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Music teachers generally agree that students learn the most about music by engaging with the highest quality examples. Band directors have the responsibility to select this kind of music for their student musicians, which is relatively easy at the high school level. However, the middle school level lacks a comparable core repertoire of established artistic music.

As a music education major who is entering the Master of Arts in Teaching program and who eventually wants to teach in middle school, I am always looking for ways to increase my knowledge of music education issues. An opportunity to do this presented itself when I successfully applied for a Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship (SURF) from the University of New Hampshire for the summer of 2008. My project was to help fill the middle school music void by researching the characteristics of high–quality band music for this age level and using this information to craft my own examples. To do this, I planned to spend the spring studying select middle school band scores and then use my results to guide the orchestration of such a piece or pieces during the summer.

Analyzing the Musical Scores

The restrictions of a middle school band’s musical skills can make it difficult for composers to write music that is engaging and artistic while also being technically feasible for the students’ developing skills. Middle school students typically are in grades five or six through eight or nine, which translates to ages eleven to fourteen or fifteen. They frequently have just begun instrumental music lessons and have only basic facility with their instruments. The older middle school students may be more advanced, but many of them have recently switched from common beginning instruments (flutes, clarinets, trumpets, saxophones) to the more difficult secondary instruments (oboe, tuba, bassoon, French horn) and are essentially beginners again. Additionally, students are still learning the basic skills involved in playing in an ensemble, which means the music can be neither technically rigorous nor structurally complicated.

To clarify these differences and help teachers identify pieces that will be most suitable for their ensemble, music is ranked, usually by publishers, on a scale of difficulty (called grades or grade levels) from one to six. Grade level one is an early beginner piece; grade level six is intended for advanced college or professional groups; and grades two to three are a middle school or early high school range. While many well known, high-quality pieces of band literature exist for the higher grade levels, lower grade level pieces rarely enjoy the same prominence or quality.
To explore this problem, I asked Dr. Andrew Boysen, Jr., Director of Bands at UNH, to become my mentor because of his extensive knowledge of band repertoire and orchestration. Indeed, I first became intrigued by the middle school band music problem in his orchestration class. Our first step involved searching for examples of middle school band music that are widely recognized for being high quality and appropriate for younger students. We identified several books written by music educators and music publishers that listed many such band pieces. (See References) We selected eight scores composed for middle school band that were cross-referenced in the most lists and, therefore, the most consistently well regarded by music educators and also by Dr. Boysen. They are, in approximate ascending order of difficulty: Ancient Voices by Michael Sweeney; The Red Balloon by Anne McGinty; The Battle Pavane by Tielman Susato, arr. Bob Margolis; Portrait of a Clown by Frank Ticheli; Air for Band by Frank Erickson; On a Hymnsong of Philip Bliss by David Holsinger; Yorkshire Ballad by James Barnes; and Snakes! by Thomas Duffy.

I studied them in depth to analyze many musical and technical factors. I listened to all of the pieces many times, took notes, made charts, and recorded the data into a large outline on the computer. The factors I analyzed were:

- Instrumentation—which instruments, how many of each, and how many parts for each instrument.
- Harmonic, melodic, and structural forms—how the composer organized the piece.
- Style—qualitative characteristics as they pertain to the genre of the piece.
- Time signature—the meter of the piece, which can change.
- Rhythms—combinations of notes of differing lengths.
- Key signatures—automatic sharps or flats in the piece.
- Length—performance time of the piece in minutes and seconds.
- Doublings—which instruments played by themselves or with others and when.
- Dynamics—levels of loud and soft.
- Instrumental ranges—how high and low each instrument played in the piece.

For some of the factors, such as dynamics and doublings, I simply made notes in the score so I could reference them during my orchestration stage. For instrumental ranges, I created a chart of the highest and lowest notes played by each instrument in each piece. (See Appendix A) I organized my detailed analysis of the other factors separately for easier reference. (See Appendix B)

Instrumentation varied directly with grade level. Higher level pieces generally had more complicated instrumentation than lower grade levels. Complicated instrumentation implies that each instrument is divided into several parts and there are more different instruments. Although every piece I studied contained similar core instrumentation for wind instruments, which was expanded according to grade level, there was little consistency in the percussion. The number and type of percussion parts were directly related to the style of the piece.

The category of style was the most difficult to quantify—or even qualify—because of the variations within each piece. This category is not as related to grade level as others are because it correlates more to genre. A listener identifies style when she responds to characteristics of the piece, such as fast or slow, smooth or choppy, loud or soft; and how their contrasts contribute to the overall effect. I tried to identify the characteristic styles of each piece and some of its notable or representative “colors,” or dominating sounds which provide contrast. These style characteristics can include texture, such as “thin” or “full,” “brassy” or “reedy;” whether the notes are performed as separated or connected (articulations); and combinations of other elements such as doublings. Most of the pieces included legato or sustained sections that allow students to musically comprehend more easily what they are performing. Many pieces were wholly or partly programmatic, meaning that they represented through music nonmusical themes, people, or events. For example, McGinty’s The Red Balloon and Duffy’s Snakes! depict musically the images in their titles. The musical material for most of the pieces were original compositions or unfamiliar to the students.
A composer organizes a piece according to harmonic, melodic, and structural forms. Most of the pieces I analyzed used simple, straightforward forms that involved copious repetition; some had embellishments or codas (endings) added to the form. Each piece tended to be built on relatively few themes or melodies. This probably helps students comprehend the music structurally and musically. The time signature of most pieces involved a large portion of 4/4, a common time signature easy for students to internalize and count. Variations on the time signature, such as 3/4, had to do with the style as well as the grade level of the piece. Rhythms, the lengths of notes and their combinations, also directly correlated to grade level, especially in the careful treatment of syncopation and ties over bar lines in the lower grade level pieces. Percussion tended to have more complicated rhythms than wind instruments.

Key signature indicates the key of each piece (its sharps or flats), which alters the difficulty level, especially for younger students. Although key signature is not apparent to most listeners, B♭ Major is the most common key in early beginning pieces because it is easy for most beginning players in that the fingerings are simple and the notes fall in a comfortable range. Interestingly, all of the pieces I analyzed were in different keys, with only one in B♭ Major in its simplest form. This suggests that high quality middle school band music challenges students to expand their facility in the key signature arena. Accidentals, which are additional sharps or flats, add an extra level of challenge and are considered when evaluating the level of difficulty of a piece.

In analyzing length, I found that no pieces were shorter than 2:15 minutes or longer than 4:30. The average length was approximately 3:30, which I deduce is an optimal length because it allows the composer to develop musical ideas in a convincing way while not presenting endurance problems, especially for young brass players.

Overall, the pieces I analyzed approach high-quality band music in different yet related ways. I was expecting there to be a high correlation between the grade level and the combinations of difficult elements in these pieces, which I found was true between grade levels but not within each grade level. Grade 3 pieces were more difficult and complicated than grade 2 pieces, but pieces within each grade level contained different types of difficult elements. For example, the Holsinger piece, *On a Hymnsong of Philip Bliss*, has simple rhythms, a time signature of 4/4, straightforward form, comfortable ranges of pitch and dynamics, and few accidentals. However, the key signature is more difficult (D♭), and the doubling includes exposed and solo passages. Both of these factors require musicians of higher skill levels, so the grade level is higher, at 3. Other grade 3 pieces, such as *Yorkshire Ballad* and *Snakes!*, contain different types and amounts of difficult elements. In that way, there is little consistency of combinations of difficult elements within the grade level.

The analysis stage, which lasted from the spring into the summer, greatly increased my understanding of the structure of middle school band music in both its larger concepts and smaller details. Based on my analyses and the summer orchestration practice which followed, I feel confident that I could study a piece of middle school band music and determine its quality for use in a middle school band.

**Orchestration**

For the second part of my project, Dr. Boysen helped me orchestrate my own arrangements for middle school band. Orchestration is the process of arranging a piece of music for a particular set of instruments, which, in this case, is the instrumentation most common in the middle school band pieces I analyzed. I wanted a variety of styles, like those I saw in the band scores, and I also wanted to be able to use these scores in an interdisciplinary lesson plan for my senior honors thesis. Most importantly, I wanted my orchestration to suit the skill level of a middle school band. Dr. Boysen helped me select two pieces that fulfilled these requirements.

First, I chose Tchaikovsky’s fantasy-overture *Romeo and Juliet* because of its familiar melodic themes, wide recognition as a quality piece of music, and ties to English literature. I analyzed the entire overture to *Romeo and Juliet* for form, instrumentation, style, and complexity. I also listened to several recordings, each with different musical interpretations, to familiarize myself with the style of the piece and the effects that Tchaikovsky intended to produce. Second, I selected a Brazilian folk tune, “Suspira, Coracao Triste,” as the
basis for another piece because of its ties to world culture, its appealing melody, and simple harmonies. To prepare myself for orchestrating this song, I listened to many recordings of Brazilian and Portuguese music and researched the origins of Brazilian music.

The first page of the author's score of her “Love Theme” arrangement:
Although I originally wanted to condense the entire *Romeo and Juliet* overture into a three-minute arrangement for middle school band, my resulting drafts sounded too frantic and lacked cohesiveness. I had cut out so much musical material that the piece sounded thrown together, whereas I wanted it to flow as organically as the original did. I then selected the overture’s most familiar melody, the “Love Theme,” as the basis for my piece.

As Dr. Boysen helped me through the orchestration process, we relied on information gained from my analyses to justify all of my orchestration choices. In other words, every time I made an orchestrating decision, I found an instance in a piece I analyzed where the composer made a similar decision. For example, when I orchestrated a quiet, flowing part of my arrangement, I studied quiet, flowing parts of the pieces I analyzed and imitated the composer’s doublings, dynamics, ranges, and style. As another example, the ranges of the instruments in my “Love Theme” arrangement stay within the instrumental ranges of the middle school band pieces I analyzed. I put my piece in the key of $E_b$, a close neighbor to $B_b$. Once I had developed more drafts of the “Love Theme” arrangement, I sent them to Dr. Boysen and he commented on them. Eventually, I produced a finished draft that he approved. I went through the same process for “Suspira, Coracao Triste.” The summer ended before I finished this second piece, but I completed it with Dr. Boysen’s help during the following fall semester. (Click here to listen to the piece played by the UNH Wind Symphony.)

**Performance**

Dr. Boysen generously offered to have the UNH Wind Symphony, which he directs and in which I play the clarinet, premiere my “Love Theme” piece during the installation ceremony of UNH President Mark Huddleston on September 16, 2008. (Click here to listen to the piece played by the UNH Wind Symphony.) It was thrilling to participate in rehearsing and performing my piece for a live audience. I was able to hear the transition from how the music sounds on the computer to how it sounds played by a real ensemble. I also heard which aspects of my arrangement were successful and which aspects I would change. The sense of accomplishment I gained from being recognized by an audience for a piece that I crafted was worth all of the revisions and difficulties. Dr. Boysen and the Wind Symphony recorded both of the pieces I wrote so I could send the finished scores and recordings to publishing companies. I am currently waiting to hear from these publishers who are reviewing my pieces, which is an exciting and valuable experience. Although I do not expect to be successful right away, it would be a huge asset to my career and experience with band music.

This project has given me a lot of experience with the research process, middle school band scores, orchestration, analysis, music literature, project and time management, and working with a mentor. It will help my career because I now feel familiar and comfortable with middle school band music. I will know some of the qualities to look for when I select band repertoire for my future middle school band. I will understand the reasons that the pieces are written the way they are, and I will be able to translate that knowledge into success for my students.

*I am very grateful for the financial support provided by Mrs. Elizabeth Lunt Knowles and Mr. Dana Hamel through the Hamel Center for Undergraduate Research. I owe many thanks to Dr. Andrew Boysen, Jr. for his expert mentorship and support before, during, and after my research. His guidance and knowledge have been vital in my discovery of the research process.*
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Appendix A: Instrumental Written Ranges

Appendix B: Detailed Analysis Results

1. Grade Level (publisher ratings)
   1. *Ancient Voices*, by Michael Sweeney (1, 2)
   2. *The Red Balloon*, by Anne McGinty (1.5, 2)
   4. *Portrait of a Clown*, by Frank Ticheli (2, 3)
   5. *Air for Band*, by Frank Erickson (2, 3)
   6. *On a Hymnsong of Philip Bliss*, by David Holsinger (3)
   7. *Yorkshire Ballad*, by James Barnes (3)
   8. *Snakes!*, by Thomas Duffy (3)

2. Instrumentation
   1. Common Instrumentation (usual number of parts)
      1. Flute (1)
      2. Oboe (1)
      3. Bb Clarinet (3)
      4. Bass Clarinet (1)
5. Bassoon (1–2)
6. Alto Saxophone (2)
7. Tenor Saxophone (1)
8. Baritone Saxophone (1)
9. Bb Trumpet (3)
10. French Horn (2)
11. Trombone (3)
12. Baritone Horn/Euphonium—Tenor and Bass Clef (1)
13. Tuba (1)
14. Percussion (see Section I.C.)

2. Optional/Unique Instrumentation (number of pieces that used them)
   1. Piccolo (3, including 1 optional)
   2. Flute
      1. Two parts (1)
      2. Three parts (1)
   3. Oboe
      1. Optional (1)
      2. Two parts (1)
   4. Eb Clarinet (1)
   5. Bb Clarinet
      1. Two parts (3)
   6. Eb Alto Clarinet (3, including 1 optional)
   7. Contralto/Contrabass Clarinet (2)
   8. Alto Saxophone—one part (3)
   9. Tenor Saxophone—optional (1)
 10. Trumpet
     1. Two parts (3)
     2. Trumpet/Cornet (2)
     3. Cornet (1)
 11. Horns
     1. One part (3, including 1 optional)
     2. Four parts (1)
 12. Trombones
     1. One part (3)
     2. Two parts (1)
 13. Tuba—Octave divisi (1)
 14. String Bass (3)
 15. Bells—2 separate parts, included in two percussion parts
 16. Xylophone (1)
 17. Timpani, two drums (4)
 18. Recorder (1—optional doubling with flutes)
 19. Voices (1)
 20. Pencil tapping doubled with percussion (1)

3. Percussion Instrumentation (number of percussion parts)
   1. Triangle, Snare Drum, Suspended Cymbal, Claves, Tambourine, Bass Drum, Bells—McGinty (5)
   2. Triangle, Suspended Cymbal, Crash Cymbals, Bass Drum, Snare Drum—Holsinger (3–4)
   3. Bongos, Maracas, Gong, Snare Drum, Sizzle Cymbal, Flexitone, Bass Drum, Timpani (two), Bean Shaker, Vibraslap—Duffy (6)
   4. Castanets, Snare Drum, Bass Drum, Wind Chimes, Suspended Cymbal, Medium or Low Tom, Triangle, Gong, Shaker, Crash Cymbal, optional Bells—Sweeney (4–8 +1 optional)
   5. Snare Drum, Bass Drum, Tambourine, Triangle, Cymbal, Woodblock—Ticheli (3–5)
6. Timpani (two), Bells, Triangle, Suspended Cymbal—Barnes (4)
7. Snare Drum, Crash Cymbals—Erickson (2)
8. Tenor Drum, Tambourine, Snare Drum, Field Drum, two pairs Crash Cymbals, Bass Drum, Tam–Tam, Triangle, Glockenspiel, Chimes—Margolis (4–8)

3. Keys
   1. G Minor/Modal—Sweeney
   2. Bb Major—Margolis
   3. Bb Major accompaniment with Bb Lydian melody—Ticheli
   4. Tonal shifting/lots of C and flat keys Lydian and Major—McGinty
   5. C harmonic minor/modal—Duffy
   6. C Minor to C Major—Erickson
   7. Db Major—Holsinger
   8. Bb Major to Eb Major—Barnes

4. Time Signatures/Other Meters
   1. 4/4 plus 1 measure 2/4—Sweeney
   2. 4/4—Margolis, Ticheli, Barnes (quarter–note pickup), Erickson
   3. 3/4—McGinty
   4. 4/4 plus 17 measures 3/4 plus 4 measures 2/4—Duffy (also unmetered measures)
   5. 4/4 plus two measures 2/4 plus one measure 5/4—Holsinger

5. Structural Form
   1. Sweeney
      1. Intro—percussion and wind through instruments, quiet (mm. 1–8)
      2. A Theme—flute and oboe melody, tone clusters (mm. 9–33)
      3. B Theme—pencil tapping on stand, voices, low winds and brass motive, growing to higher winds (mm. 34–58)
      4. C Theme—builds B section, tutti, forte (mm. 59–68)
      5. A Theme—recapitulation, tempo I (mm. 69–78)
      6. Coda—A Theme melody, B and C Theme tempo, grows to tutti fortissimo (mm. 79–89)
      7. Simplifies to Intro–A–B–C–A–Coda

   2. McGinty
      1. A Theme—A1 and A2 melody segments, light, airy, floating, high woodwinds, bells, moderately fast (mm. 1–16)
      2. A1 Theme—tutti, mezzo forte, lyrical; melody in oboes, clarinets, horns, bells (mm. 17–24)
      3. A1 Theme—cornet/trumpet melody, darker, softer accompaniment (mm. 25–36)
      4. Development of A1 Theme—low brass and woodwind melody, ritardando (mm. 37–46)
      5. A Theme—recapitulation, a tempo (47–62)
      6. Second Development of A1 Theme, A2—forte, optional cornet solo, sustained (mm. 63–80)
      7. Coda—A1 Theme, melody shifts between flutes, cornets, and bells, gradual diminuendo (mm. 81–92)
      8. Simplifies to A–B–A–B–A

   3. Margolis
      1. A Theme—smooth, sustained, mezzo piano; horn melody, low brass accompaniment (mm. 1–8)
      2. A Theme repetition—strong, full, forte; horn and Bb clarinet melody, low clarinets, bassoon, low brass accompaniment (mm. 9–16)
      3. B Theme—warm, sustained, smooth; clarinets and low brass scored by family (mm. 17–24)
      4. B Theme repetition—brass and bassoon fortissimo, tutti piano, crescendo to forte (mm. 25–32)
5. C Theme—melody switches instruments: Bb clarinets to horns to flutes and clarinets (mm. 33–40)
6. C Theme repetition—continuing to alternate colors: muted trumpet and bassoon to bass clarinet and trombone to flutes to alto saxophones to clarinet and flute and euphonium (mm. 41–48)
7. D Theme—louder, sharply accented or sustained, full tone (mm. 49–56)
8. D Theme repetition—builds to tutti fortissimo (mm. 57–64)
9. Simplifies to A–B–C–D

4. Ticheli
1. Intro—staccato, forte, moderately fast (mm. 1–8)
2. A Theme—flute and oboe, Bb Lydian melody, playful and light (mm. 9–16)
3. A Theme repeated—thicker instrumentation, plus xylophone on melody (mm. 17–25)
4. Transition—style of A theme (mm. 26–33)
5. B Theme—gentle, flowing, legato/slurred melody in flutes (mm. 34–41)
6. B Theme repetition—plus oboes on melody (mm. 42–49)
7. B1 Theme—lyrical, flowing (mm. 50–57)
8. B Theme repetition—espressivo, slurred (mm. 58–67)
9. A Theme—recapitulation, alternate legato and staccato articulations (mm. 68–76)
10. A Theme repetition—recapitulation, forte, tutti, crescendo (mm. 77–84)
11. A Theme repetition—alternate legato and staccato articulations, fortissimo, tutti (mm. 85–93)
12. Coda—recapitulation of Transition, staccato, thin scoring, softer (mm. 94–101)
13. Simplifies to Intro–A–B–A–Coda

5. Erickson
1. A Theme—Bb clarinets melody, dark woodwind and brass accompaniment, all slurred, piano (mm. 1–8)
2. A Theme repetition—tutti scoring, same style, mezzo piano (mm. 9–16)
3. B Theme—melody in 1st flute, oboe, clarinet, trumpet, horn, 2nd alto saxophone; large hairpin from piano to fortissimo to piano; tutti scoring including percussion introduction (mm. 17–25)
4. Transition—brass choir; piano, still all slurred (mm. 26–27)
5. A1 Theme—recapitulation of opening, development of melody; similar scoring (mm. 28–35)
6. C Theme—canonic melody between woodwind voices; relates to A Theme, still soft and legato (mm. 36–43)
7. Coda—shifts to Major tonality, crescendo and ritardando; melody in 1st flute, clarinet, trumpet (mm. 43–53)
8. Simplifies to A–B–A–C–Coda

6. Holsinger
1. A Theme—Bb clarinet and alto saxophone melody, lush sound, piano (mm. 1–8)
2. B Theme—hymnsong of four phrases plus ending phrase, mostly scored by register; melody shifts between different instruments on each phrase, suddenly slightly slower on ending phrase (mm. 9–30)
3. A Theme—recapitulation of introduction, almost identically scored, piano (mm. 31–38)
4. Transition—crescendo, accents, accidentals, time signature changes, growing intensity (39–41)
5. B Theme—recapitulation of hymnsong, faster tempo, mostly scored by family, ending phrase slow and expressive, rallentando (mm. 42–63)
6. Coda—Most of A Theme, scored similarly, rallentando, piano (mm. 64–70)
7. Simplifies to A–B–A–Trans–B–Coda(A)

7. Barnes
1. A Theme—adagio, legato and sostenuto, forte, melody in clarinets and horns (mm. 1–16)
2. A Theme—same melody, different accompaniment; piano, thin woodwind quintet scoring, grows at the end (mm. 17–32)
3. A Theme—same melody, different accompaniment, includes new countermelodies; key change, faster; scored in brass choir and tutti fortissimo (mm. 33–48)
4. Coda—Variation of first phrase of A Theme; tranquillo, legato, color changes, piano (mm. 49–59)
   5. Simplifies to A–A–A–Coda
8. Duffy
   1. A Section—loud, accented, moderato; prominent percussion; lots of dissonance; fortissimo 2/4 section (mm. 1–21)
   2. Transition—piano, legato, percussion motive begins (mm. 22–28)
   3. B Section (repeats two times)—sparse, accented low winds/brass line, percussion motive continues (mm. 29–36)
   4. C Section (repeats two times)—continues B Section; adds “snake–charmer theme” in piccolo, oboe, tenor saxophone, 1st trumpet with straight mute; shouting vocals (mm. 37–43)
   5. Transition—percussion, vocals (mm. 44–46)
   6. D Section (repeats two times)—continues C Section; adds downward woodwind runs; tutti scoring (mm. 47–54)
   7. E Section—programmatic interlude; representation of snakes, aleatoric notation, eerie, legato style (mm. 56–59)
   8. Coda—B/C/D section percussion restarts, big decrescendo with vocals (mm. 60–65)
6. Rhythms
   1. “Simple combinations of whole, dotted–half, half, quarter, eighth notes. Percussion includes motive of eighth/two sixteenth” (Miles, R., Vol. I, 71). Also includes some ties, especially over bar lines, more complicated entrances to put together—Sweeney
   2. Dotted–quarter/eighth, quarters, halves, dotted halves, ties across barlines, mostly simple to put together—McGinty
   4. Quarters, eighths, halves, wholes, some ties, basic rhythms, (more complicated in middle)—Ticheli
   5. Halves, quarters, eighths, eighth–rest/three eighths; very simple combinations, accompaniment is especially simple—Erickson
   6. Eighths, halves, quarters, wholes, some syncopated ties—Holsinger
   7. Lots of eighths, quarters, ties, sixteenth note runs in winds, triplet sixteenths/eighth in percussion, tricky for young bands to put together—Duffy
   8. Eighths, quarters, dotted–quarter/eighth, halves, wholes, syncopation in accompaniment lines, no sixteenths—Barnes
7. Length
   1. ~4:00—Sweeney
   2. ~2:30–3:00—McGinty
   3. ~3:00—Margolis
   4. ~2:15–2:45—Ticheli
   5. ~3:30—Duffy, Erickson
   6. ~3:45–4:30—Holsinger
   7. ~3:45–4:15—Barnes

8. Style/Material/Tempo
   1. Suggests moods and sounds of early civilizations; mysterious, andante, legato and slurred articulations, intense fast marcato section, lots of percussion, singing in perfect fifths—Sweeney
2. Programmatic based on a painting; original melody, moderato, floatingly, slurs, legato, ethereal style—McGinty
3. Arrangement of 16\textsuperscript{th}–century pavane melody; andante, sustained, full, smooth; some accents—Margolis
4. Programmatic representation of a clown; playful Bb Lydian melody in staccato sections; flowing legato section; 160 throughout—Ticheli
5. Original air; flowing, legato, slow, lush texture—Erickson
6. 19\textsuperscript{th}–century hymn; freely, flowing, slur and legato articulations, range of slow/moderate tempo—Holsinger
7. Original folksong in the style of Percy Grainger; legato, sostenuto articulations; adagio and piu mosso tempo—Barnes
8. Programmatic exploration of different snakes; uses modal motives, contemporary techniques and notation; marcato moderato section, legato slurred adagio section; wide range of articulations; uses vocals, extensive percussion—Duffy
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