

105

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

184

112

S1
 S2
 A1
 A2
 A3
 A4
 T1
 T2
 Bari 1
 Bari 2
 Bass 1
 Bass 2

Musical score for measures 112-115. The score includes vocal parts (S1, S2, A1, A2, A3, A4, T1, T2, Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, Bass 2) and piano accompaniment. The key signature is one sharp (F#). The tempo is marked 'Allegro'. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings (f, p).

118

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

The musical score is written for 12 parts: Soprano 1 (S1), Soprano 2 (S2), Alto 1 (A1), Alto 2 (A2), Alto 3 (A3), Alto 4 (A4), Tenor 1 (T1), Tenor 2 (T2), Baritone 1 (Bari 1), Baritone 2 (Bari 2), Bass 1, and Bass 2. The music is in 4/4 time. Measures 118-121 show a complex vocal arrangement. Measures 118-120 feature vocal lines with triplets and dynamics like *mp* and *f*. Measure 121 is a full orchestral measure with various dynamics including *f*, *mf*, and *fz*. The score includes many slurs, ties, and articulation marks.

124

S 1 *mf*

S 2 *mf*

A 1 *mf*

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1 *mf*

Bari 2 *mf*

Bass 1 *mf*

Bass 2 *mf*

187

This musical score page contains ten staves, each representing a different instrument or voice part. The staves are labeled on the left as S 1, S 2, A 1, A 2, A 3, A 4, T 1, T 2, Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, and Bass 2. The music is written in a system with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a common time signature (C). The notation includes various note values (quarter, eighth, and sixteenth notes), rests, and dynamic markings such as *mf* (mezzo-forte). The score is divided into measures by vertical bar lines. The first measure is numbered 124 at the top right, and the last measure is numbered 187 at the bottom right. The music for S 1, S 2, A 1, and A 2 includes melodic lines with some grace notes. A 3 and A 4 have more complex rhythmic patterns. T 1 and T 2 have simpler, more rhythmic parts. The baritone (Bari) and bass (Bass) parts are primarily composed of eighth and sixteenth notes, often with grace notes, and some parts include slurs.

129

 $\text{♩} = 200$
like busy bullfrogs

129

$\text{♩} = 200$
like busy bullfrogs

S 1 *f* 3 *mp*

S 2 *f* 3 *du*

A 1 *f* 3 *du*

A 2 *f* 3 *du*

A 3 *f* 3 *du*

A 4 *f* 3 *du*

T 1 *f* 3 *du*

T 2 *f* 3 *du*

Bari 1 *mp*

Bari 2 *mp*

Bass 1 *mp*

Bass 2 *du*

Score for voices and instruments, measures 135 to 189.

Parts included:

- S 1 (Soprano 1)
- S 2 (Soprano 2)
- A 1 (Alto 1)
- A 2 (Alto 2)
- A 3 (Alto 3)
- A 4 (Alto 4)
- T 1 (Tenor 1)
- T 2 (Tenor 2)
- Bari 1 (Baritone 1)
- Bari 2 (Baritone 2)
- Bass 1 (Bass 1)
- Bass 2 (Bass 2)

The score is written in 4/4 time. The key signature has one sharp (F#). The dynamics *mf* (mezzo-forte) are indicated for the vocal parts. The instrumental parts feature various chords and melodic lines, with some parts marked with accents (>) and slurs.

141

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

147

S1
 S2
 A1
 A2
 A3
 A4
 T1
 T2
 Bari 1
 Bari 2
 Bass 1
 Bass 2

154

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

192

[illegible]

168

S 1
A 1
A 2
A 3
A 4
T 1
T 2
Bari 1
Bari 2
Bass 1
Bass 2

fu - du -

$\text{♩} = 208$
like flirting bullfrogs

174

S1 *f* *p* *mf* *p*

S2 *f* *p* *mf* *p*

A1 *f* *p* *mf* *p*

A2 *f* *p* *mf* *p*

A3 *f* *mf*

A4 *f* *mf*

T1 *f* *mf* *f* *p*

T2 *f* *mf* *f* *p*

Bari 1 *f* *p* *mf* *p*

Bari 2 *f* *p* *mf* *p*

Bass 1 *f* *p* *mf* *p*

Bass 2 *f* *p* *mf* *p*

184

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

196

This musical score page contains measures 184 through 196. It features ten staves, each representing a different vocal or instrumental part: Soprano 1 (S 1), Soprano 2 (S 2), Alto 1 (A 1), Alto 2 (A 2), Alto 3 (A 3), Alto 4 (A 4), Tenor 1 (T 1), Tenor 2 (T 2), Baritone 1 (Bari 1), Baritone 2 (Bari 2), Bass 1, and Bass 2. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, slurs, and dynamic markings. Dynamics like *f* (forte) and *p* (piano) are used to indicate volume changes. Accents (>) are placed over many notes to emphasize them. Phrasing slurs are used to group notes into single musical phrases. The key signature has one flat (B-flat), and the time signature is 4/4. The page number 196 is located at the bottom left.

192 Lyrical

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

The musical score is written for 12 parts: Soprano 1 (S 1), Soprano 2 (S 2), Alto 1 (A 1), Alto 2 (A 2), Alto 3 (A 3), Alto 4 (A 4), Tenor 1 (T 1), Tenor 2 (T 2), Baritone 1 (Bari 1), Baritone 2 (Bari 2), Bass 1, and Bass 2. The score is in 4/4 time and features a key signature of one flat (B-flat). The tempo and mood are indicated as 'Lyrical'. The score begins at measure 192 and ends at measure 197. The vocal parts (S 1, S 2, A 1, A 2, A 3, A 4, T 1, T 2) have lyrics written below them. The instrumental parts (Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, Bass 2) are written in bass clef. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings (p for piano).

199

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

p *f* *mf* *p* *f* *mf* *p* *f* *mf* *p* *f* *mf*

204

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

This musical score page contains measures 204 through 207. The notation is arranged in a system with 11 staves. The vocal parts (S1, S2, A1, A2, A3, A4, T1, T2) are written in treble clef with a key signature of two flats (B-flat and E-flat). The instrumental parts (Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, Bass 2) are written in bass clef with the same key signature. The time signature is 4/4. The score shows a complex arrangement with many notes, rests, and ties across the measures. The vocal parts have various melodic lines, while the instrumental parts provide harmonic support. The page number 204 is located at the top right of the system.

209

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

mf

mf

221

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

p

f

p

f

p

f

p

f

p

f

p

f

S 1
 S 2
 A 1
 A 2
 A 3
 A 4
 T 1
 T 2
 Bar 1
 Bar 2
 Bass 1
 Bass 2

Musical score for page 229, measures 203-205. The score is for a 12-part ensemble: Soprano 1, Soprano 2, Alto 1, Alto 2, Alto 3, Alto 4, Tenor 1, Tenor 2, Baritone 1, Baritone 2, Bass 1, and Bass 2. The music is in 4/4 time with a key signature of one sharp (F#). Measures 203-205 show vocal entries and accompaniment. Soprano 1 enters in measure 203 with a half note G4. Soprano 2 enters in measure 204 with a half note G4. Alto 1, Alto 2, Alto 3, and Alto 4 enter in measure 205 with half notes. Tenor 1 and Tenor 2 enter in measure 203 with half notes. Baritone 1 and Baritone 2 enter in measure 204 with half notes. Bass 1 and Bass 2 enter in measure 205 with half notes. Dynamics include accents (>) and mezzo-piano (mp).

239

$J = 175$
like slightly tired bullfrogs

259

like slightly tired bullfrogs

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

204

[illegible]

S1
 S2
 A1
 A2
 A3
 A4
 T1
 T2
 Bari 1
 Bari 2
 Bass 1
 Bass 2

Musical score for measures 255 and 256. The score is written for ten parts: S1, S2, A1, A2, A3, A4, T1, T2, Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, and Bass 2. The key signature has one sharp (F#) and the time signature is 4/4. Measures 255 and 256 are shown. In measure 255, S1, S2, A1, A2, A3, A4, T1, T2, and Bass 1 have rests, while Bari 1 and Bass 2 play eighth notes. In measure 256, all parts play. S1, S2, A1, A2, A3, A4, T1, T2, and Bass 1 play eighth notes, while Bari 1 and Bass 2 play half notes. Dynamics include 'f' (forte) and 'fz' (forzando).

262

 $\text{♩} = 220$

262

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

267

207

269 $\text{♩} = 175$
like fighting bullfrogs

208

209

273

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

209

278

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

210

This musical score is for a 12-part ensemble, consisting of Soprano 1 (S1), Soprano 2 (S2), Alto 1 (A1), Alto 2 (A2), Alto 3 (A3), Alto 4 (A4), Tenor 1 (T1), Tenor 2 (T2), Baritone 1 (Bari 1), Baritone 2 (Bari 2), Bass 1, and Bass 2. The score covers measures 278 through 281. The key signature has one sharp (F#), and the time signature is 4/4. The music is written in a grand staff format with 12 staves. Measures 278 and 279 feature a complex rhythmic pattern with triplets and sixteenth notes, often beamed in groups of three. Measure 280 continues this pattern, while measure 281 shows a transition with more sustained notes and some rests. The dynamics are marked with *ff* (fortissimo) in measures 278 and 279, and *f* (forte) in measure 280. The score includes various musical notations such as slurs, ties, and accents.

282

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

211

The musical score is arranged in two systems. The first system, labeled '282' at the top right, contains staves for S 1, S 2, A 1, A 2, A 3, A 4, T 1, T 2, Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, and Bass 2. The second system, labeled '211' at the bottom right, contains staves for the same voices. The notation includes various musical symbols: treble and bass clefs, key signatures (one sharp for Soprano and Alto, one flat for Tenor and Bass), time signatures (4/4 and 3/4), and dynamic markings (mf, mp, cresc). Rhythmic patterns are indicated by note values, slurs, and triplet markings (3). The score is written for a large ensemble, with each voice part having its own staff.

Score for 10 voices and 2 basses, measures 286-291.

Voices: S 1, S 2, A 1, A 2, A 3, A 4, T 1, T 2, Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, Bass 2.

Measures 286-291 show a complex musical arrangement with various vocal parts. The notation includes treble and bass staves, clefs, and musical notes. The key signature is one sharp (F#). The time signature is 4/4. The score features a variety of musical techniques, including triplets, slurs, and dynamic markings such as *mf* (mezzo-forte) and *f* (forte).

Measures 286-291 show a complex musical arrangement with various vocal parts. The notation includes treble and bass staves, clefs, and musical notes. The key signature is one sharp (F#). The time signature is 4/4. The score features a variety of musical techniques, including triplets, slurs, and dynamic markings such as *mf* (mezzo-forte) and *f* (forte).

[illegible]

296

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

214

300

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

The musical score is written for 10 voices: Soprano 1 (S1), Soprano 2 (S2), Alto 1 (A1), Alto 2 (A2), Alto 3 (A3), Alto 4 (A4), Tenor 1 (T1), Tenor 2 (T2), Baritone 1 (Bari 1), Baritone 2 (Bari 2), Bass 1, and Bass 2. The time signature is 4/4. The key signature has one sharp (F#). The score is divided into two systems. The first system ends at measure 300, and the second system starts at measure 215. The music features complex rhythmic patterns, including triplets and accents. The vocal parts are arranged in a choir-like fashion, with each voice part having its own staff. The score is written in a standard musical notation style, with notes, rests, and other musical symbols clearly visible.

305

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

mf

f

mf

f

mf

f

mf

f

mf

f

mf

f

[illegible]

334

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

220

This musical score page, numbered 334, features ten staves for different vocal parts: Soprano 1 (S1), Soprano 2 (S2), Alto 1 (A1), Alto 2 (A2), Alto 3 (A3), Alto 4 (A4), Tenor 1 (T1), Tenor 2 (T2), Baritone 1 (Bari 1), Baritone 2 (Bari 2), Bass 1, and Bass 2. The music is written in a common time signature and includes a key signature with one sharp (F#). The notation is characterized by frequent triplet markings (indicated by a '3' over a bracket) and accents (marked with a wedge symbol). The parts are arranged in a choir-like fashion, with S1 and S2 at the top and Bass 1 and Bass 2 at the bottom. The score concludes on page 220.

339

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

$\text{♩} = 160$ or as fast as possible
like bullfrogs on 'speed'

345

A musical score for a 10-part ensemble, consisting of Soprano 1 (S1), Soprano 2 (S2), Alto 1 (A1), Alto 2 (A2), Alto 3 (A3), Alto 4 (A4), Tenor 1 (T1), Tenor 2 (T2), Bass 1 (Bass 1), and Bass 2 (Bass 2). The score is written in a single system with ten staves. The key signature has one sharp (F#) and the time signature is common time (C). The tempo/mood is indicated as $\text{♩} = 160$ or as fast as possible, with the instruction 'like bullfrogs on 'speed''. The score begins at measure 345. The vocal parts (S1, S2, A1, A2, A3, A4, T1, T2, Bass 1, Bass 2) all have rests in the first measure. In the second measure, all vocal parts enter with a half note, followed by a series of eighth and sixteenth notes, some beamed together. The instrumental parts (S1, S2, A1, A2, A3, A4, T1, T2, Bass 1, Bass 2) have rests in the first measure. In the second measure, the instrumental parts enter with a half note, followed by a series of eighth and sixteenth notes, some beamed together. The score continues with various musical notations, including rests, notes, and beams, across the system.

347

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

ff

ff

ff

ff

ff

ff

ff

ff

ff

ff

ff

ff

349

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

ff

ff

ff

ff

352

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

225

354

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

This musical score is for a 12-part choir, with parts labeled S 1, S 2, A 1, A 2, A 3, A 4, T 1, T 2, Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, and Bass 2. The score covers measures 354 and 355. Measures 354 and 355 are marked with a '354' at the beginning of the first staff. The notation is in treble and bass clefs, with various accidentals (sharps, flats, naturals) and slurs indicating phrasing. The parts are arranged in a standard choir layout, with Soprano (S) at the top, followed by Alto (A), Tenor (T), Baritone (Bari), and Bass (Bass) at the bottom. The score is written on a grand staff with 12 staves.

356

356

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

357

Score for 11 parts: S1, S2, A1, A2, A3, A4, T1, T2, Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, Bass 2.

The score is written in 4/4 time. The key signature has one sharp (F#). The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and slurs.

Measure 228 is indicated at the bottom left.

Detailed description of the score: The score is a page from a musical manuscript, page 358. It contains 11 staves, each labeled with a part name: S1, S2, A1, A2, A3, A4, T1, T2, Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, and Bass 2. The music is written in 4/4 time and has a key signature of one sharp (F#). The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and slurs. The score is divided into measures by vertical bar lines. The first measure shown is measure 228, as indicated by the page number at the bottom left. The parts S1, S2, A1, A2, A3, and A4 are primarily vocal or instrumental parts with melodic lines. The parts T1 and T2 are likely tenor parts. The parts Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, and Bass 2 are likely baritone and bass parts. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and slurs. The score is written in a standard musical notation style.

361

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

229

Duodectet II

Clare Loveday

$\text{♩} = 190$

lyrical

Soprano Sax 1

Soprano Sax 2

Alto Sax 1

Alto Sax 2

Alto Sax 3

Alto Sax 4

Tenor Sax 1

Tenor Sax 2

Baritone Sax 1

Baritone Sax 2

Bass Sax 1

Bass Sax 2

6

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

mf

mf

f

3

3

12

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

mp

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

mf

19 strident lyrical

S 1 *mf* + +

S 2 *mf* + +

A 1

A 2

A 3 *mf* *mf*

A 4 *mf*

T 1

T 2 *mf*

Bari 1 *mf*

Bari 2 *mf*

Bass 1 *mf*

Bass 2 *mf* + +

233

24 strident

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

234

30

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

235

37

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

mf

mp

f

mp

mf

mp

f

mp

mf

mp

f

mp

42

Lyrical

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

The musical score is written for measures 42 through 45. It features twelve staves, each representing a different vocal or instrumental part: Soprano 1 (S1), Soprano 2 (S2), Alto 1 (A1), Alto 2 (A2), Alto 3 (A3), Alto 4 (A4), Tenor 1 (T1), Tenor 2 (T2), Baritone 1 (Bari 1), Baritone 2 (Bari 2), Bass 1, and Bass 2. The key signature is one flat (B-flat major or D minor), and the time signature is 8/8. The score includes lyrics for each part, with some parts having multiple lines of lyrics. Dynamic markings such as *f* (forte) and *mf* (mezzo-forte) are used to indicate volume. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, beams, and slurs. The staves are arranged in a single system, with each staff having its own set of clef and key signature markings.

54

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

mf

f

mf

f

mf

f

mf

f

mf

f

mf

f

59

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

The musical score for measures 59-62 is written for a large ensemble. The vocal parts (S1, S2, A1, A2, A3, A4, T1, T2, Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, Bass 2) are arranged in a grand staff. The piano accompaniment is written in a 4/4 time signature. The key signature is one flat (B-flat major or D minor). The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, accidentals, and dynamics (e.g., *f* for fortissimo). The lyrics are written below the vocal staves.

66

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

241

[illegible]

79

$\text{♩} = 72$
gorgeously drunk

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

243

84

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

mp

244

88

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

The musical score for measures 88-90 is written for a large ensemble. The vocal parts (S1, S2, A1, A2, A3, A4, T1, T2) and the instrumental parts (Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, Bass 2) all feature complex rhythmic patterns. The notation includes numerous triplets, slurs, and ties, indicating a highly syncopated and rhythmic piece. The key signature is B-flat major (two flats), and the time signature is 4/4. The score is divided into three measures, with measure 88 starting at the top right and measure 90 at the bottom left. The parts are arranged in a standard orchestral layout, with the vocal parts at the top and the instrumental parts at the bottom.

91

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

94

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

legato

mp

f

mp

f

mp

f

mp

f

mp

f

mp

247

98

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

248

104

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

249

Detailed description: This page contains measures 104 through 109 of a musical score. The score is written for twelve parts: Soprano 1 (S1), Soprano 2 (S2), Alto 1 (A1), Alto 2 (A2), Alto 3 (A3), Alto 4 (A4), Tenor 1 (T1), Tenor 2 (T2), Baritone 1 (Bari 1), Baritone 2 (Bari 2), Bass 1, and Bass 2. The key signature has three flats (B-flat, E-flat, A-flat), and the time signature is 4/4. Measures 104-105 show vocal entries for S1, S2, A1, and A2 with triplet figures. Measures 106-107 feature A3 and A4 with single notes. Measures 108-109 show A2 and A3 with triplet figures. The instrumental parts (Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, Bass 2) feature triplet figures in measures 104-105 and sustained notes in measures 106-109. Dynamics include *mp* (mezzo-piano), *mf* (mezzo-forte), and *p* (piano).

This musical score is for a piece titled "The Rose Tree". It is arranged for vocal soloists and piano accompaniment. The score is written in G major (one sharp) and 4/4 time. The vocal parts include Soprano 1 (S1), Soprano 2 (S2), Alto 1 (A1), Alto 2 (A2), Tenor 1 (T1), Tenor 2 (T2), Bass 1 (Bass 1), and Bass 2 (Bass 2). The piano part is for the right hand (RH) and left hand (LH). The score is divided into four systems, each containing staves for the vocal soloists and the piano accompaniment. The first system shows the vocal soloists entering with a melody, while the piano accompaniment provides a harmonic foundation. The second system continues the vocal melody, with the piano part adding more detail. The third system features a more complex piano accompaniment with triplets and sixteenth notes. The fourth system concludes the piece with a final vocal melody and piano accompaniment. The score includes various musical notations such as treble and bass clefs, key signatures, time signatures, notes, rests, and dynamic markings like *mp* (mezzo-piano).

113

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

251

117

 $\text{♩} = 176$
lyrical

Score for voices and basses, measures 117-120. The score is written for Soprano 1 (S1), Soprano 2 (S2), Alto 1 (A1), Alto 2 (A2), Alto 3 (A3), Alto 4 (A4), Tenor 1 (T1), Tenor 2 (T2), Bass 1 (Bari 1), Bass 2 (Bari 2), and Bass 3 (Bass 2). The key signature is three flats (B-flat, E-flat, A-flat) and the time signature is 4/8. The tempo is marked $\text{♩} = 176$ and the style is "lyrical".

Measures 117-120 show a complex vocal arrangement. Measures 117 and 118 feature triplets in the vocal parts, with Soprano 1 and Soprano 2 having a triplet of eighth notes, and the other parts having a triplet of quarter notes. Measures 119 and 120 feature a triplet of eighth notes in the vocal parts, with Soprano 1 and Soprano 2 having a triplet of eighth notes, and the other parts having a triplet of quarter notes. The bass parts (Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 2) have a triplet of eighth notes in measure 117 and a triplet of quarter notes in measure 118. The bass parts (Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 2) have a triplet of eighth notes in measure 119 and a triplet of quarter notes in measure 120. The bass parts (Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 2) have a triplet of eighth notes in measure 117 and a triplet of quarter notes in measure 118. The bass parts (Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 2) have a triplet of eighth notes in measure 119 and a triplet of quarter notes in measure 120.

Measures 117-120 show a complex vocal arrangement. Measures 117 and 118 feature triplets in the vocal parts, with Soprano 1 and Soprano 2 having a triplet of eighth notes, and the other parts having a triplet of quarter notes. Measures 119 and 120 feature a triplet of eighth notes in the vocal parts, with Soprano 1 and Soprano 2 having a triplet of eighth notes, and the other parts having a triplet of quarter notes. The bass parts (Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 2) have a triplet of eighth notes in measure 117 and a triplet of quarter notes in measure 118. The bass parts (Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 2) have a triplet of eighth notes in measure 119 and a triplet of quarter notes in measure 120. The bass parts (Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 2) have a triplet of eighth notes in measure 117 and a triplet of quarter notes in measure 118. The bass parts (Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 2) have a triplet of eighth notes in measure 119 and a triplet of quarter notes in measure 120.

121

with a sense of fun

[illegible]

127

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

p

mf

f

254

[illegible]

149

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

The musical score is written for 12 parts: Soprano 1 (S 1), Soprano 2 (S 2), Alto 1 (A 1), Alto 2 (A 2), Alto 3 (A 3), Alto 4 (A 4), Tenor 1 (T 1), Tenor 2 (T 2), Baritone 1 (Bari 1), Baritone 2 (Bari 2), Bass 1, and Bass 2. The key signature has one flat (B-flat), and the time signature is 4/4. Measure 149 begins with a rehearsal mark. The vocal parts (S 1, S 2, A 1, A 2, A 3, A 4, T 1, T 2) enter in measure 149 with various notes and rests. The instrumental parts (Bari 1, Bari 2, Bass 1, Bass 2) enter in measure 150. Dynamic markings include *f* (forte), *mp* (mezzo-piano), and *mf* (mezzo-forte). The score ends in measure 158.

154

strident, still with a sense of fun

11

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

mp *mf* *f*

f

159

S1

S2

A1

A2

A3

A4

T1

T2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

162

S 1

S 2

A 1

A 2

A 3

A 4

T 1

T 2

Bari 1

Bari 2

Bass 1

Bass 2

**NEGOTIATING AN AESTHETIC APPROACH:
COMMENTARY ON A PORTFOLIO OF
ORIGINAL COMPOSITIONS
BY CLARE LOVEDAY**

PART I: COLLUSION AND COLLISION: A DISCUSSION OF AESTHETIC CHOICES

Introduction

Between 2004 and 2008 I composed a portfolio consisting almost entirely of works for saxophone. One work, a theatrical collaboration, did not include the saxophone, but nevertheless involved a similar aesthetic negotiation. This commentary on the portfolio attempts to account for various approaches to aesthetics that can be seen in my work, negotiated at different stages of my development and for audiences in various settings. The essay is not only a verbal articulation of my aesthetic as located within one or more contemporary aesthetics, nor is it simply a defence or description of my work – although both come into it. Rather than a monologic commentary on the portfolio, it is a dialogue with it,¹ an active interaction between text and reader (Bakhtin 1981). This metaphor allows me to present the engagement as a series of negotiations² (some of them concurrent) which involve: the saxophone repertoire, the jazz-straight divide in saxophone music, the field of South African composition, global compositional aesthetics, the cross-cultural aesthetics of South African art music, the European tradition of art music in Africa, visual art, the expectations of performers and audiences, and, most of all, the shape and materials of musical sound.

I take it as a given that, whether consciously or not, all composers constantly negotiate their aesthetic within a chosen field, and that this negotiation is ongoing, shifting with each new work, performance, and the reception. This, as well as other factors, affects and shapes their aesthetic approach. My own project unfolded over several years. During this period both my position within

¹ “Conversation which is written for a book, play or film [or] formal talks between opposing countries, political groups”
(<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=53316&dict=CALD>, accessed 20.11.08).

² “The process of discussing something with someone in order to reach an agreement with them, or the discussions themselves” (Ibid).

the artistic field and my aesthetic approach changed considerably. Even after I conceived it as a body of doctoral work I changed the focus, or rather narrowed and sharpened it. How it came about that I chose to focus mainly on the straight saxophone (only one of the works does not include saxophone) is explained in various sections of this essay, particularly in the discussion of my field, *habitus* and voice. It proved, I will argue, to be a highly productive focus.

I begin the process of reflection not with the literature on contemporary music, which is not so relevant to my purpose here, but with the literature on the saxophone and saxophone repertoire, which is more relevant to the location of my work and far less well known. After this, I examine the field of art music composition in South Africa in which I work, borrowing Pierre Bourdieu's notion of the "field of cultural production" to understand some of the dynamics and difficulties of my location and its relationship to the other fields internationally. I then situate myself using Bourdieu's notion of "*habitus*" (more complex a notion than "location"), exploring ways in which I have negotiated my own musical past, 20th century composition aesthetics, current influences, and my own development within (and sometimes despite) the local field. My own compositional voice then comes to the fore, and in the second part of the essay I engage individually with the works in the portfolio.

Chapter 1: Perspectives on the Saxophone

*Literature on the straight saxophone*³

The literature on the saxophone is more extensive than one might imagine, considering that the instrument was invented a mere 160 years ago. It is both quantitative and qualitative, primary (scores and recordings) and secondary (what has been written about the saxophone in books, chapters in books, dictionary entries, theses, journal articles, commentary in minor literature such as magazines, and websites). The quantitative literature includes a number of bibliographies, lists, and indexes of repertoire.

Reviewing the literature helped me position myself as a composer by finding out what South African art music composers had written for the instrument, or if indeed there was any literature on the straight saxophone in South Africa. This was a short search: nothing has been written about the straight saxophone in South Africa, and the documentation from the South African Music Rights Organisation (SAMRO) lists only twenty-seven works (including six by myself), all composed since 1970.⁴ More importantly, the literature review gave me insight into the saxophone worldwide, showing how the instrument has been approached historically by composers, performers and writers, and revealing changes in approach. This knowledge constituted an important part of locating myself within a broader composition community. I was more aware of what was “out there”.

The quantitative resources show how much saxophone music is currently available, what has been recorded, and where the gaps in the repertoire lie and

³ The “jazz/straight divide” is explored in some detail below. As far as the use of these terms is concerned: I have frequently heard saxophonists refer to “straight”, and I prefer it, agreeing with Harvey (1995) that “classical” is misleading and “straight” “best defines non-jazz playing as ‘straight ahead’ reading of the music exactly as written, without jazz inflections or improvisation.” (1995: 16)

⁴ The document is not always clear if the work is for straight sax or jazz, but is included in its entirety at Appendix A.

(therefore) what I am adding. Bibliographies and indexes are also helpful in revealing which of the different saxophones works have been written for most frequently.⁵ These include Puscoin's list of classical repertoire (2000), Dawson's annotated bibliography of music by British composers (1981), and Wilkins *Index of Saxophone Music* (1979). Londeix and Ronkin (1994) include educational literature and some include discographies (Schleuter 1993), as do numerous books about jazz and straight saxophone soloists and the music associated with them, which draw attention to the vital role of players in bringing the instrument to public attention.

Many tutors mentioned in this literature are written by virtuoso performers such as Sigmund Rascher (*Top-Tones for the Saxophone*, 1941) and Marcel Mule (*Varied Studies (Études Variées) in All Keys*, 1950), and include explanations that I as a non-saxophone player find useful. Saxophone technique is taught through other kinds of literature too (for example Bongiorno 2000a and 2000b; Cox 1996; and Phelps 1998, which provides a helpful *Thesaurus of Saxophone Multiphonics and a Guide to their Practical Application*). Some publications have a specific readership in mind: Gold (1977), for example, focuses on performance and teaching practices in North America, and Cripps (2006) on Central America. Some theses focus on the pedagogical influence of certain individuals, such as Joseph Allard and Laurence Teal in McKim (2000) and Colegrove (2001) respectively. Others aim at a particular level of study: Owen (2005) at entry level, Gorman (2006) at pre-college and Fagaly (1998) at college level. Liley (1988) offers a guide for the interpretation of selected repertoire and Sampen's thesis (1985) is an interesting practical guide for saxophonists to the notation and performance of chance music.

Such publications tell me what I can expect from saxophonists at different levels. This is particularly important in South Africa where there are no

⁵ The most commonly used saxophones are the Bb soprano, Eb alto, Bb tenor and Eb baritone.

The bass is used less often, but appears in the repertoire more often than, for example, the soprano, contrabass or C saxophones.

virtuoso straight saxophonists. The saxophone is often perceived here by the public as an “easy” instrument played for pleasure, not to be taken seriously. This inevitably affects what I am able to write and how I negotiate my way with each new work.⁶ (I discuss this in more detail in the section on my own works.) Many technical (exercise) books published in the mid-20th century by Mule (1943, 1946, 1950) are still widely used. They helped me understand how my performers would have been taught, which sounds or technical approaches I might use, and at which level performers can use extended techniques.

Books that examine the saxophone as an instrument tend to be part of a series, such as *Yehudi Menuhin Music Guides* (Harvey 1995) and the *Rough Guide* series (Pinksterboer 2000). The most useful is *The Cambridge Companion Guide to the Saxophone* (Ingham 1998), an edited volume of essays that gives an overview of the saxophone, its development, and impact in various fields of music. Importantly, it also includes sections on the contemporary saxophone; few other books examine the saxophone so broadly while also addressing its contemporary use. Histories of the instrument are fairly common, exemplified by Rendall (1932) and Howe (2003). Some give considerable attention to its colourful inventor, Adolphe Sax (Horwood 1983 and Kochritzky 1985). The controversy surrounding the instrument in the hundred years after its invention is also the subject of investigation. Pituch (1998), for example, examines the history of its reception from 1918 to 1942. Plugge (2004) traces the history of the saxophone ensemble, focusing on the saxophone quartet (which was interesting to me), while Hindson (1992) examines aspects of the saxophone from 1850 to 1980 within the framework of American musical culture. Although I do not engage much here or in the portfolio with jazz saxophone except in terms of discussing the jazz/straight “divide” (below), it is worth noting that

⁶ Saxophone teaching overseas is more specialised than in South Africa, where only a few tertiary institutions have permanent (full-time) saxophone teachers. Jeff Robinson and Jeff Judge at the University of KwaZulu-Natal and Brian Smith at the University of Pretoria teach straight and jazz saxophone. Mike Rossi and Rick van Heerden teach jazz saxophone at the University of Cape Town and Rhodes University respectively; both are interested in new music. Most institutions appoint a shifting part-time staff, which hinders localised development of the instrument. Saxophone is taught in some private schools, often by clarinetists who play saxophone as a second instrument.

some of the books dedicated to the history of the instrument are about jazz: Bacon and Gelly (2000) examine the main exponents, and the legendary Six Brown Brothers are the subject of Vermazen (2004). Segell's book (2005) is colourfully titled *The Devil's Horn: The Story of the Saxophone, from Noisy Novelty to King of Cool*.

Some articles published in the first sixty years of the 20th century, although not historical in their intention, are historical documents in the way they narrate the controversy around the instrument in art music. These include titles such as "The Controversial Saxophone" (Anderson 1959) and, significantly, "A Plea for the Saxophone" (Elliot 1941). Cole argues in "Light Music – and Serious" (1956) for the superiority of the baritone saxophone to the bass clarinet and expounds the virtues of the soprano saxophone. Antcliffe's article (1950) "Why Quartets?", on the other hand, brushes aside the saxophone quartet as something of an oddity. These articles are intriguing in light of the change in attitude to the straight saxophone in recent decades, apparent not only by the increase in compositions and recordings but also by the noticeable increase in scholarly publications that no longer seem to need to justify the instrument.

It is interesting, despite all this, how limited the space given to the saxophone (still) is in books on instrumentation/orchestration, compared to other instruments: only four pages in Kennan & Grantham (2002), while there are three in Piston (1986); and in the older Baines (1967) which is *about* woodwind instruments, the saxophone gets a mere six pages. Multi-volume dictionaries and encyclopaedias show a similar tendency: six pages on the saxophone in *New Grove II* (Sadie 2001) compared to eleven for the trombone and sixteen for the French horn. *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart II* (von Wartensee 1963) does not even give the saxophone a separate entry, including it under "Saxinstrumente" which examines all the instruments invented by Adolphe Sax.⁷

⁷ This may have changed in the new edition, which I have not seen.

On the other hand, there has been an increase in postgraduate theses, mostly from the United States of America (U.S.A.), with some institutions (Northwestern University, University of Northern Colorado, the University of North Texas) featuring prominently. (Presumably they have a strong focus on saxophone and are home to seasoned teachers.) They provide insight into where current interest and (indirectly) gaps lie. Many of them are most likely part of a degree in performance or composition for they either examine an aspect of the existing repertoire (in the case of the former) or analysing a new work (the latter).

Relevant discussions on the saxophone can be found in several scholarly journals. *The Musical Times*, due to its longevity, also offers interesting insights into the early controversy surrounding the instrument. The saxophone's early years were plagued with difficulties despite praise by some composers and performers. Adolphe Sax's invention was not welcomed by the woodwind manufacturers who, sensing a threat to their livelihood, made numerous attempts to discredit the saxophone. This involved battles in court, which plagued Sax throughout his life, and battles on the "playing fields" in which Sax's invention was put to the test in a public competition of military bands. (The French public chose the ensemble including saxophones.) These conflicts had far reaching effects including, for example, many clarinetists refusing to double on saxophone in orchestral works, fearing the wrath of woodwind manufacturers. The controversy took on a new dimension when the saxophone became popular in jazz and, later, popular music, creating a reputation amongst players of classical repertoire that the instrument lacked finesse and refinement. This continues to haunt the saxophone.

The Saxophone Journal, as the name suggests, is the most important source for teaching, historical investigation and studies of the saxophone in particular geographical contexts. Then there are over a thousand reviews of saxophone music in journals ranging from *The Saxophone Journal* to *The Quarterly Journal of the Music Library Association* or *Musical Opinion*. These include

many reviews of new music for saxophone. Most, however, emphasise performance rather than composition, and many of them are on jazz.

The “minor” literature (magazines, advertisements etc.) is extensive, particularly for jazz saxophone, but provides some useful insights into straight saxophone. A good example is the announcement in *The Musical Times* (1990: 204) of the new Grades 1 and 2 Associated Board saxophone examinations, reflecting the increasing interest in the straight saxophone, which I discuss in more detail below.

There are a number of publications focusing on compositions for (or including) saxophone by a single composer, often including a study of that composer’s life, including Elliot Del Borgo (Barrick 2008), Paul Creston (Morris 1996), Karl Heinrich David (Wright 2005), David Maslanka (Keedy 2004), Louis Mayeur, (Greenwood 2005), Lucie Robert (Bleuel 1998), Giacinto Scelsi (Fancher 2002), William Schmidt (Koger 2004), Sherwood Shaffer (Hays 2007), and Heitor Villa-Lobos (Butler 1995). Other valuable examples include Shner’s thesis (2007) on the development of the saxophone and harp genre, Bender (2000) on published saxophone quartets by American composers, selected soprano saxophone repertoire by Beaty (2004), and alto saxophone sonatas published between 1980 and 1990 (Gast 1994). Ballard (2007) provides arrangements to expand the repertoire for student saxophone orchestras, a gap in the repertoire that I discuss later in reference to my own work for saxophone orchestra, *Duolectet*. Influential straight saxophone soloists such as Mule, Lefèvre, Boyer Hall, Leeson and Londeix are discussed in Gee (1986), Dryer-Beers (1998), Rousseau (1982), Noyes (2000), Street (1983), Hulsebos (1989), and Zagorski (2007).

If I were looking for a handy “guide to composing new music for saxophone”, however, or publications that explored composition for the saxophone in a variety of contexts – such as overviews of new saxophone compositions, changes in approach to the instrument, different approaches or style in different

geographical regions, similar compositional approaches in different composers, the influence of different sound qualities of performers on compositions written for them – I was doomed to frustration.

I found a few scattered interesting comments on the sound of the instrument, by musicians such as Berlioz, who described it as “full, mellow, vibrant, extremely powerful and capable of being soft” (quoted in Liley 1998: 16). There are also some analytical works by students on compositions submitted for higher degrees. These include Stonaker’s *Diversions for alto saxophone and orchestra* (2007) and his (limited) exploration of the role of the solo instrument with the orchestra, Ward’s (2006) project involving an interesting interaction between saxophone and computer operator where discussion of the role of the saxophone in the short written document (only twenty pages) is disappointingly limited, Currie’s (disappointing) commentary on his *Rhapsody for Saxophone and Orchestra* (1999). Foster (1999) provides a more detailed explanation for his choice of the soprano saxophone for his concerto, where he considers the instrument’s rare use in this role. Similarly, Rubinoff (2007) comments on how he exploited some of the saxophone’s capabilities with reference to his *Incantation and Dance for Solo Alto Saxophone*.

The most obvious (and primary) aspect of the literature of use to me as a composer is the music itself – the repertoire. One of the most interesting things about the repertoire, however, is that it has been shaped and affected by the origins of the instrument and its subsequent prominence in jazz, as well as its “exotic” use by early modernist composers such as Ibert (*Concertino da Camera*, 1935) and Milhaud (*Scaramouche*, 1937). More than any other instrument, I suggest, the saxophone has had a divided repertoire, and I now examine that divide, which has had an impact on a number of composers, including myself.

The jazz/straight divide

Although Walter Horwood notes that the “excesses of style which earned the saxophone a bad reputation in the so-called ‘jazz age’ are now a distant memory” (1983: 17), there continues to be a flirtation in which the straight seems attracted to, yet repelled by, the jazz. Straight composers find jazz techniques intriguing – there is evidently still something exotic about jazz – and look to jazz for techniques such as growling and slap tonguing. But there is also some debate around the origin of these techniques. Claude Delangle and Jean-Denis Michat argue that “only subtone[s] seems to have originated in jazz itself” (1998: 167), while David Roach lists subtones, ghosting, slap-tonguing, bending, false fingerings, and growl and flutter-tonguing as jazz techniques (1998: 90–93). What is significant is that the extended techniques that emerged from jazz performers were the result of a desire by performers to extend the expressive boundaries of the instrument, rather than a desire by *composers* to broaden their sound world. This speaks to the close rapport between (jazz) performers and (straight) composers, fairly unusual in the instrumental world and evident in, for example, Christer Lindvall’s *Jiin* (1993/1996)⁸ and Luis Tinoco’s *Short Cuts* (2004).

The influence of jazz on straight seems far more profound than the other way around. Delangle and Michat argue that “jazz saxophone has virtually developed in parallel with the contemporary saxophone” (1998: 167).⁹ But there remains a somewhat reticent approach to jazz techniques in art music. Roach notes, for example, that “some players reject growling as vulgar” (1998: 92). This is probably a legacy of the saxophone’s popularity in jazz and popular music in the

⁸ All compositions are referenced as scores in the Reference section; the recordings on which they appear in the Discography. In some cases, the composer specified the date of composition as different to the date of publication – in these cases I have given the composition date first, publication date second. Some publication information was not available. For these, the date of recording is given as the publication date in the reference section, marked with a *, and the composer as the publisher.

⁹ Presumably “contemporary” refers to the last three decades, as I find it difficult to believe parallel development occurred in the middle of the twentieth century when the straight saxophone was of little consequence while its jazz counterpart enjoyed considerable performance space.

early part of the 20th century, when “the world of ‘art’ music was greatly incensed at the unrefined sounds and effects [sic] the new style extracted from the instrument.” (Horwood 1983: 189) This, I find, has had a lasting effect on the reputation of the saxophone: “the snobbery and prejudice the saxophone had to overcome have persisted, in some cases, to the present day” (Trier 1998: 102).

Aesthetically, this snobbery is related to – indeed may have been entrenched by – the high art/low art divide, used by cultural theorists in the earlier 20th century to theorise the difference between “mass culture” and “high culture”. Through a series of discussions, the Frankfurt School (Horkheimer, Benjamin, Marcuse, and Adorno) analysed and perhaps even to a large extent created this divide, which typified artistic modernism, in order to frame their Marxist reading of the role of art in society. Their major claim was that mass culture threatened cultural development and autonomy, generated dependency rather than challenged, and depoliticised the working class, thus maintaining the “iron grip of social authority” (Storey 1997: 114). High art was autonomous and “privileged as the site of authenticity” (Milner & Browitt 2002: 77) and, from the Marxist perspective, was where the status quo could be challenged and provide an alternative Utopian vision of the world.

This “low-high divide”, although deeply discredited by postmodernism, continues to be surprisingly pervasive in terms of scholarly literature and popular literature on saxophone music. In this respect, there seem to be three broad components: popular music at the bottom of the creative heap; jazz occupying a rather uncomfortable middle ground, straddling the low-high divide where exponents are revered yet still not “quite good enough”; and art music which remains in the minds of many as intellectual, rarified and independent from the paltry considerations of daily life or social concerns.

The relation between art music and society, particularly in terms of its (relative and changing) autonomy and the power relations of its promoters, has been

taken up by Bourdieu, who sees creative fields as being related to and affected by other fields; I explore this notion in more detail later in relation to my own location within the field of art music composition and how I negotiate my way in it. Because in South Africa the saxophone is (still) primarily associated with jazz, its role in art music (still) sits uncomfortably with some straight performers and composers. As a “saxophile” – the word for saxophone enthusiasts used by Ingham (1998: xiii) – I often find myself on the receiving end of derogatory comments and jokes about the saxophone’s reputation as a “brothel instrument”.¹⁰

Jazz performers seen minimally influenced by the straight style. Nor are they threatened by it. Jazz saxophonists, particularly in the first half of the 20th century, were not formally trained and could not read staff notation with ease. Few, therefore, would have engaged with the emerging straight saxophone repertoire. This changed in the middle of the twentieth century when jazz saxophonists in most countries started out with some formal music training, and there are jazz saxophonists who bridge the great divide, such as Bradford Marsalis. The focus for jazz players, however, is not usually on learning or contributing to the repertoire but on technical mastery of the instrument and improvisation skills. Straight saxophonists, on the other hand, are trained in a practice that focuses on sound production (discussed further below) and the interpretation of repertoire, including many arrangements of works by composers who pre-dated the appearance of the instrument.

There has also been a change in attitude to the approaches in teaching the two styles. Roach, for example, notes a change in attitude by teachers to jazz techniques, such as the turned out lower lip. “This used to be heavily frowned upon by educators, but it is now almost universally agreed that, even in the classical style, the tenor sax in particular needs the extra freedom afforded by the turned-out lower lip.” (1989: 88) What remains steadfast, however, is that

¹⁰ Pers comm. Simon Dagut, 16 January 2008. (This remark was made in jest, but was revealing nonetheless.)

jazz saxophone is almost exclusively about the performer; great excitement is generated when, for example, two saxophonists “duel”, pushing the boundaries of the instrument in an attempt to stamp improvisatory and technical authority. The composer is of minimal or no interest here. Although performers are important in straight saxophone writing, the composer has to take a more prominent role in the writing of “straight” music. Here the composer drives the music; in jazz, the performer drives the music.

It is therefore worth drawing attention to literature such as Wetzel’s article “Jazz Sound for Classical Saxophonists” (2005), whose title alone indicates a perceived separation between the two. This sense of two independent knowledge bases may come from the academy, where defining and defending intellectual turf is often tied into creating space for and justifying jobs. Keeping the two “separate but equal” (which we all know about in the South African political arena) is in the interests of the specialists in the academy, in spite of the fact that they learn from each other’s styles and techniques.

Post-apartheid South Africa presents a somewhat different scenario, in which tertiary institutions rarely have the luxury of large, specialised departments. The result is somewhat ambiguous: specialisations in some institutions blur into one another, receive a token nod, or are simply ignored. This could potentially have advantages; the straight/jazz divide could be less marked and provide students with the opportunity to learn from one another. South Africa’s small saxophone domain and isolation from world trends, however, sometimes results in teachers who are sometimes simply unaware of the different techniques and their potential to speak to each other. One tertiary-level saxophone teacher I talked to, for example, understood the differences between jazz and straight saxophone only in relation to the use of vibrato.¹¹

This compartmentalisation in the literature and, it would appear, in the training overseas, is disappointing to me as a composer. It makes me more (not less)

¹¹ Pers comm. Brian Smith, 17 September 2008.

aware of the difference between writing for straight and jazz saxophone, and trying (in some cases) to straddle the divide. I have yet to encounter a review that combined the two approaches, and the only hint of interest in crossing over comes in a thesis that examines Branford Marsalis's improvised cadenza in Jacques Ibert's *Concertino da Camera* for alto saxophone and eleven instruments (James 2006).

However, the styles of playing *are* quite different and saxophonists use different techniques and a wider mouthpiece for a jazz sound. So what is the reason for this silence around the topic? In addition to an educational interest (also involving “turf”), one could hypothesise a commercial interest in keeping the two apart. Roach observes that “most players possess at least two mouthpieces (each suited to different styles of music) and some many more, for the mouthpiece and reed combination can make an immense impact upon the quality of sound and ease of playing.” (1998: 89)

Sound seems to bridge the gap more easily than economics. The “rougher” sound of the jazz saxophone appears to have influenced some straight saxophonists; for example, the Stockholm Saxophone Quartet and alto saxophonist Jörgen Pettersson show the jazz influence in their more aggressive sound, compared with the “sweeter” sound of the Adelphi Saxophone Quartet and soprano saxophonist Simon Haram. I have also heard saxophonists refer to the “French sound”,¹² but I only found one reference to this in the literature: Nick Turner, in describing the “focused and deliberately understated sound” of the middle and upper registers of the alto saxophone, notes this as “a characteristic developed in the so-called ‘French School’” (1998: 94). The different sounds of the saxophone are an important aspect of my writing for saxophone; the ongoing negotiation in my approach to these sounds is discussed in detail later.

¹² I am indebted to Ceri Moelwyn-Hughes for drawing my attention to this term. I consequently heard it mentioned by other saxophonists, including Camron Andrews who used it when describing to me the difficulties he was having changing his sound from straight to jazz (pers. comm. 29 July 2008).

Emerging interest in the straight saxophone

In general, I have been disappointed with literature which deals with compositional approaches to the straight saxophone. However, an overview of saxophone publications and the saxophone discography (for example) reveals a noticeable increase of interest in the instrument from the 1980s to the present. Of about twenty books on the saxophone, the three earliest publication dates are the late 1970s (Fridorich 1975, Gold 1977, Wilkins 1979). There is otherwise minimal interest in the instrument between 1960 and 1980, with almost no publications referring to the saxophone during those two decades.

Of the published articles (a better indication of changing interest in the instrument due largely to the longevity of *The Musical Times*) only six appeared before 1960, most referring to the controversy surrounding the saxophone. As Horwood points out, "From about 1920 onwards, the writings of the world of legitimate music [sic] are full of snide, often uninformed and inaccurate remarks about the saxophone. On reading them one might wonder: Is this the same instrument over which eminent composers went into raptures?" (1983: 165) A review in *The Musical Times* in 1978 still describes the saxophone as "neglected" (O'Loughlin 1978) in an interesting moment before the surge of interest that was to come. Only four theses were written before 1980, while sixty-nine have been written since, forty-one of them since 2000. Straight saxophone recordings are a less reliable indicator as I could only source 86 publication dates of 127 recordings, but it is worth noting that the earliest publication date I could find is 1988.

The reason for this recent surge of interest is probably an increase in the number of straight saxophonists being trained (as opposed to clarinetists who double on saxophone when an orchestral score requires it). The first World Saxophone Congress, held in 1969, was an indication that the saxophone was beginning to receive serious attention; increasing numbers of saxophone teachers at conservatoires further promoted the instrument. Laurence Teal, a virtuoso player

and respected teacher, was the first to establish a doctoral programme in saxophone in the U.S.A. – a “milestone in the acceptance of the instrument as a course of study” (Dryer-Beers 1998: 40). High profile performers, such as Eugene Rousseau, Claude Delangle, John Harle and Haram, significantly raised the profile of the instrument in recent decades, as have a number of saxophone quartets, such as the Amstel, Apollo, Quartz, Raschèr, Stockholm and Tetraphonics saxophone quartets, who strive to promote the ensemble and the music written for it.

The surge of interest in the straight saxophone that became apparent in the 1980s appears to show no signs of abating. Quite the opposite: the increase in scholarly publications and recordings since 1980, and particularly the surge of theses on the instrument in the past ten years, indicate it is gaining momentum. This, along with the apparent increasing number of saxophonists, saxophone quartets and works being written or arranged for these performers, and recordings of the straight saxophone, justifies my focus on the instrument. I can say with some confidence that South Africa is starting to take up this trend, if in a much smaller way: the South African Saxophone Quartet (SASQ) was formed this year, is performing around the country and plans a recording in early 2009;¹³ the 2008 SAMRO Overseas Scholarship Competition (in 2008 for Instrumentalists) had, for the first time, a straight saxophonist as a finalist in the western art music section.¹⁴

When I embarked on this doctorate I had a sense of a growing interest in the straight saxophone in South Africa. This was partly a result of the enthusiastic response to some compositions for straight saxophone I had already written, and contact with saxophone teachers who had increasing numbers of students. Many

¹³ The quartet, which performed for the first time on 16 August 2008, comprises Matthew Lombard (lead alto and soprano sax), Gerhard Geyser (second alto sax), Tanya Brown (tenor sax) and Brian Smith (baritone sax).

¹⁴ The saxophonist was Matthew Lombard from Pretoria. The work commissioned by SAMRO for the Intermediate Round was my work for alto saxophone and piano, *Displacement*, shortened for the competition to meet the five minute requirement. SAMRO also commissioned my work *Wind-Play* for soprano saxophone and piano, first performed in 2001, which I rewrote for the competition for alto saxophone.

of these teachers and saxophonists complained about the lack of repertoire for the instrument, lamenting the many arrangements for graded examinations set by the examination boards (such as the Associated Board and University of South Africa). There seemed to be a need for repertoire for the straight saxophone, at all technical levels, and my earliest works (not in this portfolio) addressed this need.

It must be noted, however, that there remains, in South Africa at least, a somewhat reticent attitude to the straight saxophone by the concert-going public and parts of the more conservative music community who, at best, view it with sceptical caution. Although the contribution of my works for the saxophone repertoire in South Africa seems well timed among some players and colleagues, the reception by audiences and some performers is by no means predictable. The straight saxophone field here is not established and thus still fluid, which presents many opportunities but also means that, due to its newness and lack of critical readiness for it, anything goes. (The problems of lack of criticism of art music composition more generally are addressed in more detail below.)

Because the works I write for South African saxophonists are not contributing to an established, high-powered field (of either composition or wind performance), there is the possibility that other works offering easier listening will have the same if not more favourable reception as mine. Thomas Pooley, for example, draws attention to the success with audiences and musicians of Michael Hankinson's *A Mandela Portrait*, which he aptly describes as "exud[ing] accessibility of a ... popular kind ...; a kind of kitsch" (2008: 133). This presents some interesting questions on how I negotiate my location within the South African field of composition and saxophone domain. Each work I write needs to be considered on a number of levels: the players I am writing for and their technical limitations, the audience, and the field I am contributing to. All this relates to the complexities of the field of composition reception in South Africa, and its small composition community.

Chapter 2: The Field of Art Music Composition in South Africa

Cultural theory is an enormous field that has been applied across a wide range of disciplines. It is too big to cover all of it here, and in this essay I hone in on what is relevant to composers. I have already discussed, for example, the influence of high-art/low-art divide on way the saxophone is viewed, a divide that has affected the development of the saxophone's repertoire and performance practice. The impact of this theory continues to exert some influence on how the saxophone is perceived in South Africa, affecting, notably and problematically, the quality of performance and the way in which the instrument and works written for it are perceived. Bourdieu's notion of the "field of cultural production" (Bourdieu 1993) is particularly useful in this respect. I engage with this concept to understand the field of art music composition in South Africa.

Bourdieu's model suggests a fluid field of interdependent factors in which three interlocked fields co-exist in tension with each other. In this context, the smallest field can be seen as the composers in the field of art music composition in South Africa. The middle field contains agents who control the work of practitioners (composers and performers), and include sponsoring and commissioning bodies such as SAMRO and the National Arts Council. Bourdieu's largest field comprises "the economic, race, and class imperatives of society as a whole" (Lucia 2005: 90).

The field of art music composition in South Africa has been described as "very small, fragmented and geographically dispersed, beset by political tensions and professional rivalries" (Pooley 2008: 135). Few composers compete for limited recognition in terms of commissions and writing for few interested and capable performers, with few performance opportunities: most opportunities have to be forged by composers themselves; they are not "given". The field is isolated both nationally and internationally: a small number of composers are scattered

around the country;¹⁵ and the geographical distance between South Africa's major cities,¹⁶ and from the rest of the art music world, exacerbates the problem, even in these days of the "global village".

Relating (or not) to the international field

The international field of composition has, of course, always been present as a phenomenon and the South African field engages with it. This international field is both imagined and present from time to time in the form of visiting composers and performers, or works played. Visits by composers and performers from the African continent are, however, rare, and when I refer to the international field I am referring to those fields beyond Africa, most particularly Europe and the U.S.A. Although the cultural and economic boycott during the height of the apartheid era closed the local field off in many ways from the outside world, there were attempts by numerous societies to maintain links with the international arena, as well as create networks within South Africa. These included the New Music Network (Johannesburg late 1970s and '80s), Soundwaves (Durban 1980s) and Obelisk (Pretoria 1980s to '90s) (Lucia 2005: 84).

Isolation was difficult to overcome even after the end of apartheid: South Africa's political and cultural separation was extended when rivalries between the Composer's Guild (now defunct) and SAMRO prevented an attempt to rejoin the International Society of Contemporary Music (ISCM) in 1992 (Blake 2007: 367). South Africa eventually rejoined the ISCM in 1999 and has been

¹⁵ Tertiary institutions are home to most of South Africa's art music composers: three composers at the University of Cape Town; two each at the Universities of Stellenbosch and the Free State, and one composer each at the Universities of Kwazulu-Natal, Pretoria, the North-West, the Witwatersrand (Lucia 2005: 107). A few composers in South Africa work freelance, such as Philip Miller, but often their income is supplemented by work in their related fields - Paul Hamner, for example, also works as a jazz pianist. There are numerous composers in South Africa who work in choral music; often, however, their work as composers is secondary to their work as choral conductors (such as Mokale Koapeng).

¹⁶ Cape Town and Johannesburg, for example, are 1450 kilometres apart.

represented at the ISCM's annual World Music Days since 2000.¹⁷ Although this has raised interest in South Africa internationally, the field here remains somewhat intellectually isolated both from international developments and even from some music within South Africa, which can be seen in how some tertiary institutions view African music. For as Pooley puts it, the older (50+) generation of composers "spent their formative years [in] a narrow if not repressive cultural environment that excluded African music from the curriculum. This ... inculcated a view of African music as 'other'." (2008: 18) The curriculum he is referring to continues at some local tertiary institutions where African music theory is not integrated into the syllabus but taught superficially as a separate component.

The intellectual isolation affects postgraduate training too: at one of South Africa's biggest tertiary institutions, for example, composition students who have been through the system to Masters level encountered no rigorous engagement with music written after 1980 other than that of their composition lecturer.¹⁸ Students who wish to engage in more radical approaches, such as experimental interdisciplinary work (which would probably be considered much milder overseas), often face obstacles and sometimes even recrimination. Although there are exceptions, concerts of student compositions are uncommon, usually organised by the students themselves with little institutional support and, in my experience, rarely feature works that push boundaries. (See Mullins, forthcoming, for evidence of these problems.)

There are practical difficulties too that have become more pronounced in the last ten years, contributing further to the isolation of the field. The South African economy currency has declined steadily in value over the past fifteen years,¹⁹ making international flights, technology (such as up-to-date computers and

¹⁷ South Africans whose works were performed at the World Music Days include: Bongani Ndodana in 2000; Kevin Volans in 2001, Mokale Koapeng in 2003; Jürgen Bräuninger and Sazi Diamini (collaboration) in 2004; Hendrik Hofmeyr in 2005; Stefans Grové in 2007.

¹⁸ Pers. comm. 22 September 2008. The student asked to remain anonymous for fear of recrimination.

¹⁹ The SA rand/US dollar exchange rate is currently 10:1.

broadband internet connections taken for granted in the developed world), scores and CDs expensive and, thus, keeping in touch with international developments difficult. CD shops in South Africa, for example, some of which used to keep a wide range of contemporary recordings (such as Compact Disc Warehouse, subsequently bought out by a large chain), stock very few contemporary CDs or scores; orders frequently fail to materialise or are prohibitively expensive.

Some societies that promote new music in South Africa, such as NewMusicSA and Kennus, strive to keep South Africa in the international loop, but in many ways the field remains limited, inward-looking and outdated. The ambivalent attitude by some prominent composers in this field to some South African composers' international success, such as Kevin Volans, reflects on the limitations here. During the years of apartheid and beyond, numerous South African composers, such as John Joubert, Pritaulx Rainier, Stanley Glasser, David Hoeningberg, David Kosviner, Rudiger Meyer, Martin Scherzinger and Volans, left South Africa, at least in part out of a frustration with the narrowness of the local field.

It is also worth noting that South Africa does not have a central music information centre, as many countries overseas do – we do not even have a website yet that provides comprehensive information about the work of South African composers. Some university (and City) libraries around the country do stock some scores and recordings (for example, the Johannesburg City Library) of new music, including music by South African composers. But, as noted before, in a country as large and dispersed as South Africa, communication between these libraries, and therefore inter-library access to resources, can be difficult and slow. The resources available are negligible compared to the libraries in centres such as Birmingham or York. A search of South African libraries revealed very little international contemporary art music; what is there is usually part of donated collections, indicating that contemporary scores and recordings are rarely ordered. This in turn affects student access to resources,

creating a vicious circle of ignorance and fear of (unknown) developments in composition overseas. It is not even easy to stay abreast of local events, made more difficult by the localised nature of events within the country. New music events in the western Cape, for example, rarely travel to, or receive press coverage, in Gauteng or KwaZulu-Natal.²⁰ Keeping up to date with international events is even more difficult.

It is of course not impossible to keep abreast of international trends through the internet and personal contact between composers who share what resources they have, such as recordings, scores and concert programmes. This is how those (few) composers here who are interested in the broader world of composition keep themselves informed. However, we cannot assume the same knowledge of new music developments that a composer in, for example, Europe or the U.S.A. would have. While I have a sense of developments overseas in the past thirty years, such as post-minimalism, I have little experience of live performances. I may know about trends, but my view is very different as I am heavily influenced by the environment from which I am looking: politically and economically unstable, insecure, and strife-laden. I am negotiating the broader world of art music from this environment, looking out towards the centre from “the colonies”. So I am not only taking a view of the field in South Africa, I am also taking a view *from* it.

Engaging in international fields can challenge the perceptions of those fields that, at a distance, are often viewed as gloriously perfect. Attending the rehearsals and performance of *Blink* in Vienna provided me with revealing glimpses into a European field and how it relates to my own. The new music scene is active in Vienna. The concert season booklet produced in October 2007 by the Schönberg Centre advertised a very busy schedule of concerts of new music – Ensemble Reconsili alone had five concerts. But although in many ways

²⁰ A notable exception to this was the performance of Stockhausen's *Mantra* by the Kenus Ensemble, Jill Richards, and Liza Joubert, first performed in Stellenbosch earlier this year and then again in Pretoria on 7 September as part of the 2008 NewMusic Indaba.

Vienna lived up to its reputation – the standard of performance is astoundingly high, for example – discussions with some of the Viennese composers revealed a frustration with audiences who demand endless performances of Mozart and Strauss, and performers who pander exclusively to these demands. It is a city that, in one way, struggles under the weight of its history, making the field of composition more complex than one might imagine from the outside.

Cameron Harris, in response to a seminar paper about *Blink* I presented at Wits School of Arts (WSOA) in February 2008, drew attention to how my view as a South African, indeed the view of any composer here, is informed by post-colonialism: “Many people in countries on both sides of the colonial equation still see metropolitan areas in Europe as central and those in the former colonies as peripheral.” (Harris 2008: 3) I cannot comment with authority on how South African composers are viewed from Europe, but there is certainly evidence to support Harris’s observation from the South African perspective. Responses to the news that I was having *Blink* performed in Vienna were revealing. Many still see Vienna as the world centre of art²¹ and the venue of the performance almost certainly helped me to secure funding for travel expenses.

A composer visiting from the United Kingdom (U.K.) in early 2008 (Luke Bedford) expressed amazement at our interrogation of identity when he attended the seminar I gave on *Blink*. “I just never think about these things”, he commented.²² Identity is not an issue for him in the U.K. “Knowing” oneself as a composer there is a very different kind of knowledge from knowing oneself in South Africa where our understanding is imbued with a post-colonial sense of “difference”. The questions I ask now from South Africa about identity are very different to those that might be asked by a composer at the University of York or Southampton. Adam Howard, a U.K.-trained trumpeter now living in South Africa, noted differences as a performer between the two countries. He finds South Africa, for example, easier to work in as he is freer to cross over between

²¹For example, pers. comm. Bill Freund, 11 July 2007.

²² Pers. comm. 21 February 2008.

jazz, classical and commercial work. But his observation that he would not be aware of these differences had he not left the U.K. was particularly revealing.²³ So while composers in the European and American centres are likely to be more au fait with their own field, they are probably less introspective.

Sadly, South African composers' interactions with international fields that can reveal the imperfections of those fields are limited, further entrenching isolation and a sense of inadequacy. Perhaps because of this, the South African field seems to be stuck in an aesthetic rut: many composers improve their craft of composition, but produce the same *kinds* of works over and over again.

Contested aesthetic approaches: cross-culturalism

The field here is fraught with political in-fighting over aesthetics too, and cross-culturalism has been an area of contention for over 25 years. Volans, for example, was alienated by the art music community in the 1980s when he explored cross-cultural possibilities in his compositions and demonstrated in such works as *White Man Sleeps* (1982). Volans remembers: "I was practically boycotted for my involvement in black music. I was actually denounced at a national conference on contemporary music [in 1983]." (quoted in Gilmore 2006) Volans and Hans Roosen Schoon were given a mere two pages each in *Composers in South Africa Today* (1987) in spite of their considerable success. This was a result, Pooley argues, of their "cross-cultural practices" (2008: 64).

The attitude to cross-culturalism has shifted dramatically since the 1980s as commissioning bodies now almost all require "African elements" in compositions. But what these elements are, and how they are used by composers, is controversial too: for many, and most influentially at government level, the definition of these elements seems to be frozen in the pre-colonial past and does not acknowledge culture as something dynamic and shifting. This perception has been challenged, but the "common understanding of tradition as

²³ Pers. comm. 27 November 2008.

stable, unchanging practices handed down through the generations tends to hold sway outside the academy” (Allen 2002: 2) (and probably *in* some academies too). This is the understanding of “African elements” in music within the largest field that controls much of the funding (and therefore commissions). This, in turn, influences composers profoundly.

It is not without its critics in the music academy: Christine Lucia (1993), for example, questioned the use of African elements in a work by South African composer Peter Klatzow, as does Pooley (2008) in his investigation and critique of selected works of three South African art music composers. But the requirements from the commissioning bodies remain, and the composition community in South Africa continues to grapple with them, willingly or not. It has aesthetic implications for composers who do not wish to present African elements in the “acceptable” way, or do not wish to engage with it at all. There are composers in South Africa who do not toe the aesthetic line: Jürgen Bräuninger, for example, focuses on multi-media composition, and the African elements in his works are somewhat unconventional, often humorous and occasionally tongue-in-cheek.

The cross-cultural requirements impact on some local performers too who sometimes perceive a “South African” sound as being some kind of arrangement of African folk music. I, for example, was asked by a prominent local saxophone teacher to write a work for his saxophone quartet based on “a South African folk theme”, which would then, ideally, be “developed”.²⁴ There seemed little space for dialogue on the subject. This has serious implications for me, both aesthetically and in terms of my location, which I discuss later.

Contested aesthetic approaches: resistance to criticism

Cross-cultural engagement is not the only area of contention. Partly because of the political agenda that dictates to commissioning bodies, and because of

²⁴ Pers. comm. 17 September 2008.

international isolation, composers rarely take risks. Few works heard in the public domain offer a listening challenge, and critique of this is met with considerable hostility. There seems to be resistance from several prominent composers to criticism that engages beyond analysis, a belief that some established composers are in a class of “untouchables”. This is evident, for example, in Klatzow’s outraged response (Klatzow 1994) to Lucia’s criticism – one paragraph of mild criticism in a generally favourable review – of his work *From the Poets* (Lucia 1993).

Several of South Africa’s most high-profile composers, used to a “‘celebratory’ approach” (Pooley 2008: 18), interpret criticism as a personal attack, making longer term dialogue unsustainable. This seems to have created an ethos throughout the South African field where almost all criticism is seen as a result of personal or professional vendettas rather than musical critique, thus preventing a wider culture of debate. My criticism, for example, in mid-2008 of Philip Miller’s *ReWind*, a cantata staged as a theatrical work, met with considerable hostility by some of the involved parties; the manager of the hosting theatre angrily accused me of ignorance and professional jealousy.²⁵

Pooley notes the problems resulting from lack of criticism in the South African field of art music more generally:

Critics play an important role in ascribing value to performances, and an equally crucial role in ascribing value to works; and at least part of the crisis around programming new music, not to mention around how to conceive new works, is the patent lack of good country-wide critique. In effect it is the critics that help to establish the conventions of the art world. When critics are mostly absent – as in the present case in South Africa – these systems of valuation are almost absent or lack influence and credibility. (2008: 130)

This is in contrast to fields in, for example, Europe and the U.S.A., where publications by critics appear with some regularity, and both performers and audiences are more critical.

²⁵ Pers. comm. Malcolm Purkey, 26 April 2008.

One of the few places where constructive critique occurs publicly is in the *South African Journal of Musicology* and *South African Music Studies* (for example, Blake 2005 and 2006/2007), but the readership is small and reviews rarely appear in the general press. A composer panel formed part of the South African Society of Research In Music to discuss approaches to composition from a variety of perspectives in 2007, and the annual NewMusic South Africa Indaba Growing Composers Workshops provide constructive and collegial criticism in which new composers try out new works with a group of musicians (usually professional chamber musicians visiting from Europe or the U.S.A.), with guidance from experienced resident composers. Again, while these critical experiences are positive, they do not reach the public domain.

Michael Blake observes that “[i]deological differences between South African composers continually erupt”, adding that these difficulties are further exacerbated by “a shortage of funds (and regular burnout) [which] dog a very over-stretched group of new music devotees.” (2007: 371) But this is not unique to South Africa. Aesthetic difference is defended or attacked everywhere, and sometimes with considerable aggression. This is evident in the uptown-downtown New York schools, for example. Informal conversations with composers and performers in Sweden revealed animosity towards “the Professors” who, it is perceived, are deeply conservative and prevent innovations in new music.²⁶ There are cliques, and there are people who become favourites with funders, or the public. Klatzow and Hendrik Hofmeyr in South Africa, for example, seem to be popular with both commissioning bodies and audiences. Above all, the field in South Africa is small and scattered and young composers are dependent on others.

The contestations presented here can be interpreted as a result of “the struggle [by composers] for power within a highly contested cultural space” (Pooley 2008: 135). Bourdieu’s notion of “cultural capital” is useful here, as used by

²⁶ Pers. comms. Leif Karlborg, 15 December 2007 in Stockholm, and Ramon Anthin, 19 December 2007 in Visby, Sweden.

Lucia (2005), to understand the dynamics of the field. Cultural capital is not economic, or even aesthetic, but based on prestige, acquired through the kind of value that comes with unpaid or paid commissions, significant performances, reviews, recordings, and various kinds of hype – bearing in mind that most people in the South African cultural sphere know nothing of the craft of composition and little about contemporary art music. Art music composition is rarely about money, and performances are thus hugely important: these are the composer's "publications", and the more prestigious the performance and the venue (in the eyes of the small composition field and the rather ignorant art world) the higher the cultural capital.

I acquired significant cultural capital, for example, through having *Blink* performed in a major European capital (Vienna), in a highly prestigious venue by an internationally renowned ensemble, even though the venture was very expensive in economic terms. Further capital was acquired after the performance by a press review, written by a critic from South Africa who happened to be in Vienna at the time, published in the *Business Day*. For a composer negotiating a space in the South African field of composition, this kind of cultural capital is considerable. Because, however, many South African composers and the concert-going public do not know much about the international field, or performances by South African composers in it, the local field looms much larger.

It is further exacerbated by the significant prestige attached to tertiary institution art music composition posts in South Africa. I was intrigued to discover in Vienna that several of the composers' "day jobs" are not directly related to composition: one is a librarian in Universal Edition's library, for example, while another is a speech therapist.²⁷ They prefer jobs that leave them with creative energy for composing. Their identity as composers, therefore, is not tied to how they earn their living. I encountered a similar attitude in Sweden where many composers (and musicians who play new music) choose not to work full-time in

²⁷ Pers. comms. Roland Freisitzer and Norbert Sterk, 1 October 2007 in Vienna, Austria.

tertiary institutions, perceiving that the pressure to produce adversely affects their creativity. This is noticeably different in South Africa where the scarcity of academic posts, combined with the smallness of the local field, can create a stifling parochialism.

Chapter 3: Negotiating the Field

Challenges in the international field of composition are different from those facing composers in the South African field, particularly for those seeking to enter it.²⁸ Location is about where composers situate themselves in the smallest field, which corresponds with how they negotiate the demands of the two larger fields. This location is not fixed; it constantly shifts in relation to the three interacting fields of art music composers, the sponsoring and commissioning bodies, and society as a whole. Changes in any of these three fields affect composers' location and, in South Africa's politically fraught environment, these changes can be significant.

Although composers throughout the world respond to some extent to changes in the broader fields, the smallness of the South African art music environment makes any shift resonate throughout the smallest field, often with negative results. As Pooley observes, some South African composers have responded to shifts in the larger fields by deliberately adjusting their style and aesthetic to meet the new demand of accessibility, such as the inclusion of African elements. In doing this they move their location into one of more influence and power in the smallest field, securing the acquisition of more significant cultural capital, in some cases at the expense, Pooley argues, of artistic integrity (2008). These composers then establish a significant influence, and the ripple effect on other composers in the field, performers and audiences is considerable.²⁹

²⁸ The impact of restricted resources on South African composers entering the field, for example, is significant enough to have been the subject of an investigation by Angela Mullins (2007).

²⁹ Some examples of powerful positions include: Peter Klatzow, appointed in 2007 as Director of the College of Music, University of Cape Town, the oldest music department in South Africa, and Jeanne Zaidel-Rudolph, recently appointed onto the Board of SAMRO. Both composers now occupy positions of significant influence, the former affecting, for example, curriculum development and academic staff appointments at one of South Africa's biggest departments, the latter affecting funding and, importantly for composers, the commissioning of works and their criteria. Both composers favour a somewhat conservative approach to composition, and this has serious implications for the development of new music in South Africa.

There has been an explosion of movements and counter-movements in composition internationally in the past thirty years, and the contemporary aesthetic seems to be what Arnold Whittall describes as “persistent stylistic plurality” (quoted in Pieslak 2005: 45). Perhaps in fifty years it will be possible to identify particular aesthetic schools of the late 20th - and early 21st centuries with clarity, but it is tricky to identify common trends as they are happening. Haydn, for example, was not aware of the formalities of sonata form while writing within their conventions. As Charles Rosen acerbically noted: “Sonata form could not be identified until it was dead.” (1971: 30)

It is difficult for any composer to categorise her style, and in the “plurality” of new music globally I have fingers in various musical pies. I would describe myself as an intuitive composer, responding to immediate stimuli – musical, intellectual or environmental – as I compose, particularly in the early stages of a work. The affect of individual works or approaches on my compositions is discussed in more detail in Part II. I am partly post-minimalist, although not in the stripping of musical parameters by such composers as Feldman or Volans but rather in the minimal material I use. I rarely use the formal structures of the western classical tradition, such as sonata form or fugue, used often by composers such as South Africans Hofmeyr and Jeanne Zaidel-Rudolph; instead, forms that emerge tend to be a result of the working of the musical material rather than a predetermined structure. I do, however, sometimes use these structures as a starting point, “deconstructing” them at a later point. I do not always strive for accessibility; I am sometimes experimental, often driven by a core concept – not always necessarily musical. My use of rhythm is probably what locates me most as a South African composer, although it must be noted that it is my *approach* to rhythm that is different to composers from, for example, Europe, rather than the result sounding distinctly “African”.

Bourdieu’s notion of “habitus” is useful here, a term used to describe the agency that composers have and the position they occupy in relation to other composers, which includes influences on them over a lifetime of professional and personal

experience. Writing about the French literary field, Bourdieu says, “We must ... ask, not how a writer comes to be what he is ... but rather how the position or ‘post’ he occupies – that of a writer of a particular type – came to be constituted.” (1993: 162) It is only once we have considered how the position of the writer came to be constituted, Bourdieu says, “that we can ask if the knowledge of particular social conditions of the production of what I have termed his *habitus* permits us to understand that he has succeeded in occupying this position, if only by transforming it.” (Ibid.) In other words, *habitus* is not fixed but rather changes as the composer changes when new influences come into play. These include, for example, class, race, education, childhood environments, and, in the case of composers, all musical experiences and influences.

The musical choices composers make can be seen as decisions based on their *habitus* (often unconscious) and the forces exerted by the fields (often conscious). My location is partly about how I relate to contemporary music in general, and in the South African field is partly about where I come out of musically, economically, educationally and socially: my *habitus*.

I see my basic location as a white woman composer in the South African field of art music composition. But this location is affected by other composers in the same field, how I negotiate the powers at play in this field and those exerted by the middle field of commissioning bodies, et cetera. My own power in that field is gained by, for example, the cultural capital I earn through performances, or the commissions I receive. With each work I produce, my location may shift, possibly even moving into fields that overlap with art music composition (through collaborative work, for example). *Habitus*, on the other hand, is constantly changing. As a composer, I am very different from the one I was ten years ago as, with every new composition I hear or performance I attend, new influences come into play. Even this composition portfolio is not fixed; it is fixed as a document but not as an experience.

My musical habitus

“Today the music I write stems in some degree from all of my experiences” (Still 1998: 153).

Problematising my position as “habitus” rather than “location” means I cannot locate my work in this portfolio in any other way than temporarily and contingently. One of the things this portfolio is contingent on is history, including my own personal musical history.

I only engaged systematically with new music of the last thirty years when I changed composition teachers in 2006, but my path into composition was a roundabout one. I consequently came into contact with a wide range of musics that now form part of my habitus. I grew up on a diet of western classical music - Bach, Handel, Mozart and Beethoven - and inserted into this was the music of the Xhosa farm workers I heard on my grandfather’s farm in southern KwaZulu-Natal where I spent up to three months a year. I have distinct memories of sitting outside my grandparent’s farmhouse as a child, hearing Mozart floating out the window and the distant singing of farm workers as they called to each other across the southern Drakensberg foothills – a colonial music mix if there ever was one. My grandmother’s Irish heritage intrigued me, which I explored through Celtic music. I developed an interest in jazz in my late teens, including Chick Corea, Jan Garbarek, Keith Jarrett, Manhattan Transfer and Pat Metheny.

As a professional pianist, I worked for many years in musical theatre. Many of the productions I worked on during this time required, more or less, imitative playing of existing music, but I gained valuable experience of theatrical productions. More important, however, was the enjoyment of working with people who were not musicians yet shared a creative focus. I met numerous creative artists who were working on smaller, less commercial, more aesthetically challenging projects at the same time as “paying the rent” with larger commercial productions. Through them, I encountered a kind of theatrical

sub-culture in which artists staged experimental projects wherever they could find a platform – more often than not seedy venues in undesirable, if not dangerous, areas of Johannesburg. Over the years, I continued to be involved in numerous theatre projects, some more experimental than others, until a hand injury put an end to my piano playing days. However, the interest in interdisciplinary work continued and, when I was employed at the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits) in 2004 as a theory lecturer, I was thus eager to explore the interdisciplinary philosophy advocated by the WSOA. This gave rise to *The Collision Project*, the one work in this portfolio that does not include saxophone. During the 1990s I also worked in the commercial world of advertising, writing jingles that, while aesthetically unchallenging, gave me some useful skills.

When I decided to pursue studies in composition at postgraduate level (my undergraduate degree was in jazz performance) I began learning about other music, for example, the music of György Ligeti. During this time I explored further an already existing interest in traditional African music, particularly that of West Africa, with the help of the university department's ethnomusicologist. I started my own search for new music, and discovered, for example, *Bang on a Can* and composers such as Philip Cashian, Judith Weir and John Woolrich. But when I was put on a more rigorous “new music diet” in 2006 by my new supervisor I was astounded by the music I encountered: Louis Andriessen, Gerald Barry, Ruth Crawford, Morton Feldman, David Lang, Volans and Ian Wilson, among others. What grabbed my attention with the composers was the diversity of styles and approach, and that this diversity was indeed celebrated.

Although some traces of similarity could be found (such as from Feldman to Volans), I was immediately struck by the fact that each composer asserted an individual voice. The intention of composition went beyond a demonstration of craftsmanship, which is what I had become used to in South African music. Lang reveals this in his somewhat contrary approach in *Cheating, Lying, Stealing*:

I wanted to make a piece that was about something disreputable. It's a hard line to cross. You have to work against all your training. You are not taught to find the dirty seams in music. You are not taught to be low down, clumsy, sly and underhanded. [...] This piece is a series of unreliable, imperfect repetitions. There is a swagger, but it is not trustworthy.³⁰

This "voice" sometimes varied from one work to another by the same composer, not something I had encountered before, nor been encouraged to pursue in my own compositions, and the discovery of this aesthetic and stylistic plurality opened up a host of compositional possibilities for me. George Rochberg notes the confusion that greeted his *Third String Quartet*, a work that appeared to baffle critics as it was neither easily categorised nor reflected his usual style: "Some critics rejected the work out of hand on the grounds that its combination of tonal and nontonal musics simply did not add up to being 'contemporary'", adding that "they were uncertain whether the direction that the quartet pointed to could or would be followed up." (Rochberg 1998: 235). My relationship to these diverse styles, which relates to my *habitus*, is what defines my location and guides my compositional aesthetic.

Defining location

As Bourdieu's notion of *habitus* has revealed, my sense of "location" is not something fixed but moveable, not a position so much as a constantly changing circumstance. I use the word "location" here, then, in this fluid way.

The smorgasbord of my musical influences presents an interesting challenge in locating myself in contemporary music as I do not fit comfortably into a particular style or approach. There is presently much more diversity than, for example, the early- and mid-20th century that offered some cosy composition "schools", complete with pre-defined parameters and fiercely defended territory such as the 12-tone method of Arnold Schönberg or the avant-garde of John Cage. Many South African composers emerged out of these schools, sometimes moving into the broad composition schools that exist now, such as post-

³⁰ CD sleeve of Bang on a Can. 1996. *Cheating, Lying, Stealing*. Sony Classical SK 62254.

serialism or post-minimalism; Volans, for example, trained with Stockhausen and then turned towards Feldmanesque postmodernism. Several other South African composers received influential training overseas: Klatzow trained in France with Nadia Boulanger; Bräuninger with Erhard Karkoschka and Allen Strange, Robert Fokkens, who initially studied with Klatzow, continued his studies in the U.K. with Michael Finnissy.

Because I have not studied overseas, do not subscribe to the more conservative approach of much of the South African field of composition, and am reluctant to take on board the “acceptable” ways of including African elements which I see as not dissimilar to the jingle writing style of composition I willingly left behind, I have avoided slotting into an existing niche. Although Pieslak observes that “no point in history has experienced such a diversity of compositional styles” (2005: 45), this plurality is not reflected in the South African field, which, partly due to conservatism and lack of resources, is less tolerant of difference than fields overseas may be. Locating myself in this field, therefore, presents some interesting challenges. I am, of course, not unique. Other composers in South Africa, such as Fiona Tozer, face similar dilemmas. Tozer describes her difficulties in negotiating the field as “a sense of non-belonging”, not knowing where she “fits in”³¹. Sadly, many new composers in South Africa find the field too difficult to negotiate and leave it altogether to pursue alternative careers, as noted in Mullins (2007).

Focusing on the straight saxophone is, for me, part of seeking out a place in the field of composition in South Africa. But I was motivated largely by a fascination with the instrument, a love of the sound developed over many years of hearing it in various contexts and working with straight saxophonists; and not hearing the kinds of works I would have liked to hear. I have also noticed a shortage of repertoire for the saxophone, particularly with the increasing interest in the instrument.

³¹ Pers. comm. 13 October 2008.

It is perhaps worth explaining here the lack of electronic music in the portfolio. I made a conscious decision in 2001 not to write electronic music. There were numerous reasons: the electronic facilities available to me were out of date, access to them was difficult, and I did not have the funds to create my own. More importantly, however, I enjoy the physicality of music making, continuously learn from rehearsing with musicians, and relish the “mistakes” that sometimes end up permanently in the score. Steve Reich too notes how his work with a group of performers affected the compositional outcome of some of his works, changing in rehearsal with different performers. “These musicians are also my first and most important critics.” (Reich 1998: 118).

Electronic music, by contrast, I find flat and unsatisfying. I have, in the last few years, heard a few works using electronica that are more appealing, such as Suk-Jun Kim’s *Welcome to Hasla* (2008) and Bräuninger and Süssé’s ... *anywhere far* (1991) (which combines acoustic instruments with electronic tape). Interestingly, Bedford observed that *Arc*, one of the works I present in my portfolio, written for and premiered in a large, echoing art gallery “creates the effects that electronic composers try to achieve through multiple speakers.”³²

In making the decision not to write electronic music, I removed myself from that particular section of the field. This does not necessarily mean that I will never explore electronic music – as my habitus changes, so too may my compositional choices that, in turn, will shift my location in the field.

Considering the limited field of production in South Africa, one of the ways in which to negotiate location in this restricted field is to expand its boundaries into other creative disciplines. My interest in theatre and interdisciplinary work, another result of my habitus from numerous years of working in various theatre projects, places me in a position to take advantage of other fields. By linking into other creative fields in *The Collision Project*, my own field of composition overlapped with those of Fine Art and theatre, both fields that in South Africa

³² Pers. comm. 1 March 2008.

are significantly larger, better resourced, and more willing to facilitate work that is adventurous and experimental than the field of art music composition.

A cross disciplinary project has other practical advantages: multiple performances as well as an appeal to a wider audience from a broader range of creative disciplines. Most art music composition receives one performance, attended by a small group of new music devotees. Staging *The Collision Project* in the SubStation (an art gallery on the Wits campus) for ten days provided not only substantially more performances but also widened the potential audience. It is revealing that the venue was full every performance, and the cultural capital gained was significant: extensive press coverage, including two reviews in the public press (which rarely happens with new music performances), and several radio interviews.

Location, therefore, can also shift from one project to another: writing a work for an international ensemble, for example, creates an overlap of location with the international field; a collaborative work can create an overlap with the field of Fine Arts and/or theatre.

When the habitus of a composer and the field in which she works do not align, she may find herself on the outer perimeter of the art music composition field's influence. The following example illustrates my shifting location in the field, and the movement of this location in relation to my habitus.

When I recently left university employment, my location shifted dramatically as I moved out of the relative protection of full-time university employment and became far more susceptible to the influences of the two larger fields of production. This move quickly resulted in an aesthetic dilemma: being asked to write a saxophone quartet "based on an African folk theme" (mentioned earlier) raises questions of artistic integrity for me. I am extremely uncomfortable about writing a work in a mode that I believe to be outdated at best, patronising at worst. Yet I may get a commission, and it will be performed around the country.