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The purpose of this study is to create a performer’s guide for three separate pieces written by David Sampson. The first piece, *Breakaway*, is written for two trumpets and electronic accompaniment. The second piece is entitled *Passage*, and is written for muted flugelhorn and viola. The final piece for examination is the Sonata for trumpet entitled *Triptych*, a commission from the International Trumpet Guild in 1991.

Although the number of compositions for trumpet has increased in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, guides for the performer regarding pieces with unique instrumentation and internationally commissioned works extremely limited.

Included in this study is an examination of the specific challenges found in *Breakaway, Passage, and Triptych*, with detailed consideration regarding the methods with which to execute the unique performance elements of each composition. In addition, the information found in this study will expand the number of twentieth and twenty-first century trumpet works that have been investigated in a formal research capacity.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the last ten years, approximately 340 theses or dissertations have been written on the trumpet.\(^1\) From this number, as far as can be determined, approximately seventeen academic works have focused on the trumpet and its use in twentieth and twenty-first century trumpet music.\(^2\) Of these seventeen writings, three dissertations have discussed


the trumpet writing or the writing for other instruments and how this relates to the trumpet writing of David Sampson. Within this research list, composers who focused on trumpet literature and performance in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries include Vincent Persichetti, Stefan Wolpe, Frank Ticheli, Alexander Arutunian, Norman Dello Joio, Eric Ewazen, and Robert Suderburg, among others. This group of prolific composers has contributed to the expansion of the trumpet repertoire in the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries. With the bulk of the trumpet literature being written after the invention of the tubular valve and the application to the instrument in 1820, performers are constantly looking for new literature, which expands the possibilities for the performer.

**Background**

David Sampson, born in 1951 in Charlottesville, Virginia, is a significant composer of trumpet works, adding over fifty pieces to the solo repertoire. This number includes over twenty published works for solo trumpet and seven works for trumpet and background.

---


David Sampson received a 2006 Fellowship from the New Jersey State Council on the Arts. He has also received major grants from the NEA, American Academy of Arts and Letters, Barlow Endowment, Jerome Foundation, Cary Trust, and the Dodge Foundation, among others. He holds degrees from the Curtis Institute of Music, Hunter College, Manhattan School of Music, and the Ecoles d’ Art Americaines, where his teachers included Karel Husa, Henri Dutilleux and John Corigliano in composition; and Gerard Schwarz, Gilbert Johnson, Robert Nagel, and Raymond Mase in trumpet. His music is published by Editions BIM, Hickman Publications, Cantate Press and David Sampson Music. He has served on the Board of the Composers Guild of New Jersey and the Advisory Board of the Bergen Foundation. 

Recordings of Sampson’s works are extensive, and include performances by The American Brass Quintet, Summit Brass, Solid Brass, The Meridian Arts Ensemble, Scott Mendoker, and Raymond Mase. Sampson is also a highly regarded composer of music for wind ensemble, orchestra, and wind quintet. His solo compositions include works for piano, flute oboe, saxophone, french horn, bass trombone, trumpet, tuba, percussion, viola, and violoncello, among others. Mr. Sampson is also well versed with choral ensemble, as he has written for chorus, chorus and orchestra, and chorus with organ.

---


8 Ibid.
The music David Sampson writes for trumpet draws on all elements of his compositional styles and molds the trumpet lines artfully to create wonderful phrases and melodies. Sampson has contributed to the limited trumpet repertoire with these quality compositions and has greatly increased the exposure of the instrument through performances and recordings of his pieces.

Justification of Study

Although the number of compositions for trumpet has increased in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, guides for the performer exploring pieces with unique instrumentation and internationally commissioned works are extremely limited. As far as can be determined, this short list includes works by David Sampson, Stefan Wolpe, Frank Ticheli, Robert Henderson, Hans Werner Henze, Verne Reynolds, Stanley Friedman, and Fisher Tull.10


Just as other composers who were commissioned to write for the International Trumpet Guild represent leading contemporary composers,\textsuperscript{11} David Sampson is an important composer who strives to creatively expand the musical and technical repertoire of the trumpet.\textsuperscript{12} The composer’s works for trumpet stretch the imagination of the player using combinations such as two trumpets and percussion, suites for unaccompanied trumpet, concert music for three trumpets, and trumpet with organ accompaniment.\textsuperscript{13}

This study will create a performer’s guide for three separate pieces written by David Sampson. All three pieces have been researched, practiced, and performed by the author of this paper. The first piece, \textit{Breakaway}, was chosen from the large number of works by Mr. Sampson due to the unique instrumentation and exceptional challenges presented to the players. The work is composed for two trumpets and electronic accompaniment, creating many balance and ensemble performance issues as well as extremely challenging writing for both parts.\textsuperscript{14}

The second piece is entitled \textit{Passage}, and is written for muted flugelhorn and viola. This work involves the construction of a mute by the performer, created by following specific guidelines for the construction outlined by Sampson.\textsuperscript{15} Additionally,
the ensemble challenges resulting from the combination of a duet between the flugelhorn and the viola create specific ensemble issues involving balance, style, and an agreement on musical line and phrasing (David Sampson, July 2009, e-mail message to the author.

The final piece for examination is the sonata for trumpet entitled Triptych. This work was a commission from the International Trumpet Guild in 1991. This composition will be the third commission from ITG that has been examined in a DMA dissertation and is one of twenty-five commissioned works by the International Trumpet Guild from the years 1987-2006. Triptych brings elements of a classic Sonata together with Sampson’s innovative compositional style. This composition is exceptionally unique in that it is one of only two of the twenty-five commissions for the ITG to be scored for trumpet and orchestra. The only other work scored with orchestral accompaniment is William Schmidt’s Concierto for Trumpet and Orchestra, written for the ITG in 1986. Many of the composers on the list of ITG commissions have had at least one composition, although not necessarily the work written for the ITG, serving as an object for dissertation research. More specifically, as far as can be determined, this


20 Ibid.
list includes David Sampson, Norman Dello Joio, Eric Ewazen, Karel Husa, Jan Bach, Stan Friedman, Fisher Tull, William Schmidt, Harrison Birtwistle, Peter Maxwell Davies and Ned Rorem.21

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to create a performer’s guide for three selected works by David Sampson.

---

Research Questions

The specific research questions addressed by this study include:

1. What is the compositional background of *Breakaway, Passage, and Triptych*?
2. What are the analytical components, which serve the basic structure of the works?
3. What inferences and conclusions can be drawn regarding the performance practice of each piece?
4. For each piece, what are the overall challenges the player must consider in the composition?
5. Based on the analyses of research questions 1-4, what suggestions can be made to the performer regarding the unique elements of each piece, including but not limited to, the unique challenges of the music, unique trumpet challenges, unique ensemble challenges, and the execution of musical elements.

Research regarding twentieth and twenty-first century trumpet compositions is limited to a small group of composers including David Sampson, Stefan Wolpe, Frank Ticheli, Robert Henderson, Hans Werner Henze, Verne Reynolds, Stanley Friedman, and
Fisher Tull, among others.22 This study will increase the trumpet repertoire that has been investigated in a formal research capacity, and will also examine the specific challenges of the pieces, with detailed consideration regarding the methods with which to execute the unique performance elements of each composition.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter outlines research regarding the reviews of the music of David Sampson, performance analysis of Sampson’s music, and the performance analysis of solo trumpet literature written by the contemporaries of David Sampson. Additionally, numerous journalists have reviewed the music of David Sampson in various publications. In these publications, individuals have investigated the written music, recordings, concerts, and the historical background of Mr. Sampson.

Reviews of the Written Music

In 2004, Carolyn Sanders\textsuperscript{23} examined David Sampson’s composition entitled \textit{Notes From Faraway Places}. Sanders begins the review with a brief description of the ensembles for which Sampson has composed and moves quickly into the organization of the work into three suites. The review provides very important information such as the instruments used in suites to help create the colors desired by the composer. Sanders focuses on the compositional style of David Sampson, including his highly personal interest in programmatic music and the variety of sounds created by the performer.

Additionally, Sanders speaks of Sampson’s use of expanded traditional techniques, such as unusual rhythms and trill passages, in combination with highly lyrical melodic statements. Sanders continues the description of Sampson’s compositional style by presenting the commonalities of the three suites. These areas of similarity include a wide range of dynamics and articulations, mixed meter, and contemporary rhythmic notation requiring performer interpretation. Sanders concludes the review by stating that “Sampson has done an excellent job supplying the more advanced player an effective and highly versatile work, firmly rooted in the twentieth century.”24 This review is exceptionally useful, as the author speaks of the characteristic writing of David Sampson. Sanders also provides the reader with a clear idea as to the colors and sonorities used by David Sampson to convey emotions in his music.25

Reviews of the Recorded Music of David Sampson

In January of 2001, Timothy Hudson said of Ray Mase’s recording of Triptych, an ITG commission from David Sampson, “Triptych takes the listener on an exciting musical voyage of sounds, rhythms, and colors.”26 The author compares the form of the work to the form of the Christian triptych, a set of three painted panels consisting of two smaller panels on the sides of a central panel. While describing the writing of David


25 Ibid.

Sampson, Hudson draws a general similarity to the music found in Karel Husa’s *Music for Prague 1968*. Descriptive terms used by Hudson include “haunting, intense, lyrical, and with rhythmic energy.” 27 The depiction of the music is clear and the emotion Hudson discovers through the recording is strong. The author concludes the article by briefly describing the performer’s ability to soar through the melodic lines. Directly regarding the performer, Ray Mase, Hudson states, “Mase gives what seems to be the definitive performance of this work.” 28 Within this review, Hudson not only describes the intricacies and sonorities of Sampson’s music, he makes comparisons to other contemporary compositions in order to give the reader a better idea of the character of the work. Additionally, although this recording also contains works for orchestra by David Sampson, Hudson views the recording from a trumpet performer’s perspective, providing information specifically for the performer.

Peter Wood reviewed the recording entitled “Dectet, The Music of David Sampson,” in January 2007 for the ITG. 29 One of the first elements Wood mentions about the compositions is the wide variety of instruments for which Sampson composes. Wood also comments on Sampson’s liberal use of the flugelhorn in his compositions and the instruments use on half of the pieces on the recording. In regards to Sampson’s emotional and personal connection to his compositions, Wood describes how the first piece is a reflection of Sampson, his wife, and his two children. Again, Sampson’s work is compared to an outside composer and piece to assist the reader in creating a

27 Ibid., 49.

28 Ibid.

visualization of the composer’s sonority and style. Wood compares one movement directly to Barber’s Adagio and another to the music of Ärvo Part.\textsuperscript{30} The slow portions of the recording are likened to a “haunting tone and silky legato,” while portions of the final piece are said to be a “study in sonority and harmony.”\textsuperscript{31} Additionally, Wood describes the rhythmic material in the recording as having jazz influence and written with angular style. Wood creates a clear picture in the reader’s mind as to the general stylistic elements as well as specific tendencies found in the compositions of David Sampson. The comparisons drawn to other composers give the reader the opportunity to locate these referenced works to help create an image of David Sampson’s compositional style. Wood makes many generalizations about the music on this specific recording, leading the reader to believe that each piece shares similar elements.\textsuperscript{32} Although Wood provides information of music similar to David Sampson’s, he does only provide his opinion of this similarity. Upon further examination, the reader may find that, in fact, the author was incorrect about these similarities. However, the references do serve to create a foundation on which further research can be built.

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
Reviews of Performances of David Sampson’s Compositions

At the ITG conference held in New Jersey, David Sampson’s work for two trumpets and electronics was performed and reviewed by Kevin Eisensmith. In the first sentence, Eisensmith states that David Sampson is a “name familiar to many trumpet players.” The composition is in three movements and each movement is detailed in the review. Eisensmith makes a connection between the titles of the movements and the expression of the music and suggests that they are programmatic in nature. The author states that the first movement, entitled “Carving the Stone,” was percussive with nature with angular writing and lines resembling trumpet fanfares. Eisensmith finds the second movement, “A Single Shot: Prayers and Chants,” like an “elegy” with a pulsating ostinato underneath wonderful lyric trumpet lines. The piece ends with a movement entitled “Awakening” which, according to the author, contains some “rock-like elements with electronic sounds reminiscent of a Moog synthesizer. The trumpet lines are punctuated by flourishes and kicks.” The review supports David Sampson’s desire for his music to represent human emotions and experiences.

In the year 2000, the American Brass Quintet played a concert at the International Trumpet Guild Convention in Purchase, New York. Kimberly Stephens, the woman who reviewed the concert, took particular interest in a piece by David Sampson entitled

---


34 Ibid., 17.

35 Ibid., 18.

36 Ibid.
Quintet 99. In her thoughts on the composition, Stephens comments on the “seamless, even quality in the middle movement, which is a long section of muted notes passed back and forth between the musicians.”37 Additionally, the author likens this second movement to other works (unspecified) by David Sampson.38 While speaking on the imagery of Sampson’s composition, Stephens states, “as one note decrescendos, another crescendos, giving the impression of a prism, or sun-catcher turning slowly, revealing different sides and colors as it turns.”39 The rest of the article focuses on the other pieces performed on the concert, serving to provide an example of Sampson’s music in the context of a public concert. The Quintet 99 was clearly the centerpiece of the concert, surrounded by works and arrangements of works by Luca Marenzio, Anthony Plog, Josquin des Pres, and Thomas Stolzer.40 This particular review demonstrates the emotion of the compositions of David Sampson and begins to show structural similarities between his writing. With reviews such as this one, an aural characteristic can begin to be identified for the works of David Sampson.


38 Ibid.

39 Ibid.

40 Ibid.
Historical Background of the Composer and Compositional Style

In February of 1996, The International Trumpet Guild celebrated twenty years of existence with an article covering the history of the organization. This article is a comprehensive history of the ITG, including sections reviewing the early years, the International Trumpet Guild Journal, the annual ITG conference, composition contests, commissions, reprints, and plans for the future of the organization. Included are tables of the board of directors of the ITC from the 1975-1997, representing the top performers of the time. This list includes performers such as David Hickman, Robert Nagel, Roger Voisin, Thomas Stevens, Vincent Cichowicz, Allan Dean, Timofei Dokschitzer, Anthony Plog, Ray Sasaki, Charles Schlueter, Edward Tarr, Marvin Stamm, and Frank Campos.

This impressive list of major names in trumpet performance led to the decision to commission works from composers in the name of the ITG. This list includes Norman Dello Joio, Samuel Adler, Raymond Premru, Karel Husa, Jan Bach, Stan Friedman, William Schmidt, Robert Suderberg, Fisher Tull, Bernard Heiden, and David Sampson.

Not only does this article state that David Sampson is on the list of composers who was commissioned to compose for the ITG, he is one of only two composers to write a work for solo trumpet and full orchestra, the other being William Schmidt in 1986. This factual information regarding the history of the association, as well as the other


43 Ibid.

44 Ibid.
composers who have written a commissioned work for the ITG helps to solidify David Sampson’s position as one of the foremost composers for trumpet music in the twentieth and twenty first centuries.

**Performance Analysis of the Compositions of David Sampson**

In 2005 at the University of Miami, Peter Francis wrote his DMA dissertation entitled *A Performance and Pedagogical Analysis of Compositions for Unaccompanied Solo Trumpet by Persichetti, Wolpe, Sampson, and Ticheli.* Overall, this dissertation investigates the use of traditional elements of music in innovative ways. Francis examined the construction of Sampson’s work for solo flugelhorn in intricate detail, including the analysis of thematic motifs and development of these motives. Within his research into the piece, Francis located the challenging elements of the piece and made suggestions as to the way the soloist might perform these passages. Although the work written by Sampson and investigated by Francis in the dissertation were for solo flugelhorn, the analysis and performer’s guide provides the reader with characteristics of Sampson’s compositional style and his emotional attachment to the music. The detailed theoretical analysis shows the structure of each portion of the piece and helps to identify the composer’s musical intent. Additionally, the approach to the performance practice provides a combination of analytical information and musical interpretation that is informative to the performer. Francis examines the piece not only from a theoretical

---


46 Ibid. 13.
standpoint, but from a pedagogical perspective as well. Furthermore, Francis discusses the challenges of musical interpretation of an unaccompanied work. This dissertation provides an excellent model which functions very well for the presentation of a performer’s guide. Additionally, the pedagogical, interpretive, and instrument specific elements found by Francis can be compared to those found in other pieces by David Sampson to help create a characteristic profile of the composer’s work.47

In 1998, Jay Randall Sorensen wrote his D.M.A. dissertation entitled, Original repertoire for the American Brass Quintet, 1962-1987: A guide for performers and composers at Ball State University.48 The complete list of composers and works include, Charles Whittenberg, Triptych for Brass Quintet; Ralph Shapey, Brass Quintet; Gilbert Amy, Relais; William Lovelock, Suite for Brass; Leonardo Balada, Mosaico; Virgil Thomson, Family Portrait; Elliott Carter, Brass Quintet; Jacob Druckman, Other Voices; Robert Starer, Evanesence; Dan Welcher, Brass Quintet; Vladimir Ussachevsky, Dialogues and Contrasts; David Sampson, Morning Music; Maurice Wright, Quintet; and Eric Ewazen, Colchester Fantasy.49 The works are each examined in terms of historical background, descriptive analysis, and performance considerations. Sorensen concluded that the American Brass Quintet (ABQ) has encouraged the composition and performance of new music for brass quintets of all abilities.50 Although this particular


49 Ibid., 16

conclusion does not relate directly to David Sampson, Sorensen does investigate the
particular performance considerations related to Sampson’s writing for brass music.
Also, David Sampson is again listed with many of his successful contemporaries
including composers who also appear on the ITG commission list. The reason for the
appearance of these composers on both lists can be derived from comparing the research
from both the dissertation and the article. Additionally, this article provides further
information regarding performance practice of compositions by David Sampson.

In his DMA dissertation from Arizona State University entitled, *Brass Quintet
Instrumentation: Tuba Versus Bass Trombone*, Robert Gordon Lindahl examines a brief
history of the brass quintet, the two instrumentations currently used by brass quintets, and
the compositions for these two instrumentations.51 One of the works investigated is
*Morning Music* by David Sampson. The other four composers and works investigated
are Gunther Schuller's *Music for Brass Quintet*, Alvin Etler's *Quintet for Brass
Instruments*, Jan Bach's *Laudes*, Charles Whittenberg's *Triptych*, and Elliott Carter's
*Brass Quintet*.52 The study concentrates on the lowest voice of the quintet and the use of
bass trombone or tuba to perform this voice. Additionally, interviews with professional
performers, composers, and pedagogues are included to further investigate the
performance practice of the bass trombone or tuba in the listed compositions.53 Although
this dissertation does not focus on the use of the trumpet in the ensemble, performance

[D.M.A. diss., Arizona State University, 1988].
52 Ibid., 8.
53 Ibid., 10.
practice considerations have been researched regarding the brass composition of David Sampson. The research deals directly with the performance of the compositional style of David Sampson and the characteristic elements of the work can be transferred.

**Performance Analysis of Trumpet Literature Written by the Contemporaries of David Sampson**

The opening portion of Gary Thomas Wurtz’ DMA dissertation, *Two selected works for solo trumpet commissioned by the International Trumpet Guild: A structural and performance analysis with a history of the commission project, with three recitals of selected works by Arutunian, Haydn, Fasch, Chaynes and others*, from the University of North Texas, investigates the history of the ITG commission project.\(^{54}\) Furthermore, Wurtz researched the formal organization and musical implications of *Sonata for Trumpet and Piano* by Norman Dello Joio and *Sonata for Trumpet and Piano* by Eric Ewazen.\(^{55}\) Finally, Wurtz discusses the importance of the works produced by the ITG commission project and the impact these pieces have on the trumpet repertoire and the future success of the ITG commission project.\(^{56}\) This dissertation provides an analysis of two of the works by contemporaries and fellow commissioned composers of David Sampson. Additionally, the thirteen composers who wrote commissions between the

---


\(^{55}\) Ibid., 14.

\(^{56}\) Ibid., 130.
years of 1993 and 1998 are listed and are discussed briefly in terms of their importance to the trumpet repertoire. Within the analysis portion, Wurtz provides an assessment of the work’s difficulty and tempi, dynamics, articulation, and phrasing found within the composition. The author shows one method of breaking down a composition into units grounded in theory and makes suggestions of how to best perform the work. Though the study of ITG commissions other than the work of David Sampson, Wurtz investigates the characteristics of works written in the same time period and for the same organization and the commissioned work by David Sampson. This information can be used in collaboration with research to validate the quality of the ITG commissions.

In 2007 Brendan K. McGlynn wrote his DMA dissertation entitled *An analysis for performance of selected unaccompanied works for trumpet by Robert Henderson, Hans Werner Henze and Verne Reynolds* at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln.57 The paper is an examination of unaccompanied solo trumpet literature, descriptive analysis, and the performance practice of this literature.58 Additionally, McGlynn examined the extended techniques used in the compositions and created performance suggestions for these new techniques based on research. Furthermore, McGlynn found that the composers combined traditional melodic motifs with new compositional devices for the works. McGlynn concludes by stating that the knowledge of these innovative extended techniques will contribute greatly to the quality of the performance.59 This same method

---

58 Ibid., 6.
59 Ibid., 13.
of combining traditional melodic ideas with innovative extended technique is apparent across a wide range of David Sampson’s music. This dissertation provides the reader with research, which can be compared to the compositional methods of David Sampson, in order to help determine effective ways for the performer to approach the composition.

The programmatic ideas used in extended technique composition is discussed in Scott Meredith’s DMA dissertation from the University of North Texas entitled *Extended techniques in Stanley Friedman’s Solus for Unaccompanied Trumpet.*\(^6^0\) Within the dissertation, Meredith explores the technical execution of extended techniques required by the composer and researches the musical and pedagogical benefits of incorporating such works into a collegiate trumpet studio. An interview with the composer is also included, detailing the creation of the music and the programmatic ideas behind the technique.\(^6^1\) This dissertation provides research and evidence as to the validity of including works similar to David Sampson’s in the collegiate teaching repertoire. Additionally, Meredith’s interview with the composer displays the extramusical representation of personal ideas through extended technique, similar to the programmatic works written by David Sampson.

The examination of one of the works of the ITG commission composer Karel Husa exists in the DMA dissertation of Joel Andrew Treybig from the University of Texas at Austin entitled, *An Investigation and Analysis of Karel Husa’s Concerto for*

\(^6^0\) Scott Meredith, “Extended Techniques in Stanley Friedman’s Solus for Unaccompanied Trumpet” [D.M.A. diss., University of North Texas, 2008].

\(^6^1\) Ibid., 5.
Trumpet and Wind Orchestra.\textsuperscript{62} Included in the dissertation is a biography of the composer, a history of the Concerto for Trumpet and Wind Orchestra, an overview of Husa’s compositional style, and analysis of the Concerto, and a soloist’s performance guide.\textsuperscript{63} The author researched the compositional methods used in the work while investigating the unique notational methods and the extended techniques required by the composer. Additionally, Treybig discussed Husa’s use of “rapid rhythmic motives, jazz-like passages, and masterful orchestrations.”\textsuperscript{64} This research can be compared to the works of David Sampson, as both composers have been described as using similar rhythmic elements, jazz motifs, and extended techniques. The research completed by Treybig will assist in the description and documentation of Sampson’s technical ideas and compositional style.

\textbf{Literature Review Summary}

Due to the large number of publications, recordings, and performances of the music of David Sampson, many sources are available which discuss the compositions. Published commentary directly related to the compositions of David Sampson exist in many different forms, including but not limited to reviews of the written music, reviews of recordings, performance reviews, historical background of the composer and compositional style, formal and motivic analysis and performance analysis.

\textsuperscript{62} Joel Andrew Treybig, “An Investigation and Analysis of Karel Husa’s Concerto for Trumpet and Wind Orchestra” [D.M.A. diss., The University of Texas at Austin, 1999].

\textsuperscript{63} Ibid., 14.

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., 18.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Research Questions

The specific research questions addressed by this study include:

1. What is the compositional background of Breakaway, Passage, and Triptych?
2. What are the analytical components, which serve the basic structure of the works?
3. What inferences and conclusions can be drawn regarding the performance practice of each piece?
4. For each piece, what are the overall challenges the player must consider in the composition?
5. Based on the analyses of research questions 1-4, what suggestions can be made to the performer regarding the unique elements of each piece, including but not limited to, the unique challenges of the music, unique trumpet challenges, unique ensemble challenges, and the execution of musical elements.
Procedures for the Selection of the Composer

David Sampson is a significant composer of trumpet works, adding over 50 pieces to the limited solo repertoire including over 20 published works for trumpet.65 Recordings of his works are extensive, including performances by The American Brass Quintet, Summit Brass, Solid Brass, The Meridian Arts Ensemble, Scott Mendoker, and Raymond Mase.66

In 2007, David Sampson visited the campus of the University of Miami as a guest artist. The composer stayed for the performance of his piece for wind ensemble entitled, Moving Parts, and spoke in a number of master classes and composition forums. Mr. Sampson also spent time with trumpet performance students who were performing any of his pieces at the time of his visit. A number of the students, under the coaching of professor Craig Morris, were working on solo works from Sampson’s Notes From Faraway Places and worked extensively with the composer on performing the solos. The intensity with which Sampson worked with the students performing his work, coupled with the widespread performance and recording of his compositions led to an interest in using some of David Sampson’s trumpet literature as the basis for a dissertation.


Procedures for the Selection of Pieces to be Studied

The first piece that will be discussed in this paper is entitled, *Breakaway*, written for two trumpets and electronics. The work was chosen from the large number of trumpet pieces written by Sampson due to the unique instrumentation and exceptional challenges presented to the players. The work is composed for two trumpets and MIDI accompaniment, creating many balance and ensemble performance issues as well as extremely challenging writing for both parts.\(^{67}\)

The second piece is entitled *Passage*, and is written for muted flugelhorn and viola. Several characteristics distinguish this work, including the creation of a mute for performance, unique notational techniques, and difficult ensemble considerations due to the combination of a brass instrument and a string instrument. Additional performance aspects are highlighted through angular rhythmic passages and beautiful melodic ideas (David Sampson, July 2009, e-mail message to the author). Furthermore, both parts involve some form of extended technique for the instrument, adding to the challenge of the composition.\(^{68}\)


The final piece for examination is the Sonata for trumpet entitled *Triptych*. This work was a commission from the International Trumpet Guild in 1991. This piece brings elements of a classic Sonata together with Sampson’s compositional style. *Triptych* is one of twenty-five commissioned works by the International Trumpet Guild from the years 1987-2006. This composition is exceptionally unique in that is one of only two of those twenty-five commissions to be scored for trumpet and orchestra, the other work being *William Schmidt’s Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra*. Many of the composers on the list of ITG commissions have had at least one composition serving as the object for dissertation research. More specifically, Dello Joio, Ewazen, and Husa, have had their commission for the ITG researched directly.

---


Procedures for Determination of the Compositional History of Each Work

Each of the three pieces has a unique compositional history tied to the personal life of the composer.\textsuperscript{74} Investigation of these histories will be pursued through interviews and correspondence with the composer, recording notes, and performance reviews.

Procedures for Analysis of Compositions

Each of the three compositions that will be examined will first be evaluated through formal and motivic analyses that are necessary for the performance of the work. All of the pieces, regardless of their respective tonalities, can be broken down into the basic elements of structural form. The use of form while utilizing innovative melodic material is a characteristic element of Sampson’s work.\textsuperscript{75} In Breakaway, the work will be discussed briefly in terms of form and motivic development. Passage will be studied from the perspective of the melodies created by Sampson and their placement within the work, creating a sense of unification and a general form for each movement. In Triptych, the traditional form of the Sonata will be traced as Sampson uses innovative sonorities and extended techniques in the solo instrument.

\textsuperscript{74} David Sampson, Breakaway (New Jersey: David Sampson, 2004), 2; David Sampson, Passage. (Vuarmaren, Switzerland: The Brass Press, 1980), 1; David Sampson, Triptych (New Jersey: David Sampson, 2009), 1.

**Procedures for Performance Guide Analysis**

For each of the three pieces investigated, stylistic and performance considerations will be determined based on the formal and motivic analysis. Within each piece, the trumpet part or parts will be investigated in a sequential fashion, from beginning to end. Elements such as, interpretation, style, line, and phrasing will all be addressed, based on research related to Sampson’s style, the style of his contemporaries, and interpretation of these compositional styles. Sources to be referenced in order to evaluate the performance elements will include pedagogical and stylistic research completed regarding the interpretation of trumpet literature composed in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. These sources will include documents related to the interpretation of Sampson’s works, as well as the performance practice and interpretation of the trumpet works of Sampson’s contemporaries.76 Research involving the execution and performance of extended techniques will also be investigated as these elements relate to those found in Sampson’s works. 77


Procedures for Discussion of Challenges Specific to the Instrument

Within each piece, the specific challenges presented to the performer will be discussed following the performance practice of each movement. This section will extract the most difficult technical challenges presented in the specific movement and view them separately. The performance and practice suggestions will be based on the findings from the formal and motivic analysis trumpet pedagogical principles related to the performance of contemporary literature and extended techniques. These pedagogical elements will be obtained from research related to the study of twentieth and twenty-first century trumpet literature.

Procedures for Creating Suggestions for the Performer

These suggestions will appear at the end of each piece as well as at the end of the dissertation and will be a synthesis of the research acquired through the formal and motivic analysis, performance practice analysis, and the discussion of the challenges specific to the instrument. This section will be a summary of the detailed research on each piece individually and finally on all three pieces by David Sampson.
CHAPTER 4

BREAKAWAY

Background

*Breakaway for Two Trumpets and Electronics* was commissioned by Raymond Mase and is dedicated to Mr. Mase and Kevin Cobb. The following information regarding the genesis of the composition and personal meaning of the movements was attained through a telephone interview with the author on February 2, 2009. The transcript of the conversation is found in Appendix A. At the time of the commission, the two aforementioned gentlemen were touring with the American Brass Quintet. On the tours, the quintet would often visit local schools and give clinics to the students. At the clinics, Mr. Mase and Mr. Cobb would work together to lecture and help the students, but wanted a piece with accompaniment, that they could perform in the clinics. A piece with a piano score was an option, but Mr. Mase and Mr. Cobb did not want to have to be concerned with having a proficient pianist at each school. With the use of electronic accompaniment formatted into a CD track for a three-movement work, David Sampson created options of three different lengths, styles, and stories that could be presented either partially or in full for the students.

The first movement was written and then named “Carving the Stone” as a poetic title, which Mr. Sampson felt fit the work. The second movement, “A Single Shot (25 Years): Prayers and Chants,” was written in remembrance of the five victims of a
shooting which occurred at a rally against the Ku Klux Klan in 1979. The movement is meant to reflect the repercussions that a single action has and how many individuals are affected. The music is written in memory of the victims of the tragedy and the families affected by their deaths. The final movement, “Awakening,” is simply meant to be a good time.

The work is tonal in style and revolves around the excitement of rhythmic energy in the electronic accompaniment. The rhythmic and tonal vocabulary required to perform the work is extensive and would be very challenging to program for any student before entering college. For the college student, the work is not particularly demanding in terms of range or endurance, and the final movement provides a flashy ending to a recital program. The work also serves well to end a program due to the additional time for stage assembly and the electronic equipment involved.

As can be see in Figure 4.1, the performers will each need a monitor in order to hear the CD accompaniment as clearly as possible. This is important if the CD tracks run through a speaker system mounted either in the hall or in front of the stage. In the case of the speakers being mounted in front of the performers, the monitors are essential to eliminate any lag between the recorded electronics and the performer. It is also recommended that the performers be in physical contact with the monitor (by touching the speaker with the leg) so as to feel the vibrations of the lower rhythmic tones. To the side of the performers, or off stage, should be a third individual who will start and stop each track. On the recorded CD, the movements each have separate tracks, making it easy to halt the performance between movements in order to empty water from slides or
make adjustments to the instruments. The work is unique in that it provides the performer with an unusual combination of sounds from the CD accompaniment that encourages a new and different type of collaboration between the musicians.

Figure 4.1. Stage set-up for Breakaway.
Movement I

The movement begins with a solemn three bar introduction in the recorded electronics including a pulsating drone and soft flourishes in the percussion. Not only does this serve to establish the accompaniment for the trumpet melody in bar four, having the electronics start first also has a functional capacity. The players have that time to aurally synchronize with the track and get into the rhythmic groove of the piece. The intro works perfectly as an opportunity for the performers to adjust to the balance and sound of the electronics.

The form of the movement is determined by the placement of a specific rhythmic motive found throughout the movement mostly in the electronics, but occasionally in the trumpets. This rhythm serves to segment the movement into its various sections. In Example 4.1, which shows only the voices in the electronics, the rhythm is located in the top on beats two, three, and four.

The general form of the movement is ternary, with a portion of the middle section being a combination of the rhythmic element presented in the electronics and the melodic elements presented on the trumpets.

The opening line in the electronics is like a bell tolling in the water with gentle waves of notes falling on the sea. The trumpet players answer this tolling bell with long lines and rising intensity, as if a ship is coming out of a fog and then seeing the shapes of the land as through the smoke. This opening melodic statement in the trumpet lines dictates the basis of all following melodic material of the movement (Example 4.2). In the following example, as well as all other examples from this work, the trumpet music is represented in the top two staves, while the electronics are represented in the remaining staves. The label of “MIDI Reduced” is copied directly from the score.
Example 4.2. David Sampson, *Breakaway*, Movement I, mm. 4-6. Opening melodic statements.

In the same way that tolling bell sounds through the fog, the emphasis and weight should be on the first note of the pair. Not only does this bring the sound out of the MIDI drone, but also serves to help imitate that bell tone where there is a lot of front to the note followed by a gradual decay.

Within the opening statement of the first trumpet, the performer should lead up to the “F#,” while the 2\textsuperscript{nd} part should begin a quick growth in m. 7 to the upper “F#,” beginning a cascading effect of the two trumpet parts. The 2\textsuperscript{nd} trumpet must listen and respond to the playing of the preceding statements, especially due to the fact that the
cascading lines recur throughout the work. Almost exclusively, the first trumpet sets the
cascading lines recur throughout the work. style for both players. Therefore, it is essential that the players communicate their artistic
ideas in rehearsal and come to a unified decision of expression.

The original theme returns in m. 22 with a fugal character in the trumpet parts.
The section is set apart from the surrounding elements by the distinct rhythmic figure in
the electronics. The two elements trade off one bar at a time, starting in m. 28 and
continuing alternating rhythmic element and melodic elements through m. 33.

The end of the phrase, found in m. 23, should lead directly into the line in the
electronics. For the reason of assisting in the transition between the two parts, the
performers should attempt to create a single musical line through the three measures,
despite the existence of rests in the trumpet parts. (Example 4.3).

Example 4.3. David Sampson, *Breakaway*, Movement I, mm. 23-25. Interaction of the
trumpets and the electronics.
In a piece written for three voices, the performer needs to think linearly in order to create cohesive musical lines. The idea that one musical phrase may be made up of all three voices is one which the composer uses constantly, demanding that the players must be careful not to end any phrase arbitrarily. This is especially important on the releases of phrases.

The next portion of the movement, beginning at m. 43, is very complex and is easily the most challenging part to play. This section is a combination of the electronic rhythmic element with a new theme in the trumpets. With difficult rhythms in the trumpet voices and complicated rhythms in the electronics, as seen in Example 4.4, the combined effect is very thick and requires exacting performance. The section is completed by yet another restatement of the primary theme, although this particular statement is the longest and most complex thus far in the piece.

Again, the rhythmic motive is used to signify the end of the section, this time moving to a central development in which the electronic accompaniment plays the main melodic material and the trumpet voices provide the accompaniment.

The electronics begin a solo section with trumpet accompaniment at m. 54. This portion features virtuosic playing in the recorded accompaniment, which would be nearly impossible to recreate on an acoustic instrument.

Example 4.5 shows the trumpet accompaniment to the solo in the electronics. When accompanying the electronics, the player must be sensitive to the fact that the recorded CD cannot make balance adjustments to the ensemble. Additionally, the rhythm
and note length have already been determined by the composer and set down in the CD. This provides the performers with the perfect example with which to base their articulations.


![Trumpet accompaniment figures](image)

**Movement II**

Both the first and second movements begin on the same note, the “Bb,” and have the same general musical idea. This pedal “Bb” serves as a very nice transition between movements and stabilizes the overall sonority of the opening. Overall, the movement is in ABA form, with the opening serving as a prayer, the middle section as the chant, and ending with a solemn prayer.
The first 22 bars have a pedal “Bb” in the electronics. In this movement, the trumpet parts have an opportunity to exhibit expressive playing, as the electronic accompaniment subsides and creates a calm palate with which the trumpet players have to perform.

The first prayer opens the movement and continues until m. 22. The performers have the opportunity to share the intimacy of prayer with the audience through the emotion of the lines. The sound and shape of the phrases will depend greatly on the performer’s personal experience, but it is a necessity that the sound be clear and pure. The sound must be spectacular because the emphasis of the opening and closing of the movement relies on the beauty of the musical expression rather than on technical means.

The parts are layered, and the weight should be placed on the moving notes in order to bring out the melodic material found in each voice. Each player should place weight on the beginning of the notes, relax through the middle, and then lead to the next changing pitch. Through applying the above effect, the emphasis will be placed on the moving notes in each voice and assist in balancing of the voices through the sustained tones (Example 4.6). Shown below are only the two trumpet parts. The score for the electronic accompaniment is not included in this example.

In Example 4.6, note that the dynamics are staggered to bring out the important lines. The waves of sound should have separate peaks and valleys, creating a cascading effect in pitch and a forward motion to the long lines.

Sampson keeps the emotional content of the music in the trumpets throughout the work. In the case of this composition, the recorded element will be the same every time and is not variable. Sampson uses this fact to his advantage and puts a simple accompaniment in the electronics and allows the performers the opportunity for expressive gestures.

Within the following section, the chant, the two trumpet parts are in echo, hence they are very. The first trumpet starts as the cantor and the second part overlaps and copies the style exactly (Example 4.7). Sampson puts in exacting dynamic markings under the score to further enforce the desired overlapping effect.

The chant is repeated a number of times during the section, each time with a slight variation. Each time the phrase is presented, there must be a slight growth in the intensity of the line. Such a gesture will prove to sustain interest in the repetitive nature of the musical statement, the alternative being performing the statements identically each time. Sampson helps this through adding longer notes at the end of the statement that can be used to grow as the other player begins the chant again. Pacing is a large part of the challenge of this movement. The players have an obvious end point at m. 43 at the ff.
One way to efficiently reach the climax of the movement is to map out the dynamics to be used at various points. Sampson helps the performers by changing the dynamics as the passage progresses. The chant phrase starts \textit{mp}, moves to \textit{mf} eleven bars later, then finally reaches \textit{f}. An excellent way to build the intensity of the line is to crescendo slightly past the marked dynamic, then drop down slightly before beginning the next line. This will help the intensity grow, while assisting to layer the two trumpet parts and keep the music moving forward as the crescendo occurs.

The movement ends with a final prayer. Although this section is very brief, it presents some interesting performance choices. Again, the dynamics are layered here and written in a cascading fashion. As a player, decisions must be made regarding dynamic shading and the treatment of the grace notes.

Memorial prayers are typically solemn and meditative. The grace notes at the end of this movement should be treated in the same way. The weight of the melodic statement might be at the beginning with perhaps a slight increase of tempo as the notes progress. A visualization may help with the description. Perhaps imagining that the notes are small pebbles slipping from a hand. First one pebble drops, then another, and then quickly another. Where the grace notes move below the final note, the lowest note must be given greater weight. The articulations marked in Example 4.8, which includes only the trumpet music from the score, are editorial and are intended to provide clarity to the verbal description.

\[
\text{Trumpet in C 1}
\]

\[
\text{Trumpet in C 2}
\]

Remember that the prayer is concluding the movement and there is no rush to finish. Pacing is important, and experimentation with dynamic shading will provide various ways to emphasize the final notes. The last two grace notes in the first trumpet part can be delayed significantly, adding more suspension before being resolved into the open fifths over the drone in the electronics. This movement has the potential for great impact on the listener. Experimentation regarding the phrasing and dynamic pacing of the movement is essential to discovering the ideal method by which to create the greatest impact for the listener.
**Movement III**

The opening of the final movement utilizes the many sonic options of the electronically generated accompaniment through the use of percussion sounds and melodies played on pan flutes. Through the use of the electronic track, the performers can have these instruments in the pieces without traveling with a full accompanying ensemble.

Following the introduction in the electronics, the two trumpets play together in rhythmic unison, ending with a trill fragment. Although the trill itself does not return, the rapid groupings of notes such as those in the second trumpet and in both parts in the second measure return to serve as bookends for various sections of the movement.

Trills can be difficult from a performance standpoint, in regards to the starting note, frequency of trill, and the resolution. The trill is written above the note and a grace note does not precede the trill, so the conclusion can be drawn that Sampson would like the trill to begin on the base note, or the “D.” The $tr^b$ is an indication that the note the trill will go to the “Eb” above. This poses a difficulty for the player, as the fingering for this trill is very awkward. As far the as speed of the trill, the first player should look to the second part, where the trill is written out in rhythm. The different labeling of the gestures leads the performer to believe that there is not a need to line up the notes exactly. However, the way that the second part is written out gives an indication as to the speed and style of the trill.
Underneath the trill in the first part, the second trumpet plays eight notes then nine notes, each over one beat. More important than actually playing each one of these notes, is the gesture of starting the notes slower, then getting faster in the last beat of the measure. This concept should be transferred to the first part as well. The number of times the notes are changed is not important, but the player will need to increase the speed of the trill over the course of the two beats. The written out version of this trill figure appears numerous times in the movement, and should be performed in a similar fashion each time.

The main theme of the movement, one that returns transposed later, is very lengthy and is presented in the trumpets beginning at m. 17 and is outlined by the aforementioned rapid note figure, as seen in m. 24. The rhythmic motive added to the end of the trill-like figure leads to the first complete silence in the entire piece.

Precise coordination of the trumpet and electronic accompaniment is essential at the end of the opening section due to the rhythmic complexity, angular lines, and technical challenges for the performers.

As can be seen in Example 4.9, specific rhythm and exact articulations must be established in the trumpet parts in order to synchronize correctly with the accompaniment in the electronics. Due to the rhythmic unison of the trumpet parts and the running 16th note rhythms in the accompaniment, the performers should use a biting and crisp articulation, excepting the slurred notes, to help vertical alignment. The performers should also be aware that precise practice with a metronome is strongly encouraged. The
accompaniment will not fluctuate in tempo, due to the recorded nature of the medium. This addition of a mechanical element into the performance should indicate a very strict and exact rhythmic preparation of the piece.


The rhythmic challenges for the performers continue, as the theme is re-stated in the trumpets at m. 32. Due to the independence of parts in the work, the players must make the sections where the writing is the same come together exactly. The challenge becomes how to make this joining of parts exact, thus creating a unified statement. The players must perform with exacting rhythmic drive and be conscious of where the two parts combine. The theme is offset by a minimal accompaniment in the electronics, making way for the unification of the two parts and the establishment of the theme. Not
only is this theme set apart due to minimal accompaniment, but also a trill-related figure closes the theme, punctuated by a final rhythmic flourish and a bar of silence. The return of the first theme comes with the addition of a triplet rhythm opening the statement with a grace note on the first tone (Example 4.10).

Example 4.10. David Sampson, *Breakaway*, Movement III, mm. 32-34. Return of the first theme with the grace note.

The difficulty here is how to treat that grace note in the first trumpet. Although both parts have a grace note, in the first trumpet part, the ornament approaches the main note from above, and can easily be mistaken as simply a missed note on the part of the performer. The best way avoid such a misconception is to stretch the beginning of the note into the end of the previous measure, thus beginning the note sooner so the note has
more length and will not be perceived as a mistake. The second trumpet should be aware of this and should do the same with the grace note found in the second part, despite the fact that the grace note approaches the main note from underneath.

The dynamic differences are essential for making the ends of Sampson’s phrases emerge of the ensemble texture. As a performer, the most efficient method of increasing the sonic impact of the phrase is to delay the substance of the crescendo. The lines will have great impact if the bulk of the crescendo happens in the last portion of the actual marking. Sampson helps the performers by making extreme changes in dynamics such as in mm. 49-51 (Example 4.11). The following example shows only the trumpet parts from the score.


The dynamic changes should start slightly below the previous crescendo point. All of the crescendos marked in the above example have specific dynamic points indicated by the composer except for in m. 51. The final crescendo should start at the dynamic level of *mf*. All of the crescendos should have the most movement in the last quarter of the crescendo.
The new material opens the B section of the movement with a rhythmic introduction in the electronics, a lyrical trumpet theme carried in both parts, and a weaving together of all three voices at m. 52. The section is marked “legato” in the trumpet and is the first appearance of a style marking since “playfully” was used in m. 45 of the first movement. Sampson clearly wants a different sound as well as a different musical shape and character. Throughout the middle section of the movement, the electronic accompaniment stays rhythmically and dynamically below the lyrical trumpet lines. The line is played over two octaves of a pedal “C” in the accompaniment, which continues all the way until measure 73 and the return of the original theme (Example 4.12).

---


With the majority of the movement being angular and intensely rhythmic, these lyrical lines are an opportunity for melodic contrast and expression. The two melody lines are brought together, although briefly, before spinning away, each taking a moment of soloistic personality before joining together with their partner once more. The two parts literally dance together twice, playing rhythmically together in m. 60 and the end of m. 65. The marked dynamics also give the players an opportunity to bring out the melody lines in waves, which complements the atmospheric setting created by the octaves of pedal “C” in the accompaniment. The dynamics are placed excellently as guides to the climax of each small line. As a performer, it is very important to play the exact dynamic shape of each line, as the climax moments are different for each trumpet part.
Following the return to the initial theme of the movement in m. 78, the trumpets have the duty of sending the movement off to a raucous finish. The performers should think of this section as a single statement, including all three parts.

Beginning at m. 79, the performers see a variety of accents and articulation markings, which need special interpretation (Example 4.13). The rooftop accents in m. 79 are dry and separated, so as to fit into the rhythmic 16th notes in the accompaniment. The last two notes have almost a “swung” feel, with a delayed final note. This last note can also have significantly more substance than the same accents just notes before. The players may want to think of this note as a “fat” note as if they were playing lead trumpet in a jazz band. Essentially, these two motives are jazzy fanfares commentating on the line in the electronics, just as a trumpet section would in a jazz band. The statement at m. 81 serves the same purpose, although the opening dynamic level should be less at the initial entrance so as to create a greater contrast in the dynamic shape. This will increase the impact of the dramatic effect. For the reasons of solidifying the alignment of the two trumpet parts and driving the groupings of notes forward through the measure, the first note of each grouping should be given a slight accent.

The grace note in m. 83 is reminiscent of the grace notes preceding the triplets earlier in the movement and should be treated similarly. Again, remember that the grace note must be done with purpose, otherwise the upper grace note in the first trumpet part will sound like a mistake. The rest of the melody is also similar, containing rapid passages with tiered dynamics, or waves of dynamic contrast.

For the remainder of the piece, the composer often uses the roof-top accents, which should be treated as “fat” lead trumpet player notes. Measure 101 is an excellent example of this (Example 4.14). This method of playing will also insure that the notes not sound “pecky” or too short in the hall. Written very much in a jazz style, as can be seen through the rhythmic structure in the final measure, the notes will be almost swung, including an elongated last note, ending the piece with declamation.
CHAPTER 5

PASSAGE

Background

The following information regarding the genesis of the composition and personal meaning of the movements was attained through a telephone interview with the author on February 2, 2009. The transcript of the conversation is found in Appendix A. Passage was originally written for Mr. Sampson and his wife, a violist in New Jersey. Just prior to the writing of the piece, the composer was scheduled to travel to Fontainebleau, France for a compositional tour premiering a few of his new works. Within a few weeks of his departure, Mr. Sampson’s oldest brother, Jim, was diagnosed with terminal cancer and was given only a few weeks to live. Instantly, Mr. Sampson cancelled his trip in order to spend time with his brother. His brother, however, encouraged Mr. Sampson to make his trip to France in order to enjoy his accomplishments and celebrate the achievements of his own life. Following a very difficult personal decision, Mr. Sampson traveled to France for the next few months. The work was written that summer in France, following the news of his brother Jim’s death. The piece is a tribute to Jim’s “passage” from life to death and is dedicated to his fond memory.

Passage is essentially an atonal work, based primarily on motives that reflect a variety of moods and feelings. Although there are sections of each movement based on form, the composer’s focus on the ensemble sound and the texture created by the two
solo instruments is paramount. The work does not test the extreme register of the performer, and there are few elements that require extreme individual technical dexterity. The challenges of the piece are found mainly in the intricate rhythms and the dynamic balance of the ensemble. In terms of programming, the piece works well on a collegiate recital and requires an excellent violist. The work serves nicely as the middle piece on a half of a recital. The unique instrumentation provides variety in programming for the listener while also creating some new challenges for the performers. Due to the physical layout of the printed music, it is recommended that a number of pages be copied and both performers share one stand. Individually, there are no easy options for page turns. However if the performers use one stand and share the page turning duties, the transitions will work substantially better. Additionally, due to the many page turns and the resulting one hand grip on the flugelhorn, the piece works nicely for seated performers.

Although the piece is written for muted flugelhorn and viola, when it was premiered, the composer performed the piece with a cellist who was on the composition tour. The aforementioned mute is specifically requested and described by the composer, with the idea that the mute will enhance the mellow sound of the flugelhorn as well as assist in the balancing of the dynamics throughout the work. The concept of balance is that with the mute, the flugelhorn player will not have to adjust the physical creation of sound while giving the violist the opportunity to dynamically dominate the phrase.
On the first page of the score, the composer describes the creation of the mute:

The flugelhorn mute necessary for this work must be constructed by the performer. It is made of several layers of terry cloth covered with a light finishing material and fastened to the bell with elastic. The amount and type of material used will depend on the performers; the desired result is a well-balanced duo without the flugelhorn player holding back.79

While constructing the mute for a recent performance, the player (myself) created a mute that reflected the sound desired by the composer. The description of the sound characteristics of the mute on the title page of the work was the guidance for construction. A large element of the mute construction was experimentation and recording. Various styles and types were used and recorded, producing a documented sound of the instrument. Note too, that the construction will be different for every player, as each duo will have a unique blend. The final result was a terry cloth, similar to a kitchen dish towel, which was draped over the end of the bell with a clothespin holding the cloth in place at the top of the bell (Figure 5.1).

Originally, the cloth was also attached at the sides and bottom of the bell, but those clothespins were removed in favor of a more open sound. Although the finished product did not look especially pleasing, the sonic result was exactly as described by the composer.

Within the work, the flugelhorn is used for each movement, including the angular and aggressive sections. Playing these sections in particular creates a great challenge for the performer. With flugelhorn being a mellow instrument and a mute making that instrument even more so, a solution must be found so as to accurately perform the angular lines and exacting rhythms. The articulated lines as well as balancing the dynamics of the work are the major challenges for the performer.
The first movement is a set of two different moods or feelings. Essential to the overall mood of the movement is the first mournful tune presented in the solo viola and soon joined by the flugelhorn. For the purpose of obtaining a consistent style in both solo instruments, the opening style established in the viola, including articulation and phrasing, should be copied in the entrance of the flugelhorn.

The absence of bar lines is an interesting compositional device used by the composer. The specific use of rhythmic note values indicates that the two parts need to align as far as general rhythm is concerned. However, the fluid sound and transition between the parts as indicated by the lack of bar lines should be observed. This presents a challenge to the performers in that the parts can easily become ambiguous and not particularly interesting to the listener. The weight of this movement relies on the dynamic pacing of the performers to create intensity. The moments when the two performers come together in a unifying rhythm or entrance need to be immediately apparent to the audience.

The first example of the two parts uniting in a single rhythm happens in the third stanza on the first page of the movement. Sampson specifically places the “Bb” in the viola directly underneath the “C#” in the trumpet. Even though the “C#” is an eighth note and the “Bb” is a quarter note, this point marks the first point in the piece that the two parts attack at the same moment. Also, in the following statements, the two parts interact in an exacting rhythmic fashion that requires precise placement by both players. In order to enforce this performance element as well as emphasize the combining of the
two parts, the flugelhorn should press into the “C#,” putting extra weight on the front of
the note. Not only will this propel the line forward, but will also help line up with the
viola quarter note. In turn, the violist should lean into the sound of the flugelhorn,
especially at the attack. Here, the dominance of the brass sound can help solidify the two
parts. The performers must be mindful of every time the two parts come together.

As shown by the editorial breath mark in the flugelhorn voice in Example 5.1, the
performer should insert a break at the end of the 4th stanza to align with the breath mark
in the viola. The breaths should exist together in order to line up the next rhythmic
passages. The space falls naturally for both players, being at a breath mark in the viola
and on an eighth rest in the flugelhorn. This should take the phrase right up until the
fermata at the top of the second page, where the two parts land together on a unison
“C#.”

Example 5.1. David Sampson, Passage, Movement I, page 3, stanza 3. Rhythmic
alignment and placement of the breath.
The top stanza of the second page starts a passage, which repeats later in the piece, to create an ABA form for the movement. This section opens with a unison statement leading to a trill in the flugelhorn. Underneath the trill, the moving line is an aggressive pizzicato in the viola. This is the first instance in the work where the part is marked \textit{ff}. This aggressiveness continues into the first \textit{ff} marked in the viola, and a \textit{sfz} \textit{f} marked in the trumpet. The two parts relax into a shortly held unison “F” before returning to the unison line, which begins to distinguish the elements leading to the next trill figure. The aggressive angular figure now appears in the trumpet with the trill appearing in the viola. The two parts switch roles here as the lines come together in a stylistically unified \textit{fff} statement, which is the climax of the movement.

The unison figures, which begin the B section of the movement, should be played as one instrument (Example 5.2). The performers can take full advantage of the flugelhorn’s mellow sound and the added smooth texture of the mute to blend the sounds together.


\begin{verbatim}
\begin{music}
\flugelhorn\phrase{\textit{pp}}
\viola\phrase{\textit{pp}}
\end{music}
\end{verbatim}
The viola color is the dominant factor here, as the flugelhorn should blend into the viola sound. The reason for this is that by combining the two unison sounds, the performers are generating a very specific sound quality, which the composer uses as the basis of the piece. The listener and performers know that this is the case due to the specific attention to sound quality and creation by the composer, as shown through the ensemble writing and specific mute instructions. When adjusting to the articulation of the violist, the flugelhorn performer should think in terms of string bowing. For example, the violist is going to have slightly more weight on the down stroke. The first note in the unison motive in the 1st stanza at the top of page two will start on an up bow, thus leading to a slight lean on the first note of the next eighth note grouping. The flugelhorn needs to be aware of this and phrase the line similarly. This will become even more evident on the notes directly before the large slurred leaps. The players should lean, lengthen, and put weight on the upper notes, thus creating a large amount of tension to be released into the lower note. Also, when the flugelhorn – and later, the viola – land on their trilled notes, the first player should arrive with weight and then back off in order to let the second player’s aggressive line speak easily.

As mentioned previously, playing accented angular lines effectively on a flugelhorn that is muted in this fashion provides a unique challenge for the player. The first example of this kind of line appears in the fourth stanza on the second page. The composer has the part marked “Aggressively” and uses accents to shape the rhythmic intensity of the line. The difficulty is getting a strong leading edge to the aggressive notes. There must be a degree of compensation for the use of the flugelhorn.

---

Additionally, a further degree of separation must be used to compensate the use of the cloth mute. The best way to work around this problem is to record a variety of attacks while playing the passage and then choose one that creates the desired result. Additionally, the player should experiment with a variety of different articulations and dynamics to hear the effect of the flugelhorn and mute combinations. In preparation, both performers should record a number of practices and rehearsals so as to check on balances and consistency of ensemble articulations.

The issues of balance can also be addressed through exacting observation of the dynamic markings. Sampson knows and understands the power and strengths of each instrument and uses his dynamic markings to reflect these performance elements. A perfect example of this varied dynamic use is in the end of the first stanza into the second stanza of the third page (Example 5.3).

Example 5.3. David Sampson, Passage, Movement I, page 5, stanza 1. Specific dynamics in each part.
Notice how the maximum flugelhorn dynamic is \textit{f}, while the violist continues to crescendo to a marked \textit{fff} at the climax of the movement. This layering of dynamics should be observed carefully by the performers so as to not exceed these dynamics as the composer writes with the strengths of the instruments in mind. Sampson, himself a trumpet player, realizes that the dynamic balance issues between the instruments can be solved by writing different dynamics for each soloist. For this reason, it becomes essential for the performers to precisely observe the composer’s written dynamics.

The first performance element to observe in the closing section of the movement, “TEMPO I” on p. 5 to the end of the movement, is the \textit{p} marking in the viola and the \textit{pp} marking in the trumpet. Again, Sampson anticipates balance issues and attempts to help out the performers by inserting these different dynamics. Just after the “TEMPO I,” the viola and trumpet parts play lyrically, although the trumpet line is slurred and the viola line is not. The violist should be careful to play his line in a legato style, so the longer notes in the flugelhorn are not left unsupported.

The final statements of the movement require some thought as to the performance aspect. The final notes create an interesting consonant sonority with the flugelhorn ending on the upper “Eb” and the viola coming down to the “C.” In the final stanza, the trumpet eighth note should line up with the “C#” sixteenth note in the viola. The rest in the viola with the fermata over it should be treated as a pause to let the flugelhorn “Eb” soar at the top of the line. As the trumpet starts to decay, the viola quintuplet of 16\textsuperscript{th} notes should be played, as indicated in the score, in the first tempo of the movement. The last note of the viola line should be held longer than indicated so as to emphasize the
resonance of the resulting minor third. The trumpet should embrace the minor third before decaying the “Eb” slightly to the release so as to help bring the minor third to the listener’s attention.

Movement II

The first statement of the second movement is a dissonance between the “Ab” in the flugelhorn and the “A” in the viola. The performers should embrace this dissonance as much as possible. The snap pizzicato of the viola will be extremely aggressive at the opening attack and decay very quickly. In order to help accentuate this effect, the flugelhorn should accent the initial attack strongly followed by a rapid decay, thus allowing the resonance of the string pizzicato to meld with the sustained note in the flugelhorn. When timed correctly, the cumulative effect is a brief but intense dissonance, which resolves into the beautiful, silky sonority of the flugelhorn.

Following the opening statement, the music moves directly into the first instance of a rhythmic motive (Example 5.4). Throughout the rest of the work, this motive serves to distinguish the various sections. The performers should be aware of this and highlight the note groupings accordingly.

Highlighting the above phrases found in Example 5.4 doesn’t necessarily mean heavy accents, or extreme dynamics, but rather playing these phrases with strength and conviction, creating cornerstones of tonality for the performers and the audience. While performing modern pieces such as this one, the performers should strive to take advantage of repetitive musical ideas in order to help create a cohesive experience from the listener’s standpoint.

The use of space and rests within this movement present a unique challenge to the performers. Tempo and rhythm must be set strongly by the viola in the opening bars. Internalized rhythm is essential for both players in the opening of the movement, due to the fact that the first time the two parts are unified in rhythm is not until bar seven. In this movement, the flugelhorn player must work exceptionally hard for clean and crisp articulations in order to line up vertically with the violist’s “spicatto” articulations. Dynamically, the markings given by the composer must be followed exactly. This is another instance where the composer’s knowledge of the instruments and their specific
sonic tendencies assist the performers. As long as the players adhere to these markings, the sound will be well balanced in the hall. The articulation and the dynamic aspects apply to the entire movement and need careful consideration by the player.

Specific consideration must be given to the cumulative rhythms created by the individual lines of the two performers. The first example of this cumulative rhythm is found in the second and third stanzas, as can be see in Example 5.5.

Example 5.5. David Sampson, *Passage*, Movement II, mm. 8-9. Cumulative rhythm created by the two voices.

As is apparent in this example, the interplay between the parts is essential for an organized product. As a performer, both players must subdivide every beat in order for these motives to line up exactly. As the flugelhorn player, due to the response at the mouthpiece, if the player waits to hear the viola part, he or she will be late. The players must commit to the groove established in the opening bars.
The element of steady time is essential to this movement. In order for the performers to provide clarity, the individuals must agree on an articulation style, and be consistent throughout the movement. This can be challenging, especially considering the difference of the attacks in each of the instruments. For example, at the top of page 8 in mm. 37-40 (Example 5.6), both players are involved with creating a cohesive line.


The flugelhorn player must consider the length of the notes very carefully. Throughout the piece, the use of the mute will soften the articulation, causing the player to work very hard to provide the clarity to the front of the note. In this movement, and especially in this passage, the performer might bring the front of the note out with a slight decay, as to match the sound and phrasing of the viola. The final two bars of the movement result in an octave between the two parts (Example 5.7).
Example 5.7. David Sampson, Passage, Movement II, mm. 95-96. Concluding octave of the movement.

In order to accentuate the finality of the statement, the viola should sustain the $f$ dynamic in the lower octave beginning immediately and for full value. The flugelhorn player should land decisively on the downbeat and should elongate that downbeat to the full value of the eighth note. Tonal consonance is extremely rare in this work, so the moments where the two parts settle on the same pitch need to be brought to the forefront of the performance.

In terms of specific trumpet issues in this movement, the difficulties mainly lie in consistency of articulation and matching the dynamic of the viola. Concerning performance preparation, experiment with starting the work under tempo, but with the lightness of sound and delicacy of playing of the final product. Keeping the sound at the volume and style desired at the final tempo throughout the preparation process will encourage the players to use this style in the final product.
Movement III

This movement is comprised of two solo cadenzas, which lead directly into Movement IV without any pause. The flugelhorn plays first, presenting the same melodic element used in the opening of the piece, and overlaps with the viola cadenza only by a single held “E.” This motive serves to provide structure to the trumpet cadenza. The cadenza is separated into three sections, all beginning with the same base theme. The framework is balanced as the first and final sections span approximately two stanzas with the central development section representing the main element of the movement.

The unaccompanied music of David Sampson has shown to have great flexibility in dynamic range and tempi in terms of performer interpretation. One of the main challenges within this cadenza is deciding how to pace the dynamics within the crescendos and diminuendos. Additionally, the climax of the movement is clearly marked with the strongest dynamic given to the trumpet, a fff in the second stanza of p. 13. The performer must consider the pacing of this impact point in order to express a meaningful musical idea.

The first step in the pacing of the cadenza is creating a wide spectrum of dynamics. The opening statement of the cadenza is marked with a number of dynamic alterations (Example 5.8).

---


The performer can take advantage of the lack of exact dynamic marking at the end of the first trill and fermata. Starting the movement authoritatively and coming away with the trill to an extremely soft dynamic, perhaps *pp*, can achieve a huge difference. The next sweeping gesture can bring the sound back up to a full *forte* before receding again.

The opening statement ends lightly, with the final note reaching into an eighth rest. While performing the phrases ending with a rest, the player must carefully consider the release of the note into the rest. Instead of thinking of the rest as a stopping of the music, the performer should strive to make the silence as beautiful as possible, so as to continue the phrase. In this fashion, the performer will be able to include the rests as a part of the music, rather than treating the pauses as a stoppage of sound.

The penultimate note before the cezzura in the above example is marked very specifically with a ¼ sign followed by an upward arrow above the concert Bb. This indication means that the performer should raise the pitch of the note a quarter step. The
best approach to achieving this is to use a tuner and make adjustments to bend the pitch until the tuner reads +50. This is best done over long tones at first and gradually reducing the length of the note until it can be done after a full eighth note of the normal concert “Bb”. This will then exactly reflect what is written in the music.

The composer is very specific about notating trills in this work. All trills within this movement are notated with a natural sign above the note. The natural sign is referring to the upper note to which the trill moves. The performer should experiment with varying speeds of trill and also with varying dynamic shaping. Options such as a very slow trill, or a trill, which starts slowly, speeds up and then resolves slowly are recommended for a beautiful musical effect. However, the trills should be used as an opportunity for individual expression and creativity. Unrestricted experimentation is a wonderful way to discover the best use of the trills for each individual performer.

Remember that this cadenza is the first of a two-part cadenza. The final note leads directly into the viola cadenza and the style of the release is essential to the musical line. The performers should try a variety of different ways to blend the two parts, again using experimentation to reach a satisfactory result. This transition will be very personal and may not be the same for each group of performers.

**Movement IV**

The final movement emerges into a basic ternary form. The “A” section begins directly out of the viola cadenza. The first entrance of the flugelhorn is one of the few times in the piece where the two voices are playing the same pitch, a concert “C.” The
composer uses this pitch as the center for the next few phrases before settling again on the “C” at the “TEMPO I” in the second stanza of pg. 17. The pitches found in the opening of the movement are certainly atonal, but are aleatoric in organization.

The first entrance of the flugelhorn in this movement is a \( pp \) unison with the viola. This is a challenging entrance, because this will be the first time that the flugelhorn enters and the player must meld directly into the unison with the viola. The unison note takes on a secondary importance of being one of the few times where both parts play the same pitch in the entire piece. The performers should reach this tone together and help create the functional beginning of the final movement. The violist can help this by elongating the two tied “A#s” directly preceding the flugelhorn’s entrance, thereby allowing both players to connect visually to solidify the cue (Example 5.9).

Example 5.9. David Sampson, Passage, Movement IV, mm. 8-11. Unison entrance.
Throughout the 6/8 section of the movement, beginning on p. 17, stanza 2, the flugelhorn is the accompaniment to the viola’s melody and dance-like figures. The challenge to the flugelhorn player is to accompany while maintaining a dance feel within the line. While performing the long lines, the player should lift slightly before the notes on the offbeat of the measure, even from the initial entrance (Example 5.10).

Example 5.10. David Sampson, Passage, Movement IV, mm. 22-24. Dance feel created by the rhythm and lift in the flugelhorn.

With the viola playing the main melody, the flugelhorn can assist the dance through similar lifts all the way to the change of tempo in the 3/4 and the beginning of the B section.

The B section of the movement begins on p. 18 with a new tempo and a more active rhythm in both parts. The idle conversation stops and the incessant rhythm drives both parts through the middle of the movement. The climax of the entire movement is shared over a series of bars where both parts come together in a similar rhythmic idea.
The character of the movement changes with the entrance of the flugelhorn at the 3/4 bar at the top of p. 18. The roles are reversed as the flugelhorn contains the majority of the moving lines. The existence of the 16th notes also brings the important role of setting the tempo to the flugelhorn performer for section of the movement. Example 5.11 shows the multitude of subdivisions of the beat contained in each solo voice. The exact placement of these subdivisions is essential for the success of this movement. The preparation of each part must be exact. Practicing both parts together with a metronome is strongly suggested. The players must also realize that throughout the middle portion of this movement, from the “Faster, Strong” the pulse is driven by the performer with the constant rhythm. It begins in the trumpet and then is passed to the viola. Another practice method is to play while having a colleague look on in the score. This will not only provide a third set of ears to the listening process, but will also allow the players to concentrate on making musical lines, instead of constantly trying to discover the exact place where a mistake happened.

Example 5.11. David Sampson, Passage, Movement IV, mm. 32-34. Flugelhorn entrance.
Also in the “Faster, Strong” is the first appearance of the “fanfare motive,” a short note followed by a longer note, creating a lopsided fanfare, which is found throughout the remainder of the movement. Below, in Example 5.12, the motive is given in the flugelhorn and is later repeated in the viola.


Within the entire work, there are few repetitions of melodic or rhythmic statements. Therefore, when these statements are found to repeat, the performers can take advantage of these motives to bring these phrases to the fore of the line.

The fanfare motive returns as the two parts finally unite in a single melodic idea. The fanfare motive can now be brought to the front, and the rhythmic unisons should be accented and very precise, so as to distinguish the exact rhythms of the phrases while keeping good time (Example 5.13).

Although not all of the statements are in rhythmic unison, the players should take special care to line up the groups of quintuplet and sextuplet 16\textsuperscript{th} notes as exactly as possible. These groupings help to provide structural grounding points for the remainder of the work. Additionally, from a listener’s perspective, having distinct and repetitive unison rhythms assists to bring the piece to a close.

The final section of the movement has a transposed version of the original viola theme, moving into a brief coda with both solo voices bringing back the fanfare motives. A cascade of the fanfare rhythmic motive concludes with a held concert “C” in the trumpet and a falling motive in the viola also ending on a concert “C.”

As is shown in Example 5.14, the flugelhorn essentially sustains the concert “C” over the last three bars. It is essential that the notes be exactly placed, as the viola eventually reaches the concert “C” by the final bar. In the final bar, the viola should let the flugelhorn establish the pitch solidly and not be concerned with taking the two quarter rests in time. There should be a feeling of resolution preceded by the tension of seeing if the viola will in fact also reach the “C.” The final 16\textsuperscript{th} note of the quintuplet grouping,
which ends the viola part should be slightly elongated so as to bring out the consonance of the two parts. In the flugelhorn, the final note should be held significantly longer and be released at the behest of the performer. The extra length following the release of the viola will allow the consonant sonority to ring in the hall, adding to the conclusiveness of the phrase and the piece.

CHAPTER 6

TRIPTYCH

Background

The final piece for examination is the composition for solo trumpet and orchestra entitled *Triptych*. This work was a commission from the International Trumpet Guild in 1991, and is one of twenty-five commissioned works by the International Trumpet Guild from the years 1987-2006. This composition is exceptionally unique in that it is one of only two of those twenty-five commissions to be scored for trumpet and orchestra, the other work being *William Schmidt’s Concerto for Trumpet and Orchestra*. For the purpose of advancing the research for this paper, the composer has released his piano accompaniment for the work, which will be published shortly. For the reason that most players will not be performing the work with full orchestral accompaniment, this study will create the performer’s guide based on the aforementioned piano reduction of the original orchestration.

Prior to preparing the work, the performer should note that the piano reduction of the original orchestration retains all of the original solo instrument dynamic markings from the orchestral version. Due to the change in instrumentation, there are instances where the dynamics do not accurately reflect the performance volume of the solo instrument. It must be noted that the composer, in the final edition of the piano accompaniment, may correct these differences. Additionally, the many accidentals Sampson uses throughout the work carry through the measure and are applied to any appearance of the note, regardless of octave.

Below are Sampson’s thoughts about his composition:

The form is similar to the Christian triptychs in which there is a central panel and two flanking panels half its size that fold over it. Although there is no religious content in Triptych, the focus of the entire work is on the center, or Main Movement. It is the longest and most involved movement including two cadenzas and a variety of moods.85

**Movement I**

The first movement opens with a flourishing metered cadenza in the trumpet. Although the performance of the statements should have a feeling of metric freedom, the performer must play in strict time so as to line up correctly with the piano accompaniment. The opening statement finishes with the “fanfare figure” which has been found in the other two pieces included in this study. As seen in Example 6.1, the performer’s time must be exact so that the pianist can place the accompaniment figure

---

with precision. With good time established earlier in the phrase, the piano can accurately judge the placement of the 32\textsuperscript{nd} notes. In the solo voice, the performer can increase the chance of upper register success by giving extra weight to the first note in the fanfare figure. With more substance to the lower note, that note will help act as a trampoline into the final “D.”


The first example of extended technique appears at the beginning of m.15, as Sampson writes out of the natural range of the instrument. The piano accompaniment is sustaining the low “F” against the trumpet’s “F♯” in m. 14. One option for the soloist to reach the low “F” in m. 15 accurately is to move both the first and the third valve slides out on the downbeat of the measure. Such a solution requires excellent slide function as well as a significant amount of time with a tuner and a metronome working on reaching the center of the “F” exactly on the beat. This writing also dictates the Bb trumpet as the equipment for the opening movement, due to the existence of the low “F.”
Following the introductory material, the A theme appears at m. 27. The motive at m. 31 is the first time in the work where the piano and the trumpet play the same rhythm and the same pitches (Example 6.2).

Example 6.2. David Sampson, *Triptych*, Movement I, mm. 31-33. The end of the A theme and unison motive in the trumpet and piano.

Due to the rarity of both voices playing a unison motive, the performers should line up with extreme precision and commitment to a unified sound. Also within this section, the composer asks the soloist to perform over the range of the instrument, culminating with the fanfare figure at m. 34. Although the range is extreme in the solo voice, the performer does not have to play at an extreme dynamic. The piano accompaniment crescendos only to a *mf*, allowing the soloist to relax dynamically and not having to be concerned with pushing the upper register in order to be heard. The section finishes with a series of fermatas in m. 37, as shown in Example 6.3.
Also seen in Example 6.3 are the original orchestral dynamics being transferred directly into the piano reduction. In the original performance, the solo instrument needed to sustain the \textit{ff} completely through the orchestral accompaniment. In this case however, with only the piano underneath, the soloist can play the upper note with intensity, but with less volume.

In terms of the navigation of the fermatas, the pianist should enter, as indicated, following the initial trumpet figure. The rhythm in the accompaniment serves to establish the tempo for the B theme and should be set from the first entrance of the piano under the fermata in the trumpet. Precise time will also make it easy for the soloist to release the fermata note exactly on the fourth beat of the measure.

Example 6.3. David Sampson, \textit{Triptych}, Movement I, mm. 36-37. Fermatas and orchestral dynamics.
The B theme area begins at m. 42 and leads into the primary motive at m. 50-53 (Example 6.4). Sampson uses the piano accompaniment to create a single line in combination with the solo instrument.


Although the main thematic material, 32nd notes running into the eighth notes, appears in the solo part, the overall line is created through the combination of both instruments. The trumpet can encourage this union by leading forward with the final eighth note of the first statement, thus helping to include the piano part. Additionally, the piano can assist by striving to pick up the dynamic in the trumpet, thereby creating a smooth transfer of thematic material. This feeling of a singular line continues all the way through the end of m. 54, where the piano takes over the section.
The development section opens with a call and response between the two parts, again accentuating the importance of creating a single musical line and the need for exacting rhythmic security. In the solo part, the tempo must be kept steady through the multiple tonguing elements beginning in m. 61, thereby creating a steady rhythmic base in which the piano can fit easily (Example 6.5).

Example 6.5. David Sampson, *Triptych*, Movement I, mm. 61-63. Call and response between the two parts.

This passage requires precise articulation in the trumpet and the piano. Establishing a single musical idea as a result of the combination of the two parts can be assisted by the pianist attempting to exactly duplicate the trumpet articulation. Sampson has clearly indicated the desired articulation in both parts, and the players should, in turn, agree to the length of the specified articulations. These agreements are essential to create a specific clarity to the line and to help ensure precise rhythmic alignment. Additionally, the uniform articulation will help to distinguish the themes and motives throughout the work.
The recapitulation begins at m. 97 and brings back both themes separated by the fanfare figure. The difficulty of the variety of specific articulations required by the performer can be seen clearly in the solo part at m. 109-110.

In Example 6.6, Sampson asks for three different kinds of articulations over the course of a single measure. The additional difficulty for the performer is that the measure involves multiple tonguing as well. A tonguing combination that can be used is beginning the motive with a “ku” syllable followed by a double tongue. A triple tongue can be used on the 16th note triplet, followed soon afterward with the 32nd note double tongue. Making this particular motive a bit easier is the fact that the articulations do not change over the course of the multiple tonguing. In preparation, the performer can practice the sets of articulations independently and then combine them in the order dictated by the music.


Throughout the first movement of the piece, the only extended technique used by Sampson is writing off the low end of the instrument. He does, however, create a vocabulary specific to this piece through his use of melodic and harmonic intervals and
motifs. In the case of the first movement, Sampson uses the intervals of 7ths and 9ths, usually filled in by 4ths. In order to become familiar with the vocabulary of the movement, the performer might practice the intervals starting on a variety of different pitches. Additionally, practice might include a combination of a variety of 4ths, connecting the 7ths and 9ths. The challenge of performing the written pitches accurately can be lessened by familiarity with the common intervals used by the composer.

Movement II

Exemplified through the second piece examined in this study, David Sampson writes extensively for the flugelhorn. Additionally, out of fourteen published works for trumpet, five are written for, or include, the flugelhorn in the instrumentation. Based on the above information, it is not unusual that Sampson includes a flugelhorn element in Triptych. This and the “Main Movement” of Triptych opens and finishes with a flugelhorn cadenza. Similar to the overall form of the piece, this movement contains a central section framed by the two flugelhorn cadenzas.

The first cadenza opens with four statements based on an ascending pattern, which is expanded in each iteration of the theme. Although the dynamics are marked similarly, there are subtle differences in the pace of the crescendos and decrescendos.

The first three phrases build to longer and greater crescendos as the theme is expanded. The final statement in the cadenza contains the smallest crescendo and the longest diminuendo to *pp*, the softest dynamic of the movement.

Although there are no markings to indicate any freedom in the opening, the performer can assume a measure of rhythmic liberty due to the placement of the fermatas at the end of each repetition of the theme. The framing of the phrases with fermatas enforces the idea of a cadenza opening. In his program notes regarding the work, Sampson states, “It is the longest and most involved movement including two cadenzas...”

Within the second movement, Sampson calls for a variety of instruments and equipment to assist in the shifting of the overall mood. At the outset, the choice of the mellow flugelhorn combined with the middle register of the instrument will serve to create a pensive opening. The player can be a bit more aggressive in the third statement as is indicated by the *poco accel.*, which moves to the upper register, followed by an elongated diminuendo and *rit.* into the fermata. As a result of these markings, the performer has the option to experiment with a variety of interpretations of the opening statements.

Sampson clearly has a specific sound in mind, as is evident from his decision to write for the flugelhorn. The performer should strive for a characteristically warm and rich flugelhorn sound to more effectively contrast the trumpet timbre. If the performer is not comfortable on the instrument, basic exercises and elements should be completed...

---

outside of the written music. Practice of standard exercises, etudes, or other familiar repertoire on the flugelhorn will help the performer find the desired sound. Through the playing of familiar material, the player can focus solely on creating the desired sound on the instrument. Once the desired sound is achieved on the familiar material, the sound will be easily transferable to the Sampson.

An additional challenge of the flugelhorn writing is keeping a warm and mellow sound through all registers. In m. 32-36, the writing moves to a $f$ dynamic in the upper register (Example 6.7).


Although the register changes, the challenge becomes keeping the same mood in the sound of the flugelhorn. Due to the characteristics of the instrument, the tone will naturally become more strident in the upper register, creating a need for the performer to focus intensely on keeping the sound warm throughout the range of the instrument.
The central section of the movement is written for Bb trumpet and transitions into an agitated mood in the solo line, which is transferred into the piano accompaniment. Sampson writes for muted trumpet in two phases at the opening of this section. The first muted section is m. 62-74 and reflects a legato voice, which is reminiscent of the flugelhorn opening. The second muted section, m. 76-78, is more aggressive and transfers that aggression to the piano accompaniment at m. 79.

The moods and characters of this transitional section can be greatly affected by the performer’s choice of straight mute. For the section in m. 62-74, the performer has the opportunity to capture the mood of the opening flugelhorn section, as the lines continue to be lyrical in character (Example 6.8).


For the reason of continuing the pensive mood of the earlier flugelhorn opening, the performer should look for a straight mute that contains some elements of warmth in the sound. One option is to use the Tum-Cor Lyric Mute, which combines the general “buzzy” characteristic of the standard metal straight mute with the velvet texture created through the mute’s wooden-based construction. In m. 75, the soloist has the opportunity
to switch to a different mute in order to assist in changing the mood to a more aggressive feel. At this point, the soloist could consider changing to a metal Denis Wick straight mute, which will give a firmer edge to the sound and assist in creating an aggressive mood in the solo voice.

The agitation continues in the piano part, but is not duplicated in the solo instrument as the movement develops. Other than the return of the initial fanfare figure in m. 84 and m. 85, the trumpet plays expansive lines over the anxious piano accompaniment. The development of the opening theme supports the idea that the flugelhorn line should be soaring and expansive, while being a sharp contrast to the busy piano accompaniment. Each of the soaring solo themes build in structure and intensity, gradually developing into the apparent recalling of the theme first presented in the opening cadenza. The ascending 16th note patterns seen in Example 6.9 are strikingly similar to the opening beginning in m. 107 and continuing throughout the climax of the central section at m. 110.

The notation of the rhythm for the ascending 16th notes is an indication that the initial pitches should be played at a slower tempo, with the speed increasing into the final pitch. The effect desired by the composer is similar to the figure found in the opening cadenza at m. 9. Despite the opening being written as a *poco accel.*, the effect of increasing speed through the figure is the same. The idea is repeated at the end of m. 108 and should be treated similarly. In preparation, and in order to ensure rhythmic accuracy, the soloist might practice the figures without alteration before attempting to slow down the first few notes. The final result of the figures should feel as though the notes are tumbling forward into the next measure. Ultimately, to compensate for the extra length spent at the beginning of the figure, the performer will have to perform the final notes of the figure faster than the 16th note value indicated. This treatment of the notation should be consistent throughout the piece, as instances of this notation recur later in the piece.

The second cadenza in the movement is written for flugelhorn and begins in m. 116. The constant switching of instruments and equipment brings the challenge of adjusting to different instruments quickly and efficiently. When preparing the work, practicing switching between the instruments will assist in the overall success of the piece. Switching between the flugelhorn, muted trumpet, open trumpet, and finally returning back to the flugelhorn is as much of a skill as actually playing the notes of the piece. This skill must be considered and can easily be lost in the regimented practicing of the various challenging elements of the work.
The final moments of the movements are not to be rushed, as the composer marks the solo part to play “wistfully.”\textsuperscript{88} In the original version for orchestra, the commentary now found in the piano was orchestrated in the upper woodwinds. In performance of this arrangement for piano, the pianist should strive to imitate the lightness of the sound of the upper woodwinds as much as possible.

\textbf{Movement III}

The third and final movement is described by Sampson as, “. . . a coda with a quick tempo and flourishes in all of the instruments.”\textsuperscript{89} This statement serves the written music perfectly. The statements in the solo trumpet generally begin with a rhythmic motive and then develop gradually over the next few measures. Soon afterwards, following a brief piano interlude including elements from the previous motive, a new statement is introduced and then developed in the solo voice. This pattern repeats throughout the movement and ends with a brief coda, which draws from the opening material of the entire piece.

All of the motives that are developed share an aggressive mood involving complex rhythms and multiple tonguing. One of the main challenges to the soloist in this movement is keeping steady time while the accompaniment does not play. The challenge

\textsuperscript{88} David Sampson, \textit{Triptych} (New Jersey: David Sampson, 2009), 24.

\textsuperscript{89} Program notes from \textit{Monument: The Music of David Sampson}, Ray Mase, trumpet; Czech Philharmonic Chamber Orchestra; Alan Balter, conductor. Summit Records DCD 237, 1998, 1 compact disc.
is increased through the composer’s use of a variety of slurs and articulations. Vertical alignment between the two parts is very difficult due to the rhythmic figures surrounding the overlapping section of the music.

Example 6.10 shows the end of the trumpet line, which has been independent for the previous two measures, and the beginning of the piano line. Not only does the accompaniment enter on a triplet rhythm, which is made awkward by the preceding 16\textsuperscript{th} notes in the trumpet, there is a space written between the downbeat in the solo instrument and the entrance of the piano in m. 25. The ensemble’s sense of time and steadiness of tempo must be very solid throughout the movement.


The recommendation of straight mute in the trumpet, indicated in m. 30, is greatly influenced by the following motivic material. The lines following the insertion of the mute are extremely angular with many multiple tonguing passages. Additionally, the
dynamic spectrum used varies from \( p \) (although very briefly) to \( ff \), while staying mostly in the loud dynamic area. For the performer, these considerations indicate a mute that enhances strong and precise articulations and is able to handle a very loud dynamic. The performer should experiment extensively with a variety of mutes to find the desired sound. It is not necessary to play the entire passage for testing purposes, especially if the accompanist is present for the testing. Rather, the performer might find a section that encompasses all of the above elements into a short excerpt of the music.

One possibility is to use the section shown in Example 6.11, where dynamic spectrum, articulation, angular line, and register shift are all addressed. A simple run of these two measures with a variety of equipment will give the information necessary for a decision. As mentioned previously in this project, a recording device is an invaluable tool for the performer. When placed in the hall, the device will provide direct feedback as to how the mute reacts in the performance hall. In terms of mute suggestions, a mute with a copper or brass end, or even a mute made entirely out of brass or copper, are good options. The heavier material will help the mute stay resonant at the louder dynamic.
Example 6.11. David Sampson, *Triptych*, Movement III, mm. 46-47. Possible section to be used for mute experimentation.

The figures in the solo instrument beginning at m. 60 are written over a pedal “A” in the accompaniment, creating a feeling of a cadenza in the middle of the movement.

The motives in the solo instrument are again based on the intervals of sevenths and ninths (Example 6.12).

In terms of practice techniques, the performer can become familiar with the intervals through repetition of the intervals in a variety of combinations and styles. The creation and practice of exercises by the performer, including the intervals and notes used in the work, is essential to learning the unfamiliar tonal vocabulary used by Sampson. In the case of the above example, the performer might practice the motive at a slower tempo and include all of the pitches in the first phrase up the “Ab,” thus creating a chord style exercise similar to those found in the Arbans book. Both exercises have the goal of familiarizing the performer with a certain pitch set found commonly in literature, thus increasing the accuracy of performance.

Towards the end of the movement, Sampson uses the same motive multiple times, using the repetition to help build intensity to the end of the piece. The resulting repetition has an added dramatic effect due to the lack of such thematic recurrence in the rest of the piece. Sampson uses trills and angular multiple tonguing to ornament the end of this repeating motive.

The trill seen in Example 6.13 is tricky for the performer due to the re-articulation of the “F#” on the downbeat of m. 95. Practicing to resolve this trill accurately, the soloist might start with a slower, measured trill, creating a specific rhythm and gradually increasing the frequency of the trill. This regimented practice will help the soloist resolve the trill accurately while also playing the “F#” on the downbeat of the following measure. Additional options for the performer would be to use alternate fingerings for the “F#” (123) and “G” (1 and 3), or to use a lip trill (123).

The coda of the piece is extremely brief and includes a transposition and inversion of the opening theme from the first measures of the entire work. The dynamic written at the end of the piece is a sustained $fff$ for the final eight measures. This indication reflects the power of the original orchestral scoring and does not necessarily mean that the soloist must observe the written dynamic. The dynamic markings here are suggesting a great intensity finishing the piece. The soloist should consider the extreme register of the writing and the thickness of the accompaniment when deciding exactly how loud to play. Both phrases at the end of the work are written in the extreme upper register of the solo instrument. Due to the register, the notes will naturally pierce the texture in the accompaniment and come to the fore of the ensemble. For this reason, the soloist should not feel the need to play a true $fff$; the written register of the trumpet line and the reduction to piano accompaniment will create the effect of the dynamic marking in the score.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Despite the increase of works for trumpet written in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, the amount of research done on the subject of modern trumpet performance practice remains extremely limited.91 Furthermore, a very limited number of writings exist regarding the performance practice of new works for trumpet. As far as can be determined, this short list includes works by David Sampson, Stefan Wolpe, Frank Ticheli, Robert Henderson, Hans Werner Henze, Verne Reynolds, Stanley Friedman, and Fisher Tull.92

David Sampson, whose works are examined in this study, is recognized among leading contemporary composers, as shown through recent commissions for the International Trumpet Guild.93 Through his compositions, Sampson looks to creatively

---


expand the musical and technical repertoire of the trumpet.\textsuperscript{94} The composer’s works for trumpet stretch the imagination of the player using combinations such as two trumpets and percussion, suites for unaccompanied trumpet, concert music for three trumpets, and trumpet with organ accompaniment.\textsuperscript{95}

Specifically examined in this study are Sampson’s \textit{Breakaway}, for two trumpets and electronics, \textit{Passage}, for muted flugelhorn and viola, and the ITG commission, \textit{Triptych}, for trumpet and orchestra, reduced to piano accompaniment by the composer.

Through the course of the study, Sampson’s description of his personal views regarding composition became strikingly apparent:

Form is taught all wrong in music schools. It’s all sonata-allegro and sixteen-bar periods and retrograde inversions. Just suppose we concentrate first on the ebb and flow of musical intensity.\textsuperscript{96}

Within each of the pieces examined, the focus of the work is the emotion of the music and the movement of musical intensity. Although there may be fragments of material that compose the form of the work, these sections are not immediately apparent to the listener and must be thoroughly investigated in order to promote the discovery of said sections by the performer. These formal fragments combined with the composer’s frequent use of motivic development create a sense of overall architecture to the works.


\textsuperscript{96} Paul Somers, Program notes from \textit{Monument: The Music of David Sampson}, Ray Mase, trumpet; Czech Philharmonic Chamber Orchestra; Alan Balter, conductor. Summit Records DCD 237, 1998, 1 compact disc.
Although the formal elements provide a structure to the works, the main force of Sampson’s music comes from the personal quality of the music. Sampson’s emotional attachment to his writing is evident through his program notes and the stories behind the works. Additionally, the composer creates a large variety of moods and feelings through the colors created by the combination of solo instruments, as is seen in *Breakaway*, *Passage*, and *Triptych*.

Within the score of *Breakaway*, Sampson explores the unique combination of two trumpets with electronic accompaniment. Not only is this combination rare in trumpet literature, the instrumentation creates a number of ensemble performance issues to which the performers will not be accustomed. The main issue for the performers is to create a balanced sound, which integrates the electronic elements from the recorded CD seamlessly into the ensemble. Performance practice issues considered within the main body of this paper include accurate syncing of the live performers and the electronics, overlapping dynamic shading, ensemble rhythmic precision, considerations dealing with trumpet technique, and interpretation of the written notes.

The piece works very nicely in a recital setting, serving to provide contemporary variety without sacrificing tonality. The work has many rhythmic grooves and challenges the performers technically as well as in an ensemble capacity, with the use of electronic accompaniment. The exciting and raucous ending serves nicely to finish any recital with a flourish.

In *Passage*, Sampson writes for muted flugelhorn and viola, unaccompanied. The composer’s desire for a specific sonority is clear through the specific instructions for the construction of the flugelhorn mute. The first challenge for the performers to address is
creating a mute that will allow the flugelhorn performer to play without holding back, without overpowering the viola, and without creating a sound that might be classified as “stuffy.” Once a good balance is achieved through the mute construction, the player will have to work tirelessly to match articulations and note lengths. Sampson assists the balance issues by marking the dynamics precisely and differently for each instrument. Performance practice issues considered within the main body of this paper include the emotional context within which the piece was written, stylistic interpretation, practice techniques, the melding of the two voices, dynamic shading and differences, and the manipulation of consonance and dissonance to create the desired musical effect.

The work as a whole functions well in a recital program, providing an interesting variation in ensemble, as well as challenging the performer to work with different instrumentations and equipment. Additionally, the overall mood of the piece accurately reflects somber memorial of its dedication and the depiction of the “passage” from life to death. For this reason, Passage is especially effective when presented with either accompanying program notes or a verbal description regarding the genesis of the work.

The first and foremost consideration regarding performance practice of Sampson’s Triptych is rhythmic integrity. The work is extremely rhythmic in style and often uses rhythm to define motives, themes, and sections of the piece. For this reason, it becomes necessary that the soloist and accompanist have an impeccable sense of rhythmic time. There are many sections of the work that exist with no accompaniment, but must sustain the rhythmic integrity of the line so as to set up the next entrance in the second instrument to either enter or join in time. The piano accompaniment and trumpet solo part, unpublished at the time of the completion of this study, contain only the
dynamic markings from the original orchestral score and can be overbearing at times. Dynamic adjustments must be made by the performers so as to create an acceptable balance while accurately reflecting the intentions of the original orchestration.

Performance practice issues considered within the main body of this paper include the emphasis on rhythmic motives, dynamic challenges, the unification of both parts into a single musical line, mute choices, and practice techniques.

Not mentioned in the previous discussion of the piece is the fact that the piano reduction is extremely difficult. If this piece is to be performed on a recital, the rehearsal time will have to be extensive due to the rhythmic complexity in both parts. In terms of recital programming, the piece is very flashy and ends with excitement, thus having the potential to end either half of a program. Although the work is tonal, the motives and themes are based primarily on rhythmic elements giving the piece a distinct impression of atonality.

*Breakaway, Passage, and Triptych* are all works worthy of study by any collegiate student or performing artist. The works are an excellent representation of the writing of David Sampson and include many challenges for both soloist and accompanist. Not only does Sampson’s music provide technical and ensemble challenges for the performer, the emotion and personal depth of the composition affords the performers an excellent opportunity for artistic expression.
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APPENDIX A

DAVID SAMPSON INTERVIEW

MICHAEL FLYNN: Do you mind if we record this interview for the purposes of my dissertation and recital notes?

DAVID SAMPSON: Not a problem, Michael.

MICHAEL FLYNN: Great, thank you. With my recital and my dissertation dealing with only your music, I wanted to speak a little bit regarding the basis for each of the pieces.

DAVID SAMPSON: Are you going to do verbal program notes?

MICHAEL FLYNN: Yes, I am.

DAVID SAMPSON: Ok, great.

MICHAEL FLYNN: Now, I’d like to ask you about the one for muted flugelhorn and viola. I’ve already had some rehearsals with the violist for the work, Passage.

DAVID SAMPSON: Oh, ok. Are you going to be doing it with viola then?

MICHAEL FLYNN: Yes, I am.
DAVID SAMPSON: And, how is it going so far? Have you created a mute, or are you playing it open?

MICHAEL FLYNN: Well, I was going to use a light towel over the bell . . . a smaller one, much like a kitchen hand towel.

DAVID SAMPSON: Well, you know, that’s all I’ve done too. I’ve heard of the use of all sorts of things. It all depends on the strength of the violist and just the power of the instrument. You know, some players are much lighter than others. And some players are like, you know, monsters! So that, I think, very much affects the kind of muting that you want to do.

I mean, obviously, you don’t want to make the instrument stuffy, you want to make it responsive. But you want to also allow yourself not to hold back. So you can really play fully.

MICHAEL FLYNN: I’m very lucky in that my violist is very strong.

DAVID SAMPSON: My wife is a violist, by the way.

MICHAEL FLYNN: Oh really?
DAVID SAMPSON: Yeah, that’s actually where this piece came from, I wrote it for us to play. She’s played with the New Jersey Symphony for about thirty-five years.

MICHAEL FLYNN: Now, it says for Jim on the top. What is the significance of the dedication and title?

DAVID SAMPSON: Well, Jim, well, he’s my older brother. And, he actually died the summer that piece was written. Of cancer. And I had seen him for the last time before I went to Fontainebleau, which is where I wrote the piece. Fontainebleau France and the American Academy. He was pretty much on his death bed at that point and he . . .

Well, I was not going to go to France and he told me to go. He knew he was dying and he said, let’s say our goodbyes now.

So, I went to France and he died about a week and a half later. So, this is to Jim.

And Passage – obviously a musical passage, but it also has to do with the passage from life to death. Sort of a double connection there.

MICHAEL FLYNN: Well – that’s certainly a really nice tribute to him, of course.
DAVID SAMPSON: Yeah – thank you.
And it was first played in Fontainebleau and I
was the first to play it. Actually, I didn’t play it
with a violist, I played it with a cellist. We
didn’t have a strong enough violist. So that’s
where that was done. And it was played that
summer, pretty much right after it was written.

MICHAEL FLYNN: Well, have you played it with your wife since?

DAVID SAMPSON: I dedicated it to her and we played it later, but
not at the premier. Well, not dedicated, but she
was my inspiration, because she was a violist.
She was not with me at the time of the premier.

MICHAEL FLYNN: Well, thank you for those memories.

DAVID SAMPSON: Oh, no problem.

MICHAEL FLYNN: I’d like to ask you about your composition

Breakaway, for two trumpets and electronics.
This was a commission by Ray Mase. Was it
commissioned for the trumpet and electronics, or was that your choice?

DAVID SAMPSON: Alright. Well, I’ll tell you the way that piece
came about. Yes, it was commissioned by Ray
Mase and Kevin Cobb, who was the other
trumpet player in the American Brass Quintet at
the time. What they wanted, well, they do a lot of touring and they go to various universities, and they have master classes. And a lot of times in these master classes, they’ll break up into their instrumental groups. So, there they are, the two of them, with a whole bunch of trumpet players at a university. In the past, they would have to work with some sort of accompanist where they could play some repertoire for the kids. What they thought would be really interesting would be if I could come up with something where it’s sort of self-contained, where we already have the rehearsing done. And I thought, “well, why not come up with electronics, or electronic accompaniment?”

And, I’ve always been interested in electronics. At one time, it had a kind of stylistic prejudice, but I think that’s really changed now it is no longer the domain of serialist composers or some of this austere music. So I just had a lot of fun with it. I created my
own little electronic orchestra. And I wrote it very much like I had created an ensemble and these were the players and sounds I had to work with. And it just started there and I just wrote it like I would write any other piece. And so that’s what came out.

And it’s been a very popular piece – trumpet players really like to play it. It’s something different on the recital; I find it to be very effective. They’ve played it a lot and we’ve been trying to get it recorded and published and out there.

MICHAEL FLYNN: That’ll be great. Now the movements – the first one says, “Carving the Stone” what does that mean?

DAVID Sampson: That’s just a poetic title. Oftentimes I will read poetry titles, I love poetry, and one that just seems to fit the message of the music was this one.

The only one that really came out of a specific situation was the second movement. Well, that one came out of . . . well, do you know *Morning Music*, the brass quintet?
MICHAEL FLYNN: Yes I do.

DAVID SAMPSON: You know the story behind that with my brother?

MICHAEL FLYNN: No, unfortunately, I don’t.

DAVID SAMPSON: Well, he was . . . well, in 1979, in November, there was a demonstration at Greensboro North Carolina, it was a demonstration against the rise of the Ku Klux Klan in NC. And he was killed, shot with four others during the rally. And this refers to . . well, it says “A Single Shot: 25 Years” and that has to do with when it was written. It was the 25th anniversary of that single shot. Which is amazing, the repercussions of one single action of somebody pulling the trigger and killing someone. And the number of people it affected. Not just the person who died, but the family members and others and how it reverberated. And you think about it today in the world and how the reverberations go out and that the impact of one single life is really tremendous. And so that is what that movement is about.

And you’ll hear that with the gong and the kind
of chant like feeling of it and the mournfulness
of it and the memorial feeling of it.
And obviously the third movement gets you out
of that and simply gives you a good time.
Does that help you out?

MICHAEL FLYNN: Oh yes, that’s absolutely fantastic, thank you so
much.

DAVID SAMPSON: Well, thanks for playing and writing about my
music, it’s really great to have this done. I
really appreciate it.

MICHAEL FLYNN: Oh, it’s my pleasure! Thank you again.