the first time in this movement in measure 14, presenting a new, simple, and gently rolling theme (Theme b) as the tempo of the music increases slightly. While the opening section was contemplative, the pacing in Section B is more direct. The texture here appropriately changes to a more melody-dominated homophony, as the accompaniment responds to the melody with harmonically static quarter notes that avoid the downbeat.

Example 4.17. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 2, mm. 14-19

![\(J = \text{c. 72}\) molto espressivo (Theme b)](image)

The accompaniment seen above is the beginning of a new pulsing and rhythmic ostinato, one of Liebermann’s favored devices. The underlying and consistently reliable
rhythmic pattern, of great importance to the texture of the first movement, will also play a role in imparting a sense of forward motion in the second movement. A brief transition in measures 23-30 is presented in two competing melodic lines (flute and clarinet in the orchestral score) and is a continuation of the rhythmic ideas derived from measure 20 and measures 21-22, respectively. During this transition, the ostinato and the two melodic lines above it all move in a gradually descending contour.

Section C, beginning at measure 31, has a slightly more urgent tempo, and sees the trumpet exploring a new cantabile theme (Theme c) that soars into its upper register, above a new ostinato pulse, a heartbeat-like succession of half notes. This new theme is characterized by its occasional avoidance of the downbeat, specifically in measures 32, 34, 38, and 42.

Example 4.18. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 2, mm. 31-36

The pedal half notes shown in Example 4.18 make clear that the tonal center of the beginning of Section C is F; the presence of A♭ in the solo trumpet’s melodic line further clarifies that the key is minor. Complexities arise in this passage as the ostinato’s harmonic implications begin to clash with itself and the flowing melodic line. For
example, in measure 41, the solo trumpet line outlines D major, the bass line implies the
tonality of A, and the treble outlines a G♯ diminished chord. The overall effect of the
growing harmonic discord is to increase musical tension and energy.

Example 4.19. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 2, m. 41

The solo trumpet withdraws from the texture as Theme c concludes at measure 45, but the tension does not release. As seen in Example 4.20, this is due to a further increase of tempo and the presence of dissonance, in the form of a persistent A♭, in the ostinato (the harmony and the melodic line outline E♭ minor). The melodic line’s continuing avoidance of downbeats emphasizes that the music between measures 45-59 is really a continuation of the already established Theme c, and establishes these fourteen measures as an interlude.

---

120 One could also argue that the treble line suggests an E dominant seventh chord, if one takes into account the E in the bass line.
The solo trumpet doubles the top melodic line when it re-enters in measure 53. The tonal center moves upwards by a half-step to E, but an A♭ is added to the context, to maintain the already established dissonance of the fourth scale degree. The melodic line changes into major with the modulation, but it is written in the Lydian mode, accounting for the A♭ in the bass line. Liebermann concludes this subsection by firmly resolving downwards, again by half-step, to E, major: the dissonance disappears as Liebermann grants relief, albeit only briefly.

Played over a drone E♭ in the lower strings and piano, our attention is drawn to a soaring theme (Theme d), which is characterized by the repetition of a quarter note, two eighth notes, and two quarter notes during a four measure period:
The theme and the drone are accompanied by the pitches B♭, A♭, and G, which are played by the tubular bells at random and are meant to serve as an imitation of church bells.\footnote{The piano is given this task in the reduction, though Example 4.21 does not include this indication. In both the orchestral version and the piano reduction, the musician is instructed to begin the passage with a B♭ on the downbeat of measure 59 and not to coordinate the notes with the tempo of the work.} As seen above, Theme d is commandeered by the first violin in measure 65, which is imitated by separate lines over a successive period of two beats. This creates an interesting contrapuntal and somewhat canonic texture. There is a harmonic shift to E (in its Lydian mode) in measure 69 when the solo trumpet has a short break. The imitation of Theme d continues for an additional four measure cycle.

Seen in Example 4.22, measure 73 brings an unexpected lurch to the harmonically remote key of C, as the solo trumpet plays a descant line (Theme e) above the Theme d imitation. The solo line begins in C major, but evolves to C Phrygian with its usage of B♭, E♭, A♭, and D♭. This gives the phrase a somewhat nebulous harmonic quality. The first climax of the second movement comes at measure 76, as the trumpet reaches the high point of this phrase. However, a diminuendo is quickly called for and the D♭ in the bass provides an unsettling dissonance as the energy level subsides and the bells fade out. This reduces the energy of the music and prepares the listener for the approach of a more consequential climax.
As the bells fade, the half note ostinato in the bass is replaced by a contrasting ostinato comprised of repeating triplets in the upper woodwinds. As before, the ostinato plays the predominant role in determining the harmony, which is clearly G major at this point. The solo trumpet introduces a new wandering melody (Theme f). Seen in Example 4.23, the theme begins in G major, but does not stay there. The theme is characterized by its lyrical syncopation and somewhat wider intervallic leaps than have generally been seen thus far in the concerto’s lyrical themes.

Example 4.23. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 2, mm. 83-86
At measure 91, Liebermann creates an aurally pleasing combination of the wandering melody (Theme f) and the descant melody (Theme d). There is an uprush of energy as the orchestra swells to the largest climax seen in the work up to this point, culminating with the re-entrance of the solo trumpet in measure 96. At this point, the work finally returns to the key of F natural major and a fff dynamic is used for the first time. The melody used here is a surprise:

Example 4.24. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 2, mm. 96-99

Theme I originally appeared in the first movement at measure 181. Appropriately, this melodic idea leads to another mini-cadenza, just as it did in the first movement. Unlike its presentation in the first movement, the accompaniment to Theme I is aggressively presented: dynamic intensity is high and the triplet ostinato and wandering theme (Theme f) are still present in the texture. The phrase’s apex arrives at the downbeat to measure 99, but the accompaniment suddenly disappears. The solo trumpet

---

122 See Example 4.22, p. 66.
123 See Example 4.15, p. 58.
124 See Example 4.23, p. 66
winds down the unbridled passion in a short and simple mini-cadenza that brings a
recapitulation of the opening themes in reverse order.

Theme b’ is now presented without the ostinato. The purpose of the ostinato was
to build drama but the second movement’s climactic moments have passed. Section B’
thus gives off an aura of contemplation instead of tension.\(^{125}\)  The background texture
adds layers as Theme b’ develops, but a pedal F\(\sharp\) in measure 112 anticipates the arrival of
F\(\sharp\) major in measure 115, and the statement of Theme a’. The chorale’s restatement also
uses unusual harmonic progressions and tonalities. However, the closing chorale does
not search for a tonal center as the opening chorale did: it begins and ends in the key of
F\(\sharp\). As a result, the closing chorale creates a more soothing and calming effect.

**Third Movement**

Lowell Liebermann describes the third movement as a “sort of slapstick comedy”
and helpfully mentions that he has “worked in . . . certain harmonic detours that can
prove amusing.” Overall, this movement “has quickly shifting gears: the music is forever
starting one way but then veering off into something unexpected.”\(^{126}\)  Generally
speaking, this movement has a very different character than the previous two: where the
first was characterized by its ethereal and mystical lyricism and the second by its somber
and grieving melodies, the third movement is jaunty, witty, and contains many instances
of parody.

\(^{125}\) Theme b’ is first presented alone in the piano reduction. In the orchestral version, the theme is
presented by clarinet, but also shadowed by vibraphone and downward octave glisses in the upper strings.
This adds to the meditative effect, but it obviously cannot be recreated in a piano reduction.

\(^{126}\) Keller, 22.
The music critic Barrymore Laurence Scherer has referred to a “Shostakovian urgency” in the *Concerto for Trumpet’s* third movement.\(^{127}\) He is right; not only has Shostakovich had a strong influence on Liebermann in general, but Liebermann has also acknowledged knowingly composing in a Shostakovian manner during the third movement.\(^{128}\) John Marsteller, the commissioner of the work, indicated a desire for “something of Shostakovich” in the concerto, because Edward Treutel had given the American premiere of Shostakovich’s *Concerto No. 1 for Piano, Trumpet, and Orchestra*.\(^{129}\) The jaunty and insistent quarter note accompaniment of the opening of the third movement is reminiscent of Shostakovich’s style, and Liebermann has stated that “the circus-like music” at measure 170\(^{130}\) and the group of fourths which follow at measure 176 are, to him, “total Shostakovich.”\(^{131}\)

It is clear that the third movement experiences an important division at measure 82, where there is a change of meter and a major shift in the character. Viewed this way, it is possible to separate the movement into an unequal binary structure on the macro level, where Section B is a great deal larger than Section A.\(^{132}\) Macro Section A is constructed as an extremely abbreviated ternary form (ABA’), while Macro Section B has a more complicated structure. While Macro Section A uses entirely new thematic ideas,
the much larger Macro Section B almost exclusively uses themes derived from material that originated in the first and second movement. As a result, Macro Section B is best described as a fantasy on previously established themes. Similar to the earlier movements, Liebermann sectionalizes the music in a distinct manner. Table 4.4 outlines the organization of the third movement.

Table 4.3. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, mvt. 3, outline of sections and tonal centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro Level</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Significant Tonal Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1-38</td>
<td>F major, G major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>39-74</td>
<td>E minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A'</td>
<td>74-81</td>
<td>F major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>82-123</td>
<td>F♯ major, A♭ major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>124-168</td>
<td>B minor, unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C'</td>
<td>169-202</td>
<td>F♯ major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D'</td>
<td>202-235</td>
<td>G major, F major, A♭ major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C''</td>
<td>236-266</td>
<td>F♯ major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>267-303</td>
<td>F♯ major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because Liebermann reintroduces a large number of themes from the first and second movement, it is useful to view a summary of the third movement’s themes in a separate table, found below.
Table 4.4. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, mvt. 3, outline of themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Theme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'</td>
<td>B (mvt 1), c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>G (mvt 1), B (mvt. 2), <strong>rising 4th motive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'</td>
<td>A (mvt 1), I (mvt. 1 and 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'</td>
<td>G (mvt 1), F (mvt. 2), E (mvt. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C''</td>
<td>A (mvt 1), I (mvt. 1 and 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>a, c, I (mvt. 1 and 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third movement follows directly from the last chord of the second movement without pause. Beginning in F major, the tonality of third movement therefore drops a half-step from the final chord of the second movement, which is, again, one of Liebermann’s favorite devices in this work. Also a familiar device to the previous movements, Liebermann uses an ostinato to open the movement. The ostinato emphasizes the tonality and boldly declares the personality of the section. An interjection by the trumpets and trombones responds to the ostinato, emphasizing the half-step motion.\(^{133}\) The unexpected **ff** dynamic and the half-step shift upwards to F\(\sharp\) major in measure 7 is one of the humorous devices seen in the movement. Seen in the example below, the solo trumpet introduces a lyrical but agile melody over the separated quarter-note ostinato.

\(^{133}\) The trumpets and trombones are muted in the orchestration; the trumpets use a harmon mute and are instructed to create a “wa” sound with each note. This underscores the light-hearted and humorous nature of the music, as Liebermann asked for the same effect in the first movement at measure 171, another tongue-in-cheek moment.
Example 4.25. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 10-18

The solo trumpet’s melody in the above example generally unfolds in step-wise motion. While it reinforces the tonal center, the melodic line uses several chromatically altered pitches, such as E♭ and D♭. The pitches highlight Liebermann’s use of B♭ minor in measure 14 as a chromatic neighboring IV 6-4 chord, a harmonic decoration. While the theme is new, some of the individual gestures are not. For example, the trumpet’s opening motive in measure 10 is an exact quotation (in a different enharmonic spelling) of the first movement’s opening theme, and the descending response to the trumpet’s melody, which starts in measure 16, is strikingly similar to the background decoration seen in measure 5 of the first movement.

The subsequent passage (measure 18-38 of the third movement) is a repeat of measure 2, but is transposed up by a major second. At measure 29, the rising eighth note

---

134 See Example 4.2, p. 43.
figure is further developed, the harmony shifts to D major, and the falling sixteenth note figure is also further extended. As the music enters Section B at measure 39, the harmonic progression is B minor in measure 37, A½ major in measure 38, and E minor in measure 39. This is obviously an unusual sequence, but the voice leading makes it seem conventional: the uppermost voice of the accompaniment simply moves upwards by half-step in successive measures (D in m. 37, E½ in m. 38, and E in m. 39).

With the beginning of Section B there is a sudden shift in mood, evidenced by the editorial marking, which translated from Italian to English means “suddenly serious, but still at the same tempo.” A chorale-like melody is presented in the clarinets and muted trumpets over an offbeat pattern in the bass. It becomes apparent in due course, as these lines are repeated verbatim at an interval of seven measures, that the chorale merely functions as a background to the main melodic idea (Theme b), which is presented as a new layer by the solo trumpet, and is illustrated in Example 4.26.

Example 4.26. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, modified score, mvt. 3, mm. 46-54

While the thematic material presented by the trumpet is new, the background chorale seen in Example 4.26 is familiar:
This comparison demonstrates that elements of the background texture are borrowed from earlier movements, even though the opening melodic ideas of the third movement are new. At measure 53 of Example 4.26, the first violins begin to restate Theme b, presented by the solo trumpet in measure 46. Seven measures later, the second violin enters with this theme, as the first violin continues with material from the solo trumpet at measure 53, and seven measures after that, the viola enters with the same theme.\textsuperscript{135} In short, Liebermann is writing a canon. In the New York Philharmonic’s program notes, Liebermann refers to this part as a “parodistic section that sounds like Pachelbel’s canon gone awry.”\textsuperscript{136} Nevertheless, the section is not necessarily written in jest, but is meant to be a sudden change in mood and a part of Liebermann’s objective of quickly “changing gears.”\textsuperscript{137}

Following another tritone\textsuperscript{138} cadence (B\textsuperscript{7} to F major), Liebermann returns to the opening ostinato, but only for a short time. The solo trumpet enters at measure 82, in the same manner as at measure 10. However, instead of a variation or repeat of the opening

\textsuperscript{135} The fourth statement of theme, presented by the viola at measure 67, does not appear in the piano reduction.

\textsuperscript{136} Keller, 22.

\textsuperscript{137} Liebermann, interview; See Appendix A, p. 185.

\textsuperscript{138} An earlier tritone cadence was found at mm. 12-13 of Movement 2; see p. 61.
theme, Liebermann suddenly unveils an entirely new texture and overall mood, but not a new theme:

Example 4.28. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 82-89

The theme seen above follows the same pattern, order of notes, and key of its parent theme from the first movement. The surrounding texture is simply so dramatically different that it is possible for the casual listener to overlook this linkage; the theme, presented before in a reflective and mystical context, is now used in a bright and urgent manner. This transformation is an example of the flexibility of Liebermann’s themes.

After a brief transition of rising figures, the structure solidifies around a new melodic idea (Theme c) at measure 104, in A♭ major. Example 4.29 shows the new theme but also demonstrates that this theme has harmonic inflections (7th, 6th, 4th) that are similar to those of Theme a in the first movement. The tonal center of the two themes is separated by a whole step, enharmonically speaking (A♭ and F♯).

---

139 Compare Example 4.28 with Example 4.4 (p. 46).
Example 4.29. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, solo trumpet, mvt. 3, mm. 104-108 and mvt. 1, m. 3-4

Liebermann feinted at the two principal tonal centers of Section C ($F#$ and $A\flat$) back in Section A, which were highlighted with the disrupting $ff$ dynamic in measures 7 and 22. This further emphasizes that the opening material was not only presented in “the wrong key” but also that Macro Section A, as a whole, is a prelude to the principal part of the movement, Macro Section B.

A modulating sequence follows at measure 112 that is based on the repeating half note figures introduced in measure 104. This leads to a spinning out of thematic episodes that partially reproduce memorable themes from the earlier two movements and an alteration of the rising fourth motive. The following examples place each of these episodes alongside their parent theme:
Example 4.30. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, melody, mvt. 3, mm. 124-127 and mvt. 1, mm. 72-75

3rd movement

124  (Theme G [mvt. 1])

(basl, vla) \(\textit{f} \ dim.\)

1st movement

72  (Theme g)

\(\textit{f} (\text{ob, chn, vln})\)

Example 4.31. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, melody, mvt. 3, mm. 131-134 and mvt. 2, mm. 14-17

3rd movement

131  (Theme B [mvt. 2])

(solo trpt) \(\textit{p}\)

2nd movement

14  \(\textit{j = c. 72}\)  (Theme b)

(solo trpt) \(\textit{p}\)
Example 4.32. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 145-149 and mvt. 1, mm. 166-168

Example 4.33. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, melody, mvt. 3, mm. 153-156 and mvt. 1, mm. 60-62
The concerto focuses almost exclusively on the interval of a fourth between measures 139-168. This is partially demonstrated in Examples 4.32 and 4.33, seen above. Competing treble lines and bass lines embrace this interval while diverging to the higher and lower range of their respective registers. At the same time, a decrescendo occurs. This gradual decrease of energy results in a startling reprise of measure 1 of the first movement, seen in the example below. But instead of a simple repeat, Liebermann introduces a transformation of the first movement’s opening theme:

Example 4.34. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 169-177

The texture of the above example is strongly reminiscent of the texture at measure 82; as a result, this section has been labeled as C′. A comparison of the solo trumpet’s
theme above to its parent theme from the first movement\textsuperscript{140} shows that the two lines are identical with respect to key and note order. The surrounding textures, however, are completely opposite. In fact, as the theme at measure 82 of the third movement\textsuperscript{141} was found to be a mutation of Theme b from section A\textsubscript{3} of the first movement, the theme in measure 170 is likewise a mutation of the first movement’s Theme a. Thus, powerful thematic relationships have been established between the first and third movement. In this light, it is clear that Liebermann quoted the opening texture of the first movement in measure 169 to draw the listener’s attention to this thematic relationship.

As he did in Section C of the third movement (m. 82), Liebermann moves to a second thematic idea in Section C’ after a short transition. This second idea, which begins in measure 186, is a re-working of the melody that introduced the mini-cadenzas of both prior movements (Theme I), though it is now nearly unrecognizable to listeners due to the speed and energy of its presentation.

Example 4.35. Liebermann, \textit{Concerto for Trumpet}, solo trumpet, mvt. 3, mm. 186-192\textsuperscript{142}

\begin{quote}
\begin{figure}
\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example4.35}
\end{center}
\end{figure}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{140}See Example 4.2, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{141}See Example 4.28, p. 75.
\textsuperscript{142}To compare with Theme I of the first movement, see Example 4.15, p. 58.
A decorative and technically difficult extension of Theme I completes Section C':

Example 4.36. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 194-196

![Example 4.36. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 194-196](image)

Another section of thematic episodes that quote earlier movements follows. The first theme quoted is Theme G from the first movement, the same theme quoted by the third movement’s earlier episodic section; therefore, this second episodic section is labeled as Section D’. The second thematic episode (Theme F [mvt. 2]) quotes the memorable wandering theme from the second movement\(^{143}\) above an accompanimental texture derived from the solo trumpet’s line in Example 4.36.

Example 4.37. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 208-211

![Example 4.37. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 208-211](image)

\(^{143}\) See Example 4.23, p 66.
Section D’ proceeds with a soaring melody played by the strings. The melody is firmly rooted in A½ major but was first heard in F major, at measure 91 of the second movement. After a crescendo to **ff** in measure 232, a gradual decrescendo leads directly into another recap of the first movement’s opening texture, as we earlier saw at measure 169 of the third movement. It is written in the “wrong key,” but after one measure the music finds its way back to F½ with the solo trumpet’s entrance. Liebermann proceeds with an alteration to the theme, showing musical wit and humor:

Example 4.38. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 237-241

The theme seen above quotes the famous theme from *The Carnival of Venice*. Liebermann has stated that he noticed that the first movement’s opening theme had a close association with the *Carnival of Venice* theme, even though this was possibly disguised to the audience because of the dissimilar nature of harmonic support.¹⁴⁴ As a result, Liebermann alters the melodic line and accompaniment at this point to make the close relationship clear to the audience and, as Barrymore Laurence Scherer of the *Wall

¹⁴⁴ Keller, 22.
Street Journal suggests, “to reassure his listeners that their ears are not deceiving them.”

After this short melodic detour, there is a third reprise of the “circus-like music,” which is labeled as Section C”. This section presents a nearly literal repeat of the material heard at measure 170 of the third movement. The only substantive difference is found in the solo trumpet’s ascending run at measure 257, where several notes are chromatically altered.

The Coda begins at measure 267. Liebermann uses this concluding section to revisit two themes originally introduced in the third movement. He begins with a review of the three-note gesture that began Theme a, originally played by the solo trumpet in measure 10. The three-note gesture’s frequency of repetition gradually increases, creating a hemiola effect:

Example 4.39. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 272-277

---

145 Scherer.

146 See Example 4.34, p. 79.

147 See Example 4.25, p. 72.
Liebermann next employs Theme c (from m. 104 of the third movement)\textsuperscript{148} but this time it is written in the home key of F\#. The last theme Liebermann uses in the coda is Theme I (the pre-cadenza theme in movement 1 and 2, and the circus theme in movement 3). It is fitting that this is the last theme to be used, as it was the only theme to be seen in all movements. An ascending line in the orchestra is taken up by the solo trumpet, which climbs to its highest notes of the work:


The rising fourth motive is clearly present in the bass line of Example 4.40. The line is played by the snare drum in the orchestra, so the reduction and orchestral score share the same rhythm, but not the same melodic interval. However, Liebermann created the piano reduction himself,\textsuperscript{149} so the inclusion of the motive in the piano reduction shows that the snare drum alludes to the rising fourth motive in the orchestral version. Liebermann has used this motive, in a work full of lyrical themes and memorable tunes, to help bind the work together as an organic whole. It is therefore altogether appropriate for the motive to be found at the opening of the concerto as well as at the end.

\textsuperscript{148} See Example 4.29, p. 76.

\textsuperscript{149} Lowell Liebermann, interview; See Appendix A, p. 177.
Practice and Performance Considerations

Lowell Liebermann’s *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* is a difficult work and presents significant challenges for prospective performers. A review of the concerto, written in the ITG journal, states that the concerto’s inherent challenges make the performance of it most appropriate for professionals.\(^{150}\) Additionally, Hickey’s Music Center, a popular resource for sheet music, rates the Liebermann *Trumpet Concerto* as a “Grade 6” piece\(^{151}\) (with Grade 7 being the most difficult). The concerto uses no extended or experimental techniques and the challenges it presents are certainly not insurmountable for a talented and fundamentally sound collegiate musician. If approached in an intelligent manner, the study and performance of this piece can ultimately be enriching and rewarding.

Some of the most challenging aspects of this work involve range (F\(#\)\(^3\) to D\(^6\)), tricky technical passages, wide intervallic leaps, and very quick multiple tonguing. However, as Ryan Anthony has said, the work’s most difficult feature involves pacing.\(^{152}\) The concerto contains many lengthy lyrical phrases and soft entrances. The concerto is approximately twenty-five minutes long and the last two notes are the solo trumpet’s highest notes of the concerto. Therefore, the trumpet player needs considerable endurance and strength for either a performance with an orchestra or on a recital. If a trumpet player is scheduled to play just the concerto, Ryan Anthony suggests that he/she


\(^{152}\) Ryan Anthony, interview by author, recording, Coral Gables, FL, March 12, 2011; See Appendix B, p. 196.
should be able to play through the entire concerto twice. If performing it as part of a recital, he thinks that the soloist should be able to play through the entire recital program without breaks, followed by a short rehearsal of problem areas.\textsuperscript{153}

Because most trumpeters who perform this work will use the piano reduction, the trumpet player needs to think of the performance as an ensemble performance since the piano accompaniment is extremely difficult and, in many ways, as virtuosic as the solo part. Liebermann has said that his philosophy with reductions is that it is preferable to include everything found in the orchestral version that is necessary for the performer to hear, even if it’s almost unplayable.\textsuperscript{154} To play the work, a pianist will need a reasonable amount of practice time. If at all possible, the pianist, as well as the soloist, should become familiar with the orchestral version and strive to bring out the orchestral language in their part.\textsuperscript{155} For the best possible performance of the concerto, the soloist and pianist will need to spend quality time rehearsing to successfully present the concerto’s collaborative nuances.

**First Movement**

The opening movement offers a full range of moods. Both the beginning and ending of the movement are delicate, ethereal, and mystical, but they border a florid, militant, and aggressive middle section. The first movement presents a wide array of challenges, including the shaping of lengthy lyrical phrases, soft passages in the high tessitura, rapid multiple tonguing, and swift melodies with awkward fingering.

\textsuperscript{153} Anthony, interview; See Appendix B, p. 197-198.

\textsuperscript{154} Liebermann, interview; See Appendix A, p. 177.

\textsuperscript{155} Anthony, interview; See Appendix B, p. 195.
combinations. A performer should carefully study the rise and fall of phrases to produce an intelligible and original musical plan. In addition, the soloist must make note of the different articulations found in the middle of the movement; the performer should make a very clear distinction between staccatos, tenutos, and the varying types of accents.

The first important question the performer needs to address is the type of mute used in the opening passage. The solo part that comes with the piano reduction indicates “con sord.” (which usually means straight mute). However, the orchestral score indicates cup mute. Both Phil Smith and Ryan Anthony used a cup mute for the opening phrases of their performance, so the use of a cup mute at the opening is certainly acceptable. If using a straight mute, the performer will have difficulty creating a suitable timbre. Metal straight mutes tend to make the opening bars sound too bright, but plastic straight mutes tend to not provide enough energy for the ascending runs that start at measure 14. An inventive approach with the straight mute tends to work best. As a compromise, a performer might try using a metal straight mute with a Crown Royal bag over the bell or over the mute. If using a cup mute, the performer must “dig in” to the lowest notes for them to be audible.

The performer’s goal in the opening section should be to create a tranquil and placid mood. With this in mind, he/she should strive to create expressive, yet completely smooth phrasing. A natural tendency is to swell from note to note of the extended slurs, especially when they occur in downward motion. This can be avoided if the performer

156 Anthony, interview; See Appendix B, p. 198.

keeps a steady airflow behind the notes, and concentrates on maintaining a full sound quality and the richest possible vibrancy from the beginning note of each phrase.

The opening phrases are broken up by eighth rests in ways typified by the rests found in measures 4, 7, and 8. While the performer must respect the notated rest, the phrases can sound choppy and pedantic if the rests break up the musical line. This possible segmentation can be avoided if the performer envisions the note immediately before the rest continuing over the break, while still leaving a break to acknowledge the rest.

The first aggressive articulations appear at measure 51. The performer should pay special attention to the short accents and the staccatos, striving to make them sound different. However, the notes which have no marking regarding length and the notes with tenutos must be allowed to ring. The soloist should strive for clarity and uniformity on the articulations. Practicing simple exercises that address and isolate fundamental aspects of trumpet playing is an excellent way to improve one’s ability; this approach is usually superior to working out fundamental issues while practicing solo literature. To address clarity and uniformity of articulation, simple and helpful exercises can be found in pages 28-36 of Jean Baptiste Arban’s famous Complete Conservatory Method for Trumpet.158 The short exercises will be most helpful if played under tempo. Striving for stability and listening for consistency on the attack, one should use both “tu,” and “ku” single tonguing, along with multiple tonguing.

---

The descending passage of thirty-second notes found in measures 57-59 is a somewhat difficult phrase to execute. There are three principal challenges involved: 1) The descent from A₃ to an accented F₃, while maintaining the same core sound and f dynamic, 2) coordination of tongue and fingers, and 3) awkward finger combinations, especially the C♯/B♯ grouping followed by the A/G♯ grouping in measure 58.

Example 4.41. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, skeleton of melody, mvt. 1, mm. 57-59

Besides practicing the above passage slowly and meticulously, Ryan Anthony suggests creating a skeletal line in the descending phrase and slurring downward on these structural notes to capture the essence of the line; in short, turning the phrase into a “flexibility exercise.” Additionally, trumpet players sometimes tend to rush when playing this downward line; performing the line in a methodical and deliberate style should create immediate improvement.

With the arrival of measure 60, the solo trumpet has three rhythmically similar phrases. Not only should the performer maintain sound intensity through each phrase, but each subsequent phrase should be more intense than the one preceding it. The soloist should also be aware of the measures where he/she has a countermelody or a supporting

---

159 Anothony, interview; See Appendix B, p. 200.
line and not the melody. For example, even though the solo trumpet’s countermelodic line between measures 120-132 does not have specific dynamic markings, he/she should play with subtlety, observing the nuances of his/her part underneath the piano’s (or orchestra’s) dynamic level. As the solo trumpet line ascends, beginning in measure 127, the soloist should reassert his/her primacy.

Perhaps the most difficult technical element of the first movement involves the execution of the sextuplets, beginning at measure 135. They occur at a very fast tempo (\(\text{\textbf{=150}}\)). This makes clear triple tonguing difficult, as it requires two “tu” syllables to be strung together in each three note grouping. Mr. Anthony has recommended that the soloist use “as light a tongue as possible,” “fast air,” while “keeping the tongue forward.” He further recommends practicing the line while flutter tonguing to keep the tongue loose and the air fast.\(^{160}\) It may also be helpful to double tongue through the sextuplets instead of using triple tonguing; this will allow for a simple alteration of “tu” and “ku” syllables.

The orchestral score indicates that the soloist should use a straight mute between measures 165-168. This is, apparently, a typo; Mr. Liebermann indicated to Mr. Anthony that he would prefer the trumpet be open in this passage.\(^{161}\) Additionally, the indication of “wah-wah” mute at measure 171 should say “harmon mute;” this is indicated in the orchestral score.\(^{162}\) When using the harmon mute, the performer should keep the stem in, not only to facilitate the creation of the “wah,” but also to make sure that the phrase speaks audibly enough.

---

\(^{160}\) Ibid.; See Appendix B, p. 200.

\(^{161}\) Ibid.; See Appendix B, p. 199.

\(^{162}\) Liebermann, interview; See Appendix A, p. 179.
In the final section, starting at measure 194, it is once again important for the solo trumpet to maintain the vibrancy of sound by “digging in” to the low register, especially in measure 195-196, since the cup mute naturally dampens the radiance of the sound. The soloist must be careful not to play too softly or decrescendo too quickly in the final phrase, starting at measure 199. In this phrase, the soloist simply needs to remember that it is more important to create a mystical and silky color rather than a soft sound with no character.

Second Movement

The second movement of Liebermann’s Trumpet Concerto contains a number of lengthy lyrical melodies which look deceptively simple upon first inspection. In context, however, they will test a performer’s stamina and musical maturity. This movement presents challenges of musicality, expression, nuance, and endurance, rather than challenges of technique and agility. Fortunately, Liebermann gives the soloist helpful rest periods in this movement, thus separating several of the longer phrases. The periods of respite should allow a well-conditioned performer to maintain his/her strength throughout the movement. The solo trumpet part can therefore be divided into six segments, separated by the multiple bars of rest.163 Because strength and control of the sound is important, the trumpeter would do well to practice each passage individually. Over time, he/she can slowly string them together, which will allow him/her to build the needed endurance.

The pianist should put a great deal of thought into both the opening and closing chorale. The two sections are relatively simple compared to the rest of the reduction, but

---

163 Segment 1 begins at measure 14, segment 2 at measure 31, segment 3 at measure 53, segment 4 at measure 73, segment 5 at measure 83, and segment 6 at measure 95.
this can make the sections sound lifeless and flat. A reasonable amount of rubato, along with meticulous attention to the indicated crescendos and decrescendos, will create interesting and affecting music.

The first phrase for the solo trumpet, starting at measure 14, while not difficult from a standpoint of range or endurance, is a good example of a passage that will test the performer’s musical acumen. Marked *molto espressivo*, it is relatively static and uncomplicated. The dynamic must remain soft; however, it should not sound banal or uninspiring. Thus, nuance is important in this line to impart expression and emotion, but within a soft context. Experimenting with adding or removing vibrato and creative phrasing that responds to the rise and fall of the melodic line will help the performer produce an individualized and expressive melody.

The solo line’s next four segments are physically more demanding; each segment has sustained melodies written in a high tessitura, expanding the soloist’s range to B5, C6, C6, and B5, respectively. The soloist should make sure the tempo is not dragging or too sluggish in segments 2, 3, or 4. Increasing momentum at this point enhances the musical effect and allows for greater expression.

Breath control is especially important in the relatively quiet segments 2 and 3. The soloist must be sure to take relaxed breaths, endeavor to keep bodily tension to an absolute minimum, and try to create a floating and warm sound. The process of achieving control over decrescendos and crescendos in the upper register can be facilitated through isolating the most difficult individual pitches (such as the A♭ in measure 33, the G in measure 37, the F in measure 45, and the B in measure 53) and
practicing hairpins, while striving to produce a smooth change in volume and a pure sound, in the following manner:

Example 4.42. Hairpin practice in the trumpet’s upper register

Because a cup mute is used for the solo trumpet’s entrance on B5 in measure 53, the soloist will need to account for the increased resistance of the mute. To overcome the resistance, it will be necessary to use a steady, intense, but refined airstream. While the solo line does not indicate a crescendo between measures 53-59, a gradual increase in volume leading to the bottom of the line would be musically appropriate.

In the concerto’s premiere performance, Phil Smith kept the cup mute in through measure 69 – this was a change that Smith had earlier suggested. Mr. Liebermann said that he liked the idea and had meant to make the change official in both the piano and orchestral score. Nevertheless, if the soloist observes the current indications in their part, he/she must be prepared for a quick mute change at measure 60. Ryan Anthony

---

164 Liebermann, interview; See Appendix A, p. 181.
mentioned, starting at measure 59, Maestro Gittleman slightly reduced the tempo to accommodate the mute change;\textsuperscript{165} other soloists may also find this a satisfactory solution.

Two of the most demanding phrases of the movement are unquestionably located at the end of segment 3 and the entirety of segment 4 (measures 61-79). Between measures 61-66, the soloist should be aware of the first note in each measure:

Example 4.43. Liebermann, \textit{Concerto for Trumpet}, solo trumpet, mvt. 2, mm. 61-66

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example4.43}
\caption{The arrows highlight the gradual ascent of the melodic line.}
\end{figure}

The example shows a macro pattern of rising stepwise motion. The soloist should be aware of where he/she is heading (C\textsubscript{6}) and try to be set up for the highest pitch at the beginning of the phrase. The soloist must not let the G\textsubscript{4} in measure 61 or A\textsubscript{4} in measure 62 interfere with the upward trajectory of the overall line. Segment 4 also ascends to C\textsubscript{6}, but at a $f$ dynamic. This melody also moves upwards in stepwise motion. To effectively improve the performance of this phrase, the performer may want to slowly practice slurred octave minor scales at a loud dynamic, starting with A\textsubscript{4}-A\textsubscript{5} and trying to expand to D\textsubscript{5}-D\textsubscript{6}. The overall goal of this mode of practice should be to exceed the demands of the phrase and to produce an even sound quality over the octave.

The orchestral score indicates a reduction of the tempo to $\frac{1}{2}$=82 at measure 81. This seems logical since this creates an arch of the movement’s tempo structure, which

\textsuperscript{165} Anthony, interview; See Appendix B, p. 199.
corresponds with its arch-like thematic structure. As a result, the soloist and pianist should observe this reduction in tempo, even though it is not indicated in the piano score.

The solo trumpet’s last phrase (starting at measure 95) marks the first appearance of a $fff$ dynamic in the concerto. If the phrase is to create a maximum emotional impact, it must remain powerful and grow in intensity through the cutoff of the fermata in measure 99. Effective pacing of the following mini-cadenza will bridge the gap between the intensely passionate fermata and the reflective reprise of the opening themes. A gradual decrease in tempo that coincides with lengthening the duration of the cadenza’s printed notes will aid the performer with this short transition from one extreme emotion to another.

**Third Movement**

The third movement of Liebermann’s *Concerto for Trumpet* not only contains lyrical passages that challenge the soloist’s phrasing ability and musicality, but it also contains many rapid and florid passages that are challenging to execute cleanly. As in the previous movements, the performance of the third movement also entails confronting issues of range and endurance. Even though many of the solo trumpet’s phrases are lengthy and contain passages above the staff, the performer must have strength in reserve to finish the concerto, which ends on D6 and C♯6. The greatest difficulties, besides endurance, presented in this movement are of finger dexterity and flexibility.

While the tempo of the opening movement is marked at $\textit{q}=76$, the New York Philharmonic played the premiere at approximately $\textit{q}=92$. However, the performers should endeavor to use the slower tempo; this will allow them to play the following material at measure 82 at a doubled tempo, as indicated. If the performers begin at too
brisk a pace, they will have to hedge on the mathematical relationship or risk making the subsequent music unplayable.

The opening section (measures 1-38) is fairly straightforward. The accompaniment should be extremely crisp and should blatantly exaggerate the dynamic contrasts, to bring out the music’s humor and Shostakovian inspiration. Likewise, despite the slurred nature of the lines, the soloist should strive to bring out a playful, vivacious, and buoyant character in his/her sound to reflect the character of the accompaniment. To create effective music, the soloist also must not neglect the shaping of the two lengthy phrases. While it is important to observe the rests (for example, in measures 10, 11, 15, etc.) they should not break up the complete musical thought. The sixteenth note mordent-like figures can be somewhat difficult to control, especially the descending passage beginning at measure 32. Most performers will need to diligently practice the sixteenths in measure 32 and 33 to establish dexterous use of the third valve.¹⁶⁶

The character of the following lyrical section should be dark to reflect the “suddenly serious” mood. Liebermann has stated that it was very difficult to create a piano reduction for this section.¹⁶⁷ The trumpeter and pianist must be aware of the canon, first introduced in the solo line at measure 46. The subsequent statements of the canon are found in the piano (at measures 53 and 60). The pianist should highlight the canon entrances even at the expense of the accompanimental figures, if necessary.

¹⁶⁶ The passage becomes easier if the performer uses an alternate fingering on A5 (using 2 or 3 instead of 1-2). For most performers, though, this will significantly change the timbre of the note, making this solution imperfect at best.

¹⁶⁷ Liebermann, interview; See Appendix A, p. 184.
Liebermann does not provide much editorial instruction regarding phrasing in this section, so the performers should spend some time considering how to shape the musical lines. The soloist will need to create a musical plan, including breath marks. The trumpet line contains a number of short rests and the trumpet player should avoid breathing after each of them, which will result in a feeling of being “overfull” and likely cause excess body tension. The soloist should gradually increase the brilliance of his/her sound through the ascending line that leads to C6 in measure 74; this creates an effective retransition.

Beginning at measure 82, the soloist should concentrate on producing crisp and consistent articulation; the goal is to create a clear point on the staccato quarter notes while giving each note a full-bodied sound. Herbert L. Clarke’s “Second Studies” from his *Technical Studies* method book\(^\text{168}\) are beneficial exercises for addressing this issue. One should practice them slowly, treating each note of the exercise as a quarter note, played in the style and register found at measure 82 of the third movement, while monitoring the clarity of his/her articulation and the resonance of his/her sound.

There may be a tendency to rush in the dotted quarter and eighth note measures; the soloist should take care to avoid compressing the eighth notes and play them deliberately. The trumpet player may also find it difficult to center the heavy and accented half notes at measure 112, which are complicated by the wide intervallic skips and notes in the low register. The trumpeter should practice slurring the intervals and buzzing the intervals on just the mouthpiece, to make sure he/she is hearing the correct pitches. The performer should also use his/her loudest and “buzziest” metal straight mute

---
that gives him/her the greatest degree of articulative precision in the passage at measure 139.

The *prestissimo* section at measure 170 will give all but the most technically skilled players a great deal of trouble. The marked tempo is extremely fast, and many players may be helped by performing a few “clicks” under the tempo. To help with the downward lip slur at the end of measure 187, it is acceptable for the soloist to use a 1-2 fingering on G4, instead of the usual open fingering. The note passes so quickly that the change in note color and the inherent flatness of the partial is not perceptible.

Most would agree that the phrase between measures 193-202 is the most difficult technical passage of the concerto, due to the rapidity of the line and the quick changes of register involved. Ryan Anthony stated that he simplified the phrase by creating a skeletal structure of the musical line:169

Example 4.44. Liebermann, *Concerto for Trumpet*, skeleton exercise, mvt. 3, mm. 194-202

He practiced this slowly, both slurred and articulated. Once he filled in the line, his goal was to think of the notes in between as passing tones and to keep his attention

---

169 Anthony, interview; See Appendix B, p. 200.
focused on the most important structural notes of the skeleton. The performer’s aural goal should be for the passage to sound “light” and nimble, instead of labored.\textsuperscript{170} The orchestral score has a \textit{calmato} indication at measure 202 and decreases in tempo to $\frac{1}{4}=152$ by measure 206. This is not indicated in the piano score but should be observed by the trumpeter and pianist.

The trumpeter must be aware of the differences in the second \textit{prestissimo}, namely in the rising eighth notes figures of measures 257-258. The soloist should conscientiously practice these two very similar, but slightly different runs because it is easy to confuse one with the other. Coordinating the fingers and tongue during the hemiola pattern of measures 275-277 may be more difficult than anticipated. The soloist should be as deliberate as possible with the valves and concentrate on maintaining a steady air column through the end of the phrase.

Assuming that the trumpet player has acquired the needed range, endurance, and strength through extended practice of fundamentals from well-known method books including those by Schlossberg, Irons, Arban, Clarke, and/or Stamp,\textsuperscript{171} the performer may still have difficulty being strong at the end, if, for example, it is the last piece on a recital. The performer can help himself/herself by using the previous phrase (between measures 289-297) to prepare for the last two measures. The performer should have as relaxed and open an air column as possible and should retain the setup that he/she had on the A\# in measure 297 through the three-plus bars of rest that follow. By keeping the

\textsuperscript{170} Ibid.; See Appendix B, p. 200.

same setup, and aggressively blowing through the upward slur, the soloist should be able
to spectacularly execute the concerto’s final gesture, assuming substantial time has been
spent building a foundation for success.
Biographical Sketch of John Williams

John Towner Williams has been said to have “the biggest name recognition of any living symphonic composer”\textsuperscript{172} and is unquestionably one of the most significant people associated with modern American music. As of May 2010, he has won twenty-one Grammy Awards, four Golden Globes, five Oscars, and “with forty-five Oscar nominations, is the second-most nominated person after Walt Disney.”\textsuperscript{173} He was inducted into the Hollywood Bowl Hall of Fame in 2000 and was the recipient of a Kennedy Center Honor in 2004.

John Williams was born in New York City on February 8, 1932 and began piano lessons at the age of eight. Stephen Moss remarked that “Williams was born with a score in his hand: his father was a musician with the CBS Radio Orchestra in New York and later with 20\textsuperscript{th} Century Fox in Los Angeles.”\textsuperscript{174} After moving with his family to Los Angeles in 1948, he attended Los Angeles City College and UCLA, studying orchestration with Robert van Epps and composition with Mario Castelnuovo-Tedesco. After serving in the United States Air Force (1951-1954), where he spent part of his time

\textsuperscript{172} Jack Sullivan, “John Williams: Close Encounters with a Modest Icon,” \textit{American Record Guide} 69, No. 4 (July/August 2006): 30.


orchestrating for and conducting service bands, he studied piano at the Juilliard School with Rosina Lhévinne, while working as a jazz pianist in clubs and recording studios.\textsuperscript{175}

Returning to Los Angeles in 1956, Williams began working as a studio pianist in Hollywood, where he began his distinguished career in the film industry arranging and composing music for television while collaborating with composers such as Bernard Herrmann, Alfred Newman, and Franz Waxman.\textsuperscript{176} Through the 1960’s he composed for many television series, winning two Emmy Awards in the process. He also worked for Columbia Records as a pianist, arranger, and conductor; he also recorded several albums with André Previn.

During the mid-1960’s, Williams began writing scores for feature films; some of his first scores were written for comedies. His already remarkable versatility and talent was demonstrated in several early endeavors: his score\textsuperscript{177} for the film \textit{The Reivers} (1969), which exhibited a “rollicking dose of Americana”\textsuperscript{178} and earned him his first of many Academy Award nominations for Best Original Composition, his composition of the underscore to the film \textit{Goodbye, Mr. Chips} (1969), and his adaptation of the score for the film, \textit{Fiddler on the Roof} (1971), which won him his first Academy Award. Williams also garnered a great deal of acclaim during this period for his scoring of disaster films.


\textsuperscript{177} Williams’ score for \textit{The Reivers} replaced a rejected earlier score, composed by Lalo Schifrin.

such as *The Poseidon Adventure* (1972), *Earthquake* (1974), and *The Towering Inferno* (1974).\textsuperscript{179}

His scoring of *The Reivers* and *The Cowboys* (1972) inspired Steven Spielberg to hire him for his debut film, *The Sugarland Express* (1974).\textsuperscript{180} This marked the beginning of a long association between the two men: over thirty-seven years, Williams has scored all but one of Spielberg’s films. Spielberg’s second film, *Jaws* (1975), became the highest grossing film of all time and “Williams' varied and full-bodied score – especially the repeated two notes of the shark theme – was one of the most talked about contributions to the film's success.”\textsuperscript{181} While Williams’ reputation was further cemented by subsequent smashing successes, including *Close Encounters of the Third Kind* (1977), *Superman* (1978), *Raiders of the Lost Ark* (1981), and *E.T.: the Extra-Terrestrial* (1982), his legacy was ensured by his work with filmmaker George Lucas in the original *Star Wars* trilogy (1977, 1980, 1983). In 2005, his score for *Star Wars* was chosen as the best film score of all time by the American Film Institute.\textsuperscript{182} Since the early 1980’s, Williams has continued to be arguably the most uniquely celebrated and predominant composer in the United States. He has subsequently continued to produce noteworthy scores for films such as *JFK* (1991), *Jurassic Park* (1993), *Schindler’s List* (1993), *Amistad* (1997), *Saving Private Ryan* (1998), the *Star Wars* prequels (1999, 2002, 2005) and *Memoirs of a

---

\textsuperscript{179} Bettencourt, “Timelines: John Williams; Part One.”

\textsuperscript{180} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{182} Father Raymond J. De Souza, “The Force is Strong with this One,” *National Post* (Toronto), May 31, 2007.
Geisha (2005). Williams is widely credited with reviving and reinvigorating symphonic movie music, which had become a victim of pop and synthesizer sounds in the 1960’s and 1970’s, and with providing an opportunity for classical music to be encountered by younger and more multinational audiences.\textsuperscript{183}

Mr. Williams’ record is also full of successes in the realm of conducting. While he has guest conducted many of the world’s major symphony orchestras, his most notable conducting role was his fourteen-year tenure as the Music Director of the Boston Pops Orchestra, beginning in 1980. These decidedly successful years saw the Boston Pops connect with a new audience, as the position “enabled [Williams] to compose many occasional pieces, as well as to conduct numerous best-selling recordings of works in the classical and film repertories.”\textsuperscript{184}

Even though Williams considers himself a film composer first and foremost, and has stated, “I’ve done concert pieces as a kind of respite from my other work,”\textsuperscript{185} much of his occasional and concert music is as equally well-known and celebrated as his film music. He has composed two symphonies and a number of other works for the concert stage. Some of his most recognized music in this genre are his themes for four Olympic Games (1984, 1988, 1996, 2002), NBC News, and “Liberty Fanfare,” which was composed for the rededication of the Statue of Liberty in 1986.\textsuperscript{186} He has also been


\textsuperscript{184} Palmer and Marks, 410.


highly respected as a composer of solo concertos: as of October 2010, he has written eleven concertos, many premiered by famous musicians, including Yo-Yo Ma, Gil Shaham, and Dale Clevenger.

Table 5.1. List of Concertos Written by John Williams

| Concerto for Flute and Orchestra | 1969 |
| Concerto for Violin and Orchestra | 1976 |
| Concerto for Tuba and Orchestra | 1985 |
| Concerto for Clarinet and Orchestra | 1991 |
| Concerto for Bassoon and Orchestra (The Five Sacred Trees) | 1993 |
| Concerto for Cello and Orchestra | 1994 |
| Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra | 1996 |
| Treesong: Concerto for Violin and Orchestra | 2000 |
| Concerto for Horn and Orchestra | 2003 |
| On Willows and Birches (Concerto for Harp and Orchestra) | 2009 |
| Concerto for Viola and Orchestra | 2009 |
| Concerto for Oboe and Orchestra | (2011) |

Williams’ compositional style has been described as romantically traditionalist, but often with a blend of “traditional musical syntax and expression with avant-garde techniques and elements of popular music.”187 While many of his concert works are written in a slightly more sophisticated, but tonal idiom, Williams has stated that his concert works have been where he has “been able to make some experiments and apply perhaps a denser kind of structuring and texturing because I might have an audience that

---

187 Palmer and Marks, 410.
would pay attention.” Many critics find Williams’ concerto music to be more harmonically adventurous; his *Flute Concerto* is an atonal work. But his concerto output can generally be characterized as inventive and advanced utilizations of the solo instruments’ personalities. For example, Williams’ *Clarinet Concerto* has been described as eloquently portraying “the aspirations and ideas of the history and tradition of clarinet writing.” Likewise, his *Concerto for Horn and Orchestra* also seeks to portray the solo instrument in various roles that illustrate its historical tradition. Each of its movements has a title that invokes certain historical imagery, such as faraway bells, a call to battle, a hunt, and a nocturne.

A number of Williams’ concertos depict some of his most personal feelings. For example, his somber *Violin Concerto* pays tribute to his wife, who tragically died in 1974. His more recent violin concerto, *Treesong*, and his bassoon concerto, *The Five Sacred Trees* invoke a love of nature and reveal a compositional approach that is much more than just style and technique. Williams’ concertos also sometimes reveal his humorous side. For instance, his *Viola Concerto* features a “family argument” between timpani and the solo viola; the solo violist for the premiere was married to the timpanist of the orchestra. Even though Williams’ concertos at times reveal an experimental and erudite approach, the music typically retains some of his signature compositional

---

188 Timothy Mangen, “John Williams Writes Movie Music That’s Hard to Forget,” *Orange County Register* (Santa Ana, CA), July 16, 2002.


characteristics, including ostinatos, virtuosic and idiomatically appropriate writing, and his distinctive approach to orchestral colors and texture. Williams is currently working on an *Oboe Concerto* that is expected to be unveiled in 2011, and will be composing music for Spielberg’s movie, *Lincoln*, in 2012.

**Overview of the Concerto**

The Cleveland Orchestra, with Principal Trumpet Michael Sachs serving as the soloist, premiered John Williams’ *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* on September 26, 1996, under the direction of Musical Director Christoph von Dohnányi. The concerto was commissioned by Tom Morris, the executive director of the Cleveland Orchestra. By all accounts, the world premiere was a marvelous success: music critics commented that the concerto was a work of “dignified personality, soloistic variety, and orchestral color,” praised its “intelligent [and] attractive craftsmanship,” and applauded the “exceptional clarity and shine” of Sachs’s sound and his “superlative grasp of the score’s intricacies.” In speaking of the premiere, Williams said, “It was a wonderful experience! I couldn’t have wished for a better hall, a better conductor, or a finer soloist.”

---

192 Donald Rosenberg, “John Williams’ *Trumpet Concerto* a Hit in Premiere,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, September 27, 1996.


194 Rosenberg.

195 Ibid.

The successful premiere of the trumpet concerto was the result of nearly two years of rigorous collaboration between Williams and Sachs. For Williams, a significant amount of pleasure experienced in the composition of concert music and concertos is derived from the personal connection between the soloist and himself.197 Often, Sachs traveled to Williams’ house in Los Angeles, and worked through parts of the concerto. Mr. Sachs states that Williams “often cited Brahms’ collaboration with Joachim for his violin concerto and how, if it was good enough for Brahms, he would do the same.”198

Williams typically sent Sachs a copy of the new material ahead of their meeting. Together, they discussed a number of technical aspects such as pacing and range and many times, Williams would try out new ideas on the spot during their consultations. The collaboration that Williams and Sachs had in the compositional process was extraordinarily detailed and helped to create a work of satisfying quality.

The Trumpet Concerto was recorded in 2002 by Arturo Sandoval and the London Symphony Orchestra, conducted by Ronald Feldman. Released on Denouement Records, the CD also includes Williams’ Essay for Strings and several works by Kevin Kaska.199

Williams’ Trumpet Concerto contains significant organizational features that acknowledge the musical traditions of the past. For instance, in an interview with Mary Thornton, Williams depicts the concerto as configured in a European classical structure


198 Michael Sachs, interview by author, e-mail, April 2, 2011; See Appendix C, p. 204.

199 John Williams and Kevin Kaska, A Long Way, performed by Arturo Sandoval, trumpet; Ann Hobson Pilot, harp; Kristine Jepson, mezzo-soprano; London Symphony Orchestra; Ronald Feldman, conductor; Denouement Records DR 1003, compact disc.
on the macro-level, as it contains three movements in a fast-slow-fast design. Other traditional characteristics include alternating solo and tutti statements of similar thematic material, an extended solo cadenza near the end of the first movement, contrasting theme groups, and the employment of either rhythmic ostinatos or melodic motives to establish a unifying foundation. The author of the program notes from the premiere observes that Williams’ style is “characterized by great clarity, a heightened sensitivity to melodic lines, and a remarkable virtuosity in orchestration” and asserts that these elements are apparent in this work.

As with most of his other solo concertos, John Williams’ *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* is written in a contemporary harmonic and melodic language. Williams himself describes the harmonic scheme of the concerto as “very nearly tonal” and states that the work is composed in an “American romantic idiom,” though not in a “popular idiom.” While the work and its component movements have no overall tonal center, individual tonal centers can be found throughout the concerto. The specific tonal centers are often well disguised by dissonances, typically sevenths and ninths. Many times, Williams combines diminished, minor, major, and/or augmented sonorities, creating a very dense sound. Williams plainly intends the dissonance to be comprehended as a settled entity, not relying on a consonant resolution to justify its usage. Instead of using functional harmony in a traditional sense, chords are sometimes used as background timbre and underlying ostinatos. Williams uses ostinatos with great frequency

---

200 Thornton, 20.

201 Peter Laki, “Program Notes” from World Premiere performance of John Williams’ *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra*, Cleveland Orchestra (September 26, 1996).

202 Thornton, 20.
throughout the concerto. It functions in one of its customary roles in this work, namely as a device to create varying atmospheres of tension, insecurity, and vigor.

Regarding melodic language, Williams stated that one of his major goals in the composition of this piece was to give the trumpet an “opportunity to sing” in an almost vocal sort of “cantabile expression.” While the slower middle movement is predictably full of lyrical melodies, the outer movements also contain prominent lyrical sections. The melodic lines tend to sound quite angular, but a good deal of this comes from octave displacement. This gives the lyrical melodies an aurally pleasing soaring quality. Other melodies, particularly ones that imitate fanfares, tend to be defined by their embrace of specific intervallic sequences, although no particular interval receives a favored status in the concerto. In his orchestral score, Williams features several instruments of the orchestra in prominent positions, employing the orchestral trumpet section in the first movement, and the trombone, English horn, and flute in the second movement. They are his orchestral “pets,” according to program notes for Williams’ *Tuba Concerto*, so this practice of giving solos to orchestral instruments within a concerto is not unusual for Williams. Their role is to compete with or complement the solo trumpet. While the piano score is well written, it is inherently unable to demonstrate Williams’ masterful orchestration and all of its intricacies.

As with his *Horn Concerto*, Williams seeks to portray the trumpet differently in each movement, in ways that illustrate the trumpet’s historical tradition and wide range of

---

203 Thornton, 20.

204 Jean-Pascal Vachon, Program notes for John Williams’ *Concerto for Tuba and Orchestra*, *20th Century Tuba Concertos*, performed by Øystein Baadsvik, tuba; Singapore Symphony Orchestra; Anne Manson, conductor; BIS Records BIS-CD-1515, compact disc: 8.
expressive abilities. The first movement is meant to portray the trumpet in a traditional ceremonal and military context. The work opens with fanfares for the solo trumpet and the orchestral trumpets, in a “typical heraldic, flag-waving” style. In a section that not only portrays Williams’ sense of humor, but also his sense of theatrics, the end of the cadenza features a musical “chase” between the solo trumpet and the orchestral trumpets, with each trying to demonstrate “what they’ve got.” The second movement depicts the trumpet in its lyrical role, exploring both mystical and jazz-influenced traditions. It contains a smoky, Gershwin-esque main theme that employs elements of the blues. The third movement puts the trumpet in an athletic context, a more recent, post-World War II tradition. It is written as a technical showpiece, employing a great amount of multiple tonguing, extended range, and flashy, mercurial melodic lines.

**Musical Analysis**

**First Movement**

While the structure of the first movement is coherent and well defined, it does not adhere closely enough to any classic formal structure to allow the author to apply a succinct label to its organization. However, each section is denoted by either a change in tempo, or a very significant shift in style. Generally speaking, the form of the first movement may be most accurately described as a ternary form encased between an introduction at the start and a cadenza and coda at the end. This construction makes

---

205 Sachs, interview; See Appendix C, p. 203-204.
206 Thornton, 20.
207 Ibid., 20.
sense on a thematic level: a fanfare theme in the introduction signals the opening of the work, and the same theme is used to announce the transition from the ternary form to the cadenza.

Table 5.2. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, mvt. 1, outline of form and other significant features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Style Marking</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Theme(s)</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Maestoso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>a,b</td>
<td>13-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Risoluto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>21-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>d,e (solo)</td>
<td>25-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>d (orchestral)</td>
<td>42-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>c (transition)</td>
<td>55-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Cantabile/Warmly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>f, g (solo)</td>
<td>63-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>f,c,g,d (orch)</td>
<td>99-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’</td>
<td>Marcato Molto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>120-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>d,e</td>
<td>137-148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cadenza)</td>
<td>Maestoso</td>
<td>trans.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>149-153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cadenza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presto</td>
<td>Measured Cadenza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154-165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’’ (Coda)</td>
<td>A tempo poco meno</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>166-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>175-188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>c (codetta)</td>
<td>189-196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The soloist begins the Introduction without orchestral accompaniment for the first measure, with a heraldic and militaristic gesture, epitomized by the sixteenth/dotted eighth note rhythmic figure. This opening melody (shown in Example 5.1) immediately displays two characteristics of Williams’ composition in this work: the use of intervallic sequences (there are the rising thirds and falling fourths in measure 2) and the octave displacement in measure 3 that changes a simple gesture into a soaring gesture.

Example 5.1. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 1-4

The tonal center of the solo trumpet melody shown above is clearly D. The supporting accompaniment, however, does not support this notion in a traditional sense, as the certainty of the opening measure is startlingly pierced by an E nearly two octaves below. The dissonances grow in stepwise motion as more tones are added to the mix, creating an even more unsettled feeling. In a way, the accompaniment does reinforce the key of D: all the notes of a D minor scale can be found in measures 2-4, except for the D, which is emphatically stated by the solo trumpet. Obviously, this method of harmonic support would be very difficult for an audience to recognize.
In the orchestral score, each new entrance in the opening four bars is stated by different pairings of instruments, comprised of one stringed instrument and one brass instrument (excluding trumpets). The incongruent lines all coalesce into a quiet quarter note pulse in the next subsection. The solo trumpet line above the pulse is a florid and articulate melody of sextuplets, which is still concentrated around a D minor scale.

Example 5.2. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 5-7

A reprise of the opening four measures follows in measures 9-12 (subsection 3), with more emphasis on the sixteenth/dotted eighth note figure in the accompaniment. The last subsection of the introduction creates a fusion of the opening heraldic theme (found in the solo trumpet) with the florid melody (in the orchestral second trumpet), accompanied by the quiet pulse in the brass and a sustained drone in the upper strings.
Example 5.3. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, modified score, mvt. 1, mm. 13-15

While Example 5.3 shows a clear D pedal in the bass and an emphasis on D in the florid orchestral line, the solo trumpet line now avoids D altogether, sounding as if it is now centered around F instead. A B₃ neighbor is now added to the sixteenth/dotted eighth note motive, which avoids the more tonal intervals of a third or fifth and gives instead the more ambiguous interval of a fourth. There is an echo of the motive in the orchestral first trumpet, but it lands on G, a whole step away from the solo trumpet. This is another example of the whole step dissonances that Williams employs in his harmonic scheme.

Section A₁, marked *Risoluto*, opens with a martial theme (labeled as Theme c in Table 5.2) which is characterized by the retrograde of the dotted motive first seen in measure 1, a 3/8 bar, and syncopation in its third measure. Williams often uses the dotted rhythms of measure 21 and the duple sixteenth note rhythm of measure 23 as a background motive throughout the opening movement.²⁰₈

---

²⁰₈ One instance of the usage of Theme c as a rhythmic motive can be found in Example 5.12, p. 123
Example 5.4. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, modified score, mvt. 1, mm. 21-23

The tightly bundled notes\(^{209}\) found in the treble line of the above example are each spaced at the interval of a second, creating a densely textured sound. Despite its appearance, this is not a tone cluster. Instead, the harmonic organization is like that of the introduction; the tonal center is G and has all the notes of a G major scale in the three measures of Example 5.4. The fact that the uppermost voice follows a scalar pattern past the leading-tone F to G in measure 23 helps to identify the tonal center through the high density of notes.

The solo trumpet enters with a new theme at Section A\(_2\) (labeled as Theme d) after this short introduction:

Example 5.5. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 25-28

\(^{209}\) The written G\(_3\) in the treble line of the piano score is an F\(_3\) in the orchestral score except for the note on beat 1 of measure 21. The author assumes that it was kept as a G in the piano score for the pianist’s sake.
The melodic line is ambiguous if one tries to place it within the confines of a particular key. What is clear about its construction is that the first part has a line of rising fourths, the middle part moves upwards by step, and the third part of the line rises in a string of thirds, in the shape of a minor 9th chord. The upward motion and flourish towards the upper note help reinforce the movement’s ceremonial and militaristic attributes. When the solo trumpet reaches the apex of the phrase, the orchestra responds with the dotted rhythm motive just used as Theme c. The chord found in measure 28 is a D major/augmented chord, as it employs both an A and a B♭. This is the first instance of a split chord (in this case a split fifth), which is a device Williams uses in several combinations throughout the concerto.

The melodic line is continued in the solo trumpet with ideas derived from the rising sixteenth motive of measure 27 and the intervals of measures 25-27, utilizing strings of sixteenth notes repeated in groups of two. The line appears to lose direction in the middle, where there is a legato triplet motive (Theme e):

Example 5.6. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, solo trumpet, mvt. 1, m. 35-36

However, another string of sixteenths using the two-note grouping leads upwards to a return of the tonal center of G. As can be seen in Example 5.7, while the solo trumpet takes a few measures to emphasize its arrival on G, the orchestra has already
started a restatement of the material from the beginning of Section A, but in a different inversion. This creates the illusion of an overlap between the solo and orchestral statements.

Example 5.7. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 38-41

The movement’s first orchestral interlude between measures 42 and 62 is split into two sections. The first section (Section A₃) is characterized by a mood of anxiety, which is produced by the swirling broken chord accompaniment that outlines a G Major/Augmented split chord. This is further intensified in measure 47 by a triple split chord, the outline of Aₒ diminished/minor/major. Over this ostinato, groups of low brass and woodwinds reproduce fragments of Theme c and Theme d.
Example 5.8. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score,\textsuperscript{210} mvt. 1, mm. 47-51

An enormous crescendo follows as the dotted eighth-sixteenth rhythm becomes more insistent, dissonant, and higher in register.\textsuperscript{211} This insistent dotted rhythm leads to the second part of the interlude (Section A\textsubscript{4}), a clear restatement of Theme c. Harmonically, there is a mixture of a G Major and B Major chord, which, in the context of this work, can be classified as a combination of a G Major 7th chord and a G Augmented chord or a G Major 7\textsuperscript{th}/Augmented split chord. This leads to a further intensification of the dotted eighth-sixteenth rhythm, with it becoming a unanimous rhythm across the orchestra and growing to a fff dynamic. The solo trumpet enters confidently with Theme d as before, but without orchestral accompaniment. With a quick decrescendo, the solo trumpet transitions into the contrasting Section B, introducing a lyrical melody (Theme f). The beginning of this theme is seen below:

\textsuperscript{210} The piano score contains A\textsubscript{s}, B, C\textsubscript{,} and D in the broken-chord accompaniment. Only the orchestral score contains the E\textsubscript{b}, which cements the diminished, minor, and major sound.

\textsuperscript{211} In the orchestral score at measure 52, the oboe, flute, and piccolo have the highest and most prominent sound in the orchestra, a constant pitch of F\textsubscript{6}. However, the piano score reflects nothing of the kind, instead displaying a constant pitch of D. The same issue with pitch variation also occurs at a similarly dramatic moment between measures 59-60. Additionally, the rhythm on the last beat of measure 53 differs between the orchestral and piano score. The reason for the above discrepancies is unclear.
Example 5.9. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 1, mm. 63-67

Section B₁ can be further broken down into two parts: the first part consists of two phrases, the second has three. The first two phrases feature Theme f. This melody is distinguished from all previous themes by its sustained quality, characteristic syncopated pattern (exemplified in measure 63), and less active melodic line. By changing the octaves of notes in the melody of Example 5.9 to create the most closely spaced melodic line, it would look like the following:

Example 5.10. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, Theme f transposed, mvt. 1

Example 5.10 makes it apparent that Williams, by using a high number of large interval skips in this theme, has created a remarkably lush and soaring melody out of a relatively simple idea. While the theme opens with the hint of an allegiance to B₃,
minor,\textsuperscript{212} it becomes difficult to tie the music to a tonal center after measure 66.\textsuperscript{213} The solo part is supplemented in the orchestra by a sparse texture that nevertheless maintains the interval of a major second throughout the two phrases, which reinforces the harmonic ambiguity. Each of the two phrases is similar in that they grow in tension to a high point in the solo line, but the second phrase achieves a feeling of greater release at measure 79 with the highest pitch of the first part of Section B and, for one of the few times in the concerto, an unfettered tertian chord (A, Major).

The second part of the solo section is indicated with the return of the dotted eighth-sixteenth rhythm. It is, at first, a small part of the texture, but its influence grows over time, anticipating the buildup of vigor towards the end of the solo part of section B. The first phrase of this second section is grounded around a tonal center of F, seen most clearly in measure 84 with the tonic emphasis in the solo line. The second phrase begins with a sudden modulation to the tonal center of A. The soloist displays a new theme (Theme g) in measure 88. While the accompaniment has moved into an alignment with the key of A major, the theme does not really acknowledge this, hovering around D instead, creating an open sonority.

\textsuperscript{212} The B, minor inference is found in measure 63 with the D, in the solo line, the F and B, in the bass line, and the G, viewed as an appoggiatura.

\textsuperscript{213} The D, C, and E found in measure 67-68 of the solo line indicates a harmonic shift. While the usage of F, C, and G in the overall texture insinuates the key of D major or B minor, the aural sense of the tonality does not exist, as neither possible tonic pitch receives any special treatment.
The first violins play a countermelody that soars expressively above the solo trumpet and recalls Theme f, showing the compatibility of these two lyrical ideas. The last measure of Example 5.11 shows the beginning of the solo section’s last phrase, where the solo trumpet joins in with the dotted rhythm, and steadily moves upwards to A5, emphatically confirming the shift of the tonal center. By measure 98, the rhythm across the orchestra has uniformly returned to the dotted eighth-sixteenth with sixteenth duple motive. On the whole, the ending of this solo section bears a resemblance to the ending of the first solo section at measure 42 with its repeated tonic emphasis.

---

214 I have elected to use the orchestral score for this example, rather than the piano score because the underlying sixteenth note pulse in the piano uses different rhythms, likely for greater pianistic ease.

215 See Example 5.9, p. 120.
Likewise, the second orchestral interlude (Sections B₂ and A’₁) is very similar to the first interlude: both consist of two parts that play the same dramatic role. The first part of both interludes expounds upon fragments of established themes²¹⁶ and eventually builds dramatic tension bringing the arrival of the second part. The second part of both interludes uses Theme c as the primary material and not as a background ostinato:

Example 5.12. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, modified score, mvt. 1, mm. 120-125

The second interlude’s statement of Theme c (Example 5.12) is more intense than the analogous material seen earlier at measure 55. Both sections have a similar harmonic structure, though the material has now been transposed upwards by a step. The earlier section combined a G Major and B Major chord to create a G Major 7th/Augmented combination, but this section combines an A Major and C♯ Major chord to create an A Major 7th/Augmented split chord. The energy level grows as Theme c is restated three times.

---

²¹⁶ The revisited theme fragments include Theme f in mm. 99-100, Theme c in m. 104, Theme d in m. 112, and Theme g in m. 114.
times in succession while the upper voices move into an extremely high register. Seen in Example 5.13, the material again consolidates into the dotted eighth/sixteenth rhythm at a sudden \textit{mf} dynamic. This monorhythm is reinforced by outbursts from the lower voices derived from Theme c as a crescendo builds towards the solo trumpet’s re-entrance. In general, the outbursts from timpani and the low voices is a signature aspect of Williams’ use of orchestral color and texture throughout his music.

Example 5.13. Williams, \textit{Concerto for Trumpet}, modified score, mvt. 1, mm. 131-134

The solo trumpet enters (Section A’2) with the angular eighth notes of Theme d as it has with each of its two previous entrances after the introduction, but proceeds after the first measure to combine the triplet and falling seventh intervals of Theme e with the dotted rhythm and rising sixteenths of Theme d:\textsuperscript{217}

\textsuperscript{217} See Examples 5.5 (p. 116) and 5.6 (p. 117) for a musical description of Themes d and e.
The orchestral texture in this section is sparse and the harmony is ambiguous. For example, the accompaniment in measures 138 outlines the combination of a diminished chord (E♭, F♯, A), a major chord (D, F♯, A), and an augmented chord (D, F♯, B♭).

However, these merged sonorities are clearly not reflected in the solo trumpet’s line. These elements combined with waning rhythmic energy, volume, and tempo create an air of mystery and eeriness.

At the moment when the music seems to have lost all direction, the solo trumpet appears to lead the way out of the impasse with a marcato line of eighth notes, organized mainly around the interval of an ascending major seventh, that lead to a restatement of the introduction. Although the return of the opening theme is clearly a dramatic moment, it is clear that the music has not reached a point of equilibrium; the trumpet line is higher in pitch than at the beginning and the tonal center has moved upwards from D to F.

Additionally, all forward motion is suspended: the orchestra is caught up in an echo of the sixteenth/dotted eighth motive and the solo trumpet is held on the quintuplet figure. Once the solo trumpet breaks the pattern in a string of dotted sixteenth/thirty-second notes leading to a spectacular arrival on C6, it finally becomes apparent that the reprise of
the introduction was meant as a proclamation for the coming of the cadenza, similar to how the same theme earlier heralded the opening of the concerto.

Williams’ cadenza provides the soloist with an opportunity to display his/her sense of style, expressiveness, range, and technical prowess using a combination of improvisatory figuration and thematic development. As evidenced by Williams’ editorial marking of “freely” and use of fermatas in the cadenza’s first line, the opening of the cadenza is clearly released from metric restrictions and can be acceptably phrased in many different ways. The middle of the cadenza, which starts at the espressivo marking, incorporates motives heard earlier in the movement, quoting Themes f, d, and c. The climax of the cadenza occurs next, beginning with the tenuto mark over the dotted quarter B5; this section is meant to display the soloist’s range and strength. The climax is all the more impressive since, to this point of the cadenza, Williams had not included any notes above the staff. Williams uses this memorable motive again in the third movement.\(^{218}\)

Example 5.15. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, solo trumpet, mvt. 1, cadenza excerpts

---

\(^{218}\) See Example 5.39, p. 152.
The next section of the cadenza, consisting of improvisatory-like figuration, is metered and coalesces around a strict tempo by measure 156. This section (seen in Example 5.16) functions as a transition to the Coda. With a unique style of orchestrational genius, Williams’ transition not only demonstrates the soloist’s technical abilities, but also those of the three trumpets of the orchestra. The four actors embark on a musical chase in which each seemingly tries to outdo the other with lines of running sixteenth notes that enter almost haphazardly. Eventually all four parts align in a crescendo for an ascending run of sixteenth notes that come to a sudden halt at the highest point of the line.
Theme c, which had up to this time only been taken up by the orchestra, is now firmly restated in the key of G by the solo trumpet and the three orchestral trumpets at the opening of the Coda, followed by an orchestral statement of the same theme. It is written in a lower inversion than previously heard; as a result, while the theme retains its energetic quality, it is simultaneously mild in character. This leads to a return of the
swirling broken chord accompaniment, placed underneath a solo trumpet recap of elements of Theme d. After a subdued climax, the solo trumpet part descends to its lowest pitch of the movement, G3, which is sustained as the orchestra quietly recaps Theme c a final time, confirming the tonal center of G. The first movement’s tranquil ending allows it to flow easily and without pause into the serene opening of the second movement.

Second Movement

The second movement of Williams’ *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* is constructed as a ternary form with an introduction. The introduction serves as a transition from the first movement and introduces a quartet of solo voices in the second movement: the English horn, flute, trombone, and solo trumpet (in order of appearance). Michael Sachs states that Williams had this partnership in mind at the beginning of the compositional process. He says Williams used the trombone because it is the trumpet’s “closest partner in the orchestra,” the English horn because it was the trumpet’s partner in Copland’s *Quiet City*, and the flute because it “gives the trumpet the opportunity to show a very different quieter intimate side.”

The second movement’s two A sections serve as the movement’s structural pillars. In these sections, the solo trumpet emerges as the main soloist above the other featured orchestral soloists with the presentation of a melancholy and beautiful melody. The dividing B section, nearly as long as the other parts of the second movement combined, brings a reemergence of the solo quartet, though the solo trumpet is clearly the leading voice. While the themes presented in Section B are independent from previous

---

219 Sachs, interview; See Appendix C, p. 205.
material, their outline bears a great deal of resemblance to the melodic ideas found in the second movement’s introduction. The B section provides a contrast of strife and restlessness and steadily builds towards a great climax. The heightened intensity is sustained for a short period but a gradual decrease of tension follows the climax and leads to a return of the A material.

Table 5.3. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, mvt. 2, outline of form and other significant features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Themes / Motives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>rising theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11-21</td>
<td>rising theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>22-42</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43-54</td>
<td>b (I and II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55-66</td>
<td>b (I and II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67-86</td>
<td>a, b (I and II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (trans.)</td>
<td>87-93</td>
<td>fragments of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A'</strong></td>
<td>94-109</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The solo lines are placed over a drone in the strings, which is first heard in the second violin and viola, though it eventually expands to softly include the full string section. This accompanying texture, nearly unused in the ostinato-rich first movement, conveys a new mood of serenity. Because the drone simultaneously employs F♯, G, A, B, C, and D, it has only a superficial harmonic impact; its role is to function as background coloration.
The solo quartet provides the other important element of the introduction. The movement opens with the English horn followed by a response from the flute. Following an additional English horn/flute episode, the trombone is paired with the solo trumpet in a comparable relationship. Example 5.17 shows each instrument’s initial melody:

Example 5.17. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, initial melodies of English horn, flute, trombone and solo trumpet, mvt. 2

All the solo instruments, except for flute, which is responding to the English horn line, begin their phrase with an elongated note. Additionally, each solo line ascends from a lower pitch to a sustained upper note. The English horn begins with A3, a fourth below the orchestra’s prevalent pitch (D4) that finished the first movement; the effect is an open perfect fourth sonority. Even though each melodic line is somewhat different, each
prominently features the interval of a seventh, giving the listener a distinct impression of similarity. Tertian harmony between voices is avoided; the themes instead embrace open sonorities like fourths and fifths. The result is a tranquil and amorphous atmosphere.

The second half of the introduction (subsection 2) features a duet between the trombone and solo trumpet over an aleatory texture in the strings. Their repeated patterns at varying moderate speeds give off the same nebulous harmonic effects of their early drone, but create a contrasting and even more unformulated backdrop. The trombone and trumpet line’s usage of sevenths and florid ascending motion in measures 13-15 demonstrate their kinship to the earlier statements. However, this ascending motion gradually becomes a descending pattern by measure 17, shown below in Example 5.18.

As the string pattern dies away, the trumpet ends with an emphasis on G4, while the trombone shifts from C3 to A2, thus giving the introduction an appropriately unsettled ending.

Example 5.18. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, trombone and solo trumpet, mvt. 2, mm. 16-20

Section A begins with an ostinato pattern in the strings that repeats every two measures, placed underneath a soulful and tender melody in the solo trumpet. The
uppermost voice of the accompanimental pattern is dissonant: if it is removed from the texture, the B minor tonal center becomes clear. The solo trumpet melody also camouflages the tonal center by giving a great deal of weight to F, or the fifth scale degree:

Example 5.19. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 2, mm. 26-31

The expressive character of the solo trumpet’s line in Example 5.19 (Theme a) contains a perceptible blues influence. This is seen in the importance of the $\flat 3$ and $\flat 7$ (D and A, respectively) in the melody, which are bordered by half-step neighbors to underscore their influence. Blues melodies traditionally have flattened fifth scale degrees, but in this case Williams highlights a $\flat 6$ scale degree (G) instead, which is approached or departed by a half-step to show its importance. After a sympathetic interjection from the flute and English horn, the trumpet develops the theme and the strings become more responsive to the melody. A crescendo builds for the trumpet’s ascent to B5 and recedes as the section ends. This confirms the B minor tonal center, though the presence of C, C, E, and G in the accompaniment creates an unresolved
texture. This is clearly not unusual for this work; it is simply a part of Williams’ harmonic language.

Example 5.20. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 2, mm. 43-44

Section B begins with a two-measure 3/4 and 5/8 ostinato metric pattern (seen in Example 5.20) and has a more complex orchestral texture than the preceding material. The first measure’s material is constant; the upcoming melody (Theme c) implies that it and this subsection have a tonal center of C. The solo trumpet presents the theme after the ostinato is established, paired with a countermelody in the trombone. The melody and countermelody have essentially the same tail but with a different rhythm and order: the trombone’s notes of beat one in measure 49 match the sixteenths of the solo trumpet on the following beat. The relationship of a seventh between the F and E, along with the similar contour of the trombone line to material in measure 13, displays a kinship between these themes and Theme a of the introduction.
Example 5.21. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, melody, mvt. 2, m. 13 and mm. 47-49

Both the quintuplet motive and the crossing motive,\(^{220}\) first presented in the solo trumpet line at measure 47, are the basis for most of the thematic activity in Section B though there is variance with regard to the intervals used in the motives. Section B can thus be accurately viewed as presenting the same motives on top of several contrasting accompaniments.

The second part of Section B uses a thinner texture, before a shift to a fuller sound that leads towards the movement’s climax. Pizzicato strings utilize harsh *marcato* hits that contrast with more florid lines in the familiar solo voices of English horn, trombone, and trumpet. The strings suggest a B minor tonality. However, this is not reinforced by the solo lines, which avoid B’s altogether. Likewise, dissonances like E, G, and C\(^{##}\) in the strings, in addition to the shortened tone quality of pizzicato notes, contribute to an overall concealment of tonality in this subsection.

---

\(^{220}\) The quintuplet motive consists of a quintuplet followed by an upward release. The crossing motive is a pattern of three sixteenth notes followed by a fourth note of varying length that lands on a beat. The motive is further identified by its pitch contour. Using “1” as the lowest pitch and “4” as the highest pitch, the order of pitches in this motive is 1, 3, 2, and 4.
The three solo lines meanwhile continue to further develop the two motives that comprise Theme b. Williams writes these lines in pairs, sometimes in imitation but always spaced apart by at least one beat. The trombone is paired with the English horn, followed by a trumpet and English horn coupling. A crescendo carried by the English horn and trumpet leads into a new accompanimental background: a bell chorus setting that employs chimes, shadowed by the strings and horns. It supports a declamatory statement of the crossing motive in the solo trumpet with the quintuplet motive in the trombone.

Example 5.22. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 2, mm. 63-66

The ascent to D6 in the trumpet provides the most dramatic moment of the movement; while there are clearly periods of high energy after this moment, there is a gradual and inexorable reduction of dramatic intensity after this point. The solo lines and the uppermost accompanimental voice imply a G minor tonality. This is not at all reflected in the bass, which uses quintal harmony, or in the middle voices. Because the upper voices are the most audible voices in this section, G is the perceived tonic.
An impassioned restatement of Theme b follows, played in unison by the upper strings, with harmony supplied by horns and lower brass.

Example 5.23. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, modified score, mvt. 2, mm. 67-69

Based on Theme a’s original statement, one can safely assume the tonal center of this melody is C. The accompaniment found in Example 5.23 is a standard example of Williams’ general harmonic style throughout the concerto. On the downbeat of measure 67, the tonic triad of C, E♭, and G is apparent, but Williams has mixed in the second and the fourth as well, resulting in the usage of the first five scale degrees.\(^{221}\) It is important to note that the sharpest dissonance of this chord (the minor second interval of the D and E♭) is placed in the outermost voices. Converting minor seconds into major sevenths or minor ninths is also typical of Williams’ compositional style, particularly in this movement; a less caustic chord is the consequence.

The solo trumpet takes up the primary role again in measure 72, presenting the motives of Theme c in reverse order. A reiteration of the bell chorus setting\(^{222}\) ensues.

\(^{221}\) Another of the many examples of this type of harmony is found in the first movement, at the opening of Section A. See Example 5.4, p. 116.

\(^{222}\) See Example 5.22, p. 136.
after a crescendo, now transposed up a half-step. However, the horns are absent and the solo trumpet does not ascend into the extreme upper register as before. Therefore, the energy level of the second bell chorus is not as high as the first; the general “winding down” of Section B’s energy has begun.

The flute reappears at the beginning of this dénouement and participates in an extended interplay with the solo trumpet. The music cycles through a B minor tonal center in measure 82 as the accompanying string voices begin to fade. Their disappearance at measure 86 marks the beginning of the fourth part of Section B, a transition to a restatement of Section A.

Example 5.24. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 2, mm. 87-93

Example 5.24 shows that the quintuplet motive has disappeared, and the crossing motive is presented in augmentation and in canon between the trumpet and trombone in measure 87. Additionally, anticipation of Theme a can be seen in the solo trumpet’s line
starting at the third beat of measure 89, which uses the same half-step neighbor gesture and intervals earlier seen in measure 31. The diminishing texture, an overall decrease of motion, and the fading of the two remaining voices to a morendo is satisfyingly reminiscent of the Introduction’s earlier approach to Section A. This creates a general feeling of events coming to a full circle.

The first seven measures of Section A’ are nearly a literal repetition of the material found at the beginning of Section A. The trumpet line is less expansive and the accompanying strings are now muted, but the key and harmony are the same. The trumpet line departs on an extended and somewhat improvisatory sounding passage that stretches out the latter part of Theme a into a short cadenza. Because improvisation is viewed as an important element of blues music, this passage serves to reinforce the blues association. The music has remained in B minor; the blue notes of A and D figure prominently. The \( \frac{5}{5} \) (F\( \sharp \)) appears for the first time and the \( \frac{6}{5} \) is still important as well.

Example 5.25. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 2, mm. 105-109

\[223 \text{ See Example 5.19, p. 133.}\]
Seen above, the trumpet comes out of the cadenza in a simple gesture and confirms the B tonal center. Interestingly, the strings and harp support this with a completely unambiguous B major chord, giving a fantastic sense of release. This is immediately punctured by a dissonance on beat two with the notes D and E, supplied by two members of the solo quartet and a clarinet.\(^{224}\) The pure chord and ensuing dissonance is repeated three times, growing softer throughout. This allows the effect to sink in.\(^ {225}\) The dissonances are entirely consistent with Williams’ compositional style, but the act of delaying their entrance this time creates an exceptional moment.

**Third Movement**

The program notes from the premiere performance of Williams’ *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* describe the third movement as a *moto perpetuo* in varying meters. The author further states that the “intense rhythmic activity temporarily recedes into the background as the trumpet intones a new phrase in long-held notes,” but resumes in anticipation of the work’s “brilliant” conclusion.\(^ {226}\) Overall, this is an accurate description; the movement is conceived as a division of two contrasting sectional designs over a unifying three-note background motive.

Section A (indicated in the table on page 141) is distinguished by its rhythm, time signature, and melody. A driving pulse of eighth and sixteenth notes on repeated pitches is present in the musical texture of this section, while a time signature that alternates

\(^{224}\) It is unclear why the clarinet gets a solo role here instead of the English horn. One can speculate the reason is for a more muted orchestral color.

\(^{225}\) The piano reduction adds a C7 to the third statement of dissonance. This does not happen in the orchestral score.

\(^{226}\) Laki
between compound meter (9/8 and 6/8) and simple meter (3/4 and 2/4) occurs when Theme a is played. The melodic material is comprised of two elements, which will be labeled in Example 5.26 as Germ I and II. Germ I is repeated pitch sixteenth note pairs, while Germ II is slurred two note groupings of eighth notes that are often, but not always, separated by a half-step. Additionally, the simple meter measures always contain a rising pattern in an angular configuration, often involving the sonority of a tritone or seventh. Theme a is the synthesis of these three components, which are presented in varying orders throughout the A Sections. The solo trumpet’s melody seen in the example below demonstrates these characteristics.

Example 5.26. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, solo trumpet, mvt. 3, mm. 20-25

Section B is classified in the same way as Section A. Its first appearance is delineated by a slight lessening of tempo. Section B also has a constant underlying pulse; in this section, however, the pattern is a winding pattern of rising and falling eighth notes. Section B uses a compound time signature of 9/8 or 6/8, maintaining each of these, respectively, for the duration of B and B'.\(^{227}\) The melodic fabric is more expressive and sustained, but preserves the technical demands upon the soloist by employing runs of sixteenth notes. These attributes are shown in Example 5.27.

\(^{227}\) A later statement of Section B material (labeled Section B ′′) combines the 9/8 and 6/8 meters (with two 5/8 bars). This device helps build anticipation as the music progresses towards the coda.
The third movement’s “unifying motive” consists of three notes. In its original and most-used form, the first note is the center, the second note is a half-step below the first note, and the third note is a whole-step above the second note (a half-step above center).

This pattern, highlighting a falling and rising minor second, can be found in each section of the third movement, in changing rhythms, and either in the accompaniment or the solo line. The motive’s first pitch consistently corresponds to either the first or fifth scale degree when tonal centers are present. When used as the fifth scale degree, the second and third notes of the motive give off a blurring of augmented, major, minor, and diminished sonorities, which is entirely consistent with Williams’ method of composition.
in the earlier movements of this work. Williams also periodically changes the ordering of notes in the motive, and as the movement progresses, occasionally substitutes a major second in place of the established minor second interval. \(^{228}\)

The table below illustrates the overall design of the third movement. The A and B section schematics each cover approximately seventy measure periods. Williams then alternates between each idea in shorter segments before finishing with a coda that uses elements of each section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1 (orch. intro)</td>
<td>1-17</td>
<td>rhythmic motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (solo)</td>
<td>25-41</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (tutti)</td>
<td>54-65</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (transition)</td>
<td>66-73</td>
<td>rhythmic motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74-108</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>109-148</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'</td>
<td></td>
<td>149-159</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'</td>
<td></td>
<td>160-171</td>
<td>fragments of c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A''</td>
<td></td>
<td>172-192</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B''</td>
<td></td>
<td>193-228</td>
<td>c'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>229-239</td>
<td>fragments of c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>240-256</td>
<td>fragments of b, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>257-268</td>
<td>fragments of a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{228}\) If both the original order and a minor second interval are changed in a three note figure, it is not deemed as an occurrence of the motive.
The third movement begins with a unison sffz on B♭, immediately shifting to a soft dynamic level. This introductory section has no discernable melodic theme; the exclusive purpose of this subsection is to establish the movement’s atmosphere. It uses motor rhythm of repeating eighth notes as the three note motive passes through different orchestral voices:

Example 5.29. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, modified score, mvt. 3, mm. 1-5

Example 5.29 shows the unifying motive used in a variety of rhythms, in a modified ordering (m.5), and even as part of the motor rhythm. The example also illustrates the lack of a tonal center; the motive’s center pitch weaves from B♭ through F, A, B, D♯, and C♯ in succession in the first three measures.229 The introduction continues in this vein, building three times to a harsh outburst and instantly returning to a quiet dynamic level. The final outburst, occurring in the last measure of the introduction, has a center of D. This adequately prepares the way for the solo trumpet’s statement of Theme a in measure 18, where the note D is prominent for a few measures.

---

229 The piano score reflects many fewer occurrences of the motive in the first three bars, and in the third movement overall, due to reasonable technical constraints.
Example 5.30. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 18-21

Example 5.30 shows a predictable metric pattern that largely endures throughout Section A₂: one measure of compound meter followed by one measure of simple meter. The only exceptions are two one-measure extensions of the simple meter, to allow for an orchestral response to the solo instrument, used as a device for building tension and energy. Each 3/4 measure of A₂ contains a tritone sonority. Combined with the unifying motive in the background, the result is an unsettled harmonic environment. While the unifying motive gradually fades away by measure 22, the vast majority of measures in this section contain either a falling or rising minor second, so the sound of this motive remains in the listener’s ear. The above example implies that A₂ begins with a tonal center of D; however, the solo line is too chromatic to be sure of this.²³⁰ Theme a is crisp and articulate but starts at a *p* dynamic level. There is a gradual and steady crescendo throughout the solo statement, culminating at an orchestral *ff* in measure 49 as the solo trumpet soars above the fray with an extended C6. The trumpet’s gesture immediately preceding the high C is new; it is a mixture of Germ I and II, called Germ III.

²³⁰ It is equally possible, for example, that the D’s are the fifth scale degree, rather than the first scale degree. This would be consistent with ensuing restatements of Theme a and would indicate a tonal center of G. G’s, however, are not found in the orchestral texture at the beginning of Section A₂.
Section A₃ is an orchestral tutti restatement of Theme a. It is transposed up a whole step, written at f, and written with fuller harmonic support and a slightly altered melodic outline:

The combined use of E, A, D, and C, without a G in the above measures, shows the tonal center is A, and not C or E. Williams mixes the unifying motive into the melodic line in measure 55 and 57, separated by a beat and an octave, though the motive now reappears in the background texture as well. A string of simple meter measures at measure 61 carries a wave of intensity into Section A₄. At this point Theme a degenerates into a stream of Germ I and the accompanying unifying motive, augmented by the timpani. Therefore, this subsection is not developing melodic material, but is
acting as a transition to Section B. Like the earlier transition to the B section of the first
movement, this transition is harmonically stable, using repetition and crescendo to create
interest. Williams eventually restricts the unifying motive to two centers: C and G. This
creates a veiled and cleverly disguised traditional V-I cadence as the transition concludes.
Section B begins with the solo trumpet’s theme centered in C. The trumpet’s first
measure outlines the unifying motive:

Example 5.33. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, modified score, mvt. 3, mm. 72-79

As in the first movement, the solo trumpet enters and is alone for one measure,
before Section B begins. Section B starts off with an open and consonant sound: the
prominent pitches in measure 74 are F, C, and G (a grouping of perfect fifths). This
section is, in general, harmonically stable. However, the chords tend to be combinations
of diminished, minor, major, and augmented triads. As usual, neighboring non-chord tones are also mixed in. Along with the sustained notes, the solo trumpet plays a florid line above the chords. The trumpet’s swift melody consists primarily of stepwise motion.

Example 5.34. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 96-102

In measures 101 and 102, there is a return of the major/augmented mixture that was prominent in the first movement. This continues with a C major/augmented chord as Section B₁ evolves into B₂. In this context, the solo trumpet’s climactic ascending run to D₆ in measure 105 seems like the wrong note. However, the note is anticipating a forthcoming upward modulation of a whole step for the start of Section B₂. While Section B₂ opens with a tonal center of D, the simultaneous incidence of Fₜ and Fₜ, along with passing Gₜ's and Bₜ's (in measure 119) creates an interesting diminished, minor, major, and augmented fusion. The trumpet enters with an eerie, even more sustained and austere line than before, which uses a duple subdivision as a main part of the theme for the first time in the movement.
Example 5.35. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 115-119

Example 5.35 shows how Williams seamlessly brings the unifying motive into the accompanying texture. Namely, the A, G♯, and B♭ in the treble line of the accompaniment in measure 119 is not only a precise statement of the motive, but these are the essential notes for the creation of the major, minor, diminished, and augmented sonority. The more tightly winding motion of the accompaniment is a characteristic that distinguishes it from the previous subsection’s accompaniment, which was a more widely spaced arpeggiating pattern. The trumpet’s next phrase follows a similar upward arc, but jumps to a B5 instead, anticipating a harmonic change in the following measure made clear by the shift in the accompanimental line.

Following the B5 is a short lull in dramatic tension as the trumpet line takes on the winding characteristics of the accompaniment, using a passing reference of the unifying motive in measure 131. The harmonies found throughout this subsection appear to be augmented chords combined with neighboring dissonances, especially major sevenths. For instance, Example 5.36 shows a bass line that outlines B♮ major, though the F♯ in the bass line disappears when the trumpet has a sustained F♯ in measure 132.
This creates an augmented chord, with an added major seventh, found in the treble accompanimental line.

Example 5.36. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 130-134

The musical plot moves forward, leading to the end of Section B, when the solo trumpet line is given a broken arpeggiated passage in E♭ major that leads up to B♭5. Drama is created through three continuously strengthening repetitions of two chords, spearheaded by the B♭ and B♭ in the solo trumpet.

A short orchestral interlude follows (Section A′) with a re-visitation of Theme a. The interlude is characterized by the alteration of compound meter and simple meter measures. It begins with harmonies that resemble E♭ minor, but quickly shifts away from this tonality. The statement is cut short by the solo trumpet (Section B′) after a crescendo to ff and a string of simple meter bars.
Example 5.37. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 160-163

From here through the rest of the movement, the tonal center is firmly attached to C at all important structural points. As a result, there is a greater emphasis on C’s, G’s, and B♭’s in melodic lines, which highlight either tonic or dominant-like harmonies. As the above example shows, the short reiteration of Theme a is followed by an equally short reprise of the lyrical Theme c, in a constant 6/8 meter. The unifying theme is present in both the treble line of the accompaniment and the solo trumpet melody.

In the following section (A′′), starting at measure 172, Williams presents Theme a in the standard compound/simple meter configuration, with a conversation between the orchestral trumpets and the solo trumpet:

Example 5.38. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 172-177.
As the example demonstrates, the orchestral trumpets’ line sustains a laser-like focus on G (Germ I) while the solo trumpet responds with ascending angular lines characteristic of the simple meter measures. Over time, the orchestral statements grow shorter, decreasing to a single G in measure 187, as the solo line grows longer. The predominance of G creates a pedal effect on the dominant, creating a feeling of suspended motion throughout the section. This heightens tension as the solo line increases in range and volume while the listener anticipates the dislodging of the G pedal barrier. The tension reaches its highest point when a succession of simple meter bars leads to the solo trumpet’s outburst on B5 at a $\textit{fff}$ dynamic. This is the first time Williams has given the soloist this forceful a dynamic marking.\(^{231}\)

Example 5.39. Williams, \textit{Concerto for Trumpet}, solo trumpet, mvt. 3, mm. 188-192

In the above example, the unifying motive is present in the form of the $B\flat$, $B\natural$, and $C$ in the solo line. Additionally, the melodic idea seen in the example bears a clear resemblance to the first movement cadenza’s climactic moment.\(^{232}\) In hindsight, it is evident that Williams intends for this particular idea in the first movement’s cadenza to not only display the soloist’s power and range, but also to serve as a harbinger of an important third movement motive.

\(^{231}\) The only other time the soloist receives a dynamic of $\textit{fff}$ is on the final note of the concerto.

\(^{232}\) See Example 5.15, p. 126.
A sudden quietness follows the solo trumpet’s outburst, though the accompaniment maintains the frenetic rhythmic intensity created by Section A”. The extended lyrical orchestral tutti that follows allows for a necessary release of tension. The swirling accompaniment of sixteenth notes recalls a similar accompanimental pattern found in Section A3 of the first movement. In addition, both accompanimental patterns display a clear tonal center, but with mixed quality. At this point, the accompaniment and melodic line combine diminished, minor, and major harmonies around a tonal center of C.

Example 5.40. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 195-199

The ascending, simple contour of the melodic line in the above example is similar to that of Theme c, even though it is more filled out, less harmonically ambiguous, and accompanied by a different and more active harmonic texture. However, the inherent resemblances between the two melodies are strong enough to label the above melody as Theme c’. Each statement of Theme c’ receives a response from the lower strings and third bassoon that is derived from Theme a. During this orchestral interlude, the swirling voices at first consist of only marimba, harp, viola, one clarinet, and one bassoon. With each passing melodic phrase, more voices are added to the accompaniment, until each
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233 See Example 5.8, p. 119.
woodwind and string voice is included. After the third phrase, which coalesces around a dominant chord, the violins join the swirling texture and the solo trumpet plays two statements of Theme c'.

The disposition of the music changes at measure 229, marking the beginning of the Coda. The quavering sixteenth note undercurrent disappears and the lower voices begin to play a consistent C, which is functioning as a pedal tonic; the bass almost exclusively plays either C or G from this point to the end. From this point forward, there is a general combining of motives seen in earlier themes.

Example 5.41. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, piano score, mvt. 3, mm. 229-232

The coda can be broken down into three subsections of nearly equal length. The first subsection is primarily concerned with concluding lyrical ideas, the second with wrapping up florid motives, while the third subsection emphasizes ideas originating in Section A, using the alternating compound and simple meters to build a wave of energy for the brilliant conclusion. Example 5.41 shows a solo line with similar contour to the
melody in measure 162; both outline the unifying motive.\textsuperscript{234} The example below shows a typical florid line in the second subsection\textsuperscript{235} and a characteristic metrically divided line in the third subsection.

Example 5.42. Williams, \textit{Concerto for Trumpet}, solo trumpet, mvt. 3, mm. 254-256 and mm. 262-264

Harmonically, the coda underscores the synthesis of tertian sonorities and their seventh chords with an emphasis on C, D\#/$E_b$, F\#, G, A\#, B\#, and B. The above examples show the continued presence of the unifying chord in the form of G, F\#, and A\#. This gives Williams an efficient way to accentuate the harmonic mixture that plays an essential role in the fabric of this work. From measure 265 through the end of the third movement, C’s become more prevalent in the orchestral instruments. This is capped by an electrifying ascending run in the solo trumpet to C6, which creates a decisive tonal center with a nearly unison finish; the only instruments without C as their final note are the second trombone and viola, who have B’s. While the weight of the full orchestra’s

\textsuperscript{234} See Example 5.34, p. 148.

\textsuperscript{235} This line is very similar to the stepwise florid lines found in Section B; the run starting in measure 104 is one appropriate parallel.
sound hides this conflict, Williams’ inclusion of dissonance in the final chord is conclusive evidence of the concerto’s progressive and “nearly tonal” harmonic idiom.

**Practice and Performance Considerations**

John Williams’ *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* is widely considered one of the most challenging concertos for trumpet, equal to, if not exceeding the demands of well-known standards such as Henri Tomasi’s *Trumpet Concerto*, Charles Chaynes’ *Trumpet Concerto*, and André Jolivet’s *Concertino* and *Concerto No. 2*. As mentioned previously, the concerto is written in a modern harmonic idiom, but it also contains a number of characteristics that have an unmistakable connection to Williams’ well-known works for movies and ceremonies. The similarities include soaring lyrical lines that employ significant intervallic leaps, soulful melodic lines that explore the trumpet’s lower register, ostinatos (especially dotted ostinatos), flashy multiple tonguing, mercurial and virtuosic florid passages, and frequent usage of the trumpet’s upper register, including a focus on C6 at several of the concerto’s important structural points.

The characteristics listed above are, essentially, a summary of challenges that confront a prospective performer of Williams’ *Trumpet Concerto*. In online research, this author has found that all collegiate professors of trumpet who post suggested repertoire lists for students and include this work on their list put the Williams *Trumpet Concerto* in their most advanced category. Additionally, Hickey’s Music Center, a reliable and well-regarded source for sheet music, rates the Williams *Concerto* as a “Grade 7 – Virtuosic” work (out of a possible 7 levels), calling it an “exciting, demanding work for the true
Nevertheless, advanced trumpet players with sound fundamental skills should not hesitate to study and perform this concerto. The piano reduction includes solo parts for both C trumpet and B♭ trumpet. Most players will prefer to play the work on C trumpet since it adds brilliance to their sound and makes it easier to navigate in the upper register. Williams employs no extended techniques in the concerto, but the modern style, endurance requirements, and technical aspects involved in the performance of this piece make it a challenging and gratifying endeavor for an accomplished soloist.

As with the Liebermann Trumpet Concerto, executing the piano reduction of the orchestral score is a difficult undertaking for any pianist. The orchestra scoring is very complex; the piano reduction includes many of the orchestral score’s essentials, but it also is obliged to omit noticeable elements. The harmonic idiom creates extremely dense and complex writing for the pianist. This means that the most important accompanimental or melodic lines are not always immediately clear. To create an accurate and convincing performance, it is therefore essential that the performers become familiar with the orchestral score and the various colors created by the orchestral instruments.

**First Movement**

Williams has said that the first movement of the Trumpet Concerto “begins with fanfares for the solo trumpet and orchestral trumpets” and that the movement as a whole is meant to invoke the trumpet’s traditional “military and ceremonial” role. Except for a few notable areas, such as the lyrical section starting at measure 63 and the unrestricted

---


237 Thornton, 20.
cadenza, the trumpet player should keep this description in mind and venture to depict this quality in the music. Other challenges found in this movement include: angular melodies (both lyrical and technical), musical pacing (especially in the cadenza), endurance, pointed articulations in the low register, and the rapid florid lines at the conclusion of the cadenza.

At the opening of the concerto, the trumpet starts alone. Playing with commitment and a ringing marcato sound will immediately capture the audience’s attention. A small amount of stylization is acceptable in the opening phrase, provided the soloist and pianist correctly synchronize their lines. More specifically, stylization is effective on the quintuplet in measure 2; the soloist might subtly delay the first two notes of the grouping and slightly accelerate through the subsequent three notes to keep the overall tempo steady. One should be attentive to evenness of sound in measure 3; both octaves should be equally resonant.

Example 5.43. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, solo trumpet, mvt. 1, mm. 1-3

The soloist must play in strict time beginning in measure 5 matching the quiet background pulse. It may be a challenge to play crisp, articulate, resonant, and well-centered low notes in measures 5-7. Spending a good deal of time practicing articulation in the low register to develop ease with this passage would be a worthwhile endeavor.
Chris Gekker’s *Articulation Studies* method book is an excellent source for exercises that will improve stability in this passage and will also benefit one’s general technique.\(^{238}\) In measure 8, the solo B₃ trumpet part of the piano reduction includes a typo: the written C♯ on the second beat should be a C♮.

The *Risoluto* section that follows the introduction is generally straightforward, but it contains moderately disjunct melodic lines; slurring and mouthpiece buzzing any difficult areas should improve one’s accuracy and resonance. The soloist should be very deliberate with the sixteenths, exaggerate the dotted figures, and show a clear difference of pace in the triplets. It is important to pay close attention to Williams’ editorial marking. For example, the soloist will play this section more dramatically if he/she does not give away the *subito p* in measure 36.

Starting in measure 63, the solo trumpet line becomes legato and *cantabile*. The soloist should produce a smooth and connected line, even when articulating through octave skips. It is helpful to notice that the melody is generally very simple if written in only one octave. At the outset, practice the melody in the same octave. Next, while playing the melody as written, endeavor to maintain the ease of playing that was created while playing in the single octave. It is acceptable to introduce gentle but not active vibrato to sustained notes. It is important to bear in mind that when vibrato is used effectively, it is not the primary thing noticed by listeners. Starting in measure 91, the soloist should immediately resume playing in a *marcato* and militaristic manner, taking care to gradually crescendo towards the climax in measure 99.

---

The trumpet’s next section begins with motives heard earlier. The trumpeter should try to eliminate nearly all vibrato on the sustained notes, especially as the section progresses toward the *Maestoso*. This will bring out the foreboding nature of the music. A gradual lengthening of the sixteenths in measure 146 during the *rallentando* is an effective tactic. A recognition of the repeated pattern of major sevenths in measure 148 will help with the execution of this angular group of eighth notes. While the soloist should play in a *marcato* style from the beginning of measure 148, it is musically effective to downplay the character change at first, increasing the degree of *marcato* through the crescendo. Play “only” at *f* in measure 149, because the true arrival point is the upcoming C6. Each of the three quintuplet statements should grow successively more intense, in advance of the C6.

The soloist must put a great deal of thought into the pacing of the cadenza to perform it effectively. Michael Sachs states that Williams “wanted to take the trumpet in a different direction with the initial part of this cadenza.” While many cadenzas are “pyrotechnic,” Williams’ cadenza “starts out very lyrical and intimate.” Mr. Sachs emphasizes that “pacing is extremely important; taking appropriate time and not rushing through this [the cadenza] is essential to give it the proper dramatic effects.”

While it is written freely, the soloist should make a distinction between eighth notes, triplets, and sixteenth notes. The very athletic and florid aspects of the cadenza come towards the end; the beginning should be very expressive. There should be an ebb and flow in meter. For example, one way to play the opening phrase is to stretch the first three eighth notes, gradually increasing speed past the triplet, and progressively digging

---

239 Michael Sachs, interview; See Appendix C, p. 209.
into the following sixteenths, leading to a powerful finish at the fermata. There are many ways to interpret this cadenza; the performer should perform it for many people to receive musical feedback, including colleagues who are not trumpet players.

Continuing through the cadenza, the soloist will need to find a good spot for a breath before the B5 because it is important to not hurry through the high note passage, as difficult as that may be with regard to endurance. One approach for building the needed endurance to successfully execute this passage is to work backwards from the high notes, slowly adding more material. The soloist should avoid starting the subsequent sixteenth notes too quickly. The solo trumpet and the orchestral trumpeting brethren should be very deliberate with their sixteenth notes because any deviation from the “groove” will likely lead to a chaotic finish at measure 165.

The soloist should strive for a placid sound at measure 178 and maintain this subdued character through the melodic ascent. It is of great importance to maintain a militaristic style, but it should have a far-away and departing character. There is no need to begin the concluding G3 too softly; it will not cover up the orchestral texture, and the soloist should leave enough room for an effective decrescendo to niente.

Second Movement

The militaristic lines disappear in the second movement, replaced by sustained and lyrical melodies. In fact, the second movement does not contain even one staccato note in the solo trumpet part. Michael Sachs refers to this movement as having a “Samuel Barber/Gershwniesque” atmosphere. This atmosphere is created by the sustained and soulful melodies. Some of the common difficulties encountered by
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240 Ibid.; See Appendix C, p. 205.
performers of this movement include navigating wide melodic intervals, producing a tender sound in the lower register, and maintaining endurance and a dark sound in the upper register passages.

The solo trumpet is of equal importance to the orchestra’s solo voices in the opening, so the trumpeter should not overshadow his/her partners. The soloist should strive for a benign sound quality. As such, the trumpeter may find it helpful to use only a very slowly oscillating vibrato, if any. Time does not need to be strictly enforced in this section, especially between measures 13 and 21, but the soloist must be aware of the balancing line in the piano (or trombone) to create an effective counterpoint. The soloist should maintain a warm and full sound, despite playing at a subdued dynamic level.

To make the $F_\sharp$ octave slur as smooth as possible, keep a steady and active airstream moving through the slur. In a sense, try to keep the lower note going as long as possible, attempting to run it into the upper one. While a clean slur is obviously best, it is preferable to have *portamento* rather than a gap in sound. A tasteful stretching of measure 31 is not only a good musical idea, but it will help set up the low $F_\sharp$. In the second part of this section (measures 35-45), the soloist should play the notes preceding the eighth rests to full value, so that the rests do not segment the overall musical phrase.

At measure 47, be sure to clearly differentiate between the quintuplet and the sixteenth notes. Furthermore, the quintuplet should be played at an even pace, rather than in a careless duple/triple subdivision. The expansive and cantabile eighth note figure in measure 54 is not heard on the Sandoval recording, nor was it heard in Michael Sachs’ premiere of the *Concerto*. The same melodic discrepancy occurs later in the second movement in measure 75. Regarding this difference, Mr. Sachs informed the author that
these two measures were changed after the premiere, most likely to add greater embellishments to the solo part. While Williams paces this movement well, including rests at places that allow the soloist to avoid becoming overly tired, the ascent to D6 at measure 66 is a common challenge for many players. Performers can achieve success on the high D if they immerse their sound in the preceding G5 in measure 64. Maintaining the sensation of a resonant G across the 3 beats of rest is helpful in the ascent to D6. The trumpet player should experiment with his/her fingering on the D as well: an open fingering combination sometimes works better than a first valve combination, but both choices will feature different intonation and timbres.

Example 5.44. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, solo trumpet, mvt. 2, mm. 63-66

There is another discrepancy in measure 75. Similar to the earlier discrepancy, both Sachs and Sandoval played a different melodic idea in measure 75 than what is seen in either the orchestral score or the piano reduction. Once more, the melody found in the solo trumpet part of the piano score is more embellished and expressive than the original melody. The angular lines of measures 72, 77, and 79 should be connected; practicing the figures while slurring usually improves their execution. As before, between measure 87 and 93, the orchestration is reduced to the solo instrument and one other balancing orchestral instrument (the flute). The trumpeter should know the flute’s line in this
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241 Ibid.; See Appendix C, p. 208.
section as intimately as he/she knows his/her own melody. As Williams indicates, *rubato* should be used here. Only a thorough knowledge of the two equal melodic lines will allow the two players to create effective, dramatic, and intelligent chamber music.

The blues-influenced melody that follows at measure 98 is nearly identical to the melody earlier heard in measure 26. The cadenza should start slowly, pick up a trace of momentum following the tenuto marks (though never becoming fast) and then relax into the low F#. The trumpet soloist can greatly inform and improve his/her performance in this movement by listening to recordings of great jazz musicians, such as Louis Armstrong, Miles Davis or Ella Fitzgerald, and emulating characteristics that he/she admires. Additionally, familiarity with music of George Gershwin, including his *Second Prelude* for Piano and *Rhapsody in Blue*, will also help the soloist become immersed in the style, colors, and phrasing of the second movement.

**Third Movement**

The third movement is described as an athletic showpiece, full of technical “fireworks.” The solo trumpet has only a scant amount of multiple tonguing in the first movement and no multiple tonguing in the second movement. Conversely, the third movement is an adventurous journey of multiple tonguing. Additional challenges for many players of this movement include endurance, range, dexterity in technical passages, and wide intervallic leaps in numerous angular passages.

In the first solo section, the trumpeter needs to play with a crisp sound at a soft dynamic level. To navigate the disjunct intervals found in this section, the soloist should simplify the phrase by slowly playing through a skeletal structure of the most important notes.
Example 5.45. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, skeleton exercise, mvt. 3, mm. 26-33

Bringing out the accents is crucial to an effective performance of this section. This section provides the opportunity to take many breaths. The soloist obviously would be well-advised to not take a breath after every two bar phrase. As a result, the soloist should carefully plan when he/she will breathe. The sudden jump to C6 is very difficult to handle for many trumpet players, as it comes at the end of a long period of playing. The performer should let the preceding crescendo provide momentum for the leap. Consciously taking relaxed breaths and avoiding bodily tension in the multiple tonguing passages that precede the C6 will also be of great assistance.

The following section, starting at measure 74, begins with lyrical lines but also includes difficult florid passages. The soloist needs to create a noticeable difference between the staccato and non-staccato notes, but must give all notes substantial body. He/she should identify patterns in the scalar runs for efficient practice of the difficult technical figures. For example, the downward run in measure 88 could be labeled as a descent in F major, with a 7th and a 6th. This section is also difficult regarding endurance considering the scalar ascent to D6 from B3. As mentioned previously, the soloist will have a greater chance of success on the high D if he/she concentrates on creating a resonant and vibrant B♭ in measure 99, being careful not to change his/her setup when playing the low C and B in measure 103.
The following section has an extremely unadorned melodic line. The line is lyrical in nature, though it is not marked *cantabile*. The section can be accurately described as pensive or meditative. As a result, the soloist should focus on creating an interesting arc to his/her phrasing, and should concentrate on producing a mystical tone color, eschewing an overly bright sound.

Beginning at measure 160, Williams proceeds to run through many melodic fragments derived from themes presented earlier in this movement. Once again, this section presents challenges of endurance, especially considering that this movement has already presented sections that tested the performer’s strength. The performer should make note of the gradually ascending melodic line: F# in measure 183, G in 184, A in 186, B♭ in 188, and finally B in 189:

Example 5.46. Williams, *Concerto for Trumpet*, solo trumpet, mvt. 3, mm. 183-189

To double tongue in the upper register, the soloist may find it helpful to keep the tongue very far forward and high in the mouth, while keeping oral changes to a minimum.

The technical passages beginning in measure 242 are arguably the most difficult yet seen in the concerto. The intervallic leaps become even more severe, and the technical passages seem unpredictable. For these passages, Mr. Sachs recommends
working on “interval studies in Arban, Bai Lin, Schlossberg, Stamp, etc.” He states that one must get used to playing quick and wide-ranging intervals in a centered manner, but that it is equally important to be able to easily hear the intervals ahead of time.242 The soloist will need to spend an extensive amount of time preparing the technical runs. The best approach for mastering this difficult coda is not exciting, nor is it new: only slow, methodical, and extended practice will allow a performer to experience enduring gains.

CHAPTER 6
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this document, the author discusses the history of the concerto, the trumpet’s role in the concerto’s early history, and the need for study and performance of outstanding contemporary concertos for trumpet to keep it relevant as a soloistic instrument in the twenty-first century. Lowell Liebermann’s *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* and John Williams’ *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* were chosen as exemplary modern concertos worthy of extensive study. This document has presented a short biography of Liebermann and Williams, an overview of their compositional output, a discussion of the history of both trumpet concertos, detailed musical analysis, and practical suggestions to help a soloist interpret and perform the score effectively.

Deeply rooted in traditions of the past, Lowell Liebermann’s music has been described as reinterpreting the past “by filtering it through a contemporary sensibility.”243 He is said to write music that “build[s] support for modern music without alienating [audiences].”244 Liebermann’s *Trumpet Concerto* is written in a manner that is consistent with his overall compositional output. Like most of his mature works, it is written in a traditional tonal language, but uses unconventional harmonic progressions. It also uses extended periods of dissonance for dramatic purposes, or to illustrate violent and caustic moods. As with many of his other solo works, his writing style in the *Trumpet Concerto*


is largely homophonic. Liebermann uses traditional forms; the arch form that he employs in the first and second movement of the Trumpet Concerto is one of his most commonly used structures. Liebermann has also said that his Trumpet Concerto is written in an “organic” manner, as are many of his other works, where no individual movement stands alone. Instead, the Concerto can be thought of as a logical progression where “there will be material from one movement that is developed and transformed in another movement.”

245 This can be clearly seen in the third movement of the Trumpet Concerto, which is largely derived from themes or fragments of themes from preceding movements.

Like Lowell Liebermann, John Williams also acknowledges the musical traditions of the past. However, his methods of accomplishing this are quite different. As a result, John Williams’ Trumpet Concerto is an effective contrasting work compared to Liebermann’s Trumpet Concerto. While Liebermann’s works often employ extended themes and pleasant tunes, Williams’ Concerto, though not devoid of tuneful melodies, is unified by the use of identifiable rhythmic motives. The significance of motives is an important aspect not only in Williams’ Trumpet Concerto, but also in his overall musical output.

Generally speaking, Williams’ writing in the Trumpet Concerto is conventional in the sense that it embraces a well-established tradition of solo and tutti statements of important themes, contrasting theme groups, and recapitulation of previously established material. However, the Concerto employs an inventive harmonic scheme that Williams has described as being “nearly tonal.”

246 The Trumpet Concerto contains tonal centers
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245 Liebermann, interview; See Appendix A, p. 176.

246 Thornton, 20.
that are effectively camouflaged by dense scoring, competing dissonances, and a mixture of diminished, minor, major, and augmented sonorities. As a result, sections can be written around a specific tonal center and yet avoid “sounding” tonal. While John Williams’ best-known cinematic and ceremonial works are tonal, the *Trumpet Concerto* is written in a manner consistent with his other concertos. Williams’ concerto output has been described as using advanced tonal idioms and seeking to portray the traditions of the featured solo instruments. His concertos have also been known to display a sense of wit and theatrics. The *Trumpet Concerto* demonstrates all of the above characteristics. Each of the concerto’s movements focuses on an aspect of trumpet tradition. Additionally, the first movement cadenza features a “competition” between the solo trumpet and the orchestral trumpets to see who can outdo the other. It also has many characteristics in common with Williams’ immensely successful occasional and cinematic music, e.g., the use of ostinatos, his signature use of orchestral colors, and vibrant flair.

Overall, there are more differences between the piano score and orchestral score of the Williams *Concerto* than there are between the piano score and orchestral score of the Liebermann *Concerto*. A possible reason for this disparity could be that Liebermann and Williams may have different philosophies regarding the creation of piano reductions. Liebermann mentioned that he tries to include everything from the orchestral score in the piano reduction, even if this creates a piano part that is “not necessarily playable.”247 Williams, on the other hand, does not seem completely devoted to creating a piano reduction that precisely adheres to all of the orchestral score’s features. Instead, it seems
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247 Liebermann, interview; See Appendix A, p. 177.
his overriding objective is to create a reduction that is idiomatic for the piano and appealing in a recital setting.

Both Lowell Liebermann’s *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* and John Williams’ *Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra* are significant works in the history of the trumpet concerto genre. Ryan Anthony has described Liebermann’s *Concerto* as “filling a void in the Romantic repertoire [for trumpet].”\(^{248}\) He elaborated, saying, “I feel like we’ve got our traditional Classical pieces and we’ve got the newer concertos that are technically advanced [but what is nice about Liebermann’s *Concerto*] is you don’t have to be a trumpet player to really appreciate it.”\(^{249}\) The Liebermann *Trumpet Concerto* provides many challenges to the soloist, but it is noteworthy among the trumpet’s concerto literature not for its purely technical challenges, but for its musical and lyrical challenges.

John Williams’ *Trumpet Concerto* is perhaps one of the greatest trumpet concertos of the late twentieth-century written by an American composer. After its premiere, the concerto was quickly designated as a significant work for the trumpet community.\(^{250}\) Essentially written in a not-quite-tonal framework, it provides soaring lyricism and idiomatic brilliance. John Williams is clearly one of the most recognized and reputable composers of this generation, and is undoubtedly the most famous composer since Haydn to write a trumpet concerto. As a result, Williams’ *Trumpet Concerto* has a unique power to draw new audiences and introduce them to a style of

\(^{248}\) Anthony, interview; See Appendix B, p. 201.

\(^{249}\) Ibid.; See Appendix B, p. 201.

composition that is recognizably traditional and exciting, yet also experimental considering the expansion of conventional boundaries.

Both Liebermann’s *Trumpet Concerto* and Williams’ *Trumpet Concerto* are challenging works to perform that require command of technical skills involving range, flexibility, and articulation. In addition, since both works explore many different musical styles, the soloist needs to be able to convincingly express the intricacies and characteristics of the various styles. However, neither use any extended techniques, and each is eminently playable with dedicated and meticulous practice. This author feels that both concertos are difficult not for difficulty’s sake, but to make an effective musical statement. To quote Gunther Schuller, a reputed American composer and conductor: “It is rather the kind of difficult, the kind of complexity – the quality of the complexity – that determines whether something is worth struggling through.”

Lowell Liebermann’s *Trumpet Concerto* and John Williams’ *Trumpet Concerto* are indeed works with quality behind their complexity. In the final analysis, it is evident both concertos are major contributions to the trumpet concerto genre and warrant greater recognition and more frequent performance. As Michael Sachs has said, “time” will eventually determine the place of these works in the history of the trumpet concerto.

Numerous trumpet concertos have been composed since 1990; the ones worthy of detailed study, remain to be seen. As Thomas Stevens, the former Principal Trumpet of the Los Angeles Philharmonic has said, it behooves us as performers and teachers to
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pursue this endeavor so that we “keep pace” with our peers in the musical world.\textsuperscript{253} Although many contemporary trumpet concertos are complex, difficult to analyze, and challenging to perform, exploring new works is beneficial to one’s development as a complete musician. In addition, due to the physical and technical demands of the concertos, the soloist’s skills are put to the test and usually improve as a result. Given these benefits, the ultimate goal for the future is to see a significant increase in the performance and recording of contemporary trumpet concertos.

Critics have described you and your compositions as “neo-tonalist” and “post-modernist.” I’d like to start off by asking what your opinion is of these labels. How would you describe the music that you write?

I really prefer not to ascribe labels to my music. I don’t like most of those labels and the one that irks me the most is neo-romantic. If I had to describe myself it would be a neo-classicist being preoccupied with organic integrity and form. Romanticism implies a much more subjective approach. I think when people say romantic what they usually mean is tonal, and what I think they really mean is melodic. You know, if there’s a tune in it, they immediately call you a neo-romantic and they don’t look any further to see if there’s anything else going on. But I generally avoid those labels. I think they’re limiting. The bad thing about them is that once you’re labeled, people just view your music by that label rather than looking at the music to see if there’s anything different going on.

Could you describe how, in general, you go about composing. What’s the process like?

It’s an organic process. Whatever the material of the piece is based on, hopefully a lot of formal things will come out of that. Everything is related more or less. My first composition teacher at Juilliard, David Diamond, had me keep
sketchbooks, a la Beethoven, and work through material the same way Beethoven did. It’s a very intensive, arduous process of going over the material, racking the most you can out of it.

**BW:** Do you usually have a compositional blueprint, with regard to form or melody, in mind ahead of time?

**LL:** It depends. Usually, it will start out with whatever the material is, whether it’s a chord, melody, or a combination of both. A lot of the material will be derived out of that.

**BW:** Do you ever work on several pieces at the same time? Do some of your ideas in certain pieces “cross-pollinate” to other works? Or do you try to make everything absolutely different?

**LL:** Well, I usually work on only one piece at a time. Ideas intersect between separate works sometimes, and certain pieces will share the same kind of attributes, but I don’t really set out to approach things that way.

**BW:** In general, how long would you say it takes to write a composition? Specifically, how long did it take to write the Trumpet Concerto?

**LL:** That really depends. The Trumpet Concerto is one of the few pieces I’ve written for which I can give an exact time frame. I wrote it during a residency in Bellagio, Italy. So it was written in a month.

**BW:** The recurrence of themes has been a traditional practice of Western music for centuries. Usually these restatements happen within the context of a single movement, though there are important exceptions. To me, one of the most
effective aspects of the trumpet concerto is the transformation of themes across
the boundaries of any single movement. Would you agree?

LL: Definitely. It’s one way of tying together the movements. I usually don’t
compose each movement as a separate standing object. A work is completely
thought out as a progression throughout however many movements it may have.
So, very often there will be material from one movement that is developed and
transformed in another movement.

BW: So this is something that can be found in other works you’ve written?

LL: Yes.

BW: Then would you say you had this in mind when you started composing the
individual movements?

LL: Well, it’s different with each piece. Sometimes you do have an overall idea of the
structure that you’re setting out to achieve ahead of time. At other times, you’re
just starting with the material and letting the plot develop as you go along. The
way it develops will demand certain things. But there’s no hard and fast rule
about how the piece is going to develop. In the long run, though, you want to
make the development seem somehow inevitable.

BW: Given that you’ve composed works for almost every genre and instrument, did
you find it difficult to write a concerto for trumpet? Were there any unusual
challenges?

LL: I think one of the challenges is that the trumpet is not the most naturally varied
instrument in regards to timbre. You can address this with mutes but you don’t
have as wide a variety of shadings as you do with certain other instruments. At
least this was my preconception when I wrote the piece. I think one of the results of this was a desire to try and get as much variety out of the sound as possible.

**BW:** Did you find the trumpet’s range or intrinsic characteristics to be limiting?

**LL:** The limitations are actually what spur creativity. This is, again, kind of a classical approach. To me, art is defined by the limitations. It’s transcending those limitations and doing something that goes beyond them that makes it a work of art. If you have total free range it then becomes total subjectivity. So I think limitations are a good thing.

**BW:** Did you arrange the piano score?

**LL:** Yes, I did the piano version myself.

**BW:** I’ve been told that it’s really difficult for the pianist to play, but I thought it was great to find little difference between the piano score and the orchestral score.

**LL:** Well, it’s better with reductions to give everything that’s in the orchestra that’s really necessary for the performer to hear, even if it’s not playable. It’s kind of like what they do with opera scores; if the singers suddenly hear a voice that they’ve never heard before, they get thrown off sometimes. So it’s always better to have certain things in the piano score, even if they’re not necessarily playable.

**BW:** What do you remember about the trumpet concerto’s commissioning process?

**LL:** I was contacted by the commissioner, Mr. John Marsteller, who was the brother-in-law of Edward Treutel. Edward Treutel was a trumpet teacher at Juilliard; after he died, his brother-in-law wanted to commission a piece in memory of him. He was Phil Smith’s teacher, so the idea from the beginning was to have Phil Smith premiere the concerto. Originally, the commissioner wanted the premiere to be at
Juilliard, where Treutel taught Smith. The people at Juilliard said it would have to be played by a student, and the commissioner wanted Phil Smith as the soloist. So Mr. Marsteller approached the New York Philharmonic and the Philharmonic agreed to do the premiere. All this was decided before the commission agreement was drawn up. By the time I started the piece, I knew that it was going to be premiered with the New York Philharmonic and Phil Smith was going to be the soloist.

**BW:** When you compose a work, do you usually like to work with the soloist ahead of time?

**LL:** No, absolutely not. I will work with the soloist once the piece is completed. There were some changes that Phil Smith suggested. Just in terms of changing triple tonguings to double tonguings or the other way around, mostly minor things.

**BW:** Some composers find a performer’s input helpful as they compose. Do you prefer to work alone so that your ideas will not be diluted?

**LL:** Well, it’s not so much that. It’s just that I like to let the ideas develop the way they want to develop and then take it from there if there’s something that has to be changed.

**BW:** So then it’s basically all your ideas.

**LL:** That’s right.

**BW:** What do you remember about the rehearsals? I suppose there were only two?

**LL:** No, there was only one. I was in Dallas the week before. I sent an email to the Philharmonic asking if they could tell me what the rehearsal schedule was
because I wanted to be sure I’d be back from Dallas in time. I received an email from Masur’s assistant telling me that Maestro Masur would allow me to attend the one rehearsal, as long as I didn’t interrupt or say anything.

**BW:** I assume, in your experience, that’s not how it usually works, right?

**LL:** Correct. Usually, I find conductors are very eager to have a composer’s input and find out what they were thinking when the work was composed. Masur wanted none of that.

**BW:** I’d like to go back to our discussion about the various timbres and colors that you’re trying to get out of the trumpet, by using mutes. In the first movement, you refer to a wah-wah mute. That’s a Harmon mute, right?

**LL:** Right. It says wah-wah, not harmon mute?

**BW:** Yeah. In the piano score.

**LL:** Oh, but the orchestral score says harmon mute?

**BW:** Yes, it does.

**LL:** That’s a mistake that should have been caught.

**BW:** I imagine you’d want the stem to be in. Is that correct?

**LL:** Yes, so it speaks.

**BW:** Other than in the second movement (where it asks for cup mute) and the first movement (where it asks for harmon), should the choice always be straight mute? Do you have different types of straight mutes in mind?

**LL:** I wasn’t specifically that concerned with the exact kind of straight mute. I left that up to the performer.
**BW:** In the recording of the premiere, which you graciously sent me to help in my research, it sounds like Phil Smith is using a cup mute at the beginning - it has the same timbre as the cup muted passage in the second movement. Could it be that you’re more interested in a certain sort of color and sound and not so much about how we achieve it?

**LL:** Yes. You know maybe it comes from being a pianist. Basically, to me the difference was between muted and not muted. I was less hung up on the fine details of timbre. It’s sort of like a pianist playing on different pianos. To the pianist they each have radically different timbres. So likewise, possibly a trumpet player might be much more hung up on the exact kind of mute, since he is more sensitive to the timbre each mute creates. When you ask what I had in mind in terms of the timbre, I don’t have anything specifically musical in mind. I don’t have any images or any kind of situations in mind. The most specific thing regarding the use of a mute in the Trumpet Concerto is the use of the wah-wah where I was after a kind of almost sarcastic or comic effect.

**BW:** Continuing with the topic of mutes, during the second movement of the premiere recording, Phil Smith uses his cup mute in the passage starting at measure 53, but doesn’t remove it at measure 61 as the music prescribes. He instead removes it after measure 69. Was this change agreed to before the performance?

**LL:** Yes, that was something that we agreed to do. I see we didn’t change that in the piano score, which I should have. Is it also that way in the orchestral score?

**BW:** Yeah.
LL: That should be taken out. I originally intended it to be senza sord. but then he suggested keeping the mute in and I liked it that way.

BW: That’s interesting. I liked it that way too and it’s good to know what is preferred.

LL: You know, it’s just the nature of publishing that there are always mistakes and discrepancies no matter how careful you think you’re being. And no matter how many people go through a composition, I still find discrepancies every now and then in pieces that have been published for twenty years. Unfortunately, when you’ve written a piece and you look at the score you tend to see what you think you should be seeing and not what’s actually there.

BW: In the trumpet concerto literature, it’s quite unusual for an opening lyrical passage to be muted the way it is in your concerto. I’m not aware of any parallels to it in any other trumpet concertos. What effect were you looking to create?

LL: I was attempting to give a distant impression with the muted sound, in line with my goals to write a very lyrical piece for trumpet. When I’m going to write a concerto for an instrument that doesn’t have a huge repertoire, I try to consider what I can add to the instrument’s literature. For example, when I wrote my piccolo concerto, I decided that I wanted to write a very lyric work for the piccolo because it’s kind of going against the stereotype. Trumpet music generally falls into a few kinds of categories. You’ve got the Baroque stuff, you’ve got the military stuff, and you’ve got your kind of generic modern concertos like Tomasi or Jolivet, which are angular and not terribly involving pieces at the end of the day. I really wanted to write a melodic work and present lyrical, musical challenges for the instrument.
BW: In preparation, did you do a listening survey of other trumpet concertos before writing this work?

LL: Yes, but really just to get the sound of the instrument in my ear. I’m not necessarily listening to see what other composers have done in terms of their own language and details, but just to get the sound of the instrument and technical things down.

BW: The second movement is entitled “Elegy” and is the only titled movement. Could you elaborate about that? Does this refer to Mr. Treutel?

LL: I don’t remember if that’s why I did it. It certainly would be appropriate. I think it was a case where I could specifically give a title that gave a character indication to the music and to how it should be interpreted. I think that it just says something about the mood you want to portray. It’s almost like having an expressive marking, rather than it being a title for a programmatic reason. When I use titles that seem very programmatic, it’s often the case that the title was chosen after most of the music was written. That’s the case of my piano piece, Gargoyles, which gets performed quite a bit. I don’t write a lot of programmatic music and when people ask me what is your piece about, my answer is always it’s about the notes and nothing else.

BW: Then should the music’s mood be interpreted or portrayed in whatever way the performer or listener imagines it?

LL: (laughs) I don’t know that I agree with that. I once was horrified by an article in a flute magazine where somebody published an interpretive guide for my flute sonata. This guide was a program that they had come up with that was supposed
to help students interpret it. The program was about an evil dwarf named Oden who was kidnapping water sprites. I was totally aghast after reading this. I do not think of images and don’t encourage other people necessarily to think of images.

**BW:** There’s one theme that actually appears in all three movements and it may be the only one. It leads up to the mini-cadenzas that we have in the first and second movement. Each passage has a different enharmonic spelling. Is there a reason for that?

**LL:** I don’t really see that there was a reason. And I think it was just me writing it from memory and just not even thinking about that. When you’re writing music in open tonality, you don’t always necessarily harmonically spell things the most correct way. You tend to spell them in a way that will be easiest for the performer. So it probably had more to do with where that passage was coming from and where it was going to. I usually avoid a sudden transition from sharps to flats if it’s not necessary.

**BW:** Right. It’s actually easier, at that point, to read it with the flats.

**LL:** Yeah.

**BW:** I read in the program notes that there’s a Shostakovich reference in the third movement, but I don’t recognize a specific quotation. Is there a specific reference from one of his works?

**LL:** No, but one of the things the commissioner did say to me was that he hoped there could be something of Shostakovich in my piece because Treutel played the American premiere of Shostakovich’s Concerto for Piano and Trumpet. Although

---

254 The first movement’s mini cadenza begins at measure 181. The second movement’s mini-cadenza begins at measure 99.
I kind of ignored it and didn’t set out to do that, Shostakovich has had a strong influence on me. Basically, the parts that, to me, are very like Shostakovich are with the group of fourths at measure 176, which, of course, comes out of the very opening. When you add in the circus-like music that precedes it, starting at measure 170, to me that is total Shostakovich. So that was something that happened as I was writing and I just decided, “Okay, I’ll give him some Shostakovich!”

**BW:** The program notes also mention that the third movement contains a section that sounds like “the Pachelbel canon gone awry.” Is that referring to the section that starts at measure 39?

**LL:** Yes, and it was a very problematic little section for coming up with a reduction. Because of the way the voices are spread out in the orchestra, it was nearly impossible to write anywhere near a playable reduction that sounded like anything.

**BW:** When only looking at the piano part, I didn’t notice the canon at first. But it’s very apparent in the orchestral score. How did you resolve the issue?

**LL:** Well, I sort of compromised by putting in as much as was playable and leaving a decision about what to omit up to the performer. I just couldn’t put in all the notes that were in the orchestra part. The thing is, when it’s a canon like that, if you try to put everything in the same octave so that a pianist can play it, it sounds completely different. You end up with inversions of things and they end up having totally different harmonic implications.
**BW:** Even though it’s marked as “suddenly serious at the same tempo”, does the “canon gone awry” idea mean that it is written a little bit in jest?

**LL:** Oh no, I wouldn’t say so. I think it’s meant as a very sudden change of mood. One thing about that movement is it’s constantly shifting gears. You know, jumping from different material and changing tempos.

**BW:** Yeah, it’s almost like a kaleidoscopic effect.

**LL:** Right.

**BW:** There are several challenging technical passages in the work. One is the section in the third movement between measures 170 to 201. It goes by pretty fast and gets around the horn quite a bit. In this section, measures 184-185 have a parallel when the same idea recaps itself in measures 257-258, but the two runs are slightly different. Was that change intentional? Were you trying to create a specific effect?

**LL:** I think that I just liked the idea of having a slightly different thing going on there, rather than just repeating it absolutely literally.

**BW:** Also in the third movement: after measure 82, nearly every reference seems to be derived from either the first or second movement, or the preceding of the third movement. However, the idea at measure 104 seems familiar, but I’m not sure what it’s related to. Is it a new theme?²⁵⁵

**LL:** Right. It might take me awhile to remember what exactly that came from. As a composer, you can forget your own music and especially you forget how you wrote it. That is to say, generally, whatever piece I’m working on kind of

---

²⁵⁵ The author later discovered that the melody at measure 104 of the third movement is derived from the melodic contour at mm. 3-4 of the first movement. See pp. 75-76 for a more detailed discussion.
obliterates the memory of every piece before it. So I would have to go through
the piece myself to tell you exactly where that came from. And sometimes it can
be something fairly obscure.

**BW:** Even in the first 81 bars, where the material is “new,” there are striking
resemblances. For example, the solo trumpet’s opening motive in measure 10 is
nearly identical to its opening line of the first movement. I imagine this imitation
is fully intended?

**LL:** Yes, a lot of the material comes out of fragments of that opening theme.

**BW:** The sixteenth note idea that the trumpet has in measures 12-14 of the third
movement also looks very similar to what we find in the flute at measure 5 of the
first movement.

**LL:** Or it can also be seen as just a variation of measure 10: basically, the three
descending notes in sequence, ornamented. When you start writing and working
in an organic way, where you’re trying to relate materials, you’ll start having
relationships of material that you’re not even necessarily aware of. They’ll just
happen because your work is kind of like mathematics.

**BW:** Sure. It creates the feeling of a much greater and unified whole. It just makes
more sense to a listener and performer that way.

**LL:** Right.

**BW:** Are there any suggestions you might give someone who’s working on this piece?

**LL:** Look at what’s on the page and try to understand what the composer was getting
at before you decide to do something different.
BW: Would you recommend that a prospective performer of your trumpet concerto listen to other works of yours as a way of informing their preparation?

LL: Yes. Whenever you’re playing a piece by a composer it’s great to become familiar with as many pieces as one can of that composer, since that will help you understand his language.

BW: What contributions do you see this piece making in the trumpet concerto genre?

LL: Besides it being a melodic piece, presenting lyrical and musical challenges for the trumpet, I wanted it to be a substantial piece. I think it might be one of the longest of the trumpet concertos in the repertoire. A lot of them tend to be in the fifteen to twenty minute range, but this is almost thirty minutes long.

BW: The Dallas Symphony Orchestra and obviously, the New York Philharmonic, have programmed the trumpet concerto. Has it been played by any other major symphonies or solo artists that you’re aware of?

LL: It’s actually being done on January 7 and 8, 2011 by the Dayton Philharmonic Orchestra with Ryan Anthony, who is now the principal of the Dallas Symphony Orchestra. They’re also going to record it.

BW: Is the Trumpet Concerto your only work that featured a brass instrument?

LL: As a concerto, yes.

BW: Did you enjoy writing it? Do you have any future plans to write more works for trumpet or brass instruments?

LL: Sure. I enjoy writing for instruments for which I have not previously composed works. But one of the things about making a living as a composer is that you
have to write what people are willing to commission. So I don’t have the luxury necessarily of writing just any old thing I want to write.

BW: The reviews of your trumpet concerto have been outstanding and I’m sure the trumpet players who have performed it have enjoyed it. So it’s a mystery to me why it isn’t performed more.

LL: Well, actually, it’s not that strange to me. These days with the current economic climate, if an orchestra’s going to have a soloist, it’s going to be a name soloist. And right now, there does not seem to be a popular trumpet player out there - I mean someone who’s recognized by the broader public. So, when an orchestra does a concerto, it’s going to be a piano, violin or cello concerto. And you know the rare times that they’re going to let one of their principals do a concerto, it’s just not often the brass instruments.

BW: And if it’s a trumpet player, I suppose they’re going to be playing the Haydn more often than not.

LL: Yes, that’s the other thing. If they’re going to feature one of their soloists with an instrument that’s not necessarily seen as an audience draw, they’re going to want it to be safe repertoire. I’m hoping that when the recording of the trumpet concerto comes out, more people will know about it.

BW: Unfortunately at the collegiate level, students don’t have an orchestra that can accompany them for recitals, so they have to perform the concerto with piano accompaniment.

LL: That’s right and it is also a tough piece and probably intimidating to a lot of college-level players.
**BW:** Yeah, but the Tomasi Concerto is performed a lot and, in my opinion, it’s comparable in difficulty.

**LL:** The thing about something like the Tomasi or Jolivet is that those came out in a period where there were actual star trumpet soloists such as Maurice Andre, Timofei Dokshitzer, and Wynton Marsalis; they all recorded those pieces. So those pieces got numerous recordings and pretty good circulation. It’s much more difficult to get a concerto out there now when getting it recorded is next to impossible in the present climate.

**BW:** How did you hear about the Dayton Philharmonic Orchestra doing this?

**LL:** The Dayton Philharmonic Orchestra was one of the commissioners of my Clarinet Concerto. We talked from the beginning about recording the Clarinet Concerto and then the question was what to fill up the CD with. I suggested the Trumpet Concerto because it’s a work that I’d like to see on CD, to get it out there. So that’s how that happened.

**BW:** That’s terrific. Having a quality recording of a work is a big help to both performers and teachers. I’m sure many people in the trumpet world will be excited when they hear the recording. Thank you very much for this interview. Hopefully, it will assist future performers of your trumpet concerto and help promote it.

**LL:** You’re very welcome. It was a pleasure talking to you.
BW: You currently have a very diverse career as a trumpet artist. Not only are you the principal trumpet of the Dallas Symphony, but you’re also very busy as a soloist and chamber musician. How do you go about balancing all of these demands and being prepared for each of them?

RA: It’s a tricky thing and I wish it were clear cut. There are different obstacles every month. These past couple months are probably the busiest I’ve been in a few years with work outside of the orchestra. Pertaining to the Liebermann Trumpet Concerto, I was asked to do it about a year-and-a-half in advance. So an agreement was created between the management of the two orchestras (Dallas and Dayton) to ensure I would be available. Dayton wanted an agreement that far in advance because they wanted to record the performance. As it happened, the Dallas Symphony schedule was not released yet and anything I do outside the orchestra is usually during a Pops or Education week when it’s okay for me to be gone (I have a wonderful Associate Principal who can cover for me). So I have to be careful that my activities outside the orchestra don’t affect my job with the Dallas Symphony. Secondly, I have to make sure that it actually falls in a time period where I can be prepared for it. For example, I won’t take anything after or before a Mahler week. The Liebermann Concerto performance with the Dayton
Philharmonic was to occur after the Christmas break. I was excited about that, since I would have plenty of time to prepare for it.

**BW:** How did this opportunity come about?

**RA:** Actually, it was arranged by my manager. My solo manager is also the manager of the Dayton Philharmonic Orchestra’s conductor, Neal Gittleman. I originally heard about the piece around 2004 from Phil Smith when I was in New York doing a week with the Philharmonic. I had recently left the Canadian Brass and was looking for some new solo repertoire. He told me about the piece, showed me the part while we were just talking in his basement, and said he enjoyed it. That was the first time I’d ever heard about it. So it was a little bit on my radar but it really wasn’t anything that I started preparing or looking at. A couple of years ago, my manager asked if I’d be interested in playing it and I said “absolutely.” It took awhile to iron out the details, but eventually I received the green light. I’m not sure what conversations occurred before that, but I was just happy to get the call.

**BW:** Did you have any contact with Lowell Liebermann during your preparation?

**RA:** No, not at all. We didn’t have any contact until the week of the performance.

**BW:** Was he there for the performances or the recording?

**RA:** No, he wasn’t there. The rehearsal was recorded. We sent him the recording over the Internet and corresponded by e-mail and phone. We had some questions for him. We wanted his input for any changes he might want to make and his approval for what we were doing. There were questions about tempos and about discrepancies between the trumpet part that goes with the piano reduction (which
I was using) and the trumpet part in the orchestral score. My biggest question was about the mutes since, for the recording, I wanted to have the sound that he had in mind when he wrote the composition.

BW: When I talked to Mr. Liebermann last December, he was excited about the upcoming performance and recording.

RA: They recorded the rehearsal, both concerts (there were two), and a fifteen minute patch session to run through some of the transitions. It was pretty quick – I had basically two shots, so the recording engineers don’t have a lot of material to work through. I think what they’re currently doing with the recording is some edits with regard to balance and other things they can still control.

BW: So there was no formal recording session, just the two live concerts and a patch?

RA: That was it, two live concerts. Once they cleared out the hall after the second concert, we had a 15-minute patch session.

BW: You’ve premiered works written specifically for you, by Donald Erb and Stanley Friedman. Did you work with them while the works were being written? Is this something you like to do?

RA: Yes, though I really haven’t done a whole lot with contemporary music. I’ve known Stanley for a long time. He is familiar with my playing – he was a trumpet player before he started composing. I knew Don Erb in Cleveland, and I did a lot of his music around town. So he also knew my playing pretty well. He asked a few questions, but mostly the work was just sort of handed to me. But on both of those occasions, I was working with a composer with whom I had an ongoing relationship. So that made it easier.
BW: What was your initial impression of Liebermann’s Trumpet Concerto once you began working on it?

RA: I was really taken by all the lyrical, singing lines for the solo trumpet. The work extends the boundaries of the trumpet not only as a solo instrument, but also as a vocal instrument. You know, there’s a lot of music out there that’s sort of an athletic event – new works that are hard just to be hard. They seem to focus on pushing the boundaries of physical ability. Obviously, there are some technical passages in Liebermann’s concerto, but they are used to make a statement and not just to be hard for the technical flash. So I really enjoyed the singing lines. For me as a soloist, what I then try to do is put my own story to it. Later on, once I got a chance to experience the orchestration in rehearsal with Dayton and use the colors of the trumpet within the colors of the orchestral instruments’ lines – that was something that really attracted me too. As a soloist, having so many lyrical lines makes it easier to put my own story to the music. And that’s what I want to do as a trumpet player. To me, it actually sounded like the concerto had a lot of Shostakovich romanticism. So it was sort of a combination of some of my favorite things – the orchestral composing style that I like, plus the lyrical lines and solo opportunities.

BW: When you first begin to study a work that you’ve never seen before, what are some of the things you like to do to maximize the efficiency and productivity of your preparation?

RA: I had the Liebermann about a year in advance. I was given an archival recording of the New York premiere. Without looking at the music, I just listened to it,
trying to make my own judgment about it as a musical piece. I just put it in the
car and listened to it a couple times. Eventually, I opened up the music and
played through it to gauge how difficult it was going to be. I was looking for the
problems and pitfalls. I made a list of these things. Then I let it sit for awhile.
When I came back to it, I did not listen to the recording again until I had it
completely worked out. I wanted to come back to it with my own fresh
interpretation and styling. It wasn’t until I had worked out all the technical
aspects and had really worked on the piece musically, that I listened to it again.
This is always interesting because, many times, I’ve found my own sort of voice,
and then I find out that’s exactly how it was done! So this is sort of how I do
everything: I listen to it, play through it, figure out my game plan, and then, after
some time has passed, work on it technically without listening to it again.

**BW:** Did you work with a pianist ahead of time to become familiar with the orchestra’s part?

**RA:** That was my original plan. I was going to work it out with a pianist because I had
the piano score. But that didn’t happen because, by the time November and
December came around, things just started to get too busy with work, scheduling,
the holidays, and family events. The next thing I knew it was Christmas break.
At that point, I felt secure enough with what I wanted to do that I decided not to
work with a pianist. A few weeks before the performance, I played along with the
recording to check some tempos. Basically, the first time I played it with the
accompaniment/orchestra was the first rehearsal. Actually, I think I’m glad it
turned out that way because there are so many beautiful colors with an orchestra
that you just can’t get with the piano. It was nice not to have any preconceived ideas about it until experiencing it with the orchestra and the way it was supposed to be. Actually, now I would like to record it with piano. Knowing how it should be played with the orchestra, I’d like to see the orchestral colors brought into the piano part instead of the other way around.

**BW:** What was the experience of performing the concerto with the Dayton Philharmonic Orchestra like?

**RA:** I was extremely impressed with the whole process and with Neal Gittleman, the conductor. He had obviously spent a lot of time analyzing and studying the concerto. With respect to tempos and transitions, he knew exactly what he wanted and how to put it together. So that made it a lot of fun; we were able to collaborate and put our research together in a very efficient way. And the orchestra just played phenomenally. Everyone did a terrific job and it came together very fast. The work is so well written that you can put it together quickly and you don’t need a huge orchestra to do it. It’s a very programmable concerto. It’s just as appealing to the audience as it is to the musicians – for me that’s very important. There’s nothing worse than exerting yourself over a solo and then finding nobody enjoyed or understood it. I hope it starts to be performed more often.

**BW:** You know, it really hasn’t been performed much. I’ve wondered why.

**RA:** From a conversation I had yesterday, I think we’re going to try to do it in Dallas sometime in the next couple of seasons. Once this recording comes out, hopefully, people will hear it and it will be performed more. I think it would be a
great recital piece too. There are a lot of new pieces being composed, and prospective performers really want to hear the orchestration. I’m glad we did the recording because that will help people to hear what it’s like.

**BW:** What were the most difficult challenges you faced in the performance of the Liebermann *Trumpet Concerto*?

**RA:** Well, for me, a lot of it was pacing. My goal was for my comfort level to be pretty much the same throughout the concerto. The third movement has some of the most technically difficult passages and you need to be strong at the end. The second movement is a heartfelt, emotional piece; I felt the tendency was to spend so much effort and emotion in it that there might not be enough strength left for the third movement, especially in the live performance. On the first night, I really felt myself getting into it so much that I just had to be careful to make sure that I was being smart. You don’t want to sacrifice anything musically, but you also want to be strong at the end. It’s also difficult in the sense that the first movement is just really delicate. It’s not that it’s extremely technically challenging, but with all the soft entrances and needing to be able to sing, I needed to have my face in a condition where I’d feel comfortable in all the soft high passages. So it wasn’t so much a technical issue as it was having the endurance to play all the soft and loud singing lines.

**BW:** Right. Each movement presents somewhat different demands and you’ve got to maintain your endurance the whole time because the concerto is almost 30 minutes long.
RA: The concerto is a well-paced work but each movement is different in its approach. Building endurance came from playing straight through it after I practiced. About two to three weeks before the performance I was just trying to get to where I could play it through. Any time I do a concerto I want to be able to play it through twice because it’s natural when you perform live to just get tired faster than you do in the practice room. For me, personally, I spent a lot of the time with the soft entrances in the first movement. I wanted to make sure that I felt fresh for that. It worked out well that I was able to gear myself up for the performance over Christmas break.

BW: If a collegiate player programmed this concerto on a recital, do you think he/she would need to prepare in the same way? Should they be able to play through their entire recital twice?

RA: Well, maybe not the whole recital twice. If I’m doing a recital, what I like to do is play through it without any breaks. If I can play through it without the breaks (the intermissions, the set-up changes, talking, etc.) and go back and practice through anything I might want to fix, then when it’s time for the actual recital having those breaks and not doing any additional playing usually keeps me strong enough to get through the recital. Also, for a recital with piano, you’re probably not going to be putting out the same volume and that helps. If it’s just one recital piece, the Brandenburg, or a concerto, I want to be able to play through it twice. A lot of times when you’re doing rehearsals with orchestras that’s exactly what you’re doing. You may rehearse for 45 minutes. You might play through it twice or you might do each movement twice. You have to have that endurance even for
the rehearsals. In addition, when there’s a full symphony orchestra behind you, I’m sure the tendency is to play out a bit more. More than I would if I was just doing a recital.

BW: You mentioned earlier that you had some questions for Lowell Liebermann about the mutes. How was that resolved and what mutes did you use?

RA: There were some differences between the printed solo part that goes with the piano reduction and the solo line in the orchestral score regarding the use of mutes. There are actually quite a few discrepancies between the parts, including tempo markings. In measure 2 of the first movement, the orchestral score states cup mute, but the solo part only says that in the 2nd movement. At the opening of the first movement, I think it just says mute.

BW: It sounds to me like Phil Smith used a cup mute in the beginning of the first movement.

RA: Yeah, it’s marked that way in the orchestral score. I didn’t know this when I was preparing for the concert. So I tried all sorts of different options when I practiced and I was going to make a decision once I heard the actual orchestration behind me in the hall. But when I discussed it with the conductor, we compared our music and the cup mute marking was clear. So that’s what I used for the beginning and ending of the first movement; I did what was marked. I was going to use a Crown Royal bag to end the first movement, and possibly even at the beginning. With the cup mute, there are several places, like on the low notes that begin the ascending runs in measures 14-16, where I found it hard to be heard. But the color of the rest of the cup-muted line works really well. Also, at measure
165 of the first movement, the orchestral score is marked straight mute, but the trumpet part is not. We asked him about it and he did not want it muted.

**BW:** There’s a place in the second movement where you need to remove the cup mute very quickly.

**RA:** Yeah, it’s a real quick change. Actually, in the recording we slowed it down a little bit to accommodate for that. For the spot in the first movement where it says wah-wah mute (the orchestral score says harmon mute), I did it with a solo-tone. It was just my personal favorite. I liked its sound with the vibes and background. That was one of the things we communicated with Mr. Liebermann about, to make sure that it was okay with him. Like I said, we sent the recording of the rehearsal off to him to make sure that he was pleased with the mutes that I chose.

**BW:** I’ve never used a solo-tone mute before. Can you make the “wah” sounds with it?

**RA:** It’s a little difficult, a far stretch, but yeah, you can. I just looked in my bag of mutes and thought it would be kind of interesting. I really liked it; it’s not quite as tinny sounding as a harmon mute. If you hear the recording and wonder what that is, I used a solo-tone and, for the rest, cup mute or straight mute.

**BW:** While most of the challenges in this piece aren’t necessarily technical, there are a few things that might give a student some trouble like in the first movement, after measure 55 or measure 132.

**RA:** Yeah, with the triple tongue.

**BW:** Right, and also the descent down to the low F# in measure 59. And then in the third movement –
RA:  *sings the solo trumpet melody in measure 193 of the third movement*

BW:  *(laughs)* Yeah, yeah, that was really hard. How would you suggest that someone go about practicing these spots?

RA:  Well, I have my own methods; it’s hard to explain over the phone. With the last movement (m. 193), I play almost every other note while slurring, touching the outer notes of the line, which creates a skeleton of the line, if you will. When I fill in the line, I think of all the notes in between as passing tones. I practiced it many times over and over, tongued and slurred, so that I got comfortable going to the extremes of the horn, making it nice and light, so that it didn’t sound labored. That was the goal. With the triple tonguing thing, that was tough. The tempo marking, for me, is very fast. At that spot, I’m just thinking as light a tongue as possible, making fast air, keeping the tongue forward, and really trying to pop that out. A good way of practicing this line would be to flutter tongue it, trying to keep the tongue nice and loose and the air nice and fast. In the run down to the low F♯, I would use the skeleton effect again, singling out the first note of each thirty-second note grouping. Slurring downward, I would turn it into a flexibility exercise. It’s important not to rush; it doesn’t have to be lightning-fast, the orchestra is not very active in these measures. That was another one of those spots where we made sure to hold back a little bit, making it statelier. There are a few technically difficult passages, but most of it is more of a musical exercise, having control over the horn, rather than an athletic event.

BW:  How would you look at this concerto in relation to other concertos, in a historical sense?
RA: It may sound kind of weird, but I feel like it really fills a void in the Romantic repertoire. I don’t know if Lowell would agree or if that’s really what he would want to hear. But personally, I feel like we’ve got our traditional Classical pieces and we’ve got the newer concertos that are technically advanced. But we don’t have that Romantic repertoire. This work has a lot of nice phrasing and orchestrations. I see it as more of a Romantic piece.

BW: Are there any other contemporary concertos that you find outstanding?

RA: To be honest, I’m just really not up on that. When an orchestra asks me to play a concerto, most often it’s to play a particular piece that fits their programming. I’m familiar with James Stephenson, I really like his writing and he’s written some concertos. There’s also a great concerto by Eino Tamberg that seems to be getting some popularity. I don’t think it is necessarily new but it is in the sense that it’s now being recognized. Now that I’m in the orchestra I really don’t have a chance to learn as much new rep. I was happy that the Liebermann came up and that I was asked to do it. It forced me to really look at it and I loved the experience.

BW: Do you think that it’s important for students to perform newer works?

RA: I think we have to keep encouraging new works and, in time, the great ones will stand. There have been many concertos that were composed through the years and we perform the standards that have lasted. Right now we need to become familiar with new compositions so we can promote them and lock in the new standards for future trumpet players. I certainly think the Liebermann Trumpet Concerto has everything that is needed to be put on that list. Currently, it seems
like more composers are writing music for the technically advanced trumpeters but in a style that actually makes music. For a while we got away from that. In the past a lot of the music I saw was technical, just to show what the trumpet can do in the grand scheme of things. It seems like composers got away from actually composing musical lines. Now it seems like composers are going back to writing music for the non-trumpet audience. That’s what nice about the Lieberman; you don’t have to be a trumpet player to really appreciate it. Hopefully the Dayton Philharmonic recording will help promote this work.

**BW:** What are your future plans as a trumpet artist?

**RA:** I don’t see a whole lot changing. Obviously I want to get better at my art. I’m thrilled with my orchestra position, working with my colleagues, and performing in Dallas. I love doing that but my passion really is doing chamber music and soloing. I miss it but the fact that I still can do it is great. That’s what I want to work at and hold on to. It’s something I was told, years ago, was not possible. So right now I feel like what I’m doing is carving out that niche: holding down a great principal job, and still being able to do some chamber music work, brass quintet and solo stuff. Right now, I’ve got two young kids I love being home with so I don’t see a whole lot changing. I just want to make it better. Bigger and better.
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BW: It’s been nearly fifteen years since the premiere of John Williams’ Trumpet Concerto. Looking back, what are your feelings about the experience? Have you been pleased with the reception the concerto has attained in the trumpet world and the general musical community?

MS: The entire experience of getting to work with John and playing the piece was tremendous in every way. Many players have told me how much they’ve enjoyed the piece, but my only regret is that somehow the piece hasn't really gained more popularity and become one of the standards for trumpeters to play.

BW: I think it’s correct to say that John Williams is most celebrated for his vibrant and inspiring cinematic and ceremonial music. How would you describe Williams’ compositional style in the trumpet concerto? What stylistic similarities and/or differences do you perceive that there are between his most well-known music and the trumpet concerto?

MS: John once described to me that, for movies, he must compose something specific to fit with the action and emotions on the screen at that moment, while, for his concert music, it is a blank canvas where he can go any number of different directions. For this concerto, he wanted to highlight a wide variety of characters that the trumpet can play – from the beginning fanfare style that historically has
been the role of the trumpet, to a bluesy Gershwin-like sense in the 2nd
movement, to the pyrotechnics of the 3rd movement, and everything in between.
I guess you could say his harmonic language is a bit different for this piece in
comparison to his movie music, but there are still some very quintessential John
Williams moments that are very familiar.

**BW:** I read that you and Mr. Williams had a great deal of interaction during the period
of time in which he composed the concerto. Through this relationship, it sounded
like you were able to learn about the “character and emotions” that Mr. Williams
wanted to be portrayed. I was wondering if you could expand on this. How
would you describe Mr. Williams’ intentions regarding character and emotions in
each of the three movements? How would you describe the atmosphere of each
movement? Would you describe the main theme of the second movement as
rhapsodic or blues-influenced?

**MS:** John was incredibly gracious and inviting of my input from the start. He often
cited Brahms’ collaboration with Joachim for his violin concerto and how, if it
was good enough for Brahms, he would do the same. Because I spent so much
time with him throughout the process over about 2 years I did get a very clear
sense about what he wanted. As I mentioned earlier, I think John wanted to
explore a wide variety of characters, ranges, dynamics, technical aspects, and
emotions that the trumpet can portray. The 1st movement has a lot of fanfare
elements throughout as a nod to the traditional role of the trumpet. Going into the
cadenza is very declamatory, but then he turns it a different direction and it’s a bit
more introverted at the start after the high C fermata. Eventually, it morphs into a
chase with the orchestra trumpet section. For the second movement, this started out in initial drafts as a very low bluesy tune. He eventually stretched it out vertically so it really spans a wide range while still having a very Samuel Barber/Gershwinesque feel to it all. He also wanted to partner the trumpet with three instruments – the trombone, our closest partner in the orchestra; the English horn, our partner from Copland-Quiet City; and then finally, the flute, which is an unlikely partner and gives the trumpet the opportunity to show a very different quieter intimate side. The third movement is for the most part a joyous sprint with some more jazzy rhythmic elements and lyricism sprinkled throughout.

**BW:** You previously said that you started out with sketches for the third movement. How do you remember the process in which each of the movements began to take shape?

**MS:** The first sketches I saw where most of the 1st movement, the lower version of the 2nd movement, and two or three fragments of ideas for the 3rd movement. Gradually, with each visit, John asked about various technical aspects of what was possible for the last movement, as well as intervals, range, endurance factors overall that I might see. Eventually, the second movement was spread over a much wider range and the third movement took a more complete shape rather than a few fragments of ideas.

**BW:** What conclusions did you and Mr. Williams come to about the variety of technical possibilities regarding range and pacing, etc.?

**MS:** As we went along he was constantly asking me questions about limitations of what I thought was possible and how far he could stretch them. He knows his
craft as well as anyone I can imagine, so he really knew how to place things in a way that sounded and lays great on the horn. We both knew as we went along that this was shaping up to be a mouthful, and he was sensitive to building in an appropriate amount of pacing throughout.

**BW:** Because you were the soloist for the premiere of the Williams and because you’re actively engaged in teaching, you’ve probably come across a number of young students or professionals who have played the Williams *Trumpet Concerto* for you. In your experience, what would you say are the most common problems that trumpet players have with the work, on the macro and micro level? To perform the work well, what should trumpeters be doing in preparation?

**MS:** The most common issues I see are related to just getting into strong overall shape for this, but also cultivating the flexibility and nuance to navigate the piece well musically – not just physically.

**BW:** The reduction of the concerto, published by Hal Leonard, includes both a C trumpet and a B♭ trumpet part. Did you perform the work on C trumpet? Is there any scenario in which you would find it preferable to perform the concerto on B♭ trumpet?

**MS:** I play this on my C and, at this point, don’t foresee a time when I would want to use a B♭. I was not involved in the decision to include a B♭ part with this.

**BW:** I read that you worked ahead of time with a pianist, and performed the concerto with piano three weeks before the premiere. Was this the version that later became the Hal Leonard piano reduction? Do you know if Mr. Williams personally created the Hal Leonard reduction?
MS: I’m not sure if the Hal Leonard piano version is exactly what we played before the premiere with the orchestra, but it’s probably pretty close, if not the same. My understanding is that John did put that together for us and it went on to become the piano version we see from the publisher.

BW: How different was it performing with orchestra instead of with piano? What adjustments would a trumpet player usually need to make?

MS: It’s not really that different from a playing standpoint other than, when you stand in front of the whole orchestra, there is definitely a huge rush of sound supporting you that is easy to ride on top of. Also with the orchestra, you can feed off of the different colors of the instruments you are playing with at different times throughout the piece to create a wider tonal palate.

BW: Were there any last minute changes during your rehearsals before the concert? Did Williams attend any of the orchestral rehearsals? Did he work ahead of time sharing his thoughts with the conductor regarding the orchestration?

MS: John did make a couple of last minute adjustments and requests of me. Funny, there is a fax he sent with a few small things he wanted me to add a couple of days before the first rehearsal and he signed it, “Your Greedy Composer.” He really could not have been nicer about all of this and I was only too happy to do anything he wished. John was at the dress rehearsal and first two concerts. Basically, before anyone plays a concerto in Cleveland, there is usually a quick meeting/rehearsal between just the soloist and conductor to go through the piece, discuss tempos and transitions, and really anything else that needs coordination before the first rehearsal. A pianist is always there for this meeting to help give
the conductor an overall sense of the piece as they go through it. John was not there for my meeting/rehearsal with Mr. Dohnanyi.

**BW:** I’ve noticed several interesting discrepancies between the piano score and the orchestral score. I’m not referring to the omission of material or the slight alterations that would be necessary for a pianist to perform the work, but instead, consequential differences. For example, the hauntingly beautiful ending of the second movement has three B major chord with a following dissonance of D♭ and E. The piano version adds a C♮ on top of the last dissonance, creating a different background sonority. This doesn’t happen in the orchestral version. Do you have any insight as to why the note was added? The same thing happens in the first movement in the lead up to measure 55 and measure 61: the upper note is different, and so the dominant sound that the audience hears is also different.

**MS:** I really don’t know why this is different.

**BW:** On both Arturo Sandoval’s recording of the concerto, plus your archived recording of the premiere, I noticed at measure 54 and measure 75 of the 2nd movement that you both play a different melodic line than what is indicated in both the piano and orchestral score. Did the melodic line change after the premiere?

**MS:** These two spots in the second movement were changed after the premiere. I don't specifically know why these changes were made. If I had to guess, I would say that, after hearing the premiere, John simply wanted to add greater musical embellishments at those moments.
BW: Would you like to one day produce a published recording of the Williams concerto? I’m convinced that the trumpet world would be excited to obtain it.

MS: Yes, I would very much like to have a recording released with me playing this concerto. The recording of the premiere was actually done in a manner that it is ready for commercial release if the orchestra ever decided to do that. Most of the hold-up with this is related to the orchestra’s collective media agreement. Hopefully, at some point that can be resolved and this can be released.

BW: I’ve found that many trumpeters have trouble creating a musically engaging cadenza in the first movement. What suggestions would you have with regard to pacing or style to make the cadenza musically effective?

MS: As I mentioned earlier, John wanted to take the trumpet in a different direction with the initial part of this cadenza. Typically, cadenzas are very pyrotechnic and this starts out very lyrical and intimate. Eventually, it gets more dramatic as it goes on. Pacing is extremely important; taking appropriate time and not rushing through this is essential to give it the proper dramatic effects.

BW: The concerto often uses melodies with large intervalllic leaps and regularly transverses a range of two octaves or more in relatively short periods of time. What methods would you suggest a student use to confront this technical challenge?

MS: Lots of interval studies in Arban, Bai Lin, Scholssberg, Stamp, etc. One just has to get used to the idea of playing wide range or quick intervals in a centered manner and be able to hear these easily. Air speed is the key for any of this and
knowing what balance is needed for any given note and how it will need to be approached.

**BW:** How would you view this concerto in a historical sense, in relation to other concertos for trumpet, recent or distant? What would you say that its impact is and will be on the trumpet concerto genre?

**MS:** My hope is that over time it will take its’ place as one of the great American trumpet concertos. Only time will tell . . .

**BW:** I’ve read that you’re going to be premiering another new trumpet concerto towards the end of this year, by Michael Hersch. When you begin to study a work that you’ve never seen before, either in the orchestra or as a soloist, and for which there are no recordings, what are some of the things that you like to do, to maximize the efficiency and productivity of your preparation?

**MS:** First, I key in on all technical aspects that are included and set about getting those elements together in my playing. Range and endurance can be factors, so I also try to get that in proper order as well. In this case, Michael has made a MIDI CD for me to hear what it will basically sound like, so that’s a big help.

**BW:** Being actively engaged in the promotion of new music, what would you say are the benefits students can receive from playing not just the standards of our repertoire (Haydn, Hummel, Tomasi, Artutunian, etc.) but also works by composers of our time?
**MS:** I think it’s extremely important to perform a variety of pieces from all eras and styles. The standards always need to be preserved and kept fresh but, many times, exploring new works can expand your playing in style, character, and technique. If done in a nice balance, this can only serve to yield positive things for you and keep your playing evolving forward.
APPENDIX D

PARTIAL LIST OF TRUMPET CONCERTOS WRITTEN SINCE 1990

Francine Aubin  
*Russian Concerto*  Trumpet and Orchestra  
Premiered by Guy Touvron with the Orchestre Symphonique Region Centre, Tours, France- July 4, 2009

Lauren Bernofsky  
*Trumpet Concerto*  Trumpet and Orchestra (1998)  
Premiered by Gary Peterson with the Halsnøy Musikksommerskole Symphony Orchestra, Bergen, Norway- August 12, 2001

Robert J. Bradshaw  
*Concerto No. 1*  Trumpet and Orchestra (2007)  
Performed during the premiere season by Gil Cline with the Humboldt State University Symphony Orchestra, Arcata, California- May 1, 2008

Dimitrije Buzarovski  
*Concerto for Trumpet and Strings Op.58* (2010)  
Score in pdf and audio of computer performance available at [http://mmc.edu.mk/TrumpetConcerto.html](http://mmc.edu.mk/TrumpetConcerto.html)

Peter Eotvos  
*Jet Stream*  Trumpet and Orchestra (2002) 18'  
Premiered by Markus Stockhausen with the BBC Symphony Orchestra, London, UK- February 15, 2003

H K Gruber  
*Aerial*  Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra (1999) 25'  
Premiered by Hakan Hardenberger with the BBC Symphony Orchestra, London, UK- July 29, 1999

H K Gruber  
*Busking*  Concerto for Trumpet, Accordion, Banjo and String Orchestra (2007) 30'  
Premiered by Hakan Hardenberger with the Amsterdam Sinfonietta, Muziekgebouw, Amsterdam, Netherlands- May 17, 2008

Joachim Gruner  
*Concerto for Trumpet No. 2* (1990)  
Premiered by Jouko Harjanne, Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra, Helsinki, Finland

Hans Werner Henze  
*Requiem*  Nine Concertos for Trumpet, Piano and Large Orchestra (1990-93)  
Premiered by Hakan Hardenberger with the Cologne Ensemble Modern, London, UK- February 24, 1993
Michael Hersch  
*Night Pieces*  
Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra (2011)  
Will be premiered by Michael Sachs with the Cleveland Orchestra, Cleveland, Ohio- 2011/12 season

Aaron Jay Kernis  
*A Voice, A Messenger*  
Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra (2010)  
Will be premiered by Philip Smith with the New York Philharmonic, N.Y., N.Y.

Hanna Kulenty  
*Trumpet Concerto*  
Trumpet and Symphony Orchestra  
(2002) 25'  
Premiered by Marco Blaauw with the National Radio Symphony Orchestra, Katowice, Poland- March 3, 2003

Martin Matalon  
*Trame V*  
Trumpet and Orchestra (2003) 19'  
Premiered by Eric Aubier with the National Orchestra of Lorraine, Metz, France- May 16, 2003

Barry McKimm  
*Concerto for Trumpet*  
Trumpet and Brass Band  
Premiered by Paul Goodchild with the St Mary’s District Brass Band, ITG Conference, Sydney, Australia- 2010

Greg McLean  
*The Twain Have Met*  
Concerto for Two Trumpets and Orchestra (2008)  
Premiered by Marvin Stamm and Cathy Leach with the University of Tennessee Orchestra, Knoxville, TN- February 17, 2008

Peter Meechan  
*Aphopienia*  
Concerto for Trumpet and Wind Band (2008)  
Premiered by Rex Richardson with the Fodens Brass Band, Royal Northern College of Music, Manchester, UK- January 2009

Erik Morales  
*Concerto for Trumpet and Wind Band* (2009)  
Premiered by Richard Stoelzel with the Keystone Winds, Harrisburg, PA- May 28, 2009

Fabian Panisello  
*Trumpet Concerto*  
Double Bell Trumpet and Large Ensemble (2007)  
Premiered by Marco Blaauw with the Israel Contemporary Players, Tel Aviv, Israel- November 2, 2008

Stephen Paulus  
*Concerto for Two Trumpets and Orchestra* (2003) 23'  
Premiered by Doc Severinsen and Manny Laureano with the Minnesota Orchestra, Minneapolis, Minnesota
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Piece Title</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Premiered By</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doug Richards</td>
<td><em>Intercontinental Conerto</em></td>
<td>Jazz Trumpet and Orchestra</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Rex Richardson, International Brass Festival, Melbourne, Australia</td>
<td>October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Richardson</td>
<td><em>Concerto</em></td>
<td>Jazz Trumpet and Brass Band</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Rex Richardson, International Brass Festival, Melbourne, Australia</td>
<td>October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfgang Rihm</td>
<td><em>Marsyas Rhapsody</em></td>
<td>Concerto for Trumpet with Percussion and Orchestra</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Reinhold Friedrich, Badische Staatskapelle Orchestra, Karlsruhe, Germany</td>
<td>16'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodion K. Shchedrin</td>
<td><em>Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra</em></td>
<td>Trumpet and Brass Band</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>George Vosburgh, Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra, Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>September 30, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Stephenson</td>
<td><em>Concerto for Trumpet</em></td>
<td>Trumpet and Orchestra</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Jeffrey Work, Pro Arte Chamber Orchestra of Boston, Cambridge, MA</td>
<td>November 30, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Stephenson</td>
<td><em>Rextreme Conerto: Concerto #2 for Trumpet and Orchestra</em></td>
<td>Trumpet and Orchestra</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Rex Richardson, ITG Conference, Sydney, Australia</td>
<td>July 6, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eino Tamberg</td>
<td><em>Trumpet Concerto No. 2</em></td>
<td>Trumpet and Orchestra</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Matthias Hofs, Tampere Philharmonic Orchestra, Tampere, Finland</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramwell Tovey</td>
<td><em>Songs of the Paradise Saloon</em></td>
<td>Trumpet and Orchestra</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Andrew McCandless, Toronto Symphony Orchestra, Toronto, Canada</td>
<td>December 2, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Instrumentation</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Premiere Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark-Anthony Turnage</td>
<td><em>From the Wreckage</em> Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra (2004) 15'</td>
<td>Trumpet and Orchestra</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>Premiered by Hakan Hardenberger with the Helsinki Philharmonic Orchestra, Helsinki, Finland- September 4, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Vizzutti</td>
<td><em>Concierto Mexicano</em> Trumpet and Orchestra (2008)</td>
<td>Trumpet and Orchestra</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Premiered by Allen Vizzutti with the Greater Bridgeport Symphony Orchestra, Bridgeport, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Walczyk</td>
<td><em>Concerto Gaucho</em> Trumpet and Orchestra</td>
<td>Trumpet and Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Premiered by Yuri Kornilov with the Ukraine National Symphony, Kiev, Ukraine- May 17, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Wilson</td>
<td><em>Leader Lieder</em> Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra (2005) 17'</td>
<td>Trumpet and Orchestra</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>17'</td>
<td>Premiered by Rex Richardson with the Xiamen Philharmonic Orchestra, Xiamen, Fujian Province, China- August 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Wolfe</td>
<td><em>Trumpet Concerto</em> Trumpet and Orchestra</td>
<td>Trumpet and Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Premiered by Tim Morrison with the Boston Pops Orchestra, Boston, MA- John Williams conductor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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