Précis

Steve Reich is one of the most renowned American composers of the post-modern era. Using a style that is generally referred to as minimalism, Reich has affected the perception of music and has influenced many composers. Among his compositions is New York Counterpoint (1985), written for one live performer on clarinet and recorded sound. In the recorded part there are ten clarinets, three of them doubling bass clarinet. The piece was selected to be performed as a part of a degree-required senior recital.

The piece is challenging if one chooses to create the recorded part, as encouraged by the composer. With current recording technology, the process could be made simpler by recording the core materials for each part and each movement, then editing and multiplying these fragments together to create whole parts. Doing so would save the performer the stress of performing each part in its twelve-minute entirety. There could be drawbacks to recording in this fashion, since the parts would have to sound as if they were naturally produced. This project aims to determine whether recording the piece by fragments rather than by complete part produces an artistically acceptable recording in a more efficient manner.

Research began with an analysis, starting the identification of fragments. Once the fragments were identified, recording and editing commenced in the WSU Recording Studio. Early concerns about recording fragments rather than whole parts were: attaining the smoothness of each line and managing the changing dynamics of the piece. These problems did not materialize, as the recording studio editor could create each part from fragments with ease and capability. In only five sessions, as opposed to a projected eight sessions, the entire recording was generated and edited for performance.

Two performances of the piece, one partial and the other complete, showed that this recording technique met the goal of producing a natural-sounding recording. Because of the
efficient manner of putting the parts together, the project was deemed a success. Application of current recording techniques to this work will encourage other performers to program this work.
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I. Creative Challenge

*New York Counterpoint* (1985), composed by Steve Reich, presents many challenges to anyone wishing to perform it. I have long wished to program the work since hearing it in 2006, and I saw an opportunity to do so in my degree-required senior recital. The only advice Reich gives to the performer who wishes to make his or her own recording was to record at least sixteen tracks to allow for alternate takes.\(^1\) In this perspective, the process of making the recording seemed prohibitively difficult. Recording all ten of the accompanying clarinet parts in their twelve-minute entireties would take intense concentration to both maintain rhythmic stability and to be error-free. I also suffer from intermittent pain in my jaw caused by temporomandibular joint disorder (TMJ). To perform these ten parts in a limited space of time would aggravate the disorder.

With digital recording and current editing software, I envisioned recording the core fragments of this material, then duplicating and editing the fragments as needed. This would solve both the artistic and physical challenges of recording this material. It was not known to me whether a recording studio, with current software, would be able to create a part that would still sound as if I had played the entire part in the traditional manner. I set out on this artistic experiment to see if the modern recording studio could edit fragments of parts into naturally-sounding clarinet lines. This technique, if found to be less physically stressful yet artistically valid, would encourage other performers who had thought the work too difficult to be able to program it.

II. Body of Knowledge

The first step in this project is analyzing *New York Counterpoint*. To analyze the work, one must understand the compositional technique, including its origins, development, and application to the piece, and previous entries in the genre of clarinet and recorded sound.

A. Steve Reich

Steve Reich (b. 1936) is one of the most lauded and influential American composers of the post-modern era. He started composing in the early 1960s, and was quickly categorized with other artists such as Terry Riley, LaMonte Young, and Phillip Glass as composing in an experimental musical style that would come to be called minimalism, although the music of these composers varies widely. Reich was particularly intrigued by the creation of music through processes:

*The distinctive thing about musical processes is that they determine all the note-to-note (sound-to-sound) details and the overall form simultaneously...I am interested in a perceptible process. I want to be able to hear the process happening throughout the sounding music.*

A very simple musical process is the canon, in which one voice starts a melody, and a second voice starts the same melody but on a different beat.

In his early compositions from 1964 to 1970, Reich believed that “musical processes can give one a direct contact with the impersonal and also a kind of complete control,” explaining that a composer could, to some degree, control the results of the process, but have the results arrive through the impersonal means of the process. These early works are written for small ensembles, usually consisting of no more than five players or voices, and make frequent use of electronic equipment.

---

3 Reich, *Writings on Music* 35.
Reich’s later works would grow more complex than his earlier works. Although rhythmic drive and processes still remained the basis for his music, pieces such as *Drumming* (1970-71), *Music for Mallet Instruments, Voices, and Organ* (1973), and *Music for Eighteen Musicians* (1974-76) are written for large ensembles in multiple sections composed of numerous processes that intersect to form larger patterns. The electronic equipment featured in his early works largely disappears save for electric keyboards and amplification devices.

A distinct structure emerges in each piece, clearly formed by Reich and not by a musical process. K. Robert Schwarz believes that this indicated that Reich was becoming “doubt[ful] not only about the audibility of process, but about the entire doctrine of impersonability.”

Schwarz portrays the later music of Reich as a tension between process and intuition, whereby the strict processes that Reich championed in his early career are made obscure by intuitive decisions on Reich’s parts to slightly alter the processes.

Portraying Reich’s later work as a struggle between strict process music and the composer’s intuition is misleading. Reich has always acknowledged the importance of his intuition in setting up his processes, such as determining pitches, harmonic content, the number of processes, and so on. His later music reflects the growing influence of a variety of musical sources: West African tribal drumming, Balinese gamelan music, Hebrew cantillation, and more familiarity with the sounds and capabilities of musical instruments. Instead of compromising his view of processes, Reich incorporated what he learned composing strict process music into his growing musical vocabulary.

---

5 Reich, *Writings on Music* 35.
B. New York Counterpoint

*New York Counterpoint* for clarinet and tape or clarinet ensemble was written during this period of growing complexity in Reich’s works. The piece is part of a series of three *Counterpoint* pieces: the first, titled *Vermont Counterpoint* (1982), was written for flute and tape, and the third, *Electric Counterpoint* (1988), was written for guitar and tape. The pieces mark a return to recorded sound not seen since Reich’s earlier pieces, which continue in his post-*Counterpoint* compositions, including the Grammy Award-winning *Different Trains* (1988).

The genre of tape and instrument ensembles is as old as the magnetic tape itself, with entries from a variety of composers, such as *Déserts* (1950-54) by Edgard Varèse and *Philomel* (1964) by Milton Babbitt. Part of the reason for popularity of combining live and taped sounds is the ability of the tape to bridge the gap between tradition and modernity for electronic music composers. Concert halls were traditionally conservative venues, and a piece played entirely on a tape deck would have been difficult to present to an audience expecting live performances. The particular genre for clarinet and tape was not invented by Reich in *New York Counterpoint*. There have been many contributions to the genre, such as Olly Wilson’s *Echoes* (1974), Roger Hannay’s *Pied Piper* (1975), and David Alan’s *Composition for Clarinet and Tape* (1976). In F. Gerard Errante’s article on clarinet and electronics published in 1985, he stated that “the great piece for clarinet with electronics has yet to be written” since most of the pieces written had no perceivable coordination between the tape and the clarinet, “result[ing] in what seems to be a

---

7 The use of “tape” from this point onward will refer to recorded sound designated by the composer and not a specific magnetic tape recording.
conventional clarinet piece with electronic sound effects in the background.\textsuperscript{10} It is important to note that while \textit{New York Counterpoint} was written in 1985, it was not premiered until 1986.

In contrast to these pieces, Reich’s \textit{New York Counterpoint} is a carefully coordinated contrapuntal work between the clarinet and the tape in three uninterrupted movements. The recorded sound is not electronic music, since the tape consists of an ensemble of clarinets that is not electrically generated or electronically distorted.\textsuperscript{11} The tape does not present radical electronic musical ideas to the audience; instead, it provides an invisible chorus of clarinets that both support the live clarinet and direct it to new ideas. The piece displays elements used in Reich’s previous works: the concept of live instrument with taped accompaniment from \textit{Vermont Counterpoint}, an insistent series of pulses from \textit{Music for Eighteen Musicians}, the use of resulting melodies rising from dense canonic textures from the early work \textit{Violin Phase} (1967), and a faster rate of change and harmonic combinations inspired by the \textit{Sextet} (1985).\textsuperscript{12}

The production of the tape presents the largest obstacle to a performer wishing to play this piece. It is unlikely that a performer could record a twelve-minute piece without making a mistake. Recording technology of the time made editing cumbersome. The method for editing magnetic tape required a razor blade, splicing tape, a splicing block, a ruler to measure the passage of time on the tape, and depended on careful cuts and proper application of splicing tape.\textsuperscript{13}

If one chose to record each part without edits, there were still difficulties from playing each part in its entirety. Playing large sections of a twelve-minute piece, most of which is repetitive, and remembering the changes whenever they happen requires intense concentration.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{10} Errante, “Performing with Tape” 63.
\textsuperscript{12} Reich, \textit{Writings on Music} 135.
\textsuperscript{13} Holmes, \textit{Electronic and Experimental Music} 80.
\end{flushright}
Maintaining this level of concentration over ten parts is extraordinarily difficult. The piece must be performed with as much rhythmic precision as possible, as the effect of the piece relies upon a unified tempo between all ten parts.

There is also the option of renting a taped accompaniment from Boosey & Hawkes, the publishers of the piece. This would not create the ideal presentation of the work. The soloist would be playing with an accompanying clarinet ensemble that has different pitch and volume tendency from his or her playing style. The rented tape also restricts the soloist’s latitude in interpreting dynamics, articulation, and other musical aspects of the piece. Therefore, the best option to performing the piece is for the musician to make the recording his or herself.

III. Methodology

A. An Analysis of *New York Counterpoint*

Musical analysis must be understood in the context of the composer’s language. Traditional analysis focuses on the motion of form, functional harmonic structure, and phrase structure. Process music requires non-traditional analytical techniques. In *New York Counterpoint*, form is defined by the beginning and end of musical processes. The harmonies are derived from groups of notes selected from modes, instead of from vertical chords. Rather than being a homophonic piece with reliance on a single melodic line, the effect is polyphonic. In order to identify the fragments for recording, one must make a thorough analysis of the piece.

*New York Counterpoint* is divided into three movements following a fast-slow-fast pattern, despite the fact that the speed of the pulse does not change between any of the movements. The first movement has a tempo marking of quarter note = ca. 184, and begins

---

14 All analysis of the piece refers to the full score of Reich *New York Counterpoint*.
with pulsing eighth-notes. The notes in the pulses are derived from modes as opposed to major and minor scales, and the progression of each harmonic area does not align with traditional Western harmonic practices. The modes used in the first movement are E-flat Aeolian,\textsuperscript{15} which is the prevalent harmony, and A-flat Mixolydian, which, in the introduction, is used only at rehearsals 2 and 6. Three measures before rehearsal 8, taped clarinet 1 plays a distinct melody as the last statement of pulses from all the recorded clarinets fade out, beginning the first process of the piece. At rehearsal 9 the live clarinet part continues this process by introducing new melodic lines that function as quasi-canons to the taped clarinet 1 line. Each line is then taken up by taped clarinets 2 through 6, until a dense canonic structure is fully developed. The structure is divided into three separate rhythmic statements using pitches from the E-flat Aeolian mode, with taped clarinets 1, 2, and 3 paired with taped clarinets 4, 5, and 6, respectively; taped clarinets 1, 2, and 3 chiefly sound in the upper register, while taped clarinets 4, 5, and 6 sound chiefly in the lower register.

Once this process is complete at rehearsal 36, the live clarinet part starts a second process by playing a series of composite melodies drawn from the interlocking canonic material, while taped clarinet 7 and 8 and bass clarinets 9 and 10 start a series of pulses similar to the introduction at rehearsal 37. These pulses serve as the indicator that the process of creating the canonic texture is complete, and that a new process has begun. The live clarinet part plays three other composite melodies, with two abrupt changes in harmony to the A-flat Mixolydian mode at rehearsals 39 and 42 that do not affect the rhythmic insistency. After the last composite melody ends at rehearsal 43, all voices except taped clarinets 1 and 4 fade out.

\textsuperscript{15} All modes and notes are given in concert notation, as opposed to the written notation of the B-flat clarinet.
There is no pause between movements 1 and 2. The shift from the first to the second movement utilizes a metric modulation; the half note of the first movement equals the quarter note of the second movement, the effect being that the pulse remains constant between the two movements. The movement begins with taped clarinets 7 and 8 playing a smoother, more connected line, as opposed to the staggered eighth-note leaps in the first movement. The mode used is E Mixolydian and does not change for the rest of the movement. As in the first movement, the live clarinet part introduces new lines that the taped clarinets pick up, separated into three rhythmic structures with two taped clarinets paired as before. Unlike the first movement, the live clarinet part is accompanied by the lower taped clarinet part as it is forming a new line, so that the taped clarinet part has formed its own line by the time the live clarinet hands off the melody to the corresponding higher taped clarinet part. Taped clarinet 5 accompanies the live clarinet for the first melody that is handed off to taped clarinet 2 at rehearsal 46, and taped clarinet 6 accompanies the live clarinet for the second melody that is handed off to taped clarinet 3 at rehearsal 51. Taped clarinets 1 and 4 take over the opening material from taped clarinets 7 and 8 at rehearsal 46. Once the process is complete at rehearsal 53, the live clarinet part again plays composite melodies suggested by the canonic material in taped clarinets 1 through 6 while taped clarinets 7 and 8 and bass clarinets 9 and 10 play the pulses to mark the completion of the process. At rehearsal 60, after the live clarinet plays four composite melodies, the pulses stop, and all voices except taped clarinets 1 and 4 fade out.

The third movement, which returns to the tempo and unit of beat of the first movements (quarter note = ca. 184), starts with articulated eighth note lines similar to the first movement, heard in taped clarinets 7 and 8. The pitch collection at the start of the third movement is not based on any scale or mode, and instead consists of the following concert pitches: F-sharp, G, A,
B, C-sharp, D-sharp, and E-sharp. As in the second movement, the clarinet begins playing a quasi-canonic line with an accompanying taped clarinet (6). There are two key differences between the process in this movement and the processes in the previous two. There are only two rhythmic patterns in the third movement, with three clarinets in each pattern, as opposed to three patterns with two clarinets in each pattern as before. The live clarinet, instead of starting another canonic line after completing the first one of the movement, abruptly enters with taped clarinet 4 to complete the canonic process and become a part of it at rehearsal 66. The live clarinet part and taped clarinets 2 and 3 compose the first rhythmic grouping, and taped clarinets 4, 5, and 6 compose the other. Taped bass clarinets 9 and 10 play a snappier syncopated line instead of continuing with straight eighth-note pulses, becoming a process of their own, though they still enter only after the canonic process has been completed. At rehearsal 71, the tonal center abruptly changes to the F-sharp Phrygian mode. The top lines in the live clarinet part and taped clarinet 4 remain unchanged, while the lower parts emphasize the new mode. When the piece reverts back to the first pitch collection at rehearsal 73, taped bass clarinets 9 and 10 emphasize a different rhythmic pattern; instead of three beats of four notes each, the rhythm becomes four beats of three notes each:

\[
\begin{align*}
3 \times 4: &\quad \text{\textbullet \textbullet \textbullet \textbullet} + \text{\textbullet \textbullet \textbullet \textbullet} + \text{\textbullet \textbullet \textbullet \textbullet} = 12 \\
4 \times 3: &\quad \text{\textbullet \textbullet \textbullet} + \text{\textbullet \textbullet \textbullet} + \text{\textbullet \textbullet \textbullet} + \text{\textbullet \textbullet \textbullet} = 12
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 1. A metric representation of the bass clarinet rhythm.

The changes occur repeatedly at a faster pace, until there are only four measures between mode changes and the bass clarinet rhythmic changes. The processes of canonic material, harmonic
change, and rhythmic emphases intersect to form a larger pattern of eight bars. One measure after rehearsal 81, the bass clarinets begin a slow fade out that lasts for an entire statement of the now-eight bar pattern. One measure after rehearsal 85, taped clarinets 2 and 6 also fade out. The canonic material continues until the live clarinet part and taped clarinets 2, 4, and 5 arrive at F-sharp Aeolian mode at rehearsal 88. The live clarinet part and taped clarinet 4 continue the same line, but taped clarinets 2 and 5 change to a line consisting of nothing but the open fifth of F-sharp and C-sharp. The live clarinet climbs higher and higher along with taped clarinet 7 until reaching a high note of concert F-sharp at rehearsal 90, continuing as part of the canon. After four statements of this climactic pattern, the piece suddenly ends on the emphasized open fifth in the live and taped clarinet parts.

**B. Initial Preparation**

The potential fragments for the piece were identified before a clear idea of what the recording studio is capable of was formed. I started by hand-writing parts based on the full score and what I believed was possible and necessary to create the whole parts in a modern recording studio. The chief goal in recording would be the creation of a natural-sounding part, with any digital editing and copying undetectable. I was especially preoccupied with pick-up notes across the bar lines in certain parts and about how to treat dynamics in the piece.

My first thought was that each fragment that ended with a pick-up note across the bar line would have to be recorded with that particular pick-up note at the beginning. This was especially problematic in the third movement; with rapid key changes in all the parts, pick-up notes to certain fragments would change over the course of the movement, resulting in fragments that had two or even three different pick-up notes at any time in the piece. Therefore, some of my third movement fragments included multiple versions with different pick-up notes. At times I
wondered if it would not be easier simply to record each part for the third movement non-stop, rather than in fragments.

Figure 2. An Example of a fragment with a pick-up note across the bar-line (Clarinet 1, 1 after Rehearsal 37).

Another concern was how to manage dynamics. In this early stage of analysis, the idea occurred to me that I could manufacture these dynamics electronically. If this was possible, I could play pulses at full volume, and then allow the computer to add volume changes to give the impression of fade-ins and fade-outs. This would lower the number of pulses I had to play, since I could play a set of pulses for each unique pitch and then edit and add crescendos and decrescendos for each part that used it. This would also save the labor of recording a fade-in or fade-out for each fragment that had one in the canonic lines.

Once the core fragments had been identified the next step was to practice them. At this time, I was not proficient on the bass clarinet, which is required in three parts of the piece. I started playing the bass clarinet in fall of 2010 for the WSU Wind Symphony, hoping to learn the instrument to the proficiency required for the parts in the piece. Although my proficiency with the instrument advanced considerably, by the end of the semester I did not advance to the level of proficiency required. The return of the TMJ syndrome pain in December prevented me from continuing my work on bass clarinet in the spring semester, as I could not afford to aggravate the pain any further and risk being unable to play my recital. Because I could not learn the bass clarinet parts in time, Shannon Scott, my advisor, agreed to learn the parts for recording.
C. Recording

The recording process began in the spring semester of 2011. Before recording, I consulted recording studio engineer Jeremy Krug at the WSU Recording Studio about ideas for producing the recording and to learn what was possible with recording software. In these discussions, I found that many of my fears about the initial recording of the core fragments were unfounded. The recording and editing software would be able edit my fragments together into whole parts that sounded natural, regardless of whatever pick-up note was required or how many cuts had to be made. I learned about the degree to which digital sound could be manipulated, so that slightly flat notes or lines that are out of sync could be easily fixed.

There were some limitations to the technology that caused me to abandon my idea of manipulating dynamics. While the software could create dynamic change electronically, it could not do so musically. A series of pulses played at full volume and a *decrescendo* added by the software would sound like pulses at full volume getting softer, instead of pulses getting softer with pitch and timbre change coincidental with the volume change. Therefore, I would have to perform all the dynamic changes in the fragments. While the precise number of times each fragments was repeated was not a concern, Mr. Krug suggested that a balance should be struck between recording as short a fragment as possible to spare the stress of performing whole parts, while recording as much as possible to give musicality to each line.

There was an additional question of how to treat the marked fade-ins and fade-outs. Interpretations in other recordings varied from treating them as literal fade-ins and fade-outs, where the beginning and ending sounds, respectively, would be inaudible, to treating each
beginning fade-in and end fade-out as pianissimo. I chose the latter to help facilitate putting the individual parts together and for the relative ease of recording from pianissimo as opposed to da niente (from nothing).

Another decision was how fast to play the piece. Reich gives a direction of circa quarter note = 184, and recordings I had listened to were slightly faster or slower than this tempo. I was worried that I would be unable to articulate the notes at the speed indicated, so I opted for the slightly slower tempo of quarter note = 168. After making these determinations, I photocopied the score and created a final ink version of the core fragments of each part. The fragments of recorded Clarinet 4 can be found in Appendix 2.

The recording for New York Counterpoint was completed in five separate sessions. I had estimated that constructing the recording by playing the whole parts would have taken at least eight sessions, with one session per recorded clarinet part that I had to play, so that I would not overtax my jaw. Most of the recording was done on March 14, 15, and 16, 2011. During those three sessions, the pulses in the introduction and canonic lines in the first movement, the canonic lines in the second movement, and the canonic lines in the third movement were recorded. We created an initial mix of these parts so that I could practice the live part with a recording as early as possible. The bass clarinet lines were recorded in a fourth session on April 6, 2011. The final pulse-figures were recorded in a fifth session on April 7, 2011, and the recording was given a final mix to prepare me for my first performance of the piece on April 12. The recording was made using Pro Tools by Avid, which is industry standard recording software. We used an Audio Engineering Associates R-84 microphone, a modern replica of the Classic RCA Broadcast

---

Microphone, which Mr. Krug selected as being able to record the best sound on a clarinet that could still be blended with other sounds.\textsuperscript{17}

Early concerns I had about the ease of lining up the parts were, for the most part, not realized. Mr. Krug had created a click-track that I listened to as I was recording, which helped me synchronize the fragments to a common beat and provided a useful structure for focusing our cuts and edits. While I had thought that I could record each fragment while hearing other fragments from other parts playing, this proved to be too distracting, and so I recorded each part with only the click-track. Generally, only one take of each fragment was recorded; the few exceptions were when I played a note error, an unexpected upper partial, or did not play with a full enough sound. Once the fragments for a part had been recorded, we edited the fragments together to create the whole parts before moving on to recording the next fragments.

Changes of the fragments themselves were kept to a minimum. There were a few spots, especially in pulsing sections, where some notes had to be realigned because one line had sped up or slowed down enough to go out of synchronization. The only dynamic changes through editing were to slightly lower the general volume of the second movement and to facilitate the long \textit{decrescendo} in the bass clarinet part. The most significant editing that was done was in the construction of the bass clarinet lines in the third movement. At many points throughout their syncopated line the recorded bass clarinets have rhythmic and pitch unisons; if any one of them was ever out of alignment it was very noticeable. As it turned out, there were many instances where notes had to be slightly moved and rests slightly elongated to make these problems disappear, but, eventually, a natural-sounding line was made.

After the editing was completed, the recording was given a final sound mix. This involved slightly modifying the sound of the entire recording to have a warmer, richer sound.

\textsuperscript{17} Jeremy Krug, interview by author, Pullman, WA, September 20, 2011.
Reverberation was also added to give the sound recorded clarinets more of a ringing quality to the sound, a quality which is lost when playing in a sound-neutral recording studio. The recording was mixed in stereo, and each part was put on a continuous interval from the left to the right, so that some parts would sound as if they were coming more from the left speaker while others would sound more from the right speaker. This creates a more natural sound and further gives the impression of an invisible chorus of clarinets.

VI. Conclusions

A. Performance

With a final tape, I could practice the live part with the full sound of the clarinet choir. Practicing the live part turned out to be the most difficult feature of performing this piece. Unlike the short fragments I played for the tape, I had to learn to play the entire twelve-minute live clarinet part that was active, repetitive, and had few pauses. Playing the live part was an exercise in tonguing ability, endurance, tone, and dynamic control.

My first live performance of the piece was in full convocation at Kimbrough Concert Hall on April 12, 2011, where I played the first movement. One unanticipated consequence of performing in Kimbrough was discovering the extent to which Kimbrough amplified reverberation. The small reverberation we had added in the final mixing process dramatically increased in Kimbrough, to the point that the texture became muddy and cacophonous and I was forced to play louder for the live part to be heard. After this performance, we created two different mixes of the piece, one with the reverberation so that I could practice with it, and one without, which was specially made for Kimbrough Concert Hall.
My first full performance of the piece was on April 19th in Kimbrough Concert Hall. It was the third piece of a four-piece recital that I gave as a requirement for my Bachelor of Music in Performance. There were new difficulties in presenting the piece that evening, as it followed an extensive and exhausting unaccompanied work, broken by a ten-minute intermission to set up the speakers and microphone. This exhaustion was evident in my unanticipated harmonic overtones and in the general difficulty of articulating with sufficient rapidity. The canonic lines and melodies were successful, and among the praises I received afterwards were comments about how balanced the sound was in the hall and how the recorded sound gave the impression that there was an ensemble of clarinets on stage with me. I consider the performance to be a success in three ways: successfully presenting a piece using technology only available in the modern era, showcasing my own performance ability, and demonstrating how a recorded ensemble of instruments can effectively be created in a modern recording studio.

B. Conclusion

Recording *New York Counterpoint* represents a significant personal achievement. I had not worked with a recording studio before, and learning how a studio works is important, as recording studios are becoming an important venue in a musician’s career. Working with Jeremy Krug in the WSU Recording Studio allowed me to see what was possible and what was not in recording an instrument’s sound and editing this sound into an ensemble. The process I decided on to record the parts was less stressful and quicker than if I had tried to record entire parts for each movement. Many of my early concerns about creating a naturally-sounding recording were not realized, as the recording studio could seamlessly blend all the fragments into whole parts. Learning the entire work was simplified, allowing me to present the piece. The process of
recording and playing Reich’s composition was a rewarding experience, and introduced me to Reich’s body of works.

There were two negative aspects to this recording. The first was my inability to play the bass clarinet parts. I had planned to learn the instrument, so that I could genuinely present a piece where I played all eleven parts. The return of the TMJ syndrome made this unfeasible for this particular project. I hope to record the bass clarinet lines in the future, so I am the only player on the recording. One additional problem emerged from the idea of breaking the recording parts down into its component fragments. The recorded parts are similar to the live part in structure and material; playing straight through each recorded part would have assisted me in learning the live part. By practicing and recording in fragments, I did not derive this benefit, because I did not get the additional preparation for the live part. I do not believe it significantly affected my presentation of the piece.

With a less stressful method of producing the recording for the piece, other musicians who were once daunted by the task may be motivated to program the piece more often. I believe that Reich’s music represents an important statement of post-modern music and a uniquely American contribution to the ever-growing musical language of the world. More frequent programming of his pieces, including this one, will help solidify his presence in contemporary music.

If given the opportunity, re-editing or even re-recording the piece would be a useful exercise. I would like to the recording even further, allowing me to make transitions sound even more seamless and remove the most noticeable errors. The recording, as is, will accompany me in my music career, as I plan on presenting *New York Counterpoint* again. It represents both my own personal achievement and an achievement in the growing influence of American music.
Appendix 1
Program Copies:
Full Convocation, April 12, 2011
Graham Dart Senior Recital, April 19, 2011
Sonatina for Clarinet and Piano
Allegro con brio
Krista Penney, clarinet Elena Panchenko, Piano
Malcolm Arnold

Three Romances for Flute and piano
Nicht schnell
Christina Beahm, flute Kana Ishii, piano
Robert Schumann

Times Like This (from Lucky Stiff)
Kelsey Doyle, mezzo-soprano Jeremy Briggs, piano
Stephen Flaherty

Sonata Op.12 No.1
Allegro con brio
Keora Flanary-Olayvar, violin Andrew Romanick, piano
Ludwig van Beethoven

Sonata for Flute and Piano
Ashley Brown, flute Elena Panchenko, Piano
Francis Poulenc

New York Counterpoint
I.
Graham Dart, clarinet Shannon Scott, bass clarinet
Steve Reich

Kaleidoscope
Julianne Zahl, piano Jason McDougall, piano
John Corigliano

Boplicity
Thomas Guenther, alto saxophone Brian Wesley, baritone saxophone
Christine Rushton, piano Matt Piatt, bass
David Jarvis, drums
Miles Davis / Gil Evans

Any recording and/or reproduction of the whole or any portion of this performance is permitted only with the approval of the WSU School of Music. Please refrain from the taking of photographs during performance. We also ask that you shut off all cell phones and pagers.

April 12, 2011 11:10am Kimbrough Concert Hall
Steve Reich was born in 1936 in New York City. His music, which he refers to as process music, is marked by insistent rhythm and slowly-changing patterns that require careful listening. New York Counterpoint was written in 1985, the second in a series of three Counterpoint pieces. The piece is played by eleven clarinets and bass clarinets, ten of which are recorded and played through the concert-hall while the eleventh part is played live. The piece is in three movements played without pause, structured in a fast-slow-fast form, although the pulse is kept constant throughout. The first movement introduces three structural elements. The first is a series of insistent pulses that mark important developments. The second is the development of a canonic texture in six of the clarinets. The third is the live clarinet's aggregated melodies based on the canonic material. The second movement uses the same pattern as the first, whereas the third movement features the live clarinet becoming part of the canonic material and a snappier bass line by the bass clarinets. The recording was recorded by the performer on clarinet and Shannon Scott on bass clarinet, with the assistance of Jeremy Krug in the WSU Recording Studio.

Leonard Bernstein, born in 1918 in Lawrence, Massachusetts, was a well-known American conductor and composer. The Sonata for Clarinet and Piano, the first published work of Bernstein, was written in 1940 after he attended the Tanglewood Music School, and is dedicated to clarinetist David Oppenheim, whom he met there. The piece shows the heavy influence of Aaron Copland and Paul Hindemith, although a unique Bernstein optimism is already present. The piece is in two movements. The first is in a sonata-allegro form with a very short development, and two differing melodic materials based on modal scales, the first sweeping and emotional, the second more staid and centered. The second movement could actually be considered in three parts. After a mysterious introduction, the piece starts on dance in the asymmetrical meter of 5/8. The pace slows as the introduction is recalled, then returns to the dance and climaxes on a high E in the clarinet before crashing to an A Major finale.
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Sonatina for Clarinet and Piano

Bernhard Heiden (1910-2000)

I. Con Moto
II. Andante
III. Vivace, ma non troppo

Canto XIV: A Klezmer Fantasy For Clarinet Solo

Samuel Adler (b. 1928)

I. Slowly, expressively, but very freely
II. Dance

~Intermission~

New York Counterpoint for Clarinet and Tape

Steve Reich (b. 1936)

I. Quarter Note = ca. 184
II. Quarter Note = ca. 92
III. Quarter Note = ca. 184

Sonata for Clarinet and Piano

Leonard Bernstein (1918-1990)

I. Grazioso
II. Andantino – Vivace e leggiero

Bernhard Heiden was born in 1910 in Germany, and at an early age showed interest in music. Studying under Paul Hindemith, he eventually left Germany in 1935 and settled in America. After World War II, Heiden received his M.A. from Cornell University, taught at the Indiana University School of Music until his retirement in 1974, and continuously composed until his death in 2000. His Sonatina for Clarinet and Piano was written in 1957, and is in a typical three-movement structure that shows the influence of Hindemith. The first movement is in sonata-allegro form, and features a fairly quick and meandering melody with interchange with the piano. The second movement is a slower binary form with lyrical clarinet lines. The third movement is an energetic rondo that features hemiolas in both the clarinet and piano, which are frequently placed on different beats.

Samuel Adler was born in Mannheim, Germany in 1928. By 1939, he and his Jewish family fled to the United States, where Adler would eventually begin studying music at Boston and Harvard Universities. Adler’s first position was the music director of the Temple Emanu-El in Dallas, and he later taught at the University of North Texas, the Eastman School of Music, and The Juilliard School, where he is currently on the faculty. Adler has published over 400 works in his life, including this piece for solo clarinet, published in 1997. The piece is inspired by klezmer music, a style of music that has influences from Jewish religious music and various Eastern European folk styles. Klezmer music both imitates the human singing voice and shows off the virtuosity of the instruments. The piece is in two movements – the first a slow rhapsodic introduction that moves through several different motives, the second, a dance structured in a theme and variations.

Any recording and/or reproduction of the whole or any portion of the performance is permitted only with approval of the WSU School of Music.

This recital is given in partial fulfillment of the Bachelor of Music Performance Degree.
Appendix 2
Recorded Clarinet 4 part created by author
faded out

b. tenuto sempre
(x 2)
faded in

mf

c. x6

d. x16

e. x9
Bibliography


Permission is requested for a non-exclusive license to post the Honors thesis described below in digital form in the Honors College community within the WSU Research Exchange (<https://research.wsulibs.wsu.edu:8443/dspace/community>). Posting in the Research Exchange will make the material publicly available as part of the Washington State University Research Exchange digital repository of research-related documents. Additional information about Research Exchange can be viewed at (<http://research.wsulibs.wsu.edu>).

Author: Graham Dart

Title: New York Counterpoint: Exploring the Techniques of Taped Music

Date: Fall 2011

I grant a non-exclusive right to include this item in the Research Exchange. All other rights under copyright law are retained.

Permission granted by:

Graham Dart

Name (Please print)

Signature (not computer generated)

(206) 948-5143

Telephone/Email

December 5th, 2011

Date
REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO INCLUDE YOUR HONORS THESIS IN
THE WSU RESEARCH EXCHANGE
Washington State University Libraries

Permission is requested for a non-exclusive license to post the Honors thesis described below in digital form in the Honors College community within the WSU Research Exchange <https://research.wsulibs.wsu.edu:8443/dspace/community>. Posting in the Research Exchange will make the material publicly available as part of the Washington State University Research Exchange digital repository of research-related documents. Additional information about Research Exchange can be viewed at <http://research.wsulibs.wsu.edu>.

Author: Graham Dart
Title: New York Counterpoint: Exploring the Techniques of Taped Music
Date: Fall 2011

I grant a non-exclusive right to include this item in the Research Exchange. All other rights under copyright law are retained.

Permission granted by:

[Signature]
Name (Please print)

[Signature]
Signature (not computer generated)

[Signature]
Telephone/Email

[Signature]
Date