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Introduction

The portfolio of compositions and the accompanying commentary explore methods of engagement with iconic works from Western Art Music as an embedded, contingent aspect of a wider contemporary Western culture. The primary goal behind this portfolio was to create a set of compositions that concretely engaged with well-known works from the Western Art Music canon explicitly as works and not as quotation. A secondary aim was to find a set of methods for treating these historical works that not only engaged with their materiality, but also with the aspects of cultural association and reception that have accrued around them. To these ends, I have drawn on historical approaches to the application of Critical Theory in other artistic disciplines such as theatre and the visual arts. These approaches, which are discussed and critiqued within the opening methodological section of this thesis, form a set of frameworks that provided stimulation for the compositions. Whilst I might have engaged these iconic works through historical musical models such as theme and variations or the paraphrase, I was drawn to approaches suggested by Critical Theory as I was eager to try to ground my compositions ‘in the world’, so as not to have them be simple technical exercises concerned only with internal musical matters.

The portfolio of compositions, and their discussion within this commentary, are presented in the chronological order in which they were written. This thesis, therefore, should be read as a selection of snapshots in time that reflects an on-going and dynamic process of composition, performance and critical reflection whereby my reflection on the approaches applied to one work feeds both directly and indirectly into the composition of the next. The portfolio and accompanying commentary thereby blends narrative account with systematic inquiry. In this light, presenting the compositions in the order of their creation conveys the dynamic unfolding of the compositional process across the body of work. That said, there is inevitably some cross-referencing, which I have signposted throughout.

This commentary is divided into two parts. The first part outlines the motivations and methodologies, as well as the wider historical and contextual issues within which the portfolio takes place within and are in dialogue. The second part explores how and why I have used the theoretical aspects and techniques in the practical aspects of composition, with each work given its own chapter.
Chapter 1: Methodology and Historical Context

At the heart of this portfolio is an active, creative engagement with historical musical works. As such, this portfolio places itself alongside a long and varied tradition of musical borrowing that stretches back to the emergence of Western Art Music itself. Before discussing the focus of the portfolio, I outline the wider historical backdrop that this thesis stands in relation to. To provide a broader context and methodology, I firstly offer a historical summary of the larger tradition, before considering some recent examples. This summary will be a means of sketching out the range of ways in which composers have conceived their relationship to historical works in their own compositions. This discussion is not intended to be a definitive account, but simply a means to set my own work into a broader historical context.

Given this portfolio’s explicit engagement with works, and not simply quotations of works, in the next part of this chapter I provide an account of how I conceptualise the matter of musical ontology. The purpose here is not to provide a grand proclamation on musical aesthetics, but simply to define my own approach to how I am conceiving the bounds of the found material. Having outlined these larger-scale historical and aesthetic issues, I then narrow the scope of this thesis by explaining the methodological tools I have used to achieve the central goals of this portfolio — namely the re-contextualisation of a certain sub-category of iconic Western Art music. This section will provide a detailed introduction to several approaches and techniques drawn from other artistic disciplines, to what is often referred to as de-familiarisation or enstrangement, and explore how I have engaged and adapted them within a musical context. I then shift the focus to the principle subject to which these techniques of re-contextualisation are aimed: the highly commercialised, culturally-saturated, canonic works of Western Art music that can be defined as having become ‘kitsch’ by their contemporary position in wider popular culture. This introductory chapter concludes with a consideration of how my work sits alongside, and possibly departs from, contemporary practices and debates in New Music.

1.1 Historical Traditions of Musical Borrowing

The practice and traditions of using, embedding, and referencing pre-existing musical works in new pieces has a long and varied history that runs throughout Western music history. The forms in which these borrowings, citations and allusions take place are innumerable and dynamic, developing as a facet of the wider cultural and aesthetic practices and conceptualisations of the
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epistemes from which they emerged. That said, we can (approximately) classify these approaches according to how the composer has construed the relationship between their work and the original with which it engages. In this opening section, I firstly provide a survey of historical musical borrowing and outline a rough taxonomy of approaches. This serves as the background for a more detailed discussion of recent approaches to the use of pre-existing musical works in the act of composition. I will conclude this part by articulating how my own approach of ‘re-contextualisation’ both relates and departs from these established historical practices.

The medieval trope, the Renaissance parody mass, the nineteenth century piano paraphrase, the post-modern collage, and the New-Conceptualist reimagining of the musical avant-garde all take found material as a basis for their own compositional praxis. Despite their divergent aesthetics, they all fundamentally share and comment upon an overt relationship with a historical predecessor, regardless of whether that relationship is one of homage, critique or something else altogether. These historical approaches, for all their differences, all separate themselves from another form of musical borrowing, from which I also wish to distance my own work, that of the arrangement.

Any distinction between the practice of arrangement and composition is liminal, as every form or arrangement will necessitate a certain amount of deviation from the source work. For instance, no matter how faithfully an arranger tries to adapt a string quartet for solo piano, the different methods of sound production between the two instrumental types will always necessitate a degree of alteration. The difference between a functional arrangement and a re-composition is largely determined by the intention on the part of the agent involved. An arranger is one who actively seeks to retain an understanding that the ‘work’ is identical across both the original and the arrangement by restricting their level of intervention to the minimum needed to translate from one group of instrumental forces to another.1 This contrasts with the composer, who seeks to create a distinctly new work from the pre-existing one, not present a new ‘version’ of the original. For example, Igor Stravinsky’s (1882-1971) The Star-Spangled Banner (1944) is much closer to an example of an arrangement than composition proper. The melodic material is identical, but it is couched in an extended harmonic palette. Stravinsky’s interventions are

---

1 By ‘identical’, I mean that the arranger would attempt to keep the to the spirit of some of the identity conditions in performance espoused by Nelson Goodman. While the well-discussed austerity of Goodman’s identity conditions would mean that any amount of arrangement would, by definition, invalidate the arrangement in his terms. Nonetheless the kind of fetishistic dominance of the literary object is still common to both (Nelson Goodman, Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols [Cambridge, UK: Hackett Publishing, 1976], 121).
therefore limited as he does little to alter or embellish the melodic material, or otherwise substantially depart from the source by way of substantial re-harmonisation.

If Stravinsky’s The Star-Spangled Banner provides an example of an arrangement with a minimal level of intervention, most approaches to source material within the ‘art tradition’ lie closer to the compositional pole. For most, the notion of an arrangement is usually typified by a change of instrumental forces: or, as Michael Boyd describes in his Grove definition, it is: ‘[t]he reworking of a musical composition, usually for a different medium from that of the original.’ The liminal space between ‘arrangement’ and ‘composition’ is most easily revealed by examining when large orchestral works are reduced down to function adequately on a single piano. An example of this can be found in the piano paraphrases of Franz Liszt (1811-1886). In Liszt’s paraphrases he uses a source work from another genre as a vehicle for a display of virtuosic piano technique. These ‘arrangements’ do not simply reduce the original source into a piano short-score — thereby requiring adapting to the limitations and idiosyncrasies of the piano — but they are extended to exploit the idioms of the instrument itself: becoming not simply for the piano, but paradigmatically pianistic. This process can be seen in Liszt’s paraphrase of the third act quartet ‘Bella figlia dell’amore’ from Giuseppe Verdi’s (1813-1901) Rigoletto (1851).

---

2 Here I want to make a slight distinction between commercial arrangements and those intended for the concert hall, of which Stravinsky’s The Star-Spangled Banner was an example. There is obviously an industry of publishing and recording that aims to reproduce different arrangements of works for both commercial and educational purposes. In these contexts, the arrangements often serve a secondary or subsidiary function to that of the performance of ‘the work’. While Stravinisky’s arrangement of the American national anthem served a purpose in the sense that it was written and performed as a patriotic act during the Second World War, it was still performed as a ‘work’ in a concert hall and intended to be heard for its own sake.


4 For the sake of avoiding a lengthy ontological discussion, this thesis takes Lydia Goehr’s understanding of the emergence of the ‘Work Concept’ around 1800 to be more or less true (Lydia Goehr, The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music [Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2007]). In respect to my work, the exact timing of the emergence of the ‘Work Concept’ as a regulative function is for the most part irrelevant. However, from a historical perspective the fact of its emergence is important to the conception of this portfolio. Before the emergence of the ‘Work Concept’ the boundaries between arrangement, improvisation and composition were much less clearly defined, with pieces being not only regularly published for different instrumental combinations, or even completely unspecified instrumentation, but also as vehicles for improvisational extemporisation. In many respects, Liszt’s paraphrases are as much an extension of the preluding tradition of early keyboard practice as anything else. However, as Liszt’s paraphrases were published as ‘notationally-fixed’ works, they can also be considered as re-composition or transcription too. This shift in conceptualisation towards the fixed, idealised ‘work’ is what allows for the distinction to be drawn between source material, arrangement and re-composition that finds an exemplar in this Rigoletto example.
Verdi’s publisher, Ricordi, produced a piano reduction of the complete opera for domestic consumption. The short score stands in stark contrast to Liszt’s *Paraphrase de concert sur Rigoletto* (1860), a virtuosic transcription of the opera quartet. A comparison of the publisher’s piano reduction (figure 1.1) — an example of a ‘functional arrangement’ of minimal compositional intervention — with the opening of Liszt’s paraphrase (figure 1.2) clearly demonstrates how there is a continuum between ‘functional arrangement’ and composition that is at times clear, and at others less distinct.

Figure 1.1: Page 78 from the piano reduction of G. Verdi’s ‘Bella figlia dell’amore’ from *Rigoletto* (1851).
Figure 1.2: Page 6 of F. Liszt’s *Paraphrase de concert sur Rigoletto* (1860), corresponding to the same bars of Figure 1.1.
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The ‘functional arrangement’ and, to a more complicated extent, the piano paraphrase largely proceed from a one-to-one relationship with the original source work. That is, they take the source work and may add, reduce, or embellish that work, but with the form and boundaries of the derived work remaining largely coterminous with the original. This is, however, not the case with most compositions from the Western Art Music tradition that make use of found material — usually a melody, but also potentially a chord sequence or ground bass — to form the backbone of a more involved and extemporised investigation of the found material. Later medieval polyphony took earlier plainchant and used it as a *cantus firmus* upon to which to construct and structure their own material in a form of palimpsest. Renaissance parody masses extended the techniques of medieval polyphony with imitative techniques that began to fragment the ‘logical structure’ of the original source. And the variation form of the eighteenth century onwards was predicated on the presentation of a self-contained theme, which is treated to a process of segmented variation that maintains the structure of the theme. In all these examples, the quotation or source becomes a vehicle for the application of compositional techniques.

Whilst it may be entirely incidental to the intentions of the composer, some of these technical — or musico-dramatic — alterations may add layers of further complications to their relationship to the source materials: most noticeably when structural alterations result in a re-ordered chronology of their source material. For instance, unlike most operatic piano paraphrases, such as *Paraphrase de concert sur Rigoletto*, Liszt’s *Réminiscences de Don Juan* (1841) radically re-orders the operatic numbers of Mozart’s original *Don Giovanni* (1787). Omitting some altogether and introducing a more cyclical form by ending not with the usual ensemble number (or even the more dramatic decent of Don Giovanni into Hell), but returning to material with which Liszt had begun his paraphrase. Whether this radical re-structure of the Mozart opera was driven by purely harmonic or musico-dramatic motivations, or alternatively as some kind of commentary on the original opera isn’t relevant here. However, it raises issues around interpretation of modified source material. Unlike the plastic arts, deformation of a musical work does not in any way ‘damage’ the original artwork. Therefore — assuming a level of familiarity with the original source work in an audience — any changes to a musical work effectively result in the creation of a ‘double image’ whereby the original and the modified work are understood simultaneously.

---

7 This is particularly problematic so for narrative, textual or programmatic sources, such as songs or opera, whereby the original source has a clear, concrete sense of time or narrative logic that is being dis-ordered or disrupted by the composer’s interventions
8 The case of manipulating a reproduction of an art work (such as Duchamp’s *L.H.O.O.Q.*) will be discussed in relation to ‘Kitsch’, pages 37-42.
with the latter being parasitical on the former for its meaning. In fact, for any musical commentary to be appreciable this ‘double image’ is a necessary effect for the process to function. Any potential interpretations of that commentary (either intentional or incidental on the part of the composer) relies on the distance between the modified work and the familiarity and knowledge of the original in the mind of the potential listener. This portfolio’s focus on individual works will mean that this ‘double image’ function, whereby a manipulated object is parasitically dependent on the understanding of an original for it to function as a form of commentary or critique, is an important aspect of this portfolio.

In those works discussed so far, the source material is fundamentally a vehicle for technical variation and elaboration on the part of the second composer. There might be some symbolic or semiotic intention behind the use of found material (particularly in the case of medieval and Renaissance sacred music), but these potential meanings are often secondary to the display of technical expertise. With the onset of the twentieth century this becomes less the case, as there are instances where the extant musical work is embedded as a quotation within a larger-scale original work to create a discernible association or meaning. A notable example is the use of Johannes Sebastian Bach’s setting of the chorale ‘Es ist genug’ in Alban Berg’s (1885-1935) Violin Concerto (1935) (example 1.1 and example 1.2).\(^9\) While Berg’s Violin Concerto is possibly the most widely discussed example of this emergent practice of using quotations embedded within a work that consist of a larger-scale network of allusions, he was by no means the only composer to do so. Much of Charles Ives’s (1875-1954) oeuvre is predicated upon the same kind of interleaving of original material, citation, generic allusion, and pastiche — his Piano Sonata No.2 (1840-1860), Symphony No.4 (1910-c.1924), and A Symphony: New England Holidays (1897-1913) being just three. Whilst in Berg’s Violin Concerto the quotations are most frequently interpreted as signifiers of remembrance and homage,\(^10\) in Ives the citations are constructed to evoke a sense of a specific place and community by layering materials (differentiated by key and tempo) to reflect — quasi-programmatically — a New England fair.\(^11\) Regardless of the specificities of the semiotic intentions, both composers seek to use quotation for signifying purposes and not simply as a formal site for technical play and embellishment.

---

\(^9\) Berg’s Violin Concerto also includes several other quotations and generic allusions; however, the Bach allusion is both the strongest and best known.
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Example 1.1: J.S. Bach, *O Ewigkeit, du Donnerwort*, BWV 60 (1723), Chorale: ‘Es ist genug!'; bars 1-4 [transposed into Bb to match A. Berg’s Violin Concerto].

Example 1.2: A. Berg, Violin Concerto (1935), Coda; bars 214-218.

This subtle shift of aesthetic purpose behind the work of a handful of early twentieth century composers prefigures a much more radical shift that would come in the second half of the same century. The use of quotation in music takes a starkly different turn in the 1960s with the rise of collage and assemblage practices. Reflecting post-modern aesthetics, these approaches are often cited as moving away from the fundamental high-modernist preoccupation with internal coherence. Rather than using found material as a touchstone for constructing a new work that transforms the source work, some post-modern composers began constructing pieces that consisted of mostly found and referential material that remains intact. Some commentators have even described this use of collage as the defining feature of post-modern aesthetics.\(^\text{13}\)

---


\(^\text{13}\) Glenn Watkins, *Pyramids at the Louvre*, 1-2.
Luciano Berio’s (1925-2003) *Sinfonia* (1968) — particularly its central scherzo — is often held as the paradigm of this practice within music.\(^\text{14}\) However, *Sinfonia* not only includes elements of original material interwoven alongside citations of extant works,\(^\text{15}\) but also omits or overwrites much of its central source.\(^\text{16}\) It would be more accurate to say that Berio expands and develops Ives’s practice of integrating found and original material, rather than moving beyond it to create a work entirely constructed out of citations. However, whilst *Sinfonia* might not be an example of a work entirely constructed from extant material, Bernd Alois Zimmermann’s (1918-1970), *Musique pour le soupers du Roi Ubu* (1962-1966) is a more apt example. Described by Richard Taruskin as ‘nothing but a tissue of promiscuous quotations,’ that ‘expressed [Zimmermann’s] conviction that the modern concept of time [as a] simultaneous awareness of past, present, and future.’\(^\text{17}\) This would make *Musique pour le soupers du Roi Ubu* — in both aesthetic and concept — the archetypal post-modern musical work. Taruskin, however, is not entirely correct in asserting that there is no new material in Zimmermann’s piece. As C. Catherine Losada has identified, Zimmermann does include some additional new material (as well as elements of arrangement of the original musical sources).\(^\text{18}\) However, in contrast to both Berio’s *Sinfonia* and Zimmermann’s other works (such as his *Monologue* for two pianos [1960-1964]), in *Musique pour le soupers du Roi Ubu* these personal musical commentaries are more limited and closer to minor arrangements than Berio’s interventions in *Sinfonia*. The ratio of ‘original’ content to quotations is not the only thing that separates these two roughly cotemporaneous works from each other: they both arrange their respective found material in distinctly different ways. As we will discuss later in this commentary,\(^\text{19}\) in the theory of montage laid out by Soviet filmmaker Sergei Eisenstein (1898-1948), it is not so much the content of the individual shots that provides the principle meaning in a montage but the manner of their arrangement.\(^\text{20}\) Therefore, these works by Berio and Zimmermann communicate something very different from each other despite their common aesthetic of borrowed material. In Zimmermann, whilst there is some degree of superposition of found sources and original material, the work is overwhelmingly structured in horizontally-dominant, film-like blocks. This is in contrast to the scherzo of Berio’s *Sinfonia* which is so-

---


\(^{17}\) Taruskin, *Oxford History of Western Music*, vol. 5, 419.


\(^{19}\) See pages 97-99.
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famously built on the scherzo of Gustav Mahler's (1860-1911) Symphony No.2 (1888-1894) which plays continuously, if not completely, throughout.

The structural dominance of the Mahler quotation in Sinfonia means that any other quotation is always seen as commentary on the Mahler, never equal or independent to it. A fact that is reinforced by how most of the additional quotations are drawn from a period of thirty years after the premiere of the Second Symphony.\(^{21}\) Therefore, for all its textural density, Sinfonia is in actuality quite a narrowly focused work. As such, it contrasts quite strikingly to the more diverse arrangements at play in the Zimmermann, the structure of which is more readily identifiable with filmic montage. Therefore, Musique pour le soupers du Roi Ubu can express Zimmermann’s ‘conviction that the modern concept of time [as a] simultaneous awareness of past, present, and future,’\(^{22}\) as its construction is of an assemblage of independent and non-hierarchically-structured materials.

The primacy of a single work above other material that it might be placed in proximity to places the work contained within this portfolio closer to that of Berio’s Sinfonia.\(^{23}\) However, that by no means implies that this portfolio has similar aims to those of Berio, whose work is more clearly focused on exploring the liminal borders of comprehension and incomprehension.\(^{24}\) Whilst both Sinfonia and the works contained within this portfolio place a single piece of found material at the centre of a new work in order to explore a relation of music to the world, both do so to achieve vastly different aesthetic and ideological aims. Berio uses an accumulation and saturation of materials constructed in a tightly controlled relationship to one another to explore human perceptions of comprehension in a materially-focused aesthetic, whereas this portfolio seeks to take a pre-existing work that already exists in the world so as to enstrange both the object’s place in the world and the cultural mechanisms that positioned it there.

1.1.1 Materiality and Quotation

As has been documented fairly extensively, Berio constructs the dense collage in Sinfonia by a process of harmonic and rhetorical matching between the primary material (the Mahler) and both secondary quotations and original (primarily chromatic) commentary. For all its apparent critique of Modernity, the Sinfonia’s construction still retains a strong Modernist proclivity for a sense of

\(^{21}\) Osmond-Smith, Playing on Words: A Guide to Luciano Berio’s Sinfonia, 47.
\(^{22}\) Taruskin, Oxford History of Western Music, vol.5, 419.
\(^{23}\) Particularly in the case of the last piece of this portfolio, Popular-Classic (see, Chapter 6).
\(^{24}\) Osmond-Smith, Playing on Words: A Guide to Luciano Berio’s Sinfonia, 90.
internal coherence. Something that is more forcefully — if not entirely — rejected by Zimmermann, whose work has a much more evenly balanced dynamic between its constituent materials. Zimmermann’s sharper structural articulation of the juxtapositions between these quotations means that its constituent parts are more readily interpreted as being semantically distinct and separate from each other, allowing for it to be interpreted in a filmic mode in a manner that Berio’s *Sinfonia* precludes. This difference can be articulated in terms of their respective sense of ‘materiality’.

Whilst Zimmermann’s (albeit limited) use of original material may not strictly be constructed entirely from pre-existing music; more recent examples are. Jennifer Walshe’s (1974—) *Becher* (2008) is constructed entirely from quotations of solo piano works and piano reductions of pre-existing music, which are all listed at length at the front of the score. Walshe includes quotations from an array of styles across ‘high’ and popular culture, from 1722 to the present. In many ways, *Becher* ticks all the boxes for an archetypal, even quintessential, post-modern composition. Walshe’s quotations are much more fragmentary and fleeting than those we’ve examined up until now, with many only lasting for a few moments There is, however, a notable difference between *Becher* and both *Sinfonia* and *Musique pour le soupers du Roi Ubu*, and that is that in Walshe’s work the quotations are always placed in sequence one after the other in a form reminiscent of filmic montage. Unlike in the file-card music of John Zorn (1953—), where there is commonly no return to a quotation once it has been used, in *Becher* Walshe uses a number of reference works to which she returns: Beethoven’s ‘Pathétique’ Op.13 (1798) and ‘Hammerklavier’ Op.106 (1818) sonatas, as well The Beatles *A Day in the Life* (1967). The use of reference sources provides semantic points that anchor *Becher* even further into a filmic-montage aesthetic. Walshe’s notation of the montaged sources reinforces the independence and distance of the materials from each other:

Because many of the quotations are shorter than one bar in length, the original meter of the piece the quotation is taken from is given above each quotation in brackets. This is done so the performer can place the quotation within the context of the original meter. For example, the first bar is a quotation from Mozart’s Sonata KV 331. The original meter is 6/8 – this is notated above the bar. Though the quotation barely lasts a dotted crotchet and a semi-quaver before switching, the quotation should be interpreted as an excerpt from a 6/8 bar rather than a 3/8 +1/16 bar.25

25 Jennifer Walshe, performance directions from the score to *Becher*. 
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By maintaining the metre of the sources — rather than imposing an external metre on top of the citations — the ‘materiality’ of the source quotations is maintained (example 1.3).\textsuperscript{26} Retaining a sense of ‘materiality’ is a key aspect to the function of collage/montage. It is also a pre-requisite for creating a sense of critical distance between a source and its commentary, as I have sought to achieve in this portfolio. How Walshe accomplishes this in \textit{Becher} is just one method, and others are worth considering briefly.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example_1.3.png}
\caption{Example 1.3: J. Walshe, \textit{Becher} (2009), bars 5-9. \copyright J. Walshe \Reprinted by Permission}
\end{figure}

The sense of materiality that we have seen in Walshe’s \textit{Becher} is common to all works that have elements of quotation. It is in many respects analogous to quotation marks differentiating a quote from a body of original text. This distanced quality provided by a strong sense of materiality allows for a clear delineation between process and form, therefore allowing for the meaning of the successor work to be constructed in the manner of the Kuleshov Effect.\textsuperscript{27} Unlike filmic montage, where the act of combining shots always projects a sense of materiality, the performative nature of instrumental music means that the extent of a work’s materiality is

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{26} ‘Materiality’, in this context, was a term used by cubist painter Georges Braque (1882-1963) to describe his use of real objects in his later cubist works. It should not be confused with ‘Materialism’ in philosophy, with which it is unrelated. In the context of this thesis, ‘materiality’ should be taken as its usage by Braque, whereby it refers to an aesthetic work that intentionally draws attention to its own mode of construction. In the case of the Cubists, this can be seen in their use and integration of materials other than paint (newspaper clippings, patterned paper, etc.) in what is known as ‘Synthetic Cubism’ (J. Golding, ‘Cubism’, in N. Stangos [ed.], \textit{Concepts of Modern Art}, 59-73).
\item \textsuperscript{27} The Kuleshov Effect will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5 (pages 97-98).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Chapter 1: Methodology and Historical Context

intimately tied to the work’s construction. The works of Austrian composer Bernhard Lang (1957—) show how, despite similar approaches, different works can have different levels of materiality. Some, but by no means all, of Lang’s work lacks a clear sense of materiality of the source material in the successor work. *Monadologie VII ‘Kammersinfonie’* (2009), which is based on small, cell-like extracts from Schoenberg’s Second Chamber Symphony (1906-1939) (example 1.4), is a prime example of this (example 1.5). In *Monadologie VII* the combination of an esoteric source requiring highly specialised knowledge to identify, and the manner of the treatment of that material, means that (in performance) the piece displays stylistic and generic traits that easily make it confused with a post-minimalist work, rather than an engagement with, and reworking of, the original Schoenberg.

Example 1.4: A. Schoenberg, Second Chamber Symphony Op.38 (1939), Movement 1; bar 1.

Example 1.5: B. Lang, *Monadologie VII* (2009), thema 1, bars 1-11 (bass flute and oboe only).


Reprinted by Permission

---

28 A musical work either using, or completely constructed out of, recorded sound could easily imitate the materiality of filmic montage. The ‘plunderphonic’ works of John Oswald (1953—) being a prime example.
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Most of Lang’s music is based on techniques of musical processing that draw on, and are analogous to, digital techniques of musical production: with loops, compression, and spectral processing all featuring. Loops in particular provide the fundamental premise from which Lang’s music is constructed, as Christine Dysers describes: ‘obsessive repetition of the same musical cell generates difference in perception.’ Lang’s ‘difference through repetition’ paradigm is drawn from the work of French philosopher Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995), which Dysers summarises in her claim that ‘by placing the musical material into a number of repetitive loops, Lang not only deconstructs its emotional gesture but also questions its identity.’ Furthermore, in his Monadologie series, Lang takes Deleuze’s reflections on the work of seventeenth century rationalist Gottfried Wilhelm Von Leibniz (1646-1716) as the aesthetic premise for his ‘deconstruction’ through repetition. Leibniz’s metaphysics sees the world as constructed out of basic, discrete entities called monads. In the Monadologie series, Liebniz’s monads are represented by Lang’s use of short, fragmentary musical cells of found material. These cells are derived by putting the source work through a process of what Lang calls ‘granular analysis’, whereby small fragments are selected from the source and then processed by means of mathematical principles known as ‘cellular automata’. This computer-aided process of composition is designed to generate a host of developing variations on the selected cells, which are then procedurally structured and manipulated before being rendered performable.

If one compares Lang’s work to one of his non-musical influences, it clearly demonstrates what I mean both by ‘materiality’, and Monadologie VII’s lack thereof. The work of the ‘de-constructivist’ filmmaker Martin Arnold (1959—) is often mentioned in relation to Lang, and it is clear to see why. Arnold makes use of small fragments of found footage — usually from early or Classic Hollywood — and repeats, reverses and temporally distorts them to construct a new, often sinister or disturbing, narrative directly at odds with the ‘motherhood and apple pie’ values inherent in the original source material. This can be seen clearly in Arnold’s Alone. Life Wastes Andy Hardy (1998). This work, which draws most of its footage from Andy Hardy Meets Debutante (1940), opens with the titular Andy Hardy and his mother. However, rather than seeing the original quick, perfectly maternal, peck on the cheek between mother and son, the footage has been manipulated — by means of repetition and slowing down the projection speed — to give the impression of a much more uncomfortable, sensual, and incestuous relationship. Arnold

30 Ibid, 37.
31 Ibid, 37.
32 Ibid, 38.
undermines the wider cultural values of Classic Hollywood (and, for that matter, the moral values of Western culture today) by turning the aesthetic products of that culture against itself.

There remains, however, a crucial distinction between Arnold’s practice and Lang’s. In Arnold’s manipulation, the use of recorded sound and film footage as the material of his transformations results in sonic and visual markers that reveal to the viewer the methods by which the film has been constructed. When a clip has been cut, slowed or reversed the sound track retains all the clipping and distortion that one would expect. The artificiality and manipulation of the source is inescapably foregrounded to the viewer. Arnold does not try to suppress these features as they are integral to how the films function. The fact that a viewer can trace the construction of the film from its source means that they are presented with a kind of double-image whereby they are simultaneously aware of both the original and its derivation. The meaning and critique of Arnold’s work lies in the dissonance that exists between these two understandings of the same source material. Whilst Lang may or may not be seeking to imitate or translate Arnold’s praxis in music, the lack of materiality in *Monadologie VII* means that if it is the case he is not wholly successful in this regard. He is not using recorded sound as his material, but instead transcribing the results of the procedures and process he is enacting upon the source, and then having them performed by live musicians — all the sonic and visual markers of artificial treatment that are present in Arnold’s work are absent from Lang’s *Monadologie VII*. If the composer were working with recorded sound as his material, one could argue that Lang would be successful at creating the kind of critique located in Arnold’s films. But by transposing his works into a live performance setting, he eliminates the audible, material traces of the source’s manipulation. That said, it is worth noting that this is not the case with all of Lang’s work. In *DW16 (Songbook 1)* (2004) the vocalist’s heightened use of breath (example 1.6), as well as the alteration of the pronunciation of the text to mimic a reversed recording (example 1.7), helps evoke or mimic the sense of materiality of the original source. While the *Songbook* may still lack the critical distance that I required for my portfolio, it contains the sense of materiality that is a prerequisite of it. This heightened sense of materiality in Lang’s *Songbook* articulates the embodied, material origins of the quotations used. As the material has been rendered in such a way that it retains the audible markers that indicate its origins from a specific, embodied and contingent performance of that source work, it delineates itself from the conventional, ideal and literate understanding of a musical quotation.
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Example 1.6: B. Lang, *DW16* (*Songbook 1*) (2004), Movement 1: the watchtower; bars 16-17.


Reprinted by Permission

Example 1.7: B. Lang, *DW16* (*Songbook 1*) (2004), Movement 1: the watchtower; bars 24-28.


Reprinted by Permission

Traditionally in Western music, the transmission of musical material came through one of two means: the aural and the literate. Musical objects were transmitted either from person to person by ear, or were inscribed on paper and passed from person to person as a fixed, written object. For composers of Lang’s generation, a third form of musical transmission was not just possible, but dominant — recorded music. This means that for many, if not most composers of the same post-war generation as Lang, the primary mode of musical distribution and circulation was of fixed, ‘definitive’ musical performances rather than as the transmission of modes of production of that idealised ‘work’. This fundamental change in musical experience necessarily entails a potential shift in the understanding of musical ontology for those who came of age in the post-modern, technologically-saturated world.33 When we discuss the use of post-war and post-modern quotation, it is important to understand that there might well be a third ontological paradigm at play. It should not be surprising, therefore, that Lang’s heightened materiality in the

---

33 Lang has even referred to music history as a ‘giant archive of samples’ (Dysers, ‘Re-Writing History’, 38).
Songbook features techniques that consciously draws attention to the performative and the embodied, while Liszt’s piano paraphrases do not.

Mark Katz has acknowledged that contemporary practices of musical borrowing using digital samples are rooted in a tradition as long as Western Art Music itself.\(^{34}\) Whilst Katz lists the similarities between contemporary sampling practices and historical models from the Western Art Music tradition, he also highlights key differences that mean that while ‘sampling does not differ from traditional musical borrowing in kind, it certainly differs in degree.\(^{35}\) The essence of this difference is what Katz calls ‘performative quotation’.\(^{36}\)

While a quotation is simply a representation of another piece, a sampled passage of music \textit{is} that music. But that depends on what the meaning of ‘is’ is. Consider a conventional example of musical quotation: in the third movement of Luciano Berio’s \textit{Sinfonia}..., the composer quotes music by Brahms, Debussy, Hindemith, Mahler, Ravel, Schoenberg, and Strauss, amongst many others. These quotations are notational — that is, Berio reproduces not the sounds themselves, but the instructions for recreating them. The quotations are only complete when performed. Digital sampling also involves symbols — 1s and 0s instead of various lines, dots, and squiggles of traditional notation. As a standard textbook on computer music explains, “What computers manipulate is not sound itself but representations of sounds.” Therefore, if sampling represents sounds, we cannot say that a sampled passage of music \textit{is} music.

But if sampling does not differ from traditional musical borrowing in kind, it certainly differs in degree. Consider a hypothetical quotation, in which the score of an otherwise original work notates the two-second “Funky Drummer” solo. At most, only a dozen or so instructions (in the form of various symbols) would be used: several to indicate the parts of the drum kit (bass, snare, tom-tom, hi-hat, etc.), a handful for the duration of each note, and a few for dynamics, accentuation, and meter. But the equivalent digital sample would require nearly a hundred thousand distinct instructions, a level of specificity impossible to notate. With all of these instructions, so much more can be indicated: the sound of a particular drum being hit with a certain amount of force using a specific stick, or the exact number of milliseconds a note enters before or after the beat. Moreover, the sonic aura surrounding the sound can also be captured. By “aura” I


\(^{35}\) Ibid, 140-141.

\(^{36}\) Ibid, 140-141.
Critiquing Classical Kitsch

mean two things: the reverberation that imparts a sense of space, and the slight but constantly ambient noise — a patina, perhaps — that is a by-product of imperfect recording fidelity. Digital Sampling offers the possibility of what I would call performative quotation: quotation that recreates all the details of timbre and timing that evoke and identify a unique sound event...In other words, traditional musical quotations typically cite works; samples cite performances.37

The notion of a distinction between a ‘literate’ citation and Katz’s formulation of a ‘performative quotation’ has a host of implications for how we discuss how a contemporary composer approaches their understanding of their musical source. In a performative quotation, the vagaries of a given performance — which may in themselves be indicative of a specific tradition of performance practice — are captured alongside the information usually found within a musical score. While a notated transcription of a specific instance of a performance will never come close to capturing the mass of information and detail that a digital sample can inscribe, that does not mean that the features of a specific performance cannot still be captured, or at least evoked, in traditional notation to some degree.

Whether Lang’s approach to Songbook could be definitively categorised as a ‘performative quotation’ is beyond the scope of this commentary, but the implicit understanding in works like the Songbook of the source material as an embodied instance of a specific performance has repercussions for the contemporary use of found material. Is one composing with the ‘literary’ ‘work’ or with a specific, historically-contingent performance of that work? The source material for the first movement of Lang’s Songbook is a prime example. Lang takes Bob Dylan’s 1967 All Along the Watchtower as the ‘literary’ source, but if we should see Songbook as a performative quotation then which version of All Along the Watchtower does Lang take as his source? One would probably assume that it would be one of the two ‘canonic’ recordings: either Dylan’s original or Jimi Hendrix’s 1968 cover. However, could it be based on any of the other high-profile covers, such as U2 or Neil Young, or even an amateur covers band? Is the provenance even audible in Lang’s reworking? If the answer is no, the understanding of it as a ‘performative quotation’ is, for all intents and purposes, irrelevant. While it may not be the case in Lang’s specific instance, it is a consideration that needs to be made in an age when digital replication and distribution is as cheap, fast, and accessible as it is now.

37 Katz, Capturing Sound, 140-141.
1.2 Enstrangement and De-Familiarisation

The wider concept called enstrangement is known by many different translations and variations: de-familiarisation, estrangement and the Verfremdungseffekt, being the most common. Whilst Bertolt Brecht’s (1898-1956) formulation of the concept, commonly translated as de-familiarisation, is the most widely used, the notion neither originated with him, nor is it a concept that is restricted to the theatrical world that he inhabited. Versions of the concept predate Brecht’s formulation, and, over the decades since, many who followed have developed their own variations of the theory for different disciplines. For this thesis I have chosen to focus on the formulation of the concept put forward by Russian literary theorist, Viktor Shklovsky (1893-1984).

Fundamentally, my choice of the term enstrangement over de-familiarisation reflects this portfolio’s closer proximity to Shklovsky’s formulation. While some of the compositions may reflect certain aspects of Brecht’s thought, these references tend to be confined to specific, isolated aspects of individual compositions, rather than the broader influence of Shklovsky’s theoretical writings. The choice is also motivated by a desire to avoid bringing this body of work closer to the more overtly political connotations that can be, fairly or unfairly, attached to Brecht. My own use of enstrangement is not Shklovsky’s alone, however. It is not only mediated by the theories of Brecht and others, but it also takes on board much of the critique — like that of Jacques Rancière and Frederic Jameson — of these writers’ work that has emerged in the decades since they were published. Therefore, this portfolio is concerned with critical, self-reflexive and ‘meta’ theories more broadly, rather than any one interpretation or formulation. It uses these theories as a touchstone from which to depart, rather than a specific model to be enacted or realized.

1.2.1 Shklovsky and Ostranenie

Viktor Shklovsky’s notion of ostranenie — literally translated as ‘making strange’ or ‘enstrangement’ — just like Brecht’s Verfremdungseffekt, is most commonly translated as ‘de-
familiarisation’.41 Shklovsky’s theorisation was formulated as a reaction to what he perceived to be deficiencies in the focus on metaphor of contemporaneous literary theorists. Like most perceived ‘breaks’ in theoretical precepts, Shklovsky’s ideas were as much a continuation of a tradition as a formal departure from it. He built his theory on the fundamental assertion of the Russian philosopher and linguist Alexander Potebnja (1835-1891) that to differentiate a critical literary theory from other disciplines it must primarily be that of the study of language. Shklovsky wanted to orientate the focus of literary theory around the change in the arrangement of images, rather than the cataloguing of their creation. Shklovsky’s criticism of the Symbolist concentration on metaphor was predicated on the understanding that, given ‘images flow on without changing’,42 to organise a critical literary theory on the cataloguing of metaphors would tell you nothing about literary history. Therefore, for the study of both literary history and literary theory to be valid it must examine the use and dissemination of techniques and structures that contain these images rather than the generation of those images themselves. This conceptual realignment along historically-mediated formal principles were, however, only the foundation of Shklovsky’s theory, not its entirety.

Essential to Shklovsky’s formulation of enstrangement was his contention that — contrary to the maxim summarised by Herbert Spencer that if ‘language is the vehicle of thought…the sole thing to be done, is to reduce this friction and inertia to the smallest possible amount’43 — the greater the disruption to the reader’s habituated literary expectations, the more clearly the object under investigation would be perceived. It is Shklovsky’s view that ‘[b]y “enstranging” objects and complicating form, the device of art makes perception long and laborious’,44 the reader is forced to contemplate the object closer to as it is, rather than as it has been conditioned to be expected to be seen (or, for that matter, unseen). It is clear then that, for Shklovsky, the idea that poetry — or, more accurately, all art — should have the smallest economy of effort was contradictory to the very purpose of art itself: a purpose whereby the artwork was designed to attempt to try and perceive the old — or familiar — anew.

At the heart of Shklovsky’s enstrangement is the process of habituation: ‘[a]fter we see an object several times we begin to recognise it — hence we cannot say anything significant about it. Art

41 The substantive differences between Brecht and Shklovsky’s theories (both in subject and purpose) mean that collecting them together under the single term ‘de-familiarisation’ can be misleading.
44 Viktor Shklovsky, Theory of Prose, Benjamin Sher (trans.), (Elmwood Park, IL, USA: Dalkey Archive Press, 1991), 5-6.
removes objects from the automatism of perception.\textsuperscript{45} Here, Shklovsky is describing the process whereby the mental effort required to perform an activity or task may begin to become increasingly less noticeable when repeated frequently. One example among many, including learning a musical instrument, is that of driving.\textsuperscript{46} While at first every action and thought process needed to drive a car may require the significant majority of the driver’s attention and concentration, over time these processes and tasks begin to recede from the driver’s conscious attention — they become habitual. Lemon and Reis, in an introduction to Shklovsky’s \textit{Art as Technique}, summarise the process of habituation as ‘learning is largely a matter of learning to ignore.’\textsuperscript{47}

What are the formal techniques that ‘makes perception long and laborious’,\textsuperscript{48} and therefore cause an object to be enstranged? Shklovsky identifies numerous ways for enstranging an object in poetry and literature, but he saves most of his discussion for the literary devices of Leo Tolstoy. He identifies two major techniques: the making of ‘the familiar seem strange by not naming the object’;\textsuperscript{49} and the use of unorthodox narrative perspectives or subjectivity. The first revolves around the idea that instead of referring to an object by its name, one should describe its properties and attributes. By doing so, you force the reader not only to ‘work out’ what it is that you are referring to, but also that it should force them to reconsider what it is exactly that contributes to the identity boundaries of that object or concept. Or, in the words of Frederic Jameson: ‘[t]o remove the names thus becomes a philosophical therapy which promises to lead us back to the freshness of raw experience itself.’\textsuperscript{50} The second technique involves the use of an unexpected or unconventional narrative or subject position to enstrange the object that is under scrutiny. The example from Tolstoy that Shklovsky uses is that of a horse considering the rationale behind the idea of private property.\textsuperscript{51} By shifting the narrator to an unorthodox position, that of an animal whom we would not associate with language capability, Tolstoy forces the reader into an alien position that allows them to conceive what would otherwise seem like the ordinary in an extraordinary fashion. Whilst Shklovsky’s theories are the primary theoretical influence on this portfolio, the work of Bertolt Brecht is not entirely absent and needs brief discussion if only to clarify the rationale for Shklovsky’s primacy.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid, 4.
\textsuperscript{48} Shklovsky, \textit{Theory of Prose}, 5-6.
\textsuperscript{49} Shklovsky, ‘Art as Technique’ in \textit{Russian Formalist Criticism}, 13.
\textsuperscript{50} Jameson, \textit{Brecht and Method}, 53-54.
\textsuperscript{51} Shklovsky, \textit{Theory of Prose}, 6-8.
1.2.2 Brecht, Rancière, and the Critique of Critical Art

The philosopher Jacques Rancière has described Brecht’s theories as encapsulating a fundamentally Marxist basis. Almost all the variations of Brecht’s theories are predicated on the notion of a mass, or working class, consciousness that his theoretical and dramatic works are aimed at ‘enlightening’. To generalise about Brecht’s work (or more accurately to take a snapshot of it from when his theory most closely matched its stereotype), it is fundamentally concerned with trying to ‘teach’ or ‘reveal’ to the working classes the reality of their socio-economic situation:

Marxism then seized on it [the critical aspects of collage] to render palpable, through the incongruous encounter of heterogeneous elements, the violence of the class domination concealed beneath the appearances of quotidian ordinariness and democratic peace. This was the principle of Brecht’s alienation effect.52

In contrast, Shklovsky’s enstrangement is more concerned with constructing a general method that could be applied equally to the largest socio-economic process to the smallest, most mundane, of objects. For example, on one end of the scale Shklovsky discusses ostranenie being used to problematize the idea of ‘private property';53 and of making a stone appear ‘stony’ at the other.54 Herein lies a crucial difference between Brecht and Shklovsky’s theories. For Shklovsky, the process of enstrangement does not necessitate any material change in the object being perceived anew, the enstrangement happens entirely within the mind of the perceiver. The Marxist heritage of, for want of a better word, ‘Classical’ Brechtian Verfremdungseffekt, means that — suitably agitated — an audience will undergo a material change in their behaviour. It is this act of compulsion implicit in both Brecht and other forms of Critical art that many, including Rancière, have identified as its principle point of failure.

In discussing one specific example of photomontage, Rancière explains how ‘the image said: here is the hidden reality that you do not know how to see; you must become acquainted with it and act in accordance with that knowledge.’55 This form of Marxist Critical art is explicitly politically motivated and highly paternalistic. Once the hidden social structures are brought to the conscious level, the now appropriately educated spectator should feel sufficiently agitated or guilty (depending on their class consciousness and levels of complicity) to compel them to rectify the situation in a certain, predefined (Marxist) fashion. But, as Rancière identifies, by what means can

---

53 Shklovsky, Theory of Prose, 6-8
54 Shklovsky, ‘Art as Technique’ in Russian Formalist Criticism, 12.
55 Ibid, 26-27.
the artist compel the spectator to change his ways?56 The spectator might be perfectly happy with the status quo, even once it has been ‘revealed’; and they therefore may feel under no obligation to change their relationship to the world — or they may even go so far as to entrench that relationship further. Inherent in this tradition is a paternalistic attitude whereby the artist knows better than their audience and must educate them to think ‘correctly’. Many critics argue that this is simply exchanging one form of ‘domination’ for another.57

The fundamental, and fundamentally flawed, premise of historical attempts to employ Critical Theory in the aesthetic domain is this belief that they can compel a spectator to believe or respond in a certain, predefined, way, and that there is a fundamental and immutable logic of consequence. This premise fails on account of the difficulty that the audience must come to the work not only with a certain level of prior knowledge, but also a certain willingness or openness to ‘go along’ with the critical premise. In other words, there is a certain extent to which someone wishing to create a ‘successful’ Critically-orientated artwork must ‘preach to the converted’. The work of French semiologist Roland Barthes on the role of the spectator as arbiter of meaning of a text is a crucial touchstone for Rancière’s critique of the Critical tradition within the arts.58 If Barthes is correct about the ‘Death of the Author’, and the relocation of the locus of the ascription of meaning from authorial intent to the interpretive power of the reader,59 we can see how Critical art (or any text, for that matter) does not possess the power to force the spectator to reconsider their relationship to society. If the power of interpretation and meaning lies in the hands of the spectator — and not pre-determined by the potentially speculative intentions of the author — for any manner of Critical reflection to take place the spectator must be at, the very least, sympathetic to the critique that the author is positing and therefore willing to entertain the critique contained within the artwork.

Some have used this criticism to immediately jump to the conclusion that all Critically-orientated art is at best misguided, and at worse completely ineffectual. While it certainly may not have the theoretical force that its early advocates, such as philosopher Theodor W. Adorno (1903-1969), may have ascribed to it, that by no means results in no possibility of effecting any kind of influence on its audience. To state or insinuate such is to fall for the same flawed, immutable logic of consequence that was the failure of the early standard bearers of Critical art. Instead, we must talk about possibilities, or potentialities of Critically-orientated art. Given an amenable spectator who is willing to accept — even if temporarily — the premise of the work’s Critical aspect, the

---

56 Rancière, The Emancipated Spectator, 84-85
57 Ibid, 26-27.
spectator may be able to modify their world view, even if they cannot be forced to act upon that modified view. Rancière’s critique of both the effectiveness and potential paternalism of Critical art comes close to recognising this need for at least a sympathetic spectator, if not a wholly complicit one. This is where Shklovsky’s formulation of enstrangement allows us a potential avenue for moving beyond these valid criticisms of ‘traditional’ Critical art. There is no compulsion — implied or otherwise — to act on a newly de-habituated understanding, how the perceiver chooses to act after the fact is entirely their own. An enstrangement following Shklovsky merely sets up the opportunity or possibility for critical reflection on the part of the spectator.

1.2.3 Critical Composition and the Spectre of Adorno

Much of these criticisms aimed at Brecht and other member of the Critical tradition in the arts are equally applicable to its most overt manifestation in music, Critical Compositional. Given this portfolio’s expressed aims at investigating and utilizing aspects of the Critical tradition within music, Critical Compositional has been up until now conspicuous by its absence. As this portfolio has little in common aesthetically with ‘classical’ Critical Composition, tackling this subject too early would have given a misleading impression of this portfolio’s intended aims. Having now established some of the portfolio’s methodological groundwork (and some of the historic pitfalls it aimed to avoid), it is now worth considering Critical Composition — a school of compositional thought with the expressed aims of using Critical Theory to inform musical creation — and how this portfolio has sought to both learn from and move beyond it, as well as on what grounds it differs entirely.

In his critique of historical Critical Composition, Rainer Nonnenmann argues that the term encapsulates two related but fundamentally different concepts. The first — identified by capitalisation — delimits the music of a historically-defined group of composers largely centred in Germany around Helmut Lachenmann (1935—). This group, in a response to the post-war serialists, tried to formulate the Critical Theory of Frankfurt School into a new compositional aesthetic that sought to destabilize the cultural norms of its contemporaneous culture. The second application of the term — identified using lower case — is an ideological approach to

---

60 In his monograph on Experimentalism in New York, 1964, Benjamin Piekut implicitly draws a distinction between historical groupings and ontological groupings. In many respects, a similar distinction could be made here, between the historically-defined movement, Critical Composition, and those who could be grouped together by bent of a common aesthetic or ideological purpose (Benjamin Piekut, Experimentalism Otherwise: The New York Avant-Garde and Its Limits [Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011], 5-8).
composition whereby a composer actively seeks to critique contemporaneous norms in their own compositions, regardless of style or techniques. In other words, the term covers both an historical phenomenon and an a-historical ideological intention. Nonnenmann's larger point being that while the former of these two concepts has failed, the second is still vital, necessary, and possible — if a now more complex and difficult activity.

Key to this the first (historical) form of, Critical Composition were the writings of the Frankfurt School philosopher and sociologist Theodor W. Adorno. Whilst a touchstone for many composers of the Post-War European Avant-Garde, for the school of ‘Critical Composition’ Adorno had a fundamental importance, forming the movement’s theoretical underpinning. Given the centrality of the dialectical method to the Frankfurt’s School’s thinking, Adorno’s aesthetics of new, or progressive, music held that for a work to be Critical it must result in a concrete material change that negates or rejects the subject of the critique. For instance, Schoenberg’s twelve-tone music critiqued and moved beyond the contradictions inherent in Romanticism’s chromaticism in just the same way that Post-War Serialism critiqued and moved beyond the latent stylistic gestures retained in Schoenberg’s twelve-tone works. This portfolio’s deliberate engagement with historical works means that this Critical condition is clearly not applicable. The reasons why I have chosen to discard this condition, as well as Adorno more widely, are worth considering briefly.

In Nonnenmann’s consideration of the historical grouping of Critical Composition, he describes how ‘Critical Composition’ is needed to develop the skills and attitude of ‘Critical Listening’, but in order for the ‘Critical Composition’ to be identified as such the listener must already have all the prerequisite experience of a ‘Critical Listener’. Herein lies the contradiction: if a listener needs a new set of skills and experiences to validly engage with a Critical Composition, how can they develop those skills if they cannot engage with the Critical Composition in order to do so? For many commentators, this has been the central failure of Critical Composition. Even if Critical Composition could force the listener to question their worldview, how can they access that critique if they cannot develop the skills of a ‘Critical Listener’? This contradiction is further complicated by another factor that Nonnenmann highlights in his discussion of the composer Nicolaus A. Huber (1939—). Just as we have seen in Rancière critique of the problematic

---

61 Nonnenmann is performing a similar intervention with Critical Composition that Max Paddison makes with Popular music. Paddison nuances Adorno’s infamous critique of Popular music to allow for the possibility that some types of Popular music may be critical of their own stylistic contemporaries. Both Paddison and Nonnenmann are trying to accomplish the same task, realigning the use of critique away from an aesthetic preoccupation and towards describing Critical Composition as a set of specific relations (Max Paddison, ‘The Critique Criticised: Adorno and Popular Music,’ Popular Music, Vol. 2, [1982], 201-218).

relationship between Brecht’s authorial intention and his spectators, even if a listener could access the Critical Composition, how does the work compel them to act?. ‘Classical’ Critical Composition is, therefore, in a double-bind. Not only is it based on the faulty and paternalistic premise that it both knows best and can compel its audience to act upon the knowledge that is revealed to them, but its aesthetic language is so alien to its intended audience that they cannot even access that knowledge. Just as I had avoided leaning too heavily on Brecht’s Verfremdungseffekt for fear of internalising its inherent paternalism, the double quandary of an Adorno-inspired materialist aesthetic struck me as jeopardizing rather than aiding the aims of the portfolio.

1.2.4 A Post-Modern ‘critical composition’

One of the many side effects of the relocation of interpretative power into the hands of the spectator that Barthes identifies in ‘Death of the Author’, is that any work could potentially be interpreted Critically, and, conversely, that a Critically-composed work could not incite Critical Listening in its auditor should they be unable or unwilling to critical engage. Nonnenmann identifies a question that results from this shift in interpretative power: ‘[d]oes [the critical composition] have to be critical in every respect, or is it sufficient for its critique to be directed only at particular aspects?’63 This question leads us to his second category of critical composition, which aims to try and reformulate a form of critical composition that can function in a post-modern — relativistic — age. The absence of a strong, concrete sense of history, geography or culture means that Critique (and by extension also Critical Composition) becomes difficult, if not outright impossible. If the object that is subject to the critique is not highly defined and delineated, it cannot be determinately negated; or, in Nonnemann’s words:

the loss of any objectively binding tendency to the material...‘critical composition’ threatens to lose that position which enables and legitimates that critique in the first place. As every material is multiply encoded and is no longer occupied in any unambiguous fashion...it can no longer be determinately negated. If ‘determinate negation’ is no longer possible, however, then ‘critical composition’ is also damned to failure.64

---

64 The conceptual artist Joseph Kosuth has extended this aspect of Duchamp’s work, and he will be discussed at more length in Chapter 2
Whilst the relativism that Nonnenmann and others have ascribed to post-modern culture has certainly been a side effect of post-modern thought, it is by no means its guiding principle as it was originally conceived by its earliest theorists like Jean-François Lyotard. In many respects, this argument is the same one levelled by those who have misread the intentions of Duchamp and the Dadists, that just because anything can be art, that everything now is art. Duchamp’s readymades, like his Bottle Rack (1914) and Fountain (1917), were intended as critiques of the art institutions of the early twentieth century. By submitting a mass-produced object, so clearly devoid of aesthetic value, Duchamp sought to show how the institutions legitimised the value of an artwork, not any ontological or metaphysical property the object might possess.65 Regardless of the problems with Nonnenmann’s understanding of post-modernism, he is essentially correct in arguing that a post-modern critical composition can no longer be a resistance to a totemic tonality, as that tonality has not only been weakened by the now century-old traditions of serial and twelve-tone musics, but also by non-functional variations found in contemporary Popular music. A post-modern critical composition, therefore, must account for the fragmentary nature of contemporary culture, and place its ‘determinate negation’ in relation to smaller sites of musical praxis, rather than the monolithic culture of its modernist heyday.

Any attempt at a post-modern critical composition must therefore try and overcome not only the Critical Composition/Critical Listener contradiction, but also the relocation of interpretative power with the listener and the ‘loss of any objectively binding tendency to the material’. Duchamp’s use of ‘readymades’ as a form of critique may offer us ways forward for constructing a more modest, tightly-focused form of critique by re-orientating our consideration of ‘material’. A way that would seem sympathetic — possibly unintentionally — with some of Lachenmann’s own writings on Critical Composition. In his seminal 1985 essay, Hearing is Defenseless—Without Listening: On Possibilities and Difficulties, Lachenmann makes frequent appeals to a similar perception-based aesthetics as Shklovsky — in his case though, specifically to a differentiation between the act of passive hearing and active listening:

Think of the face of someone close to you, apparently familiar. Perhaps only an injury or estrangement of some sort would allow you to see this face as it really is; not just to look at it, but to perceive the actual structure of the physiognomy, the landscape of this

65 The conceptual artist Joseph Kosuth has extended this aspect of Duchamp’s work, and he will be discussed at more length in Chapter 2
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face with its blemishes and refinements. It might take as much to perceive it anew, and thereby one’s proper relation to this face, to this human being.66

The parallels between Shklovsky and Lachenmann are clearly visible. Like Shklovsky, Lachenmann argues that the act of disrupting the familiarity of an object (in this instance a face) helps to render the existing features in a new light, which in turn causes the spectator to re-evaluate their relationship with the object. In this example, along with the aforementioned examples of the readymades of Duchamp, show how a praxis of critical art is possible using pre-existing material. By taking found ‘material’ that already has significant cultural presence, that potential spectators will know, or at least recognise — in this case iconic found material from the Western art music canon — it might help overcome the barrier of the interpretative authority of the spectator as gatekeeper of the critical that a work of a more Adorno-led material aesthetic would never allow.

The use of found material as a critical praxis is not confined to either Duchamp or the plastic arts. On the face of it, Peter Maxwell Davies’s (1934-2016) Eight Songs for a Mad King (1969) is much like any other twentieth century piece of expressionist monodrama: a single protagonist on stage apparently in the throes of some episode of mental illness. Davies, however, overturns the usual deployment of atonality as a signifier of madness. Manipulated, distorted or transformed quotations of works by Handel are used to underscore the King’s episodes of madness, whilst his more lucid moments are clearly in an atonal idiom. Like much of Davies’s paraphrases of extant materials, these quotations are transformed by procedures of generic cross-pollination. The dance forms of Handel have their accompaniments manipulated to form anachronistic, twentieth century dance styles like the Foxtrot — a perennial stylistic signifier of Davies for bourgeois decadence and decay. In his exploration of parody in post-war musical theatre, Yayoi Uno Everett describes how the audience of Eight Songs for a Mad King is left: ‘to grapple with the question: is this piece about King George’s madness or a critique of a society that is in itself mad? By portraying madness as a societal phenomenon, the composer tries to lift the stigma attached to the individual affliction of madness’.67 In other words, Davies’s use and manipulation of found material and stylistic allusion (along with the codes associated with these familiar tropes, styles and musical works) are deployed in such a way as to critique the world itself as well as the artistic languages within which the world is constructed.

This portfolio’s focus on pre-existing works as a means of trying to construct a type of critical composition that would be valid in a post-modern world was always going to make any intellectual relationship with Adorno’s materialist aesthetic difficult, even without many of the well-discussed ‘failures’ of Critical Composition as a movement. Rather than trying to re-build the Adorno/Critical Composition wheel, this portfolio is an attempt explore a different course. Instead of seeking to create something new, or simply de-habituating the familiar, this portfolio seeks to manipulate the familiar in order to say something about the world that these musical works inhabit and are constituted from. By re-orientating the conception of ‘material’ towards semantically-rich found objects, this portfolio seeks to say more about the world than Shklovsky’s language-centred enstrangement alone can, whilst also avoiding the many well-discussed pitfalls of an Adorno-inflected materialist aesthetic.

1.3 Interdisciplinarity and the Aesthetic Object

It goes without saying that the transposition, translation, or transduction of non-musical theories — like those of Shklovsky and Brecht — to music necessitates alterations and adaptions. The theories and techniques that I have explored are predicated upon a repertoire, history and ontology that is different from that of the Western Art Music tradition that this portfolio seeks to engage. While many of the larger philosophical concerns of these critical and self-reflexive theories (and the repertoires from which they emerge) might share similarities with music, the respective contingencies of the differing media mean that any direct translations will always necessitate some form of adaption or modification. The nature of these adaptions largely depends on the direction of travel of the translation. The differences between understandings of how an aesthetic object is perceived in time across different artistic disciplines is one key example of when these adaptions may be significant. There are key taxonomical differences between those disciplines that fundamentally work in or through time compared to those that are (notionally) temporally static. To make a parallel to linguistics, one could consider visual art to be effectively synchronic, and the performative arts to be diachronic.\(^69\)

\(^{68}\) For this reason, it would be technically correct to consider the movement of one critical theory from one media to another to be closer to transduction, rather than translation (Stefan Helmreich, ‘An Anthropologist Underwater: Immersive Soundscapes, Submarine Cyborgs, and Transductive Ethnography’, American Ethnologist, Vol. 34, No. 4 [2007], 822). However, for the purposes of this commentary, the use of translation is perfectly adequate and avoids unnecessary confusion.
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As traditionally conceived, the musical work is experienced through time by an audience of listeners. The musical work being presented cannot be appreciated in its entirety at once, nor can the listener freely ‘choose’ where in the piece their attention is directed at any given moment — no ‘bird’s eye view’ of the work is available to a listener.70 This contrasts with the conventional understanding of how the spectator of a painting experiences their aesthetic object, whereby the ‘work’ is presented in its entirety as a fixed, bounded object that can be appreciated at once and at any given time. Therefore, the unfolding of a musical object in time allows the composer to control the information that is being transmitted to their potential listener at any one time, while an artist must resort to ‘leading’ their spectator’s attention ‘through’ the painting. There is, therefore, a trade-off between the two conceptions of time inherent in the two disciplines. The ‘diachronic’ experience of time in music allows for the creator to control the rate and exposure of their material, while the work of visual art — predominantly existing in ‘synchronic’ time — allows for the spectator to have greater freedom to choose, examine, and interpret the work at their own leisure.71

The differences in constructions of time are relevant not in terms of trying to establish a definitive ontology, but as a means of explaining, or at least contextualising, the practices of not only the creative agents (composers, artists, playwrights, etc.) but also the theorists who attempt to explain, influence or guide their work.72 For instance, the ‘concept’ of tautology that informs conceptual artist Joseph Kosuth’s (1945—) early work is, for all intents and purposes, synchronic (or immanent) in the work. This is not the case with diachronic art forms like film, theatre and music. If I were to step away from a narrative film and return later, I might recognise the protagonists and therefore understand that I am still perceiving the same aesthetic object, but I am now missing potentially vital pieces of information about the object that cannot be reconstructed after the fact. This possibility is further exaggerated where music is concerned. If I were to attend two performances of the same musical work it would almost certainly be the case that the second performance would be different to the first. Whilst we may see the same painting

71 The ontological delineation I have made between the experience of aesthetic objects from the different disciplines of music and the visual arts is deliberately intended to be an over-generalisation. To borrow a phrase from Brian Ferneyhough, my intention is to establish the ‘conventional wisdom’ regarding aesthetic experience across the two disciplines (Brian Ferneyhough, Brian Ferneyhough: Collected Writings [Amsterdam, NL: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1995], 369). I fully recognize and appreciate that this hypothetical model of the difference between the functioning of aesthetic time in both music and the plastic arts is much more complex and historically contingent than I have discussed here. However, not only is a more detailed discussion well beyond the limits of this thesis, but the discrepancies and contradictions between the ‘conventional wisdom’ and the contingent reality are important for the discussions that follow.
72 As we will see when I consider the work of the conceptual artist Joseph Kosuth in Chapter 2 and — in particular, how it was translated across to One and Four Canons — the differences in understandings of time created difficulties in the process of translation.
in different light levels, the absence of the inherent indeterminacies of human performance from a painting mean the aesthetic object is still identical.

In *Beyond the Score: Music as Performance*, Nicholas Cook charts a concise history of traditional musicology’s understanding of music as primarily a literate, rather than performative, practice. Throughout the first few chapters, Cook continually returns to the historic notion that the role of the performer is of a kind of vanishing mediator that allows the transmission of the ‘work’ from ‘the heart [of the composer]…to the heart [of the listener]’73 One side effect that Cook attributes to the literary understanding of music is that it has caused a disjunction between how we experience and how we conceive music. For Cook, historically, ‘most theorist’s analysis does not construe music as intrinsically temporal, in the way that performance is, but treats it as some kind of non-temporal structure that is unfolded through time.’74 Cook elaborates on this disjuncture between theory and performance by drawing on the work of Mark Johnson and Steve Larson, who he suggests:

distinguish the perspective of the observer, who as it were flies over the landscape and can see the whole at once, from that of the participant, who is located on the ground and follows “the path that defines a particular musical piece.”75 The observer’s perspective, Johnson and Larson is predominantly that of the analyst, and from here all relationships within the piece can be seen at once: it is in this sense that they are spatial…. By contrast the pedestrian perspective of the participant means experiencing the music as a continuous unfolding from one moment to the next, horizontally as it were.76

Theory must by necessity be reductive to some degree, and the taxonomical differentiation between notions of time in different disciplines begin to break down when examined in closer detail. Cook himself gives an example of how historically paintings would have been exhibited packed together as tightly as possible,77 not separated by the vast expanses of blank wall that modern gallery goers are used to.78 When artworks are so densely packed together with other potentially unrelated works it problematizes how the individual works can be appreciated in the conventional terms that I outlined earlier. The same goes for much of the description of musical

74 Ibid, 45.  
76 Cook, *Beyond the Score*, 45.  
77 It is worth noting that this practice is still maintained at the Royal Academy of Art’s annual Summer Exhibition.  
78 Cook, *Beyond the Score*, 133-134.
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experience; just because we experience a musical work in time, is that how we understand it? Do we remember musical objects, or any aesthetic object for that matter, in its entirety or in parts? In answering these questions, Lawrence Kramer has described how meaning is not distributed evenly across a work:

[M]eaning, hermeneutically regarded, is not diffused evenly throughout a work of music or anything else, but distributed unevenly in peaks and valleys. The peaks are the points of endowment from which meaning extends to ‘cover’ the work as a whole. Meaning in general arises at such distinct and specific sites, from which it expands and contracts in hermeneutic time and space.79

If this is the case, we can say that in any musical work there is a tension between synchronic and diachronic experiences of time. Themes and rhetorical flourishes may stick out as ‘specific sites’ of musical meaning in a synchronic sense, but that meaning is often granted by the placement of sites in a wider diachronic context across the work: the recapitulation of a theme in a sonata form is defined by the fact that a ‘specific site’ is returned to after a period of absence. This axis of tension between synchronic and diachronic experiences of time can also be applied to other art forms, and therefore the different experiences of aesthetic time from one art form to another may not be that alien as ‘conventional wisdom’ might first suggest.

The purpose of this discussion of the experience of different aesthetic works in time is not designed to make some great aesthetic proclamation. Instead, the aim is to, on the one hand, highlight the difficulties and potential pitfalls of the process of interdisciplinary translation or transduction of different historical theories, but also to identify where ‘conventional wisdom’ may also obscure commonalities between the disciplines. The theories of Shklovsky, Brecht, and others that are taken up and examined in this portfolio all originate from a specific place and time, and therefore are predicated on certain ontological assumptions that were taken for granted in their time. By discussing and highlighting some of these basic historical assumptions here, I hope to outline the background for the rationale of why I may have chosen to take certain compositional decisions and pathways.

I have largely focused on the comparison of synchronic (plastic) arts and diachronic (performative) arts. This has been to establish the extreme poles of the spectrum of aesthetic time. When we begin to examine and categorise other disciplines by their understanding and conception of time, the picture becomes less clear. In setting out his ideological stall, Cook claims that musical scores are in practice much closer to theatrical scripts than to literary texts:

[it is] only once you think of music as performance that you can start to make sense of scores. Seen in the context of performance culture, scores are much more like theatrical scripts than the literary texts as which musicology has traditionally understood (or misunderstood) them.\footnote{Cook, \textit{Beyond the Score}, 1-2.}

Besides the many other repercussions of the rethinking of the relationship between performance and score that Cook elucidates, it has one repercussion for this portfolio: if theatrical scripts and musical scores are closer to each other than we initially presumed, then theatrical techniques may in fact need far less adaption to bring them into the realms of the musical.

The compositional project that resulted in this thesis and its accompanying commentary initially had a differently weighted focus to that which is presented in this commentary. Originally, this project was focused on the application of specific models drawn from interdisciplinary contexts (mainly art, dance, film and theatre) as a means of deriving new models of critical enstrangement in a musical context. As I progressed from work to work, and critically evaluated and responded to each work that I had produced, the importance of the interdisciplinary model decreased from composition to composition. It became clear that that these models were more useful as starting frameworks or scaffolds from which to begin the process of composition rather than as an end point to be replicated. Whilst the interdisciplinary legacy from a theoretical perspective is still a primary focus, this is no longer the case from an aesthetic perspective. That said, traces of this portfolio’s interdisciplinary heritage in its compositional practice are still very much noticeable — particularly in \textit{One and Four Canons} (Chapter 2), \textit{Mahlerstück} (Appendix A), and \textit{Snare Dance} (Chapter 4).

\section*{1.4 The Case for the Kitsch}

Having decided to utilise well-known and semantically-rich found materials as a means of developing a post-modern critical composition, the question arose as to well-known by whom? If a post-modern critique needs to be tightly focused in relation to smaller sites of highly-defined musical praxis, I would need to circumscribe the corpus of works with which I was seeking to engage for the target audience of this portfolio. Whilst theoretically any body of work would have sufficed as a subject of critique, even works of the school of Critical Composition itself, I personally wanted this portfolio to be accessible to a wider audience than that of a specialist
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‘New Music’ audience. I needed to define a canon of musical works that were both widely-known and semantically-rich enough to act as signifiers for aspects of the wider world. This led me to the body of iconic works from Western Art Music that I would call ‘kitsch’, or ‘vulgarised’, Classical Music. This understanding of kitsch is somewhat non-traditional and needs some explanation.

Despite its widespread usage in art discourse, the term kitsch has remained nebulously defined. Dennis Dutton describes it as a ‘term used to identify spurious imitations of genuine artistic creations in the fine and applied arts.’\(^8\) This definition is the purest translation of the original German term, as Matei Calinescu echoes: ‘[t]he term kitsch is, like the concept it designates, quite recent. It came into use in the 1860s and 1870s in the jargon of painters and art dealers in Munich and was employed to designate cheap artistic stuff.’\(^1\) Over the last century its use has expanded to include other related contexts, definitions and applications, but until very recently it has remained largely pejorative.\(^2\) The term’s contemporary usage has now come to potentially encompass ‘any form of popular art or mass entertainment, particularly when sentimental.’\(^3\) For the most part, however, usages of the term fall somewhere between the two archetypal positions of cheap, crudely-fashioned replicas, and works of a cynical, commercialised aesthetic.

Historically, integral to what denoted an object as kitsch was its substandard construction, but this is no longer necessarily the case. In his consideration of the cultural phenomenon of kitsch as an aspect of Modernity, Calinescu is at pains to acknowledge the multivalent and multifaceted position the term now occupies, identifying three different modes of kitsch. The first mode concerns its original usage as a means of identification of art products that are intentionally designed and marketed to a ‘well-defined audience of average consumers.’\(^4\) The second type refers to those objects that incidentally make use of kitsch elements as a by-product of the intervention and consequences of modern technologies and mechanical modes of reproduction. It is, however, the third possibility that explains why I have chosen to use ‘popular classics’ as the focus of this portfolio:

The third possibility consists of considering kitsch from the vantage point of the consumer who, willing to accept the ‘aesthetic lie’ of kitsch and who, conditioned by the

---


\(^3\) Certain post-modern artists — the most notable exemplar being Jeff Koons — who have embraced the populist, commercial aspects of post-Pop Art have embraced the label kitsch almost as a badge of honour (Arthur C. Danto, Encounters and Reflections: Art in the Historical Present, [University of California Press, 1997], 280-281).

\(^4\) Dutton, ‘Kitsch’, Grove Art Online.

\(^5\) Calinescu, Five Faces of Modernity, 249.
sheer quantity of pseudoart and instant beauty with which he is surrounded, can perceive even genuine works of art as kitsch.\(^{86}\)

The example that Calinescu gives for this process is Marcel Duchamp’s (1887-1968) infamous 1919 ‘vandalism’ of a postcard that reproduces Leonardo da Vinci’s (1452-1519) La Gioconda (c.1503-1506), entitled *L.H.O.O.Q.*\(^{87}\) Duchamp’s ‘ready-made assisted’ has a double function, as Calinescu identifies:

The Gioconda he abused was not the masterpiece but a reproduction, an instance of the modern falsification of tradition. Duchamp would have probably agreed with Adorno’s view...that, in the modern world, tradition has become false, and that there is virtually no tradition that has not been falsified. So Duchamp insulted merely a kitsch object...one of those countless images of the Mona Lisa with which we have been flooded for decades. And I would add that it is not at all certain whether in proceeding as he did, the artist was attacking da Vinci’s original painting or whether, on the contrary, he did not try secretly...to vindicate it. One thing is clear, however; namely that Duchamp resorted to kitsch not only to reject certain crass aesthetic misconceptions and jaded conventions but also to advocate the avant-garde drive toward the abandonment of an aesthetics based on *appearances*, which, in our time, are so easily falsified.\(^{88}\)

The exact target of Duchamp’s critique is ambiguous, however. Calinescu is correct to identify that the vandalism is inflicted on a reproduction, and so Duchamp’s critique could be interpreted as being aimed at the ‘kitschification’, or vulgarisation, of ‘genuine’ art, and the artist’s own words seem to support Calinescu’s interpretation. In a reference to Pop Art of the 1960s, Duchamp explained how they turned the materials and techniques of Dada from a critique of kitsch into kitsch itself:

This Neo-Dada, which they call New Realism, Pop Art, Assemblage, etc., is an easy way out, and lives on what Dada did. When I discovered ready-mades I thought to discourage aesthetics. In Neo-Dada they have taken my ready-mades and found aesthetic beauty in them. I threw the bottlerack and the urinal into their faces as a challenge and now they admire them for their aesthetic beauty.\(^{89}\)

---

\(^{86}\) Calinescu, *Five Faces of Modernity*, 249.
\(^{87}\) Ibid, 253-255.
\(^{88}\) Ibid, 253-255.
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By stripping Dada of its critical philosophy, Duchamp felt that the Pop Artists had removed the implicit critique of kitsch from his ready-mades. While he saw *L.H.O.O.Q.* as aimed at the vulgarisation of ‘genuine’ art, just as Calinescu identifies, that does not neutralize the fact that the reproduction is also a representation of the original. It is a substitute or proxy and therefore the vandalism inflicted upon it could be considered as also having been aimed at the original. While his interpretation is both reasonable and supported by Duchamp’s own writings, Calinescu misses the possibility that Duchamp has constructed an object that critiques both the original and its simulacrum simultaneously. The example of Duchamp’s that Calinescu provides is, however, problematic in terms of discussing vulgarised ‘genuine’ works of music. With plastic art the presence of simulacra is clear, but the well-discussed slippery ontology of music makes the delineation between ‘genuine’ and simulation problematic. Calinescu does, however, provide a hypothetical example of this type of kitsch that is applicable to music:

> [T]he ‘law of aesthetic inadequacy’ has a much wider scope, and we may well speak of kitsch effects in connection with combinations or arrangements of objects that, taken individually, have absolutely nothing kitschy about them. Thus, a real Rembrandt hung in a millionaire’s home elevator would undoubtedly make for kitsch. Obviously this is a hypothetical example and a caricature but it has the merit of suggesting the use of genuine great art as mere ostentations decoration.90

Here, Calinescu identifies how kitsch objects are no longer limited to those objects that are created with the intention of being kitsch. Meaning that whether an object is kitsch is highly dependent on the newly kitsch object’s context:

> To determine whether an object is kitsch always involves considerations of purpose and context. In theory, there should be nothing kitschy about the use of a reproduction or slide even of the Mona Lisa, in a study of art history. But the same image reproduced on a plate, a table cloth, a towel, or an eyeglass case will be unmistakable kitsch. A number of excellent reproductions of the same painting put beside each other in a shop window will have a kitsch effect because they suggest availability in commercial quantities. The mere consciousness of the industrial multiplication of an art object for purely commercial reasons can kitschify its image.91

The twin processes of re-contextualisation and commodification are both necessary to accomplish the vulgarisation of a ‘genuine’ aesthetic object. In Calinescu’s example of a Rembrandt in the lift

---

of a millionaire’s apartment, we have a genuine aesthetic object being repurposed to become a kind of kitsch. It is not that the object’s ownership by the millionaire grants it its kitsch classification, but its location in the lift. Placed within the semi-public realm of the lift it functions as a signifier of the millionaire’s bourgeois credentials and ‘civilised tastes’. Or, to paraphrase art critic Clement Greenberg, the Rembrandt in this context ‘pretends to demand nothing of its customers except their money — not even their time.’ The second process by which a ‘genuine’ aesthetic object can be made to be kitsch, commodification, is best typified by the account Calinescu gives for the Mona Lisa. The saturation of cheap reproductions in the form of souvenirs, memorabilia and other presentations of the reproduced image means that the original aesthetic object becomes more widely known through its reproductions than its original.

This process of vulgarisation by re-contextualisation and commodification is equally applicable to musical works. We could easily replace the Mona Lisa with Beethoven’s Für Elise, Mozart’s Eine Kleine Nachtmusik, or Johann Pachelbel’s ‘Kanon’. These pieces are staples of a host of kitsch compilation CDs, marketed with titles like Classic FM: Mozart for Babies (2006) and A Bride’s Guide to Wedding Music for Civil Ceremonies (2006). Just as in Calinescu’s example of a Rembrandt in a millionaire’s lift, these repackagings of ‘genuine’ aesthetic works grants them a kitsch classification by virtue of their repurposing, marketing and mass-production as functional commodities which purport to enlighten, relax and provide the appropriately coded ambience with little mental effort on the part of the consumer.

Many aspects of musical vulgarisation by commodification and re-contextualisation are charted by Mark Everist in the specific instance of Mozart’s Piano Concerto K.467 (1785). The Piano Concerto shot to public prominence in 1967 following the use of its slow movement on the soundtrack of the film Elvira Madigan (1967). The re-contextualisation of a single movement of the concerto within a popular motion picture meant that ‘the association of Mozart’s slow movement with Elvira Madigan gave the work an unparalleled status outside the cinema, as the concerto in concert and in recording both took on the same name of the film, as well as some of its ideology and tinta’. In other words, as the single movement became more widely known from its new context than its original one, this new context reflected back upon the work and was

92 Dutton, ‘Kitsch’, Grove Art Online.
94 I at no point wish to insinuate in this commentary that any of those ‘popular classics’ that I have enstranged in the portfolio were ever created with the intention of being kitsch. My contention is that these ‘popular classics’ have become kitsch, and therefore also ‘automised’ by both their contemporary contextualisation and the sheer extent of their cultural pervasiveness.
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integrated into its presentation and branding within the concert hall and CDs targeted at the educated ‘Classical’ music market. In his account of the slow movement of K.467, Everist shows on a practical level how musical works that were once ‘genuine’ aesthetic objects can be repurposed and repackaged to provide the same societal functions as other kitsch objects. For many, this particular corpus of Western Art music that has been rendered kitsch by mass-production and modern marketing practices has become synonymous with ‘Classical Music’ in toto. One only needs to look at the institutionalisation of the Classic FM radio station, a station that can easily be considered only to broadcast those works that have been rendered kitsch.

In many respects, kitsch (of all kinds) has similarities and shares common origins with nostalgia as described by Svetlana Boym. Citing Charles Maier, Boym, even makes the analogue that ‘[n]ostalgia is to memory as kitsch is to art’. The former focusing its longing on an invented and never-attainable sense of time and space, whilst the latter directs it more towards a sense of bourgeois refinement that — through a lack of either opportunity or leisure time — is forever out of reach. In practice, however, nostalgia and kitsch often appear intertwined and inseparable. In relation to ‘Classical’ music’s use as Muzak, anthropologist Jonathan Sterne has explained how the lingerie chain Victoria’s Secret uses a nexus of nostalgia and kitsch to cloak their stores in an invented cultural ambience to help give their merchandise the allure of a constructed sense of European aristocracy:

[T]he music program, along with the decor, offers listeners an index of class and a coherent frame within which to experience the store and themselves. The music plays to an American bourgeois identity by suggesting a refined, European, aristocratic taste. As a form of music that is generally associated with refined taste and prestige, it functions to legitimate the store as a respectable place to shop.

Victoria’s Secret’s use of music has exactly the same function as the millionaire’s placement of his Rembrandt, they allow someone to purchase entry into an invented ‘cultural intimacy’. A cultural intimacy founded on the same ‘modern falsification of tradition’ that Calinescu identifies in contemporary relationships to da Vinci’s La Gioconda and Everist charts in the use of the slow movement of Mozart’s K.467. ‘Genuine’ art works are rendered in to a type of kitsch so
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96 Everist, Mozart’s Ghosts, 239.
99 Boym, The Future of Nostalgia, 42-43
100 Calinescu, Five Faces of Modernity, 253-255.
as to be marketed as, or used as marketing for, products that aim to alleviate an unquenchable nostalgia.

In *The Future of Nostalgia*, Boym outlines two types of nostalgia: restorative and reflective. The former focuses on the home and its ‘transhistorical reconstruction’,\(^{101}\) whilst the latter centres on the sense of longing itself. For Boym:

Restorative nostalgia does not think of itself as nostalgia, but rather as truth and tradition. Reflective nostalgia dwells on the ambivalences of human longing and belonging and does not shy away from the contradictions of modernity. Restorative nostalgia protects the absolute truth, while reflective nostalgia calls it into doubt.\(^{102}\)

The processes that result in a ‘genuine’ work of art becoming kitsch replicate in many ways a move from reflective to restorative nostalgia. A move from the ironic and knowing to the deadly serious, the same seriousness that is needed for these iconic works of Western Art music to function as a form of vulgarised kitsch. In many respects, the critical focus of this portfolio can be described as an attempt to return vulgarised kitsch works back to a ‘reflective’ state. Each work in this portfolio engages with a specific work of vulgarised ‘kitsch’ in an attempt to reflect back that process seen in the case of Mozart’s K.467 and the film *Elvira Madigan*, where a work’s new kitsch context overwrites that of its original status as a ‘genuine’ aesthetic work. Therefore, the enstrangement is not only aimed at de-habituating the work itself, but the process of commodification and re-contextualisation that granted it that status.\(^{103}\)

The corpus of ‘kitsch’ Classical works that this portfolio engages with has a ubiquity and cultural presence in contemporary Western that allows them to illicit some kind of recognition, whilst also being heavily embedded within certain practices of the culture industry. Pieces such as ‘Pachelbel’s Canon’ and *Fur Elise* are widely recognised because they are regularly encountered beyond the confines of the concert hall. As a consequence, such works have a ‘real-world’ quality and presence that is absent from more esoteric works, and allows for the possibility of these pieces to be understood as found material with a functional or utilitarian purpose; playing off the tension between the aesthetic and the mundane in much the same way as Robert Rauschenberg’s (1925-2008) ‘combines’ or Joseph Cornell’s (1903-1972) ‘assemblages’. These kitsch, iconic works
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\(^{101}\) Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia*, xviii.

\(^{102}\) Ibid, xviii.

\(^{103}\) One piece within this portfolio, *Re: Mozart* (Chapter 5), engages with a much less familiar work that is difficult to understand as the same type of kitsch as the other source works in this portfolio. In this case, whilst the specific work might be obscure, the familiarity of the work’s style is engaged with. The reasons why this source work was chosen are discussed in Chapter 5 (pages 95-96).
of Western music therefore have the ubiquity and familiarity that allows for a non-specialised audience to engage with the critique whilst also allowing for the possibility of critiquing the process itself that has rendered them kitsch.

1.4.1 Text and Interpretation

Barthes’s ‘Death of the Author’ has implications for this portfolio beyond my consideration of the critiques of Critical art that I have discussed. It also has parallels with, and reinforces our understanding of, the vulgarisation of extant aesthetic works. If texts are no longer bound to the perceived intentions of their authors, they are free to be re-contextualised as kitsch works just as Calinescu describes. In *The Emancipated Spectator*, Rancière explores Barthes’s 1981 book *Camera Lucida*, an inquiry into the nature of photography. In these readings, Barthes expounds his ‘Death of the Author’ manifesto, completely ignoring any biographical information of either the photographer or the person depicted in the photograph. Rancière highlights all the ambiguities and indeterminacies that result from attempting to read a text by relying only on information contained within the text itself. Without the stabilising function of what Michel Foucault called the ‘author function’,104 formal elements of the work of art are free to have new meanings attributed to them by the spectator, according to the spectator’s previous experiences. As most vulgarised works are, almost by definition, stripped of their historically-contingent contexts in their new presentation, they become multivalent objects that are free to accumulate new meanings from new contexts.

Musicologist Kenneth Gloag reminds us how Barthes’s ‘Death of the Author’ is deliberately provocative, a polemic designed to destabilise a discursive norm, and it needs to be understood as such.105 After all, just as the author of a work of Critical Art cannot force his audience to reconsider their relationship to a wider world, neither does the reader come to a text with an omniscient, omnipotent agency, free to choose how to interpret from an exhaustive network of codes and references. As the author draws together a text from a ‘tissue of quotations’,106 the reader likewise interprets the text from an invariably different network of codes, knowledge and experiences. This is one of the central points of Foucault’s lecture *What is an Author?*, which many have interpreted as a riposte to Barthes. Foucault makes the point that simply erasing the
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author from critical discussion does not reflect the way that post-Enlightenment readers interact with texts, and what he terms the ‘author function’ is still vital in determining how we understand an aesthetic work. Foucault might be right in most cases, but I would argue that this ‘author function’ is lost in the case of extremely ubiquitous, or ‘vulgarised’, art works. When musical works are presented so frequently in contexts that suppress or omit the details of their provenance or authorship, like television advertisements, the new context within which they are presented suppresses the ‘author function’ as most of the audience will not have the requisite knowledge to provide this information themselves.

The author function in kitsch music is replaced by the function of the work’s new context: Vivaldi’s *The Four Seasons* (c.1723) as hold music, or the use of the *Trio* from Edward Elgar’s *Pomp and Circumstance March No.1* in North American graduation ceremonies. In these two examples, aesthetic objects originally designed for a space where assumptions could be made about the knowledge of an audience are projected into a wider space where these assumptions can no longer be held as true. Even when an author’s name is still retained in association with the work (such as with ‘Pachelbel’s Canon’), it is reduced to its most basic function — an aid to identify the work. It no longer serves the function of providing a marker for the kinds of references and contextualisation that help guide the interpretation of meaning. So, when we encounter these works in these new kitsch contexts, we interpret them according to these new socio-cultural coordinates. Rather than seeing Claude Monet’s (1840-1926) *Impression, soleil levant* (1872) as a radical work that rejected the then-ascendant aesthetic ideals of Academicism in favour of a focus on capturing the fleeting changes of light in human perception, we see a romanticised image tied to greetings cards and coffee mugs. Moreover, the ubiquity of these associations does not disappear when a spectator goes to the concert hall or art gallery. They remain active and begin to interact with established cultural codes of meaning. When hearing *Eine Kleine Nachtmusik* a listener is forced to decode the work not in terms of Mozart the author, but of Mozart as the face of Mozartkugel, or of the fictional Mozart of the Academy-Award-winning film *Amadeus* (1984).

---

107 Foucault, *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*, 211.
108 Ibid, 211.
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The parameters for the canonicity of the specific works chosen as subjects for critical engagement in this portfolio are not the same as those of conventional musicology.\(^{109}\) I am not interested in the works of the ‘masters’ \textit{per se}, but in those canonic works that have established a prominent role in wider contemporary popular culture. As an example, whilst I would be interested in this portfolio in enstranging Beethoven’s Piano Sonata No.14 in C# minor (1810) — the ‘\textit{Moonlight Sonata}’ — I would focus only on the first movement, not the complete sonata, as this is the part of the work that is usually heard in Popular-cultural contexts. To make a trite analogy, one could say I am interested in the ‘Classic FM’ canon: works of Western Art Music that have become so well established in contemporary popular culture that they have, for all intents and purposes, become kitsch.

1.5 \hspace{1em} \textbf{Motivation and Contextualisation}

Key to this portfolio is the notion of playing \textit{with}, rather than playing \textit{on}. While the latter can be conceived of as a form of un-directed play, predicated upon the interaction between the composer and the materiality of the source work, the former seeks to engage and disrupt the object within its socio-cultural web of meaning. Jimi Hendrix’s renditions of the American national anthem, \textit{The Star-Spangled Banner} (1814) have received much attention in this regard.

For the two-year period from August 1968 to August 1970, Hendrix played his version of \textit{The Star-Spangled Banner} over sixty times. Mark Clague has extensively pieced together the performance history of Hendrix’s \textit{Banner}, and his efforts have shown that the \textit{Banner} was a much more nuanced, complex and dynamic affair than it is commonly understood to be. Clague identifies how Hendrix’s first known reference to the anthem was tied to another musical quotation, the American Civil War bugle call ‘Taps’.\(^{110}\) The fleeting nature of the \textit{Banner} quotation in this first outing means it is more appropriate to consider the \textit{Banner} as an embellishment of the ‘Taps’.\(^{111}\) The first substantial performance of the \textit{Banner} quotation in August 1968 coincided with

\(^{109}\) As Bruno Nettl has identified, whilst there has been extensive discussion of the nature and formation of the Western Art Music Canon over the past three decades, few have been willing to specify its content in print (Bruno Nettl, ‘The Institutionalization of Musicology: Perspectives of a North American Ethnomusicologist’, in Nicholas Cook and Mark Everist [eds.], \textit{Rethinking Music} [Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1999], 304-305). However, Nettl’s suggests that the canon can generally be understood to be represented in the curricula of University music departments. Whilst these curricula have certainly widened in scope and diversity over the past thirty years, it can be still said to centre — albeit less strongly — on the music of the Common-Practice and Romantic eras.

\(^{110}\) Mark Clague, “‘This is America’: Jimi Hendrix’s Star Spangled Banner Journey as Psychedelic Citizenship’ \textit{Journal of the Society for the American Music}, Vol. 8, No. 4 (2014), 438-439.

\(^{111}\) Ibid, 442-443.
Hendrix’s old military unit being deployed to Vietnam, and Clague has noted that ‘while “the Star-Spangled Banner” was incomplete and included a wrong note, “Taps” was rendered correctly and in full. The anthem was fragmented; the bugle call complete.’ Over time, the ‘Taps’ quotation fell by the wayside and other quotations came into play. This, combined with the fact that Hendrix used the *Banner* as a prelude or coda to *Purple Haze* (1970), showed a clear compositional intent on Hendrix’s part that meant that, as Steve Waksman has identified, while ‘he experienced each performance as a unique, spontaneous act...the repetition of gestures over time suggest a more conscious and complicated process.’ Regardless of any political overtones, which are understandably the focus of Clague’s account, his reconstruction of the performance history of Hendrix’s *The Star-Spangled Banner* shows how Hendrix’s performances were a nexus of contingencies, improvisations and pre-determined composition. Depending on where he was playing, when he was playing, to whom he was playing, and in what socio-political climate he was performing in, a strikingly different rendering of the work could emerge. Eric Clarke has described this as ‘playing with the anthem rather than playing it’, a view supported by Nicholas Cook who describes how the *Banner* gained its notoriety by the way it relates the ‘subversive acoustic qualities of Hendrix’s guitar playing to another and much broader element in the network of signifiers from which meaning emerges: the expectations and values of the late 1960s as symbolised by the American national anthem.’

It is in this vein that this thesis should be understood: as playing with its subjects not just in an autonomous, technical fashion, but as works that both emerge from and are in dialogue with a wider, dynamic cultural milieu. By engaging with a sense of play through Critical frameworks, this portfolio should remain firmly engaged with the world as well as the materiality of the music that it inspects. The ideas of play, fun, and humour in this portfolio draws on a long history, and Brecht himself talked at length about the role of ‘fun’ within his Epic Theatre. Given this portfolio’s reliance on quotation, irony and self-reflexive relationships to its sources, a discussion of its engagement and relationship with post-modernism is required.
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112 Clague, “‘This is America’: Jimi Hendrix’s Star Spangled Banner Journey as Psychedelic Citizenship’, 441-442.
113 Ibid, 446.
116 Cook, *Beyond the Score*, 293.
117 Play — as opposed to purpose — is one of the defining binary oppositions that literary theorist Ihab Hassan denotes as being vital to distinguishing the modern from the post-modern (Ihab Hassan, *The Postmodern Turn: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture* [Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1987], 91).
1.5.1 Post-Modernism

In recent years, there has been a renewed reaction to the idea of post-modernity, both in composition and musicology, as well as further afield in wider cultural contexts and social media platforms. Many have sought to escape what they see as post-modernity’s decent into a nihilistic, absolute relativism. A few have argued for simply winding the clock back by reinstalling Enlightenment ideals, whilst others, such as David Clarke, have tried to chart a middle course that accounts for the critiques of both modernity and post-modernity. What these statements fail to recognise, however, is that works like Berio’s *Sinfonia* have gained their historical notoriety because of the stylistic rupture they represented at the time of their premières. *Sinfonia* was a counter-cultural reaction to the then institutionalised aesthetics of High Modernity, and its musical manifestation in total serialism. But the aesthetic of post-modernity now stands as the *de facto* aesthetic position that the high modernist total serialism once held, and so to point to the fall of post-modernity one would need to provide evidence of other works that hold the same relationship with *Sinfonia* that *Sinfonia* held to the high modernist works of Boulez or Stockhausen. After all, the collage and cut-up techniques that are the mainstay of post-modern aesthetics in most media can be dated back to Dadaists like Max Ernst (1891-1976), Hannah Höch (1889-1978) and John Heartfield (1881-1968). The mere fact that these techniques and ideas existed prior to the emergence of post-modernity does not invalidate post-modernity’s historical import; it is their codification and institutionalisation that is paradigm defining.

In an introductory text to post-modernism in music, Kenneth Gloag — echoing literary theorist Linda Hutcheon — describes how the post-modern is already a historical phenomenon given that it has its own canon of authorial texts. While Gloag and Hutcheon are perfectly correct in asserting post-modernism’s historicity, some commentators have misconstrued this statement to mean that post-modernity has *passed* into history — that it is no longer a dominant, regulative concept. Given that there is still clearly a debate underway in many aspects of culture over the...
relative value and position of post-modernity, it seems a little premature to proclaim its death considering that no one seems yet to have been able to articulate a coherent alternative. Furthermore, the fragmentary nature of post-modernity means that to talk about post-modernity in monolithic terms at all is to doom your critique to failure from the onset.

In the preface to an edited collection of essays entitled *Postmodern Culture*, art critic Hal Foster divides post-modernity into two opposing subsets:

> ‘[a] basic opposition exists between a postmodernism which seeks to deconstruct modernism and resist the status quo and a postmodernism which repudiates the former to celebrate the latter: a postmodernism of resistance and a postmodernism of reaction.’

The schema that Foster sets up is a useful model for trying to understand some of the contradictions inherent in post-modern cultural works. Firstly, it points towards an often under-acknowledged repercussion of post-modern thought: that to talk of one post-modernism is, ironically, to fail to learn one of the principles lessons of post-modern scepticism — that of the ‘incredulity toward metanarratives’. As a theoretical position, if post-modernism’s primary understanding is to always cast doubt on any grand statement of universal truth, to then talk of a monolithic post-modernism is both contradictory and ironic. The usefulness of Foster’s bisection of post-modernism is that it reveals how the lessons of post-modernism can be constructed and implemented in a myriad of forms. For example, by using post-modernism’s ‘incredulity toward metanarratives’, those on the ‘reaction’ side of Foster’s post-modern divide can negate or ignore the modernist teleology of music history, ‘legitimising’ the unironic return to pre-modern, pre-serial modes of musical rhetoric and structure. On the other hand, a post-modernism of resistance, by similarly denying the Modernist historical teleology as one narrative among many, can use other potential narratives to critique Modernity and open discursive space for other voices and narrative possibilities.

To move Foster’s binary division into the realm of the musical, Gloag posits George Rochberg (1918-2005) as the archetypal post-modern reactionary composer and John Zorn (1953–) as the archetypal post-modern composer of resistance. The former is considered as such because of his output’s gradual transformation into pastiche, and the latter because Zorn’s music always
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resituates — in one aspect or another — the music it apes or manipulates.\textsuperscript{125} Jameson has drawn a similar distinction between the reactionary process of pastiche and resistive process of parody, claiming that:

Pastiche is, like parody, the imitation of a peculiar or unique, idiosyncratic style, the wearing of a linguistic mask, speech in a dead language. But it is a neutral practice of such mimicry, without any of parody's ulterior motives, amputated of the satiric impulse, devoid of laughter.\textsuperscript{126}

In other words, the distinction between the two techniques is largely one of context rather than kind. However, another explanation can also be found if we return to Barthes: the delineation between honest, uncritical, pastiche and ironic parody could potentially be decoded by the level to which we — as interpreters — permit authorial intent to be included within the criteria with which we evaluate the post-modern work. Whilst it is difficult to see Rochberg's return to historical modes as anything but uncritical nostalgia, it is not the existence of pastiche that defines a post-modern work as reactionary, as opposed to resistive, but the contextual armature within which it is placed.\textsuperscript{127}

In many respects, these appeals for the death of post-modernity go to the heart of why so many of the criticisms levelled at what has been called The New Discipline in music are ill founded. It is not so much that these ideas are new that is important, it is the fact that they are codified from a loose assemblage of historical models and artefacts into a more logically-constructed discipline, that defines them as noteworthy.

\textsuperscript{125} Another rationale for calling Zorn the epitome of the post-modernist of resistance is that referring to his 'music' in an implied singular is deeply problematic. When we talk of his 'music' do we mean the dense collage works of Carney, \textit{Cat o'Nine Tails} (1988), or \textit{Forbidden Fruit}? Or do we mean the occult-inflected, 'avant-metal' of \textit{Six Litanies for Heliogabalus} (2007). Or, still yet do we mean the largely formal, tonal Jazz songs of \textit{Towards Kafiristan} (2012). The sheer breadth and depth of range of Zorn's output, often with different styles and genres running simultaneously, sets him apart from Rochberg whose stylistic transformations largely proceed in a gradual, linear fashion. Zorn's place sat astride a multitude of different musical practices means that discussing his 'music' in anything but the most generalised, neutral terms is extremely problematic.


\textsuperscript{127} Giles Deleuze, \textit{Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation} (London, UK: Continuum, 2005), 22.
1.5.2 The New Discipline

‘The New Discipline’ is a term coined by Irish composer Jennifer Walshe in a 2016 manifesto written for the Borealis Festival of that year. It describes what she identifies as a recent trend within New Music for compositions that display ‘a wide range of disparate interests but all share the common concern of being rooted in the physical, theatrical and visual, as well as musical.’

She believes that these works ‘often invoke the extra-musical, which activate the non-cochlear.’ Fundamentally, for Walshe, The New Discipline is a method of composing that recognizes, and actively engages with, the understanding that musical performance is an embodied and holistic act that takes place within, and is intimately connected to, the world in which it takes place. It does so by making extensive, but selective, use of inter-disciplinary techniques and devices including electronics, film, and physical performance:

Composers working in this way draw on dance, theatre, film, video, visual art, installation, literature, stand-up comedy. In the rehearsal room the composer functions as a director or choreographer, perhaps most completely as an auteur. The composer doesn’t have aspirations to start a theatre group – they simply need to bring the tools of the director or choreographer to bear on compositional problems, on problems of musical performance.

One modification I would make to Walshe’s description of The New Discipline’s practice is that the role of the composer is not always necessarily one of an auteur. Whilst the composer might take up the role of the director or the choreographer to accomplish a task, they would be equally willing to collaborate or consult with professional directors and choreographers to create the composition. Brooklyn-based group Object Collection is one such group, with writer and director Kara Feely and composer Travis Just working as a core duo around which they collaborate with a host of practitioners from other disciplines to create their works. However, whilst Object Collection is a formalized group of collaborators, much of the time these collaborations are formed around single works or a specific series of works. For example, in 2008 the Letter Piece Company was formed by dancer Shila Anaraki, composer Matthew Shlomowitz, light designer Tom Bruwier, and musicians Mark Knoop and Tomma Wessel in order to perform Shlomowitz’s Letter Piece (2008—) series. There is, however, one key distinction that Walshe is at pains to
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make. For her: ‘The New Discipline is a way of working, both in terms of composing and preparing pieces for performance. It isn’t a style.’\(^{132}\) Neither is it a collection of composers grouped together by similar aesthetic preoccupations, as could be said of the Wandelweiser composers. Instead it is a loose collection of composers with a broadly similar outlook or practice.

There has been some criticism of Walshe’s manifesto,\(^{133}\) much of it based on the assumption that the ‘new’ of ‘The New Discipline’ refers to the individual practices that constitute the discipline. That the use of film, theatrical devices, the extra-musical, and all the other interdisciplinary devices that Walshe identifies have been used and developed since the 1960s and therefore there is nothing ‘new’ about ‘The New Discipline’. This criticism, however, is fundamentally predicated on a misunderstanding of Walshe’s meaning. It is not that Walshe is declaring that those aspects and devices that constitute it are, in and of themselves, new, it is that rather their constellation and ‘disciplinisation’ into a coherent and developed field of compositional activity that is new. The brand of inter-disciplinarity that is on display in The New Discipline is not that of the historical models that Walshe’s critics cite. Whilst there are certainly examples from the 1960s and 1970s, the relationship between the musical and the extra-musical disciplines can often be one-sided, with the extra-musical being brought into the musical only to serve a specific musical purpose. Mauricio Kagel’s (1931-2008) music can fall into this kind of relationship. Although Kagel is certainly a key touchtone and forerunner for many New Discipline composers, several of his theatrically-inclined works can often fall foul of an undigested use of dramatic rhetoric or devices. In Atem (1969-1970) the wind player is required to not just play, but to act in a fully theatrical sense: to take and impersonate a role. Likewise, in his earlier Mirum (1965) for solo tuba, the performer is required to stand up after playing ten minutes of short fragments of material of varying levels of virtuosity and begin shouting phrases from the third and fourth stanzas of the Latin hymn, Dies Irae. Whilst the connection between the piece and the opening lines of the third stanza — ‘Tuba mirum spargens sonum’ — is patently obvious, the lack of any seeming connection between the final page of the text and the musical material that precedes it calls into question the text’s role as anything other than as a means to cause a disruption to the audience’s listening experience. While this is obviously a legitimate usage of this kind of crude performative

\(^{132}\) Walshe, ‘The New Discipline’.

\(^{133}\) Unfortunately, there has been little published criticism of Walshe’s position, most circulating as either concert hearsay or on social media (especially Facebook). This makes it hard to analyse and potentially refute either position in a concrete fashion. However, in the special May 2016 edition of MusicTexte devoted to ‘The New Discipline’, many of the articles reference the general thrust of these criticisms. This is most noticeable in the title of Andy Ingamells contribution, ‘Stop Inhaling Oxygen and Exhaling Carbon Dioxide, Because “We Did That In The 60s”’ (Andy Ingamells, ‘Stop Inhaling Oxygen and Exhaling Carbon Dioxide, Because “We Did That In The 60s”’ [2016], accessed 01 August 2017: http://musiktexte.de/WebRoot/Store22/Shops/dc91cf2-4fd-41fe-82da-0ce2be8528c1e/MediaGallery/Ingamells.pdf).
device, it fundamentally serves a purely musical function that could, if desired, still be achieved by conventional musical means.

In contrast, the composers of The New Discipline attempt to create a more symbiotic, or at least sympathetic, relationship between the musical and extra-musical. The more direct and equal interaction between various disciplines that The New Discipline aims for can often be understood as a desire, need, or willingness to actively participate in the total performance process. It is no coincidence that many of the composers that Walshe cites as belonging to this group are not only composers, but also performers themselves who are often intimately involved in the performance of their own works. In many respects, what Walshe is calling for in the New Discipline is not that far removed from what Nicholas Cook has called for in musicology: ‘[t]o see music as just a form of writing or even as the designing of sounds is, in this way, to overlook the entire social dimension of performance, from which music derives so much of its meaning.’

My purpose in discussing The New Discipline is not to align myself with it ideologically, but to show how the compositions that constitute this portfolio are just one part of a wider move towards a contemporary practice that engages not just with both every aspect of performance, but also with the world more broadly. Whilst still a fundamentally score-based practice, the New Discipline seeks to cast its net more widely than the conventional, literate mindset of traditionally-construed Western Art music — just as I have sought to do here. Many of the works contained herein make use of physical performance, formal gesture, and speech beyond what is nominally considered to be part of conventional musical performance. However, these directions are always scored and articulated within a distinctly musical framework. They are never left to the complete discretion of the performer, beyond the usual interpretative practices that performers would bring to bear to decode a score. Other pieces in this portfolio make no use of devices or gestures beyond the conventionally musical, yet still use the musical to try and engage with the extra-musical by overtly playing on the kitsch, real-world embeddedness of their source materials. Just like the composers of The New Discipline, whose interests roughly align with those of my own, this portfolio seeks to consciously orientate music outward into a dialogue with the wider world in that it both emerges from and is part of.

134 Walshe’s sample list of composers includes: Object Collection, James Saunders, Matthew Shlomowitz, Neele Hülcker, François Sarhan, Jessie Marino, Steven Takasugi, Natacha Diels and herself (Walshe, ‘The New Discipline’).
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Chapter 2: One and Four Canons

One and Four Canons is written for three melody instruments and two harmony instruments, and takes as its source material one of the most kitsch works of the ‘Classic FM Canon’, the canon from Johann Pachelbel’s (1653-1706) Canon and Gigue for Three Violins and Basso Continuo (c.1680-1706), popularly known as ‘Pachelbel’s Canon’. As this was the first work in the portfolio, I wanted to begin with a work that stayed near to Shklovsky’s original formalist conception of enstrangement. Before I began trying to engage with the kitsch cultural contexts that have accrued around these works, I was eager to ensure that I had a fundamental technical base from which to begin. As ‘Pachelbel’s Canon’ is constructed from rather fundamental musical materials (scalic passages) and a simple form (a three-voice canon over a ground bass), it made a prime subject for an initial exploration of musical enstrangement. For this first composition I took as an interdisciplinary model the early work of the American conceptual artist Joseph Kosuth. I should make it clear from the onset that One and Four Canons is by no means intended as a literal musical analogy of Kosuth’s works in music; rather, it takes aspects of the formal properties and theoretical premises of the artist’s works and develops them within a distinctly musical context of its own.

2.1 Joseph Kosuth

Joseph Kosuth’s body of work is almost exclusively dominated by a focus on works that challenge, question and raise awareness of how the contextual nature of what we consider to be art is determined by the socio-cultural structures that form the institutions in which we appreciate art. The resulting works centre on the interplay between language, text and object. Kosuth has always been a controversial figure and his place within the canon of twentieth-century art history falls well outside the purview of the present discussion. However, given how intimately connected Kosuth’s theoretical methodology and the resulting artworks are, a brief discussion of the roots of the controversy is illuminating of Kosuth’s work.

Much of the controversy around Kosuth can be attributed to the artist’s belligerent dismissal of traditional artistic mediums — particularly Abstract Expressionist painting and its critical wing headed by Clement Greenberg (1909-1994). He has also criticised other conceptual artists that

---

he deemed not to be theoretically discerning enough. While this was undoubtedly a part of the internal debate and posturing of the different factions that characterised art movements of this period, the severity of Kosuth’s theoretical discriminations forced him into a particularly isolated position within this debate. The theoretical motivation for Kosuth’s dismissal of certain conceptual artists is outlined in his essay ‘1975’ (1975). His critique hinges on the distinction that he draws between what he idiosyncratically terms ‘stylistic conceptual art’ (SCA) and ‘theoretical conceptual art’ (TCA). Kosuth’s distinction is premised upon the differences in the use and function of language in these two types of Conceptual Art. In SCA the use of language has become another ‘cute’ painterly technique, while in TCA the use of language retains the theoretical force that was the aesthetic imperative of early Conceptual Art. In TCA the use of language is both fundamental to the form of the artwork and fundamentally embedded in the socio-cultural structures within which that artwork is being interpreted. René Magritte’s famous The Treachery of Images (1928-29) can, therefore, be considered a proto-conceptual artwork in the TCA manner. In The Treachery of Images, a label under the pictorial representation of a pipe reads ‘Ceci n’est pas une pipe’. Here, Magritte deliberately draws attention to the process by which representational images are being interpreted, disrupting that very process by means of making it ‘visible’ to the spectator. Conversely, in a work of SCA the use of language may evoke a certain set of connotations, but for the most part it never rises above a purely graphic design.

Kosuth’s work, to date, can be divided into two distinct periods, defined more by the change in the theoretical motivations and legitimations that underpin them than by the resulting work. The two theoretical periods can be organised roughly around two large essays: the first, and arguably most influential is ‘Art After Philosophy’ (1969), with the second being ‘The Artist as Anthropologist’ (1975). It is the first of these two periods of Kosuth’s work — most clearly seen in his One and Three Chairs (1965) — that had the most significant influence on One and Four Canons.

---

3 Ibid., 130.
4 In ‘1975’, Kosuth insinuates that the work of Bruce Nauman is an example of SCA. However, he neither explicitly states this, nor provides any other examples of SCA artworks (Kosuth, ‘1975’, in Art after Philosophy and After, 129-133).
2.1.1  One and Three Chairs

One and Three Chairs is Kosuth’s most widely known work, and is emblematic of his early ‘philosophical’ period. It is an installation that consists of a chair, a full-scale photographic reproduction of that same chair in situ, and a Photostat of a dictionary definition of the term ‘chair’. In this work, Kosuth is trying to challenge the viewer’s understanding of an object’s ‘art condition’ by problematizing the relationship between the object and its visual and linguistic representations. At the heart of One and Three Chairs is Kosuth’s notion that a concept, presented in a certain way, can remain unchanged despite alterations in its formal properties — i.e. the use of a different chair.

In his 1969 essay ‘Art as Philosophy’, Kosuth outlines the fundamental theoretical precepts that govern his work of this period. For Kosuth ‘art…is a tautology; i.e., the ‘art idea’ (or ‘work’) and art are the same and can be appreciated as art without going outside the context of art for verification.’ Kosuth uses Ludwig Wittgenstein’s definition of tautology to question, or problematize, preconceived notions of how we understand and define art. Fundamental to Kosuth’s early work, including One and Three Chairs, was the presupposition that ‘[w]orks of art are analytic propositions. That is, if viewed within their context — as art — they provide no information what-so-ever [sic] about any matter of fact.’

Most of Kosuth’s early work follows a similar set of aesthetic propositions as One and Three Chairs, featuring commonplace objects and their respective representations and linguistic definitions and/or denotations. While many follow the formula of ‘object—photographic representation—definition’ of his ‘One and…’ works, others do not. One such work from the same year is Clear Square Glass Leaning (1965), which consists of four large squares of transparent glass leaning against the gallery wall. Each pane of glass is labelled in its centre by one word from the title of the work, but each word also simultaneously describes a property of the glass panels. Like One and Three Chairs, Clear Square Glass Leaning seeks to problematize the viewer’s perception of the contextual nature of an object presented in a gallery. While One and Three Chairs does this by highlighting an object’s linguistic definition, Clear Square Glass Leaning makes apparent the object’s material properties over its artistic ‘aura’. However, it is important to note that these

---

7 Unfortunately, I was unable to obtain copyright permissions to reproduce images of either One and Three Chairs or Clear Square Glass Leaning. However, images of both (and similar contemporary examples of Kosuth’s oeuvre) are widely available online.
material properties are always of a banal, unaesthetic nature. Whether it’s a sheet of glass, an
everyday chair, or Duchamp’s urinal, these objects gain their ‘enstranged’ quality by being placed in an aesthetic context.

2.2 One and Four Canons

Kosuth’s 1969 essay ‘Art as Philosophy’ claims that ‘art…is a tautology; i.e., the ‘art idea’ (or ‘work’) and art are the same and can be appreciated as art without going outside the context of art for verification.’

This idea of using tautology to question, or problematize, preconceived notions of how we understand and define art is an aspect of Kosuth’s work that I wanted to explore as a means of enstranging a canonical and ubiquitous musical work. A ‘musical tautology’ would allow me to engage ‘distancing’ strategies to try to show the multiple possibilities contained within a musical context. Tautology would, therefore, allow me to show the same object from a multiple of unorthodox (i.e., non-musical) perspectives that would allow for the audience to re-evaluate their understanding of what constitutes the musical object that is being presented to them.

To investigate Kosuth’s notion of art as tautology further, I turned to the key text for Kosuth’s ‘Art as Philosophy’, Wittgenstein’s 1922 *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. In the *Tractatus*, one of the examples that Wittgenstein uses while discussing propositions is a musical one:

> The gramophone record, the musical thought, the score, the waves of sound, all stand to one another in that pictorial internal relation, which holds between language and the world.

> In the fact that there is a general rule by which the musician is able to read the symphony out of the score, and that there is a rule by which one could reconstruct the symphony from the line on a gramophone record…lies the internal similarity between these things which at first sight seem to be entirely different. And the rule is the law of projection which projects the symphony into the language of the musical score. It is the rule of translation of this language into the language of the gramophone record.

---

Wittgenstein’s idealised understanding of what constitutes a musical object is not far from Nelson Goodman’s definition of an art ‘Work’.15 Regardless of the extent to which these musical objects are ontologically the same, it is the fact that they are habitually understood to be the same that is relevant for both Kosuth and One and Four Canons. In One and Three Chairs, Kosuth is not actually arguing the case that the chair, its photo, and its definition are intrinsically one and the same; rather he shows that our perception of aesthetic objects depends on the interactions of habituated understandings of an object, its definition, and its representation, that are usually not seen at the same time but are nonetheless integral to both the object’s recognition and its interpretation within a specific context. While One and Four Canons does not seek to problematize a musical object’s institutionally derived art-condition in quite the concrete fashion that Kosuth’s One and Three Chairs does, it uses its methods to perform an act of musical, rather than visual, estrangement.

One and Four Canons takes ‘Pachelbel’s Canon’ as its source material for estrangement — my equivalent of Kosuth’s chair. My choice of such a well-known, and well-worn, original was motivated by both theoretical and pragmatic concerns. ‘Pachelbel’s Canon’ is a work with a significant position within wider culture, and so it meets the requirements that it should be both easily recognised by a wide cross-section of any potential audience and have the ubiquity of a piece of musical furniture, just like Kosuth’s chair.

The use of a chair by Kosuth has similarities with Duchamp’s choice of objects for his ready-mades. By choosing objects that traditionally belong in the ‘real’ world, and not those of the art world, Duchamp highlights the subjectivity of the artist in defining the boundaries for what constitutes art. He also attempts to show the processes of visual interpretation by bypassing notions of aesthetic taste. While at first it may seem that ‘Pachelbel’s Canon’ is of the art world, and not the ‘real’ world, its vulgarised status granted by its widespread cultural dissemination has given it a similar ‘in the world’ ubiquity to Kosuth’s chair. It is present on innumerable ‘Classical’ compilation CDs that are marketed for a whole host of different occasions and functions. Whilst it is frequently played at weddings, it lacks the more prevalent semantic associations of either Mendelsohn’s or Wagner’s wedding marches, and so the ‘Canon’ occupies a particularly amorphous cultural space that lends it a ubiquity without specificity.
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From a more technical perspective, the choice of Pachelbel’s Canon’ was motivated by both the musical material and structure of the source work. Not only does Pachelbel’s initial thematic material (consisting largely of a descending scale) make the tautological translations into different media more easily recognisable as such, but its structure, that of a canon, would allow me to treat the material without compromising the properties that give the work its identity condition — its ‘internal similarity’ (example 2.1).

To a certain extent, we can see that the theoretical and pragmatic concerns of One and Four Canons were symbiotic. The formal properties of a canon over a ground bass (imitation, repetition, variation, and an ability to convey a sense of, if not actual, simultaneity) not only allowed for the ability to layer multiple independent statements in a manner that can be perceived as part of a larger structure, but also shows the multiplicity of simultaneously functioning concepts that the object under investigation is constructed out of — just as One and Three Chairs does.

Example 2.1: J. Pachelbel, Canon and Gigue for Three Violins and Continuo (c.1680-1706); Canon, bars 1-6.

2.2.1 Translation and Tautology

One and Four Canons is structured around the presentation of the same thematic subject in four different media: colour, physical gesture, musical sound, and language. This presentation of different translations of one musical work are designed to produce a similar effect to Kosuth’s presentation of three iterations of a chair. Despite the translation into different media, each presentation of a musical object retains the ‘internal similarity’ of the original object. In the case of the colour medium, each pitch class of the original musical object is mapped onto a corresponding colour (figure 2.1). The colour medium mimics the scalic relationship of the pitch-classes in the original by cycling these colours through a colour wheel that matches the pitches on to the seven traditional colour bands of the light spectrum. Similarly, the gesture medium (drawn
from the standard semaphore letter system) mimics this same cycling, as the letters from A to G in semaphore consist of the position of one arm moving around the body in a clockwise direction (figure 2.2). This results in the cyclical property of the original diatonic scale being both maintained and rendered articulate in each of these translations.\textsuperscript{16} Furthermore, the presentation of the colours and the gestures through time maintains the same rhythmic-temporal proportions as the original musical source. The other two media, language and musical sound, function differently from the colour and gestural media just outlined. The music medium is the original music, as written, but substantially slowed down to allow for the source’s ‘rhythm’ to be uniform and evenly maintained across each medium and performer in the piece.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Pitch: & D & E & F# & G & A & B & C# \\
\hline
Colour: & Red & Orange & Yellow & Green & Blue & Indigo & Violet \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Pitch to Colour in One and Four Canons}
\end{table}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2_1.png}
\caption{Semaphore, positions for letters A-G.}
\end{figure}

Rather than translating the original into an analogous system of communication of discrete but cyclically related phenomena, in the language medium the original material is translated into a

\textsuperscript{16} The exact translation of the relative distance between each successive pitch of the major scale (either a tone or a semitone) is dependent upon the availability of specific pigments of coloured card, and the precision of the performers physical actions. However, it is extremely unlikely that an audience would be able to perceive these fine degradations of colour and physical movement.
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system of signs that represent the original pitch classes; in this instance, the nomenclature of the pitch classes. It is important to note that this use of language is different to that of Kosuth’s in *One and Three Chairs*. While in Kosuth’s work the text is drawn from a technical (dictionary) context, the text for *One and Four Canons* is purely denotative. This divergence in use of text and language has a qualitative difference on the effect of the piece. The use of notational nomenclature seeks to highlight the difference between the notes as representation and the sound themselves. In this way, the use of this denotative language is closer to the photograph in *One and Three Chairs* than to the dictionary definition. By having the performers speak the denotations aloud, rather than having them hold up a picture of a segment of the score, I aim to draw attention to the performative difference between the object and its representation. To paraphrase Magritte, by speaking it aloud both the audience and the performers become aware that *ceci n’est pas la musique*.

Those performers in the piece that are directed to speak are asked to do so in clear, but unpitched and unaffected, declamations. This direction serves two principle functions. On the one hand, it takes up Brecht’s ideas of speech as quotation, a distancing effect that seeks to limit any associations of empathy with the performers on the part of the audience. In this context, as the performers aren’t personifying characters in a theatrical fashion, the effect is one of a formal detachment that mimics the presentation of the cards or the semaphore, and limits the possibility for dramatic interpretation. Secondly, the requirement has the effect of presenting the action as a simple task that they have been directed to enact. As for which language, these denotations should be spoken in, the score contains specific instructions that mediate theoretical, practical and musical concerns. The performance directions indicate that the performers should decide amongst themselves whether they: all perform in English (as the score is written); all in the vernacular of the place of performance; or (providing they either all speak the same language or there are at least three different languages present) in the languages of the performers. The overriding consideration regarding which arrangement of languages are chosen should be the clarity above all. This not only allows the audience to clearly hear the text, but also ensures that the formalistic *tinta* of the work is maintained. The final interpretative option, that three or more languages can be used, is there to help reinforce the Wittgensteinian understanding of the ‘internal similarity’ of these objects as ‘universal’. Just as in Kosuth’s *One and Three Chairs* where any chair could be taken as the basis of the work, in *One and Four Canons* this ability to use multiple languages mimics this same translation of place. There is one caveat to this, however:

---

18 Here, I take up one of the aspects of Kagel’s instrumental theatre that will be discussed in more detail later in Chapter 4 (pages 81-84).
the stipulation that at least three different languages be used is intended to reinforce the notion of multiplicity. If only two languages were used they might project a binary opposition that did not exist within the work.

The piece is constructed according to the same formal premise as the original canon, with two players realising a repeating harmonic progression (the original continuo) over which three melody instrumentalists perform the same thematic material in canon (example 2.2). Rather than increasing melodic elaboration of the original source, as the piece progresses each performer comes in with the same material a second and third time, but in a different medium. This means that on the entrance of the third melodic performer the same material is being presented simultaneously in three different media (example 2.2). After the first three media (colour, physical gesture and language) have been presented, there is a ‘cadence’ on which the music medium enters. This music begins with the same material as the opening but then continues past the first thematic statement with the second, quaver-embellished, material of the second section of the original canon. This ‘fills in’ the original silence between events at the opening to give the piece a greater sense of movement and a feeling of counterpoint (example 2.3).
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As One and Four Canons progresses, the media begin to combine where this is practically possible. For example, some performers are instructed to speak simultaneously the name of the gesture that they are performing (example 2.4). This is complicated further towards the end of the work when a new text is introduced, a quotation from Wittgenstein already discussed earlier:

The gramophone record, the musical thought, the score, the waves of sound, all stand to one another in that pictorial internal relation, which holds between language and the world.\(^\text{19}\)

This text is divided up into seven parts and assigned to the diatonic pitches A to G in the same manner as the other media were before. Certain performers are required to recite the section of the text that is assigned to that pitch class in lieu of the nomenclature they had recited previously. The inclusion of the text was motivated by a desire to offer another means of gently reinforcing the premise of the work as presentation of multiple instances of the same aesthetic object. The piece is then brought back together at the end with all parts playing the concluding passage of the original in the colour medium.

Example 2.4: A. Glyde-Bates, One and Four Canons (2014), page 16; system 1.

2.3 Critical Reflection

Several issues arose whilst writing One and Four Canons. These largely centred on matters surrounding the processes of translation and perception of a work in one medium, into another medium, or set of other media. In One and Four Cannons, while the basic structures and proportions of the original musical material are maintained across the translations to different media, other fundamental elements are lost or distorted. For example, there is no sense of a tonic

\(^{19}\) Wittgenstein, Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus, 4.014.
in the colour medium. While the use of the colour wheel provides some sense of polarity within the mapping of red and blue onto the tonic and dominant functions, it would be a stretch to suggest that dominant function is maintained. This loss of functionality is not necessarily a problem, in and of its self — in fact it is fundamental to the enstranging process — it is an issue as the function of the material is perceived differently across mediums. The translations lose aspects of one system and gain features from the new system. The one-to-one and quasi-didactic methods employed in presenting these translations (e.g. notes represented by colour cards), also enhances the formal aspects, which I hope creates new perspectives on the material and its construction.

The element I am the least happy with is the Wittgenstein text towards the end. At the time of its composition I was concerned that the piece might be too esoteric. I hoped that the Wittgenstein text would add a final, albeit subtle, chance to lead audiences towards the concerns of the piece, as well as an add extra element to maintain audience interest in the final stage. However, I now feel that, contrary to my attempts to avoid otherwise, the inclusion of the Wittgenstein text in the piece has degenerated it into a work of what Kosuth called SCA by disrupting and moving outside of the formal one-to-one translation of media that had been the aesthetic of the piece up to this point. I could have achieved the same heightening of musical interest in the final few minutes by developing the pre-existing material rather than adding in any additional material.
Chapter 3: Serenade

Serenade, for saxophone quartet, was commissioned by the Laefer Saxophone Quartet for a concert at The National Gallery, London. As part of the commission brief, the piece was required to engage with one of the paintings contained within the room of the gallery where the concert was to take place. However, instead of engaging with a specific artwork, I chose to engage more broadly with the institution of the art gallery itself in its role as a museum of art works. The permanent installation of a set of canonic works not only defines the institution, it also gives the institution an embodied presence. This embodied institutional presence is no more apparent than with the National Gallery: with its Neo-Classical façade and imposing location overlooking London’s Trafalgar Square, it is in many aspects a perfect physical metaphor for an artistic institution. Serenade attempts to draw on the role of the art gallery as a museum by mimicking in its structure the act of restoring a work of art. In fine art, the process of restoration attempts to recreate the past using the modern. While restorers might seek to use historically-informed techniques and materials, these will always be — by necessity — new, and not old. I wanted to use the saxophone quartet as a metaphor for this process. As the saxophone quartet is based on the historic model of the string quartet, by using a piece of music for string quartet as the basis for Serenade I hoped to make apparent the tension of trying to recreate the ‘old’ using the new.

This formal trajectory of restoration in Serenade is a somewhat romanticised interpretation of the physical process. Rarely, if ever, is it the case that a piece of art to be restored has completely decayed away. Whilst the specific reconstructive procedures that are required to be performed on a painting are highly contingent on the condition of the individual work and our understanding of its original form and materials, the fundamental premise of trying to make an object appear as close to how we think it originally would have looked remains the same. To make the process of reconstruction cognitively appreciable by the audience in a musical context, this trajectory needed to be exaggerated, leading by necessity to the romanticised approach used in Serenade.

---

1 Due to unforeseen circumstances, the piece could not be performed at the National Gallery, but was instead performed one month later at The Forge, Camden.
3.1 Restoration as Structure

*Serenade* takes as its source material the first movement of Mozart’s Serenade No.13 in G major, K.525 (1781), commonly known as *Eine Kleine Nachtmusik*. A similar mixture of theoretical, historical and musical factors to those that motivated the choice of the source in *One and Four Canons* also motivated the choice of *Eine Kleine Nachtmusik* for *Serenade*. The choice of a work originally written for string instruments was not incidental, and was made to draw a further allusion with the idea of restoration. The trajectory of *Serenade* follows the emergence and re-obscuration of the Mozart. The combination of a lengthy un-manipulated quotation at the centre of the piece and the fundamentally linear processes of ‘restoration’ and ‘obscurcation’ differentiates *Serenade* from other contemporaneous works that deal directly with a single found source — for example Bernhard Lang’s *Monadologie* series,² where the repetition and mutation of small fragments disrupt the formal integrity of the musical source. In *Serenade* the source material is always present in at least some reduced manner: for instance, by elongating rests into more substantial general pauses. Compare examples 3.1 and 3.2: the original single crotchet rest becomes a five second general pause. Similarly, the alternating minor thirds and the arpeggio figuration of bars 3 and 4 of the Mozart become microtonally embellished tremolos in the alto saxophone. The appoggiaturas that follow the pause on the final beat of bar 4 become simple quavers approached by grace notes in *Serenade*. Here, the gestures and phrases are at the most distant from the original source, but they quickly begin to form into discrete and recognisable moments as the overall level of reduction becomes less and less.

---

² This aspect of Lang’s *Monadologie* series was discussed in Chapter 1 (pages 14-19).

*Serenade* begins with barely discernible utterances, moving through the gradual emergence of more concrete gestures and phrases to the lengthy un-manipulated quotation of the original source material at Fig. 12. To follow the logic of the trajectory of the piece, from Fig. 13, a similar process of emergence to that which structured the opening ‘restoration’ phase is reversed to obscure the Mozart once more. In pacing this trajectory, I first established the point at which the full quotation would emerge. The decision of where to place the quotation was mediated by a desire to balance the larger scale musical issues of pacing and fidelity to the form of the source work. Fig. 12, where the full quotation begins, coincides with the start of the short development section of the Mozart. The first movement of K.525 is structured in what was a conventional sonata form for the time, with a short central modulatory development based on material recognisably derived from the exposition. This section not only equates to two-thirds of the way through the duration of the moment, but is also based upon the homophonic opening gesture of the movement. This placement of the quotation allows for the recognition of the distinctive opening gesture of the musical source, but retains a sense of forward movement as it is not in the home key. The citation continues verbatim until Fig. 13, which marks the start of the recapitulation in the Mozart.

This lengthy quotation in *Serenade* was deliberate, and not a result of any external musical process imposed upon it. First, I made this decision to reflect the structural metaphor of the process of restoration — at some point the Mozart had to be established conclusively as having been ‘restored’. There were also theoretical and aesthetic rationales for doing so: by quoting a substantial and un-distorted portion of the original Mozart, I hoped to reinforce the ‘artefact-
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ness’ of the source. If I had retained only slight and fleeting allusions to the source it may have
created the effect of either becoming a game of ‘guess the tune’, or fallen into more Romantic
compositional tropes. Both possibilities would have undermined the ‘artefact-ness’ that was at
the heart of the piece’s allusions to both the process of restoration and the role of the gallery or
concert hall as a museum. In this respect, the piece attempts to engage some of the same themes
as Marcel Duchamp’s ready-mades or Andy Warhol’s Brillo Box (1964).

Most of the discourse surrounding Duchamp’s Fountain (1917) has centred both on how the
ready-mades both ruptured the ‘work’ character of an aesthetic object, and on how they had the
effect of avoiding judgements of taste. However, the ready-mades also had a secondary
repercussion that is less often discussed, but which is particularly pertinent here: their
highlighting of issues of authorship. The by-product of quoting such a lengthy passage of un-
modified music is the raising of the same issues of authorship as those of Duchamp’s Fountain.
While much of the critical response to Duchamp’s ready-mades focused on his decision to display
a mass-produced object under either his name or a pseudonym, rarely is the point made that
these objects were still manufactured by people. By placing these objects in the gallery context,
Duchamp therefore implicitly appropriates these objects as his own without acknowledging their
origins. In Serenade this same issue is problematized by the choice of a piece of music that is so
well-known as having been written by someone else. However, as the quotation is presented on
saxophones, rather than the original string instruments, the piece highlights how often we hear —
without necessarily questioning the aesthetic value of — musical arrangements such as string
quartets played by saxophone quartets, or Bach’s ‘cello suites played on a tuba. The choice to
highlight these issues of authorship was not intended to be a specific critique in-and-of-itself, but
to throw the source’s ‘object-ness’ into starker relief.

After plotting out its formal trajectory, the next phase in the composition of Serenade was to
create a harmonic reduction of the source material. Reducing the Mozart to its background
harmonic and contrapuntal elements allowed me to see its most basic structure. I then had a
baseline from which I could build up the increasingly recognisable gestures until they reached the
un-manipulated quotation. In the opening bars of Serenade the reduction takes the source
material as an ‘ideal’ musical object, rather than as a composite of four independent melodic lines
performing the same material in unisons and octaves. This explains why only the alto and tenor
saxophones play in bars 1-7, as what was a four-part homophonic texture is reduced to two
tremolo lines around the pitches G and D. Bars 1-7 of Serenade, which are based on the opening
(bars 1-4) of the Mozart, embellish the basic pitch content of the harmonic reduction with

quarter-tonal inflections. Bar 19 signals the first time that two of the lines start to move towards recreating the foreground of the Mozart. The soprano and tenor saxophones play an embellished modification of bar 14 of K.525 (examples 3.3 and 3.4). Taking the first violin and ‘cello parts, with the addition of two extra pitches in each line, the two lines are condensed into a tuplet of 5:3. Furthermore, the tenor saxophone line is displaced by a semiquaver to avoid an exact homophony. From bar 21 previously unmeasured tremolos begin to give way to measured demisemiquaver oscillations with a greater dynamic range alongside the first appearances of sustained pitches.

From Fig.4, which coincides with bar 28 in the Mozart, gestures with a closer fidelity to K.525 begin to emerge for sustained lengths of time. But the detached quavers of the original Mozart are still distorted by rhythmic displacement, quarter-tonal inflections and the use of slap tonguing that limits the amount of discernible pitch content that is projected. Similarly, the repeated staccato high As in the first violin, and its occasional flurries, are distorted with quarter-tone inflections around the fundamental pitch, as well as a rhythmic transformation into triplet.
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quavers. Fig. 4 also sees the emergence of audibly recognisable formal repetitions, which are prevalent in the Mozart. Bar 65 coincides with bars 54 and 55 in K.525, which marks the end of the first statement of the exposition, with Fig.7 marking the beginning of the repeat of the exposition. A literal repeat of the exposition does not occur in Serenade. Instead, after loud and aggressive multiphonics and growls — referencing the multiple stops in the violins — in the soprano saxophone, sustained pitches in the high register replace the short tremolos of the opening. At Fig. 8 (bar 5 in K.525) the tremolos return, but this time they are predominantly diatonic and more prominent, due to louder dynamics. Furthermore, Serenade settles into a steady 4/4 metre, and a closer relationship between the distorted material and the Mozart. Bar 80 in the soprano saxophone features the first substantial quotation of the original Mozart melodic material, and at bar 84 (bar 14 of the Mozart) the first clear cadential figure emerges across all four parts in literal homophony (example 3.5). Bars 94 and 95 are the first full quotation of the Mozart across all four parts; however, the quotation is denied its cadence by the ‘disintegration’ of the gesture in bars 96 and 97 (example 3.6).

From Fig. 11 Serenade begins to resemble the source material, as the baritone saxophone begins to play the written bass part with small microtonal embellishments in bars 111 and 119. The soprano saxophone plays quotations intercut with the same microtonal triplet embellishments as were applied to the repeated staccato quavers on A. The two inner parts play chromatically-inflected conjunct patterns modelled on the diatonic quavers of K.525, but with the tenor saxophone offset by a semiquaver. At bar 117, the alto saxophone begins to play the original second violin part — with some octave displacement to keep the part in a playable range — while the tenor saxophone continues to play a chromatic line that embellishes the original viola part. By bar 120, all four parts are playing the Mozart material as written for the duration of the development up to the beginning of the recapitulation. Within five bars of the start of the recapitulation, however, the process of ‘obscuring’ begins to take effect. I took the decision to include the first few bars of the first subject in its home key to reinforce the notion that source has been momentarily ‘restored’ for a time. If I had chosen to begin the process of obscuring before the recapitulation of the opening material it would have not only substantially limited the length of the quotation, but it also would have meant symbolically that the ‘restoration’ would never have been completed.


The obscuring of the Mozart begins at bar 150. At first, the inner parts play chromatic and diatonic tremolos while the outer parts play original material, but by Fig. 14 the metre is broken down by the inclusion of extra notes in 6:4 and 7:4 tuplets. The process of obscuring does not replicate exactly the reversed trajectory of the ‘restoration’ phase. It uses many of the techniques of deformations used earlier in the piece, but rather than being slowly introduced across all parts as
they were at the opening (from Fig. 15, for instance) the techniques are scattered more haphazardly among the instruments: long notes in the soprano and alto saxophones parts along with slap-tonguing and rhythmic displacements across all parts. However, there are still elements of homophonic and near-homophonic textures that come close to K.525: in bars 187-188 (example 3.7) all parts play a harmonic reduction of the material from bars 114-115 (example 3.8) of the Mozart displaced into the highest possible registers of the saxophones. This prefigures the final trajectory towards the end, which follows what is largely a retrograde of the musical process that formed the opening of the piece. While this final section prioritises different techniques and methods of transformation from those of the ‘restoration’ phase of the piece, it still fundamentally retains the same basic relationships between source and deformation. The manipulations and transformations are still predicated on keeping the Mozart largely ‘intact’. While this was intentional, it does limit musical possibilities. Most notably the possibility of making more substantial de-synchronisations and dislocations of the individual parts and the formal structures of the work in general.


Example 3.8: W.A. Mozart, Serenade No.13 in G major, K.525 (1781), Movement 1; bars 112-116.
3.2 Critical Reflection

The composition of Serenade posed several questions and challenges, the first of which was how to implement the concept of restoration: to portray the stages of the process or to try and ‘live through’ the process. The premise I have outlined in this chapter was just one of many possible interpretations that I could have used. The most obvious alternative structure would have been for the piece to end with the final few bars of K.525. While this solution may not have necessarily meant ending the piece with an unmodified ending of the Mozart, it would have still projected a clear and literal interpretation of the ‘restoration’ idea the piece was trying to portray. However, it would have done so in an unproblematic way, a way which would not necessarily stand in a critical relationship to its source material. By choosing the model that I did, while it may have confused the presentation of a process of restoration, it also problematized the perception of the Mozart. By placing the quotation proper towards the centre of the work, I hoped to incite the listener to question what happens after the reveal, how I will tackle the time after the quote and what bearing this might have on Serenade’s relationship to Eine Kleine Nachtmusik. These concerns led me to another about the unmodified quotation, its length.

I knew I wanted the quotation to be substantial, so that it caused some discomfort in the listener by its degree of absurdity. As the quotation begins during the development section, I wanted to leave the listener with the lingering question over whether Serenade would continue with the quotation until the very end. By having a lengthy quotation, it would increase the chances of a listener concluding this to be the case only for its later fragmentation to occur. A much shorter duration of unmodified quotation may not have allowed enough time for the listener to begin questioning whether Serenade was going to carry on with the Mozart for the final five minutes. The question arose as to whether the quotation was long enough to achieve this effect. Similarly, in making room for such a lengthy statement of the unmodified Mozart quotation, I was concerned that I had not left enough time to play out the process of fragmentation to a convincing degree. I was worried that the speed with which I would need to enact the process of fragmentation to fit within the work’s duration would make the ending sound perfunctory or cliché. When the work was premiered, however, I was happy with the pacing given the constraints on the duration of the work. As the commission brief restricted the duration to around eight minutes, I was limited to retaining the relative proportions of the individual sections. While it would have been preferable to have a lengthier quotation to ensure the effect was clear, given the time limit this would have restricted how long I had to play out the obscuring phase.

This brings me to my final major concerns around the final obscuring phase. Ideally, I would have preferred to introduce a new treatment of the material in the final phase that differentiated it
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from the restoration process more concretely. However, given my wish to prioritise the length of
the quotation over the process of obscuring, I felt there would not be enough time to establish a
new formal paradigm. While on the whole I am much happier with the pacing than I initially
thought I would be, I still feel the final phase is too short. If I were to follow the premise of
restoration and obscuring more literally, the process of obscuring would need to be as long as, if
not longer than, the restoration phase.
Chapter 4:  

**Snare Dance**

*Snare Dance* (2016), for speaking solo percussionist, was initially intended to redress issues that arose during the composition and performance of an earlier work, *Mahlerstück* (Appendix A). After the première of this work, I concluded that a much more effective means of examining the relationship between individual performers and orchestral practices would be to write a series of smaller solo works that focused on a single musician in the orchestra. *Snare Dance* was designed to be the first of this series, but during the process of its composition various factors caused my focus to shift considerably. To understand why I took certain decisions in composing *Snare Dance*, it is important to first discuss *Mahlerstück*, as well address some of the mutual concerns behind both it and *Snare Dance*.

### 4.1  

**Mahlerstück**

*Mahlerstück* was written for conductor, small ensemble and tape, with the performers arranged on stage according to their customary orchestral positions. This work set out to enstrange the practices of orchestral performance that are often obscured by the traditions and rituals of the concert hall. Principally, this involved drawing on the work of filmmaker John Smith (1952—) and his *The Girl Chewing Gum* (1976) as an inter-disciplinary model.

#### 4.1.1  

**The Girl Chewing Gum**

John Smith is an East-London-based filmmaker closely aligned with the Structuralist-Materialist branch of post-war avant-garde cinema of the 1960s and 1970s. This description, however, belies the strong sense of geographical place that underlies all his works, almost all of which were filmed within a few miles of his Leytonstone home. Smith’s films are dependent upon an understanding of semiotics, and he ‘was unique in that he connected film narrative to linguistics. This play of signs — visual and textual — [is] a cornerstone of his thinking.’¹ This semiotic predisposition is coloured by a predominance of humour and iconic imagery, which A.L. Rees argues is ‘often

---

Critiquing Classical Kitsch

linguistic, and plays the ambiguity of words against their seemingly realist image.\(^2\) The last cornerstone of Smith’s work is the quotidian. Cornelia Parker has described how Smith ‘can build a tragi-comic narrative around anything — the hidden Mexican in the cornice on his bedroom ceiling, a Viennese sandwich shop, a man having a haircut or an empty beer glass.’\(^3\) All these interests can be found in In The Girl Chewing Gum, the form and premise of which Rees has concisely described:

[The Girl Chewing Gum] has only two shots...The first and major shot is an east-London street, a busy intersection near a cinema. The camera explores the space in dour monochrome, while a hectoring director-like voice purports to control the action. Pigeons, cars, pedestrians and clocks all appear to follow his instructions, revealing a fantasy of cinematic power in a single-line joke. This moves from documentary to fiction...as the shot moves to the right and approaches a queue outside the cinema, here the ‘house of fiction’ itself. A concluding shot of a field is covered by the director in a voiceover, who claims to be miles away from the urban scene he has just described.

What he describes, in the second ‘field of vision’, cannot be seen by the viewer. The film ends in the improbability and doubt which it has set out to evoke.\(^4\)

This description, however, does not convey the subtlety, humour and mysteriousness evoked by Smith’s slowly developing voiceover.

The Girl Chewing Gum was inspired by François Truffaut’s (1932) Day for Night (1973), in which ‘[t]he director emerges as a megalomaniacal deity, striving to create a plausible artificial world in as much detail as possible.’\(^5\) Smith’s film inverts the power relations in Truffaut’s film by providing a voiceover for a pre-existing film. Truffaut’s film led Smith to the realisation of ‘how naïve [he] had been about the “realism” of fiction films.’\(^6\) Ian Christie has described Smith’s inversion of Truffaut’s film as an ‘ascription of artifice’,\(^7\) and has interpreted Smith’s oeuvre,\(^8\) and The Girl Chewing Gum especially, in relation to Shklovsky’s ostranenie:

8 It is unclear from Christie’s analysis whether he is simply interpreting Smith’s work through the prism of Shklovsky’s estrangement, or is implying that Smith is engaging with Russian Formalism in a more systematic manner. Given Smith has not himself mentioned Shklovsky, it is more likely to be the former. However, given the importance of Brechtian thought in the theoretical lineage of avant-garde film in post-war London it is within the remit of possibility that Smith inherited aspects of Formalist thought.
We don’t normally watch undistinguished London streets with this degree of attention for ten minutes. The primary effect could certainly be described as defamiliarising or ‘making strange’ the familiar, with our attention held by the humour of the voice-over claiming to ‘direct’ the random events taking place in the street.9

Smith’s The Girl Chewing Gum invites us to consider not only the uncanniness of the mundane, but the fictive illusions through which we interpret the every day. Mahlerstück tried to extend Smith’s exploration of the quotidian into the of the concert hall and the orchestra.

4.1.2 Overview of Mahlerstück

The first question that arose whilst composing Mahlerstück was how to enact the enstranging process of The Girl Chewing Gum in an orchestral setting. This question was further complicated by the lack of a full orchestra, which limited how I could arrange any potential formal arrangement for enstrangement. The clearest way I could see to imitate the voiceover of Smith’s film was to juxtapose live musicians with a recording of an orchestral work. This relationship between recorded performance and live performers could be structured in one of two basic arrangements: those where the performers perform no ‘musical’ sound (just performing physical actions); and vice versa, where the performers articulate musical sound without highlighting the actions that create them. These two formulations would each force Mahlerstück into one of two separate, but not necessarily opposing, paradigms. The first paradigm would have drawn attention to ‘performativity’: to the sonic and non-sonic components of live performance by providing a metaphorical separation of the musical sound (embodied in the tape part) and the sound’s source (the live players).10 By freeing the players from the physical and mental tasks needed to produce musical sound, an audience’s attention could be drawn towards the overlooked physical aspects of performance that are often considered ‘incidental’. On the other hand, by focusing on the sound alone, the second formation would result in the piece becoming less about the act of performance, and instead being focused on the sonic properties of the work being performed. This second arrangement can in turn be subdivided into two further divisions, each with a different semantic meaning. The first division includes sounds that have a direct, concrete, but abstract relationship to the music being presented on the tape (sounds derived

---

10 This separation of sound from its sounding object can be interpreted as similar to R. Murray Schafer’s concept of schizophonia (R. Murray Schafer, The New Soundscape: A Handbook for the Modern Music Teacher [Scarborough, ON: BMI Canada, 1969], 43-47).
from technical procedures such as transposition, rhythmic and melodic variation, etc.,). The sound (depending on the extent of the transformations employed) can audibly be perceived as having a relationship to the original that does not overtly challenge traditional listening practices.

Contrastingly, the second types of sounds are those that belong to the performance space, but are not commonly considered to be part of the performance. These include both the non-musical (coughs, rustling of music or programmes in the audience, etc.), and the musical (late entries, playing slightly out of time or tune, etc.). The distinction between abstract and associative sounds at times can be a matter of context. For instance, consider when an instrumental entry might be interpreted as either a ‘late entry’ or an imitative or canonical entry, or either ‘out of tune’ or microtonal? These two subtypes of sounds have different functions in performance, and the second of these subtypes is closer in its performative function to the first formation of no live sound and only actions. This is because the act of performance is foregrounded over the musical material being articulated. Unlike the use of only physical actions, the use of associative sounds would help to highlight the fallibility and subjectivity of the performers by foregrounding the ‘doubleness’ of the work and its performed articulation. Through simultaneously presenting both the ‘correct’ (in the tape) and the ‘incorrect’ sounds (in the live performers), the fact that the performers are real people performing actions (and not simply machines articulating an idealised and intransient object) is highlighted by the discrepancy between the superposition of the real and the ideal.

The source material for Mahlerstück was the third movement of Gustav Mahler’s (1860-1911) Symphony No.1 (1887-1888, revised 1896). In this movement, Mahler makes use of an Austrian variation of the common European folk melody known in the UK by its French title Frère Jacques. Mahler’s variation is notably in the minor mode and contains rhythmic embellishments not found in the French version (examples 4.1 and 4.2).

Example 4.1: Traditional melody, Frère Jacques
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Example 4.2: Austrian variation of traditional folk melody, *Frère Jacques*

The relationship between *Mahlerstück* and *The Girl Chewing Gum* is most noticeable at the beginning and the end of the piece. The work opens with the conductor keeping time in synchronisation with a recording of a full orchestral performance of the third movement of Mahler’s first symphony by means of a click track. The conductor cues the live performers to begin their parts along with the recording. This formation makes clear the fundamental opposition of the real and the nominal, from which I would later diverge. Step by step, the conductor begins to ‘conduct’ the performers on the tape as well as the live performers. This second formation also included cueing some of the live players on the stage, but this was incidental to the conducting of an ‘imaginary’ orchestra that could not possibly respond to the conductor. Here, *Mahlerstück* begins to mimic formal aspects of Smith’s film, revealing the impotency of the conductor.

The final section contains the clearest reference to Smith’s *The Girl Chewing Gum*. Towards the end, the conductor begins shouting cues for both real and imagined instruments, much like Smith’s ‘director’. This shouting develops throughout the final section (example 4.3), so that rather than the cues the conductor starts exclaiming text taken from the recording of Leonard Bernstein conducting an audience singing *Frère Jacques* at one of his New York Philharmonic *Young People’s Concerts* (example 4.3) — which had been contained within one of the additional recordings which has been used in the tape part earlier in the work. While this material is designed to bring some of the tape part into the ‘real’ word of the live performance, it also serves the function of further playing with parallels between conductor and director. For the most part, these directions have no bearing on the actions of the live performers who – like their counterparts in the film — carry on their actions regardless of the conductor/director.
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Whilst writing *Mahlerstück*, I perceived a danger in combining all the different formations of live music and recorded sound in one single work. Finally, I chose not to use any instances of only actions with no musical sound, as the mixture of mime and musical performance would have obscured the individual arrangements I was seeking to highlight. Having subsequently seen the work in performance, I was not entirely convinced that the work was saturated enough with these ideas and relationships to successfully convey the multiplicity I sought. On a macro-formal scale, *Mahlerstück* currently sits in an uncomfortable middle ground between a highly-focused work that explores a small number of closely related phenomena on the one hand, and a kaleidoscopic array of diverse relations on the other. This compositional equivocation stemmed from competing desires to both show the formal relations on a micro-formal scale, and the requirement to show a multitude of relations on the macro-scale. My desire to ensure the individual formal relationships were securely established in *Mahlerstück* undermined the greater effect that I was trying to establish. If I were to try to infuse a greater number of these arrangements across more of the work, it may have been a more successful work. Conversely, by focusing on a smaller number of conceptual arrangements but developing them more extensively, *Mahlerstück* would probably have been more successful at achieving the effect I desired. In approaching the new work, *Snare*
Dance, I decided to take up the latter of these two possibilities, narrowing the focus down on to a single performer.

4.2 ‘Instrumental Theatre’

Whilst I had engaged with elements of physical performance in One and Four Canons, it had been in a heavily formalised mode of gesture that actively sought to limit any kind of affectation. Mahlerstück, in contrast, had required a much more involved series of gestures that were more overtly theatrical. An example of this can be seen in the short interaction between the timpanist and the conductor interpolated into the general pause at bar 112 of the original symphony (example 4.4). Despite this theatricality, I was adamant to not only keep my work firmly grounded within the realm of the musical, but to ensure it was performable by musicians. To reflect on how this could be achieved I looked at Maurico Kagel and his works of ‘instrumental theatre’.

Like the performance artists of the early twentieth century, Kagel’s quasi-theatrical work took up the anti-art aim of attempting to erase ‘the boundary between art and life.’ At its heart, Kagel’s ‘instrumental theatre’ critiques the ‘inherent theatricality of musical performance’. It does so either by foregrounding the physical actions, rituals and customs that are part of Western performance (those sounds and movements that are fundamental by-products of playing instruments — i.e., breathing for wind instrumentalists), or by exploiting those socio-cultural traditions and formalities that are indicative markers of Western Art Music. Or, in the words of Paul Attinello:

Instrumental theatre acknowledges the physical presence of the performers and requires them to perform sound with a presentational dramatic meaning. Performers comment (either verbally or in mime) on their playing and that of others, or create sounds in dramatic contexts, pointing to various aspects of difficulty, mockery or confusion.

Attinello’s description misses out one crucial detail, however: a conceptual divide that exists between two distinct subsets of Kagel’s instrumental theatre.

---

13 Ibid, 35.
Both subsets of ‘instrumental theatre’ are predicated on foregrounding the physical presence and actions of the performers on the stage over the incidental necessity for audibly articulating an idealised sonic ‘work’. The difference lies between those pieces that *theatricalise* the act of performance of music, and those that place music *within* a theatrical, or quasi-theatrical, context. Björn Heile has explained these two conceptualizations of instrumental theatre by comparing two of Kagel’s compositions from the same year, 1960: *Sonant* and *Sur scène*:

Kagel’s earliest pieces of instrumental theatre...start from opposite poles, the former [*Sonant*] transforming the playing of musical instruments into theatrical action and the latter [*Sur scène*], conversely, presenting musical performance within a quasi theatrical context...\(^{15}\)

One key tenet of both forms of Kagel’s instrumental theatre is that the physicality and kinesis of playing are central, not incidental, to the music. The integral nature of the physical activity of performance is displayed in the works by the fact that often the kinetic and visual effects take primacy over their acoustic results. This emphasis is more than a theoretical point; it is an intervention into the common practice of Western art music:

In many ways, then, Kagel’s instrumental theatre strives to rediscover what has been lost in Western Classical music: the visual and kinetic nature of performance, the physicality of music-making, the bodily presence of the performers, the three dimensional space of the stage, the spectacle of stage events. These are all integral elements of music in most cultures; no other culture conceives of music as disembodied pure sound, and in Western music, too, this conception is relatively new.\(^{16}\)

If Heile is correct, Kagel’s intention is to reclaim the physicality of music performance that has been effaced from the rituals of Western art music under the conventional understanding that ‘music exists as an ideal state prior to its specific instrumental realisation’.\(^{17}\)

There is, however, one more aspect of Kagel’s instrumental theatre that is particularly important to acknowledge in relation to *Snare Dance*. Whilst his instrumental theatre includes elements of role-playing, the performers that Kagel asks to ‘act’ within a work are never usually required to stray far, if at all, from their conventional roles. Instrumentalists are still ‘acting’ as

---


\(^{16}\) Ibid, 37.

\(^{17}\) Ibid, 35.
instrumentalists and the conductor is still ‘acting’ as a conductor. This practice arose from Kagel’s not wishing to turn ‘good musicians into bad actors,’18 a desire I shared in relation to Snare Dance.

4.3 Snare Dance

The initial compositional idea behind Snare Dance was to take the percussionist out of their usually marginal orchestral context and place them firmly at the centre of the audience’s attention. The percussionist would play their part along with a tape of a full orchestral performance, either alone in the centre of the stage or in their usual orchestral position at the very back. The first question that arose whilst planning the piece was whether to focus Snare Dance on the musical source material (the ‘work’) or the idea of the ‘orchestral percussionist’. In deciding how to focus the piece, I first considered the possible situations in which a percussionist could find themselves in while performing within an orchestral context. Modern orchestral percussionists are often required to perform either highly monotonous and repetitive material, or extremely sparse material with lengthy periods of time in which they are inactive. The choice between these abstract formations would have had a substantial effect on the composition of Snare Dance; for instance, in the first formation the percussionist could be on an empty stage performing repetitive material alongside a recording, whilst the second formation could consist of the percussionist playing nothing at all — simply sitting or standing on an empty stage silently with the orchestral recording sounding around them. I chose to avoid the latter of these two options, as I wanted this portfolio to steer clear of both a pure conceptualism and an overt theatricality. Having made this decision, I began considering ways to organise the percussionist’s relationship to a more monotonous repetitive musical material. This was the first substantial choice that would end up turning Snare Dance away from its initial conception as by choosing to focus on the repetitive and monotonous aspect of the percussionist’s musical experience, Snare Dance became less about the invisibility of a performer in the orchestral concert context and more about the relationship between the performer and the material.

18 Heile, The Music of Mauricio Kagel, 45.
4.3.1 ‘The’ Bolero

Once I had made the decision to shift the focus of the percussionist’s role in Snare Dance to a physical rather than contextual perspective, I began searching for examples of orchestral music with monotonous percussion parts. One quickly came to mind: Maurice Ravel’s (1875-1937) Boléro (1928).¹⁹ In Ravel’s Bolero one of the percussionists is required to repeat the same two bar snare drum ostinato for the whole of the work’s fifteen-minute duration (example 4.5). The only change in the part comes from a slow increase in dynamic across the entire piece.

Example 4.5: M. Ravel, Bolero (1928), bars 1-2 (Snare Drum part only).

After One and Four Canons, I had become interested in how I could extend Kosuth’s use of dictionary definitions — with all their attendant connotations of institutional authority — within a work of art to help enstrange a work for the audience. To see if this would be plausible for Snare Dance, I approached the Grove Music Online entry on the Bolero. The entry, which for the most part concentrates on the Bolero in its more traditional incarnation as a Spanish dance, ends with a brief and rather perfunctory discussion of Ravel’s orchestral work of the same name:

‘Ravel’s Boléro (1928), initially conceived under the title Fandango, employs a consistently moderate and uniform tempo, as much in its melody and harmony as in its recurrent underlying rhythm, which suggests a fleeting relationship with the traditional dance.’²⁰

In response to this simple statement tagged on to the end of the entry, another shift in the focus of Snare Dance occurred, moving it away from the role of the percussionist to become an investigation of the idea of the ‘Bolero’ itself. Snare Dance became about unpicking the concept of the ‘Bolero’ for an audience for whom the most commonly played and most familiar example only has a ‘fleeting relationship with the traditional dance.’²¹

¹⁹ For most (particularly in the UK), Ravel’s Boléro was brought into the popular consciousness by its use in Jayne Torvill and Christopher Dean’s gold-medal-winning figure skating routine at the 1984 Sarajevo Winter Olympics.


²¹ Ibid.
Critiquing Classical Kitsch

Having refocused *Snare Dance* into an investigation of the ‘Bolero’, I needed to construct a formal premise that would allow me to explore my material in a purely acoustic fashion and with only one performer. To try and find a model for how to negotiate these concerns, I sought out interdisciplinary examples that would help me derive a formal premise that dealt with extracting a single performer from an ensemble-based context. The most significant interdisciplinary model that influenced *Snare Dance* was choreographer Jérôme Bel’s (1964—) *Veronique Doisneau* (2004).

### 4.3.2 *Veronique Doisneau*

*Veronique Doisneau* is an autobiographical work of ballet-theatre choreographed for the eponymous *sujet* of the Paris Opera’s *corps de ballet*. The work centres on the dancer, Doisneau, giving a range of biographical information about herself, all interspersed with short extracts of a variety of dance works that relate to these biographical details. The autobiographical details range from the basic and the factual — her name, her position within the *corps de ballet*, her salary, etc. — to the emotional and the self-reflective. The declaration at the outset of the work that Doisneau is four days from retirement colours the experience of these details in a nostalgic or bittersweet light, and lifts the quotations and extracts towards being containers for both positive and negative nostalgia.

Upon delivering this basic biographical information, Doisneau introduces each of the subsequent dance numbers by outlining her relationship to them. For example, Doisneau prepares for her first dance number by telling the audience about one of the most influential experiences that shaped her attitude to dance: her encounter with Rudolf Noureev (1938-1993). She then proceeds to dance the second variation of ‘The Shades *Pas de Trois*’ from Noureev’s *Bayadère* (1992). One key aspect of this dance that will also occur in some of the other dances that follow is that — rather than having a live, or taped, orchestral accompaniment — she accompanies herself by singing or humming the tune *whilst* she dances. This technique has two effects. Firstly, the physical strain of trying to sing while dancing highlights the exertion of both in an audible fashion. Secondly, it reinforces the ‘rehearsal’-like atmosphere of the performance that has been established by the bottle of water and other props at the front of the stage, the bare stage, the basic ‘work’ lighting, etc.. After dancing the Noureev extract, Doisneau’s microphone picks up her heavy breathing, rendering it audible for the audience in a manner that is not usual with theatrical performance. This reinforces one of the many threads that runs throughout the work: that of the human agent at the heart of the performance. Once her composure has returned, Doisneau begins to list some of her favourite choreographers, briefly discussing Merce Cunningham and his ‘dancing in silence’
method. Before going off stage to begin Cunningham’s *Points in Space* (1986), Doisneau sits down to change her shoes on the stage. By doing this, she not only gives the audience a moment to reflect on what has happened so far, but also highlights some of the usually hidden logistical necessities that are required for the performance to happen.

Following *Points in Space*, Doisneau’s heavy breathing is once again rendered audible, and when she returns to the stage she changes her shoes once again. This time, however, she starts to talk over the act of changing her shoes, explaining that she would have liked to dance men’s roles. This leads into the next dance sequence, where she explains that she would most have liked to have danced the title role of *Giselle* (1841). Again, in her performance of *Giselle* Doisneau ‘accompanies’ herself. However, the illusion of the ‘accompaniment’ is disrupted when she gets to the section in the choreography when the dancer whom she is enacting is required to be lifted by her partner. With no partner present on the stage, Doisneau is required to articulate the existence of the lift by verbally announcing that the lift should be taking place. This breaks the illusion that the dancer is ‘quoting’ *Giselle* by acknowledging the limitations of being unable to be lifted without a partner. Doisneau admits, in other words, that on her own she is not truly able to ‘quote’ *Giselle*.

The next dance articulates a change in the subjectivity of Veronique Doisneau. Whilst in the extract from the 1841 *Giselle* the individuality of Doisneau has been articulated by the need to describe her lift with a non-present partner, in the next quotation — a performance of Mats Ek’s *Giselle* (1982) — a second dancer is introduced who performs while Doisneau watches. This shift away from Doisneau as active agent to a role as passive voyeur is introduced and legitimised by the autobiographical passage that links the two chorographic interpretations of *Giselle*. The section that links the two interpretations focuses on the ballerinas that Doisneau admires. Like each of the dance sections that have preceded it, this scene has a subjective legitimation: she had learnt from or enjoyed dancing the works of Cunningham and Noureev, and so she danced them; she had most wanted to dance *Giselle*, and so she just has; now, *she* enjoys watching, and so she watches. Bel has her sitting on the front of the stage watching the second dancer with her back to the audience. She is thus simultaneously an audience member and a participating agent in the *mise-en-scène*. There is one further important shift at this point. Previously Doisneau had either ‘accompanied’ herself or danced in silence. This time the second dancer is accompanied by a tape activated off-stage. While this reinforces the distancing effect of Doisneau’s quasi-voyeurism, it also prefigures an important feature for the final dance section of the work, which centres upon Doisneau’s role during Act 2 of *Swan Lake*. During one scene of the ballet, the *corps de ballet* is required to hold a series of poses in the background while the principal dancers dance their solos. Doisneau finds this the most horrible thing that she is required to do, and she explains that it
makes her want to scream or walk off stage. It is at this point that the tension between the human agent and the dehumanised conventions of performance that have been threaded throughout the work comes to the forefront. As taped music plays, Doisneau takes up her respective poses. Without any solo dancers, all attention is on Doisneau and the straightjacket of her role is foregrounded. This not only serves as a critique of the hierarchical structures of classical ballet, but also of how the conventions of performance allow for notions of aesthetic beauty to legitimise otherwise dehumanising acts. This final ‘scene’ is the one that I primarily see as being formally analogous to the conceptions of Snare Dance. Just as Doisneau is required to perform the dehumanising act of remaining motionless whilst the audience’s attention is elsewhere, in Bolero the snare drum player is required to repeat the same musical fragment for fifteen minutes. While these actions are not literally analogous with each other, they do function in a similar manner in their respective generic contexts.

When I came to think of how to translate elements from Veronique Doisneau into music, there was one crucial difference that rendered the task problematic. Bel’s work of dance-theatre is fundamentally autobiographical, whilst I was strongly inclined to keep Snare Dance more closely aligned to a lecture. I wanted to make this distinction because the portfolio is concerned with ‘works’ in their abstract cultural form, and not in a performative frame. In this regard, Snare Dance is different from other works for speaking solo percussionist such as Matthew Shlomowitz’s (1975—) Hi Hat and Me (2010) or Vinko Globokar’s (1934—) Toucher (1973).

In Hi Hat and Me, Shlomowitz combines elements of autobiography with references to more abstract practices of playing percussion. Spoken elements include references to beats in the bar as well as the hi hat in its open and closed positions. These abstract elements are placed in a relationship with the autobiographical by the direction for the percussionist to reveal a secret of theirs during the performance. Hi Hat and Me sits in the liminal space between the notion of the percussionist as an individual agent and the abstract idea of ‘the percussionist’. In contrast, Globokar’s Toucher takes a straightforward theatrical stance in its relationship between percussionist and spoken text, which in Toucher is drawn from Brecht’s play Life of Galileo (1945). Whilst the percussionist is not required to ‘act’ in any conventional manner, the choice of text still places them within a theatrical, and specifically ‘dramatic’, context rather than an autobiographical one.22 Both these works have aspects that I wanted to avoid in Snare Dance. In the case of Hi Hat and Me, while it has a less autobiographical focus than Veronique Doisneau, the work still has elements of autobiography that would defuse Snare Dance’s focus on the Bolero.

Chapter 4: Snare Dance

Toucher makes use of a device previously used in One and Four Canons (and later used in Snare Dance): that of coupling spoken text with musical sounds. However, Globokar’s coupling serves a different purpose to my own, as the spoken text is coupled with thirteen sounds that emulate the French phonetic alphabet. Whilst I wanted to use similar techniques to relate text and sound, I also wanted to put those means to a very different end to Globokar’s.

To make use of these various models in a musical setting, I settled on the premise of a montage (or collage),23 in order to be able to show the related and synchronous conceptual formations of the ‘bolero’ without resorting to the use of any electronics. This formation allowed for all the material to emanate from a single performer, rather than an electronic ‘recollection’. It would therefore help convey the simultaneous and synchronous nature of the different conceptual formations of the ‘bolero’ as well as serving as an enstranging device. Having settled on the use of montage, I then went about collecting a set of materials that related to different connotations of the bolero.

4.3.3 Composing Snare Dance

Snare Dance was constructed from a set of materials that, whilst being stylistically distant from one another, were all related to the idea of the ‘bolero’:

- Extracts of text from the ‘Bolero’ entry in Grove Music Online.24
- The basic rhythmic patterns of the traditional eighteenth-century Spanish court dance ‘Bolero’ (example 4.6).25
- The bien parado gesture, as outlined in the ‘Bolero’ entry in Grove Music Online.
- The two-bar rhythmic cell played by the snare drum from Maurice Ravel’s Bolero (example 4.5)
- The melody of the Maurice Ravel’s Bolero (example 4.7).
- The basic step patterns for the Latin rumba, the basis of the modern Latin Bolero (figure 4.1).

---

25 Ibid.
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Example 4.6: W. Kahl and I. J. Katz, Early Bolero Rhythms, ‘Bolero’, *Grove Music Online*

Example 4.7: M. Ravel, *Bolero* (1928) (extract: melody only).

Figure 4.1: Basic foot pattern for the Latin ‘Rumba’, the fundamental steps for the modern Latin Bolero dance
Chapter 4: Snare Dance

The text declaimed by the percussionist is taken from the *Grove Music Online* article ‘Bolero’, and is edited so that only the statements that can also be applied to *Snare Dance* are used.\(^{26}\) As in other works in this portfolio, I have tried to translate the deep structures of the source materials into my own works. However, unlike in *One and Four Canons* or *Serenade*, *Snare Dance* is not based on a single work or structural form. While the main musical material of *Snare Dance* is taken from Ravel’s *Bolero*, it is not a palimpsest in the manner of *Serenade* — where the new material is effectively ‘written over’ the original music. Rather, it is closer to *One and Four Canons*, where the centrality of the text constitutes a similar structuring principle to the use of the canon in the earlier work: the edited text provides the guidance for the form of the montage. In terms of macro-structure, therefore, *Snare Dance* mimics the historical bolero dance as defined in *Grove*:

that of a basic AA\(^{1}\)B form.\(^{27}\) In the A sections (A: bars: 1-42; A\(^1\): bars: 43-86) the same basic montage dominates. Material is effectively layered in a superposition and then ‘cut’ between in a fast-paced fashion. In bars 1-24 only one type of material is heard at any one time. However, these large-scale formal sections are interrupted by interludes that divide them roughly in half. This means that each section is repeated twice resulting in the form of: aa\(^1\)a\(^2\)a\(^3\)bb\(^1\). The separation of the different larger-scale sections is indicated using the *bien parado* physical gesture, which is defined as a ‘fixed pose with one arm arched over the head and the other crossed in front of the chest’.\(^{28}\) This dance position was used to indicate the end of each section, functioning as form of visual punctuation mark on the part of the dancer. These interludes (the first being bars 25-27) centre on the rumba material and — in contrast to the material that they break up — are complete, un-fragmented citations. The interludes are further delineated from the main material by general pauses. The reason for the inclusion of these interludes is to mimic the ‘short instrumental interludes’ as defined in the encyclopaedia entry.\(^{29}\) Since the instrumental interludes in the historical bolero provided moments of relief and contrast in the dance, in *Snare Dance* — a piece of primarily instrumental music — I inverted the relationship in the dance by including an

---

\(^{26}\) The bolero is in moderate tempo and triple metre. It is usually performed by a couple, but in theatrical performances was executed by four to eight couples. It comprises three equal sections (*coplas*), each beginning with a *paseo* (promenade). Only in the middle section is solo performance alternated with couple-dancing. The bien parado (a fixed pose with one arm arched over the head and the other crossed in front of the chest) closes each section and, sometimes, phrases within the section. Complicated steps, including the cuarta (kicking and crossing the feet while executing a leap) and battement (in which the lifted leg is struck against the standing leg), and fast movements characterize the solo sections. The dancers accompany themselves with singing (often a vocalise) and castanets, and sometimes also on the guitar and tambourine. Musically the Spanish bolero is usually in AAB form. The entry of the voice is preceded by at least one bar of sharply marked rhythm, and short instrumental interludes separate the sung couplets. The earliest rhythms […] took on characteristics closely related to traditional polonaise rhythm (Kahl and Katz. *Bolero*, *Grove Music Online*).

\(^{27}\) Kahl and Katz, *Bolero*, *Grove Music Online*.

\(^{28}\) Ibid.

\(^{29}\) Ibid.
interlude of physical movement rather than instrumental playing in order to provide the contrast that the instrumental interlude would have in its traditional context.

In the opening section of the piece (bars 1-43) the spoken text is overlaid onto the rhythms of the basic rhythmic material of the historical dance. The material in the snare drum and the castanets is constructed out of a superposition of the Ravel rhythmic cell and the more varied rhythms that are used in the historic bolero. There is a subtle hierarchical relationship within this superposition, with the historical material on the castanet taking precedence over the Ravel material. This decision was motivated by the desire to obscure the more iconic and easily recognisable material of the Ravel rather than any desire to show or depict some form of historical subordination of one element to another. In the repeat (A¹), two sets of new materials are added to the montage: sung pitched material, and the vocal mimicking of the snare and castanets with vocally-produced percussive sounds. In this section, there is also a greater level of ‘bleeding’ between materials so that certain materials are presented simultaneously, creating a superposition of related materials that had been previously held distinct from one another. This is particularly the case for use of the percussive vocalisations, which aim to replicate the effect of self-accompaniment that is both cited in the Grove entry on the Bolero and used by Bel in Veronique Doisneau. Furthermore, the similarities between Veronique Doisneau, the Grove text, and Snare Dance are further reinforced in this section by the first instance of the player singing or humming a section of melodic material from Ravel’s Bolero (example 4.8). Besides the two new types of material in the A¹ section, the form of the montage is also modified. The rumba material, which was previously confined to the interludes, is now integrated into the montage, effectively creating a ‘second-order ‘montage.


From the first half of the final section, B (bar 87-146), the montaged fragments lengthen, as well as settling on a homophonic relationship between the percussionist’s voice and instrumental sounds. The relationship of the ‘T’ and ‘K’ sounds to the castanets and snare is now made explicit in the lengthier durations of the individual fragments. Similarly, the more extensive quotations of both the melody and the snare drum pattern mean that the work’s basis in Ravel’s Bolero
becomes more apparent. From the start of the B1 section (bar 147) the Ravel quotation is presented in its correct chronological order, although each citation of the Ravel is interrupted by a spoken segment of the Grove text equally in its chronological order. These statements of both the Grove text and the Ravel quotations serve a dual purpose. Firstly, they bring a kind of resolution to the process of the lengthening of the montaged material that has been enacted throughout the work. Secondly, they allow the text to be appreciated, for the first time, in discrete units that allow for the comprehension of the relationship between the text, source materials and structure of the work.

4.3.4 Critical Reflection

After hearing Snare Dance performed in a workshop, I identified several issues that impacted the compositions that followed. The most important of these concerned questions relating to performance practice that had not occurred to me during its composition. Given the work’s theatricality, should the work be performed from memory, read from a score, or some mixture of the two? If the first, does there need to be more direction in the performance notes about how the percussionist should comport themselves on stage (i.e., where they should look, etc.)? If they should read from the score, do the page turns need to be composed into the work, just as one would notate dynamics? A further corollary to these issues also presented itself. Can these questions help delineate the different levels of autonomous activity contained within the work? For example, should the montage sections be read, the interludes memorised, and the difference in body language theatricalised and turned into material just as the notes and text are?

Unfortunately, at the time of writing I have not been able to explore these questions in following compositions. After Snare Dance I began to develop the structural use of ‘cut ups’ that I initially used in this work. What started in Snare Dance as a solution to the problem of trying to convey multiple levels of material via a single acoustic performer, became in the following two compositions — Re: Mozart and Popular-Classic — a primary technique for enstrangement. However, the questions of how to handle and embed the practical aspects of musical performance in a more theatrical context will prove a vital one to consider when the opportunity next arises to compose in a situation where I can introduce elements of physical performance.
Chapter 5:  Re: Mozart

Re: Mozart, for double wind quintet and obbligato piano, was commissioned by the University of Southampton Music Department as part of their Mozart Remix Festival (20-23 November 2015). The brief for the commission required a response to a lesser-known part of Mozart’s oeuvre, his works for glass harmonica and mechanical organ. The festival was tied to research conducted by Mark Everist into the changing reception of Mozart and his music in the two centuries since his death. In the introduction to Mozart’s Ghosts, Everist explores how historically much of Mozart’s music would not have been heard in its original form. Most contemporary audiences would have encountered these works through arrangements: ‘most large-scale concerted pieces circulated in versions for reduced forces that had immense levels of exposure; in short, the circulation and consumption of the symphony was more frequently in the form of some arrangement.’¹ One such example was to be the major piece in the concert, a recently rediscovered arrangement of Mozart’s opera Don Giovanni, K.527 (1787) for a Harmonie.²

Unlike the other compositions in this portfolio, Re: Mozart was written for performers who were (aside from the pianist) all undergraduate students. The combination of the standard of the performers with the requirement to focus on more esoteric source material made me wary of using physical gestures like those in One and Four Canons or Snare Dance. I was concerned that not all the performers would be either willing or able to do so convincingly. Similarly, whilst the source material would be highly indicative of Mozart’s compositional practice, it would not be as individually recognisable as a work like Eine Kleine Nachtmusik. Given the potential source material’s reduced level of ‘recognisability’ when compared to the rest of the portfolio, I was cautious of obscuring the source material too heavily. These two significant concerns necessitated a different approach to that which I had taken in rest of the portfolio in Re: Mozart.

After considering all of Mozart’s works for mechanical organ and glass harmonica, I settled on his F Minor Phantasie for Mechanical Organ, K. 608 (1791). The choice of K. 608 was motivated by the existence of prior arrangements by Muzio Clementi (1752-1832) and Ferruccio Busoni (1886-1924). The history of re-arrangement of K. 608 allowed me to engage with Everist’s research in a direct manner that the other options for source material could not have permitted. I then sought

² In this context, Harmonie refers to a type of eighteenth century wind ensemble of around five to eight players. They were usually employed by an aristocratic patron, but occasionally also by city states and civic authorities.
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a framework through which I could create a work that enstranged the source work’s historicity by giving the impression of representing the different levels of ‘compositional sediment’ that have accumulated around K. 608 through time. I quickly found the answer in the title of the festival: the remix.

5.1 The Remix

Will Fulford-Jones describes a remix as fundamentally ‘[a] recording produced by combining sections of existing recorded tracks in new patterns with new material,’ and argues that [i]n their most basic form, remix records loops elements of an original dance track to create a longer version.3 Importantly, Fulford-Jones additionally describes how ‘[a] remix can also be a radical reworking of an original track, leaving little of the original recording.’4 With the remix we have a contemporary practice that, whilst reflecting the more recent ontological musical paradigm of digitally-recorded music, is also a manifestation of a compositional impulse that we have encountered in works like Liszt’s operatic paraphrases for solo piano.5 The contemporary remix therefore provides a touchstone from which I could engage with the play between K. 608’s historicity and its location in the present. However, given the remix’s origin in recorded, digitally-produced sound, using it as a model raised the same issues of ‘materiality’ that I discussed in relation to Bernhard Lang’s *Monadologie VII*.6

When considering Lang’s work previously, I was interested in outlining the importance of ‘materiality’ to this portfolio more widely. With *Re: Mozart* these issues became of the utmost importance for a different reason. Of all the pieces contained within this portfolio, *Re: Mozart* is the work that could most easily fall foul of the problems I identified with Lang’s *Monadologie VII*.7 One advantage that *Re: Mozart* has over *Monadologie VII* is that the harmonic and rhetorical language of its source material, K. 608, is sufficiently clear in its tonal focus and stylistic traits that any potential transformation and editing has more potential to retain a sense of its materiality than with Lang’s manipulations of Schoenberg. The key to retaining a sense of materiality was to render audible the ‘joins’ of the loops and the traces of the manipulations. Given my critique of

---

4 Ibid.
5 See pages 5-9.
6 See pages 14-19.
7 That the lack of definition and distance between source material and derivation means that its critical potential is diminished or obscured (pages 14-19).
Lang, it seemed important to directly engage with the possibility of using filmic thought as a method for enstranging K. 608 and avoiding the problems I had identified in other works with a similar approach.

Considering this portfolio’s interest in Critical Art and enstrangement, the most logical place to begin examining film theories and techniques was the works and writing of Soviet filmmaker Sergei Eisenstein (1898-1948). The filmmaker and theorist is a figure who features in the writings, if somewhat obliquely, of both Shklovsky and Brecht; and the work of all three heavily influenced the London Filmmakers’ Co-op, from which John Smith emerged.8 Regardless of the circumstantial importance of Eisenstein’s work to this portfolio, he and his colleague Lev Kuleshov (1899-1970) are regarded as two of the most influential figures in cinematic history. Despite having been nuanced and expanded since their development, Kuleshov and Eisenstein’s theories of montage have remained largely unchanged and are still regarded as core principles of filmic construction.

Eisenstein refers to montage as the ‘nerve of cinema,’9 and for the filmmaker it was ‘the means of unrolling an idea with the help of single shots.’10 For him, montage functioned in a manner identical to Marxist dialectics, where a thesis and an antithesis (in this context two discrete, contrasting shots placed side by side) interact to create a third outcome, a synthesis (here, the meaning created by the montage). The original experiment by Kuleshov is a perfect example. In the experiment, the expressionless face of an actor (the thesis) is intercut with other shots of soup, a girl in a coffin, and a woman on a divan (the antitheses). Depending on the choice and order of the sequence of shots, the audience interprets the expression of the actor in a different way — as hunger, grief, and desire respectively. Whilst Kuleshov’s experiments laid the foundations for the fundamental principles of montage theory, it was Eisenstein who paved the way for theorising and implementing the possibilities for how this effect could be used in practice.

In his influential writings on montage, Eisenstein describes five methods of constructing a montage:

- Metric; where editing is entirely constructed by regular or proportionally-related time periods akin to bars of music.
- Rhythmic; where the editing is constructed by matching the rhythms of movements within the spatial frame (i.e., the rhythm of a drummer and the rhythm of marching soldiers).

---

10 Ibid, 49.
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- **Tonal;** where the editing is constructed by trying to match emotional elements and properties between different shots (i.e., similar levels of lighting, *mise-en-scène*, etc.)

- **Overtonal (sometimes known as associational montage);** where the first three methods listed above are used to try and evoke more specific or abstract emotional or associational meanings.

- **Intellectual;** where a small number of seemingly un- or disparately-related shots are placed together in close proximity to construct an abstract, or intellectual, meaning that is lacking from the shots individually (the textbook example being Eisenstein’s own *October: Ten Days That Shook The World* [1928], where shots of the actor portraying the leader of the Provisional Government, Alexander Kerensky, are intercut with those of a mechanical peacock).

What Eisenstein’s categorisations hide, however, is that these divisions are not distinct taxonomical categories at all, but rather a continuum of development and variation within which one category builds upon the other,¹¹ a fact that Eisenstein acknowledges himself:

> [T]he transition from metrics to rhythmics came about in the conflict between the length of the shot and the movement within the frame.

> Tonal montage grows out of the conflict between the rhythmic and tonal principles of the piece.

> And finally — overtonal montage, from the conflict between the principle tone of the piece (its dominant) and the overtone.¹²

For Eisenstein, the most important factor that contributed to the generation of meaning was not the specific method of montage being used but the ‘relationships of conflict with each other.’¹³ How, for instance, one balances the internal rhythms of individual shots (rhythmic montage) against the tempo, or ‘beats’, of the cutting between those shots (metric montage). Unlike in the later *Popular-Classic* (Chapter 6), where I was more concerned with a type of assemblage closer to

---

¹¹ Whilst Eisenstein divides the practice of montage into five methods, in practice overtonal montage is fundamentally a variation of intellectual montage. The former of these seeks to create a sense of a specific emotional state rather than the latter’s more abstract associative purpose that seeks to create, rather than simply evoke, a particular meaning. In turn, both overtonal and intellectual montages are the combination of the first three methods put towards the purpose of creating a specific aesthetic effect. Why Eisenstein chose to do this is well beyond the remit of this portfolio, but it is important to acknowledge the somewhat confusing way Eisenstein has structured his theory of montage as it helps to explain why in *Re: Mozart* I only focused on the first three methods of montage and not the final two.

¹² Eisenstein, ‘Methods of Montage’, in *Film Form*, 79.

¹³ Ibid, 78.
Eisenstein’s overtonal or intellectual montage, in Re: Mozart I was concerned with the first three basic methods of montage. While this choice was motivated by my wariness towards using less iconic source material, it was also driven by my desire to limit the focus of the piece to enstranging the material and its historical arrangements, rather than trying to draw associations with any external referent.

Eisenstein’s descriptions of the methods and principles of montage are littered with musical analogies, particularly regarding ‘overtonal montage.’ In his influential ‘A Dialectic Approach to Film Form’, Eisenstein makes numerous, but qualified, allusions between music and film, stating at one point that ‘In the moving image (cinema) we have, so to speak, a synthesis of two counterpoints — the spatial counterpoint of graphic art, and the temporal counterpoint of music.’\(^\text{14}\) In terms of the potential complications and adaptions that might be necessary in using filmic theory in a musical setting, these points of connection mean that Eisenstein’s ideas are less problematic than the literary theories of Shklovsky and Brecht.\(^\text{15}\) Eisenstein was not the only writer who saw a closely analogous relationship between music and early cinematic theory. Theorists attached to the avant-garde wings of both disciplines often developed theories explicitly drawing on each other’s practices.\(^\text{16}\) Given the closely interwoven history of early film and music, Eisenstein’s concept of montage seemed like an appropriate model to use for Re: Mozart.

5.2 Re: Mozart

Following Eisenstein’s assertion that it is not necessarily the specific materials but their ‘relationships of conflict with each other’ that are of primary importance in the generation of meaning in montage, I went about creating and collating materials without any a priori assumptions of how that material would later be edited. To ensure the focus was on K. 608 as a work, all the material contained within Re: Mozart was derived from either K. 608 or its arrangements by Busoni and Clementi. These materials can be categorised according to their distance from the source material, effectively creating three ‘orders’ of derivation:

- Original Quotation: either outright quotation, or with minor rearrangement to accommodate different instrumentation (i.e. from two pianos to two wind quintets).

\(^{14}\) Eisenstein, ‘A Dialectic Approach to Film Form,’ in Film Form, 51.

\(^{15}\) See Chapter 1 (pages 31-35), for a discussion of the issues around translating theoretical models between different aesthetic disciplines.

\(^{16}\) For an account of how this relationship developed in Germany, see Francesco Finocchiaro, Musical Modernism and German Cinema from 1913 to 1933 (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017).
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- First Order: quotations that have been manipulated in a ‘wholesale’ fashion that retains rhythmic and pitch structures; inversion, transpositions, and retrogrades of blocks of material rather than individual lines.
- Second Order: rotational-serial procedures (in the vein of late Stravinsky)\(^\text{17}\) applied to both the rhythmic and pitch structures of the melodic material, this creating secondary material that relates to the source without being isomorphic with it.

My decision to work using these three groupings was intended as a means of creating material that fell along a continuum of resemblance, from exact quotation to distant derivations that may have little resemblance to their original sources. By interpolating these materials into the source text without regard to the phrasing of the source, I hoped to create a piece that enstranged the idea of an object being adapted through time.\(^\text{18}\)

Just as with the rest of this portfolio, \textit{Re: Mozart} is constructed in a manner that aims to enstrange the deeper structures of the source materials as well as their surface features. K. 608’s macro-structure is a basic ternary form, with the outer subsections also divided into ternary substructures. In the outer sections a short introduction frames a fugato passage, with these ‘a’ sections in turn framing a central andante passage structured as a theme, two variations and a coda. Given the different tempos and metres of the two sections, I chose to differentiate them by applying different filmic treatments to each section. The outer sections are structured in a form of montage, whilst the inner section is treated in a way that mimics the forms of temporal manipulation that can be applied to the medium of film. For example, at Fig. 4 the otherwise un-manipulated Mozart-Busoni quotation is slowed, reversed and then sped up again to carry on as normal (example 5.1), an effect that is frequently used by the filmmaker Martin Arnold in his work (see \textit{Pièce Touchée} [1989]).


\(^{18}\) In many respects, in \textit{Re: Mozart} I was trying enstrange an idea similar to that of an aesthetic work as a gift that John Brackett has described in relation to John Zorn’s homage pieces. Brackett locates Zorn’s practice within an adapted form of Marcel Mauss’s gift economy. Fundamental to discussions of gift exchange is the notion that when a gift is given the object being exchanged still retains a trace of the gift giver. In the case of \textit{Aporias: Requiem for Piano and Orchestra} (1998), for instance, Zorn takes material from Igor Stravinsky’s \textit{Requiem Canticles} (1966) — a metaphorical gift to Zorn from the composer — who in turn transforms this material according to his own interests, influences and predilections, and then passes on the resulting work as a gift to his listeners. Each time along the chain, aspects of the new recipient are retained by the ‘gift’ (John Brackett, \textit{John Zorn: Tradition and Transgression} [Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2008]).
Chapter 5: Re: Mozart


The differences in treatment between the materials from the outer and inner sections were reinforced by instrumentation and staging. The instrumental forces of *Re: Mozart* can conveniently be divided into three instrumental groups: the two wind quintets and the obligato piano. The two source arrangements — the Busoni and the Clementi — are deployed across these three groups. In the outer sections, Clementi’s solo piano arrangement is presented in the piano whilst the Busoni is divided between the two wind quintets — each taking one of the two piano parts. This division of material was reinforced by the instruction that the wind quintets should sit symmetrically in a V-shape around the piano at the vertex. This staging would not only provide a visual reinforcement of the deployment of the source materials, but it would also help acoustically differentiate the structure of the montage passages. In contrast, the central slow section of the Busoni arrangement is split between the piano and the second wind quintet with the Clementi absent. This different arrangement for the andante passage was motivated by the desire to differentiate the two filmic paradigms. As the paradigm operating within the andante material was to transform the quotations by means of playing with aspects of time (but keeping the internal relations of the cited material proportionate), splitting the Busoni between two different instrumental groups (the piano and a wind quintet) would make this easier to appreciate perceptually.
5.2.1.1 Montage and Fugue

To enstrate the outer sections, I took the basic ternary/arch form and extended its premise by creating palindromes out of the material. The Clementi in the piano and the Busoni in the wind quintets were turned into palindromes: with the piano playing the first half of K. 608 retrograded in the second half of Re: Mozart, and the wind quintets playing the second half of the Mozart in retrograde in the first half of the piece. Similarly, I also extended the formal principle of the fugato passage. As well as having the palindromes, I created a second layer of material based on serial techniques. With these techniques, I created new melodic lines that began with the original material but which progressively departed from it. By substituting original entries of the fugato subject with serially-derived material I enstranged the outer sections by creating a ‘roughened form’ that partly resembled the Common-Practice harmonic structures that underpinned the Mozart (example 5.2).

Example 5.2: Extract from pre-compositional sketches for Re: Mozart, showing an excerpt from the serially-derived fugato material.

Having established the basic materials for the first section, I superposed them and then intercut between the different layers without regard for the phrasing of the musical content (fig. 5.1). To ensure that I did not allow musical content to influence my editing choices, I imposed a form of ‘rhythmic’ editing that selected the ‘beats’ of the cuts by means of a metrical scheme composed of augmented statements of the rhythmic component (talea) of the serial material (see top lines of figure 5.1; only the rhythmic values were used). At first there is a clear division between the piano and the wind quintets, with the montage alternating between the two groups up to Fig. 2. When the montage resumes between Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 the piano plays throughout, cutting between the two wind quintets. When the montage passages resume at Fig. 5 there is another shift. Both wind quintets now alternate between quotations and serially-derived materials; so that when quintet 1 is playing material from the Busoni, quintet 2 is playing serially-derived fugal material (example 5.3). At Fig. 7 the trajectory moves towards a loss of synchronization between the two quintets, with each quintet now alternating between quotation and serially-derived material at an independent pace.


---

20 The proportional relationship between the metrical scheme dictating the editing procedures and the serially-derived material was not intended to be audible on the part of the audience. It was simply a means of deciding the pace of the editing that on the one hand had an element of indeterminacy (in relation to the musical structure of the source), but did not feel ‘random’ in an expressive manner.
Figure 5.1: Pre-compositional workings for Re: Mozart, showing superposed layers of material and working for the montage (corresponding to bars 20-26 in the final Re: Mozart score).
Following my critique of Lang, it was important that the editing was foregrounded to highlight the ‘materiality’ of the music. This heightening (or, to use a Shklovskian term, ‘roughening’) of the editing process had repercussions for how the score was notated. In the case of the material from the outer sections it made sense to keep K.608’s constant 4/4 metre, as the construction of the montage meant that the ‘edits’ simply switched between different layers, which were all in same tempo and metre. This, however, could not work for the sections derived from the central andante passage, as the techniques applied to it resulted in more complex rhythmic constructions and fluctuations in tempo.

5.2.1.2 Andante Passages

The andante passages of Re: Mozart make use of techniques that imitate the medium of film, particularly those that are reminiscent of Martin Arnold’s practice of prioritising a sense of materiality over narrative continuity — such as manipulating the speed of the material (reversing and changing the tempo) and looping. The central difficulty with using these techniques was how to notate them in the score, because they involved manipulations and fragmentation of metre and tempo and the semi-indeterminate ‘rhythm’ of the editing process resulted in complex time signatures. Rather than smoothing these changes in time signatures I chose to retain them to give a clear impression to the performers of how the piece was constructed. As the players were students I understood some re-notation might be needed afterwards to aid the pragmatics of the performance, but I thought it was more important to initially depict how the material was edited together so they could see where the rhythmic stresses should be as well to try and convey some idea of the filmic aesthetic behind the piece’s construction.

Having established the need to retain the complex time signature changes in the andante passages, I searched for a model of how to achieve this that mediated the pragmatic demands of co-ordinating the players and the aesthetic concerns with conveying the materiality of the editing processes. The obvious model for this was the previously discussed Becher by Jennifer Walshe.21 In Becher, Walshe eschews the conventional placing of the time signatures on the stave, and instead places them above the stave in brackets. This approach allows Walshe to give an indication of the original metre without imposing new rhythmic stresses on the quotation by using a metre that matches the length of the citation but not its original stresses. Ideally, I would have chosen a similar method to Walshe, but Becher was written for a single pianist who can

21 See pages 13-14.
more easily co-ordinate the subtle differences in rhythmic stresses that arises from ‘dropping’ into a citation that does not start at the beginning of the bar. In *Re: Mozart*, in contrast, there were up to eleven performers, many of whom would be playing competing rhythmic stresses due to the reversal of the quotations. To compromise between the two competing requirements of pragmatism and aesthetic communication, I settled on using conventionally notated time signatures, but with dotted bar lines showing the subdivisions of the original material.

Just as with the montage processes enacted upon the introductory and fugato materials, the filmic processes applied to the andante material also develop over time. When the first manipulation occurs in the piano part during Fig. 4, the piano slows down into bar 36 before accelerating, playing the retrograde of bars 5 and 6, and then carrying on with the quotation once more (example 5.1). The same process occurs again at Fig. 6, but this time the material allocated to quintet 2 is now ‘panned’ across to quintet 1 (example 5.4). The purpose of imitating this technique of recorded music was to firstly add more musical interest by bringing in the other quintet, but also to help cross the disciplinary divide of music and film. By bringing in a technique that is so strongly connoted with electronic music production, I hoped to draw on the fact that much of the sense of materiality found in Arnold’s work is as much to do with the effect of his techniques on the sound of the found footage as with the effect on the visual elements.

With each entrance of the andante material its complexity increases, with more repetitions and extensive panning of material between the wind quintets. At Fig. 12 the process begun by the panning between the two quintets at Fig. 6 is developed a stage further, with quintet 1 carrying on the slowed down quavers while quintet 2 and the piano snap back to the original tempo (example 5.5). The process of expansion and development culminates starting at bar 172, where there is a confluence between the techniques of looping, panning and montage used in the first section. What starts as a loop of a two-bar fragment of material in quintet 2 is progressively broken down and replaced with a retrograde of the same passage in quintet 1. Once the now retrograded material has been completely passed to quintet 1, it begins the same process of tempo fluctuations that had been applied to the other instances of music from the andante passage, with the quotation resuming as normal in quintet 1 at bar 186.
5.2.1.3 Cadenzas

Of the material taken from the continuum of derivation that I had created at the outset, I had thus far in the piece focused on the material that lay closer to the quotation pole. To fully convey the full sense of this continuum, however, it was also important to include material that is more distantly related to the original quotation. As things stood, there were only fleeting moments of the serially-derived material in the opening and closing sections, and these were heavily embedded within a dense collage of quotations. I wanted to reinforce the distance between source material and serial derivation by presenting the material in a way that differentiated itself from the other contexts in which it had been heard so far. This was achieved by forming the material into a set of cadenzas that distance themselves from the structured material discussed so far. The cadenzas in the piano are dense, collapsed iterations of the serial melodies, and are designed to suggest an allusion to the pianistic virtuosity common to Mozart, Clementi and
Busoni. In contrast, the presentation of the same melodic material in the two free-metre wind trios is generally smoother in contour. Just as I had transformed some of the outer material into palindromes, I took a similar approach with these wind trios. The material presented in the first opening trio at bar 17 (example 5.6) is, with some minor modifications, played at bar 307 in a transposed retrograde inversion to mirror the treatment of the other palindromic material (example 5.7).

These cadenzas served a greater purpose than simply fulfilling the formal function of completing the continuum of the material. Firstly, they provide a point of musical contrast to the rest of the piece, which is otherwise dominated by Common Practice era gestures. These short cadenza-like passages are designed to interrupt and ‘roughen’ the form of the more discernible Mozart-derived material. By inserting these cadenzas, which clearly suggest a break (or at least a significant departure from) the rest of the soundworld of Re: Mozart, I hoped that I would instigate a moment of reflection or reconsideration on the listener’s part. In other words, to parallel some of the discourse around Critical Composition, I hoped that the inclusion of these moments of difference would provide that grain of an alternative that was identified as being necessary for a composition to be conventionally Critical.22

There was another type of material that, whilst not strictly speaking a cadenza, I wanted to use in Re: Mozart. As previously outlined, to enstrange the fugato section I had constructed a quasi-fugato out of the serially-derived material.23 As with the more broader issue of the sparse use of

---

23 See pages 99-100.
the serial material in the cadenzas, I felt that this ‘serial fugato’ had not been given enough time to establish itself as a separate musical premise. I took this ‘fugato’, broke it up using the same quasi-aleatoric process that I used elsewhere, and then inserted the fragments into the central section of Re: Mozart. The purpose of montaging this serial fugato into the slow central section was to try and give a sense of collapsed time that disrupts the arch form of K.608. By disrupting the continuity of the slow central section I hoped to remind the audience of the previous material and encourage them to see the object from a perspective that was closer to a ‘bird’s eye view’. Furthermore, by giving the fugato to quintet 1, I also expanded on the way I had used the spatial arrangement of the two quintets to delineate the montage process. As most of the andante material was present in quintet 2, by allocating different material to quintet 1 I extended the process of the ‘roughening’ of the form, and furthered the process of enstranging K. 608.

5.3 Critical Reflection

One of my principle compositional concerns while writing Re: Mozart was to ensure that the processes analogous to filmic techniques that I was using retained a clear sense of materiality. I think Re: Mozart was partially successful in this regard. Whilst the piece does have a greater sense of materiality than Lang’s Monadologie VII, it does not come close to either Martin Arnold’s films or Lang’s Songbook. Given that I was writing for student performers who were not accustomed to performing many of the physical, theatrical aspects of New Music as described by Walshe, it was difficult to replicate the materiality of Lang’s Songbook without using devices such as the vocalist’s stylised breathing. While such devices certainly would have been technically possible with the wind players, I do not believe they would have been convincingly executed by these specific performers. Therefore, while it may well be an appropriate consideration for a future work, I am not convinced this would have been an effective solution for Re: Mozart.

There were several other aspects of Re: Mozart that I was unhappy with when it was performed. Largely these were concerned with its actual performance. Many of the student wind players struggled to understand the construction of the piece, resulting in them trying to play in a conventionally ‘Classical’ fashion (equalising dynamics between performers playing different

---

24 The ‘serial fugato’ I constructed is not in any technical sense a real fugue. I simply used the proportions of the entries of the subject in the original fugato and replaced the subject with its serial counterpart, which is much longer. Technically then, it would be more accurate to describe it as something closer to a canon, or simply an example of imitative counterpoint. However, given the context of the material this technical distinction seemed, from my perspective, to be moot.
material, rounding off phrases that have been interrupted, etc.). This performance practice reduced the sense of materiality that I had tried to embed in the work and made me aware of how much the conveyance of materiality is contingent on the engagement and aesthetic awareness of the performer. However, there were moments in the rehearsal process where it did seem like the performers momentarily understood the process that they were being asked to enact. At these moments, I did sense something close to the materiality that I had sought to bring to the fore in the work. This meant that the premise I had used in Re: Mozart certainly could work, but possibly was not as clear in this regard as it could have been. I am not convinced that what I set out to achieve in this work was possible with amateur or student performers, given the level of control and understanding needed to play in contradiction to the gestural associations that would normally be implied by Mozart’s music. However, many of the lessons I learnt in terms of both the importance of the performer in articulating the materiality and the general compositional potential of Eisenstein’s theories of montage would be explored further in the last piece of my portfolio, Popular-Classic.
Chapter 6: **Popular-Classic**

*Popular-Classic* is constructed out of three separate movements, each of which uses Beethoven’s *Für Elise*, but contextualises it in different ways. As its title suggests, *Popular-Classic* engages with the relationship between music of the Popular ‘low’ and the Classical ‘high’.¹ Up to now, the approach I have taken to the relationship between the vulgarised Classical and its implicit place within a popular-cultural context, has been to disregard that context. This decision emerged from my interpretation of Shklovsky’s analysis of Tolstoy’s enstrangement techniques. The idealistic approach in this portfolio was an attempt to parallel the technique of not naming the object;² by taking a kitsch work and then ignoring aspects of the re-contextualisation that has rendered it kitsch, I hoped to focus an audience’s perception on the work rather than its context. However, the more I wrote the more I began to find this approach too limited in scope. Through *Snare Dance* to *Popular-Classic*, I naturally drifted away from my earlier formalist approaches and began to engage in some manner with the works’s cultural embeddedness. This trajectory towards the socio-cultural was also motivated by the realisation that listeners were hearing my pieces as detached from their Popular contexts regardless. Therefore, to enstrange this practice I in fact needed to bring ‘the world’ into the work rather than exclude it, and so *Popular-Classic* was the first piece to overtly engage with a source material’s Popular context.

Written for piano, electric guitar and drum kit, *Popular-Classic* takes as its subject Beethoven’s Bagatelle No.25 in A minor for piano (c.1810), or *Für Elise*, a staple choice of ‘programmed music’.³ By using a work that is so heavily identified with the most stereotypical uses of vulgarised Classical music, I hoped that the relationship between *Popular-Classic* and the world would be inescapably apparent. To explore the relationship between *Für Elise’s* Popular and Classical contexts, I extended the montage techniques I had used in *Re: Mozart*. However, as I was conceiving of this work in terms of different objects rather than different aspects of the same...

---

¹ Like many of the terms used in this commentary, the terms ‘High’ and ‘Low’ can be problematic. however, for the purposes of this thesis — and this chapter in particular — I am using them in their loose ‘conventional’ usage: where ‘high’ indicates privileged, or ‘Classical’ culture, and ‘Low’ indicates mass, or vernacular, culture. This is obviously a generalisation, but that generalisation is what I am seeking to engage with in *Popular-Classic*.


³ For the sake of clarity, ‘programmed music’ has nothing to do with ‘programme music’ usually identified with the Romantic era. Here, it is a term to describe a type of recorded music that has been specifically composed and/or curated to encourage certain specified psychological effects in its auditors, almost always effects tied to commercial practices (Jonathan Sterne, ‘Sounds like the Mall of America: Programmed Music and the Architectonics of Commercial Space’, *Ethnomusicology*, Vol. 41, No. 1 [1997], 29-31).
object — in line with my focus on works rather than quotations — I chose to think of these techniques in terms of an assemblage rather than a montage.4

### 6.1 John Zorn and the Assemblage

Conceiving the piece in terms of an assemblage was a means to avoid a sense of dialogue or conversation between the constituent source materials.5 I was wary of *Popular-Classic* appearing as an archetypal post-modern attempt to bridge ‘high’ and ‘low’ arts, rather than an attempt to use that difference as an enstranging technique. Similarly, I wanted to avoid *Popular-Classic* appearing as a critique of ‘generic pop’. On the contrary, I wanted to use the form of the assemblage to enstrate the kitschness of the ‘Popular Classics’ by bringing them in to proximity to the ‘low’ — the idea being that the kitschness of the piano music is enstranged by the banality of the ‘Popular’ pastiches with which it is in proximity. To accomplish this, *Popular-Classic* needed to avoid any synthesis between the two styles (high and low) to keep the two groupings as discrete cultural sites.

In trying to provide a potential model for considering what a musical assemblage might look like, the work of John Zorn (1953—) was a logical place to begin. John Brackett has described how Zorn’s use of quotation moves beyond ‘a “name that tune” game of listening’,6 a remark echoed by Tom Service who — in discussing the solo piano work *Carny* (1991) — comments that:

> [T]he ‘referential’ is always part of *Carny*’s ‘material’ — and vice versa...The materials of *Carny* simultaneously belong to the piece and to the outside world. Zorn’s critical relationship with all the different musics in the piece is responsible for this rich but perilous situation...*Carny* might be said to reimagine autonomy by its insistence on world and work, reference and originality, interpretative openness and notational fixity.

---

4 The term ‘assemblage’ is commonly used as the sculptural equivalent of ‘collage’ in fine art, or ‘montage’ in film theory, seemingly emerging out of Black Mountain College and Robert Rauchenberg in the early 1950s. However, the distinctions between these three terms are often liminal and ill defined; an ill definition often made worse in musical discourse by an inconsistent usage that does not reflect the terms use in the plastic arts.

5 The other advantage of using the term ‘assemblage’ in the context of *Popular-Classic* is that it differentiates the work from my explicit engagement with montage in *Re: Mozart*. Whilst there are many similarities between the two approaches to my materials across the two works, they are used to achieve slightly different effects. The use of different terminology helps to highlight this difference and avoid unnecessary confusion.

These complex negotiations account for the piece’s situation between the total fragmentation of the postmodern text and the ideological confines of the musical work.\(^7\)

By creating a dense network of associations and relationships between highly defined, but briefly experienced, musical objects that can be easily related to the world, Zorn’s music moves beyond a simple game of ‘guess the tune’ and becomes something more profound.\(^8\)

Service’s understanding of Zorn’s critical use of quotation as a means of engaging with the world was an ideal reference point for *Popular-Classic*.\(^9\) While I use a different approach to my sources, I am sympathetic to Service’s reading of Zorn. I too use found material to try and speak of the ‘world’ by arranging its artefacts in a meaningful way. That said, the “‘name that tune’ game” is not necessarily an undesirable outcome. In Zorn’s work, the saturation of intertextual references and relations ensures that even when a listener has recognised a specific quotation they might miss others. The intensity and breadth of the flashes of musical imagery in Zorn’s work of the 1980s and 1990s mean that a listener is forced to interpret only the impressions formed by the composite of relations gleaned. These works — such as the string quartet *Cat O’Nine Tails* [1999], and the studio-created *Spillane* [1987] — can be described in terms of an act of destruction as a creative act. By assembling a host of fleeting fragmentary quotations and referential pastiches, Zorn establishes a new set of relationships between his constituent citations and references.\(^10\)

Service describes this assemblage of references in *Spillane* as a means of constructing a narrative. For Service:

> Spillane’s structure is one of Zorn’s developments of the “block” architecture he hears in Stalling’s soundtracks. Spillane is composed without an accompanying visual track but creates a special kind of narrative logic, analogous to the experience of listening to a cartoon soundtrack ‘in the abstract.’\(^11\)

Whilst the use in *Spillane* of spoken text — clearly in the idiom of ‘hardboiled’ detective novels — and sounds effects such as police sirens and screeching tires makes these allusions to filmic

---


\(^8\) For an in-depth discussion of my use of profundity in this context, see Chapter 5 of Aaron Ridley’s *The Philosophy of Music* for a discussion on the musically profound, and specifically the notion of expressive profundity (Aaron Ridley, *The Philosophy of Music: Theme and Variations* [Edinburgh, UK: University of Edinburgh Press, 2004] 132-162).


\(^10\) Whilst, to my knowledge, Zorn has never spoken of Eisenstein or Kuleshov, his seemingly deep-seated internalisation of Carl Stalling’s cartoon soundtracks means there is an undeniable commonality between the Russian theorist’s theories of montage and Zorn’s work.
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narrative clear, those works that don’t include generic identifiers like *Cat O’Nine Tails* can equally be understood (if more obliquely) in this way. Following Zorn, by creating a dense assemblage of references and quotations, I hoped to create a set of relationships that would enstrange *Für Elise* in relation to its contexts outside of the concert hall.

6.2 The Attacca/Non-Attacca Dilemma

The variations in the contextualisation and treatment of *Für Elise* across the different movements was a key aspect of *Popular-Classic*. How the piece moved from one movement to another would be vital in determining how the re-contextualised material would be interpreted by the listener across the whole work (in much the same way as how the Kuleshov effect helped colour the meaning of the same group of film shots). As *Für Elise* is only three minutes long there would not be much time to develop compositional ideas within or across a single statement of the Beethoven. This meant that whether the movements were either distinct and separate from each other or joined together into a continuous flow would be a crucial factor in how I could colour the potential meanings of the work. Initially, I had conceived *Popular-Classic* as two separate and dialectically opposed movements, in a manner reminiscent of Brecht’s *Lehrstücke*. The clear break that I had originally intended to place between the two constituent movements would demarcate a clear restart before the beginning of the second formal premise that would have inverted the structure of the first. In keeping with Brecht’s notion of revealing the possibilities contained within a dramatic situation, the order of these two movements was to be interchangeable. However, as I worked on the detail of the piece I realised that the short duration of *Für Elise* would have resulted in the two-movement model not allowing enough time for a thorough exploration of the work’s premise. Rather than searching for a longer source work to use in place of *Für Elise*, I opted to introduce a third concluding movement. This addition of a third movement resulted in a rethink of how and whether to join the three movements together as I would now need to utilise two movement breaks rather than one. Therefore, the question of whether and how to join the two movements became more complicated than it would have been if I had retained the original two-movement form as initially planned.

---

12 For a more extensive discussion of understanding Zorn’s work of this period in terms of linear narrative, see: Adam J. Kolek, ‘Finding the Proper Sequences: Form and Narrative in the Collage Music of John Zorn’ (PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst, 2013).
13 See pages 97-98.
14 Specifically, Brecht’s *Der Jasager/Der Neinsager* (1930).
15 Whilst I had rejected my initial plan for a Brechtian ‘diptych’, the three-movement form also had the side effect of giving *Popular-Classic* the Ancient Greek formula of Thesis—Antithesis—Synthesis.
With the movements kept independent and separate from each other, *Popular-Classic* could be constructed in a manner that would encourage a distanced listening experience by rendering the listener’s ability to hear the three movements as one interconnected work more difficult. Furthermore, by demarcating the material so clearly, attention would be focused on the individual treatments of the source material in each movement at the expense of the longer-scale relationships between the movements. As this model requires more ‘work’ on the part of the listener to apprehend and retain these inter-movement references, the relationships between the movements should be enstranged. This procedure, however, runs the risk of ‘roughening’ the form to such an extent that the listener might not pick up on the relationships between the movements at all. Conversely, by joining the movements into a continuous whole, the use of *attacca* offered up the opportunity to reinforce the relationships and shared ideas between the sections by presenting them as a single construct. Joining the movements to each other by use of material common to each adjacent section could further reinforce the relationships and commonalities present across the different movements. For example, ‘pivot’ material common to two adjacent movements — for instance, the Bossa Nova material common to both the first and second movements — could help to reinforce the relationships across the adjacent movements.

Whether to join the movements together may seem to be a straightforward binary choice, but in practice this is not the case as there are many possibilities of how to join the movements. I considered several strategies for this and reflected on how each might affect the experience of the piece and its subsequent interpretation. I saw four broad, archetypal methods of constructing a join between two movements. First, to compose a cross fade. For instance, maintaining the final resonance of one movement whilst bringing in the beginning of the next. This approach would have the effect of allowing the audience to recognise a ‘break’ or restart between the two sections without creating the ‘switch off’ space that can typically happen between movements, where the performative tension is released (and in the worse cases destroyed by players clumsily turning pages, etc.). Second, to compose a pivot between the two movements, overlapping the beginning of one movement with the end of another. This formation is different to the cross fade in that limited space is provided for the listener to appreciate that a change has occurred. Third, to create an abrupt ‘hard’ cut through moving onto the next part at an unexpected moment, shifting between the parts without any kind of preparation or transition and creating a jolt of sorts for the listener who retroactively understands that we have progressed to something different. Whereas the first three are primarily distinguished by the smoothness of the shift and the amount of time given to the audience to apprehend the occurrence of a shift, the fourth is of

---

16 Shklovsky ‘Art as Technique’ in *Russian Formalist Criticism*, 21-22.
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a fundamentally different nature, since it involved the insertion of something in between the movements. That is, there could be an interpolation between the parts, with a substantial section of alternate material that creates a disruption of sorts between the two movements. Depending on its nature and construction, such an interpolation might obscure the transition between the different movements, hiding the ‘restart’, or it could be so substantial as to become a whole new movement. But more importantly, however, is what the interpolation consists of. In the case of Popular-Classic, for example, does the interpolation continue to focus on material from Für Elise, or does it engage with something new altogether? If I interpolated a field recording of a shopping mall into the breaks between the movements, would it have the same influence on the potential interpretation of the relationship between the different movements as if I had inserted an extended piano cadenza in the Romantic tradition? Therefore, the content of any interpolation is just, if not more important, than its duration.

6.3 Popular-Classic

Whether in the formation of three distinct movements, or a ‘hard cut’ form of attacca, in Popular-Classic there was a symmetry in differentiating the movements from one another. This separation would reinforce the construction of the piece as an assemblage of discrete, connotatively-charged musical objects. The ‘hard cut’ in particular also has the advantage of avoiding the use of ‘composerly’ mannerisms in constructing a transition between the sections. These mannerisms could easily have signalled that the work should be listened to in a ‘Romantic’ mode. The crudeness of the ‘hard cut’ avoids this potential pitfall by forcing the listener to understand the demarcation of the sections retrospectively.

6.3.1 Movements I and II

Of its initial Brechtian structure, a key element that was retained in Popular-Classic’s final three-movement form was the power relationship between the Für Elise and the Popular music assemblage. The first movement of Popular-Classic takes the solo piano work and juxtaposes it against an assemblage of extracts from banal pastiches of the iconic Popular styles of Blues, Swing, Bossa Nova, Disco, and Heavy Metal in the electric guitar and drum kit. This assemblage is constructed to subordinate the Popular to the Classical, with the choice of arrangement of the Popular music determined by the form of the Beethoven. For example, the assemblage only appears when the piano plays Für Elise’s main thematic material. The subordination of the guitar-
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drum kit duo to the piano is further reinforced by specific performance instructions that ask the duo not to follow each other, but instead to listen to the pianist who has been directed to play with an exaggerated sense of soloistic rubato.\textsuperscript{17} The power relationship between the duo and the piano is not static, however. At the beginning, whenever the iconic repeated semitone motif is played in the piano, the other two parts are silent, but these silences are progressively ‘filled in’ by the duo: firstly, with resonance from the guitar (bars 22-23), and later by the drum kit continuing with its assemblage (bars 36-37). In contrast to the assemblage that accompanies the theme of the Beethoven, during the ‘episodes’ of \textit{Für Elise} the Popular assemblage ‘catches’ on the pastiche style that the musicians were playing at the end of the previous thematic section (example 6.1). The guitarist and the drummer cycle through their material at slightly different rates, meaning that they do not necessarily ‘catch’ on the same style. Therefore, even though the rapid saturation of the assemblage has momentarily abetted, the form of the assemblage has not entirely been suspended. This ‘catching’ not only allows for the individual pastiches to be heard more substantially for a time, but also prefigures movement II.


Just as in \textit{Re: Mozart}, a decision needed to be made over how best to notate the assemblage, as different modes of notational presentation would affect the sound of the work. However, the

\textsuperscript{17} By using such an exaggerated level of rubato in the piano I hoped that it would cause a further level of tension between the more fluid approach to tempo in Romantic piano performance practice and the more regular, metronomic norms of Popular music styles.
type of assemblage in *Popular-Classic* is not the same as that of its immediate predecessor. In both works material was layered and moved between; however, in *Re: Mozart* there were only two types of material for each instrumental group,\(^\text{18}\) whereas in *Popular-Classic* the edits are in a fixed order within the same part. Furthermore, rather than alternating material between the guitar and drum kit, both parts cycle through the five different popular genres at slightly different rates. The differences between *Re: Mozart* and *Popular-Classic*, in terms of both structuring their quotations and the desired aural outcomes, meant that the notational solution employed in the former might not necessarily have suited the latter.

Given that *Für Elise* is in 3/8 and all the Popular music styles used in *Popular-Classic* are conventionally in 4/4, I faced a problem in terms of deciding the best means of notating and synchronising the assemblage of Popular music with the piano. The first solution I considered was to write two independent groups of parts that keep both musical styles in their respective metres and tempos, with the duo in 4/4 and the Beethoven in 3/8. Each formal section of the *Für Elise* would have a section corresponding to the same duration in the parts for the duo, with no common score between the two groups, only short cues to help create a loose synchronisation between the parts. Another solution was to convert the Popular music into a quaver pulse, but to bar the guitar and drum kit in 4/8 over *Für Elise*'s 3/8. The last solution would be to simply write the popular music pastiches in 3/8. The first solution would have had the advantage of keeping all the source material in a metre native to its conventions, the downside being that the different metres would have made exact synchronisation between the two groups difficult. The second solution allowed for much greater accuracy in synchronising the duo and piano, but at the expense of making the duo’s Popular material harder to interpret due to the combination of a quaver pulse rhythmic groupings carrying over bar lines. The third solution makes the synchronisation between the two parts the easiest to accomplish, but at the expense of almost completely effacing the original metre of the pastiches. This final arrangement was the one I chose to use as it not only provided the most accurate means of aligning the two groups, but it also extended the principle of subordinating the ‘Popular’ to the ‘Classic’. Although the issue of converting the material into a different time signature and therefore effacing the metrical scheme of the pastiches was potentially problematic, I felt that as the fragments were mainly going to be heard for relatively short durations this was a worthwhile compromise.

The construction of the second movement began with inverting the structure of the first, principally the relationship between the Beethoven and the pastiches. Here, it is the turn of the *Für Elise* to be fragmented and re-ordered according to the Popular. In movement II the guitar and

\(^{18}\) See page 101.
kit duo play the Bossa Nova pastiche extremely quietly, with the Beethoven broken up and
subtended to the AABA structure of the Bossa Nova. I fragmented the *Für Elise* by dividing it intoour-quaver units (the length of a single chord in the Bossa Nova), and then assigned each unit to
a pitch according to the circle of fifths beginning on the tonic of the Bossa Nova. I then mapped
these fragments to the chords of the Bossa Nova based on the pitch they had been allocated. This
pitch-material relationship is not intended to be heard *per se*, but is meant to reinforce the form
of the Bossa Nova just as the organisation of the assembled material in the guitar and drum kit did
for the *Für Elise*. However, unlike in movement I, there is no development or slippage from the
formal paradigm — throughout movement II the piano only plays the ‘cut up’ Beethoven. In
contrast to the first movement, the second is designed to convey the ‘Muzak’ quality of both the
Bossa Nova and the *Für Elise*. The extremely quiet dynamic of both sets of materials is designed to
replicate the quality of ‘piped’ music from a distant shopping centre. By keeping a repetitive,
unchanging form in this movement, and coupling it with an unobtrusive dynamic level, I hoped to
replicate the quality of ‘programmed music’ identified by Jonathan Sterne. The effect I was
aiming for was one reminiscent of what Sterne calls the ‘sonic threshold’, that point (usually at
the store front) where two sources of ‘programmed music’ interact with each other creating a
virtual delineation of types of commercial space (hallway/store).

6.3.2 Movement III

Having decided to extend my original two-movement, Brechtian, form by including a final third
movement the question arose of what to do with it. Following the thinking of a thesis-antithesis-
synthesis the most logical place to begin composing a third movement was with the formal
premise of the first, so to be able to reconsider the *Für Elise* in light of its treatment in the second
movement. I therefore considered ways of creating an assemblage based on the material of the
first movement, but developed and extended from its first appearance. To fulfil the function of a
recapitulation, but still develop the work, I once more created an assemblage of disparate
elements overlaid on the un-manipulated source material. But in this final movement I also
superposed an assemblage of other quotations into the piano part over the top of *Für Elise*. By

---

19 Jonathan Sterne, ‘Sounds like the Mall of America: Programmed Music and the Architectonics of
creating a ‘meta-counterpoint’ of different examples of other ‘kitsch’ piano works, the third movement would create a kind of symmetry with the formal assemblage of the first, but with different ‘kitsch’ works now contained entirely within the piano part.

This model raised a further question: what to do with the guitar and drum kit for the final movement? Having the final movement as a piano solo would have had the effect of ‘pulling focus’ completely on the piano. The focus would be placed on the Für Elise as a piano work, rather than as a ubiquitous, kitsch cultural object. If the guitar and kit duo were given nothing to do, however, they would be left on stage with no aim or purpose. My concern with this formation was that the lack of activity for the duo would result in their onstage presence becoming distracting. Conversely, if I found a meaningful way to include the guitar and kit in the final movement, it would allow me to explore an as-yet-untried arrangement between the piano and the duo. In the previous two movements both instruments of the duo have been playing constantly and, apart from the odd moment, simultaneously. By using them in the third movement I could potentially explore the effect of using them sparingly and independently. This arrangement could allow for light, subtle references to be made with the ‘pop’ material that made up the first movement. The danger, however, was that I would need to ensure that these appearances were meaningful, rather than being included just for the sake of giving the guitar and drum kit something to do. I opted, therefore, to avoid quotation in the duo, and instead had them perform ‘noise’. The use of noise over musical material was mainly a distancing device. If I had used material which was more connotatively musical I thought I might detract from the piano part by adding an extra level of semantic material. The use of noise allowed me to complicate the soundworld of the piano’s ‘meta-counterpoint’ without adding new referential material.

---

6.4 Critical Reflection

The process of workshopping Popular-Classic was enlightening as there were many issues — mainly concerning the realisation of the performance directions — arising in performance that on paper had appeared straightforward. When discussing how to realise these directions, a series of

---

21 I would like to credit Charlie Sdraulig for the term ‘meta-counterpoint’ in describing the effect I created by the superposition of multiple quotations over the ‘cantus firmus’ of the Für Elise.

22 The additional piano sources used in the third movement are: Mozart’s Piano Sonata No.11 in A Major, K.331: Movement III: ‘Rondo alla turca’ (1783), Beethoven’s Piano Sonata No. 14 in C# minor, Movement I: ‘Quasi una fantasia’ (Moonlight Sonata) (1801), Chopin’s Piano Sonata No.2 in Bb minor, Op.35, Movement III: ‘Marche Funèbre’ (1839), and Debussy’s Suite Bergamasque, Movement III: ‘Clair de Lune’ (1905).

23 Most dictionaries define ‘noise’ as a sound that is unwanted or unpleasant, and in the context of the otherwise tonal soundworld of Popular-Classic this meant sounds that were not ‘conventionally’ musical.
questions arose about how to most effectively implement them. The two most important of these questions centred on one aspect of each of the first two movements: how to practicably organise the synchronisation between the three performers in movement I; and how strongly worded the written direction needed to be to have the performers play quietly enough in movement II. In both these cases, the issues were resolved by making the performance directions so exaggerated that the performers could not fail to understand the exact effect that was required.

In the first draft of the directions that I had given to the performers I had directed the guitarist and kit player to follow only the pianist, ignoring the other performer in their duo. The intent being that, given that the pianist was directed to play with exaggerated levels of rubato, a tension would be created in performance with the other two parts. However, their training naturally led them to try and synchronise with each other as well the pianist. In the workshop, we tried several other ways of trying to synchronise the parts, such as asking the guitarist and the kit player to actively work together. These different arrangements were not satisfactory, as they either reduced the performative tension in the assemblage, or even caused the pianist to limit the excesses of his rubato to keep the ensemble together. Therefore, we returned to the original instruction, and after some rehearsal, we achieved the desired effect. With the dynamics in the second movement, originally I used the base dynamic level of ppp throughout, but in the workshop found this did not produce the effect that I had desired. I asked the performers to play as quietly as they possibly could, and this not only gave the performance the desired quality, but it also had the effect of making the short guitar ‘licks’ much more prominent. With both issues, by working with the performers and making the performance directions more exaggerated than I naturally would, the effects that I desired were achieved.
Chapter 7: Reflective Summary

One important trajectory of this portfolio has been the shift from a formalistic enstrangement in *One and Four Canons*, to a looser, more culturally-engaged relationship to the vulgarised Classical work in *Popular-Classic*. Whilst each piece in the portfolio takes a different work from the Classical canon as its subject, the works produced increasingly begin to use this focus to engage more broadly with the process of kitschification, or vulgarisation, itself, rather than just the work as an autonomous object. This trajectory reflects an expansion of my approach, resulting from the confluence of a process of on-going critical reflection and the more prosaic concerns of the specific instrumental forces and performance contexts of each individual work. For instance, writing for a saxophone quartet in *Serenade* offered an opportunity to engage with that staple of Western Art Music, the quartet, whilst the combination of the piano, electric guitar and drum kit offered an opportunity to engage with the tensions between ‘high’ and ‘low’ music. I have not abandoned or lost interest in the formalist aesthetic of *One and Four Canons*, and expect to return to that approach when appropriate compositional opportunities present themselves. It will be interesting, however, to see how my approach might differ after having explored a more culturally-engaged form of composition in the meantime.

7.1 Critiquing my Critique

A core question at the heart of this portfolio was whether it was possible to create a kind of critical, or self-reflexive, composition in a post-modern world that has become sceptical of Critical Theory. As outlined in Chapter 1, given post-modernity’s shift in the agency of interpretation from author to audience, it was never going to be possible to evaluate the effectiveness of the my enstrangement techniques in a determinate fashion. Furthermore, this portfolio is not, and was never intended to be, an empirical investigation. My engagement with Critically-orientated theories was a means to the end of directing my own composition, not an attempt to create a quasi-scientistic means of compelling social change in my audience. With these factors in mind, I did not actively engage in any kind of audience evaluation feedback or audience-led participation. That said, I did receive several comments from audience members that are briefly worth considering.

---

1 See pages 42-43.
Critiquing Classical Kitsch

One of the considerations that led me to first investigate composing with kitsch musical works was a desire to create a compositional praxis that did not a priori exclude those without a high-level of specialised knowledge concerning New Music. It was interesting, therefore, to see the contrast in reactions between those audience members who came from a New Music background and those who did not. This was most clearly demonstrated in the case of Serenade. The context for the première of Serenade would best be described as ‘mainstream’ Classical: a saxophone quartet recital rather than a New Music concert. After the concert, one audience member told me that even though she could not name either the composer or the piece, she had recognised the Mozart quotation and that its unexpected emergence made her reconsider how she listened to Classical music and Eine Kleine Nachtmusik; I am hopeful that in some sense the nature of her ‘reconsideration’ reflects that aims I have outlined in this commentary. In contrast, Charlie Sdraulig, a composer colleague I sent a recording of Serenade to, did not experience such a moment of ‘reconsideration’:

[A]fter the Mozart Nachtmusik became clearly recognizable — personally, this happened definitively at the end of page 8 — I began to resent its presence a little (whoops!). However, I imagine that this point of recognition will occur at a different point for each listener. As the Mozart receded back in to the surrounding 'fog' so to speak, it was beautiful in a sense, but ultimately I found that my relationship to the Mozart was not fundamentally altered by its reframing/recontextualisation. Perhaps my familiarity with the received/appropriated cultural object was too strong and overpowered my ability to hear beyond that familiarity, or glean new insights into the music — I fell easily into the realization of 'oh that's Mozart' and suddenly the impact of the context you so carefully prepared just slipped away for me, its potential meanings and functions subserviently reduced to one of concealing and revealing.2

Sdraulig’s comments highlight something that I had not considered: that for some these kitsch Classical works could be over-identified with. That is, some of these works might be so well known that their kitschness might overpower any entranglement that I may enact upon them. To quote Sdraulig, some listeners may never be able to move beyond the 'oh that's Mozart' stage of recognition. For the most part, this brief, highly anecdotal, comparison of two reactions to the same work would seem to corroborate my initial thoughts set out in Chapter 1, that a kind of critical composition is still possible, but that is requires a targeted relativism that takes account of a specific group’s field of knowledge and a shared understanding of what constitutes music.

-------------------

2 Charlie Sdraulig, personal communication to the author (10th May 2016).
Moreover, many of the techniques that I developed over the course of this portfolio have been developed in works completed after the portfolio’s completion. These later works sought to improve upon many of the limitations and problems that I identified during the reflective process that guided how I progressed from one composition to the next. For example, the processes of translation (and their respective perceptions) that I outlined in *One and Four Canons* were explored in another work,3 *Fugue State* (2017). In *One and Four Cannons*, whilst the basic structures and proportions of the original musical material were maintained across the translations, other fundamental performative elements — such as dynamics and articulation — were lost or distorted. While these limitations did affect the interpretation of the musical object in its new media, they nevertheless allowed for the more formalistic presentation of material that the piece required. I suspect that some of these limitations can never be overcome, as the process of translation always necessitates the loss of some properties and the gaining of others. However, there was one technical limitation I did want to improve upon: the limitation of having to slow the tempo of the ‘translated’ musical source to accommodate physical performative constraints.

Whilst the practical necessity of slowing down ‘Pachelbel’s Canon’ in *One and Four Canons* to accommodate the physical actions of presenting the coloured cards had the desirable side effect of adding a formal, almost clinical flavour to the work,4 it did also mean that I had to denature the source material. In *Fugue-State* I tried to overcome this limitation using small extracts of film triggered by visual-control software. The performer has a MIDI keyboard on top of their acoustic keyboard instrument that triggers short clips assigned to each of the keys. By using a standard music keyboard, I could present a musical source translated into a new medium just as fast as a performer could render the original. Furthermore, the technological mediation of this means of translation had the advantage of presenting the performer with the original musical quotation, rather than a graphical substitute.

Although this portfolio has used interdisciplinary ideas and techniques within concretely musical frameworks, I have steered clear of using multimedia. This was to ensure that my practice firmly stayed within, and focused upon, music. The use of film in *Fugue State* was sufficiently substantial that, whilst clearly still focused on and structured around music, the filmic component might detract from the kitsch musical work being enstranged. To ensure that this portfolio was centred on the kitsch Western Art Music I chose not to include *Fugue State* (or any of the other multimedia works) in the portfolio.

---

3 See pages 62-63 for my critical evaluation of *One and Four Canons*.
4 See pages 58-59.
7.2 Conclusion

As discussed in Chapter 1, this portfolio has a clear affinity to wider contemporary practices in New Music. Many of the works contain elements of an extended compositional practice that assimilate interdisciplinary techniques, as well as an acknowledgment that ‘the bodies playing the music are part of the music’. One and Four Canons, Mahlerstück (see Appendix A), and Snare Dance all make use of the performers’s bodies in an explicitly compositional manner, integrating their presence into the compositional concerns of the work. Whilst the ways in which I have integrated the performers’s presence might not be as foregrounded as in some examples of ‘The New Discipline’ (such as in the works of not only Jennifer Walshe, but younger composers such as Andy Ingamells and Edward Henderson), my practice still considers the act of performance as an embodied act. However, in contrast to much of the work belonging to The New Discipline, the role of the body is less central to this portfolio as it is primarily concerned with musical works rather than musical practices. This portfolio’s principle concern of engaging with musical artefacts was always going to necessitate the primacy of the literate and self-referential over the performative and the physical. In Snare Dance, the most overtly physical of all the pieces in this portfolio, the work’s focus on the different incarnations of the Bolero meant that to engage more actively in physical movement was more relevant than in a work like Popular-Classic, where the focus was on the use of Classical works as Muzak. Whilst this portfolio does make use of interdisciplinary practices in a manner like other works of ‘The New Discipline’, the use of these interdisciplinary practices always serves the principle aim of enstranging kitsch Classical Art music.

Primarily, the value of both this portfolio and its accompanying commentary lies in its reformation of the Critical within a post-modern, relativistic practice. Whilst I do not believe that every piece in this portfolio is fully successful in this regard, the larger body of work it represents offers a potential starting point for future avenues for the Critical exploration of found material. What I hope to have demonstrated is that a kind of critical composition is not only possible, but worth investigating, as just because one can no longer critique in relation to a universal truth, this does not preclude a construction of a more narrowly-focused, relativistic critique. I hope that this work has not only contributed to demonstrating how a Critically-orientated composition can still be both relevant and effective, but that it also offers an example of how we can discuss relationships between music and the world in which it emerges and is embedded.

---

5 See pages 49-51.
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One and Four Canons

Volume 2 of 7

For Five Performers

Alexander Glyde-Bates
Layout:

Small table or large flat music stand

Audience
Equipment List:

Player 1:

- A set of thick coloured A4 cards ordered: Yellow—Orange—Red—Violet—Indigo—Blue—Indigo—Violet
- An extra Green and an extra Blue card, to be swapped in during performance to make a second set of cards ordered: Red—Violet—Indigo—Blue—Green—Yellow—Indigo—Orange—Yellow
- A melodic instrument of their choice that is comfortably capable of:

Player 2:

- A set of thick coloured A4 cards ordered: Yellow—Orange—Red—Violet—Indigo—Blue—Indigo—Violet
- An extra Green and an extra Yellow card, to be added in during performance to make a second set of cards reordered: Red—Violet—Indigo—Blue—Green—Yellow—Indigo—Orange—Yellow
- A melodic instrument of their choice that is comfortably capable of:

Player 3:

- During performance reorder some of the cards to make a new set ordered: Blue—Green—Yellow—Orange—Red—Violet—Red
- A melodic instrument of their choice that is comfortably capable of:

Players 4 and 5:

- A set of thick coloured A4 cards ordered: Red—Blue—Indigo—Yellow—Green—Red—Green—Blue
- A harmonic instrument of their choice that is comfortably capable of realising chords
General Performance Directions:

All performers will require either a small table or a large music stand, capable of being laid horizontally, to rest materials on when not needed. It should either be low enough to not obstruct the audience’s view or set slightly to the side.

Each box in the score indicates an action that should either be held for, or begin on, a two second duration. While the piece is not metered, per se, the performers should begin and end the action on the ‘downbeat’, i.e. complete the action on the two-second mark. When two different types of material are indicated in the same box (with a ‘+’ between them) these two types of material should be articulated simultaneously. Occasionally two types of material are indicated in the same box, they should be both articulated within the two-second window, i.e. one second each. Lines between multiple boxes indicate that the specified actions should be held for the combined duration of the boxes. Where this includes words, the words should only be articulated once at the beginning of the action.

Empty boxes indicate ‘a rest’, where a neutral — at rest — pose should be adopted. Depending on the type of material being indicated (detailed below)

In the piece there are four types of material that are articulated in different ways:

Cards:

A set of coloured cards should be pre-ordered (see relevant equipment list, above) before the concert. They will be needed at the beginning and at the end of the piece. Some performers may be required to re-order the cards during the performance as stated in the equipment list.

Initially the cards should be held in both hands at the bottom of the card, with the first card to be displayed facing the floor. When the performer is required to ‘play’ the card they should tilt the cards up so that the bottom card is facing the audience. When not required to ‘play’, the player should return to the previous neutral position with the cards held horizontally and take the bottom card (just displayed) and place it on the top of the pile. This motion should be as ‘crisp’ and defined as possible, but not too mechanical like an automaton. The players should try not to look down at the cards, but keep their eye contact with the audience as much as possible.
Semaphore

The player should adopt a neutral, but comfortable standing position with their arms by their sides. From this position when indicated they should 'play' the semaphore gesture as directed in their part. This position should be held for two seconds before moving on to the next semaphore or returning to the neutral position (indicated by an empty box).

N.B. Players should not use flags. They should have straight arms with the flat of their palms facing the audience.

Words:

When indicated to 'play' words, the player should adopt the same neutral stance that is required for the semaphore (standing position with their arms by their sides). 'On the beat' of the box the player should say the name of the colour or pitch/chord (as indicated in the score in speech marks) in a flat and expressionless monotone with no discernable pitch content whatsoever. It is important that the manner in which the words are spoken is as uniform as possible for the duration of the piece as well as between the five players.

The players should decide in advance if they wish to use all the same language (English, as written; the vernacular of the country in which the piece is being performed; or if the performers all share a common language — that language.) If the ensemble is made up of players with different vernaculars they may chose to all speak their own vernaculars, providing there are more than three different languages being spoken.

Music:

When indicated to play music (by the use of conventional notation in players 1-3, and chord symbols in players 4 and 5), the player should play, and hold for the duration of the box (if possible on that instrument) the specific pitch or chord indicated. It should be played in a neutral (i.e. no vibrato, etc.) timbre that is idiomatic to that instrument. It should be in the comfortable middle range of the instrument, and of a moderate volume (between mezzo-piano and mezzo-forte).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>G.P.</th>
<th>&quot;F Sharp&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;E&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;D&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;Red&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Green&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Blue&quot;</td>
<td>G.P.</td>
<td>(To Instrument)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

//

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;C Sharp&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;B&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;A&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;B&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;C Sharp&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;D&quot;</td>
<td><em>(To Instrument)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;F Sharp&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;E&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;D&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;C Sharp&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;B&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>D</em></td>
<td><em>A7</em></td>
<td><em>Bm7</em></td>
<td><em>F#m7</em></td>
<td><em>G</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;C Sharp&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;D&quot;</td>
<td><em>(Rearrange cards, to Instrument)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Rearrange cards, to Instrument)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>D</em></td>
<td><em>G</em></td>
<td><em>A7</em></td>
<td><em>D</em></td>
<td><em>A7</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bm7</td>
<td>F#m7</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

//

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A7</td>
<td>D + “Red”</td>
<td>A7 + “Blue”</td>
<td>Bm7 + “Indigo”</td>
<td>F#m7 + “Yellow”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

//
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+&quot;G Major&quot;</td>
<td>+&quot;D Major&quot;</td>
<td>+&quot;G Major&quot;</td>
<td>+&quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>+&quot;D Major&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>(To Instrument)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>G + &quot;Green&quot;</td>
<td>D + &quot;Red&quot;</td>
<td>G + &quot;Green&quot;</td>
<td>A7 + &quot;Blue&quot;</td>
<td>D + &quot;D Major&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Rearrange cards)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>\text{A}^7 + \text{&quot;A Seven&quot;}</td>
<td>\text{D} + \text{&quot;D Major&quot;}</td>
<td>\text{A} + \text{&quot;A Seven&quot;}</td>
<td>\text{Bm7} + \text{&quot;B Minor Seven&quot;}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>\text{Fm7} + \text{&quot;F Sharp Minor Seven&quot;}</td>
<td>\text{G} + \text{&quot;G Major&quot;}</td>
<td>\text{D} + \text{&quot;D Major&quot;}</td>
<td>\text{G} + \text{&quot;G Major&quot;}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

//

1

2

3

4

5

\text{``all stand to one another''}

\text{``which holds between''}

\text{``the score''}

\text{``all stand to one another''}

\text{``The gramophone record''}

\text{``The gramophone record''}

\text{``which holds between''}

\text{``all stand to one another''}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>+ &quot;The gramophone record&quot;</th>
<th>+ &quot;language and the world&quot;</th>
<th>+ &quot;which holds between&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+ &quot;Red&quot;</td>
<td>+ &quot;Yellow&quot;</td>
<td>+ &quot;Blue&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ &quot;Green&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+ &quot;Yellow&quot;</td>
<td>+ &quot;Red&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 A7 + "A Major Seven" D A7 Bm7

5 + "In that pictorial internal relation" + "The gramophone record" + "In that pictorial internal relation" + "which holds between"

1 + "In that pictorial internal relation"

2 + "Yellow" + "Orange" + "Red" + "Indigo"

3 + "Red" + "Blue" + "Green" + "Indigo"

4 F#m7 G D G

5 + "the score" + "all stand to one another" + "all stand to one another"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>+ &quot;which holds between&quot;</th>
<th>+ &quot;In that pictorial internal relation&quot;</th>
<th>+ &quot;the score&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+ &quot;Blue&quot;</td>
<td>+ &quot;Green&quot;</td>
<td>+ &quot;The gramophone record&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ &quot;the score&quot;</td>
<td>+ &quot;The musical thought&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ &quot;language and the world&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ &quot;The gramophone record&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ &quot;the score&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+ &quot;In that pictorial internal relation&quot;</td>
<td>+ &quot;The gramophone record&quot;</td>
<td>(Instrument down)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ &quot;which holds between&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

//
language and the world

In that pictorial internal relation

The gramophone record

In that pictorial internal relation

which holds between

the score

all stand to one another
Serenade
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For Saxophone Quartet

Alexander Glyde-Bates
Performance Directions:

Extended Techniques:

*Serenade* does not make use of techniques that are not part of modern saxophone practice.

Multiphonics:

The multiphonics in the soprano saxophone from bars 70-73 part are taken from the first performance of *Serenade*. If this multiphonic can not be played by a performer they may substitute in another based on the same fundamental pitch as long as it is has a loud, abrasive quality. Equally, an abrasive growl (see below) can equally be substituted.

'Growl':

The player should vocalize into the instrument to create a 'growling' sound. For the most part these grows should be as loud and abrasive as possible, however, at bar 188 the baritone saxophone is required to play a softer growl.

Slap-Tongue:

Slap-tonguing is indicated by a cross-notehead:

\[ \text{Slap-tongue symbol} \]

Quartertones:

All quartertones in *Serenade* are approximate, and should be seen as an expressive deformation of line or pitch rather than as a definite pitch. Those that are approached by glissando should be considered as a bending of pitch rather than a discrete pitch of its own.

Harmonics

Harmonics are indicated by a small circle above the notehead:

\[ \text{Harmonic symbol} \]

The notated pitch corresponds to the desired sounding pitch (after transposition). The exact means of producing the pitch are left to the discretion of the individual performers. If a performer finds that they are unable to cleanly produce the specified harmonic, a conventional note at the same pitch may be played but the tone quality should be as close to that of a harmonic as possible.

The score is transposed.
Serenade

Allegro $J = 140$

Soprano Saxophone

Alto Saxophone

Tenor Saxophone

Baritone Saxophone
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Snare Dance
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For Speaking Percussionist

Alexander Glyde-Bates
**Snare Dance — Performance Directions**

**Instrumentation:**
- One Snare Drum
- Mounted Castanets
- (Optional) Headset microphone, or freestanding microphone, to amplify the performer’s voice and vocalisations

**Layout:**
The player should stand in front of the snare drum with their feet close together (as in the START position, below, in the Rumba diagram). The mounted castanets should be next to/above the snare drum at a position of the player’s convenience. If using a freestanding microphone it should be positioned to the player’s right-hand side so as to not obscure the player from the audience or to obstruct the player’s movement.

**Voice:**
Cross noteheads indicate the text written above should be spoken in a plain, unaffected manner.

Triangular noteheads indicate the player should articulate the given rhythm by forcing/clicking the tip of the tongue against the roof of the mouth either at the front, just behind the teeth (‘t’), or, the back of the tongue against the back of the roof of the mouth (‘k’). This is an over-exaggerated form of double/triple-tonguing used by brass players. If the player cannot perform this cleanly, another ‘beat-boxing’, or similar, substitute can be used.

Pitched, ‘conventional’, noteheads indicate that notes should be ‘sung’ in an absent-minded, almost amateurish manner. Phrase marks indicate phrasing, not a legato style. The individual notes should be articulated by freely using ‘da, dee, dum, etc.’. The effect should be of ‘singing in the shower’.

**Movement:**
The diagram below shows the basic steps for a rumba. Each individual movement is allocated a number and arrow that shows the sequence and direction in which they should nominally be completed. The player should complete each step without taking their foot from the floor — the performer should shift their weight off the foot to be moved and slide the foot to the next position while keeping the ball of the foot just touching the floor (or just above, if the surface of the floor does not allow for a sliding motion).

A number and an arrow underneath a note that indicates: the specific movement to be completed; the direction (forward or backward through the motion in the diagram); and the duration, with which the specified movement should be completed.

The distance of the steps should be large enough that it is clearly visible to the audience that they are discrete and deliberate movements of the player. However, the movements should not be so large that they cause problems for the player in terms of either playing the snare drum or the castanets, or their balance in general.
Snare Dance

Andante ma sempre meccanico \( \text{\textit{q}=72} \)

The snare drum starts at \( \text{pp} \) and should gradually crescendo through to \( \text{ff} \) at Fig. 4.

The castanets should stay at an even \( \text{sf} \) up to Fig. 4.

It comprises three beginnings.

Copyright © Alexander Glyde-Bates 2005
G.P. — Hold playing position, for 5”, then slowly move into the Bien Parado position. Hold position for 10”. Move back slowly into playing position and continue to play.

Voice Cast. S.D. Move.

A Tempo \( \text{q} = 72 \)

Vocal Parts

and

and sometimes

Voice Cast. S.D. Move.

Voice Cast. S.D. Move.

Voice Cast. S.D. Move.

Voice Cast. S.D. Move.

G.P. — Hold playing position for 5 seconds, then continue to play.
Half Tempo $\frac{1}{2} = 36$

A Tempo $\frac{1}{2} = 72$

Voice Cast. S.D. Move.

Voice Cast. S.D. Move.

Voice Cast. S.D. Move.

Voice Cast. S.D. Move.

G.P. — Hold playing position for 5 seconds, then continue to play.

G.P. — Hold playing position for 5 seconds, then continue to play.

G.P. — Speak the text, then hold the Bien Parado position for a further ten seconds before moving to the playing position.

G.P. — Speak the text, then hold the Bien Parado position for a further ten seconds before moving to the playing position.

Speak the text, then hold the Bien Parado position for a further ten seconds before moving to the playing position.
G.P. — Speak: 'The bolero is in moderate tempo and triple metre.'

G.P. — Speak: 'It comprises three equal sections...'

G.P. — Speak: '...each beginning with a paseo.'
Evenly, but naturally, speak the text while repeating the snare drum ostinato. On the final repetition (when the text is finished) play the crescendo and the final bar.

'Ravel's Bolero, initially conceived under the title *Fandango*, employs a consistently moderate and uniform tempo, as much in its melody and harmony as in its recurrent underlying rhythm, which suggests a fleeting relationship with the traditional dance.'
Re: Mozart

Volume 5 of 7

For Two Wind Quintets and Obbligato Piano

Alexander Glyde-Bates
Re: Mozart was commissioned by the University of Southampton Music Department as part of their *Mozart ReMix Festival, 20-23 November 2015*. The University of Southampton Woodwinds performed the piece twice over the course of the festival with soloist, Edward Pick, on piano.

**Performance Directions:**

**Instrumentation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quintet 1:</th>
<th>Quintet 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flute (Doubling Piccolo)</td>
<td>Flute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboe</td>
<td>Oboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor Anglais</td>
<td>Basset Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinet in Bb</td>
<td>Clarinet in Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassoon</td>
<td>Bassoon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cor Anglais and the Basset Horn can be replaced by French Horns if necessary.
Mechanical, as fast as possible, and without any damper pedal.
moito rall., .......................... ..........................

moito rall., .......................... ..........................

lunga
Andante cantabile con molto rubato,

quasi senza misura \( \left( \frac{3}{4} \right) \)

Play part freely as you wish. Do not attempt to synchronize your part with others. Hold the notes on the final pause until the other two players have reached their final note.

Your part freely as you wish. Do not attempt to synchronize your part with others. Hold the notes on the final pause until the other two players have reached their final note.

Your part freely as you wish. Do not attempt to synchronize your part with others. Hold the notes on the final pause until the other two players have reached their final note.

Your part freely as you wish. Do not attempt to synchronize your part with others. Hold the notes on the final pause until the other two players have reached their final note.

Your part freely as you wish. Do not attempt to synchronize your part with others. Hold the notes on the final pause until the other two players have reached their final note.

Your part freely as you wish. Do not attempt to synchronize your part with others. Hold the notes on the final pause until the other two players have reached their final note.

Your part freely as you wish. Do not attempt to synchronize your part with others. Hold the notes on the final pause until the other two players have reached their final note.

Your part freely as you wish. Do not attempt to synchronize your part with others. Hold the notes on the final pause until the other two players have reached their final note.

Your part freely as you wish. Do not attempt to synchronize your part with others. Hold the notes on the final pause until the other two players have reached their final note.

Your part freely as you wish. Do not attempt to synchronize your part with others. Hold the notes on the final pause until the other two players have reached their final note.
Andante cantible
con molto rubato

\( q = 72 \)
molto rall.  molto accel.  molto rall.  molto accel.  molto rall.  molto accel.  A tempo (r+75)
molto accel.    molto rall.    molto accel.    molto accel.    A tempo (r = 72)

A tempo (r = 72)
\[11\text{ Allegro} = 104\]
Subito a tempo (q = 70)

Fl. 1

Ob. 1

C. A.

Cl.

Bsn. 1

Pno.

Fl. 2

Ob. 2

B. Hn.

Cl. 2

Bsn. 2

Subito a tempo (q = 70)
Andante cantabile
con molto rubato (4 - 79)

Allegro \( \times 104 \)
molto rall. . . . . . . . . . . . . molto accel. . . . . . A tempo (L = 70)

Fl. 1

Ob. 1

C. A.

Cl.

Bsn. 1

Pno.

Fl. 2

Ob. 2
Andante cantabile
con molto rubato (\textit{\textbf{c} = 72})
Mechanical, as fast as possible, and without any damper pedal.
Mechanically, as fast as possible, and without any damper pedal.
Mechanical, as fast as possible, and without use slapper pedal.
the other two players have reached their final notes.

Play part freely as you wish. Do not attempt to synchronize your part with others. Hold the note on the final pause until the other two players have reached their final notes.
Popular-Classic
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For Piano, Electric Guitar and Drum Kit

Alexander Glyde-Bates
Popular-Classic: Performance Directions

**Equipment:**

Grand Piano

Electric Guitar:

  - With tremolo bar
  - Wah-Wah pedal
  - Distortion pedal (or series of pedals) that creates an excessive amount of distortion
  - Volume pedal
  - A guitar stand positioned, and facing, directly in front of the amp.

Drum Kit:

  - Crash Cymbal, Ride Cymbal, Hi Hat, Kick Drum with Double Pedal, Snare Drum, and High, Medium and Low Floor Toms.

**Key:**

A ‘cello, or double bass, bow

Unless otherwise specified, the hi-hat should be closed throughout.
Performance Directions:

Rubato is an important aspect of Popular-Classic, and its usage varies in each of three movements.

Movement I:
In the first movement the piano should play Für Elise with an excessive amount of soloistic rubato. The pianist should play with a little-to-no regard for the other two parts, which should endeavor to follow the pianist alone (i.e. not each other) as closely as possible.

Movement II:
The kit and guitarist should lead this movement, and should play with a light, casual fell that only has a hint of tasteful rubato that is appropriate to the Bossa style. The pianist should follow the other two parts as closely as possible.

Movement III:
In the third movement the pianist should aim to replicate their use of rubato in the first movement, and likewise the other two parts should follow the piano. Further to its use in Movement I, the pianist should also rubato in order to try and play all the written notes — tempo should be considered flexible so as to articulate all the written material.

Individual Performer Directions:
Piano:
Pedaling:
All pedaling has been specified. In the first movement this should mean that the Für Elise is pedaled stylistically. In the final two movements the pedaling should be at times stylistic, at others un-stylistic. The directions written should be followed precisely, regardless of how

Dynamics:
In Movements I and III dynamics should start pianissimo as the original Für Elise does, but they should change to reflect the performer’s use of excessive and caricature-like rubato, phrasing and expression. In Movement II, the pianist should match the other two players in their pppp.

Guitar:
Dynamics:
In the first movement dynamics are 'terraced'. Where this is not practically possible the absolute, written volumes are more important than the suddenness of the change, which should still be as quick as possible.

Kit:
Dynamics:
In the first movement dynamics are 'terraced'. Where this is not practically possible the absolute, written volumes are more important than the suddenness of the change, which should still be as quick as possible.

Unless otherwise specified, the hi hat should be closed throughout.
Play with a level of soloistic rubato and dynamics beyond the obscenely indulgent. Make no concessions to the other two performers.

Follow the pianist's rubato as closely as possible. Do not attempt to actively synchronize with the drum kit.

Follow the pianist's rubato as closely as possible. Do not attempt to actively synchronize with the guitar.
Movement II

Poco moto senza rubato \( \frac{1}{2} = 132 \)

Play with a light, casual feel that only has a hint of stylistic rubato.
Follow the Guitar and Kit's tempo meticulously.

Pno.

sempre PPP

E. Gtr.

Dr.
Bridge

Distortion on for the remainder of the piece.

Stabilise the cymbal by firmly pressing down with the finger tips around the bell, then take a Cello bow and vigorously scrub the edge of the cymbal with the bow at a perpendicular angle.
Movement III

Poco moto con molto rubato $\lambda = 132$

Try to replicate the rubato and dynamics used in Movement I, but also make use of it to try and fit in as many of the notes as possible.

Walk over to the amp and quietly turn the amp off. Place the guitar — pick-ups facing the amp — on the prepared guitar stand. Turn the amp down to silent. Using both the volume on the amp and if necessary also the volume pedal of the guitar control the volume of the feedback as indicated in Movement III. At the end the feedback should be painfully loud to the point it is unbearable.

Signal the other two players when you are ready to commence Movement III.
Mahlerstück
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For Conductor, Tape and Small Ensemble

Alexander Glyde-Bates
Stage Layout

The players should be sat in their conventional orchestral positions.

The timpanist and tuba player should sit as they would normally. The flautist and bassoonist should sit in the position of the second players, whilst the violin should sit as if in the back desk of the seconds, and the violist should sit as if in the back desk of the violas.

The rest of the performance space should be empty space except for the conductor's podium (which should also be placed conventionally) and two loudspeakers.

An extra chair will be needed to be placed next to the flute, tuba, violin and viola players.

The diagram below offers an example of the layout, but this may need adapting depending on the specific performance venue and the orchestral customs of the location of performance.
Performance Directions

General Directions:

Spoken Text: Text that is indicated to be spoken (by the text in speech marks and cross noteheads) should be spoken in a clear, unaffected and unpitched manner. It is important that it is sufficiently projected over the tape part, but shouldn’t sound strained or forced like a shout.

Walking: Several of the live performers parts are required to walk between other player’s locations during the piece. The time allowed within the score should be sufficient, however, this will obviously depend on the size and layout of the specific performance space. Certain adaptations to the score may have to be made in the few situations were this problem should arise.

Singing/Humming: All those sections that are sung should be done so in a rough and untrained fashion. The singing should deliberately sound amateurish and under practiced. Where indicated, players should only hum if all the players are able to project the hum over and above the tape part. If they are not they should sing the notated music wordlessly, but in the same manner as those sung sections with given text. It is important that all players hum, or all sing. There should not be a mixture of different types of production.

Dynamics: To a certain extent the dynamics indicated within the score should be seen as being indicative or relative. At all times the live players should either be heard above, or in balance with, the tape part.

Line: When a thick black line is present across a stave, this indicates that the action specified should be continued until the line stops.
Specific Directions:

Tuba:

- **Flute Part**: The tuba player should photocopy page four of their part, and place the copy — up-side down — on the flautist’s stand. When the player walks over to the vacant seat next to the flautist they should turn this page the correct way up, so that they can play it. However, the effect to the audience should be that of turning a page of the flautist’s music up-side down.

Timpani:

- **Computer Game**: The performer should find a computer game for a smartphone or a tablet. The game needs to be clearly audible above the tape, and therefore it will almost certainly be necessary for the device to be connected to a small amp hidden behind one of the timpani. It is important that the amp be obscured from the audience as much as possible. The specific game needs to be one where the sound effects of the game are more prominent than any music, for this reason an iconic game such as Tetris or Space Invaders would be ideal.
- **Tuning**: When indicated to re-tune the timpani, without regard to being in the middle of the concert, the timpanist should tune the timpani loudly, just as if it was before the concert had started and the concert hall was empty. Here, no attempt at subtlety should be made whatsoever.

Conductor:

- The conductor has two types of spoken material that should be delineated in slightly different ways. Those spoken cues that are just the names of instruments should be spoken just as the live performers speak, in a clear, unaffected and unpitched manner. However, it should be louder as the effect should be that of the conductor giving a direction or order to the performer to start playing, rather than simply making a statement as the live performers do when speaking. The second type, those words derived from the Bernstein sample (‘Louder’, ‘good’ and ‘sing along’) need to be full-throated exclamations, just like Bernstein’s delivery.
- From Fig. 5 the conductor is required to conduct the empty space as if he was conducting the players on the tape. For this section a short score with cues has been written out, but the conductor should feel free — in fact, is actually encouraged — to derive a set of cue and gestures that they would perform if they were actually conducting the Mahler with a real full orchestra.

The Tape:

- The tape part has a click track. Due to the slow tempo of the piece, and the exaggerated use of rubato in the original sample the click track should be considered a means of a metric scaffold, or synchronisation, rather than as a final arbiter of an exact tempo.
Speak the text in a clear, unaffected, and unpitched manner.

Start conducting the imaginary players of the tape orchestra.
Use the cues as a guide but try to make the gestures as 'natural' as possible.

A tempo \( \text{\( \mathcal{L} \) = 60} \)

Time

\[ 4^\text{40}^\text{\textdegree} \]
Gradually de-tune the instrument when indicated by pulling the head joint out slightly then playing as written. It is important that you do not try and 'correct' for the intonation 'problem'.
Speak the text in a clear, unaffected and pitchless manner at the same time as playing.
Pull the head joint out further.

Pull the head joint out further.

Pull the head joint out further.
Pull the head joint so that it is as far out as possible and yet still be played comfortably.
Try to bend the note as close to the correct tuning as possible. But DO NOT adjust the head joint until you are told to do so.
Loudly retune the instrument (in complete disregard to the fact that you are in the middle of a concert) to A1/4 and D1/4 and then pick up your smart phone or tablet and start playing the game.
Fl.
Bsn.
Tba.
Timp.
Vln.
Vla.
Time
Cond.
Tape

22

98

pp

11
98
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Bring off the tape, glare at the timpanist, tapping your baton against the music stand until the 'Nokia Theme' comes in.

Keep playing game until you hear the 'Nokia ring tone', then put the game down and take up your timp sticks.

After 'Nokia Theme' there are 4 clicks before the tape part resumes. Cue the Timps.
Fl. A tempo (q = 60)

Timp.

Vln.

Vla.

Keep basic time, cue live performers's entries.

Cond.

Hym if able to project over the tape otherwise wordlessly sing.

Start of canonic entries to tape.
Sing with a rough 'rustic' quality
Fl.

Son nez- les ma tîn-es! din, dan, don. Frè re Ja- cques, Frè re Ja- cques,

Ben.

Tima.

Vln.

Timp.

Vla.

Time

Cond.

Tape

Son-nez les ma-ti-nes! Son-nez les ma-ti-nes!
Fl.

Son-nez les ma-tin- es!

Son-nez les ma-tin- es!

din, dan, don.
din, dan, don.

Ben.

Tba.

Timp.

Vln.

Vla.

Time

Cond.

Tape din, dan, don.

Re-tune to D and A, obnoxiously loudly as with no regard for the fact you are in the middle of a concert

A tempo \( q = 60 \)

ppp

\( q = 60 \)
Walk to Flute, pretend to turn her music upside down.

Track 1 continues quietly until it finishes at Fig. 21.
Speak the text in a clear, unaffected and pitchless manner at the same time as playing.
23

Fl. poco rit. . . . . . . . . . . A tempo (q = 60)

Bsn. poco rit. . . . . . . . . . . A tempo (q = 60)

Tba. poco rit. . . . . . . . . . . A tempo (q = 60)

Timp. poco rit. . . . . . . . . . . A tempo (q = 60)

Vln. poco rit. . . . . . . . . . . A tempo (q = 60)

Vla. poco rit. . . . . . . . . . . A tempo (q = 60)

Time poco rit. . . . . . . . . . . A tempo (q = 60)

Cond. poco rit. . . . . . . . . . . A tempo (q = 60)

Speak the text in a clear, unaffected and pitchless manner at the same time as playing.

Repeat ad lib.

Keep time meticulously and mechanically. Shout out the cues labelled.

Looping

poco rit. . . . . . . . . . . A tempo (q = 60)
Count rests aloud in a clear, unaffected and unpitched manner.
29 A tempo (\(q = 60\))

Cond.

"LOUDER!"

Time

Original track intercut with new samples. Mahler continues on throughout underneath.
Fl. 299
Bsn. 31
Tba. 32
Timp. 32
Vln. 32
Vla. 32
Time
Cond.
Tape

'LOUDER!' 'LOUDER!' 'LOUDER!' 'Good!' 'Good!'

Fl. 264
Bsn.
Tba.
Timp.
Vln.
Vla.
Time
Cond.
Tape

'din, dan, don.'

'Good!' 'Sing along!'

Retune to D and A

Continue to conduct dispassionately.

LOUDER!
LOUDER!
LOUDER!
GOOD!
GOOD!

Retune to G and A