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Unaccompanied literature has been gaining a world-wide reputation and importance in the trumpet performance repertoire. This study examined how analysis of these pieces contributed not only to the knowledge of the performer, but to the performance itself. Three compositions were analyzed in this document: *Variation Movements* (1967) by Robert Henderson (b. 1948), *Sonatina* (1974) by Hans Werner Henze (b. 1926) and *Calls and Echoes* (unpublished) by Verne Reynolds (b. 1926).

These composers used a variety of compositional devices that were discussed in detail and showed how knowledge of these techniques benefited the performer. *Variation Movements* was derived from a nine-note motive that was utilized throughout the piece. The *Sonatina* incorporated set classes and twelve-tone serialism. *Calls and Echoes* also utilized set classes as well as motivic development.

The first chapter of this document provides a discussion of unaccompanied trumpet literature and previous scholarly research on the topic. The second chapter focuses on Robert Henderson’s *Variation Movements*. The third chapter examines Hans
Werner Henze’s *Sonatina* and the fourth chapter studies Verne Reynolds’ *Calls and Echoes*. The concluding chapter provides a summary.
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Chapter One
Introduction

Unaccompanied literature has been gaining a world-wide reputation and importance in the trumpet performance repertoire. This study shows how analysis of these pieces contributes not only to the knowledge of the performer, but to the performance itself. Three compositions will be examined in this document, Variation Movements by Robert Henderson, Sonatina by Hans Werner Henze and Calls and Echoes by Verne Reynolds. These composers employ a variety of compositional devices that will be discussed in detail, showing how knowledge of these techniques benefits the performer.

One of the first issues with this topic is the lack of primary source material. Unaccompanied trumpet literature has existed only since the last half of the twentieth century and it has yet to attain the lasting power of other masterful unaccompanied works (e.g., the Bach cello suites). Two of these composers are also relatively obscure in the grand scheme of the music world: Verne Reynolds is primarily known in horn and brass circles and Robert Henderson is scarcely known at all. Hans Werner Henze has enjoyed an illustrious compositional career but the Sonatina is not mentioned in his autobiography nor has it been mentioned in any other source material on Henze. Nevertheless, these pieces are becoming standards in the medium of unaccompanied literature. The research presented here, therefore, is an important step in adding to the source material of this genre.

Unaccompanied solo literature is a defining moment in a performer’s interpretive ability. Because there is no accompaniment (e.g., piano or orchestra) supplying a
continuous musical setting, it is up to the performer to provide the entire musical experience. Every phrase, articulation and dynamic marking is at the discretion of the performer alone. Particular attention must be paid to rests, which act as an additional performance aide because of the silence they create. While not every phrase will end with a flourish of notes or a long sustained pitch for the audience to hear fade in the performance hall, the silence itself acts as a strong musical element. These ideas are all key components in executing a strong performance of unaccompanied literature. This study will show how analysis can further aid performance of unaccompanied pieces.

One of the few proponents and pedagogues of new and contemporary trumpet literature is Thomas Stevens. Mr. Stevens was the principal trumpet of the Los Angeles Philharmonic from 1972-1999. He is perhaps best known for his activities in the promotion, performance, and premier recordings of new music for solo trumpet. His efforts have resulted in many works that have become staples of the genre, including the "Sequenza X" of Luciano Berio, which was written specifically for him. In regards to the need for new trumpet literature, Stevens says:

We cannot overlook the fact that even though the trumpet has existed in its present form most of the twentieth century, two generations of trumpeters have somehow managed to avoid having major works written for them by the leading composers of the times. Barber, Bartok, Berg, Copland, Poulenc, Prokofiev, Schoenberg, Shostakovich, Stravinsky, Walton, Webern, for example. All wrote well for the instrument, and they similarly wrote solo works for other instruments. Yet, for any number of reasons, the trumpet, as a solo instrument, was neglected. The result? Not only a needless extension of the void in our repertoire from the Classical and Romantic Periods, but also a denial of the logical historical musical continuity which has led to present day musical developments.\(^1\)

Another important proponent of new and unaccompanied trumpet literature is Edward Carroll. Mr. Carroll was appointed Instructor of Trumpet and Coordinator of Brass Studies at the California Institute of the Arts in 2001 after serving as the International Chair of Brass Studies at London's Royal Academy of Music and Professor of Trumpet at the Rotterdam (NL) Conservatory. He also teaches at the McGill University Faculty of Music in Montreal and at Dartmouth College. Mr. Carroll is also the director of The Center for Advanced Musical Studies at Chosen Vale in New Hampshire. Edward Carroll had this to say in regards to unaccompanied literature:

I'm a huge advocate of learning to perform solo works. I suppose there's a correlation to a violinist or cellist playing Bach, or a pianist playing almost anything... it's you and the composer, nothing else. [It's] just the music with no distractions. I think of this music the same way an actor does a monologue or soliloquy.²

This is further evidence of the need to expand the repertoire to other aspects of composition, like the unaccompanied solo. Thomas Stevens has recorded a wide range of new and unaccompanied trumpet literature.³ These recordings also include a large number of unaccompanied trumpet pieces, such as Henze’s *Sonatina* and Henderson’s *Variation Movements*.

A small amount of scholarly literature devoted to unaccompanied trumpet literature includes: Paul Ulrich’s annotated bibliography in 1989⁴ and Timothy Justus’ in 1995.⁵ They each give general information of unaccompanied pieces (difficulty, difficulty,

---

² Email correspondence with Edward Carroll, January 23, 2007.
³ As well as other famous trumpeters such as Gerard Schwartz, Hakan Hardenberger, Anthony Plog, Reinhold Friedrich and Terry Everson for example.
⁴ Paul Ulrich, “An Annotated Bibliography of Annotated Trumpet Solos Published in America,” (DMA diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1989).
duration, range, and instrument) and provide brief descriptions of the pieces being discussed. Neither of these documents, however, gives any in-depth information on the individual pieces or their performance.

There are two more recent bibliographic studies of unaccompanied trumpet literature. Luis Engelke’s study focuses on Brazilian solo trumpet works, accompanied and unaccompanied. Michael Bellinger’s document is a model for evaluating the serious artistic merit of unaccompanied trumpet literature. Both of these studies differ from the above-mentioned bibliographies. The Engelke study focused on the fundamental principles of interpreting the folk and popular genres of Brazilian music in relation to the discussed trumpet works from specific regions. The Bellinger study was derived from wind band literature researchers to evaluate the quality of each unaccompanied piece listed in terms of serious artistic merit.

A variety of other dissertations has been written about specific unaccompanied trumpet compositions or examines an unaccompanied trumpet work within a larger list of pieces. Mark Nelson’s study analyzes the Vincent Persichetti Parables for brass instruments, all of which are unaccompanied works. Edward Bach’s study encompasses five compositions by five contemporary composers: Malcolm Arnold (Fantasy), Robert Henderson (Variation Movements), Stan Friedman (Solus), John Elmsly (Triptych) and

---


Lucia Dlugoszewski (*Space is a Diamond*). Each work in the Bach document is unaccompanied with the exception of the Elmsly *Triptych*, which is for trumpet and tape. Larry Engstrom’s study on contemporary Swedish music for trumpet includes Folke Rabe’s *Shazam*, another unaccompanied trumpet work. Peter Francis’ document focuses on four unaccompanied trumpet compositions by Vincent Persichetti (*Parable*), Stefan Wolpe (*Solo Piece*), David Sampson (*Solo*) and Frank Ticheli (*The First Voice*).

It is clear that unaccompanied trumpet literature is gaining scholarly interest. None of the pieces in this study have been written about in any depth. Edward Bach’s study includes Robert Henderson’s *Variation Movements* but does not go into any of the topics that will be discussed in this document. Hans Werner Henze’s *Sonatina* and Verne Reynolds’ *Calls and Echoes* have yet to be mentioned in any scholarly research; this document will provide the depth and analysis necessary to help further understand these unaccompanied pieces.

---

Robert Henderson (b. 1948) began his musical studies on the violin at the age of four and studied piano and horn in addition to composition and conducting from the age of 12. He was awarded the Composer’s Award by the Young Musicians’ Foundation at the age of 16. Henderson was also one of the youngest people to be awarded the prestigious BMI composer’s grant for three of his works.\(^{12}\) At California State University at Fullerton Henderson studied with Daniel Lewis and Donal Michalsky. Work with these composers led to a scholarship offer from USC to study with Ingolf Dahl. After several years playing horn with the Westwood Wind Quintet and with film companies in Hollywood, he became assistant conductor of the Utah Symphony Orchestra and then Music Director of the Arkansas Symphony (1981-1992).

Henderson began composing *Variation Movements* while in high school and later revised the work while studying with Dahl. The piece was finished in 1967 and has been featured at the 1976 International Brass Convention in Zurich and the 1986 Munich Instrumental Competition.\(^{13}\) *Variation Movements* does not follow the traditional form of “theme and variations.” The theme is built on a nine-note row but the variations rarely incorporate the entire theme. Instead, Henderson favors fragmentation and less traditional alterations of the row form.


\(^{13}\) Terry Everson, *Terry Everson, trumpet*, (liner notes): International Trumpet Guild, ITG 001.
Thomas Stevens agrees that Henderson’s piece is a standard unaccompanied work; however, he still is of the opinion that it has yet to attain serious merit. Stevens says:

The problem with the Henderson, as with many other solo trumpet works, is one of substance. It is viewed as being a lightweight student work. This, of course, is also the case with a good deal of our solo material from other periods. I will never forget the time one of the greatest symphony orchestra conductors of the 20th century complimented me on a very fine performance of the Hummel Concerto, and then followed the comment with the qualifier that I surely was aware of the fact it is one of the trashiest pieces of music any major orchestra would ever be required to perform. My point here is that for those of us trumpeters who exist in the real so-called classical music world, nary a day goes by when we are not reminded of where we stand in that world—and the real issue is our dearth of serious repertoire, which many consider as a limiting factor in our overall musical development.14

There are no published biographies on Robert Henderson or literature on any of his music. Mr. Henderson proved to be very difficult to get in touch with as well. I made contact with the secretary of the Arkansas Symphony, his last prominent position, but they did not have any current contact information for him. Henderson used to be a studio horn player in Los Angeles, yet an attempt to locate him through the local American Federation of Musicians also proved unsuccessful. The best reference material comes from Henderson himself, courtesy of a recording of Variation Movements performed by Thomas Stevens. In the liner notes, Henderson gives general descriptions of each of the movements as well as this general statement about the piece:

Variation Movements for Trumpet is not a “theme and variations” in the classical sense. The theme is stated in the first twelve bars of the first movement, but the variations do not incorporate the entire theme. This theme is constructed on a ten-note row (using nine pitches) that is repeated twice in the

14 Email correspondence with Thomas Stevens, November 11, 2006.
original form and once in retrograde form, with three additional cadential notes tacked on.\textsuperscript{15}

The only known source material about \textit{Variation Movements} is Edward Stanley Bach’s 1991 DMA dissertation.\textsuperscript{16} Bach’s project does not devote the entire document toward the Henderson piece; rather it is one of five select works on which he focused. He chooses a rather general discussion to explain the piece and its musical decisions.\textsuperscript{17} Because Bach’s discussion contains general comments and focuses primarily on key centers, it does little to provide real insight into the composition. This document is another example of the limited research material on \textit{Variation Movements} of Robert Henderson.

For the purpose of this discussion, it will be clearer to say that \textit{Variation Movements} is based on a nine-note row. Even though Henderson mentions that the piece is constructed on a ten-note row (using nine pitches), the analysis used in this project lends itself better to a nine-note row.

\textbf{1. Moving and in a singing style}

The first movement begins with the initial statement of the nine-note row (P4). The breath mark at the end of m. 3 helps illustrate the end of the row’s first statement. The d# at the beginning of m. 4 acts as a leading tone before the next entrance of the row (P4). Measure 8 is the first of three examples of a minor sixth interval before a retrograde row. The first retrograde row begins in m. 9 (R4) and ends at the end of

\textsuperscript{15} Thomas Stevens, \textit{Thomas Stevens, trumpet}, Crystal Records CD 667, 1989, notes by composer.
\textsuperscript{16} Bach, 13-31.
\textsuperscript{17} Bach, 13.
measure 10. The three notes in m. 11 (D#, G, B) serve as a cadence, here and throughout the piece. A quarter-note rest precedes three of the four statements of the cadence.

Example 1 contains mm. 1-11:

![Ex. I]

The first movement is comprised of four main sections, with three of the four ending with the cadence. The other markings throughout this score are various 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 note segments. These segments emerged from the matrix shown in Appendix I.

The second section (mm. 13-30) begins with the first of many row fragments. Measure 13 comprises the first P4 tetrachord followed by the first P6 tetrachord in the next measure. In m. 17, beat 3 contains the first P8 tetrachord followed by an I6 trichord in m. 19. After the cadence in m. 20, P4 enters in the following two measures, once again ending with a breath mark. A minor sixth begins in m. 24, is followed by an augmented statement of R4. The first six notes of R4 are easily detected, but after the E# Henderson continues to raise the line with G#, reaching the movement’s peak on an A. These two pitches serve as a brief interruption of the R4 row, which ends in the second half of measure 28 in example 2:
After the third cadence statement (mm. 29-30) the third section begins (mm. 31-42). This section deviates from Henderson’s previous fragmentative style. Measures 31-36 begin with the I5 tetrachord and then develop into a new idea, which will be used in a later movement. In example 3, Henderson repeats the I5 tetrachord in m. 36 but varies the new idea, finishing on a modified version of the cadence in mm. 41-42 (Bb, Db, A):

The first twelve measures of the first movement complement the analysis. Breath marks at the ends of phrases coincide with the ends of rows (end of mm. 3, 7 and 10) and
the cadence is preceded and followed by rests. The rest of the movement does not align as closely with the analysis.

Without prior knowledge of the cadence or rows, at mm. 20-21 a performer might tend to connect the D# to the E for continuity. But in considering the analysis, it would make more sense to put more emphasis on the E, since it is the beginning of the theme, P4. The next row, R4 in m. 24, is interrupted by the high G# and A in mm. 26-28. Traditional performance would suggest for the performer to lead the E# directly into the G# in order to continue the crescendo. But because the G# and A are not part of the row, a breath before the G# in m. 26 helps keep the G# and A independent of the R4 row. Finally, example 4 contains the last three notes of m. 28 (C, A, E) should not diminuendo too soon, due to their importance as the last three notes in R4:

Ex. 4
In mm. 43-49, one interpretation might be playing the entire phrase in a single breath. A breath at the end of m. 45 would be useful given that P6 is repeated in the following measure, shown in example 5:

Ex. 5

2. Very fast

Three main sections make up the second movement. At the beginning, Henderson uses the P7 row in an accented fashion with an accompanying figure lower in both range and dynamics. The lower note groupings are taken either from fragments of other rows or the cadence figure. A repeat of P7 begins at the end of m. 6 but is an incomplete statement. P7 is repeated immediately in m. 10, this time as a pentachord. In m. 12, P6 is elided with the P7 pentachord ending on F#. The P6 row is missing its last pitch when a cadential gesture enters in m. 15. In example 6, this cadential gesture contains elements of P6 (B, D, G, F) and is repeated note-for-note in mm. 33-35 and mm. 50-52:
In the first subito section (m. 18) the E-Eb leads the music into a statement of R4 in m. 19 the only time the original theme is used in this movement. The gesture in mm. 24-25 acts as a “deceptive” cadence figure, beginning with D#, G and then going to A, rather than the B in the previous movement. The remainder of this middle section derives from P4 and R14 in example 7:

In the final section of the second movement, mm. 36-44 appear a whole step higher than in mm. 1-9. In this section, the row used is P9 along with the P9 tetrachord.
Measures 45-52 are an exact repeat of mm. 10-17 with the exception of mm. 46 and 47, where the Eb and F# are an octave higher. Henderson ends the movement with an expansion of the cadence figure leading forcefully into the third movement, shown in example 8:

Ex. 8

Henderson’s notation and dynamic markings line up perfectly with the analysis. The separation of rows and accompanimental figures are clear from the very first measure. In the second section, breath marks coincide with the phrases and the ends of rows. The cadential gesture in mm. 15-17 is repeated exactly in mm. 33-35 and 50-51. The first phrase from the third section is a whole step higher. The only new material in this movement is the last four measures, found in Example 9:
3. Fast and marked

The third movement follows without pause, embellishing the theme with short, scalar passages. This movement, like the second, comprises three main sections. Initially, the third movement follows the first movement’s statements of the row. The theme (P4) is stated at the beginning, highlighted by all of the accented notes. P4 is repeated in m. 4 (with a leading tone Eb on beat 2), followed by an inverted minor sixth in mm. 7 & 8 (accented G and D#). In example 10, the R4 hexachord follows in m. 8 ending with the only occurrence of the cadence in mm. 12-13:
What follows in mm. 14-24 is a trichordal repetition of P6. Measure 14 opens with the first three notes (F#, B, D) of P6, followed by an accented repetition of the first three notes in m. 15. This process repeats with the next three notes (G, F, C#) in mm. 16-18 and G#, D#, A in mm. 19 & 20. P6 repeats in m. 21 with a leading tone F before the F#, followed by the accented repetition in m. 22. Measures 23-24 deviate from the established form but are loosely based on material from R8, shown in example 11:

Ex. 11

In example 12 the return of P4 begins in m. 25 with a pentachord statement. A brief statement of a P11 pentachord leading into m. 28 interrupts the final statement of the P4 triad in m. 30. The movement closes with a descending chromatic passage, the first such instance in the piece.
While this movement lends itself to a continuous, flowing line, knowledge of when the next row starts is helpful for the performer. Ideally, mm. 1-11 should be played in a single breath. It is easy, however, to emphasize the wrong notes with this large number of notes. In example 13, more emphasis on the E in m. 4 and the G in m. 8 helps break up the larger phrase into three smaller units:
The middle section (mm. 14-24) can initially be seen as two separate ideas. The contrast of dynamics plus the scalar notes against the more stagnant rhythms, tend to lead the performer toward presenting two moods. The analysis suggests hearing this section as one large phrase. The row is presented in three note segments with one measure variations on each three-note groupings in example 14:

Ex. 14

Performance of the third section (mm. 25-32) is virtually identical to the beginning of the movement. While there are no complete rows, the pentachords of P4 and P11 clearly mark the phrasing in mm. 25 and 28, shown in example 15. The last three measures of the movement are technically demanding beginning with a double forte dynamic and ending at a double piano. During the diminuendo in the last two measures, one option would be to emphasize the only chromatic figure in the movement.
4. Slow and in a lyric style

The fourth movement contains the greatest amount of material not related to the original row. The three main sections are highlighted by the use of mutes for the first time (mm. 1-12 straight mute, mm. 13-26 are open, mm. 27-40 Harmon mute). The first five pitches at the beginning are the same opening five pitches of the third movement. After the phrase ends in m. 5, mm. 6-12 contain the first full example of new material. This section, shown in example 16, grows out of the opening phrase (mm. 1-5) and does not contain any fragments from any of the possible rows shown in appendix I.
The beginning of the “open” section contains the first use of “displaced” rows. Beats one and four of m. 13 plus beat two of m. 14 comprise the cadence. Next, P4 is outlined in the following measures: m. 14 (beats three and upbeat of four); m. 15 (beats one, upbeat of two and upbeat of three); m. 16 (beats one, three and four) and the row ends in m. 18 (on the downbeat). The same inverted minor sixth interval is present in m. 18 (G, Eb) before the first retrograde statement (R4), which is outlined in the following measures: m. 19 (beats one, two and upbeat of three); m. 20 (beats one and second and third sixteenths of beat two); m. 23 ends the row with the forte notes (C, A, E). A two-measure interruption occurs before the end of the row with an expansion of the figure in m. 20. Measures 13 through 23 are demonstrated in example 17:

![Ex. 17](image)

Measures 23-25 contain two examples of material from preceding movements. Measure 23 is taken from the second movement, and m. 25 is taken from the third movement. Henderson includes these two instances in the row identification throughout the fourth movement. In example 18, m. 23 contains the last three notes of the R4 row and m. 25 is part of an entire phrase from the first movement. In m. 24, the I5 tetrachord
is found on beat two, the upbeats of three and four, and the accented E in m. 25. The outlined I5 and the accented pitches from m. 25 plus every pitch from m. 26 is taken directly from mm. 31-36 in the first movement.

This borrowing continues in mm. 27-28 where the entire phrase of these two measures is up a major third from m. 1 of the third movement. Measures 29 through the downbeat of m. 31 are a whole step higher than mm. 3-5 earlier in the movement. This whole phrase (mm. 27-31, shown in example 19) also contains exactly the same rhythmic values as the first five measures of the movement, with the exception of m. 28 which is extended by one beat.
The I5 tetrachord is outlined again in mm. 31-32 (F, C, A, E). Another statement of the cadence follows in beat four of m. 34 and beats two and four in m. 35. This second statement of the cadence is a variation of the first statement in mm. 13-14. These two cadence statements should be played in the same manner due to its importance throughout the entire piece.

A fragmented statement of P4 begins in m. 36 with only five notes showing: m. 36 beat one, upbeat of two, beat three and m. 37 beat one and four. The movement concludes with a modified cadence statement in the last two measures. Here, the cadence begins on D natural instead of D# followed by an added G# leading to the last two cadence pitches, B and G natural. Measures 31 through 37 are demonstrated in example 20:

Ex. 20

The first twelve measures of the fourth movement give the performer a large amount of freedom with interpretation. Because this first section is not based strictly on any of the rows or more than two measures of previous material, a wide range of performance ideas can be used. For example, beginning at the end of m. 7, an accelerando following the crescendo works well until the diminuendo at the end of m. 9.
Pushing the tempo helps move and create contrast for a movement that Henderson labels “Slow and in a lyric style.”

During the open section (mm. 13-26), emphasis on the embedded cadence and rows is essential. The music, for the most part, is written to highlight these row pitches. In m. 14, most of the row pitches of P4 occur on strong beats and points of emphasis. In example 21, this is also the case with the R4 row that follows in m. 19:

![Ex. 21](image)

The last section (m. 27) combines elements of the first two sections (embedded row structure plus free interpretation). Henderson has now added two instances of thirty-second note chromatic runs (mm. 33 and 36). In example 22, both of these phrases begin forte and diminuendo quickly. Neither of these two examples should be played so fast that the listener will not be able to discern their chromatic quality. Instead, the performer should take a relaxed approach and make the lines as smooth as possible.
5. Fast and rhythmic

The fifth and final movement of *Variation Movements* is set up in the structure of a fugue. The subject is accompanied by countersubjects that expand in range and dynamics. Henderson adds another dimension to the difficulty of this movement by writing out the various subjects and countersubjects on separate staves (two starting in m. 7, three starting in m. 17). This makes the music easy to read but all the more difficult to play. Like the second, third and fourth movements, the fifth movement is in three main sections.

The first statement is the initial row of P4 in m. 1. Following the form set up in the previous movements, the row is repeated in m. 5 with a D# leading tone. In this instance, however, the last pitch is omitted at the end of m. 6. In m. 7, the theme now shifts to P11 and the first countersubject (interjectory trills). P11 is repeated in m. 11 (with a leading tone A#), and then the first instance of the row moving up to the countersubject line occurs in m. 13, with D being the last note in the row. Measure 15 marks a return of the altered cadence (from the previous movement) with the D natural in place of the traditional D#. Example 23 exhibits this opening passage:
The three-staff section, which will last for the majority of the movement, begins in m. 17, shown in example 24. P3 appears in the lowest staff while the upper two staves share a dual purpose. The top staff comprises the second countersubject of triplets, and the middle staff continues the trills. Nonetheless, both lines share statements of row fragments in mm. 17-21. Measure 17 in the upper two staves comprises the first four notes of P1, m. 18 includes the last four notes of RI11, m. 19 contains the first four notes of P4, m. 20 consists of the last four notes of RI6 and m. 21 comprises the first four notes of P7. Measure 21 restates P3 with a leading tone D natural.
Measure 24 begins a series of independent tetrachords and other countersubjects. A P6 tetrachord is in the upper staff in m. 24 followed by the first P8 tetrachord. Measure 25 ends with a P0 tetrachord followed in m. 26 with the first P4 tetrachord in m. 26. In-between P8, P0 and P4 are interjections of perfect fourth in the lower staff. These tetrachords can be highlighted by adding a slight accent at the beginning of each entrance.

In m. 27, Henderson now has all three staves overlapping with enharmonic pitches but two different tetrachords are present (P5 in the upper staff, P1 in the lower). The I5 tetrachord returns in m. 28 as the rising cadential figure of the fifth movement, ending in m. 30. Measures 24 through 30 are displayed in example 25:
The second section begins in m. 31 with the first hexachord of P3 in the upper staff. On beat four of m. 32, the middle staff follows with the first hexachord of P6. The entrance of P6 in the middle staff is also the beginning of the next countersubject in the upper staff, forte flutter-tonguing, followed by a sixteenth eighth-note grouping (m. 35). This continues when the lower staff enters with the first hexachord from P7. In m. 36 beat four, the first pentachord of P9 is in the upper staff. After the middle and lower staff continue the countersubjects (mm. 38-39), the first septachord of P0 is in the upper staff in m. 40, shown in example 26:
In mm. 41-44, Henderson uses another example of material from a previous movement. The upper staff in m. 41 contains a P6 row that moves down into the lower staff (m. 42) but does not contain the last pitch. This was the case in the second movement, mm. 12-15. The lower staff (in mm. 42-44) also contains an extension of one of the previous countersubjects (lower staff, mm. 37-39, for example). The material in example 27 also stems from the second movement’s cadential gesture (mm. 15-17).
It would appear in example 28 (mm. 45-47) that the three lines continue the notion of breaking up the rows across the staves. This is not the case, either by combining the pitches across the staves or by viewing them independently. The upper staff contains only the last three pitches from I5 (D#, G#, D) and the lower staff contains the last three pitches from I2 (C, F, B). The middle staff is not related to any row from the created matrix. Measures 45-47 seem more like an attempt at a complete 12-note statement, but Henderson has left out C#, F# and A#.
The previous method of rows across the staves returns in m. 48 with the lower staff beginning the first tetrachord of P3. In m. 49, the fourth note of P3 also serves as the first note of a P4 septachord. In m. 50, the upper staff transposes the middle staff’s last three pitches up a whole step. The lower and middle staves conclude the second section with more material taken from m. 50, shown in example 29:

Ex. 29

The third and final section, shown in example 30, eliminates the three-staff arrangement that took place over the previous 36 measures. Because the music now lies in single line format, the row methods are much more difficult to detect. Measures 53-56 are not derived from any established row and are mostly extensions of the previous material in mm. 51-52.

Ex. 30
The first example of Henderson using two rows in a single line appears in mm. 57-60. Here, the lower notes of the line contain the pitches for P4, while the upper notes spell out P3. The only pitch that does not fit in this scenario is the Bb on the upbeat of two in m. 60. This simultaneous row sequence is repeated in m. 60 upbeat of four, where the C# begins P1 septachord and a P4 septachord begins in m. 61 beat two on the E. The P1 and P4 share a few pitches along the way (A and D#) but the two rows are easily seen. Measures 63 and 64 are a sequential ending to the dual rows while in m. 65, a return of the cadential ending from the first section begins. On small beat three of m. 65, the I5 tetrachord marks a slight variation of the cadential figure from mm. 29-30, ending in m. 67. In example 31, the piece concludes in the final measure with sextuplet flourish up to high C# and ending an octave lower.

![Ex. 31](image)

Of all the movements in the piece, the fifth is by far the most difficult to perform. The most obvious difficulty for the performer is reading three staves of music.
simultaneously. The other challenging aspect of the movement is the continuous “gymnastics” involved in the music. The performer must easily facilitate leaps ranging from ninths to fifteenths (sometimes within the same beat) as well as making some of these leaps while coming out of complicated trills.

During the first 23 measures, each entrance of a new staff begins a new row, with the previous staff taking on a countersubject. After the initial statement of P4, m. 7 contains P11 with the upper staff beginning the first countersubject. The dynamics are the biggest aide to the performer from mm. 7 to 16 to help distinguish the subject from the countersubject. Measures 17-23 add the second countersubject in the top staff and the middle staff continues the first countersubject. The bottom staff still remains the most important due to the fugue subject. The two countersubjects can now be seen as a single idea due to their tetrachordal row spellings. This is a slight aid in performance of this extremely complicated passage, shown in example 32:
Measures 24-30 are written in a complementary style towards the analysis. Each line enters separately and each tetrachordal spelling can be seen in example 33. The three staves are mostly in the same octave and the leaps (with the exception of m. 29) never go beyond a seventh. In m. 27, it is possible to play this part without looking at the bottom staff. Because Henderson has overlapped the three lines, reading the bottom staff is almost unnecessary, from a performance standpoint. The cadential figure (mm. 28-30) contains the first long pitch (three beats on high C) and the first space for rest (m. 30, beats three and four). The performer could also take advantage of the acoustics of the performance hall in this situation, waiting for the sound to fade out before entering in m. 31.
The new countersubjects (including flutter-tonguing) increase the difficulty yet again. Because there are so many variables happening at the same time, it is easy to forget where the listener’s attention should go. In example 34, mm. 35-42, it is very important to bring out the rows and not the countersubjects. In m. 35, focus should be placed on the lower staff’s line with P7. In m. 36, attention now shifts to the upper staff with the entrance of P9 and likewise in m. 40 with P0.
The intervals between the staves are at their most extreme in example 35 (mm. 45-47). Because most of the notes are on upbeats, there is a real tendency to rush this section. Even though there are no complete row statements, keeping a solid, steady tempo will make this section more convincing.
Henderson returns the music to a single line beginning in m. 53. The music continues to be challenging as it moves towards its difficult conclusion. Aside from the intervals, the difficulty in this final section is the rhythmic complexity. Measures 57-62 contain two simultaneous rows, P4 and P3. Without prior knowledge of the rows, most performers might make the phrases quite connected and smooth. But because the dynamic is piano and Henderson’s articulation markings do not coincide with the two rows, accenting the pitches in the P3 row help highlight a sense of duality. This is more difficult to achieve in the next section, mm. 61 and 62. The rhythms are extremely challenging due to tempo, range and tonguing. Measures 53 through 62 are shown in example 36:

Ex. 36
Analysis of Henderson’s *Variation Movements* proves to be extremely useful. Knowledge of the row forms and how they are used provide a new dimension for the performer as well as the listener. When played with conviction, the dual row form in the fifth movement (example 37, mm. 57-64) takes on a whole new personality. Rather than performing the line as one idea, the listener is able to decipher the two rows.

*Ex. 37*
Hans Werner Henze (b. 1926) has been one of the foremost European composers of the last fifty years. His extensive and wide-ranging output includes eighteen operas, ten symphonies, fourteen ballets and numerous choral, chamber and instrumental works that have all gained an international reputation. Hene taught composition from 1972 to 1976 at the Royal Academy of Music in London, the Salzburg Mozarteum, the Musikhochschule in Cologne and at the Tanglewood Festival.

*Sonatina for Solo Trumpet* (written in 1974 and published in 1976) is a complicated piece to decipher. Henze never discussed the piece in two of his own books, his autobiography *Bohemian Fifths*, (last published in 1998), and his collected writings.\(^{18}\) Even Gerhard Koch’s list of Henze’s works (dated from 1980 to 1985) does not cite the *Sonatina*.\(^{19}\)

The piece is dedicated to Howard Snell, a former principal trumpet of the London Symphony Orchestra. Because of the lack of source material, it is not known whether the piece was commissioned by Snell or if Henze wrote the piece with him in mind. Nevertheless, the *Sonatina* is a landmark trumpet composition. It is full of some of the most technically difficult and musically challenging passages in the repertoire. This

---


analysis will show the basis of the music and the use of subtle changes in existing techniques.

One of the first considerations present with this piece is that there are two different performing editions; the original publication in 1976 by Dunster Music\textsuperscript{20} and the modern edition published by Schott Musik International.\textsuperscript{21} While each edition is clear and easy to read, there are inconsistencies with printed notes. In the first movement, the second line has four separate discrepancies. In the Schott edition, A-flat, G-flat, F\# and C\# are all marked in example 38:

\begin{ex}
\begin{music}
\begin{measures}1-8\end{measures}
\end{music}
\end{ex}

Ex. 38

In the Dunster edition, those pitches appear unaltered in the same passage (F-natural instead of G-flat) in example 39:

\begin{ex}
\begin{music}
\begin{measures}1-8\end{measures}
\end{music}
\end{ex}

Ex. 39

This is also true in the second movement. In the second line of the Schott edition, an F-natural is marked, but in the Dunster edition it is labeled as an F-flat in example 40:

![Ex. 40](image)

Later in the movement, after the fermata, the trumpet begins on B-flat in the Schott edition, whereas in the Dunster edition it begins on B-natural, shown in example 41:

![Ex. 41](image)

In example 42, the third movement contains a note discrepancy in the unmeasured section. In the Dunster edition, the phrase below contains F# followed by F-natural. This follows Henze’s indication from the beginning that “accidentals apply only to the notes that they precede.”

---

In the Schott edition, the addition of the F# accidental is clear in example 43:

Determining which edition is correct is beyond the scope of this study. While further, in-depth research with the Schott edition might provide different results than the ones present; this analytical study used the Dunster edition. It is still interesting to observe that this piece has such a large number of different notes between editions.
1. Toccata

In the first movement of the *Sonatina*, Henze establishes pedal points and “expanding” motives. That is, the register and rhythmic values of the motives quickly increase upon their re-entrance. Because the movement is unmeasured, the forward motion of the music can easily be heard and seen. The movement is broken into four large phrase groupings.

Upon first glance, one might assume that Henze has grouped certain pairs of notes due to his beaming. This notion provided no continuity within the movement. Analysis of the first movement lends itself better to pitch class notation. The first line of the Toccata does show a few repeated melodies, such as the opening pitches (ten, two, five, eleven), (zero, five, ten), and (one, six, eleven, four), shown in example 44:

Ex. 44

The (nine, two, five) motive is circled because when it is repeated at the end of the line, it now shows up two octaves higher and inverted. This is also not an exact repetition because pitch class five is now replaced with seven. The example also shows that Henze has moved the order from its first appearance to occur after the (one, six, ten, four) motive instead of ahead of it.
The beginning line also contains Henze’s first usage of a compound melody. The first four notes of each of the opening motives (ten, zero, nine, one) also happen to be the lowest notes of each motive. These motives are easiest to analyze using set names from Allen Forte’s method in the text *The Structure of Atonal Music*. Example 45 shows the four notes of the tetrachord (0134):

![Ex. 45](image_url)

These same four pitches are present as well in the repetition passage at the end of the line. The only difference is the reordering of pitch class nine (fourth instead of third), in example 46:

![Ex. 46](image_url)

Another issue regarding the opening line is whether all twelve pitches are used. The first melodic section does not contain pitch class 8 and the second melodic section is
lacking pitch class 3. Looking closely at example 47, it can be seen that pitch class 3 occurs at the end of the first melodic section and pitch class 8 occurs at the end of the second melodic section:

![Ex. 47](image)

The placement of each of these pitches is hard to dismiss as coincidental. Henze has clearly intended the missing pitch classes to occur at the end of each melodic section. The beginning of the second line marks the end of the first large phrase. This contains a rising melody that will be repeated later in the movement.

In the second line the second large phrase starts after the two eighth rests. While there are no repeating motives in this phrase (as in the first line), the phrase still carries over the compound melody idea. The beginning set class (0123) is followed by (0134). With exception to the beginning pitch class seven, each pitch in the set classes is the lowest note of the melodic content. This relationship is demonstrated in example 48:

![Ex. 48](image)
In the third line, the second half of the second large phrase marks the return of the opening melodic ideas. The only motive not repeated in its entirety is the (one, six, ten, four) motive. In this case, pitch class four is omitted to provide a shorter ending. Henze also adds slurs and staccato marking to further change the re-emergence of this material. The same (0134) is also produced in example 49:

As in the opening of the movement, neither one of these melodic lines produces the aggregate. The first half of the second phrase is missing pitch class 4 and the second half of the phrase lacks pitch classes 4 and 8. The last part of the second large phrase serves as transition material into the third large phrase beginning after the repeated pitch class 9.

The third large phrase, in the fourth line, contains a repeated motive from the first line, shown in example 50:
This phrase also contains the re-entrance of the end of the first phrase. Henze begins with exactly the same pitches then expands the line, first descending then ascending to the high pitch class zero. In example 51, the end of the third large phrase is expanded when compared to the end of the first phrase:

Ex. 51

Henze still has not completed the aggregate, leaving out pitch class 3 in the third large phrase.

The fourth and final large phrase is again centered around compound melodies. This time Henze frames the pedal points with the two highest and lowest notes in the phrase. The (0124) tetrachord is shown in example 52:

Ex. 52
One might assume that the Toccata is built on tetrachords. Although 4-3 appears four times, it is hard to make a final conclusion that the movement is entirely based on this set class. The incomplete aggregates, the recurring motives and expansion within those motives also are valid conclusions. It is probably safer to assume that Henze did not intend for the first movement to be based on any one method, but that he wanted to manipulate these existing ideas into his own compositional style.

When determining an interpretation for the first line, emphasis should be placed on the lowest pitches. This helps highlight the 4-3 set class occurrences as well as give the performer direction in the line. Giving the low pitches accents also helps propel the grouped figures in example 53:

![Ex. 53](image-url)
This holds true for the second and third lines as well by accenting the lowest pitches to bring out the set classes in example 54:

Ex. 54

In terms of technique, the remainder of the movement requires an extreme amount of diversity from the performer. With that in mind, there are a couple of moments that can be brought out. In example 55, the descending three-note motive from the opening can be emphasized as well as the rising d-minor seventh and E-major triad.

Ex. 55

In general, the first movement must be played aggressively with intense dynamic contrast. Insistent, assertive articulation should also dominate the first movement. Double-tonguing must be clear and exact to avoid any notes being lost in the frantic
rising and falling lines towards the ends of phrases. Since the movement is less than a
minute in duration, the performer must create a large amount of expression in a small
amount of time. Careful attention to these details should provide excellent results.

2. Canzone

Of the three movements of the Sonatina, the Canzone proves to be the most
difficult for analysis. As with the Toccata, the second movement is unmeasured.
Themes and motives are even scarcer in the Canzone, than in the Toccata, due to Henze’s
continuous music. There are a few motives sprinkled in the movement but Henze does
not state them as clearly as in the first movement. Specific mute indications in the
movement (where the mute is half off or slightly removed) might also draw attention as a
point of emphasis. This approach does not yield anything of substantial value, as with
the first movement and the beaming of notes.

The Canzone is mostly built on dyads of set classes (04), (05) and (06). These
can be found from the beginning to the end of the movement. The (04) dyad is used
twenty times, the (05) nineteen and the (06) fourteen. There is no clear pattern as to the
order of the dyads used or how often they appear at any given time.
A few motives present have some stability in the movement. In the first line, a rising three-note motive (a) is shown in example 56:

![Ex. 56](image)

Motive ‘a’ reappears at the end of the fourth line with a few rhythmic differences in the end of the theme. Another motive (b) appears at the beginning of the third line. The ‘b’ motive is built mostly on (04). The second occurrence of b is at the end of the fifth line in example 57:

![Ex. 57](image)

The ‘a’ motive goes through several instances of manipulation throughout the Canzone. After the initial occurrence in the first line, it recurs in the second line, as well as the third line and twice in the fourth line. Motive ‘a’ is always written with a slur or phrase indication and always at the beginning of a crescendo, as in example 58:
The second half of the second movement (after the first fermata) utilizes more of Henze’s mute techniques and quarter note vibrato on select pitches. The set classes (04), (05) and (06) saturate this passage and diminution is also used. In example 59, Henze introduces the quarter note vibrato on the pitch E with a three-eighth note motive (c), followed by a triplet, quintuplet and septuplet:
This phrase takes a slight break at the end of the eighth line with the return of the ‘c’ motive but is quickly restated with a sixteenth-note triplet figure. This phrase moves to a quarter note vibrato B with a crescendo and decrescendo, followed immediately by another crescendo. Each quarter note vibrato pitch up to that point only contained a crescendo followed by a decrescendo. This passage concludes with the rising melodic motion to the high C#, shown in example 60:

Ex. 60

Like the first movement, it is very difficult to make a decision on the exact basis of the second movement. The appearance of set classes (04), (05) and (06) is quite clear but the entire movement is not built on these dyads. The Canzone has even fewer motives than the Toccata; these few are only developed (if at all) to a small degree. There is a dyadic continuity throughout the movement. This is another case of how Henze manipulates the music through select repetition, sequence and dyadic solidity.

By far the most difficult performance aspect of the second movement is the use of the mute. Henze’s indication is ‘soft mute’; the most logical choice of mute would be Harmon. The Harmon provides a stark contrast to the first (open) and third (straight mute) movements and is easier to continuously remove than the cup or bucket mute. The difficulty with the mute has to do with removing it at various stages throughout the
movement. This also means the performer must keep the left hand on the mute and the bell at all times. This is awkward positioning because the performer now has to adjust to playing the instrument with one hand. The left hand is now used exclusively for the mute and not holding the instrument.

The quarter note vibrato indication is not meant to be used in the traditional sense. Instead of a very warm and lyrical, in this context it should be wider, almost closer to bending the actual pitch. Because this quarter note vibrato shows up in a number of examples in the section after the fermata, the performer should incorporate a variety of speeds and dynamics with it.

Henze has clearly written the dynamics in accordance with the rising and falling nature of the music. As noted above, the second movement is made up primarily of the dyadic set classes (04), (05) and (06). Dynamics must be exaggerated because these set classes occur either during crescendos and decrescendos or the beginnings and ends of phrases. The dyads, dynamics and phrasing also follow the melodic contour. When the melodic line rises, there are faster notes, crescendos, flutter tonguing and mute removal indications. When the line descends, there are slower figures and decrescendos.

Like the opening Toccata, the Canzone must follow a method of intense dynamic contrast. Because the Canzone is the slowest movement of the Sonatina, a lyric quality should be present while performing under the challenging conditions that Henze has put forth. Once the performer gets used to the positioning of the mute and the vibrato, the performance should be executed with the same conviction and determination as the Toccata.
3. Segnali

The third movement of the *Sonatina* is the only one that follows an overtly systematic approach: twelve-tone serialism. Even so, Henze still alters the music slightly. All but two of the rows have reversed orderings to some degree and some of the rows do not even use exact orderings.

The Segnali opens with the first row, P11. This row is immediately repeated with the first of Henze’s specific ordering changes; reversing ordered notes 9 and 10. After a complete statement of P6, every subsequent row contains reversed pitches; 9 and 10 in the P-rows and 3 and 4 in the R-rows. Appendix II aligns all of the rows showing that reversing these specific pitches was intentional by the composer.

There are a few instances of repeated pitches before proceeding to the next appropriate pitch. In the RI9 row in m. 15, the B is repeated twice before proceeding to the D#. It is also clear to see that order number 7 (D) has been moved to the end of the row. In the next row (I2), after order number 11 (B) comes a restatement of order number 6 (G). These two examples are demonstrated in example 61:

*Ex. 61*
This passage contains the only I-row in the third movement and the only time where one pitch (D) begins and ends two different rows. I2 is also where Henze reverts to unmeasured music.

Two of the rows in the Segnali are also missing specific pitches, according to the matrix in appendix II. In m. 9, the R5 row is missing order number 7 (C). It could be suggested that the C could be heard between order number 6 (A) and 8 (A#) in measure 10, shown in example 62. While this is possible there is not enough substantial reasoning to make a firm conclusion. The A going to the A# is a thirty-second note with the tempo at a brisk pace. To suggest that the listener could audibly hear the passing C occurring at the same time is difficult to grasp but not impossible. Much of the music in the Segnali is fast and difficult to clearly ascertain.

Ex. 62

The other row missing a specific pitch is in the tenth line where RI11 begins. This row is missing the C, but in this row it is order number 11. There is an outside chance that the first C in the last line could be order number 11 from the last row but as stated with the R5 row, it’s hard to justify. In example 63, order number 12 (B) of RI11 arrives at the first fermata of the movement. This repeated B is best described as order number 1 of the last row, R10.
The last row of the third movement is the most disjointed. The row is not a complete statement of any of the rows from the matrix in appendix II. The row uses hexachords from the R10 row. Four of the pitches are in the correct order: B (1), F# (3), G (5) and F (7). The order of the second hexachord is a systematic rotation, where Henze has moved the D# to the end of the row and left all of the other pitches in place (with exception to the repeated D from the first hexachord). The order of the first hexachord is also done in a similar fashion only Henze has performed a rotation of every second interval. These orderings are displayed in example 64:

H’S:  B  C  F#  D  G  C#  F  G#  E  A  A#  D#
R10:  B  C#  F#  C  G  D  F  D#  G#  E  A  A#

Ex. 64

Henze is more systematic than one might think with this movement. The reordered pitches from the rows provide an interesting look into the music. When lined
up, pitches 9 and 10 from the P-rows and 3 and 4 from the R-rows are related by a half-step. In example 65, the pitches move in criss-cross fashion ascending by half steps: 23

Ex. 65

After moving down a whole-step from the R7 to the RI9 rows, the pitches still move criss-cross, only now by descending half-step. RI7 going to RI11 is also a whole-step and the form is broken once the music reaches the hexachords of the R10 row.

Another noticeable relationship in these reordered pitches is their ascending and descending direction in the music. The direction of the B and F in the P3 row is descending and the direction of F# and C in the P10 row is ascending. A pattern can be seen in example 66:

Ex. 66

---

23 *R-rows were reversed to better show relationship.
Even in the opening P11 rows, order numbers 9 and 10 are moving in opposite directions.

It is clear that Henze had a systematic idea in mind when composing the Segnali. The reordered pitches are intentional and the ascending and descending half step motion is another aspect of Henze’s systematic reordering. The use of measures in the beginning of the movement is another indication that the composer wanted the last movement to be more structured than the previous two.

Even though Henze favored the twelve-tone approach in the Segnali, it serves as little benefit to the performer. The rows go by at such a frenetic pace that it is very difficult for the performer in any way to indicate to the audience when a new row has begun. While the rows are easy to identify in the analysis, they have a modest chance of being deciphered by the listener. Nevertheless, it is still beneficial to the performer to know what the music is based on and how it is functioning.

While there should be a steady tempo throughout the movement, there are a couple of instances where the performer may choose to hold back or push ahead with the tempo. In example 67, the opening ten-tuplet figure does not necessarily have to be played strictly in tempo. One option is to start slow and gradually get faster towards the end of the figure. This will still produce a dramatic effect albeit not as impressive if one were to play the entire gesture in a single beat.

Ex. 67
While each of these movements can be analyzed in a different way, there are a few similarities between them. As stated before, the majority of the second movement is made up of dyadic set classes (04), (05) and (06). The first movement contains an even larger number of occurrences of these same dyads: thirty for (04), twenty-six for (05) and (06) occurs fifteen times. This could bring up the notion that the entire piece is based on these dyads. The third movement, however, does not contain the same relatively equal balance of the three dyads as the first two movements do. The third movement only has eight occurrences of (04), twenty-six of (05) and only ten for (06).

Because the third movement is undoubtedly based on manipulations of a twelve-tone row, it is difficult to pin any one conclusion on the entire work. Henze’s intentions might have been for each movement to have its own identity and compositional technique. There are a few similarities between the first and second movement as well. The Toccata and Canzone contain no aggregates in any phrases. Both are unmeasured and both have minor (but valid) expansions of motivic ideas in some fashion. Henze does not follow any traditional form in any of his movements and the extreme brevity in the first and last movements emphasize this point. Perhaps Henze himself can best describe his unique use of certain systems of composition to help bring a small understanding of his *Sonatina*:

Berg is the only affinity I have to the Vienna School, to dodecaphony and twelve-note technique. I can understand dodecaphony in Berg’s sense, in other words as a language, and never quite in the sense of Webern or Schoenberg, where for me it remains theory, grammar, esotericism perhaps; a bourgeois self-affirmation.  

---

Like the Henderson and Henze pieces, Verne Reynolds’ *Calls and Echoes* furthers the unaccompanied literature by use of new ideas with the addition of another player. This piece is not a duet in the traditional sense. Neither part serves as an accompaniment to the other nor should each line be viewed as independent.

*Calls and Echoes* was written in 1986 for Barbara Butler and Charles Geyer, current trumpet professors at Northwestern University. The two recorded the piece while they were on faculty at the Eastman School of Music. The piece was not a commission from them rather it was a gift from Reynolds.

Verne Reynolds was born in Lyons, Kansas in 1926. He was in the Navy from 1944-1946 and graduated from the Cincinnati Conservatory in 1950. He was a member of the Cincinnati Symphony from 1947-1950. Reynolds received a Masters degree in composition from the University of Wisconsin in 1951 and also served on the faculty at Wisconsin from 1950-1953. He was also on faculty at Indiana University from 1954-1958 and then took a job at the Eastman School of Music in 1959 until his retirement in 1995. Reynolds was Principal Horn in the Rochester Philharmonic from 1959-1968, was a member of the American Woodwind Quintet while at Indiana University and was a founding member of the Eastman Brass Quintet.

As a composer, he has published over 60 works and has received many awards and commissions. One of his most recent publications was *The Horn Handbook*, in 1996. Mr. Reynolds has published numerous original works and is particularly well known for his transcriptions of Renaissance and Baroque music for brass quintet and horn choir.
Calls and Echoes has not been published to this date. In regards to the publishing, Charles Geyer says that “a number of his works he felt were too difficult for the general public to perform, and his publishers supported that idea. For a while he would print private copies for inquiries to perform those more difficult arrangements and compositions.”25 A large number of Reynolds compositions have yet to be published as well as a number of his transcriptions. This does not mean that he does not appreciate music of his that has not been published. Reynolds mentions that one of his favorite compositions is his unpublished piano piece Florilegium, vol. 2, written in 1983.26

Calls and Echoes begins with continuous ascending and descending triplet figures. At first glance, the piece appears to be based on whole tone and diminished scales. While there are a number of sequences of whole steps and half steps, there is never a full statement of either scale. Most of the runs from the first section (mm. 1 to 61) contain any number of variations on half and whole steps. In example 68, the first section lends itself much easier to pitch set class analysis, referenced in chapter 2:

---

The second section (mm. 62-80) is a stark contrast to the opening section. Reynolds actually begins this section back in m. 53 with the first long pitch on the ‘f’ in the lower part. He seamlessly fades out the previous section in the upper part with two final statements of 3-7. In example 69, the tempo is drastically slower and instead of immediate call and response, the trumpets now have much longer phrases to call and echo:

Ex. 69

The lower part ends with a cadential figure in example 70 (mm. 64-68) that will be used throughout this next section. While the figure is not repeated exactly, its variations are obvious. Without prior knowledge, each version of this cadential figure might be performed differently. The cadential figure becomes another theme throughout this section if both performers work to achieve the same interpretation.
In m. 68, the upper part uses a whispa mute to further highlight the distant sound of the trumpet. In mm. 68 through 80, the upper part begins a series of repeated and varied phrases. This section is much easier to perform knowing that each following phrase is an augmentation of the same pitches from mm. 68 and 69, shown in example 71:

In m. 80, the entrance of the lower part begins a long, unmeasured section that further delays the call and response of the piece. The lower part begins a large section full of short motives and ideas that the upper part will either repeat or embellish upon its entrance. In example 72, the music exhibits the two parts repeating identical motives:
Embellishments of certain passages are fairly straightforward but it is less clear to find motives that are transposed. Example 73 demonstrates how a figure in the upper part is played down a minor third in the lower part and then a whole step higher in the upper part. Emphasis should be placed on this figure in the upper part so that the two following statements are more audible to the listener.

Ex. 73

This unmeasured section should be approached in a cadenza-like fashion. While Reynolds has indicated a tempo marking, he also mentions that it should be played “freely.” As mentioned before, the cadential figure should be played with some similarity because of its occurrence in mm. 64 to 66 and mm. 77 to 80. The two performers can work together to create a variety of contrasting styles and tempos that should coincide with the given analysis.

---

27 Verne Reynolds, *Calls and Echoes*, pg. 3.
The third main section (mm. 81 to 134) returns to the immediate call and response from the opening section. This section focuses less on continuous triplets and more on interval relationships between the two parts. In example 74 (m. 83), the parts echo minor sixths and in m. 86 & 87 they are only a half step apart:

Example 75, (mm. 91-103) contains the most complex arrangement of calls and echoes. Each part explores minor sevenths, tri-tones, minor sixths, whole steps and half steps. With the entrances being so close together, Reynolds is also able to overlap the entrances by half steps as well. Rather than each performer focusing on their own part (in this section), it is more beneficial to listen to the relationship of the parts. It is easy to get caught up in the intricate rhythmic figures but the music is less complicated if the performers think of the interval and repeated relationships.
Measure 103 marks the first moment that both parts a playing a “unison” figure. Even though they are a whole step apart, this is the first instance of the two parts fusing together. This is broken in the following measure with each part reverting back to call and response with whole steps, shown in example 76:
In example 77 (m. 105), Reynolds returns to the triplet form of the opening section. This begins with ascending 3-7 and 3-6 figures followed by descending 3-2 lines in the lower part. Even though the set class analysis is not similar, the two parts contain identical notes moving in opposite directions.

Ex. 77

Both lines are ascending in example 78, (mm. 106 & 107) and the call and answer of exact set classes follows (3-6, 3-2, 3-1):

Ex. 78

The closing material of the third section (mm. 108 to 134) begins with echoing two-note segments with minor sixths in m. 108 and major seconds in m. 109. This is immediately followed by the rising triplet figures but in m. 111 they begin to rise by half
step in each part. This leads to the next unison passage (with the parts a whole step apart) at the end of m. 112 to the downbeat of m. 115 in example 79:

In mm. 116 to 134, Reynolds begins to add more rests between the parts and longer note values. Each of the parts contain sc 3-3 figures in mm. 115 and 116 before moving to a repeated augmented fourth motive in the following two measures. In example 80, this repeated motive is in both parts with the lower part moving to a perfect fifth at the end of mm. 118 and 119:
The upper part continues in m. 120 by adding a perfect fourth after the augmented fourth interval, creating sc 3-5. The lower part adds a major sixth before the augmented fourth which creates sc 3-10. These two figures are used in the following measure until Reynolds begins longer note values with the augmented fourth interval in mm. 122 and 123. The lower part is out in m. 124 with the upper part giving the final statements of the previous 3-5 and 3-10 figures before fading out with the augmented fourth interval, demonstrated in example 81:
The fourth section (mm. 135 to 170) returns to the slow material from the second section. While the themes are not the same, the overall mood and quality is quite similar. The lower part opens with three consecutive perfect fifths followed by a cadential figure which belongs to sc 3-5. The upper part begins a half step higher than the lower part but continues with three perfect fifths. In example 82, the cadential figure in mm. 152-154 is a whole step lower and belongs to 3-5 as well:
Because this section is one of the few places that contains close to exact
repetition, it is imperative that the upper part tries to emulate the lower part as much as possible. The upper part has returned to the mute but each performer should try and create the serene mood that Reynolds is trying to achieve. The fourth section is made up of almost all the same themes and cadential figures.

The final section (mm. 171-193) begins with the closing material from the third section (mm. 116-122). This sequence also begins with three consecutive perfect fifths (reminiscent of the opening of the fourth section) and end the final series of calls and echoes, shown in example 83:
Measure 177 finally combines the two lines into a unison segment until the end of the piece. In the other previous instances of similar lines at the same time, the parts were separated by a whole step (m. 103 and beat four of m.112 to m. 114). In example 84, the two performers must sound like a single instrument to provide the final contrast of the piece:
Chapter Five
Conclusion

The analysis used in this document shows its benefits towards performance. Performers are generally not accustomed to learning music through analysis. A lot of performers tend to learn solo literature through private lessons and reference recordings, rather than analysis. Another advantage to analysis is that the music is being learned without practicing the trumpet. The mental comprehension involved with analysis becomes imbedded in a performer’s memory. This memory can then be referenced at all times in future practice sessions or performance.

As mentioned earlier, previous studies written about unaccompanied trumpet literature have covered an assortment of topics. Performers can search wide listings of unaccompanied literature to determine what piece might best suit their interests and abilities. Other documents have covered analysis of specific pieces and historical background on their composers.

None of the previous scholarly writing about unaccompanied trumpet literature has covered any of the composers in this document in this amount of detail. These pieces are substantial solo works for trumpet and deserve deeper understanding. Henderson’s *Variation Movements* has been frequently recorded, Henze’s *Sonatina* is widely performed and even though Reynolds' *Calls and Echoes* has not even been published, it is still an important work by an important composer in the brass world.

Because unaccompanied music is so difficult to perform, players should take every step necessary in preparation. Dynamics must be exaggerated to a large degree because the audience has no other reference for contrast. Therefore, extreme contrasts in
range and dynamics in the beginning of a composition will help set the tone for the rest of
the piece. An example of this could be increasing the indicated dynamics in a
composition from *piano* to *mezzo-piano* or *mezzo-forte* to *forte* and so on. These
contrasts generally coincide with the analysis and help the performer achieve a desired
affect for the listener. While analysis is not the only method that should be used in
performing this music, it is definitely a catalyst in the overall preparation.
### Appendix I – Variation Movements Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D#</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F#</th>
<th>C#</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>R4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>R8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>R10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>R0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I – Variation Movements Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I4</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>G#</th>
<th>D#</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>C#</th>
<th>RI4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I6</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I7</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I8</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I10</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I11</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I10</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I11</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I12</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I13</td>
<td>D#</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>C#</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II – Sonatina Matrix

P11: B  Bb  F  A  E  F#  D#  G#  C#  G  D  C
P6:  F#  F  C  E  B  C#  A#  D#  G#  D  A  G
P3:  D#  D  A  C#  G#  A#  G  C  B  F  F#  E
P10: A#  A  E  G#  D#  F  D  G  F#  C  C#  B
R5:  F#  G#  G  C#  D  A  A#  D#  B  E  F  (C)
P0:  C  B  F#  A#  F  G  E  A  G#  D  D#  C#
R7:  G#  A#  A  D#  E  B  D  C  F  C#  F#  G
R19: G#  F#  G  C#  C  F  B  E  D#  A#  A  D
I2:  D  D#  G#  E  A  G  A#  F  F#  C  B  C#
R17: F#  E  F  B  A#  D#  C  D  A  C#  G#  G
R11: Bb  G#  A  D#  D  G  E  F#  C#  F  B  (C)
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