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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

A Brief Historical Background of

Ralph Vaughan Williams’

Concerto for Bass Tuba

The Concerto for Bass Tuba by Ralph Vaughan Williams was completed and premiered in 1954 and is considered the first tuba concerto written by a major composer. Documentation does not exist either in Vaughan Williams’ writings or his biographies to explain why he wrote the Concerto for Bass Tuba, although some authors attempt to fathom his reasoning. Martin Cooper refers to the work as writing for the “underprivileged”¹ and Michael Kennedy refers to the tuba as a “neglected instrument”². What would lead a man, who had already achieved great success personally and professionally, to write for the tuba?

Vaughan Williams had by this time received numerous honors and awards and had written many successful works. He had received an Honorary Doctor of Music at Oxford, at least five more doctorates from other British universities, the Cobbett Medal (1930), the Gold Medal of the Royal Philharmonic Society of London (1930), the Collard Life Fellowship (1934, in succession to Elgar), the Shakespeare Prize (1937), the Albert Medal of the Royal Society of Arts (1955), and the Order of Merit from King George V (1935).³ He was heralded as the most prolific composer England had seen in many years and was

proficient in many mediums, including ballets and operas for the stage, films for television, works for band and orchestra, chamber and instrumental works, incidental music and an extraordinary number of vocal works. In addition, Vaughan Williams had etched his place in history as a symphonist, having written seven symphonies before the *Concerto for Bass Tuba*. When Vaughan Williams was 81, George Trevelyan told him “You are so full of energy” because he recently had "produced a large-scale symphony, supervised an opera production, written a concerto for a mouth-organ, experimented in *An Oxford Elegy* with the difficult form of melodrama, written several occasional pieces and fulfilled many conducting engagements." While he was preparing the *Concerto for Bass Tuba*, Vaughan Williams was actively working on *Hodie* (This Day) as a Christmas cantata, *Te Deum and Benedictus* for unison or mixed voices with keyboard accompaniment, *Violin Sonata in A minor*, *Heart’s Music* for unaccompanied mixed chorus, *Menelaus on the Beach at Pharos* for medium voice and piano, and *Three Gaelic Songs* arranged for unaccompanied mixed chorus. Table 1 provides a complete listing of his solo works with orchestra spanning a period of forty years from 1914 to 1954. With such a successful and busy career and eight works completed for solo instrument and orchestra with an unfinished sketch for a ninth work, *Cello Concerto*, why did he write another concerto?

Unfortunately, we will probably never know why Vaughan Williams wrote *Concerto for Bass Tuba*, but for the first time in history tuba players were able to sit in the front of the orchestra and have their “moment of glory” because of this great composer. Composers had included the tuba in symphonic and operatic works since its invention in 1835 as a foundation for the orchestral and wind band low brass sections. The tuba occasionally was given a brief melody and typically was scored for special moments such

---

5 Ibid., 327-328.
as climaxes and large, dynamic endings to a composition. However, the tuba had not been

**TABLE 1**

WORKS FOR SOLO INSTRUMENT AND ORCHESTRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>FEATURING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>The <em>Lark Ascending</em>, Romance</td>
<td>Violin and Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rev. 1920)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td><em>Flos Campi</em>, Suite</td>
<td>Viola, Chorus and Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Violin Concerto in D minor</td>
<td>Violin with Strings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-31</td>
<td>Piano Concerto in C</td>
<td>Piano and Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rev. 1946 for 2 pianos with some new material)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td><em>Suite</em> for Viola</td>
<td>Viola and Small Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943-44</td>
<td>Oboe Concerto in A minor</td>
<td>Oboe and Strings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td><em>Fantasia on Old 104th Psalm Tune</em></td>
<td>Piano, Chorus and Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td><em>Romance</em> in Db</td>
<td>Harmonica, Strings and Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td><em>Concerto for Bass Tuba in F minor</em></td>
<td>Tuba and Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
<td><em>Cello Concerto</em></td>
<td>Cello and ? (orchestra?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

given serious consideration as a solo instrument until Ralph Vaughan Williams wrote *Concerto for Bass Tuba*, which was premiered on June 13, 1954 in London's Royal Festival Hall by the London Symphony Orchestra with Philip Catelinet as soloist and John Barbirolli as conductor. At that time, many critics did not consider the work a worthy musical contribution by Vaughan Williams or the tuba suitable as a solo instrument.

Within the first two years of the premiere performance several critics expressed
their views about the tuba and the *Concerto for Bass Tuba* in a manner that would have
damaged many composer’s egos. However, Vaughan Williams may not have been
concerned about what the critics thought. He once told a student “If you're going to be a
composer you'll need the hide of a rhinoceros.”7 The editor of *The Strad* wrote:

> Vaughan Williams' new Concerto for Bass Tuba proved to be a slight work in
> which the composer has presumably used up some earlier material. While
> welcoming the spirit of the adventure which informs these efforts, we hope that
> Vaughan Williams is not going to concentrate on unpleasant instruments. The tuba
> is tolerated rather than welcomed in the orchestra and promotion to the rank of
> soloist reveals it as a brutish monster, woolly and uncertain in attack and dubious in
> intonation.8

This review might imply that the soloist, Philip Catelinet, was not up to the task of
performing the work. However, immediately following the performance, the secretary of
the London Symphony Orchestra, John Croft, and a representative of *His Master's Voice
Recording Company* informed Catelinet that a recording session was to be held the very
next morning.9 One could assume that the London Symphony Orchestra and the recording
company would not have approached Catelinet with a recording offer had he not performed
with distinction. Possibly the reviewer wrote the scathing review because of his
unfamiliarity toward the tuba.

Not all reviewers attacked the tuba, while others attacked the composer to differing
degrees.

Not even VW's seniority can excuse this coarse & ugly offering which poses &
inevitably fails to solve an impossible textural problem. His ear & mus. conscience
must have taken a holiday during the work's compsn.10

A jovial work which, however, is unlikely to rank in the composer's list of
important works, and does not suggest a likely path for other composers to
follow.11

---

7 Grace Williams, *The RCM Magazine* 55, no. 2 (February 1959): 37.
Performances of Vaughan Williams' Concerto for bass tuba and orchestra have not been greeted with much enthusiasm, but in the reduction for tuba and piano ... it seems very successful and characteristic, ....

The reviews became less abusive over the two years following the premiere indicating gradual acceptance of both audience and critics of the Vaughan Williams' Concerto for Bass Tuba as a worthy musical contribution and the tuba as a solo instrument. Positive reviews continued throughout 1956 and 1957 respectively.

Vaughan Williams's Concerto for bass tuba and orchestra ...is, indeed, a thing of strange intent. To create a work of art in such a medium is a formidable proposition, for to write academically is more than possible, but to create music from such a combination betokens a rare mind and a comprehensive one. Suffice it to say that Vaughan Williams has succeeded in producing a composition unique of its kind.

For the evidence of the music is of exuberant and lyrical delight, of a spring of unending melody and rhythmic invention, bubbling as irrepressibly as ever it did back in those days when the composer filled his first two symphonies full of more tunes than any respectable symphony can possibly contain.

The United States premiere performance, presented by the Little Orchestra Society with soloist William Bell, was given a very favorable review by critic Frank Milburn in Musical America.

In less than skilled hands than Vaughan Williams', a tuba concerto would be a gruesome affair, for the instrument's timbre is not conducive to extended solo passages. But the composer has certainly solved all the problems. One never grew tired of the tuba's sound, and the orchestra complements the solo instrument by a variety of tonal colors. The first movement finds the composer in one of his lighter moments. It obviously amused the audience, for it sounded as if the composer might have had his tongue in his cheek. The second movement, with its bittersweet pastoral atmosphere, is characteristic Vaughan Williams, while the third with its many tempo changes, is more knotty and less attractive on first hearing. William Bell performed his difficult part excellently and with apparent ease.

Since these early reviews and Vaughan Williams' death in 1958, many books have

---

been written about the composer. Some authors have inexplicably ignored the *Concerto for Bass Tuba*, others have included it when listing his works, while others have included a brief discussion about its quality. Most authors tend to agree that the concerto is not a great work or even a good work, but Clifford Bevans seems to have summed up the general feeling of critics and tuba players. Bevans refers to the concerto as a “sacred cow” to tubists because tuba players have very little else to play, which was true when he wrote his book.¹⁶

Within the last twenty years, many new works and recordings have become available by various artists around the world. Major composers including Edward Gregson, Bernard Heiden, John Williams, Thomas Beversdorf, Halsey Stevens and Alec Wilder have found the tuba a viable solo instrument. Recording companies have taken on the project of recording many of their tuba works. Since Catelinet’s recording of the *Concerto for Bass Tuba*, other solo tuba artists have made recordings of this work, including Floyd Cooley, Eugene Dowling, John Fletcher, Patrick Harrild, Manfred Hoppert, Arnold Jacobs, Ian King, Michael Lind, Richard Nahatzki, Daniel Perantoni, Harvey Phillips and Donald Strand. The numerous recordings of this work show that the tuba concerto is now considered worthy of performance and interpretation.

Interpretation of a work is very personal to a performer, and some composers allow for a wide array of interpretations. Adrian Boult tells a story about working with Vaughan Williams and interpreting the tempos in his *Pastoral Symphony*.

There is a legend that he only bought a metronome quite late in life, and no one knows how he determined the earlier tempo figures. Already with the *Pastoral Symphony* he was continually pressing me to do every movement faster than I had felt it when studying the work. I hoped the first performance had satisfied him, but it was not until six or seven years later that he again heard me rehearse it. 'Everything is much too fast' was the alarming comment. I reminded him of the first performance and got this wonderfully characteristic reply: 'Oh that, yes, it was years ago, but I have heard it a good deal and conducted it myself several times since, and I now know it isn't as boring as I thought it would be, so I like it

¹⁶ Bevan, 182.
slower." I thereupon happily reverted to my original conception.\textsuperscript{17}

The fact that Vaughan Williams altered his interpretation of his works throughout his lifetime provides justification for various personal interpretations to emerge regarding his \textit{Concerto for Bass Tuba}.

Tempo is one aspect of interpretation that can change the mood and style of a work. Arnold Jacobs, Donald Little, Richard Nahatzki and Harvey Phillips have different views of the tempos for each movement. As can be seen in Table 2, not only do their tempos

\textbf{TABLE 2}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
Soloist & Mvt. 1 & Mvt. 2 & Mvt. 3 \\
\hline
Arnold Jacobs & quarter=116 & quarter=54 & quarter=158 \\
Donald Little & quarter=90-92 & quarter=56-58 & quarter=140 \\
Richard Nahatzki & quarter=96 & quarter=60 & quarter=150 \\
Harvey Phillips & quarter=106 & quarter=45 & quarter=132 \\
\textbf{Vaughan Williams} & \textbf{quarter=96} & \textbf{quarter=60} & \textbf{quarter=150} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

vary from each other, but they vary from the composer's indication. Richard Nahatzki was truest to Vaughan Williams' tempo markings, but does that mean his interpretation is correct? From what we already have seen from Boult, different interpretations, not only of tempo, can and need to exist to give performers expressive freedom.

Since the premiere of the \textit{Concerto for Bass Tuba} in 1954, views have changed dramatically concerning its quality and acceptance, and it has consequently been programmed by professional orchestras throughout the world. United States military bands, orchestras and universities typically include this work as part of the audition

\textsuperscript{17} Sir Adrian Boult, "Vaughan Williams and His Interpreters," \textit{The Musical Times} 113, no. 1556 (October 1972): 957.
reertoire, and many tuba teachers at the university level require the work to be performed by senior and graduate level students.

The historical significance, quality of the work, utilization of the work as recital and audition repertoire and numerous recordings available indicate that the *Concerto for Bass Tuba* is clearly significant tuba repertoire. However, very little research has been documented regarding this concerto. Catelinet discusses his personal experiences as the tubist who premiered the work\(^\)\(^{18}\) while David Reed outlines the changing views of the work from its inception to the 25th anniversary.\(^{19}\) Skip Gray approaches the *Concerto for Bass Tuba* both from a performer's and editor's viewpoint. He tries to present interpretive ideas and a "definitive" version of correct notes and rhythms. Gray's corrections are based on the full score published in 1979 and the 1982 corrected solo tuba and piano edition.\(^{20}\)

**Purpose**

It is the purpose of this dissertation to document the various interpretations of Ralph Vaughan Williams' *Concerto for Bass Tuba* by prominent tuba performers regarding tempi, interpretation of the melodic line, ornamentation, dynamics, pitches, rhythms, phrasing and articulations, and to present the results through comparative analysis. The results will provide tubists an interpretive study source. Performers selected to share their interpretations include Arnold Jacobs, Donald Little, Richard Nahatzki and Harvey Phillips. Little, Nahatzki and Phillips provided a copy of their solo parts with their personal markings. Jacobs gave permission to transcribe his interpretation from the recording he made with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra. All interpretations were notated with a musical software program entitled "Overture" and imported into "Microsoft Word

---

\(^{18}\) Catelinet, 30-33.


6.0.1.” Several musical examples were imported into Adobe Photoshop 4 for slight alterations before being placed into the Microsoft Word document.

Performers’ Biographies

These individuals have achieved prominence in their field as performers and as teachers, and they represent divergent backgrounds and approaches to performance on the tuba. Each of the players has performed with, or is currently a member of, a major symphony orchestra. Recently retired from the Chicago Symphony Orchestra as principal tubist, Arnold Jacobs serves as a worldwide lecturer, master clinician and private instructor. Mr. Jacobs also performed with the Philadelphia Orchestra, Pittsburgh Symphony and Indianapolis Symphony. Donald Little has performed with the Chicago Civic Orchestra, Berlin Radio Symphony Orchestra, Dallas Opera Orchestra and the Fort Worth Symphony Orchestra as well as serving as Professor of Music in tuba and euphonium at the University of North Texas College of Music. Richard Nahatzki currently serves as solo tuba with the Radio Sinfonie Orchester Berlin and has performed with the Staatstheater in Kassel and Saarländische Rundfunk. Recently retired as Distinguished Professor of Music in tuba at Indiana University and former member of the New York Brass Quintet, New York City Ballet, Metropolitan Opera Orchestra and U.S. Army Field Band, Harvey Phillips currently serves as international clinician and soloist.
CHAPTER 2

INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS
OF MOVEMENT ONE

The opening movement, Allegro moderato, has a metronome marking (m.m.) of quarter note equals 96 which only Nahatzki follows. Little prefers a slightly slower tempo at m.m. 90-92 while Phillips and Jacobs take the tempo faster than indicated at m.m. 106 and 116 respectively. There are no marked tempo changes throughout the movement and all four soloists maintain their respective tempos until the cadenza. An expression indication, cantabile, is part of Vaughan Williams’ original markings. Nahatzki wrote “SING” at the top of his solo part in large, underlined, upper case letters. Phillips agrees that “the first movement should be sung” and that Vaughan Williams “could have been more generous” with the cantabile and dolce markings.¹

Measures 4-42

Articulation, phrasing, dynamic and breath marks vary slightly among the performers from measures 4-12 as seen in figure 1. Jacobs places emphasis on the downbeat of measure 5 and beat two of measure 9 while Little adds tenuto markings in measures 4, 6 and 7. Nahatzki and Phillips use similar phrase indications in measures 4-7. Phillips stresses that many of his “long slur markings are more importantly phrase markings” and “are not intended to erase articulations.”² It should be noticed that Phillips changes the placement of a slur in measure 9 to match the slur in measure 10. Dynamically the only notated difference between the performers occurs in measure 4 where Jacobs and

¹ Harvey Phillips to Michael Fischer, 8 January 1998.
² Ibid.
Little indicate a slightly louder mezzo-piano dynamic while Nahatzki and Phillips maintain Vaughan Williams’ soft dynamic. The breath marks added by the performers are similar to a certain extent with all agreeing on a breath at the beginning of measure 10 which allows them enough air to increase their dynamic while descending to the low G flat in measure 11. The only difference in breathing during measures 4-12 occurs at measures 6 and 8 where Jacobs and Phillips catch a breath in the middle of measure 6 while Little and Nahatzki prefer to take breaths between the staccato notes in measures 7 and 8. Little does not add breath marks between the staccato notes to allow himself the freedom to breathe dependent upon his need for air.³

³ Donald Little to Michael Fischer, 15, 16 May 1998.
Figure 1. Movement 1, Measures 1-12: a, Jacobs; b, Little; c, Nahatzki; d, Phillips.

Similarities are seen from measure 15 to the downbeat of measure 22 with the only notable difference occurring in measures 15-16 by Nahatzki and Phillips. Phillips prefers to use the traditional slur mark seen in figure 2 indicating a phrased section while Nahatzki uses an arrow the length of the two measures.

Figure 2. Movement 1, Measures 15-16: Phillips.
Little strives for full-valued sixteenth notes in measures 22-24 by adding tenuto marks. He lengthens the eighth note in measure 26 with a tenuto mark as seen in figure 3 while Nahatzki includes the word "toh" above this eighth note indicating a full and resonant tonal sound. The phrase markings utilized by Phillips in measures 22-24 and seen in figure 3 are similar to his markings in measures 4-7. Nahatzki is the only performer who places breath marks in measures 24-25. The markings are placed between the last two eighth notes of measure 24 and the first two eighth notes of measure 25. Little does not prefer adding breath marks between these eighth notes to allow himself the option to breathe if necessary.\textsuperscript{4}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure3.png}
\caption{Movement 1, Measures 22-26: a, Little; b, Phillips.}
\end{figure}

The first difference of opinion among the performers regarding pitches is seen in

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid.
figure 4 where Nahatzki changes Vaughan Williams' original sixteenth note passage "C, D flat, F, G flat" in measure 27 to "C, F, A flat, B flat". The other performers make no pitch changes at this location although Phillips adds a phrase mark beginning on the C in measure 27 and extending to beat two in measure 28.

![Figure 4. Movement 1, Measures 27-28: a, Nahatzki; b, Phillips.](image)

The two measures of tremolo preceding the key change at measure 31 are initiated with emphasis by Jacobs and, like Nahatzki and Phillips, he prefers to phrase the passage from the beginning of the tremolo to the end of measure 32 before taking a breath. Little chooses rather to take a breath immediately preceding measure 31. Then he performs to the end of measure 37 before catching his next breath. Jacobs and Little insert a breath before the last two sixteenth notes in measure 39 while Nahatzki and Phillips bypass this opportunity and play measures 38-42 in one breath. Little and Phillips place tenuto marks on many of the notes in measures 33-41 as seen in figure 5 to emphasize the cantabile which is indicated by Vaughan Williams. In addition, Phillips brings this section to a close with accents both on and off the beat in measures 40-41.
Figure 5. Movement 1, Measures 32-42: a, Little; b, Phillips.

**Measures 51-103**

A new meter, 6/8, is seen in measure 51. Phillips believes the eighth notes should be performed absolutely evenly and asserts that the tenuto markings over the quarter note triplets should not be treated as slurs nor should the markings influence stretched triplets.\(^5\) Phillips and Jacobs include a phrase mark from the downbeat of measure 60 to the downbeat of measure 62 which indicates a continuous motion of sound before taking a breath. In addition, Phillips adds a shorter phrase mark from the second quarter note of measure 61 to the downbeat of measure 62. Little and Nahatzki prefer taking a breath between the first two quarter notes of measure 61. Jacobs and Little perform every eighth note with a staccato articulation in measures 62-66 while Nahatzki and Phillips do not deviate from Vaughan Williams' articulations as seen in figure 6. In addition, Jacobs performs the first three eighth notes of measure 63 in a bouncy style which is indicated with tenuto markings over the staccatos.

\(^5\) Phillips.
Phillips inserts more phrase marks in measures 67-68 as seen in figure 7 which are identical to his earlier marks in measures 60-61. The other performers utilize one phrase mark extending from the downbeat of measure 67 to the downbeat of measure 68 and all four soloists perform measures 69-70 with staccato markings.

Figure 7. Movement 1, Measures 67-68: Phillips.
Four interpretive differences are notated in measures 80-94 with three of those differences made by Jacobs. Jacobs and Little place staccatos on all eighth notes from measure 80 to 88. In addition, Jacobs places a crescendo the entire length of measure 88 building the dynamic to forte in measure 89 and dropping back to subito piano in measure 90. All performers keep Vaughan Williams' original markings from measure 95 to 101. Nahatzki places a ritard in the second half of measure 102 and \textit{a tempo} in the following measure.

\textit{Measures 107-134}

Measures 107-110 are identically approached by all performers while Jacobs and Phillips interpret measures 111-118 the same. Little adds tenuto markings in measures 112-114 to remind himself to perform the notes smoothly and with full value while Nahatzki adds phrase markings to group the last three sixteenth notes of each set as seen in figure 8.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure8.png}
\caption{Movement 1, Measures 112-114: a, Little; b, Nahatzki.}
\end{figure}

Measure 119 and the eighth note preceding the measure are treated differently among the performers. Jacobs chooses to perform the preceding eighth note with a
staccato attack while Little lengthens the note by adding a tenuto mark as seen in figure 9. This figure also shows Little's additional tenuto markings and Phillips' phrasing technique.

Figure 9. Movement 1, Measure 119: a, Jacobs; b, Little; c, Phillips.

Phillips takes great liberties in measures 120-121 by adding thematic material found earlier in the movement and seen in figure 10. Jacobs adds staccatos to the original eighth notes while Little and Nahatzki prefer leaving the eighth notes as notated.

Figure 10. Movement 1, Measure 121: a, Jacobs; b, Little and Nahatzki; c, Phillips.

The second beat of measure 122 is performed by Jacobs with a duple C and G flat as seen in figure 11 while Little, Nahatzki and Phillips create an eighth note triplet by inserting a B flat.

Figure 11. Movement 1, Measure 122: a, Jacobs; b, Little, Nahatzki and Phillips.

The next interpretive difference is seen in measures 126-128 where Phillips adds accent marks to various notes in the triplet figures seen in figure 12. Phillips feels the
phrase is "aided considerably with jazz phrasing (dividing the triplets in fours)." Little lengthens the eighth note in measure 128 with a tenuto mark.

![Figure 12. Movement 1, Measures 126-128: Phillips.](image)

The final few measures before the orchestral interlude are treated differently by the artists. Jacobs prefers to add a staccato to the downbeat of measure 130 and tenuto markings to all notes following it through measure 132. Little's only deviance from Vaughan Williams' markings in measures 129-134 includes a breath mark before the last two sixteenth notes in measure 132 while Nahatzki completely follows Vaughan Williams original markings. Phillips adds tenuto markings on the sixteenth notes in measures 131-132 and phrase markings as seen in figure 13.

![Figure 13. Movement 1, Measures 131-134: Phillips.](image)

**Cadenza**

The performers present several interesting ideas regarding interpretation throughout the *cadenza* starting with the initial dynamic on the low C. Little and Nahatzki abide by Vaughan Williams' fortissimo marking while Jacobs chooses to start at mezzo forte before

---

6 Ibid.
beginning the decrescendo to piano. Phillips believes "the first note of the cadenza should not be 'slam-dunked' but resonate gently out of the orchestra texture." In addition, Phillips states that the cadenza should be beautifully played and "not become a barbarous display of technique and range; with a flare but with style and grace." After sustaining the fermata C Little takes a breath before performing the four note figure that follows and he lengthens the eighth note F with a tenuto mark. After playing the next low C, Jacobs and Little take a breath before starting the ascending figures leading to the high F. As seen in figure 14, Little accelerates beginning with the second group of thirty-second notes and slightly slows down during the last set of thirty-second notes. In the same figure, Phillips demonstrates his phrasing technique which groups the last three thirty-second notes of every set except the last set which leads into the high F.

Figure 14. Movement 1, Cadenza - opening passage: a, Little; b, Phillips.

\[\text{Ibid.}\]
The second passage of the cadenza again leads to the high F and is similarly approached by all four performers. Jacobs takes two breaths, the first occurring after the fermata low F and the second after the first thirty-second note C. Little performs this passage with a breath after the fermata F and accelerates and ritards similar to figure 14.a. After reaching the high F Nahatzki is the only performer who continues playing to the first note of the eighth note triplets where he finally takes a breath. In addition, Nahatzki utilizes Vaughan Williams’ accelerando while descending through the triplet patterns but takes a quick breath before the last set of triplets and is the only performer to insert an 8vb sign indicating a pedal C as seen in figure 15. Also seen in this figure is the high A flat which all four performers agree on playing. Little, Nahatzki, and Phillips do not alter the rhythm when replacing the E flat with the A flat but Jacobs changes the rhythm to a sixteenth, eighth, sixteenth grouping.

Figure 15. Movement 1, Cadenza - last part of second passage: a, Jacobs; b, Little; c, Nahatzki.
A breath is taken after the fermata C by all performers which sets them up for the *Lento* section. Little and Phillips enjoy performing the *Lento* in one breath with Little preferring a slight forward motion while playing the last group of eighth notes and pulling the tempo back on the two quarter notes before the 6/8 section. Phillips takes his breath during the first eighth rest in the 6/8 section and Little takes a breath immediately before the 6/8 section. Jacobs and Nahatzi use two identical breathing locations during the *Lento* with the first breath occurring after the first eighth note of the last eighth note grouping immediately preceding the 6/8 section. The other breath occurs prior to the beginning of the 6/8 section.

The 6/8 section is sixteen measures long and is divided with dashed bar lines which will be numbered from one to sixteen for reference purposes. Vaughan Williams' original tempo marking at the beginning of the 6/8 section is *a tempo*. Phillips is more creative with his tempo interpretation by including *a tempo - rubato - stringendo*. Measures 1-4 are approached identically by the performers. Jacobs crescendos from the beginning of measure 5 to forte in measure 7 then diminuendos throughout measure 8 to piano in measure 9. The other performers only crescendo throughout measure 6 to forte in measure 7 although they match Jacobs diminuendo in measure 8. A breath is taken by all performers except Nahatzki after the eighth note C in measure 8. Each performer maintains Vaughan Williams' *Tranquillo* marking and performs measures 9-12 identically except for Jacobs who prefers to ritard measures 11-12. The last four measures of the cadenza are approached differently by each performer as seen in figure 16. Jacobs takes a breath between the dotted half notes while Nahatzki and Phillips play them in one breath. Phillips adds a connecting phrase mark and the indication "No Pause!". He does not like a grand pause before the last note, but prefers to think of the motion as "ALL IN GOOD TIME."

---

*8 Ibid.*
Little is very creative in the last four measures by performing the opening phrase of the movement for the listener.

Figure 16. Movement I, Cadenza - last four measures:

a, Jacobs; b, Little; c, Nahatzki; d, Phillips.
CHAPTER 3
INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS
OF MOVEMENT TWO

The second movement, *Romanza*, is described by Phillips as "a romantic love song sung with gentle feelings." Nahatzki wrote "CHEST" and "SING" at the top of his solo part indicating a vocal style and Little uses the phrase "cello-like" to describe his image and stylistic approach. The tempo indicated by Vaughan Williams is quarter note equals 60 and Nahatzki is the only performer to adhere to the composer's marking. Little takes the tempo slightly slower at m.m. 56-58 and Jacobs prefers even a slightly slower tempo at m.m. 54. Phillips performs the movement much slower than the other artist performers at m.m. 45.

**Measures 9-27**

Jacobs, Little and Nahatzki similarly approach measures 9-14 while Phillips adds phrase marks as seen in figure 17. The first phrase mark extends from beat two of measure 9 through measure 10. Measure 11 is phrased as one unit while the next phrase begins on the downbeat of measure 12 and continues to the eighth note on beat two of measure 13. Phillips phrases the second half of beat two through measure 14. A dynamic difference is seen in this opening passage by Little who prefers a mezzo piano dynamic while Jacobs, Nahatzki and Phillips utilize Vaughan Williams' original piano marking. All of the performers take a breath at the end of measure 11 and after the eighth note in measure 13. Jacobs, Little and Phillips prefer taking a breath at the end of measure 14 while Nahatzki

---

1 Harvey Phillips to Michael Fischer, 8 January 1998.
2 Donald Little to Michael Fischer, 15, 16 May 1998.
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continues performing until beat three in measure 15 where all the performers take a breath.

Figure 17. Movement 2, Measures 9-14: a, Little; b, Phillips.

Phillips uses phrase marks in measures 15-16 as seen in figure 18. He phrases from the beginning of measure 15 to the first sixteenth note of beat three. A new phrase mark begins on the second sixteenth note of beat three and extends to the downbeat of measure 16. Phillips then adds a phrase mark from the second half of beat one to the last eighth note of the measure. Little and Nahatzki follow Vaughan Williams' original

Figure 18. Movement 2, Measures 15-16: Phillips.
markings in measures 15-16 while Jacobs adds a crescendo and decrescendo in measure 15 as seen in figure 19. All performers replace the first sixteenth note on beat three in measure 15 with a breath mark and they agree with taking a breath at the end of measure 16. Little slightly differs from the group by indicating this breath as optional by placing the breath mark in parenthesis.

![Figure 19. Movement 2, Measure 15: Jacobs.](image)

Three different breathing ideas are utilized in measures 17-20. All four performers take a breath between the eighth notes in beat one of measure 18 which is the last breath Little and Nahatzki take until measure 20. Jacobs adds a breath at the end of measure 18 while Phillips takes a breath after the dotted quarter note.

The performers use Vaughan Williams’ markings in measures 21-22 as seen in figure 20 with only Little changing the pianissimo dynamic to piano. Phillips connects

![Figure 20. Movement 2, Measures 21-22: Little.](image)

the beginning of measure 23 to beat two of measure 24 with a phrase mark and, like the other performers, takes a breath after beat two. Phillips and Jacobs tie the last eighth note F in measure 23 to the first sixteenth note F in the following measure while Little and Nahatzki omit the tie. Jacobs places emphasis on the last quarter note in measure 24 with
an accent. Little and Jacobs add a breath mark before the last eighth note in measure 25. However, Little places his breath mark in parenthesis making this an optional breath. Three of the performers stress the first beat of measure 26 and resolve the passage in differing manners as seen in figure 21. Jacobs crescendos from the last eighth note of measure 25 and diminuendos in measure 26 after playing the F while Little crescendos in the same location but does not decrescendo. Phillips approaches the situation differently by placing tenuto markings on the eighth notes F and E in measure 26 while keeping the slur mark.

Figure 21. Movement 2, Measure 26: a, Jacobs; b, Little; c, Phillips.

Measures 35-48

The poco agitato begins at measure 27 with the orchestra interlude and continues when the tuba enters in measure 35. Phillips believes the poco agitato should express the anxieties often involved with a love affair. He also states that a definite climax is reached between #6 and two before #7 when everything starts to gently resolve into a normal state and four after #7 to the end restates the most beautiful expressions of a great love. Phillips adds "GO GENTLY INTO THAT GOOD NIGHT!" to express his stylistic view for the
ending of the movement.\footnote{Harvey Phillips to Michael Fischer, 8 January 1998.}

Jacobs accents the first note in measure 35 and the quarter note C in the following measure. A breath is taken before beat three in measure 36 by Jacobs, Little and Nahatzki while Phillips' first breath mark in the \textit{poco agitato} is after the first note in measure 38. Jacobs and Nahatzki also use this same location to breathe. Little prefers to breathe between the eighth notes in this measure and Phillips breathes after the dotted sixteenth note C. The next breath for all the performers is after beat one in measure 40. The last breath taken before the key change by all the performers is after the first eighth note triplet on beat two in measure 42. Jacobs crescendos through the last three pitches in measure 39 to mezzo piano on the downbeat of measure 40. Then, he performs the C on beat two at subito pianissimo. He also crescendos through the group of sextuplets on beat two of measure 41 and decrescendos through the sextuplets on beat three.

Two other stylistic ideas need to be mentioned regarding articulations and phrasing. Nahatzki places accents on the note immediately following the dotted sixteenth notes in measures 38-39 as seen in figure 22. Phillips adds several phrase marks in measures 35-42 as seen in figure 23. He begins with a phrase mark that extends from the first pitch in measure 35 to the second beat of measure 36. His next phrase begins on beat three of measure 36 and continues to the first pitch of measure 38. Phillips groups the last five thirty-second notes of measure 38 and includes a long phrase mark from the beginning of
these five notes to the downbeat of measure 40. Finally, he adds a phrase mark from beat two of measure 40 to beat two of measure 42.

![Musical notation]

Figure 23. Movement 2, Measures 35-42: Phillips.

Measures 44-47 are similarly approached by Jacobs, Little and Nahatzki with only minor differences. Little prefers to change the pianissimo dynamic in measure 44 to piano and lengthens the eighth note downbeat of measure 45 with a tenuto marking. Jacobs takes a breath in measure 46 between the third and fourth sixteenth notes of beat two. Little and Jacobs breathe after the first sixteenth note of beat three in measure 47 while Nahatzki breathes after the second sixteenth note in that beat. A slight difference is seen in the placement of the ritard in measure 47. Jacobs begins the ritard on the last three sixteenth notes, Nahatzki ritards only the last two sixteenth notes and Little begins his ritard during the second half of beat two. All three performers utilize Vaughan Williams' original
articulations as seen by Jacobs' markings in figure 24 while Phillips takes creative liberties with the articulations and phrase markings. Phillips changes the articulations from

![Musical notation](image)

Figure 24. Movement 2, Measures 44-48: a, Jacobs; b, Phillips.

slurring two notes and tonguing one note to slurring three notes throughout measures 44-45 and also adds a phrase mark extending from the first note of measure 44 to the downbeat of measure 45. His next phrase mark encompasses the second half of beat two in measure 45 through the end of measure 46. Phillips groups the first three sixteenth notes in measure 46 with a slur and places an accent on the last sixteenth note of each beat. In measure 47 Phillips groups the sextuplets into two groups of three sixteenth notes, takes
a breath after the first sixteenth note of beat three, places tenuto markings on the last three sixteenth notes of the measure, and does not ritard into measure 49 like his colleagues.

**Measures 52-79**

Measures 52-56 are played dynamically similarly by Little, Nahatzki and Phillips beginning with forte in measure 52 followed immediately by a diminuendo reaching piano on the downbeat of measure 53. Jacobs decrescendos in measure 52 like the other performers but only to mezzo piano. In addition, Jacobs begins measure 54 at mezzo forte and diminuendos throughout the sixteenth note septuplets in beat one. Phillips continues his use of phrase markings throughout these measures as seen in figure 25. He begins by phrasing all of the notes in measure 53 with one phrase mark similar to Vaughan Williams’ phrasing in the previous measure. Then, he groups all of the notes in measures 52-53 with one long phrase mark. Phillips also adds a phrase mark beginning with the first note of measure 54 and extending to the downbeat of measure 55. He takes a breath after the first eighth note in this measure and then performs the following three eighth notes with tenuto marks.

![Musical notation](image)

**Figure 25. Movement 2, Measures 52-56: Phillips.**

Three different dynamics are used among the four performers to begin the section at
measure 58. Nahatzki and Phillips use Vaughan Williams’ forte marking, Jacobs prefers to begin the section at mezzo forte, and Little starts at piano. Little crescendos gradually over measures 59-60 to reach forte at the beginning of measure 61. Jacobs, Little and Nahatzki follow Vaughan Williams’ articulations and phrasing but add their personal breathing preferences. Each performer, including Phillips, breathes after the first sixteenth note in beat two of measure 60. Jacobs and Phillips breathe after the first beat of the next measure and all four performers breathe after the first eighth note in measure 62. Jacobs and Nahatzki take their next breath before the last eighth note in this measure and Little takes his breath at the end of the measure. Phillips prefers to wait and take his next breath after beat two in measure 63 where Little and Nahatzki also breathe. Nahatzki and Phillips breathe after the dotted eighth note in measure 64 while Little waits and breathes after the first sixteenth note in beat two of measure 65. Jacobs and Phillips also breathe at this point while Nahatzki draws an arrow starting above beat three in measure 64 and extending to the end of the dotted quarter note in measure 66 indicating a continuous musical line where he finally adds a breath mark. Little and Jacobs add a breath after the first eighth note in measure 67. Although Phillips does not add a breath mark at this location, his phrasing suggests that he might take a breath.

Phillips adds several phrase marks throughout measures 58-69 along with a few tenuto markings to indicate length to certain pitches. Figure 26 compares Phillips’ markings with Vaughan Williams’ original markings as utilized by Little. As mentioned earlier, Jacobs and Nahatzki use Vaughan Williams’ original phrase and articulation markings with only slight differences with the placement of breath marks and the use of dynamics.
Figure 26. Movement 2, Measures 58-69: a, Little; b, Phillips.
The concluding passage of this movement beginning at measure 70 is approached by all four performers with very few differences regarding breathing, articulations, dynamics and phrasing. Phillips adds only two phrase markings from measure 70 to the end of the piece. The first phrase begins in measure 70 and extends to beat two of measure 73. The other phrase mark begins on the eighth note E in measure 77 and ends with the fermata A in measure 78. Phillips, Jacobs and Little take a breath in measure 73 after beat two while Nahatzki takes his breath with the other performers after the first eighth note in measure 75. Nahatzki and Phillips take their next breath after the dotted quarter note in measure 76 while Jacobs takes his breath between the last two eighth notes in that measure. Little waits to breathe after the quarter note in the next measure where the other performers also breathe. Little is the only performer to alter Vaughan Williams’ dynamic markings. He begins the passage in measure 70 at mezzo piano instead of piano. He then crescendos through the last two eighth notes in measure 75 to the dotted quarter note in measure 76 where he immediately decrescendos over beats one and two. One other interesting difference in this concluding passage is Jacobs’ use of accents on the F in measures 75-76 as seen in figure 27.

![Figure 27. Movement 2, Measures 75-76: Jacobs.](image-url)
CHAPTER 4

INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS
OF MOVEMENT THREE

Vaughan Williams entitled the last movement FINALE- RONDO ALLA TEDESCA. Rondo is an instrumental form common to the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Alla tedesca means "in the German manner" but more particularly indicates a piece or movement in rather slow waltz time.\(^1\) Phillips considers the third movement "a 'romp', a 'Tarantella', a time for fun and celebration, a grand waltz with a middle section (poco animato - four before #5 to #6) that once again expresses a theme of love and all the anxieties it implores."\(^2\) Nahatzki follows Vaughan Williams’ original tempo marking of quarter note equals 150 while Jacobs takes the tempo faster at m.m. 158. Little and Phillips prefer slower tempos at m.m. 140 and 132 respectively.

Measures 1-22

Phillips feels the opening should be carefree and cantabile, and that #1 to #6 should "soar above the clouds."\(^3\) The opening passage beginning in measure 2 is performed mezzo piano by Jacobs and Little while Nahatzki and Phillips prefer Vaughan Williams’ piano marking. In measure 2 and 4 Phillips removes the slur connecting the first two eighth notes in beat two and four respectively to perform these notes staccato as seen in figure 28. Phillips also adds phrase marks from the beginning of measure 2 to the downbeat of measure 4 and repeats this phrase with the following identical passage that


35
begins on beat two of measure 4 and ends on beat two of measure 6. Jacobs, Little and Nahatzki perform measures 7-10 according to Vaughan Williams' original markings as

![Musical notation]

Figure 28. Movement 3, Measures 1-6: Phillips.

seen in figure 29. Phillips changes beat one of measure 9 to "pick up the contra bass part."

![Musical notation]

a.

![Musical notation]

b.

Figure 29. Movement 3, Measures 7-10: a, Jacobs, Little and Nahatzki; b, Phillips.

* Harvey Phillips to Michael Fischer, 8 January 1998.
The cantabile section beginning in measure 11 is performed mezzo piano by Little and the other performers utilize the original piano marking by Vaughan Williams. Nahatzki takes a breath at the end of measure 13 while Jacobs and Little breathe at the end of measure 14. Nahatzki takes another breath in measure 16 between beats two and three. Phillips takes his first breath of the cantabile with the other performers after beat two in measure 17. Jacobs and Nahatzki take another breath after beat two in measure 18. A few articulation differences occur among the performers. Little adds tenuto markings to the quarter notes in measure 16 while the other performers prefer to perform beat two without any marking and beat three as staccato. Phillips places staccato markings on the last eighth note of measure 18 and the last eighth note of beats one and two in the following measure. In addition, he places staccatos on each eighth note of the last set of triplets in measure 19. Phillips also adds phrase marks of various lengths in measures 12-22 as seen in figure 30.

He phrases measures 12-14 and 16 by connecting the first note to the last note of each.

Figure 30. Movement 3, Measures 11-22: Phillips.
measure. In measures 15 and 17 Phillips phrases the beginning of each measure to the first note in beat two. He phrases beat three of measure 17 to beat two in the following measure and phrases beat three of measure 21 to the downbeat of measure 22 which mirrors the pickup notes to measure 12.

**Measures 26-48**

Phillips adds various phrase markings from the pick up note of the *poco animato* through measure 36 as seen in figure 31. He groups the last beat in measure 26 to the downbeat of measure 27 and phrases the beginning of beat three in measure 27 to beat two in measure 28. Phillips repeats this phrasing pattern for the following passage beginning at the end of measure 28 and extending into the next measure. The third beat of measure 29 is phrased to beat one in measure 30 and beat two is phrased as its own unit. He creates a longer phrase from the beginning of measure 31 to the half note F sharp in measure 33.

![Sheet Music](image)

Figure 31. Movement 3, Measures 26-36: Phillips.
The third beat of this measure is phrased to the end of measure 34 and measures 35-36 are phrased together. Jacobs, Little and Nahatzki differ only their breath marks during measures 26-36. Little and Nahatzki add a breath after the half note in measure 33 and Phillips joins them with a breath at the end of measure 36.

Phillips is the only performer to alter Vaughan Williams' markings in measure 37-42 as seen in figure 32 by adding a phrase mark from beat two of measure 39 to beat two of measure 40.

![Figure 32. Movement 3, Measures 37-42: Phillips.](image)

As seen in figure 33, Phillips again is the only performer to deviate from Vaughan Williams' markings in measures 43-48 by adding phrase marks and changing one
articulation. He takes away the slur over the first two sixteenth notes on beat three in measure 43 and adds a slur over all of the sixteenth notes. Phillips adds phrase marks in measures 44 and 46 that cover each entire measure.

Measures 50-66

Vaughan Williams included a tempo indication, Poco animato, at measure 50 with the marking cantabile e sostenuto. Little defines the tempo indication as “a little faster”\(^5\) and Phillips feels this section should “soar above the clouds.”\(^6\) However, Little prefers to “slightly pull back”\(^7\) in measure 65. Little and Phillips include dynamics and phrase markings respectively to measures 50-66. The dynamics Little provides nearly coincide with Phillips’ first two phrases as seen in figure 34. Little crescendos through measure 51 and decrescendos through measure 53 while Phillips creates a four measure phrase in measures 50-53. In the next four measures, Little crescendos through measure 54 and decrescendos through measure 57 while Phillips again creates a four measure phrase. Phillips continues adding phrase marks to the end of this section including two measure phrases over measures 58-61. He connects the eighth notes in measure 62 to the downbeat

\(^5\) Donald Little to Michael Fischer, 15, 16 May 1998.
\(^6\) Phillips.
\(^7\) Little.
of the next measure and phrases the third beat of measure 63 to the downbeat of measure 64.

**Measures 76-95**

Phillips explains that "#7 should be exciting and super articulate - every note in its place". Jacobs begins this section slightly louder than the other performers at mezzo piano and crescendos through the sixteenth notes in measure 77 to forte in measure 78. The other performers begin measure 76 at piano. Phillips begins a gradual crescendo starting on beat one of measure 77 while Little begins a gradual crescendo on beat three of this measure. Both performers reach forte on the downbeat of measure 81. All of the performers diminuendo over beats two and three in measure 82 reaching piano in measure 83. Little adds breath marks at the end of measures 85, 91 and 93. Phillips includes phrases from measure 76 to 95 as seen in figure 35 and adds a few articulations not seen in Vaughan Williams' original work. He articulates every group of four sixteenth notes from measure 76 to the downbeat of measure 82 by slurring the first two notes and staccato tonguing the second two notes. In addition, Phillips creates five note groupings by phrasing from the beginning of each group of sixteenth notes to the following eighth note.

---

8 Phillips.
Beginning in measure 82 the phrases begin to get longer. Phillips phrases from the beginning of beat two in measure 83 to beat three in measure 84. One measure phrases are seen in measures 84-85 and a two measure phrase occurs over measures 86-87. In measure 88, Phillips phrases beat one to two and beat three to beat two of the following measure. He adds staccatos to the three sixteenth note pickups to measure 90 and phrases from the first sixteenth note to beat three in measure 91. Phillips creates a two measure phrase in measures 92-93 and phrases the beginning of measure 94 to the downbeat of measure 95. The *Poco animato* section beginning at measure 90 is approached similarly.
by Little and Phillips to the Poco animato at measure 50. Little prefers to go slightly faster and Phillips again imagines the melody is soaring above the clouds.

Cadenza

Phillips suggests “the cadenza is the soloists last chance to be super articulate, be dramatic, to briefly sing once again, and to exit in grand heroic style - LOVE CONQUERS ALL.”9 In the first three measures of the cadenza Jacobs deviates slightly from the original markings by adding a crescendo and decrescendo on the tremolo in measure 110 seen in figure 36.

![Figure 36. Movement 3, Measures 108-110: Jacobs.](image)

Again, in measures 111-113, Jacobs alters Vaughan Williams’ markings as seen in figure 37. He accelerates throughout measure 111 and ritards in the next measure. Jacobs and Little breathe after the sixteenth note G flat in measure 112. However, Little prefers to make this breath optional and places it in parenthesis. Jacobs accelerates throughout measures 114-115 and crescendos in measure 115. Phillips joins Jacobs by placing a caesura at the end of measure 115 to provide a slight break before beginning the following lyrical section. Little and Nahatzki prefer continuous motion into measure 116 and Nahatzki places a fermata over the dotted half note in measure 117. Jacobs begins the lyrical section slowly in measure 116, accelerates gradually over measures 118-121, and ritards in measure 122. In addition, he crescendos and decrescendos in measures 120-121. All performers indicate breaths at the end of measures 117, 119 and 122 with the use of

9 Ibid.
breath or phrase marks as seen in figure 38.

Nahatzki adds two measures to Vaughan Williams' original score which are labeled 122a and 122b in figure 39. Tempos and articulations vary among the performers in measures 123-132. All of the performers begin measure 123 slowly with Jacobs and Phillips changing to a fast tempo on beat three. Prior to beat three Phillips slurs the first
two eighth notes, staccato tongues the next two eighth notes, and takes a breath before beat three as seen in figure 40. Also, Phillips indicates With Flourish above the sixteenth notes. Jacobs performs the eighth notes in measure 123 in slurred pairs. Nahatzki and Little slur the first two notes and tongue the next two notes.

Jacobs and Phillips add several markings to Vaughan Williams’ original part from measure 125 to the end of the movement as seen in figure 41. They indicate a slower tempo in measure 125. Jacobs, Little and Phillips take a breath after beat two in measure 125. In this same measure Phillips places a ritard under beat three and begins a phrase at the beginning of this beat which extends to beat two of measure 126. Jacobs places fermatas over the quarter notes in measure 126 and resumes a slow tempo on beat three. Phillips begins a tempo or more accurately tempo primo on beat three and performs to the end of the movement with rapid speed. Jacobs breathes after beat two in measures 128-129 and begins a tempo on beat two of measure 129. Little and Nahatzki adhere to Vaughan Williams’ original marking and begin a tempo on beat one of measure 129.
Nahatzki prefers to perform the final eighth note F two octaves higher than originally marked as seen in figure 42.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Many tubists have questioned the validity of the first edition solo part regarding certain pitches, rhythms, tempos, dynamics, articulations and phrasing. The musical examples in this document should not be considered a definitive Vaughan Williams version. Rather, since the premise of this document is to compare interpretations of prominent tuba players, it seemed important to include significant differences and similarities.

The interpretations shared by Jacobs, Little, Nahatzki and Phillips of Ralph Vaughan Williams’ Concerto for Bass Tuba are valuable sources of information for performers. The impressive accomplishments of these performers place them at the top of the tuba world and make their ideas worthy of study. Through comparative analysis, numerous interpretations have been documented showing that different opinions are to be expected as part of the creative process. It is hoped that this document will provide tuba players and teachers an important teaching resource. However, tubists and teachers should use this document only as a source of possible interpretations. The young tuba player certainly should experiment with the ideas presented in this document, but should also explore his or her own ideas.
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