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ABSTRACT

This monograph gives information about the collaborative process that takes place between commissioning saxophonists and composers of electronic music. It focuses specifically on music for solo performers and works for electronics, either with prerecorded tape or live electronics. The core of this paper centers on interviews conducted with composers of works for saxophone and electronics and professional saxophonists about the nature of their collaborations on new music for solo saxophone and electronics. The composers and performers selected had previously worked together on preparing and premiering a piece. Questions were developed for interviews of the composers and performers. The questions were about the collaborative process and specifically about the changes made before, during, and after the piece was premiered. Composers and performers were interviewed in person and over Skype. This document also serves as a pedagogical tool for composers and musicians in future collaborative experiences.
INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

In my time collaborating with composers who write for saxophone and electronics, I have had remarkably different experiences. This includes working with composers who have a range of familiarity in writing for the saxophone and for saxophone and electronics, including composers who have never written for the instrument before. I have worked with composers very closely by having lengthy discussions about the idea of a piece and having an initial in-person meeting in which saxophone sounds were recorded and extended techniques discussed in detail. With other composers, the entirety of the back and forth occurred after most of the piece was written. In each collaboration, I felt differently about the success of the collaborative process. This led to a curiosity about how to improve the collaborative experience between composers and saxophonists.

The collaborative process between composers and performers can vary greatly, from little to no communication, to performers having a substantial role in the compositional process. In the case studies examined in this monograph, all performers communicated with the composers and went through multiphonics, stacked extended techniques, and other effects that the performer was comfortable playing and found interesting. There was also much back and forth between composer and performer via phone and e-mail. As with any collaboration, the relationship between the composer and performer was an important factor in the development of the pieces.

At the beginning of the process, I made a list of saxophonists who regularly performed music for solo saxophone and electronics. I did more research by looking at past SEAMUS and NASA conference programs, made a larger list of saxophonists, then reached out to at least twenty saxophonists through e-mail. The saxophonists interviewed in this study were ones who were the most responsive through e-mail. These saxophonists include were John Sampen,
professor of saxophone at Bowling Green State University; Geoffrey Deibel, professor of saxophone at Florida State University; and Nick Zoulek, saxophonist and doctoral student at Bowling Green State University.

I was also fortunate enough to interview saxophonists who are all at different stages in their professional careers. Nick Zoulek is finishing his doctorate at Bowling Green State University, composes music, produces short films for screening with musical performances, and regularly performs new music for saxophone and electronics around the United States and abroad. Geoffrey Deibel is the alto saxophonist in the award-winning h2 Quartet, and frequently commissions and premieres new music for solo saxophone, saxophone and electronics, and saxophone quartet. John Sampen is a true pioneer in the genre of music for saxophone and electronics. He has premiered over fifty pieces for saxophone, many of them for saxophone and electronics, as well as releasing a CD of saxophone and electronic music. He has worked with giants among composers, including Milton Babbitt, John Cage, and Morton Subotnik.

While interviewing the saxophonists, I asked them about composers they worked with on a completed project that was collaborative in some way. They offered suggestions to multiple composers, and I reached out to the ones they recommended. I then interviewed the recommended composers, which were the composers who were the most responsive through e-mail communication. Composers whom I interviewed were Pablo Furman, professor of composition at San Jose State University; Jesse Ronneau, American composer residing in Berlin; and Thomas Rex Beverly, composer and sound designer residing in Philadelphia.

I came up with a list of questions about the collaborative process that takes place between composers and performers. The interviews were semi-structured, starting with questions from a list I created. These questions include:
• What type of personal relationship do you have with the composer/performer?
• Did you feel that your personal relationship with the composer/performer improved after this experience?
• What was the most valuable thing you learned from this experience?
• Can you talk about how much communication went on between you and the composer before, during, and after the piece was composed?
• Did the piece change many times before the initial performance? As in, did you receive multiple drafts of the piece before it was performed?
• Were these edits done because of your comments to the composer, or because the composer mind changed?
• Can you talk about how much communication went on before, during, and after the piece was composed?
• Have you worked with this saxophonist/composer another time?
• How much influence does a performer have on your compositional process?
• If the performer does have input on the compositional process, where do you draw the line between your intentions and collaborating with someone else? Does it have to do with range preferences or preferences that a performer has in terms of technical abilities?

The questions were very broad and then moved towards specific questions about the process. For each interview, I tailored it to the saxophonist or composer. The composer interviews ended up being more specific and detailed, most likely because I had already interviewed the saxophonists and had more background information on the piece, the composer, their relationship, etc. I also applied for exemption from International Review Board (IRB) approval for this project and was granted exemption. I created consent forms for all participants in the study to sign or be read aloud.

There is not much research done on this topic in terms of performer-composer collaboration. There is also a lack of literature on saxophonist-composer relationships; this is specifically true of electronic music. I could not find in-depth questioning and research about the collaborative process during the creation of electronic music for saxophone. However, there has been some research on performer-composer collaboration. Martha Elliot wrote a chapter about working with living composers in her book Singing in Style. She explains the importance of notation, communicating with the composer to express what the performer is comfortable doing
in terms of modern techniques, and willingness to offer suggestions that may make the piece work better.\(^1\) Trombonist Barrie Webb documented his experiences, which led him to many collaborations over the years, in the article *Partners in Creation*. He discusses his collaboration with composers Vinko Globokar, Brenton Broadstock, Peter Tahourdin, Richard Barrett, Michael Finnissy, Anthony Adams and many other composers.\(^2\) Previous dissertation research has been done on specific electronic music composers who have written pieces for the saxophone such as Morton Subotnick and Jacob ter Veldhuis. Composer David Gorton and guitarist Stefan Östersjö document their collaborative improvisational sessions and how they used these recorded sessions to create scores two pieces.\(^3\) Connie Frigo writes about types of commissions, commissioning process, the composer-performer relationship, and a commissioning guide for saxophonists in her dissertation.\(^4\)

While doing these interviews, recurring themes were noted while discussing the collaborative process. These include trust between composer and performer, professional relationships between composer and performer, types of communication during the collaborative process, and playability of the score after the premiere. Other aspects discussed in the interviews

---


include the initial consultation, the revision process during and after the piece was premiered, and advice for young performers and composers in the future.
CHAPTER 1. SAXOPHONE AND ELECTRONICS

Definitions

Electronic music is defined as music produced by electronic means. The sounds may be recorded previously on tape or another medium or performed live. Initially, the term electronic music was used to describe electronically synthesized sounds exclusively. This was in opposition to musique concrète, which consisted of normal music and everyday sounds. The term electronic music today encompasses both, all electronically produced sounds in multiple combinations.  

Many times, pieces are described as music “for saxophone and electronics” instead of taking a further step to classify the music as electro-acoustic, and further into live electronic music and mixed music. Electro-acoustic music is defined as music in which technology is used to access, generate, explore, and configure sound materials, and in which loudspeakers are the primary medium of transmission. There are two types: acousmatic and live electronic. These genres developed in Europe and spread to the Americas in the 1950s. In acousmatic music, the sounds are prerecorded sounds and the audience perceives the music without seeing the original sources of the sounds. In live electronic music, there are two approaches to combining live performers with electronic resources; mixed music and live electronic music. In mixed music, live performers play with fixed media. In live electronic music, sound produced by the performer is electronically modified at the time of production and controlled by the instrumentalist or another performer.  

For more information on the history and development of electronic music, 


6 Simon Emmerson and Denis Smalley, “Electro-acoustic music,” In Grove Music Online, 2001,
one could refer to *The Development and Practice of Electronic Music*,\(^7\) *The Cambridge Companion to Electronic Music*,\(^8\) and *The Oxford Handbook of Computer Music*.\(^9\)

**Trends in Electronic Music**

There are many ways to use of devices to transform sounds in electronic music. Tape music, sometimes written for tape, computer-generated tape, live analog electronics, etc. Composers choose to manipulate different types of sounds in electronic music: such as computer-generated sounds, prerecorded sounds, or live sounds, the control of space through multi-channel systems. Tools composers use to execute their ideas include computer software, digital synthesizers, digital audio recorders, musical instrument digital interface (MIDI), and computers. Specific types of general digital control systems include the MUSIC-N language, with the score and orchestra created by computer code, textual computer languages such as LISP, C++, and ChucK (used for live coding), and nonprogrammatic software, multimedia, and graphical patching languages such as MITSYN (multiple interactive tone synthesis system) and the most well known language, MAX/MSP, created by Miller Puckette. It allows for real-time audio signal processing and synthesis.\(^{10}\)

---


Some compositional techniques used in early electronic music are algorithmic music: serialism, stochastic music, field composition/aleatoric composition, chance, generative music, and realtime music.11 Ukrainian composer Joseph Schillinger first developed a method of algorithmic composition using mathematical processes and algorithms for, as Karlheinz Essl says, “generating or transforming melodies, rhythms and musical forms; techniques that can be considered as tools for artistic imagination.”12 Serialism is a strict method of composition using a series of pitches, rhythms, dynamics, or timbral elements. Stochastic music is generated through mathematical processes and is randomly determined. Field composition creates synthesis between serial and chance composition, making a “field” of possibilities. Aleatoric and chance compositions leave some or all elements up to chance, sometimes decided by the performer. Generative music is constantly changing and is created by a system. In realtime music, the composer uses algorithmic compositional methods to generate sound instantaneously during a performance, rather than creating material before the performance occurs. Composers who write electronic music use technology, mainly computers, to implement these compositional techniques. There are different ways to manipulate sound through computer generation. These methods include granular manipulation of sounds, sound modelling, spectral modelling, and physical modelling.13

The development of electronic music has evolved through the use of mainframe computers, analog synthesizers, digital synthesizers, personal computers, DIY equipment, new


instruments, computer-assisted composition, digital audio workstations, and many other developments. With technology such as MAX/MSP, there is use of live-sampling and live coding in works for electronics rather than everything prerecorded. In recent years, there has been a move toward electronic music and collaboration with various art forms including sound design with film, coordination with time-lapse photography, sound installation with visual art, collaboration with dance, computer-game controlled electronics, and transmission of sound through cellphones.

**The Saxophone and Electronics**

Some of the earliest works for saxophone and electronics were composed by the leading minimalist composers including LaMonte Young, Terry Riley, and Steve Reich. LaMonte Young’s earliest work for saxophone and electronics is *Invisible Poem Sent to Terry Jennings*, written in 1964 for alto saxophone and tape. Steve Reich’s *Reed Phase* was originally written exclusively for saxophone and was first titled *Saxophone Phase*. It was written in for Jon Gibson in 1966 for saxophone and tape. There is also another version written for three saxophonists or reed players instead of using the delay on the tape. Riley later dismissed the piece and does not talk about it in his interviews, focusing more on pieces such as *Piano Phase* and his famous *In C*. He felt that the eighth note patterns were not as interesting and did not change as much over time as in *Piano Phase* and other works where phasing was the main technique of composition.

---


Terry Riley composed and played on the recording of *Poppy Nogood and the Phantom Band* in 1963 and also composed *Dorian Reeds* in 1964 for saxophone and electronic delay.

According to the *Londeix Guide to the Saxophone Repertoire 1844-2012*¹⁶, there are over 1,000 of pieces written for solo saxophone and electronics. This resource gives a comprehensive list of music for saxophone and numerous combinations including saxophone and electronics. The list comes from the many pieces that Londeix has in his possession that people have sent to him or that he has purchased over the years. However, if Londeix did not own it, it does not appear on the list. Every piece written for saxophone and electronics is not in the book, including in that period of time because sometimes there may not be a published score or Londeix did not have it in his possession.

In the 1970s, most were orchestrated for saxophone and tape. Even today, the combination of saxophone and tape even today makes the piece more accessible to performers and more readily available to play in any concert hall without the worry of possible technological woes. In many instances, the sound of the instrument is manipulated through live electronics or tape. Recently, there has been a move towards saxophone and live electronics with development of technology and software. There has also been a shift towards more collaboration with video, dancers, time-lapse photography, use of video game controllers, and live coding and processing of sound.

CHAPTER 2. CASE STUDIES

Zoulek/Beverly

In the first case study, I interviewed Nick Zoulek over Skype. He is currently working on his DMA at Bowling Green State University in Bowling Green, Ohio. He has premiered and also composed many works for saxophone and electronics. He also creates his own music and videos for performances. Tom Beverly is a composer and studied at Bowling Green State University for his master’s degree. He focuses on field recordings and implements them into his compositions. Nick Zoulek comments on how the two met:

He was doing his master’s while I was doing my master’s at Bowling Green. He finished his master’s a year ahead of me. And then later on I was a TA for the University Bands here and I did a band piece for wind ensemble and electronics and that’s how the conversation started going. But he lives in Pennsylvania so he’s not too far but throughout that whole process it was mostly conversations digitally and then a few days before the conference was when we got together. 17

The piece Beverly composed for Zoulek is called Shake the Dust for saxophone and live electronics. It uses MAX/MSP software and a foot pedal to control the Max patches. There were elements of fixed media and also elements of interactive media. The piece also uses a contact microphone, which was strapped to Zoulek’s neck. This amplified humming that Zoulek was doing while playing the saxophone within some improvisatory sections.

In his interview, Zoulek talked about the source material for the piece and some of the prerecorded sounds used: “He was taking…prevailing frequencies in…the field recordings, then [mapping] my pitches over those--that’s how he decided it; so then he’d [ask] ‘Ok, is there anything in your techniques to map over it? And I want to go from essentially from this harmony

17 Interview with Nick Zoulek, November 21, 2018.
to that harmony.” Beverly used the sounds from his recordings and took advice from Zoulek about what techniques would work over the prerecorded sounds.

Tom Beverly explains how their collaboration before the piece was written influenced the saxophone part:

Yeah, the whole section where he’s giving these wild multiphonics, a lot of that was driven by these fingering patterns that he showed me. He’s like ‘this is what I can do, these are the sound that I can create with these certain types of fingering patterns, Now, write something with that.’ And so he kind of gave me a toolkit of interesting things he could do with the saxophone and then and I wrote the piece kind of coming out of that. So the genesis of this piece was some interesting techniques that he could do that I had never written for. So it’s generally the multiphonics stuff with these really fast fingering patterns and then the stuff with the contact mike where he’s playing pitches and humming a different pitch so he can kind of be, kind of play in counterpoint with one instrument, so that was pretty fun.

Beverly then goes on to explain that the type of collaboration was crucial to create Shake the Dust:

I think that this type of piece would have been impossible to write if I weren’t working directly with a performer because of the extended techniques that I was messing with, the multiphonics and we would try out techniques, I’d send him recordings, I’d send him a bit of the score, he would practice performing that and then he’d send me a back a little draft recording so I could see what that sounded like. Then I’d send him a draft of the max patch and what I was doing with the electronics. I’d show him some of the video. It was a lot of back and forth and a lot of him recording some stuff. He would improvise some with the multiphonics and he’d say this is what I’m doing, this is how you notate it. I’d do some composing; he’d send that back. He would play a little bit of the stuff that I had written and then it was a lot back and forth. I wasn’t living in Bowling Green anymore, so it was a lot of emailing back and forth and talking over the phone and that sort of thing. It’s definitely easier if you’re working with the performer in the same place but it was a lot of back and forth with recordings and some in person stuff too.

---

18 Interview with Nick Zoulek, November 21, 2018.

19 Interview with Thomas Rex Beverly, January 14, 2019.

20 Ibid.
Beverly also explains how he feels that a close collaboration is very useful to composers and in making the piece playable:

I’d much rather learn about an instrument from a person that’s an expert at it and is really excited about performing that and so a lot of the- I like using the performers to basically be like well, what are sounds that you can make with your instrument that are really exciting to you? Ok, make some of those sounds. And then I’m like ‘Ok, well let’s figure out how to write something with that.’ I think that’s a really fun way of working with a performer and I think it’s really important to take a lot of feedback from them because composers write a lot of terrible stuff and you gotta go through lots of drafts of things or like ‘is it really worth it to play?’ and then there’s the side of things where it’s ‘Is it really worth it to notate it like that, composer friend? Because it’s really insanely hard to perform that.’

In the piece, no changes have been made since the first (and only) performance; however, he stated that he would make changes if the piece were to be performed again. These changes had to do with the range of electronic sounds. Some were too similar to the range of the saxophone, making the saxophone and electronics difficult to hear. The piece has only been performed one time at the SEAMUS conference. The score was also more of a working score, with notes that the composer and performer only understand and has not been published. It also had improvisatory elements, making it more flexible and open than a traditional fixed score. This was most likely because Beverly knew Zoulek’s overall aesthetic and capability as a regular performer of electronic music. Beverly was able to collaborate on a deeper level and give more control to Zoulek in this collaboration because of their trust through their working and personal relationship.

---

21 Interview with Thomas Rex Beverly, January 14, 2019.
Deibel/Ronneau

For the second case study, I interviewed Dr. Geoffrey Deibel, assistant professor of saxophone at Florida State University. This was an in-person meeting with a short introduction to the nature of my research over e-mail before. He recommended that I reach out to Jesse Ronneau, an American composer originally from Chicago who is currently living in Berlin. Deibel collaborated with Ronneau on many pieces over time, including pieces for solo tenor saxophone and saxophone quartet.

Ronneau wrote three pieces for Deibel for saxophone and electronics: *Ligature* (2004) for tenor saxophone and electronics, *Aphasia* (2008/2017) for baritone saxophone and electronics, and *Parison* (2013) for soprano saxophone and electronics. The two met at Northwestern University when they were both graduate students. Deibel was enrolled in an electronic music class, and Ronneau was the teaching assistant for the class. Deibel describes their initial relationship in his interview:

So I was in a class of his during my Master’s actually and he was teaching this electronic music class and it was an electronic music class that was sort of, (I’d have to go back and look at the syllabus honestly but) it was a lot of history of electronic music so we were studying Morton Subotnick, Stockhausen, those types of things, and just the historically relevant really big pieces that have been created over the years and then we had some equipment that was actually in this electronic music studio at Northwestern including a really, really old machine, that was a relic where you had to put patch chords in and then we’d learn how to sort of operate this machine. We were supposed to write our own pieces essentially; you know electronic music pieces…And then he knew that I was a saxophone player and he was at the time he wanted to write a saxophone piece so we started collaborating that way. Yeah we just we got together a lot. I’d say that happens a lot with most composers. You know, if you’re on a commissioning consortium, then you may not be, if you’re a lead or if you’re just a friend that you’re working with that’s really the process of just initial kind of a group think, in terms of like usually when I get together. It’s like, OK, I want to do this sound, this sound, this sound. Can you do this and this and this? And I’m like yeah, well
what if we do it this way to get that resolved or you know it’s just kind of a bit back and forth and then they write the actual piece.  

An important part of the process was going over multiphonics and figuring out which ones work well on the saxophone. Deibel talks about how he and Ronneau figured out which ones to use in *Ligature*: “So he’d look through this Kientzy book and was like ‘try this one, try that one. Ok, I like that one.’ So he’d get the materials together by hearing what they sound like when I would play them. So that would be information for him. ‘That one works really well, that one is unstable’, that kind of thing.”  

The Kientzy book, *Les Sons Multiples Aux Saxophones* is and was a standard resource for multiphonics published in 1982. Ronneau comments on his initial collaborative experience with Deibel:

> So we worked on that to find the multiphonics and then from the multiphonics, the pitch material was generated and then I would compose the textures thinking about it with the electronics sort of abstractly. and then, yeah, once it was done he came back into the studio as it were. We just made sure everything worked. And it worked really quite well, there was I think maybe one or two things I had to change. It worked quite well and then he premiered it, somewhere in Chicago, fairly quickly.  

The second piece that Deibel and Ronneau collaborated on was *Aphasia*. Deibel talks about the techniques Ronneau used in this piece:

> The bari piece was called *Aphasia*. What he would do the is he would write the electronics would often include surround sound you know ‘quadrophonic diffusion’ as he would say and just lots of manipulation filters of sound, lots of delays and things like that. At the same time keeping, I would say, the saxophone sound intact and not, like. I’m kind of wary sometimes of electronic pieces that add a lot of sounds that don’t sound organic, or don’t sound like they belong. It was always

---

22 Interview with Geoffrey Deibel, December 27, 2018.

23 Ibid.


25 Interview with Jesse Ronneau, January 20, 2019.
coming completely from the saxophone; whatever sounds would be manipulated or added would always be taken from the live sound.  

In *Aphasia*, Ronneau made sure that the multiphonics came easily so that it would be performable on any baritone saxophone. Traveling with a baritone saxophone is cumbersome and not always an option, so making sure the technique was playable on any instrument allowed for more performances around the world. It also takes into account other performers playing on different instruments.

Over time, Geoffrey Deibel and Jesse Ronneau were able to develop a professional working relationship that allowed for fewer questions and more trust. By the time Ronneau sent the third piece he had written, he sent the score with few instructions and it was more improvisatory than the previous pieces. Ronneau commented on how composer-performer relationships affect the way he writes:

If I really know the person well, or get to know the person well, I start to give them much more freedom in the notation or things about timing. So depending on how much I trust the performer, the more I hand over to the performer to decide during performance. And if I don’t know the performer so well, I take back most of the control so that it’s much more shall we say, I guess traditionally notated.

There were changes made after the premiere of *Aphasia*, resulting in two different versions, the original version and the “Berlin version”. Figures 1 and 2 below show passages from the first version of Aphasia, with very specific musical figures. The changes that were made in the Berlin version were mainly omissions, rather than adding sections to the piece. Figures 3 and 4 below show a more improvisational style of composition, with timing notated above the multiphonics rather than shown through note values.

---

26 Interview with Geoffrey Deibel, December 27, 2018.

27 Interview with Jesse Ronneau, January 20, 2019.
Fig 3. Ronneau, Berlin Version of *Aphasia*, Page 1

Fig 4. Ronneau, Berlin Version of *Aphasia*, Page 2
In the Berlin version of *Aphasia*, Ronneau uses the *The Techniques of Saxophone Playing* by Marcus Weiss for multiphonics fingerings instead of using the Kientzy book, which he used for the original version. Ronneau talks about the two different versions of *Aphasia*:

Yeah, so there’s actually recently been a major change with this piece. It stayed the same for about 6 years. I was never happy with the ending because What happened is I sort of lost my nerve. And going from this sort of sound art composition where it’s an atmospheric piece and then suddenly it moves into a more composed piece with an, almost a succession of sounds rather than an atmosphere of sounds. It works fine; it does what it does. But I always wanted to, instead of having it suddenly break into a composed piece redo it so it just goes into a different atmosphere. And so last summer we recorded a new version that I still haven’t put up yet where the second half is completely erased and it’s replaced with a new material.  

Both versions of *Aphasia* use multiple extended techniques. In the original version of *Aphasia*, there is a middle section that is meticulously notated, using quarter notes, slap tonging, smorzado (pulsed breathing), glissandi, singing and playing simultaneously, bisbigliandi-microtonal “key” coloring, and fluttetonguing. The original version is fifteen minutes long. In the Berlin version, the notated section is omitted, with the majority of the work containing multiphonics lasting up to two minutes. The second version contains multiphonics, slap tonguing, smorzado, and tongue rams. The Berlin version is twenty minutes long, but only two pages of score.

The third piece for saxophone and electronics, *Parison*, was written after Deibel visited Ronneau while he was working overseas:

---


29 Kientzy, *Les Sons Multiples*.

30 Interview with Jesse Ronneau, January 20, 2019.
We worked on this in Ireland because even though I said I started to like the saxophone previously, I always hated the soprano saxophone. So he tried to convince me otherwise. So he brought his soprano and alto to Ireland. He stayed with us for a good week or so; we had a nice time. But he showed me all of these great sounds that the soprano can actually make and kind of convinced me that it’s not as annoying as some composers have made it out to be. You can actually do some interesting things with it. yeah this was a fun piece to write as it was extremely, because it’s already the 5th piece I’ve written for Geoff. There’s the quartet and there was a piece for tenor with no electronics. So I could really just or I felt confident enough in his technique and his abilities that I could just do whatever I wanted and so I just really went on sort of flight of fancy with this piece for 40 minutes. 31

Parison is an excellent example of how a score can be detailed enough for the performer to be able to perform the piece if they are not able to directly ask questions or collaborate with the composer. In the figures 5 and 6, Ronneau denotes detailed information about the extended techniques that he wants the performer to execute in his piece.

Figure 5. Ronneau, Parison Score, Notes Page 1

31 Interview with Jesse Ronneau, January 20, 2019.
This is extremely helpful to any saxophonist who may perform the piece in the future, including Deibel. The multiphonics are all taken from the *The Techniques of Saxophone Playing* by Marcus Weiss\(^\text{32}\), a resource many contemporary saxophonists own or are able to access via the internet at [https://www.baerenreiter.com/materialien/weiss_netti/saxophon/seite1.html](https://www.baerenreiter.com/materialien/weiss_netti/saxophon/seite1.html). The multiphonics are numbered in the piece the same way they are numbered in the book. Over time, Deibel not only became familiar with the composer’s style of composition but also style of notation and overall expectations.

---

\(^{32}\) Weiss and Netti, *Techniques of Saxophone Playing*. 21
Having an open working relationship can lead to new perceptions about an instrument. A composer can realize new possibilities of an instrument and increase compositional output. In my interview with composer Pablo Furman, he spoke about his heightened understanding while collaborating with John Sampen:

Then because I had never written for the saxophone I asked him for a bunch of things and I did a lot of research in terms of what the instrument could do. I mean, I had heard saxophones all my life but never had really sat down to think really closely about what they could do. So that’s how the process started with John. And after I did a lot of studying of the instrument, I listened to a lot of pieces, you know, classical music, modern classical music for the saxophone. I sent him a series of sketches that he played for me and he recorded at the studios at his university and he sent me the recordings. And from there, I kept on going and I was in constant contact with him. ‘Can you do this, and how high can you go? How loud? How soft?’ Especially with the issue of multiphonics. So in that piece I literally wrote almost a catalogue of what the saxophone could do and knowing he could do it. Including that section where it goes way up high to some ridiculous written A or whatever it was. He said ‘Well, I can go this high’ and I pushed it even higher. So that’s how it went. So that’s the process.

Pablo Furman talks about how his conversations with John Sampen led to back and forth communication while he was writing *Music for Alto Saxophone & Electronics*. In doing so, he showed me sketches of the piece, from the very early stages through the final version.

So I asked John ‘What’s the highest note that you can play?’ He said ‘Well, I can play a blah, blah, blah…’ And so those became my first two notes but then I started working with a tone series but this piece is not 12 tone. So I started to write pitch notation. And I think, as a matter of fact… Aha! Here it is. What I’m looking for is what I sent to John. So these are the pages that I sent him. And I said ‘Ok, John, play through these and record them.’ So he did. Specifically, these. So he recorded all of this for me. And you can see here – see I numbered all the multiphonics and I said ok, all of these passages are numbered, including the multiphonics. And he sent me a list of all the recordings of each one of those passages. So this is his writing. And so I could always reference to that what it is that I was listening to and figure out. Ok, that sounds good, that doesn’t sound so good. But most of them made it into the score. And then I used all these

---
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recordings, some of them are short – 5 seconds, 10 seconds, as the beginning of the actual piece. So that’s how this started. I’m glad I have this.  

In the case of Pablo Furman and John Sampen, most of the back and forth was not done in person. They communicated over the phone. Sampen also sent him recordings of multiphonics that Furman asked for. Because Pablo Furman knew of John Sampen’s reputation as a performer of new music and of his collaborations in the past, Furman was able to trust that the collaboration would not only take place but would be performed at an extremely high level. The electronics came from prerecorded sound that Sampen sent to Furman. Sampen recalls this in an interview: “He elected to record me on some specific sounds which he then transformed electronically in developing his tape accompaniment.”  

Many sketches, specific edits, and versions of the piece were created during the compositional process.

In *Music for Saxophone and Electronics*, no major changes were made after the premiere, most likely because of the constant back and forth between composer and performer before and while the piece was being written. Figure 7 is a handwritten version of the score, which was created in the middle of the compositional process. In the figures below, the main parts of the score appear the same in the published version as in the earlier handwritten version. The length of the A quartertone sharp on the third line (in the published score) is extended by an eighth note. The next A on the same line is extended by an eighth note in length. On the fourth line in the published score, Furman clearly notates a glissando between the B and D, which was previously written as quarter tone motion above and below the B (Figure 8, line 1). Furman changes the trill from D to an E to D to B-flat in the published score. He also includes an abrupt stop after the F-

---
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sharp at the end of the fourth line, where there was not a rest notated before. On the first line of Figure 10, the saxophone tremolo starts after the dyad in the electronic part. In the former version, the dyad starts after the tremolo between G sharp and B. The length of the first A on the first line of Figure 11 was shortened, from a whole note to a half note. The next note was shortened from a whole note to a dotted half note. Furman also shortens the note of the C on the second line of Figure 11. The next note, F, is notated with a slap tongue in the handwritten score, but the notation was omitted in the published version. The next section in the handwritten score, starting on the second line of Figure 9, is the most different from the published score, with similar figures and notes, but differing rhythms and sequences in the published version. These changes are all very minimal, from a working document to the published version. Sampen also sent Furman recordings of the piece throughout the process compositional process because they lived in different states at the time. The list of the recordings is shown in Figure 12.
Figure 7. Furman, *Music for Saxophone & Tape*, Handwritten Score, Page 1
Figure 8. Furman, *Music for Saxophone & Tape*, Handwritten Score, Page 2
Figure 11. Furman, *Music for Saxophone & Tape*, Published Score, Page 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PNO</th>
<th>Furman excerpts/Title/Notes</th>
<th>Start/Stop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Letter A</td>
<td>0:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1st 2nd withflytune</td>
<td>0:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3rd with Piping Sound</td>
<td>0:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/6 flutter tune instead of grace notes</td>
<td>0:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Letter B</td>
<td>1:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot; take 2</td>
<td>1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Letter C w/Flutter</td>
<td>1:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot; take 2 w/growl</td>
<td>1:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot; 3rd flutter and growl</td>
<td>2:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot; take 2</td>
<td>2:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Letter D</td>
<td>2:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>&quot; take 2</td>
<td>3:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Letter E</td>
<td>3:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>&quot; take 2</td>
<td>4:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Letter F</td>
<td>4:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>&quot; take 2</td>
<td>4:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>5:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>5:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>6:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>6:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>7:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>G6</td>
<td>7:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>G7</td>
<td>7:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>G8</td>
<td>8:03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© Pablo E. Furman 2000

Figure 12. Furman, List of Recordings from Sampen
CONCLUSION

The collaborative process between composers and performers can vary greatly, from little to no communication, to performers having a substantial role in the compositional process. The interviews show that there was much collaboration between the composer and performer. Regardless of the relative success of each piece, all the collaborations resulted in improved knowledge about the compositional process for the saxophonists and about the saxophone and its particulars for the composers. In the case studies examined in this monograph, all performers communicated with the composers before and during the collaborative process by playing through multiphonics and extended techniques and letting composers know certain passages or techniques that did not work well on the saxophone.

The relationship between the composer and performer was also an important factor in the development of the pieces. In Deibel and Ronneau’s case, they worked together on many pieces over the course of a decade. By the time Ronneau wrote the third piece for saxophone and electronics, he was able to trust Deibel to play what was notated: “Yeah, this was a fun piece to write…because it’s already the fifth piece I’ve written for Geoff. There’s the quartet and there was a piece for tenor with no electronics. So I could really just, or I felt confident enough in his technique and his abilities that I could just do whatever I wanted and so I just really went on sort of flight of fancy with this piece for 40 minutes.”

Artists are sometimes seen as isolated from the rest of the world. The general nature of composer-performer relationships is removed, especially if musicians are playing popular

36 Interview with Jesse Ronneau, January 20, 2019.

classical music, where the composer is no longer living. Paul Roe, musician and former clarinetist of the National Symphony Orchestra of Ireland, describes how composers should seek out collaboration instead of working alone: “Creative practice in classical music is usually considered an individual pursuit, especially in relation to composition; nonetheless it is clear from this research that collaboration is ‘real-time’ dynamic creativity. As composition can often involve prolonged periods of working in isolation, collaboration with a performer can stimulate and assist the emergence of new thinking for composers.”

The collaborative efforts can help the composer to figure out if certain passages will work more idiomatically than others, or in the case of extended techniques, work at all. Beverly talks about how he was able to expand his traditional writing style when writing for Zoulek:

The kind of beauty of writing a commission for a specific person is that in general you can get much further outside of the box than you would be if I was just writing for, a piano and electronics piece for some undetermined person. I’m not able to do a lot of the stuff that, I was able to try and get way out of the box from things that I’ve written before because I was working with Nick and because he has these interesting techniques and we’re going back and forth.

When a performer gives a composer stipulations and restrictions for a new piece of music, the probability of the piece working for that instrumentalist is higher. Beverly comments on how his collaboration with Zoulek led him to write things that worked well on the instrument and were also exciting to play on the saxophone:

So just learning about difficulty of things and trade-offs because I think composers can have a tendency to write things that sound cool but aren’t necessarily fun to play. And so making the piece fun to play, and I don’t mean easy but making something that is, that fits the instrument well. I think that was really important for me working with Nick as well as trying to write a piece that fits the instrument well and is fun to play. And I think

---

38 Roe, “Phenomenology of Collaboration,” 203.

39 Interview with Thomas Rex Beverly, January 14, 2019.
that you have a much better chance of writing a lasting piece that lots of people want to play if it is idiomatic to the instrument. ⁴⁰

Furman comments on getting to understand the performer’s preferences to make new pieces work well for the instrumentalist and to have them played multiple times:

I’ll get an idea of their preferences. And the reason why I do that is because I want them to enjoy playing my music. And for a variety of reasons and one is very practical. If they like the piece, they’re going to play it a lot. And also it gives them a little bit of an “in” into the process. So that’s what I did in the case of John Sampen. ⁴¹

Those who choose to perform electronic music generally spend more time learning the technologies used to create the electronics for the piece, working with click tracks, reading unconventional notation, etc. There are many reasons a saxophonist would choose not to perform electronic music. It takes not only an interest in contemporary music and electronic music, but also a large time commitment on the part of the performer to read nontraditional notation, understand cues for electronic parts, coordinate with time markers, etc. Zoulek not only performs music for saxophone and electronics, but also composes music for saxophone and electronics along with visual media. The more information the composer gives the performer and careful attention to details pertaining to readability will increase the chances of the performer recommending the piece to colleagues and students in the future.

Perhaps composers and performers of electronic music must have a more collaborative process because of notation, technology, use of new and extended techniques, etc. In cases where there is a single commissioner, consultations between the performer and composer can be extremely helpful and informative for both parties. These meetings can serve as not only creative brainstorming sessions but also as important professional development for both

⁴⁰ Interview with Thomas Rex Beverly, January 14, 2019.

⁴¹ Interview with Pablo Furman, January 27, 2019.
performers and composers. Roe comments on how some collaborations can broaden musicians’ understanding: “Such resourcefulness and aptitude when applied in the context of collaboration can result in significant creative development for musicians.” 42 In all case studies, there was interaction before the piece was composed. When possible, in person meetings were arranged. Instead of learning about an instrument’s capabilities such as range, pitch bends, multiphonics and extended techniques from a book, the performer can easily show the composer in a meeting in a practice room. Roe talks about the collaborative process and how opening up with composers can broaden the composer’s perspective, and thus the piece: “The process of collaborative engagement between musicians provokes ideas, images, and sounds that ultimately serve to enhance creative understanding. The focus on the collective development of work rather than outcomes helps open up possibilities that otherwise are limited when working independently.” 43 The understanding that can happen in meetings between composers and saxophonists can expand the composer’s knowledge about the instrument.

Geoffrey Deibel gives advice to young saxophonists about an initial meeting with a composer in an article online on the Vandoren, saxophone and clarinet reed and mouthpiece manufacturer, website:

Holding sessions with the composer to work out the parameters and materials of a new work is crucial; engage in discussions to start, and then bring your instrument along to test out the composer’s ideas when necessary. Always record your sessions, especially if you’re playing. If a year goes by before the piece is finished, you might forget what sound you were making during your meeting by the time you get the completed score! You should also think about the simplest way to achieve a desired effect in music, and to be honest about what is feasible for a performer under pressure. Can you circular breathe

42 Roe, “Phenomenology of Collaboration,” 156.

while going back and forth between slap and regular tongue on complicated multiphonics and extreme altissimo? 44

Composers may choose to consider playability not only for the current performer, but also for future performers. When working so closely with a specific composer, a performer may not realize there are specifications and details that were orally discussed that may not have been clearly written on the score. This can prevent other instrumentalists from performing the piece, or could discourage those wanting to perform the piece again. Ronneau comments in his interview about the detailed notes he includes in his scores so the pieces can be easily performed again:

You absolutely have to give notes to the performers because even if you work with somebody like Geoff very closely he’s gonna forget over time. Or if he’s in, I don’t know, Topeka and he needs to do the piece but can’t find where I am, you know, I’m not answering my phone he needs to have the answer. And if somebody else wants to play it. Yeah, you absolutely have to have these notes with it. 45

The more specific information contained in the score, the better, especially if there are to be repeated performances of the work. If there is an unconventional score, the composer should add detailed notes about how to perform the piece. In an article by Mark Doffman and Jean-Philippe Calvin, a composer talks about providing performers with more than just the written out music: “You have to provide a context from where musical decisions can then be made, because at the moment all you have is dots on a page, and I don’t think it’s easy to get music out of just dots on a page. So I think that’s where the collaborative thing comes in: to provide this context in a manner that sort of works really.” 46 In an interactive collaboration with a composer, the


46 Mark Doffman and Jean-Philippe Calvin, "Contemporary Music in Action: Performer-
performer can gain more contextual information about the piece than just receiving a score from a composer. Additionally, having readily available recordings of the pieces can serve as an important guide to other performers who are interested in playing the piece. If the composer does not care about having the piece performed multiple times, then this is not necessary. In the case of Beverly and Zoulek, the piece was only played once, and the score was not published. Beverly talks about his compositional process, and how the piece was not notated for multiple performers: “...I don’t have to spend as much time trying to figure out how to notate something perfectly. You can work with the performer, get a really fantastic result, get the piece performed and then sort of figure out how to notate it all perfectly later, if you want some other performer to perform it.” However, as a performer, having more information is very helpful when it comes to performing new music, especially music for saxophone and electronics. This will allow other performers to play the piece even if the composer does not interact with the performer.

If there is standard notation already established for an extended technique or a stacking of extended techniques, composers can make the process of performing the piece easier if they adhere to a more standard notation. These types of standardizations can be found in saxophone resources such as the Les Sons Multiples Aux Saxophone and The Techniques of Saxophone Playing. A composer could also look at pieces of standard saxophone repertoire incorporating


47 Interview with Thomas Rex Beverly, January 14, 2019.

48 Kientzy, Les Sons Multiples.

49 Weiss and Netti, Techniques of Saxophone Playing.
techniques they want to include. It is important the composer is familiar with contemporary saxophone literature and compositional trends. The performer can help by sharing literature that they are excited about, consider a significant part of the repertoire, and/or is interesting enough to play multiple times.

In all three cases studies, changes were made while the piece was being written. The composers were all happy with the performances of their works, providing only positive feedback. Giving the performer specific feedback during the collaborative process and after can help to better realize the composer’s vision. In his interview, Deibel talks about how he told Ronneau that the draft of the piece should be written differently:

He was asking me to trill, I think it was just a like physically impossible thing to do. He wanted me to hold this one multiphonic where it was really contorted in the right hand and then he wanted me to trill c6. Which I could have done, maybe with my thumb. And it lasted for a really long time. And I was like ‘Dude, this is going to sound like shit, don’t do this. And it’s not going to have the effect that you want.’

Because Ronneau was given immediate feedback, the trill was changed before the piece was finalized, and also Ronneau learned about the physical impossibility of the specific trill.

Students should take advantage of the network of people they have at their disposal while in school and create relationships with musicians around them. Deibel comments on his and Ronneau’s initial collaboration while they were students at Northwestern: “…He knew that I was a saxophone player and he was at the time he wanted to write a saxophone piece so we started collaborating that way”.

Zoulek and Beverly were also classmates at Bowling Green State University when their collaboration of Shake the Dust initially occurred. Zoulek talks about how

---
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he and Beverly were students together: “I think when we first talked about it, so he was doing his master’s while I was doing my master’s at Bowling Green. He finished his Master’s a year ahead of me. And then later on I was a TA for the University Bands here and I did a band piece for wind ensemble and electronics and that’s how the conversation started going.”  

Performers should also seek out composers who write music they find interesting by attending new music concerts and conferences. In the case with John Sampen and Pablo Furman, they met at the Bowling Green New Music Festival. One of Sampen’s colleagues performed a piece Furman wrote for flute and electronics. Sampen comments on approaching Furman and asking him to write a piece for him: “Pablo was here for a festival prior to that and we talked quite a bit and I invited him to write a piece for saxophone and electronics. He agreed. And then he finished it sometime in 1995 and we premiered it at San Jose State University in April that year.” After hearing the piece for flute and electronics, Sampen took initiative and asked Furman to add to the repertoire for saxophone and electronics.

For further research on this topic, interviews should be done on a more diverse group of subjects. This group of case studies does not cover a broad group of composers and saxophonists, but it is a sample of collaborations that were highly interactive and ended with a finalized result. More research should also be done on collaborations that were not as successful, acoustic music, music for chamber ensembles and large groups, and how the collaboration process works for consortium commissions.

Reaching out, making an ask, having a conversation about performing contemporary music or about the saxophone: all of these things should be done not only to increase knowledge

---
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as a musician, but also to develop important relationships that can lead to more commissions and/or more professional experiences in the future. Make sure that any performance or contact the performer has is positive, and that the performer is always prepared and gives the best performance. Composers who are impressed by the performer’s playing, skill set, and professionalism will be more willing to write for someone who has a reputation for regularly performing new music at the highest level. All three saxophonists interviewed in this monograph play at a professional level and are known for performing music for saxophone and electronics. Student musicians should listen to all types of music, develop their own aesthetic preferences, and have a clear idea of what type of music they like to listen to and play. Understanding these preferences can push them in the direction of what type of repertoire to choose next and what type of music and style of composition they gravitate towards. This can help them to make informed comments when collaborating with a composer. Performers who have a deeper personal connection to the composer may gain a deeper connection to the music itself and perhaps a better transmission to the audience. The future of the saxophone repertoire will depend on diligent saxophonists who are willing to collaborate and engage in important discussions with composers. It is imperative that performers are willing to take the time to meet with composers to collaborate and explain the intricacies of the saxophone.
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APPENDIX A. INTERVIEWS

INTERVIEW WITH NICK ZOULEK

The following interview with Nick Zoulek, saxophonist and DMA student at Bowling Green State University, was conducted by Taylor Barbay Assad. It was recorded over Skype on November 21, 2018.

Taylor Assad: A lot of what I’m interested in is the process of people who collaborate, so I don’t know all of the collaborations with composers or performers that may be meaningful to you, you know, that’s what I want to get into I guess… or maybe just talk about your aesthetic as a saxophonist and as a composer as well.

Nick Zoulek: Well, for the collaborative aspect of it there’s a few ways we could go with it… the first option, the usual, they write a piece, I play the piece, there’s people like Andrew Cole, his piece(s) were you know along those lines. There are other collaborations where the composer has approached me moreso because they’ve heard the techniques that I write with and they’re intrigued by that or they enjoy it or they just want to work together that way and those collaborations are interesting because they’re trying to use that vocabulary in their pieces and really it becomes more of a symbiotic relationship. [The] Sensoira residency that I did at UW Milwaukee that resulted in five works for saxophone and electronics in different sorts and different mediums and that was interesting because it was a year long thing and there were workshops on the repertoire. And then the last thing that could be interesting is my own work, [with] animators and people like that. So which of those is most interesting? That’s a lot of things at once.

TA: I think they’re all interesting, for me it’s more of What did you talk about with your collaborator that made it meaningful? or maybe it changed a way you that you wrote a piece, or your talking to a composer… Did they change things before, did you meet before and discuss what you wanted? … was it during the process or maybe after, you know?

NZ: So you’re more interested in the process of it and what kind of communications were happening? Yeah, ok, so in that case it’s probably most interesting to talk about the ones where either they approached me or we like mutually agreed upon a piece and um yeah so let’s see I guess it goes different ways with who approached who that way but usually they’ll have alright so let’s pick a case study it’s too hard to generalize. So one piece that comes to mind was by Thomas Beverley and it’s called Shake the Dust, we premiered it a SEAMUS when it was in Georgia. And, um, so for that piece, Tom Beverley, who’s a composer and also, um - what would you call it a sound designer. He does a lot of field recordings like another example of his work outside of composing he had gone around and recorded hummingbirds, uh, and then those sounds were used in a museum with this huge hummingbird exhibit so he designs that kind of stuff. As a composer when he was writing this piece, he had just completed this huge trek like…. hundreds of miles on bike through the desert. If I remember correctly it was south of California and part of the way through Texas, and the whole time he was collecting these sounds and images. So first off, one of the reasons for biking through this area, it was so isolated that there was no satellite interference and no grid interference nothing from electrical signals so he could
pick up the sounds of the atmosphere, like, another example would be like the northern lights and stuff like that and he had a specially built like antenna or receiver that would pick that up. For images he was doing all these time lapses of, like, stars and long exposure skies, you know, yeah, different time lapse of desert scenery and things like that. And then he was collecting other random sounds from the desert. So when he approached me and all of these sounds that he and these images that he compiled and what he was interested in with my sounds was all of these different layers how they were… the fundamentals of it and then of course all of these things on top of it. So he was interested in using that sound in that if I remember correctly from the early conversations there was like something representational about that to him about this whole desert thing. You have, you know, the fundamental “what you hear when you’re in the desert,” but then the sounds extend all the way up to these things that are far beyond human perception and stuff like that. So if I remember right, that’s how that piece started. He wanted to use those sounds and then he had these images and you know the sounds of the deserts and he wanted to put all these things together. And the other concept that he was exploring was via Max and wi-fi connection. He would be reading weather data from all of the places where these videos where these things were taken and the sounds were supposed to correspond to whatever the weather was in these particular places. Now, I don’t know if that ever actually worked. I don’t think it did, but that was the concept at least.

TA: Ok. Did he record you for the piece as well? Or no?

NZ: For this piece, no. There are other pieces where samples of mine have been used but this one was not that. It was just, it was saxophone and these sounds put together.

TA: And was it tape or was it live electronics?

NZ: For the performance that we did, it was sound files that were triggered by Max. There was some interactivity but the level of interactivity you know it wasn’t entirely interactive. There was some fixed media, there was some interactive media.

TA: So a combination, ok.

NZ: Yeah.

TA: Cool. Does he live near you or did you meet with him?

NZ: I think when we first talked about it, so he was doing his master’s while I was doing my master’s at Bowling Green. He finished his Master’s a year ahead of me. And then later on I was a TA for the University Bands here and I did a band piece for wind ensemble and electronics and that’s how the conversation started going. But he lives in Pennsylvania so he’s not too far, but throughout that whole process it was mostly conversations digitally and then a few days before the conference was when we got together.

TA: And you played it for him the first time, just like a few days before.
NZ: Yeah. He had, it was one of those things where I would record samples and you know it was that kind of back and forth, which is so typical now.

TA: So he gave you feedback?

NZ: Yeah, that back and forth is tricky and I’ve found this whenever it comes to a piece that uses the techniques that I use … and you understand this too… when you’re… [Skype connection lost]

What were we talking about?

TA: You’re talking back and forth and sending him recordings before you premiered the piece.

NZ: Oh yeah. And we were talking about the techniques and all of that. The biggest point of conversation was how to implement the techniques using the pitches or the you know sets of pitches (If you even want to say that I’m not sure what the theory or method was… of him deciding those pitches), but if I remember right actually he was taking like prevalent frequencies in… the field recordings, then and he wanted to map my pitches over those. That’s how he decided it. so then he’d give me those pitches be like ‘Ok, is there anything in your techniques to map over it? And I want to go from essentially from this harmony to that harmony.’ And that’s what that was. The piece has a lot of circular breathing and singing and stuff. I should mention this one, you do put a contact m\k on your throat. It’s that whole kind of thing and as I’m remembering that, the throat/vocal part had the most like interactive element or the most like live process.

TA: Right ok. Yeah that would be interesting, so I don’t know if I could interview him…

NZ: Yeah, Thomas Rex Beverly.

TA: And maybe like I could look at the score or something too…

NZ: As far as I know that piece was only played at SEAMUS that one time, (laughs) as so many of these pieces are.

TA: I know it’s a lot of work for it to just be played once…

NZ: Yeah, it’s a shame.

TA: What about like after the performance, did he give you any specific feedback? Before you performed it were you like “Could you change this here?”

NZ: Yeah, there’s a lot of that, especially from the saxophonist to the composer and I’m sure you’ve found this and it’s very, I find this to be one of the most frequent things, especially with tech pieces. There’s so much thought that goes into the tech, right? But then the distribution is an issue sometimes along with the score, and how readable it is, and how much is reliant on the performer knowing what to do. Man, there’s this video piece right now that I’m about to do again by composer Mark Oliverio. And it’s a nice piece. It has interactive video and a lot of
sampling. It’s called *Black (Midi) Matter* and I did it at Navy Band [Saxophone Symposium] this year and I’ll do it at Oakland University in just a couple of weeks but, um, this is another one he approached me because he was really into the singing and playing thing, and to him that sounded like a low frequency oscillator where you input one pitch into the other and you get the resulting sounds. So that’s what he was really enamored with. So he gave me the sketch and for Navy Band the performance went just fine but there were a lot of details that if it hadn’t been like my techniques and if we hadn’t talked like the whole time, then you know who knows how that would have turned out.

TA: Or if it’s, say, the next person who received the score, maybe he doesn’t have enough instruction for them but you know because of being in the process with the composer.

NZ: Right. Which is an issue, not just for reproducibility of the work and not just for realizing the composer’s vision but also just for longevity and also advancing the instrument, there are all these things we can do, but of course it’s limited by notation and practicality and all of that so…

TA: Right. Have saxophonists commissioned pieces from you or do you mostly just write stuff for yourself?

NZ: From a composer’s perspective, there have been a couple of people who have approached me for commissions, but it’s, you know that’s why for lack of a better term I’m not a “capital c” composer but a “lower c” composer because I’m mostly writing output that I’m interested in playing and of course others have played the pieces I’ve already written but even with the pieces that I write, really for me the end product is when video is online and streaming or when the album is out and I will shift a piece until then. So I haven’t really pursued commissions as much, kind of purposefully, it’s just not where my output is right now. But I feel like there’s more to talk about with the collaborative aspect especially if visual media or multimedia is at play. What works are you looking at right now for the paper?

TA: All the early pieces like Terry Riley and Steve Reich…

NZ: So is it primarily then is it a question of canonizing certain works….

TA: Not really, … this is more about the process the collaborative process.

NZ: …When that technology is from a large corporation and dealing with the increasingly quick obsolescence of technology, and sometimes even planned obsolescence, right? Because that piece was written originally with the Yamaha WX7 wind controller in mind and then you know you had to port all of this technology around and in Heisler’s document he talks about how difficult that was and all these revisions that they did but you know then when you get to it now, I mean, a WX7 like yeah you can find them, but just getting that running, like, you got to work to make that thing happen. So then there’s the question what happens to that piece? You know, Jeff adapted that one for MAX MSP, but even so, like, what data is lost in the adaptation of it? I always think that you mentioned the Steve Reich and the Terry Riley pieces and all of that. I always think it’s funny when I hear especially like young saxophonists. …Fancher’s recording, you know there are so many questions of identity there, … it’s Susan’s sound… it really would
be quite different than you playing all those parts on your own. Same with Reed Phase… and technically that’s still more analog than digital…so really the medium has changed and it’s important to think about the medium. Where else from there …?

NZ: In terms of recent ones, that Mark Oleviro… the five works for saxophone and media… there was this sensoria residency… of those I’ve only played two of them multiple times afterword the other ones like there are some decent pieces like these Andrew Cole ones this frozen atmospheres piece… Andrew I don’t think really composes anymore but that leads to a really interesting point… but then if other saxophonists aren’t ready to perform it then it’s going to fail and I feel like that’s the story of 2000-2010. Yeah, the guy who was really pushing, especially with the saxophone and electronics thing was Michael Straus… not to mention like one of our key advertising venues is the saxophone conference or any saxophone conference and we still struggle to get solid tech at those which I think everyone’s aware of but how can you give a solid performance?

TA: Have you had any collaborations that were less than ideal?

NZ: You know to be honest, I’ve enjoyed all of the collaborations I’ve had but I really don’t try to force collaborations. I think this is just a personal way of approaching it. …Solid collaborations are built on solid personal bonds.
The following interview with composer Thomas Rex Beverly was conducted by Taylor Barbay Assad. It was recorded via Skype on January 14, 2019.

Tom Beverly: I knew Nick Zoulek because we went to grad school together, was trained as a classical composer… some sound art stuff. I also do a lot of nature and sound design field recording. But, yeah, one of the most recent pieces I wrote was the collaboration with the saxophonist Nick Zoulek.

Taylor Assad: Where were you in school together?

TB: We were at Bowling Green State University in Ohio.

TA: Ok, great. I knew he was there; I just didn’t know where he was before. …If maybe you could you talk about, did you approach him for that piece, or was this something he approached you about?

TB: I got a commission for this SEAMUS conference, which is the society of electroacoustic music in the United States and I got a commission from them to write a piece for the next year’s conference and I’d been wanting to work with Nick for quite a while while I was in school and we had talked through some ideas before and got this commission and decided to write a piece for him. He had a bunch of really interesting ideas of ways that we could try some fun saxophone stuff that that I’d never written for in the past. And, yeah. So we wrote this piece. The piece ended up being a solo sax piece with electronics and a video component as well.

TA: Ok. And was it with foot pedal? Were you triggering the sounds on Max?

TB: Yeah so there’s a Max MSP patch that I wrote that was controlling a bunch of stuff, and then he had the electronics were triggered by a foot pedal that he could control. There were various sync points through the piece. Some of the piece was kind of fluid and then there were some strict sync points when he would get to a section he would trigger the next event with the electronics. So that he could stay in sync with it. He didn’t have a click track he was listening to, this was all semi-fluid electronics that he could trigger with a foot pedal and perform the score that he was working off of, because the score is somewhat improvisatory. He was doing some fun stuff with the multiphonics and a contact mike strapped to his throat that he was humming while playing the sax and saxophone and stuff so it was fun.

TA: So some of the improvisatory sections, I’m sure you wrote with him in mind because you had heard him play similar things before?

TB: Oh, sure. Yeah, the whole section where he’s giving these wild multiphonics, a lot of that was driven by these fingering patterns that he showed me. He’s like, “This is what I can do, these are the sounds that I can create with these certain types of fingering patterns. Now, write something with that.” And so he kind of gave me a toolkit of interesting things he could do with the saxophone and then and I wrote the piece kind of coming out of that. So the genesis of this
piece was some interesting techniques that he could do that I had never written for. So it’s generally the multiphonics stuff with these really fast fingering patterns and then the stuff with the contact mike where he’s playing pitches and humming a different pitch so he can kind of be, kind of play in counterpoint with one instrument, so that was pretty fun.

TA: And so you hadn’t written for saxophone before at all?

TB: Not in a solo context. I’d written for saxophone in some larger ensemble, like wind ensemble pieces. But it was my first solo sax thing, yes.

TA: Ok. Can you talk about maybe the Max patches- was it external sounds or did it manipulate his sound, or was it a combination of both of those things for the piece?

TB: So Max/MSP is basically, it’s a computer programming language so you can basically build your own software to do whatever you want with audio things and a lot of stuff that I’ve worked with. I have this idea of, I call it seasonal electronics, so basically I tend to write things about a specific place and then I build a Max patch that’s pulling in real time weather data and it’s doing some data sonification, so that it’s actually changing the piece in real time. And so for example I have another piece, a piano piece where it’s pulling in real time weather data and if the piece is performed in the winter it affects the pitch collection of part of the electronics so you have a more low, dark, ominous sorts of drones in part of the piece And if it’s performed in the summer it would pull on a temperature data point that was higher so you’d have more open, higher, rich sort of drones coming out of that and so basically it’s the idea I like connecting a piece to a place in real time. And it doesn’t actually take very much that’s changed in the piece to make the character of it change a lot. You just think like horror movie you think high string or something. It very much changes the character of that scene you’re seeing. And so I would do a similar thing with the pieces that I’m working on and so that’s sort of what I did with this saxophone piece with Nick is it used a bunch of time lapse footage and field recordings and weather data from a few different places in the American Southwest, New Mexico and Arizona. And it was all based on, I did this long distance bicycle trip from San Diego to El Paso, about 1000 miles. I did a bunch of time lapse photography and field recording and this whole piece was kind of about that experience. I don’t know what your original question was but that gives you a little bit more context about what the piece was because we don’t actually, he’s performed it but we don’t have a full recording of it yet.

TA: Right, at the conference. So he’s only played it once? That’s what he’s told me.

TB: Yes.

TA: Ok, so, like you were saying, if he played it in a different season, would the pitch collection be different, or is it fixed for that piece?

TB: It would change in that piece, and then, let’s see if I remember correctly, this piece wasn’t changing the pitch collection, it was taking wind speed data and so it would actually change if the wind speed was higher in the location, it would actually play different samples of wind recorded at higher speeds to match the weather data I think is what I was doing but I haven’t
opened the Max patch in a little while. But, yeah, I do it with pitch collection sometimes. The electronics change based on the actual recordings change, so if I’m using temperature data usually I match that into pitch collection. And then if I’m using wind data, that’s usually matched to actual samples. So if it’s higher wind, it’s playing recordings of strong wind. If it’s weaker wind data, it’s going to play softer, gentler wind clips.

**TA:** That’s interesting. So I know you met with him before the piece was written and he showed you some multiphonics and fingering patterns. What about while you were writing the piece, was there any back and forth during the process?

**TB:** Yeah, for sure. Yeah, I think that this type of piece would have been impossible to write if I weren’t working directly with a performer because of the extended techniques that I was messing with, the multiphonics and we would try out techniques, I’d send him recordings, I’d send him a bit of the score, he would practice performing that and then he’d send me a back a little draft recording so I could see what that sounded like. Then I’d send him a draft of the Max patch and what I was doing with the electronics. I’d show him some of the video. It was a lot of back and forth and a lot of him recording some stuff. He would improvise some with the multiphonics and he’d say, “This is what I’m doing, this is how you notate it.” I’d do some composing; he’d send that back. He would play a little bit of the stuff that I had written and then it was a lot back and forth. I wasn’t living in Bowling Green anymore so it was a lot of emailing back and forth and talking over the phone and that sort of thing. It’s definitely easier if you’re working with the performer in the same place but it was a lot of back and forth with recordings and some in person stuff too.

**TA:** So he performed the piece, did you give him any feedback?

**TB:** Yeah, there was a lot of stuff, a lot of little things. I mean I was really happy with the first performance. Just a lot of little things that I would say a lot of little tweaks with the mixing of the electronics with the saxophone and some masking that was happening with certain parts of the electronics that were too much in the same frequency range. Something I had written for the saxophone, just tweaking that, so. Yeah, there were a few things. Not a whole lot of specific stuff. The next time I get him to perform it, we’ll probably try to make a lot of little tweaks. I don’t know. I don’t have a lot of specific things. But yeah, it’s the type of piece that can sound different each time it’s performed. I guess if I had to say something specific, I would say we’d make some adjustments to the contact mike that he had on his throat and how he mixed that into the rest of the electronics. Yeah that would probably be the most specific thing because I really like that effect but I think it could have been more effective with some tweaks.

**TA:** So he performed the piece, did you give him any feedback?

**TB:** Sorry what?

**TA:** I’m sorry, did you say he mixed that in to the electronics? I know he also uses Max and knows how to…
TB: It was just the audio from the contact mike that was strapped to his throat. That would run into the audio interface that was pulling in the audio from his saxophone and the contact mike and it would run through the computer and be mixed into the speakers so the contact mike stuff, he was humming while playing was all happening in real time.

TA: I was just wondering because I know he writes things too. It’s a little bit of a unique situation with that. Do you generally, when you write pieces do you have a concept before that piece starts or do you kind of tailor it to performers?

TB: In general, it starts with a concept more for me. It can start the other way around, occasionally I’ll be in a position where I’ll get a commission for an ensemble and you gotta figure out something to write for that group, that’s a good problem to have. But in general, a lot of the stuff that I’ve written has been while I was in grad school and it was just coming up with whatever concepts were exciting to me at the time or I would just write things for electroacoustic things and just some big speaker array and so you don’t have instruments. But in general I am mostly interested in doing a mix of multimedia and acoustic instruments.

TA: Did you know Nick for a while before you collaborated with him, were you friends?

TB: Yeah I knew him for a while. Had some shared friends while in grad school and got to know him that way and had seen him perform a lot when I was in grad school and was just impressed at how insanely good he is at the saxophone. I was intrigued by the very interesting things that he does that, from my understanding, not a lot of other saxophonists do.

TA: Right. Did that have an effect on how you worked together, because you knew each other?

TB: Oh, yeah, for sure. The kind of beauty of writing a commission for a specific person is that in general you can get much further outside of the box than you would be if I was just writing for, a piano and electronics piece for some undetermined person. I’m not able to do a lot of the stuff that, I was able to try and get way out of the box from things that I’ve written before because I was working with Nick and because he has these interesting techniques and we’re going back and forth. I’m talking to him and I necessarily don’t have to figure out exactly how to notate that I just have to be able to say, “Ok, play it like this. Oh no, that sounds bad. Let’s try this. Ok, play it like this. Let’s make a recording of that so we remember what that sounded like.” And in general, the commissioning process when I’m working back and forth with somebody, I love it because I don’t have to spend as much time trying to figure out how to notate something perfectly. You can work with the performer, get a really fantastic result, get the piece performed and then sort of figure out how to notate it all perfectly later, if you want some other performer to perform it. So in general, a collaborative relationship with a performer is a really fun way of writing a piece and I think that’s a lot of what you’re interested in getting on with this paper.

TA: Yes…I just wanted to know what other people experience [during the collaborative process].
**TB:** I think it’s really fun for the composers, if you can, at least with me I really like it when the performer can, it’s basically like the performer brings a ton to the equation and I’d much rather, I mean that’s basically what Nick did. He taught me all these insanely cool sounds you can make with the saxophone right and I don’t have to go look that up in a book or figure out how to do fingering patterns or whatever. And I’d much rather learn about an instrument from a person that’s an expert at it and is really excited about performing that and so a lot of the, I like using the performers to basically be like, ‘Well, what are sounds that you can make with your instrument that are really exciting to you? Ok make some of those sounds.’ And then I’m like, ‘Ok, well, let’s figure out how to write something with that.’ I think that’s a really fun way of working with a performer and I think it’s really important to take a lot of feedback from them because composers write a lot of terrible stuff and you gotta go through lots of drafts of things or like is it really worth it to play, and then there’s the side of things where it’s ‘Is it really worth it to notate it like that, composer friend? Because it’s really insanely hard to perform that.’ And those kinds of things. So just learning about difficulty of things and trade-offs because I think composers can have a tendency to write things that sound cool but aren’t necessarily fun to play. And so making the piece fun to play, and I don’t mean easy but making something that is, that fits the instrument well. I think that was really important for me working with Nick as well as trying to write a piece that fits the instrument well and is fun to play. And I think that you have a much better chance of writing a lasting piece that lots of people want to play if it is idiomatic to the instrument.

**TA:** Right, idiomatic. How much do you think about the audience, too, when you are doing this process? Or is it more of just an internal, collaborative thing?

**TB:** I think I get pretty conceptual with the seasonal electronics thing. Generally, my philosophical viewpoint on the stuff with the audience is that I want you to be able to appreciate the piece even if you haven’t read the program notes. I want my conceptual stuff to make the piece more interesting, but if it can’t stand on its own without the concept, I think that’s problematic. In general, I prefer to, attempt to, write things that… stand on their own without the concept and then when you read about the concept or the weather data it makes it more interesting. That’s kind of how I think about the audience. Yeah.

**TA:** Ok, great. Could I look at a score? Is that possible? … It’s no big deal if there are no major revisions that are notated in the score.

**TB:** Yeah, there’s no revisions. For a variety of reasons, it got premiered and then we haven’t played it again. It’s a working score. The score is basically just a bunch of notation of the contact mike singing and performing and just these fingering patterns with the multiphonics.
INTERVIEW WITH DR. GEOFFREY DEIBEL

The following interview with Geoffrey Deibel, Professor of Saxophone at Florida State University in Tallahassee, FL, was conducted by Taylor Barbay Assad. It was recorded in person in Baton Rouge, LA on December 27, 2018.

TA: When did you start working with him [Jesse Ronneau]?

GD: So I was in a class of his during my master’s actually and he was teaching this electronic music class and it was an electronic music class that was sort of I’d have to go back and look at the syllabus honestly but it was a lot of history of electronic music so we were studying Morton Subotnick, Stockhausen, those types of things, and just the historically relevant really big pieces that have been created over the years and then we had some equipment that was actually in this electronic music studio at Northwestern including a really, really old machine, that was a relic where you had to put patch chords in and then we’d learn how to sort of operate this machine. We were supposed to write our own pieces essentially; you know electronic music pieces. He was a TA for that class basically and I honestly don’t remember he says that he actually taught a few classes I don’t really remember that I just remember the main professor. If he says he did I’m sure he did. I just forget. And then he knew that I was a saxophone player and he was at the time he wanted to write a saxophone piece so we started collaborating that way. Yeah…we got together a lot. I’d say that happens a lot with most composers. You know, if you’re on a commissioning consortium, then you may not be, if you’re a lead or if you’re just a friend that you’re working with that’s really the process of just initial kind of a group think, in terms of like usually when I get together. It’s like, ‘Ok, I want to do this sound, this sound, this sound. Can you do this and this and this?’ And I’m like ‘Yeah, well what if we do it this way to get that resolved?’ or you know it’s just kind of a bit back and forth and then they write the actual piece.

So but anyways…

TA: So he knew you were a saxophonist, so he approached you. He was a graduate student at the time?

GD: Doctoral student yes, I was doing my masters so and then that led to a bunch of other pieces, us working together.

TA: You feel like you felt more comfortable over time working with him?

GD: Yeah, we hung out too. You know he was part of sort of a group of people I hung out with too, mostly composers Marcus Balter was kind of in that crew, Jim Michaels who I did that two soprano tape piece with, you may have heard it, it was called assembly line. Good piece, it’s going to be on my CD. Who else was in that group? Drew Baker. Yeah, it was that crew. They all went through school together.

TA: Did you premiere it at a concert there? Do you remember?

GD: Man, I think we played it at Northwestern. We did it at the Green Mill which is like this bar in Chicago. This guy, I can’t remember who it was, but this guy used to put on one concert a
year at Green Mill where he would have composer friends of his new music, basically. So we played it at the Green Mill then we played it at a bunch of different places. I think we did it at the Congress in Thailand… way back in 2000 whatever that was 6? 9, whatever that was. Slovenia? I don’t know if we did it there or not but I remember we did it in Thailand because he was in Thailand. Although that might have been Aphasia. Could have been a different one. So we’ve like done a soprano piece, a bari piece and a tenor piece.

TA: What was the first piece that you did?

GD: The first piece was the tenor piece.

TA: The tenor piece? Had you talked before?

GD: Yes…

TA: Did you talk when he gave you drafts of the piece?

GD: Oh, yeah. Especially with him I have almost for every piece. Maybe not the soprano piece as much, but the other two pieces I always have to go through my music, and I think this last version that he did. And he’s also constantly revising things. It was like two summers ago that we were going to try and record the album and then we had issues with recording location and stuff. Yeah, he had completely revised the piece a week before and I was like OK, great. It was basically the same stuff but moved around or deleted or whatever.

TA: Did you like offer any suggestions that were more… he’s not a saxophonist

GD: No, he’s a string player, a bass player

TA: … Maybe it was more…. Easier on saxophone?

GD: Yeah. At the time, I was learning a lot about my instrument I would say at the time because I was just a Master’s student. Berio VII was maybe the most contemporary thing that I’d played. I’d played Albright. Trying to think of what else I did for that recital.

TA: Making you think… awhile ago, sorry…

GD: But I mean I’d played these cornerstone pieces of the repertoire but the things he was asking me to do were new to me. Ligature was the tenor piece and that had a lot of glissing, which is hard on tenor, hard on saxophone in general, but especially on bigger instruments it’s hard to do a smooth gliss. So really I was learning that technique. We take it for granted maybe nowadays. It’s still one of those things that a young student or even somewhat accomplished student might find difficult to get a really, truly smooth gliss.

TA: Right, especially if its over a
GD: Yeah, a wide range. So it’s a lot of glissing. And then not too many multiphonics, but that was usually a big part of it. He would look at the Kientzy book because the Weiss book hadn’t come out at the time. So he’d look through this Kientzy book and was like “Try this one, try that one. Ok, I like that one.” So he’d get the materials together by hearing what they sound like when I would play them. So that would be information for him. “That one works really well, that one is unstable,” that kind of thing.

TA: Was it for tape or was it for live electronics?

GD: For live electronics. He writes everything for MAX MSP

TA: And did you have a foot pedal, or was he controlling the electronics?

GD: I don’t remember about Ligature, actually. I don’t think I did anything on that one. Aphasia was the bari piece. That was the next piece and I had a foot pedal. And the same with the soprano piece, which was the most recent one.

TA: And those are all through Max?

GD: Yeah

TA: Ok, nice. Do you want to maybe talk about some of the other pieces?

GD: Yep. The tenor piece then bari. I think at the time that the bari piece was written he, I feel like it was maybe it still is a trend for these European composers to write, kind of favoring the low instruments and it may be because there’s more possibilities for multiphonics and altissimo notes, bigger tube you can more with that than a smaller instrument like soprano. But he also I think at one point told me he didn’t like the soprano saxophone sound or something like that. But then he ended up writing a really great piece for it.

The bari piece was called Aphasia. What he would do is he would write the electronics would often include surround sound you know ‘quadrophic diffusion’ as he would say and just lots of manipulation filters of sound, lots of delays and things like that. At the same time keeping, I would say, the saxophone sound intact and not, like. I’m kind of wary sometimes of electronic pieces that add a lot of sounds that don’t sound organic, or don’t sound like they belong. It was always coming completely from the saxophone. Whatever sounds would be manipulated or added would always be taken from the live sound.

TA: So you didn’t record samples for him to use, it was all just live reverb?

GD: No, it was all live. And that was the case I’d say with all of those pieces and I think from working with me but also working with other wind players. He wrote a piece for Pascal Gallois, who’s the bassoon player in Ensemble Intercontemporain. He’s the best new music bassoonist, and that was a big piece for him. It was a very successful piece. He plays it all the time. He got all of his sort of lexicon of materials that he likes to use for wind players together through working with me and then especially through that bassoon piece. I think he really got his ideas
together and then the soprano piece came really quick. He’s also written a couple of quartets for h2 but those were just acoustic. But, yeah, a lot of times, I’d have to go look at some of the scores to describe them but I can send them to you if it’d be helpful. A lot of times, he was just kind of interested in the distortion of the sound, continuing distortion of the sound over time, lots of use of air sounds, He would basically start to stack techniques on top of one another. So flutter tongue, plus this plus that. So just increase the distortion of sound over time is what he did a lot of.

TA: And then the last piece, the most recent one you did?

GD: That was the soprano piece. That was Parison. It is called Parison.

TA: And did you find over time he would just send you scores and he wasn’t like asking you questions as much anymore?

GD: I think for the bari one we still a bit of back and forth and at that point I think I did that at MSU. So we probably got together on that in person. I can’t remember when he moved to Germany; honestly it’s been a while now. Definitely with the soprano one, I may have recorded a sound or two for him or a multiphonic and sent it back but other than that, there wasn’t any in person collaboration. I think just as we got to know each other…

TA: It’s easier to communicate and be honest.

GD: Well I was going to say there was one thing that I told him in the soprano piece that “It’s not possible” … Or ‘I know what you want but it’s just not going to work the way you think it is’. It was something. He was asking me to trill, I think it was just a like physically impossible thing to do. He wanted me to hold this one multiphonic where it was really contorted in the right hand and then he wanted me to trill c6. Which I could have done, maybe with my thumb. And it lasted for a really long time. And I was like “Dude, this is going to sound like shit, don’t do this. And it’s not going to have the effect that you want.”

TA: Did you talk about the piece or one of the pieces after the first performance of it? Did he give you specific feedback?

GD: No matter if I think I did well or not, he always thinks it’s great. And I remember occasionally I had a performance I was less happy with. Because I remember I went over in 2008, because he had moved to Ireland originally, so I guess it was a long time ago actually. So he moved to Ireland. I went over and did my first international on my own performance in 2008 there. And I did a whole concert including his piece and I just didn’t feel great about the concert but he like was super happy with it. Yeah, it’s been interesting because I’ve sort of changed my way about thinking about these pieces since then. Really actually kind of recently. They’re not true improvisations but rather than like trying to you know see a traditional piece and you know what it’s supposed to sound like and I think maybe there could be other possibilities. Especially when you’re doing something he’s asking, you’re stacking techniques on top of one another and, he might agree, it might not be one specific sound but there might be a couple different
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possibilities for what that ends up being. So just a, almost take a more of an improvisatory approach to it rather than just trying to be so strict about it.

TA: Did any of the pieces change after you performed them?

GD: Yeah.

TA: Ok. And was that something you suggested or he suggested, or both?

GD: For him, it was all something he had thought up. Just like, “Ok, I don’t like this part. I want to rewrite this. You know, this doesn’t work.” It compositionally things that he just wasn’t happy with.

TA: You may not know this, but have other people performed the pieces that he wrote for you?

GD: Yes. Alex Sellers, I don’t know if you know that name. I think he was up in Michigan or was he in Georgia? A couple people, yeah over the years have either emailed me about them or contacted him directly. Yeah, they’ve been performed by other people.

TA: Do you know if they had issues performing the piece? Because I’ve collaborated with someone and we wrote a piece and he gave it to someone else and it wasn’t as clear. Because I guess they didn’t go through that process together. I don’t know if you had any issues like that? Or maybe you didn’t hear about them?

GD: Ah, I see. I never heard it. So yeah, I’ve never heard anyone else play it. Um I don’t yeah.

TA: I can ask him and he may have more information on that. What are things you wish composers knew more about the instrument?

GD: Well, I think that the aspect of the stacking of techniques, a lot of times composers they find out about you know here’s all these possibilities and they get excited and they want to put them all together. But you know you can’t actually flutter tongue on an altissimo D while you’re doing this. It doesn’t work or whatever it happens to be. So I kinda wish … sometimes I wish they knew a little bit more about that. I think the Marcus Weiss book has been a big help to a lot of composers because the thing about that book he does a really good job, obviously with all the multiphonics, but then he goes through all the techniques and then he gives actual musical examples – like here’s an effective use in this piece. So they get to hear it in context and understand a little bit more about it. It used to kinda be like that. It drives me absolutely nuts when composers will try invent their own notation for some technique that is already established. Sometimes they are asking for something that, maybe it is a combination of things, and so they will have to try and make it clear what they want. But, god, I’ve played so many pieces where they write this for slap tongue or they write this for whatever, you know…

TA: It’s confusing…
GD: Yeah, because you gotta learn. “What does that mean again?” Whenever I get something like that I’ll just write down whatever it is and then at the moment and be like alright, “flutter plus this.” You know, whatever it happens to be.

TA: And I’m sure you developed a personal relationship with this composer over time, through this process? I’m sure it was easier… I think we talked about that a little bit.

GD: Well, we got along personally so that definitely helps. Ha ha.

TA: I’m also doing this as almost like a pedagogical thing for composers and for saxophonists too, so I don’t know if there’s just as an informative thing. Do you have any advice for young saxophonists or a composer who wants to collaborate with someone?

GD: I don’t know if you’ve read it but I wrote an article for Vandoren about commissioning, so that may be a resource. It’s more for saxophonists that want to get into the commissioning thing so that has a lot of my thoughts on that type of thing.

Yeah I think … advice? I think I might say some things in that article. I’d like to see more actual live collaboration, you know. Rather than just a tape, not that a tape parts are bad, Assembly Line’s got a tape part and it works great and it’s a good piece. So I think just making sure the piece works. You know what I mean? And that sounds like an obvious. But a lot of times, it’s like you hear pieces, and I’ve played a lot of these pieces where it’s just like “Alright, what the hell’s the point of this?” Let’s do something that’s interesting and different and something that works. And that’s why I really like those Joe Michaels’ pieces. He’s really doing some interesting things with intonation but in a context that is pretty intelligible to a non new music audience. You know something that people can listen to it and get it. That was the thing about Jesse I would say, is I would ask him occasionally when I’m putting together a program. I would say do you have program notes, and he was like “Nope.” He doesn’t like program notes because he’s one of those people how doesn’t think you should get up and give a talk about this. You know, just listen to it.

TA: Right, and just experience it in real time.

GD: Yeah, and if the music is doing its job then hopefully you can experience it, not have some dissertation on squeak air or whatever.

TA: Since you’re like established, most composers who approach you are experienced as well. So you probably don’t have to explain a lot of things, or do you feel like you do…

GD: About what?

TA: Do you ever talk about preferences or your strengths or anything? Or do they usually just write a piece?
GD: I mean, honestly, most of the people that I’ve worked with had a pretty clear idea of what they wanted to do already. So I haven’t, you know, the at the most I’ve had to say that won’t work or you might get a better result if you do this. Or something like that.

TA: Just kind of smaller things? Not really conceptual or anything like that?

GD: Yeah. I mean usually…. Think Jesse and Joe, Dave Remlich, that would be another person with clear ideas of what he wanted to do, this composer Martin Inen, he wrote a soprano piece that I played in Strasbourg and we’re going to do hopefully a couple new pieces this summer, actually. And so, that’s a composer who, conceptually he knows exactly what he wants to do and it’s just a matter of asking me ‘Alright, can you get this to happen?’ And I’ll say either yes or no. Here’s something. Here’s a little piece of advice. I would make sure if you’re going to do a consultation with a composer, especially, if you’re working on new things, this is something I learned with Martin. by the way. Record them when you’re doing them. Because Martin and I got together in England one summer and did a bunch of stuff. And I was like “oh man, this piece is going to be great.” Then he sends me like this graphic score and I’m like “ah, what the hell was I doing in the session?” I need be able to hear what it was I was playing where he was like “Yes, that.” I still feel uncomfortable with that piece because I think this is probably what I was doing back then. In the run up to the premiere of that piece I was constantly sending him recordings – “is this what you wanted?” And he’d be like “yeah, adjust this.” So record the sessions if you’re working on new sounds, like very important.

TA: Great that’s all I have so thank you.

GD: Yeah, sure.
The following interview with composer Jesse Ronneau was conducted by Taylor Barbay Assad. It was recorded via Skyple on January 10, 2019.

Taylor Assad: So I just have a few general questions to begin with and then I have some more specific things about your collaboration with Geoff. So, and part of this, what I would like to do is just have general questions so young performers and composers can kind of get an idea of like how should I be communicating with people, and I don’t know. Just that type of thing.

Jesse Ronneau: Sounds good.

TA: How much influence does a performer have on your compositional process, generally?

JR: Quite a bit. So the first time I work with a performer, especially a soloist, I get together with them multiple times and listen to them play, look for new sounds, look for sounds they enjoy playing. I try to find new sounds on the instruments and so forth, which is very, kind of a common thing for experimental composers. But then, if I really know the person well, or get to know the person well, I start to give them much more freedom in the notation or things about timing. So depending on how much I trust the performer, the more I hand over to the performer to decide during performance. And if I don’t know the performer so well, I take back most of the control so that it’s much more, shall we say, I guess traditionally notated.

TA: A lot of it has to do with notation?

JR: Yes.

TA:…probably the types of extended techniques that you do as well?

JR: Yeah. Well, the extended techniques, I would only think about extended techniques that a performer’s very good at doing, but things ... such as duration, especially durations of sections, durations of micro sections, durations of pauses or anything like that, I start to leave up to the performer’s discretion the more I trust them. Because I get this sense that they probably know what I’m thinking anyway, so instead of beating them over the head with measure lines and complex time signatures, I can just say, “Play complex rhythms for 36 seconds,” or something like that.

TA: Right, ok… So a lot of what I’m interested in too is the process. I know you have these initial consultations. How much do pieces usually change during the process and … after the premiere of the piece?

JR: Sure. Yeah so usually once I actually start sketching or actually start composing there’s no more meetings, or at least working meetings. I might go have a drink with the person or something like that but I sort of ring-fence the ideas that I want to work with and I don’t want to add anything. Say a performer says, “Oh, I just found this great new technique why don’t we throw it in?” So I try to stay away from the performer once collection has taken place. Then once
it’s in a pretty good state I meet with the performer for pretty extensive rehearsal. And then generally everything works pretty well but if sometimes maybe an idea really just doesn’t hold with the bigger picture of the piece and I might do a quick edit, of just, usually just deletion of a section but I almost never add anything at that point. After the premiere, I often think of a premiere of the piece as an exaggerated dress rehearsal. So what happens then is I generally - after the premiere, hopefully there’s a recording but even if there’s not - I generally take about 6 weeks away from the piece so I can come back to it cold and fresh and then often what happens in my pieces - its one of these particular things for me - is that ideas weren’t long enough or weren’t explored long enough. The ideas, I like the ideas, generally, I like how they follow each other and develop off of each other but almost invariably one idea is shortshrifted so I have to just extend an idea or two just to make the sort of durational balance more effective. So for me, very often, the second performance is actually the premiere.

TA: Great. I know in your piece with Geoff you don’t really use prerecorded sounds, is that correct? It’s more of live things that are happening.

JR: That’s right, it’s live processing of Geoff. I really don’t like the idea of prerecorded sounds with the live performer. It’s not like I think it’s a bad idea or anything like that but we just have the technology now to take from the live performer and add that back in through delays, through sampling and so forth. So I think if you are someone who uses Max MSP I think there’s just so many ways around not using prerecorded sound, that it’s more interesting to use those techniques, there’s much more feeling of self containment with the piece. One thing that I’ve often noticed, and this is either from young composers or professional composers, they’ll have say a piece for “live performer x” and 8 copies of “x.” But each of those 8 copies were recorded in a different space and then you have no idea what acoustic space you’re actually in when you hear it live. And it just seems kind of lazy to me, it’s not an intentional point to confuse you where you are but it’s just kind of a “well, that was recorded in a sound studio and this was recorded in a bathroom” kind of thing. I like the idea of just taking from a live performer.

TA: Can you briefly talk about a maybe really positive experience you’ve had with a collaborator?

JR: Oh, almost every experience has been really positive. And so for instance with Geoff, goodness we started collaborating, oh boy, in maybe 2004? He was actually a student of mine. But you know I was a GA or TA of one of his classes and then we just started hanging out, and actually before that I thought the saxophone was a pretty silly instrument to be honest. The music I had heard for saxophone in the sort of avant-garde tradition usually sounded pretty silly but he started showing me quite a few sounds that were just fantastic and showed me quite a few pieces that really opened my eyes that it wasn’t the instrument’s fault it was the composer’s fault who had just sort of never really listened to the possibilities of the instrument. So I would say that would be, in terms of the saxophone, the most positive thing that’s ever come from this collaboration is that I actually like the saxophone now.

TA: Good, I’m happy to hear that, ha ha.
JR: He’s taken these pieces all over the world. That’s been an amazing, positive thing. He played one of the pieces in Thailand so I got to tag along to Thailand so lots of life experiences associated with these collaborations and just great friendships that you know have lasted, well jeez, 14 years at least so far and probably well well into the future.

TA: Yeah, that’s great. And I’ve seen you’ve written for h2 as well.

JR: Yeah, so the first piece led to that as well.

TA: And did you feel that over time it was easier to work with him on specific pieces you were doing because he had shown you things. I know he probably introduced you to the Hello, Mr. Sax, the Kientzy, I don’t know if you’ve seen the Weiss…

JR: Yeah, I’ve got it right up there. Yeah, well he introduced me to the Kientzy, [and] the Hello, Mr. Sax. So that was a quite a few years before the Marcus Weiss books came out. In fact, once the Marcus Weiss book came out. I went and re-edited everything so that it was more in line with Marcus Weiss’ system than the earlier system. In terms with collaboration with Geoff specifically, it’s actually gotten harder to collaborate with him just because of distance. We used to live I don’t know two minutes away from each other, and he’s very busy now. But in terms of actually composing, it’s very easy now. I really don’t have to meet with him often to know what he can do. And essentially it’s gotten to a point with he and I now that if I just imagine a sound, he’ll figure out a way to get it done.

TA: Right, the way you want it.

JR: Yeah.

TA: I mean you were able to meet with him I guess. If you’re collaborating with him now he’ll just record it and send you?

JR: Yeah, we’ll often do things over Skype. The last piece we collaborated on we actually worked together in Ireland. That was in 2012, well actually that’s not true at all. He was here in Berlin two years ago and we collaborated on another piece. I forgot about that. I haven’t actually written that piece yet, but that’ll be coming up in the future.

TA: Your first one was Ligature?

JR: First piece for Geoff was Ligature, yep. I had a really small room in my apartment that we worked on that for, oh, probably two or three sessions trying to find some nice sounds. The biggest thing for me at the time was I was very much involved with spectralism. So everything, I wanted all materials to come from the multiphonics themselves so we went through all of the multiphonics for tenor, found which ones were the most stable and then we analyzed those multiphonics and all the pitch material comes from the multiphonics. This is something I used to be really interested in, I’ve kind of gone away from it now, this spectralism. Well, I still use it but, anyway it’s not as strict as it was with Ligature. So we worked on that to find the multiphonics and then from the multiphonics, the pitch material was generated and then I would
compose the textures thinking about it with the electronics sort of abstractly. And then, yeah, once it was done he came back into the studio as it were. We just made sure everything worked. And it worked really quite well. There was I think maybe one or two things I had to change. It worked quite well and then he premiered it somewhere in Chicago fairly quickly.

**TA:** Can you talk about - and that was not with a foot pedal?

**JR:** No, that’s controlled by another user. At the time I was really fresh, I was really green with Max MSP and I couldn’t really figure out ways for the saxophonist to efficiently control Max. That came with the next piece where I picked up a few tricks here and there. For that one as it stands you still need an engineer or someone to run the patch.

**TA:** Could you maybe talk about how the sounds were manipulated in *Ligature*?

**JR:** So in *Ligature* the biggest thing at the time for *Ligature* was spatialization. I was obsessed with 6 channel, 8 channel surround sound. And just the various geometries you could create with sounds, the sounds are very much extended. Very long sounds for the most part. So figuring out strategies of spatialization was the most important thing. And then on top of that there are delays to build up very thick, almost ligate-like textures. ... But each delay is on its own spatial trajectory so that was quite fun. ... So you have these snakes of sound sort of floating through the room. And then the final biggest part of *Ligature*... towards the end the saxophone has to play very high pitch. And I became very interested in, well I still am, acoustic phenomenon. And one of the strangest phenomenon is called... different tones. This is where if you play two pitches together you hear a third lower pitch... So what I was able to do with Max was have Geoff play one pitch, a high tone, and then send that to one speaker so you have Geoff in one speaker playing the pitch he’s at, and then transpose that pitch with Max just ever so slightly but in different directions on the other four speakers. So that depending on where you are in the audience you’re going to get different tones during the performance. And if you’re in the sweet spot, you hear 7 or 8 different difference tones. So that was a lot of fun because I actually got to use some of my high school physics of distance relationships and so forth. It actually became part of my dissertation at Northwestern, doing some calculations on this. And I think that was the most fun revelation I guess you might say, working on that piece is this really overlaying of distance tones.

**TA:** So if we can move on to *Aphasia* for bari. I know it says quadrophic. If you could talk about the piece and then talk about that as well......

**JR:** Yeah, so I still, almost all of my pieces for electronics are for surround sound. But the sort of, I guess, focus on surround sound has diminished to a great deal. It’s more of a creating an atmosphere for me now and *Aphasia*, this piece was one of the first pieces to really work with this creating an atmosphere. So for a long time I’ve been obsessed with the idea of noise, extended techniques, and I’ve also been really obsessed with etymology so where words come from. As far as I know, the word noise comes from the French word for nausea so making you sick and I started to wonder, well how can I make a listener ill and I didn’t want to make them sick through violence or loud sounds, but then I remembered that when you have nausea which actually means seasickness it’s an imbalance in your ear, so it’s the fluids in your ear when
you’re on the sea that make you feel a bit queasy. And I realized that if I were to take a complex sound such as a sustained multiphonic, send it to four speakers but have on each speaker a filter suite so certain frequencies are deleted, if you will, or blocked at different times, each of the four speakers has the same filter sweep so each of the four speakers. It’s almost like the concert hall is rocking very subtly back and forth in 360 degree directions. So it creates this very wobbly sense, perhaps like you’re on water. It’s just an effect I was going for and so since I worked with Geoff for quite a long time on multiphonics. I wrote this piece for him. I think it only has maybe 4 or 5 multiphonics but they’re all very closely related. Almost identical multiphonics so that when they layer on top of each other, you get this spatial effect of the uneasiness. You get the uneasiness of these multiphonics clashing with each other because each one is sent through a delay or a reverb unit. And then I add a little bit of distortion here and there as well. So in a way, the performer is almost like a sound source rather than a performer and the room itself is kind of the performer. Obviously you have to be very good with these multiphonics to be able to control them and so you don’t break apart the sound. But it worked quite well. This piece has really taken off. I think it’s the piece he’s performed most of mine probably 20, 25 times around the world. And it’s been pretty successful so far.

TA: So since you already worked with him, did you consult him before this piece, or…

JR: Not very closely, because at that time I was living in Ireland and he was in the U.S. But what I did do was I went through the book, asked him I believe on Skype to play through maybe 15 multiphonics I wanted to hear, see how closely related they were. And then we settled on these 5 or 6 whatever the number is, that sounded good - first of all, that’s the highest criteria - and that were stable, he could easily do on any instrument. So there’s a bit of practicality there because this one was for baritone and it’s really hard to travel with baritone. So he was like you need to make it so that it will work on almost any baritone.

TA: That’s very helpful as a saxophonist. What about after the piece was written? Do you know if there were any changes on this one?

JR: Yeah, so there’s actually recently been a major change with this piece. It stayed the same for about 6 years. I was never happy with the ending because what happened is I sort of lost my nerve. And going from this sort of sound art composition where it’s an atmospheric piece and then suddenly it moves into a more composed piece with an, almost a succession of sounds rather than an atmosphere of sounds. It works fine, it does what it does. But I always wanted to, instead of having it suddenly break into a composed piece, redo it so it just goes into a different atmosphere. And so last summer we recorded a new version that I still haven’t put up yet where the second half is completely erased and it’s replaced with a new material.

TA: And that was with Geoff?

JR: Yeah, that was with Geoff.

TA: I know I was looking at the score and I saw all of the notes, and that is so helpful for any performer.
JR: You absolutely have to give notes to the performers because even if you work with somebody like Geoff very closely he’s gonna forget over time. Or if he’s in, I don’t know, Topeka and he needs to do the piece but can’t find where I am, you know, I’m not answering my phone he needs to have the answer. And if somebody else wants to play it. Yeah, you absolutely have to have these notes with it.

TA: Great. This next one was Parison.

JR: Yeah, I think it’s Parison like the French. Parison is, you know, the glass blowers, the old fashioned glass blowers they have a long pipe and then you have this bulb of burning hot glass at the end. That bulb of burning hot glass is the parison. And I kind of had this imaginary image of a soprano saxophone as sort of the pipe of this glass-blowing process and I tried to create very intense sounds from it. And this piece, I’ve actually never heard this piece, even though it’s been performed 3 or 4 times. I’ve only heard parts of it. But it’s the longest piece. I think it’s about 40 minutes long. I got into a phase where I really only wanted to write 40, 50, 60 minute pieces. And I knew Geoff could handle it. I think he’s done it 3 or 4 times now and he likes it. But I still haven’t heard it. We tried to record it here in Berlin but we couldn’t find a quiet enough room to get the soft sounds. You could hear other people practicing so it was kind of a waste of time. So we’ll have to record it someday down the road in a quiet space.

TA: And you probably just sent him this piece?

JR: Yes. Well, actually I take that back. We worked on this in Ireland because even though I said I started to like the saxophone previously, I always hated the soprano saxophone. So he tried to convince me otherwise. So he brought his soprano and alto to Ireland. He stayed with us for a good week or so, we had a nice time. But he showed me all of these great sounds that the soprano can actually make and kind of convinced me that it’s not as annoying as some composers have made it out to be. You can actually do some interesting things with it. Yeah, this was a fun piece to write as it was extremely…because it’s already the fifth piece I’ve written for Geoff. There’s the quartet and there was a piece for tenor with no electronics. So I could really just, or I felt confident enough in his technique and his abilities that I could just do whatever I wanted and so I just really went on sort of flight of fancy with this piece for 40 minutes.

TA: Yeah. That must be really nice as a composer, to just be able to write and have that type of relationship with a performer.

JR: Oh it’s fantastic, yeah. It doesn’t happen too often.

TA: Yeah, that’s great. I think everyone wants a collaborator like that where they can just trust them.

JR: Absolutely. It’s good to have one. I think every composer wants two or three, but it’s hard enough to find one, yeah.

TA: Anything else on those pieces that we didn’t cover that you want to talk about collaboration-wise?
JR: Let’s see. It’s probably just trivia but the first one, Ligature, the title I guess the thing that holds the reed to the mouth cap is called the ligature?

TA: Yes.

JR: So I didn’t have a title in mind and when we were, the last rehearsal we were working, Geoff broke his or bent his and I didn’t know what it was called and I was like, “What is it called?” And it’s ligature. And I was like, “Well, that’s very interesting because usually a murder weapon is a ligature.” So that’s where the title came from. So he accidentally came up with the title for that. Let’s see. Apahsia originally started off with me running the Max MSP patch but it was the first time that he suggested that I just create a foot pedal for him so that he could sort of travel with the piece solo as it were.

TA: Right. And he performed it many times because of that, I’m sure.

JR: That’s right.

TA: So following from that, Parison only uses a foot pedal.

JR: So I don’t even need to be there, or no one needs to be there. He can do it on his own.

TA: Which one was edited recently?

JR: Aphasia has been pretty drastically edited.

TA: Is there any way I could see both copies of the score?

JR: See both copies? Yeah. I’ll find the new copy for you and send it on to you. What happens is, the last page on the copy you probably have, it looks almost melodic. That’s gone and what we did is we found another sort of another 5 multiphonics to create another atmosphere/atmospheric type of thing. But I’ll send that on to you. Maybe I could find it really quick. But one thing that I really wanted to make clear was not so much erase the old version because it had been performed for 6 or 7 years, but I just call this the “Berlin Version” so that he has an option of which version he wants to perform. Oh yeah, that’s what happened. In the meantime between Aphasia and now, when it was originally written, I really became interested in these really soft dyads that saxophones can do. If you look through the Marcus Weiss book, there are some multiphonics where it’s only two tones and they’re just so beautiful to me now that I just sort of ripped off Marcus Weiss and put them in.

TA: And other people have performed Aphasia?

JR: No, Geoff’s the only person I know that’s performed any of these pieces, as far as I know. People asked for the score but then I never heard anything back from them. Well, spatialization was a big thing in the 60s and then it sort of disappeared. And then as DVD home theaters became more and more popular it sort of came back into vogue in 2002, 2003. And I used to
write for 8 speakers and then I realized every university, concert hall has at least 4, not all have 8. So I just go quad because I know it can be performed anywhere.
INTERVIEW WITH DR. JOHN Sampen

The following interview with John Sampen, Professor of Saxophone at Bowling Green State University, was conducted by Taylor Barbay Assad. It was recorded over Skype on January 19, 2019.

Taylor Barbay Assad: Could you start with Pablo Furman, the music for alto saxophone and tape. Could you talk about your relationship with that composer, just the process that you went through with him with that piece?

John Sampen: That was the piece that was written in 1995. Pablo was one of the guests at our New Music Festival at Bowling Green State University, probably in 1994, I don’t remember for sure, somewhere around there. And I liked his music very much. We talked at that festival. Our New Music Festival at Bowling Green is a pretty big deal, it’s been going on for 39 years. We’ve had some of the top composers and musicians from all over the country and all over the world… Pablo was here for a festival prior to that and we talked quite a bit and I invited him to write a piece for saxophone and electronics. He agreed. And then he finished it sometime in 1995 and we premiered it at San Jose State University in April that year.

TA: Ok, did you talk to him before about the piece. Did he have any specific questions about the saxophone or your preferences or anything like that?

JS: My proposal was just to write a piece for saxophone and electronics. He elected to record me on some specific sounds which he then transformed electronically in developing his tape accompaniment. We corresponded back and forth a little bit about that and then… After we did the premiere he continued to work on it a little bit more.

TA: Ok. And did you play it other times as well?

JS: Yeah, I played this a lot. I don’t have a performance listing; I could probably get that for you if you need it. I played it many times. I think this is one of our really strong works for saxophone and electronics. I’ve been really pleased with that. We recorded that in 1997. That’s on CD capstone CD recordings. You probably know that already.

TA: Right. And you hadn’t worked with this composer before, this was the first time you had worked with him.

JS: Right.

TA: Great. If we can move onto Burton Beerman, the concerto that he wrote for you. If there was any discussion before, during, and after the piece, just kind of about your collaborative process with him.

JS: Yes. Burton was a faculty member at Bowling Green when we came to the University here in 1977 and he was on the faculty as a composer. I immediately asked him to write a piece for saxophone and piano. He wrote a piece called Moment 1978, which we premiered in Belgium
that year. He then went on to write three or four other pieces for saxophone. But the concerto, I
think he wrote in 1981, I believe. We premiered it in 1981 at Arizona State. He wanted to write
concerto for saxophone and electronic wind instruments that would allow us to do an actual full
length concerto but not have to have an orchestra that would perform, it would be all
electronically. So he recorded myself, he recorded several colleagues on tape. He played with
their sound a little bit. So you don’t always here a clarinet, for example that he recorded. You
hear something that has been transformed into something electronic. But it’s a full blown
concerto but it’s just with electronic accompaniment. At that time, of course it was all on tape,
now it’s not anymore, It’s all done on computer. But he was splicing tape together, putting all
this into its current format. We recorded that for a long playing disc in 1982. It came out on a
record, Ryan recordings and then later we put the same recording on a CD that was with Albany
records. Burton was a clarinetist so he knew wind instruments, certainly and he knew a little bit
about saxophone, but we did experiment a lot with possibilities that he put into the concerto.

TA: And after he gave you the part did you ask him to change anything?

JS: I don’t remember exact changes; I’m going to look at the part for a second. Certain things,
there was certain multiophonics that I know we experimented with to get them to work, changing
some fingerings. He likes to do a lot of things with singing and playing at the same time. The
first piece that I did of his in 1978 had a lot of singing and playing I never had done that before.
And especially doing this in the altissimo register, which was a big challenge. He does some of
that I think in this as well. I’m sure we made changes. I would have to really research to figure
out what changed through the collaborative process but we worked together a lot. We were in the
same building and we collaborated on this piece.

TA: Ok, great. So can we move on to the Subotnick? I read through some of Jeff’s document. If
maybe you could talk about how the piece came to be exactly and your collaborative process
with him as well?

JS: This was a consortium; you were asking in some of the other questions if some of these were
consortiums. The other two were not but this was a consortium with Ken Radnofsky and James
Forger. We received a National Endowment for the Arts grant to commission this piece as well
as a piece by Milton Babbitt called Whirled Series and then a concerto by… I’m forgetting who
the other composer was but there were three composers and three saxophonists. Each of us
received a premiere. This was my premiere, the Subotnick. We got the grant in 1984. I think I
met Subotnick in 1985 in Texas where we talked about the concerto a little bit. In probably 1987
Morton called me on the phone he said, “John, I want to do this for electronic saxophone and for
traditional saxophone,” thus the title In Two Worlds for acoustic instrument and for electronic
instrument. And so half of it was to be on an electronic wind controller and half of it was to be
with traditional saxophone and I presented about 5 premieres of this piece so it was kind of, it
was valuable for me in that way I got to do a lot of different versions of this piece. So the first
version was his, about half of the piece which we did with the Toledo Symphony and that was on
the traditional saxophone. The piece I think originally was to be about 30 minutes long so it’s a
huge piece and we did about half of that with the Toledo Symphony. That was in 1987. With the
wind controller we did the full version in England at Queen Elizabeth Hall and that was January
of 1988. And then another performance with the New Mexico Symphony soon after that. But
then Morton and I talked a lot about the piece and some of the haphazard problems of the wind controller. And the length of the piece and he elected to make a version that was just for saxophone and orchestra and then later saxophone, orchestra, and electronics and then he just did a saxophone electronics version and then he did a wind controller electronics version. So there are many different versions of this piece.

TA: How nice to play it that many times and to have that experience with him…

JS: It was great and I spent a lot of time working with Morton. He was living near Santa Fe when he was working on the piece. And I went and visited with him there and stayed with him for several days and we tried things out a lot. And then he came to Bowling Green and we worked some more with computer. This was at a time when a lot of experimentation was going on with new innovations and Morton was very much at the forefront of these new inventions. So he’s experimenting with controlling the computer, letting the soloist be interactive with the electronics and with the computer. Controlling the electronics with the baton so the conductor could conduct different tempos and the electronics would respond to that. Controlling dynamics as I played the wind controller, if I would crescendo he could write into the program that it would crescendo with me. So a lot of things were happening, it was really exciting but they didn’t always work and thus he started pulling back some of these things that were possible but just not very practical. And eventually, we got to the version now that’s played the most which is saxophone and electronics and that’s sometimes with orchestra.

TA: Ok, great. Do you think this was one of your more valuable experiences, or is there another one that comes to mind? You’ve had a lot of pieces written for you.

JS: This is one of the I’ve collaborated the most with Morton than anybody. Except for Marilyn Shrude, who is my wife… written many pieces for saxophone of course. But because of all of the different versions of the piece and the lifespan. What we haven’t talked about of course, is the fact that that electronic music, the technology changes over time. And as that changes some of these pieces, will no longer be, we won’t be able to play them. And that’s exactly what happened with the Subtonick, we couldn’t get the software or the hardware to perform this piece unless it was put into an updated version. So that’s what Jeff Heisler did with my colleague Mark Bunce and some of the older electronic pieces, maybe they do exist with tape versions that have been put on CD, but a lot of them had been lost or will be lost as a result. But we had a lot of collaboration and this piece has a lot of history, a lot of very interesting history. It’s at the forefront of our modern computer so it’s exciting to see that.

TA: Yeah, that’s great.

JS: You had asked what electronic music I had played prior to maybe to these three and how far back I went. I played a piece by Karl Korte called dialogues, that would have been in the early 1970s. There wasn’t very much at that point. It was called Dialogue for Alto Saxophone and Tape in 1971. There was a piece by Don Owens who was a colleague of mine back when I was teaching high school. He wrote a piece in 1973 for saxophone and tape that I did. So those are two of the earlier things I was doing with electronics but there just wasn’t very much music at the time for this medium. I did a piece of Marilyn’s she had written an acoustic saxophone
quartet, and one of my colleagues and I, we prerecorded two of the tracks and played live two of
the other tracks against. I wouldn’t really call that electronic music but we used electronic music
equipment for it. That was in 1973.

**TA:** What do you wish composers knew more about the instrument?

**JS:** Well, I don’t have a good answer for that. I always tell composers that I’m working with,
young composers, especially that they should be working with a live performer and trying things.
Because often times they read in a book, you know the Daniel Kientzy book multiphonics? Ok, a
lot of them don’t work very well and young composers will get that book and they’ll try, they’ll
write something in because it’s got the right notes in it for their piece but the saxophonists can’t
make it work. So it’s really important to have a player trying these out, especially the performer
that’s going to do the premiere. If you have maybe not such an advanced saxophonist, then you
don’t want to write those really hard ones. Just experimenting with a live player is absolutely
imperative. You know we talked about the range, we can play a full octave above the f and f
sharp but we wouldn’t want to write those in 32nd notes up there in that range so telling them
what’s practical in the altissimo register. The Pablo Furman piece goes up really high but he uses
that in a way that allows the player to get ready and prepare for playing the right note. So I think
those kind of things, just encouraging players and composers to work together in that process.
The following interview with Pablo, Professor of Composition at San José State University, was conducted by Taylor Barbay Assad. It was recorded over Skype on January 25, 2019.

The beginning of interview was not recorded because of technological problems.

**Pablo Furman:** So, I was talking about the influence of the performer on the compositional process. And so it depends. I’ll give you one example. When the person who was asking me to compose something for them just says “write whatever” and so it’s completely up to me. On the other hand, they may ask me “Could you write a piece like such and such a thing?” Then I have to decide is that my style or do they want something that is very close to something else that they like? Then I have to make a decision: do I want to go that way or not. Usually it’s either write whatever you want, in the case of John Sampen, and there was a caveat that he placed, I’ll tell you in a second. Or something in between where I will ask them like I said for “What things do you like playing?” and I’ll get an idea of their preferences. And the reason why I do that is because I want them to enjoy playing my music. And for a variety of reasons and one is very practical. If they like the piece, they’re going to play it a lot. And also it gives them a little bit of an “in” into the process. So that’s what I did in the case of John Sampen. The caveat that he placed, when he worked with John Cage that he told John the only requirements that there had to be notes. Of course that was John Cage. In my case, he had heard a piece that I had performed at Bowling Green State and he said something like that. He wanted something with electronics and so that was the only condition that he placed. Other than that, it could be in any style I wanted. Then because I had never written for the saxophone I asked him for a bunch of things and I did a lot of research in terms of what the instrument could do. I mean, I had heard saxophones all my life but never had really sat down to think really closely about what they could do. So that’s how the process started with John. And after I did a lot of studying of the instrument, I listened to a lot of pieces, you know, classical music, modern classical music for the saxophone. I sent him a series of sketches that he played for me and he recorded at the studios at his university and he sent me the recordings. And from there, I kept on going and I was in constant contact with him. “Can you do this, and how high can you go? How loud? How soft?” Especially with the issue of multiphonics. So in that piece I literally wrote almost a catalogue of what the saxophone could do and knowing he could do it. Including that section where it goes way up high to some ridiculous written A or whatever it was. He said “Well, I can go this high,” and I pushed it even higher. So that’s how it went. So that’s the process. It depends on who’s asking and how much input they want to have. I enjoy taking some ideas from them as to what they can do and what they like to do and see if I can incorporate them.

**Taylor Assad:** What was the piece you were playing [at Bowling Green], and what instrument do you play?

**PF:** It’s a piece of mine that I wrote many years ago for flute and electronics. And actually that was my first full-fledged piece for an instrument and electronic sounds. You know at the time they were called “flute and tape,” “saxophone and tape,” and this and the other. But that’s what it was. And he liked it enough that he approached me to write one for him. So that’s what influenced his wanting to work with me.
TA: Ok. And that was maybe like a year or two before, was it at a conference, or you were just performing there?

PF: They still do this, there’s a festival of new music at Bowling Green State. And I was one of the invited composers at the time. This was a long time ago. That’s when I met John. A faculty member, a flute instructor back then played my piece for flute and electronics. And so we met each other there and you know chatting and whatnot. At the end of the festival he said “I would be interested in you writing a piece for me and we’re going to record it, and this and the other.” So I jumped at the opportunity. It took a while; I think it took a couple of years after that. And finally he called me up and said “Hey, it’s been some time now and I think it’s time for you to work on this piece.” And I said “Ok” and that’s how it went.

TA: Did your first draft of the entire piece, were there changes after that that maybe he gave you?

PF: There weren’t many changes. I worked very hard and I remember specifically the sections, excerpts that I sent him and they actually all made it into the piece. I can’t remember if it was specifically in the middle, but it was afterwards, when he, and actually on the way to the airport because he came here to California to premiere it. And he left me his copy of the score and at the airport when I took him back we sat down and he circled all the edits he had made, particularly about fingerings for the multiphonics. And we had gone back and forth with that. I knew that he could play them all because he recorded them. I wrote a long list of multiphonics for him and I sent those to him. And he said, “Well, I can do all of these,” “These are very difficult,” or “I don’t think you’re going to like the sound, etc., etc.” And that’s when I really learned about working with multiphonics for wind instruments, particularly single reed instruments. That you may hear, you may read about them but then you really have to focus on what that one player can do with that one instrument with that kind of reed. And so you know, it’s tricky in that sense you can’t just write any type of multiphonic or new technique unless you really tailor it for that one performer for that one instrument. I recently wrote a piece for oboe and the same thing happened. She’s one of the top oboists in the nation, she’s the principal with the New York Philharmonic. So she can play anything. She started her career many years ago with the Berio Sequenza. I mean, crazy. And she says, “I don’t want to play that piece anymore, it’s so hard” she always has to relearn it. But in my piece, I use multiphonics too but it depends on what instrument she has to play and what reed she was using, so it’s kind of like “Oh, forget it.” But with John at the time, it was a crazy time, you know, “Yeah, let’s do anything.” And so with the back and forth, we figured out what he could do well. I mean he can do just about anything well, but that would sound really good and therefore what fingerings would work best. And I remember at the airport, he just jotted those things down, you know he said, “Write it this way.” One point that may be interesting for you and for me and for when I talk to students about it is that many times when people write multiphonics, they’ll just write “multiphonic on this note,” and so they leave it up to the player to figure out. And in that piece I have very specific pitches sometimes in the multiphonic, sometimes like four pitches. And I said, “John, do you think that this is crazy, to have those very specific pitches and then it starts with one, then you hear the multiphonic and it ends up with another one?” And he said, “No, just leave it like that because the more information the better, because they will attempt to really play, really sound all those pitches.” And I thought
that was really nice feedback from him. So that was about as much as he gave me feedback to rewriting. It wasn’t rewriting the piece but actually correcting things or adding edits to some of those things like multiphonics that can be very tricky. And he asked me to be as specific as possible. He said “No, write these fingerings.”

**TA:** Do you know, have many other people performed it?

**PF:** Yes, I don’t remember all the names. One is a person from France, Claude Delangle, the professor at the Paris Conservatory. And through John’s acquaintance with him through international festivals and whatnot. I think that Claude is like the fourth saxophone teacher after Sax.

**TA:** Yes.

**PF:** You know the story about degrees of separation?

**TA:** Yes.

**PF:** So I have, whatever, five degrees of separation from the inventor of the instrument. So that was funny. Also, fantastic player and nice to know that they use it now in their pedagogy over there. So the graduating students have to know how to play certain pieces. So that one became one of those pieces that they had to perform. So that was kind of funny.

And another very good saxophonist from the Boston area. He has a Greek name; I can’t remember his name. I’ll remember in a while. He’s played it several times in the Boston area and then he went on tour in Eastern Europe several years ago and took it with him. Lately somebody else played it, he’s from Canada. He teaches at University of Alberta. What’s his name?

**TA:** Bill Street?

**PF:** Yeah. So he was out here in San Jose. He played it again. So the piece has been played by other people. You know John plays it any time he can. He sends me concert reports. And that’s exciting because they all have a different interpretation of it. And I’m fine, I’m not a stickler for, “Oh no, you have to play it just like this.” In fact, Bill, when he played it over here he said, “John didn’t do this right. And he should have done this, blah, blah, blah. And he didn’t play that note right.” And I said “Whatever.” So he edited a couple of things, said, “No, John wrote it this way, it shouldn’t be that.” So a lot of people have played it. It’s fun to see it being played by other people and giving it different interpretations.

**TA:** Can you talk about the process or how you created the tape part for the piece? Or what your process was behind that specifically?

**PF:** Yeah. Always I start with the sound of the instrument itself. And that was another reason why I asked John to record all those passages because then I had all those recordings and he made digital recordings of it so there was no quality loss. Because then I’ll start manipulating the sound of the instrument in different ways. And the instrument itself becomes the inspiration for
the electronic texture. So it’s like dealing with a basic color and then stretching it and mixing it with other things. So I think of sound in the same way, particularly with the sound of an instrument. Secondly, I think not only about what the instrument can do but also about what the instrument cannot do. And that becomes part of the challenge and the interesting thing for me as to what to do with the electronic part. So for instance, you with a saxophone, saxophone players cannot play for forever. You have to stop and take a breath. That’s great. Because then, I can make the electronics continue the sound and make it sound as if it’s going on forever. Unlike with clarinet, for instance, you can do glissandos, maybe a fourth, maybe a fifth. But that’s about it. Alright, that’s great because then I can make the saxophone sound appear as if it’s doing a huge glissando until we cannot hear the frequency anymore. And you can see that at the end of the first section – that’s what happened. So the electronics take up a glissando that John recorded and it just keeps going higher, and higher, and higher. It sounds a little bit like a gimmick but the idea is now that saxophone is transformed into something that does not exist. And so for me, the sound of the instrument is what inspires the electronic section. I asked him to play percussive sounds with key clicks and whatnot. And by amplifying those and transforming them, they became percussion sounds. So the saxophone’s sound become the percussion accompaniment and things like that. So that’s the process. You know, at the time I was using technology that was available back then. I guess I wrote the piece 18 years ago, which seems unbelievable to me. So I used anything that I had at my disposal, at home and at the university. But that’s how the process starts, it’s from the sounds of the instruments themselves.

**TA:** And it’s not referencing anything else, it’s just what you explained to me right now?

**PF:** Yeah. While I was studying the saxophone and looking at pieces. I don’t have it here; you know I didn’t think about it. I could have sent you or showed you some of it, the sketches. I always have it here… Just a second.

Rewind. Ha ha. Because I do have it here. So I don’t know if you can see, so these are all my notes. And so these are the kinds of things that I did. See, there’s no notes, can you see that?

**TA:** Yes.

**PF:** So I just started writing sketches, making sketches like this. These are gestures and passages. But after a while, I collected all of the similar ones. For instance, and the first idea that I had was how to begin the piece. This long sustained note that then the electronics transformed. And by the way, that was an influence from this piece that John Cage wrote for John, actually for saxophone quartet, which is titled *four five*. And I was there at the premiere. It was that festival. And Cage had passed away, I think, a year before. He never got to hear the piece played live. I think that I’m correct about that. Anyway, and I was flabbergasted by the piece. It was fantastic. The saxophones are spread out in the auditorium in four different corners and they start play through the harmonic series. I mean, fabulous. And it starts in a very similar way. Of course, I just have one saxophone and the electronics then take up the rest of the idea. So I collected all the passages in my sketches that were similar. So I created this group, and then this group, then that group and that group. And so by grouping all of them, I ended up with about 5 sections. And that was the piece. So then the trick was to start writing pitch notation. And so the easiest thing for me was to think, “Ok, what’s the lowest written note of the saxophone?” Ok, that’s easy.
“What’s the highest?” Well, that one is subjective. It depends on the player, the instrument, and all that. So I asked John, “What’s the highest note that you can play?” He said, “Well I can play a blah, blah, blah...” And so those became my first two notes but then I started working with a tone series but this piece is not 12 tone. So I started to write pitch notation. And I think, as a matter of fact... Aha! Here it is. What I’m looking for is what I sent to John. So these are the pages that I sent him. And I said, “Ok, John, play through these and record them.” So he did. Specifically, these. And you can see here – see I numbered all the multiphonics and I said ok, all of these passages are numbered, including the multiphonics. And he sent me a list of all the recordings of each one of those passages. So this is his writing. And so I could always reference to that what it is that I was listening to and figure out. Ok, that sounds good, that doesn’t sound so good. But most of them made it into the score. And then I used all these recordings, some of them are short: 5 seconds, 10 seconds, as the beginning of the actual piece. So that’s how this started. I’m glad I have this.

**TA:** Yeah, that’s actually incredible. You keep extremely organized records.

**PF:** Ha. Sometimes I do. Other times, like the oboe pieces. Just all scratches and just they’re there. But in this case, it was a very fun process. I remember I wrote it during a summer break and it was a really fun summer for me, writing that, and the relationship with John. If you ever work with somebody, a composer, I mean, that is so inspiring to work with a performer like that. The piece just writes itself, really. Because the composer will be very excited and the performer, you know somebody like you, will be really excited to play it and go back and forth. Anyway, I recommend it.

**TA:** Is there any way I could take a couple pictures of that?

**PF:** Sure. I’ll send you stuff.

**TA:** You don’t have to send me everything. I don’t want you to go out of your way. Also, could I use pieces of the finished score in my dissertation? I may have to get something in writing from you for that in my document.

**PF:** Sure. Just send me a blurb. Those are usual, you know just typical blurbs – used by permission from blah blah blah. You know I’ll sign it and put an electronic signature.

**TA:** Ok, thank you. This is very helpful and actually really exciting for me.

**PF:** Yeah, this is a good thing to do. Some of my students have done or written a master’s thesis or just graduate research papers and the most exciting ones are pieces that they’ve analyzed of composers who are still around. You know, how many analyses of Beethoven’s *Pathetique* are you going to write? And you don’t know really what he was thinking about unless there are letters. But working with a composer and being able to say, “Yeah, this is what the composer said.” Then you have the right to do that because so many times you read analyses in history books or theory books and you say, “Well, I’m not quite sure that the composer was thinking of that.” But when you work with somebody, says no “that’s what he or she said.” So that’s pretty cool.
What else?

**TA:** This document, in some ways, I would like to present it as a pedagogical resource for young composers and young performers, just about how to collaborate with someone else and how to communicate effectively and things like that.

**PF:** Yeah, I think that process is not only interesting but also exciting. When I don’t know the performers and they somehow, we came to an agreement. Let’s say I got a commission or a grant, but I don’t really know the performers. The process is not that exciting. I mean, it’s exciting because you’re writing new music. I find that working with somebody that I know, and of course that you like as a person, so much more interesting and inspiring because you’re writing for that one person and you know that they like what you do. I don’t know. The process just feeds itself. So, I recommend if you can join forces with composers and/or other performers, I think it’s really rewarding.

**TA:** Have you written any other pieces for saxophone after this?

**PF:** No. I thought you were gonna ask me that. I haven’t. But however, one of my colleagues, Aaron Lington, plays baritone saxophone. And I just helped him do a CD recording. Most of the time he plays jazz, but he’s one of those rare saxophone players that’s both. He plays straight classical music as well as jazz. And this recording was just saxophone and piano. And baritone saxophone. And I fell in love with the baritone sax sound. I mean, it’s an amazing instrument. And he plays it very, very well. In fact, we played, you know Joan Tower has a piece for, she was here couple of years ago.

**TA:** Wings?

**PF:** *Wings.* Yes. And that piece is also on the CD where my piece is. And I had forgotten about that. And just because I saw it in her catalog, I emailed her and said, “You know, we could play this piece again.” And I talked to my colleague, Aaron, and I said, “Aaron, would you play this?” And he said, “Well, I actually play baritone. I don’t play alto saxophone.” And I said “Oh, oops.” So I emailed Joan and I asked Joan “What do you think?” and she said “Oh, what the hell. Let’s go for it.” And as a matter of fact, it was written for John Sampen too. And the end passage, this lick just keeps going higher, and higher, and higher and higher. And Joan said, “You know, this is not possible.” She didn’t like it. Ha ha. So after it gets so high, he has to drop down an octave and keep going up. With Aaron, and this is what happens, right? Every new generation pushes the limits. And Aaron did it on the baritone. She was flabbergasted. And it sounds wonderful. But he kept going, and he didn’t drop an octave. He just went up and up. So having finished that CD with him of baritone saxophone and piano. We talked about it. So I’m going to write a piece for him.

**TA:** Ok, great. I’m looking forward to it.

**PF:** Anyway, so since that one [*Music for Saxophone and Tape*] I haven’t written for another saxophone.
I love the sound of the saxophone. We also have a student saxophone quartet ensemble, and they are very good. They just rock. They keep winning competitions left and right. The sound of a saxophone quartet is also unique. It’s not like a clarinet quartet or a woodwind quartet. I don’t know. So I’m really excited about the potential of writing more for the instrument.
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The requested permission extends to any future revisions and editions of my dissertation, including non-exclusive world rights in all languages. These rights will in no way restrict republication of the material in any other form by you or by others authorized by you. Your signing of this letter will also confirm that you own the copyright to the above-described material, or that you otherwise have sufficient rights to the material in order to grant the requested permission.

To grant this permission, please sign where indicated below and return it to me in the enclosed return envelope. Please contact me should you have any questions or need additional information. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Taylor Barbay Assad
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Permission granted for the use requested above:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(for individuals):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(for companies)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Fischer LLC,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o/b/o Theodore Presser Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed name of company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Licensing Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 2/22/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Acknowledgment:** Carl Fischer, LLC, on behalf of Theodore Presser Company, grants to Taylor Barbay, permission to include the copyrighted musical composition entitled "Music for Alto Saxophone and Electronics" by Pablo E. Furman in dissertation.
February 20, 2019

Taylor Barbay Assad
3753 Hyacinth Ave
Baton Rouge, LA 70808

Re: Dissertation Permission

Dear Taylor:

Carl Fischer, LLC, on behalf of the Theodore Presser Company (the “Owner”) hereby grants to you (the “Licensee”) non-exclusive permission to include the copyrighted musical composition entitled *Music for Alto Saxophone and Electronics* by Pablo E. Furman (the “Musical Work”) in your dissertation (“Dissertation”) to Louisiana State University. The Dissertation is to be published by Louisiana State University per the following terms:

Term: Perpetuity
Media: Distribution through Louisiana State University
Fee: Twenty-Five Dollars ($25.00)

The copyright notices, as they appear in the Work, shall appear in any written materials associated with the Dissertation.

Please sign and return one copy of this agreement.

Carl Fischer, LLC o/b/o Theodore Presser Company

Anastasiya Purushova
Assistant, Licensing & Copyright

Taylor Barbay Assad

48 Wall Street 28th floor, New York, NY 10005
P (212) 777-0900 • F (212) 477-6996 • www.carlfischer.com
**VITA**

Saxophonist Taylor Barbay Assad is currently the Adjunct Instructor of Saxophone and Jazz at Nicholls State University. She plans to graduate with the doctor of musical arts degree in Saxophone Performance at Louisiana State University, and also holds a Master of Music Degree in Saxophone Performance from the University of Florida, a Bachelor of Music Degree in Saxophone Performance, and a Bachelor of Music Education Degree in Instrumental Music from Louisiana State University. Her primary teachers include Griffin Campbell, Jonathan Helton, and Geoffrey Deibel.