

MORTON FELDMAN'S *FOR SAMUEL BECKETT*:

THE SEMIOTICS OF MUSICAL TIME

AND

I MEET YOU. I REMEMBER YOU.

(AN ORIGINAL COMPOSITION FOR VIOLIN AND CHAMBER ORCHESTRA)

by

David Gerard Matthews, Jr.

B.M., Oberlin College Conservatory of Music, 1999

M.A., University of Pittsburgh, 2002

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Arts and Sciences in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2011

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

This dissertation was presented

by

David Gerard Matthews, Jr.

It was defended on

March 11, 2011

and approved by

Mathew Rosenblum, PhD., Professor of Music

Eric Moe, PhD., Professor of Music

Mary Lewis, PhD., Professor Emerita of Music

Marcia Landy, PhD., Distinguished Professor of English and Film Studies

Dissertation Advisor: Mathew Rosenblum, PhD., Professor of Music

Copyright © by David Gerard Matthews, Jr.

2011

**MORTON FELDMAN'S *FOR SAMUEL BECKETT*:
THE SEMIOTICS OF MUSICAL TIME**

AND

***I MEET YOU. I REMEMBER YOU.*
(AN ORIGINAL COMPOSITION FOR VIOLIN AND CHAMBER ORCHESTRA)**

David Gerard Matthews, Jr., PhD.

University of Pittsburgh, 2011

In *For Samuel Beckett*, for twenty-three players, Feldman creates a seemingly static surface of sound lasting nearly an hour that challenges the listener's perception of time and explores musical memory. The fact that Feldman's work does not conform to received notions of organic development creates unique challenges in musical analysis. The present study attempts to put to use some concepts of difference and repetition derived from the French philosopher and cultural theorist Gilles Deleuze in order to create an appropriate model for the analysis of non-teleological music. This study notes the role of notation and the graphic layout of the score, arguing that the visual presentation of the score is an important aspect of the work.

The original composition, *i meet you. i remember you.*, for violin and chamber orchestra, also explores ideas of non-linear temporality and difference and repetition. The piece further explores the non-organic model-repetition strategy employed by Feldman, but does so in a completely different musical context. This work also reflects my interest in microtonality, in heterophony, and in engaging with popular music.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 FELDMAN AND BECKETT: A SHARED MISTRUST OF NARRATIVE	2
1.2 NON-DEVELOPMENTAL DIFFERENTIATION AND THE PROBLEM OF FORM.....	4
1.3 THE PROBLEM OF ANALYSIS.....	6
1.3.1 The Troping of Temporality	6
1.3.2 How Can this Music Be Analyzed?	9
1.3.3 A DELEUZEAN PERSPECTIVE	13
1.4 OVERVIEW OF THE PRESENT STUDY	15
2.0 DELEUZE ON TIME, MEMORY, AND RHYTHM: SOME THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS	16
2.1 DIFFERENCE AND REPETITION	18
2.2 TIME AND DURATION	20
2.2.1 Memory: The Three Syntheses	21
2.2.2 Memory Falsified	22
2.3 RHYTHM.....	23
2.3.1 Repetition, Symmetry, and Asymmetry.....	23
2.3.2 Chaos, the Sublime, and the Diagram.....	24

2.4	THE MOVEMENT-IMAGE AND THE TIME IMAGE	26
2.4.1	Deleuze on Narrative in Cinema	26
2.4.2	Comparison to Musical Time: Observations from Kramer and Ligeti	28
3.0	ANALYSIS OF <i>FOR SAMUEL BECKETT</i> : PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATIONS .	30
3.1.1	General Characteristics	30
3.1.2	Orchestration, Timbre	31
3.1.3	Harmony: The Altered Cluster	32
3.2	THE SCORE: GRAPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	33
3.2.1	The Importance of the Visual Aspect of the Score.....	33
3.2.2	The Musical Intent of the Notation.....	35
3.2.3	Notation as Abstract Machine	37
3.3	TIME SIGNATURES	38
3.4	STRUCTURAL DIVISIONS OF THE SCORE.....	39
4.0	DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF <i>FOR SAMUEL BECKETT</i>	42
4.1	THE OPENING OF THE PIECE.....	43
4.2	SECOND SECTION	49
4.3	THIRD SECTION	52
4.4	FOURTH SECTION.....	59
4.5	FIFTH SECTION	63
4.6	CLOSING REMARKS ON THE DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS	63
5.0	CONCLUSION: MORTON FELDMAN’S TIME MACHINE	67
5.1.1	Memory and Repetition.....	67
5.1.2	Rhythm and Pulse	68

5.2 THE TROPING OF TEMPORALITY REVISITED	70
5.2.1 Comparison to Deleuze’s Time-Image	71
5.3 CLOSING REMARKS	72
BIBLIOGRAPHY	74
I MEET YOU. I REMEMBER YOU., FOR VIOLIN AND CHAMBER ORCHESTRA..	77

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Claren's structural division of <i>For Samuel Beckett</i>	40
Table 2. Structural division of <i>For Samuel Beckett</i> (Matthews)	41

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: The altered cluster	44
Figure 2: Upper winds, mm. 1-9.....	45
Figure 3: Lower winds, mm. 1-9	45
Figure 4: Piano and vibraphone, mm. 1-9	46
Figure 5: Full score, mm. 28-36	48
Figure 6: Brass and bassoons (reduction), mm. 42-45	49
Figure 7: The 5/8 “model” (reduction).....	50
Figure 8: Palindromic construction in the low brass	51
Figure 9: Full score showing symmetrical construction, mm. 208-216	53
Figure 10: Harp, piano, and vibraphone	55
Figure 11: Full score, palindromic construction with string chord, mm. 244-252	56
Figure 12, strings	58
Figure 13, strings	60
Figure 14, full score	62

PREFACE

Permission to reprint excerpts from Morton Feldman's *For Samuel Beckett* granted by the publisher, © copyright 1987 by Universal Edition (Ltd.), London/UE18526.

Thanks to all of the members of my dissertation committee for encouraging me to persevere through what has been an exceptionally slow and often difficult process. I would like to single out Mathew Rosenblum for prodding me when necessary. Thanks to Eric Moe for his helpful insights in the early stages of composing the *i meet you. i remember you.* I am grateful to Mary Lewis for her support, both inside and outside of the university. Thanks also to Marcia Landy for facilitating my earliest explorations into Deleuze. It has been a pleasure having her be a part of my dissertation committee. A special round of thanks is in order to Roger Zahab and to the members of the Eclectic Laboratory Chamber Orchestra, who took part in the premiere of the dissertation piece. My friends, colleagues, and fellow composers, both at Pitt and elsewhere, provided much-needed support, constructive criticism, and advice. In this regard, I would like to especially recognize the valuable insights of Alan Tormey and Benjamin Breuer. Lastly, I would like to thank my family, my parents, and above all, my wife, Heidi Baldt Matthews.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

“I am not a clockmaker. I am interested in getting to time in its unstructured existence.”

– Morton Feldman¹

For Samuel Beckett has been described by critic Alex Ross as a “long journey into darkness.”² Completed in 1987, the year of the composer’s death, it is therefore one of Feldman’s last compositions, followed only by *Piano, Violin, Viola, Cello*. Like many of Feldman’s late works, the first impression one gets of *For Samuel Beckett* is that of complete stasis. There is very little in the way of conventionally-recognizable thematic material, and almost nothing in the way of forward-moving rhythmic drive. The piece presents what seems to be a massive, amorphous body of sound that seemingly comes from nowhere and which does not have a clear destination. Individual features do peek out from the sonic mist from time to time, but they are not so much obvious points of articulation as they are local disturbances of the sonic flow of information. If one could compare the surface of the piece to a landscape, it would resemble a foggy plain with the occasional small rock poking out from an otherwise nearly featureless surface.

With a duration of between forty-five minutes to around an hour in performance, *For Samuel Beckett* is one of the shorter works in Feldman’s late period. Sebastian Claren remarks that much like Feldman’s 1986 orchestral work *Coptic Light*, *For Samuel Beckett* “is made of single blocks of sound” and that it “largely renounces the use of patterns and is sustained for

¹ Morton Feldman. “Between Categories,” in *Give My Regards to Eighth Street: Collected Writings of Morton Feldman*, ed. by B. H. Friedman (Cambridge, MA: Exact Change, 2000), 87.

² Alex Ross, “Pensive Music Yearning To Be Alone,” *The New York Times*, 6 August 1996.

nearly double the length of *Coptic Light* through an exceptionally complex, but formally unequivocal organization.”³

1.1 FELDMAN AND BECKETT: A SHARED MISTRUST OF NARRATIVE

While it is easy to take issue with Claren’s assertion regarding a purported “renunciation” of patterns, there is no doubt that the organization of *For Samuel Beckett* is indeed complex and formally unequivocal – deceptively so, given the apparently static surface of the music. Practically every writer of program notes on *For Samuel Beckett* has attempted to find parallels between Feldman’s static, uncompromising musical language and Beckett’s writing.⁴ One may certainly find commonalities: the repetitions, the obsession with time and memory, and the spare, unadorned style. Whether this is due to a direct influence is debatable (and, ultimately not particularly relevant to the present investigation), but Feldman did have a longstanding interest in Beckett, and collaborated with him on a musical-dramatic work, *Neither*.

The events which led to the genesis of *Neither* are interesting, and shed some more light on Feldman’s relationship to Beckett. In a 1976 interview, Feldman expressed some interest in setting some of Beckett’s texts to music.⁵ Up to this point, Feldman had written few settings of literary texts, but shortly afterward, he received a request from the director of the Rome Opera to stage his “Beckett opera” – a piece that did not yet exist. When Beckett came to Berlin, where Feldman was living at the time, for a staging of one of his plays, Feldman approached him during the rehearsal, introduced himself, and asked Beckett if he would be interested in meeting him for lunch. Over the course of the meal, Feldman asked the playwright if he might be interested in collaborating on an opera. “Mr. Feldman, I don’t like opera,” replied Beckett. “I

³ Sebastian Claren, *Neither: Die Musik Morton Feldmans* (Hofheim: Wolke Verlag, 2000), 492. The translation is mine, as are all subsequent translations from Claren.

⁴ Indeed, the essay accompanying the recording by Klangforum Wien is entitled “Isn’t Morton Beckett...Samuel Feldman?”

⁵ Claren, *Neither*, 15.

don't blame you!" was Feldman's reply.⁶ Having gotten that out of the way, the two agreed that they would be able to work together after all. Beckett had, at this point, never heard a note of Feldman's music, although he would soon be very impressed by a performance of one of Feldman's works that he heard on the radio. A short while later, Feldman received the libretto of *Neither*, a short text, from Beckett, and their non-narrative "anti-opera" was premiered shortly thereafter. Feldman remarked, while studying Beckett's text, that each line seemed to be a restating of the previous line in somewhat different language – in other words, that the libretto is a constant set of variations that somehow advanced the ideas Beckett was trying to express without constructing a conventional rhetorical argument.

What probably struck Feldman about Beckett's writing was precisely its refusal to adhere to conventional notions of plot, character development, and syntax. Sebastian Claren, in his comprehensive survey *Neither: Die Musik Morton Feldmans*, views this meeting and the resulting work as a kind of turning point in Feldman's career.⁸ Although Feldman's music had grown more discursive and more concerned with melody and repetition throughout the later 1960s and 1970s, Claren sees a new sensibility in *Neither* that marks the real beginning of Feldman's last compositional phase, which ends with the composer's death shortly after the completion of another apparently Beckett-inspired piece, *For Samuel Beckett*. As noted previously, it is debatable what level of influence Beckett may have had upon Feldman's music⁹, but one thing this amusing little story about the meeting of two of the giants of the twentieth-century avant-garde illustrates is that Feldman and Beckett shared a profound mistrust of narrative, at least in any conventionally-understood sense of the term. Characters in a Beckett play often find themselves unable to progress, or to develop; they find themselves caught up in a web of repetition.¹⁰ Similarly, Feldman's late works, while not entirely devoid of identifiable

⁶ James Knowlson, *Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett* (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 2004), 557

⁸ In the introduction to the book in question, Claren writes: "...this opera, even in Feldman's own estimation, represents a central role in his output, which shows a turning point in his artistic development, and which therefore offers the possibility to discuss his previous as well as his following works, and above all to investigate more exactly the decisive phases of Feldman's compositional-technical development." Claren, *Neither*, 9.

⁹ Moreover, such questions are not particularly relevant to the present study.

¹⁰ I am especially thinking of such works as *What Where*, *Footfalls*, *Endgame*, and *Krapp's Last Tape*.

thematic content, do not adhere to any classical conception of motivic development or organic thematic evolution.

1.2 NON-DEVELOPMENTAL DIFFERENTIATION AND THE PROBLEM OF FORM

It is partially due to this rejection of received notions of narrative development that Feldman's music does not easily lend itself to conventional analytical methodologies. Feldman's own attitude toward analysis, and the technical aspects of composition has not helped the situation. As he himself liked to point out, Feldman composed largely with his ears and intuition; he famously told Stockhausen that his "secret" was not to "push the sounds around";¹¹ he expressed something approaching contempt towards the rigorously systematic approach of composers such as Boulez and Babbitt. Musical analysis has often privileged organic motivic development and clarity of line - two qualities largely absent in Feldman's late work, which largely eschews self-conscious development. Patterns occur, and then they disappear, as inexplicably as they appeared. Material is repeated, varied according to limited parameters, and then largely abandoned. Formal motivic development in any teleological sense is almost nonexistent. However, it cannot be said that the music is completely flat or static. It is full of repetitions, but also of differences. The course of the piece seems to be defined by a process which could be called differentiation, rather than development: successive modules of sound are repeated, sometimes verbatim, sometimes with rhythmic, harmonic, or orchestrational differences, but without an apparent evolutionary progression.

"Non-developmental differentiation" may seem like a contradiction in terms, but we must remember that Feldman soundly rejects notions of narrative, and developmental form. In a very brief essay on his very long *Second String Quartet*, Feldman states that the work is an "assemblage",¹² rather than a "composition":

¹¹ Morton Feldman, "Crippled Symmetry", in *Give My Regards to Eighth Street*, 143.

¹² Interestingly, the term "assemblage" is also much used by Deleuze.

A “composition” for me forms sentence structures within a scenario of beginning, middle, and end. Very much the way Picasso uses the rectangle as a ready-made protagonist. With assemblage there is no continuity of fitting the parts together as words in a sentence or paragraph.

A syntactic approach would be as out of place here as Schoenberg felt a tonality not based on triadic harmony would be in his music.¹³

Thus, Feldman equates “composition” with received notions of narrative development. This passage is also telling because it illustrates that form is for Feldman at least as important a concern as harmony had been for earlier composers. Moreover, it shows the distance between Feldman’s conception of form and that of earlier composers. Feldman is clearly not interested in “ready-made protagonists” any more than Beckett is interested in Aristotelian conceptions of plot. It is this non-syntactic formal conception, along with their often extraordinary durations, that is so striking about Feldman’s late works.

This unique conception of form and its accompanying rejection of narrative obviously requires unique listening strategies. As pianist Louis Goldstein describes in his account of performing Feldman’s *Triadic Memories*:

During the course of performing *Triadic Memories* my own sense of time is stretched and tugged in ways I never before experienced. There come moments where the unit of time I am measuring in my mind suddenly doubles and simultaneously begins to move at half the previous tempo. Sometimes I experience beats of time slower than I have ever been able to imagine.

Goldstein’s description is similar to the experience that many listeners have with Feldman’s late music (especially the longer pieces). Typically, the piece is aurally very seductive and engaging at first. Then the passage of time becomes almost painfully apparent, and the listener can even become bored by the apparent lack of surface detail. At some point, however, this gives way, and the listener is surprised to see that the piece is over sooner than expected.¹⁴ It is as if time itself were speaking: Feldman seems to be making time itself, and the perception of time, the level of his discourse. While we have seen the difficulties of speaking about motivic development in *For Samuel Beckett*, one can almost speak of “temporal development.”

¹³ Morton Feldman, “String Quartet II”, in *Give My Regards to Eighth Street*, 196.

¹⁴ I first heard *For Samuel Beckett* in a live performance in Vienna in 2000. My reaction was almost exactly as described. Anecdotal reports and personal conversations confirm that others have similar reactions to other late Feldman pieces. For example, see Kyle Gann’s review of the epic, six-hour-long *Second String Quartet* (<http://www.cnvill.net/mfkgann2.htm>, accessed February 1, 2011.)

Feldman discusses something along these lines in an essay entitled “Between Categories.” He considers that music extends along the temporal plane in a manner analogous to the visual plane of a painting. He then argues that most Western classical music does not develop a temporal surface. When Feldman asks his friend Brian Doherty to attempt to define the concept of a musical surface, Doherty replies that “music that has a surface *constructs* with time. A music that doesn’t have a surface submits to time and becomes a rhythmic progression.”¹⁵ When Feldman goes on to say that “the idea is more to let Time be, than to treat it as a compositional element. No – even to construct with Time would not do. Time must simply be left alone.”¹⁶ This attitude seems strangely contradictory: on the one hand, Feldman does not wish to “submit to Time,” but on the other hand he believes in leaving time alone. Behind this rhetoric we can recognize a desire to present a pure image of time, to make his music truly be *about* time, in a way that so many of the paintings that Feldman so greatly admired are about space. In order to do this, he must (paradoxically) “construct with time,” but he cannot do this in any obvious, transparent fashion. In order for the music to be about Time, he must slow down the perception of time, while simultaneously making the listener acutely aware of the passage of time. In a sense, he must falsify time.

1.3 THE PROBLEM OF ANALYSIS

1.3.1 The Troping of Temporality

The idea of such a temporal development is not necessarily unique to Feldman. In an article entitled “The Troping of Temporality in Music”, Robert Hatten distinguishes between musical time (as it has traditionally been understood) and what he calls “temporality”: “When we think of musical time, we generally think of meter, rhythm, rubato, or pacing – elements of great structural and expressive significance for music.” What he calls *temporality* is something closer

¹⁵ Feldman, “Between Categories,” in *Give My Regards to Eighth Street*, 85. Italics in the original.

¹⁶ Ibid, capitalization in the original.

to Bergson's *duration* or Deleuze's *Aion*, the direct image of time, unmeasured and unmeasurable, incommensurable and unmediated. Composers, says Hatten, can "trope temporality" through "the complex syntheses created when composers explore the unexpected relationships between the expected location of musical events and the actual location where they appear, relative to one another, and to their plausible dramatic sequence." In other words, by disrupting the normative expectations of musical narrative, composers can use time as a kind of rhetorical device. Hatten's terminology is overwhelmingly linguistic and literary in its inspiration: he speaks of tense and aspect in music, for example. While these linguistic metaphors can be distracting or misleading,¹⁷ the distinction between time and temporality is a useful one, and the idea that temporality can somehow be invoked or denoted directly through music is powerful. Hatten does not discuss Feldman at all; his discussion centers mainly on nineteenth-century tonal music, with a short passage on Berg's early, marginally-tonal Piano Sonata. Near the end of the article, he tantalizingly remarks that the "hypercharged atonal masterpieces" of Schoenberg and Berg constitute "the ultimate troping of tonality." He does not, however, discuss any such pieces in depth. Hatten's emphasis on narrative and motivic development, coupled with his linguistic preoccupations, do give reason to question whether a composition in which motivic development is attenuated (if not entirely absent) can trope temporality at all. "Troping" is obviously a rhetorical term with obvious literary connotations, and it is of the utmost importance to be mindful of such connotations when discussing music as stubbornly anti-rhetorical as Feldman's. However, in manipulating the perception of time for expressive purpose, Feldman's late works do achieve something very much like Hatten's troping of temporality. Feldman upbraids his fellow composers for failing to make a distinction between what he calls "timing" (corresponding to Hatten's "time") and what he calls "Time" (which he capitalizes, corresponding to Hatten's "temporality").¹⁸

¹⁷ We will see how non-literary art forms do not necessarily function by analogy to language in the second section of the present study. Deleuze's criticism of Metz's linguistic semiotic of film is a good comparison.

¹⁸ The confusing terminology is indicative of the problems that composers and theorists still face in talking about musical time, and a sign that the study of time in music is still a relatively new phenomenon.

One would think that music more than any other art would be exploratory about Time. But is it? *Timing* – not Time, has been passed off as the real thing in music.¹⁹

That Feldman was interested in exploring time, and the perception of time, is readily apparent in his music. A remark made to Tom Johnson, a former student of his, further affirms the primacy of time: “All we composers really have to work with is time and sound – and sometimes I’m not even sure about sound.”²⁰

Time, of course, is inextricably linked to memory. In fact, we are unable to perceive time at all except through memory. As Henri Bergson famously remarked:

Your perception, however instantaneous, consists then in a multitude of remembered elements; and in truth every perception is already memory. Practically we perceive only the past, the pure present being the invisible progress of the past gnawing into the future.²¹

We will explore the connection between time and memory in greater detail in the following section, but it is relatively uncontroversial to say that it is through memory that we experience time and through time that we experience memory.

It is therefore unsurprising that Feldman sees a connection between time, form, and memory. In fact, he writes that “musical forms and related processes are essentially only methods of arranging material and serve no other function than to aid one’s memory.”²² Contrasting his own conception of form and memory with traditional, classical conceptions, Feldman goes on to say that “Western musical forms have become a paraphrase of memory. But memory could operate otherwise as well.”²³

The distinction between memory itself and a paraphrase of memory is not trivial. Feldman wishes to present a pure image of memory, not a paraphrase. Rather than working by analogy, Feldman seeks to work directly with memory, unmediated by linguistic metaphor. The fact that Feldman seems to largely succeed in this endeavor is evidenced by the reactions of

¹⁹ Feldman, “Between Categories”, in *Give My Regards to Eighth Street*, 87.

²⁰ Tom Johnson, “Remembrance”, *Musiktexte*, No. 22 (December 1987).

²¹ Henri Bergson. *Matter and Memory*, trans. N.M. Paul and W.S. Palmer (New York: Zone, 1991), 150. This remark of Bergson’s has taken on a life of its own in a paraphrased and differently-translated form after it appeared as quote in the novel *Kafka on the Shore*, by the Japanese writer Haruki Murakami: “The pure present is an ungraspable advance of the past devouring the future. In truth, all sensation is already memory.” Murakami, *Kafka on the Shore*, p. 273.

²² Feldman, “Crippled Symmetries”, in *Give My Regards to Eighth Street*, 137.

²³ *Ibid.*

listeners and performers to his music described above, whether positive or negative. It also has the effect of rendering descriptions and analyses of it considerably more difficult: without the literary and linguistic analogies many theorists have come to rely on (or, alternatively, the mathematical systems some prefer, which, as we have already noted, are potentially even less useful in discussing Feldman), how can we discuss this music at all?

1.3.2 How Can this Music Be Analyzed?

This brings us to our fundamental question: having established that Feldman's primary concerns are with sound, memory, and manipulating the listener's perception of the passage of time, how does Feldman realize this artistic project? How do difference and repetition function, and how does continuously varying repetition affect the process of remembering? Is musical signification possible in a work that seemingly limits motivic development and avoids rhetorical gesture in any traditionally-understood sense, and if so, how does it occur? How can the experience of the piece be reconciled with the score, if at all?

As mentioned above, analysis of these works certainly does present obstacles. As we have discussed, most analytical tools have been developed to deal with teleological, narrative music. Jonathan Kramer, who uses the problematic term "vertical time" to refer non-linear perceptions of time remarks:

...most discussions of non-teleological music are more descriptive – or proscriptive – than analytic. It is not simply that adequate analytic tools have not been developed. There is a fundamental incompatibility between the nature of vertical time and the process of music analysis, at least as it is traditionally construed.²⁴

He goes on to quote Edward Cone: "...the only possible or appropriate analytic method [for non-teleological, non-developmental music] is to determine the original prescriptive plan. This is not analysis but cryptanalysis."²⁵

Cone's use of the term "cryptanalysis" is curious. He seems to be implying that analysis of non-teleological music is necessarily an act of code-breaking. Certainly, much discussion of the music of the last hundred years has fallen under this rubric, and such an approach to analysis

²⁴ Jonathan D. Kramer, *The Time of Music* (New York, New York: Schirmer, 1988), 388.

²⁵ Ibid.

has certainly been encouraged by many composers, often to the exclusion of other possible ways of studying the music. Since Kramer subsumes under the heading of “non-teleological” or “vertical” all sorts of dissimilar composers (from Babbitt to Glass and from Messiaen to La Monte Young), there are some cases where determining the “prescriptive plan” might be appropriate, or at least an analytical possibility. Certainly, much of the literature on serial music (and, to some degree, minimalism) attempts to discern the composer’s original algorithm. But in the case of Feldman, who professed to have no sort of code to crack, the cryptanalytic approach is doomed to fail, because there simply is no algorithm. So what are the analytic tools adequate to the task? Kramer’s own analysis of Frederic Rzewski’s nonlinear *Les moutons de Panurge* is, by his own admission, largely a failure, since, by subjecting a nonlinear piece of music to linear analysis, he has failed to account for its most salient feature – nonlinearity.

Despite the many challenges posed by traditional theoretical paradigms, several studies devoted to the analysis of Feldman’s music have emerged in recent years. The various contributors to Thomas DeLio’s *The Music of Morton Feldman*, and Sebastian Claren, in his massive *Neither: Die Musik Morton Feldmans*²⁶ (available only in German), examine Feldman’s work with the much the same tools they would use to investigate any other twentieth-century music. A somewhat different approach is offered by Catherine Costello Hirata, who in an article (tellingly entitled “The Sounds of Sounds Themselves”) emphasizes the subjective quality of hearing intervals and single pitches in and out of context, while still retaining an analytical focus.²⁷ In many ways, something like a synthetic approach might be ideal – to examine the score with all the insights traditional analysis can offer, while simultaneously being aware that such analyses may fail to reveal important aspects of the music, aspects that may not even be the most noticeable characteristics of the piece.

Ironically enough, such an approach is suggested by Edward Cone himself, who, as we recall, had suggested that analysis of non-teleological music is impossible. In an article entitled “Three Ways of Reading a Detective Story – Or a Brahms Intermezzo,” Cone compares musical

²⁶ Claren’s exhaustive volume, already mentioned above, is primarily analytical in orientation.

²⁷ Catherine Costello Hirata. “The Sounds of the Sounds Themselves: Analyzing the Early Music of Morton Feldman.” *Perspectives of New Music* 34, no. 1.

analysis to reading a Sherlock Holmes story.²⁸ Cone suggests that there are three possible types of “readings” of a work. Cone’s First Reading refers to “any reading based on total or partial ignorance of the events narrated.”²⁹ One’s first reading of a story is necessarily a First Reading, but subsequent readings can also be considered First Readings, as long as the primary motivation for reading remains to understand the plot as it unfolds. Cone’s Second Reading is analytically focused.³⁰ In the case of a Second Reading, the reader is already aware of the outcome of the story. Referring to the Second Reading as a “synoptic analysis,” Cone states that the Second Reading view the work under scrutiny “not as a work of art that owes its effect to progress through time, but as an object abstracted from the work of art, a static art-object that can be contemplated timelessly.”³¹ A Second Reading, in other words, views the totality of the work and its internal relationships simultaneously, without taking time as an independent variable.

Cone finds reductive analysis frustratingly inadequate even in dealing with the linear, narratively-conceived music of Beethoven and Brahms.³² But by synthesizing the plot-based, temporal strategy of the First Reading with the analytical insights gained through the Second Reading, we arrive at Cone’s Third Reading. Cone describes the Third Reading thusly:

Like the First, this one is temporally oriented: it accepts the story as narrated. Again like the First, it aims at enjoyment; but now, guided by the synoptic comprehension of the Second Reading, it can replace naïve pleasure with intelligent and informed appreciation. Yet at the same time this reading requires an intentional “forgetting.” For if one is really to appreciate a narrative as such, one must concentrate on each event as it comes, trying to suppress from consciousness those elements meant to be concealed until some later point in the story.³³

Cone’s Readings are, of course, overtly literary in their inspiration, and the musical examples he cites are of works from the nineteenth century. On the one hand, this approach

²⁸ Edward Cone, “Three Ways of Reading a Detective Story – Or a Brahms Intermezzo,” in *Music: A View From Delft*, ed. Robert P. Morgan (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 77-94.

²⁹ Cone, 79. Cone alternates between the terms “Reading” and “Hearing” and consistently capitalizes both.

³⁰ It is important to recognize that just as a First Reading does not necessarily need to be one’s first encounter with a work, a Second Reading may actually be one’s third or twenty-sixth encounter. It is, however, not possible for a Second Reading to occur *before* one is familiar with the plot of the story.

³¹ Cone, 80.

³² A review of Cone’s criticism of reductive analysis, such as practiced by Schenker and his followers, is beyond the scope of the present discussion.

³³ Cone, 80.

would seem to have little relevance to a discussion of music which explicitly rejects narrative forms, and which Cone himself considered incapable of being analyzed through traditional means. However, implicit in Cone's Third Reading is the concept that the auditor's perception of the work as it unfolds through time is at least as important to the understanding of the work as the text itself. As recounted earlier, First Readings of Feldman's works are often frustrating affairs. One can attempt to undertake Second Readings, but such analyses do little justice to the piece as it exists in sound and time.

The problem, as we have discussed, is that *For Samuel Beckett* does not have anything resembling a narrative form. However, Cone himself suggests that another kind of Third Reading exists – one which is “a more efficient Second Reading”, rather than an ideal First Reading.³⁴ Cone does not discuss this sort of Third Reading at length, but, glossing the literary theorist Joseph Frank, he claims it is appropriate to the literary works of Joyce and Proust. Following Frank, he describes such works as “spatial,” and, on account of their non-traditional plot structures, questions whether a true Third Reading of such works is even possible.³⁵

But assuming that Feldman can be analyzed at all, what can we really hope to gain by studying a late Feldman composition? Edward Pearsall notes that the materials of *For Samuel Beckett* are “not rich in content.”³⁶ Even a casual glance at the score reveals that it is made up primarily of various permutations of tone clusters. Motivic or even harmonic development is minimal (if it occurs at all). The piece does have some very interesting rhythmic and formal properties that are worthy of further investigation. However, the assemblage of rhythmic, motivic, and formal aspects of the work does not necessarily equal the experience of the piece, as Cone reminds us in his discussions of the Second Reading, and his accompanying criticisms of reductive analysis. Feldman's music, especially as seen in the later works, is notable above all for its manipulation of time and memory, and on the surface, its exploration of timbre as a primary force. Therefore, any analysis that does not give primacy to timbre and time runs the risk of missing the terms of Feldman's musical discourse. In discussing his analysis of Rzewski,

³⁴ Cone, 84.

³⁵ As mentioned, Cone is adopting terminology from Joseph Frank's “Spatial Form in Modern Literature.”

³⁶ Edward Pearsall, “Anti-Teleological Art,” in *Approaches to Meaning in Music*, ed. Byron Almén and Edward Pearsall, 41-61 (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2000), 59.

Kramer notes that “...it is a curious analytic situation when the less structurally important aspects [of a piece] receive the most attention.” As we do not wish to prioritize those aspects of the work which of less interest from the viewpoint of the composer or of the listener, this situation is to be avoided at all costs. Ultimately, one of the most remarkable aspects of Feldman’s works is the manner in which the listener’s sensation of time is distorted. Any successful analysis of these works ultimately must attempt to come to terms with this fact, ideally while incorporating insights gleaned from close analytical study.

1.3.3 A DELEUZEAN PERSPECTIVE

Problems of time and memory occupied French philosopher and cultural theorist Gilles Deleuze, especially in his two volumes on cinema. Deleuze suggests that, as a system of visual signs presented through time, a film can be understood directly, without recourse to verbal analogies. Indeed, Deleuze suggests that language emerges after the image (and sound), and that language functions as an analogy to pure image and sound, not vice versa. Cinema is thus a semiotic system in its own right, not dependent directly on the written or spoken word. In the preface to the English edition of *Cinema I*, Deleuze puts it thusly:

The cinema seems to us to be a composition of images and signs, that is, a pre-verbal intelligible content (*pure semiotics*), whilst semiology of a linguistic inspiration abolishes the image and tends to dispense with the sign.³⁷

That this system is expressed through the movement of images through time is emphasized in the subtitles of the two volumes on film, *The Motion-Image* and *The Time-Image*. As Feldman reminds us, music, like film, is a time-based art form with a complex and problematic relationship to language, so Deleuze’s work might offer a possible point of departure for an investigation into the semiotics of time in music. We will delve further into the ideas of Deleuze further in the next section, but a few words may be in order at this point.

According to Deleuze, it is the work of philosophers to create concepts, and of artists to create percepts. In other words, philosophers create ideas, whereas artists create perceptions, or

³⁷ Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema I: The Movement-Image*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1986), ix.

sensations.³⁸ Deleuze sees the two activities as roughly equivalent, because thinking is for Deleuze an act of perceiving. This fundamental notion informs much of Deleuze's thinking. For example, in *The Logic of Sense*, Deleuze begins by offering an extended exegesis of Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland*, implying that Carroll, a novelist, has contributed a text at least as valuable to the philosophy of signification as those of professional philosophers. Similarly, in his two books on film, Deleuze advances the theory that the cinema, through its direct appeal to perception, can function as a philosophy of moving images. Artists, therefore, whether writers, composers, visual artists, or film directors, are thinkers who happen to work with sensations directly, rather than with abstract concepts (or "thought-images" as Deleuze might say). Consequentially, the present study takes as a point of departure the belief that Feldman's late works constitute a profound and insightful meditation on time and memory.

As we have seen above, Deleuze believes that non-verbal semiotic systems do not depend upon language.³⁹ The concept of a non-verbal semiosis offers one possible solution to the endless debates about the nature of musical signification (see Nattiez and others), and, in relation to the present study, offers a possibility for understanding how a work which shuns any sort of narrative can nonetheless communicate something. In the present case, we might ask if temporality can have a semiotic. In other words, can time, or the representation of time, attempt to signify? Hatten's troping of temporality, as we have seen, is largely linguistic in its inspiration, and relies on reference to musical narrative. But if we accept that a temporal-semiotic system does not necessarily require recourse to language or literature, can a system of non-verbal signs related only to each other acquire sufficient richness to create the complex syntheses required to achieve something like a troping of temporality?

³⁸ Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 1p*. xiv (preface to the French edition). This idea is a recurrent theme throughout Deleuze's work.

³⁹ This does not mean that they necessarily always function independently of language (indeed, Deleuze has some interesting observations about the interaction between word and image in the cinema), but when nonverbal and verbal semiotic systems are combined, the result is a complex mass of signification existing in an uneasy, provisional relationship. The difficulty of this relationship is doubtlessly one of the reasons for Beckett's distrust of opera (and in having his own texts set to music in particular.)

1.4 OVERVIEW OF THE PRESENT STUDY

The present study is of a largely speculative nature. The goal is not necessarily to “reverse-engineer” the blueprint of *For Samuel Beckett*.⁴⁰ As mentioned previously, Feldman always claimed not to follow a rigorous system of any sort, and there is no reason not to take him at his word. However, even if that were not the case, the primary interest of this study is in examining what the composition has to say about time and memory. This necessarily involves a rather intensive conceptual background, which will be explored in the next section. We will be borrowing concepts, terminology, and general inspiration from the work of Deleuze (and, via Deleuze, from Bergson and Peirce, two thinkers to whom Deleuze himself acknowledges a heavy debt). However, just as Deleuze uses other thinkers to explore concepts uniquely his own,⁴¹ we may feel free to reinterpret some of these ideas in light of our own interests and priorities. Deleuze valued above all else the creative evolution of concepts, the rhizomatic development of ideas according to their own logic, and it is in that spirit that we will explore his ideas in the realm of musical analysis, a subject he discussed rather less than cinema, literature, or film.

Of course, as the present study is of an analytical nature, a detailed examination of the score of *For Samuel Beckett* is central. Claren, Hirata, and others have proven that Feldman’s music is not, as some have claimed, “un-analyzable.” There is still much to be gleaned from examining the notes on the page, especially when coupled with careful listening. We will be interpreting our findings in light of the concepts borrowed from Deleuze, but we must also exercise a degree of caution. Concepts and terms do not always map flawlessly across disciplines. In his critiques of Christian Metz, Deleuze took Metz to task for a theory of film Deleuze perceived to be overly linguistic. Deleuze argues that Metz’s enthusiasm to apply Saussurean semiology to cinema overlooked cinema’s most essential quality – the moving image. We would do well to remember this lesson as we attempt to put some of Deleuze’s own ideas to work in order to understand a piece of music.

⁴⁰ In other words, to engage in Cone’s “cryptanalysis.”

⁴¹ For example, his monographs on Leibniz, Hume, Spinoza, and Foucault; in a different vein, his work on the artist Francis Bacon and on Proust, as well as the two books on cinema.

2.0 DELEUZE ON TIME, MEMORY, AND RHYTHM: SOME THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The writings of Gilles Deleuze have a reputation, not entirely undeserved, for difficulty. Deleuze's books are full of strange terms and phrases such as "body without organs", idiosyncratic usages of otherwise familiar words ("intensity," "nomad"), appropriations of terms familiar through earlier philosophers for his own unique meaning ("monad"), and all sorts of odd compounds and constructions ("becoming-animal," "any-instance-whatever"). Beyond the difficulty of language and concepts, moreover, another barrier to understanding Deleuze's work is the sheer scope and breadth of his output. Although a philosopher by training and academic appointment, Deleuze also wrote on visual arts (*The Logic of Sensation: Francis Bacon*), literature (volumes on Proust and Kafka, as well as much of *The Logic of Sense*, which is largely concerned with Lewis Carroll), and film (*Cinema 1* and *Cinema 2*.) Yet he always insisted that even in his work on the arts, he was doing philosophy, not criticism or analysis. For example, *The Logic of Sensation: Francis Bacon* applies concepts Deleuze previously introduced in earlier writings to the work of a specific artist, resulting in a sort of dialog between Deleuze's ideas and Bacon's paintings. As a result, coming to terms with one of his arguments often requires becoming familiar with a substantial portion of his oeuvre.

For all the difficulties presented by Deleuze's work, however, his reputation has only increased in recent years. All of his major writings are now available in English, and the secondary literature on Deleuze is immense and growing by the day. When Deleuze's friend Foucault opined that the twentieth century may one day be known as Deleuzean, he was perhaps a bit premature. The twenty-first century, on the other hand, may turn out to be the Deleuzean

era. One of the main reasons for the interest in Deleuze's work is, in fact, its interdisciplinary nature. While it is true that Deleuze regarded himself as a philosopher first and foremost,⁴² Deleuze's concerns with the arts (as well as with psychoanalysis and politics) have made him an attractive figure to scholars and thinkers in many different fields. While working with Deleuze's ideas requires a serious engagement with all of the difficulties posed by his work, the originality of Deleuze's thought has made this engagement a worthwhile endeavor for an ever-increasing number of scholars and intellectuals.

Since Deleuze was by training a philosopher, not a film critic or art historian, it must be said that Deleuze's volumes on cinema and on Francis Bacon do not read at all like conventional critical-historical studies. While Deleuze has come under some criticism for this (his analyses have been called "derivative,"⁴³ even by Rodowick, who is very sympathetic to his cause), the fact is that his priorities are different from those of specialist scholars. His work on Bacon, for example, relies heavily on the theories of German art historians Alois Riegel, Heinrich Wölfflin, and Wilhelm Worringer, as well as on Bacon's own statements. However, he re-interprets the work of specialists, and even the pronouncements of the artist himself, in light of his own philosophical questions, much as he re-reads Leibniz, Spinoza, Hume, and the other philosophers of the past. The object of his work on Bacon is not necessarily a critical analysis (any more than his studies of other philosophers are textual or historical examinations). Rather, it is a sort of "reading-through" of Bacon, of explicating certain concepts Deleuze sees inherent in the work of art.

Deleuze does this because, as we have seen in the previous chapter, he considers artists to be equivalent to philosophers in that artists produce images of thought. Nowhere is this idea more apparent than in the two volumes on the cinema. For Deleuze, cinema, as a succession of images moving through time, presents a pure semiosis, unmitigated by language, and therefore can be considered as an image of thinking. This explains his famous quip that "the brain is the

⁴² Academic philosophers of the Anglo-American analytic tradition sometimes take issue with assertions such as this.

⁴³ D. N. Rodowick, *Gilles Deleuze's Time Machine* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997), xiv.

screen.”⁴⁴ This last concept deserves some greater clarification, as it is a somewhat counter-intuitive, but intriguing, concept. The basic thesis is that we think through a succession of images, moving through time. Cinema also presents a temporal succession of images. Therefore, cinema is equivalent to an image of thought.

2.1 DIFFERENCE AND REPETITION

As was mentioned above, the cinema books build upon concepts Deleuze introduces in his earlier works. Among other things, they further develop Deleuze’s concept of difference. First introduced in *Difference and Repetition*, Deleuze’s theory of difference has become one of his most noted and influential ideas. One of the most critical components of this theory is the idea of Difference in itself. Difference in itself is an enormous topic, so much so that Deleuze devotes an entire book to explicating it. The basic idea, if it can be summarized here, is that our commonplace definition of difference is always in respect to similarity. Difference is usually defined by what it is not – identity or sameness – rather than by what it is. Deleuze, on the other hand, celebrates difference as a positive quality. He wants to liberate difference, to show that sameness and identity (if they are possible at all) are possible only in the context of difference. “Difference inhabits repetition,”⁴⁵ Deleuze proclaims. Already in the introduction to *Difference and Repetition*, he writes:

...variation is not added to repetition in order to hide it, but it is rather its condition or constitutive element, the interiority of repetition par excellence.⁴⁶

What this passage illustrates is that difference, for Deleuze, is an essential quality of a thing. Deleuze encourages us to think of difference not as the characteristic that distinguishes

⁴⁴ Gilles Deleuze, “The Brain is the Screen. An Interview with Gilles Deleuze” Trans. Marie Therese Guiris. In *The Brain is the Screen. Deleuze and the Philosophy of Cinema*, ed. Gregory Flaxman (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 365-375. This remark is obviously used as the title of Rodowick’s study of the cinema books.

⁴⁵ Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, trans. Paul Patton (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1994), 76.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, xvi

one thing from another, but rather as the means through which things distinguish themselves. Difference is thus an essential, existential fact. Deleuze gives an example:

Lightning...distinguishes itself from the black sky but must also trail behind, as though it were distinguishing itself from that which does not distinguish itself from it.⁴⁷

The lightning is only visible because it *differentiates*⁴⁸ itself against the (apparently) *undifferentiated* black sky. Thus, its existence (or at the very least its perception) is dependent upon it being something different from the sky. Because Deleuze believes that every thing comes into being by virtue of its being different from every other thing, every thing that exists has an infinite number of attributes. James Williams calls this a “difficult metaphysical claim,” but encapsulates the concept succinctly:

Put simply, Deleuze’s view is that no object is fully accounted for through its actual properties since the changes that it has undergone and will undergo, and the differences implied in those changes, must be considered to be part of the object.⁴⁹

Every object is thus in a constant state of differentiation from itself. This is not necessarily as counter-intuitive as it seems. If I paint my white car red, it remains my car, and is recognizably so, even though one of its most obvious attributes has changed. Deleuze would argue that the concept “my car” includes the potential for it to be red as well as to be white. Thus, to refer to my car as white may be convenient, but it is not completely accurate, since the color of my car is subject to change. In fact, aside from willful and obvious acts, such as painting it, my car is slowly changing its set of properties, as it rusts and components deteriorate. Since no two things can have exactly the same set of attributes, no two things can ever truly be identical.

One consequence of the concept of the infinite number of attributes is that the whole idea of classification in general becomes problematic. Classification requires “blocked concepts” – an expression that implies a sort of failure. Putting things into categories, for Deleuze, requires

⁴⁷ Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 36.

⁴⁸ Deleuze introduces the term “differentiation” to describe the process of a difference becoming actual, rather than conceptual, or real, rather than virtual. While some of Deleuze’s translators and commentators have kept Deleuze’s spelling, this is not done consistently, and we have chosen to adopt a more normative English spelling.

⁴⁹ James Williams, “Gilles Deleuze's *Difference and Repetition*: An Introduction and Guide,” (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004), 40.

ignoring their differences, thus “blocking” the potentially infinite process of differentiation.⁵⁰ Williams defines blocked concepts as those which “fail to have an infinite comprehension,” or, in other words, those that “only involved a limited number of predicates.”⁵¹ Williams goes on to say: “If we accept Deleuze’s assumption that a particular thing is determined by an infinite set of properties, then a blocked concept never satisfactorily corresponds to a particular object.”⁵² As Deleuze writes in the introduction to *Difference and Repetition*:

In so far as it serves as a determination, a predicate must remain fixed in the concept while becoming something else in the thing (animal becomes something other in man and in horse; humanity something other in Peter and in Paul). This is why the comprehension of the concept is infinite; having become other in the thing, the predicate is like the object of another predicate in the concept.⁵³

As the quote above illustrates, the further evolution of the concept of “mammal” is blocked by its differentiation into human, horse, rat, dog, mongoose, etc. The theme of constant evolution, emphasized throughout Deleuze’s work, highlights the fact that concepts themselves are in a constant state of evolution, because their predicates are constantly changing.

2.2 TIME AND DURATION

This brings us to another important point regarding difference, namely, the essential quality of time and duration. Put simply, the idea is that time introduces difference into identity. For Deleuze, following Bergson, time and motion are qualitative in nature. When an object moves, it undergoes a “translation” of sorts. Not only is it in a different location in space, it has also moved in time. In other words, the same object at a different point in time has taken on a different set of attributes, precisely because it exists at a different point in time. Deleuze (again following Bergson) rejects the idea that movement can be reduced to a series of poses or immobile sections. In other words, one cannot truly create movement from stasis: the qualitative

⁵⁰ Deleuze’s use of the term “differentiation” (or “differenciation”) is somewhat reminiscent of Derrida’s “différance”, but the meaning is not identical.

⁵¹ Williams, *Gilles Deleuze's Difference and Repetition*, 40.

⁵² Ibid

⁵³ Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 13.

nature of real movement means that the sort of “movement” produced by animated films is, at best, an imperfect simulacrum.⁵⁴ Since movement is an essential quality, an object at rest is manifestly different from one in motion, and an object which has moved in time or in space has taken on a different set of properties. Because every thing that exists is inevitably moving forward in time, every object is in a constant state of change.

The concept of the indivisible Duration is one of Bergson’s most important contributions. Bergson gives the analogy of a thread continuously winding from one spool onto another. The motion is continuous, irreversible, and unmeasurable. No two points on the thread are identical, and a point in space between the two spools will have thread moving beneath it constantly, and it will fall on a different piece of thread at every instant.

Movement, therefore, is always in time as well as space. Movement cannot exist without time. Duration cannot be reduced to a series of immobile sections, and therefore, neither can movement. If movement and time can be neither added to nor subtracted from something, and everything is moving in time, this means that time is a quality which cannot be removed, and that it is an essential attribute. It also means that everything is in a constant state of flux. Thus, a real, identical repetition is impossible, because time has introduced an element of difference. Even in repetition there is difference, because the second instance of a thing is separated from the first instance in time (an essential quality, as we have seen) and because, as we will soon see, the second instance invokes the memory of the first. This is behind Deleuze’s statement that “difference inhabits repetition.”

2.2.1 Memory: The Three Syntheses

Repetition is, of course, closely tied to memory. Deleuze considers three aspects of memory, which he calls “passive syntheses,” relating to repetition. The first type of repetition is associated with habit. In this case, he relates, we passively repeat, more or less without thinking about it, out of habit as when we remember to brush our teeth before going to bed. In the second case, repetition relates to recognition. In this case, we recognize an object based on its

⁵⁴ This requires Deleuze to devote some pages to defending the illusion of movement in film.

characteristics, which remind us of other objects previously encountered. In describing this second Deleuzian memory-synthesis, Williams gives the example of a chair: we recognize a chair when we see one, because of prior experience with chairs.⁵⁵ The third passive synthesis, which Williams justifiably describes as “counter-intuitive,” shows the relationship of the first two syntheses to what Deleuze calls “virtual difference”: because the repetition of anything takes place against a background of difference. For example, I may brush my teeth every night, but doing it tonight is different from doing it tomorrow, because tomorrow is at a different point on the thread of Duration. Because of virtual differences, the third synthesis shows that the first two are, in fact, illusory. The problem with habits has already been noted, but the problem of memory is even more acute. In order to recognize an object as a chair, for example, we must block the concept of “chair” on some level, ignoring possible differences, and suppressing the evolution of the concept.

2.2.2 Memory Falsified

As a result, memory can be deceptive. Samuel Beckett described the problems of false memories in his short play *Footfalls*,⁵⁶ in which the protagonist, obsessively listening to the sound of her own footsteps as she paces the hallway, cannot remember whether her name is May or Amy, or if the story she is relating is her own, or if it belongs to someone else entirely. Deleuze describes the repression or falsification of memory that can result from repetition:

Repetition is not necessarily about recovery or remembering. On the contrary, it can be about repressing and forgetting.... I do not repeat because I repress. I repress because I repeat, I forget because I repeat.⁵⁷

Beckett’s May-Amy repeats incessantly, unaware of time passing around her (in fact, she has even forgotten her own age). The obsessive repetition has drowned out the process of differentiation going on in the world, and in a world without difference, her memory has failed, because all she can perceive is Sameness.

⁵⁵ Williams, *Difference and Repetition*, 12.

⁵⁶ Interestingly, it was this play which Beckett was rehearsing in Berlin when he met Feldman.

⁵⁷ *Difference and Repetition*, 18.

2.3 RHYTHM

2.3.1 Repetition, Symmetry, and Asymmetry

In music, repetition is often related to rhythm. Deleuze does, in fact, discuss rhythm, but in a broad sense that does not necessarily refer to musical rhythm, but does not altogether exclude it either.⁵⁸ Like so many of Deleuze's terms, rhythm here is used in a sort of multivalent fashion, evoking different, but overlapping, simultaneous meanings. Rhythm, for Deleuze, refers to the interaction between things. He speaks of the interaction between a painting and the viewer as producing a rhythm. If we were to apply this back to music, we could refer to rhythm as the interaction of sound and silence, or perhaps, as the interaction between sound and *differentiated* sound. Note that rhythm for Deleuze is not necessarily periodic or predictable. On the contrary, for him, the most interesting types of rhythm (whether visual, auditory, or abstract) are asymmetrical, because asymmetrical rhythms produce greater variation, and therefore, motion, and, ultimately evolution:

The negative expression 'lack of symmetry' should not mislead us: it indicates the origin and positivity of the causal process. It is positivity itself. For example, as the example of the decorative motif suggests, it is essential to break down the notion of causality in order to distinguish two types of repetition... One is a static repetition, the other is dynamic.⁵⁹

Deleuze's "decorative motive" can be compared to the asymmetrical patterns Feldman observed in Middle Eastern and Central Asian rugs: non-symmetrical repetition introduces difference, creating a dynamic process. For Deleuze, symmetry implies stasis, whereas asymmetry implies difference and movement. But even in symmetrical, periodic rhythms (to which he gives the name "cadence-repetitions") Deleuze sees an inner complexity:

Cadence-repetition is a regular division of time, and isochronic recurrence of identical elements.... Yet we would be mistaken about the function of accents if we said that they were reproduced at equal intervals. On the contrary, tonic and intensive values act by creating inequalities or incommensurabilities between metrically equivalent periods or spaces. They create distinctive points, privileged instants which always indicate a poly-

⁵⁸ At least not as the term is used in *Difference and Repetition*. Rhythm has a somewhat different usage in *A Thousand Plateaus*.

⁵⁹ *Difference and Repetition*, 20.

rhythm. Here again, the unequal is the most positive element. Cadence is only the envelope of a rhythm, and of a relation between rhythms.⁶⁰

Even the simplest rhythm, then, has accents, strong beats, and points of articulation (“privileged instants”), creating an inner polyrhythm. Deleuze gives the example of a rhyme: the phonemes are repeated, but the repetition “includes the difference between two words and inscribes that difference at the heart of a poetic Idea.”⁶¹

2.3.2 Chaos, the Sublime, and the Diagram

Deleuze opposes rhythm to chaos, but (in collaboration with Guattari) he also writes that rhythm is born from chaos.⁶² Rhythm and chaos come together in the concept of the *diagram*. Deleuze uses this familiar word in a rather specialized way. In order to consider the diagram, however, we must make a slight detour back to Kant (and ultimately to Edmund Burke) in order to introduce the concept of the *sublime*. In his *Critique of Judgment*, Kant describes the sublime as that which is “absolutely great.”⁶³ Following Burke, the sublime is seen as incommensurable, referring to experiences that exist beyond the human frame of reference or the limits of human language. Burke describes the sublime as producing a state of “astonishment...with some degree of horror.”⁶⁴ Experiences of the sublime can be exhilarating, but they can also be terrifying. As Burke states: “Astonishment, as I have said, is the effect of the sublime in its highest degree; the inferior effects are admiration, reverence, and respect.” Because they exist outside the normal range of human language, experiences of the sublime cannot be adequately described by human language.

Feldman writes about something resembling the temporal sublime in musical terms:

⁶⁰ *Difference and Repetition*, 23.

⁶¹ *Ibid*, p. 24.

⁶² Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 313.

⁶³ Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgement*, trans. Werner S. Pluhar (New York: Cosimo, 2007),

64

⁶⁴ Burke, Edmund, “A Philosophical Enquiry into the Sublime and Beautiful,” in *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Sublime and Beautiful and Other Pre-Revolutionary Writings*. (London, Penguin: 1998), 49.

What if Beethoven went on and on without any element of differentiation? We would then have Time Undisturbed. 'Time has turned into Space and there will be no more Time,' intones Samuel Beckett. An awesome state that would induce anxiety in any of us. In fact, we cannot even imagine this kind of a Beethoven.⁶⁵

This is scarcely the forum for considerations of the sublime in the works of Beethoven (whom some, in fact, see as the composer of the Kantian sublime, *par excellence*),⁶⁶ but it would seem that Feldman is suggesting that it would be impossible to conceive of a non-teleological, non-developmental Beethoven.⁶⁷ If language, or even musical works with linguistic-dramatic models (such as works of Beethoven) are inadequate to cope with the sublime, how are we to express the sublime state? Deleuze proposes the concept of the "diagram." Deleuze's diagram is a generalized version of a concept borrowed from Peirce, who, in his semiotic system, assigned a special place to mathematical diagrams. Such diagrams, thought Peirce, represent iconically concepts that cannot be verbally explained. The diagram is, therefore, an attempt to render the inexpressible in nonlinguistic terms; Deleuze describes it as "asignifying" and "nonrepresentational."⁶⁸ Deleuze takes this idea further, and considers any sign or system of signs that expresses ideas beyond normal language to be a sort of diagram:

...the diagrammatic or abstract machine does not function to represent, even something real, but rather constructs a real that is yet to come, a new type of reality.⁶⁹

The diagram (or "abstract machine") is, as the quote above illustrates, virtual and pre-individual. It represents a possibility, or an *undifferentiated* form, which has not yet become what it will be. Therefore, when Deleuze describes Bacon's backgrounds as diagrammatic, he is

⁶⁵ Feldman, "Between Categories", in *Give My Regards to Eighth Street*, p. 87. Feldman does not cite the source of the Beckett quotation. The implication is that the narrative-developmental model of Western classical music, as exemplified by the works of Beethoven, does not truly engage with temporal sublime.

⁶⁶ Indeed, Stephen C. Rumph cites a crowded field of scholars and critics discussing the sublime in the works of Beethoven: Paul Henry Lang, Carl Dahlhaus, Eberhad Müller-Arp, William Kinderman, Roland Schmenner, Richard Taruskin, and James Webster, among others. See Rumph, *Beethoven After Napoleon: Political Romanticism in the Late Works* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press: 2005), 36.

⁶⁷ Again, much scholarship on Beethoven has focused on the manner in which he thwarts the expectations arising from the developing forms of his era. For the purposes of the present argument, however, we can safely assume that Feldman is citing the works of Beethoven as quintessential examples of familiar, organically-developing, narrative compositions.

⁶⁸ *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation*, p. 82.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

referring to Bacon's use of chance procedures, random marks, and involuntary gestures. The procedures and gestures follow a definable procedure, but the result is unknowable. They are, as Deleuze says, "nonrepresentative, nonillustrative, nonnarrative." Therefore, they are an example of potentiality, because we cannot know what will emerge from the "catastrophe" of the gesture.

Deleuze considers abstract paintings of the expressionist school to be diagrammatic in the extreme, because he sees in them an attempt to render the experience of the sublime in visual terms: "the abyss or chaos is deployed to the maximum."⁷⁰ Whereas Bacon uses nonrepresentational markings or chance gestures as a starting point, Deleuze notes that abstract expressionism takes nonrepresentation to an even greater level. Deleuze describes Pollock's action paintings as a "liberation of the hand." In this case, there is a gestural concept (the motion itself), an "abstract machine" which governs the creation of the entire painting; in a sense, the painting *is* the execution of the gesture. Deleuze writes that it is in abstract expressionism, "at the point closest to catastrophe, in absolute proximity, that modern man discovers rhythm."⁷¹ Deleuze is implying that the paintings, and the gestures which produced them, have a kind of rhythm, resulting from the meeting of diagram and catastrophe. This rhythm is not a cadence-repetition, or any kind of symmetrical repetition. Rather, as Deleuze says, it is the rhythm of matter and material, the interaction between artist and canvas, and between canvas and viewer.

2.4 THE MOVEMENT-IMAGE AND THE TIME IMAGE

2.4.1 Deleuze on Narrative in Cinema

We have thus examined a few of Deleuze's ideas. In the two volumes on film, Deleuze applies some of these concepts to cinema. As we have noted, Deleuze considers film to be a visual-temporal medium functioning outside the realm of linguistic signification. It is thus especially suited to the exploration of his ideas.

⁷⁰ Ibid, 85.

⁷¹ Ibid, 86.

In *Cinema 2*, Deleuze describes the crisis of the movement-image in post-war cinema. As he describes it, causality has broken down, narrative has become unreliable, and, “it is no longer time which is subordinate to movement; it is movement which is subordinate to time.”⁷² In the old cinema (the so-called “movement-image”), images were grouped according to “rational” cuts, related by conceptions of natural causality. As Deleuze explains, with images “linked or extended according the laws of association, of continuity, resemblance, contrast, or opposition.”⁷³ The new cinema follows no similar rules:

The modern image initiates the reign of “incommensurables” or irrational cuts: this is to say that the cut no longer forms part of one or the other image, of one or the other sequence that it separates or divides. It is on this condition that the succession or sequence becomes a series, in the sense that we have just analyzed.⁷⁴

We could say that in the motion-image, individual images were grouped logically, into a rational sequence of cuts. But the time-image no longer privileges causality. Cuts are just as likely to occur as a series of unconnected images, linked temporally, but not necessarily causally:

It is no longer time that depends on movement; it is aberrant movement that depends on time. The relation, *sensory-motor situation* → *indirect image of time* is replaced by a non-localizable relation, *pure optical and sound situation* → *direct time-image*. Opsigns and sonsigns are direct presentations of time. False continuity shots are the non-localizable relation itself: characters no longer jump across them, they are swallowed up in them.⁷⁵

Opsigns and sonsigns are, as Rodowick puts it, signs which “no longer derive from the image as movement.”⁷⁶ Rodowick describes this as a reversal of the earlier relationship between sign and image: “...opsigns produce an image whose material they specify and whose forms they constitute from sign to sign.”⁷⁷ These are signs which do not signify in the Saussurean sense, or even represent in the Peircean sense. Because they are pure, a-signifying optical and auditory images, which follow no external logic of temporality, Deleuze describes these signs as “pure images of time.” They follow their own “inorganic” (to use a Deleuzian term) logic that does not depend on the rational development of action. They exist in time and

⁷² *Cinema 2*, 271.

⁷³ *Cinema 2*, 276.

⁷⁴ *Ibid*, 277.

⁷⁵ *Ibid*, 41. Italics and arrows are in the original.

⁷⁶ Rodowick, 78.

⁷⁷ *Ibid*.

move through time, but they are not linked by logical relations external to themselves. In other words, they follow one another sequentially and experientially, but not causally.

2.4.2 Comparison to Musical Time: Observations from Kramer and Ligeti

Concurring with Deleuze that film, like music, is an inherently temporal medium, Kramer makes the connection between post-tonal music and post-war cinema, especially citing the works of Resnais and Fellini. While he admits that film “manipulates absolute time more directly than other arts can”, Kramer believes that “few narrative films...are really *about* time.”⁷⁸ This passage is somewhat problematic, in that it would seem to be impossible for a film that exists in time and moves through time to have time itself as its subject matter – to be “about time,” as it were. However, as Deleuze proclaims in *Cinema 2*, narrative cinema is capable of presenting what Deleuze calls a “direct image of time.” Since, as we have seen above, the montage of post-war cinema no longer necessarily obeys the classical laws of causality, time has become an independent variable, to be explored in its own right.

It is doubtlessly no coincidence that the concept of the musical phrase, and by extension, the developing form, began to be rejected in the music of the post-war avant-garde, around the same time as the development of the time-image. While some composers prior to 1945 did have a problematic relationship with traditional concepts of phrase, even Schoenberg sought to preserve traditional forms and phraseology. Ligeti, writing in 1958, notes that Schoenberg’s radically new musical vocabulary did not necessarily entail a new musical grammar:

Schoenberg, despite his radically new filling-out of musical substance, was concerned to preserve the empty shell of the developing forms, and in this way he considerably delayed the process which we shall refer to as the “spatialization of the flow of time.”⁷⁹

What Ligeti is calling the “spatialization of the flow of time” can be likened to Deleuze’s liberation of time from motion. In music that has abandoned developing forms, time itself is free to expand and contract, following no logic but its own. In this sense, it can be likened to Deleuze’s time-image, since the time-image requires a cinematic approach in which the cause-

⁷⁸ Kramer, *The Time of Music*, 166-7.

⁷⁹ György Ligeti, *Metamorphoses of Musical Form*, Vol. VII, in *Die Reihe*, trans. Cornelius Cardew, (Bryn Mawr, PA: Theodore Presser, 1965), 10-20.

effect relationship of normative plot development is subordinated to time. The phrase, with its model in the linguistic utterance, subordinated temporality to meter. But by moving beyond the phrase, composers could work with time in new ways. As Kramer notes, “lack of phrases is a sufficient but not necessary condition for vertical time.”⁸⁰

In other words, some non-narrative music may possess something like traditional phrase structure, but any music that does lack phrase structure is necessarily non-narrative in nature.

Kramer argues that time itself eludes language or logic. Certainly, it is difficult to express in verbal terms – otherwise, Deleuze’s writings on the subject would undoubtedly be much less difficult. However, Deleuze maintains that it is not beyond the limits of non-verbal semiotic systems, such as cinema, to be “about time.” By presenting an image of time that itself unfolds in time, but does not necessarily conform to normative expectations of causation or of temporal sequence, cinema can (to use Hatten’s term) trope temporality.

Similarly, as we will see in our analytical examination of *For Samuel Beckett*, Feldman is able to present a direct image of time itself through a process of non-linguistic semiosis. The next chapter investigates how Feldman utilizes notation in a manner reminiscent of Deleuze’s diagram, and how the interaction between the inaudible (virtual) and the audible (real) elements of the piece creates a kind of synthesis.

⁸⁰ Kramer, *The Time of Music*, 55.

3.0 ANALYSIS OF *FOR SAMUEL BECKETT*: PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATIONS

Time passes.

First without words.

I switch on.

-Samuel Beckett, *What Where*⁸¹

3.1.1 General Characteristics

In calling Feldman a composer who “distributed minimal parcels of sound over long durations,” Alex Ross succinctly describes the most recognizable, and most remarked-upon, aspect of Feldman’s style.⁸² Accounts of Feldman’s music never fail to mention the sparseness, the generally soft dynamic, and, in the case of many of the later works, the often extreme durations. In all of these regards is *For Samuel Beckett* utterly typical of Feldman’s late works. At just under an hour in performance, it is far shorter than some of the late pieces (for example, the four-hour-long *For Phillip Guston* or the six-hour-long *String Quartet II*), but it is of a very substantial length for a single-movement work. And, like most Feldman piece of any period (and quite unlike the works of most other composers), it is uncompromising in terms of its very quiet dynamic and lack of melodic activity. At first listening, the texture is unrelentingly uniform: there seems to be very little in the way of contrast, beyond the constantly shifting timbral palette. Repetition is a very obvious feature of the music, but attempts to find a definite rhythmic pulse prove elusive. Brief figures and patterns are heard, but never do these patterns coalesce into anything that could be called a theme. An initial sensation of stasis gives way to a realization that the music is in constant motion, but like the footsteps of Beckett’s *May/Amy*, it is a decidedly directionless motion, with no clear goal and no overarching form.

⁸¹ Samuel Beckett, “What Where”, in *Shorter Plays for the Stage*, (New York: Grove Press, 1994), 307.

⁸² Ross, *The Rest is Noise*, 475.

3.1.2 Orchestration, Timbre

The piece is scored for a chamber orchestra of twenty-three players: two each of flutes, oboes, clarinets, bassoons, horns, trumpets, and trombones, plus a single tuba; harp, piano, and vibraphone; and two violins, viola, cello, and double bass. The ensemble seems to suggest something of a symphony orchestra in miniature, albeit one in which the traditional balance between winds and strings is inverted to strongly favor the winds. While the models for such an ensemble go back to Schoenberg's First Chamber Symphony, Feldman's orchestration in some ways almost seems to refer even further back to Mozart and Beethoven, with the omission of coloristic woodwinds such as English horn or bass clarinet in favor of the classical woodwinds in pairs. The winds (aside from the tuba) are, in fact, treated in pairs throughout. As Claren notes, Feldman divides the instruments into four distinct groups: upper winds (high woodwinds and trumpets), lower winds (bassoons, horns, trombones, and tuba), strings, and a "pitched percussion" group of harp, piano, and vibraphone.⁸³ There is some permeation between the two wind groups, with the trumpets sometimes joining the other brass, the clarinets occasionally joining the low winds, or the double reeds occasionally joining the brass in a kind of "nasal" group. The tuba, as the only wind instrument without a partner, has special role to play. Due to its volume and sheer sonic mass, its entrances are often very noticeable, and since it is nearly always the lowest sounding voice, it plays a key role in opening up the lowest register of the ensemble. The strings and pitched percussion are generally kept as separate groupings throughout, with very little admixture from the winds. The strings are usually scored as a group in block chords, in rhythmic unison, playing sustained notes. The piano and vibraphone form a natural pairing, generally playing alternating chords. The harp plays exclusively single, isolated notes, all of them harmonics, in the middle of its range. It does not participate in the chordal patterning which characterizes the piano and vibraphone; rather, it seems to belong with them timbrally, but it exists in its own space, rather detached from the rest of the ensemble, and sometimes almost completely inaudible.

Feldman's use of register as an orchestrational device is also very striking. The double bass plays in harmonics in the topmost part of its range throughout the entire piece, and the cello

⁸³ Claren, 492.

rarely ventures into its lowest octave. The harp and piano likewise remain consistently in the middle part of their ranges. This leaves the lowest register to the low winds, resulting in a very unusual texture. As Feldman remarked to his sometime student Tom Johnson, “the lowest register is gravity.”⁸⁴ By relegating this “gravity” register to comparatively heavier instruments such as trombones and tuba (as well as bassoons), Feldman produces an intense weight of sound in the bass registers. By contrast, the upper winds and strings seem to shimmer above the depth, producing an effect not unlike the two-tone canvases painted by Feldman’s good friend Mark Rothko.⁸⁵

3.1.3 Harmony: The Altered Cluster

Feldman’s approach to harmony is likewise coloristic rather than developmental. Harmonic assemblages do not imply later events, nor does rigorous transformation of vertical sonorities play a crucial role in the unfolding of the piece. As Paula Klopstick Ames notes, Feldman does freely use all twelve equal-tempered pitch classes, but, in contrast to serial composers, Feldman’s chromatic field is not “rigorously saturated.” Rather than ensuring that no pitch class or assemblage of pitch classes is repeated until all twelve have been stated, Feldman, as DeLio notes, “frequently restricts the chromatic palette by repetitions – often extended – of single chords or groups of chords.”⁸⁶ In the case of *For Samuel Beckett*, these chords consist almost exclusively of chromatic tone clusters and their permutations. In some ways, the chromatic cluster can be viewed as a radical simplification of the post-tonal language. It is inherently non-tonal and non-modal, while at the same time avoiding any sort of implications of melodic development, since any transformation of a cluster results in another cluster. All of the essential properties of non-tonal harmony are present, yet concerns about complex intervallic relationships are essentially irrelevant. Since interval content is therefore restricted largely to seconds and their inversions and expansions (sevenths and ninths), the result is that the primary means of creating contrast is through orchestration.

⁸⁴ Johnson, Tom. “Remembrance.”

⁸⁵ *Light Red Over Black* (1957) in particular comes to mind.

⁸⁶ Quoted in Thomas DeLio, *The Music of Morton Feldman*, 100.

As Feldman has remarked:

In the '60's, I got into the *altered* cluster. By the altered cluster, I didn't just have the semitones, but I started opening them up a little bit. [It was] a question of just orchestrating the cluster in various ways.⁸⁷

Much of *For Samuel Beckett* does proceed through continuous re-orchestrations of altered clusters. The clusters often have one or several pitches displaced by an octave (“altered clusters”), and the displacement can be regarded as an aspect of orchestration as well, since the shift of register results in a change in timbre. Feldman highlights the connection between harmony and timbre, questioning whether his sonorities can even be considered harmony at all:

...as far as my sounds and I just wonder to what degree I even want to call it harmony. A lot of it comes to voicing, a lot of constant architectural decisions... I think it's just a question of coloration or orchestration. I don't see [the chords] as harmony. Sometimes to color one tone, you have to have much more of a complex. I'm really painting, but I'm not painting with a harmonic language.⁸⁸

Thus, if one can speak of harmony at all – which I will, for purposes of convenience, despite Feldman's understandable reservations – it consists primarily of altered clusters. Since, as noted above, a transformation of a cluster can only result in a new cluster, register and timbre become the vehicles for effecting variation. Orchestration has thus replaced the motive as the primary means of differentiation.

3.2 THE SCORE: GRAPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

3.2.1 The Importance of the Visual Aspect of the Score

Much like the musical language of the piece, the visual appearance of the score of *For Samuel Beckett* is characteristic of Feldman's late work, but rather unlike the appearance of scores produced by other composers. Doubtlessly influenced by his friends in the visual art world, Feldman's notation, from the early graph pieces onwards, has always been visually striking. In

⁸⁷ Thomas DeLio, *The Music of Morton Feldman*, 111. Brackets and italics in the original.

⁸⁸ *Ibid*, 110.

the case of most composers, this would be at most an interesting curiosity, probably not meriting further examination. As Tom Hall notes, “Analysis of conventionally notated Western music typically ignores how a score looks on the page.”⁸⁹ In the case of Feldman, however, as Hall reminds us, the visual aspect of the score is relevant to analysis, because of Feldman’s emphasis on “the almost hierarchical prominence I attribute to the notation’s effect on composition.”⁹⁰ Feldman’s interest in the score as visual artifact is strangely reminiscent of Brian Ferneyhough, an otherwise totally dissimilar composer. For Feldman as much as for Ferneyhough, the musical work encompasses both the notated score and sounding event. As Ferneyhough would remind us:

A score as, let’s say, a visual representation of a possible sound – that’s just one aspect of what a score is. A score is also an entire cultural artifact with an aura of spiritual resonance which is completely its own, in spite of its being related to the sonorous experience of the work in one of its other manifestations...And therefore I think that the score being one thing and the piece being another is a complete absurdity.⁹¹

Ferneyhough’s use of the term “aura” is, of course meant to evoke Walter Benjamin, and his discussion of the “spiritual resonance” of the score suggests a kind interaction between the printed page and the sounding reality. Hall uses Feldman’s term *notational image* as “a descriptive term which mediates between the acoustic and visual domains of these scores.”⁹² Like Ferneyhough’s “spiritual resonance,” it is intriguing to note that this mediation between two disparate domains (or *milieus*, in Deleuze’s terminology), is precisely what Deleuze referred to as “rhythm.” There is, in Deleuzian terms, a rhythm in the interaction between the notated score and the aural result. This rhythm is not apparent to a listener, unless he or she is following with a score, but it was doubtlessly part of the compositional process, in the interaction between the composer and his material. There is also a rhythm in the interaction between the performer and the score, as the musician realizes the score’s instructions. Similarly, musical patterns that may

⁸⁹ Tom Hall, "Notational Image, Transformation and the Grid in the Late Music of Morton Feldman," ed. Linda Kouvaras, Ruth Lee Martin and Graham Hair, *Current Issues in Music* (Southern Voices) I (2007): 7-24, p.7.

⁹⁰ Quoted in *ibid.*

⁹¹ Brian Ferneyhough, “Interview with Richard Toop,” in *Collected Writings* (Amsterdam, 1995: Harwood Academic Publishers), 272.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 19.

not be apparent to a listener are often obvious when viewing the score.⁹³ As we shall see, *For Samuel Beckett* is full of visual patterns which translate to retrogrades, symmetries of various sorts, or voice exchanges.

3.2.2 The Musical Intent of the Notation

Beyond the abstract interaction of the notation and the sonic reality, Feldman's notation sometimes seems to seek to convey some aspect of the piece that may not be otherwise apparent or even audible. For example, *Piano Piece II*, from 1962, is notated without barlines or a time signature, but exclusively in dotted-eighth-notes, which some commentators have seen as implying a syncopated rhythm against an unmarked duple or quadruple meter. Ferneyhough reminds us that notation is a behavior-altering device, and Feldman would doubtlessly agree, given his tendency to sometimes eschew obvious notational solutions. One can only imagine that Feldman's dotted-eighths in *Piano Piece II*, or his consistent use of C-flat instead of B-natural in *For Samuel Beckett* represent attempts to somehow alter the normative expected behavior of the performer through notational practices which may at first glance seem profoundly unintuitive.

Like many late Feldman pieces, *For Samuel Beckett* is published as a facsimile of the composer's original manuscript. As Hall notes, Feldman typically uses a constant nine bars per system, evenly-spaced regardless of time signature, presence of a repeat sign, or of the actual duration of the bars in question, with the system or page frequently functioning as an actual unit of musical organization. While this is not at all the norm for fully-notated music with a specified time signature and barlines, it is not at all unusual for spatially-notated scores or other pieces in which the durations are not precisely indicated. Hall relates this system of layout to the grid of Feldman's early graph pieces. In these works, the grid takes the form of a number of boxes (usually ten per line), each representing an equal division of the duration of the piece. Hall quotes a 1983 interview with percussionist Jan Williams in which Feldman remarks that he "still

⁹³ One could make a comparison with certain works of the 14th century *ars subtilior*, such as the famous circular canon of Baude Cordier.

use[s] a grid. But now the grid encompasses traditional notation.”⁹⁴ We can recall that Cage is rumored to have said that Feldman’s late, fully-notated works were simply “Feldman playing his early graph pieces.”⁹⁵ In his later works, Feldman returned to traditional metrical notation, but retained the idea of the “box” as unit of time. Feldman’s bars are therefore more akin to something like Cage’s “time brackets”: they are units of duration in which an event takes place, rather than signifiers of an hierarchical temporal system. Hall writes that “the grid functions in conjunction with other notational temporal aspects of the scores.”⁹⁶ Although a downbeat is barely (if at all) perceptible, the bar remains the unit of time, and the distribution of bars on the page is a key factor in the piece’s temporal organization. Since the measure corresponds to a temporal unit, a change in time signature amounts to a change in the speed of time, because a unit of time is now shorter or longer. This, as Hall notes, is one of the crucial differences between the grid-boxes of Feldman’s early works and the measures of his later compositions. Whereas a constant time signature (and Hall cites *For Samuel Beckett* as an example of a piece in which changes of time signature are infrequent) implies a correspondence between the relationship of space on the page and duration, a change of time signature implies an alteration of that relationship.

This seems counter-intuitive in a piece where a recognizable, periodic meter is elusive. Although barlines are certainly an audible, structural component in pieces in which one can actually hear a downbeat, Feldman often seems to be going out of his way to avoid presenting anything resembling an obvious downbeat. At best, the metrical presentation could be seen as merely a compositional device - a trick employed by the composer, perhaps as a crutch to generate content, but completely inaudible to the listener. While we will see that there is more than this to Feldman’s use of barlines, it is nonetheless an idea worth exploring. In Deleuze’s terms, the disposition of the barlines could be considered to function as a sort of diagram or abstract machine, but let us first recall what is meant by this term.

⁹⁴ Williams, Jan. “An Interview With Morton Feldman.” *Percussive Notes*, September 1983: 4-14.

⁹⁵ I have come across the statement on a number of occasions, but have so far been able to find a reliable original source for the quotation.

⁹⁶ Williams, Jan. “An Interview With Morton Feldman.”

3.2.3 Notation as Abstract Machine

As has been previously described, Deleuze described the abstract machine as a mechanism for creating difference. Feldman's metrical abstract machine takes *undifferentiated* Time and divides it into smaller, unequal units. These units function somewhat like temporal "black boxes" which the composer can fill with any sort of content, resembling, as we noted above, Cage's time-brackets. This abstract machine serves many purposes, not the least of which is the production of content during the compositional process. For a post-tonal composer, the creation of content is no small problem.⁹⁷ Since the beginning of the twentieth century, composers have invented systems and procedures in order to escape what could be called a "crisis of material": once one abandons tonality, or going even further, motivic development, just how does a composer go about creating content? It is noteworthy that in his work on Francis Bacon, Deleuze introduces the concept of the diagram just after a discussion of the problem of the cliché, and, while he does not directly connect the concept of the diagram with the problem of clichés, he does connect the diagram with the initial phase of creation, a phase which Deleuze considers critical to escaping the power of the cliché. For all the emphasis placed on the intuitive process through which he created his works, Feldman must have felt the need to impose some sort of structure upon what may have otherwise remained vague creative impulses, claims of having "no secrets" and of espousing no systems to the contrary. In this sense, we can understand Feldman's early graph pieces as an attempt to escape the cliché of periodic rhythm. Eventually, Feldman returned to metrical notation, but by combining it with techniques learned from the graph era, he was able to escape not only the cliché of meter, but also his own cliché of graphical notation.

⁹⁷ At least, for composers of a more "modern" (as opposed to "post-modern") sensibility. Some post-modernists have whole-heartedly, even enthusiastically, embraced the expressive power of the cliché. Of course, one could consider Feldman's predilection for sevenths and ninths to be a sort of post-Webern clichéd harmonic vocabulary. In this regard, however, Feldman is still unquestionably a modernist.

3.3 TIME SIGNATURES

Feldman's diagrammatic approach to meter does, nonetheless, admit some of the classical conception of metrical accents. Testament to this is the fact that the initial time signature of the score is 3/8, while the tempo mark references the quarter-note as the counting unit. Like *Piano Piece II* of twenty-five years earlier, the (notated) eighth-note ictus conflicts with the indicated quarter-note pulse, creating an implied syncopation. Of course, a listener would be hard-pressed to identify the opening of the piece as being in 3/8 time, due to the avoidance of metrical accentuation. However, the choice of time signature cannot possibly be arbitrary. It is a common enough occurrence for a composer to notate nonmetrical or polyrhythmic music in a time signature that may or may not accurately reflect the aural result. This is generally done for purposes of expediency, to present the music to performers in a familiar fashion, and to make possible the process of rehearsal and performance. However, the time signature chosen in such cases is often a duple meter like 2/4 or 4/4, or something else relatively neutral, generally with a quarter-note as the counting unit. Hall does note a preference for the 3/8 time signature in several of Feldman's other late works, including *Triadic Memories* and *Neither*.⁹⁸ The 3/8 time signature is ambiguous: it implies an eighth-note or dotted-quarter-note pulse, and it recalls the dance rhythms or graceful slow movements in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century music. While it would be ridiculous to argue that Feldman is evoking dance rhythms of an earlier era, it is not unreasonable to suggest that he is calling to mind the ambiguity produced by the 3/8 time signature, and its implied syncopation against the basic quarter-note pulse. Every subsequent change of time signature is in reference to this initial 3/8: the 5/8 which occurs later can be seen as a deforming of a double 3/8, rendering it asymmetrical. The 9/16 which occurs later than that is a sort of lengthening of the 3/8 from three eighth-notes to three dotted eighth-notes per bar. The 3/4 meter which closes the piece is a doubling of the initial 3/8, representing a substantial stretching of time, while the 3/2 which is reserved for the isolated sustained string chords which occur in the second half of the piece represent a further stretching of the basic temporal unit.

Returning to the subject of the initial 3/8, the constant play of 4 against 3 (in the piano and vibraphone) that characterizes the opening of the piece serves to both destabilize the meter

⁹⁸ Hall, 7.

and to confirm it. While the polyrhythmic texture further obscures any sense of a downbeat which may exist, the quadruplet figures in the vibraphone and piano do occur within the barline (at least initially), showing that the polyrhythms are meant to be felt *in reference to* the 3/8 meter. This polyrhythm is abandoned fairly early on in the piece; with a few exceptions, nearly all later events function within the framework of the notated barline, at least until the final pages of the score.

The individual measure, of course, is not the largest unit of organization within the piece. While *For Samuel Beckett* does initially appear to be a completely through-composed work, utterly devoid of audible sectional divisions, subsequent analysis proves this not to be the case. Moreover, unlike the visual divisions created through page layout, these structural divisions do become audible with repeated listening. Despite (nearly) lacking motivic development in any sort of narrative sense, objects and assemblages are repeated and do recur, sometimes varied, sometimes not, and individual events can be discerned despite the seemingly flat surface of the music. Events having some significance can serve as demarcation points, giving rise to structural divisions. However, as one may guess, the borders of these sections are not entirely clear. This means that while structural divisions do exist, their exact nature remains somewhat up to subjective interpretation.

3.4 STRUCTURAL DIVISIONS OF THE SCORE

For his part, Claren divides the sixty-seven pages of the score into five unequal sections, “the borders of which can in any case barely be perceived.”⁹⁹ He does not say precisely how he came to this conclusion, only that this division is evident only after “exacting analysis.” In addition to the five main sections, Claren refers to two brief passages as “interludes,” though his rationale for doing so is not further explained. Claren’s division (by page) of the score can be illustrated by means of the following table:

⁹⁹ Claren, 491. Translation mine.

Table 1. Claren's structural division of *For Samuel Beckett*

Section I	Pages 1-5
Section II	Pages 6-22
Section III	Pages 23-33
Interlude I	Pages 34-35
Section IV	Pages 36-52
Interlude II	Pages 53-56
Section V	Pages 57-67

Claren's division scheme does coincide with some relatively obvious features of the score. For example, his Section II begins on page six (measure 46), which features a clearly audible change in texture (emphasizing the alternating block chords which dominate the rest of the piece, beginning with an aurally significant chord in the upper woodwinds), a change of time signature, from 3/8 to 5/8, in the second measure of the page, and the first repeated module, between measures 50 and 54. On the other hand, Claren has Section III beginning on page 23, which seems premature. While this is the first page to contain all twelve pitch classes (which is surprising, considering that roughly one-fifth of the piece has already passed by this point), the next page, 24, has a time signature change from 5/8 to 3/4, and introduces what will become (as we will subsequently see) an important pattern in the rest of the piece: a more-or-less symmetrical page with a sustained string chord in the central measure.

asserts that this interlude contains new material, since in any case the material of these pages seems very similar to preceding and subsequent sections. Taken together, Claren's next section and following interlude constitute the longest structural segment of the piece, lasting nearly twenty minutes. While the last ten pages, which are mostly in a temporally-expanded 3/4, do constitute an obvious structural unit, it is not immediately obvious why Claren sees the few pages from 53 to 56 as an interlude, rather than as part of the weighty fourth section.

On the whole, however, Claren's sections do correspond to clear structural divisions found within the score, and I will take a somewhat modified version of Claren's scheme as the sectional division assignment in subsequent discussions of the piece. However, it will be seen that smaller divisions of the score do occur, and these are noted in the subsequent analysis. Particularly noteworthy are the changes of time signature, which nearly always represent an

important structural division. As has been noted, Feldman’s changes of time signature can be read as indicating an expansion or contraction of time compared to an implied normative 3/8, so passages in other time signatures can be thought of as temporally expanded or contracted units of time, relative to the basic 3/8. Furthermore, some time signatures (such as 5/8) recur at different points in the piece, constituting a kind of “metric ritornello.” For these and other reasons, we can assume the time signature change to be one of the primary indicators of structural division. Below is a table of structural divisions which takes Claren’s divisions as a starting point, but which incorporates the critique of Claren’s structural divisions as articulated above.

Table 2. Structural division of *For Samuel Beckett* (Matthews)

Section I	Pages 1-5
Section II	Pages 6-23
Section III	Pages 24-33 (Beginning of change to 3/4)
[Interlude]	Pages 34-35 (2/2 time signature)
Section IV	Pages 36-56
Section V	Pages 57-67

Having examined the piece from a sort of top-level, global perspective, we will investigate *For Samuel Beckett* in great detail in the next chapter, which will focus on events at the micro-level.

4.0 DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF *FOR SAMUEL BECKETT*

...if by some miracle of analogy the central impression of a past sensation recurs as an immediate stimulus which can be instinctively identified by the subject with the model of duplication (whose integral purity has been retained because it has been forgotten), then the total past sensation, not its echo nor its copy, but the sensation itself, annihilating every spatial and temporal restriction, comes in a rush to engulf the subject in all the beauty of its infallible proportion.

-Samuel Beckett, *Proust*¹⁰⁰

Much of the previous discussion of *For Samuel Beckett* has focused on its essentially non-linear, non-narrative character. The fact that this piece, like nearly all of Feldman's works, does not conform to the teleological or developmental model is, as we have previously remarked, obvious upon even the most casual listening. Yet Feldman's temporal thinking is not exactly cyclical either – it has little in common with say, the pulse music of Steve Reich or Terry Riley or with Indonesian gamelan, in which time can truly be said to progress through rhythmic cycles. For all of Kramer's assertions, it is not exactly vertical, either. Feldman certainly does challenge a listener's perception of time, but his temporal ambiguity is not the mystical transcendence of, say, La Monte Young or even Olivier Messiaen. The best we can do for now is to say that time in Feldman does not apparently move forward – or, more properly, that it does not necessarily *only* move forward. It proceeds through references to past events, through a continuous re-presentation of previously stated ideas. We take a few, perhaps halting, steps forward, and then (metaphorically, at least) a few steps back. And then, possibly, a few steps sidewise.

For the moment, however, we must pretend that the music progresses in something resembling a truly linear fashion. At this point, we will embark on a kind of blow-by-blow descriptive analysis, a tour of the piece following the order of the measures in the score. This is,

¹⁰⁰ Samuel Beckett, *Proust*, 72.

of course, also the order in which it unfolds to a listener the first time, and herein lies the paradox. We do not really hear the piece in a straightforwardly linear fashion, even if that is the only way we can experience it in real time. Memory, as we have seen, constantly informs our perceptions of the unfolding musical discourse. We can really only travel forwards in time, yet Feldman's music constantly invokes the past, suggesting alternate versions of what seems to have been settled history. Yet an analysis of this sort must proceed linearly. We cannot read descriptive prose the same way we would experience a Feldman piece, or a Beckett play for that matter. For the moment, therefore, we will need to discuss the piece in a way that potentially misrepresents it. We are still mindful of Kramer's warnings about analyzing non-linear music, so this present description is somewhat provisional, and subject to greater clarification. Following this analysis, we will attempt to use insights gleaned from this sort of analysis to better understand the piece in a way more congruent with the manner in which it is actually experienced. Such an analysis is a kind of reversal of Cone's Second Reading. For Cone, a Second Reading involves examining a linearly-structured work in an atemporal fashion in order to better understand the internal relationships of the structural elements of the work in question. In this case, the reading in question involves a temporally-ordered close analysis of a non-teleological work. The goal is ultimately the same: to gain insight into the structure of the work in order to better understand the work in question as it is perceived temporally and experientially.

4.1 THE OPENING OF THE PIECE

For Samuel Beckett appears to start *in medias res*, as if we are walking in on the middle of an event that has already been going on for some time. There is nothing in the way of introductory material, no quiet build-up to bring a listener in from the silence. Nor is there any kind of strong, decisive opening statement. Instead, the piece simply starts, almost arbitrarily. It is as if the first page of the score could be exchanged for the second page, with little impact on the perceived aural result. In a sense, this is hardly surprising, given the fact that, as we have seen, Feldman

almost completely eschews the narrative-developmental model that for so long had been the formal prototype of western music. The piece does not really have a clear beginning, any more than it has a clear ending. The composer chose to start and end at the positions he did, but he could have chosen nearly any other points whatsoever along the temporal continuum as beginning and ending points.

The opening presents four basic layers of material, distributed amongst the four instrumental groups identified by Claren. The upper winds (flutes, oboes, clarinets, and trumpets) play overlapping dyads displaced by eighth- and sixteenth-notes in a quasi-canonic fashion. The entrances of the instruments do not form regular patterns and the points of imitation do not form a strict canon, but they seem tantalizingly on the verge of coalescing into regularity. The fact that they do not, and that the individual entrances of the instruments remain unpredictable makes the whole thing seem even more unstable. They play single, sustained notes, the durations of which always add up to three eighth-notes, although their entrances do not always coincide with a downbeat in the 3/8 meter. Their pitch material consists of a chromatic segment, from A-flat to C-flat¹⁰¹, with the A-flat displaced an octave higher than the rest of the pitches, creating what Feldman has called an altered cluster.

Figure 1: The altered cluster



The excerpt below illustrates the heterophonic, quasi-canonic texture created by the upper wind instruments. The basic melodic contour is a four-note cell: A-flat, B-flat, C-flat, A-natural, grouped into two pairs (A-flat/B-flat and C-flat/A-natural) with each pitch sustained. We recall that Feldman had once remarked that one of the greatest differences between composing for piano and composing for orchestra is that the orchestra lacks a sustain pedal.¹⁰² Here, he

¹⁰¹ Feldman probably notates this pitch class as C-flat rather than B-natural to avoid the notational conflict with the B-flat, and to make the interval of A-flat to C-flat look like a third, rather than a second. The alternate theory, that Feldman's use of accidentals not commonly found in non-tonal music in some of his late work may have been meant to imply just intonation, or some other non-equal tempered scheme, appears to be wanting in evidence, at least with respect to the present work.

¹⁰² Claren, *Neither*, 455.

succeeds in creating a sort of virtual sustain pedal through the use of prolonged pitches and overlapping melodic lines.

Figure 2: Upper winds, mm. 1-9

The musical score for the upper winds (Flutes, Oboes, Clarinets, and Trumpets) in measures 1-9 is written in 3/8 time. Each instrument part consists of overlapping melodic lines with many notes tied across measures, creating a sustained, layered texture. The Flutes and Oboes parts are in the treble clef, while the Clarinets and Trumpets parts are in the bass clef. The key signature has one flat (B-flat).

The second layer of material is found in the lower winds (bassoons, horns, and trombones; the tuba does not enter until later). This group of instruments plays block chords of between five and seven eighth-notes in duration. Their pitch material is also made up of an altered cluster, which in this case includes all of the pitch classes of the upper wind group and additionally F-natural and G-natural. Octave displacement and octave doubling are much more frequent in this group, however, with pitches occurring in any one of three octave positions, as seen in the example below (illustrating the first page of these instruments' parts). Simultaneities in this group do sometimes contain pitch classes doubled at the octave. Unlike the upper wind group, the low wind group always functions homophonically, as a rhythmic unit, with all six instruments attacking each chord simultaneously, as shown below.

Figure 3: Lower winds, mm. 1-9

The musical score for the lower winds (Bassoons, Horns, and Trombones) in measures 1-9 is written in 3/8 time. Each instrument part consists of block chords of five to seven eighth notes, playing homophonically. The Bassoons and Trombones parts are in the bass clef, while the Horns part is in the bass clef with a key signature change to two flats (B-flat and E-flat) in measure 2. The key signature has one flat (B-flat).

The strings make up the third layer. Like the lower winds, they function as a unit, producing block chords, which always involve all five players, at least initially. The strings occupy the

chromatic space from G-natural to C-flat, thus overlapping with the pitch spaces of both wind groups. Octave displacement is permitted in this case, although the violin tends to get stuck on A-flat⁵, or, later A-natural⁵. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, Feldman's string orchestration is unusual in that the cello and double bass are restricted to their upper registers, with the double bass playing in harmonics in its highest register throughout, with the result that the lower instruments are forced into a register normally occupied by the violins and violas. Since the same note sounds very different when played on a violin or viola as opposed to being played as a harmonic on the double bass, Feldman is able to produce all sorts of very subtle, but striking, timbral transformations. These transformations are especially important since the string chord does not change substantially until measure 46.

The last sonic layer is occupied by the harp, piano, and vibraphone. The piano and vibraphone begin by playing alternating figures which resemble arpeggiated clusters (with displaced octaves), utilizing the same pitch material as the upper winds. The harp and piano are notable for their persistent quadruplet rhythm, playing against the notated 3/8 meter. The effect is that the piano and vibraphone can be seen as creating a sort of heterophonic texture with the upper winds. This is highlighted in some performances of the work, in which the piano and vibraphone seem to blend into the upper wind layer, adding to the "sustain pedal" effect of the upper wind group, as shown in the example below.

Figure 4: Piano and vibraphone, mm. 1-9



The harp, on the other hand, plays single notes in its middle register, sounding as bell-like harmonics. Its pitch set is derived from that of the strings. The harp's entrances are at first unpredictable, though they average to about one attack for every three measures. Towards the end of the first section, they become much more periodic and much more frequent, stabilizing on beat three of every measure beginning at measure 37. The harp does not exactly fit into a group with the vibraphone and piano, since it does not really share material with them. Rather, it seems to stand somewhat on its own, marking time irregularly.

The basic model of the first page is kept without substantial alteration until page 4. (This page is shown in full score below.) Here, the strings temporarily break ranks from playing monolithic block chords as an ensemble and emerge momentarily as individual voices, and the upper wind group becomes slightly more rhythmically active, implying a 4:3 rhythmic relationship through a use of dotted notes and sixteenth-note ties. Claren refers to this process as a "transformation to linear fragments."¹⁰³ The piano and vibraphone have become more fragmented, however, having abandoned their quadruplets for groupings of two notes, which nonetheless still preserve the 4:3 rhythmic feel, since their patterns are also notated as dotted sixteenth notes. The rhythm is made more complex by rhythmic displacement, since the figures now no longer occur exclusively on the downbeat of the measure, but rather on the second sixteenth note of the measure. This is an instance of what Feldman has called "crippled symmetry," in which a rhythmic pattern is nearly symmetrical, but not completely so. The constant play of duples against the 3/8 rhythm contributes to the overall rhythmic instability, but its pervasiveness causes a sort of uneasy equilibrium.

¹⁰³ Claren, 492.

Figure 5: Full score, mm. 28-36

4

The image shows a page of a musical score for measures 28 through 36. The score is written for a large ensemble of instruments. The instruments listed on the left are: Flute (Fl.), Oboe (Ob.), Clarinet (Cl.), Bassoon (Bsn.), Horn (Hn.), Trumpet (C Tpt.), Trombone (Tbn.), Tuba (Tba.), Harp (Hp.), Piano (Pno.), Vibraphone (Vib.), Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vc.), and Double Bass (Db.). The score is in a key signature of one flat (B-flat major or D minor) and a 3/4 time signature. The measures are numbered 28 through 36. The Tuba part is introduced in measure 32, playing a D-natural. The Violin I and Violoncello parts have an 'art. harm.' (artificial harmonic) marking in measures 28-36. The score is a full score, showing the parts for all instruments.

Page 5 continues the events of page 4, but it is notable for the introduction of the tuba. The distinctive sound of the tuba is instantly noticeable, and it opens up a register barely touched so far. Additionally, the tuba enters on a D-natural, a pitch class not yet heard in the piece. The trumpets temporarily join with the other brass and bassoons in a block chord which includes C-natural and D-flat, two other pitch classes not previously heard in the piece. Claren considers this page to be the end of the first section, an assessment confirmed by the subsequent noticeable change in material. The excerpt below, shown in a keyboard-style reduction, illustrates this chord (measures 42-45).

Figure 6: Brass and bassoons (reduction), mm. 42-45



4.2 SECOND SECTION

A sustained chord in the upper winds marks the beginning of a new section (measure 46.) The change of time signature (to 5/8) in the following measure brings about a change of texture as well. The upper winds abandon their quasi-canonic patterns and join the rest of the ensemble in playing block chords. It is noteworthy that most of these sustained chords are five beats long (if we consider the eighth-note to be the counting unit), which does coincide with the time signature of 5/8, but do not necessarily occur on the downbeat of the bar. This suggests that rather than a suppression of a periodic meter, we are perhaps dealing with a multiplicity of downbeats: the basic time signature is superimposed upon itself, resulting in a “blurring” of time. The basic 5/8 is relevant to the passage of time, but *which* 5/8? It is somewhat reminiscent of the contrapuntal rhythmic treatment of medieval and renaissance music, in which the different voices may all fit into the same rhythmic structure, but the placement of their respective accents may differ. The rigid segregation of the winds into high and low groups is eventually also abandoned in favor of a freer treatment, although the strings still remain as a distinct unit. The winds are scored in pairs, mostly in intervals of seconds, sevenths, and ninths. The overall texture resembles a mosaic of constantly shifting orchestral sonorities, with novel combinations of instruments continuously emerging. This texture, with its emphasis on alternating block chords, remains the

norm throughout most of the rest of the piece. The first three measures of the 5/8, which Claren refers to as the “model” for the rest of the section (and of the piece), are illustrated in a reduction below, with the topmost staff representing the upper woodwinds, the middle staves the bassoons and brass, and the bottom staff representing the strings.

Figure 7: The 5/8 “model” (reduction)

The image shows a musical score reduction for a 5/8 time signature section. It consists of four staves. The top staff is for upper woodwinds, the second and third staves are for bassoons and brass, and the bottom staff is for strings. The music is written in 5/8 time and features complex, overlapping rhythmic patterns and chords. The notation includes various note values, rests, and dynamic markings, illustrating the intricate texture of the 'model' section.

Pages 10 and 11 represent something of a return to the opening material. The time signature reverts to 3/8, and figures resembling those of pages 4 and 5 return in the upper woodwinds, although this time the trumpets are integrated with the other brass, rather than forming a group with the upper woodwinds. However, page 12 brings us back to 5/8, and to material more characteristic of the second section. The opening material does not reoccur at any point following measure 99. Therefore, any thought of development or recapitulation of the opening ideas must be abandoned. At the same time, the change in material is certainly not dramatic or radical. The prevailing homophonic texture is established by the strings and lower winds on the very first page of the score, and the basic harmonic vocabulary remains consistent throughout the piece.

Page 12 also illustrates some of the extremely subtle timbral contrasts for which Feldman is well known. The string writing in this page makes use of three playing techniques: ordinary, *sul tasto*, and natural harmonics. Since it is used exclusively on pitches that cannot be played as natural harmonics, the *sul tasto* technique can be considered to be equivalent to harmonics,

producing a binary opposition of normal vs. *sul tasto*/harmonic. To a large extent, this timbral contrast is obscured by the layering of wind and percussion chords. However, the fact that Feldman chooses to show such attention to a potentially inaudible sonic detail is noteworthy in and of itself.

Pages 12-13 show some of Feldman's interest in palindromic construction. The passage in the trombones and tuba on page 13 is an exact retrograde of the part played by those instruments on the previous page (except for the placement of the repeat sign).

Figure 8: Palindromic construction in the low brass



The first violin part on page 13 is a very near-retrograde of the part on page 12, differing by one note (a G-natural where one would expect B-flat.) The disposition of repeat signs also exhibits mirror-like construction: on page 12, the last four measures are repeated, breaking the nine-measure page up into two groups, with the first being a five measure (unrepeated) group, and the second being a (repeated) four-measure group. Page 13 reverses the pattern, with a four-measure (unrepeated) group, being followed by a five-measure (repeated) group.

Pages 14 and 15 continue in like manner, with no real changes to the texture or pitch content. The alternation of block chords continues, with contrast being achieved through the alternation of different timbral groups. Pages 14 and 16 are repeated in their entirety. Page 16 is notable for the brief silence in the winds in measures 142-143, which exposes the piano and vibraphone. The writing remains remarkably stable (or, perhaps, static) until page 23. A few small details do emerge, such as the grace notes in the piano and vibraphone (page 18, mm. 154-162), or the barely-audible pizzicato in the cello (page 21, mm. 187-189). Beginning on page 21 (measure 181), the string chords are six beats long (measured in eighth-notes), while the wind chords remain five-beats long. The first violin is again stuck on A-natural harmonics, and the tuba is silent, causing the bottom to drop out. These few (subtle) changes in texture would seem

to prepare us for the upcoming third section, yet Feldman frustrates any attempt to link these clues to a feeling of transition by inserting material (on page 22) very much like that found on pages 14-19 (although the string chords are six beats long).

4.3 THIRD SECTION

While Claren considers page 23 to be the beginning of the third part of the piece, he does not explain his reason for this. On the whole, this page greatly resembles the previous material, although the change in pitch in the tuba (from D to E) is very noticeable. However, the shift to $3/4$ on page 24 is definitely significant, and unquestionably signals the beginning of a new section. Therefore, we will consider this change of time signature (on page 24) as the true beginning of the third section. Just as in the previous $5/8$ section, the length of chords (six eighth-notes in duration) does coincide with the time signature, although the onsets of each sonority do not necessarily line up with the downbeat of each bar. Although the material and overall texture have not changed substantially, the longer chord lengths produce an effect of dilated time. Interestingly, the strings persist with five-beat chords on page 24 (except for measure 212, which will be discussed below), joining the winds in six-beat chords only on the subsequent page. Page 24 also introduces an event that subsequently recurs throughout the remainder of the piece, namely, the string chord in measure 212. We will call this the recurrent chord. This chord, which appears in various inversions and re-voicings, will become increasingly important through the duration of the piece. It always occurs in the fourth measure of the page, and is always accompanied by a substantial thinning-out of the winds. In fact, on page 24, as in most (but not all) other occurrences of this chord, the winds drop out altogether during this measure, although the piano, vibraphone and harp do play. The recurrent chord functions as something of a signpost, marking the passage of time across long stretches of otherwise uniform material. Feldman highlights its importance on this page by symmetrically constructing the page around it. In fact, aside from the notable exceptions of the harp, piano, and vibraphone, and the repeat sign around the last four measures, the entire page nearly forms a perfect palindrome, as seen in the example below (full score). The harp, piano, and vibraphone

form an interesting exception to the palindromic form. As we have seen, these instruments are often deployed independently of the rest of the ensemble. The harp has a nearly-symmetrical part (if one allows for displacement of a few eighth-rests), producing a typically Feldmanesque “crippled symmetry.” The actual figures played by the piano and vibraphone are not perfectly symmetrical, but their placement on the page is, with three bars of silence, three bars of figures, and three bars of silence.

Figure 9: Full score showing symmetrical construction, mm. 208-216

24

The image displays a full orchestral score for measures 208 through 216. The score is organized into two systems of staves. The first system includes Flute (Fl.), Oboe (Ob.), Clarinet (Cl.), Bassoon (Bsn.), Horn (Hn.), Trumpet (Tpt.), Trombone (Tbn.), and Tuba (Tba.). The second system includes Harp (Hp.), Piano (Pno.), Vibraphone (Vib.), Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vc., marked 'art harm.'), and Double Bass (Db.). The music is written in 3/4 time and features a complex, symmetrical structure. A vertical bar line is placed between measures 212 and 213, highlighting the mirrored construction of the passage. The harp part shows a sequence of notes (B-flat, A, G, F, E, D, C) that is nearly symmetrical around measure 212.5. The piano and vibraphone parts also exhibit this symmetrical placement, with three bars of silence, three bars of figures, and three bars of silence.

It is worth interrupting the linear-descriptive analysis to briefly discuss Feldman's use of palindromic construction. While palindromes in music are certainly nothing new – Machaut's famous *Ma fin est mon commencement* comes to mind – Feldman uses palindromes for entirely different reasons than Machaut, or (to give a more recent example) Webern. In short, Feldman does not share Machaut's or Webern's concerns with symmetry or rigor of design as essential and valuable qualities in and of themselves. Rather, in Feldman's use, a palindrome would seem to be an expression of ambiguity, pointing both forward and backward simultaneously. Its direction is arbitrary. Musical palindromes are not always audible, but in this case, Feldman further cripples the apparent symmetry by repeating the last four measures, and by exempting the harp, piano, and vibraphone, thereby ensuring that the visual palindrome will remain completely inaudible.

Page 25 is likewise palindromic – more so, in fact, since it is the central five measures which are repeated. The recurrent chord makes a second appearance in measure 221. The strings join the winds in playing chords of six eighth-notes in duration, but there is a break in their homophony. Here, the violins and cello form a unit, whereas the viola and double bass are grouped together, with the two string groups acting independently. The tuba moves down a major third to C, where it remains, sounding a sort of interrupted pedal point, until page 36.

Page 26 retains the palindromic construction of the previous pages. The string groupings have become further fractured, with the violins forming one rhythmic group, the viola and cello a second, and the double bass acting independently. The recurrent chord is absent on this page, and the harp, which had been playing at irregular intervals, has settled on the fourth eighth-note of each measure. What is most notable about this page is the introduction of what we will call the “bell chords” in the piano and vibraphone. While it is doubtful that Feldman was deliberately trying to evoke the sound of bells, the sonorities produced by rich, dissonant chords played in alternation in the vibraphone and the middle register of the piano has a decidedly chime-like quality. Variations of the bell chords will occur throughout the remainder of the piece. The harp, piano, and vibraphone parts of this page are shown below.

Figure 10: Harp, piano, and vibraphone

The image shows a musical score for three instruments: Harp, Piano, and Vibraphone, in 3/4 time. The Harp part is in the bass clef and consists of a single note, G, with a circled 'o' above it, repeated in a rhythmic pattern. The Piano part is in the treble clef and features a series of chords, primarily triads and dyads, with a circled 'o' above the first measure. The Vibraphone part is also in the treble clef and features a series of chords, primarily triads and dyads, with a circled 'o' above the first measure. The score is divided into two systems, each with a repeat sign at the beginning and end.

Pages 27 through 30 follow a common paradigm. Each individual page exhibits the symmetric/palindromic construction as described above, with the second through eighth measures of each page enclosed within repeats signs. A variant of the recurrent chord occurs on the fifth measure of each page. Aside from the recurrent chord, the individual string instruments function more independently of one another than previously, even joining into chords with wind instruments. An exposed pair of wind instruments sustains a minor seventh dyad (G-flat/F-natural) in the fourth through sixth measure of each of these pages (clarinets on page 27, trumpets on page 28, oboes on page 29, and finally flutes on page 30). The texture on these pages is noticeably less dense than previously, and the chords consequently much less rich. The harp stubbornly repeats its middle G in harmonics as previously, serving as a kind of click track, although it is interesting to note that its rhythm implies a duple division of the bar against the prevailing 3/4 meter. The piano and vibraphone persist in their bell chords, which at times become rhythmically complex (as on page 28). This rhythmic complexity is all the more notable because the writing in the rest of the ensemble has become much more rhythmically stable, fitting very neatly into the notated 3/4 time signature. As an example, page 28 is shown in full score below. On the whole, this passage is one of the sparsest, most static sections in the piece, but it is also a section in which the notated rhythm is most audible. The use of recurring ideas on each page lends an air of expectation to the passage, but since each page is different in terms of the orchestration and disposition of the chords, the passage remains somewhat unpredictable. “Differentiated repetition” would not be an inappropriate term to describe this section.

Figure 11: Full score, showing palindromic construction with string chord in the central position, mm. 244-252

28

The image displays a full score for a musical piece, specifically focusing on measures 244 through 252. The score is arranged in a palindromic structure, with measures 244-249 on the left and measures 251-252 on the right, with measure 250 in the center. The instruments listed on the left are Flute (Fl.), Oboe (Ob.), Clarinet (Cl.), Bassoon (Bsn.), Horn (Hn.), Trumpet (Tpt.), Trombone (Tbn.), Tuba (Tba.), Harp (Hp.), Piano (Pno.), Vibraphone (Vib.), Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vc.), and Double Bass (Db.). The score features various musical notations, including notes, rests, and dynamic markings. The central measure (250) is highlighted as the focal point of the palindromic construction, with a string chord in the central position. The overall structure is symmetrical, with measures 244-249 mirroring the structure of measures 251-252.

Page 31 brings a shift to 7/16 time. This time signature could be thought of as an elongated version of the 3/8 that opened the piece ($3/8 + 1$ sixteenth note = $7/16$). Aside from the change in time signature, the texture and construction of the music has not changed substantially from the previous page, with a symmetrical pattern around the repeated central seven measures. The middle three measures again present a minor seventh dyad in the woodwinds (in this case, in the oboes), but the recurrent chord is conspicuously absent in the strings. In its place, the strings have a silent measure, which seems to fulfill the same paradigmatic role as the recurrent chord. The 7/16 meter has the effect of feeling much faster than the previous 3/4, a fact that is especially noticeable in the sustained oboe dyad (which occupies less time than the equivalent wind dyads in the preceding 3/4 passage).

In any case, Feldman does not occupy himself with the 7/16 meter for very long. The following page shifts to 9/16, which can be seen being intermediary between 3/8 and 3/4, since the notation suggests that the 9 should be thought of as three groups of three sixteenth-notes. The piano plays dectuplets (10 in the space of 9) against this, making this page one of the most polyrhythmic (and rhythmically unstable) passages in the piece. Again, there is a central wind minor-seventh dyad (here in the trumpets), and, as in the previous page, the strings have a silent bar in place of the recurrent chord.

Page 33 (mm. 289-297) closes out the third section of the piece. This page is notable because, in terms of notation and page layout (which, as we have seen, are not trivial matters for Feldman), it represents the halfway point in the piece, although we are less than halfway through the piece in terms of performance duration.¹⁰⁴ The construction of this page is unique. The first four measures are in 3/4, and are repeated. This is followed by a repeated 3/2 measure (measure 293), in which the strings play the recurrent chord, with rests in the winds, harp, piano, and vibraphone. This is followed by four measures (likewise repeated) in 7/8, which present essentially the same material as the 3/4 that began the page, except that each sonority lasts one

¹⁰⁴ As a reference, in the recording by Klangforum Wien under the direction of Sylvain Cambreling, page 33 begins at 19:46, out of a total length of about fifty-four minutes.

eighth-note longer. The string parts (violin 1, violin 2, viola, cello, and double bass) for this page are shown below.

Figure 12, strings

The musical score for strings consists of five staves. The first staff is Violin 1, the second is Violin 2, the third is Viola, the fourth is Cello, and the fifth is Double Bass. The music is written in a key with one sharp (F#) and features complex rhythmic patterns. The time signature starts in 3/4, changes to 3/2, and then to 7/8. The notation includes various note values, rests, and dynamic markings.

This passage illustrates Feldman's temporal elongation technique. The basic 3/4 measure is doubled to 3/2, and then returns to something closer than to the original 3/4, but still stretched out temporally (the 7/8 being one eighth-note longer than the original 3/4 and feeling consequently slower). The recurrent chord in the 3/2 measure is a particularly significant occurrence: when reckoned according to page numbers, this would be the mid-point of the piece (halfway through page 33 of a 67-page score). It occurs here for the first time by itself, and it is doubled in duration and repeated. When viewing a waveform of a recording of *For Samuel Beckett* in a digital audio workstation program, this event is immediately visible. It is also noteworthy that, having drawn attention to this chord, Feldman does not bring it back until much later, in measure 428 (page 48.)

Claren refers to pages 34 and 35 as an interlude, and, in any case, they do present material that differs somewhat from the previous section.¹⁰⁵ The time signature shifts to 2/2, implying that the half-note is to receive the pulse, in contrast to the previous quarter and eighth-note pulses. This time signature is potentially problematic, in that it looks identical on the page to 4/4, and taken at a slow tempo, might even be felt as if it were in quadruple time. Having

¹⁰⁵ Claren, 495.

established that Feldman really does mean to imply some sort of relationship between his notated time signatures and the often seemingly non-metrical audible surface of the music, we can accept that Feldman truly does intend this passage to be felt in two. In any case, the sustained chords on these pages do last for four (or more) quarter-notes in duration, and the effect feels as if the passage of time has come to an almost complete standstill. The harp, piano, and vibraphone relate much more closely to the notated pulse, further reinforcing the impression that the notated meter is relevant to the perception of time. Page 35 shows Feldman's palindromic construction technique at work again, as the parts in the winds and strings on page 35 are nearly an exact retrograde of those on page 34.

4.4 FOURTH SECTION

Claren considers page 36 marks the beginning of the fourth section, and the change of time signature, to $7/8$, would seem to confirm this. This $7/8$, as we have seen, functions as a kind of elongated $3/4$. Despite the change in meter, the long stretch from page 36 to page 48 (which lasts over ten minutes in performance) does not introduce any notable new material. A few new pitch classes are brought to prominence, such as the B-natural in the tuba and the D-natural in the double bass and second violin (significant because this pitch class had not previously occurred in the strings.) In general, however, the music progresses much as it previously had, with chords and dyads alternating amongst various groups of instruments, and the bell chords in the piano and vibraphone becoming more prominent. Some pages feature internally-repeated measures, but there is no consistent pattern which emerges (as compared to the third section). The strings once again function as a unit, playing chords homophonically, and the pitch class D seems to be given particular emphasis. Measure 353 on page 40 is notable for having a rest in all parts on the first beat, making it the first point in the piece in which there is a complete silence. Although brief, this event is noteworthy because it is the first interruption in what had previously been continuous musical discourse.

The next silence to occur is even more significant. On page 48, the pause on the first beat marks the return of material mirroring that is found on page 33. Here, the process is reversed,

with four measures of 7/8 (repeated), followed by the recurrent chord (in 3/2, this time not repeated), followed by four measures of 3/4 (repeated). As we can see in the example below (showing the string parts), the material on this page is similar, though not identical to, the material on page 33, functioning as a kind of distorted memory of previous events.

Figure 13, strings



Page 49 follows with a 9/16 passage very reminiscent of the third section. The middle seven measures are repeated, and the trumpets have a minor-seventh dyad in the fourth through sixth measures, although this time it is a major second lower than previously (F-flat/E-flat, instead of G-flat/F-natural). The recurrent chord is conspicuous by its absence. However, it does occur, in an unusual position, in the first measure of page 50. Here, Feldman places the recurrent chord, in 3/2, in the first measure of the page, followed by four measures of 7/8 and then four measures 3/4. This material is more similar to the earlier 7/8 material in the fourth section, and by page 51, our brief remembrance of things past has come to a conclusion. Pages 51 and 52 have material (in 7/8) similar to that which has dominated the fourth section, although the rest on the first beat of page 53 shows that silence has become an increasingly important aspect of the piece.

Claren refers to pages 53-56 as an interlude, but the material presented in these pages differs only somewhat from both preceding and the following pages. While Claren's first interlude (pages 34-35) could be seen as a kind of interpolation, it is difficult to view this passage as a sort of interlude in the same manner. Rather, this passage is more easily viewed as the conclusion of the fourth section. The time signature remains 7/8, but many chords are sustained for eight or even twelve beats (counting in eighth notes), producing a sensation of expanded time. While most listeners will have a very difficult time sensing an actual ictus, the chords sounding in these pages do last noticeably longer (in absolute duration) than the events which preceded them. Page 53 begins (somewhat unsurprisingly) with a rest on the first eighth note. The instrumental sections are rigidly segregated here, with the woodwinds, brass, and strings each functioning as units. The harp plays consistently on the sixth eighth-note of each measure, and the piano and vibraphone continue the alternating bell chords, as shown below (full score.)

Figure 14, full score

Musical score for Figure 14, full score, measures 469-477. The score is arranged in a system with multiple staves. The instruments and their parts are as follows:

- Fl.** (Flute): Measures 469-477, featuring a melodic line with slurs and accents.
- Ob.** (Oboe): Measures 469-477, featuring a melodic line with slurs and accents.
- Cl.** (Clarinet): Measures 469-477, featuring a melodic line with slurs and accents.
- Bsn.** (Bassoon): Measures 469-477, featuring a melodic line with slurs and accents.
- Hn.** (Horn): Measures 469-477, featuring a melodic line with slurs and accents.
- Tpt.** (Trumpet): Measures 469-477, featuring a melodic line with slurs and accents.
- Tbn.** (Tenor Trombone): Measures 469-477, featuring a melodic line with slurs and accents.
- Tba.** (Tuba): Measures 469-477, featuring a melodic line with slurs and accents.
- Hp.** (Harp): Measures 469-477, featuring a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes.
- Pno.** (Piano): Measures 469-477, featuring a harmonic accompaniment with slurs and accents.
- Vib.** (Vibraphone): Measures 469-477, featuring a harmonic accompaniment with slurs and accents.
- Vln. I** (Violin I): Measures 469-477, featuring a melodic line with slurs and accents.
- Vln. II** (Violin II): Measures 469-477, featuring a melodic line with slurs and accents.
- Vla.** (Viola): Measures 469-477, featuring a melodic line with slurs and accents.
- Vc.** (Violoncello): Measures 469-477, featuring a melodic line with slurs and accents, including the instruction "art. harm.".
- Db.** (Double Bass): Measures 469-477, featuring a melodic line with slurs and accents.

4.5 FIFTH SECTION

Claren views the final section of the piece as beginning on page 57, and although his labeling of the previous few pages as an interlude is subject to dispute, there is no doubt that this page marks the beginning of a new section. Here there is a shift back to the basic 3/4 meter of the earlier sections of the piece. However, Feldman seemingly abandons the page as a structural unit, and instead groups pages together in units of two, which contributes to a feeling of expanded time. The material has not changed dramatically from that presented in section four, although in general, this final section feels noticeably sparser than the previous section. This section also makes the most use of repeat signs, with groups of two or three measures frequently repeated. The first violin's material is limited to two pitches, E5 (played as a harmonic), and the Ab an augmented fifth below. The bright sonority of these harmonics produces a more open sound, palpable throughout the sounding mass. Beginning on page 59, rests become more frequent. Measure 567 (the last measure on page 63) is a completely silent bar, aside from a sustained harp note tied over from the previous measure. Measure 572, the middle measure of page 64, is again completely silent. Since this is the middle measure in the page, its position recalls the recurrent chord that occurred in the third section of the piece. Silent bars become gradually more frequent until the end of the piece. The first measure of page 65 (measure 577) is silent, as are the third, sixth, and ninth measures of page 66 (measures 588, 591, and 594, respectively.) The final page of the piece, page 67, is divided into three groups of three measures, each ending with two beats of silence. Each of the three groups is enclosed within a repeat sign. A final bell chord in the piano ends the piece.

4.6 CLOSING REMARKS ON THE DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

This concludes our tour through the features of *For Samuel Beckett*. While this discussion has hardly been exhaustive, I hope that it does reveal some of the salient features of the piece. Our primary objective, however, remains the investigation of Feldman's language of musical time.

So what have we learned about Feldman's manipulation of time and memory through this investigation?

By continuously varying the same material, but doing so in a non-systematic, non-developmental manner, Feldman works with difference and repetition, memory and time in a way that defies causality or narrative. "Variation" in Feldman's case does not necessarily have the same sort of organic developmental consequences as it does in say, Beethoven or Schoenberg. The critical difference here is that, in the classical developing forms, variation implies subsequent variation. (In Deleuze's terms, classical variation is arborescent.) This sort of variation, of which Brahms and Schoenberg are the acknowledged masters, proceeds in such a manner as to render each new event inevitable in light of previous events. On the other hand Feldman's technique, which could perhaps be called inorganic, does not draw any specific causal relationship between similar events. Varied repetitions do not necessarily imply subsequent variations, and new events do not necessarily inherit the characteristics of previous versions of similar material.

Literal repetitions, where they occur, do have an effect on the flow of time. This effect is undoubtedly what Kramer refers to as "vertical time," and it is in this instance that Feldman most resembles the composers with whom Kramer so uneasily groups him.¹⁰⁶ Literal repetition can have the effect of suspending time, as contemporary trance music has made apparent. Feldman's repetitions, however, are not always obvious or even audible, and because they exist in a context of non-literal varied repetition, one questions whether they are, in fact, literal repetitions at all. Particularly in the third section of the piece, where pages are repeated (in whole or in part), and then followed by a page which is a variation on the previous page, and which itself contains literal repetitions, Feldman's literal repetitions at times seem to defamiliarize, rather than to reinforce, and to interrogate memory, rather than to affirm it.

The notation in the score suggests the compression and expansion of time by fitting longer or shorter bars (some of them repeated) onto the same physical page. Of course this is not necessarily audible, although the page and measure are actual units of temporal division throughout much of the piece. While the individual page is certainly not an audible unit of

¹⁰⁶ I am speaking here, of course, of such disparate composers as Satie, Stockhausen, Reich, Glass, Young, and Riley.

musical time, Feldman employs pagination as a diagram, almost as a virtual temporal unit. This virtual temporal unit existed at the time of composition, and its existence is evident when studying the score, but it is not at all obvious when listening to the work without the score. This is one of the great paradoxes of *For Samuel Beckett*. Time is marked explicitly in a very graphic and spatial manner on the page, and a listener without the printed score is completely unaware of this. To return briefly to Cone's conception of First, Second, and Third Readings, we can say that a truly successful Third Reading would require the listener to have the score in hand, constantly mediating between time as presented on the page, and sensation of time expressed through sound.

On a purely technical level, Feldman's compositional procedures are not, on the whole, particularly complex. Having worked out his initial harmonic material intuitively, he then goes about projecting it in sound and space through varied orchestrations and differentiated repetition. He obtains a surprising degree of harmonic variation simply through re-orchestrations and re-voicings of altered tone clusters. The constant of nine bars per page imposes a sort of temporal grid over which Feldman superimposes his temporal expansions and contractions. These expansions and contractions are achieved through repeating similar material, but elongating or contracting its durations. By combining literal and non-literal repetitions of material, Feldman creates a kind of ambiguous evolution, which differs from classical development in that it does not have any clear teleology. The use of palindromic construction, near (crippled) symmetrical constructions, and combinations of recurrent events (such as the bell chords) with shifting chords all contribute to the feeling of ambiguous temporality.

While this examination has paid comparatively less attention to Feldman's harmonic language, we should remark that his altered clusters display a surprising degree of harmonic control, with some pitch classes not introduced at all until quite late in the piece. Feldman's stripped-down harmonic language, with its preponderance of seconds, sevenths, and ninths, results in a somewhat flattened harmonic surface, but it is precisely by repeating these intervals and their resultant clusters obsessively that Feldman is able to create memorable non-thematic material. This material can then be transformed through orchestration, rhythmic elongation, and through the various techniques of literal and non-literal repetition already discussed.

Feldman's approach to harmony is ultimately closely tied to his orchestration. The rich and constantly varying orchestration of *For Samuel Beckett* is probably its most immediately

notable and initially attractive aspect of the piece. Feldman's strategy of segmentation, producing discrete groups of instruments within the ensemble, allows for a further degree of differentiation in what may otherwise appear to be a flat musical surface. The constant re-orchestration of altered chords, in fact, becomes one of the prime means through which Feldman achieves differentiation of material.

For Samuel Beckett does produce a rich network of signs: the alternating block chords of winds and strings (once the listener has become immersed into the soundworld and accepted that this is to be the material of the piece), the solitary plucking of the harp, and the off-kilter bell-chords of the piano and vibraphone. We cannot, of course, read these signs as Saussurean signifiers, as their relationship to each other is provisional and problematic and their connection to external concepts is practically nonexistent. They are, for all intents and purposes "a-signifying" signs. For example the piano, vibraphone, and harp seem to imply some aspect of timekeeping – that is, they function as chronosigns, in Deleuze's taxonomy. As their patterns are irregular and their appearances unpredictable, they function as "unreliable chronosigns" throughout the piece. Feldman thereby sets up an expectation of regularity that is not to be fulfilled. Yet it would be too far a stretch to attempt to assign these signs a meaning external to the piece.

Indeed, the entire piece can be read as a meditation on the varieties of temporal experience. Feldman shows how time can seemingly expand, contract, or even seem to come to a standstill, all the while unfolding inexorably into the future. Closely connected to time is memory, and Feldman explores memory in its various forms, sometimes affirming its primacy, and sometimes questioning its authority. If Feldman found traditional musical forms to be mere "paraphrases of memory", in *For Samuel Beckett* he seeks to present a direct image of memory itself.

5.0 CONCLUSION: MORTON FELDMAN'S TIME MACHINE

5.1.1 Memory and Repetition

Writing on memory in Deleuze, Williams notes that

...concepts that depend on memory can be blocked because of the gap between the original event and our memory of it. Concepts of remembered things do not correspond to one and only one thing that we remember.¹⁰⁷

Memory, in other words, cannot be trusted. We cannot always remember an object or event exactly, and when we think we do, the possibility exists that we might confuse the memory with a different object or event entirely. When repetition is involved, the situation becomes more complicated. Because time is taken to be an essential quality, a memory or repetition is always slightly falsified, because its quality of time is different. This raises a number of pertinent questions. Does an apparently repeated object correspond to the model as we remember it? Does it differ? If so, how? Memory depends upon repetition, but what if the repetition is not identical? And is an identical repetition even possible?

We have seen, in the course of this investigation, that repetition plays a key role in *For Samuel Beckett*. Recognizable musical events, such as the recurrent string chord, do reappear later in the course of the piece. Some passages are enclosed within repeat signs, implying a literal repetition. Similarly, variation of a sort is also present. Often the technique of variation is timbral: a chord might occur several times, with a different orchestration at each occurrence. What is repeated are largely static blocks of sound, set against a series of mostly non-periodic, more-or-less unpredictable events. This can have the effect of producing a sense of timelessness, as described by Kramer, but Feldman's relationship to time and the perception of time is richer

¹⁰⁷ Williams, *Gilles Deleuze's Difference and Repetition*, 43.

and more complex than that. Feldman is not exclusively interested in simply causing time to apparently slow down, although passages in *For Samuel Beckett* seem to do just that. A complete absence of any perception of time would correspond to Deleuze's concept of the sublime: an utterly transcendent, indescribable, and potentially terrifying state, totally removed from normal perceptions. Feldman flirts with the borders of the sublime, but does not truly enter into it. Rather, he seems to prefer to explore the ambiguities of time, neither unconditionally affirming its inexorable forward motion, nor attempting to completely transcend it. We recall what Deleuze wrote about the Abstract Expressionist painters Feldman so greatly admired, namely, that it is in the experience of near-catastrophe, of approaching a breakdown of temporality, that modernity creates its own rhythm.¹⁰⁸ Feldman's rhythm is often asymmetrical, which for Deleuze implies motion and evolution, but it stubbornly refuses to develop, creating a tension between movement and stasis, which in turn is itself a kind of rhythm.

By literally repeating events, or presenting new events that are near-direct repetitions, Feldman appears to distort time. A literally-repeated object appears identical to previously-heard material, so it seemingly points backwards in time, to the past. At the same time, as we have seen, identities take place against a background of virtual difference, and time must be taken as an essential quality, so a repeated object cannot really be seen as being identical to what was apparently an earlier instance of the same object. This conflict between time (which can only move forward, and which introduces difference into repetition) and repetition (which inherently resists forward motion), the sense of forward temporal motion is ambiguous or distorted.

5.1.2 Rhythm and Pulse

For all its asymmetrical rhythms, the material of the piece does not have a particularly strong feeling of audible forward motion. Despite Feldman's apparent concern with the notated time signature, there is very little of a sense of a periodic pulse, and the harmonic field exists in a

¹⁰⁸ It could be argued that the comparison between Feldman and the Abstract Expressionist painters, made so frequently as to have become cliché, ignores the fundamental characteristic of Feldman's work, namely, its movement through time. However, Feldman himself felt a profound sense of kinship to these artists, and frequently made such comparisons himself.

carefully controlled state of equilibrium. The repeated patterns in the piano, vibraphone, and harp do repeat at intervals which are sometimes periodic and predictable, but which generally have very little to do with the rhythmic structure as established in other layers of the musical texture. Moreover, while these instruments, especially the harp, appear (in places, at least) to mark time in a quasi-periodic fashion, since their activities are not, ultimately, reducible to a common pulse, this apparent time-keeping turns out to be false, producing a further temporal distortion.

Nonliteral repetitions function in some ways like “misrememberings.”¹⁰⁹ Objects are presented, altered, and repeated over time. The original or final form is not necessarily privileged over alternatives. If similar music is presented several minutes later, but with an altered time signature, it has the feel of familiarity, but seems somehow transformed. The transformation is not of an entirely obvious nature, especially to a listener without a score, since the lack of a definite pulse causes the change of time signature to alter the music in an obscure and slightly non-intuitive manner. If the same music is repeated literally, we are similarly mistrustful, since the constant varying of already-presented material causes us to become confused with regard to what is a repetition and what is not. In other words, when faced with a varied repetition, we cannot be sure if it has been changed or not, since Feldman is so unpredictable in the way that he repeats. Moreover, when we take into account the essential quality of time, the memory never corresponds exactly to the original event, and we have a difference even when we have what seems like a literal repetition. Beckett is correct to describe memory as “some miracle of analogy”: we may, potentially, remember past events, and note their similarity to present events. Yet, at the same time, the constantly unfolding web of differentiation continually falsifies memory, producing gaps and false positives, making a real identity appear to be nothing short of miraculous. Memory cannot function without repetition, and repetition, as we have seen, takes place against a background of virtual difference. Thus, difference inhabits repetition, and repetition inhabits difference.

In discussing Samuel Beckett’s work, Connor has this to say:

Repetition turns out to be the motive principle of this vision of difference, for difference implies and relies upon the unhierarchalized interdependence of different elements, in

¹⁰⁹ Claren speaks of Feldman’s “alienation of memory” (*Entfremdung der Erinnerung*). See Claren, *Neither*, 276.

what can be seen as mutual recall or repetition. So, it becomes possible to free repetition from its role as the slave or mirror of identity and to see it as a liberating principle within an eternal recurrence which is also absolute difference.”¹¹⁰

In Beckett’s *Footfalls*, May/Amy loses track of time (she cannot remember her age, for example, or for how many years she has been pacing) and even of her own identity through obsessive repetition. We are accustomed to the commonsense notion that repeating a statement somehow reinforces its veracity, but if the statement were repeated, sometimes contradicted, sometimes slightly altered, then its truth would quite naturally be called into question. In the opening of *For Samuel Beckett*, the various pairs of upper woodwind instruments, piano, and vibraphone all present differing versions of the same material simultaneously. We cannot know which version is authoritative, because none of them are. There is no real identity here, only absolute difference, because, as Connor notes above, this type of difference is non-hierarchical, with no single element privileged over any other. Indeed, *For Samuel Beckett* is notable throughout for its non-hierarchical construction. Where distinct layers exist in the musical texture, none predominates over others. There is no background, middle ground, or foreground, and certainly no melody with accompaniment. Yet the texture bears little resemblance to the equality of voices found in baroque counterpoint. Rather, it is a series of simultaneous events, some closely related, some not. Even the beginning and ending of the piece are not necessarily privileged instances. The opening, which presents material not heard again after the first ten minutes or so, seems to suggest an introduction that does not exist and a transition to later material, similarly absent. The ending of the piece does present an inevitable move towards silence, but the process does not seem to be complete on the last page of the score.

5.2 THE TROPING OF TEMPORALITY REVISITED

In the beginning of the present study, we were introduced to Robert Hatten’s concept of the troping of temporality. As we recall, Hatten’s model is explicitly linguistic and literary in its

¹¹⁰ Connor, Steven. *Samuel Beckett: Repetition, Theory, and Text*, (Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1988), 8.

conception, and Hatten applies it primarily to tonal works. Although Hatten does not state that tonality is a necessary condition for the troping of temporality, the non-tonal works he cites are generally of a developmental, narrative nature. Nowhere does Hatten address the question of whether or not it is possible for a non-narrative work to trope temporality. If, as Hatten says, the troping of temporality involves “the complex syntheses created when composers explore the unexpected relationships between the expected locations of musical events and the actual locations where they appear,” then it becomes somewhat difficult to describe *For Samuel Beckett* unequivocally as a work which tropes temporality, since the definition given above seems to depend upon traditional narrative forms and thematic development. A work bearing no relationship to classical developing forms may seem at first glance to be automatically excluded by this definition. On the other hand, perhaps Hatten’s definition may be generalized to include those works that explore unexpected relationships between time and temporality (to use Hatten’s terms) or between memory and the ongoing present. By this measure, Feldman does indeed trope temporality. He does this by contracting tempo (“time,” in Hatten’s terminology; “timing” in Feldman’s) in ways that are sometimes audible, and sometimes inaudible. Additionally, he continuously varies material in a manner suggestive neither of stasis, nor of development as traditionally understood, and by using repeating figures that somehow suggest timekeeping, but are neither periodic, nor predictable. Thus, Feldman’s work progresses in a manner that is temporally ambiguous, with a problematic relationship between time and temporality. Temporality is, therefore, troped.

5.2.1 Comparison to Deleuze’s Time-Image

We can draw a parallel here between the conventions of montage and plot development in the cinema of Deleuze’s motion-image and with the narrative-development model of teleological music. A similar parallel therefore exists between Deleuze’s time-image and non-narrative music – in other words, between works in which “time is no longer subject to motion.” Like the irrationally-constructed montages of the post-war European cinema, Feldman’s sonic assemblages do not follow any sort of causal relationship. When we consider linear

development as musical motion, much recent music does, in fact, emancipate time (“temporality,” in Hatten’s usage) from motion. Goldstein notes that

With all the attention placed on the liberation of sound in twentieth-century music, a more profound and far-reaching liberation has sometimes been ignored: the liberation of time...A temporal landscape is created where memory, the cornerstone of perceiving musical form, is constantly thwarted.¹¹¹

While Feldman is hardly the only composer to whom this applies, it is worth noting that Kramer thinks that his work “best epitomizes vertical time.” This statement, however, is worth reconsidering. Kramer’s work, like much scholarship on time in music, seems hopelessly stuck on the duality of narrative versus non-narrative, or horizontal as opposed to vertical. If there is one thing which post-structural thought has taught us, it is that relationships between concepts are more complex and problematic than simple binary oppositions suggest. Feldman’s work is so rich because it both affirms and interrogates the linear progression of time. His sense of temporality, as expressed in *For Samuel Beckett*, is uniquely his own, and has little in common with many other supposedly “vertical” composers. Feldman states that we cannot imagine a Beethoven of undifferentiated Time. This may be true, but we can almost imagine such a Feldman. But in actuality, Feldman’s flat temporal surface is not completely undifferentiated. If it were, it could not deal with memory, and therefore, it could not truly trope temporality. Feldman needs difference as much as Beethoven does, even if their respective approaches to time are nearly antithetical.

5.3 CLOSING REMARKS

Future work on time in music will need to focus on differing strategies of temporality. As Goldstein notes, this, possibly even more so than the oft-cited liberation of sound, has been one of the real innovations of musical modernism, and one of the ongoing concerns of postmodernism. Contemporary audiences, having been brought up on modern dance music, with its aesthetic of repetition and general lack of organic development, do not necessarily take linear

¹¹¹ Goldstein, “Morton Feldman and the Shape of Time,” 74-75.

development as a given.¹¹² This suggests that our understanding of time and memory is changing, as musical forms reflect wider ideas about time and memory in the broader culture.

The present study has made modest use of a few concepts borrowed from Gilles Deleuze's work in an attempt to understand Feldman's use of difference and repetition, and his manipulation of time and memory. Future investigations may find Deleuze's concepts, especially as developed in the works on cinema, to be of use in understanding time and memory in music. While Deleuze's work has had some influence on musicology and music criticism, his writings have had far less of an impact on musical analysis. This is understandable, given that Deleuze was a rather prolific writer, and his work is complex and difficult. Additionally, given the curious split in musical scholarship between criticism and analysis, theorists are more likely to dismiss Deleuze's work as unrelated to analytic concerns. This is not the place to discuss the state of musical scholarship and its division into theorists and musicologists, but it is worth remembering our earlier discussion of the inadequacies of traditional analytical models in dealing with non-teleological music. If we can accept that traditional analysis rests upon a philosophical basis ultimately having its roots in nineteenth-century European romanticism, an analytical model more appropriate to the music of our era will ultimately need to rest upon the philosophical models of the present day.

¹¹² I recall a former student who, having been exposed primarily to hip-hop music, found the concept of a tonal progression completely alien. He was similarly confused by modulation, thematic development, and other concepts associated with the teleological aspect of narrative tonal music.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almén, Byron, and Edward Pearsall (ed.). *Approaches to Meaning in Music*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2006.

Beckett, Samuel. *Proust*. London: Chatto and Windus, 2000.

—. *Collected Shorter Plays*. New York: Grove Press, 1984.

Bergson, Henri. *Matter and Memory*. Translated N.M. Paul and W.S. Palmer. New York: Zone, 1991.

Burke, Edmund. "A Philosophical Enquiry into the Sublime and the Beautiful." In *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Sublime and the Beautiful and Other Pre-Revolutionary Writings*, edited by David Wormersley, 49-200. London: Penguin, 1998.

Claren, Sebastian. *Neither: Die Musik Morton Feldmans*. Hofheim, Germany: Wolke Verlag, 2000.

Cone, Edward. "Three Ways of Reading a Detective Story – Or a Brahms Intermezzo," in *Music: A View from Delft: Selected Essays*, ed. Robert P. Morgan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989, 77-94.

Connor, Steven. "Samuel Beckett: Repetition, Theory, and Text." Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1988.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinema I: The Motion-Image*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberham. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.

—. *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.

—. *Difference and Repetition*, trans. Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

—. *Francis Bacon: The Logic Of Sensation*, trans. Daniel W. Smith. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

- . *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*, trans. Tom Conley. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1992.
- . *The Logic Of Sense*, trans. Mark Lester with Charles Stivale; ed. Constantin V. Boundas. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.
- DeLio, Thomas. *The Music of Morton Feldman*. New York: Excelsior Music Publishing, 1996.
- Feldman, Morton. *Give My Regards to Eighth Street: Collected Writings of Morton Feldman*. Edited by B. H. Friedman. Cambridge, MA: Exact Change, 2000.
- Flaxman, Gregory. *The Brain is the Screen: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Cinema*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.
- Gann, Kyle. "Almost Too Beautiful." <http://www.cnvill.net/mfkgann2.htm> (accessed February 1, 2011.)
- Goldstein, Louis. "Morton Feldman and the Shape of Time." In *Perspectives on American Music Since 1950*, by James R. Heintze, 67-80. New York, New York: Garland, 1999.
- Hirata, Catherine Costello. "The Sounds of the Sounds Themselves: Analyzing the Early Music of Morton Feldman." *Perspectives of New Music* 34, no. 1 (Winter 1996).
- Johnson, Tom. "Remembrance", *Musiktexte*, No. 22, Cologne, Germany: December 1987.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Judgement*, trans. Werner S. Pluhar. New York: Cosimo, 2007.
- Knowlson, James. *Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 2004.
- Kramer, Jonathan D. *The Time of Music*. New York, New York: Schirmer, 1988.
- Ligeti, György. *Metamorphoses of Musical Form*. Vol. VII, in *Die Reihe*, translated by Cornelius Cardew, 10-20. Bryn Mawr, PA: Theodore Presser, 1965.
- Murakami, Haruki. *Kafka on the Shore*, trans. Philip Gabriel. New York: Knopf, 2005.
- Nattiez, Jean-Jacques. *Music and Discourse: Toward a Semiology of Music*, trans. Carolyn Abbate. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Pearsall, Edward. "Anti-Teleological Art." In *Approaches to Meaning in Music*, by Byron Almén and Edward Pearsall, edited by Byron Almén and Edward Pearsall, 41-61. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2000.
- Rodowick, D. N. *Gilles Deleuze's Time Machine*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.

Rumph, Stephen C. *Beethoven After Napoleon: Political Romanticism in the Late Works*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2004.

Ross, Alex. "Pensive Music Yearning To Be Alone." *The New York Times*, August 6, 1996.

_. *The Rest is Noise*. New York, New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux, 2007.

Williams, James. "Gilles Deleuze's Difference and Repetition: An Introduction and Guide." Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.

Williams, Jan. "An Interview With Morton Feldman." *Percussive Notes*, September 1983: 4-14.

DISCOGRAPHY

Feldman, Morton. *For Samuel Beckett*. Klangforum Wien. Sylvain Cambreling Kairos 0012012KAI

___ Kammerensemble Neue Musik Berlin. Roland Kluttig CPO 999 647-2

___ San Francisco Contemporary Chamber Music Players. Stephen Mosko. Newport Classic Premier NPD 85506

I MEET YOU. I REMEMBER YOU., FOR VIOLIN AND CHAMBER ORCHESTRA.

Instrumentation:

Solo Violin

Flute

Alto Flute

English horn

Clarinet in Bb

Bass Clarinet

Tenor Saxophone

2 Horns

Trumpet

Trombone

Drum Set

Electric Guitar (with E-Bow) – D-string tuned 1/4 tone flat

Harp - F2, D4, and F4 tuned 1/4 flat

Synthesizer I (polyphonic); doubling on Toy Piano

Synthesizer II (monophonic)

Viola

Cello

Double Bass

Note on Synthesizer tuning: The pitch classes C#, D, F, and A# are tuned approximately a quarter-tone flat in all octaves. For the premiere, it was decided to employ a kind of altered mean-tone tuning (centered around E) in the synthesizers, in order to better match the flexible intonation of the winds and strings and to emphasize E as the tonal center. The following tuning adjustments were made (showing the deviation in cents from equal temperament):

C: -17	C#: -59	D: -47	D#: -11	E: 0	F: -57
F#: -5.	G: +6	G#: -7	A: -2	A#: -57	B: +2

The harp and guitar used the synthesizer as a reference for their detuned strings.

The polyphonic synthesizer used a patch resembling an electric piano (Rhodes or Wurlitzer type), and the monophonic synthesizer was set to a patch resembling an Ondes Martenot. Other patches are permissible. The drummer should be skilled at improvising and elaborating on a written part as well as reading from notation.

All instruments sound as written (except for the usual octave transpositions).

i meet you. i remember you.

for violin and chamber orchestra

for Roger Zahab, and the members of the Eclectic Laboratory Chamber Orchestra

David Gerrard Matthews
(b. 1976)

1. canso (stanzas)
flowing, with tranquil uneasiness

2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14

sempre dolce ed esp.

Flute *p*

Alto Flute *pp*

English Horn *ppp*

Clarinet in B \flat

Bass Clarinet in B \flat *pp*

Tenor Saxophone *ppp*

Horn I in F *pp*

Horn II in F *pp*

Trumpet in B \flat *p* *dolce*

Trb. *cantando* *pp*

Drum Kit *pp* very soft roll on crash cym

Electric Guitar *mf* Clean tone, blend well with winds, strings, and harp. 12-string detuned 1/4 tone flat

Harp *f* *mf* [P2, D4, and F4 detuned 1/4 tone flat]

Synthesizer I (polyphonic) *mf* [Quasi-electric piano (Rhodes or Wurlitzer) - see notes for tuning]

Synthesizer II (monophonic) [See notes for tuning] *mf* [Quasi-Ondes Martenot]

Solo Violin *mp* *sempre dolce*

Viola *pizz* *p* *arco esp* *mf*

Violoncello *cantando* *f*

Double Bass *f*

[Except where indicated, vary the ostinato drum part. The basic pattern is 23 beats long.]

15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Fl. *p* *mf*

A. Fl. *mf*

Eng. Hn. *pp* *esp.* *p*

Cl. *p*

B. Cl. *mf*

Ten. Sax. *pp*

Hn. I *pp*

Hn. II *pp*

Tpt. *pp*

Tbn. *pp* *pp* *ppp*

Dr.

E. Gtr.

Hp. *Eb* *Eb*

Synth. I

Synth. II

Solo Vln. *pp* *mf* *p* *mf* *f*

Vln. *f* *pp* *f* *pp* *mf* *pp*

Vc. *f*

Db. *mp*

3/4 2/4

3/4 2/4

15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42

Fl. *pp* *p* *mf* *mf*

A. Fl. *mp* *pp* *mf*

Eng. Hn. *pp* *p*

Cl. *mp* *pp* *mf*

B. Cl. *mf*

Ten. Sax. *p*

Hn. I *ppp* *ppp* *p* *ppp* *ppp*

Hn. II *p* *p* *ppp*

Tpt. *mf* *pp* *ppp* *mp*

Ttb. *p* *mf* *mf*

Dr. *pick*

E. Gtr. *pick*

Hp. *ff*

Synth. I *f*

Synth. II

Solo Vln. *p* *f* *p* *ff* *p* *p* *f* *ff*

Vln. *pp* *f* *p* *f* *pp* *f*

Vc. *ff*

Db. *mf* *f*

3/4 2/4 3/4 2/4

43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54

3/4 2/4 3/4

Fl. *mf* *pp*

A. Fl. *f* *mp* *pp*

Eng. Hn. *p*

Cl. *mf*

B. Cl. *mf*

Ten. Sax. *mf*

Hn. I *pp* *pp* *mf* *pp* *mf*

Hn. II *pp* *mp* *p* *pp*

Tpt. *ppp* *p* *mf*

Ttb. *pp* *mf*

Dr.

E. Gtr. **3/4 2/4 3/4**

Hp. *Gtr.*

Synth. I *f*

Synth. II

Solo Vin. *pp* *f* *non esp.* *almost violently* *p*

Via. *f* *pp* *mf* *p* *p*

Vc. *pp* *f*

Db. *ff*

82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95

Fl. *ff* *pp* *ppp* *pp*

A. Fl. *ppp* *f* *f* *pp*

Eog. Hn. *ppp* *ppp* *mf* *pp*

Cl. *mf* *p* *ppp* *ppp* *f*

B. Cl. *mf* *pp*

Ten. Sax. *ppp* *p* *mf* *p*

Hn. I. *mf*

Hn. II. *mf*

Tpt. *pp* *mf* *pp* *pp* *mf* *ppp*

Tbn. *pp* *mp*

Dr. *pp*

E. Gtr. *pp*

Hp. *p* *f* *Gt*

Synth. I. *pp*

Synth. II. *pp*

Solo Vln. *p* *ff* *ff* *p* *mp* *p* *pp* *sal pont.*

Vla. *f*

Vc. *f*

Db. *f*

3/4 2/4

con sord.

flaut. *(ord.)*

sal pont.

D1 Gb F D Gt

96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109

Fl. *f* *pp* *p*

A. Fl. *mp*

Eng. Hn. *p*

Cl. *pp* *mf* *f* *f* *mf* *pp*

B. Cl. *p* *pp* *fff*

Ten. Sax. *mf* *f* *pp* *f*

Hn. I *pp* *pp* *pp* *mf* *pp* *pp*

Hn. II *pp* *pp* *ppp* *mf* *ppp* *pp* *mf*

Tpt. *pp* *mf* *pp* *pp* *p* (con sord)

Tbn. *f*

Dr. *f*

E. Gtr. *f* *pick* *3*

Hp. *Al*

Synth. I

Synth. II *f* *legato*

Solo Vin. *fff* *mp* *p* *pp* *vibemently* *arco*

Via. *fff*

Vc. *f* *pp* *p*

Db. *fff* *"Bartók" pizz* *fff* *arco* *fff*

3/4 2/4 3/4 2/4 3/4

110 $\frac{3}{4}$ 111 $\frac{2}{4}$ 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 $\frac{3}{4}$ 121 $\frac{3}{4}$ 122 $\frac{2}{4}$

Fl. *f* *pp* *p*

A. Fl. *p* *pp* *pp* *pp*

Eng. Hn. *mf* *pp* *pp* *pp* *mp*

Cl. *pp* *esp* *mp*

B. Cl. *cantabile* *pp* *ppp*

Ten. Sax. *ff* *p* *pp*

Hn. I *mf* *pp*

Hn. II *pp* *ppp*

Tpt. *mf* *pp*

Ttb. *ff* *pp* *ppp*

Dr. *mf* *pp* *ppp*

E. Gtr. *p* (non harm.)

Hp. *Rt*

Synth. I

Synth. II

Solo Vln. *ppp* *n* *pp*

Vln. *fff* *sub. p* *col legno battuto* *nonesp. arco* *p*

Vc. *p*

Db. *p* *gliss along E string (from as high as possible down to open string and back)* *seagull effect!*

ii. tombeaux
sostenuto, solemm, lumineux

123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136

Fl. *p* *p* *ppp* *p piu possibile (throughout this section)*

A. Fl. *ppp* *ppp* *p piu possibile (throughout this section)*

Eng. Hn. *n*

Cl. *p* *ppp* *pp* *p piu possibile (throughout this section)*

B. Cl. *pp* *p piu possibile (throughout this section)*

Ten. Sax. *pp* *pp* *p piu possibile (throughout this section)*

Hn. I *p piu possibile (throughout this section)*

Hn. II *p piu possibile (throughout this section)*

Tpt. *senza sord* *p* *p piu possibile (throughout this section)*

Trb. *p piu possibile (throughout this section)*

Dr. *p*

E. Gtr. *pp* *p (throughout this section)*

Hp. *mf* *p (throughout this section)*

Synth. I *p (throughout this section)*

Synth. II *p* *ppp* *p (throughout this section)*

Solo Vln. *ppp* *f* *p* *mp* *n*

Vla. *p* *non dim.* *p (throughout this section)* *p (throughout this section)*

Vc. *p* *p (throughout this section)*

Db. *p (throughout this section)*

137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147

Fl.

A. Fl.

Eng. Hn.

Cl.

B. Cl.

Ten. Sax.

Hn. I

Hn. II

Tpt.

Ttb.

Dr.

E. Gtr.

Hp.

Synth. I

Synth II

Solo Vin.

Via.

Vc.

Db.

3/4 5/4 3/4 5/4 3/4 5/4 3/4

without a trace of expression

mp

mp

EF7GHA1
B1C4D6

EF7GHA1
B1C4D6

148 3/4 149 5/4 150 3/4 151 3/4 152 3/4 153 3/4 154 5/4 155 3/4 156 3/4 157 3/4 158 5/4

Fl.
A. Fl.
Eng. Hn.
Cl.
B. Cl.
Ton. Sax.
Hn. I
Hn. II
Tpt.
Trb.
Dr.
E. Gtr.
Hp.
Synth. I
Synth II
Solo Vln.
Vla.
Vc.
Db.

mp p ppp

REPIGNAI
BICORD

170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181

Fl.

A. Fl.

Eng. Hn.

Cl.

B. Cl.

Ten. Sax.

Hn. I

Hn. II

Tpt.

Ttb.

Dr.

E. Gtr.

Hp.

Synth. I

Synth. II

Solo Vln.

Vln.

Vc.

Db.

The musical score is arranged in a system of staves. At the top, measure numbers 170 through 181 are indicated. Above measures 173 and 174, the time signature changes to 3/4 and 5/4 respectively. Above measures 178 and 179, it changes to 3/4 and 5/4. The instruments listed on the left are Flute (Fl.), Alto Flute (A. Fl.), English Horn (Eng. Hn.), Clarinet (Cl.), Bass Clarinet (B. Cl.), Tenor Saxophone (Ten. Sax.), Horn I (Hn. I), Horn II (Hn. II), Trumpet (Tpt.), Trombone (Ttb.), Drums (Dr.), Electric Guitar (E. Gtr.), Harp (Hp.), Synthetizer I (Synth. I), Synthetizer II (Synth. II), Solo Violin (Solo Vln.), Violin (Vln.), Viola (Vc.), and Double Bass (Db.). The Harp part includes chord diagrams for F#FG#AA1 and B#C#D#A. The score contains various musical notations including notes, rests, and dynamic markings.

iii. interpolation
(solo violin alone)
parlando, molto rubato

194 5/4 195 2/4 196 3/4 197 2/4 198 5/4 199 2/4 200 3/4 201 2/4 6/4

Fl.

A. Fl.

Eng. Hn.

Cl.

B. Cl.

Ten. Sax.

Hn. I

Hn. II

Tpt.

Trb.

Dr.

E. Gr.

Hp.

Toy Pno.

Synth. I

Synth. II

Solo Vin. *mp* *f* *p* *f* *mf* *p* *f*

Vla.

Vc.

Db.

iv. *déploration*. (D.K.A. in memoriam)
Sempre pianissimo e tranquillo

202 $\frac{6}{4}$ 203 $\frac{4}{4}$ $J = 44$ 204 205 206 207 $\frac{3}{4}$

Fl. *sempre pp e senza esp.*

A. Fl. *sempre pp e senza esp.*

Eng. Ha. *sempre pp e senza esp.*

Cl. *sempre pp e senza esp.*

B. Cl. *sempre pp e senza esp.*

Ten. Sax. *sempre pp e senza esp.*

Hn. I *con sord.* *sempre pp e senza esp.* *sempre pp e senza esp.*

Hn. II *con sord.* *sempre pp e senza esp.*

Tpt. *con sord.* *sempre pp e senza esp.*

Trb. *con sord.* *sempre pp e senza esp.*

Dr. *Very slow, but steadily moving eighth-note pattern. The basic unit is again 23 beats (5 bars of 4 + 1 bar of 3). Vary after the first cycle. Always sotto.*

B. Gr. *sempre pp e senza esp.*

Hp. *mf throughout*

Toy Pno. *very prominently throughout*

Synth. I

Synth. II

Solo Vln. *p pp* *con sord.* *sempre pp e senza esp.*

Vln. *con sord.* *sempre pp e senza esp.*

Vc. *(Note: This pitch is C \sharp , not C-quarter-sharp as elsewhere in the piece.)* *con sord.* *sempre pp e senza esp.*

Vcl. *con sord.*

Db.

208 3/4 209 4/4 210 211 212 213 214 3/4 #p. 4/4

Fl.

A. Fl.

Eng. Hn.

Cl.

B. Cl.

Ten. Sax.

Hn. I

Hn. II

Tpt.

Trb.

Dr.

B. Gtr.

Hp.

Toy Pno.

Synth. I

Synth. II

Solo Vln.

Vln.

Vc.

Db.

sempre pp e senza esp.

sempre pp e non esp

(rebow discretely as necessary)

Detailed description: This page of a musical score covers measures 208 to 214. The score is for a large orchestra and a solo violin. The top section includes woodwinds (Flute, Flute in A, English Horn, Clarinet, Bass Clarinet, Tenor Saxophone), brass (Horn I & II, Trumpet, Trombone), and percussion (Drum, Bass Guitar, Harp, Toy Piano). The bottom section includes Synthesizers I & II, Solo Violin, Violin, Viola, and Double Bass. The score features complex rhythmic patterns, including a 3/4 to 4/4 change at measure 209 and a 3/4 to 4/4 change at measure 214. Dynamic markings include *sempre pp e senza esp.* and *sempre pp e non esp*. Performance instructions for the double bass include *(rebow discretely as necessary)*. The Solo Violin part has a *pp* marking at the beginning of measure 208.

Musical score for measures 215-220. The score is arranged in a system with multiple staves. The instruments and their parts are as follows:

- Fl.:** Flute part, starting with a melodic line in measure 215.
- A. Fl.:** Alto Flute part, mostly silent.
- Eng. Hn.:** English Horn part, mostly silent.
- Cl.:** Clarinet part, playing a melodic line with some grace notes.
- B. Cl.:** Bass Clarinet part, mostly silent.
- Ten. Sax.:** Tenor Saxophone part, mostly silent.
- Hn. I:** Horn I part, mostly silent.
- Hn. II:** Horn II part, mostly silent.
- Tpt.:** Trumpet part, mostly silent.
- Trb.:** Trombone part, mostly silent.
- Dr.:** Drums, playing a steady rhythmic pattern.
- B. Gtr.:** Electric Guitar part, playing a melodic line.
- Hp.:** Piano part, playing a complex rhythmic accompaniment.
- Toy Pno.:** Toy Piano part, playing a rhythmic accompaniment.
- Synth II:** Synthesizer II part, mostly silent.
- Solo Vin.:** Solo Violin part, playing a melodic line.
- Vla.:** Viola part, mostly silent.
- Vc.:** Violoncello part, mostly silent.
- Db.:** Double Bass part, playing a melodic line.

Measure numbers 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, and 220 are indicated above the staves. Time signatures include 4/4 and 3/4. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings.

221 222 223 224 225 226 227

Fl. $\frac{4}{4}$ $\frac{3}{4}$ $\frac{4}{4}$

A. Fl.

Eng. Hn.

Cl.

B. Cl.

Ten. Sax.

Hn. I

Hn. II

Tpt.

Trb.

Dr.

B. Gtr. *ebow* $\frac{4}{4}$ $\frac{3}{4}$ $\frac{4}{4}$

Hp.

Toy Pno.

Synth II

Solo Vin. $\frac{4}{4}$ $\frac{3}{4}$ $\frac{4}{4}$

Vla.

Vc.

Db. *pizz*

228 229 230 231 232 233 234

Fl.

A. Fl.

Eng. Hn.

Cl.

B. Cl.

Ten. Sax.

Hn. I

Hn. II

Tpt.

Trb.

Dr.

B. Gtr.

Hp.

Toy Pno.

Synth II

Solo Vin.

Vla.

Vc.

Db.

3/4 4/4

ebow

3/4 4/4

arco

235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243

Fl.

A. Fl.

Eng. Hn.

Cl.

B. Cl.

Ten. Sax.

Hn. I

Hn. II

Tpt.

Ttb.

Dr.

B. Gtr.

Hp.

Toy Pno.

Synth II

Solo Vin.

Vla.

Vc.

Db.

pick

pizz

$\frac{3}{4}$ $\frac{4}{4}$ $\frac{3}{4}$ $\frac{4}{4}$ $\frac{3}{4}$

244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251

Fl.

A. Fl.

Eng. Hn.

Cl.

B. Cl.

Ten. Sax.

Hn. I

Hn. II

Tpt.

Trb.

Dr.

B. Gtr.

Hp.

Toy Pno.

Synth II

Solo Vin.

Vla.

Vc.

Db.

252 253 254 255 256 257

Fl.
A. Fl.
Eng. Hn.
Cl.
B. Cl.
Ten. Sax.
Hn. I
Hn. II
Tpt.
Trb.
Dr.
B. Gtr.
Hp.
Toy Pno.
Synth II
Solo Vin.
Vla.
Vc. (pizz, arco)
Db.

3/4 4/4

3/4 4/4

252 253 254 255 256 257

3/4 4/4

pizz arco

258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266

Fl.
A. Fl.
Eng. Hn.
Cl.
B. Cl.
Ten. Sax.
Hn. I
Hn. II
Tpt.
Ttb.
Dr.
B. Gtr.
Hp.
Toy Pno.
Synth II
Solo Vin.
Vla.
Vc.
Db.

3/4 4/4

267 ²⁶⁸ $\frac{3}{4}$ ²⁶⁹ $\frac{4}{4}$ 270

Fl.
A. Fl.
Eng. Hn.
Cl.
B. Cl.
Ten. Sax.
Hn. I
Hn. II
Tpt.
Ttb.
Dr.
E. Gtr.
Hp.
Toy Pno.
Synth II
Solo Vin.
Vla.
Vc.
Db.

271 272 273 274

Fl.
A. Fl.
Eng. Hn.
Cl.
B. Cl.
Ten. Sax.
Hn. I
Hn. II
Tpt.
Ttb.
Dr.
E. Gtr.
Hp.
Toy Pno.
Synth II
Solo Vin.
Vla.
Vc.
Db.

7/8

7/8